bilig
AUTUMN 2022/ISSUE 103
183-209

Araştırma Makalesi / Research Article

Code-Switching Pattern of Turkish-Russian Bilingual Ahıska Turks and Matrix Language Frame Model*

Kayhan İnan**

Abstract

During the 75 years following Ahıska Turks' expatriation from their homeland in Soviet Georgia in 1944 to the Central Asian Soviet Republics, they have evolved into a multilingual society. Ahıska Turks use Turkish and Russian language pairs in their daily communication. They adopt code-switching strategies in their daily communication. Turkish-Russian code-switching pattern of Ahıska Turks was not analyzed linguistically in terms of bilingual communication. Therefore, this study aims to investigate Ahıska Turks from a different perspective. It reflects the code-switching situation by examining the Bishkek show of Miko Şov, an Ahıska Turks' comedy group. The records were investigated based on the Matrix Language Frame Model and the pattern is divided into categories as nouns, adjectives, adpositions, verbs, and adverbs. It is determined that the same strategies were followed with other Turkic languages contacting Russian.

Keywords

Ahıska Turks, code-switching, Matrix Language Frame Model, Turkish-Russian bilingualism, Turkish diaspora.

---

* Date of Arrival: 28 Şubat 2021 – Date of Acceptance: 01 Mart 2022
You can refer to this article as follows:
İnan, Kayhan. "Code-Switching Pattern of Turkish-Russian Bilingual Ahıska Turks and Matrix Language Frame Model." *bilig*, no. 103, 2022, ss. 183-209.

** Dr., Amasya University, Faculty of Education, Department of Turkish and Social Sciences Education – Amasya/Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-7438-0742
kayhan.inan@amasya.edu.tr

Introduction

Ahıska Turks are one of the Caucasian peoples who were exiled to Central Asia and Siberia in the Stalin period. The studies in the literature generally discussed the Ahıska Turks with the issues surrounding social and political problems related to the exile in 1944 (see Trier and Khanzin). However, the investigation of Ahıska Turks in a sociolinguistic context is a relatively recent topic of interest. They are of a unique position in linguistic and cultural terms as they live in the Soviet Union but speak both Turkish and Russian languages.

The issues about linguistic contacts of the Turkish immigrants and minorities living in Western Europe and the Balkans with the dominant languages in those countries are well-known and described thoroughly (Backus, *Patterns of Language, Two in One*; Şener; Petrou; Ahmed). However, the contact between Turkish and Russian languages in bilingual communication has not been studied, especially in code-switching. Several studies examined the contact of Russian with the Turkic languages among the Turkic peoples who lived in the Soviet Union and were exposed to the linguistic and cultural influence of Russian (Menz, Auer and Muhamedova, Jankowski, Killi Yilmaz, Yazıcı Ersoy). The Ahıska Turks share bonds with the two groups mentioned above; therefore, an analysis of bilingualism and code-switching among the Ahıska Turks would contribute to the literature. This paper aimed to describe the Turkish-Russian code-switching patterns using the Matrix Language Frame Model (MLFM).

Following the introduction, the second part provided an overview of Ahıska Turks' community and their language use. The third section briefly introduces the Matrix Language Frame Model (MLFM) and the assumptions related to Ahıska Turks' language use. In the fourth part, the data collection and analysis procedures were presented. The fifth chapter was the main body of the article and described the patterns (e.g., noun, adjective, preposition, verb, and adverb order) in which Turkish was the matrix language, and Russian was the embedded language. The MLFM assumptions were also tested on the data and compared with the findings in the literature. The study results were discussed in the sixth section.

Ahıska Turks and Language Use in Multilingual Context

Ahıska Turks are a Turkish-speaking community originally living in the Ahıska, border region between Türkiye and Georgia (i.e. *Samtskhe-Javakheti* today). Due to Türkiye and Ahıska Turks' historical and cultural ties, they were considered "potential enemies" of the Soviet Union in case of a war (Kreindler 392). In 1944, they were exiled to Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Kyrgyzstan and were not allowed to return to their homelands. They were not recognized as an 'official nation' and could not assert their cultural, educational, and political representation rights. Due to the ethnic conflicts in Uzbekistan in 1989, they experienced the second wave of exile and were settled in Russia and Ukraine. Following the Soviet Union's disintegration, the mass migration to Türkiye and the USA began. Today, Ahıska Turks are a transnational community) dispersed in nine countries with a population of nearly four hundred thousand (Aydıngün, *Creating Recreating*).

Family and kinship ties that extend beyond borders show the evidence of creating a shared identity regardless of geography. It is shaped around Turkish identity and language, which is considered the myth and the reason for the exile. Regardless of the country, they live in, Ahıska Turks have a strong bond with the Turkish language. Although Ahıska Turks do not live in Türkiye and have close relationships with modern Türkiye, Turkish is still their primary language (Trier and Khanzin). As they have been exposed to cultural pressure and discrimination, they assume Turkish to define themselves and an instrument against assimilation (Aydıngün et al. 24).

Before the exile in 1944, Ahıska Turks were a monolingual community living in villages in the Ahıska region of Georgia. After the exile, they lived in a closed community in rural and engaged in agriculture. They could not claim their language and cultural rights in those new settlements. As the community members attend Russian schools and learn Russian for a living, bilingualism has resulted among Ahıska Turks. Even the Russian media once mentioned them as a unique community speaking 'a strange mixture of 19th century Turkish and modern Russian' (Whitehouse).

Ahıska Turks use Turkish for daily communication in family and community and prefer Russian for communicating with other communities and public service. The bilingual mode (Grosjean) has become a standard form of

communication among Ahıska Turks. Their language repertoire can include additional languages such as Uzbek, Kazakh, Kyrgyz, and English, depending on the country of residence. Nevertheless, they still cannot use cultural rights, including education in their native language, except in Türkiye and Azerbaijan. The quantitative research results conducted by the İnan with the participation of 131 Ahıska Turks in Kyrgyzstan and the field notes show that Ahıska Turks can be described as three groups according to their Turkish proficiency.

Individuals above 50 years old: This is the oldest generation who speaks Turkish in Ahıska Turk community. This generation was exposed to the exile or was born right after the exile. They had to live in small villages and a closed environment with limited educational and economic opportunities. Turkish was their native language, and they learned Russian. Men's Russian speaking skills were better than women's as women had fewer educational opportunities and men had military service and worked in different jobs. Turkish was the primary communication language in this generation.

Individuals between 30-49 years old: This generation had tight communication with other language societies due to education and business. While these groups also learned Turkish first, they were introduced with Russian at an earlier stage compared to the previous generation. Therefore, this group uses Turkish and Russian in their daily communications. Individuals in this age group have weaker Turkish speaking and listening skills than the previous generation, however, their Turkish reading and writing skills are better. Individuals in this generation had the chance to visit Türkiye and follow Turkish media in their adolescence and early adulthood.

Individuals between 10-29 years old: Turkish was still the first language for those. Besides, this generation was exposed to Russian through media and communication tools at a much earlier age than other generations. They also learned about the Turkish media during infancy and childhood. Some received education in Türkiye or attended Turkish schools in their region. Hence, this generation showed better reading and writing skills in Turkish than former generations. However, the primary language of communication outside was Russian.

Borrowing from Russian to Turkish and code-switching are common in the language, a sign of bilingualism. The community speaks Russian for functional reasons. They use Russian equivalents of daily life devices, tools, and instruments to bridge the semantic gap. Russian words and phrases are also preferred for public institutions, authorities, and the items and situations in public.

Methodology

Although there are many different terms and definitions for code-switching in the literature, this study adopted Myers-Scotton's approach and terminology, which underlines the use of two languages in the same speech (*Multiple Voices* 239). Code-switching occurs in two ways: intrasentential and intersentential forms. Intrasentential code-switching is acknowledged as the classic code-switching by Myers-Scotton and is the central research topic of the MLFM (*Multiple Voices*).

The MLFM describes the typical code-switching in a morphosyntactic framework. In this study, Myers-Scotton's MLF (*Constructing the Frame*, *Dueling Languages*) and the 4-M (Myers-Scotton and Jake, *Revisiting the 4-M*) models were applied to the Turkish-Russian language data of Ahıska Turks as the model has been validated on very different languages by typological features.

As Myers-Scotton stated, the MLFM describes the relationships between the dominant and recessive structures of two languages in contact (*Constructing the Frame*, *Dueling Languages*). The dominant language in the model constitutes the discourse's general framework and is called the *matrix language*. On the other hand, recessive language is embedded in this frame and creates a second channel in the matrix language. Therefore, recessive language is called the *embedded language*. Although some scholars find the model problematic the MLFM was performed on the study data without any problems (Gardner-Chloros, MacSwan, Muysken 64-69).

Myers-Scotton argues that grammatical features should be considered with linguistic indicators of a community in determining the matrix language (*Comparing Codeswitching*). They emphasize that the language without any indicator is the matrix language. Besides, Myers-Scotton suggest reflecting the general discourse instead of a single sentence and claim that the lan-

guage with more morphemes can be accepted as the matrix language (*Constructing the Frame*). The study data were collected from the Ahıska Turks performing stage shows in Turkish. The matrix language was Turkish, and the embedded language was Russian. Turkish is richer in grammatical items than Russian, which implies Turkish as the matrix language in the model.

The matrix and embedded languages were structurally examined using the 4-M Model (Myers-Scotton, *Multiple Voices*). In the model, content and system morphemes in the matrix and embedded languages constitute matrix language island, embedded language island, and matrix language + embedded language island patterns. Content morphemes include nouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs. System morphemes refer to suffixes, prepositions, conjunctions, and affixation structures that do not have thematic roles (Myers-Scotton and Jake, *Revisiting the 4-M*). Accordingly, it is anticipated that there would be more Turkish language islands than Russian and common language islands based on both Turkish and Russian. Those assumptions were tested on the MLFM.

The Matrix Language Hypothesis, one of those assumptions, describes the roles of content and system morphemes between the dominant language and the recessive language. The matrix language determines the order of system morphemes. Thus, it can be inferred that the Turkish and Russian structures are ordered based on the Turkish syntax. The system morphemes such as an adjective, adverb, possession, and modal also come from Turkish.

When the matrix language and the embedded language morphemes are not typologically compatible, *the matrix language blocking hypothesis* is considered. If the morphemes from Russian do not fit with Turkish's typology, they are blocked, resulting in a composite structure suitable for Turkish. However, if the morphemes from Russian are included in the pattern despite Turkish dominance, it is called *the embedded language trigger hypothesis*. In this case, Russian morphemes are considered an integrative part of the embedded language island. However, the number of morphemes that surpass the matrix language and establish an embedded language island is limited, which indicates *the embedded language hierarchy hypothesis*. The hypothesis assumes that it is difficult for components that are not an integrative structure of the embedded language to form an embedded language

island. (Myers-Scotton, *Constructing the Frame*). Accordingly, it is easier for Russian formulaic expressions to overcome the dominance of Turkish.

Myers-Scotton also acknowledges the single-word structures from embedded languages due to code-switching rather than borrowing (*Multiple Voices* 253-260). It is stressed that code-switching has structural form and phonetic harmony, occurs in bilingual communication, and has a lower frequency (Treffers-Daller, Myers-Scotton, *Comparing Codeswitching*; Matras). Besides, it may be a synchronicity problem between the native language and new language that stems from the meaning gap (Haugen). According to Myers-Scotton and Okeju, it stems from exposure to different cultural influences. As Ahıska Turks were exposed to Soviet education and culture, there were likely borrowings from Russian. However, it is beyond the scope of this paper.

Data and Analyze

The researcher collected the study data were at the show of Miko Şov in Kocomkul Sports Centre in Bishkek on 19.05.2017. Miko Şov is a show group based in Uzbekistan. 'The group was established to introduce and keep alive the traditions of Ahıska Turks in their language' (Süleymanov). The group is well known in the community and goes on frequent tours. The show's recordings were reviewed in this study since it is a non-community show, and many people with different demographic characteristics talk in the show.

The show includes improvised and spontaneous conversations and musical performances on a general topic. The audience actively participates in the conversations during the show. During these conversations, the speakers frequently switch codes. The show provides an authentic atmosphere for observation and recording of the language. Since the researcher was not a community member, to ensure the show's authenticity, He hid his identity from the audience, except the show's manager.

The show lasted about 150 minutes and was performed by 4 performers and 3 audiences. It was recorded with a tape recorder, and several notes were taken. Then, the recordings were transcribed except for the 60-minute concert. This concert and songs were excluded from the analysis because it was entirely Turkish and did not contain code-switching examples. The 90-minute conversation was transcribed, and the code-switching exam-

ples were labeled and numbered. The general corpus of research contains 458 sentences. Code-switching examples were found in 61 sentences. 53 sentences were analyzed in this article. 8 examples were considered as intersentential code-switching and excluded from the analysis. Turkish-Russian code-switching data were classified using adjectives, prepositions, verbs, and adverbs as Backus did in his study on the Turkish-Dutch code-switching pattern. The data in this pattern were analyzed using the MLFM (*Codeswitching as One*).

Results and Discussion

Nouns

In code-switching, nouns are switched more frequently than other word types. Muysken used a cognitive approach and stated that nouns are changed more frequently by bilinguals as nouns form a more extensive and united collection of two languages' vocabulary repertoire rather than separate forms. According to Myers-Scotton, code-switching focuses on nouns 'to fill the lexical gap in the discourse' (*Comparing Codeswitching* 30). The lexical gap occurs due to difficulties in remembering the correct word, not knowing the other language's correspondence, and not completely fulfilling the desired meaning by that word. On the other hand, since nouns are content morphemes and have less limitation than system morphemes, they facilitate filling the lexical gaps with the other language's codes. The examples show that content morpheme from the embedded language (Russian) is placed as a single word in the matrix language frame (Turkish).

(1) Yarın *kosmos*[1]-a gitseler *kosmos*-a gideriz.
Tomorrow space-DAT go-COND-3PPL space-DAT go-AOR-1PPL
'If they go to space tomorrow, we will go to space.'

(2) Bizim gençlerimiz *škola*-dan sonra okumaya yönelsinler.
I-GEN young-PL-POSS1PPL school-ABL after read-INF-DAT tend-IMP-3PPL
'Our young people should lead to studying after school.'

(3) Türlü çeşit *vopros*-ları-n-ı karşılamaya çalışırız.
Sort various question-POSS3PPL-PRO-ACC reply-INF-DAT try-AOR-1PPL
'We try to answer their various questions.'

(4) Bizim halkın *kačestva*-sı-n-ı yükseltin.
We-GEN people-GEN quality-POSS3PSG-PRO-ACC enhance-IMP-2PPL
'Increase the quality of our people.'

(5) Öyle *sejf*-te saklıyoruz filmi.
As such case-LOC keep-PROG-1PPL movie-ACC
'We are keeping the film in the safe like that.'

(6a) Yok *neopytnyj*-ler-e vurdurmuyorum.
No inexperienced-MAS-PL-DAT inject-CAUS-NEG-PROG-1PSG
'I do not give an injection to inexperienced.'

(6b) Ben *opytnyj*-ler-e vurduruyorum.
I experienced-MAS-PL-DAT inject- CAUS-PROG-1PSG
'I give an injection to experienced.'

(7) Dede neyi dörde bölüyoruz *medicina*-da?
Granpa what-ACC four-DAT divide-PROG-1PPL medicine-LOC
'Grandpa, what do we divide into four in medicine?'

(8) Var mı aranızda *lyubovnica*-dan yanan?
There is Q among-POSS2PPL-LOC mistress-ABL burn-PART
'Does any of you suffer because of a mistress?'

(9) Gözümü açtım ki *bol'nica*-da, *palata*-da
Eye-POSS1PSG-ACC open-PAST-1PSG CJ hospital-LOC chamber-LOC
yatıyorum.
lie-PROG-1PSG
'I opened my eyes; I was lying in the hospital room.'

(10) Doktorlar *mozg*-i-n-ı sıyırdı diyor.
Doctor-PL brain-POSS3PSG-PRO-ACC freak-PAST say-PROG
'Doctors say I went mad.'

The examples above (1-10) show that single words in the embedded Russian language are marked with Turkish system morphemes. Additionally, vowel harmony was applied to Russian structures with Turkish affixes, and morphologically, Russian nouns resembled the matrix language. In this sense, those examples were compatible with the morpheme order principle and system morpheme principles of MLFM. Additionally, in examples (6a) and

(6b), the Russian adjectives *neopytnyj* and *opytnyj* were used as nouns in the matrix language.

(11) *Samolët* desene. O da eğri *samolët*.
Plane say-IMP. That CJ skewed plane
'Just say place. That is a skewed plane.'

(12) Ameliyat paraları ödenmemiş, *kvitancija*
Operation money-PL-POSS3PSG pay-PASS-NEG-INPAST receipt
yok.
there is no
'Operation costs were not paid. There is no receipt.'

(13) Şimdi yaz *kanikul*-ı geldi.
Now summer vacation- POSS3PSG come-PAST
'Now we have a summer vacation.'

In examples (11) and (12), Russian nouns do not have Turkish morpheme forms. In example (13) of summer vacation *yaz kanikulı* language island, the Russian *kanikul* word was marked with Turkish third singular possessive case suffix. Although original form of the word in Russian is *kanikuly,* it was used as *kanikul*. Although it is thought that the bare form strategy is adopted in this language island due to the phonetic similarity between *-y* and *-ı*, it is more likely that it is a Turkish noun complement.

Bare forms are preferred in code-switching to eliminate the conflicts due to morpheme order differences between the languages. In examples (11) and (12), not marking by the matrix language was due to Turkish's grammatical properties, and there was no conflict. However, *eğri samolët*, in example (11), is different from others in terms of language island. The study data showed that Russian adjectives and Turkish nouns were combined to create language islands in the examples in which Turkish was the matrix language. However, these examples also revealed that a Turkish adjective described a Russian noun. Thus, the word *samolët* might be a result of borrowing rather than code-switching. A noun with a structural and semantic matrix in an adjective clause formed with Turkish's morphologic and syntagmatic properties cannot come from the embedded language through code-switching. This example can be considered a product of code-switching in the model. However, studies are emphasizing it as borrowing in the literature. For such

ambiguous cases, Myers-Scotton suggested considering the frequency of a word to accept it due to borrowing rather than code-switching (*Constructing the Frame*). However, there were no sufficient data to accept this example as borrowing in this study.

(14) İstekleri yerine getirmek için *kompozicija* hazırladık.
Request-PL-ACC perform-INF for composition prepare-PAST-2PPL
'We prepared a repertoire to meet those requests.'

(15) *Koncert*-e başlamak lazım.
Concert-DAT start-INF must
'We must start the concert.'

(16) Bakıyorum elinden *telefon* düşmüyor.
Look-PROG-1PSG hand-POSS2PSG-ABL telephone drop-NEG-PROG
'I can see that you are glued to that phone.'

(17) Burada *balet* oynardım.
Here-LOC balette play-AOR-PAST-1PSG
'I used to do ballet here.'

(18) Ben bir *professor*-la konuşayım.
I a professor-INST talk-OPT-1PSG
'I will talk to the professor.'

(19) Akademik *licej* fortepiyano bölümünü bitirdi.
Academic highschool forte piano branch-POSS3PSG-PRO-ACC finish-PAST
'He graduated from fortepiano departments of the academic high school.'

(20) Gençlerimiz *internet*-e bu *virus*-a esir oldu.
Young-PL-POSS1PPL internet-DAT this virus-DAT captive become-PAST
'All our young people are captive of this virus called the internet.'

(21) Onların içinde *muzyka* var.
They-GEN inside-POSS3PSG-LOC music there is
'They have music in them.'

(22) Düşmeyesiniz oradan yuvarlanıp *teatr*-a.
Fall-NEG-OPT-2PPL there-ABL roll-GER teatre-DAT
'Do not roll around and fall to the theatre.'

The examples between (14) and (22) are different from other examples of Russian nouns. The Russian nouns inserted in Turkish are borrowed words from Western languages to both standard Russian and Turkish. These structures, described as *cultural borrowing* by Myers-Scotton (*Dueling Languages*), were defined by Johanson as the global copies between languages that are in contact with each other in the global age (*Türkçe Dil İlişkilerinde*). Although cultural borrowings have similar meanings, they are pronounced differently. That is why these nouns in the examples were marked as Russian codes. However, these can be easily understood by monolingual Turkish speakers, too.

From the exile in 1944 to the beginning of the 1990s, Ahıska Turks were separated from Türkiye's cultural and lingual bonds. They were subjected to Russian culture and language like many other nations in the Soviet Union. They have lost the synchronicity with standard Turkish and have followed the technical and social advancements in the Russian language. Therefore, the words in the examples are inserted into Ahıska Turks' languages from Russian. Today, it is believed that as the relationships between Ahıska Turks and Türkiye have increased, especially in media and education, speakers pronounce closer to Turkish when they speak Turkish. Therefore, these examples are thought that there is no intrasentential code-switching.

Adjectives

According to MLFM, attributive morphemes from the embedded language can be found in ML+EL island. Since attributive adjectives are categorized under the content morphemes in the model, an adjective in the embedded language can also be found in the matrix language. Besides, the adjectives from the embedded language can be seen in embedded language islands (Myers-Scotton, *Dueling Languages*).

In the sentences in which Turkish is the matrix language below, there are two types of adjectives from the embedded languages.

(23) Sonra da *arabskij* dans.
Then CJ Arabic-MAS dance
'And then, oriental dance.'

(24) *Sovremennyj* şeytan.
Modern-MAS devil
'It is a modern devil'

(25) Gel çok *sekretnyj* yerde.
Come-IMP very secret-MAS place-LOC
'Come, it is in a very secret place.'

(26) Bir *voobšče original'nyj* kayda *zakaz* ediyor.
A really original-MAS song order do-PROG
'He really wants an original song.'

(27) Bir *sovremennyj* kayda çal.
A modern-MAS song play-IMP2PSG
'Play a modern song.'

In examples (23), (24), (25), (26), and (27), the content morphemes in Russian adjectives formed ML+EL islands with Turkish nouns. Adjectives in Russian are used in two forms. First, the adjective describes a noun or a structure with an embedded noun form. Second, adjectives can be used as the verb of sentences in bare and instrumental forms. In Russian grammar, attributive adjectives mark the noun by number, gender, and case, but the adjectives that become verbs are marked for number and gender (Dunn and Khairov 131). The bare form in the masculine and singular conjugated form of an adjective is acknowledged as the original form. These adjectives in the original form have *-yj, -ij, -oj* affixes. Russian adjectives in examples (23), (24), (25), (26), and (27) have attended to the islands as nominative masculine form. This can be observed in other languages contacting with Russian (Auer and Muhamedova, Johanson, *Remodeling Grammar*, Aqtay, Killi Yılmaz, Forker).

In the examples, the adjectives that formed ML+EL island are in the original form, and embedded language rules were not applied. The model's matrix language blocking hypothesis refers not to applying embedded language rules but following the matrix language rules instead—the examples above, except for the (23), fit with the assumption. In example (23), *arabskij dans* is in ML+EL island. According to the model, only the embedded language island accepts the embedded language system morpheme. However, in the example, a word acting as a noun in the embedded language morpheme did

not have a system morpheme of the matrix language. Therefore, although it was expected to see *arabskij dansı (Arap dansı)* in Turkish, the word *dans* were not marked with a possessive suffix. Here, the model uses the bare form strategy. However, as the Russian correspondence is *arabskij tanec*, it is understood that the structure is formed with an embedded language system morpheme. Here, it is believed that the speaker mispronounced the word in the forms of *dans* and *tanec* due to the phonetic properties of Russian and Turkish that coined the word from the Western languages.

(28) Gittim pazardan *prostoj* *telefon* aldım.
Go-PAST-1PSG market-ABL simple-MAS telephone buy-PAST-1PSG
'I went. I bought a simple phone from the market.'

(29) *Staršaja medsestra* bana öyle iyi bakıyor ki bana
Head nurse I-DAT so well care-PROG3PSG CJ I-DAT
Burası ev.
here-POSS3PSG home
'Head nurse takes care of me so well that this place is like a home to me.'

(30) Bu *praktikantka* kızlar gelmiş her birimizi
These intern girls-PL come-INPAST every one-POSS1PPL-ACC
deldi.
puncture-PAST
'This intern girls came and punctured all of us.'

In the examples (28), (29), and (30), the Russian words in adjective form were used with embedded language elements in the language islands and followed Russian grammar rules. MLFM allows creating embedded islands inside the matrix language. Therefore, the examples fit with the model. The adjective *prostoj*, in example (28), described the noun as masculine and singular, and the adjective *staršaja* (29) was marked as feminine and singular. The word *praktikantka* was a feminine noun in the embedded language (30) and formed the embedded language island with the noun *kızlar*. In the example, the matrix language blocks all rules related to the adjective derivation and adjective clauses in the embedded language. In this regard, those examples did not conflict with the matrix language blocking hypothesis.

Adpositions

In terms of adpositions, Turkish and Russian are languages with different typological features. In Turkish, adpositions are found right after their compliments, and called postpositions. However, in Russian, adpositions occur as prepositions. They are placed before nouns, and each preposition is related to cases. Therefore, the Russian nouns must be conjugated after the preposition. It is likely to mention a functional difference between Turkish and Russian adpositions. The function of bound morphemes in Turkish, such as case suffixes, corresponds to Russian free morphemes.

(a) *v gorode* (in city)	(b) *iz goroda* (from city)
PRE-city-LOCF	PRE-city-GENF

Although *being* and *leaving* in examples (a) and (b) was given with Turkish *-DA* and *-DAn* bound morphemes, in Russian *v* was used for being and *iz* for leaving. These nouns are conjugated for being and leaving states. Since *gorod* is a masculine and singular word, it should be written as *gorode* for being and *goroda* for leaving. This mismatch between the languages affects the linguistic outcomes of bilinguals.

(31) Kız oğlanı *ot duši* seviyor mu?
Girl boy-ACC PRE-soul-GENF love-PROG-3PSG Q
'Does the girl love the boy from the soul?'

(32) Doktor ben zaten hep *napravo* gidiyorum.
Doctor, I already always PRE-right go-PROG-1PSG.
'Doctor, I am always going to the right.'

(33) Adam gerek biraz da *nalevo* gide.
Man need some CJ PRE-left go-OPT.
'We need men who go on the left.'

(34) Doktor bu *bezoperaci* olmaz mı ki?
Doctor this PRE-operation-GENF become-NEG Q CJ
'Doctor can't we have this without operation?'

(35) Unutmuşum seni *ot sceny* olunca
Forget-INPAST-1PSH you-ACC PRE-stage-GENF be-GER
kıyamadım.
harm-NEG-PAST-1PSG
'I forgot about you. I couldn't harm you because you were away from the stage.'

(36) Bura *do balkona* *polnyj* idi.
Here PRE-balcony-GENF full-MAS be-PAST
'This was full up to the balcony.'

Although the matrix language prevents the disharmony between the matrix language and embedded language, it triggers the use of content and system morphemes in the embedded language. Myers-Scotton stated that when prepositions in the embedded language do not match with the correspondence in the matrix language, prepositions can be seen in the embedded language island with the related nouns (*Dueling Languages*). Backus analyzed the Dutch-Turkish code-switching phenomenon acknowledged similar examples as collocations and an embedded language island (*Codeswitching as One* 209). Therefore, the structures in the given examples are considered embedded language islands.

In examples (31) and (36), the matrix language is Turkish. *Ot, na, bez, do* prepositions are structurally independent of the matrix language and marked the nouns based on Russian state conjugation. Since prepositions break the matrix language hierarchy and concentrate around Russian grammar rules, they seem to have a double morphology and are recognized as embedded language islands, although they have a single content morpheme.

Verbs

Like nouns, verbs are included in different code-switching processes. Although verbs play a thematic role in transferring the meaning, they are not as common as nouns in code-switching. Myers-Scotton and Jake explained the reason for infrequent use of verbs in code-switching as different processing of verbs in linguistic terms (*Revisiting the 4-M* 13-14). It requires more work for a conjugated verb from the embedded language to interact and form a structure with the matrix language than the bare form. Therefore, speakers tend to use unconjugated verbs or matrix language verbs to avoid this challenging process—unconjugated verbs from the embedded language

form a united structure with an auxiliary from the matrix language. An unconjugated verb can be conjugated in the matrix language or integrated with other structures in the matrix language frame.

In the examples, speakers follow the strategy of using Russian morphemes with Turkish auxiliary verbs. None of the examples in which Turkish is the matrix language have verbs with Russian conjugation or phrases.

(37) Gerek ki *dvižehie* olsun, hareketler yapasın.
Need CJ move be-IMP-3PSG, move-PL do-OPT-2PSG
'We need to have move. Make some move.'

(38) Ben yattığım yerde böyle *dvižehie*-lar ediyorum.
I lie-GER-POSS1PSG place-LOC so move-PL do-PROG-1PSG
'I do these moves from where I lie.'

(39) Biz yere zorla *posadka* ettik.
We ground-LOC hardly landing do-PAST-1PSG
'We landed hardly.'

(40) Bir *voobšče original'nyj* kayda *zakaz* ediyor.
A really original-MAS song order do-PROG
'He really wants an original song.'

(41) Son günlerde karı *uže vinovat* etmeye başladı
Last day-PL-LOC wife already blaming do-INF-DAT start-PAST
telephone-u.
telephone-ACC
'In recent days, my wife started to blame the phone.'

(42) Yarı yolda *zavisat'* ediyor bak doktor.
Half way-LOC hang-INF do-PROG look-IMP doctor
'It is hanging halfway, look doctor.'

(43) Türkiye'ye *postupat'* etmek isteyebilirler.
Türkiye -DAT apply-INF do-INF want-ABIL-3PPL
'They may want to apply to Türkiye.'

(44) *Operacija* etmem şart.
Operation do-INF-1PSG MUST
'I must operate.'

(45) Doktor bu *bezoperaci* olmaz mı ki?
Doctor this PRE-operation-GENF be-NEG-AOR Q CJ
'Doctor, can't we have it without operation?'

(46) Ben cerrahım ayda üç dört *operacija* yapacağım.
I surgeon-1PSG month-LOC three-four operation do-FUT-1PSG
'I am a surgeon; I will do three-four surgeries per month.'

As seen in the examples above, nouns and infinitive verbs from the embedded language are embedded in the matrix language with Turkish *yap-, et-, ol-* auxiliary verbs. According to Backus, using foreign elements as unbiased verbs is a localization strategy in agglutinative languages like Turkish (*Codeswitching as One*). With the integration of Russian elements with Turkish verbs, they were protected from the conjugation of Turkish verbs, and thus they did not lose their meanings.

Examples in (37), (38), (39), (40), and (41) mainly have Russian nouns derived from verbs, and examples in (42) and (43) have Russian unconjugated infinitive verbs with an auxiliary verb from the matrix language. In example (37), the speaker used *dvižehie* and the matrix language correspondence *hareket* in the same sentence. Such a double use might be preferred to increase the effect of the message or to ensure comprehension.

In the model, the system morphemes of the embedded language come from the matrix language. However, sometimes the embedded language component does not take the system morpheme from the matrix language and is used in the bare form. Russian structures in all examples are used in bare form, except for the example (38) in which *dvižehie*-lar, morpheme of the embedded language, accepted a plural suffix in the matrix language. According to the 4M model, the plural suffix is a system morpheme (Myers-Scotton and Jake, *A Universal Model*). The plural suffix from the matrix language, Turkish, does not harm the system morpheme. Therefore, all the examples fit with the model.

Similar structures like *zavisat* and *postupat* infinitive verbs in the examples (42) and (43) were observed in multiple language pairs in code-switching researches (Backus, *Two in One*; Şener; Menz; Killi Yılmaz; Ahmed). Backus stated that this strategy was commonly applied by Turkish immigrants in Western Europe and emphasized that *yap-* auxiliary verb was more com-

mon in Holland, but *et-* auxiliary verb was more common in Germany and Denmark (*Codeswitching as One*). In the examples, the most frequently used auxiliary verb was *et-*. However, it is inaccurate to say that the *et-* auxiliary verb is dominant among Ahıska Turks. In examples (38), (45), and (46), the same Russian component was used with different auxiliary verbs. Although the *et-* verb was more commonly used in the examples, there was the flexibility to include other auxiliary verbs from the matrix language.

Adverbs

In the model, adverbs are system morphemes. Therefore, Myers-Scotton emphasized that due to the system morpheme principle, adverbs from the embedded language could not be used alone in the matrix language and could not describe ML+EL islands (*Dueling Languages*, *Constructing the Frame*). In this case, an adverb from the embedded language can only be included in the embedded language island.

(47) Attım baktım *točno* düştü.
Throw-PAST-1PSG look-PAST-1PSG exactly fall-PAST
'I throw. I looked; it fell exactly.'

(48) Siz *uže* kaynana oldunuz mu?
You (PL) already mother in law become-PAST-2PPL Q?
'Have you already been mother in law?'

(49) Biz toyda düğünde *muzyka* çalmaktan
We bridal-LOC wedding-LOC music play-INF-ABL
uže bıktık.
already bore-PAST-1PPL
'We are already bored to play music in this wedding.'

(50) *Prosto* doğru dilek.
Just right wish
'Just a right wish.'

(51) Ben *prosto* oynayacağım.
I just dance-FUT-1PSG
'I will just dance.'

(52) Bir *voobšče* *original'nyj* kayda *zakaz* ediyor.
A really original-MAS song order do-PROG
'He really wants an original song.'

(53) Son günlerde karı *uže* *vinovat* etmeye başladı
Last day-PL-LOC wife already fault do-INF-DAT start-PAST
telephone-u.
telephone-ACC
'In recent days, my wife started to blame the phone.'

The adverbs in the embedded language above were included in the matrix language in two ways. First, in examples (47), (48), (49), (50), (51), Russian adverbs were placed as single words in the matrix language without forming an embedded language island, which was contrary to the model. It can be stated that the examples with a single adverb change in the embedded language are against the model. However, in examples (52) and (53), Russian adverbs described the entire ML+EL island without creating an embedded language island. Therefore, these examples did not match the system morpheme and contradicted the model.

Although using adverbs from the embedded language and the matrix language does not fit with the model, such use is not unique to Ahıska Turks. For most languages that contact Russian, Russian discourse is used alone in the matrix language (Menz, Muhamedova, Jankowski).

Johanson stated that interlingual contact between the languages in different regions allows copying words from one language to another, and it is called *global copying (Türkçe Dil İlişkilerinde*). The use of Persian *hem*, Arabian *ama*, Russian *no,* and *i* in Turkish is an example. In this context, adverb forms that did not fit with the model were believed to be borrowed from Russian to Turkish spoken by Ahıska Turks.

Conclusion

This study aimed to explore and describe the code-switching patterns among Turkish-Russian multilingual Ahıska Turks living in Kyrgyzstan. Therefore, the researcher analyzed the code-switching patterns in dialogues in the Miko Şov by using the MLFM.

The analysis results revealed that code-switching mainly occurred for nouns. The content morphemes were integrated to Turkish from Russian as a single word. Bilingual individuals used this method mainly to fill lexical gaps (Haugen, Muysken, Myers-Scotton, *Comparing Codeswitching*). Şener found similar results in Turkish immigrants in Germany.

In line with the Matrix Language Frame Model, Russian nouns were marked by Turkish morphemes. Highly embedded words in the matrix language might be a form of cultural borrowing. However, since this study had a limited sample, it was difficult to reach a definitive conclusion. As Myers-Scotton highlighted, it is likely to achieve more precise results related to words (*Constructing the Frame*).

It was determined that a masculine-singular form of adjectives was used for Turkish nouns, and Russian adjective conjugations were avoided in language islands created with Russian adjectives. It is also observed in other languages that are in contact with the Russian language (Auer and Muhamedova; Johanson, *Remodeling Grammar*; Aqtay; Killi Yılmaz; Forker). In languages like Turkish, where adjectives are not conjugated, and there is no grammatical gender system, the bare masculine-singular form is used as the matrix form.

Due to Turkish and Russian typological differences for adpositions, only embedded language island with Russian elements was used. None of the Russian prepositions was marked with Turkish morphemes. They were mainly formulaic expressions in Russian. Backus (*Patterns of Language*) investigated Turkish-Dutch code-switching, and Şener explored Turkish-German code-switching. Both studies revealed different findings.

In terms of verbs, Russian morphemes followed Turkish auxiliary verbs. The Russian structures were used as infinitive verbs or bare nouns. Other research also mentioned a Turkish localization strategy (Backus, *Two in One*; Şener, Menz, Ahmed). It was concluded that Turkish components that created language islands with Russian morphemes were *et-, ol-,* and *yap-* auxiliary verbs.

Russian adverbs were positioned as a single word without forming an embedded language island, which fit the model. However, such uses are com-

mon in other languages such as Kazakh and Gagauz, which also contact Russian (Menz, Muhamedova, Jankowski).

Generally, the Turkish-Russian code-switching pattern is similar to other Turkish dialects that contact German, Dutch, and Macedonians, especially noun and verb patterns. In addition, it can be said that the adjectives, adverbs, and adpositions in the examples follow similar code-switching strategies with other Turkic languages such as Kazakh, Bashkir, and Gagauz interacting with Russian in bilingual communication. Future studies can focus on the frequency of Russian content morpheme in Turkish and achieve detailed results for borrowed Russian words in Turkish spoken by Ahıska Turks.

Notes

1 ISO9 equivalents are used in the transliteration of Russian words.

Abbreviations

ABIL	Ability
ABL	Ablative
ABLF	Ablative form
ACC	Accusative
AOR	Aorist
CAUS	Causative
CJ	Conjunction
COND	Conditional
DAT	Dative
FUT	Future
GEN	Genitive
GENF	Genitive form
GER	Gerund
IMP	Imperative
INF	Infinitive
INPASS	Indirect past
INST	Instrumental
LOC	Locative

LOCF	Locative form
MAS	Masculine
ML+EL	Matrix language + embedded language
MLFM	Matrix Language Frame Model
NEG	Negation
OPT	Optative
P	Person
PART	Participle
PASS	Passive
PAST	Past
PL	Plural
POSS	Possessive
PRE	Preposition
PRO	Pronominal /n/
PROG	Progressive
Q	Question marker
SG	Singular

Support and Acknowledgment Statement

Author thanks the World Union of Ahıska Turks Bishkek Branch and performers of Miko Şov for their help.

Conflict of Interest Statement

There is no conflict of interest with any institution or person within the scope of this study.

References

Ahmed, Oktay. "Copied Verbs in Turkish Dialects of Macedonia." *The Uppsala Meeting*, ed. Eva Csato, Birsel Karakoç, and Astrid Menz, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2016, pp. 9-18.

Aqtay, Gulayhan. "Adjectives in Modern Kazakh." *Turkey, Kazakhstan and the Crimea: Ten Years of Turkology in Poznan,* ed. Henryk Jankowski, Wydawnictwo Naukowe, 2013, pp. 37-47.

Auer, Peter, and Raihan Muhamedova. "Embedded Language and Matrix language in Insertational Language Mixing: Some Problematic Cases." *Rivista di Linguistica,* vol. 17, no. 1, 2005, pp. 35-54.

Aydıngün, Ayşegül. "Creating, Recreating and Redefining Ethnic Identity: Ahıska/Meskhetian Turks in Soviet and Post-Soviet Contexts." *Central Asian Survey,* vol. 21, no. 2, 2002, pp. 185-197.

Aydıngün, Ayşegül, et al. *Meskhetian Turks: An Introduction to Their History, Culture, and Resettlement Experiences.* Cultural Orientation Resource Center-Culture Profile. 2006.

Backus, Ad. *Patterns of Language Mixing.* Harrasowitz Werlag, 1992.

Backus, Ad. *Two in One*. Tilburg University Press, 1996.

Backus, Ad. "Codeswitching as One Piece of the Puzzle of Language Exchange." *Multidisciplinary Approaches to Code-switching,* ed. Ludmila Isurin, Donald Winford, and Kees de Bot, John Benjamin Publishing, 2009, pp. 307-336.

Dunn, John, and Shamil Khairov. *Modern Russian Grammar.* Routledge, 2009.

Forker, Diana. "Sanzhi-Russian Code-switching and the Matrix Language Frame Model." *International Journal of Bilingualism,* no. 23, 2019, pp. 1448-1468.

Gardner-Chloros, Penelope. *Code-switching.* Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Grosjean, François. "The Bilingual's Language Modes." *One Mind, Two Languages: Bilingual Language Processing,* ed. Janet Nicol. Blackwell, 2001, pp. 1-22.

Haugen, Einar. "The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing." *The Ecology of Language*, ed. Anwar S. Dill. Stanford University Press, 1972, pp. 79-109.

İnan, Kayhan. "Bilingualism, Language Choice, and Language Loyalty in Ahıska Turks in Kyrgyzstan in Terms of the Generation Variable." *TEKE,* vol. 9, no. 4, 2020, pp. 1557-1580.

Jankowski, Henryk. "Kazakh in Contact with Russian in Modern Kazakhstan." *Turkic Languages,* no. 16, 2012, pp. 25-67.

Johanson, Lars. *Türkçe Dil İlişkilerinde Yapısal Etkenler*. ed. Nurettin Demir, Türk Dil Kurumu, 2007.

Johanson, Lars. "Remodeling Grammar Copying, Conventionalization, Grammaticalization." *Language Contact and Contact Languages*, ed. Peter Siemund, and Noemi Kintana, John Benjamins, 2008, pp. 61-79.

Killi Yılmaz, Gülsüm. "Khakassian-Russian Code-switching in the Stories by Ilya Topoyev." *Journal of Modern Turkish Studies,* no. 11, 2014, pp. 208-234.

Kreindler, Isabelle. "The Soviet Deported Nationalities: A Summary and an Update." *Soviet Studies,* vol. 38, no. 3, 1986, pp. 387-405.

MacSwan, Jeff. "Codeswitching and Generative Grammar: A Critique of the MLF Model and Some Remarks on Modified Minimalism." *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition,* vol. 8, no. 1, 2005, pp. 1-22.

Matras, Yaron. *Language Contact.* Cambridge University Press, 2009.

Menz, Astrid. "Slavic Language Influence on Gagauz." *bilig,* vol. 24, 2003, pp. 23-44.

Muhamedova, Raihan. "Remarks on the Kazakh Discourse Marker žaŋaγï." *Trans-Turkic Studies,* ed. Matthias Kappler, Mark Kirchner, and Peter Ziem, Türk Dilleri Araştırmaları Dizisi, 2010, pp. 441-454.

Muysken, Pieter. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-mixing.* Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. "Comparing Codeswitching and Borrowing." *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development,* no. 13, 1992, pp. 19-39.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. "Constructing the Frame in Intrasentential Codeswitching." *Multilingua,* vol. 11, no. 1, 1992, pp. 101-127.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. *Dueling Languages.* Oxford University Press, 1993.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism.* Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Myers-Scotton, Carol, and Janice Jake. "A Universal Model of Code-switching and Bilingual Language Processing and Production." *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Code-switching,* ed. Barbara E. Bullock, and Almeida J. Toribio, Cambridge University Press, 2009, pp. 336-357.

Myers-Scotton, Carol, and Janice Jake. "Revisiting the 4-M Model: Codeswitching and Morpheme Election at the Abstract Level." *International Journal of Bilingualism,* no. 21, 2017, 340-366.

Myers-Scotton, Carol, and John Okeju. "Neighbors and Lexical Borrowing." *Language,* no. 49, 1973, pp. 871-889.

Petrou, Maria. "Lexical Borrowing and Code-switching in Turkish Varieties of Western Thrace." *Ankara Papers in Turkish and Turkic Linguistics,* ed. Deniz Zeyrek, and Çiğdem Sağın Şimşek, Harrassowitz Werlag, 2015, pp. 4440-4522.

Süleymanov, Mikail. Personal Interview. 17 May 2017.

Şener, Serkan. *Code-switching of Turkish-German Bilinguals: A Structural Analysis.* Master Thesis. Ankara: Ankara University, 1998.

Treffers-Daller, Jeannie. "Towards a Uniform Approach to Code-switching and Borrowing." *Papers for the Workshop on Constraints, Conditions, and Models,* European Science Foundation, 1991, pp. 259-279.

Trier, Tom, and Andrei Khanzin. "Introduction." *Meskhetian Turks at a Crossroads: Integration, Reparation or Resettlement?* ed. Tom Trier, and Andrei Khanzin, Lit Verlag, 2007, pp. 1-42.

Whitehouse, Mark. "Politics of Persecution." moscowtimes.com, *The Moscow Times,* 24 January 1998, http://old.themoscowtimes.com. Accessed 18 November 2019.

Yazıcı Ersoy, Habibe. "Code-switching Among Languages: The Instance of Bashkir Literary Language." *Dil Araştırmaları,* no. 21, 2017, pp. 61-77.

Ahıska Türklerinde Türkçe-Rusça Kod Değiştirme Deseni ve Temel Dil Çerçeve Modeli*

Kayhan İnan**

Öz

Ahıska Türkleri, 1944'te Sovyet Gürcistan'daki anavatanlarından Asya'daki Sovyet Cumhuriyetlerine sürüldükten sonraki 75 yıl içinde çok dilli bir topluma evrilmiştir. Ahıska Türkleri, iletişimlerinde Türkçe ve Rusça dil çiftini kullanmaktadır. Günlük iletişimlerinde kod değiştirme stratejilerine başvurmaktadır. Ahıska Türklerinde Türkçe-Rusça kod değiştirme örüntüsü iki dilli iletişim bağlamında dil bilimsel olarak analiz edilmemiştir. Bu nedenle bu çalışma, Ahıska Türklerini farklı bir bağlamda incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. Bu kapsamda Ahıska Türklerinin komedi grubu Miko Şov'un Bişkek gösterisi incelenmiş ve kod değiştirme durumunu yansıtılmaya çalışılmıştır. Veriler Temel Dil Çerçeve Modeline göre isim, sıfat, edat, fiil ve zarf başlıkları altında incelenmiştir. Rusça ile iletişime geçen diğer Türk toplulukları ile benzer stratejilerin izlendiği tespit edilmiştir.

Anahtar Kelimeler

Ahıska Türkleri, kod değiştirme, Temel Dil Çerçeve Modeli, Türkçe-Rusça iki dillilik, Türk diasporası.

* Geliş Tarihi: 28 Şubat 2021 – Kabul Tarihi: 01 Mart 2022
Bu makaleyi şu şekilde kaynak gösterebilirsiniz:
İnan, Kayhan. "Code-Switching Pattern of Turkish-Russian Bilingual Ahıska Turks and Matrix Language Frame Model." *bilig*, no. 103, 2022, ss. 183-209.

** Dr., Amasya Üniversitesi, Eğitim Fakültesi, Türkçe ve Sosyal Bilimler Eğitimi Bölümü – Amasya/Türkiye
ORCID: 0000-0002-7438-0742
kayhan.inan@amasya.edu.tr

Шаблон переключения кода тюрко-русского двуязычия турок-месхетинцев и рамочная модель матричного языка*

Кайхан Инан **

Аннотация

За 75 лет после того, как турки-месхетинцы были изгнаны со своей родины в Советской Грузии в 1944 году в советские республики Центральной Азии, они превратились в многоязычное общество. Турки-месхетинцы используют пары турецкого и русского языков в своем повседневном общении. В своем повседневном общении они используют стратегии переключения кодов. Модель переключения кода между турецким и русским языками у турок-месхетинцев не анализировалась с точки зрения двуязычного общения. Данное исследование направлено на изучение турок-месхетинцев с другой точки зрения. Ситуация с переключением кодов была исследована на основе бишкекского шоу комедийной группы турок-месхетинцев «Мико Шоу». Записи были исследованы на основе рамочной модели матричного языка, и шаблон разделен на существительные, прилагательные, глаголы и наречия. Установлено, что такие же стратегии применялись и при контакте с русским языком других тюркских языков.

Ключевые слова

Турки-месхетинцы, переключение кода, рамочная модель матричного языка, турецко-русское двуязычие, турецкая диаспора.

---

* Поступило в редакцию: 28 февраля 2021 г. – Принято в номер: 1 марта 2022 г.
Ссылка на статью:
İnan, Kayhan. “Code-Switching Pattern of Turkish-Russian Bilingual Ahıska Turks and Matrix Language Frame Model.” *bilig*, no. 103, 2022, ss. 183-209.

** Д-р., Университет Амасьи, Педагогический факультет, Отделение турецкого образования и социальных наук – Амасья/Турция
ORCID: 0000-0002-7438-0742
kayhan.inan@amasya.edu.tr