Layers of Convergent Syntax in Macedonian Turkish

Author(s): Yaron Matras

Source: *Mediterranean Language Review*, Vol. 15 (2003/04), pp. 63-86

Published by: Harrassowitz Verlag

Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13173/medilangrevi.15.2004.0063

YARON MATRAS
University of Manchester

LAYERS OF CONVERGENT SYNTAX IN MACEDONIAN TURKISH*

1. INTRODUCTION

Turkic languages in contact are known to have incorporated a vast number of grammatical items from their contact languages, leading in many cases to syntactic re-arrangement and the adoption of new typological structures especially in the areas of complex clause arrangement and connectivity (see Johanson 1992; Slobin 1986: 288). The specific development of Turkic languages in the Balkans may be seen perhaps as part of this general tendency. The Balkans nevertheless constitute a special case owing to the pressure towards convergent development exerted mutually on all the languages in the region. Despite its relative late arrival in the region, the Ottoman dialect spoken in the central Balkans has adopted some of the structural characteristics of the area, leading to the complete collapse of one of the significant typological features of Turkic: the converbal constructions. This paper documents the outcome of this process.

I suggest that there are three distinct mechanisms of contact-induced syntactic change involved. The first two may be described along the notions suggested by Harris & Campbell (1995) as 'extension' and 'reanalysis' respectively. These are language-internal mechanisms of change, but in Macedonian Turkish they are triggered by the pressure to syncretize sentence-planning operations among congruent languages, leading to a convergence of abstract structures and patterns of sentence-arrangement, though no replication of actual linguistic material from the contact language

* This article is based on papers that were presented at the International Conference on Turkish Linguistics at the SOAS, London, in August 1990, and at the workshop on Turkish in Contact, at the NIAS, Wassenaar, in February 1996. Both papers were accepted for publication, but the appearance of the volumes containing them has been delayed. The Wassenaar paper has been distributed as manuscript, dated May 1997. The present version contains only minor modifications compared to the Wassenaar paper. I wish to thank Marcel Erdal for his comments.

is involved. These developments may be observed for the loss of the infinitive and the extension of the finite subjunctive, and for the loss of Turkic relative and participial constructions and the reanalysis of interrogatives as relativizers and subordinating conjunctions. The third mechanism of change, by contrast, involves adoption of actual linguistic surface items from the contact language, substituting a class of converbs which in Turkic expresses connectivity of clauses at the discourse level. I argue that the distribution of these three mechanisms is not accidental, nor is it entirely specific to the contact situation encountered here. Rather, I suggest that it is conditioned by universal mechanisms of contact-induced change in syntax, the rule being that contact-induced grammatical change begins at the discourse level, and that extra-propositional markers (discourse markers) are more vulnerable in language-contact situations and so more likely to undergo formal fusion with those of a prestige or dominant contact language (cf. Matras 1998).[1]

As a direct descendant of Ottoman, the Macedonian dialect of Turkish is, despite typological differences, very closely related to standard and Anatolian Turkish, and there are virtually no barriers to mutual comprehensibility. The data I present below are taken from transcriptions of tape-recorded narratives and conversations. The speakers are natives of Štip and Bitola (Manastir), who have immigrated to Germany in the late 1980's and early 1990's, mostly as asylum-seekers. Some have Romani ancestors, and some of them can also speak Romani. However, Turkish is their first and primary language, and some have indeed acquired their active knowledge of Romani only in Germany. There are no apparent differences between the speech of those who can and those who cannot speak Romani, nor between those who do and those who do not (or not admittedly) have Romani ancestry. I emphasize this since I believe one can rule out the possiblity that the phenomenon with which we are concerned here, namely syntactic convergence, is either a result of errors on the part of learners, or that it represents a special feature of a Gypsy Turkish ethnolect. The morphophonological and syntactic features it shows are in fact widespread among various dialects of Balkan Turkish. All speakers are bilingual in Turkish and Macedonian, most have an active knowledge of Serbo-Croatian, and some of German as well. German insertions and Turkish-German code-

1 Several other studies have reported the observation that contact-induced change begins at the discourse or connectivity level: cf. e.g. Stolz & Stolz 1996, Matras 1996, Ross 2001, Haig 2001.

switching are frequent in the data, especially when topics are centered around the speakers' status and activities as asylum applicants and refugees in Germany.

2. INFINITIVE-LOSS AND THE EXTENSION OF THE SUBJUNCTIVE OPTION

The replacement of the infinitive by finite forms, usually introduced by a non-factual complementizer, is perhaps the most well-known common feature of the Balkan languages. While traditional explanations of the phenomenon have concentrated on adstratum hypotheses (cf. Sandfeld 1930; Solta 1980), Rozencvejg (1976) advocates instead simplification and isomorphism of surface representations in syntax as a motivation for what Weinreich (1958) had defined as a mutual process of language convergence. According to Rozencvejg, tendencies towards simplification and isomorphism are driven by the special communicative situation in multilingual communities, as they facilitate language learning and translation from one language into another. Joseph (1983), though generally supportive of this view, argues that compatibility of structures or 'isogrammatism' (Gołąb 1956, 1959) is just one part of the picture, and that language-internal developments play a significant role as well. In each of the languages involved, the reduction of the infinitive is the result of a gradual generalization of an existing finite option. At the same time, the process has a snowball effect in its geographical spread across an area with Macedonia roughly at its center. It is only in Macedonian, Joseph argues, that no traces of the infinitive can be detected.[2]

Ottoman Turkish, as well as Old Turkish, indeed had a finite option for complement clauses, which has been inherited by modern Anatolian and standard Turkish. There are in fact two types of finite options. The first involves verbs of cognition, utterance and perception, where the events referred to in each part of the construction are semantically independent and are accordingly encoded independently as regards tense, aspect, and mood. With tighter semantic integration in complements involving modality and manipulation and in purpose clauses, the finite verb in the dependent clause appears in a form derived from either the historical optative or imperative

2 In fact, this also applies to Romani (Matras 1996), a language often disregarded in the context of Balkan linguistics, and to the variety of Turkish spoken in Macedonia and discussed here, which has equally received little attention in comparative studies of the Balkan linguistic areal, save in its role as a donor of lexical items.

paradigms, employed as a subjunctive. There are, however, restrictions on the distribution of this irrealis finite option. While it is generally admissible in complements corresponding to infinitives of the *mA-* type, the *mAk-* infinitive, which is reserved for tight integration and subject control (cf. Csató 1991), does not usually allow a corresponding finite option. The Macedonian Turkish constructions in (1)–(3) may thus be said to continue the older state of affairs:

(1) *ben* *beklerdim* *sade* *bitsin*
1SG.NOM wait.AOR.PAST.1SG only end.SUBJ.3SG
'I was just waiting for it to end.'

(2) *o* *bana* *diiverdi* *nasıl* *bir/*
3SG.NOM 1SG.DAT show.ASP.PAST.3SG how INDEF
kısa *bir* *yardım edeyim* *insanlara*
short INDEF help do.SUBJ.1SG people.PL.DAT
'He showed me how to/ how to help people a little bit.'

(3) *mecburi idik* *biz* *türkçesini* *konuşalım.*
must COP.PAST.1PL 1PL.NOM Turkish.3SG.ACC speak.SUBJ.1PL
'We were forced to speak Turkish.'

In (1)–(2), different subjects figure with single events in manipulative and purpose constructions, while (3) derives from an impersonal modal expression, to which the copula is added. These two types of constructions correspond, respectively, to the type of Ottoman and Old Turkish complex sentences documented in (4)–(5) (from Adamović 1985: 260). Note that here, however, the second clause is introduced by the complementiser *kim*, and that arguably, we are not dealing with straightforward subordination, but, comparable to *ki* in modern Turkish, with a chaining structure, where the second clause has independent illocutionary force:

(4) *gözümi* *ač* *kim* *seni* *bellü* *görem*
eye.1SG.ACC open COMP 2SG.ACC clear see.SUBJ.1SG
'Open my eyes so that I may see you clearly.'

(5) *gerek* *kim* *bu* *sïrrï* *soravan* *aŋa*
necessary COMP this secret.ACC ask.SUBJ.1SG 3SG.DAT
'It is necessary that I ask him [to tell me] this secret.'

Macedonian Turkish goes a step further and generalizes the finite option in purpose clauses with same subjects, without requiring a conjunction:

(6) *Geldi* *önce* *yapsın* *Asylantrag,*
come.PAST.1SG before make.SUBJ.3SG asylum-appl.[GER]
ben *gittim* *Asylantrag* *yapım*
1SG.NOM go.PAST.1SG asylum-appl.[GER] make.SUBJ.1SG
ona *Krefeld'te*
3SG.DAT Krefeld.LOC
'First he came to apply for asylum, I went to apply for asylum for him in Krefeld.'

(7) *ben* *gittim* *benim* *soyismimi* *değiştirim*
1SG.NOM go.PAST.1SG 1SG.GEN surname.1SG.ACC change.SUBJ.1SG
'I went to change my surname.'

Corresponding constructions in Ottoman and Anatolian Turkish exploit the illocutionary meaning of the optative in the adjoined clause, with a sentence arrangement which could be rendered as something like 'I went, [saying] let me change my name', and which we might choose to term '*para*-paratactic': It is beyond a simple paratactic arrangement as it contains the seeds of syntactic intergation, but it is not a hypotactic construction in the sense of European-type subordinations. Beside the conventionalization of finite subordinations of this type in Macedonian Turkish there is an additional typological difference between these embedded constructions in Macedonian Turkish and their counterparts in Ottoman/Anatolian. In the latter, the subordinated finite clause is introduced by a conjunction, usually Iranian *ki*, or a contamination of *ki* and the interrogative *kim*, or by the semi-grammaticalized gerund *diye*, figuring as a final conjunction.[3] Macedonian Turkish has kept *ki*, but only in realis complements of factual verbs of cognition, utterance, and perception. The use of distinct markers for factual and non-factual subordinations is a further feature of the Balkan area, extending even to more peripheral languages of the Balkans such as Serbo-Croatian. In all these languages, with the exception of the Balkan dialects of Turkish, the relevant marker is an unbound and uninflected conjunction

3 While Turkish *ki* is generally assumed to be of Iranian origin, *kim* is attested in Turkish in this function since the 9th century, even before contact with Persian, and may have been borrowed from another Indo-European language spoken in Central Asia (cf. Latin *quem* as interrogative and relativiser), or it may have emerged to copy the function of an interrogative-plus-conjunction in another contact language.

introducting the dependent clause.[4] Turkish, however, makes use of the productive verb inflection to express non-factual dependency, instead of resorting to a conjunction. The Balkan distinction between factual and non-factual subordination is replicated by restricting *ki* to factual complements.

As the subjunctive/optative becomes regularized in conjoined clauses as an expression of syntactic dependency, rather than illocution, the semantic restrictions on its occurrence in dependent clauses are removed: In Ottoman, finite complements in same-subject constructions with tight event integration appear to be restricted to verbs that rank low on the agentivity scale, and so are weak with respect to subject control:

(8) *qorqaram* *kim* *yolda* *ölem*
fear.AOR.1SG COMP way.LOC die.SUBJ.1SG
'I fear I might die on the way.'

In Macedonian Turkish, the subjunctive appears in tightly-integrated, subject-controlled complements of modal constructions as well:

(9) *Minibus'la* *başladım* *gezım* *kasabaları,*
minibus.INSTR start.PAST.1SG travel.SUBJ.1SG town.PL.ACC
yani *Ruhr'a.*
i.e. Ruhr.DAT
'I started to frequent the towns with my minibus, that is [to go to] the Ruhr.'

(10) *bilirsin* *ne* *istiyom* *deyim*
know.AOR.2SG what want.PROG.1SG say.SUBJ.1SG
'You know what I want to say.'

(11) *toplantılık* *istemirdiler* *yapsınlar*
meeting want.NEG.AOR.PAST.3PL make.SUBJ.3PL
'They didn't want to hold a meeting.'

There is thus, following Harris & Campbell (1995), an *extension* of function involving changes at the surface level. Finite subordinations are subsequently promoted from an option which exists alongside the infinitive to the only possible device marking dependent propositions, and so they are *generalized*. In integrated clauses, the optative paradigm is re-interpreted

4 Cf. Rumanian *să*, Romani *te*, Bulgarian/Macedonian *da*, Greek *na*, Albanian *të* for non-factual, Rumanian *că*, Romani *ke/kaj*, Bulgarian *če*, Macedonian *deka*, Greek *pos/oti*, Albanian *që* for factual.

from an illocutionary marker to a subjunctive which now expresses syntactic dependency.

This internal development is obviously motivated by the dynamics of language contact and convergence. What is copied, however, is the general arrangement of propositional units in the clause, beginning with the main clause as a point of departure, and inserting the target or objective action afterwards. The arrangement of single adjoined clauses assumes an iconic structure, with unreal events following real events, and goal actions following preparatory actions. This iconic arrangement takes precedence over the syntactic rules of constituent ordering in the language, which place the direct object before the verb and so the non-finite complement clause in front of its governing main verb. The fact that the arrangement of propositions now yields to iconicity rather than to the ordering rules of clausal constituent syntax is in turn related to the shift towards finiteness. Finiteness allows maximum consistency in the surface representation of events or actions. The more a language relies on a one-to-one representation or isomorphism, the stronger the tendency to have the ordering of events follow their real-world order of occurrence, i.e. the stronger the tendency towards iconicity (cf. Haiman 1980).

Macedonian Turkish non-factual finite complements differ however from their counterparts in other Balkan languages: They are not introduced by a non-factual complementizer. This gives us some idea as to how the copying process may have taken place: It is not the formal structure of the clause that is borrowed, but the regularity of finiteness as an expression of events and actions that is generalized as a cross-linguistic rule within the area. Convergence thus pertains not to the plain or surface structural dimension of the clause, but to the mental operations involved in planning the utterance and expressing relations between its individual propositional units. I have elsewhere referred to this process as a "fusion of utterance-planning operations" (Matras 1998, 1996). The level of grammar affected by convergence is the level at which individual propositional elements are arranged and processed, while the actual surface representation of structures is subject to language-internal mechanisms of change involving specific structural options that are inherited from earlier stages of the language.

3. MOTIVATION AND FUSION

Two questions arise: First, why the generalization of the finite option? And second, why a fusion of planning operations at the utterance level? Rozencvejg (1976) argues that the preference given to finiteness follows a preference for a one-to-one relation of underlying and surface representations, resulting in effect in simplification. Slobin (1986: 277) similarly states that "languages strive – as much as possible – toward one-to-one mapping between surface forms and underlying meanings", a generalization which, if true, might put finite structures at an advantage. But there are other linguistic areas, such as Southwest Asia (Masica 1976), where infinitives have been generalized, and so it is extremely difficult to adopt a positivistic approach to the infinitive-reduction (cf. Joseph 1983). From the specific point of view of Turkish, however, it is important to note again that the infinitive-reduction coincides not only with a generalization of finiteness as a one-to-one mapping relation, but also with the re-ordering of clauses in complex constructions and the retreat of the Turkic modifier-head or left-branching arrangement, a clear advantage as regards the possibilities to apply uniform sentence planning operations in the dialect and the contact languages.

This leads us to the second question, that of the motivation behind convergence at the utterance-planning level. Johanson (1992) proposes the term 'copying' as an alternative to the conventional labels 'borrowing', 'transfer', or 'interference'. 'Copying' captures the replicative character of the process, for what is copied is not simply taken, but also actively employed. For our discussion, 'replication' itself, a term used by Harris & Campbell (1995: 51) in their definition of borrowing, might be even more adequate, given that we are speaking not of a single form, but of a pattern of arrangement at the utterance level; 'replication' allows to capture the relative structural independence a single language may assume in adopting to a common, convergent pattern, or the re-generative aspect of syntactic convergence. The problem with both 'copying' and 'replication', however, is that they both assume a clear and recognizable target for imitation, and so, in traditional terms, a 'donor' and a 'recipient' language. While this might be the case for Turkish in Macedonia if we assume contact with Macedonian itself to have brought about the changes, it is certainly less so for Turkish in the Balkans as a whole, not to mention the Balkan languages as an areal group.

The main inadequacy of both terms is their failure to address the issue of motivation: Since syntactic integration of semantically dependent and closely-related clauses can be expressed in older stages of the language as well, we are not dealing with a process of change that is motivated by grammatical gaps (cf. Harris & Campbell 1995: 128–130). Rather, the functional motivation behind the shift in sentential structure is derived from the need to reduce the planning effort in constructing utterances while drawing on a repertoire of syntactic options in two or more languages (cf. for instance Ross's 2001 explanation of what he calls 'metatypy'). Salmons (1990) discusses the use of English discourse markers in a variety of German spoken in Texas, which coincides with the disappearance of the corresponding German forms. He suggests that language contact has resulted in a shared system of discourse-marking, consisting of borrowed surface forms from English, and so that the two languages have undergone convergence in this domain. His account suggests that speakers in some language-contact situations cannot or do not cope with the load of a double system in certain areas of grammar, while still keeping two languages apart. In Matras (1998) I referred to this process as 'fusion', and suggested that it derives from the conventionalisation of bilingual speech production errors, which, in the community in question, become acceptable, and ultimately generalised as the norm.

A similar conclusion may be drawn, I propose, from the collapse of infinitives, and with them of the Turkic left-branching complementation and purpose clause structure in Macedonian Turkish. The pressure to syncretize utterance planning operations results in a *fusion* of a set of rules pertaining to the arrangement of single propositional units and the clauses that contain them. In our case, at least at the level of the infinitive-reduction, it is not a fusion of an inventory of surface forms, but of abstract processing operations or 'operational linguistic-mental procedures' (Ehlich 1986). The structural changes triggered by the process are language-internal and make use of the specific inherited inventory of forms in each language. The choice of the finite option in the outcome of the process can be seen as a case of 'linguistic selection' (Croft 2000), where a form felt to be most compatible among a group of languages is given preference and generalized at some stage in their convergent evolution, leading ultimately to the replacement or partial replacement of alternative inherited constructions.

4. RELATIVE CLAUSES

Relative and adverbial clauses are not usually discussed as one of the Balkan convergent features, as they normally adhere to the general European type; yet for Turkish the shift away from converbal (gerundial and participial) constructions and on to finite subordinate clauses, as well as the emergence of a new class of subordinating particles, is a significant change in syntactic structure and typological affinity. Similar constructions appear in related Turkic idioms in close contact with Iranian or other Balkan and Slavic languages (such as Azeri, Gagauz, or Karaim). Older forms of Turkish allow to introduce postposed, finite predications that are attributive to a head noun, using *ki(m)* (Adamović 1985):

(12) *ben* *deyem* *sözler* *ki* *kimse* *demedi*
1SG.NOM say.FUT.1SG word.PL REL nobody say.NEG.PAST
'I will say things that nobody has said.'

In Macedonian Turkish, however, a new construction emerges, in which the interrogative *ne* figures as a relativizer:

(13) *şu* *araba* *kimindir* *bura* *ne* *duruyor?*
that car who.GEN.COP here what stop.PROG
'Whose car is that which is parked here?'

(14) *ondan* *önce* *çok* *yardım* *ettim* *Çingenlere,* *yani*
that.ABL before much help do.PAST.1SG Gypsy.PL.DAT i.e.
ben/ *bana* *Çingene* *ne* *geldi*
1SG.NOM 1SG.DAT Gypsy what come.PAST
'Before that I helped the Gypsies a lot, that is I/ [any] Gypsy who came to me.'

There are a number of features that are particular of the Macedonian Turkish relative construction, and which suggest that we are not dealing with a continuation of the older Turkish relative clause borrowed from Iranian. The first and most salient of those is the emergence of *ne* as a new relativizer. This is connected to the loss of the interrogative illocution in environments such as those documented in (13)–(14), although, structurally, a similarity between relative constructions and 'rhetorical questions' employed as highlighting-devices in discourse is apparent; indeed it appears to be this affinity between the two which ultimately leads to the reanalysis of the interrogative as a relativizer. Furthermore, unlike genuine Indo-European relative clauses such as those replicated in older Turkish

(example 12), relative clauses in Macedonian Turkish are not typically constituents of the main clause, and so they are not embedded, but adjoined to it.[5] The relativizer *ne* does not necessarily introduce the relative clause, but tends to immediately precede the restricting verb, which, since Turkish verb-final order is retained, appears at the end of the relative clause. This provides a contrast not only to the Iranian-type relative clause in older Turkish, but also to the congruent Indo-European languages of the Balkans, where VO order is prominent, and relative clauses are typically embedded.[6] Finally, since the verb appears in final position, the relativizer precedes the restricting verb, and the relative clause is adjoined and postposed, it is often necessary for the relativizer to include adverbal material into its scope *retrospectively*. This is exemplified by the position of *bura* 'here' in (13), and of *bana* 'to me' in (14). In (15) the relativizer can be said to occupy the ideal position, as it appears just between the head noun and the restricting verb:

(15) *iki yüz elli, üç yüz mark para alırdı*
two hundred fifty three hundred mark money take.AOR.PAST
bir mektup ne gönderirdi
one letter what send.AOR.PAST
'He used to take two hundred and fifty, three hundred marks for each letter that he used to send.'

In (16a), we find again retrospective inclusion of adverbal material – here the direct object *Zylinder* in the relative clause. (16c) shows that the relativizer can introduce the relative clause, but that there are two constraints: First, the relativizer is followed by a dummy-verb, the copula *dir*, which appears before the relative clause is actually initiated. Second, the relativizer is repeated in its 'normal' position – that immediately preceding the restricting verb (the indented utterance in (16b) represents the listener's comment):

5 Relative clauses in Indic are also adjoined, but usually pre-posed. They are introduced by a distinct class of relativizers which is not derived form interrogatives. One should therefore rather speak of Irano-European relative clauses.

6 Friedman (paper presented at the NIAS workshop on Turkish in Contact in February 1996) has pointed out that word order patterns in the relative clauses documented here are generally compatible with those of (spoken) Macedonian, but not with Albanian.

(16) a. *Var* *ya* *o* *adam,* *yani* *Zylinder* *ne*
existent PART that man i.e. hat[GER] what
taşiyor, *bir* *kara* *Zylinder, ...*
wear.PROG INDEF black hat[GER]

b. [*Ah,* *tamam.*]
right

c. ... *nedir* *Schopper* *"er ist meine Präsident aus Krefeld"*
what.COP Schopper [he is my president from Krefeld]
ne *diyor,*
what say.PROG

d. *o* *idi* *içerde.*
he COP.PAST inside

a. 'There's that man, I mean [the one] who wears a hat, a black hat,...
b. [Oh, right.]
c. ... the one [about] whom Schopper says "he's my president from Krefeld",
d. He was inside'

(17) [about Turkish Radio in Macedonia]
yasak *ettiler* *nasıl* *bu* *şimdi* *Separatismus* *ne*
prohibited do.PAST.3PL how this now separatism[GER] what
kalkti, *yani* *Republik* *neler,* *kestiler*
ended.PAST i.e. republic[GER] what.PL cut.PAST.PL
'They prohibited it due to this separatism which has now ended, I mean the republics and all that, they stopped it.'

Some of the apparent restrictions on the integration of relative clauses into complex sentences – especially their status as adjoined, rather than embedded clauses – might be explained by their distribution in spoken narrative discourse, where they constitute explanatory insertions into the discourse, rather than pre-planned complex constructions. This also accounts for their strong resemblance, in some cases, to 'rhetorical questions', although the latter still maintain a residue of their original illocution, while this is entirely lost in the *ne*-insertions documented here. One must however bear in mind that the dialect has no alternative structures to express relative constructions. This, along with the appearance of corresponding adverbial subordinations (discussed below), suggests that *ne*-constructions are indeed conventionalized. Additional evidence may be found in the appearance of relative clauses on most positions of Keenan & Comrie's (1977) accessi-

bility hierarchy, as seen in (13)–(17), as well as in their relative high frequency of occurrence.

To conclude this section, convergence or cross-linguistic fusion of utterance-planning operations is seen in its effect on relative clause formation to have stimulated a) the extension of finite clauses to relative constructions, and b) the extension of an interrogative as a relativizer. These two features, finiteness and an introductory unbound relativizer, can be taken to constitute the salient features of the Balkan or European-type relative clause, as seen from the Turkish perspective. For it is these two features, not the pattern of constituent order or embedding, that are taken as the underlying orientation coordinates in syntactic fusion. Slobin (1986), in a comparative discussion of relative clauses in Turkish and Indo-European, shows that participial relative clauses of the Turkic type with their modifier-head arrangement, morphological complexity, and choice of participial or gerundial form are acquired later than Indo-European relative clauses, are less frequent in discourse than the latter, and are often subject to renewal in contact situations. Slobin argues on these grounds that Turkish relative clauses impose a stronger processing burden on the speaker than the corresponding Indo-European constructions. Thus, one is inclined to expect a greater vulnerability of relative constructions in contact situations involving Turkic languages. Yet most Turkic languages, as Slobin points out, appear to have enriched their typological inventory in this domain, rather than change their overall relative clause typology. The Balkans must be considered as an extreme case, where, as suggested above, we witness not simply structural copying, replication, or renewal, but an overall fusion of sentence-organization patterns. The term fusion suggested above, reconsidered in light of our discussion of relative clauses, can be reinforced by the implication it contains that retention of alternative structures is excluded from the process, and that convergent constructions replace inherited ones.

5. ADVERBIAL CLAUSES

Finite adverbial clauses in Macedonian Turkish are much more similar to their Balkan counterparts than relative clauses; they display not just regularity, but full integration in hypotactic constructions. Here too, the emergence of finite subordinations coincides with the collapse of all the corresponding Turkish participial or converbal constructions. Again we are dealing with reanalysis of interrogatives as subordinating conjunctions, although it is necessary to distinguish two different levels: primary and

secondary subordinators. Primary subordinators emerge through direct reanalysis of inherited interrogatives. This is exemplified by the subordinators for simultaneity, *ne zaman* 'when', and location, *nerde* 'where' (the latter type of adverbial clause being, as in most languages, closely related to relative clauses as it typically modifies a head noun):

(18) *Şerafettine* *ne zaman* *kontağa* *geldim,* *yani*
Şerafettin.DAT when contact.DAT come.PAST.1SG i.e.
alti *ay* *önce,* *ben* *dedim* *ki ...*
six month before 1SG.NOM say.PAST that
'When I contacted Şerafettin, that is six months ago, I said that ...'

(19) *biz* *o* *tarafta* *nerde* *kaliyorduk,*
1.PL that side.LOC where stay.PROG.PAST.1PL
Yugoslavya'da, *o* *tarafta/* *Yugoslavya'yı* *ve* *o*
Yugoslavia.LOC that side.LOC Yugoslavia.ACC and that
tarafını *Türkiye* *tutu* *beş* *yüz* *sene*
side.POSS.ACC Turkey hold.PAST five hundred year
'In that area where we live, in Yugoslavia, in that area/ Turkey occupied Yugoslavia and that area for five hundred years.'

Secondary subordinators are partly or fully grammaticalized compounds, involving modified primary subordinators. (20) is an example of a partly grammaticalized compound subordinator expressing anteriority. The construction is ambivalent, and might be regarded as a mixture of paratactic arrangement expressing anteriorty, and hypotactic arrangement expressing simultaneity; but it is the only means available in the language for expressing anteriority in a complex construction:

(20) *biraz* *önce* *ne zaman* *geldi* *Ahmet* *ve* *o* *küçük*
little before when come.PAST Ahmet and that small
kadın, *o* *bana* *dedi:*
lady he 1SG.DAT say.PAST
'A short time before Ahmet and that short lady came, he said to me:'

(21)–(22) show fully grammaticalized secondary adverbial subordinators composed of an underlying interrogative (*nasıl* 'how', *ne kadar* 'how much') and the relativizer *ne*, which assumes the function of a general subordinator:

(21) *nasıl* *ne* *ben* *başladım* *gidim,* *aynı*
how what 1SG.NOM start.PAST.1SG go.SUBJ.1SG exactly
bütün *Nordrhein-Westfalen'den* *öbür* *kasabadan* *git/*
all Upper-Rhine-Westphalia.ABL other town.ABL go
vardi *bir/ bir* *yani* *Delegation* *var* *idi.*
exist.PAST INDEF INDEF i.e. delegation[GER] exist COP.PAST
'Just as I started to go [=to represent people], the same [happened] from all over Upper Rhine Westphalia, from other towns there went/ there was a/ that is, there was a delegation [for each].'

(22) *A* *birinci* *birinci,* *belki* *sen* *benden* *daha* *iyi*
and first first maybe 2SG.NOM 1SG.ABL still good
bilirsin *ben* *ne kadar* *ne* *bilirim,*
know.AOR.2SG 1SG.NOM how-much what know.AOR.1SG
birinci *geldi* *Yahudi,* *a* *ikincidir* *Çingene*
first come.PAST Jew and second.COP Gypsy
'But the very first, maybe you know more than I, as much as I know first came the Jews, while the Gypsies were second.'

In sum, the generalization of finiteness and the collapse of converbal forms enable the adoption of Indo-European relative and adverbial clause typology in Macedonian Turkish, and so a fusion of utterance-planning operations in the area of propositional integration in complex constructions. Part of the process is a language-internal innovation by which a closed set of interrogatives are reanalyzed as subordinators, which in turn support the grammaticalization of further adverbial subordinators in what might be regarded as the actualization process following reanalysis (Harris & Campbell 1995). As a result, the language acquires a new category – adverbial subordinators –, which are unknown in earlier stages of the language.[7]

6. CONNECTORS

In embeddings, relative clauses, and subordinations we saw that convergence implies compatibility of abstract utterance-planning patterns which is reconcilable with the use of different surface forms in each language. Thus, not only are the surface forms for relativizers and adverbial conjunctions innovative and language-particular, but Macedonian Turkish shows no use

7 As pointed out above, there is no continuation in Macedonian Turkish of Iranian relativiers, except for the role of *ki* in factual complements.

at all of an unbound surface form corresponding structurally to a non-factual complementizer, and relies instead on the inflected subjunctive, which continues to function as an optative in other environments. We encounter a different situation when examining the structures responsible for utterance chaining in Macedonian Turkish, or connective devices. Here, the language incorporates surface forms, not just functions or utterance 'plans', that are Macedonian in origin. Macedonian *i* 'and' functions as a clause-initial 'additive' connector:

(23) a. *çok* *Çingenlere/* *bizden* *Duisburg'tan*
many Gypsy.PL.DAT 1PL.ABL Duisburg.ABL
anladılar *ki,* *benim* *için,*
understand.PAST.PL PART 1SG.GEN for

b. *i* *başladım* *ben* *bu* *işleri* *katarliyim,*
and start.PAST.1SG 1SG.NOM this matter.PL.AC lead.SUBJ.1SG

c. *i* *o zaman* *dört* *göze* *geldim* *biraz*
and then four eye.DAT come.PAST.1SG little
önce *anlattık* *şeyle,* *Şerafettin'le*
before tell.PAST.1PL thing.INSTR Şerafettin.INSTR

a. '(For) many Gypsies/ from among our people, from Duisburg, they supported me,
b. And so I began to lead these activities,
c. So then I met alone, we told [the story] a little while ago, with what's his name, Şerafettin.'

(24) a. *Dedi* *şey,* *"hadi* *yürü",* *onlar* *hep*
say.PAST thing come-on walk 3.PL.NOM always
yürürdiler, *yürürdiler* *hep,*
walk.AOR.PAST.PL walk.AOR.PAST.PL always
anladin *mi* *şimdi?*
understand.PAST.2SG QUE now

b. *i* *şimdi* *onların* *atları* *kaldi* *"Yürük".*
and now 3PL.GEN name.PL.POSS stay.PAST Yürük

a. 'They said, "come-on, walk", they used to walk, they always used to walk, do you understand now?
b. And so now their name remained "Yürük" [= 'walking'].'

It is apparent here that *i* 'and' is not a logical connector, but a connector of both actions of speech and propositional content (see Schiffrin 1987), or a discourse marker. A frequent meaning of *i* as seen in (23)–(24) is conti-

nuity of speech action and consequentiality at the propositional level: The event portrayed in (23b) is a consequence of that conveyed by (23a), and leads to that represented by (23c). Similary, (24b) conveys the outcome of the state of affairs represented by the preceding utterance. Beside *i*, a further Macedonian conjunction *a* appears. *a* indicates contrast of propositional content, coinciding with a syncretization of speech actions. Thus, there is a discrepancy between the propositional contents presented, but unlike with 'genuine' adversatives of the *but*-type the speaker is using this discrepancy to continue to make the same point, and no revision is involved:

(25) a. *"... Krefeld'te bir Asylantrag yapalım".*
Krefeld.LOC INDEF asylum-application[GER] make.SUBJ.1PL
( )

b. *Duisburg'ta neye istemedi? istemedi ki,*
Duisburg.LOC why want.NEG.PAST want.NEG.PAST PART
şey için, çünkü gemiye verirler,
thing for because boat.DAT give.AOR.3PL

c. *a gemide para yok, biliyor musun,*
and boat.LOC money none know.PROG QUE.2SG

d. *.A bütün akrabalari hep Duisburg'ta.*
and all relative.PL.POSS all Duisburg.LOC

e. *A o oraya gitsin yazılsın Krefeld'te.*
and he there.DAT go.SUBJ.3SG write.PASS.SUB.3SG Krefeld.LOC

a. '"... to apply for asylum in Krefeld."
( )

b. Why didn't he want [to do it] in Duisburg? he didn't want to,
because of what's it called, because they send you to the boats,

c. and on the boats there's no money, you know,

d. But all his relatives were all in Duisburg.

e. But he [wanted to] go there to register in Krefeld.'

(26) a. *... birinci Demonstration ne zaman yapmıştık ...*
first demonstration[GER] when make.PERF.PAST.1PL
( )

b. *A kim yapar? Düsseldorf ve Duisburg sade.*
and who make.AOR Düsseldorf and Duisburg only

c. *A Oberhausen yapiyor Fest.*
and Oberhausen make.PROG party[GER]

d. *Biz* *Demo* *yapariz,* *onlar* *Fest*
1.PL demo[GER] maker.AOR.1PL 3PL party[GER]
yaparlar.
maker.AOR.3PL
a. '... the first time we organized a demonstration ...
( )
b. And so who is organizing it? Only Düsseldorf and Duisburg.
c. And Oberhausen is organizing a party.
d. We organize a demonstration, they organize a party.'

(27) *Birinci* *geldi* *Yahudi,* *a* *ikincidir* *Çingene*
first come.PAST Jew and second.COP Gypsy
'First came the Jews, while the Gypsies were second.'

Notice that the inherited Turkish conjunction *ve* (itself a Perso-Arabic borrowing) appears in (26b). However, *ve* typically occurs as a connector of constituents, but not as a connector of utterances. What does this indicate as to the motivation behind the borrowing of connectors? Primarily, it casts doubt on the accuracy of the traditional understanding of the borrowability hierarchy of grammatical items as being determined by structural factors alone, where borrowing of unbound and uninflected items such as conjunctions is more likely than that of semi-bound elements (e.g. adpositions) and bound derivational and inflectional morphology (see Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 74–95; also Weinreich 1953: 31–37). Both *ve* and the class comprising *i* and *a* are unbound, uninflected conjunctions. But *i* and *a* are borrowed at the level of organization and arrangement of entire utterances and speech actions in discourse, while *ve* is retained in clause-internal position. There is thus a functional hierarchy in operation here, rather than a plainly structural one. The more active an element is at the discourse level, the more likely it is to be subject to renewal in language-contact situations. This has been illustrated for discourse-markers in immigrant German (Salmons 1990), in Turkic languages (Slobin 1986: 288; Johanson 1992), in Hebrew-English bilingual discourse (Maschler 1994), in Romani (Matras 1996, 1998), in Mesoamerican languages (Stolz & Stolz 1996), and elsewhere.

In minority languages which have an in-group function and are exposed to pressure from a dominant language of higher administrative, economic, or cultural prestige, discourse-markers are likely to be replaced by those of the contact language, which is dominant in group-external

communication. Although this generalization is of a sociolinguistic nature, it bears implications for our understanding of the functionality of discourse-markers in bilingual conversation, and so of their functionality in grammar in general. Having a 'dominant' contact-language seems to imply that this language's grammatical patterns for organizing and arranging utterances in discourse dominate the bilingual's repertoire of relevant linguistic-mental operations in *both* languages. The famous arbitrarity of the linguistic sign, usually obvious to bilinguals, is obscured here by the apparent dependency of certain mental processing operations upon the specific forms that trigger them. Thus, unlike the level of utterance structuring and clause-internal arrangement of propositional contents, where cross-linguistic fusion affects abstract alignment principles that are compatible with variation of functionally equivalent signs, fusion at the level of discourse connectors pertains to surface forms as well as to organizational principles.

This can be explained by the internal function of discourse connectors. I suggest that the extra-propositional status of connectors as situation-bound, gesture-like expressions that organize actions of speech makes them detachable from the content-related part of the utterance, and so vulnerable in contact situations. In planning and organizing speech outside the propositional domain of the utterance, the association between a mental operation and the linguistic expression that triggeres it is automaticized, rendering a reflex-usage, rather than a content-related choice. Maschler (1994) as well as Salmons (1990) speak of 'meta-languaging' in this context.[8] The more intense the monitoring of hearer-processing and hearer-participation and the infiltration of hearer-related expectations by the speaker is, the more situation-bound the linguistic operation becomes, and the more likely it is to escape the control of a language-specific choice of item. Adversatives and concessives are therefore often found at the very top of the borrowability hierarchy for grammatical elements in sociolinguistic situations of the type characterized above (see also Matras 1998).

This brings us to another connector, in Macedonian Turkish: the adversative conjunction. *ama*, as shown in (28), is different from *a* as it

8 Although Maschler (1994) points out that among balanced bilinguals whose two languages enjoy equal prestige, codeswitched discourse markers constitute conscious or semi-conscious highlighting strategies or 'flagging' expressions. Nevertheless, this meta-languaging strategy exploits the extra-propositional status of the forms.

expresses mutual compatibility of propositional contents in the two utterances, but a revision of hearer-expectations created on the basis of the preceding speech action[9]:

(28) a. *Bülân: "O içmezse ağızi oynamaz!"*
Bülân he drink.NEG.COND mouth.POSS play.NEG

b. *Ama doğrü.*
but right

c. *Söz söylemiyim.*
word say.NEG.POT.1SG

d. *Ama içtim mi, hemen patlardım.*
but drink.PAST.1SG QUE immediately burst.AOR.PAST.1SG

a. 'Bülân: "If he doesn't drink his mouth doesn't play".
b. But it's true.
c. I can't say a word.
d. But if I've had a drink, I would burst immediately.'

But if adversatives are at the top of the borrowability hierarchy, why is Turkish *ama* retained? The reason is quite simple, and is entirely in line with the explanation suggested above concerning the universals of discourse-marker replacement in contact situations: Macedonian, having been exposed to Turkish as the language of administration during the Ottoman rule, has itself borrowed the Turkish adversative, while retaining the Slavic additive conjunctions. This suggests that the replacement of connectors in Macedonian Turkish by Slavic elements is a fairly recent phenomenon.

The claim for the extreme vulnerability of adversatives is supported by a slip of the tongue by one of the speakers considered in the corpus, who is fluent in German and uses insertions from German extensively. These, however, appear exclusively at the lexical level or at the level of sentential codeswitching. But in (29), while his attention is drawn to the irony of the content of his narrative, he 'slips' into German while performing the adversative operation:

(29) a. *Bu kadar bir kâğıtlar hep kopiya, ( ) yapti.*
this till INDEF paper.PL all copy make.PAST

b. *Oberhausen, bizim, ve Düsseldorf.*
Oberhausen 1PL.GEN and Düsseldorf

9 Schiffrin (1987) characterizes *but* as a marker of speaker-return; but I believe that processing and amending hearer-expectations is the more essential component (see Ehlich 1984).

c. *Aber* *bir* *ay* *sonra* *geldi.* [chuckles]
but[GER] INDEF month after come.PAST

a. 'He produced that many papers, all photocopies.
b. Oberhausen's, ours, and Düsseldorf's.
c. But it arrived a month later [= too late].'

Harris & Campbell (1995: 128–130) cite the case of borrowed Spanish connectors in Pipil, a Mesoamerican language, as an example of borrowing which fills grammatical gaps. Pipil, it is claimed, has adopted Spanish connectors since it lacked overt markers of its own for expressing interclausal relations.[10] This is, in principle, arguable for Macedonian Turkish as well, since Turkish is restriced in its inventory of clause-initial connectors, and expresses many of the functions through converbs. One might argue that Macedonian Turkish, having lost its inherited converbs, restructures its entire typology of clause coordination on the basis of the (Slavic) Macedonian model. But grammatical gaps cannot explain the slip of the tongue in (29), nor do they explain the universal vulnerability of adversatives in contact situations, as seen among others in the adoption of Turkish *ama* into Slavic Macedonian.

I suggest instead the following as a possible scenario: Slips of the tongue, of the type that appears in (29), become conventionalized in minority languages which fit the sociolinguistic conditions outlined above. This is possible since a) importing foreign connectors into the minority language, speakers of which are usually bilingual, does not stigmatize the speaker and does not create a barrier to comprehensibility, while at the same time b) such import does not jeopardize the independent status or retention of the language, as it only affects an interclausal domain, but not the actual derivational, lexical, and inflectional areas of the language where contents and meanings are conveyed. The native system of connectors is ultimately abandoned, and this entire grammatical domain undergoes both formal and functional fusion with the contact-language. In the case of Macedonian Turkish, this leads to a shift in the type of connectivity devices from converbs to clause initial connectors, and so to typological change.

10 But their claim that "this state of affairs was not as efficient for the hearer to process as a grammar with different overt conjunctions for varied kinds of clauses" (Harris & Campbell 1995: 129), does not seem to contradict the pragmatic-based hypothesis suggested here.

Once again we are confronted with fusion as a process which replaces inherited typology, rather than enriching it.

7. CONCLUSION

Language contact can stimulate processes of language-internal change, where languages undergo their own internal processes of syntactic rearrangement while following a model of sentence organization provided by a contact language. Salient features relating to the mapping and representation of functions are replicated using the language-specific inventory of inherited forms, which triggers extension or reanalysis. Convergence of this type occurs not at the level of single surface forms or actual linguistic material, but at the level of sentence planning and the arrangement of propositional elements. I regard this type of convergence, in which the inherited typology is replaced by that copied from the contact language, as a cross-linguistic fusion of sentence planning procedures.

Different layers of syntax show different types of fusion. For the Balkanization of Macedonian Turkish one could generalize that the tighter the semantic integration of propositional elements, the more the language relies on its inherited forms and functions while undergoing fusion. Thus, single-event and subject-controlled complements show historical extension of an inherited functional and formal option – the subjunctive. Clause integration shows reanalysis of inherited forms – with relativizers and conjunctions emerging from underlying interrogatives. Utterance-chaining at the discourse level shows replacement of forms, and, in the area of consequential and contradicting additive connectors, enhancement of functions. Clearly, these changes are connected to the specific typological inventory inherited from Turkish. But I claim that even where Turkish and the Balkan languages are incompatible at the structural level, fusion does not occur primarily in order to fill structural gaps. Rather, it arises from the need to syncretize processing operations when drawing continuously on a repertoire of two or more syntactic systems. In light of this distinct behavior in language-contact situations of various layers of syntax, definitions of syntactic categories seem to merit at least some analytical reconsideration from a discourse-communicative point of view.

ABBREVIATIONS

ABL	ablative	GER	German	PERF	perfect/inferential
ACC	accusative	INDEF	indefinite article	PL	plural
AOR	aorist	INSTR	instrumental	POSS	possessive
COMP	complementizer	LOC	locative	POT	potential
COND	conditional	NEG	negation	PROG	progressive
COP	copula	NOM	nominative	QUE	question particle
DAT	dative	PART	sentence particle	SG	singular
FUT	future	PASS	passive	SUBJ	subjunctive
GEN	genitive	PAST	past-tense		

REFERENCES

ADAMOVIĆ, M. 1985. *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache.* Leiden.

CROFT, W. 1996. Linguistic selection: an utterance-based evolutionary theory of language. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 19: 99–139.

—. 2000. *Explaining language change: An evolutionary approach.* Harlow, England.

CSATÓ, E. A. 1991. Non-finite verbal constructions in Turkish. In: B. Brendemoen (ed.), *Altaica Osloensia.* Oslo: 75–88.

EHLICH, K. 1984. Eichendorffs aber. In: W. van Peer & J. Renkma (eds.), *Pragmatics and stylistics.* Amersfoort: 145–192.

—. 1986. Funktional-pragmatische Kommunikationsanalyse. Ziele und Verfahren. In: W. Hartung (ed.), *Untersuchungen zur Kommunikation. Ergebnisse und Perspektiven.* Berlin: 15–40.

GOŁĄB, Z. 1956. The conception of isogrammatism. *Biuletyn Polskiego Towarzystwa Językoznawczego* 15: 3–12.

—. 1959. Some Arumanian-Macedonian isogrammatisms and the social background of their development. *Word* 15: 415–435.

HAIG, G. 2001. Linguistic diffusion in present-day East Anatolia from top to bottom. In: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics.* Oxford: 195–224.

HAIMAN, J. 1980. The iconicity of grammar: Isomorphism and motivation. *Language* 56/3: 515–540.

HARRIS, A. C. & CAMPBELL, L. 1995. *Historical syntax in cross-linguistic perspective.* Cambridge.

JOHANSON, L. 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten.* Stuttgart.

JOSEPH, B. 1983. *The synchrony and diachrony of the Balkan infinitive.* Cambridge.

KEENAN, E. L. & COMRIE, B. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and universal grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8: 63–99.

MASCHLER, Y. 1994. Metalanguaging and discourse markers in bilingual conversation. *Language in Society* 23: 325–366.

MASICA, C. 1976. Defining a linguistic area: South Asia. Chicago.

MATRAS, Y. 1996. Prozedurale Fusion: Grammatische Interferenzschichten im Romanes. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49/1: 60–78.

MATRAS, Y. 1997a. The function and typology of coordinating conjunctions: evidence from discourse and language-contact situations. In: Ch. Butler, J. Connolly, R. Gatward, & R. Vismans (eds.), *Discourse Pragmatics in Functional Grammar*. Berlin: 177–191.

—. 1998. Utterance modifiers and unversals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36: 281–331.

ROSS, M. 2001. Contact-induced change in Oceanic languages in north-west Melanesia. In: A. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon (eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: 134–166.

ROZENCVEJG, V. JU. 1976. *Linguistic interference and convergent change*. The Hague.

SALMONS, J. 1990. Bilingual discourse marking: code switching, borrowing, and convergence in some German-American dialects. *Linguistics* 28: 453–480.

SANDFELD, K. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique*. Paris.

SCHIFFRIN, D. 1987. *Discourse Markers*. Cambridge.

SLOBIN, D. I. 1986. The acquisition and use of relative clauses in Turkic and Indo-European languages. In: D. I. Slobin & K. Zimmer (eds.), *Studies in Turkish linguistics*. Amsterdam: 273–294.

SOLTA, G. R. 1980. *Einführung in die Balkanlinguistik mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Substrats und des Balkanlateinischen*. Darmstadt.

STOLZ, CH. & STOLZ, TH. 1996. Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika. Spanisch-amerindischer Sprachkotakt (Hispanoindiana II). *Sprachkontakt und Universalienforschung* 49/1: 86–123.

THOMASON, S. GREY & KAUFMAN, T. 1988. *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley.

WEINREICH, U. 1953 [1968]. *Languages in contact*. The Hague.

—. 1958. On the compatibility of genetic relationship and convergent development. *Word* 14: 374–379.