Analyzing Contact-Induced Phenomena in Karaim
Author(s): Éva Ágnes Csató
Proceedings of the 25th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society: Special Session on Caucasian, Dravidian, and Turkic Linguistics
(2000), pp. 54-62

Analyzing contact-induced phenomena in Karaim

ÉVA ÁGNES CSATÓ
Uppsala University, Sweden

1. Peripheral Turkic languages

Deviant developments are particularly strong in the periphery of the Turkic-speaking world. Turkic languages spoken in so-called language islands, separated from the Common Turkic linguistic area, have often converged in a fascinating way with dominating non-Turkic languages. Most of the peripheral Turkic languages exhibit highly interesting examples of contact phenomena, new lexical elements, syntactic structures, and articulatory habits copied from non-Turkic contact languages.

2. Code-copying

The Model of Code-Copying elaborated by Johanson (1992, 1993, 1996) serves as a typological framework in which different types of copying processes are defined. The term copying is introduced to replace traditional terms such as borrowing and code-switching. The model distinguishes between global, selective and mixed copies of material, as well as combinatory, semantic and frequential features. One of the basic tenets of the model is that a copy is never identical with the original and that copying processes always lead to innovations and change the copying code.

3. The case of the Karaim language

Here I will present examples illustrating different types of copying in the Lithuanian dialect of the Karaim language. Karaim belongs to the Kipchak branch of the Turkic language family. Its two living dialects, the Lithuanian and the Ukrainian, manifest a number of typological properties shared with cognate Turkic languages. They have, however, undergone considerable changes induced by language contact. The adaptation of new structural and lexical properties has led to a significant convergence with dominant areal linguistic types. This paper focuses on the nature of linguistic processes involved in such typological changes in general. Both dialects are highly endangered. The Lithuanian dialect is spoken today by about 40 speakers and the Ukrainian dialect by six speakers altogether, of which only two have full-fledged competence.

4. Frame-changing processes

The theoretical issue to be studied is how copying may change the structure of the copying language. Karaim data provide arguments to claim that the distinction between frame-changing and non-frame-changing processes is not a crucial one. In principle, each new copy changes the frame. I take the position that contact-induced language change occurs at all levels of linguistic structure. Continuous copying leads to increasing similarity of the codes involved. More equivalence positions for insertion of new copies are created. By incorporating new items and structures, the basic code is permanently reshaped to form the basis for new frame-changing developments.

Different types of changes are triggered by the process of copying. Global copies of lexical material may introduce new syntactic patterns, as illustrated by

adpositional and case-assigning phenomena in Karaim. Like other Turkic languages, Karaim is a postpositional language. The copy of the Slavonic preposition *okolo* meaning here 'about' introduced a new syntactic structure in which the adposition precedes the nominal complement. The case-assigning properties of the preposition, i.e. its combinatorial features, were also copied. Thus, the preposition ascribes the Karaim genitive to the noun *afta* 'week', just as the Slavonic preposition also requires the genitive.

(1) *Karaim*

Okolo	b'ir	aftanïn	Troxta	kalïm.
about.PREP	a	week:GEN	Trakai:LOC	stay:AOR:1SG

'I will stay about a week in Trakai.'

Frequential copying may change the functional load of some constructions and thus lead to the loss of certain 'typical' constructions, as the two different types of Karaim 'have'-constructions illustrate. Both constructions are grammatical; the frequency of construction (2b) has increased as a result of contact with Slavonic, in which this is the usual 'have' construction. (2a) illustrates the typical Turkic 'have' construction.

(2) *Karaim*

a.

m'en'im	ed'i	ek'i	karïndašïm
I:GEN	be:PST	two	brother:POSS1SG
N:GEN	COPULA	NP:POSS	

'I had two brothers.'

b.

Troxta	bart	b'iz'd'à	uŋlu	yùv.
Trakai:LOC	existing:3	we:LOC	big	house
	COPULA	N:LOC	NP	

'We have a big house in Trakai.'

Copied word order patterns have changed the markedness patterns of certain Karaim constructions and consequently led to basic typological changes. Today Karaim is an SVO language. The following table compares the Karaim word order features with those in the dominating languages of the area: Lithuanian, Polish and Russian. The cognate Turkic languages Karachay-Balkar and Turkish have an SOV order.

(3) *Basic word order in Karaim, its cognates (Turkish and Karachay-Balkar) and the dominating contact languages (Lithuanian, Polish and Russian)*

Karaim	SVO	Postp / (Prep)	NG / GN	AN / (NA)
Turkish and Karachay-Balkar	SOV	Postp	GN	AN
Lithuanian	SVO	Prep	GN	AN
Russian	SVO (free variation)	Prep	NG	AN
Polish	SVO (free variation)	Prep	NG	AN / NA

The hypothesis I wish to present here is that operators are especially sensitive to copying processes. I will apply the term *operator* to phonological and grammatical elements which bear a scope relation to some part of a phonological form or a

syntactic structure, such as a quantifier or a negative. *Scope* is taken to be a part of a linguistic form which is interpreted as being affected by an operator present in an utterance.

5. Copied properties of operators

5.1. The frontness operator

An operator functioning at the *phonological level* is the one assigning front or back quality to a syllable. This is the so-called palatal harmony in Turkic, a suprasegmental phenomenon of syllabic harmony (Johanson 1991). Syllables in Turkic are classified as either front or back. Both consonants and vowels can participate in the task of signalling the front or back status of a given syllable. Full vowels are either front or back and have, as a rule, a clear signal effect. Some consonants may also function as forceful back or front signals. For instance, while *k*, *g*, and *l* are front signals, *q*, *ġ*, *γ*, and *ɬ* are back signals in most Turkic languages. Their phonetic realisation differs in the individual languages, but the phonological contrast between front and back remains constant. Thus, in the Turkish words *kül* 'ash' versus *quɬ* 'slave', both the consonants and the vowels participate in signalling the quality of the syllable. Not all consonants have, however, the phonetic properties needed to function as a frontness or backness signal. See the Turkish examples (4).

(4) a. πFRONT {kul} → [kül] 'ashes'
πBACK {kul} → [quɬ] 'slave'

b. πFRONT {bun} → [bün] 'base'
πBACK {bun} → [bun] 'distress'

The front versus back classification of syllables plays an important role both with respect to the internal structure of lexical items and in determining the phonological shape of suffixes. The tendency of harmony is operative within syllables and may also apply across syllables within a word form.

The operator assigning front versus back quality to syllables in Karaim has copied some phonological properties of Slavonic languages. Most of the consonants in Slavonic languages have both palatalized and non-palatalized variants. The palatalized ones occur often in the environment of front vowels.

The Karaim operator assigning the value 'front' or 'back' to a syllable applies the Slavonic principle of selection, i.e., consonants are palatalized in the environment of palatal vowels. Consequently, the Karaim operator assigning front quality to a syllable assigns palatal quality to the vowel and palatalized quality to all consonants.

(5) *Syllabic harmony in Lithuanian Karaim*

Front		*Back*	
k'el'd'im		kaldïm	
come:PAST.1.SG		stay:PAST:1.SG	
'I came'		'I stayed'	
yùv'g'à		orunγa	
house:DAT		place:DAT	
'to the house', 'home'		'to the place'	
k'òp	m'ə	uprax	mə
many	Q	cloth	Q
'many?'		'cloth?'	

As a consequence, the consonant inventory of Karaim has become extended by the addition of the copied set of Slavonic palatalized consonants. Compare the Turkish consonant inventory in (6) with the Karaim one in (7). The Karaim inventory includes a palatalized variant of each consonant.

(6) *Inventory of Turkish consonants (in Turcological notation)*

	Labial	Alveo-dental	Prepalatal	Postpalatal	Velar	Glottal
Stop	p, b	t, d		k, g	q, ġ	
Fricative	f, v	s, z	š , ž			h
Nasal	m	n				
Affricate			č, ǰ			
Glide			y			
Liquid			l, ł, r			

(7) *Inventory of Karaim consonants (in Turcological notation)*

	Labial	Alveo-dental	Prepalatal	Postpalatal	Velar	Glottal
Stop	p, p'	t, t'		k, k'		
	b, b'	d, d'		g, g'		
Fricative	f, f'	s, s'	š , š'			x, x'
	v, v'	z, z'	ž, ž'			γ, γ'
Nasal	m, m'	n, n'			ŋ, ŋ'	
Affricate		c, c'	č, č'			
			dž, dž'			
Glide			y			
Liquid			l, l'			
			r, r'			

This copying process has affected properties of the operator assigning intrasyllabic frontness versus backness features and resulted in a new inventory of consonants in Karaim. The copying process has first affected the operator. This becomes clear when comparing the Russian and the Karaim consonant inventories. In Russian *š, c,* and *ž* are always non-palatal and *šč* and *č* are always palatal. The Karaim system, on the other hand, also has palatal and non-palatal variants of these consonants, since any consonant can be in the scope of the operator; note the following Karaim examples.

(8) FRONT {ıščı} → [iš'č'i] 'worker'
BACK {konšu} → [konšu] 'neighbor'.

5.2. The Q-operator

The interrogative Q-operator in Karaim is, like in other Turkic languages, the particle *mi*, which is always atonic and cliticized to the questioned constituent; note the following Turkish examples.

(9) *Turkish*

a. Siz eve gidiyor **mu**sunuz?
you home:DAT go:IYOR.PRES Q:2.PL
'Do you go home?'

b. Siz eve **mi** gidiyorsunuz?
you home:DAT Q go:IYOR.PRES:2.PL
'Do you go **home**?'

c. Siz **mi** eve gidiyorsunuz?
you Q home:DAT go:IYOR.PRES:2.PL
'Do **you** go home?'

Lithuanian Karaim has preserved this Turkic syntax of the interrogative particle, but, as a syntactic innovation, it has also copied the scope properties of the Russian interrogative particle *li*. The particle is cliticized to the first accented word of the Russian clause; see (10).

(10) *Russian*

...ljubiš li ty svoju rabotu?
like:PRES.2SG: Q you own:FEM.ACC job:FEM.ACC

Da, ja očen' ljublju svoju rabotu.
yes I very like:PRES.1SG own:FEM.ACC job:FEM.ACC
'... whether you like your job? Yes, I like my job very much.'

The same scope properties may be observed in Lithuanian Karaim as well. The interrogative particle *mi* follows the first word of the clause although this word is not questioned. See the first example in (11), in which the particle is used in a main clause, and the second example, in which it is attached to the first word of the subordinated clause. Note that, whereas the Karaim particle can be used both in main clauses and in subordinated clauses, the Russian particle is usually used only in subordinated clauses. Thus, not the Russian syntax but the scope properties of the operator have been copied.

(11) *Karaim*

Iš'iyn'i	**m'ə**	s'ův'ås'?
job:POSS.2SG:ACC:	Q	like:PRES:2SG

'Do you like your job?'

Astrï	iš'im'd'ån'	b'iyån'åm.
very	job:POSS.1SG:ABL	be fond of:PRES.1SG

'Yes, I am very fond of my job.'

B'il'm'im	m'en'	**-m'ə**	k'ib'it'k'å	barïm.
know:NEG:1SG	I	Q	shop:DAT	go:AOR:1SG

'I don't know whether I will go to the shop.'

5.3. Discourse operators

The most frequently copied operators assign discourse and pragmatic functions. The particle *to* is a discourse operator copied from Slavonic. It is used in (12) and (13) to mark a vague consecutive relation.

(12) *Karaim*

Son	n'eč'ik	čïxsa,
end	when	emerge:COND

to	k'er'åk	alma	n'in'd'ikol'ek		savut.
PARTICLE	need	take:INF	some		pot

'After they have emerged, then you need to prepare the pot.

(13)

Da	n'eč'ik	is's'i	da	ombun'd'i	n'eč'ik	kuyaš
and	when	warm	and	so	when	sun

to	bu	savutnu	k'er'åk	čïyarma	azbar	usnu.
PARTICLE	this	pot:ACC	need	take out	yard	POSTP.on

'And when it is warm and sunny outside, then you have to put the pot out in the yard.'

The last example of contact-induced changes in the operator system of Karaim is a specific strategy applied to mark a constituent as pragmatically prominent. The hypothesis that operators are especially targets for copying is corroborated by the fact that this construction is widely spread in a huge linguistic area. It is found in Slavonic languages, in Turkic languages spoken in Slavonic surroundings, e.g. in Azerbaijanian dialects, in Gagauz in Moldavia and Bulgaria, in Balkan Turkic dialects. It is used also in Hungarian, in Modern Greek and even in Khalaj in Iran.

The construction under investigation is characterized by the non-initial position of the subjunctor, see (14).

(14) π PROM SUBJUNCTOR

Let us first look at this construction in Russian. Russian temporal clauses are normally introduced by a subjunctor such as *kogda* 'when', but, as the following examples illustrate, one or several nominal constituents of the subordinated clause can also precede the subjunctor. Note that no extraction from the clause takes place; the nominal constituent *zima* 'winter' is syntactically and semantically still a constituent of the subordinated clause.

(15) *Russian*

a. **А зима когда придет,** время летит.
but winter when comes time flies
'But when the winter comes, the time flies.'

b. А **зима у нас когда придет,** время летит.
but winter by us when comes time flies
'But when the winter comes by us, the time flies.'

c. Вот **крем когда приготовишь,** тогда и доделаем торт.
well cream when you prepare then and make ready cake
'When you have prepared the cream, we will make the cake ready.'

d. Мы доделаем торт, **крем когда приготовишь.**
we make ready cake cream when you prepare
'We will make the cake ready when you have prepared the cream.'

The constituent preceding the subjunctor may be the subject or any other nominal constituent of the clause. Several constituents may stand in the pre-subjunctor position. The subordinated clause may introduce the sentence as in the first example. It can, however, also take the final position, in which case the constituent *krem* 'cream' can be interpreted as a contrastive focus.

Also a Karaim temporal subordinated clause is normally introduced by the subjunctor *nečik* 'when', but the non-initial position of the subjunctor occurs as well.

(16) *Karaim*

Kïš n'eč'ik k'el'ȧt',
winter when come:PRS

to šaγarda t'ež vaxt ašat.
PARTICLE town:LOC quick time pass:PRS
'When the winter comes, time passes quickly in the town.'

Corresponding constructions are also used in other Turkic languages spoken in Slavonic linguistic surroundings, such as Gagauz and Macedonian Turkish.

(17) *Gagauz in Moldova* (Menz 1996)

Ilkin **kolxoza ačan geldik**
first kolkhoz:DAT when come:PST:1PL

o zaman ödärdilär pek islāx.
that time pay:R.PST:3PL very good
'The first time when we entered the kolkhoz they paid very well.'

(18) *Macedonian Turkish* (Matras 1996)

Šu araba kimindir, **bura ne duruyor?**
that car who:GEN:PRT here what stand:PRS
'Whose car is that which is parked here?'

Another genetically non-related language of the area is Hungarian. The construction under investigation here is frequently used in spoken varieties of Hungarian.

(19) *Hungarian*

a. **A** **tél** **amikor** **jön,**
the winter when come:PRS

a városban gyorsan múlnak a napok.
the town:INESS quickly pass:PRS3 the day:PL
'When the winter comes, the days pass quickly in the town.'

b. **A** **városba** **hogy** **beértünk** megéheztünk.
the town:ILL that arrive:PST:1PL become hungry:PST:1PL
'When we arrived at the town, we became hungry.'

The internal processes contributing to the development of these constructions in the particular Slavonic, Turkic, Finno-Ugric languages, respectively, are surely different. A model construction or several model constructions have been successively copied into the languages of the area. The copies have been adjusted to the system of the particular languages or language varieties and are thus clearly never identical. The syntactic frames of the copying languages have been changed to the effect that these languages have become syntactically more similar, i.e. convergence has taken place.

6. Copying of operators and discourse strategies

I have presented here the hypothesis that operators are especially attractive for copying. This is not surprising considering that they pay a central role in the discourse strategies applied by speakers in speech production.

References

Csató, Éva Ágnes. (1994). On word order differences between Turkish and Karaim. *Dilbilim Araştırmaları*, 1994, 54-61.

Csató, Éva Ágnes. (1996). Some typological properties of North-Western Karaim in areal perspectives. Boretzky, Norbert, Werner Enninger and Thomas Stolz (eds) *Areale, Kontakte, Dialekte. Sprache und ihre Dynamik in mehrsprachigen Situationen,* Bochum-Essener Beiträge zur Sprachwandelforschung 24, Bochum: Brockmeyer, 68-83.

Csató, Éva Ágnes. (In print). Some typological features of the viewpoint aspect and tense system in spoken North-Western Karaim. Dahl, Östen (ed.) *Tense and aspect in the languages of Europe,* Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Csató, Éva Ágnes. (In print). Syntactic code-copying in Karaim. Dahl, Östen and Maria Koptjevskaja-Tamm (eds) *The Circum-Baltic languages: their typology and contacts.*

Csató, Éva Ágnes and Lars Johanson (1995). Zur Silbenharmonie des Nordwest-Karaimischen. *Acta Orientalia Academiae Scientarium Hung.* 48, 329-337.

Johanson, Lars. (1991). On syllabic frontness oppositions in Turkic. *Varia Eurasiatica,* Szeged, 77-94.

Johanson, Lars. (1992). *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten.* Stuttgart: Steiner.

Johanson, Lars. (1993). Code-copying in immigrant Turkish. Extra, Guus and Ludo Verhoeven (eds) *Immigrant languages in Europe*, Clevedon, Philadelphia, Adelaide: Multilingual Matters Ltd., 197-221.

Johanson, Lars. (1996). Kopierte Satzjunktoren im Türkischen. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49, 1-11.

Matras, Yaron. (1996). Layers of convergent syntax in Macedonian Turkish. Paper given at the workshop *Turkish in Contact, February 5-6, 1996*. Wassenaar: Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences.

Menz, Astrid. (1999). *Gagausische Syntax. Eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel*. Dissertation. Universität Mainz.

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, Oxford: University of California Press.