

Code- mixing and comparative grammar

Assist. Professor. Dr. Sabah Rashed Qadir
University of Raparin

1-Introduction

This paper entitled (code- mixing and comparative grammar). The term code-mixing (code-switching, code-shifting or code-changing) is ambiguous; it may refer to the bilingual ability to choose one or the other of the two languages in a particular speech situation. The choice being influenced by setting the topic or the nature of the interlocutors the speakers' mood, alternatively, it can be referred to the act of mixing two codes within a single utterance, exchange or conversation. It is with the second sense of the expression that this paper is concerned, less interchangeably. Especially in formal studies of syntax, morphology, etc., both terms are used to refer to utterances that draw from elements of two or more grammatical systems. These studies are often interested in the alignment of elements from distinct systems, or on constraints that limit switching. While many linguists have worked to describe the difference between code-switching and borrowing of words or phrases, the term code-mixing may be used to encompass both types of language behavior(Pieter 2000:168). While the term code-switching emphasizes a multilingual speaker's movement from one grammatical system to another, the term code-mixing suggests a hybrid form, drawing from distinct grammars. In other words, *code-mixing* emphasizes the formal aspects of language structures or linguistic competence, while *code-switching* emphasizes linguistic performance.

The sense of using two , or more languages genetically different, though a really akin , languages in an interaction some portion of which is clearly in one of the bilingual language, and the rest in another's. It can be said that code- mixing is a widespread phenomena in bilingual and multilingual communities, particularly in naturally occurring every-day conversations, and it has been studied for several decades using various linguistics approaches within the frameworks of sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, and grammatical studies. All of which have put greater emphasis either on descriptive or on theoretical aspects of the phenomenon.

2-1-Code- mixing In psychology and in psycholinguistics

The label **code-mixing** is used in theories that draw on studies of language alternation or code-switching to describe the cognitive structures underlying bilingualism. During the 1950s and 1960s, psychologists and linguists treated bilingual speakers as, in Grosjean's term, "two monolinguals in one person."^[7] This "fractional view" supposed that a bilingual speaker carried two separate mental grammars that were more or less identical to the mental grammars of monolinguals and that were ideally kept separate and used separately. Studies since the 1970s, however, have shown that bilinguals regularly combine elements from "separate" languages. These findings have led to studies of code-mixing in psychology and psycholinguistics (Sridhar and Kamal 1980:407). Sridhar define code-mixing as "the transition from using linguistic units (words, phrases, clauses, etc.) of one language to using those of another within a single sentence. They note that this is distinct from code-switching in that it occurs in a single sentence (sometimes known as *intrasentential switching*) and in that it does not fulfill the pragmatic or discourse-oriented functions described by sociolinguists) The practice of code-mixing, which draws from competence in two languages at the same time suggests that these competences are not stored or processed separately. Code-mixing among bilinguals is therefore studied in order to explore the mental structures underlying language abilities.

Based on several theories, scientific research, and our experience , we noticed that the problem of Kurdish children in learning their language in emigrate states focus on two kinds of different points like syntactical ordering of the languages and the morphological classification of the language, for instance, Kurdish, Persian are classified as incorporating language , but Turkish is in agglutinative language. All of these may produce many difficulties in language acquisition without mixing them in a bad example.

On the other hand, the structure or the derivation of parts of speech makes another problem , for example ,infinitive in Turkish is distribute into two types MEK ,and MAK which depended upon the kinds of vowels which entered the infinitive , but in Kurdish and English is different.

Therefore this research falls into three parts , second part is about the operational tests employed distinguish between borrowing and code-mixing ,after giving the situation of the language in Hawler and our collective data, next part lists and

illustrates, in depth the syntactic switch sites where they are disallowed , the last part is about some notes about comparative grammar between Kurdish , Turkish ,Persian Arabic and English ...structure or form of code-mixing may have relatively little interest to separate code-mixing from code-switching, some sociolinguists have gone to great lengths to differentiate the two phenomena. For these scholars, code-switching is associated with particular pragmatic effects, discourse functions, or associations with group identity.^[4] In this tradition, the terms **code-mixing** or **language alternation** are used to describe more stable situations in which multiple languages are used without such pragmatic effects.

2-2-Code-mixing in language acquisition

In studies of bilingual language acquisition, **code-mixing** refers to a developmental stage during which children mix elements of more than one language. Nearly all bilingual children go through a period in which they move from one language to another without apparent discrimination.^[5] This differs from code-switching, which is understood as the socially and grammatically appropriate use of multiple varieties.

Beginning at the babbling stage, young children in bilingual or multilingual environments produce utterances that combine elements of both (or all) of their developing languages. Some linguists suggest that this code-mixing reflects a lack of control or ability to differentiate the languages. Others argue that it is a product of limited vocabulary; very young children may know a word in one language but not in another. More recent studies argue that this early code-mixing is a demonstration of a developing ability to code-switch in socially appropriate ways.

For young bilingual children, code-mixing may be dependent on the linguistic context, cognitive task demands, and interlocutor. Code-mixing may also function to fill gaps in their lexical knowledge, and such lexical uncertainty may subsequently lead to naming errors (Bedore 2012:39).

3--Language Situation in Hawler(arbil).

Hawler is home to diverse linguistics minorities. Here are at least one major and several minor ethnic groups, each of which retaining to a certain extent to its own language, though they share almost an identical cultural these ethnic groups ,be it Kurds , Asyrians , Turkomans , or Arabs use their respective languages at home with family and friends and neighborhoods, where they are overwhelmingly dominant

.Outside these restricted domains all use the Hawler dialect of Kurdish, a variety of Central Kurdish . This variety of Kurdish is the official language of the region besides Arabic. It is the medium of instruction in its schools and colleges although there is a limited number of schools in the other languages .Arabic has had a privileged prestigious position since the establishment of the Iraq government in the early twenties ,But of late it is losing grounds to Kurdish since the latter is increasingly used in formal contexts including the workplace, and school and interaction with local government officials.

Language contact in Hawler contrasts with the situation of other multiple settings where members of community do not share the same linguistic competence, attitude and norms. Such differences often lead to social tension between different ethnic groups (as in the Canada and Catalonia) which is absent in Hawler. The population interacts on a daily basis with Kurdish and with the other languages speakers are multi-lingual in their mother tongue, Kurdish and smattering of Arabic.

The variety of code-mixing under scrutiny here is that used Arabs bilingual in their mother tongue and CK. A survey of language choice among such bilinguals reveals that while there are some domains where the tendency is to exclusively use Arabic (the home for example) , there are others where the use of Kurdish is predominant . (in education and neighborhood for example).In these social contexts peoples use mixture of Kurdish and Arabic, Turkomans, English and (some time Persian , because of their same origin with Kurdish language). The use of this mixture which involves very frequent code-mixing could in fact be considered a separate language or code variety used typically in casual conversations (Fattah2005:9)

4-1-Code mixing and classification of languages

The Turkish language belongs to the Turkic family. All members of this family are close to one another in terms of linguistic structure. Typological similarities are vowel harmony, verb-final word order and agglutinative morphology. This latter property causes a very fast vocabulary growth resulting in a large number of out-of-vocabulary words. In this paper we describe our first experiments in a speaker independent LVCSR engine for Modern Standard Turkish. First results on our Turkish speech recognition system are presented. The currently best system shows very promising results achieving 16.9% word error rate. To overcome the OOV-problem we propose a morphem-based and the Hypothesis Driven Lexical Adaptation approach. The final

Turkish system is integrated into the multilingual recognition engine of the Global Phone project **Agglutinating languages** refer to those processes in which the words can be decomposed into a sequence of morphemes. Each of these word elements, however, represents no more than a single grammatical category.

Finnish, Japanese and Turkish are commonly considered as language types, which by and large form words by **agglutination**.

Take for instance the Turkish word *evlerden* (*evlerden* = from the houses). Here, the word contains a stem and two further morphemes. Thereby, each element only represents one single grammatical category

-ev	-ler	-du
- house	- plural form	- to indicate "from"

As can be seen above, prototypical representatives of **agglutinating languages** have the tendency of a more or less one-to-one matching of morpheme with morphs.

Incorporating languages, often referred to as polysynthetic languages, include all those in which a single - though extensively long - word may represent an entire phrase, or even sentence, including a verb, an adjective and even an object.

Words in **polysynthetic languages** are formed either by inflection or extensive agglutination.

The following word from Tiwi might be of help to understand the underlying principles of word-formation. Here, the single word *ngirruunthingapukani* is propositionally equivalent to an entire English sentence:

ngri	rru	unthing	apu - kani
I	PAST	for some time	eat repeatedly

Afro-asiatic languages, such as Hebrew or Arabic, are classified as typical examples of **infixing languages**. Roughly speaking, infixing languages usually form words by inserting a word-building element within the root. Look at the example from the Bontoc language, the native language of the indigenous Bontoc people who live in the northern area of the Philippines: *fikas*= strong *fUM ikas* = to be strong

It is crucial to note, however, that language typology and its five major morphological categories tend to blur -- in short: there is no such thing as a clear-cut demarcation

between these classifications that allows to classify a given language as unalloyed agglutinating, analytic, inflecting or incorporating morphological systems. Instead, the typological classification of language systems reflects general tendencies

4-2--Data:

This study is mainly based on a corpus of naturally-occurring speech ,composed of several hours of conversations, in all of which participants were unaware that they were being recorded because it was felt that only in such circumstance could the recorded samples illustrate spontaneous unselfconscious speech .

Admittedly this method of data collection has its limitation. The actual utterances exhibiting code-mixing which one finds in such a corpus are subject to a variety of influences , and cannot simply be regarded as a set of sentences exhibiting the syntactic constraints governing code-mixing . Firstly besides syntactic constraints , there may be functional constraints ,i.e., the lack of occurrence of a certain type of which in the corpus may be due not to syntactic consideration , but to the fact that such a switch is very motivated .Secondly a corpus consists of actual performance data and cannot accurately reflect or represent a native speakers abstract competence , since it can be characterized by anacolutha hesitation slips of the tongue , pauses , corrections ,stutters and other performance errors that are irrelevant to his competence(Auer1984:71).

To remedy these well-known blemishes of a corpus base study ,we have found it imperative to verify and expand the investigation by resorting to elicitation experiments in which specific example of structures involving a switch were submitted to bilinguals other than those whose speech was recorded and were requested to judge their acceptability .thus we have averted and defects of both a corpus-based and elicitation-based study by combining both methods to supplement the information from the corpus.

4-3--Code-mixing vs. Borrowing:

Since Kurdish and other languages have been in contact for centuries it is very essential to distinguish instance of borrowing from those of switches, particularly because the two phenomena are likely to overlap, and are often confused. Borrowing refers to the use in one language, of items which originate in another language, but which are currently felt to form an integrated part of the borrowing language. Haughen describes it as 'the regular use of material from one language in another,

so that there is no longer either switching or overlapping, except in historical series (Haughen 1950:211). This contrasts with switching, which occurs when a bilingual introduces a completely unassimilated word, phrase or even sentence from another language into his speech. Here we have applied several tests to apart switches from loans because hundreds of Kurdish words originate in other languages some of which have different meanings. These idealizing processes include:

1-We discarded from the corpus any item which occurs in the speech of monolinguals as well as that's of bilinguals, considering them as instances of borrowing not switches.

2-We discarded instances where a speaker introduces a word to fill a lexical gap in the second language, regarding them to be examples of loans, rather than switches, since code-mixing unlike borrowing, need not be motivated by the need to fill lexical gaps (Appel and Muysken 1987:119).

3-All notarized words i.e. Words which have been phonologically adapted to system of host language, vise Kurdish, have been discarded from the corpus as instance of loans because phonological adaptation is a feature of loans, and not of mixes.

4-We have regarded all foreign items preceded by hesitation to be instances of code mixing and not borrowing, because only the former can be characterized by hesitation or pause (Pfaff 1979:303).

5-With very few exceptions, we have identified as borrowing all changes of language that extend over one single element. Changes of language that extend over more than one element have been considered as instances of cod-mixing. However, we have taken into consideration that Kurdish has borrowed many phrases of everyday use like ahlan wa sahlán (hello). salam-u alaikum (peace be on you) inshalla (hopefully), etc.

6- we have identified as cod-mixes all changes of languages that occur both in writing or formal speech and in formal speech because as Shaffer notes while borrowing may occur in writing, cod-mixing confined almost exclusively to informal speech since in speaking or writing formally, a bilingual can take more time to monitor his output and avoid mixing (Fattah 2002: 9).

The universal constraints proposed in the literature cluster around two grammatical concepts: linearity and dependency (government). Linearity constraints generally state that possibilities for switching are determined by the relationship between the surfaces structures of the two languages involved some kind of equivalence between

them being required as a prerequisite before the switch can occur. That is code-mixing is likely only if the linear order of sentences on both languages is preserved (pfaaf: 1979:303). For the models that stress dependency rather than linearity, the basic assumption is that there cannot be a switch between two elements that are lexically dependent on each other. The government restriction on cod-mixing predicts that ungoverned elements such as tags, parentheticals, exclamations, interjections and most adverbs can easily be switched. This prediction is overwhelmingly supported by empirical evidence. However, governed elements are sometimes switched. Di sciullo, muysken and sing (1986) claim that this can be accomplished through neutralizing elements such as a determiner or a complementizer.

Similar proposals have been put forward in klavens 1983, and Betahila and Davies 1983. The former argues that it is a clause that determines the restrictions on cod-mixing in that particular clause since these elements constitute in same sense the syntactic head that governs the rest of the clause. The latter, however, using Moroccan-french code mixing as an example, argues that the sub categorization properties of word determine what elements of another language may appear within a phrase syntactically headed by the word.

Most of these concepts and proposals will be related to, and thoroughly debated within, the context of Kurdish-Arabic, Mixing.

4-4- mix sites:

This part examines the types of syntactic boundary, i.e. the syntactic sites at which a mix can occur in the speech of Kurdish-Arabic bilinguals to see whether certain constituents are bound together in such a way that mixing is impossible within or between them, as suggested in most of the previous investigations. Here is a list of various syntactic sites where mixing is possible or permitted. For ease of reference we begin with inter-clausal mixes, and proceed to intra-clausal ones.

5-Comparing the Infinitives:

There were differences between languages, and (Chomsky 1995:388) illustrated that the differences between languages begin with morphological level; therefore comparing the infinitive of languages is a good starting:

5-1- Kurdish Language has had five kinds of infinitive according to its Premark as a following:

Hatin(coming).

Henan(bringing)

Brrin(cutting)

Chun (going)

Birdin(taking)

In kurdish if we replace infinitive mark (which are “in” for bases ended with vowel and,”n” which ended with consonant, the remain was a past simple verb, but may have past tense with third person, in intransitive verb such as:

Brrinbrrre(s(he cut)

In transitive verb, after replacing the remark we have have a past verb without a person see the following example:

Birdinbird (it needs a clitic pronoun to be in well meaning

inf base

Bird +i (birdi>S(HE took)

5-2-Persian Language:

In Persian there are two kinds of infinitive according to their marks , the Premarks are “d” or “t”:

Raftan (going)

Kardan (doing)

In replacing infinitive mark is the same like Kurdish syntactic behavior, but there are some differences , Persian language takes some infixes in Arabic , and entered its infinitives for example:

Raftan (going)

Ruftan (sweeping)

When we wite them in Arabic alphabet they both have the same writing:

رَفْتَن (going)

رُفْتَن (sweeping)

Whereby we can consider Persian language as a morphological classify as mixing between “incorporative and infixing language”(Samadi2012:169).

5-3-Arabic Language:

Its typological classification is “infixing language”in this language not infinitive , but the verb is the origin , the infixes (case marking –harakat) entering roots for instance : Kataba= (k,t,b)are the root

(a-a-a)-infixes

If we change the infixes -:

Kataba – maktub (it is a kind of infinitive derived from the verb”kataba”

In other way we can transform “kataba” to “kitaaban” also it is another kind of infinitive Arabic (Ibn-Al-Anbari 1995:32).

5-4-Turkish Language:

It has two kinds of infinitive mark 1-if the base contains vowels like (e,i,Ö,Ü,semi vowel) the infinitive must end with mark “mek” for instance:

Ver mek (giving)

Bil mek (knowing)

gÖr mek(seeing)

gÜl mek (laughing)

2-If the base contains vowels like (a,o,u)the infinitive must end with the mark “mak”see the following example:

Yap mak (doing)

Agr(s.v)mak (suffering)

Kop mak(biting)

Kuru mak (drying)

After replacing the infinitive mark, the remain part is imperative mood for instance:

Yapmak(doing) >yap >you must do (imperative mood)

The same in English after replacing “to” or “ing”as infinitive mark, the remain part has the form and concept of “imperative mood”

“Writing” or “to write” are infinitive, when we replace “ing or to” remains “write” as a base (see Yuksel Goknel2013:15).

Finally I see there are no constraints on code-mixing, whatever the types of morphological of languages might be all of the languages allowed mixing with other codes, and in every sites . Now we try to apply our given information on code- mixing of the mention languages:

Code-mixing between Arabic –kurdish, and Kurdish- arabic

1-adri saza naxosh.

I know saza ill.

I know saza is ill.

2-da-zaan-im shi- sawi

AS-know –I what-will do he.

Between Persian- Kurdish:

3-xayish dakam

Per kurd

I apologize

Between Turkish – Kurdish:

4-Agar gedisan bende gyalirem.

If you go, I shall come.

5- dei, yokse ben gedim.

Did you come? Or I go?

6- da-len saza xasta-di.

AS-say saza ill.

They say saza is ill.

da-len saza xasta-y-di.

They say saza was ill.

Conclusions

1- *code-mixing* emphasizes the formal aspects of language structures or linguistic competence, while *code-switching* emphasizes linguistic performance.

2 While the term code-switching emphasizes a multilingual speaker's movement from one grammatical system to another, the term code-mixing suggests a hybrid form, drawing from distinct grammars.-

3-The difference of morphological classification of languages cannot make any difficulties in mixing more than one codes.

References

Auer,P.(1984)*Bilingual Conversation* ,Amsterdam.

Bedore,D.(2012)*Lexical Choice and Language Selection*,Pre-scholers

Chomsky,N.(1995)*Minimalism Investigation in Linguistic Theory*,London

Fattah,M.M.(2005)*Code Switching in English and Arabic*

Salahaddin University.

Haughen,E.(1950)*Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing*.Wisconsin University.

Ibn-Al-Anbari (1995)*Kitab-Al-Asrar al arabiah, dar –al jil*.Beirut.

Pfaff,C.(1979)Constraints on Language mixing intrasentential code switching

Pieter,M.(2000) Bilingual Speech :A Typology of code mixing: Cambridge University.

Samadi ,H .(2012)Persian Grammar ,ISBN978-1

Sridhar,S. and Kamal,K.(1980)The Syntax and Psychology linguistics Blackwell.

Yuksel Goknel (2013) Infinitive in Turkish :Estanbul

پوخته

ئەم باسە بە ناوی "تیکە لکردنی زمان و ریزمانی بەراورد" ه تییدا تیشک خراووتە سەر دیاردهی تیکە لکردنی زمان ،یان بازدان لە زمانیکە وە بۆ زمانیکی تر ، ئە بەراوردکردنی ریزمانی زمانەکاندا ، ئە پال گەت و گوگردن ئە بارە وەرگرتنی زمان و قەرزی زمانی ، و کاریگەری پۆلی زمانەکان بە سەر ئە و تیکە لکردنە ، بە هۆی ئەوەی زمانەکانی کوردی و عەرەبی و ئینگلیزی و فارسی ، تورکی ئە پۆلی زمانی جیاوازی ، ریزە تیکە لکردنە کە بە پێی پۆلی زمانە کە دەگۆری. ئەم تووینە وەهیه بە سەر پینج بەشدا دابەش دەبی: بەشی یەكەم لایەنی تیوریی بابەتە کە دەخاتە پوو ، بەشی دوووم ئە بابەتی وەرگرتنی زمان و تیکە لکردنی زمان دەکوئیتە وە ، بەشی سێیەم ئە ژینگە ی زمانی شاری هەولێر دەکوئیتە وە . بەشی چوارەم بریتییه ئە جیاوازی نیوان قەرزی زمانی و تیکە لکردنی زمان ، بەشی پینجەم ، لایەنی کارەکی تیکە لکردنە کە ئە نیوان زمانەکانی کوردی ، و عەرەبی ، و تورکی ، و فارسی ، و ئینگلیزی دەخاتە پوو

الخلاصه

المزج اللغوي ومقارنة اللغات هما ظاهرتان من الظواهر اللغوية تشابكهما صلات وطيدة ، وهما معلقتان على التقارب التصنيفي لتلكم اللغات ، المزج بين اللغات هي قابلية تنمو لدى الناطقين الذين يمتلكون في ملكتهم اللغوية التكلم بأكثر من لغة واحدة حيث يتحيرون ، او لا يسعفهم لغة واحدة في المواقف اللغوية لبوح بكل مبتغاهم ومقاصدهم ، يخوض هذا البحث و تدقق تفاصيل هذه الظاهرة . كون التصنيف التصريفي للغات الكوردية ، و العربية ، والإنجليزية ، والفارسية ، والتركية من مجاميع مختلفة ، تولد مواقف صعبة للمزج اللغوي ، او بالاحرى يستحيل المزج اللغوي في تلك المواقف يتوزع البحث على خمسة مباحث :يقدم المبحث الأول آراء بعض الباحثين حول الموضوع ومدى ملائمة هذه الصنوف اللغوية لظاهرة المزج . وكون اللغات الكوردية ، و العربية ، و التركية ، و الفارسية ، و الإنجليزية من اصناف تصنيفية مختلفة ، تعرض المزج اللغوي واكتساب اللغة في المبحث الثاني ، يخصص المبحث الثالث للبيئة اللغوية و واقع الامتزاج في مدينة اربيل ، المبحث الرابع يقارن المزج اللغوي بالاقتراض اللغوي ، المبحث الاخير يطبق الظاهرة بين اللغات الخمس المذكورات سابقاً .