5

Loan translations versus code-switching

Ad Backus
and
Margreet Dorleijn

5.1 Introduction

Loan translations or *calques* are defined as words or phrases that are reproduced as literal translations from one language into another. These terms figure prominently in lists of contact phenomena, and sit comfortably besides relatively well-described linguistic consequences of language contact such as code-switching (hereafter CS), *interference*, and *attrition*. However, actual theoretical treatments of loan translation are surprisingly rare. This contribution aims to summarize extant theoretical treatments, and to provide the basis for furthering a theoretical account that integrates loan translation with these other language contact phenomena, specifically with CS. The two are closely related because they are both arguably lexical contact phenomena.

While theoretical treatments may be rare, individual examples of loan translations, or calques, are easy to find in the literature on contact linguistics, especially in work on CS. Somewhat surprisingly though, textbooks on language contact and historical linguistics generally just mention one or more of a handful of standard examples. A classic example is the literally translated compound noun, such as the words for "skyscraper" in various European languages, which all use morphemes for "sky" and "scrape": French *gratteciel*, Spanish *rascacielos*, German *wolkenkratzer*. However, the phenomenon is found across a wide range of linguistic constructions, including complex verbs, prepositional phrases, and idiomatic expressions. An example culled from the CS literature is given in (1), in which the English phrasal verb *work out* is calqued with the equivalent German morphemes *schaff* and *aus*.

(1) *Pennsylvania German*
Es hat juscht net ***aus***-ge-***schaff***-t far Amisch Leite, so ham mer vehicle grieg-t

it have.3SG just not out-PRT-work-PRT for Amish people so have we vehicle get-PRT
"It just didn't work out for Amish people, so we got vehicles."
(Fuller 1999:49)

Loan translation has received limited attention because it has been assumed to be relatively rare. However, its frequency in actual data depends on how you define it. Traditionally, it has been limited to clear cases of translated lexical combinations only, as in *skyscraper*. However, there are at least two good reasons for expanding this definition. The first one is empirical: many other cases are a lot like *skyscraper* in the sense that some degree of literal translation seems to have taken place, but the translation process involved is rarely one of total translation. As will be demonstrated below, most cases involve what is best termed partial translation. However, since the mechanism that produces these cases is the same as that which produced *skyscraper*, it would be sound academic practice to group together all cases that involve some form of concrete translation. The second reason is more theoretical: having a wider definition of loan translation allows us to better explore its relationship to CS, lexical borrowing, semantic extension, and what is often called structural or grammatical borrowing. Having a narrow definition isolates loan translation as a relatively minor phenomenon; having a wide definition allows us to explore the boundaries it shares with these other phenomena.

5.2 Definitions

We will begin illustrating the basic division between loan translation and CS on the one hand, and loan translation and structural borrowing on the other, by defining the phenomena as explicitly as possible. For each phenomenon, we tease apart whether it is synchronic (i.e. linked to specific utterances, and, therefore, directly observable in speech data) or diachronic (i.e. related to historical development, and thus not directly observable in the transcript of a conversation), and discuss its structural implications.

(1.) ***Code-switching***: the use of overt material (from single morphemes to entire sentences) from Language B in Language A discourse. CS roughly comes in two types (see Muysken 2000):
  (a.) *Alternational CS*: the alternation of material in two languages in bilingual discourse, as in the Turkish–Dutch example in (2).
    (2) sen de kalkma-n lazım onlar-la ***en hoe moet je dan op de rest letten***?
    you too get.up-POSS.2SG necessary them-with and how can you then on the rest keep.an.eye?

"You must get up with them as well, and then how can you keep an eye on the rest?"

(b.) *Insertional CS*: the use of material from one language, the Embedded Language (EL), in bilingual discourse. In this type, the foreign material is embedded in clauses that are clearly recognizable as in the Matrix Language (ML), as exemplified in the Turkish–Dutch example in (3). Note that in this contact phenomenon both form and meaning are from the EL (see Myers-Scotton and Jake, this volume).

(3) mesela okul-da iki tane kız da bana ***verkering*** sor-du
for.instance school-LOC two CLAS girl too me.DAT engagement ask-PAST-3SG
"For instance, two girls at school have asked me out on a date."

(2.) ***Lexical Borrowing***: the process whereby words from a lending language become entrenched as conventional words in the receiving lexicon. It is often difficult to distinguish "new" code-switches from "established" loan words in synchronic data. For example, because of their frequency, the words *uitgaan* "to go out," *opleiding* "school," *afstuderen* "to graduate," and *Hemelvaart* "Ascension Day" may very well have become established Dutch-origin loan words in Dutch Turkish, rather than code-switches.

(3.) ***Loan translation***: any usage of morphemes in Language A that is the result of the literal translation of one or more elements in a semantically equivalent expression in Language B. In this type of contact phenomenon, only the meaning, and not the overt morphemes, is from Language B, as for example, the use of the word for "to play" (*oynamak*) in (4).

(4) piano oynamak
piano play; "to play piano"
cf. Standard Turkish: piano çalmak (literally "piano to.sound")
cf. Standard Dutch: piano spelen (literally "piano to.play")

(4.) ***Lexical change***: the process whereby the use of words or morphemes, or morpheme combinations, from the lending language, becomes entrenched as conventional usage and/or combinations in the receiving language lexicon. Again, it is not always possible to determine whether a particular foreign-inspired combination or usage is used for the first time (i.e. as a result of on-line translation) or has been already conventionalized. For example, the collocation *piano oynamak* mentioned above has been attested various times by different researchers, so it is possible that it has become a borrowing in Dutch–Turkish.

(5.) ***Interference/Transference***: any structure used in discourse in Language A that is the result of influence from Language B but where there is no evidence that this usage was produced by the translation of a concrete expression in Language B. As in loan translation, only the formal structure comes from Language B. Consider example (5):

(5) hiç Türkçe kitap-***lar*** oku-ya-m-ıyor-um
no Turkish book-PL read-ABIL-NEG-PROG-1SG
"I can't read Turkish books."
cf. Standard Turkish: *hiç Türkçe kitap okuyamıyorum*, with singular noun *kitap*
cf. Standard Dutch: *ik kan geen Turkse boeken lezen*, with plural noun *boek-en* (book-pl; "books")

(6.) ***Structural borrowing***: the process whereby the use of a structure originally from the donor language becomes entrenched as a conventional part of the grammatical structure of the receiving language. It can sometimes be shown that a foreign-inspired structure has become conventionalized if it is used exclusively, or with much more frequency, than the native structure it is replacing or has replaced.

Three important distinctions are made in the above definitions. The first is the difference between the use of overt words and morphemes from Language A and Language B versus the use of Language A forms with Language B semantic and/or structural characteristics. The use of overt material from two languages unites CS and lexical borrowing, against the four other phenomena. The second difference allows us to distinguish loan translation and lexical change, on the one hand, from interference/transference and structural change, on the other. The crucial point here is whether there is a concrete lexical model that acts as the source or not. Note that the definitions of loan translation and interference/transference are almost identical. They only differ in the specificity of the element that is copied from the other language: a specific expression in the case of loan translation (e.g. a word, a collocation, or an idiom), and general grammatical structure in the case of interference/transference. As we shall see below, the line between the two is often hard to draw.

Finally, it is important to distinguish between synchronic and diachronic facts. Note that the definitions of CS, loan translation and interference/transference make reference to synchronic discourse. That is, they are seen as characteristics of "speech" or of the actual utterances people produce while talking. "Speech" is a synchronic entity, while "language" is a diachronic one. Every synchronic utterance has diachronic effects, i.e. it contributes to the development of the language involved. The result of insertional CS, especially if the same foreign word is repeatedly used in discourse by many different people, may be that the foreign word in question becomes a normal word in the recipient language discourse: it becomes a loan word. We refer to this diachronic process as "lexical

Table 5.1 Synchronic and diachronic instantiations of contact phenomena, classified by the nature of the source material

Linguistic Source	*Synchronic*	*Diachronic*
Foreign words	Insertional code-switching	Lexical borrowing
Foreign meaning/combinations	Loan translation	Lexical change
Foreign structure	Interference/Transference	Structural change/borrowing

borrowing." Loan translation, likewise, may have the diachronic effect that the new expression catches on in the speech community. The language has then undergone "lexical change": the new collocation has become a fixed unit in the language, alongside the numerous other conventional collocations, but with the distinguishing feature that its ultimate etymological origin lies in another language. Note that we cannot call this development "lexical borrowing" because that term is traditionally used for loan words only. A similar relationship holds for "interference/transference" and "structural change." These dimensions are summarized in Table 5.1.

5.3 Theoretical interest: why study loan translation?

How exactly CS and loan translation relate to each other has not been the focus of much study, and this chapter aims to elucidate this relationship. Descriptively, the issue is fairly clear: we are either dealing with words from the other language (CS) or with native words that are used in a new way, one inspired by the other language (loan translation). But accounting for the two phenomena is much harder. What governs a speaker's choice? Can we predict when CS rather than loan translation will take place? While most of this chapter will consist of a presentation of types of loan translation, we will come back to this question in the conclusion.

Apart from its link with CS, there are at least three independent reasons for studying loan translation. The first has to do with scientific accountability. Loan translation simply figures in contact data, so it needs to be explained. In fact, since CS and loan translation tend to co-occur in corpora, the question arises whether they are in free distribution, or whether there are patterns to uncover about when a speaker will opt for CS versus loan translation. The second motivation is that studying loan translations in contact settings provides us with an opportunity to identify conventional combinations in a language, something that is not so easy in speech from monolinguals. Loan translations stand out, certainly for speakers of non-contact varieties of the same language, precisely because they break the conventions those speakers are used to. Such conventional combinations are central to the perspective of cognitive linguistics, in which there is intense interest in the division between structures that are fixed in

language and those that are innovated in speech. Given enough of these new structures, a language may come across as significantly different from other, non-contact, varieties of the same language, despite using the same words and the same syntax. Third, the study of loan translations provides insights that monolingual data cannot through the dissociation of semantic from phonological structure. Contact phenomena, particularly loan translation, show that this can be done relatively easily, at least for some elements. Loan translation provides unique data in this respect.

5.3.1 Previous treatments of loan translation

Owens (1996) presents one of the few systematic synchronic corpus studies of loan translation. He demonstrates that Nigerian Arabic sounds distinctly "un-Arabic" to Arabic speakers from the Middle East, because of the many unfamiliar collocations and idioms. Nigerian Arabic shares these lexical collocations and idioms with most languages of the Lake Chad Basin area, even though these stem from different families. A typical example is that all languages of the area render the meaning <roof> as *head of house*, i.e. as a possessive combination. As Owens maintains, "loan translation" is actually not a very accurate term since speakers are using established collocations, rather than innovating on the spot through translation from another language. Such expressions often arise in Sprachbund-type situations, such as the Lake Chad Basin, and it is often impossible to identify the source language that originally provided the model for the loan translation. Speakers using these forms are not necessarily bilingual.

Treatments of loan translation in general accounts of language contact that abstract away from particular bilingual settings are very rare, with the exception of taxonomies of contact effects (e.g. Haugen 1972a). These, however, contain little theorizing about what brings loan translations about, and especially about what constraints may be placed on its application. There are at least two exceptions, however. First, Johanson (1998) provides a descriptive model of contact effects in which loan translation finds a place among the other phenomena. His model, the Code Copying model, makes a distinction between Global Code Copying (taking over forms from another language, i.e. insertional CS and lexical borrowing) and Selective Code Copying. The latter type of copying comes in four different kinds, which all have in common that only part of a foreign model is copied: phonological characteristics, semantic features, the way in which words and morphemes are combined, and/or its relative frequency of usage. Loan translation can be considered a type of selective code copying, and can be of the semantic or combinational type, or both.

In Myers-Scotton's (2002a) Matrix Language Frame model, loan translation and structural borrowing are discussed together under the rubric of the "Composite Matrix Language." If words or morphemes are combined in unexpected ways due to contact, a new variety of the Matrix Language,

the Composite ML, has come into being. Incorporated into this new variety are some lexical and structural changes. Specifically, in the case of lexical change, one or more aspects of a morpheme or a word, such as a shade of meaning, or the words or morphemes it can combine with, are replaced by those of its equivalent in the other language. Interestingly, for Myers-Scotton and associates it seems to make no difference whether the pivotal element is a content word or a functional morpheme (e.g. a conjunction or a case marker). For most others in the field, the former would be a loan translation or lexical change, and the latter a case of interference or structural borrowing. We will discuss examples of each further on; in fact, the distinction between content and function elements will be used as a dimension on which to classify types of loan translation.

Discussing loan translation and structural borrowing together is reasonable, since there are quite a lot of similarities between the synchronic phenomena, loan translation and interference/transference, and between the diachronic processes, lexical change and structural borrowing (recall that we cannot talk of "lexical borrowing" here, because that term is reserved for loan words) (see Winford 2005:385). Though we classified loan translation as a lexical phenomenon, it is more accurate to say that it is lexical as well as structural in nature. As will be seen from examples presented below, the term "lexical" leaves room for a broad interpretation. We want to emphasize that the crucial property of a loan translation is that the model is a specific expression in the other language. If the result of this translation produces not just an unconventional combination of morphemes, but also an unconventional structure, interference/transference has occurred as well, but only as an accidental by-product of the loan translation. Normally, however, loan translations do not violate the grammar of the language in which they are coined, as will be shown below. Otheguy (1993) goes so far as to reject the term loan translation because of this. According to him, since loan translations have no systemic impact on the receiving language, they reflect cultural rather than linguistic influence. It is the foreign concept that is imported. The point is exemplified with the often-cited construction [Verb + *para atrás*] in American varieties of Spanish, assumed to be a calque of English [Verb + *back*], in (6). Otheguy's position is that the combination of lexemes *para atrás* "exploits inherent Spanish possibilities" (Otheguy 1993:23), and does not violate Spanish syntax. However, it should be noted that although no grammatical structure is introduced, it is nevertheless a new expression in Spanish, brought about through language contact.

(6) *US Spanish*
Papi, tú me prestas esa pluma y yo te la doy ***para atrás***; please, please, préstamela y yo te la doy ***para atrás***.
"Daddy, you lend me that pen and I'll give it back to you, please, please, lend it to me and I'll give it back to you."
(Otheguy 1993:22)

We will now review the various kinds of loan translation, and see how they vary systematically along the dimension "lexical to grammatical"; this will be illustrated with examples from our data on contact varieties of Turkish.[1] Similarities and differences with CS will be highlighted throughout the discussion and summarized in the conclusion.

5.4 Identifying loan translations

The definition of loan translation formulated above is vague with respect to what counts as a literal translation. Foreign influence can take a variety of forms, ranging from exact translation to mere resemblance. Identifying a loan translation is not always easy, since it often requires subtle knowledge of the norms of the pre-contact variety. In many contexts, of course, we know very little of certain linguistic varieties, particularly in situations in which the entire speech community is bilingual. However, among bilingual immigrants, identification of loan translation is a bit more straightforward. If a putative calque is produced only by bilinguals, while monolinguals use a different form, this provides evidence for loan translation. By way of example, the combination *piano oynamak* ("piano play"; "to play the piano"), is only produced by Turkish speakers in Holland, as a loan translation, see example (4) above.

Loan translations can be categorized according to the type of morpheme involved in the calque, allowing a continuum in which the specificity of the semantics of the calqued morphemes decreases gradually:

(1.) loan translations involving content morphemes
(2.) loan translations involving function morphemes
(3.) loan translations involving grammatical morphemes
(4.) loan translations involving discourse patterns

In the first three types, some element of meaning is the source of the translation, but it must be emphasized that if the meaning is relatively abstract, the translated element tends to be a functional element, and thus the translation may have structural consequences. Therefore, the continuum shades into the realm of interference and structural borrowing. The fourth category, the copying of discourse patterns, has, to our knowledge, not received much attention in the literature on contact linguistics. We discuss each category in turn.

5.4.1 Loan translations involving content morphemes

As stated above, the most familiar type of calque is a compound noun such as English *sky-scraper*, French *gratte-ciel*, Spanish *rasca-cielos*. This type may be subdivided according to the number of words involved. Classic loan translations are mostly two-word combinations, while one-word translations are

often discussed as *semantic extension*. An example is *registrarse* "to register (for class)" in contact Spanish (cf. non-contact Spanish *matricularse*).

5.4.1.1 One-word loan translations: semantic extension

Semantic extensions are not commonly understood by speakers of non-contact varieties of the language involved. An example is the use of Turkish *kalabalık* ("crowded"), in which it is semantically extended on the model of Dutch *druk* ("noisy," "crowded," "busy"), as in examples (7) and (8). Such translations do not normally have implications for the structure of the receiving language.

(7) çocuk-lar bugün çok kalabalık
child-PL today very crowded
"The children are very crowded (> noisy) today."

(8) bugün çok kalabalığım
today very crowded.COP.1SG
"I am very crowded (> busy) today."

5.4.1.2 Two-word loan translations

Two-word loan translations, like one-word loan translations, can be semantic extensions, but more importantly it is the combination of the two particular morphemes that is unconventional. There may be structural consequences, too, in that, for instance, the relative ordering may be "ungrammatical" (see the un-English ordering of adjective and noun in translated expressions such as *Surgeon-General*, modelled on French with the word order intact), but this does not seem to be common.

Two-word loan translations are found in all the morpho-syntactic domains in which content words are combined to form a new, more complex "word," notably compound nouns, adjective–noun units, and verb–object collocations. A particularly frequent type seems to be the translated Object + Verb construction. Interestingly, in the case of Turkish–Dutch contact, whenever such loan translations appear, the object is often generic, or non-specific, as in (9).

(9) iyi olan hasta-nın hal-in-den anlamaz ama doktor mecbur anlama-sı lazım bi de ***para soruyo*** yani o doktora doktor de-mi-yce-n ki
healthy bePART ill.person-GEN condition-POSS-ABL understand.AOR.NEG.3SG. but doctor necessary understand-POSS.NOM necessary and too money ask.PRES.3SG so.that doctor.DAT doctor say-NEG-FUT-2SG EMPH
"A healthy person does not understand how an ill person feels, but a doctor should [understand], and then on top of that he asks [for] money, I mean, you can't very well call such a doctor a doctor."

Here Turkish *para soruyo* "money ask," is modelled after the Dutch collocation *om geld vragen* "for money ask" ("to ask for money"). The expected

Turkish counterpart would be: *para istemek*, "money want" ("to want/demand money"). Generic objects are not case-marked in Turkish (only specific direct objects are marked with the accusative case in Turkish), and this stimulates an incorporation reading, in which verb and noun form a single semantic unit. Such verb–object combinations are as much cases of word formation (of compound verbs) as of synchronic syntactic composition.

Empirically, most examples concern unique fixed combinations of two words or morphemes, directly translated from the source language. These are usually inserted into regular syntactic constructions, and therefore have no structural consequences beyond the distribution of the words involved. However, structural implications do arise if functional elements within a combination get translated as well. This can be seen in (10), another Object + Verb loan translation:

(10) suç-u bana ver-di
guilt-ACC to.me give-PAST.3SG
"He accused me."

The monolingual Turkish equivalent is the single verb *suçlamak* "to accuse"; the Dutch expression *de schuld geven*, "to give the blame" is the model. Note that the translation involves more than the simple juxtaposition of the content morphemes for "guilt" and "give." The presence of the accusative marker and the indirect object are also the result of the translation process because they are required in the Dutch model. The use of the definite article *de* "the" in the Dutch model is idiomatic (*guilt* is construed as inherently definite), and the speaker has copied this through the use of the accusative marker *-u*, the relatively transparent equivalent of the definite article. The replacement of the single transitive verb by the Object + Verb construction has the further consequence that the Dutch subcategorization frame is also copied – a third argument is needed to encode the person or thing being blamed. As in Dutch, this must surface as an indirect object. Though the loan translation is more complex than in the case of *para soruyo* above, the translation is still lexical in nature, because the borrowing is the entire Dutch lexical unit *give blame to someone*. That is, speakers do not borrow the abstract double object construction or the partially schematic construction [Direct Object + Indirect Object + give], but rather the specific collocation.

Evidence of slightly more abstract structural change as the consequence of loan translation can be seen in the next example. In monolingual Turkish, the dative-marked directional adverbs *öne* ("to the front") and *arkaya* ("to the back") can only be combined with motion verbs, but in Dutch Turkish they co-occur with the stative verb *durmak* "stand." This combination is normal in Dutch, presumably the model for this usage: *naar voren staan* "stand towards the front" and *naar achteren staan* "stand towards the back."

(11) erken gel-ir-se-n ön-e doğru dur-ur-sun, geç gelirsen, arka-ya doğru dur-ur-sun.
early come-AOR-COND-2SG front-DAT towards stand-AOR-2SG late if.you. come, back-DAT towards stand-AOR-2SG
"If you come early, you stand towards the front; if you are late, you stand towards the back."

It is unclear whether this effect should be interpreted as lexical or as structural. Under a lexical interpretation, a specific Dutch collocation has been copied using Turkish morphemes. From a grammatical point of view, the Dutch rule permitting the combination of directional adverbs and stative verbs may have been copied. It is in principle impossible to decide on the correct option on the basis of isolated examples, but at this point the available data are simply lacking. Data demonstrating the use of directional adverbs with different stative verbs would indicate a grammatical interpretation rather than a lexical one.

5.4.1.3 Multi-word loan translations

The source of a multi-word loan translation is generally a conventional phrase or expression that is translated along with some or all of its structural features. Since loan translations of this kind tend to occur at sentence boundaries, as can be seen in example (12), they are not unlike alternational CS, only, of course, they have the phonological shape of the receiving language. They differ from the one-word and two-word loan translations in that they are not separate lexical items. Instead, they often constitute a clause on their own.

(12) bazı-ki-ler işde anne baba-m oku /oku di-yo işde oku-mu-yo-lar işde istek ol-ma-dıkça o / ***o*** aile oku / oku diy-ince/ ***bi şey yardım et-mez***
some-N-PL well mother father-POSS.1SG read/read say-PRES.3SG well read-NEG-PRES-3PL well motivation be-NEG-as.long.as that/ that family read / read say-when a thing help do-AOR.NEG.3SG
"Some people, well, their parents say 'come on, study, do your homework,' but they don't, if you have no motivation [for it] that family can say 'come on, study,' as often as they want, but it doesn't help one bit."

The phrase *bir şey yardim etmez* is modeled after the Dutch phrase *dat helpt niks*, literally "it helps nothing." Though this phrase instantiates the syntax of a normal Dutch intransitive clause, the expression itself is so common and has such idiomatic meaning that it can be safely assumed to be a fixed unit (see Wray 2002). Further evidence of its status as a unit is the fact that *helpen* would otherwise require a direct object: *hij helpt hem*, "he helps him." Its impersonal use is also a conventional part of the idiom. The Turkish verb *yardım etmek* normally has a different subcategorization frame: the person who is helped is encoded as an indirect object (by the dative): *birine yardım etmek* "to help someone." None of these characteristics of the verb surface in the Dutch idiom nor in the loan translation in (12). Most features

of the Dutch unit, i.e. the idiomatic impersonal use of the verb *helpen* and the adverbial reinforcer "nothing," are copied and translated (through the use of the Turkish verb for "to help" and the discontinuous unit consisting of "something" (*bi şey*) and the negation on the verb).

The final example in this section, another translated idiom, takes us to the limits of what can be identified as a loan translation. While all cases discussed so far were easily detected on the basis of relatively clear unconventional semantics and/or structure, some loan translations are less noticeable, and this causes a serious methodological problem. In Example (13), the highlighted segments are unconventional, but the phrases in question are semantically transparent.

(13) (a.) ama işde bazen insan-lar unut-uyo-lar doktor ve hemşire-ler de *insan-lar, yanlış yap-abil-ir-ler*.
but well sometimes people-PL forget-PRES-3PL doctor and nurse-PL too *people*-PL, *mistake make-can*-AOR-3PL
"But sometimes people forget that doctors and nurses are human and can make mistakes."

(b.) *Monolingual Turkish*
hata yap-ar-lar
mistake make-AOR-3PL
"They may make mistakes."

The plural noun *insanlar* "people" is the translation of Dutch *mensen*, also a plural noun, while conventional Turkish would use singular *insan* in this context. The reason why the plural is used is probably the fact that the whole Dutch phrase *x en x zijn ook mensen* ("X *and* X *are people too*") is used as the idiomatic basis for the Turkish expression. While the unconventional plural provides us with at least one reason to assume that this is what has happened, the clause that follows **yanlış yap-abil-ir-ler** is virtually impossible to establish as a loan translation, yet it may very well be one. Again, the phrase is semantically transparent, and in this case it also follows default Turkish structure. Possibility is expressed through an explicit modal marker, the derivational suffix *–abil-*, possibly translating the Dutch use of the modal auxiliary verb "can" in the expression *die kunnen fouten maken* "they can make mistakes." At least according to some of our informants, conventional Turkish would prefer to use the expression in (13b), with a different word for "mistake" and the aorist tense. This example illustrates the methodological problem one runs into: sometimes there are no objective features that can incontrovertibly demonstrate that something is a loan translation. Because of this, loan translations may well be considerably under-identified.

5.4.2 Loan translations involving function morphemes

In this section, we will discuss cases of loan translation that clearly revolve around grammatical elements, such as case markers, but we will begin

with an example that could just as well have been differently classified. Because function morphemes have largely grammatical meaning, cross-linguistic influence involving such morphemes as the crucial element is close to what is traditionally called structural borrowing or contact-induced grammaticalization (Heine and Kuteva 2003). If, for instance, an indefinite article is used like its counterpart in another language, and this usage deviates from what is conventional in its own language, one could argue that indefiniteness marking has changed. The examples to be discussed operate on this line between lexical and grammatical change, and we will discuss to what extent they should be considered loan translations. We will make one subdivision in presenting the examples: either the entire loan translation consists of a function morpheme, or a function morpheme is the most crucial part of it.

One-word loan translations of functional morphemes have much in common with semantic extensions of content words, see (7) and (8) above. Adpositions especially, because of their concrete semantic content, are often analysed as somewhere in between a function word and a content word, so one may argue that in (14), just as in (7) and (8), the loan translation is purely lexical. There is no real structural effect, because only one lexical element is involved, and in addition it replaces a word from the same part of speech, which is structurally used in an identical way. In monolingual Turkish, the postpostional phrase *önünde* ("in front of") would be the expected choice, but a Turkish translation of the Dutch convention, which uses the preposition *achter* ("behind"), is used instead.

(14) bütün gün kompüter ***arka-sın-da*** otur-du-m
whole day computer back-POSS.3SG-LOC sit-PAST-1SG
"I have been sitting behind the computer all day (i.e. I have been at the computer all day)."

Other elements that are in between content and function morpheme status include adverbs, particles, and conjunctions. In (15), the use of the sentential adverb *belki* "maybe" betrays direct copying of how its Dutch equivalent *misschien* is used, as a sentential modifier in a question with the effect of making the question more polite.

(15) ***belki*** sen de farket-ti-n mi?
maybe you too notice-PAST-2SG Q
"Did you happen to notice that, too?"

In example (16) the particle *te* "also" is used like its Dutch counterpart. In Turkish, normally the somewhat more specific forms *bir de* or *aynı zamanda* ("at the same time") would be expected, but bilinguals may feel that these have too strong an additive meaning ("and then on top of that, you also . . ."), probably because Dutch *ook* is used in both strong and weak additive contexts. The usage of simple *te*, therefore, has its semantic motivations in the usage of its translation equivalent, and thus it qualifies as a loan

translation (for another example, see the conjunction *ve*, "and," in example 21 below).

(16) çok iyi, öğretmenlik ***te*** yap-ıyo-sun, değil mi?
very well, teaching also do-PRES-2SG, not Q?
"Very well, and then you teach, right?"

The comitative suffix in (17) is the result of translating the Dutch way of saying "burden someone with responsibility." Dutch, like English, uses "with" and marks the person saddled with the responsibility as a direct object. Turkish, on the other hand, normally construes the responsibility as the direct object and the person involved as an indirect object (through the dative). Dutch Turkish has copied the subcategorization pattern for this expression from its Dutch equivalent.

(17) (a.) birin-***i*** sorumluluk-***la*** yükledi
somebody-ACC responsibility-with burden.PAST.3SG
(b.) *Monolingual Turkish*
sorumluluğ-***u*** birin-***e*** yükledi
responsibility-ACC somebody-DAT.burden.PAST.3SG
"He burdened somebody with the responsibility."

As long as we are dealing with morphemes that have a clear semantic core, loan translation seems to be an apt term, since bilingual speakers have operated on the basis of a transparent link between Form A in Turkish and Form B in Dutch, both with Meaning X. The effect of the various examples we have seen is more lexical than structural. In the examples that follow, however, bound morphemes are involved, and their meaning is more grammatical than lexical, and hence their effect is more like structural borrowing than like loan translation. The question is: where does loan translation end and structural interference begin?

5.4.3 Loan translations involving grammatical morphemes

In (18), accusative marking is used instead of dative, but this should not be seen as an example of a generalized morpho-syntactic change. Rather, the change in case marking is the result of the translation of the Dutch expression: *iemand (iets) vragen* ("to ask somebody (something)"). Dutch construes the person who is being asked as a direct object, while Turkish marks it as an indirect object. In monolingual Turkish the meaning of (18) would be: "My mother asked for information about (the well-being of) her friends." Although no content morphemes are involved in this loan translation (in neither of the languages), some concrete translation of semantic content has nevertheless taken place, namely the construal of the Recipient (the person being asked) as a Direct Object.

(18) anne-m sor-du arkadaşları-***m***
mother-POSS-1SG ask-PAST.3SG friends-ACC
"My mother asked her friends [something]."

In the following example, the use of the plural ending on the noun seems to be modeled on Dutch syntax, rather than on a particular Dutch plural noun. In fact, we come across this pattern quite often, especially when generic or categorial reference is intended. Dutch tends to use the plural ending in such cases (combined with the absence of an article), while Turkish normally uses a singular noun. In (19), it is unlikely that the whole noun phrase is a translation from Dutch; most likely it really is just the plural marking that is copied, in which case we have passed into the realm of foreign-modeled morpho-syntax. This, therefore, is not loan translation according to our definition. On the other hand, it illustrates that there is a scale from one realm to the other, since we might say that the plural meaning is translated from Dutch.

(19) hiç Türkçe kitap-**lar** oku-ya-mı-yor-um
no Turkish book-**PL** read-ABIL-NEG-PRES-1SG
"I can't read Turkish books."

If grammatical morphemes are used like their Dutch counterparts, the effect is often the extended use of a syntactic construction, since functional elements are not selected on their own. A case in point in our data is the distal, non-anaphoric use of the demonstrative pronoun, to encode some sort of "mental distance" from the referent of the noun that follows the pronoun, as in (20), in which the English translation indicates the connotation that is implied by the use of the deictic marker. This usage is copied from Dutch, in which demonstratives are often used in this way.

(20) yani kendi-m-i ifade etmek ist-er-se-m bile ed-e-mem çünkü ***o*** sözcükler-i bul-a-mam
so self-POSS-ACC expression to.do want-AOR-COND-1SG even do-ABIL-AOR.NEG.1SG because those word-PL-ACC find-ABIL-AOR.NEG.1SG
"So even if I want to express myself I can't because I can't find those damn words."

5.4.4 Loan translations involving discourse patterns

Finally, discourse patterns from the other language may be incorporated. These are generally better seen as cases of structural borrowing, but sometimes there is a clear lexical model. So, there are good arguments to group these under either loan translation or interference/transference. In the following question–answer sequence, the follow-up question (A2) follows an unconventional pattern that is similar to what is done in Dutch.

(21) A1: Ilke, sen daha çok yani Hollandaca konuş-uyo-sun değil mi günlük hayat-ın-da sadece aile içerisinde Türkçe konuş-uyo-sun?
Ilke, you more so Dutch speak-PRES-2SGnot Q daily life-POSS.2SG. LOC only family in Turkish speak-PRES-2SG
"Ilke, you speak more Dutch, isn't it, in daily life, only in the family you speak Turkish?"

B1: evet sadece aile içerisinde.
yes only family in
"Yes, only in the family."

A2: ***ve arkadaş-lar-ın-la Türkçe*** [*sic*]
and friend-PL-POSS.2SG -with Turkish
"And with your friends Turkish?" [*sic*: "Dutch" is meant]

B2: ***ja***, arkadaş-lar-ım-la Türkçe [*sic*].
yes, friend-PL-POSS.1SG -with Turkish
"Yes, with my friends Turkish."

According to monolingual conventions the follow-up question (A2) would require repetition of the finite verb of the main question (A1). It is probably no coincidence, however, that this pattern co-occurs with the use of the clause-initial conjunction *ve* "and," inspired by the Dutch convention of starting such questions with *en* "and." In monolingual Turkish, this conjunction is not used much at all, especially not for the resumption of a topic.

5.4.5 The translation process

What do all these examples have in common? The basis of any loan translation is an urge that a bilingual feels, consciously or not, to say something in a base language in the way that it is said in the other language. This much may be similar to the motivation for CS. Yet, for some reason, in loan translation incorporating the full form from the other language is not judged to be the right thing to do. Instead, the form is translated. This can only be done if there is a transparent link between Form A in Language X and Form B in Language Y, in the sense that they mean the same thing in some way (see Sebba, this volume). This is, of course, not equivalence as established by linguists, but is based on what speakers perceive to be equivalent across the languages (Bolonyai 2000). The forms A and B are translation equivalents, but this is not to be understood as "identical" in meaning. In fact, by definition, loan translations alter the meaning of the involved morpheme, since it is used in a novel way. For this reason, what Weinreich (1953:51) calls "loan rendition" seems to be much more common than "real" loan translation (see Grzega 2003). In loan rendition, the translation is not exact, but there is still a clear similarity in meaning between the source form in the other language and the target form in the native language.

5.5 Pervasiveness of loan translation

Loan translations may play a large role in creating the impression that immigrant varieties are different from their non-contact counterparts. It is not clear, though, how pervasive loan translations actually are. Do immigrant varieties seem different because there are so many of them, or are loan translations, when they occur, simply very salient and noticeable? Owens (1996) gives some indication of how widespread loan translation is in Nigerian Arabic. He mentions having collected some 200 idioms that deviate from other varieties of Arabic, in a corpus of about 500,000 words. However, Owens limited his investigations to clearly idiomatic combinations, and left the more modest forms of semantic extension out of his analysis. Therefore, it is possible that the pervasiveness of the phenomenon in his corpus is underestimated. Moreover, we should take into account that many loan translations may be under-identified since their deviation from the conventional norm in the non-contact variety is so minimal that they cannot be detected, but that nevertheless they contribute to the perception of a variety that deviates considerably from monolingual norms. In any case, quantitative analyses are needed.

Another unknown is the degree to which individual loan translations have spread to all or most idiolects in a given bilingual community. As far as we know, there is no information on this for situations of on-going language contact, but studies of past contact situations certainly show that, given time, a language can undergo serious semantic restructuring as the end result of calquing numerous expressions from another language (Ross 2001).

5.6 Final remarks

In this chapter, we have presented a classification of loan translations along a cline of abstractness, going from translations of specific meanings, as embedded in lexical items and fixed expressions, to translations of abstract, partially grammatical meanings, as embedded in functional elements that are themselves part of larger constructions. Imposing a strict boundary between loan translation and structural borrowing seems elusive. It is an empirical point whether the same cline can be filled in with data from other language pairs, with less or more typological distance, and in different sociolinguistic settings.

At least two intriguing questions remain to be answered by further research:

(1.) Since bilinguals have the possibility to choose between CS and loan translation (and the two co-occur frequently in our bilingual speech data), is it in any way predictable which form they will choose?

Our tentative answer is that most lexemes involved in loan translation are from the stock of the basic vocabulary. Relatively specific meanings, on the other hand, tend to be imported along with the morpheme expressing it, through CS (see Backus 2000; Dorleijn 2002). It remains to be seen, however, whether this suggestion can be upheld once a larger and more diverse set of data has been examined. It stands to reason, however, that faced with the task of planning an utterance containing a concept that is best expressed by a complex lexical item from the other language, speakers have a choice between overtly code-switching for that item or calquing it. For instance, if Turkish speakers in Holland wish to express a concept easily produced through a particular verb-object collocation in Dutch, e.g. *schuld geven* "blame give" ("to accuse"), then they have various possibilities for doing this. First, they can take both the noun and the verb from Dutch. Or they may take just one of these forms from Dutch and translate the other. Or they may produce the loan translation exemplified in (10) above. Bilingual data seem to indicate that all options occur, but that there are preferential patterns. Specifically, CS is most often used for nouns and verbs that do not belong to the basic vocabulary. Those that do belong to the basic vocabulary are subject to calquing. This suggests that basic vocabulary patterns with functional elements are being produced without much conscious attention, while specific vocabulary is consciously selected. Though it remains a problem how exactly we should distinguish between basic and specific vocabulary, we may eventually be able to establish a complementary distribution of CS and loan translation. This would considerably clarify the empirical basis of a theory of contact linguistics (see Weinreich 1953).

(2.) Why are some elements translated and others not?

One possibility is that there exist, apart from semantic criteria, structural criteria also that would favor loan translation. Counting the loan translations in a limited set of bilingual Turkish–Dutch data has revealed a numerical preponderance of translated Object–Verb and Prepositional Phrase–Verb combinations (Dorleijn and van der Heijden 2000). Whether this is a coincidence, whether this applies only to Turkish–Dutch data or also to other language pairs, and what exactly the theoretical implications would be if indeed Object–Verb combinations were relatively "translation-prone," remains open for further investigation.

To conclude, we are aware of the fact that in this chapter we have raised more questions than we have answered, but we hope to have convinced the reader that the study of loan translations needs to be considered as an integral part of the study of CS behavior.

Note

1. The data used to illustrate language contact outcomes in this chapter are all taken from recordings of spontaneous conversations involving men and women who were born in Holland and were between 18 and 25 years old. Interviews were conducted by Ad Backus, Seza Doğruöz, and Margreet Dorleijn.