

## Post-verbal position in heritage Turkish in the U.S. and Germany

Christoph Schroeder, Kateryna Iefremenko

[schroedc@uni-potsdam.de](mailto:schroedc@uni-potsdam.de), [iefremenko@uni-potsdam.de](mailto:iefremenko@uni-potsdam.de)

Migration from Turkey to Europe, in particular to Germany, and migration from Turkey to the U.S. are rather recent phenomena, and Turkish seems a vital heritage language in these two contact settings. Speakers are bilingual in Turkish and the respective majority language. It is safe to say, however, that they are more competent in the majority language, at least when it comes to more formal registers.

In SOV-language Turkish, the post-verbal position is a non-canonical linguistic phenomenon. It seems characteristic for spoken media and informal registers, while in formal registers, this position is infrequently employed (Schroeder 1995).

Looking at contact of Turkish and other Turkic languages with other languages, the post-verbal position appears as a grammatical domain which is sensitive to change. Some Turkic languages in contact with Iranian or Slavic languages have a clear tendency to SVO word order, Gagauz being a well-known example (Menz, 2006), and some have also adopted postpositive clauses akin to Indo-European subordinate clauses (Johanson, 2002).

This raises the question to what extent the contact settings we look at show similar developments. While German is also a SOV language, English is strictly a SVO language. We thus expect a higher frequency of structures in post-verbal position in the Turkish of heritage speakers in the U.S. Besides, since both dominant languages prefer finite subordination in post-verbal position, we expect a higher frequency of sentential complements in the form of finite clause among Turkish heritage speakers in the U.S. and Germany.

Data comes from RUEG (Research Unit Emerging Grammars) project (see Wiese et al. 2019 for a data sample). Participants are Turkish heritage speakers born and raised in the U.S. and Germany, as well as a monolingual control group from Turkey. We investigate data produced by 64 speakers from each country. Speakers are of two age groups: adolescents (15-18 years old) and adults (23-35 years old). Since post-verbal position in canonical Turkish is highly dependent on the register, we control our data for register (formal/informal, spoken/written).

### References

- Johanson, Lars (2002). *Structural Factors in Turkic Language Contacts*. Translated by Vanessa Karam. pp. xii, 186. Richmond, Curzon.
- Menz, Astrid (2006). On complex sentences in Gagauz. *Turkic languages in contact* by Boeschoten, Hendrik & Johanson, Lars. Harrassowitz, 138-151.
- Schroeder, Christoph (1995). Post-predicate arguments in Turkish. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung*, 48, 1995, 204-218.
- Wiese, Heike, Alexiadou, Artemis, Allen, Shanley, Bunk, Oliver, Gagarina, Natalia, Iefremenko, Kateryna, ... Zuban, Yulia. (2019). *RUEG Corpus* (Version 0.2.0) [Data set]. Zenodo. <http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3236069>