

Patterns and Features of Kyrgyz–Russian Code-Switching in Bishkek

ビシュケク市におけるキルギス語とロシア語の
コード・スイッチングのパターンと特徴

Nami Odagiri
小田桐 奈 美

本研究は、キルギス語とロシア語のコード・スイッチング (CS) のパターンと特徴を明らかにするものである。キルギス共和国の首都で収集した談話データ内の CS を、主に Myers-Scotton の MLF モデルを用いて分析し、文法的な枠組みを作る「母体言語」と、そこに挿入される「埋め込み言語」を明らかにした。

その結果、キルギス語が母体言語となる場合が大多数で、ロシア語の名詞が挿入されるパターンが最も多く見られた。なかでも頻度が高かったのは、ロシア語の名詞とキルギス語の接尾辞が組み合わせられる例であり、同様の例は、形容詞や動詞が挿入される場合にも観察された。これはまさに、膠着語であるキルギス語と、言語類型的に異なるロシア語との CS に見られる、特徴的なパターンであるといえる。

キーワード

キルギス語、ロシア語、コード・スイッチング、旧ソ連地域

1. Introduction

This study investigates code-switching (CS), defined as “the juxtaposition within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems” (Gumperz, 1982, p.59), between Kyrgyz and Russian in post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan.

Kyrgyzstan, where Russian continues to be mandated as the official language under the provisions of the constitution, is one of the few ex-Soviet states that has retained a role for this language. In many others, the status of Russian, once the most influential and prestigious language, is falling year after year. Previous studies of the sociolinguistic state of Kyrgyzstan have examined various aspects of bilingual use of the two languages in language policy,

language education, and language use in everyday life (Korth, 2005, Odagiri, 2012; Orusbaev et al., 2008). In this context, CS can be expected to show the most dynamic aspects of bilingualism.

While CS between Russian and Kyrgyz can be observed in Bishkek, the capital of Kyrgyzstan, CS—generally referred to as *aralash*¹⁾ (mix) in Kyrgyz—is often criticized in political discourse and mass media, described as something hindering the development and spread of Kyrgyz as the state language, which was the symbol of independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union. In addition, while the existence of the phenomenon of Kyrgyz–Russian CS has been noted in the sociolinguistics literature on Kyrgyzstan, its analysis remains wanting (Odagiri, 2016, p.22).

2. Theoretical framework and methodology

This study investigates the patterns and features of Kyrgyz–Russian CS using an analysis of conversational data taken from residents of Bishkek.

2.1 Data collection

Recordings of 20- to 35-minute conversations among six pairs of conversation partners were undertaken during the summer months of 2016 and 2017 (Tables 1 and 2). After they filled out a face sheet and questionnaire form discussing attitudes toward language, the informants were asked to begin a conversation in a pair for 20–30 minutes on example topics provided by the author,²⁾ or any other topics they freely chose. The participants were informed that they could speak either Kyrgyz, Russian, or both. All handouts were prepared in both languages.

All informants were residents of Bishkek (Fig. 1), which is recognized as a bilingual space, although Kyrgyz is dominant in rural areas.³⁾ All informants regarded themselves to be ethnically Kyrgyz, the dominant ethnic group in Kyrgyzstan. Note that Kyrgyz–Russian CS is most often observed among ethnic Kyrgyz, while Russian is preferred for inter-ethnic communication.⁴⁾ It should also be noted that Kyrgyz–Russian CS in Kyrgyzstan is most common among ethnic majority groups, whereas recent studies on CS have largely focused on non-dominant groups, such as immigrant communities or bicultural families, where CS is more common than in majority groups (Odagiri, 2016, p.22).

Table 1 Informant information (summer 2016)

Pair	1		2		3	
Pseudonym	Aida-1	Nursuluu	Dinara	Gulzat	Cholponai	Meerim-1
Sex	F	F	F	F	F	F
Selected L for handouts	R	R	K	K	R	R
Age	33	35	60	38	26	35
Birth place	Chui O	Naryn O	Chui O	Naryn O	Bishkek	Chui O
L of instruction at school	K	K	K	K	R	R
Mother tongue, per respondent report ⁵⁾	K	K	K	K	K, R	K
L used at home	K, R	K	K, R	K	K, R	R, K
L used outside home	R	K, R	R	K, some-times R	K	R
L most convenient for writing and reading	R	Writing: K, reading: R	K	K	R	R
L most convenient for everyday communication	R	Dependent on situation	K, R	K	R	R

Note: F, female; L, language; R, Russian; K, Kyrgyz; O, Oblast; K, R, use of both languages and may imply preference for Kyrgyz; R, K, use of both languages and may imply preference for Russian.

Table 2 Informant information (summer 2017)

Pair	4		5		6	
Pseudonym	Meerim-2	Seitek	Erkin	Taalabek	Aida-2	Keremet
Sex	F	M	M	M	F	F
Selected L for handouts	R	R	R	R	R	R
Age	36	36	19	19	34	36
Birth place	Chui O	Bishkek	Bishkek	Bishkek	Chui O	Naryn O
L of instruction at school	R	K	R	R	K	R
Mother tongue, per respondent report	K, R	K	K	K	K	K
L used at home	Mix (equivalent)	K	K, R	R, K	Mix (K, R)	Both (equivalent)
L used outside home	Mainly R	Both (equivalent)	R	R, English	R	Both (equivalent)
L most used for writing and reading	R	R	R	R	R	R
L most used for everyday communication	R	Both (equivalent)	R	R	R	Both (equivalent)

Note: F, female; M, male; L, language; R, Russian; K, Kyrgyz; O, Oblast; K, R, use of both languages and may imply preference for Kyrgyz; R, K, use of both languages and may imply preference for Russian.

The author selected pairs that already had a rapport to ensure conversation was smooth and active. The pairs were made up either of friends, colleagues, immediate family members, or relatives. Two informants (Aida and Meerim) participated in the research project in both years in different pairs.



Figure 1 Map of Kyrgyzstan

2.2 Data analysis and research questions

Conversational data were transcribed by a local assistant, and the transcript was double checked by the author to ensure all CS utterances were noted.

2.2.1 Preliminary analysis

The transcription was given a three-part preliminary analysis, to identify the relevant data for the fuller analysis.

Firstly, the language used in the conversational turns was analyzed, to grasp the complete picture of the data, as is shown in Table 3. Zuercher (2009) explored Azerbaijani–Russian CS using a similar procedure of recording staged conversations, where CS within conversational turns appeared quite rarely. Consequently, his discussion was based on other data that were recorded in different conditions. However, in this study, CS appeared quite often, even in staged conversations, indicating that CS is more widespread in Kyrgyzstan than in Azerbaijan.

While levels of proficiency in the two languages might differ, all informants resided in a largely bilingual city and used both languages regularly. Therefore, following Grosjean’s concept of language mode, the state of activation of two languages, and language-processing mechanisms of the bilingual individual at a given point in time which includes two features - the base language chosen and the comparative level of activation of the two languages - informants were assumed to operate in a bilingual mode. While the base language can be changed (e.g., when a bilingual speaker switches over completely to the other language), the comparative level of activation of the two languages cannot. Similarly, a change in the level of activation of the two languages is possible even in the absence of a change in base language. The activation level of

Table 3 Languages used in conversational turns

Pair	1	2	3	4	5	6
Monolingual turns in K	52	78	0	4	0	40
Monolingual turns in R	3	0	14	16	173	31
Bilingual turns	53	50	4	17	5	37
Turns not in a particular language or whose language could not be determined (utterances that were non-linguistic, only proper names, only cognates, or other)	1	1	0	2	1	2
Total number of turns	109	129	18	39	179	110
Relationship	Colleagues	Relatives	Family members	Husband and wife	Friends	Colleagues
Recorded location	Workplace	Home	Home	Home	University cafeteria	Workplace
Total time of conversation	20'27"	22'12"	21'54"	33'36"	17'59"	17'29"

Note: K, Kyrgyz; R, Russian.

a language can vary in response to a number of factors: language proficiency; the relationship between conversational partners; the language mixing habits they have; and the attitudes they have toward language mixing, and others (Grosjean, 2003, pp.1-3).

Therefore, even where the informants are in bilingual mode, the base language chosen and the comparative activation of the additional language can vary among pairs or in a single conversation in a given pair. Consequently, Table 4 describes the base language and comparative level of activation of the languages in each pair.

Secondly, utterances with CS were classified into three types according to a classic CS typology (Poplack, 1980; Appel & Muysken, 1987, p.118): **Tag CS** appears as an exclamation, a tag, or a parenthetical in another language from the remainder of the sentence, and this serves as an emblem of the bilingual character of an otherwise monolingual sentence. **Intra-sentential CS** occurs in the middle of a sentence or a clause; this is often called code-mixing. **Inter-sentential CS** is found between sentences or clauses. Intra-sentential switches were predominant, and all types of CS were observed, as is shown in Table 5.

Table 4 Base language and comparative level of activation of Kyrgyz and Russian

Pair	Base language, comparative level of activation and other notes
1	- Base language: Kyrgyz (More Kyrgyz monolingual and bilingual turns. Less Russian monolingual turns.) - Russian comparatively inactivated (In the follow-up interview, informants explained that they tried to speak only in Kyrgyz because they considered the conversation to be an official matter. Aida told that she used some Kyrgyz words that she never used in ordinary speech.)
2	- Base language: Kyrgyz (More Kyrgyz monolingual and bilingual turns. No Russian monolingual turns.) - Russian comparatively inactivated (the informants were from rural areas, where Kyrgyz is dominant.)
3	- Base language: Russian (No Kyrgyz monolingual turns.) - Kyrgyz partly activated only while discussing Kyrgyz customs. - Note: Fewer conversational turns. Much of the conversation was a sequence of short monologues, where each informant presented her ideas on the sample topics.
4	- Base language: both (No single base language used in part or all of the conversation was identified. There were more Russian monolingual turns and fewer Kyrgyz monolingual turns, at a number of points, the base language of a bilingual turn appeared to be Kyrgyz. Alternation of monolingual turns in either language and bilingual turns were common.)
5	- Base language: Russian (No Kyrgyz monolingual turns.) - Note: More turns taken in spite of the lower total time of conversation.
6	- Base language: Russian → both (The most balanced combination of three types of turns among all groups. The informants were asked not to regard the situation as an official one but to speak as they would in everyday life. In the follow-up interview, the informants explained that they still tried to speak in one language, in Russian this time, which meant that Kyrgyz was inactive at first. However, they also said that they noticed that they began to use CS as they became relaxed. Alternation of monolingual turns in either language and bilingual turns was common.)

Table 5 Types of CS in the conversational data

Pair	Tag CS instances ⁶⁾	Intra-sentential CS instances (number of bilingual clauses)	Inter-sentential CS instances
1	2	80	0
2	1	106	0
3	1	8	1
4	5	37	6
5	0	7	0
6	8	52	14
Total	17	290	21

Note: CS, code-switching

Intra-sentential CS instances can be classified into three categories using Muysken's typology (2000: 3), which describes **insertion** of material (lexical items or entire constituent parts) from one language into a structure from the other language, **alternation** between structures from languages, and **congruent lexicalization** of material from different lexical inventories into a shared grammatical structure. After all cases of intra-sentential CS were categorized as either insertional or non-insertional CS, the former appeared to be more common in our conversational data.

2.2.2 Main analysis

After the data were sorted for the main analysis, that is, the insertional type among intra-sentential CS, Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model (Myers-Scotton, 1997, 2002) was applied, as it appears to be one of the most compelling models for the insertional CS.

Using the MLF model, the matrix language (ML) that serves as the source of structure for the grammatical frame of the bilingual clause can be distinguished from embedded language (EL), which supplies content morphemes inserted in the ML frame. The model is based on the premise of asymmetry between the participating languages in a bilingual clause, where ML has a more controlling role for the relevant clause (Myers-Scotton, 2002, pp.19-58).

ML is defined by the role it plays based on the following two principles: **The morpheme order principle** indicates that in ML+EL constituents consisting of singly occurring EL lexemes and any number of ML morphemes, the surface morpheme order, reflecting surface syntactic relations, will be that of the ML. **The System Morpheme Principle** states that in ML+EL constituents, all system morphemes (e.g., function words) that have grammatical relations external to their head constituent, come from the ML (Myers-Scotton, 1997, p.83).

Using the MLF model, as Namba (2012b) reported, the ML of a bilingual clause can be identified, and items from the other language can be considered to be embedded in it. In contrast, as in other cases, either the distinction between ML and EL does not exist (such as in alternation), or the ML consists of both languages (such as in congruent lexicalization). Following this model, here, the ML (i.e., Kyrgyz or Russian) for each bilingual clause was identified using the MLF model, and then items inserted as the EL into the structure of the ML were analyzed to identify their parts of speech and other features.

The author also addressed the question of the distinction between CS and borrowing, which appears to be worth considering in the analysis of insertional CS, as the use of insertional CS is conceived of as something akin to borrowing, that is, it is an insertion of an alien lexical or phrasal category into a pre-existing linguistic structure (Muysken 2000: 3). The difficulty of distinguishing between CS and borrowing, particularly in the case of single-item insertion, has

been noted by previous studies of CS that examined different language pairs (e.g., Forker, 2019; Namba, 2012a; Van Dulm, 2007). As Matras (2009, pp.110–114) illustrated, CS and borrowing can be conceived of as two ends of a dynamic continuum. The dimensions of this continuum would be bilingualism (whether the item in question is used by a bilingual or monolingual speaker), regularity (single occurrence or regular occurrence), and structural integration (whether the item in question is not integrated or integrated to the structure).

Note that Russianism, or the influence of Russian on Kyrgyz, is widespread and is characterized by calquing of Russian phrases, lexical borrowing from Russian, and semantic influence of Russian on Kyrgyz (Krippes, 1998, p.xviii). The Soviet Kyrgyz linguist Orusbaev (1980, p.29) found in a study carried out during the 1970s that 70%–80% of modern Kyrgyz terms, especially in the spheres of science and technology, consisted of words borrowed from or via Russian. Moreover, the words borrowed after this period were spoken with Russian pronunciation, in contrast with the early 20th century, when reports stated that Kyrgyz pronounced Russian words with a noticeable accent. This has made it difficult to determine whether a Russian word that appears by itself in a conversation in Kyrgyz should best be considered CS or borrowing. The author primarily followed Forker (2019), who, in studying Sanzhi Dargwa-Russian CS, simply reported all words of Russian origin, irrespective of whether they might be considered borrowings or CS in a given utterance.

There still could be differences between instances of CS in the patterns and elements inserted that could be used to distinguish potential borrowing from other uses. The present author distinguishes them in the following way to allow for comparison: if a word of Russian origin is included in a Kyrgyz–Russian dictionary (Iudakhin, 1965) as an entry word whose translation in Russian is either identical to the entry word⁷⁾ or shows only slight morphological adaptation, the word is considered to be borrowed.⁸⁾

2.2.3 Research questions

Following from the above theoretical and methodological review, the following research questions were proposed to guide investigation of the patterns and features of Kyrgyz–Russian CS in Bishkek.

1. Is the ML of a Kyrgyz–Russian bilingual clause identifiable using the MLF model? (Section 3.1)
2. Which EL items are inserted in the structure of ML, and how are they inserted? (Sections 3.2 and 3.3)
3. Are there any differences in patterns and items inserted between the instances of CS

categorized as potential borrowings and others? (Section 3.4)

Most of the discussion in this paper uses the transcription of the conversational data collected by the author, supplemented by the results of follow-up interviews with the informants and the author's own field notes on naturally occurring conversations in Kyrgyzstan. Although a productive sociolinguistic approach also exists to examine the CS, this study adopted an approach to CS that deals with it from a structural point of view.

3. Insertional CS between Kyrgyz and Russian languages

3.1 Identifying ML in bilingual clauses

In total, the ML was identifiable in most cases, which means that insertional CS was more common than non-insertional CS, while the frequency of insertional CS differed greatly among pairs (Table 6). As expected from the results of the preliminary analysis in 2.2.1, in pair 2 the MLs were considered to be exclusively Kyrgyz in all cases of bilingual clauses in bilingual turns, where Kyrgyz was the base language throughout the conversation, and Russian was comparatively inactivated. Pair 5, by contrast, showed a similar tendency for Russian.

The results for pair 4 were more complex: the frequency of non-insertional CS was the highest, possibly because a single base language was not identified in the preliminary analysis as being in use throughout the conversation. Although there were few monolingual Kyrgyz turns, a number of cases were found where the base language of a bilingual turn was Kyrgyz. This probably led to the result being the majority of MLs were Kyrgyz, and clauses where the ML was Russian were rare. Similarly, even in pair 6, where the number of utterances in the two languages seemed most balanced, in the majority of cases, the ML was Kyrgyz. Thus, Kyrgyz was the dominant ML in bilingual clauses, even among pairs where both languages were used in a balanced way.

Table 6 Distribution of MLs in bilingual clauses

		1		2		3		4		5		6		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Insertional CS	ML=K	78	97.5	106	100	0	0	21	56.8	0	0	38	73.1	243	83.8
	ML=R	0	0	0	0	7	87.5	3	8.1	7	100	4	7.7	21	7.2
Non-insertional CS		2	2.5	0	0	1	12.5	13	35.1	0	0	10	19.2	26	9.0
Number of bilingual clauses		80	100	106	100	8	100	37	100	7	100	52	100	290	100

Note: ML, matrix language; CS, code-switching; ML=K, Kyrgyz matrix language; ML=R, Russian matrix language

3.2 Items inserted in ML=K clauses

Which items are inserted in the structure of ML, and how are they inserted? Table 7 shows the distribution of inserted items by part of speech and insertion pattern.

Table 7 Items inserted in ML=K clauses

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Nouns							226
Single noun	23	43		8		14	88
Single noun (with morphological adaptation)						1	1
Single noun + ML suffix	34	64		7		13	118
Single noun + ML suffix (with morphological adaptation)	2	1					3
Single noun + ML suffix = adjective	3	1				2	6
Noun phrase	3	1		1		2	7
Noun phrase (with morphological adaptation)		1				1	2
Noun phrase + ML suffix	2						2
Adjectives							14
Single adjective	3			1		3	7
Single adjective + ML suffix	1						1
Single adjective + ML suffix (with morphological adaptation)	3					2	5
Single adjective + ML suffix = noun		1					1
Adverbs							25
Single adverb	3	5		3		3	14
Adverbial phrase	6	3		2			11
Verbs							
Single verb	1						1
Verb + ML suffix				1		1	2
Particles	2			1		2	5
Parenthesis, filler ⁹⁾	1			2		1	4
Quotes (Russian monolingual phrase or clause)	2	1					3
Quotes (bilingual phrase or clause)		7				2	9
	89	128	0	26	0	47	290

Note: ML, matrix language; ML=K, Kyrgyz matrix language

3.2.1 Nouns

Nouns were inserted more often than other parts of speech. This result supports previous work on CS, which indicates that of all grammatical categories, nouns are the most frequently and readily inserted into other MLs (e.g., Poplack, 1980; Muysken, 2000; Namba, 2012a).

Examples of single noun insertion are given below within quoted fragments from the transcript, which are transliterated with Latin characters, whereas utterances in Russian are indicated with boldface.

- (1) *Bar beken kyrgyzcha mektep, **sadik**?* (Dinara)
 there are INT+appear to be in Kyrgyz school **kindergarten**
 ‘Do there appear to be any Kyrgyz schools or **kindergartens**?’
- (2) *Bir zholu **roditel’skoe** **sobranie** bolup* (Dinara)
 one time **parents’-NOM-NEUT-SG meeting** be-CONV
 ‘Once we had a **parents’ meeting**.’
- (3) *Men da, sen aityp zhatsang, bir **istoriia iz detstva*** (Keremet)
 I also you say-CONV AUX-COND-2P-SG one **story from childhood-GEN-NEUT-SG**
 ‘I also have an interesting story **from childhood** that I remembered while you were talking.’

Examples (2) and (3) feature EL islands, or constituents that feature relations of structural dependency and are well-formed in the EL, not in the ML. Where they are not morphologically integrated into the ML in an optimal way (Myers-Scotton, 2002, p.67), their placement in the given bilingual clause is under ML control.

The most frequently observed pattern with embedded nouns is noun + ML suffix, wherein Russian nouns are inserted and given Kyrgyz suffixes.

Case suffixes

- (4) *Orus **sadikke** berip* (Gulzat)
 Russian **school-DAT** send-CONV
 ‘(Shall we) send (our children) to a Russian **kindergarten**’
- (5) *Biz dele süilöp zhatkanda bir **predlozheniada***
 We even speak-CONV AUX-VN-LOC one **sentence-LOC**
eki-üch söz oruscha bolup zhatpaiby? (Aida-1)
 two-three word in Russian be-CONT AUX-NEG-INT
 ‘Two or three Russian words appear per **sentence** while we are speaking, don’t they?’

Possessive suffixes

- (6) *Chong atamdyn bir mechtasy bar ele* (Meerim-2)

Grandfather-POS-1P-SG-POS one **dream**-POS-3P-SG there is PAST

'My grandfather had a **dream**'

- (7) *Oshol üchün üidögülör eme oshol udobstvosyna karap*

Therefore family members you know this **convenience**-POS-3P-DAT consider-CONV

kyrgyz mektepke berishken (Nursuluu)

kyrgyz school-DAT send-PAST

'Therefore, you know, my family members decided to send me to a Kyrgyz school for their **convenience**'

Plural suffix

- (8) *Tigi spisoktordu karap kele atyptyr da* (Gulzat)

The person **list**-PL-ACC look-CONV come-CONV AUX-PST EMPH

'The person, having checked the **lists**, was coming, you know'

These examples illustrate the high degree of receptiveness of Kyrgyz, an agglutinative language, in incorporating elements of Russian origin into its own structures by attaching suffixes in the practice of insertional CS.

3.2.2 Adverbs

The second most frequently seen insertion was that of adverbs, which appeared without morphological adaptation, by contrast to what was observed for nouns.

- (9) *Voobshche ishtei albait eken da* (Dinara)

completely work-CONV AUX-NEG-3P-SG EMPH

'It seems that he can't work **at all**'

- (10) *V obshchei slozhnosti oshondoi go* (Nursuluu)

In total like this aren't they?

'**Overall**, (things are) like this, aren't they?'

- (11) **Na samom dele** oruscha tak süilöp ataby, zhokpu? (Aida-1)
Actually in Russian fluently speak-CONV AUX-INT no-INT
 ‘Are they **actually** speaking Russian fluently or not?’

The phrases used in the above Eg. (10) and Eg. (11) are Russian idioms. According to Myers-Scotton (2002, p.141), many EL islands are adverbial phrases designating time or place; that is, they are adjuncts. Moreover, their structure is often formulaic and may include idioms or set collocations.

3.2.3 Adjectives

The third most frequently appearing part of speech was the adjective, whose patterns of insertion appeared to differ starkly in their degree of adaptation to the Kyrgyz grammatical system. As seen in Eg. (2) in 3.2.1, cases were observed in which a Russian adjective was used as it would be in Russian grammar, constituting an EL island. By contrast, the following example is not an EL island, as the word *slabyi* (weak) does not follow Russian grammar: it should have been declined to *slabaia* with the ending *-aia* because it precedes the nominative feminine singular noun *gruppa* (group).

- (12) “*Nazgul degen mugalim bar*
 Nazgul called teacher there is
anyky slabyi gruppa eken” dep (Gulzat)¹⁰
 hers weak-NOM-MASC-SG group-NOM-FEM-SG appears to be say-CONV
 ‘They said that “There is a teacher called Nazgul, whose **group** appears to be **weak**”

In the following example, the Russian adjective *aktivnaia* (active) is used in the nominative feminine singular form before the Kyrgyz noun *kyz* (girl), although Kyrgyz does not have grammatical gender.

- (13) *Ushundai aktivnaia kyz bolchu turbaisyngby* (Keremet)
 such active-NOM-FEM-SG girl be-PAST AUX-NEG-2P-SG-INT
 ‘It seems that you used to be such an **active** girl didn’t you?’

By contrast, in Eg. (14), the Kyrgyz suffix *-duu*, which denotes an adjective, is placed where inserted items were more adapted and integrated into the ML structure. If the phrase had

formed an EL island, *aktual'naia* (acute) should have appeared before the nominative feminine singular noun *tema* (topic).

- (14) *Birok bul aiabai aktualduu tema dep oiloim* (Aida-1)
 but this very **urgent**-ADJFS topic think-CONV think-PRES-1P-SG
 'But I think that this topic is very **urgent**'

There were also cases in which a single noun combined with the Kyrgyz adjectival suffix was used as an adjective, among which were included nouns in Table 7, labeled as single noun+ML suffix=adjective.

- (15) *Ekonomikalyk zhaktan özübüz öñügüp ketpegendikten* (Nursuluu)
 economy-ADJFS side-ABL ourselves develop-CONV AUX-NEG-VN-ADJFS-ABL
 'As we are not developed from an **economic** point of view'

3.2.4 Verb

While verbs were more rarely inserted than the parts of speech discussed above, the patterns of their insertion were unique. In most cases, the infinitives of Russian verbs were used in combination with the Kyrgyz auxiliary verb *et-*, and the two elements were usually elided in the following ways. For example, in Eg. (16), *ispol'zovat' et-* was pronounced as *ispol'zovatet-* to form the infinitive of a new Kyrgyz verb stem, on which any type of suffix (e.g., conjugative, personal) could be placed.

- (16) *Chisto özüngdün golosungdu ispol'zovat' etseng* (Keremet)
 simply yourself-POS voice-POS-2P-SG-ACC use-INF AUX-COND-2P-SG
 'How about if you **simply used** your own **voice**?'

- (17) "Kele ber" dedim
 come-CONT AUX-IMP say-PAST-1P-SG
 "Erte kel stol nakryvat' etseng" (Aida-2)¹¹⁾
 early come-IMP table set-INF AUX-COND-2P-SG
 "Just come," I said, "Why don't you come early and set the table?"

Abduldaev et al. (1987, pp.232-233) in their study reported that this type of word formation

became productive during the Soviet era and was common in spoken language, describing the example of *zvonit' et-*,¹²⁾ formed from the Russian verb infinitive *zvonit'* (call on the phone). This phenomenon was also reported in Odagiri (2015, pp.185–187) in the form of bilingual compound words often observed in Kyrgyz-Russian bilingualism: *zaviset' et-* (depend), *rasshiriat' et-* (expand), *vystupat' et-* (make a speech), and *ukhazhivat' et-* (care). Additionally, other examples are here supplied from conversational data and the author's field notes regarding naturally occurring utterances: *postupat' et-* (act); *smeshivat' et-* (mix); *dergat' et-* (pull); *nabirat' et-* (collect); *teriat' et-* (lose); and *analizirovat' et-* (analyze).

This pattern of word formation is quite common and is a productive way of incorporating Russian verbs into the Kyrgyz frame as ML.

3.3 Items inserted into ML=R clauses

By contrast to the illustrations of ML=K above, clauses in which Russian was considered to be the ML were rare, as indicated in Table 8.

Table 8 Items inserted in ML=R clauses

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
Single noun			1	1	4		6
Noun phrase			6	2	2		10
Adjective						1	1
Single adverb			1			1	2
Adverbial phrase						1	1
Particles						1	1
Quote (bilingual phrase or clause)					1		1
	0	0	8	3	7	4	22

The use of Kyrgyz words connected to Kyrgyz culture and customs, including *salt* (custom), *uiat* (shame), were prominent.

- (18) *Est' i vrachi* *kyrgyzdar* (Meerim-2)
 there are also doctors Kyrgyz-PL
 'There are also Kyrgyz doctors'

- (19) *To eto budet uiat* (Erkin)
 then it be-FUT shame

'Then it will be a shame'

- (20) *Nu tak kyrgyzcha govoritsia "bizdin salt"* (Meerim-1)

Well in this way in Kyrgyz is said our custom

'Well, it is called "our custom" in Kyrgyz'

EL island

- (21) *My ispol'zuem aila zhok oruscha* (Aida-2)

we use-PRES-IP-PL exit no in Russian

'(In such cases) we have no choice but to use Russian'

Note that nine out of 10 noun phrases that appeared in Kyrgyz were *kyz ala kachuu* (bride kidnapping), one of the most controversial social problems in Kyrgyzstan. This phrase appeared in Kyrgyz on the Russian version of the list of example topics, expressed in this way: what do you think about *kyz ala kachuu* (bride kidnapping)? In most cases the informants preferred to use the phrase only in Kyrgyz, but one informant did use the Russian equivalent.

- (22) *Kyz ala kachuu, pokhishchenie nevest, konechno negativno* (Taalaipek)

bride kidnapping kidnapping bride-GEN-FEM-PL of course negatively

'Bride kidnapping, kidnapping, of course, (I consider it) negatively'

3.4 Potential borrowings in ML=K clauses

Words in the ML=K cases that might be counted as borrowings and the others are tabulated separately in Table 9.

In the analysis of inserted items in ML=K clauses as a whole in 3.2, the most frequent part of speech was the noun, followed by the adverb and the adjective. Among the potential borrowings, nouns were most frequently seen. However, it is notable that the noun + ML suffix pattern, where Russian nouns were inserted in combination with Kyrgyz suffixes, was significantly more common than single noun insertion, which means that the Russian words that could be classified as potential borrowings are more readily incorporated into the Kyrgyz frame than other words.

The majority of cases of adverbs were not included in the list of potential borrowings. It seems that nouns are comparatively easier to use in combination with Kyrgyz suffixes and thus are often considered already borrowed, while adverbs are inserted without modification, and

Table 9 Potential borrowings vs. the others¹³⁾

Pair	Potential borrowing					Others				
	1	2	4	6	Total	1	2	4	6	Total
Single noun	15	37	1	10	63	8	6	7	4	25
Single noun (with morphological adaptation)					0				1	1
Single noun + ML suffix	31	57	5	4	97	3	7	2	9	21
Single noun + ML suffix (with morphological adaptation)	2	1			3					0
Single noun + ML suffix=adjective	3	1		2	6					0
Single adjective					0	3		1	3	7
Single adjective + ML suffix					0	1				1
Single adjective + ML suffix (with adaptation)	2			2	4	1				1
Single adjective + ML suffix=noun					0		1			1
Single adverb	1		1		2	2	5	2	3	12
Single verb					0	1				1
Single verb + ML suffix					0			1	1	2
Particle					0	2		1	2	5
Parenthesis, filler					0	1		2	1	4

Table 10 Words classified as potential borrowings

Noun	63	<p>Examples: <i>avtobus</i> (bus), <i>gazeta</i> (newspaper), <i>zakon</i> (law), <i>pedagog</i> (teacher), <i>problema</i> (problem), <i>sumka</i> (bag)</p> <p>Among the sixty-three words, two appeared in an adapted form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>shakhmat</i> (chess): original Russian word: <i>shakhmaty</i>, appearing without the plural ending <i>y</i>, which is required in Russian. - <i>shköl</i> (school) Original Russian word: <i>shkola</i>, without the final <i>a</i> and with a phonological adaptation from <i>o</i> to the Kyrgyz front vowel <i>ö</i>. Note that in the conversational data, the word was pronounced <i>shkol</i>, closer to the Russian pronunciation.
Adjective	6	<p>All entry words appeared in an adapted form.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>ofitsialduu</i> (official), adjective+ML suffix (with adaptation) - <i>ekonomikalyk</i> (economic), noun+ML suffix=adjective
Adverb	1	<i>prostó</i> (simply)
Total	70	

thus are less considered to be potential borrowings. Table 10 above gives a list of words classified as potential borrowings.

4. Discussion and conclusion

To clarify the patterns and features of Kyrgyz-Russian CS in Bishkek, three research questions were proposed, focusing on the insertional type among intra-sentential CS, the most commonly observed in the conversational data collected for this study.

1. Is the ML of a Kyrgyz-Russian bilingual clause identifiable using the MLF model?

On the whole, MLs were identifiable with the MLF model without difficulty, as far as the insertional type of CS was concerned. However, a significant imbalance in frequency was found between ML=K and ML=R cases. ML=K clauses were dominant among bilingual clauses, even in pairs where both languages were used in a balanced way.

2. Which EL items are inserted in the structure of ML, and how are they inserted?

The insertion of nouns was most common in ML=K clauses, supporting previous studies of CS, followed by the adverb and adjective. Among all cases of noun insertion, the most frequently observed pattern was noun + ML suffix, where Russian nouns were inserted with Kyrgyz suffixes. Unique patterns of insertion in combination with Kyrgyz suffixes were found for adjectives and verbs as well. These examples confirm the high receptiveness of Kyrgyz, an agglutinative language, to integrating elements of Russian origin into its structure with and without added suffixes and morphological adaptations.

In the ML=R cases, by contrast, insertion was practically limited to words connected with Kyrgyz culture and customs.

3. Are there any differences in patterns and items inserted between the instances of CS categorized as potential borrowings and others?

The most frequently borrowed category was the noun, and the noun + ML suffix pattern was significantly more common than single noun insertion. Thus, Russian nouns appeared to be readily inserted in combination with Kyrgyz suffixes and are even considered to be already borrowed into Kyrgyz, while adverbs are inserted without modifications and thus are less considered to be potential borrowings.

Following these findings above, it could be hypothesized that insertional Kyrgyz-Russian CS, where the ML of a clause is identified, tends to occur in ML=K clauses. An explanation for this could be found in the high receptiveness of Kyrgyz language, an agglutinative language, which provides a productive means of incorporating elements of Russian origin into the ML structure, through the use of suffixes. This hypothesis would require testing with larger and more varied

conversational datasets.

Additionally, non-insertional CS, which could be classified as either alternation or congruent lexicalization, should be analyzed further to describe the whole picture of Kyrgyz-Russian CS. This paper's purely linguistic approach to CS should be supplemented by sociolinguistic approaches to the functions of CS in the Kyrgyz context.

Notes

- 1) Besides CS, *aralash* also includes other aspects of bilingualism: e.g. language choice in accordance with domains, situations or interlocutors.
- 2) Example topics included: their experience and ideas concerning language use, memories in their childhood, funny anecdotes they knew, their opinions on social problems, etc.
- 3) The Uzbek language is widely used among ethnic Uzbek in the south Kyrgyzstan.
- 4) Ethnic composition in 2019: Kyrgyz: 73.5%; Uzbek: 14.7%; Russian: 5.5%; Dungan: 1.1% (National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic)
- 5) Usually, the Kyrgyz language is indicated among ethnic Kyrgyz as their sole mother tongue, irrespective of their actual proficiency in the language, even when either they are balanced bilingual or have limited proficiency in Kyrgyz. The cases of Cholponai and Meerim-2 are rare in which they indicated two languages as their mother tongue.
- 6) Use of such parenthesis or filler was common: In Kyrgyz: **eme** (well), *e?* (right?), in Russian: *mozhet (byt')* (maybe), *dopustim* (let's say).
- 7) The Cyrillic script is used for both Russian and Kyrgyz languages, the latter uses additional three letters to the Russian Cyrillic alphabet. In this paper, the three letters are transliterated using Latin characters in the following way: $\text{н} \rightarrow \text{ng}$, $\text{ө} \rightarrow \text{ö}$, $\text{ү} \rightarrow \text{ü}$.
- 8) In some cases, a Russian-Kyrgyz dictionary (Iudakhin 1957) and an orthographic dictionary of Kyrgyz language (Karasaev 2009) were used to identify potential borrowing.
- 9) Counted here are only instances of a parenthesis or a filler that is attached to a bilingual clause, which is not considered to be tag-switching.
- 10) This example is classified as 'quote (bilingual phrase or clause)' in Table 7. The name referred to in the utterance is a pseudonym.
- 11) This example is classified as 'quote (bilingual phrase or clause)' in Table 7.
- 12) This example is usually pronounced as *zvontet-* in a more elided way than other examples. (From the author's fieldnotes.)
- 13) There were no cases of ML=K in pairs 3 and 5. Only single item insertions were included, insertions of phrases were excluded.

Acknowledgments

The author expresses her sincere gratitude to the informants and the local assistant for their cooperation in this research. The author would like to thank Enago (www.enago.jp) for the English language review. This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP16K16668.

References

- Abduldaev, E. et al. (Eds.), (1987). *Grammatika kirgizskogo literaturnogo iazyka*. Frunze: Ilim. [In Russian]
- Appel, R., & Muysken, P. (1987). *Language Contact and Bilingualism*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Forker, D. (2019). Sanzhi-Russian code switching and the Matrix Language Frame model. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 23(6), 1448–1468.
- Grosjean, F. (2013). Bilingual and monolingual language modes. In Chapelle, C. (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. Hoboken, NJ: Blackwell Publishing. doi: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0090
- Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Iudakhin, K. (1957). *Russko-kirgizskii slovar'*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo inostrannykh i natsional'nykh slovarei. [In Russian and Kyrgyz]
- Iudakhin, K. (1965). *Kyrgyzcha-oruscha sözdük*. Moscow: Sovetskaia entsiklopediia. [In Kyrgyz and Russian]
- Karasaev, Kh. (2009). *Kyrgyz tilinin orfografialyk sözdügü*. Bishkek: Mamlekettik til zhana entsiklopediia borboru. [In Kyrgyz]
- Korth, B. (2005). *Language Attitudes towards Kyrgyz and Russian*. Bern: Peter Lang Publications.
- Krippes, K. (1998). *Kyrgyz-English Dictionary*. Kensington: Dunwoody Press.
- Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual speech: A typology of code-mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (1997). *Duelling languages: Grammatical structure in codeswitching*. Second edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2002). *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Namba, K. (2012a). *English-Japanese code-switching and formulaic language: A structural approach to bilingual children's interactions*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Namba, K. (2012b). Non-insertional code-switching in English-Japanese bilingual children: alternation and congruent lexicalization. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15 (4), 1–17.
- National Statistical Committee of the Kyrgyz Republic <http://www.stat.kg/kg/>
- Odagiri, N. (2012). A study on language competence and use by ethnic Kyrgyz people in post-Soviet Kyrgyzstan: Results from interviews. *Inter Faculty*, 3, University of Tsukuba, 39–62.
- Odagiri, N. (2015). 'State language' in the post-Soviet era: *Language and society in Kyrgyzstan*. Osaka: Kansai University Press. [In Japanese]
- Odagiri, N. (2016). Pilot study on the code-switching between Kyrgyz and Russian languages. *Bulletin of the Faculty of foreign language studies*, Kansai University, 15, 21–32. [In Japanese]
- Orusbaev, A. (1980). Kirgizsko-russkie iazykovye svyazi. In Desheriev, Iu. & Ivanov, V. (Eds.), *Russkii iazyk v natsional'nykh respublikakh Sovetskogo Soiuza* (pp.19–29). Moscow: Nauka. [In Russian]

- Orusbaev, A. et al. (2008). Multilingualism, Russian language and education in Kyrgyzstan. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 11(3&4), 476-500.
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en español: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Van Dulm, O. (2007). *The grammar of English-Afrikaans code switching. A feature checking account*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Zuercher, K. (2009). *Azerbaijani-Russian code-switching and code-mixing: Form, function, and identity*. Arlington: ProQuest Dissertations Publishing.

Abbreviations of grammatical terms

ABL	ablative	INT	interrogative particle
ACC	accusative	LOC	locative
ADJFS	adjective forming suffix	MASC	masculine
AUX	auxiliary verb	NEG	negation
COND	conditional	NEUT	neuter
CONV	converb	NOM	nominative
DAT	dative	PAST	past tense
EMPH	emphasis particle	PL	plural
FEM	feminine	POS	possessive
FUT	future tense	PRES	present tense
GEN	genitive	SG	singular
IMP	imperative	VN	verbal noun
INF	infinitive		