

A Phonetic Comparative Study of Mauritian Creole *Kreol* and Turkish - Twin Orthography Discussed

Naailah DUYMUN-DEMIRTAŞ¹

Abstract

Located within an interpretivist paradigm, this study seeks to demonstrate the similarities in orthography between Turkish and Mauritian Creole with regard to the presence in both of these languages of lexemes that do not have only the same pronunciation and orthography but bear the same or approximate semantic value in most cases. These similarities constitute an element of intrigue, as Turkish and Mauritian Creole are not cognate languages. Yet, this study invites a reflection on the interconnection through mutual intelligibility, of these remote languages which are geographically located far apart from each other, one on the European and Asian border and the other in the Indian Ocean. The researcher adopts a synchronic approach to analyse aspects of both Turkish and Mauritian Creole with regard to their respective lexicons. An International Phonetic Alphabet presentation illustrates the common sound patterns justifying the orthography of each language in the context of this study.

Keywords: Mauritian Creole; Turkish; pronunciation; orthography; intelligibility

DOI: 10.24818/DLG/2023/40/13

1. Introduction

This study is unique as it is founded on a phonetic exploration of an interesting combination of languages which are of different origin and completely detached from each other. The comparative nature of this research helps to unravel the simple, yet interesting similarities languages share with one another. The comparison and contrast of the languages presented herein, namely Turkish and Mauritian Creole, is unprecedented, making this study one of interest.

The study is inspired by lived experiences which are briefly presented. Mauritian Creole and Turkish are two languages that the author uses currently in her linguistic space in the written form as well as the

¹ Naailah Duymun-Demirtaş, The University of the Western Cape, Cape Town, Republic of South Africa, naailahd@gmail.com

pronunciation form. Being born in Mauritius, the author had Mauritian Creole as a home language. She acquired Turkish in adulthood.

After moving to Istanbul, Turkey and living there for six months, the author became fascinated with lexemes in Turkish that appeared familiar, as she could read them easily and quickly assumed she could understand what they meant. These lexemes were advertised everywhere in town on media or billboards, either for services or trade. Terms like 'sinema', 'garaj', 'garson', among many others made her feel like being anywhere in Mauritius, like home. These terms felt familiar. She soon realised that she understood what these terms meant. She started to learn that they mostly had exactly the same meaning as the same lexemes used in Mauritian Creole.

She further started to notice that sometimes the pronunciation would have a slight variation in Turkish, which she realised was negligible with regard to intelligibility across the two languages. The author explains the slight variation later in the paper.

Eventually as her knowledge of Turkish grew, she became even more familiar with the written form of the language, enabling her to do a cross-analysis between the languages concerned. She is thus able to select specific lexemes based on frequency of exposure to the two languages, and indicate the similarities in their spelling and pronunciation. She realised that it is mostly lexemes of French origin, in both languages, that are similar in orthography as well as phonetically. Moreover, the same phonemes and graphemes are used to transcribe these words. However, key to this study is the fact that the orthography in both Turkish and Mauritian Creole are far from being akin to French.

The origin of both languages as well as their development and evolution is introduced as a first step in this study. A brief diachronic presentation of the two languages in this study leads to a synchronic assessment of these languages to come to the observation of the similarities between them. The crux of the study rests on the common French connection of the two languages.

Creole is a language that is known to have a background of mixed languages merging and intersecting. Mauritian Creole is speculated to be located at the intersection of various languages such as: English, French, and arguably Asian and African languages depending on the theories which underpin its genesis (Adone 1994). Turkish has a long history of

Persian and Arabic links as will be explained later but then culminates with Western borrowed words, hence the French words.

This study is qualitative in nature, located within an interpretive paradigm. Ontologically, interpretivism is a relative experience. Relativism is the view that reality is subjective and differs from person to person (Guba & Lincoln 1994). The interpretive epistemology stipulates that knowledge is based on subjectivity. It is based on real world phenomena and the lived experience. This study, thus is based on the personal experience of the author, of discovering the affinity between Turkish and Mauritian Creole; Turkish being her L7 or her seventh acquired language chronologically, which is the last language she acquired, but which is now the second language in use in her daily life, together with her Mauritian Creole L1 which is now sitting in the backseat. The affinity between these two languages is further explored.

The two languages are presented diachronically based on extant literature. Thereafter the focus narrows to the synchronic properties of each language. This process culminates to the main aim of the study.

2. Aims and Objectives

The key aim of the study is framed in the fields of phonetics with morphological and semantics as well as pragmatics underpinnings. Using the theoretical construct lexeme, explained by Lyons (1968), the author demonstrates how similar lexemes in both Mauritian Creole and Turkish are closely interconnected phonetically and semantically despite their non-cognate relationship,

While comparing a series of lexemes featured in Turkish and Mauritian Creole to highlight the interesting similarities between these languages, even if they are historically non-cognate languages, the author reflects on the mutual intelligibility that the speakers, listeners as well as readers of these languages would likely experience, as she experiences it herself. The fact that these languages are not related makes this study interesting and special. While focussing on the graphemic presentation of each lexeme, she zooms in on the similar spelling and pronunciation. Moreover, she highlights the semantic value of the lexemes as it is synchronised across both languages.

Such a familiarity felt motivating for her as she embarked on her journey to acquire the Turkish language to a current C2 level – based on the

European Framework. The French connection that Turkish enjoys has contributed to her interest and level of motivation as she proceeded to study Turkish as French is another native language of hers.

In the following section, she presents extant literature on various foci involving comparative studies on each of these languages.

3. Literature Review

Various studies that have been consulted focus on Turkish and Mauritian Creole as they are compared with other languages but not with each other, which invites this study as a novelty. Moreover, studies have previously focussed on various aspects of linguistics and are interdisciplinary either with lexical, phonetic, semantic, or syntactic foci. A few of these studies are presented herein to lead to the unique focus of the comparison between Turkish and Mauritian Creole.

Previous studies of comparative nature, with Turkish language at the centre have been mainly focussed on the Turkic languages. Turkish has been compared to Kazakh, Kyrgyz, Turkish, Uzbek and Uyghur languages (Sagdieva, Husnutdinov, Mirzagitov, & Galiullin 2019). The focus of this quoted article is on kinship terms and it reveals the history of development and interrelations of these speakers. It also contributes to the description of the lexical-semantic system of these Turkic languages. In the article, a comparison of the phonetic, nominal and semantic similarities of genetic features of kinship terms is made. The study reveals that each language has distinctive features and peculiarities, although they are included in the Turkic group.

Turkish is also compared to Chinese with regard to the conceptualising of 'face' in both these languages (Ruhi & Kadar 2012). Bozavli (2017) compares English, French, and Turkish in terms of assessing the rate of learning English and French words which are homonymous with Turkish, as well as the rate of retention of the words learned. That study has a phonetic association focus and it samples 6th graders learning English in high school and 9th graders learning French at 3 high schools. Interviewing 70 respondents and administering a phonetic association test of 25 English and 25 French words which are homonymous with Turkish words constitute the data for this study. Using descriptive and content analysis to interpret the data, the author of that study unfolds that those learning English are better than those learning French in learning

vocabulary by means of phonetic association method. The focus on the phonetic association heralds the current study. Saibekova and Aytas (2019) explore graphemic comparison between Kazakh and Turkish languages. Due to the scope of this paper the literature review is restricted to the above works on the Turkish language.

As far as Mauritian Creole is concerned, studies on its uncertain and flexible orthography system constitute a common focus. Cross-creole typological studies in general have been studied by Taylor (1971) and Holm and Patrick (2007), whereby lexical structures of Creoles not only those with a common lexifier but those with Creole derived from other sources are compared. Grant and Guillemin (2012) focus on Mauritian Creole and further discuss its typological features by claiming that they mostly use the orthography of *Grafi larmoni*, 'a harmonized writing system for the Mauritian Creole Language' (Hookoomsing 2004), and those used by *Ledikasyon pu Travayer* in their *Diksyoner Kreol Angle* ('Creole English Dictionary') (2004). They also claim, just as this study posits, that there is no formal orthography for Mauritian Creole, despite a number of proposals for phonemically based orthographies, including, Baker and Hookoomsing (1987) (Grant & Guillemin 2012)

4. Theoretical Framework

For this study the theoretical lens lies in phonetics and morphology with a semantic twist. The author uses the theoretical construct of lexeme which was discussed in the early works of Lyons (1968) as a theoretical construct and proceeds to present the linguistic data both graphemically and phonetically. The study does not claim to be located within corpus linguistics due to its scope.

In his early work on theoretical linguistics as an introductory presentation on linguistic 'jargon', Lyons (1968) stipulates, as a reaction to a criticism about the complexity of linguistic terminology, that the terms used by non-linguists such as 'word', 'syllable', 'verb', 'noun', etc. were once part of traditional grammar. Linguists have been inventing terms that were required during the course of their work and study.

In this paper which is located at the intersection of a few linguistic fields as mentioned above, namely phonetics, morphology, and semantics, the term 'lexeme' will be used to qualify 'word' and 'phonemes' will be used to demonstrate the pronunciation of these lexemes. Phonetic

transcription serves the instrumental purpose of presenting and explaining the linguistic data in this study. The term 'spelling' is used traditionally to indicate the orthography of specific lexemes, chosen for the purpose of this study.

The system that will be used to present the linguistic data will be based on the International Phonetic Association (IPA) which is primarily concerned with transcription and pronunciation of languages. The IPA is the tool used in this paper to demonstrate the similarities claimed to exist between the languages in question.

5. Mauritian Creole – a diachronic perspective

Mauritian Creole is the creole language of Mauritius. A creole language is a language that has come to exist at a point in time that can be established fairly precisely. Non-creole languages are assumed (often in the absence of detailed knowledge of their precise development) to have emerged gradually (Muysken & Smith 1995). Creolists do not agree about the definition of the terms pidgin and creole, nor about the status of a number of languages that have been claimed to be pidgins or creoles (Muysken & Smith 1995). It is believed that pidgins and creoles only recently started to attract the attention of researchers (Wardhaugh & Fuller 2021) and in the case of Mauritius, Mauritian Creole is believed to have been formed from a few languages, with French being the dominant one (Adone 1994; Pyndiah 2016). For the purpose of this study Mauritian Creole is regarded as a creole.

Before the 1930s pidgins and creoles were neglected in research. Pidgins and creoles are marginal, in the circumstances of their origin, and in the attitudes towards them on the part of those who speak one of the languages from which they derive (Hymes 1971).

Diachronically following Mauritian Creole, it is suggested that African and Indian languages brought by slaves and indentured labourers in conjunction with French contributed to the beginnings of Mauritian Creole. The language evolved for more than a century and, before the Indian Ocean islands passed to British hands in 1810 when, a French-based Creole was already established (Pyndiah 2016).

6. Creole spelling or orthography

Characteristic of Mauritian Creole is the orthography which is explained as being determined and driven by either French, this being the natural tendency by most speakers, or alternatively by resorting to a more English-based orthography.

Mauritian Creole is French-based. Although it is extensively used, it has not been officially standardised. Efforts to devise an official standard for the language have been made but to no avail.

Texts on and in Mauritian Creole have adopted French orthographic conventions, with the partial exception of Anderson (1885) in which, e.g., French <qu> is consistently replaced by <k> (Baker & Kriegel, 2013). Writing systems have been proposed between 1968 and 2000. Various orthographies reflected the diversity of the population and from the author's experience, the orthography would be shifting depending on the disposition of the speaker and writer of the text. Hookoomsing's (2004) *grafi-larmoni* sought to overcome these difficulties and has proved more influential than any of its predecessors. A slightly modified version of this, backed by the *Akademi Kreol Morisien*, has now received official approval and was introduced into primary schools in January 2012 (Baker & Kriegel 2013). However, flexibility and versatility still accompany the spelling of Mauritian Creole.

In this paper the author's argument is that the standardising of Mauritian Creole does not prevent Mauritians from attempting to write their language in any way they choose at any given moment. This is part of the rationale for the choice of paradigm for this study as interpretivism. This is where this study fits, where Mauritian Creole spelling intersects with Turkish spelling, specifically of lexemes borrowed from French.

7. Turkish – a diachronic perspective

Turkish belongs to the South-western group of Turkic languages, which are part of a larger Altaic language family. It is the official language of Turkey and is one of the official languages of Cyprus. It is also spoken by Turkish-speaking minorities in countries that formerly belonged (in whole or in part) to the Ottoman Empire, such as Bulgaria, Greece, Macedonia, Romania and Serbia (Yavaş 2010).

Diachronically, Turkish was influenced by Arabic and Persian in the 15th and 16th centuries. Thereafter, history saw the alphabet revolutions in the Ottoman Empire and the Russian Empire, beginning in the 1860s culminating eventually with the new Turkish alphabet and the Soviet latinisation movement (Kuzuoglu 2020). The Arabic alphabet was replaced with a latinised one in 1928. While at that moment new imports from Arabic and Persian have stopped, other Western languages such as French started to become part of the Turkish linguistic landscape.

Turkish as it is today, contains words gathered from a variety of languages as per documented history and the evolution of Turkish. Turkish which is the most dominant language of Turkey, in its modern version follows a script which consists of 29 graphemes; seven of which (ç, ş, ğ, ı, i, ö, ü) have been modified from their Latin originals for the phonetic requirements of the language. Below are some rules for Turkish pronunciation.

8. Some rules for Turkish pronunciation:

Each grapheme is pronounced, which confirms the language as highly phonetic, each letter/grapheme bears one sound, letters are never combined to form other sounds like English ch in 'church', there are no diphthongs like in English 'coil', there is a slight stress on the last syllable which is explained later in the paper when the slight variation of pronunciation of the last sound in Turkish is compared to the same in Mauritian Creole.

The additional graphemes in Turkish language, different from the conventional Latin script are explained below:

- "ı" is an extra vowel quite different from "i". It is pronounced like "u" in "plus" with lips unrounded.
- "y" is a consonant like y in "you" and it is used to form the "yon" in words borrowed from French language ending with "ion"
- "c" like g in "gentle"
- "ç" like ch in "church"
- "ğ" is a soft g, barely pronounced. It will lengthen a preceding vowel.
- "j" is a voiced sh like the last sound in French "garage"

- “r” is rolled like in Italian or like the American English sound of “r”
- “ş” is like /sh/ in the English word “shop”

The rest are: Ç ç - Ğ ğ - İ i - Ö ö - Ş ş - Ü ü

The “ö” is pronounced interestingly as the “e” or “eu” sound in French. The “ü” sounds exactly like “u” in French, with which the Mauritian speaker and listener is familiar. With regard to Mauritian Creole, the spelling is very fluid and flexible as one who is familiar with the language (in writing especially in context of this study) can use any suitable graphemes and phonemes to unpack the lexemes being transferred to the listener/reader/viewer. The term viewer is used when I refer to the one who sees adverts, billboards, boards, posters with lexemes on them as opposed to the reader being someone who reads the media. I have experience in both.

9. Methods

From a methodological perspective, the author uses purposive sampling as she deliberately seeks lexemes, both the languages focussed in this paper, which are based on French lexemes and to which the author was exposed during her stay in Istanbul. Her familiarity with both languages allows her some flexibility of choice too. She starts with Turkish and summons the same lexemes from Mauritian Creole. It is estimated that there are around 5000 words from the French lexicon in the Turkish language. In both Turkish and Mauritian Creole, the French words are borrowed and the spelling is adapted. In the case of Turkish, the specific special graphemes from the language are used and in Mauritian Creole, the lexemes which are still in currency can be spelt using any style one feels comfortable with. The one who spells and writes Mauritian Creole is the master of their orthography.

Driven by her exposure to specific Turkish words or lexemes that she witnessed in their organic context regularly in Istanbul, the author randomly chooses fifty of these lexemes which are common and displays their graphemic system as well as the phonetic and semantic one. The scope of this paper only allows a limited number of samples. More examples are likely to exist in both languages, should this study be taken further. Focussing on the fifty lexemes, thereafter the author comments on

the comparison highlighting the similarities between the two languages targeted in this paper.

A list of the common lexemes in no particular order
Graphemic presentation/Orthography of both languages and Semantic value

Table 1

French lexemes	Turkish lexemes	Mauritian Creole lexemes with same and other possible orthography/graphemes	Semantic value/Meaning in English
Touriste	turist	turist, tourist	Tourist
Valise	valiz	valiz, valise	Suitcase
Baggage	bagaj	bagaj, bagaz	Luggage
Barrage	baraj	baraj, baraz	Dam
Détail	detay	detay	Detail
Présentation	prezentasyon	prezentasyon, presentation, presentasion	Presentation
Abonné	abone	abone, abonne, aboner	Subscriber
Adaptation	adaptasyon	adaptasyon, adaptation, adaptasion	Adaptation
Adresse	adres	adres, ladres, adress, adresse, etc.	Address
Alcool	alkol	alkol, lalkol, alcol, lalcol, etc.	Alcohol
Garage	garaj	garaj, garaz, garage, etc.	Garage
Virage	viraj	viraj, viraz, virage, etc.	Bend
Régime	rejim	rejim, rezim, regim, regime, etc.	Regime
Message	mesaj	mesaj, mesaz, message	Message
Massage	masaj	masaj, masaz, masage, massage	Massage
Collage	kolaj	kolaj, kolaz, collage, collaz, etc.	Collage
Agence	ajans	ajans, azans, agence, etc.	Agency
Geste	jest	jest, zest, gest, geste, etc.	Gesture
Générique	jenerik	jenerik, zenerik, generik, etc.	Title credit or generic
Idéologie	ideoloji	ideoloji, ideoloji, ideologi, ideology, etc.	Ideology

French lexemes	Turkish lexemes	Mauritian Creole lexemes with same and other possible orthography/graphemes	Semantic value/Meaning in English
Calorie	kalori	kalori, calori, etc.	Calorie
Carrière	kariyer	kariyer, karyer, etc.	Career
Cathédrale	katedral	katedral	Cathedral
Crêpe	krep	krep	Pancake
Laser	lazer	lazer	Laser
Ligue	lig	lig, ligue, lalig	League
Merci	mersi	mersi, merci,	Thanks
Mystique	mistik	mistik, mystique, etc.	Mystic/Mystique
Omelette	omlet	omlet, omlete, etc.	Omelette
Positif	pozitif	pozitif, positif, etc.	Positive
Cirque	sirk	sirk, cirk, cirque, etc.	Circus
Allo	alo	alo, allo, hallo, etc.	Hello
Rapport	rapor	rapor	Report
Saison	sezon	sezon, saison	Season
Ampoule	ampul	ampul, ampoul, etc.	Ampoules
Avantage	avantaj	avantaj, avantaz, lavantaz, avantage, etc.	Advantage
Base	baz	baz, base, etc.	Base or basis
Bifteck	biftek	biftek	Steak
Électrique	elektrik	elektrik, elektrik, etc.	Electric
Fréquence	frekans	frekans, frekens, etc.	Frequency
Guitare	gitar	gitar, lagitar	Guitar
Groupe	grup	grup, group	Group
Discothèque	diskotek	diskotek	Disco
Scandale	skandal	skandal	Scandal
Saucisse	sisis	sisis	Sausage
Crise	kriz	kriz	Crisis
Téléphone	telefon	telefon	Telephone
Télescope	teleskop	teleskop	Telescope
Tableau	tablo	tablo	Picture, chart
Fonction	fonksiyon	fonksiyon	Function

The above confirms the similarities between the orthography of the listed Turkish lexemes and the ones in Mauritian Creole.

Drawing on the table above, the author then proceeds to present the following table where she demonstrates phonetically by using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), the transcription of selected lexemes from the above table. This illustration shows the pronunciation system of each chosen lexeme. The pattern is anticipated to be the same for all the other examples provided above. The selected ten lexemes phonetised herein are merely to demonstrate the point she attempts to make in this paper, that the two languages being studied share a twin orthography and pronunciation, to varying degrees.

Thus, Table 1 proves the orthography of the presented graphemes and Table 2 below a phonemic presentation of a few lexemes. It is presented below to corroborate the above graphemic presentation but this time the focus is on the sound of each lexeme.

International Phonetic Transcription to confirm similarities

Table 2

Turkish lexemes	Mauritian Creole lexemes	Phonetic transcription (IPA) of the lexemes in the first two columns
turist	turist	/turist/ (Turkish) / tuɾɪst/ (Mauritian Creole)
diskotek	diskotek	/diskotek/
skandal	skandal	/skandal/
kriz	kriz	/kriz/ (Turkish) /kɾɪz/ (Mauritian Creole)
sosis	sosis	/sosis/
valiz	valiz	/valiz/
detay	detay	/detaj/
prezentasyon	prezentasyon	/prezentasjon/ (Turkish) /prezɑ̃tasjɔ/ (Mauritian Creole)
abone	abone	/abone/
adres	adres	/adres/

10. Results

In the first section of the data presentation, the chosen list of lexemes, common in both languages, is introduced without any indication of the phonetic properties. The focus is on the orthography and meaning as in the far right column. Only 50 random words are chosen as a sample for this study. It is clear that due to the affinity of both languages central to this study with French, there are likely to be many more lexemes in both languages that would display similar features. What transpires through this data presentation in Table 1 is that clearly Turkish and Mauritian Creole share an orthography, the phonetic value of specific lexemes as well as the semantic value of those specific lexemes.

10.1 Semantics and Intelligibility

Key to this study is the phenomenon of semantics whereby as demonstrated in the data presentation above, these lexemes are mutually intelligible across both these languages. The semantic value, in terms of the meaning of each lexeme provided in the far right column in Table 1 further corroborates the statement that some lexemes across these languages are mutually intelligible. The author personally experienced this phenomenon upon her first encounter with Turkish. She understood some lexemes in Turkish and predicted their meaning. She was correct in her assessment. The slight variations in pronunciation as shown in Table 2 are negligible and do not jeopardise mutual comprehension. Usually mutual intelligibility occurs across languages that are closely related. In this study, the two chosen languages are remote geographically and only share one or two influential languages historically. French was a welcomed Western linguistic influence in Turkey, as it was adopted during the linguistic transition to modern Turkey and in Mauritius, French is a colonial heritage. Despite the geographical divide, the selected lexemes would be understood by speakers, listeners, and readers of both languages.

10.2 Spelling/Orthography/Grapheme

As demonstrated through the mere graphemic presentation of each lexeme in the table above, the lexemes in Turkish and those in Mauritian Creole are identical. They are spelt the same way. This is due to the flexibility of the Mauritian Creole language, as explained above. Even though in many cases where the Mauritian Creole speaker and writer tends

to incorporate the French definite articles “le” or “la” or even “les” as the plural form as a neutral “l” in front of some Mauritian Creole lexemes, that would not always necessarily be the case. It is a choice. Such speaker and writer may also decide not to use the articles. Various orthographies of the chosen lexemes in Mauritian Creole are offered in Table 1 above in the third column. The various proposed orthographies, although different from the one akin to the Turkish one, still bear the same value semantically. Various systems of orthography are acceptable and useful in Mauritian Creole, whether they are based on the pure French spelling system or the pure English one – these two languages being the most common influences on Mauritian Creole. The words in various spelling systems still have the same meaning. This allows for mutual intelligibility across Turkish and Mauritian Creole in the written form mainly but also in the spoken form as is argued in this paper.

10.3 Pronunciation/Phonetics/Phonemes

At times the pronunciation of the provided lexemes is exactly the same in both languages. Other times there are slight variations whereby in Turkish the final consonant is not silenced as it would be in French, hence Mauritian Creole. In Turkish, the final consonant “n” sound is pronounced and not nasalised. It is noted that the words ending in “ion” in French, is translated into Turkish and “yon” with the “n” being pronounced as an alveolar nasal sound as opposed to the nasalisation of the same last syllable in Mauritian Creole as the French would.

Moreover, as presented earlier, according to the rules for Turkish pronunciation, the “r” sound is pronounced with a trill in the American way while Mauritian Creole keeps the hard French “r” which is pronounced in the throat represented as /ʁ/ in Table 2 above. This pronunciation style does not interfere with intelligibility across the two languages which is key in this study. The Turkish pronunciation style does not interfere with intelligibility either. There are still, however, many other lexemes which retain the exact same sounds phonetically as in the samples provided.

In light of this study, the chosen samples of lexemes are considered similar phonetically in both the key languages.

10.4 French-based words not the only factor for intelligibility

As established in this study and others cited, in the Turkish lexicon, there are many words borrowed from French language. Mauritian Creole is based on French language. This is the common factor in this study. However, as it is pointed out as a reflection below, not only French based words across these two languages allow for mutual intelligibility.

11. Conclusion

Based on this comparative study, it is clear, that both languages, Mauritian Creole and Turkish, somehow adapted and modified the spelling of the borrowed French words as in the case of Turkish, or, in the case of Mauritian Creole, allowed an evolution of French words. Somehow the adopted spelling systems merge and seem identical across these two languages studied in this paper. The data presented are just selected samples that the author thought would serve the purpose of this study. What should be noted is the slight change in the pronunciation for some of the sample lexemes as mentioned earlier. However, such a slight variation still allows mutual intelligibility.

The various spelling possibilities proposed for Mauritian Creole, even though they are not always aligned with the standard set by the new academy (Hookoomsing, 2004) is celebrated in this paper. The author illustrates and, thus perpetuates, the dynamic nature of her mother-tongue by highlighting its versatility and multifarious nature from graphemic and phonetic perspectives.

As much as it may be likely that the lexemes used in this study may have similar affinity with other lexemes in other languages, and there may be intelligibility between Turkish or Mauritian Creole and many other languages in the world, this study remains focussed on and committed to the similarities strictly between Turkish and Mauritian Creole.

Moreover, it is very likely that the two languages used in this research could have similar affinity and similarities with other languages in other respects but the focus of this paper is limited to the similarities between Mauritian Creole and Turkish lexemes based on French language.

Although outside the scope of the focus of this paper which is on French-based vocabulary, it is worthy to note the following; which the author would like to suggest: the phenomenon of transliteration of Arabic and Persian lexemes as they are widely used in both Turkish language and

Mauritian Creole also intersect. The use of these lexemes in both the latter languages mostly carry spiritual, religious as well as scriptural value for being the terminology of Islam, a common religion which is shared by Turkey and Mauritius to a different proportion.

Some of the examples of such terms that the author offers for the purpose of this study are “Dünya” “Namaz”, “Ramazan”, which also feature in Urdu, a cultural heritage language the author learnt in primary school and it is occasionally present in the repertoire of the Muslim community in Mauritius; furthermore, some lexemes get assimilated in Mauritian Creole. Note the diacritic on “Dünya” which will not prevent intelligibility across the two languages concerned here as expressed in this study.

This study can be amplified and diversified using more lexemes across the two languages constituting the foci, and in-depth studies on the causes for the slight phonetic variations that were highlighted in Turkish could be undertaken further.

Both Turkish and Mauritian Creole remain active languages in the author’s linguistic space but for many years Turkish has taken over and become her L2 after English.

Bibliography

1. ADONE, D., (1994) *The acquisition of Mauritian creole* (Vol. 9). John Benjamins Publishing.
2. ANDERSON, S.H., British and Foreign Bible Society, (1885) *L’Evangil selon S. Matthié (dan langaz créol Maurice)*. British and Foreign Bible Society.
3. BAKER, P., & HOOKOOMSING, V. Y. (1987) *Diksyoner kreol morisyen: Dictionary of Mauritian Creole*. l’Harmattan.
4. BAKER, P., & KRIEGEL, S. (2013) *Mauritian Creole*. In: Michaelis, Susanne Maria & Maurer, Philippe & Haspelmath, Martin & Huber, Magnus (eds.) *The survey of pidgin and creole languages*. In "The survey of pidgin and creole languages". Volume 2: Portuguese-based, Spanish-based, and French-based Languages. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
5. BOZAVLI, E. (2017) *Effect of phonetic association on lexis learning in natural language context: a comparative study of English, French and Turkish words*. *Educ. Res. Rev*, 12(2), 45-53.

6. CRUSE, A. (2011) Meaning in language: An introduction to semantics and pragmatics.
7. DOUGLAS, T. (1977) Languages of the west Indies. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
8. GRANT, A. P., & GUILLEMIN, D. (2012) The complex of creole typological features: The case of Mauritian Creole. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole languages*, 27(1), 48-104.
9. GUBA, E. G., & LINCOLN, Y. S. (1994) Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K.
10. DENZIN, & Y. S. LINCOLN (Eds.) (2017) Handbook of qualitative research (pp. 105-117). London: Sage.
11. HOLM, J., & PATRICK, P. L. (2007) Comparative creole syntax. London: Battlebridge.
12. HOOKOOMSING, V. Y. (2004) Grafi-larmoni. A Harmonized Writing System for the Mauritian Creole Language.
13. HYMES, D. H. (Ed.). (1971) *Pidginization and creolization of languages*. CUP Archive.
14. KOHRT, M. (2012) The term 'grapheme' in the history and theory of linguistics. In *New trends in graphemics and orthography* (pp. 80-96). de Gruyter.
15. KUZUOGLU, U. (2020) Telegraphy, Typography, and the Alphabet: The Origins of Alphabet Revolutions in the Russo-Ottoman Space. *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 1, 19.
16. LYONS, J. (1968) Introduction to theoretical linguistics (Vol. 510). Cambridge university press.
17. MATTHEWS, P. H. (1965) The inflectional component of a word-and-paradigm grammar. *Journal of Linguistics*, 1(2), 139-171.
18. MUYSKEN, P., & SMITH, N. (1995) The study of pidgin and creole languages. *Pidgins and creoles: An introduction*, 1, 14.
19. PYNDIAH, G. (2016) Decolonizing creole on the Mauritius islands: Creative practices in Mauritian Creole. *Island Studies Journal*, 11(2), 485-504.
20. RUHI, S., & KADAR, D. Z. (2012) A comparative study of Turkish and Chinese. *Understanding Historical (Im) Politeness: Relational linguistic practice over time and across cultures*, 41, 25.
21. SAGDIEVA, R., HUSNUTDINOV, D., MIRZAGITOV, R., & GALIULLIN, R. (2019) Kinship terms as proof of genetic relationship. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 10(3), 103-117.

22. SAIBEKOVA, N. U., & AYTAŞ, G. (2019) The Similarities of Graphemes in Kazakh and Turkish Languages. *Хабаршы*, 78.
23. TAYLOR, D. (1971) Grammatical and lexical affinities of creoles. In Hymes, D. (eds) *Pidginization and creolization of languages*, 293-6.
24. WARDHAUGH, R., & FULLER, J. M. (2021) *An introduction to sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
25. YAVAŞ, M. (2010) Some structural characteristics of Turkish. In *Communication Disorders in Turkish* (pp. 48-62). Multilingual Matters.