THE ROLE OF GREEK AND GREECE LINGUISTICALLY IN THE BALKANS

Brian D. Joseph

The Ohio State University, USA

1. INTRODUCTION: THE BALKANS? POST-ENLIGHTENMENT?

For most aspects of the examination of culture and cultural encounters, a chronological focus on the past two centuries when coupled with a geographical focus on the Balkans is quite appropriate and makes for an intellectually compelling and coherent framework for discourse and investigation. This observation does not hold, however, for all areas of study. In particular, with regard to the domain of language, it is necessary to break out of this mould of post-Enlightenment contact in the Balkans, even though the period is not without interest for that region. There are two main reasons for expanding the temporal and areal perspective here.

First of all, when considering linguistic encounters in the Balkans involving Greeks, one really has to start much farther back than the Enlightenment. In fact, significant contact between Greeks and non-Greeks has taken place throughout the course of the more than four millennia since Greek-speakers first entered southeastern Europe, starting even as far back as the second millennium BC. Early evidence is the non-Greek vocabulary to be found in the most ancient attestations of Greek, e.g. *da-pu-ri-to-* (later Greek *labúrinthos* "(Cretan) labyrinth") or *a-sa-mi-to* (later Greek *asáminthos* "bathing tub") from Mycenaean Greek of the fourteenth century BC, where the *–nth-* consonant cluster and the apparent polysyllabic root structure have long been considered to be indicators of non-Greek origin for these words. One can further point to a large influx of Latin loan words as evidence of contact during the Koine era, and in the Medieval and Ottoman periods, similar evidence is found showing contact between Greeks and Slavs, and

Greeks and Albanians as a consequence of shared Eastern Orthodoxy (though in this case, it is mainly Greek that finds its way into these other languages), between Greeks and Western Europeans as French-speaking Crusaders and Venetians entered Greece, and later, between Greeks and Turks. Thus external contacts involving Greeks and others in the Balkans predate the Enlightenment by several thousand years. Importantly, though, they have also continued, from the nineteenth on into the twentieth and now the twenty-first centuries, i.e. into and throughout the post-Enlightenment era.

There is another reason, as far as the Greek language is concerned, for looking outside the boundaries imposed by the juxtaposition of "post-Enlightenment" and "the Balkans" as delimiting parameters. During the focal period identified here, contact involving Greek and the Balkans, i.e. the languages of the Balkans, in any direct way is less significant, as it is largely Western European languages, especially French and English, that have supplied numerous loanwords into Greek and these have not necessarily come from a Western European presence on Greek soil in the Balkans, given modern media for communication and possibilities even for "virtual" contact. One can cite examples such as *asansér* "elevator" and *mayió* "bathing suit" from French, or *básket* "basketball" and *kombioúter* "computer" from English, to name just a few of the literally hundreds of such words. Thus, looking at the other side of the conjunction of "post-Enlightenment" and Balkan contacts reveals that the Balkans have not figured prominently as external linguistic influences on Greek linguistically in the modern era.

At this point, yet another departure is in order. The evidence mentioned above concerns loanwords as indicators of the linguistic effects of external contacts, and for a very good reason: loanwords, also referred to as "borrowings", are by far the most obvious indicator of contact among speakers of different languages. But loanwords are extremely common — there probably is not a single language in the world without at least some borrowings — and moreover

loanwords can occur even without face-to-face contact between real people. In other words, one can borrow through written sources alone: a speaker of English need never talk to or meet a Tibetan or a Buddhist to know and use the word *lama*, for instance. Also, there is the phenomenon of so-called learnèd borrowings, something that has happened repeatedly in the history of Greek with ancient Greek feeding into *katharevousa*, in which speakers reach back and borrow from earlier stages of their own language, accessible to them typically through written texts. Thus, in some ways, however intriguing and striking loanwords may be, they can in fact be the least interesting type of contact phenomenon for revealing anything about the actual nature of contact among speakers.

It is thus noteworthy that there are some grammatical and structural, i.e. non-lexical, aspects to the post-Enlightenment but non-Balkan encounters that Greek has had with other languages. A brief mention of these provides a suitable lead-in to the most important linguistic contact — pre-Enlightenment but Balkan in nature — involving Greek and its Balkan neighbours, to be discussed in considerable detail below.

Thus, for the post-Enlightenment period, one can notice occasional English plural endings that occur with English loanwords in Greek, as in *to film* / *ta films* "the film / films", or *to test* / *ta tests* "the test / tests", where English grammatical suffixes have found their way into Greek usage. Similarly, Western European models seem to be at the basis of a foreign structural intrusion into Greek, in double-"headed" compounds (referred to as "loose appositional compounds" by Holton, Mackridge, & Philippaki-Warburton[1]) like *paidí-thávma* "child prodigy" (cf. English *child prodigy*, German *Wunderkind* but especially French *enfant prodige* for likely models).

However, these Western European non-lexical features in Greek are really quite

marginal. For instance, the plural markings are only found with words of English origin, and not even consistently at that, since *ta test* (treating the loanword as indeclinable) is just as likely, maybe even more so, than *ta tests*. Moreover, there are forms such as *to klips* "(hair) clip", where the original plural *–s* of English has, in the process of borrowing, come to be just part of the root of the word, no longer having its grammatical function. And, with regard to the *paidí-thávma* type, there is considerable fluctuation with these as to how grammatical suffixes are realized, whether on just one part of the compound or on both; for instance, the genitive singular with double inflection, *tou paidioú-thávmatos*, is somewhat unusual and sounds odd to many Greek speakers, but *tou paidioú-thávma* with only one grammatical inflection is fine, whereas the doubly inflected *tis hóras mélous* "of the member state" is fine.

In a sense, then, these patterns have not really settled into the language, so to speak, giving them somewhat marginal status at this point.

What all this means is that to get the best picture of the linguistic involvement of Greek with its neighbours in the Balkans, one has to look to the period before the Enlightenment, and moreover, to get a good sense of what was going on, it is important to look beyond the relatively superficial evidence of loanwords. Fortunately, relevant facts of this sort are available, and much is known about how Greek has been involved linguistically with neighbouring languages in the Balkans, involving ways in which Greek has influenced them and ways in which they have influenced Greek. The area of scholarship that has provided these insights is generally known as "Balkan Linguistics", the linguistic investigation of the languages of the Balkans and their interrelations. The following section provides a brief introduction to the methods and findings of this subfield of linguistics.

---

[1] David Holton, Peter Mackridge, & Irene Philippaki-Warburton, *Greek. A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern*

2. BALKAN LINGUISTICS

Despite the fact that there is demonstrably great continuity in the Greek language, in that Modern Greek can be seen as the direct outgrowth, albeit a transformed one, of Ancient Greek, it can also be said that the single most significant external force shaping Modern Greek into what it is now was the intense, sustained, and intimate interaction with speakers of other Balkan languages, especially Albanian, Aromanian (i.e. Vlach), Bulgarian, Macedonian (i.e. the modern South Slavic language), Romanian, Romani (i.e. the language of the Gypsies), Southeastern Serbian (the so-called "Torlak" dialects), and Turkish, in the Medieval and Ottoman period, roughly the tenth to the seventeenth centuries.

The effects of this contact are to be seen in all of these languages to one degree or another, and they go well beyond the lexicon, well beyond mere borrowing of words and phrases, extending also into major grammatical domains, including subordinate clause structure, marking for direct objects, future tense formation, and others. The effects of this mutual influence by the various languages on one another has been a remarkable *convergence* among these languages, so that they are structurally quite parallel. Importantly, also, these languages are quite different from the way they used to be, to judge from the evidence of Ancient Greek, Old Church Slavonic, Latin, and so forth, so there has been considerable *divergence* in their development, away from their previous states. The massive structural convergence that these languages show has created a situation aptly labelled with the term "Sprachbund"(for which there is really no good equivalent in English) in the literature on the Balkans, and aptly described, paraphrasing Kópitar,[2] as involving several distinct languages from a lexical and phonological standpoint but with a single grammar.

The linguistic features which characterize the Balkan *Sprachbund* are given below,

---

Language (London 1997) 345.

adapted from discussions and lists by Sandfeld, Banfi, and Joseph, among other sources:[3]

1. Key Balkan Convergence Features

a. the presence of a (stressed) mid-to-high central (i.e. "schwa"-like) vowel (Tosk Albanian, Romanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, Torlak Serbian, Turkish, many dialects of Macedonian, and (marginally) in some Romani dialects)

b. the presence of vowels *i-e-a-o-u* without additional contrasts in length or nasalization (Greek, Tosk Albanian, Romanian, Aromanian, most of Macedonian, Bulgarian, Torlak (Southeastern) Serbian, and Romani)

c. a reduction of the nominal case system, especially a falling together of genitive and dative cases (Greek, Albanian, Romanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, and Macedonian)

d. a future tense marker based on a reduced, often invariant, form of the verb 'want' (Greek, Tosk Albanian, Romanian, Aromanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Romani, and Serbo-Croatian)

e. a postposed definite article, i.e. "book-the" as opposed to "the book" (Albanian, Romanian, Aromanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, and Torlak Serbian)

f. special verbal forms to express the speaker's withholding of personal confirmation of the narrated event (Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Turkish, at least one Aromanian dialect, and to a lesser extent in Romani, Serbian, and Romanian (the so-called "presumptive" mood))

g. the reduction in use of the infinitive, and its replacement by fully finite clauses (Greek, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Serbian (especially Torlak dialects), Aromanian, and Romani, but also in Albanian (especially Tosk) and Romanian)

---

[2] J. Kópitar, "Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache", *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 46 (1829) 59-106.

h. adjectival comparative structures that are analytic, i.e. marked with a separate word, not with a suffix on the adjective (Greek, Albanian, Romanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, and Romani, as well as in Turkish)

i. co-occurrence of weak object pronominal forms together with full noun phrase direct or indirect objects (with grammatical status in Albanian, Aromanian, and Macedonian; with a different (pragmatically conditioned) status in Greek, Romanian, and Bulgarian; and to a very limited extent in Romani and in Torlak Serbian)

j. lexical parallels, including shared phraseology and other calques (e.g. "to take [someone's] eye" meaning "to dazzle" or "to cut [one's] mind" meaning "to decide"), and numerous shared loan words (many from Turkish) that include "intimate" and "expressive" forms, such as discourse particles, interjections, and the like, e.g. *de* signalling impatience (from Turkish), *ja* in commands (most likely from Greek), *éla* "c'mon" (definitely from Greek), *bre*/*oré* (etc.) "hey (you)!" (definitely from Greek), etc.

A few comments on these features are in order. First, although they can be (and indeed often are) presented more or less as a "checklist" together with an indication of which languages show a given feature, this is a view that can be very misleading. The Balkan *Sprachbund* is not a "club" or something of that sort, and being a "member" of the *Sprachbund* is not something that languages can apply for — the "language union" at issue here is thus not like the "European Union". Yet, some linguists have actually talked about the *Sprachbund* in exactly those terms. What such a view overlooks is that these features, and, more importantly, the structural convergence they represent, are forged in the speaker-to-speaker interactions that are at the heart of contact — in other words, what is often glibly referred to as "language contact" is really

---

[3] Emanuele Banfi, *Linguistica balcanica* (Bologna 1985) passim; Brian D. Joseph, "The Balkan Languages", *International Encyclopedia of Linguistics* (William Bright, ed., Oxford 1992) I.153-155; Kristian Sandfeld. *Linguistique balkanique. Problèmes et résultats*. (Paris 1930).

"speaker contact". Moreover, this contact does not take place in the abstract but in the day-to-day involvement that speakers of one language have with speakers of another language.

It thus makes sense that no single feature in this list is criterial (in that its presence is crucial for classifying a language as "in" or "out") and the realization of these features is not uniform across all the languages. The absence of the infinitive, item (1g), for instance, is total in Greek and Macedonian, nearly complete in Bulgarian, but less evident in Romanian and Albanian. Rather, these features really represent the intersection and the union of several more localized pockets of convergence. The overall *Sprachbund* is in a sense derivative from these clusters of localized contact and convergence.

Further, since localized contact is really what is at issue, there can be interesting convergences that involve only two languages. Moreover, the effects on a language can persist long after the contact has taken place and is no longer on-going; that is, there can be a lasting aftermath to the contact, even if the conditions that gave rise to the *Sprachbund* are no longer active.

However, these features coincide more or less with the geographic limits of the region and it can be demonstrated that geography therefore really is important here. In particular, non-Balkan Greek does not show all these features to the same degree as Balkan Greek; in Pontic Greek and Southern Italy Greek, for instance, the infinitive was retained far longer than was the case in Balkan Greek, while the 'want'-based future did not fully take hold in all parts of Asia Minor Greek. Taken together, when one maps out the greatest intensity and concentration of these features, these features help to define a core Balkan convergence area in the central Balkans, taking in Northern Greece, Albania, Macedonia, and extending into Southern Serbia and Bulgaria.

3. INTERPRETING THE SPRACHBUND FEATURES

The configuration of facts concerning these features and the Sprachbund is such that careful interpretation is needed, and, to be sure, there is considerable controversy surrounding each of these features with regard to their extent, their manifestation in a particular language or cluster of languages, and their causes. Still, of relevance here is that Greek is clearly involved in many, though admittedly not all, of these features. Even though two that are not found in Greek — the postposed definite article (cf. (1e)) and the confirmatory verbal form (cf. (1f)) — may be the most significant for defining the *Sprachbund* core, comment here is restricted to just the ones that involve Greek in some way and focuses on generally agreed-upon aspects of the origin of these features. Attention will also be paid to a few aspects not mentioned above that show ways in which Greek has changed as a result of this significant contact in the Balkans.

Although lexical parallels are not generally the most important or interesting convergence facts to examine, as noted above, there are some borrowings evident in the Balkans that are very revealing of the social circumstances that surrounded the borrowing. In particular, the types listed in (1j), what linguists refer to as "intimate" borrowings and "loan translations", show the nature of the contact since they necessarily involve some degree of bi- or multi-lingualism in a given contact community (i.e. some knowledge of the other language or languages on the part of speakers of one language) and such shared knowledge is instrumental a speaker of one language being influenced by another language. Also, the intimate nature of some of the borrowing, involving conversational particles (e.g. *de* in Greek, from Turkish or variants of *bre* all over the Balkans, from Greek) shows that these speakers were indeed talking to and interacting with one another conversationally, for these are not typical elements of written language.

Moreover, as suggested by *de* and *bre*, as far as Greek has been concerned, the borrowings can go both into Greek and out of Greek. The same is true with the grammatical

features that define the Sprachbund.

Several are likely to reflect Greek influence on other languages; for example, the WANT future is a good candidate for that, especially since it occurs relatively early in Medieval Greek, before its appearance in any of the other languages, and since the range of variation in Greek (full form of WANT plus an infinitive, reduced form of WANT with a finite verb, presence or absence of connective element like *na* in Greek (cf. contemporary dialectal *the na grápso* 'I will write')) is duplicated in the other languages somewhat later on.

Similarly, Greek never had distinctive vowel nasalization and lost vowel length distinctions very early in the Hellenistic period, so that it is a reasonable model for the absence of such vowel properties in the other languages through contact, especially since such "overlay" features (ones that modify or are added to basic contrasts in vowel quality) are often the first to be altered in the compromise phonology that generally results in a contact variety of a language.

In at least one of these features, Greek may have been a starting point for the development, but the nature of the contact situation was what gave the impetus to the ultimate change, both within Greek and into the other languages. In such a case, as far as Greek is concerned, one can talk of a pre-existing tendency in the language being extended and carried through due to contact. Such seems to be the case with feature (1e), the absence of the infinitive, as I have discussed at some length elsewhere.[4] In particular, I argued that even though the replacement of infinitive by finite verbal forms was going on in Greek at an early stage in post-Classical times (observable in New Testament Greek, for instance), it continued into Medieval times, where there are still clear indications that the infinitive was a living, albeit marginal, grammatical category in the language that even showed some signs of regeneration (as shown by its innovative use in the future tense formation and some other constructions). The ultimate loss

of the infinitive in Greek, and the spread of this characteristic into other languages in the Balkans, was exacerbated by language contact, especially in the north of Greece — the central Balkan territory — in a multi-lingual setting, where there were Slavs, Greeks, Albanians, Aromanians all in contact with one another on a day-to-day, intense and intimate basis. The important evidence of non-Balkan Greek mentioned above can be reiterated here, for the infinitive has survived longer in Southern Italy Greek and in Pontic Greek, i.e. away from the locus of and the central focal point for the requisite multi-lingual contact.

Finally, some other cases, not noted in (1), deserve mention as they are of a very specific and localized variety and not widespread in the Balkans, and present instances in which Greek may have been affected by other languages.

In particular, I have argued elsewhere[5] that there are many uses of the negator *mi(n)* in Modern Greek covering modal (i.e. subjunctive) verbal negation, constituent negation, complementation with verbs of fearing, dubitative questions, and others, and that most of these uses continue usages found in Ancient Greek. Moreover, for the most part, these uses are found in Albanian with its analogous and comparable negative marker *mos*, and have parallels across all the Indo-European language family that Greek and Albanian belong to; it is significant here also that the *mi* of Modern Greek (Ancient Greek *me:*) and the *mo-* of Albanian match up perfectly in terms of their historical antecedent form *me:, suggesting that these shared uses are largely shared inheritances from uses attributable to Proto-Indo-European, the ancestor language of Greek and Albanian. However, one use is found only on Balkan soil, and not in ancient times, namely the use of *mi* and *mos* as one-word prohibitive utterances, rather like *Don't!* in English.

---

[4] Brian D. Joseph, *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics* (Cambridge 1983).

[5] Brian D. Joseph, "Is Balkan Comparative Syntax Possible?", *Balkan Syntax in a Comparative Light* (Maria-Luisa Rivero & Angela Ralli, eds., Oxford 2001) 17-43; Brian D. Joseph, "Balkan insights into the Syntax of *me: in Indo-European", *Indo-European Perspectives* (Journal of Indo-European Studies Monograph Series 41, M. Southern, ed., Washington, DC, To appear 2002).

There are no parallels to this found anywhere in the Indo-European languages other than Greek and Albanian, and within Greek, significantly, it is not found at all in the considerable amount of documentation available on Ancient Greek usage. It is a reasonable inference therefore that one or other of these languages is the source of this innovative usage, and while it cannot be proven which is the innovator, the fact that there is so much information on the early stages of Greek, with no indication of this usage until after the potential for contact with Albanians, suggests strongly that in this respect, Greek was influenced by an external source, namely an early form of the Albanian language.

Another result of contact on Greek can be seen in the special value that the sounds *ts* and *dz* have in the language now. Again, I have argued elsewhere[6] that these sounds are the primary phonic carriers of expressivity and affectiveness in the language. This is shown mainly by their skewed lexical distribution, namely that these sounds are found primarily in colourful, slangy, low-style words — note for instance their predominance in diminutives with *–itsa*, *-itsos*, *–itsi*, *–outsikos*, among others, and in onomatopoeia, e.g. *mats-mouts* for a kissing noise, *tsak* for a breaking noise, etc. — but also by contrasts between dialectal forms with *–ts-* and standard forms without, such as *kóskino* vs. *tsíta* "sieve" or *mikrós* vs. *mitsós* "small", where in fact Ancient Greek is the source of each modern dialectal form. What such contrasts show is that *ts* and *dz* are somehow "other", and through their expressivity stand outside the normal purely informational uses of language.

It is thus interesting that another strand that has fed into this sense of "otherness" for the expressive function of *ts* and *dz* is the entry into Greek, as the result of borrowing, of foreign words with these sounds. While some of these are from Western European languages, the

[6] Brian D. Joseph, "Yia tin idiaíteri thési tou [ts]/[dz] stin ellinikí fonoloyía", *Studies in Greek Linguistics, Proceedings of the 3rd Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki,*

majority of words with these sounds come from the Balkans, specifically from Turkish, Slavic, or Albanian. Not only are they perceptibly "other" but these Balkan loans are also almost always on a lower stylistic level than other words in Greek, as is especially evident when there are synonymous pairs of native Greek words (inherited or taken as a learned borrowing from Ancient Greek) and words of foreign origin, as in *doreán* vs. *dzámba* (from Turkish) "for free", or *nános* vs. *dzoudzés* (from Turkish) "dwarf"; such stylistic differences even show up in non-Balkan loans compared with Balkan loans, as in *vólta* (from Italian) vs. *tsárka* (from Turkish) "walk, stroll".

Thus, in this case, contact with other languages in the Balkans has contributed to and helped to enhance an already existing aspect of the language, seen in the standard versus dialect pairs for instance, strengthening it and making it even more salient.

The formative period for the Balkan *Sprachbund* predated the Enlightenment, but these various examples make it clear that the effects of the contact that shaped the *Sprachbund* remain with Greek to this day.

4. CONCLUSION

This examination of the role that Greek has played linguistically in the Balkans, therefore, has led to a consideration not only of the many ways in which Greek has influenced neighbouring languages, but also of various aspects of Greek itself that have been affected by contact with these languages. Indeed, it is fair to say that the most profound changes in grammatical structure between Ancient Greek and Modern Greek cannot be fully understood without some reference to the place that Greek holds in the range of Balkan languages. The results of this undertaking of viewing the history of Greek in its Balkan context, as carried out in greater depth and detail than

---

1982 (Thessaloniki 1983) 227-35; Brian D. Joseph, "Modern Greek *ts*: beyond sound symbolism", *Sound*

is possible here, are extremely important therefore for understanding the nature of language contact in general as well as the specifics of Balkan linguistic contact. At the same time, they also reveal much about the historical development of Greek. In this regard, a consideration of the linguistic role of Greek in the Balkans also has implications for Greek linguistic historiography.

There has been a tendency among many Balkan linguists to get caught up in the linguistic nationalism that pervades public policy in most Balkan nation states, including Greece. That is, many Balkan linguists have been interested in demonstrating that their language could have developed as it did without outside influence; some Albanian publications in the 1960s, for instance, went to great lengths to show that Albanian could have lost its infinitive on its own without any help from Greek.[7] Alternatively, they have aimed at demonstrating that some features found in other languages must necessarily have originated in their language; Andriotis & Kourmoulis,[8] for instance, essentially deny the existence of the Balkan *Sprachbund*, claiming that all the features that have attracted the attention of linguists are nothing more than the result of the influence of Greek. Also, as I have discussed elsewhere,[9] there are cases involving etymology where Greek linguists seem to have deliberately overlooked well-founded etymological explanations of Greek words drawing on contact with other languages in favour of less soundly conceived ones drawing just on native Greek lexical stock.

It is therefore of some considerable interest to see that some recent accounts by non-Greeks of the historical development of Medieval and Modern Greek[10] treat what seems to be the

---

Symbolism (Leanne Hinton, Johanna Nichols, & John Ohala, eds., Cambridge 1994) 222-236.

[7] Joseph, *Synchrony and Diachrony ...,* 185-187.

[8] Nikolaos Andriotis & George Kourmoulis, "Questions de la linguistique balkanique et l'apport de la langue grecque", *Actes du premier congrès international des études balkaniques et sud-est européennes VI: Linguistique* (Sofia 1968) 21-30.

[9] Brian D. Joseph, "European Hellenism and Greek Nationalism: Some Effects on Greek Linguistic Scholarship", *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 3 (1985) 87-96.

[10] Henri Tonnet, *Histoire du grec moderne* (Paris 1993); Geoffrey Horrocks, *Greek. A History of a Language and*

profound linguistic "Balkanizing" period and the massive structural changes in Greek associated with it as being actually rather incidental, at least to judge from the number of mentions made of and pages devoted to Balkan contact in these works. And, Mackridge, though not historical in his focus, nonetheless in his discussion of the factors influencing the lexicon of contemporary Modern Greek[11] seems to attend far more to the somewhat superficial and mainly lexical effects associated with contact with Western European languages than to any effects of contact with other Balkan languages.

All of these treatments — well-meaning and deeply scholarly — are in no sense tinged with the ideology that can be found in various works written about individual Balkan languages. Indeed, the approach taken in them can certainly be justified, in that Western European languages have definitely had a noticeable impact on Greek in the twentieth century, as discussed above in Section 1, and numerous aspects of the historical development of Greek are natural transformations of Ancient Greek features requiring no impetus from outside contact. Nonetheless, and perhaps here the biases of a Balkanist show through somewhat, it seems unfortunate, both for Balkanists and for Hellenists, that the significant effects of contact between Greek and its linguistic neighbours should be relegated to the margins of Greek linguistic historiography. There is much to be learned by keeping oneself open to viewing the relation between Greek and the other languages of the Balkans as a symbiotic relationship with give and take in both directions; a richer view of the role of Greek in the Balkans thus awaits.

---

its Speakers (London 1997).

[11] Peter Mackridge, *The Modern Greek Language* (Oxford 1985) 310-318.