UNIVERSITY OF THE AEGEAN - FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES

# *11th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*

(Rhodes, 26-29 September 2013)

## Selected Papers / Πρακτικά

*Edited by*
G. Kotzoglou, K. Nikolou, E. Karantzola,
K. Frantzi, I. Galantomos, M. Georgalidou,
V. Kourti-Kazoullis, Ch. Papadopoulou, E. Vlachou

RHODES 2014

*Selected Papers of the*
*11th International Conference*
*on Greek Linguistics*

11th International Conference on Greek Linguistics
*Rhodes, 26-29 September 2013*



*Text editing*
M. Fesopoulos

*Layout*
A4_artdesign

ISBN 978-960-87197-9-8


ΕΡΓΑΣΤΗΡΙΟ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ ΝΑ ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΟΥ
ΤΜΗΜΑ ΜΕΣΟΓΕΙΑΚΩΝ ΣΠΟΥΔΩΝ, ΠΑΝΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΙΟ ΑΙΓΑΙΟΥ

LABORATORY OF LINGUISTICS OF THE SE MEDITERRANEAN
DEPARTMENT OF MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES, UNIVERSITY OF THE AEGEAN

UNIVERSITY OF THE AEGEAN - FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF MEDITERRANEAN STUDIES

# *11th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*

## Selected Papers / Πρακτικά

*Edited by*
G. Kotzoglou, K. Nikolou, E. Karantzola,
K. Frantzi, I. Galantomos, M. Georgalidou,
V. Kourti-Kazoullis, Ch. Papadopoulou, E. Vlachou

LABORATORY OF LINGUISTICS
OF THE SOUTHEASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

# *Table of Contents*

# *Preface*

The 11th International Conference on Greek Linguistics was held at the Department of Mediterranean Studies, University of the Aegean, from September 26 to 29, 2013. In total, 234 papers were presented, including three plenary talks by invited speakers, six thematic workshops, and a pre-conference student workshop.

This edited volume contains the majority of the papers submitted, which were selected after a blind review process, and illustrates the wide range of current research in all branches of Greek linguistics, synchronically and diachronically.

This publication is the result of the work of many people to whom we would like to express our gratitude. First, we would like to thank those colleagues who undertook the task of reviewing the papers submitted. Many thanks are also due to our students A. Gioka, K. Metaxa, L. Biboudi, Ch. Avrabou, M. Kalogirou, M. Karavitaki, M.-A. Balasopoulou, who helped with text editing, during their placement in the Laboratory of Linguistics of the SE Mediterranean and the Laboratory of Informatics. Special thanks go to our postgraduate student M. Stella for her contribution in the initial phase of the editing process. Finally and most importantly, we are grateful to our postgraduate student Marios Fesopoulos for his invaluable help in all the stages of the organization of this conference and the publication of the volume; his hard work, commitment and effectiveness contributed greatly to the completion of the present volume. Many thanks also go to A4 art for their help in the design of the e-book.

THE EDITORS

# *Plenary Papers*

# LANGUAGE AND SUSTAINABILITY IN THE GREEK CONTEXT

Brian D. Joseph
*The Ohio State University*
joseph.1@osu.edu

**Abstract**

The notion of sustainability, used in various popular and scientific contexts, is here applied to language, with general discussion first of what factors might go into making a language sustainable, or viable, within a given speech community. Specific case studies that highlight "language/linguistic sustainability" as it pertains to the Greek language and the Greek milieu are then presented, with brief examinations of a possible way of measuring language loss in Classical times, the viability of Greek in southern Albania, the effects on the local Rumeika dialect of the teaching of Standard Modern Greek in Ukraine, and the adaptability of Greek in Ottoman-era Adrianople.

**Keywords**: sustainability, language endangerment, Greek, language contact, Albania, Rumeika, Ottoman-era Greek, Palaic

## 1. Introductory thoughts

The term *sustainable* and related derivatives such as *sustainability* have become something of a watchword in recent years. Sustainability is an important notion, and can be defined, as for instance by the *New Oxford Dictionary* (in its on-line edition), as the "ability to be maintained at a certain rate or level; ability to maintain an ecological balance by avoiding depletion of … resources." The term is used now in a number of contexts having to do with the natural world, including agriculture, energy extraction and production, fishing, industrial production, and the like. In essence, anything that pertains in some way to the environment can be tied to sustainable practices that maintain the balance between what is used or produced and the particular environment from which that product emerges. This means that in its basic sense, *sustainable* can be used in connection with almost anything that concerns consumption, and thus consumers — in a sense, then, anyone and everyone – in some way.

The notion has been extended to use in reference to social structures, e.g. governments, political organization, etc., as in "Libya is no more stable, or self-sustainingly democratic, than Iraq" (Thomas Friedman, *New York Times* 25 Aug 2013). Such extended uses raise an interesting question for linguists: Can the notion of *sustainability* apply to language, inasmuch as it can be viewed as type of social structure, one that is consumed, in a certain sense? That is to say, is sustainability relevant to language and to linguistics? My answer is "Most assuredly so — yes indeed!"; it is indeed reasonable to talk about language sustainability.

In particular, many languages today — maybe 50% or more according to some claims

In G. Kotzoglou et al. (eds), 2014, *Selected Papers of the 11th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, 5-18. Rhodes: University of the Aegean.

one sees in the popular press[1] — are losing speakers at an alarming rate, and numerous languages are even faced with extinction. Language researchers therefore have to be interested in sustainability and especially in what contributes to a language's viability within its national and local context, that is, within its own specific "language/linguistic ecology". What this means is that it is not enough to just document or catalogue endangered languages, as important as that is in itself, but it behooves us to consider and to investigate what leads to endangerment for a speech community and, by the same token, what leads to viability and sustainability.

I would like in this piece, therefore, to try to accomplish several goals. First, I would like to explore the notion of sustainability as applied to language, both in general and with reference to some specific situations around the world. Second, I would like to look at issues of linguistic sustainability as they pertain to the Greek world, i.e. to the Greek language, especially in its instantiations outside of Greece and to (other, non-Greek) languages in Greece. Third, I would like to highlight a few projects I am involved in personally that bear on matters of linguistic sustainability and viability. I admit from the start that some of the observations here are obvious and perhaps banal, but if this is the case, I trust it is so only in the sense that much of social science involves the verifying and codifying of the obvious about human behavior. It is to be hoped that by gathering these observations here and in particular by placing them in the Greek context, some special benefit to Greek linguistics might accrue from them.

## 2. Some initial thoughts on linguistic sustainability

It is important to recognize a truism about sustainability: a system can be a sustainable on a macro level even if some instantiation of that system is failing, i.e., is not sustainable or not being sustained, at a micro level. A good example of this on the linguistic front is English, as strange as that may sound. English in general, on a global (macro) level, is certainly viable and certainly sustaining itself; there is no overall endangerment of English world-wide. However, in the Japanese-controlled Ogasawara Islands (also known as the Bonin Islands), south and east of Japan, where an English-speaking community was established in mid-19$^{th}$ century that continues to this day, English is now losing out to Japanese. The globally sustainable language English is failing to thrive on a very localized basis. On an individual level, one can note the frequent occurrence of children rejecting their language in favor of the dominant language they encounter in school and in the world outside the home in general, a situation which leads to loss in a language, speaker by speaker. The "threat" to English in the Ogasawara Islands presumably is being realized one speaker at a time, so that the loss of English in the islands altogether would be the loss of the language on an individual basis, again and again, summed over many individual speakers.

The — presumable — eventual loss of English on those islands admittedly is not a huge loss compared with the entrenchment of the language world-wide, with hundreds of

[1] I do not doubt such claims, though I note that the numbers are hard to determine, and that languages are counted, typically, as if they are monolithic entities. It might be more realistic, except in cases where there are truly just a small number of speakers concentrated in a particular community, to be concerned about dialect loss, with that notion extended, or added up, as it were, to take in fuller ("macro-") languages.

millions of speakers. Thus we can say that English in general is not threatened, regardless of what happens on the Ogasawara Islands. Still, this situation puts a very individual and personal face on language-loss in terms of choices that individuals make. To some extent, language loss in the large sense — the extinction of a language altogether — must lie in the cumulative, speaker-by-speaker, loss of the language, as each speaker remaining for a language weighs his or her choices as to which language to use. Of course, at some point, when there are truly just a handful of speakers left, there are issues to reckon with of how frequently any individual will be able to use the language, as a lack of use can lead to obsolescence on an individual basis, thus forcing speakers to make linguistic choices they might not make, or have to make, in a community of many speakers.

This last point leads to another truism about sustainability, one having to do with numbers. In particular, it must be recognized that numbers alone are not enough for sustainability. According to Crystal (2000), and the point seems to resonate with common sense, a language with, say, 1000 scattered speakers in an urban environment with other-language pressures impinging on the language choices of these speakers, is in a very different sort of ecological situation from a language with 1000 speakers in three villages in a relatively tight geographic cluster (e.g. in an isolated valley). Such a scenario means that "small" languages can thrive, especially under favorable conditions.

Now, of course, there is "small" and then there is "small"; a few hundred speakers, or fewer even, is certainly very small as far as speaker numbers are concerned, and it is reasonable to suppose that any language with several million speakers is in a relatively safe position. Still, there can be languages that might seem "small" when viewed in a larger context that can still be considered to be doing very well. In particular, there are two national languages in Europe that seem to be thriving even though they are relatively small, in terms of number of speakers, as far as European languages — leaving aside minority or enclave languages — are concerned. These languages are Lithuanian and Slovenian, and both are sustaining themselves successfully. Lithuanian has approximately 3,000,000 speakers, most of them located in Lithuania; it is used on a daily basis by speakers whose national identity is tied in part to their language and who show a collective interest in their ethnic history and their culture. The same can be said about Slovenian, though with about 2,500,000 speakers mostly in Slovenia.

The fact of these two being national languages of course makes a huge difference to their viability, and several million by any measure is a considerable amount of speakers. But they give an idea of the kinds of factors that can matter for a language's viability. Such factors, and others, are explored in the case studies examined in the following sections.

## 3. Case studies in language sustainability

By way of illustrating what seems to matter in language sustainability, I offer here a few case studies, drawn in part from various projects that I am currently engaged in and which are commanding my attention.

### *3.1 The ancient past and language viability/sustainability: The Herodotos Project*

One of my mentors when I was a graduate student was Calvert Watkins, the noted historical linguist and Indo-Europeanist. He remarked once that the Anatolian language Palaic is the first Indo-European language known to have died, inasmuch as it was a dead language as far as the Hittites were concerned in the 18th century BC. Thinking about this comment years later in the context of highly believable claims made about the current rate of language endangerment being worse than it has ever been, I wondered if it would be possible to get a handle on the rate of language death in ancient times.

It was thus at this point, in 2010, with the collaboration of Dr. Christopher Brown, a colleague in the Ohio State University (OSU) Department of Classics, and with some early financial assistance from the Division of Arts and Humanities of OSU and the LinguistList, that the "OSU Herodotos Project" was born, dedicated to identifying and mapping ancient peoples and languages. For the past four years, the project has moved along, being refined considerably along the way, both with more collaborators involved,[2] and with an important new computational linguistic methodology added.[3] We are still not in a position to say anything definitive, but the immediate project goal is to develop a comprehensive catalogue of peoples known to the ancient Greeks and Romans, drawn from ancient testimony, e,g. Herodotos, Strabo, Caesar, and as many sources as can be exploited,[4] so that once that list is available, augmented — as is our plan — with what is known ethnographically, culturally, geographically, and linguistically about each group, thus satisfying a purely descriptive goal, it will be possible to answer the historical question of how many of the ancient groups survived into the Common Era. At that point, the characteristics that the survivor groups have in common can be examined, an investigation that has clear relevance to language sustainability studies, and, if the numbers are determinable, it should be possible even to develop a sense of the rate of loss per century from, say 1000BC to 500AD. At this point, the only very preliminary result we can report is the not very surprising one that conquest matters, but is not the only factor. We expect to be able to report on more results, hopefully of a more significant nature, in the years to come, as the project continues.

[2] I would like to acknowledge, for instance, from OSU, the important early involvement of Dr. Julia Papke, who combed through Herodotos for us for a summer and worked on developing the database for us, and Lara Downing, who likewise helped with Herodotos and with the design of webpages for various ancient peoples, and from abroad, an important external partner, Dr. Mark Janse of the University of Ghent, and his assistants Julie Boeten and Anke De Naegel, who have been working through the text of Strabo. Financial support to date has come through OSU sources, including more recently the Targeted Investment in Excellence money allotted to the Department of Linguistics, the College of Arts and Sciences, and the Office of Research, and from Dr. Janse's research funds.

[3] This shift came about through the participation of both Dr. Brown and me in a weeklong seminar at Schloss Dagstuhl in Germany, aimed at bridging the gap between the humanities and computer science; see Brown et al. (2014) for some details.

[4] This is where computational linguistics comes in, as intelligent, trainable "named entity recognition" software can allow for the extraction of names of ancient tribes and groups of people quite easily from machine-readable versions of ancient texts.

*3.2 Greek in southern Albania: The Saranda Project*

Working again with Dr. Christopher Brown of OSU but this time engaging in fieldwork, I have been studying the viability of the Greek language in southern Albania, in what we refer to as the "Saranda Project", named for the southern Albanian city where we knew Greek to be spoken and where we began our investigations in 2010. We have since made several trips to the region for further fieldwork, both separately and together, and are in a position to report on some findings (see also Brown & Joseph 2013).

Speaker numbers are hard to verify — census figures say that there are approximately 24,000 Greek speakers in the regions of Ayioi Saranda and Aryirokastro, while the Greeks themselves say it may be ten times that — but all evidence points to a robustness for the language. Whatever the numbers are, they are not insignificant, and one can witness the use of Greek all up and down the age continuum, from young children who learn and use the language at home, learning from Greek-speaking parents, to elderly speakers in their 80s. We observed the language being used in a number of different settings, from informal to formal, so that it seems to have a broad functional range.

Moreover, we can recognize various "ecological niches" — defined geographically and in other ways — for Greek in the region, including (among others):

- the language of the mostly traditional mountain villages, with a dialect quite similar to what is found in Epirus in Greece in general, with characteristic northern dialect features (e.g. regarding high-vowel deletions and mid-vowel raisings)

- the language of the (more-or-less) urban centers of Ayioi Saranda and Aryirokastro, with a dialect that is somewhat akin to southern dialects but divergent from them in certain respects, e.g. showing various the palatalization of velars and /s/ before front vowels, as in [turʃitʃi] 'Turkish' (i.e. τουρκική (γλώσσα)) or [ikoʃi] '20' (i.e. είκοσι)

- the language of speakers of Greek descent who have come to the language late in life

- the Greek as used by Albanians who moved to Greece to find work and stayed there for several years, and even raised families there.

I give here some examples that illustrate these niches for different varieties of the language; these are in the form of brief case-studies, based on speakers whom we interviewed:

a. An L1 Albanian speaker, an engineer born and raised in Ayioi Saranda, reported that he grew up in the Hoxha period when, he claims,[5] speaking Greek was forbidden so that his mother, a native Greek-speaker, did not speak to him in Greek. He now travels to Ioannina and Arta frequently for business and work, has learned Greek, and is comfortable in Greek as a professional *lingua franca*.

[5] It was apparently not the case that Greek actually was forbidden by law, but this man's mother nonetheless felt pressure not to use Greek.

b. His friend, a native Albanian speaker, gained a reasonable command of Greek over ten years of working in Greece, but his Greek was distinctly non-native; for instance, he showed phonological transfer from his native Albanian in his substitution of [k] for [ç], e.g. [oki] 'no' for όχι.

c. A third example — really several at once — was provided by a meeting with students from the Modern Greek program of the Eqrem Çabej University of Aryirokastro, illustrating the range of Greek language use in the region:

- all are speakers of Standard Modern Greek (what is taught at the University), but all also showed familiarity with the Epirote dialect; many use the language in village and family situations.

- two students were of Muslim background, one of whom had learned Greek while living in Greece (and so is essentially a native speaker).

- four students spoke mainly Albanian at home, two spoke mainly Greek, three spoke both languages at home, and one spoke Vlach (Aromanian); three reported that they talk exclusively Greek to themselves, one Albanian, three both languages, and one both Vlach and Albanian.

- a strong identification with the Greek language was for most the motivation for studying the language at the University, though most said either that they already were using their Greek professionally or that they planned to: several wanted to become teachers of Greek, another found it essential for office work, another hoped to work in translation, and another saw a future for using Greek in the tourist trade.

In our view, what contributes to making Greek sustainable in the region, now at least, or perhaps better, in the last 30 years, is a salubrious combination of economic factors, i.e. an economic niche that the language fills, social factors, i.e. groups of people for whom conversing in Greek is expected and situations in which Greek is called for, political factors, i.e. a national, or at least local, context in which Greek is not discouraged, and identity-based factors, i.e. a sense of Greek identity that is at least in part tied to the use of the language. In addition, we saw a willingness on the part of speakers to be flexible and adaptable; all of the Greek speakers we interviewed are fluent in Albanian as well, and use Albanian readily as the situation calls for it. Moreover, the Greeks seem to have cooperative neighbors, allowing for more or less amicable interactions between Greeks and non-Greeks in the region, though some ethnic tensions certainly exist.[6]

In this assessment of the robustness of Greek, nonnative speakers of Greek have deliberately been included. That is, in a situation like this, where there are nonnative users of the language, the common division between native and nonnative speakers can

[6] There is, for instance, the particularly tragic incident of the murder of a young Greek man, Aristotle Gouma, in Himara in 2010, at the hands of Albanians who were upset about his speaking in Greek.

be viewed as simply an arbitrary distinction that obscures the situation as to language use in the area rather than illuminates it. In particular, if there are Albanian-dominant speakers who can manage in Greek for whatever reason — usually because of having worked in Greece but there are other reasons, e.g. for use in the city market — and who use Greek on at least an occasional basis, then they contribute to the overall use of the language and to the extent to which Greek is thriving in the region. Moreover, it shows that there is some prestige and/or advantage recognized for Greek in the region, if non-Greeks find it useful to be able to communicate in the language.

Overall, then, with various ecological niches that it fills and a not insignificant number of speakers who use the language in a variety of contexts, the Greek language can be said to show considerable vitality in southern Albania, even if in the larger context of Albania as a whole, it is a minority language. Greek in the region is thus in a sustainable situation, thanks to a convergence of several factors.

### *3.3 Greek in the Mariupol area*

Work by Dr. Anna Chatzipanagiotidou and Dr. Simeon Tsolakidis (2011) on the teaching of Standard Modern Greek (SMG) in the Mariupol area of the Crimea allows us to consider the case of Greek of that region from the perspective of language sustainability. The prevailing Greek dialect in the region is a form of Pontic Greek, what locals call "Rumeika", so that SMG is competing with Rumeika.

The interest in the learning of SMG is largely both economic and political, based on a desire of many Ukrainians to emigrate to Greece; Chatzipanagiotidou and Tsolakidis describe the situation as follows:

> Generally, the need to learn Modern Greek is almost pressing for a lot of Ukrainian citizens who are willing to emigrate to Greece or to get involved in economic or cultural exchanges with Greek authorities or firms. As a result, there is a keen interest in the learning of Modern Greek and the Ukrainian government, anxious to strengthen economic ties with European Union or generally with countries of the West, complied to pressures by FHCU [Federation of Hellenic Communities in Ukraine] and the Greek authorities asking the introduction of SMG as a second/foreign language or as an optional subject in Ukrainian schools. So, according to recent data SMG is being taught to 3,094 pupils and, at the same time the Institute of Humanities of the Faculty of Arts in Mariupol confers diplomas in Greek Language and Literature, thus preparing the new qualified teachers of SMG in Ukraine. Generally, SMG is currently expanding in Ukraine, mainly because it is a language which makes easier the contact with or the access to an westernized EU member state (Greece) with close historical and cultural ties with Ukraine.

Thus, learning SMG offers possible economic opportunities and advantages for Ukrainian citizens.

A by-product of the introduction of instruction in SMG in Mariupol is an effect on the local Greek dialect, which Chatzipanagiotidou and Tsolakidis describe thus:

> Unavoidably this means that Rumeika — as a non standard dialectal variety — is facing heavy competition not only from the two state languages of Ukraine (Ukrainian and Russian) but also from a standard version of its own variety (SMG).

Thus Rumeika may be a loser, so to speak, in this spread of SMG into a new region.

As an aside, relevant to §3.2 and the Greek of southern Albania, it can be conjectured that such a scenario, involving the teaching of a non-local variety, might be behind the presence of an apparent non-northern urban variety of Greek in Ayioi Saranda and Aryirokastro. In particular, in the aftermath of proselytizing visits to the region made by Agios Kosmas o Aitolos (St. Kosmas the Aitolian) in the 18th century for the sake of (re-) Hellenizing and Christianizing the area, there were various schools established throughout the area. It is possible that the Greek that was taught in these schools and which spread as a consequence was in fact a southern variety, and if so, then the urban centers may well have had a southern dialect as a competitor to their local variety. Clearly, more work with sources on Kosmas is needed, and is planned on for the near future, but preliminarily it seems that his language was somewhat southern and (for his time), somewhat καθομιλουμένη, learnèd but with the common touch so as to be widely accessible.

If such a scenario is plausible, it would show how, given enough time, distinct varieties can arise in new places and thereby contribute, via ecological blending with older varieties, to a degree of sustainability/viability for a language in an area, even if not for a particular dialect of the language. Rumeika proper might lose out, but Greek, writ large, might win, in a certain sense. To the extent that making predictions is at all advisable, we can conjecture that this could well be the ultimate outcome in Mariupol, with a variety emerging of SMG that is colored by a Rumeika substratum, in effect; alternatively, one might suppose that SMG in its usual form would come to dominate.

It is fair to ask if such outcomes would be good or bad for Greek in Mariupul, and if they would be good or bad for Greek in general? And, for that matter, would they be good or bad for linguists of Greek? Clearly, for speakers, whether Rumeika speakers or Ukrainian speakers, introduction of SMG offers advantages on the economic and political fronts, in terms of possible emigration to Greece. For Greek on a global scale, either outcome would extend the range of the language, adding a cadre of motivated L2 users. It would mean that the regional dialect would be threatened and perhaps pushed out altogether, or relegated to a marginalized position in outlying villages or the like. Linguists would lose access to the local regional dialect the more and more marginalized it becomes. But, still, some form of Greek would still be present, and one might be inclined to argue that that is a positive overall.

A non-Greek parallel can be offered here. Schaengold (2004) discusses the emergence on the Navajo reservation in New Mexico of a mixed code called by its mostly younger users simply “Bilingual”. It is Navajo in its structure but English in its lexicon (for the most part), and is thus an English-lexified Navajo-structured language variety. It is not traditional Navajo nor is it English, and its non-English character is in the direction of

Navajo structures. Although the elders on the reservation do not accept Bilingual as a form of Navajo, inasmuch as they consider only the traditional language variety to be Navajo, the general argument that some observers make, and which Schaengold ultimately endorses, is that despite the erosion of *traditional* Navajo as a result, *some* form of Navajo on the reservation is better than no Navajo. One might say for Mariupol, if it comes to that, that some form of Greek is better than no Greek at all.

In a way, then, in such circumstances, languages — and more particularly speakers of the languages — are showing *adaptability* and *resiliency*. To the extent that adaptability is a positive force in sustainability and continued viability, such situations show the mechanisms speakers summon up to help sustain their language.

### *3.4 More on adaptability and sustainability: Ottoman varieties of Greek*

From the discussion in the previous sections, it should be clear that a certain kind of linguistic adaptability is a useful trait for speakers, as it allows them to "go with the flow" in situations where there is a degree of social fluidity. From the point of view of sustainability more generally, adaptable organisms survive and thus in that sense are able to sustain themselves. In this section, a few cases of linguistic adaptability of different kinds are presented, showing the applicability of the notion of adaptability to language.

Adaptability for organisms is a biological process, but it can be a social process too. In a linguistic context, it has to do with how speakers react to environmental pressures, whether the environment can be contact with speakers of other languages, as with Navajo Bilingual or simply the language being in a new setting. Either way, it is thus a test of their adaptability and a measure of their linguistic sustainability.

Regarding the use of a language in new contexts, i.e., new environments, the case of Pennsylvania German in Holmes Country (Ohio) is worth mentioning. As shown by Keiser (2003), this language has spread successfully away from its traditional agricultural and home-based context into new workplace settings in towns away from the farms, such as light manufacturing factories or outlets within the service industry. This has expanded the range of the daily use of the language considerably, and has allowed it to be "modernized" lexically.

A dramatic case of linguistic adaptability to a changed environment in the Greek context is the case of Ottoman-era Greek in what is now Turkey, where in both Cappadocian and Adrianople (present-day Edirne), Greek adapted to the environments and, up to a point, did very well. Most famously, there is the case of Cappadocian, as described nearly a century ago by Dawkins (1916) and more recently studied so thoroughly by Mark Janse more recently (cf., e.g., Janse 1994, 2004, 2009, among numerous other studies), with its adaptations to the local Turkish linguistic environment on all levels of linguistic structure.

Less famously, but quite telling too, is Ottoman-era Adrianople Greek, as revealed in Ronzevalle (1911), for this variety of Greek shows lexical adaptation to Turkish of an extreme kind. There is borrowing of more than just Turkish culturally based words, for the range of Turkish words borrowed into Adrianople Greek includes many closed-class forms and numerous expressives, words that are highly tied to conversational

interactions.[7] A sampling of these borrowings is given below, arranged by class and with the Turkish source indicated and any relevant notes or comments that Ronzevalle may have added:

i. Pronouns

- *bu* 'this', *kim* 'who' (only in *bu kim* 'who (is) this?') < Trk *bu* 'this', *kim* 'who?'
- *hitʃ* 'at all; never' < Trk *hiç* 'a mere trifle; nothing; at all, never'

ii. Adpositions

- *karʃi* 'opposite' (preposition) < Trk *karşı* 'opposite' (postposition)
- *gibi* 'like' (postposition) < Trk *gibi* 'like' (postposition)

iii. Interrogative Marker[8]

- *mu* '(phrase-final) marker for polar (i.e. yes-no) questions' < Trk *mi*/*mü*/*mı*/*mu* 'marker for yes-no questions', as in:

  θα 'ρτ'ς μου 'Will you come?'
  FUT come/2sg QN

iv. Connectives

- *hem* 'and; too' < Trk *hem* 'and, too, and yet'

v. Greetings (and the like)

- *merhaba* 'hello' < Trk *merhaba* 'hello'
- *urular olsun* 'goodbye' < Trk *uğurlar olsun* 'good luck! good journey' (literally "good-omens may-there-be")
- *oγlum* 'my son' (used as a 'word of endearment or consolation') < Trk *oğlu-m* 'son-my'
- *džanım* 'my dear' < Trk *can-ım* (literally "soul-my" but used endearingly)

vi. Exhortatives

- *ha* 'a call to action' < Trk *ha* '*idem*'

vii. Expressive Reduplications

[7] Friedman & Joseph (2014, 2016: Chap. 4) refer to such loans as "E.R.I.C." loans, acronymic for those that are "Essentially Rooted In Conversation"; they consider such loans to be diagnostic of intense and intimate language contact.

[8] Ronzevalle (p. 451) notes other, more discourse-based functions for this marker that were borrowed too: "it offers many nuances that accompany interrogativity: irony, doubt, challenging, swearing (an oath)".

- τα σάνταλα και τα μάνταλα ‘stuff and things’ (cf. the pattern of Trk *kitap mitap* ‘books and such’)
- τšατ πατ, τšατιρ πατιρ ‘stumblingly (with reference to speaking a language)’ < Trk *çat pat* ‘a little, some (ability in speaking a language)’, *çatra-patra* ‘incorrectly and brokenly (speaking a foreign language)’, *çıtır pıtır* ‘with a sweet babble (said of the talking of a child), prattling’,

viii. Curses/insults/terms of reproach or scorn:

- αννανά μπαμπανά < Trk *annana babana* ‘to your father, to your mother’; an “expression vulgaire, employé par manière de plaisanterie” (p. 95)
- *ouʃi* “interj., “serves to chase away dogs. Insult to shut [someone/something] up: *ouʃi k’upék*$^{i}$, silence, dog!” (p. 103)
- *džanabet’s* “term of insult or reprimand/reproach; miserable, rascal. … the original sense of the Koranic word [= ‘ritual impurity’] [is] absolutely unknown to the Greeks who however make great use of it” (p. 285)

The above represents just a sampling of the deep penetration of Turkish lexis into the Greek of Adrianople. The language is still very much Greek, even with some structural “intrusions” from Turkish, such as the adposition *gibi* ‘like’ retaining its Turkish postpositional syntax, or the interrogative marker *mu* showing, through its phrase-final positioning, its Turkish enclitic origin. Overall, then, the Greek speakers of Adrianople of the time adapted well to having Turkish all around them, not yielding entirely to Turkish and giving up Greek but rather borrowing Turkish forms that were, it seems, socially useful from their conversational interactions with Turks, and for the most part, retaining Greek structure. That kind of adaptability seems have served the speakers of Greek well in the context of an Ottoman urban center, giving the language a degree of sustainability in this particular environment.

## 4. Some final thoughts: Working towards some conclusions

One important point that cannot be stressed enough in thinking about sustainability and viability for a language is that whatever goes into making for sustainable, viable languages, it *cannot* be their structure; that is, although it may be hard to test this, it seems that languages do not survive or sustain themselves because of or through any structural characteristics that they might have. For instance, verb-medial English is sustained in much of the world in contact situations but not in the Ogasawara Islands where verb-final Japanese is winning, whereas in some parts of the Andes, verb-medial Spanish is threatening verb-final Quechua. It seems that languages, by which is meant actually speakers of the language, avail themselves of various strategies as they choose, in contact situations, to either adapt their speech or give it up altogether. Cappadocian took on Turkish structures to a considerable degree while Adrianople Greek did so only on a very limited basis; in both cases, Greek was maintained in some form, even though the structural starting point was the same in each case.

If structural factors are not an issue, then the answers to questions about sustainability

must lie in various social factors instead. These social factors can be internal to the speech community, that is to say, essentially sociological issues pertaining to language and identity, the value of the language to the speakers themselves, the ecological “niches” for the language in the overall linguistic community, and the like. Alternatively, these social factors can be external to the speech community and thus represent "environmental" factors, in a broad sense of environment (specifically, not the physical environment, for the most part), and here we have to include factors beyond a community’s control.

The effects of such uncontrollable factors can be positive. For instance, the recent economic crisis, which was beyond the control of any individuals or groups of individuals, has actually helped the Greek language in southern Albania somewhat. In particular, it has driven many non-Greek but Greek-knowing Albanians back to Albania where in some places, e.g. Ayioi Saranda or Aryirokastro or Himara, their new knowledge of Greek can be put to use and can contribute to the status of Greek in the region. Moreover, their now Greek-speaking children further enrich the Greek-language ecology of the area by adding new users of Greek to the mix.

Such uncontrollable factors can also have negative consequences, in that no matter how well "poised" a language, that is to say a speech community, might be to be sustained and maintained and to continue being viable, external factors can be simply too great to be overcome. By way of closing, two examples from the Greek world can be cited here. First, the dispersal of Ottoman-era Adrianople Greek speakers after the Treaty of Lausanne in the 1920s seems to have led to them simply assimilating into mainstream Greek and thus losing their distinctive variety; this is unlike Pontians, who maintained their Pontic identity once relocated within mainland Greece, and unlike the Cappadocians (though it was thought for 80 years that the Cappadocian had gone extinct until Mark Janse and Demetrios Papazachariou discovered otherwise in 2005). Second, in Thessaloniki, Judeo-Spanish, also known as Judezmo or by some as Ladino, the Spanish-affiliated language of the Sephardic Jews who moved into the Balkans and elsewhere after the Spanish Inquisition, was almost entirely wiped out by the actions of the Nazis in World War II, destroying the community and almost totally eradicating the population; the language has survived marginally in the city, and was spoken by a few families at least into the 1980s (and it survived elsewhere, with speakers still in Israel), but in Greece, at least, it is virtually nonexistent now. And, to end on a sad but important note of local interest, the same can be said about Judeo-Spanish in Rhodes, where the monument in the old city of Rhodes pictured here bears silent but moving witness to a now-extinct community.


**References**

Brown, Christopher, and Brian D. Joseph. 2013. "The texture of a linguistic environment: new perspectives on the Greek of Southern Albania." *Albano-Hellenica. A Journal of Philological Studies* XIII-XIV, 5: 107-114.

Brown, Christopher, Loretta Auvil, David Bamman, Gregory Crane, Kurt Gärtner, Fotis Ioannides, Brian Joseph, David Mimno, and David Smith. 2014. "Report of working group on literature, lexicon, diachrony." In Chris Biemann, Gregory R. Crane, Christiane D. Fellbaum, and Alexander Mehler (eds), *Computational Humanities - Bridging the Gap Between Computer Science and Digital Humanities*, 20-28. *Dagstuhl Reports* 14301: 1-31. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik: Dagstuhl Publishing.

Chatzipanagiotidou, Anna, and Simeon Tsolakidis. 2011. "Child's development and its impact on programs for Foreign Language Learning (FLL)." Paper presented at the 24th International Congress for School Effectiveness and Improvement (ICSEI), Limassol, Cyprus, January 4-7. [Available at http://www.icsei.net/icsei2011/Full Papers/0154.pdf; accessed June 27, 2013].

Crystal, David. 2000. *Language Death*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dawkins, Richard M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor. A Study of Dialect of Silli, Cappadocia and Pharasa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Friedman, Victor A., and Brian D. Joseph. 2014. "Lessons from Judezmo about the Balkan Sprachbund and Contact Linguistics." *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 226: 3-23.

Friedman, Victor A., and Brian D. Joseph. 2016. *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Forthcoming).

Janse, Mark. 1994. "Son of Wackernagel. The distribution of object clitic pronouns in Cappadocian." In Irene Philippaki-Warburton, Katerina Nicolaidis, and Maria Sifianou (eds), *Themes in Greek Linguistics. Papers from the First International*

*Conference on Greek Linguistics, Reading, September 1993* (Current issues in Linguistic Theory, 117), 435-442. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Janse, Mark. 2004. "Animacy, definiteness and case in Cappadocian and other Asia Minor Greek Dialects." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5: 3-26.

Janse, Mark. 2009. "Watkins' Law and the development of agglutinative inflections in Asia Minor Greek." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9: 32–48.

Keiser, Stephen H. 2003. "Pennsylvania German and the 'Lunch Pail Threat': Language Shift and Cultural Maintenance in two Amish Communities." In Brian D. Joseph, Johanna Destefano, Neil Jacobs, and Ilse Lehiste (eds), *When Languages Collide: Perspectives on Language Conflict, Language Competition, and Language Coexistence*, 3-20. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.

Ronzevalle, P. Louis. 1911. "Les emprunts turcs dan le grec vulgaire de Roumélie et spécialement d'Andrinople." *Journal Asiatique* 18: 69-106, 257-336, 405-462.

Schaengold, Charlotte. 2004. *Bilingual Navajo: Mixed Codes, Bilingualism, and Language Maintenance*. PhD Dissertation, The Ohio State University.

LABORATORY OF LINGUISTICS
OF THE SOUTHEASTERN MEDITERRANEAN

ISBN 978-960-87197-9-8