

APPEARED IN: *CONTACT MORPHOLOGY*, ED. BY ANGELA
RALLI. CAMBRIDGE SCHOLARS PRESS, 2016, pp. 211-224.

MULTIPLE EXPONENCE IN LANGUAGE
CONTACT SITUATIONS:
A CASE STUDY FROM THE GREEK
OF SOUTHERN ALBANIA

BRIAN D. JOSEPH

Abstract

In this chapter, by way of examining how and why multiple exponence can arise in language contact situations, a unique plural form found in the Greek of southern Albania is discussed from a variety of perspectives. Special attention is given to its place within Greek dialectology, Greek morphology, Balkan language contact, and language ideologies under conditions of contact between speakers of different languages.

1. Introduction

Sometimes singularities in data can be very interesting and revealing, even if one might be inclined at first to dismiss them as anomalies, perhaps even errors; we can recall in this regard the Latin maxim *Unus testis nullus testis*, “one witness (is equivalent to) no witness”. And yet, it is possible to learn from a *testis* that is *unus*. Bloomfield 1928, for instance, when faced with a challenge to the principle of the regularity of sound change from a singular, and otherwise anomalous, set of sound

correspondences across the Central Algonquian languages, decided to go with regularity and posited a distinct Proto-Algonquian phoneme to account for that one set; the belief he showed in the principle of regularity of sound change was vindicated when he later encountered confirmatory forms in a single Cree dialect, namely Swampy Cree.¹ Similarly, George M. Bolling, in commenting in an editorial note on Bloomfield 1928, noted that “Sommer [1902] ... argues to the existence in Latin of a phonetic law *–rwo–* becomes *–ro–* (later *–ru–*) not from ‘a large mass of examples’ but from the single form *parum*”.

Such instances demonstrate that data need not be widespread or widely instantiated to be important and to tell us something about language structure or language history. The trick is to be able to place the data in a framework which allows it to be viewed as reasonable and believable. Once established as credible, the singular datum can then be explored as to its import.

The same sort of reasoning can be employed when the datum in question is a singular fact from a single person’s speech, a nonce form that neither recurs nor is widely distributed across a speech community. I report here on one such nonce form from the Greek of southern Albania that has these characteristics: singular, yet able to be placed in a larger analytic context from which it gains credibility, and most revealing as to various aspects of the effects of language contact.

2. Greek of Southern Albania: Background

In order to understand best the nature of this form, some background on the Greek language in southern Albania is essential. A key fact is that there is clear evidence of robustness for the Greek language in southern Albania along various dimensions:

- a. numerically: Greek today is spoken by some 30,000 speakers, maybe more.²
- b. geographically: Greek occurs in three urban settings (Agiio Saranda, Argyrokastro, and Himara) and in numerous villages both near to these

¹ Subsequent research proved that his analysis of the value of the data from that single dialect in connection with that single set of correspondences was correct, as discussed in Bloomfield 1946.

² It is very difficult to get anything like precise figures on the number of speakers in the area, not just for political reasons but also Greek is spoken by native-speaking Albanians as well and it is not clear how they should count or for some analysts (though not me – see Brown & Joseph 2013) even if they should.

urban areas and in remote locations in the mountains surrounding the cities.

- c. demographically: Speakers of Greek range over all ages, from young children up through the elderly; moreover, there are children who learn Greek as their first language and speak it in the home.
- d. functionally: From a functional standpoint, Greek can be said to fill various niches in the local language ecology (see also Brown & Joseph 2013 on this notion), being, for instance, a home language as well as a public language, as evinced by its use in public signage but also in various modes of commerce, for instance in public markets; in this last regard, it is worth noting that Greek serves extra-territorial economic functions via the ties that it affords to business interests and jobs in Greece – many individuals, both Greeks and Albanians, have worked in Greece or do business with Greek companies – and via the needs created by tourists from Greece.³

Moreover, historically, there was a Greek presence in southern Albania in ancient times, as is evidenced by ancient monuments such as the World Heritage site of Butrint, ancient Βουθρωτός. Similarly, there are remains of Byzantine-era churches that attest to the presence of Greeks in that period. Without addressing politically thorny questions regarding continuity between Greeks of old and the Greeks of today in the area or regarding the chronology of the entry of Albanians into the area, one can safely surmise that Greeks and Albanians have lived side-by-side for centuries. As a result, virtually all speakers of Greek are functionally bilingual in Greek and Albanian, and some are natively bilingual; thus the Greek population is generally fluent in Albanian in addition to being fully fluent in Greek.

This bilingualism and the language contact that has caused it have had effects on each language; that is, one can see evidence of the languages mutually affecting one another. A simple demonstration of this bidirectional influence is the occurrence of lexically hybrid forms in which some elements of the phonology or use of a word in one language that is related to a word in the other language have made their way into the other language's form of the word. For instance, and see Brown & Joseph 2013 for other examples, in Greek of the region one can hear *μεχανικός* ([*mexanikós*]) for 'engineer', as opposed to *μηχανικός* ([*mixanikós*]) elsewhere in Greek, where presumably the Albanian word *mehanik*

³ Many Greek tourists over the years have come from Corfu, just a short and relatively inexpensive boat ride away from Agioi Saranda.

‘engineer’ (related to the Greek as a borrowing) is responsible for the otherwise unexpected /ɛ/ of the regional Greek. And, Albanian of the region has forms that have been affected by parallelisms in Greek; locally one can hear (and see on signs) *suvllaqe* for ‘kebab’, as opposed to *sufllaqe* elsewhere in Albanian, where presumably the Greek *suvlaki* ‘kebab’ is responsible for the otherwise unexpected /v/ of the regional Albanian.

With this foundation for understanding the status of Greek in the region of southern Albania, the nonce form in question can be presented and discussed further as to its significance.

3. The Singular Datum

In a conversation I had (September 2013) with a native speaker of Greek who lived in Agioi Saranda and who was also fluent in Albanian, a form occurred that is the basis for this discussion. It is a singular datum, a unique form that I have not found in other contexts in Greek⁴ nor even with other speakers in southern Albania.⁵ Nonetheless, I would argue that it is significant and worth taking seriously.

In particular, in telling me about religion in the area, this speaker used the form *χοτζαλάρες* (phonetically [xodzaláres]) for the plural of *χοτζας* ‘Moslem priest’ ([xodzas]). Albanian has the same noun, *hoxha* (pronounced [hodʒa]) in the singular and *hoxhallarë* ([hodʒalar]) in the plural, and it is obvious that the Greek plural form is somehow connected to the Albanian form. What makes this form interesting, both in Greek and in Albanian, is that it has both a Turkish-derived plural marker, Greek *-lap-* (Albanian *-llar-*), cf. Turkish *-lar*, and a native plural marker, Greek *-ες* (Albanian orthographic *-ë*, a schwa-like sound, pronounced (in final position) in some dialects though not in Agioi Saranda). This unique form therefore shows a sort of multiple marking for

⁴ Ronzevalle 1911, in his account of the Greek of Ottoman-era Adrianople (present-day Edirne) and the heavy influence it shows from Turkish, gives one Turkish *-lar* plural in use by Greeks, but in a fixed expression that is a wholesale borrowing: *urular olsun* ‘goodbye’ from Turkish *uğurlar olsun* ‘good luck! good journey’ (literally “good-omens may-there-be”). Because it is in a fixed phrase, this form is clearly different from the *χοτζαλάρες* example discussed here.

⁵ I have not been able to elicit this form, or other plurals with *-lap-* for that matter, from other speakers, though one whom I queried about *χοτζαλάρες* said it must be a mistake and another thought it was something one could hear but it was certainly not usual. I would be happy of course to find more examples of it and forms like it but feel that interesting inferences can be drawn from this single form nonetheless.

the inflectional category of number, and in this way differs from the plural found elsewhere in Greek for this noun, *χοτζάδες*, which has simply the usual plural ending *-ες* added to the (apparently heteroclititic, but see below) plural stem *χοτζάδ-* ([xodzað]). In the sections that follow, this occurrence of a Turkish plural marker in a Greek form is explored from various angles, all by way of giving a larger contextual basis from which to judge the broader import of this singular fact.

4. Placing *χοτζαλάρες* in a Broader Context

There are three ways in which the occurrence of the form *χοτζαλάρες* can be placed in a broader context. The first is a fuller examination of the role of *-λαρ-* in the system of Greek morphology in particular and morphological marking more generally. The second is a more general consideration of the occurrence of grammatical markers like a plural suffix such as *-λαρ-* in language contact situations. And the third offers a contact-inspired ideological interpretation of the appearance of the Greek plural marker on the form.

4.1. The Nature of *-λαρ-* vis-à-vis Morphology and Greek

As noted in §3, *χοτζαλάρες* shows two different affixes for plural, the Turkish *-λαρ-* and the native Greek *-ες*. Multiple marking for a category in and of itself is not all that unusual a phenomenon, and examples of it can be found from various languages. It can be seen in derivation, where examples like the English noun *competency*, with its two noun-forming suffixes, *-enc(e)* and *-y*, or the adjective *syntactical*, with its two adjective-forming suffixes, *-ic* and *-al*, can be cited. It is perhaps less common in inflection, given a general expectation in most morphological theories of a one-to-one matching between grammatical features to be expressed and exponents realizing those features.⁶ Again, though, examples can be found and one does not have to go too far afield to find them: the English plural *children* has both a plural *-r-* (historically a plural though unique synchronically for English) and a plural *-en*, seen also in *oxen*, and Ancient Greek *Zēna*, accusative singular of the god-name Zeus (nominative *Zeus*), has both an accusative *-n-* (found with vowel-stem nouns and in the older accusative form of this noun, *Zēn*) and an

⁶ All theories must allow for deviations from such a one-to-one matching, e.g. many-to-one or one-to-many, but most theories start with the assumption that such cases will be the exception rather than the rule.

accusative *-a* (found with consonant-stem nouns). In these examples just cited, especially in derivation but possibly also in inflection, the multiple marking might be thought of as due to expressiveness, perhaps even emphasis, with speakers apparently making sure that the category is expressed at all by making too sure that it is. In some instances, though, as with *Zēna*, the issue is rather one of reanalysis and the formation of a new stem *Zēn-* that happens to incorporate the old accusative ending, as shown by the occurrence of other forms built from it, such as a genitive *Zēn-os*.

Speaking of reanalysis, as in this last case involving *Zēna*, raises a question as to whether it is fair always to talk about “multiple marking” in these cases in any way other than perhaps an etymological sense. That is, in *Zēna*, given that the *-n-* was reinterpreted as part of a new stem, the only way in which there is double marking for accusative is if one looks to the history of the *-n-* and not to its synchronic status. Similarly, *-ren* of *children*, inasmuch as the form is irregular anyway, could probably just as easily be viewed as showing an irregular plural marker *-ren* synchronically, even if the history of this marker is different from that. Applying that reasoning to *χοτζαλάρες*, we are led to the view that the *-λαρ-* is a plural marker only in terms of its origin, i.e. based on the fact that its ultimate source is to be sought in Turkish, so that the characterization of double-marking holding only from an etymological standpoint makes sense.

In fact, since a true inflectional ending, the plural marker *-ες*, is added to this plural of *χότζας*, it is possible to view *χοτζαλαρ-* simply as a new stem, much like *Zēn-* in Ancient Greek, and thus to see *-λαρ-* as a stem-extending or stem-creating element. If this is the right analysis, it would parallel the extension seen in the standard language with this noun, since the stem in the plural, as noted above, is *χοτζάδ-*, where the singular stem *χοτζά-* has been extended with *-δ-* ([ð]). This *-δ-* is found with many nouns, creating a class referred to in most Greek grammars as ‘imparisyllabic’, since the plural forms end up having a different number of syllables from the singulars in all cases (e.g., two-syllable nominative singular *χοτζά-ς* versus tri-syllabic nominative plural *χοτζάδ-ες*).⁷ In that sense, *-λαρ-* could be thought of as associated with the plural, inasmuch as it only appears there, without marking plurality per se. In this way, *-λαρ-* has taken on a new value in its new language, serving as a stem-formative, and thus reflects an aspect of derivation, and is not an inflectional ending

⁷ This *-δ-* extension appears on many nouns borrowed into Greek but it most likely derives simply from a native Greek noun type with *-δ-* as the stem-final element throughout the paradigm, e.g. *ἐλπίς* ([elpis]) ‘hope.NomSg’ / *ἐλπίδ-ος* ‘of-hope.GenSg’ / *ἐλπίδ-ες* ‘hopes/NomPl’; and there were (native) nouns with *-αδ-* as the stem-final, e.g. *λαμπάς* ‘torch’ ([lampas]), with genitive singular *λαμπάδ-ος*.

as it was in Turkish. It is not at all uncommon for inflectional material that is borrowed with a word to take on a different function from what it had in its original language. For instance, the past tense suffix *-dl-* of Turkish, e.g. *boyadım* ‘I painted’ (root *boya-*, with 1Sg ending *-m*), has been borrowed into Greek along with various roots and is simply part of a verbalizing morpheme,⁸ e.g. Greek *μπογιαντίζω* ([bojadizo]) ‘I paint’ has the *-d-* (spelled *-ντ-*) in the verbal stem but not in the borrowed noun *μπογιά* (nominative [bojá]).

Although more data on *-λαρ-* is not available, it is important to keep in mind that it could very well behave differently from the stem-extension *-δ-* in certain respects. In particular, the extended stem that is created with the *-δ-* suffix is not restricted to the (imparisyllabic) plural forms. Rather, it is the basis for a number of derivatives, such as the diminutive; for instance, *καφές* ‘coffee.NomSg’ has a plural with *-δ-*, *καφέδ-ες*, but also a diminutive *καφεδ-άκι* ‘a small cup of coffee’ (not, e.g., **καφ(ε)άκι*). Based on my sense of what *-λαρ-* is doing in *χοτζαλάρες*, it would be very surprising to see a diminutive, or some other formation, that was based on *χοτζα-* and had the *-λαρ-*; that is, a form like *χοτζαλαράκι* ‘a cute little *hodza*’ seems most unlikely (whereas *χοτζαδάκι* would be possible).⁹ If such formations are indeed not possible, then *χοτζαλάρ-* would be a variant plural stem associated with the singular noun stem *χοτζα-*. It is clear that more data is needed but it is equally clear what sorts of data one would need to look for to settle the issue of the status of *-λαρ-* in the morphological system of Modern Greek (for this speaker and any speakers like him).

Given that *-λαρ-* probably serves a different function from its original Turkish setting, being no longer a plural marker per se, it is worth considering why it would have been reanalyzed. In some of the cases of double marking given above, the motivation is likely to have been the opacity of one marker. Opacity in the case of *children*, for instance, would have been caused by a lack of productivity, since the *-r-* as a plural marker is otherwise unparalleled in later English (though it was part of a more

⁸ See also Ralli 2012 for the use of this *-di* in the Asia Minor dialects of Greek.

⁹ These forms are of course semantically unusual as one would not normally form a diminutive of a respected person like a *hodza*, but they are given here just to illustrate the point about the nature of the suffix. No disrespect is intended; one might imagine such a use, for instance, if one were referring to a small figurine of a *hodza*.

widespread plural marker in Old English¹⁰). Opacity could also be caused by the presence of extreme irregularity in the paradigm, as with the paradigm of *Zeus*, inasmuch as an alternation of *-eu-* ~ *-ē-* does not occur elsewhere in Ancient Greek; thus the old accusative *Zēn* had an odd alternation and an accusative that was unexpected if the stem were *Ze-* (that is, with *-eu-* as [-ew-] and thus with a consonantal final) as the nominative would suggest (*-s* being the nominative singular ending). From such opacity sprang the need, or the feeling on the part of speakers to be more accurate, to renew the marking overtly through the use of another, presumably less opaque, ending, resulting in what historically — though not necessarily synchronically — constitutes double marking for the same category.

In these cases, it was language-internal developments that led to multiple markings within a single word for the same grammatical category. But by looking to the opacity of one marker, a natural way emerges by which the insight that explains language-internal cases can be extended to cases of language contact, where language-external factors come into play. That is, inasmuch as borrowed material is inherently opaque in the borrowing language, since it originates in an alien system, the notion of opacity of marking can cover both internal causation and external causation in these cases. As an opaque marker, it would be especially susceptible to being reanalyzed as having a function different from its source function. It is thus appropriate to turn to the matter of language contact regarding *-lap-* more directly.

4.2. Language Contact and *-lap-*

The suffix *-lap-* is ultimately from Turkish, as noted above, but it is also clear, again as stated above, that the Greek form in question has some relationship to the Albanian plural *hoxhallarë*. The most likely scenario is that *-lap-* entered the Greek of this one speaker via Albanian, given its absence from the rest of Greek and given his bilingualism. That is, as is often the case when foreign suffixes enter a language, *-lap-* entered Greek as part of a whole word, attached to a stem. This means that the status of the Turkish-derived suffix *-llar-* in Albanian, as the proximate source language, is worth examining.

¹⁰ More widespread, but still somewhat restricted; there are a half-dozen or so nouns that take an *-r-* in the plural in Old English, e.g. *lamb* / *lambru* ‘lamb / lambs’, *cealf* / *cealfriu* ‘calf / calves’, etc.

4.2.1 Other Turkish Plurals in Albanian¹¹

As it happens, the Turkish plural suffix *-lar* in Albanian is found in nouns other than *hoxha*. While not wildly productive, it does occur in a small but generally well-definable class of nouns, with either the back harmonic form *-lar*, written <-llar-> in Albanian to reflect the velarized pronunciation of the lateral, or the front harmonic variant *-ler*, written <-ler-> and thus with a “clear” lateral. In the standard language, the relevant class for plurals in *-llar/-ler-* is nouns of Turkish origin that refer generally to males of some importance or prestige. This class includes *aga* ‘Turkish nobleman’, *baba* ‘father’, *dai* ‘maternal uncle’, *dervish* ‘dervish’, *efendi* ‘gentleman’, *kadi* ‘judge’, *pasha* ‘pasha’, *sheh* ‘sheikh’, *xhaxha* ‘paternal uncle’, and our *hoxha* ‘Moslem cleric’, among others. Thus, one finds plurals *agallarë*, *baballarë*, *dervishlerë*, *efendilerë*, and so on. The general semantic classification of prestigious males is violated for one noun in the standard language, the non-human *at* ‘stallion’, but this is a prestigious sort of horse. Dialectally, the class is extended somewhat, taking in occasional females (*hanëm* ‘Turkish lady’ is reported (Kaleshi 1971) with a plural *hanëmlarë* in the Albanian spoken in the Republic of Macedonia and in Kosovo), as well as other respected males, including some nouns not of Turkish origin, e.g. *mbret* ‘king’ (plural *mbretellërë*, versus standard Albanian plural *mbretër*), from Latin *imperator*.

These facts about *-llar/-ler-* mean that even though *χοτζαλάρ-* is an occasionalism of the highest degree in the Greek of southern Albania, it has a wider use in Albanian more generally. It is thus available to Greek-Albanian bilinguals as part of the set of resources available to them as bilinguals.¹² Under those conditions, it is not surprising that one such form should have made its way into the Greek of (at least) one speaker.

The situation seen with *-llar/-ler-* in Albanian is found in other languages in the Balkans in contact with Turkish. These facts are discussed briefly in the following section.

4.2.2 Turkish Plurals in the Balkans

¹¹ This section and the next one draw on material prepared by Victor Friedman, working mostly with standard reference works, for Chapter 6 of Friedman and Joseph 2016, where a fuller treatment is to be found.

¹² I would like to thank Arjiris Archakis of the University of Patras for reminding me of the importance of thinking of multilingual situations in terms of the resources that speakers have access to and can exploit for various communicative purposes.

Turkish plurals in *-lar/-ler* are found in virtually all of the Balkan languages influenced by Turkish. Macedonian has forms such as *kardašlar* ‘brothers’ and *efendiler* ‘gentlemen’, used mainly as vocatives, but also non-male, non-human Turkish plural forms such as *iplikler* ‘clothes’ (literally ‘threads’, from Jašar-Nasteva 2001: 215), and there are even instances of the *-lar-* form being used as a derivational base, as in the (singular!) diminutive *agalarče* ‘O (you) young *aga*!’ (Dimitrovski et al. 1983: 8). Bulgarian, as discussed by Grannes 1977, has a rather extensive set of *-lar* plurals, with essentially the same semantics as Albanian, so that nouns like *aga* are typical inputs to the use of *-lar*; examples come from literature as well as colloquial usage and include abusive vocatives such as *kjaratar* ‘scoundrels!’ and *kjopolar* ‘sons of bitches!’, though some of the literary uses may actually be better considered true Turkish forms, as they are spoken by Turkish characters. The Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian (BCS) language complex shows some relevant instances; Popović (1960: 584), for example, offers the now-familiar form *hođalari*, from Bosnia, as the plural of *hođa-*, and Miklosich (1890: 9) cites Serbian *agalar*. Finally, an early example from Aromanian, *păshălarl’i* ‘the pashas’ (with definite article *-l’i* attached) is cited by Leake (1814: 391).¹³

Given the ubiquity of Turkish plurals in Balkan contact situations, and the sizeable, though admittedly limited, number of *-llar/-ler-* plurals in Albanian, the spread of the suffix, via Albanian, into the speech of one Greek-Albanian bilingual is less surprising. In fact, under the circumstances, it might be considered surprising that there are not more examples to cite from the Greek of southern Albania.¹⁴

Finally, many of these languages show native plural markers added to the Turkish, as in the case of the Greek *χοτζάλαρες*. As already noted, the Albanian pluralizer *-ë* occurs on its *-llar/-ler-* nouns, as seen above with *agallarë*, *efendilerë*, etc. Macedonian, Bulgarian, and BCS also all have such forms, with native plural *-i* added, e.g. *agalar*. Thus these Turkish-derived plurals are a prime context for plural marking that is multiply realized (from an etymological standpoint).

4.2.3 Multiple Exponence in Contact Situations

¹³ This appears to be a unique form, at least as far as Leake’s account is concerned, but one that we can take seriously, given the overall context of Turkish plurals in the Balkans.

¹⁴ And hence the need for more investigation into this form, despite my making the most of the single datum I have.

It should be clear from the evidence of the preceding sections that Turkish-derived plurals are a common phenomenon in the Balkans, even if such nouns have come to be restricted in most of the languages. In this section, by way of placing *χοτζαλάρες* in a broader language-contact context, an example of contact-induced multiple exponence in the verbal system of a variety of Greek under considerable influence from Turkish is presented, drawing on Janse (2009).

In particular, Janse discusses some two cases from Asia Minor Greek in which Turkish verb endings for first and second person plural are added to Greek forms that are fully inflected. In Cappadocian Greek, in the dialect of Semendere, Janse, citing Dawkins (1916: 144, 148), gives 1Pl and 2Pl forms of the imperfect of *cé-mi* ‘I am’ and *ín-mi* ‘I am’ as *cétun-mistic* / *cétun-stiniz* and *(i)tun-mistic* / *(i)tun-stiniz*, respectively. In these forms, the material after the hyphens are the composite endings, consisting of a Greek part, *-misti* and *-sti* in 1Pl and 2Pl respectively, and a Turkish part, *-c* and *-niz*, respectively. Similar facts can be found in Lycæonian Greek, in the dialect of Silli, though with slightly different endings. The basis for the double marking in these cases is not opacity, but rather, as Janse argues, the similarity in the sound shape of the Greek 1Pl ending *-misti* to the Turkish pluperfect (thus also a past tense) suffixal formation in *-mİş-tİ*, which thus “invited” completion with a Turkish person marker; from the 1Pl, Janse argues, this pattern spread to the 2Pl, due to the phonic similarity in the Greek of *-misti* (1Pl) to *-sti* (2Pl). Thus for different reasons, but triggered by access to resources that only language contact provides, multiple realizations of the same inflectional categories by material of different language origins can result. From this, we can conclude that the appearance of the Greek plural *-ες* in *χοτζαλάρες* is an entirely expected sort of development in a multilingual milieu like southern Albania.

4.3 An even Broader Context: *χοτζαλάρες* and Ideology

It is suggested in §4.1 that one similarity between multiple exponence arising from language-internal pressures, as with *children*, and multiple exponence that arises due to language-external pressures, as with Turkish plural *-lar*, is that opacity can be involved in each as a motivating factor. There are, however, some ways in which the two types of situations can differ, and one such difference is relevant for the example under consideration here, *χοτζαλάρες*.

What is different about contact-induced multiple exponence is that it admits also of an ideological interpretation. That is, in adding the native

ending to a word with a foreign marker, speakers can be seen as in a sense “claiming” it for their native system, marking the foreign word as native, and thus allowing it to appear more native. While there may well be system-internal pressures at work, such as the elimination of unmotivated (opaque) morphological differences, the ideological dimension cannot be ignored, as speakers in multilingual situations are aware of the language differences before them, even if they do not always pay attention to them. Ideology here gives a dimension of intentionality to the developments, so I conclude with other ways in which there are ideologically driven contact-related developments in the Balkans. In particular, aspects of Aromanian phonology lend themselves to such an ideological interpretation, as does Greek resistance to the development of evidential marking.

That is, Joseph 2009 (see also Friedman and Joseph 2016: Chapter 5) argues that the borrowing of the rather “un-Slavic” and “un-Romanian”¹⁵ fricatives [ð θ] as fricatives, without their being nativized as stops, in various dialects of Macedonian (e.g. Bobošćica) and of Aromanian (e.g. in the Pindos area of Greece) that are in contact with Greek and Albanian, both being languages that have those fricatives, can be interpreted as reflecting an ideology whereby the contact language is not viewed as all that different from the native language. It is suggested there that “familiarity”, an ideological notion of inclusion rather than exclusion, is behind the adoption of the fricatives as fricatives, even though structuralist phonology would lead one to expect the fricatives to be nativized as stops.

As for evidentiality, the marking of information-source grammatically on verb forms, it is a grammatical device that has spread from Turkish into Balkan Slavic (Macedonian and Bulgarian) and Albanian, and it is found even in some dialects of Aromanian, due to contact with Albanian.¹⁶ Thus evidentiality seems to be a convenient grammatical category, one that is prone to spreading in contact situations. Despite this, evidentiality did not develop in Greek, even though there was extensive contact with languages that have this category, especially Turkish. In Joseph (2003: §3), following a suggestion made by Friedman (p.c.), it is argued that Greek may have resisted evidentiality for the very reason that it is a Turkish phenomenon, given the history of uneasy relations between Greeks and Turks. If this is the right account, then ideology played a role in shaping the outcome of language contact in this case as well.

¹⁵ “Romanian” is used here in the sense of non-Italian, non-Dalmatian eastern Romance, i.e. the node in the Romance family tree that takes in Aromanian, Istro-Romanian, Daco-Romanian, and Megleno-Romanian.

¹⁶ See Friedman 2003 on evidentiality in the Balkans in general and 1994 on the emergence of evidentiality in Aromanian.

5. Conclusion

Although a clarion call is made throughout this discussion of *χοτζαλάρες* that more data would be welcome, the various considerations given here concerning the morphology of double marking, the state of affairs with Turkish plurals in Albanian and in the Balkans, and the fate of Turkish endings in general in contact situations should make it clear that this one isolated form from that Agioi Saranda Greek speaker is perhaps the tip of the iceberg. As Bloomfield and others showed, a lot can be learned from a single form, under the right conditions. It is hoped that the conditions for learning from *χοτζαλάρες* are indeed of the right type.

References

- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1928. "A note on sound change." *Language* 4: 99–100.
- . 1946. "Algonquian." In *Linguistic structures of native America* (Viking Fund Publications in Anthropology 6), ed. Harry Hoijer et al., 85–129. New York: Wenner-Gren Foundation.
- Brown, Christopher and Brian D. Joseph. 2013. "The texture of a linguistic environment: new perspectives on the Greek of Southern Albania." *Albano-Hellenica* 5: 145–152 (=Papers from the First International Conference of Greek-Albanian Studies, Tirana, Albania, March 24–5, 2012, ed. Aristotel Spiro).
- Dawkins, Richard M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dimitrovski, Todor, Blaže Koneski, and Trajko Stamatovski. 1983. *About the Macedonian Language*. Skopje: Institute for the Macedonian Language.
- Friedman, Victor A. 1994. "Surprise! Surprise! Arumanian has had an admirative!" *Indiana Slavic Studies* 7: 79–89.
- . 2003. "Evidentiality in the Balkans." In *Studies in Evidentiality* (=Typological Studies in Language 54), ed. Alexandra Aikhenvald and Robert Dixon, 189–218. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Friedman, Victor A. & Brian D. Joseph. 2016. *The Balkan Languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grannes, Alf. 1977. "The use of the Turkish pluralizer -lx²r in South Slavic and Albanian." *The New Zealand Slavonic Journal* 3: 83–93.
- Janse, Mark. 2009. "Watkins' Law and the development of agglutinative inflections in Asia Minor Greek." *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 9: 93–109.

- Jašar-Nasteva, Olivera. 2001. *Turski leksički elementi vo makedonskiot jazik*. Skopje: Institute for the Macedonian Language.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2003. "Evidentials: Summation, Questions, Prospects." *Studies in Evidentiality* (=Typological Studies in Language 54), ed. Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon, 307-327. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- . 2009. "Broad vs. Localistic Dialectology, Standard vs. Dialect: The Case of the Balkans and the Drawing of Linguistic Boundaries." *Language Variation-- European perspectives II: Selected papers from the 4th International Conference on Language Variation in Europe (ICLaVE 4), Nicosia, June 2007*, ed. by S. Tsiplakou, M. Karyolemou, & P. Pavlou, 119-134. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kaleshi, Hasan. 1971. "The importance of Turkish influence upon word formation in Albanian." *Balkanica* (Belgrade) 2: 271-293.
- Leake, William Martin. 1814. *Researches in Greece*. London: John Booth.
- Miklosich, Franz. 1890. "Über die Einwirkung des Türkischen auf die Grammatik des südosteuropäischen Sprachen." *Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 120, Abteilung I, 1-12.
- Popović, I. 1960. *Geschichte der serbokroatischen Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Ralli, Angela. 2012. "Morphology in language contact: verbal loanblend formation in Asia Minor Greek (Aivaliot)." In *Morphologies in contact*, ed. Thomas Stolz, Martine Vanhove, Hitomi Otsuka, and Aina Urdze, 177-193. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Ronzevalle, P. Louis. 1911. "Les emprunts tures dan le grec vulgaire de Roumélie et spécialement d'Andrianople." *Journal Asiatique* 18: 69-106, 257-336, 405-462.
- Sommer, Ferdinand J. 1902. *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre. Eine Einführung in das sprachwissenschaftliche Studium des Lateins*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Verlag.