To appear in: *Researching language repertoires, practices, and identities in minoritized settings: Insights from diverse Greek-speaking communities* (Routledge Critical Studies in Multilingualism), ed. by Petros Katsareas & Matthew Hadodo. Routledge Publishers, 2023.

==========

Ideology and Greek-Albanian bilingualism: On the permeability of language boundaries

Brian D. Joseph* & Rexhina Ndoci**

* https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5963-9322; **https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2204-0954

Abstract

In a bilingual community, the way in which speakers view their two languages is an ideological matter, though one with accompanying structural consequences. In this chapter, based on the authors' fieldwork in Greek-speaking enclaves in southern Albania, we explore this claim by examining the situation with Greek of Southern Albania (SAGrk) where Greek speakers are bilingual in Greek and Albanian but use the languages in a manner that suggests that no clear and distinct boundaries exist between the two. Rather, the elements of the two languages co-exist in such a way as to yield forms with a mixed character. Such "hybrid" linguistic behavior is evident at different levels of analysis, e.g., in the lexicon, the syntax, the morphology, the phonology, and in discourse. Despite the mixing observed, SAGrk multilinguals view their codes as distinct, as indicated by ideologically based characterizations of language variants. Evaluative designations for the two languages show an awareness of the social construction of each code as a distinct entity, but their speech nonetheless is characterised by mixing, fluidity, and consequent "permeability" of code boundaries. The interconnected nature of the linguistic resources of multilingual and multidialectal individuals is shown to contrast with speakers' overt ideological statements on the distinctiveness of their codes.

1. Introduction and background

We examine here a speech community in southern Albania that is bilingual in Greek and Albanian, focusing attention on certain interactions between the two languages evident in the usage of the speakers. We consider these interactions against a backdrop of so-called "mixed languages" and explore how this community adds to our understanding of language mixing. Of special importance is the way in which ideological notions about language help to shape the way speakers view what they do linguistically in their bilingual practices. We start with background on the region, on the languages, and on language mixing in general, and then turn to the specifics of the interactions in the region and ultimately their ideological underpinnings.

The south of Albania has long been an enclave for varieties of Modern Greek due to the presence of a considerable Greek minority there. This minority has existed as part of what Sobolev (2021: 137, emphasis in the original) calls an "*ethnic symbiosis*" between Greeks and Albanians in the area, evident in toponyms. The end of the socialist regime in Albania 30 years ago and the subsequent possibility of crossing the border between Albania and Greece

led many south Albania Greeks to seek relocation to Greece, movement that was parallel to a wave of migration of ethnic Albanians into Greece. Although the Greek minority has seen dramatic reductions in population since the early 1990s, Greek is still very much alive in various parts of the Albanian south and offers a rich field for investigations into language contact, language change, and associated language ideologies.

Having lived in present-day Albania, the members of the Greek minority are fairly balanced bilinguals in both their local Greek and Albanian varieties (Sobolev 2021). Bilingualism was also reinforced by intermarriage with local Albanians and by instruction in Albanian-medium schools for much of the formal education these individuals have received. As a result, these bilinguals engage extensively in practices most typical of speakers involved in intense and continuous language contact, such as bidirectional borrowing and code-switching (Joseph et al. 2019).

The South Albania Greek (SAGrk) varieties show numerous features in common with each other and with other varieties of present-day Greece (Brown & Joseph 2015). The Greek-speaking area of Himara (Greek Χειμάρα)[1] includes the villages of Palasa (Greek Παλάσα) and Dhërmi (Δρυμάδες), as well as the larger town of Himara itself (Figure 1). Despite the geographical position in the northern reaches of the Greek-speaking world in the Balkans, Himara is classified by Greek dialectologists as a part of the southern Modern Greek dialects based on features it shares with the south. Palasa and Dhërmi, however, are classified as semi-northern varieties because they exhibit the deletion of unstressed high vowels and the raising of unstressed mid vowels (Kyriazis 2007) typical of northern Greek varieties. The other two Greek-speaking areas of south Albania consist of the town of Saranda (Άγιοι Σαράντα) and surrounding villages such as Delvina (Δελβίνο), as well as Dropull (Δρώπολη) and Pogon (Πογώνι) of Gjirokastër (Αργυρόκαστρο) county and Vlora (Αυλώνα), Narta (Άρτα), and Zvërnec (Σβέρνιτσα) of Vlora county (Kyriazis ,& Spiro 2011). Saranda and its villages are classified with the southern Greek varieties while Dropull, Pogon, Vlora, Narta, and Zvërnec with the northern Greek varieties (ibid.). Thus, SAGrk is far from a monolith and the variation may reflect different historical dialect sources for the present-day forms of Greek found in the region. Nonetheless, we find it convenient at times to use "SAGrk" as a cover term.

SAGrk has borrowed quite extensively from local Albanian, especially in the lexicon, a domain in which contact-related influence is typically quite evident (Kyriazis & Spirou 2011, Kyriazis 2019). Although SAGrk does preserve Greek archaisms (Kyriazis 2007, Kyriazis & Spirou 2011), some of which are found in other regional Greek dialects, it has also borrowed from and has lent linguistic material to the other Balkan languages, such as Balkan Romance and Balkan Slavic, languages with which it has come in contact in the area (Poliou & Soulaj 2019; Kyriazis & Spirou 2011). Besides being influenced by other languages, SAGrk has in turn exerted its own influence onto those languages. This is especially evident in the Albanian varieties spoken close to the Greek-speaking areas that have borrowed, for instance, vocabulary related to the semantic field of farming (Kyriazis & Spirou 2011). Often these Albanian varieties have functioned as the vehicle for the transmission of the borrowed elements into other Albanian varieties not in direct contact with Greek (ibid.). Some of these Albanian varieties also exhibit phonological influence from Greek, such as the presence of

[1] We give the Greek equivalents in parentheses here, but throughout this chapter use the current official Albanian designations for the places in question.

the voiced velar affricate /ɣ/, which is found in the Greek sound system but not in that of most of Albanian varieties (ibid.).

Over the last decades SAGrk has experienced pressure from Standard Modern Greek (SMG) coming, for example, by the consumption of media from Greece (Joseph et al. 2019). Other pressure has come from the migration of South Albania Greeks to Greece, where they have acquired or at least been exposed to SMG and thus have brought it back to South Albania in visiting or re-settling there (ibid.). Standardizing pressures are not restricted to local Greek, as local Albanian varieties have also experienced the influence of Standard Albanian (ibid.).

Research on language ideologies in South Albania reveals that SAGrk has low prestige among locals as SAGrk speakers appear hesitant to use the variety with non-SA Greeks (Rodou et al. 2019). At the same time, they attribute high prestige to Standard Modern Greek (ibid.). Nonetheless, SAGrk is the subject of covert prestige as its speakers express pride toward their local varieties that seemingly function as a constitutive feature of their local SA Greek identity (ibid., and cf. Labov 1963).

In this chapter, we investigate the interconnected nature of the various languages and varieties that speakers from Palasa, using both Greek and Albanian, have in their linguistic repertoire. We contextualize them in relation to the language ideologies these individuals hold towards all these varieties and we discuss the implications of such ideologies.

Figure 1: Map of Albania showing the location of Palasa and nearby Greek-speaking villages. Map template taken from Minestrone, Public domain, via Wikimedia Commons, and edited by the authors to include country names and approximate location of the enclaves (estimated via Google Maps based on the Greek-speaking villages named in Joseph et al. 2019).

2. Language contact, mixing, hybridity, and naming practices.

Contact between languages and language varieties, whether intense or mild, can have a number of outcomes through a variety of processes. We survey these outcomes and processes here to provide the necessary context for our examination of Palasa usage.

One of these outcomes is a bilingual mixed language, that is, defined by Winford (2003: 170) as a language that is a "composite of materials drawn from just two languages". This term is well entrenched in the contact linguistic literature. Thus we adopt it here for the purposes of presenting the well-established characteristics of such languages, and thus allowing for a contrast with the SAGrk situation, before we shift to our own preferred terminology.

Prototypical examples of mixed languages are Anglo-Romani, which combines English grammar with Romani lexicon, and Media Lengua, which combines Quechua grammar with Spanish lexicon. Bakker (2003) calls these mixed languages "intertwined" and distinguishes them from "converted" and "lexically mixed" ones. Converted languages are languages that have kept the forms for all lexical and grammatical elements and have adopted the grammatical functions from another language, which, in the case of typologically different languages, may result in a typological change. An example is Sri Lanka Portuguese, which has Portuguese forms but has structurally converged to Tamil grammar. Lexically mixed languages, on the other hand, are languages like Michif, whose vocabulary can be attributed in equal parts to two languages. In the particular, Michif nouns derive from French and Michif verbs from Cree. A key point is that mixed languages can be very different from each other based on the sociohistorical context that produced them and the linguistic characteristics that define them with relation to their source languages (Thomason 2001).

Mixed languages are "autonomous systems" in their own right (Bakker 2003), independent of the systems of the languages they are in contact with and from which they arose. This becomes clear in the rare cases when mixed languages are used in contexts where the source languages are not present (Thomason 2003). They are often, however, in a symbiotic relationship with their source languages, as speakers are often fluent in one or both of the source languages as well as in the mixed language (Meakins 2012, Bakker 2003, Smith 2000), a situation which leads Smith (2000) to call them 'symbiotic mixed languages'. Mixed languages are different from other products of language contact, such as pidgins and creoles, although Bakker (2003) does not completely rule out the possibility that some pidgins/creoles might also be mixed languages. Some researchers have argued that their origin is found in practices of code-switching and code-mixing (e.g., Auer 1999, Gardner-Chloros 2000) and others have claimed that their origin lies in extreme borrowing (Thomason 1995). Meakins (2012) takes a more nuanced approach. In order to argue for the status of Gurindji Kriol (a language of north Australia where there is contact between Gurindji and Kriol) as a mixed language and to distinguish it from products of code-switching, she proposes, among others, the criterion of the ergative marker. She argues that when variation in the use of the ergative marker is predictable, it is indicative of the mixed language, as an independent system. When it is not predictable, a given utterance is a product of code-switching between Gurindji and Kriol.

The characteristics of mixed languages of any type are summarized by Thomason (1997, 80) as follows:

- They evolve or are created in two-language contact situations.
- The setting involves widespread bilingualism on the part of at least one of the two speaker groups.
- In the resulting mixture the language material is easily separated according to the language of origin.
- There is little or no simplification in either component of the mixed language (reflecting the bilingualism of its creators).

In other words, mixed languages are the product of only two languages in contact. That does not preclude their having elements from other languages that were initially borrowed into the source languages before the emergence of the mixed language. The emergence also presupposes a group of speakers bilingual in the two source languages, hence the often-used

term "bilingual mixed languages" (as in Winford 2003, as noted above). Because two languages are involved, it is often easy to identify which elements in the mixed language come from which of the source languages. This is especially true when the source languages are typologically different, as with Media Lengua (involving Spanish and Quechua). Typological similarity between the source languages does not preclude the emergence of a mixed language, however. Such an example is Chindo, a product of contact between Malay and Javanese, two Austronesian languages of Indonesia (Dreyfuss & Oka 1979). The mixed languages diverge from other products of language contact such as pidgins in that no simplification occurs in the resulting system of the mixed language; the absence of simplification speaks to the skills of the bilingual speakers who created the mixed language.

This summary of some of main characteristics of mixed languages provides a useful backdrop to a consideration of the contact situation in Palasa. Missing from this survey is a consideration of the ideological stance by speakers in these mixed language situations. We remedy this gap with regard to Palasa, focusing first on various products of contact in the village, and then arguing that the nature of these contact products reveals a certain ideology that speakers hold about the two languages, an ideology that is supported by local language-naming practices. We are thus especially concerned with identifying the sources of these products, as they occur in real time, in the spontaneous and momentary speech of highly skilled bilinguals. Our interest further lies in understanding these contact-induced forms in the context of the ideologies of separation held by the speakers who produce them.

What we discuss here has parallels with the notions of "mixing" and "mixed", as used in the literature. However, inasmuch as we specifically do not claim the existence of a mixed language, with Albanian and Greek as source language, in SAGrk with characteristics as outlined above, in order to avoid confusion with these latter terms, we choose instead to systematically use "hybridization" and "hybrid" hereinafter, following the usage in Brown and Joseph (2017).[2] These terms, for us, indicate a process whereby speakers draw on both languages freely in constructing all aspects of their utterances, as illustrated below in Section 4, and thus utilize elements from the two languages in generating the forms they use. Hybridization thus refers to the process of bringing together elements that also exist independently in the systems of their source languages. In a sense, we argue, this hybridization, unlike, say, a situation like Michif, suggests that there are no sharp divisions linguistically between Greek and Albanian. That is, we claim that all speakers can recruit different elements from the source languages and be understood by other SAGrk speakers despite there being no codified system. By way of clarification, our use of the term "hybridity" is also different from its use to refer to an autonomous system which is a product of the blending of elements from several languages, as, for instance, in the account in Zuckermann (2009) of the revival of Hebrew; in that case, he argues, the product, Modern Israeli Hebrew, resulted from the incorporation into the revived language of elements from the languages of the individuals involved in the revival. In such a case, the hybrid language is initially acquired as a second language and then modified as it is acquired by more second language speakers (Lewin 2021).

Our focus on linguistic hybridity is juxtaposed here to the naming practices that the Greek and Albanian speakers give to their usage in producing hybrid linguistic elements and structures. Naming practices are important in their own right as they can indicate the social,

[2] See also Chairetakis 2019, who discusses borrowings with elements from both the donor language and the recipient language (a phenomenon for which he also uses the term "loanblends").

historical, or cultural aspects that brought about the named phenomena. Of particular interest here is the naming of languages and language varieties (dialects), as the terms speakers use can reveal the ideologies surrounding certain varieties and the speakers of those same varieties. As an example, we can consider the names given to the language attributed to Black Americans in the US. At different points in time and in the context of sociopolitical changes, various names have been used by linguists and non-linguists alike to refer to this variety or set of varieties (cf. King 2020 and references therein). Names have ranged from Black Street English, Black English, Black English Vernacular, and Ebonics to African American Vernacular English, African American English, and African American Language (AAL), among others, with linguists moving between the last two (or three) in recent years.[3] These naming practices must be viewed against the backdrop of broader social trends and changes. Moreover, each term carries different implications and assumptions about the status of the language. The inclusion of "English" in the name places it among a set of English varieties and highlights its relationship to said varieties. Adding "language" in the name highlights the complexity of the AAL and is used to encompass all linguistic varieties used by Black Americans, including Gullah (a creole spoken by Black Americans in the coasts of Georgia and South Carolina). Both "English" and "language", moreover, offer a sense of legitimacy to the language, which is especially important for the stigmatized languages of marginalized or minoritized groups.

We take the view that the study of language contact should take into consideration the social context that brings languages in contact (Adamou 2010) as well as the language ideologies of the speakers of said languages (Rodríguez-Ordóñez 2019). These not only allow language users to "dismantle the mental demarcation boundaries that separate their individual languages" (Matras 2007, 68), but also help us better understand the outcomes in a given language contact situation. A case in point is the lack of purist ideologies by young Navajo-English bilinguals who are less passionate about separability of the two languages, compared to older members of the community, and who as such engage more often in code mixing phenomena (Schaengold 2004). In another example, Asturian-Spanish bilinguals who ideologically associate Asturian identity with informality and laid-backness are also prone to inserting into their Spanish more Asturian linguistic features such as 3rd person singular marking or the raising of word-final *o* (Barnes 2018).

We aim here, therefore, to provide relevant data pointing to hybridization in SAGrk, in the way of forms in various domains of linguistic usage that draw on both Greek and Albanian, incorporating elements from both languages interspersed with forms that are wholly one or the other language, and then to examine the names speakers assign to different aspects of their usage. We thus present here not only a linguistic perspective on the types of structures that have emerged in SAGrk and thus more generally can emerge from language contact, but also an ethnographic and sociolinguistic perspective on the nature of the contact situation in SAGrk, as revealed in actual usage.

3. Data and methods

The data presented here comes from nine fieldwork visits author Joseph has conducted in south Albania between 2010-2019, and specifically in the Greek-majority village of Palasa.

[3] This is of course a simplification of a complex situation. Black Americans are not a linguistic monolith, so that not all Black Americans speak AAL, and conversely, not speakers of what is identifiable as AAL are Black Americans.

Some of the field trips have been conducted solely by Joseph and some with other linguists and anthropologists from our home and other European institutions: Aristotle Spiro, Majlinda Spiro, Alexander Novik, Andrey Sobolev, and Christopher Brown, as well as co-author Ndoci. Data elicitation involved semi-structured and unstructured interviews with locals from Palasa, whether they were bilingual in Albanian and Greek or monolingual in the former language. For the purposes of this chapter, we focus on the bilingual speakers. The semi-structured interviews revolved around topics such as life in the village in the past, village traditions, and religious holidays. Unstructured interviews took the form of casual conversation among the language consultants and one or more researchers, depending on the field trip from which the data comes from. Some of the interviews took the form of picture-naming tasks (e.g., names for local fish) or overt elicitations for such things such as verb paradigms and vocabulary for certain semantic fields (e.g., body parts) using Albanian to elicit Greek and vice versa.

Language consultants were mostly middle-aged individuals who had spent the majority of their lives in Palasa. Some were born and raised in the village. Others, especially a couple of the older female consultants, were born in neighboring Greek- or Albanian-speaking villages but relocated to Palasa after marrying a local. Some of those in their 40s and 50s had relocated to Greece after the opening of the borders between Greece and Albania but maintain strong ties with their birthplace through frequent trips. The consultants were interviewed individually or in small groups of three or four, as was the case, for instance, with those relaxing in the village's traditional coffee house.

4. Hybridization in language

From the linguistic data it becomes evident that elements of both languages coexist in such a way as to yield forms of a hybrid character. Such hybrid linguistic behavior is evident at all levels of linguistic analysis, that is in semantics, morphology, syntax, lexicon (via borrowings), phraseology, discourse (via codeswitching/translanguaging), and perhaps most interesting of all, in the phonological realizations of particular lexemes. We illustrate each one of these levels below with attested data from the speech of our consultants.

4.1 Semantics

We start our discussion of hybridity with some examples of semantic hybrids in the speech of our consultants. Example (1) below is such a case. In a conversation held in Greek about the appropriate age for marriage involving a group of consultants, one of the men present asks his aunt, who is also present, the age at which she got married. When she responds with the age, twenty-seven, another consultant remarks that she was mature at that age, however without using the corresponding Greek word *ώριμη*. Instead, the consultant opts for the Greek *ψημένη*, literally 'baked'. Considering their multilingualism, however, and the polysemy of the corresponding Albanian lexical item *pjekur* 'baked; mature', it is reasonable to assume that *ψημένη* here, used to mean 'mature', has taken on this additional meaning to parallel the meanings that Albanian *pjekur* carries. In other words, the consultant produces a semantic hybrid whereby he attaches the Albanian semantic value 'mature' to the Greek form *ψημένη*, a word which does not carry such a meaning elsewhere in Greek.

(1) M1: Πόσο χρονών ήσουν [όταν παντρεύτηκες];
How old were you (when you got married)?
W: Είκοσι εφτά

Twenty-seven
M2: Είκοσι εφτά, **ψημένη**.
Twenty-seven, mature.

A similar semantic hybrid is noted by Brown & Joseph (2015, 7) where Greek *μηχανή* is used by Greek speakers in the Himara area with the meaning of 'car' and not with the meaning of 'motorbike' or 'apparatus' that it has elsewhere in the Greek-speaking world. They note this as a case of semantic hybridization whereby the 'car' meaning of the related Albanian *makinë* is transferred to the similar-sounding Greek form.[4]

Such forms are in essence contact-induced semantic extensions, but inasmuch as they reflect the injection of Albanian semantics into what is otherwise a Greek form, we consider them to be hybrids, produced by the processes discussed above in Section 2.

4.2 Morphology

In terms of morphology, the construction of comparative adjectives in the local Palasa variety is a robustly hybrid practice. Throughout the data speakers do not use the Greek *πιο* 'more' but instead they use the corresponding Albanian *ma*[5] followed by Greek adjectives in order to create their comparative degrees. This is exemplified in Table 1 where Albanian *ma* is followed by the Greek positive degree adjective *μεγάλο* 'big' to index 'bigger'. Speakers do not limit themselves to positive degree adjectives in their comparative constructions. We find comparatives where the Albanian *ma* is followed by the Greek comparative degree adjective *μεγαλύτερη* 'more bigger'. Similar constructions occur with the comparative degrees of adverbs, where the Albanian *ma* is followed by the Greek comparative degree adverbs *παραπάνω* 'more above' and *καλύτερα* 'more better' respectively. In all examples in Table 1, the context indicates that the interpretation of the constructions is that of the comparative degree and not of the superlative as otherwise suggested by the inflectional morphology of the adjectives/adverbs. The resulting comparatives thus show the hybridity of an Albanian grammatical element used together with a Greek adjective to produce an outcome that is neither wholly Greek nor wholly Albanian.

	Construction	**Example**
Comparative Adjectives	ma + Grk positive degree adjective	ma μεγάλο
	or	
	ma + Grk comparative degree adjective	ma μεγαλύτερη
Comparative Adverbs	ma + Grk comparative degree adverb	ma παραπάνω ma καλύτερα

[4] It is interesting, but more from a "linguistic trivia" perspective than anything else, that Ancient Greek μηχανή, which gave the modern form cited here, is the ultimate source of Albanian *makinë*, a borrowing from Italian (*macchina*), from Latin *machina*, a borrowing of the ancient Doric Greek form μαχανά.

[5] This is the form which is *më* in the standard (Tosk-based) language and the southern dialect zone (Tosk) more generally, and corresponds to nasalized *mã* of the northern dialect zone (Geg). Tosk *më* has different realizations across various local idioms, including [maº], with a somewhat backed and rounded low vowel. The *ma* seen here probably reflects the effects of this form being filtered through the Greek phonological system, since [a] is the closest vowel Greek has to [aº].

Table 1: Examples and structure of comparative degree adjectives and adverbs in Palasa.

Another type of morphological hybridity we note involves Albanian nouns that have been borrowed into the local Greek variety and have received Greek affixation in the process of being integrated into the variety. While this is a common outcome of lexical borrowing in contact situations, the result nonetheless is a form that has an Albanian lexical basis and Greek grammatical machinery, and is thus hybrid in the sense used here. This, by the way, is the type Chairetakis (2019) called a "hybrid derived loan" (see footnote 2). Such a case is *ιντζενιέριδες* 'engineers', whose base, *inxhinier* 'engineer', is borrowed from Albanian and adapted into the local Greek with the Greek plural suffix *-ιδες* (as in *ταξιτζίδες* 'taxi drivers'). Joseph et al. (2019, 240) note a similar example in the Greek of Palasa, namely the morphological hybrid *studendes* 'students'. In this lexical item, the Albanian base *studentë* 'students' occurs with the Greek plural suffix –ες as in e.g., *ερευνητ-ές* 'researchers' (in addition, it constitutes a phonological hybrid, as discussed in more detail in Section 4.7).

4.3 Syntax

Syntactic hybrids are harder to detect, especially if we consider the positioning of the two languages in the Balkan sprachbund, and the grammatical and other similarities the languages of the sprachbund exhibit. Thus, Greek and Albanian share the wide use of finite complementation and the co-indexing of objects with weak objects pronouns ("clitic doubling"); see Friedman and Joseph (2023: Chapter 7). However, examples of syntactic hybridity in the speech of Palasa natives are evident in matters of word order, as can be seen in the utterances in (2).

(2)	a	Υπάρχει	μια	γκρόπα,	γκρόπα	βαθέα,	λένε.	
		there.is	a	hole	hole	deep	they.say	
		They say that there is a deep hole.						
	b	Πήρε	αρρώστια	κακέα,	[έφυγε]	για	δυο	μήνες.
		he.took	illness	bad	he.left	for	two	months
		He got cancer and died within two months						

In both the Greek utterances in (2a) and (2b), the adjective follows the noun that it modifies. That is, the adjective *βαθέα* 'deep' follows the noun *γκρόπα* 'hole' (a borrowing from Albanian *gropa*), and the adjective *κακέα* 'bad' follows the noun *αρρώστια* 'illness'. These adjectival phrases mimic Albanian word order where the noun precedes its adjective and ignores Greek word order where the adjective precedes the noun. Based on the internal structure of the Greek noun phrase elsewhere, we would expect to find *βαθέα γκρόπα* 'deep hole' and *κακέα αρρώστια* 'bad illness' with the adjective coming before the noun. Instead, we find noun-first structures, thus a likely influence from Albanian. Admittedly, Greek does allow for post-nominal adjectives but such structures typically have a marked semantic value, e.g. literary or highly affective, that is not evident in (2) (e.g. *Ο Θωμάς είναι άνθρωπος καλός* 'Thomas is a good man', somewhat marked compared to *Ο Θωμάς είναι καλός άνθρωπος*).

The structures in (2a) and (2b) therefore represent hybrid formations, in that they have Greek words which combine with an Albanian syntax.

4.4 Lexicon

We identify hybridity in the lexicon via borrowings, examples of which are evident in some of the sections above. Borrowing in Palasa is bidirectional in the sense that it occurs both from Greek into Albanian and from Albanian into Greek. Illustrative examples of both are presented in (3). In (3a), [paɾtia] 'party', a reference to the former socialist regime of Albania, is borrowed from Albanian into the local Greek and embedded into a Greek frame. In (3b), the reverse is taking place, in that [łaxtaɹis], from Greek *λαχτάρα* 'fright' with the *-is* suffix, of Greek origin, used in Albanian as a verbalizing suffix, is borrowed and embedded into an Albanian frame, as indicated by the copula (*ishte*).[6] Sobolev (2021: 147) argues that hybridity can be found also at the level of related lexical domains where the slots in a particular semantic field can be filled partly by Greek lexical items and partly by Albanian lexical items, as in the case of the names for the months of the year (e.g. *ɣʲenári*ʃ 'January', from Greek, but ʃ*kúrti*ʃ 'February', morphologically adapted from the Albanian). At other times, the lexicon of the Greek Palasa variety is more neatly compartmentalized where Albanian lexical items make up the entirety of one semantic field (e.g., names for the colors of domesticated animals) and Greek lexical items make up the entirety of another field (e.g., the names for local fish) without competing terms from the other language whatsoever (ibid.).

(3) a

Όταν	εμπήκε	η	[paɾtia]	που	γίνηκε	το	σχολείο.
when	entered	the	party	that	it.became	the	school

When the party took over and that the school was founded.

b

Ishte	[łaxtaɹis].
was	scared

He had gotten scared.

4.5 Phraseology

Hybridity in phraseology has already been introduced in example (2b), where the Greek preposition *για* 'for' is used to convey the timeline within which the person being referred to was diagnosed and lost his life. Elsewhere in Greek this meaning would be conveyed via *(μέσα) σε* 'within'. The phrasing here seems to parallel the corresponding Albanian phrase *për dy muaj* 'within two months' in which *për* literally translates as 'for' but in such timeline constructions it also conveys the meaning of 'within'. The corresponding Greek *για* 'for' seems to have taken over this 'within' interpretation from Albanian and exhibits this sense in the Greek utterance in (2b). While on the one hand this development could be seen just as a case of semantic hybridity (see §4.1), the fact that the particular meaning that spreads from the Albanian preposition into the Greek one is associated with

[6] Neither a word *laktaris* nor *lahtaris* occurs in Standard Albanian (absent from Newmark's dictionary (http://www.seelrc.org:8080/albdict/), suggesting that this is indeed an SAGrk lexical innovation.

nouns like ‘month’ means that the hybridity is based on Albanian phraseology of *për + time noun.*

4.6 Discourse

Hybridity in discourse takes the form of code-switching, a practice widespread in the speech of locals in Palasa. In (4), the consultant was in the process of explaining the difference between *το γένι* ‘the beard.SG’ and *τα γένια* ‘the beard.PL’ in the local Greek. In that attempt she switches from Greek to Albanian apparently to clarify what she means by the plural form of the noun, *gjithë fytyren* ‘the whole face’. In (5), the consultant is giving marriage advice to the interviewers and in doing so she switches again from Greek to Albanian, *një mendim një veprim* ‘one thought one action’. Joseph at al. (2019) also give instances of code-switching in the opposite direction, that is from Albanian into Greek. They also identify a number of motivations for the code-switching of the locals, including clarification and emphasis, accommodation, topic-based switching, and triggering from Albanian and Greek homonyms.

(4)	Τα	γένια,	όλα	τα	γένια,	δηλαδή,	gjithë	fytyrën.
	the	beard	all	the	beard	that is	all	face

The beard, the whole beard, that is, the whole face.

(5)	Είπαμε	πρωτύτερα	πρέπει	να	έχετε	një	mendim	një	veprim.
	We.said	earlier	need	to	you.have	one	thought	one	action

We told you earlier you need to have a common thought and a common action.

4.7 Phonology

There is hybridization as well in the domain of phonology. We see both hybridization via the blending of the phonological forms of similar lexemes from each language, and hybridization evident in shared sound changes across both languages.[7]

The first type is not well instantiated in the literature on language contact but is found robustly in SAGrk and especially Palasa. It involves lexical items from one language that emerge in the speech of the locals with phonological elements from a parallel word in the other language. In that way, they are not the result of phonological interference based on differences in the phonological inventory of the respective languages (as with [misi] in footnote 7, but also *ma,* discussed in section 4.2 and footnote 3). Rather, they are more like cross-language blends, thus hybrids, involving sounds from phonologically and semantically similar words across the two languages that often are translation pairs. For instance, Brown & Joseph 2015 discuss the SAGrk form *εκονομική* ‘economic’ (as in *εκονομική κρίση* ‘economic crisis), phonetically [εkonomici], with ε- for expected [i] in *οικονομική*. Since both vowels involved, [ε] and [i], are found in both languages, the source of the ε- is not interference but rather appears to be based on the parallel Albanian word *ekonomik*

[7] There is also interference in the phonetic realization, e.g. Albanian [miʃi] ‘the meat’ realized in an Albanian matrix frame but with Greek phonology as [misi]. This sort of interference shows up in second-language learning by Greek speakers. For instance, Greek L2 learners of languages such as English that have an alveolar/post-alveolar distinction in its sibilants, often have difficulty making this distinction and produce them both as the alveolar sibilant.

'economic'; that is, *εκονομική* reflects Greek *οικονομική* crossed with its Albanian counterpart. Similarly, SAGrk has a form *μεχανικός* 'mechanic' for the expected form, *μηχανικός*, where the [ε] for the expected [i] (orthographic < η >) is likely from the Albanian counterpart *mekanik*.[8] The phonological form used in each such case is thus a blend of elements from the corresponding word in each language.[9] Moreover, these forms are significant for our discussion here, since they have ideological value beyond just the hybrid form they show, as discussed in §5.

The second type of hybridity in the phonological domain also has ideological significance. This type arises from the application of phonological rules of one language to material in the other, giving sound changes that are shared across the two languages. For instance, the local Greek variety exhibits a reduction of sibilant-plosive clusters to just a sibilant, as in the locative preposition *σ-* when it occurs together with the definite article, e.g. *τη* (FEM.ACC); the expected combination would be [sti] 'to the' but this reduces to [si]. Similarly, corresponding to the lexeme *στάρι* 'wheat' in Standard Modern Greek, Palasa Greek has *σάρι.* This phonological rule is not restricted to the local Greek variety but seems to have crossed language borders as its application can be seen in Albanian lexical items that exhibit the sibilant-plosive cluster. For instance, in the local Albanian we find [pasaj], a reduction from *pastaj* [pastaj] 'later', as found elsewhere in Albanian.[10]

This phonological hybridity is important from the perspective of the typology of outcomes in language contact situations, since it shows a type of contact-related outcome of the two languages that is rarely remarked upon, if at all, in the literature. These Palasa forms therefore extend the range of consequences of language contact that need to be recognized.

4.8 Summation

What we see in the hybridization data from Palasa and SAGrk more generally, then, is that the boundaries between Greek and Albanian are not particularly rigid. For one thing, the hybridization goes in both directions and affects all domains of grammar. Moreover, even sound changes find realization in both languages. Overall, therefore, there is no sort of sharp division of labor associated with each of the languages; rather, the hybrid behavior suggests a high degree of permeability and porosity to whatever weak boundaries there might be between the two languages. And, that permeability — the fact that the boundaries are easily breached — has, we suggest, an ideological interpretation in that it shows that in a certain sense there is no clear separation of Greek from Albanian or Albanian from Greek; rather, the hybrid forms point to a fluidity to the use of both languages, with one freely impinging on the other in a

[8] While there are dialects with [ε] regularly from Ancient Greek < η > ([ɛ̄]), e.g. Pontic, the fact that there is an Albanian source readily available together with evidence of hybridization in other words and in other components of grammar leads us to consider this example to be an instance of hybridization of the Greek word crossed with the corresponding Albanian word.

[9] The innovative SAGrk forms here are not simply borrowings from Albanian, since they are accented as expected in the Greek forms, not as in the parallel Albanian counterparts; thus *εκονομική / μεχανικός,* stressed on -κή / -κός, as opposed to Albanian *ekonomik* / *mekanik*, with stress on *-ík*. We discuss these phonological blends, with many more examples, in Ndoci & Joseph (forthcoming).

[10] Similar phonological hybrids where phonological rules apply across language borders are attested in Cappadocian Greek as well (Janse & Daveloose 2021). There, in a situation of intense language contact with Turkish, vowel harmony rules of Turkish are adopted and applied to Cappadocian Greek, resulting in hybrids where Greek forms are affected by Turkish phonological rules (ibid.).

bidirectional way. This lack of a clear separation finds realization as well in the labels Palasa speakers use for naming the language varieties in question.

5. Language ideologies and naming practices

During interviews with speakers from the village, overt statements that reveal the multilinguals' ideologies about their languages are sometimes expressed. In (6) one of the speakers uses the Albanian word *vulgare* 'vulgar' to refer to the local Greek variety of Palasa, in contrast to the non-vulgar Standard Modern Greek spoken within the Greek border. We see in this usage a standard-language ideology (Milroy & Milroy 1992, Lippi-Green 1994, Kroskrity 2004) in which speakers give value to standard varieties at the expense of non-standard ones such as SAGrk. In this case, linguistic value is denied to the local non-standard Greek by the speakers of the variety themselves rather than outsiders. It is likely, however, that such ideologies have been more prominent in the years after the end of communism in Albania and the freer movement to and from Greece which has allowed SA Greeks more contact with Standard Modern Greek and the social value Greeks ascribe to it.

(7) *Në gjuhën vulgare të fshatit* 'In the vulgar language of the village'

However, things are not so clear-cut that one could claim that for these speakers Standard Modern Greek is prestigious and that South Albania Greek is not. The form in (8), which was used to refer to Standard Modern Greek suggests a degree of pejoration towards the standard.

(8) *ελληνικούρα* 'Greek.AUG'

The pejorative tone comes from the suffix *-ούρα* attached to the base for 'Greek' *ελληνικ-*. This suffix, though technically an augmentative (LKNonline, s.v. -ουρα 2), intensifies the meaning of the base word in a somewhat derogatory ("μειωτικά") way, as seen in Standard Modern Greek in derivatives such as *λαϊκ-ούρα* 'folksy' and *παλιατζ-ούρα* 'good-for-nothing object'.

Thus, it is obvious that, although Standard Modern Greek carries prestige for SA Greeks, these evaluations are not fixed and are subject to revision depending on the context in which they arise. These evaluations show an awareness of distinctions between the codes, whether they be local Greek, local Albanian, or Standard Modern Greek. However, the linguistic behavior of the consultants regarding phonology and other "mixing" that we presented in Section 4 points to a greater degree of fluidity between the two languages and thus to what we characterize as greater "permeability" of the code boundaries. Without wanting to say that there is a single mixed variety here — "mixed" in the technical sense of the well-established term *mixed language* — the ease with which speakers in the course of natural conversational usage generate hybrid forms, i.e. hybrid meaning, hybrid syntax, hybrid morphology, and even hybrid phonology, speaks to a sensibility on their parts that the ostensible language differences are not critical and are not a barrier to drawing on all linguistic resources available to them, be they Greek or Albanian elements. In that way, as noted in Section 2, their hybrid linguistic behavior seems to be motivated by and bespeaks an ideology of sameness to Greek and Albanian forms.

Nonetheless, when referring to the local Albanian and SA Greek varieties, Palasa locals use a number of different names and there does not seem to be agreed-upon names for the

codes available in their repertoires (Table 2). The local Greek variety of Palasa is often referred to as [palasçótika] which is the form most Greek speakers would intuitively come up with or agree upon, based on productive means of labeling languages or dialects (e.g., [lamɲotika] for the variety spoken in Lamia). Sometimes there is deletion of the high front vowel [i] in the [-ika] derivational suffix which is typical of the local rural dialect (and other Greek varieties in the northern dialect zone) when it is unstressed.[11] We also find [palascitika] with and without the unstressed high front vowel, and [palascikoka] which, at least for us, is a surprising form inasmuch as -κοκο- is not a commonly occurring suffix in general, not just for naming language varieties. Finally, another interesting naming practice is found in [palaskotera], which despite what the *-otera*[12] suffix suggests, does not appear to be a comparative adverb here, but rather simply denotes the linguistic code of the village of Palasa.[13] In his 2015 data from the same village Sobolev (2021, 142) also notes [palasika] with reference to the local Greek variety, with the apparent reduction of a cluster of *s* with a plosive (see Section 4.6).

Local Greek	**IPA**	**Local Albanian**	**IPA**
παλασκίτ(ι)κα	[palascit(i)ka]	αρβανίτ(ι)κα	[ɑrvanit(i)ka]
παλασκίκοκα	[palascikoka]	ερβανίτ(ι)κα	[ɛrvanit(i)ka]
παλασιώτ(ι)κα	[palasçot(i)ka]	αλβανίτ(ι)κα	[alvanit(i)ka]
παλασκότερα	[palaskotera]	αλβαν(ι)κά	[alvanika]

Table 2: Attested names for the local Greek and Albanian varieties spoken in Palasa.

The local Albanian variety also exhibits a lot of variation in its naming. We find [alvanika], the Standard Modern Greek way to refer to Albanian in general. We also find [arvanitika], which is a somewhat surprising referent to local Albanian, inasmuch as it is used in present-day Greece for the Albanian varieties found within the Greek borders — in Central Greece, Attica, and parts of the Peloponnese — that are the outcome of the migration of Albanian-speaking groups in the Middle Ages (Trudgill 2002). The term is also found as [ɛrvanitika] with [a] raised to [e], and as [alvanitika] with an alternation between the approximant [ɾ] with the liquid approximant [l]. Alternations of the latter type are very common across the world's languages (e.g., Standard Modern Greek *αδερφή* [aðɛrfi] – *αδελφή* [aðelfi] 'sister'[14] and Puerto Rican Spanish [amoɾ] – [amol] 'love' (Ramos-Pellicia 2008) and are often stereotyped (see, e.g., McGowan (2016) on stereotyped representations of Chinese-accented English). All these names for 'Albanian' are derivatives of different Greek forms meaning 'Albania' and produced by our consultants with the unstressed high front vowel or omitting it, as well.

[11] The northern Greek characteristics, such as unstressed high-vowel loss, referred to in Section 1 are mostly found in urban areas in the south of Albania, such as Saranda, Gjirokastër, and Himara.
[12] Typically, it is a comparative suffix, as in, for instance, *γρηγορότερα* 'faster' and *παλιότερα* 'older (i.e., in the past)'.
[13] We speculate that there might be a trace here of an original oppositional sense of the suffix -τερος (as in Ancient Greek δεξιτερός 'right (as opposed to left' (not "more to the right"), with the local vernacular being opposed to Standard Modern Greek. Such an interpretation warrants further investigation, however.
[14] Here, though, the -λ- form is older and the -ρ- form is the innovative change, the inverse of what is the case with [ɛrvanitika].

The variation exhibited in the naming practices of the varieties available in the repertoire of Palasa locals hint towards the ideologies speakers hold about those varieties. It appears that establishing a specific name for them is not important enough for the locals as, to return to the quote in (8), those varieties are still the "vulgar language[s] of the village". This fluidity in labeling is consistent with the sense of fluidity between the two languages that the hybridization data shows. So, although labeling a language or a variety in a particular way may index the ideologies that are at place at a given point in time (McConnell-Ginet 2020), the non-conventionalization of a particular label may also index particular community ideologies, as seen in Palasa. However, it must be admitted that the speakers do indeed have labels for the two languages found in the village, even if they are subject to the variation we describe, so, somewhat paradoxically given their hybrid linguistic behavior, they clearly do have some awareness of the availability of two distinct codes.

The fact that all of our informants engaged in these hybrid phenomena and that none of them corrected one another when they produced hybrid products in the group interview settings, suggests an enregisterment of the mixed way of speaking (Agha 2005) as the norm of communication within the community. This is further supported by the practices of our Albanophone informants from Palasa, which we did not discuss here, as they had learned some Greek from the Grecophones of the village, and they engaged in similar language mixing, albeit to a lesser extent.

6. Conclusions

In this chapter we have shown the interconnected nature of the linguistic systems of multilingual and multidialectal individuals. This interconnectedness contrasts with the individuals' overt ideological statements on the distinctiveness of the linguistic codes available to them, as shown by labels like *vulgare* or the existence of names for different varieties. Thus, there is a mismatch between aspects of their ideology and aspects of their linguistic practices.

There seems to be a different type of "language mixing" in place here. The evidence points to no sharp boundaries between the language varieties, with "mixing", i.e. our "hybridization", taking place at all levels and in all components of grammar. Thus, if it is a "mixed language", Palasiotika is different from one like Michif, with French nouns and Cree verbs (Bakker 1997) and Media Lengua, with Spanish vocabulary and Quechua grammar (Muysken 1997). In these better-known mixed languages, the division of labor between the two languages is more discrete in terms of their respective contributions to the resultant mix. The hybridization observed in Palasa, however, points to bidirectional mixing at almost all levels of linguistic analysis and no clearly defined roles in the contribution of each code.

Mixing of this type is reminiscent of the view of bilingual and multilingual language production withing the framework of translanguaging. Language education researchers who subscribe to this view see the codes that make up the repertoire of multilinguals as not being distinct, but rather as constituting one single repertoire similar to that shown by individuals considered to be monolingual (e.g., MacSwan 2017, Vogel & Garcia 2017). The only difference between monolinguals and multilinguals is that the linguistic repertoires and the social norms about the use of this repertoire for the latter are much more complex (Vogel & Garcia 2017). Such approaches have broader psycholinguistic implications about the storage of linguistic information and the extent of its compartmentalization in the brain of bilinguals

and multilinguals. Such questions and implications go beyond the scope of this chapter, though they deserve mention at least in passing; exploring them, however, should be left to the more psycholinguistically-inclined researchers.

Reference list

Adamou, E. (2010). Bilingual speech and language ecology in Greek Thrace: Romani and Pomak in contact with Turkish. *Language in Society, 39*(2), 147-171.

Auer, P. (1999). From code-switching via language mixing to fused lects: Towards a dynamic typology of bilingual speech. *International Journal of Bilingualism, 3*(4), 309-332.

Bakker, P. (1997). *"A Language of our Own": The Genesis of Michif, The Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Métis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bakker, P. (2003). Mixed languages as autonomous systems. In Y. Matras & P. Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*. London & New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 107-150.

Barnes, S. (2018). Copula variation in Asturian Spanish and the multidimensionality of stancetaking in interaction. *Journal of SocioLinguistics, 22*(1), 29–54.

Brown, C. G. & Joseph, B. D. (2015). On hybrid forms in language contact: Some evidence from the Greek of Southern Albania. *Albanohellenica*, 6, 1-8.

Chairetakis, G. (2019). Turkish Loanwords and Loanblends in Cretan Dialect: Strategies and Patterns. In A. Balas, S. Giannopoulou, & A. Zagoura (eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th Patras International Conference of Graduate students in Linguistics (PICGL5, Patras, May 27-29, 2018)*, 74-91. Patras: Department of Linguistics, University of Patras (https://13090d2d-5e38-4d98-93e7-47a01aa1c4b4.filesusr.com/ugd/69b6b1_13334a5abde14258abecb06fa588cc3e.pdf)

Dreyfuss, G. R., & Oka, D. (1979). Chinese Indonesian: A New Kind of Language Hybrid? *Papers in Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*, 2.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2000). The tortoise and the hare: Distinguishing processes and end-products in language contact. *Billingualism: Language and Cognition, 3*(2), 112-114.

Janse, M. & Daveloose, E. (2021). Gender, definitiveness, and word order in ULAĞAÇ Cappadocian. Paper presented at 9th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, 4-6 June 2021.

Joseph, B. D., Ndoci, R., & Dickerson, C. (2019) Language mixing in Palasa. *Journal of Greek Linguistics, 19*(2), 227–243. https://doi.org/10.1163/15699846-01902002.

Joseph, B. D., Novik, A., Sobolev, A., & Spiro, A. (2019). Greek and Albanian in Palasa and environs: A report from the field. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistics Theory*. Patras: University of Patras. 69-78.

King, S. (2020). From African American Vernacular English to African American Language: Rethinking the study of race and language in African Americans' speech. *Annual Review of Linguistics, 6*. 285 – 300. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011619-030556.

Kroskrity, P. V. (2004). Language ideologies. In A. Duranti (ed.). *Agency in Language: A Companion to Linguistic Anthropology*. Blackwell Publishing. 496-517.

Kyriazis D. K. & Spirou, A. (2011). The Greek varieties of Albania [Τα ελληνικά γλωσσικά ιδιώματα της Αλβανίας]. *Modern Greek Dialectology* [Νεοελληνική Διαλεκτολογία], 6, 175 – 194.

Kyriazis, D. K. (2007). Η σχέση του ελληνικού γλωσσικού ιδιώματος της Χιμάρας με τα άλλα νεοελληνικά ιδιώματα [The relationship of the Greek variety of Himara with other Modern Greek varieties]. *Proceedings of the 27th Working Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, School of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki*. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies, 198 – 209.

Kyriazis, D. K. (2019). Διατοπικότητα και διαχρονικότητα των νεοελληνικών γλωσσικών ιδιωμάτων της νότιας Αλβανίας [Interlocality and diachrony of the Modern Greek local varieties of South Albania]. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistics Theory*. Patras: University of Patras, 103-132.

Labov, W. (1963) The social motivation of a sound change, *Word*, *19*(3), 273-309, https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1963.11659799.

Lewin, C. (2021). Continuity and hybridity in language revival: The case of Manx. *Language in Society*, 1-29. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404521000580.

Lippi-Green, R. (1994). Accent, standard language ideology, and discriminatory pretext in the courts. *Language in Society*, *23*(2), 163-198.

LKNon-line = Triandafillidis Foundation 1998. *Λεξικό της κοινής νεοελληνικής*. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Manolis Triandafillidis Foundation). <https://www.greek-language.gr/greekLang/modern_greek/tools/lexica/triantafyllides/index.html>

MacSwan J. (2017) A Multilingual Perspective on Translanguaging. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(1), 167-201. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216683935.

Matras, Y. (2007). The borrowability of structural categories. In Y. Matras & J. Sakel (eds), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Survey*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

McConnell-Ginet, S. (2020). *Words Matter: Meaning and Power*. New York & Melbourne: Cambridge University Press.

McGowan, K. (2016). Sounding Chinese and listening Chinese: Awareness and knowledge in the laboratory. In A. Babel (ed.) *Awareness and Control in Sociolinguistic Research*. Cambridge University Press. 25 – 61. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139680448.004

Milroy, J. & Milroy, L. (1992). *Authority in Language: Investigating Language Prescription and Standardization*. London: Routledge.

Muysken, P. (1997). Media Lengua. In S. G. Thomason (ed.) *Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective*, pp. 365-426.

Ndoci, R. & Joseph, B. Forthcoming. Phonological Hybridization in Language Contact. Unpublished Ohio State University ms.

Poliou, O. & Sulaj, M. (2019). Τα χαρακτηριστικά της γλώσσας της εφημερίδας «Λαϊκό Βήμα» της Εθνικής Ελληνικής Μειονότητας στην Αλβανία κατά τη χρονική περίοδο 1945 – 1991 [The features of the language of the newspaper "Laiko Vima" of the Ethnic Greek Minority in Albanian during the 1945-1991 period]. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistics Theory*. Patras: University of Patras. 259-272.

Ramos-Pellicia, Michelle. 2009. *Language contact and dialect contact: cross-generational phonological variation in a Puerto Rican community in the Midwest of the United States.* Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag.

Rodou, A., Tserpes, G., & Gezos, C. A. (2019). Το ιδίωμα της Χιμάρας: Όψεις στην κοινωνία και τη λογοτεχνία [The Himara local variety: Social and literary perspectives]. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistics Theory*. Patras: University of Patras. 303-309.

Rodríguez-Ordóñez, I. (2019). The role of linguistic ideologies in language contact situations. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 13,* 1-26.

Schaengold, C. (2004). *Bilingual Navajo: Mixed Codes, Bilingualism and Language Maintenance*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University.

Smith, N. (2000). Symbiotic mixed languages: A question of terminology. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, *3*(2), 122–123.

Sobolev, A. N. (2021). Symbiosis suspectus: Palasa in Himara, Albania. In A. N. Sobolev (ed.) *Between Separation and Symbiosis: South Eastern European Languages and Cultures in Contact*. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. 135-156. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501509254-005

Spirou, A. (2019). Νεωτεριστικοί ρηματικοί χρόνοι της υποδιαλέκτου Χιμάρας σε περιβάλλον διαγλωσσικής επαφής [Innovative verb tenses of the Himara subdialect in a language contact environment]. *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistics Theory*. Patras: University of Patras. 311-324.

Thomason, S. G. (1995). Language mixture: Ordinary processes, extraordinary results. In C. Silva-Corvalan (ed.), *Spanish in Four Continents: Studies in Language Contact and Bilingualism*. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press. 15 – 34.

Thomason, S. G. (1997). A typology of contact languages. In A. K. Spears & D. Winford (eds.), *The Structure and Status of Pidgins and Creoles*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 71 – 88.

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language Contact: An Introduction.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, S. G. (2003). Social factors and linguistic processes in the emergence of stable mixed languages. In Y. Matras & P. Bakker (eds.), *The Mixed Language Debate: Theoretical and Empirical Advances*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 21–40.

Trudgill, P. (2002). Ausbau sociolinguistics identity in Greece. In *Sociolinguistic Variation and Change*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 125-136.

Vogel, S. & García, O. (2017) Translanguaging. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.181.

Winford, D. (2003). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing.

Zuckermann, G. (2009). Hybridity versus revivability: Multiple causation, forms and patterns. *Journal of Language Contact, 2*(2), 40-67.