



Loan verbs adaptation in Pontic Greek (spoken in Georgia)

Svetlana Berikashvili



Outline

- Introduction
- Loan-verbs from Russian
- Loan-verbs from Turkish
- Conclusions



Introduction

The paper presents

- an empirical study on cross-linguistic influence of contact languages (Turkish and Russian) regarding the process of verb transference (including loanwords and loan blends) in Pontic Greek, as spoken in Georgia;
- accommodation strategies of loan verbs, following the classification of Wichman & Wohlgemuth (2008) and the Loan Verb Integration Hierarchy proposed by Wohlgemuth (2009); the morphological integration of verbs originating in concatenative language (i.e. Turkish) with verbs originating in non-concatenative language (i.e. Russian).



Introduction

Contact languages:

- with concatenative morphology (Turkish);
- with non-concatenative morphology (Russian)

Multimedia corpus, uploaded to the TLA archive;

- Semi-spontaneous speech and Narratives on the different (8) topics;
- Quantity of analyzed data: The average word count per speaker is 936 words, 57 informants



Introduction

- “nouns > adjectives > **verbs** > prepositions > coordinating conjunctions > quantifiers > determiners > free pronouns > clitic pronouns > subordinating conjunctions” (Muysken 1981: 181)
- “The most general constraint involves the well-known ‘hierarchy of borrowability’ according to which open-class content items like nouns and adjectives lend themselves most easily to borrowing, while close-class function items like pronouns and conjunctions are least likely to be adopted.” (Winford 2003: 51)
- “nouns, conjunctions > **verbs** > discourse markers > adjectives > interjections > adverbs > other particles, adpositions > numerals > pronouns > derivational affixes > inflectional affixes” (Matras 2007: 61-62)



Introduction

- “The restriction is that the class of borrowed constituents in a language does not include lexically homolingual constituents that are verbs in both languages [...]. The more specific claim to be advanced is that borrowed verbs, by internal syntactic composition, are (at least) bimorphemic and that they are bilingual, consisting of a generic verb constituent whose form is indigenous, and of a more specific nominal constituent whose phonetic form corresponds, by identity or similarity, to the phonetic form of the source verb.”

(Moravcsik 1975: 4)



Introduction

Main Accommodation Strategies of the Loan Verbs

- Light Verb Strategy (LVS);
- Indirect Insertion (IndI);
- Direct Insertion (DI);
- Paradigm Insertion (PI).



Introduction

Different Incorporation Strategies

- Turkish: Indirect Insertion
- Russian: Light Verb Strategy



Introduction

Loan Verb Integration Hierarchy

LVS → IndI → DI → ParI

(Wohlgemuth 2009)



Introduction

Two main questions

- Do the languages of distinct morphological typology affect each other in the transference process?
- Why the different donor languages (immediate donor languages) involved in the borrowing chose different accommodation strategies?



Introduction

- Besides that the main strategy for Russian loan verbs is LVS (75% of attested lexemes), there are examples of code-switches and nonce-borrowings which can be regarded as Direct Insertion examples, these are bare forms without any formal adaptation
- LVS is somehow problematic, as from one point of view it can be regarded as a case of Direct Insertion, because “there is no further verbalizing derivation and the replica itself is treated like a native stem” (Wohlgemuth 2009: 116), from other - unadapted loan verb into complex predicate looks like a pattern of code-switch.



Introduction

Terms used

- **acomodation** – all process required in the receipient language to make a loan verb fully functional, including that of attaching inflectional morphology, assigning valency to loan verb etc.;
- **adaptation** – a subset of the acomodation process, namely those where the borrowed element is actually formally adapted by morphosyntactic means

The markers of infinitive or inflection do not count as an instance of loan verb **adaptation**, since they are obligatory applied to all (verbal) stems, native or borrowed.

Loan-verbs from Turkish

Turkish: Indirect Insertion

Replica Form	Model Form	Attested Form
araévo 'search'	<i>aramak</i>	<i>araévume, erä´evan, eráevane, eráepsan, arä´pson</i> <i>chatévume, chatévne, echátepsen</i>
chatévo 'meet'	<i>çatmak</i>	<i>echiläzan</i>
chilä´zo 'cover'	<i>çul</i>	<i>yanévts, yanévs, yanév, yanéf, yanévne, eyáneva, eyánevan, eyánevnane, eyánepsa, eyánepse(n), yanéps</i>
yanévo 'understand'	<i>kanmak</i>	<i>yanévts, yanévs, yanév, yanéf, yanévne, eyáneva, eyánevan, eyánevnane, eyánepsa, eyánepse(n), yanéps</i>
yavurévo 'roast'	<i>kaurmak</i>	<i>yavurévumen</i>
yazanévo 'earn money'	<i>kazanmak</i>	<i>yazánepsane</i>
yuévo 'spare'	<i>kıymak</i>	<i>yuévo, yiévo</i>
yunushévo 'talk'	<i>konusmak</i>	<i>yunushévume</i>
yurévo 'set'	<i>kurmak</i>	<i>yurévum, yureéftan</i>
yurtarévo 'save'	<i>kurtarmak</i>	<i>yurtarévne, eyurtärepsa</i>
ijévo 'reconcile, suit'	<i>uymak</i>	<i>Ijëpsane</i>
kalachévo 'talk'	<i>keleç</i>	<i>kalachévo, kalachévs, kalachéps, kalachév, kalachévum(e), kalachévumes, kalachévun(e), kalachévne, ekaláchev(n)a, kalácheva, ekalácheves, kalachévnen, ekalácheve(n), kaláchevame, ekaláchevame(n), ekaláchevames, ekaláchevan(e), kaláchevan, (e)kaláchepsa, kaláchepsen, ekaláchepse, ekaláchepsan, kaláchepson</i>
kochévo 'migrate'	<i>köç itmek</i>	<i>kochévo, ekúchepsan</i>
lelévo 'rejoice'	<i>lale</i>	<i>lelévo</i>
tayutévo 'disperse'	<i>dağetmak</i>	<i>tayutéftikan</i>
tämizlä´vo 'clean'	<i>temiz</i>	<i>tämizlä´vo</i>
toplaévo 'gather'	<i>toplamak</i>	<i>topläéfkundane, etoplápsamen, etoplanéfkundan</i>
xaraplä´vo 'destroy'	<i>harab</i>	<i>exaraplä´fte</i>
xatévo 'chase'	<i>katmak</i>	<i>xatévne, (e)xátepsan</i>



Loan-verbs from Turkish

Loan Verb Integration Hierarchy

LVS → IndI → DI → ParI



Loan-verbs from Turkish

IndI:

Present Tense Stem + verbalizer *-ev-* + TAM
and Person markers

e.g.

Model Form	Present Tense Stem + Verbalizer	Replica Form in PG
<i>konuşmak</i> 'to speak'	<i>konuş+ev</i>	<i>yunushévo</i>



Loan-verbs from Turkish

- (1) *ayapó* *na értan* *s-o*
love:1.SG to come:3.PL LOC -DEF:N.SG.NGEN
V C V P -D
- spíti=m* *itonáðes*
house:N.SG.NGEN =CL.1.SG:GEN neighbour:M.PL.NGEN
N =CL N
- na káθumes* *na yunushévume*
to sit:1.PL to talk:1.PL **TURKISH**
C V C V
- 'I like when my neighbours come to me, we sit and talk together'



SG derivational suffixes for verbs

- *-év-*, *-íz-*, *-(i)áz-*, *-ón-*, *-én-*, *-ár-*

	<i>-íz-</i>	<i>-(i)áz-</i>	<i>-ón-</i>	<i>-év-</i>	<i>-én-</i>
Resultative	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Inchoative	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Ornative	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Locative	✓	✓	✓	✓	
Performative	✓	✓		✓	
Similative	✓	✓		✓	
Instrumental	✓	✓	✓	✓	

(Efthymiou 2011)



Derivational suffix *-ev-*

(MG)

jítonas – jítonevo (neighbour – to be neighbour) N

kalíteros – kaliterévo (better – to become better) A

kontá – kontévo (close – to become closer) Adv

(PG)

nätos – nätévo (tillage – till, cultivate) N

sostós – sostévo (right – set right) A

aryá – aryévo (lately – to be late) Adv



Loan verbs from Turkish

- 'For the most part verbs were not borrowed. Those that were were standardly formed by the addition of the productive *-ízo* to the Turkish past tense stem formed with the suffix *-di-* (with vowel harmony), e.g. *kavur-mak* 'to roast', past tense stem *kavur-du-* producing Greek *kavurđízo*'.

(Horrocks 2010: 380)

Model Form	Past Tense Stem + Verbalizer <i>-iz-</i>	Replica Form in SG	Present Tense Stem + Verbalizer <i>-ev-</i>	Replica Form in PG
<i>ka(v)urmak</i> 'to roast'	<i>kavur-du-iz</i>	<i>kavurđízo</i>	<i>kavur-ev</i>	<i>yavurévo</i>



Loan-verbs from Turkish

"...the exclusive use of *-iz-* is due to a certain phonological similarity between the past tense stem in Turkish and that of the Greek verbs in *-iz-*, since both types end in /i/."

(Ralli 2009: 14)

(2)	<i>ḏíi</i>	<i>méres</i>	<i>prin</i>	<i>tí</i>	<i>panajían</i>
	two	day:F.PL.NGEN	before	DEF:F.SG.ACC	mother_of_god:F.SG.ACC
	Q	N	ADV	D	N
	<i>etimáumes</i>	<i>majirévume</i>	<i>ylíkízmata</i>	<i>yavurévumen</i>	
	prepare:1.PL	cook:1.PL	sweets:N.PL.NGEN	roast:1.PL	TURKISH
	V	V	N	V	

[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-FE-00000-A16]



Loan-verbs from Turkish

- Verbs with two verbalizers: verbalizer of Turkish language *-la-* (see Kornfilt 1997: 453, Göksel and Kerlake 2005: 56 etc.), verbalizer of Pontic *-év-*

Replica Form	Nominal Stem + Turkish Verbalizer + Pontic Verbalizer	Replica Form	Nominal Stem + Turkish Verbalizer + Pontic Verbalizer
<i>tämizlä 'vo</i> 'to clean'	<i>temiz-la-ev</i>	<i>xaraplä 'vo</i> 'to destroy'	<i>harab-la-ev</i>



Loan-verbs from Turkish

- (3) *polá exaraplä´fte*
much deteriorate:MEDP.PFV.PST:3.SG **TURKISH**
ADV V
i zoí
DEF:F.SG.NOM life:F.SG.NGEN
D N
'The life deteriorated a lot'

[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-PP-00000-A03]



Loan-verbs from Turkish

- PRS

(4)	<i>emís</i>	<i>kalachévume</i>	<i>yeoryianiká</i>	
	1:PL.NOM	talk:1.PL <small>TURKISH</small>	Georgian:N.PL.NGEN	
	PN	V	A	
	<i>ke</i>	<i>ksérume</i>	<i>ke</i> <i>rúsika</i>	
	and	know:1.PL	and	Russian:N.PL.NGEN
	C	V	C	A
	'We speak Georgian and we know Russian as well'			
	[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-PP-00000-B01]			



Loan-verbs from Turkish

- IPFV.PST

(5)

eraévane

search:IPFV.PST:3.PL **TURKISH**

V

'they were searching for forest'

meshán

forest:F.SG.ACC

N

[Berikashvili 2016:PNT-TXT-AN-00000-B03]



Loan-verbs from Turkish

- PFV.PST

(6)	<i>ke</i>	<i>eráepsan</i>		<i>mástora</i>
	and	search:PFV.PST:3.PL	TURKISH	craftsman:M.SG.NNOM
	C	V		N
	<i>na</i>	<i>xtízi</i>	<i>to</i>	
	to	build:3.SG	that	
	C	V	PN	
	'They were searching for craftsman to build it'			

[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-C1-00000-B03]



Loan-verbs from Turkish

- SBJV

(7)	<i>eyó</i>	<i>ayapó</i>	<i>na tæmizljávo</i>
	1:SG.NOM	love:1.SG	to clean:1.SG <small>TURKISH</small>
	PN	V	C V
	<i>ayapó</i>	<i>na ðulévo</i>	
	love:1.SG	to work:1.SG	
	V	C V	
	'I love to clean, I love to work'		



Loan-verbs from Turkish

- Conclusion

Turkish uses indirect insertion strategy, which means that “an affix is usually required in order for the verb to inflect according to the inflectional pattern of the recipient” (Wichman & Wohlgemuth 2008: 97). In case of PG that affix is *-év-*, added to the stem of the verb (Present stem) and then inflectional affixes (TAM and person markers), characteristic to Pontic Greek.



Loan-verbs from Turkish

Further question: Why there is the exclusive use of the verbalizer *-ev-* in verbal loanblends?

Some observations:

- It is the most productive suffix in verbal derivation denoting that verb is derived from verb. Even in the cases of denominal derivation of Turkish verbs with the foreign verbalizer, PG still uses the native verbal structural element to indicate that this word is borrowed from verb and not nominal;
- During the transference process the verb is treated as non-verb, not noun exactly, but a neutral lexeme, so it has to be verbalized and moreover, to indicate that state turns into process, with resultative meaning, i.e. the meaning that can be applied by suffix *-év-*;
- While accommodating Turkish verbs in Pontic *-év-* verbalizer produces mostly transitive verbs, just like its Turkish counterpart used also in loan-verbs integrated into Pontic.

Loan-verbs from Russian

Russian: Light Verb Strategy, Direct Insertion

Replica Form	Model Form	Attested Form
<i>adyxát</i> 'rest'	<i>otdyxat'</i>	<i>adyxát', atdixáyut</i>
<i>astavátsia</i> 'remain'	<i>ostovat'sya</i>	<i>astális'</i>
<i>asvabadít'</i> 'release'	<i>osvobodít'</i>	<i>asvabadíli</i>
<i>atmechát'</i> 'hote, celebrate'	<i>otmechat'</i>	<i>atmichát', atmechát'</i>
<i>atvechát'</i> 'answer'	<i>otvechat'</i>	<i>atvecháyu</i>
<i>aznachát'</i> 'mean'	<i>oznachat'</i>	<i>aznachát', znáchit</i>
<i>byt</i> 'be'	<i>byt'</i>	<i>byt', est', búdesh, búdet, byl, bylá, býlo, býla, býli</i>
<i>chtít'</i> 'honour'	<i>chtit'</i>	<i>chtim</i>
<i>éxat'</i> 'go by car'	<i>exat'</i>	<i>poédet</i>
<i>gavarít'</i> 'say'	<i>govorit'</i>	<i>gavaryát, gavarítsa, skazát'</i>
<i>gulyát'</i> 'walk'	<i>gulyat'</i>	<i>gulyát', gulyáyut</i>
<i>imét'</i> 'have'	<i>imet'</i>	<i>iméyut</i>
<i>interesovát'</i> 'interest'	<i>interesovat'</i>	<i>interesovát'</i>
<i>kazát'sya</i> 'beam'	<i>kazat'sya</i>	<i>kázhetsa</i>
<i>moch'</i> 'can'	<i>moch'</i>	<i>mózhet</i>
<i>nachínát'</i> 'begin'	<i>nachinat'</i>	<i>nachináyu</i>
<i>padxadít'</i> 'fit'	<i>podxodít'</i>	<i>padxadíli</i>
<i>paluchát'</i> 'get'	<i>poluchat'</i>	<i>paluchíl</i>
<i>panimát'</i> 'understand'	<i>panimat'</i>	<i>panimáyut</i>
<i>perevodít'</i> 'translate'	<i>perevodít'</i>	<i>perevelí</i>
<i>pómnit'</i> 'remember'	<i>pomnit'</i>	<i>pómnyu</i>
<i>práznavat'</i> 'celebrate'	<i>prazdnovat'</i>	<i>práznavat</i>
<i>prinimát'</i> 'accept'	<i>prinimat'</i>	<i>prinimát'</i>
<i>privozít'</i> 'bring by car'	<i>privozit'</i>	<i>privezil'</i>
<i>priznavát'</i> 'recognize'	<i>priznavat'</i>	<i>priznavát'</i>
<i>razlichát'</i> 'distinguish'	<i>razlichat'</i>	<i>razlichát'</i>
<i>rugát'</i> 'quarell'	<i>rugat'</i>	<i>rugáemsa</i>
<i>sazhát'</i> 'plant'	<i>sazhat'</i>	<i>sazhát'</i>
<i>skanchátsia</i> 'die'	<i>skonchat'sya</i>	<i>skanchálsia</i>
<i>spravlyát'</i> 'celebrate'	<i>spravlyat'</i>	<i>spravlyát'</i>
<i>spráshivat'</i> 'ask'	<i>sprashivat'</i>	<i>spráshivat'</i>
<i>stírat'</i> 'wash'	<i>stirat'</i>	<i>stírali</i>
<i>uchít'</i> 'teach'	<i>uchit'</i>	<i>uchít'</i>
<i>umírát'</i> 'die'	<i>umirat'</i>	<i>umíráli</i>
<i>uxodít'</i> 'go away'	<i>uxodít'</i>	<i>uxadí</i>
<i>varít'</i> 'boil'	<i>varit'</i>	<i>svaryú</i>
<i>varovát'</i> 'steal'	<i>vorovat'</i>	<i>varúem</i>
<i>véshat'</i> 'hang'	<i>veshat'</i>	<i>povésili</i>
<i>vinchátsa</i> 'get married in church'	<i>ven'chat'sya</i>	<i>vinchátsa</i>
<i>vklyuchát'</i> 'turn on'	<i>vklyuchat'</i>	<i>vklyuchít'</i>



Loan-verbs from Russian

(8) *travoďías* *ne* *pómnyu* *ya*
song:F.PL.NGEN NEG remember:1.SG_{RUSSIAN} 1.SG:NOMN
N PRT V PN

prósto *ne* *pómnyu* *ke*
simply NEG remember:1.SG_{RUSSIAN} and
ADV PRT V C

ďe *θimáme*
NEG remember:1.SG
PRT V

'I don't remember songs, just don't remember'.

[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-CL-00000-A14]



Loan-verbs from Russian

- Russian: loan-verbs in INF

(9)	<i>I</i>	<i>máma</i>	<i>ólts</i>
	DEF:F.SG.NOM	mother:F.SG.NGEN	all:M./F.PL.ACC
	D	N	PN
	<i>epínen</i>	<i>prinimát'</i>	
	make:IPFV.PST:3.SG	accept:IPFV.INF _{RUSSIAN}	
	V	V	
	'Mother accepted all'		

[Berikashvili 2016:PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B03]



Loan-verbs from Russian

- Russian: loan-verbs in 3.SG

(10)	<i>avúto</i>	<i>aéts</i>	<i>abaznacháet,</i>
	3:N.SG.NGEN	so	mean:3.Sg _{RUSSIAN}
	PN	Adv	V
	<i>akíno</i>	<i>aéts</i>	<i>abaznacháet</i>
	that:N.SG.NGEN	so	mean:3.SG _{RUSSIAN}
	PN	Adv	V

'this means this, and that means that'

[Skopeteas et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B02]



Loan-verbs from Russian

- Light Verb Construction

“Several languages prefer to apply an overt, morphological accommodation strategy when incorporating verbs of foreign origin into the lexicon. A favourite strategy is the use of so-called “light” verbs... mainly two light verbs are used, each combining with a root of nominal form of the borrowed verb... they usually derive from or are identical to the lexical verbs for ‘to make/to do’ and ‘to be/to become’.”

(Matras 2007: 47–48)



Loan-verbs from Russian

- Use of the light verb *evtáyo* (to make/to do)

(11) *esí* *pa* *kalá* *eftás*
2:SG.NOM too well make:2.SG
PN Adv Adv V

gatóvit'

cook:IPFV.INF_{RUSSIAN}

V

'You too cook well'

[Berikashvili 2016: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B03]



Loan-verbs from Russian

- Use of the light verb *evtáyo* (to make/to do)

(12) *endáman*
together

ADV

eftáme

make:1.PL

V

v ópshem

in general:M.SG.PREP

P A

íton

such:N.SG.NGEN celebrate:IPFV.INF

PN

práznavat

V

RUSSIAN

'We celebrate generally together'

[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-FE-00000-B08]



Loan-verbs from Russian

(13) *pelä 'vun* *eftáyne* *sazhát'* *ke*
cultivate:3.PL make:3.PL plant:IPFV.INF **RUSSIAN** and
V V V C
kartólia
potato:N.PL.NGEN
N

'They cultivate and plant potatoes.'

[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-PP-00000-A05]



Loan-verbs from Russian

(14) *ke*

and

C

atmechát'

note:IPFV.INF **RUSSIAN**

V

epíke

make:PFV.PST:3.SG

V

póte

when

ADV

éxtisan

build:PFV.PST:3.PL

V

'and noted when it was built.'

[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-FE-00000-A11]



Loan-verbs from Russian

Infinitive in Pontic

In comparison with the Modern Greek, Pontic Greek as assumed by the scholars (Revithiadou and Spyropoulos 2012, Sitaridou 2014a, 2014b) possesses the infinitive forms, though these forms are used in some varieties and are not regarded as a functional part of the dialect (Tombaidis 1988). In the process of borrowing verbs from Russian, Pontic uses the Russian infinitive form in the place, where according to Greek system (SG and PG) Subjunctive mood with *na* (to) is expected



Loan-verbs from Russian

(15)	<i>óndes</i>	<i>eylítosen</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>máθin</i>
	when	finish:PFV.PST:3.SG	DEF:N.SG.ACC	learn:INF
	ADV	V	D	V
	<i>érθen</i>		<i>s-o</i>	
	come:PFV.PST:3.SG		LOC-DEF:N.SG.NGEN	
	V		P-D	
	<i>xoríon</i>			
	village:N.SG.NGEN			
	N			

'After her graduations she came to the village.'

[Kotanidi et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B06]



Loan-verbs from Russian

● Use of Subjunctive Mood

(16)	<i>na</i>	<i>razlichát'</i>		<i>to</i>	
	to	distinguish:IPFV.INF _{RUSSIAN}		DEF:N.SG.NGEN	
	C	V		D	
	<i>rosikó</i>		<i>i</i>	<i>ylósa</i>	
	Russian:N.SG.NGEN		DEF:F.SG.NOM language:F.SG.NGEN		
	A		D	N	
	<i>íne</i>	<i>polí</i>	<i>ďiáfora</i>	<i>ap'</i>	<i>ta</i>
	be:3°	much	different:F.SG.NGEN	from	DEF:N.PL.NGEN
	V	Adv	A	P	D
	<i>Pondiaká</i>				
	Pontic:N.PL.NGEN				
	A				

'Russian language differs a lot from the Pontic Greek'



Loan-verbs from Russian

- Use as complement to modal verb *can/may*

(17) *ki poró atóra atvechát'*
NEG can:1.SG now answer:IPFV.INF_{RUSSIAN}
PRT V Adv V
'I can not answer right now'

[Skopeteas et al. 2016: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B01]



Loan-verbs from Russian

- Use as complement to modal verb *can/may*

(18)	<i>eyó</i>	<i>k=eporó</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>apandó</i>
	1:SG.NOM	NEG=can:1.SG	to	answer:1.SG
	PN	PRT=V	C	V
	'I can not answer'			

[Berikashvili 2016: PNT-TRA-SN-00000-B04]



Loan-verbs from Russian

cf. examples with native verbs and with Russian ones used with modals

<i>(19) prep</i>	<i>na</i>	<i>xorízne</i>	<i>to</i>
must:3.SG	to	divide:3.PL	DEF:N.SG.NGEN
V	C	V	D
<i>pondiakón</i>	<i>ás-o</i>	<i>elinikón</i>	
Pontic:N.SG.NGEN	from- DEF:N.SG.NGEN	Greek:N.SG.NGEN	
A	P-D	A	

'They must distinguish Pontic from Greek.'

[Berikashvili 2016: PNT-TRA-SN-2-000-B03]



Loan-verbs from Russian

cf. examples with native verbs and with Russian ones used with modals

(20) *emís*

1:PL.NOM

PN

spráshivat'

ask:IPFV.INF **RUSSIAN**

V

'We must not ask.'

ki=prep

NEG=must:3.SG

PRT=V

na

to

C

eftáme

make:1.PL PL

V

[Berikashvili 2016: PNT-TRA-SN-00000-B01]



Loan-verbs from Russian

Conclusion

- The observed data reflect a binary distinction with regards to use of Russian infinitives, namely:
 - a) a subset of infinitives used as DI in *na*-clauses (including the use as complements to modals) and,
 - b) a subset of infinitives used in LVS;
- the main strategy while borrowing Russian verbs is Light Verb Strategy using the verb *evtáyo* (to make/to do);
- there is no overt evidence what particular factor governs the choice of this strategy, possible explanation the degree of bilingualism.



Loan-verbs from Russian

Loan Verb Integration Hierarchy

LVS → IndI → DI → ParI



Conclusions

- (1) loan verbs are transferred using different strategies: Indirect Insertion for Turkish and Light Verb Strategy for Russian;
- (2) in both cases there is morphological adaptation, i.e. the borrowed element is formally adapted before using it as a verb;
- (3) the accommodation of verbs by IndI and LVS shows that these verbs are borrowed underspecified for part-of-speech membership;



Conclusions

- (3) PG, as language with “strong” affixation, avoids Direct Insertion in favour of LVS and IndI;
- (4) the availability of a morphological procedure to derive verbs from non-verbs in PG is applied only to the Turkish loans and not to the Russian ones;
- (5) the common strategy observed in nouns and verbs is for Russian: reinterpreting of simple forms according to the rules of Pontic; while for Turkish: formation of new forms using derivational affixes and morphological markers



Conclusions

Possible reasons of different strategies

- (1) Typological compatibility of donor and recipient language;
- (2) Complexity of the recipient language verbal morphology;
- (3) Sociolinguistic factors.



Conclusions

Possible reasons of different strategies in PG spoken in Georgia

- (1) the intuitive evaluation of the donor language as easy or difficult;
- (2) chronological factor;
- (3) degree of bilingualism.



Conclusions

Loan Verb Integration Hierarchy

LVS → IndI → DI → ParI



References

Data base resources:

- Berikashvili, Svetlana 2016, *Interviews in Pontic Greek* (Data collected, transcribed, and glossed by Svetlana Berikashvili). Bielefeld: Bielefeld University (Corpus Resource).
- Kotanidi, Evgenia, Svetlana Berikashvili, Stefanie Böhm and Johanna Lorenz, Stavros Skopeteas. 2016. Pontic data collection, Version 2.0 (data collected, transcribed, and translated by Evgenia Kotanidi; data glossed by Svetlana Berikashvili; supervised by Stefanie Böhm and Johanna Lorenz; corpus design by Stavros Skopeteas). Bielefeld: Bielefeld University (corpus resource: TLA, Donated Corpora, XTYP Lab).
- Skopeteas, Stavros & Svetlana Berikashvili 2016, *Interviews in Pontic Greek* (Data collection by Stavros Skopeteas, 2005; transcription and glossing by Svetlana Berikashvili, 2014). Bielefeld: Bielefeld University (Corpus Resource).

Bibliography:

- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2007. Typological distinctions in word-formation. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol. III: Grammatical categories and the lexicon, 1 –64. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Angelidis, Sokratis. 2003. *Greeks of Tbilisi*. Thessaloniki. /in Greek/



References

Bibliography:

- Berikashvili, Svetlana. 2016. Morphological Integration of Russian and Turkish nouns in Pontic Greek. In *STUF – Language Typology and Universals*. Vol. 69, Issue 2, 255–276. Berlin/Boston: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bickel, Balthasar & Johanna Nichols. 2007. Inflectional morphology. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*. Vol. III: Grammatical categories and the lexicon, 169–239. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Charitonidis, Charalampos. 2012. The interaction between affixes and bases: the case of the Greek verb suffixes. In *Selected Papers of the 10th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Komotini.
- Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of language contact. English and immigrant languages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Efthymiou, Angeliki. 2011. The semantics of verb forming suffixes in Modern Greek. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Symposium of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics*, 3–5 April 2009, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 174–184.
- Garakanidze, Irina. 2000. The history of migration of Greeks in Georgia (VIII–XX cc). In *Greeks in Georgia*, 28–71. Tbilisi: Logos. /in Georgian/



References

Bibliography:

- Göksel, Asil & Elia Kerlake. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. In *Language* 26, pp. 210–231.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greeks. A History of the Language and its Speakers*. Second edition. Oxford: Willey Blackwell Publishing.
- Joseph, Bryan. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive*. A study in Areal, General and Historical Linguistics. CUP, Cambridge.
- Kaukhchishvili, Simon. 1942. The history of Greek settlement in Georgia. Works of the A. Tsulukidze Kutaisi State Pedagogical Institute IV. 219–239. /in Georgian/
- Kaukhchishvili, Simon. 1946. The history of Greek settlement in Georgia. Works of the A. Tsulukidze Kutaisi State Pedagogical Institute VI. 125–153. /in Georgian/
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Matras, Yaron. 2007. The borrowability of structural categories. In Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective*, pp. 31–74. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron. 2009. *Language Contact*. New York: Cambridge University Press.



References

Bibliography:

- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Dueling languages: Grammatical structure in code-switching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2006. *Multiple Voices. An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1975. Verb borrowing. In *Linguistische Gazette* 8, 3–30.
- Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. Language contact. In Greenberg, Joseph Harold (ed.): *Universals of Human Language*. Vol. 1. Method and Theory. Stanford: Stanford University Press. 93–122.
- Muysken, Pieter. 1981. Creole tense / mood / aspect systems: the unmarked case? In Muysken, Peter (ed.), *Generative Studies on Creole Languages*, pp. 181–199. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Muysken, Pieter. 2000. *Bilingual Speech. A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge etc.: Cambridge University Press.
- Oikodomidis, Dimosthenis. 1958. *Grammar of Greek Dialect in Pontos*. Lexicographic Newsletter, Appendix 1. Athens: Academy of Athens. /in Greek/
- Ozhegov, Sergey. 1968. *Dictionary of Russian Language*. Moscow: State Publishing of Foreign and National Dictionaries. /in Russian/



References

Bibliography:

- Papadopoulos, Anthimos. 1955. *Historical Grammar of Pontic Greek*. Journal Archive of Pontos, Appendix 1. Athens: Commission of Pontic Studies. /in Greek/
- Poplack, Shana. 1980. Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching. *Linguistics* 18, pp. 581–618.
- Poplack, Shana, Sankoff, David & Miller, Christopher. 1988. The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. In *Linguistics* 16, pp. 47–104.
- Ralli, Angela. 2009. Morphology in language contact: verbal loanblend formation in Asia Minor Greek (Aivaliot). In Stolz, Thomas, Martine Vanhove, Histomi Otsuka & Aina Urdze (eds.), *Morphologies in contact* (Studia Typologica), pp. 1–18. Berlin: Akademik Verlag.
- Ralli, Angela. 2012. Morphology. Athens: Pataki. /in Greek/
- Revithiadou, Anthi & Vassilios Spyropoulos. 2012. *Ofitika: Aspects of Grammatical Structure of Pontic Dialect*. Athens: Publishing House of Brothers Kiriakidi. /in Greek/
- Sideri, Eleni. 2006. *The Greeks of the Former Soviet Republic of Georgia*. PhD Dissertation. University of London.
- Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2011. Variation in complementation strategies in Greek: The polarity sensitive Romeyka infinitive. University of Cambridge, Queens' College & Princeton University.



References

Bibliography:

- Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2014a. The Romeyka infinitive Continuity, contact and change in the Hellenic varieties of Pontus. In *Diachronica 31:1*, pp. 23–73. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2014b. Modality, antiveridicality and complementation: The Romeyka infinitive as a negative polarity item. In *Lingua 148*, pp. 118–146.
- Shvedova, Natalia. (eds.) 1980. *Russian Grammar*. Vol. 1. Moscow: Publishing House Nauka. /in Russian/
- Thomason, Sarah. 2001. *Language contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tombaidis, Dimitris. 1988. *Pontic Dialect. Dialectic Characteristics, Classification and Texts*. Journal *Archive of Pontos*, Appendix 17. Athens: Commission for Pontic Studies. /in Greek/
- Triandaphyllidis, Manolis. 2002. *Modern Greek Grammar (of Dimotiki)*. Reprint of the 1941 edition. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Institute of Modern Greek Studies, Manolis Triandaphyllidis Foundation. /in Greek/



References

Bibliography:

- Wichman, Sören & Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2008. Loan verbs in a typological perspective. In Stolz, Thomas, Dick Bakker & Rosa Salas Palomo (eds.), *Aspects of language contact. New theoretical, methodological and empirical findings with special focus on Romanisation processes*, pp. 89–121. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Winford, Donald. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Wohlgemuth, Jan. 2009. *Typology of verbal borrowings*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Xanthopoulou-Kyriakou, Artemis. 1997. Migration of Greeks from Pontos to Caucasian countries (1829 – beginnings of 20th century). In Ioanis Khasiotis (ed.) *Greeks from Russia and Soviet Union. Migration and expatriation. Organization and Ideology*, 85–127. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press. /in Greek/