LANGUAGE TYPOLOGY AND UNIVERSALS

STUF – SPRACHTYPOLOGIE UND UNIVERSALIENFORSCHUNG

MIX
Paper from
responsible sources
FSC
www.fsc.org   FSC® C107500

Svetlana Berikashvili*

Morphological integration of Russian and Turkish nouns in Pontic Greek

Abstract: This article presents an empirical study on morphological integration of borrowed nouns in Pontic Greek. The data have been elicited from a corpus drawn from original fieldwork in Georgia. The aim of the paper was to identify whether there was an advantage associated with borrowing between languages of the same morphological type, i. e. non-concatenative (Russian) to non-concatenative (Pontic Greek). However, the research revealed that the phonological form of the loanword is decisive for the integration of Russian and Turkish nouns into PG, and not the morphological type. Additionally, we discuss some strategies of transfer which reveal the interaction between languages of different morphological types.

Keywords: Pontic Greek, transference, loan nouns, morphological integration, gender, number, case

1 Introduction

Pontic is a dialect of Greek. It was widespread in the region of Pontos, Asia Minor, until the beginning of the twentieth century, when Pontic Greeks were forced to leave their homeland as refugees to a number of different regions. It belongs to the Anatolian group of Greek dialects, together with such dialects as Cappadocian, Farasiot, Greek-Crimean (spoken in Mariupolis of the Ukraine) and dialects of Sili and Lycaonia (Revithiadou and Spyropoulos 2009: 17).

There are several stages of the migration of Pontic Greeks to Georgia. The majority of Greek villages in Georgia were settled during the nineteenth century (Kaukhchishvili 1942, 1946; Garakanidze 2000; Xanthopoulou-Kyriakou 1997 etc.); however, historians also mention earlier waves of migration. Greeks who live in Georgia belong to two main groups: Urum speakers and Pontic Greeks. In most of the historical sources, both Urum and Pontic Greek speakers are referred

*Corresponding author: Svetlana Berikashvili, Department of Modern Greek Studies, Faculty of Humanities, Institute of Classical, Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies, Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, 13 Chavchavadze Ave., 0179 Tbilisi, Georgia, E-mail: svetlana.berikashvili@tsu.ge

to by the same name: Greeks. Both emigrated from Turkey to Georgia, though they came from different regions, and their numbers total approximately 15,200 people (2002 census).

The original settlements of Pontic Greek speakers are in the regions of Tetritskaro, Dmanisi and Borjomi, and there are also some villages in the region of Tsalka, and some settlements in Adjara and in Abkhazia.

Pontic Greeks in Georgia speak a conservative variety of Greek that maintains some properties of Ancient and Middle Greek, and many embedded elements from different languages; namely, Turkish, Russian, Georgian and Standard Greek.

Linguistic borrowing from one language into another can be described from different perspectives. Thus, there are different levels of loanword usage: the level of phonological integration, morphological integration, and lexical integration. In this paper, the research subject is the morphological integration of Russian and Turkish nouns into the Pontic Greek (PG) spoken in Georgia.

As it is generally assumed, "open-class content items like nouns and adjectives lend themselves most easily to borrowing" (Winford 2003: 51), and that morphological complexity blocks transfer; as a result, the borrowing of verbs – which have high morphological complexity – tend to be rare (Myers-Scotton 2006: 229). Based on the existing hierarchies of borrowed words (see Muysken 1981: 181–199; Winford 2003: 51; Matras 2007: 61–62), we have chosen noun integration, because noun borrowings are more frequent, a fact which is also mirrored in our corpus.

The study is relevant because it presents data on an understudied variety of the Pontic dialect (as currently spoken in Georgia). Alongside the relevance of the description of PG, the issue of the typological distinction between languages with concatenative and non-concatenative morphology is important for understanding morphological integration.

Looking at the morphology of the embedded languages, Russian is a language with non-concatenative morphology, while Turkish is an example of a language of the concatenative type. The hallmark of concatenation is that formatives are readily segmentable (Bickel and Nichols 2007: 181); there is typically a one-to-one correspondence between a morpheme and its meaning, while languages with non-concatenative morphology (i. e. fusional) draw no clear boundary between morphemes. Thus, semantically distinct features are usually merged in a single bound form (Aikhenvald 2007: 4). PG is also a non-concatenative language; thus, the borrowing strategies from languages with different typological distinctions may lead to important generalizations. One of the general observations in language contact is that languages having the same morphological type facilitates the transfer of the words (see Clyne 2003,

Thomason 2001). From this point of view, the borrowing process should be easier from Russian to PG than from Turkish to PG. But is this really the case?

Thus, the study compares the morphological integration of words originating in concatenative languages with words originating in non-concatenative languages in order to reveal the role of the source language in transference phenomena.

The concept of *transference* is a cover term comprising borrowings, i. e. foreign elements of the lexicon of the Matrix Language (ML), and code-switches, i. e. elements of an embedded language (Clyne 2003: 72). The majority of Turkish and Russian words in PG are established borrowings, i. e. words already integrated into the lexicon of PG, while some Russian words are instances of code-switching, i. e. they are not yet established as part of the PG lexicon. These are singly-occurring embedded words (mostly nouns) that some researchers consider as a type of borrowing, but different from established borrowings. They could be called temporary borrowings (term used by Myers-Scotton 2006) or 'nonce' borrowings (term used by Poplack 1980); over time, they can become established borrowings, but at that moment there is every reason to consider them as instances of code-switching.

The criteria for distinguishing code-switches from borrowings are ambiguous, and there is no consensus on this issue among researchers. The main criteria as defined by Winford (2003: 107) include: (a) degree of use by monolingual speakers, and (b) degree of morphophonemic integration. The first criterion is not applicable in the case of Pontic Greeks in Georgia, as the most Pontic Greeks are (were) bilingual in Russian. The criterion of morphophonemic integration is also problematic, since, as outlined by Myers-Scotton (1993: 177–191), both borrowings and code-switches may or may not be morphologically and phonologically adapted to the ML. The only clear basis for distinguishing them is frequency of occurrence. Thus, the word *brat* – used by one of the informants – would typically be considered to be a code-switch because in the same environment, the native synonym is used by other informants and it occurs only once in a conversation. It also may not occur again though it's integrated momentarily in a syntactic environment, it is determined by the article, and behaves as neuter (that is evident by the choice of the neuter form of the definite article).

So, despite the difference between borrowings and code-switches, there is one commonality between established borrowings and Embedded Language (EL) words which allows us to compare this data.

> Both typically show morphological and syntactic integration into the Matrix Language (i.e. they both take Matrix Language inflections and function words and always follow Matrix Language word order). (Myers-Scotton 2006: 258)

This research is based on corpus data collected from native-speaking informants. The data were collected by Stavros Skopeteas in 2005, Svetlana

Berikashvili and Evgenia Kotanidi in 2014. A total of eight informants were recorded: The age range of native speakers was from 60 to 85, 5 women and three men, their places of residence were Tbilisi and Batumi. The texts contained the following topics: ancestors, family, village, culture, people, marriage, feast, language. The average word count per speaker is 936 words. The examples have been glossed according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

2 Morphological integration

Based on the corpus, we have elicited nouns of Russian and Turkish origin. The majority of them (40) are of Russian origin[1] (see Table 1), resulting from the fact that most Pontic Greeks in Georgia were bilingual in Russian.

Pontic speakers in Georgia are not bilingual in Turkish, i. e. Turkish words in their narratives cannot be the result of code-switching. These elements are inherited from the period that Pontic Greek was spoken in Turkey. A few words (6) originate from Turkish, see Table 2.

More recently, many words were transferred from Standard Greek (SG) and Georgian as well.

This paper deals with the integration of transfers into the inflectional categories of Pontic Greek nouns, which contains the categories of gender, case and number. Pontic Greek morphology is also characterized by such features as case syncretism in plural depending on [± human] distinction, metaplasm of the gender in the plural i. e. neuterization of non-human nouns and definiteness controlling certain aspects of nominal inflection.

The main criteria for measuring the degree of noun integration into PG can be defined as follows: a) assignment of inflectional class/case endings, b) gender assignment, and c) formation of plural forms. Metaplasm of gender and case syncretism can be regarded as additional criteria for morphological integration into PG.

The observed data reflect a binary distinction, namely: a) a subset of nouns that are integrated in the inflectional system: the evidence for that is that they are accompanied by inflectional suffixes, are assigned to one of the PG's three genders, and form plurals according to the rules of the ML; and b) a subset of nouns that are not integrated in the inflectional system: they are indeclinable, the gender of the NP can be defined by the use of the article, though the

---

1 Some nouns are international words, but were integrated into Pontic Greek via the Russian language.

Table 1: Words of Russian origin.

Russian word	Attested form	Russian word	Attested form
armiya 'army'	*ármia*	*khaladil'nik* 'refrigerator'	*xaladílnikon*
babushka 'grandmother'	*bábushka*	*kul'tura* 'culture/agriculture'	*kultúra*
bal'nitsa 'hospital'	*balnítsa*	*kushetka* 'couch'	*kushétkan*
bilet 'ticket'	*biléton*	*kvartira* 'flat, apartment'	*kvartíra*
brat 'brother'	*brat*	*literatura* 'literature'	*literatúran*
bukhanka 'brick'	*buxánka*	*malyariya* 'malaria'	*malaría*
chai 'tea'	*chai*	*mashina* 'car'	*mashína*
dacha 'cottage'	*dácha*	*pechka* 'oven'	*péshkos*
familia 'surname/family'	*famélia*	*pensiya* 'pension'	*pénsia*
	famélian	*pol* 'flour'	*pol*
	família	*pratsent* 'percent'	*pratsénta*
	famílian	*salfetka* 'napkin'	*salfétkas*
	famílias	*shapka* 'hat'	*shápkan*
frukt 'fruit'	*frúkta*	*slon* 'elephant'	*slon*
	frúktä	*saznanie* 'consciousness/mind'	*saznánien*
futbol 'football/ball'	*futból*	*stol* 'table'	*stol*
institut 'institute'	*institútin*		*stólia*
	institúti	*tekhnikum* 'technical school'	*téxnikum*
inzhiner 'engineer'	*inzhíneros*	*testo* 'dough, paste'	*tésto*
kanfeta 'candy/sweets'	*ka(n)féton*	*tsitrus* 'citrus'	*tsítrusä*
	kafétas	*tupitsa* 'stupid'	*tupítsa*
karalyok 'blood orange'	*karaliók*	*uspekh* 'success'	*uspéx*
kartofel' 'potato'	*kartóf*	*vodka* 'vodka'	*vódka*
	kartófä		*vódkan*
			vótkas
kasha 'hot cereal'	*káshan*	*vysylka* 'deportation'	*vísilkas*

Table 2: Words of Turkish origin.

Turkish word	Attested form	Turkish word	Attested form
diván 'divan/sofa'	*divan*	*maimún* 'monkey'	*maimún*
	diváni	*meshá* 'forest'	*meshán*
karaúli 'guard'	*karaúlia*		*mesháðes*
			mesháðas
konáki 'cabin'	*konákia*	*peshkír* 'hand/face towel'	*peshkír*

presence of the article is not evidence for morphological integration (any NP in Modern Greek (including Pontic) can be determined by the article). There are also some unclear cases, e. g. some nouns have no marker to indicate accusative, but this phenomenon could be the result of the phonological omission of the last -*n*, which is common to PG.

Most words in our corpus are integrated into the morphological patterns of the RL (in total: 27), see (1).

(1)   a. Words of Russian origin
biléton, chái, dácha, família, frúktä (PL), *inzhíneros, institútin, kaféton, kásha, kartóf, kushétka, khaladílnikon, literatúra, péshkon, pratsénton, salfétka, shápka, tsítrusä* (PL), *vódka, vísilka, stol*

      b. Words of Turkish origin
diváni, karaúlia (PL), *konáki, meshá, maimún, peshkír*

Another set of words (in total: 8) is not integrated to the inflectional paradigms, see (2).

(2)   Words of Russian origin
slon, téxnikum, karaliók, brat, saznánie, pol, futból, uspéx

Morphological integration is not clearly identifiable for feminine nouns ending in *-a*, because this is a possible form in PG (either in the nominative or in the accusative, since the final *-n* is not obligatory in PG; see Oikonomidis 1958: 113–119; Tombaidis 1988: 37–40).

(3)   Unclear cases: Words of Russian origin
ármia, bábushka, balnítsa, buxánka, kultúra, kvartíra, malaría, mashína, pénsia, tupítsa, tésto

The phonological process is crucial both in the unclear cases – where the last *-n* in accusative is omitted – and in the set of words which are not integrated, mostly those having null suffixes. In PG, the *-i* disappears (syncope) when it comes immediately after or before the stressed syllable, e. g. *xoráfin – xoráf' – xoráf'n* 'field'). This happens mostly to varieties of PG in the region of Trebizond (see Tombaidis 1988: 31–32). The same phenomenon can be observed in the case of the noun *stól(in) – stol' – stol'n* 'table'. Analogically, it could happen with non-integrated nouns, e. g. *slón(in) – slon' – slon'n* 'elephant', as Pontic has no restrictions on the occurrence of word-final consonants. However, this must still be empirically proven, since there is no evidence from the collected data; therefore, this assumption can be treated only as a hypothesis, and these words considered as instances of code-switching.

    Thus, there is a tendency for full integration of the transfers to the patterns of morphological system of PG. The possibilities of elision of final suffixes imply a limitation on integration, because for one subset of the observed nouns, there

is a Greek inflectional suffix, while for another subset of the observed nouns, there is no inflectional suffix, and still it cannot be excluded that a suffix may appear in other contexts.

2.1 Gender

There are three genders in PG: masculine, feminine and neuter. Gender of the foreign words is defined according to the rules of the dialect. Most borrowed words in PG are of Turkish origin, some borrowings come from Armenian, e. g. *mozín* 'calf', *malézin* 'flour soup', and fewer borrowings are from Russian, e. g. *stakánin* 'glass', *paraxótin* 'steamboat' (Papadopoulos 1955: 33). A major difference of the PG in Georgia is the frequent occurrence of transfers from Russian, which can be attributed to Pontic Greeks in Georgia being bilingual in Russian.

Borrowed words denoting inanimate entities and ending in a consonant in the Source Language (SL) are assigned the neuter gender, e. g. from Turkish *habar – xapár(in)* 'information', *tavan – taván(in)* 'ceiling' etc. or from Russian *kartofel – kartóf(in)* 'potatoes', *samavar – samavár(in)* 'samovar' [transcription and translation added] etc. (Papadopoulos 1955: 33–34). The ending *-in* is used to denote neuter gender in nouns and is very productive in PG. It is even called parasite *-in*, because – alongside its typical use – it is often added to the forms where it cannot be expected for metrical purposes (see Papadopoulos 1955: 22–23). So this element occurs frequently, and it seems natural to add it to the foreign words, especially when they denote inanimate entities, see (4).

(4) *na máθane   so*
     PRT study:IPFV.PST.SBJV.3SG in:DEF:N.SG.ACC
     institútin [...]
     institute:N.SG.NGEN_RUSSIAN
     'for studying at the <u>institute</u> [...]'
                               [Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B01]

As outlined by Dawkins (1916: 212), Modern Greek in Asia Minor is characterized by the extension of the suffixes of the *-i(n)* neuters to nouns belonging to the masculine and feminine inflectional classes. He finds evidence in Cappadocian, Pharasiot and Pontic. The same phenomenon is identified by Karatsareas (2011) with respect to the Cappadocian dialect, and is explained by the author as the emergence of the 'agglutinative' inflectional patterns in Cappadocian.

In SG – alongside the other cases (see Clairis and Babiniotis 1998: 66–67) – there is also a tendency to change gender of borrowed words denoting inanimate

entities to neuter, e. g. from French *le camouflage* – *to kamufláz* (Mackridge 1990: 108–109). Generally this happens to the words that are not morphologically integrated into Greek, and in such cases they do not decline. A similar tendency (although not so often) also appears with these words in PG in nouns such as *to slon* 'elephant', *to pol* 'floor' etc., which do not decline and do not form plurals; consequently, they cannot be regarded as morphologically integrated, see (5).

(5) *θa kateníz   to   pol*
FUT clean:IMP.2SG DEF:N.SG.NGEN floor:N.SG.NGEN_{RUSSIAN}
éleje = men
say:IPFV.PST:3SG = 1SG.ACC
'Clean the <u>floor</u>, (he/she) told me.'
                                    [Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B03]

Those words that have the suffixes *-a, -ä, -e* in SL are assigned the feminine gender in PG. These suffixes are associated with feminine gender in Greek as well, e. g. from Turkish *mahala – i maxala* 'neigborhood', *meşa – i mesha* 'forest' etc. from Russian *mashina - i mashina* 'car', *tschashka – i tchashka* 'cup' etc.

(6) *téresan   meshán   k = en*
watch:PFV.PST:3PL forest:F.SG.ACC_{TURKISH} NEG = be:3SG
'They watched there was no <u>forest</u>.'
                                    [Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-AN-00000-B02]

This tendency also appears in SG; thus, many feminine words in the SL remain the same in the RL, e. g. from French *la plage – i plaz, la boutique – i butik* etc. (Clairis and Babiniotis 1998: 66; Mackridge 1990: 108). Most words from the elicited data are neuter (in total: 24),[2] see (7).

(7) a. Words of Russian origin
        biléton, brat, chái, frúktä (PL), *futaból, institútin, karaliók, kartóf, khaladílnikon, péshkon, pol, pratsént, saznánie, slon, stol, tésto, téxnikum, tsítrusä* (PL), *uspéx*
     b. Words of Turkish origin
        peshkír, diván, karaúl, konáki, maimún

Then feminine nouns (in total: 18), see (8).

---

2 Those words that are instances of code-switching (in the meaning defined in Section 1) are assigned gender by the choice of the neuter form of the definite article.

(8) a. Words of Russian origin

    ármia, bábushka, buxánka, dácha, família, kásha, kultúra, kushétka, kvartíra, malaría, mashína, pénsia, salfétka, shápka, tupítsa, vísilka, vódka

 b. Words of Turkish origin

    meshá

One case is unclear; namely, the Russian word *kanfeta* 'candy/sweets', which is used by informants either as neuter or feminine (see Section 2.3).

Only one example is assigned the masculine gender, see (9).

(9) *ekínos   en   indzhíneros*
    that:M.SG.NOM be:3SG engineer:M.SG.NOM_RUSSIAN
    'He is an engineer.'
                          [Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B01]

In this example, natural gender coincides with grammatical gender. This tendency is common in SG as well. Grammatical gender of the borrowed nouns that denote people usually follows natural gender. Moreover, most loanwords in SG are assigned the neuter gender, followed by feminine, then masculine. Mackridge (1990: 110) points out that very few – except those referring to men – are masculine at all. Thus, while borrowing nouns from other languages, PG follows rules that are characteristic to SG; moreover, there is a similar tendency of increasing the proportion of the neuters[3] to other genders in PG. From the elicited material, most of the transferred nouns are neuter (in total: 24), and plural forms are also mostly transferred in neuter (in total: 6).

Additionally, it is worth mentioning that PG is characterized by the morphosyntactic expression of animacy-based distinction, which determines the selection of gender in the forms of agreeing nominals such as adjectives and pronouns. "Adjectives modifying [−HUMAN] nouns appear in their neuter form irrespective of the grammatical gender of their head nouns" (Karatsareas 2009: 216), e. g. *pontiakó ɣlósa* 'Pontic language', *íðio θriskía* 'the same religion' etc. The same is observed when the head-noun is borrowed, see example (10).

(10) *kalón   família n* [...]
    good:N.SG.NGEN surname:F.SG.ACC_RUSSIAN
    '(It's) a good surname.'
                          [Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B01]

---

3 For increasing proportion of neuters in SG see Mirambel (1959: 84); Mackridge (1990: 109).

Here, the neuter gender also has a priority. Moreover, the generalized form of neuter gender is used when nouns are modified by possessive pronouns, regardless of grammatical gender, and even of the animacy-based distinction, e. g. *teméteron i anθróp* 'our people', *teméteron i ɣlósa* 'our language' etc.

Generally, animacy-based distinction can be attributed to contact with Turkish, which does not possess grammatical category of gender. Along with the influence of Turkish, it was mostly caused by language-internal factors.[4]

In sum, borrowed words denoting human entities are assigned gender according to sex only in the cases when the form has no priority, e. g. the word *brat* 'brother' is masculine in SL, but neuter in PG, because of the word-final consonant (see Section 2), or the word *tupítsa* is common gender in SL, but the use of the *-a* suffix is reanalysed as feminine in Pontic. This proves that the form is a stronger factor than sex or gender of the SL. Non-human nouns are by default neuters, while stems ending in *-a* are feminine.

2.2 Case

Modern Greek dialects (including Pontic) have four cases: nominative, genitive, accusative and vocative. Nominative is the case of the subject, genitive is the case of adnominal dependents, accusative is the case of direct objects and complements of prepositions, and vocative is the inflectional form used in addressing an interlocutor.

There are three declensions in PG: The first declension includes masculine nouns with suffixes *-as, -is, -es* and feminine nouns with suffixes *-a, -i, -e;* the second encompasses masculine nouns ending in *-os* and neuter nouns with suffixes *-on* and *-in*, while the third has only neuter nouns with different suffixes. This classification is based on stem endings of nouns, and is more like the Ancient Greek (AG) system than the Modern one. The only difference with AG is in some nouns that do not exist in AG, namely those ending in *-es* and *-e*. Moreover, nouns of the third declension in AG include masculine and feminine nouns, which belong to the first declension in Pontic.

The examples of the nouns morphologically integrated into the case system can be subdivided into different groups, according to frequency of use:
a) Frequently occurring nouns are feminine nouns ending in *-a*, which belong to the first declension. They can be transferred either from

---

4 For more information about grammatical gender and animacy-based distinction, as well as about language-internal and language-external factors that caused the breakdown of gender in the Eastern Greek dialects see Karatsareas (2009: 196–230).

Russian or Turkish, but more often from Russian. Usually these words are used in the accusative, sometimes with ending *-n*, sometimes without it. The lack of this ending depends on phonological processes. Namely, it is omitted in the context of subsequent words starting with a fricative, nasal or liquid: *v, ɣ, j, z, l, m, n, r, s, f, x* (see Oikonomidis 1958: 113–119); however, in isolated cases it is still used in this phonetic environment. The ambiguity in the inflectional form of feminine nouns is resolved by the article that unambiguously distinguishes between nominative and accusative case (in the feminine singular), see (11) and (12).

(11) *o*　　　　　　　*énas*　　　　*epíɣen*　　　　　<u>*sin*</u>
　　　DEF:M.SG.NOM　　one:M.SG.NOM　go:PFV.PST:3SG　　to:DEF:F.SG.ACC
　　　<u>*ármia*</u>　　　　*sin*　　　*ɣermanía*
　　　<u>army</u>:F.SG.NGEN_{RUSSIAN}　to:DEF:F.SG.ACC　Germany:F.SG.NGEN
　　　'The one went <u>to the army</u> to Germany.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　　[Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B01]

(12) <u>*sin*</u>　　　　<u>*literatúran*</u>　　　　*íxa*　　　*árista*
　　　in:DEF:F.SG.ACC　<u>literature</u>:F.SG.ACC_{RUSSIAN}　have:PST:1SG　best
　　　'In <u>literature</u> I had best.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　[Kotanidi et al. 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B03]

b) The nouns which belong to the second declension, like the abovementioned example (9) and (13).

(13) *thélo*　*na*　*afíno*　　*t=emón*
　　　want:1SG　PRT　leave:1SG　DEF:N.SG.NGEN=POSS.1SG:N.SG
　　　<u>*to*</u>　　　　*konáki*
　　　DEF:N.SG.NGEN　<u>house</u>:N.SG.NGEN_{TURKISH}
　　　'I want to leave my <u>house</u>.'
　　　　　　　　　　　　[Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B01]

The noun *konáki* is already integrated into the lexicon of PG, and is used in SG as well. It is derived from Turkish *konak*, the suffix *-i* is Greek. The initial form is *konáki(n)* 'cabin'. The last *-n* is omitted, and the article is used, but unlike the first group, the case cannot be determined based on the article, because for neuter nouns it is the same in the nominative and accusative cases. Thus, the case of the word can only be guessed at based on its syntactic use.

In the PG declension system, one of the characteristic features is syncretism of nominative and accusative in plural forms of neuter and non-human nouns of any grammatical gender, see Table 3.

Table 3: Example adapted from Karatsareas (2009: 216).

	Masculine	Feminine	Neuter
NOM.SG	*o minas* 'month'	*i kosara* 'chicken'	*to xorion* 'village'
ACC.SG	*ton minan*	*tin kosaran*	*to xorion*
NOM.PL	*ta minas*	*ta kosaras*	*ta xoria*
ACC.PL	*ta minas*	*ta kosaras*	*ta xoria*

The same phenomenon appears with embedded words, cf. the example (22), where the form *ta kafétas* is used to indicate accusative, and the following example (14) where the form *famílias* (from the SG *i família*) indicates nominative.

(14) *t=imetér*   *érθane*   *ðío*
DEF:N.PL.NGEN=POSS.1PL.M./F.PL.NOM:1SG   come:PFV.PST:3PL two
tri   *famílias*
three:M/F.NOM   famliy:N.PL.NGEN_{RUSSIAN}
'ours came two-three <u>families</u>'
                                        [Kontanidi et al. 2014: PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B02]

Based on the collected corpus data, no forms of transferred words have been attested in the genitive.

In some examples, there is no agreement between article and noun in the nominal phrase, and the loanword seems to be inserted as a bare form, despite the fact that it has Pontic suffix denoting masculine gender and a second type of declension, see example (15).

(15) *epínan*   *ta*   *péshkos* [...]
make:IPFV.PST:3PL   DEF:N.PL.NGEN   oven:M.SG.NOM_{RUSSIAN}
'They made <u>ovens</u> [...]'
                                        [Kontanidi et al. 2014: PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B02]

From the elicited data, transferred words are usually integrated into the first declension, with ending *-a* (in total: 20), see (16).

(16) a. Words of Russian origin
    ármia, bábushka, balnítsa, buxánka, dácha, família, kásha, kultúra, kushétka, kvartíra, literatúra, malaría, mashína, pénsia, salfétka, shápka, tupítsa, vísilka, vodka
 b. Words of Turkish origin
    meshá

A smaller number belong to the second one with suffixes *-os, -on, -in* (in total: 13), see (17).

(17) a. Words of Russian origin
    inzhíneros, biléton, khaladílnikon, pratsénton, institútin, kartóf(in), stol (in) frúktä (PL), *tsítrusä* (PL)
 b. Words of Turkish origin
    diván(in), karaúli(n), konáki(n), maimún(in), peshkír(in)

No words in our corpus belong to the third declension. Another set of words includes bare forms, so that it is not evident to which declension they belong, see (18).

(18) Words of Russian origin
    brat, futból, karaliók, pol, slon, téxnikum, uspéx

Declension type is not clear with some nouns; these are used by informants in different ways, or some attested forms are not appropriate for this or that type, see (19).

(19) Unclear cases: Words of Russian origin
    chái, kaféton, péshkon, soznánie, tésto

2.3 Number

In PG, as well as in SG, there are two numbers: singular and plural. In spite of the fact that PG retains many archaic forms, it has not preserved the dual number, like AG. For denoting dual forms, the numeral *ðío* 'two' is used, e. g. *ðío ospitíon éksoða* 'exits of two houses' (Oikonomidis 1958: 144). There are different ways of forming the plural number in PG, depending on the gender and declension type of the noun. The peculiarity of the PG plural form is the use of the ending *-ant(oi)* for masculine nouns, e. g. *kléftes* 'thief' – *kleftánt, túrkos* 'Turk' – *turkánt* etc. Sometimes these forms are appended with more common forms se *-aðes, -iðes*. e. g. *ðespótis* 'host' – *ðespotáðes* – *ðespotánt* etc. This suffix

may involve a pejorative connotation – it is used to denote a set of similar entities and not only plural form (see Papadopoulos 1955: 48–49). However, some scholars assume that its use has been extended to show only plural forms, without any additional meaning (see Revithiadou and Spyropoulos 2009: 49). Lately it developed into a derivational suffix showing the unity of the members of a family, nationality or profession: *Antonánt* 'from the family of Anton', *turkánt* 'Turks', *aloγánt* 'stablemen' etc. (see Tombaidis 1988: 46–47).

Thus, according to different opinions, the suffix *-ant* is (a) an unmarked expression of plurality, (b) has a negative connotation, (c) is a collective affix. Based on the data in the corpus, it is evident that this suffix mostly has a collective meaning and is associated with animate entities, more frequently with the masculine. As a result of this fact (very few of the borrowed words can be masculine, see Section 2.1) neither of the elicited plurals is used with this Pontic suffix. However, there is one example of the more common suffix *-ðes*:

(20)   *Ta*   *ála*   *ta*   *xoriá*
      DEF:N.SG.NGEN   other:N.PL.NGEN   DEF:N.SG.NGEN   village:N.PL.NGEN
      ðen   *íxan*   <u>*mesháðes*</u>
      not   have:PST:3PL   <u>forest:F.PL.NGEN_{TURKISH}</u>
      'Other villages had not <u>forests.</u>'
                                          [Kotanidi et al. 2014: PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B02]

The same word is used by other informants with ending *-ðas*, see (21).

(21)   *Éxi*   *émorfa*   <u>*mesháðas*</u>
      have:3SG   beautiful:N.PL.NGEN   <u>forest:F.PL.NGEN_{TURKISH}</u>
      'It has beautiful <u>forests.</u>'
                                          [Kotanidi et al. 2014: PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B04]

A general characteristic of the PG declension system is metaplasm of gender in plural forms. In SG, there are some words that have different gender in singular and plural, though it is not common (see Mackridge 1990: 236–237); this phenomenon is a peculiarity of the Pontic dialect. Feminine nouns which are included in the first declension usually form the plural by using the neuter article, e. g. *i kosara* 'hen' – *ta kosaras*. Despite the fact that this phenomenon is often regarded as strange and unexplained, Papadopoulos (1955: 45–46) tries to explain it in such way:

> Because people say *ta za* 'animals', *ta muxterá* 'pigs', *t'arniá* 'sheep' etc. there appeared a feeling that if somebody says *ta za* etc., he can use *ta kosáras* 'hens', *ta korónas* 'cocks' as

> well and all other nouns for denoting animals could be formed in the same way, in spite of the fact, that there is used feminine article in the singular number. In most cases these nouns represent inanimacy as *i evðomáða* 'week' – *ta evðomádas, i ikóna* 'picture' – *ta ikónas, i iméra* 'day – *ta iméras...* [transcription and translation added].

According to this view, therefore, it is neutralization of gender distinctions based on animacy of the nouns (see Section 2.1). However, the crucial question here is whether the phenomenon reflects (a) a reanalysis of the grammatical gender of the plural (i. e. gender metaplasm as stated by Papadopoulos), or (b) a reanalysis of the grammatical gender of the definite article.

The same phenomenon is observed in the case of embedded words, e. g. the word *i kaféta* from Russian *kanfeta* 'sweet', which has a plural form as mentioned above: *ta kafétas*.

(22) [...] *palalón*   *ja* <u>*ta*</u>   <u>*kafétas*</u>
         crazy:N.SG.NOM for DEF:N.SG.NGEN sweets:F.PL.NGEN_{RUSSIAN}
      '[...] crazy about the <u>sweets</u>'
                                       [Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B02]

This word belongs to the feminine declension class; thus, the reanalysis does not apply to the noun, but to the article. Though some informants use this word differently in singular, *kaféton na perts ató* 'take a candy' [Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B01], in such a case it should be *ta kaféta* in plural, belonging to the second declension, not the first one. This may be partially due to the use of the neuter article in plural form; thus, the noun is associated with the neuter gender and is used as a neuter noun in the singular as well.

The claim is that in such cases, the neuter plural of the definite article is reanalyzed as a plural of inanimates (independently of the grammatical gender of the determined noun).

This happens in PG not only with nouns embedded from Russian, but from Georgian as well. By analogy with the feminine nouns that have the plural form *-as*, this suffix appears in the singular nouns which have suffixes *-o*, *-on*, characteristic to the neuter nouns of the second declension, see example (23).

(23) *as* *válo*   <u>*lóbias*</u>
      PRT put:1SG haricot_beans:N.PL.NGEN_{GEORGIAN}
      '(let me) put <u>haricot beans</u>'
                                       [Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B03]

Generally, the informants simply add the common suffix of the neuter nouns' plural form *-a* (second declension) to the embedded word stem; this inflectional form for the plural is completely expected, see example (24).

(24) triánta _pratsénta_   en   pondiakón
      thirty   percent:N.PL.NGEN_{RUSSIAN} is:3SG Pontic:N.SG.NGEN
      'Thirty percent is Pontic.'
                                    [Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-LG-00000-B02]

Those words that are borrowed from Turkish usually have ending -_ia_, this suffix relates to the fact that the singular is -_i_, see example (25).

(25) eyó   éxo   ekiká _karaúlia_
      I:1SG.NOM have:1SG there guard:N.PL.NGEN_{TURKISH}
      'I have there guards.'
                                    [Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B01]

From the elicited material, informants use transferred nouns mostly in singular (in total: 36), only 12 plural examples were attested, see (26).

(26)   a. Words in PL of Russian origin
           famílias, frúktä, kafétas, kartófä, pratsénta, salfétkas, tsítrusä, stólia, vótkas
       b. Words in PL of Turkish origin
           karaúlia, konákia, mesháðes, mesháðas

Though some nouns are used only in plural forms, see example (27).

(27) _t = emétera_   _ta_   _frúktä_ [...]
      DEF:N.PL.NGEN = POSS.1PL:N.PL DEF:N.PL.NGEN fruits:N.PL.NGEN_{RUSSIAN}
      'our fruits [...]'
                                    [Skopeteas and Berikashvili 2014: PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B01]

This can be explained by the meaning of the word. Generally, the phenomenon of selective borrowing can be attested in different languages. Elšík (2007: 278) mentions that some inflectional forms of nominals may be borrowed without a parallel borrowing of the base forms of their nominal. The word _frúktä_ is never attested in the singular, only in the plural, so there is a selective borrowing of the plural form.

From the elicited plural forms, nouns borrowed from Turkish have suffixes -_ia_, while those from Russian have different suffixes, namely -_as, -a, -ä_. One set of words is assigned the neuter gender (in total: 6), another set of words belongs to the feminine (in total: 3), but in plural the grammatical gender of the definite article is changed to neuter. Only one example from Turkish differs (see example 20, 21), and is used in feminine gender with suffix -_ðes, -ðas_.

3 Conclusions on morphological integration of transfers

Based on the analyzed material, some key conclusions on the particular role of the morphological type of the donor language can be drawn. On one side is the Turkish donor language with concatenative morphology, i. e. transparent morphological segmentation, no inflectional classes; on the other side is a language with non-concatenative morphology, namely Russian, for which the characteristic feature is fusion and inflectional classes. PG (the ML in this study) is non-concatenative. The expectation is that the structure of Russian must be "more acceptable" to PG, and at first sight the greater amount of the adapted words (from the elicited material: Russian nouns – 40, Turkish nouns – 6), can be reinterpreted as an advantage for borrowing process. There is also the convergence of the two systems (e. g. in gender PG seems to be more closely to the Russian system, because Russian has also grammatical gender, while Turkish has not (Lewis 1967: 25), Russian nouns ending in -a are of the feminine gender just like in PG etc.). However, based on the study of the elicited material, the conclusion is that the phonological form is a stronger determining factor for the integration of nouns than the morphological structure of the SL.

The main results can be summarized as follows:

Gender assignment: generally, human nouns are assigned gender according to sex, with some exceptions when phonological form takes priority (see Section 2.1.); non-human nouns are by default neuters, while those ending in -a are feminines.

Most words adapted from Russian are those with an -a suffix (e. g. *vodka, kvartira, mashina, pensia* etc.), which denote feminine gender,[5] singular number, and nominative case in Russian (they belong to the second declension) (Shvedova 1980: 484). In PG, they are associated accordingly with the feminine gender as well because of the suffix -a (e. g. *mánna, θiɣatéra, xará* etc.), which denotes feminine gender, singular number, and nominative case (belong to the first declension). Thus, the convergence of the two systems is observed. However, as Turkish has no gender, the words ending in -a in Turkish are borrowed (their number is small) using the analogous system with those borrowed from Russian: the word in the donor language has a phonological form that is reinterpreted in PG as a gender suffix (denoting concrete declension

---

5 Of course Russian also has masculine nouns ending in -*a*, which belong to the second declension, e. g. *papa, mushchina*, etc. It is used only for animate entities, and here, natural gender is the same with the grammatical one, but none of those words has been attested in our corpus.

type), so it is simply integrated into the PG declension pattern (with characteristic inflectional morphemes). Thus, the main factor here is that the form of the transferred word in the SL has an influence on the gender of the word in the RL, and not the category of gender itself.

A different transfer strategy is applied to neuter words, namely nouns with null suffixes (root ending in consonant) in the SL (in Russian those of masculine gender, in Turkish they have no gender at all) add the ending -*i(n)* that corresponds to a gender suffix (denoting concrete declension type), thus integrating it into the ML system. The process is not the same in the case of the feminine nouns: the RL speakers reinterpret an existing form, while in the latter case they create a form according to the intuition for gender that comes from language-internal factors (i. e. the general Modern Greek tendency of assigning the neuter gender to inanimate loan nouns, the increasing of the proportion of neuter to other genders, and the use of the productive neuter suffix -*i(n)*).

Most of the Turkish borrowed words follow this strategy; it could be explained by the fact that Turkish has no gender, and thus, by adding the most productive neuter gender suffix -*i(n)*, PG tries to fill in this gap. In some other Greek dialects, namely in Cappadocian, there is a tendency of agglutinative inflection, which is expressed by attaching the same suffix to what appear to be nominative singular forms of nouns (see Karatsareas 2011: 4), regardless of the gender it has. However, the same suffix is used to form nouns borrowed from Russian as well, which does have gender. Moreover, they are masculine in the SL and are assigned neuter while transferring to PG. Thus, decisive here is a phonological form, i. e. the consonant ending of the transferred nouns, and not the morphological system of the SL.

Assignment to inflectional class is also dependent upon a phonological form of the loan's ending, namely those ending in -*a* belong to the first declension class, while those with endings -*os, -on, -in* to the second one. In the declension system, nouns show morphological integration and are structurally indistinguishable from native nouns; there are no cases of borrowing inflectional suffixes: either the borrowed nouns are used with PG inflectional morphology or remain indeclinable.

Formation of plural forms: Russian nouns have plural suffixes -*as, -a, -ä, -ia*, Turkish nouns -*ia, -ðes, -ðas*. The choice of the suffixes depends on the endings they have in the singular, e. g. singulars formed with ending -*i(n)* trigger plural formation in -*ia*, while those with ending -*o(n)* – plural formation in -*a* etc. Some of these endings are attested only with Russian loans, while others only with Turkish. Thus, the morpheme -*as* used in plural to denote inanimate nouns, which belong to the first declension (feminine gender), is considered to be a Pontic dialect phenomenon, and is attested only with words borrowed from

Russian. While other morphemes for forming neuter nouns (as no masculine plural nouns were elicited) *-a, -ia* are common for PG and SG as well, *-ia* is generally attested with the Turkish nouns.[6]

However, this is not a formal distinction, and this does not mean that any of these endings cannot be used with the loanwords from another language, so the SL is not decisive in choosing the plural morphemes. Transferred nouns from both languages follow the PG rules regarding the phonological form (plural formation according to the phonological form of the word ending, gender metaplasm and case syncretism).

Thus, the research revealed that the phonological form of the loanword is decisive for the integration of Russian and Turkish nouns into PG, and there is no crucial role played by the morphological type (concatenative/non-concatenative).

Abbreviations

AG	Ancient Greek
EL	embedded language
ML	matrix language
NP	nominal phrase
PG	Pontic Greek
RL	recipient language
SL	source language
SG	Standard Greek

---

6 There is only one example from Russian with this ending – *stólia*, another example from Turkish has the ending *-ðes, -ðas* – *mesháðes, mesháðas* used in analogy with the forms *mána* 'mother' – *manáðes* or *pará* 'money' – *paráðas* (word of Turkish origin), but generally in PG the suffix *-ðes*, is not associated with the words which denote inanimate entities.

Glosses

1, 2, 3	1st, 2nd, 3rd person
ACC	accusative
DEF	definite
F	feminine
FUT	future
IMP	imperative
IPFV	imperfective
M	masculine
N	neuter
NGEN	nongenitive
NEG	negation
NOM	nominative
PFV	perfective
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PRT	particle
PST	past
SBJV	subjunctive
SG	singular

References

Data base resources

Berikashvili, Svetlana. 2014. *Interviews in Pontic Greek* (data collected, transcribed, and glossed by Svetlana Berikashvili). Bielefeld: Bielefeld University (Corpus Resource).

Kotanidi, Evgenia, Berikashvili, Svetlana & Stavros Skopetas. 2014. *Pontic Greek data collection, Version 2.0* (data collected, transcribed, and translated by Evgenia Kotanidi; revised and glossed by Svetlana Berikashvili; corpus design by Stavros Skopeteas. Bielefeld: Bielefeld University (Corpus Resource).

Skopeteas, Stavros & Svetlana Berikashvili. 2014. *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.

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.

Clairis, Christos & Babiniotis Georgios. 1998. *Modern Greek grammar. I. Noun*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata. /in Greek/

Clyne, Michael. 2003. *Dynamics of language contact. English and immigrant languages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Dawkins, Richard McGillivray. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A study of the dialects of Sili, Cappadocia and Pharasa with grammar, texts, translations and glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Elšík, Viktor. 2007. Grammatical borrowing in Hungarian Rumungro. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 261–283. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Garakanidze, Irina. 2000. The history of migration of Greeks in Georgia (VIII–XX cc). In *Greeks Georgia,* 28–71. Tbilisi: Logos. /in Georgian/

Lewis, Geoffrey. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.

Karatsareas, Petros. 2009. The loss of grammatical gender in Cappadocian Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* Volume 107(2). 196–230.

Karatsareas, Petros. 2011. A study of Cappadocian Greek nominal morphology from a diachronic and dialectological perspective. PhD. Dissertation. 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/

Mackridge, Peter. 1990. *The modern Greek language*. Translation by: Petropoulos, Kostas. Athens: Publishing House Pataki. /in Greek/

Matras, Yaron. 2007. The borrowability of structural categories. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*, 31–75. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Mirambel, André. 1959. *The modern Greek language: Description and analysis*. Paris: Klincksieck. /in French/

Muysken, Pieter. 1981. Creole tense/mood/aspect systems: The unmarked case? In Pieter Muysken (ed.), *Generative studies on Creole languages*, 181–199. Dordrecht: Foris.

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.

Oikodomidis, Dimosthenis. 1958. *Grammar of Greek dialect in Pontos*. Athens: Academy of Athens. /in Greek/

Papadopoulos, Anthimos. 1955. *Historical grammar of Pontic Greek*. 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. 581–618.

Revithiadou, Anthi & Vassilios Spyropoulos. 2009. *Ofitika Pontic: Research of linguistic recording with emphasis to diachrony and synchrony of the dialect*. Athens: John S. *Latsis* Public Benefit *Foundation*. /in Greek/

Shvedova, Natalia. (ed.). 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*. Athens: Commission for Pontic Studies. /in Greek/

Winford, Donald. 2003. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

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/