Γλωσσικές επαφές στα Βαλκάνια και στη Μ. Ασία | Language contact in the Balkans and Asia Minor

1ος τόμος 1st volume

Επιμέλεια | Editors
Χρ. Τζιτζιλής & Γ. Παπαναστασίου
Chr. Tzitzilis & G. Papanastassiou

ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΓΛΩΣΣΑ
ΣΥΓΧΡΟΝΙΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΑΧΡΟΝΙΑ

GREEK LANGUAGE
SYNCHRONY AND DIACHRONY

2

Γλωσσικές επαφές στα Βαλκάνια και στη Μικρά Ασία

Language Contact in the Balkans and Asia Minor

1ος τόμος   1st volume

Επιμέλεια
Χρ. Τζιτζιλής
Γ. Παπαναστασίου

Editors
Chr. Tzitzilis
G. Papanastassiou

Περιεχόμενα | Contents

ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ | CONTENTS

Loan verb adaptation in Pontic Greek spoken in Georgia

SVETLANA BERIKASHVILI

1. Introduction

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

The study is based on corpus data collected during several fieldwork periods in the Pontic-speaking community of Georgia (by Evgenia Kotanidi, Svetlana Berikashvili & Stavros Skopeteas 2005; 2014–2016). The corpus includes 435 recordings of semi-spontaneous speech and narratives on different topics: Ancestors, Family, Village, Culture, People, Marriage, Feast, and Language. The average word count per speaker is 936 words and a total of 57 native-speaking informants have been recorded, i.e. the whole corpus amounts to approximately 54,230 words. All the data are glossed according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules and available from the TLA archive of the Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (Nijmegen, Netherlands).

It is generally assumed that "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 – tends to be rare (Myers-Scotton 2006, 229). According to the hierarchy of borrowability, verbs are mostly adopted after nominals: nouns and adjectives (see Muysken 1981, 181–99) or nouns and conjunctions (see

Matras 2007, 61–62). However, some scholars demonstrate that "verbs are not more difficult than nouns to be borrowed, provided that certain conditions are met" (Ralli 2009, 3). Moravcsik (1975; 1978) shows that verbs cannot be borrowed as verbs, but they are borrowed as nouns and they need to be adapted (re-verbalized) in the recipient language.

According to Wichman & Wohlgemuth (2008), four main strategies are used for loan verb accommodation in all languages. These strategies are: (a) Direct Insertion (DI); (b) Indirect Insertion (IndI); (c) Light Verb Strategy (LVS); and (d) Paradigm Insertion (ParI). These strategies resemble other classifications, e.g. the first one presented by Moravcsik (1975; 1978), or the integration types listed by Muysken (2000, 184–220); they are mostly built upon Muysken's approach, but classified differently. The same classification is adopted by Matras (2009, 176), but interpreted in a slightly different way.

In the present study I follow the classification of Wichman & Wohlgemuth (2008), so the terms used can be interpreted as follows: (a) DI for two sub-categories: borrowing bare forms and inserting a verbal root directly into the verbal morphology of the recipient language; (b) IndI for the loan verbs where morphosyntactic adaptation is required, i.e. the affix (verbalizer) is added to the verbal root in order for the verb to inflect according the morphological rules of the recipient language; (c) LVS for the adaptation of the verbs by complex construction, i.e. by use of a light verb which has an auxiliary-like function and bears the inflection; and (d) ParI for the examples where the verb is borrowed with the donor language's inflectional morphology.

The paper is restricted to the adaptation strategies, i.e. those strategies which involve morphological changes applied to the borrowed verbs. According to the classification of loan verb accommodation, such strategies are IndI and LVS. This conclusion is drawn from the corpus data results, where the attested strategies are LVS for the Russian language and IndI for Turkish, and can lead us to important generalizations on the understanding of morphological integration of loan verbs.

Some points need to be explained more precisely:

(1) Although the main strategy for Russian loan verbs is LVS (75% of attested lexemes), there are examples of code-switching and nonce borrowings which can be regarded as DI examples, i.e. bare forms without any formal adaptation. I do not take into consideration clearly recognizable code-switching, still I do analyze nonce borrowings (term used by Poplack 1980) or temporary borrowings (term used by Myers-Scotton 2006), i.e. borrowed forms whose "frequency and acceptability criteria are unclear or nonexistent" (Poplack, Sankoff & Miller 1988, 52), but still have characteristics of morphological and/or syntactic integration and provide insights on the adaptation process.

(2) LVS is somehow problematic as it can be regarded as a case of DI since "there is no further verbalizing derivation and the replica itself is treated like a native stem" (Wohlgemuth 2009, 116); on the other hand, an unadapted loan verb into a complex predicate resembles a pattern of code-switching. Still I do think that this strat-

egy is decisive for further generalizations, as it shows that the recipient language, i.e. PG, treats the borrowed verb like a noun/nominalized lexeme.

(3) I adopt the approach of Wohlgemuth (2009) in using the terms *accommodation* and *adaptation*, including the state in which the markers of infinitive or inflection do not count as an instance of loan verb *adaptation*, since they are applied obligatorily to all (verbal) stems, be them native or borrowed. Accommodation means all processes required in the recipient language to make a loan verb fully functional, including that of attaching inflectional morphology, assigning valency to the loan verb, etc.

The material is from two languages of different morphological typology, namely Russian (of non-concatenative morphology) and Turkish (of concatenative morphology). The interesting fact is that PG has different incorporation strategies to accommodate verbs transferred from those languages.

2. Loan verbs from Turkish

The strategy used for the Turkish loan verbs is IndI by means of affixation with a verbalizer. In Haugen's terminology (1950), such cases are regarded as *loanblends*, i.e. words consisting of a copied part and a native part. Verbs borrowed from Turkish and elicited from the corpus are as follows (see Tables 1 and 2):

Replica form	Model form	Attested form(s)
araévo 'search'	aramak	araévume, erãevan, eráevane, eráepsan, arãpson
chatévo 'meet'	çatmak	chatévume, chatévne, echátepsen
ɣanévo 'understand'	kanmak	ɣanévts, ɣanévs, ɣanév, ɣanéf, ɣanévne, eɣáneva, eɣánevan, eɣánevnane, eɣánepsa, eɣánepse(n), ɣanéps
ɣavurévo 'roast'	kaurmak	ɣavurévumen
ɣazanévo 'earn money'	kazanmak	ɣazánepsane
ɣuévo 'spare'	kıymak	ɣuévo, jiévo
ɣunushévo 'talk'	konuşmak	ɣunushévume
ɣurévo 'set'	kurmak	ɣurévum, ɣureéftan
ɣurtarévo 'save'	kurtarmak	ɣurtarévne, eɣurtárepse
ijévo 'reconcile, suit'	uymak	ijépsane
taɣutévo 'disperse'	dağıtmak	taɣutéftikan
tämizlãvo 'clean'	temizlemek	tämizlãvo
toplaévo 'gather'	toplamak	topläéfkundane, etoplápsamen, etoplanéfkundan
xaraplãvo 'destroy'	harablamak	exaraplãfte
xatévo 'chase'	katmak	xatévne, (e)xátepsan

Table 1: Loan verbs of Turkish origin formed from verbs

Replica form	Model form	Attested form(s)
chilâzo 'cover'	çul	echíläzan
kalachévo 'talk'	keleçı	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
kochévo 'migrate'	köç itmek	kochévo, ekúchepsan

Table 2: Loan verbs of Turkish origin formed from nouns

All these verbs are fully adjusted to the patterns of the recipient language and show high integration. They are in the second place in the LVIH (Wohlgemuth 2009, 285): LVS → IndI → DI → (ParI) and the result of accommodation is a fully functional, regular member of the class of verbs.

The main accommodation strategy for the verbs in the recipient language is inserting the stem of the verb (generally of the present tense, see [1] from the Turkish *konuşmak* 'I speak', stem *konuş*) and then adding the derivational affix (verbalizer) of Greek verbs *-év-* and the inflectional markers of PG.

[1] ayapó   na értan   s-o   spíti=m
    love:1.SG   to come:3.PL LOC-DEF:N.SG.NGEN   house:N.SG.NGEN=CL.1.SG:GEN
    V   C   V   P-D   N=CL
    itonáðes   na káθumes   na yunushévume
    neighbour:M.PL.NGEN   to sit:1.PL to talk:1.PL TURKISH
    N   C   V   C   V

'I like when my neighbors come to me, we sit and talk together.'

(Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-PP-00000-B08)

In Standard Modern Greek (SMG), the derivational suffixes for verbs are as follows: *-év-*, *-íz-*, *-(i)áz-*, *-ón-*, *-én-*, *-ár-*. All of them derive verbs from nouns, adjectives and adverbs (Ralli 2012, 147); their semantics includes various meanings, quite often overlapping. The meanings of *-ón-* and *-én-* are more restricted than the meanings of *-íz-*, *-(i)áz-* and *-év-*, and all suffixes seem to share a common causative/resultative meaning. The verbalizer *-ár-* is exclusively used in SMG to derive verbs from foreign stems, e.g. *filmáro* 'to film', *fiyuráro* 'to figure', etc. However, there are other loan verbs which are formed by means of other verbalizers, mostly *-íz-* and *-(i)áz-*, e.g. *meremetízo* 'to repair' (from Turk. *meremet*), *patsavuriázo* 'to clean' (from Italian *spazzaura*), etc. (Ralli 2012, 91). In these instances, the verbalizer *-ár-* is the preferred one to form verbs from verbal stems adapted from western languages, whereas *-íz-* and *-(i)áz-* are typically used to derivate verbs from foreign

(including Turkish) nouns. Generally, the suffix -*íz*- is highly productive in Greek and most of its dialects (see Ralli 2009), with the exception of Pontic. As mentioned by Ralli (2013, 10–12), there is one more dialect, namely Griko, that also uses the suffix -*év*- to accommodate loan verbs, but the suffix is presented with phonological changes, e.g. *kuntéo* 'to narrate' (from Salentino, Romance dialect *kuntare*), etc. In PG spoken in Georgia, as evidenced in the data, all loan verbs of Turkish origin are formed by adding the -*év*- verbalizer only.

The adaptation of verbs borrowed from Turkish differs in SMG and PG. According to Horrocks, verbs borrowed from Turkish in PG involve "the addition of -*évo* to the Turkish present stem", while in SMG "the addition of the productive -*ízo* to the Turkish past tense stem formed with the suffix -*di*- (with vowel harmony)" (Horrocks 2010, 402, 380). In the dialects, the vowel harmony of Turkish verbs is kept only in Cappadocian loan verbs (see Tzitzilis 1989, 185–97). Cf. Table 3 for SMG and PG formation and [2] for a PG example attested in Georgia.

Model form	Past tense stem + verbalizer	Replica form in SMG	Present tense stem + verbalizer	Replica form in PG
ka(v)urmak 'to roast'	kavur-du-iz-	kavurðízo	kavur-ev-	ɣavurévo

Table 3: Formation of verbs in SMG & PG

[2] ðíi   méres   prín   ti   panajían   etimáumes
     two   day:F.PL.NGEN   before   DEF:F.SG.ACC mother_of_god:F.SG.ACC prepare:1.PL
     Q   N   ADV   D   N   V
     majirévume   ɣlikízmata   ɣavurévumen
     cook:1.PL   sweets:N.PL.NGEN   roast:1.PL TURKISH
     V   N   V

'Two days before Virgin Mary's feast we start preparing, we cook and we bake sweets.'

(Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-FE-00000-A16)

SMG formation is observed by Ralli (2009) in the case of verb borrowing in Aivaliot, a North-western Asia Minor Greek dialect, where the only verbalizer used is -*íz*- and it is added to the Turkish past tense stem. This exclusive use of -*íz*- is explained by Ralli (2009, 14) as follows: "[…] the exclusive use of -*íz*- is due to a certain phonological similarity between the past tense stem in Turkish and that of the Greek verbs in -*íz*-, since both types end in /i/."

Oikonomidis (1958, 402) notes that verbs in PG can be borrowed from either Turkish verbs or nominals by using the following endings: -*évo*, -*ãzo*, -*ízo* and -*óno*. He also gives several examples (like *bashlaévo* 'to begin', *ijévo* 'to reconcile', *chilãzo* 'to cover', *seiränízo* 'to enjoy looking at sth', *chichakóno* 'to blossom'), from which it can be concluded that verbalizers like -*ãz*-, -*íz*- and -*ón*- are used to denote verbs formed from nominals, and only -*év*- is used for those derived from verbs.

From the material elicited from native-speaking informants in Georgia it is evident that verbal loanblends are formed by using the derivational suffix -*év*- (see Ta-

ble 1), while for denominal formation the suffixes used are -*äz*- and -*év*- (see Table 2). It would be interesting to find out why -*év*- is not the only choice for denominal verbs as well. In our data examples, -*év*- for denominal formation is used in cases where verbs are derived from nouns which can also function as verb stems in Turkish (see Kornfilt 1997, 453), but this does not explain why different suffixes are in use. Therefore, the only verbalizer used in PG for the formation of Turkish loan verbs is -*év*-, which has acquired the additional function of showing deverbal formation.

There is also a subset of loan verbs that preserves the Turkish derivational suffix as well. The interesting thing is that these verbs have denominal formation, but their formation strategy differs from that of other verbs: they have a nominal stem, the Turkish -*la*- verbalizer, the most productive suffix that derives verbs from nouns in Turkish and serves as the basic form to three additional suffixes with the same derivational function (see Kornfilt 1997, 453; Göksel & Kerslake 2005, 56 and others), followed by the productive Pontic -*év*- verbalizer, which sometimes undergoes the phonological process of contraction of *a* and *e* into *ä*. See Table 4 and examples [3] and [7].

Replica form	Nominal stem + Turkish verbalizer + Pontic verbalizer
tämizlãvo 'clean'	temiz-la-ev-
toplaévo 'gather'	top-la-ev-
xaraplãvo 'destroy'	harab-la-ev-

Table 4: Verbs with two verbalizers (Turkish and Pontic)

[3] polá *exaraplãfte* i zoí
    much deteriorate:MEDP.PFV.PST:3.SG TURKISH DEF:F.SG.NOM life:F.SG.NGEN
    ADV V D N
    'The life deteriorated a lot.'

(Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-PP-00000-A03)

As mentioned by Kiranudis (2009, 484), the suffix -*la*- (in the form -*laévo*) became a derivational suffix in Pontic, used to form not only verbs of Turkish origin, but also Pontic ones, e.g. *kenúrios* 'new' > *kenurlaévo* 'to renovate'. However, in PG as spoken in Georgia no such examples have been attested; its use is restricted to Turkish loan verbs only, see [4].

[4] *etoplanéfkundan* *eseréfkundan* i
    gather:MEDP.IPFV.PST:3.PL TURKISH gather:MEDP.IPFV.PST:3.PL DEF:M./F.PL.NOM
    V V D
    traní
    elder:M.PL.NOM
    A
    'The elders gathered.'

(Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-PP-00000-C09)

Thus, Pontic accepts a foreign structural element, but it still needs a native one to

integrate the form morphologically, because the structure of Turkish has lost its transparency.

The main criteria for the morphological integration of loan verbs into PG include: (a) following patterns of the native inflection; (b) using the same TAM markings as native verbs. Based on the material elicited, the loan verbs show a high degree of integration and are fully adapted to the patterns of PG. The attested forms are those of Present and Past: Perfective and Imperfective, Subjunctive and Imperative mood, etc. See [5] and [6].

[5] eraévane   meshán
     search:IPFV.PST:3.PL TURKISH   forest:F.SG.ACC
     V   N
     'They were searching the forest.'

                              (Berikashvili 2016a, PNT-TXT-AN-00000-B03)

or,

[6] ke   eráepsan   mástora
     and   search:PFV.PST:3.PL TURKISH   craftsman:M.SG.NNOM
     C   V   N
     'They were searching for a craftsman.'

                              (Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-C1-00000-B03)

In PG Subjunctive mood is marked on the complementiser *na* and is used with the Imperfective Present of the verb. In this regard, it differs from the SMG system where the PFV/IPFV distinction is made in both the Subjunctive mood and the Future. In PG this distinction is observed only in some varieties, namely in those of Tripolis, Amisos & Inepolis, e.g. *n' aníkso* 'to open' (see Papadopoulos 1955, 69-70). Otherwise, it does not make this distinction, see [7].

[7] eɣó   aɣapó   na   tämizlávo   aɣapó   na   ðulévo
     1:SG.NOM   love:1.SG to   clean:1.SG TURKISH love:1.SG to   work:1.SG
     PN   V   C   V   V   C   V
     'I love to clean, I love to work.'

                              (Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-PP-00000-B08)

From the examined data we can conclude that Turkish uses the IndI 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 the case of PG, that affix is -*év*-, added to the stem of the verb (Present) and followed by inflectional affixes characteristic of PG. The interesting issue is why PG uses this particular verbalizer to accommodate loan verbs from Turkish. In SMG this affix is usually used to turn state into process, with resultative meaning, and always prefers nominal stems. The interesting question is: why is this suffix used for Turkish verbs that already have the meaning of process?

Two possible explanations can be mentioned: (a) During the transference process the verb is treated by the recipient language as non-verb, which is verbalized

afterwards through the use of the dialect's most productive suffix. This can also be regarded as an argument in favor of Moravscik's (1975) generalization that "borrowed verbs are never borrowed as verbs" or Wohlgemuth's (2009) explanation that "they are borrowed as neutral lexemes, not necessarily as nouns". So, the verb does not yet have the meaning of process and must be verbalized again in the recipient language. (b) The meaning of the suffix *-év-* could be influenced by the meaning of the Turkish verbalizer *-la-*. Generally, the Turkish verbalizer does not lend any additional semantic meaning to the verb, it simply shows the change of grammatical class from noun to verb. However, it also has an intensifying meaning whenever it is added: (i) to stems denoting noun and verb, e.g. *tat* 'to taste' and 'taste' > *tat-la-mak* 'to sweeten', etc.; (ii) to verbs, e.g. *kok* 'to smell' > *kok-la-mak* 'to smell, to sniff, to feel', etc. (see Kononov 1956, 257; Kiranudis 2009, 484). This intensifying meaning of process may have been extended to the Greek verbalizer *-év-* as well.

The selection of the suffix *-év-* is rather *ad hoc*, since it is not subject to specific criteria. Still, on the basis of our data we can try to define some of them:

(1) It is the most productive suffix in verbal derivation denoting that a verb is derived from a 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 a verb and not a nominal.

(2) During the transference process the verb is treated as non-verb, not exactly as a noun but as 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 the *-év-* suffix.

(3) While accommodating Turkish verbs in Pontic, the *-év-* verbalizer produces mostly transitive verbs, just like its Turkish counterpart *-la-*.

(4) The intensifying meaning of process denoted by the Turkish verbalizer *-la-* is also extended to the *-év-* verbalizer.

(5) Phonological reasons must be excluded, as the verbalizer's presence is not conditioned by phonology.

A plausible explanation why *-év-* is used in verbal Turkish loanblends, whereas other verbalizers are not, is also given by Ralli (2013, 22–23), who states that the use of the *-év-* suffix is conditioned by its derivational productivity diachronically and that PG preserves the productivity of the use of *-ev-* in Classical Greek (5th–4th c. BC), among lots of other ancient Greek elements it preserves.

So, the three main factors for the preferable use of the verbalizer *-év-* can be summarized as follows: (a) indication of deverbal formation; (b) intensification of the meaning of process; (c) derivational productivity diachronically.

3. Loan verbs from Russian

The strategy used for the Russian loan verbs is LVS by means of the verb *evtáɣo* 'to make/to do' combined with the infinitive of the borrowed verb. The attested verbs are as follows:

Replica form	Model form	Attested form(s)
adyxát' 'rest'	otdyxat'	adyxát', atdixáyut
atmechát' 'note, celebrate'	otmechat'	atmichát', atmechát'
aznachát' 'mean'	oznachat'	aznachát', znáchit
byt' 'be'	byt'	byt', est', búdesh, búdet, byl, bylá, býlo, býla, býli
éxat' 'go by car'	exat'	poédet
gavarít' 'say'	govorit'	gavaryát, gavarítsa, skazát'
gulyát' 'walk'	gulyat'	gulyát', gulyáyut
interesovát' 'interest'	interesovat'	interesovát'
moch' 'can'	moch'	mózhet
paluchát' 'get'	poluchat'	paluchíl
práznavat' 'celebrate'	prazdnovat'	práznavat
prinimát' 'accept'	prinimat'	prinimát'
priznavát' 'recognize'	priznavat'	priznavát'
razlichát' 'distinguish'	razlichat'	razlichát'
sazhát' 'plant'	sazhat'	sazhát'
spravlyát' 'celebrate'	spravlyat'	spravlyát'
spráshivat' 'ask'	sprashivat'	spráshivat'
uchít' 'teach'	uchit'	uchít'
vinchátsa 'get married in church'	ven'chat'sya	vinchátsa
vklyuchát' 'turn on'	vklyuchat'	vkluchít'
vstrechát' 'meet'	vstrechat'	vstrichát'
xvatát' 'be enough, suffice'	xvatat'	xvátit
znakómitsya 'make the acquaintance'	znakomit'sya	znakómitsya

Table 5: Loan verbs of Russian origin

The problem is that the corpus, in addition to borrowings, i.e. foreign elements that are already integrated into the Matrix Language (ML), also contains code-switching, i.e. elements of the embedded languages (Clyne 2003, 72). The examples analyzed are mostly temporary or nonce borrowings (not code-switching), transferred in the form of the infinitive, without any adaptation to the morphological rules of Pontic, but used into complex predicates. Alongside, there are examples of DI, used as complements to modal verbs and in *na*-clauses, but not involving any adaptation mechanism.

Based on the data elicited, most of the transferred Russian verbs are used in an

infinitive form or sometimes in 3rd-person singular present. The same is observed in other languages as well. Thus, Matras (2007, 48) mentions that the borrowed verbs usually appear in either the root form, an infinitive form, or an unmarked inflected form which can quite often be the 3rd-person singular present (see [8] and [9]).

[8]

I	máma	ólts	epínen
DEF:F.SG.NOM	mother:F.SG.NGEN	all:M./F.PL.ACC	make:IPFV.PST:3.SG
D	N	PN	V

prinimát'
accept:IPFV.INF_RUSSIAN
V

'Mother accepted all.'

(Berikashvili 2016a, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B03)

or,

[9]

avúto	aéts	*abaznacháet,*	akíno	aéts	*abaznacháet*
3:N.SG.NGEN	so	mean:3.SG_RUSSIAN	that:N.SG.NGEN	so	mean:3.SG_RUSSIAN
PN	ADV	V	PN	ADV	V

'This means this, and that means that.'

(Skopeteas & Berikashvili 2016, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B02)

Most of the transferred infinitives are used in Light Verbs Construction (LVC), a tendency visible in other languages as well. Matras (2007, 47–48) mentions that: "Mainly two light verbs are used […] they usually derive from or are identical to the lexical verbs for 'to make/to do' and 'to be/to become.'"

From our data this verb is *evtáɣo* 'to make/to do' combined with the infinitive of the borrowed verb. The light verbs can either appear in prepositional position (see [10]), or in postpositional position (see [11]).

[10]

esí	pa	kalá	*eftás*	*gatóvit'*
2:SG.NOM	too	well	make:2.SG	cook:IPFV.INF_RUSSIAN
PN	ADV	ADV	V	V

'You too cook well.'

(Berikashvili 2016a, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B03)

[11]

ke	*atmechát'*	epíke	póte	éxtisan
and	note:IPFV.INF_RUSSIAN	make:PFV.PST:3.SG	when	build:PFV.PST:3.PL
C	V	V	ADV	V

'And noted when it was built.'

(Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-FE-00000-A11)

It is worth mentioning that PG uses the construction with the verb *evtáɣo* only with borrowed verbs, not with native ones, just as is the case with the verb *káno* in SMG. The loan verb inserted in a complex predicate has nominal properties, and this shows that languages have a lower preference for borrowing verbal lexemes. In contrast to SMG, scholars assume (Sitaridou 2014a; 2014b) that PG possess-

es the infinitive forms, though these forms are only 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 the Greek system (SMG and PG), subjunctive mood with *na* is expected. It is assumed that subjunctive complements replaced infinitives (see Joseph 1983, 49–55), thus marking the transition from Ancient Greek to SMG (see discussion in Sitaridou 2014a, 24).

PG spoken in Georgia lacks the infinitive forms; however, our corpus contains one example of the infinitive as the nominalized complement to aspectual verbs, such as the verb *ɣlítono* 'to finish' (see [12]).

[12]
óndes	eɣlítosen		to	*máθin*	érθen
when	finish:PFV.PST:3.SG		DEF:N.SG.ACC	learn:INF	come:PFV.PST:3.SG
ADV	V		D	V	V
S-O		xoríon			
LOC-DEF:N.SG.NGEN		village:N.SG.NGEN			
P-D		N			

'After her graduation she came to the village.'

(Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B06)

But this form occurs as a hapax legomenon, so the infinitive is not functional in PG spoken in Georgia. Still, in the transference process, PG uses Russian infinitive forms in the place where subjunctive mood with *na* is expected. Sometimes even *na* is used in such cases (see [13]).

[13]
na	*razlichát'*		to	rosikó	i
to	distinguish:IPFV.INF_{RUSSIAN}		DEF:N.SG.NGEN	Russian:N.SG.NGEN	DEF:F.SG.NOM
C	V		D	A	D
	ɣlósa				
	language:F.SG.NGEN				
	N				

'To distinguish Russian language.'

(Kotanidi et al. 2016, PNT-TXT-LG-00000-B03)

Sitaridou (2014b, 126) mentions that in Romeyka, one PG variety in Trabzon, the infinitive is productively used and one of its uses is that of a complement to negated past tense modals: *prepi* 'must' and *bori* 'can/may'. The examples attested with transferred Russian verbs in PG spoken in Georgia show that Russian infinitives are inserted as complements mostly to negated present tense modals *prep* 'must' and (*e*)*porí* 'can/may' (see [14]).

[14]
ki	poró	atóra	*atvechát'*
NEG	can:1.SG	now	answer:IPFV.INF_{RUSSIAN}
PRT	V	ADV	V

'I cannot answer right now.'

(Skopeteas & Berikashvili 2016, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B01)

Also, there seems to be variation among speakers with regard to the use of Russian infinitives, because in the same environment *na*-clauses are used with native verbs (see [15]).

[15]
eɣó	k=eporó	na	apandó
1:SG.NOM	NEG=can:1.SG	to	answer:1.SG
PN	PRT=V	C	V

'I cannot answer.'

(Berikashvili 2016a, PNT-TRA-SN-00000-B04)

Additional files have been recorded to check the use of the Russian infinitive and *na*-clauses with positive modals and negative ones. It was found that speakers prefer to use *na*-clauses in both cases; even when they used the Russian infinitive (which was mostly used in negative clauses), *na* was inserted obligatorily. Moreover, the preferable choice was LVS (see [16]).

[16]
emís	ki=prep	na	eftáme	spráshivat'
1:PL.NOM	NEG=must:3.SG	to	make:1.PL	ask:IPFV.INF$_{\text{RUSSIAN}}$
PN	PRT=V	C	V	V

'We must not ask.'

(Berikashvili 2016a, PNT-TRA-SN-00000-B01)

In all the attested cases of Russian infinitives, all of them are imperfective ones, although in Russian after the modal verbs *nuzhno* 'must' and *mozhno* 'can/may' both perfective and imperfective infinitives can be used. The imperfective infinitive is triggered after aspectual verbs, such as *nachat'* 'begin', *konchit'* 'finish', etc., i.e. verbs showing processes (see Shvedova 1980, 603). This can be explained by the internal structure of Pontic, as it does not show any aspectual distinction in subjunctive mood. Thus, the observed data reflect a binary distinction with regard to the use of Russian infinitives, namely: (a) a subset of infinitives used as DI in *na*-clauses and as complements to modals; (b) a subset of infinitives used in LVC. In the former case, the use of the imperfective infinitive is governed by the PG rule of aspectual distinction in subjunctive mood, whereas in the latter the PFV/IPFV distinction is a feature of the light verb (if used in the past), therefore there is no need to once again make this distinction in the infinitive.

From the data elicited we can conclude that the main strategy while borrowing Russian verbs is LVS, using the verb *evtáyo* 'to make/to do' combined with the infinitive. There is no overt evidence of specific factors governing the choice of this strategy. One of the assumptions stated by Ralli (2009) in the case of loan verbs from English into SMG, which enter Greek preferably by means of the light verb *káno* 'to do', e.g. *káno frái* 'to fry', *káno ɣuéikap* 'to wake up' (Ralli 2009, 13), is that the inflectionally poor system of the donor language causes the adaptation of verbs by using the light verb 'to do'. In the case of Russian this assumption does not seem viable, because Russian has a rich verbal inflexion.

One possible explanation could also be an extralinguistic factor, i.e. the degree

of bilingualism. Pontic Greeks in Georgia are bilingual in Russian and "acceptance of bilingualism as an aspect of group identity is an important pre-condition for the failure to integrate loan verbs" (Matras 2009, 184); this means that less integrational effort is required for verb adaptation. This accounts for the fact that the Russian verbs are mostly used in infinitive, without any adaptation to the rules of the dialect, i.e. they are not integrated. To this purpose, only two strategies are used (mostly LVS and less DI). The former "involves a whole extra constituent for accommodation and renders the borrowed item in a special lexical class whose members do not have the full set of verbal properties in the recipient language" (Wohlgemuth 2009, 285), whereas the latter has no formal accommodation.

Following LVIH: LVS → IndI → DI → (ParI), Russian verbs are distributed between the two strategies, the common result of both being that the verb lacks some of the verbal properties. Thus, in either case, it is difficult to assign the loan verb to the 'verb' class.

4. Conclusions

Loan verbs in PG are transferred by means of different strategies for different languages, as already outlined. These strategies are IndI for loan words from Turkish and LVS for loan words from Russian. In both cases there is morphological adaptation, i.e. the borrowed element is formally adapted before being used as a verb.

One of the current generalizations suggests that verb accommodation by means of IndI and LVS shows that the verbs are borrowed underspecified for part-of-speech membership, so they are treated as non-verbs, while verb accommodation by the other two strategies (DI and ParI) shows that they are treated as verbs throughout the entire borrowing process. In PG they are treated as non-verbs (nouns or neutral lexemes), because they are accommodated by IndI and LVS.

Another generalization was summarized by Wohlgemuth (2009, 295): suffixing languages and languages with 'strong' affixation (like PG) show a statistically significant preference to avoid DI in favor of LVS and IndI. This is the reason why these two strategies are preferable for Pontic.

But why are different accommodation strategies chosen for the different (immediate) donor languages involved in the borrowing?

One of the interesting issues is that, generally, as scholars observe – a banal observation according to Matras (2007, 49) – "a pre-requisite for the employment of loan verb adaptation markers is the availability in the recipient language of a morphological procedure to derive verbs from non-verbs". This is available in PG, but it is only applied to Turkish loans, not to Russian ones. As outlined by Matras (2007, 49) "not all languages that possess verb derivation strategies employ them with loan verbs". All the more so since, in our case, PG employs such strategies while borrowing verbs from Turkish and does not employ them when Russian verbs are transferred.

The possible reasons for applying different strategies in PG are associated with the

following factors: (a) typological compatibility of donor and recipient language; (b) chronological factor; (c) sociolinguistic impact, namely the degree of bilingualism.

Previous research (see Berikashvili 2016b) on the borrowing of nouns revealed that the phonological form of the loan word was decisive for the integration of Russian and Turkish nouns in PG, although the same cannot be stated about loan verbs. The common strategy that has come to light for both nouns and verbs is that: (a) in the case of a non-concatenative language, i.e. Russian, PG reinterprets simple (indefinite, bare) forms (just as they are in the donor language) according to the rules of Pontic, e.g. in loan nouns ending in -a, the phonological form is reinterpreted as PG gender suffix, denoting concrete declension type; in verbs it is the infinitive form which is directly inserted in subjunctive mood, in complex predicates or as a complement to modals; (b) in the case of a concatenative language, i.e. Turkish, PG always searches for the stem and then adds inflectional markers characteristic of Pontic. This can be observed in both nouns and verbs. To this effect, in loan nouns PG adds the productive neuter gender suffix -i(n), while in verbs the productive derivational suffix -év-. Thus, in the case of non-concatenative morphology, the transferred words are loanwords, whereas in the case of concatenative morphology they are loanblends. Nonetheless, no key role of the distinct morphological types is observable.

Another reason for applying two different strategies to Turkish and Russian may be related to the chronological factor. The borrowing process from Turkish is chronologically earlier and there is a high degree of integration due to the intense and long contact with Turkish. Consequently, Turkish words are already established borrowings, i.e. integrated into the lexicon of PG, while the process of borrowing from the Russian language began lately and these borrowings are temporary or overt code-switching. Among Pontic Greeks in Georgia there is a high degree of bilingualism in Russian, but not in Turkish. Therefore, Turkish verbs cannot be the result of code-switching.

Last but not least, the bilingualism factor comes into play. According to the LVIH, less integrational effort is required when the degree of bilingualism is high. As most Pontic speakers have a high degree of bilingualism in Russian, this means that less integrational effort is required to accommodate borrowed verbs from Russian, thus predictably LVS is used, whereas for verbs borrowed from Turkish more integrational effort is required and this is why IndI is used.

References

Berikashvili, S. 2016a. *Interviews in Pontic Greek* (Corpus resource: TLA, Donated Corpora, XTYP Lab). Bielefeld: Bielefeld University. [Data collected, transcribed, and glossed by S. Berikashvili.]

—. 2016b. "Morphological integration of Russian and Turkish nouns in Pontic Greek", in *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 69(2). Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter, 255–76.

Clyne, M. 2003. *Dynamics of Language Contact: English and Immigrant Languages*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Göksel, A. & E. Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. London & New York: Routledge.

Haugen, E. 1950. "The analysis of linguistic borrowing", *Language* 26, 210–31.

Horrocks, G. 2010. *Greeks: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*, 2nd ed. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Joseph, B. 1983. *The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive: A Study in Areal, General and Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kiranudis 2009 = Κυρανούδης, Π. 2009. *Μορφολογία των τουρκικών δανείων της ελληνικής γλώσσας.* [Morphology of Turkish loan words in Greek]. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.

Kononov, A. 1956. *Grammatika sovremennogo tureckogo literaturnogo jazyka* [Grammar of the contemporary Turkish literary language]. Moscow & Leningrad: Academy of Science of USSR.

Kornfilt, J. 1997. *Turkish*. London & New York: Routledge.

Kotanidi, E., S. Berikashvili, S. Böhm, J. Lorenz & S. Skopeteas. 2016. *Pontic Data Collection, Version 2.0* (Corpus resource: TLA, Donated Corpora, XTYP Lab). Bielefeld: Bielefeld University. [Data collected, transcribed, and translated by E. Kotanidi; data glossed by S. Berikashvili; supervised by S. Böhm & J. Lorenz; corpus design by S. Skopeteas.]

Matras, Y. 2007. "The borrowability of structural categories", in Y. Matras & J. Sakel (eds), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 31–74.

—. 2009. *Language Contact*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Moravcsik, E. 1975. "Verb borrowing", in *Linguistische Gazette* 8, 3–30.

—. 1978. "Language contact", in J. H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Human Language*, 1st v.: *Method and Theory*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 93–122.

Muysken, P. 1981. "Creole tense/mood/aspect systems: The unmarked case?", in P. Muysken (ed.), *Generative Studies on Creole Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris, 181–99.

—. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. 2006. *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Oikodomidis 1958 = Οικονομίδης, Δ. H. 1958. *Γραμματική της ελληνικής διαλέκτου του Πόντου* [Grammar of Greek dialect in Pontos] (*Λεξικογραφικόν Δελτίον*, Appendix 1). Athens: Academy of Athens.

Papadopoulos 1955 = Παπαδόπουλος, Α. 1955. *Ιστορική γραμματική της ποντικής διαλέκτου* [Historical grammar of Pontic Greek] (*Αρχείον Πόντου*, Appendix 1). Athens: Commission of Pontic Studies.

Poplack, S. 1980. "Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish Y TERMINO EN ESPAÑOL: Toward a typology of code-switching", *Linguistics* 18, 581–618.

Poplack, S., D. Sankoff & C. Miller. 1988. "The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation", *Linguistics* 16, 47–104.

Ralli, A. 2009. "Morphology in language contact: Verbal loanblend formation in Asia Minor Greek (Aivaliot)", in T. Stolz, M. Vanhove, H. Otsuka & A. Urdze (eds), *Morphologies in Contact* (Studia Typologica). Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1–18.

—. 2012. = Ράλλη, Α. 2012. *Μορφολογία* [Morphology]. Athens: Patakis.

—. 2013. = Ράλλη, Α. 2013. "Ιταλογενή ρηματικά δάνεια στις νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους" [Italic loan verbs in Modern Greek dialects], *Patras Working Papers on Linguistics 3 "Μορφολογία και γλωσσική επαφή"*. Patra: University of Patras, 9–25.

Shvedova, N. (ed.). 1980. *Russkaja grammatika* [Russian Grammar], 1st v. Moscow: Nauka.

Sitaridou, I. 2014a. "The Romeyka infinitive: Continuity, contact and change in the Hellenic varieties of Pontus", *Diachronica* 31(1), 23–73.

—. 2014b. "Modality, antiveridicality and complementation: The Romeyka infinitive as a negative polarity item", *Lingua* 148, 118–46.

Skopeteas, S. & S. Berikashvili. 2016. *Interviews in Pontic Greek* (Corpus resource: TLA, Donated Corpora, XTYP Lab). Bielefeld: Bielefeld University. [Data collection by S. Skopeteas, 2005; transcription and glossing by S. Berikashvili, 2016.]

Tombaidis 1988 = Τομπαΐδης, Δ. 1988. *Η ποντιακή διάλεκτος* [Pontic Dialect] (*Αρχείον Πόντου*, Appendix 17). Athens: Commission for Pontic Studies.

Tzitzilis, Chr. 1989. "Zu den griechisch-türkischen Sprachbeziehungen", *Linguistique Balkanique* 32(3-4), 185–97.

Wichman, S. & J. Wohlgemuth. 2008. "Loan verbs in a typological perspective", in T. Stolz, D. Bakker & R. Salas Palomo (eds), *Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romanisation Processes*. Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, 89–121.

Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Wohlgemuth, J. 2009. *Typology of Verbal Borrowings*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Περίληψη

Η προσαρμογή των δάνειων ρημάτων στην ποντιακή ελληνική της Γεωργίας

Το άρθρο αυτό παρουσιάζει μια εμπειρική μελέτη για τις γλωσσικές επαφές. Εστιάζει στην επίδραση των γλωσσών διαφορετικής τυπολογίας (τουρκικής και ρωσικής) κατά τη διαδικασία του δανεισμού των ρημάτων (συμπεριλαμβανομένων και των δανείων μείξης) στα ποντιακά που μιλιούνται από την ποντιακή κοινότητα της Γεωργίας. Ακολουθώντας την ταξινόμηση των Wichman & Wohlgemuth (2008) και την Ιεραρχία της Ενσωμάτωσης Ρηματικών Δανείων (Loan Verb Integration Hierarchy) του Wohlgemuth (2009), αναλύονται οι στρατηγικές προσαρμογής των δάνειων ρημάτων.

Η μελέτη βασίζεται σε σώμα προφορικού λόγου από την ποντιακή κοινότητα της Γεωργίας, συγκεντρωμένο με επιτόπια έρευνα, σε διαφορετικές χρονικές περιόδους. Το καταγεγραμμένο υλικό διαιρείται ως εξής: (α) αρχικοί οικισμοί (δηλαδή χωριά της Γεωργίας)· (β) μετοίκιση στις πόλεις (δηλαδή σε πόλεις της Γεωργίας, κυρίως στην πρωτεύουσα Τιφλίδα)· (γ) μετανάστευση στην Ελλάδα (Θεσσαλονίκη). Οι καταγραφές πραγματοποιήθηκαν από τους Ε. Κοτανίδη, S. Berikashvili και Σ. Σκοπετέα στο πλαίσιο του ερευνητικού προγράμματος "The impact of current transformational processes on language and ethnic identity: Urum and Pontic Greeks in Georgia" του Πανεπιστημίου του Bielefeld της Γερμανίας. Ολόκληρο το υλικό με γραμματικό σχολιασμό είναι διαθέσιμο στο γλωσσικό αρχείο TLA του Max Planck Institute.

Στην παρούσα εργασία υποστηρίζεται ότι τα ποντιακά κάνουν χρήση διαφό-

ρων στρατηγικών για την ένταξη των ρηματικών δανείων που προέρχονται από μια συγκολλητική και από μια κλιτή γλώσσα (την τουρκική και τη ρωσική αντίστοιχα). Τα τουρκικά ρηματικά δάνεια ενσωματώνονται στη γλώσσα αποδέκτη (δηλαδή στα ποντιακά) ακολουθώντας τη στρατηγική της έμμεσης εισαγωγής (Indirect Insertion) με τον ρηματοποιητή -ευ-, ενώ τα ρωσικά ακολουθώντας τη λεγόμενη *στρατηγική ελαφρού ρήματος* (Light Verb Strategy) με τη βοήθεια του ρήματος *ευτάγω* 'κάνω'. Επίσης, εξετάζονται παραδείγματα ρωσικών ρηματικών δανείων που χρησιμοποιούν τη στρατηγική της άμεσης εισαγωγής (Direct Insertion). αυτά, ως επί το πλείστον, είναι απαρέμφατα της ρωσικής.

Επιπρόσθετα, επιχειρείται να δοθεί μια εξήγηση για την αποκλειστική χρησιμοποίηση του επιθήματος -ευ- κατά την ενσωμάτωση των τουρκικών δανείων, καθώς και για τις διάφορες στρατηγικές προσαρμογής που εφαρμόζει η γλώσσα αποδέκτης (τα ποντιακά) κατά την ενσωμάτωση των δάνειων ρημάτων από διάφορες άμεσες δότριες γλώσσες.