

# Greek-Turkish Language Contact in Asia Minor

Mark Janse \*

## RÉSUMÉ

Dans cet article, l'auteur s'attache à l'étude des variétés les plus lourdement «turquicisées» des dialectes grecs de la Cappadoce, à savoir, les dialectes Akso et Misti de la Cappadoce Centrale, les dialectes du sud-ouest de la Cappadoce Aravan, Ghúrzono et Fertek, et les dialectes du Sud de la Cappadoce Ulağaç et Semendere.

L'objet de cet article a été d'illustrer un cas extrême du phénomène des langues en contact, sur la base de nombreux éléments de preuve, tirés à la fois de sources primaires et secondaires.

## ABSTRACT

In this paper, the author focus on the more heavily turkicized varieties, viz. the Central Cappadocian dialects of Aksó and Mistí, the Southwest Cappadocian dialects of Araván, Ghúrzono and Ferték, and the Southeast Cappadocian dialects of Ulağaç and Semendere.

The aim of the paper has been to illustrate an extreme case of language contact on the basis of more extensive evidence from both secondary and primary sources.

## 1. Background

Cappadocian is a Greek-Turkish mixed language formerly spoken by Greek Orthodox Christians in Cappadocia in the Turkish region of Central Anatolia until the population exchange between Greece and Turkey in accordance with the 1923 Treaty of Lausanne.<sup>1</sup>

Following Thomason and Kaufman (1988), Cappadocian is often referred to as Asia Minor Greek, but the latter designation should be used only as a cover term for all the native Greek dialects of Asia Minor, not just Cappadocian and its neighbours, Farasiot and Siliot (Janse 2009a: §1.4.1). At the time of the exchange, three different Asia Minor Greek dialects were spoken in Cappadocia: Cappadocian, Farasiot and Pontic. According to a 1924 census,

\* Ghent University

44% of the Cappadocians (c. 17,530) spoke Cappadocian, 56% (c. 22,350) Turkish.<sup>2</sup> Most if not all of the Cappadocian speakers were bilingual in Turkish, some trilingual in Turkish and Greek, which was taught in several villages and spoken by men who went to work in Constantinople.<sup>3</sup>

The linguistic structure and sociolinguistic situation of Cappadocian before the exchange is described in great detail by Dawkins (1916), who conducted fieldwork *in situ* in the years 1909-1911.

At the time of Dawkins' fieldwork, the Cappadocian dialects varied considerably due to the level of interference from either Turkish or Greek. The Southeast Cappadocian dialects of Ulağaç and Semendere, for example, form a subgroup in which, in the words of Dawkins, “the Greek is in an extremely corrupt condition, and is bound shortly to disappear as a vernacular in favour of Turkish” (1916: 18).<sup>4</sup>

From a typological point of view, these dialects are closer to Turkish than to Greek, exhibiting as they do vowel harmony, agglutinative morphology and SOV-type word order. The Northeast Cappadocian dialects of Sinasós and Potámja, on the other hand, form another subgroup which, according to Dawkins, “[f]rom the dialect point of view [...] is of less importance”, because “the old dialect largely gives way to the common Greek” (1916: 27). The situation is comparable to, though by no means identical with, a creole continuum: at the one end we find a Greek-Turkish mixed language, typologically closer to Turkish than to Greek and hence “over the border of nongenetic development”, at the other a Greek dialect “in the full genetic sense” (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 93f.).

The process of “deturkicization”, to retain the parallel with the creole continuum, was accelerated by the population exchange. The Cappadocians were scattered all over Greece and rapidly shifted to Greek due to discrimination and oppression. Collaborators of the Centre for Asia Minor Studies in Athens were able to publish sketch grammars of the dialects of Aksó (Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou 1960), Anakú (Costakis 1964), Araván (Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960) and Ulağaç (Kesisoglou 1951) and ethnographic studies of the villages of Anakú (Kostakis 1963) and Mistí (Kostakis 1977) based on fieldwork conducted in the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s (for details see Janse 2009a: §1.2.3).

It was generally believed that Cappadocian died out in the 1960s,<sup>5</sup> until Mark Janse and Dimitris Papazachariou discovered that Cappadocian is still spoken as a first language by several hundreds of people in Northern and Central

Greece (Janse & Papazachariou, forthcoming). According to the present state of our knowledge, the dialect of Mistí is the only Cappadocian dialect that is still used as a vernacular, albeit mostly by middle- and old-aged people.<sup>6</sup>

Mistí is called “the most remarkable of all [the] villages” by Dawkins (1916: 19), because its inhabitants constituted a closed community who lived in isolation from both Greeks and Turks. At the time of the exchange, the Mistiots numbered 3,036 (Mourellos 1982: 228). Not surprisingly, their descendants in Greece still form a tight community, which may explain why their dialect has survived until the present day. The Mistiots have a strong sense of cultural identity, expressed in their annual Panhellenic meeting called *γavústima*, established in 1997.<sup>7</sup>

Mistiots had not been used in public until the *γavústima* of 2006, but the language remains seriously endangered or even moribund.

In this paper, I will concentrate on the more heavily turkicized varieties, viz. the Central Cappadocian dialects of Aksó and Mistí, the Southwest Cappadocian dialects of Araván, Ghúrzono and Ferték, and the Southeast Cappadocian dialects of Ulağaç and Semendere (for the dialect geography of Cappadocian see Janse 2009a: §1.4.3). Data from Mistí are taken from recent recordings, data from other dialects from Dawkins (1916) and the Greek sketch grammars mentioned above.

## 2. Phonology

The heavily turkicized Central and South Cappadocian dialects have undergone a remarkable process of phonetic and phonological convergence with Turkish. In addition to the Greek vowels /a/, /e/, /i/, /o/, /u/, these dialects also have the Turkish rounded front vowels /ö/, /ü/ and the unrounded back vowel /i/, although these are often replaced by Greek vowels.<sup>8</sup>

These vowels appear in Turkish lexical loans as well as in derivational and inflectional suffixes of either Turkish or Greek origin, where they are often subject to vowel harmony. The Turkish verb *düşünmek* “think” is borrowed as *düşündüzo* in Southwest Cappadocian and *düşündü* in Southeast Cappadocian on the basis of the Turkish simple past 3sg *düşündü* (Janse 2001). In Southeast Cappadocian (Ulağaç) the vowel harmony is found to extend to the inflections of the present 1pl *düşündüm*, 3pl *düşündün*, in Northwest Cappadocian (Malakopí) to those of the perfective past (aorist) 2sg *düşüntsüs*, 3sg *düşüntsü*, 2pl *düşüntsüt* (Janse 2009: §2.4.1.4.2).<sup>9</sup>

Another example, with different vowel harmony, is *tšïyü'dizo* (Araván) from Turkish *çağırmaq*, perfective past *çağırdı*, “shout”.<sup>10</sup>

Turkish *püskül* “tassel” is borrowed at Delmesó as *püscülǘ*, gen. *püscüljǘ* instead of *püscülí*, gen. *püscüljú*.

Three factors affect the pronunciation of particular consonants in certain environments due to Turkish interference, viz. aspiration, palatalization and voicing c.q. devoicing. The voiceless plosives /p/, /t/, /c/, /k/ and the voiceless affricates /ts/, /tš/ are often aspirated before vowels, not just in words of Turkish origin, but in Greek words as well (Janse 2009a: §2.2.1), e.g. *pú na páam* [p<sup>h</sup>ú na p<sup>h</sup>ám] (Mistiot) “where do we go?” Velar consonants are palatalized before front vowels in both Greek and Turkish. In many Cappadocian words of Turkish origin, the front vowels /ö/, /ü/ have shifted to back vowels while retaining the palatalization of the preceding consonants, e.g. Turkish *kütük* “log” → *cütüic* (Ulağaç) vs. *cutútš* (Mistiot). Palatal plosives have phonemic status in Cappadocian, as they are regularly found before back vowels in originally Greek words as well (Janse 2009a: §2.2.2), e.g. Mistiot *kóla* “drive! (present imperative 2sg)” vs. *cóla* “also”. The palato-alveolar fricative /š/ and the palato-alveolar affricates /tš/, /dž/ occur in Turkish loans, but in some dialects also in words of Greek origin as a result of palatalization, e.g. *čer* “hand” → *šér* (Ferték), *ce* “and” → *tši* (Mistiot), *tí* “what?” → *tši* (Ghúrzono).<sup>11</sup>

The Greek dental fricatives /θ/, /ð/ have generally merged with the alveolar plosives /t/, /d/ or with the velar and palatal fricatives /x/, /j/ in Central in South Cappadocian, due to the fact that Turkish does not have such consonants, e.g. *θεός* “God” → *teós* (Araván), *χεός* (Mistí); *δώδεκα* “twelve” → *dódeka* (Araván), *dójeka* (Aksó) (Janse 2009a: §2.4.2.6).<sup>12</sup>

The voiced plosives /b/, /d/, /g/ have phonemic status in Cappadocian and occur in Turkish loans as well as in words of Greek origin. The voicing of pre- and intervocalic plosives and fricatives is a Central Anatolian Turkish dialect feature which is found in Greek words as well, e.g. *to*, plural *ta* (definite article) → *do*, *da* (Ulağaç), *du*, *da* (Mistiot). As in Turkish, voiced plosives and voiced fricatives are devoiced in word-final position and often, though not consistently, revoiced before suffixes beginning with a vowel.

The pronunciation of the unvoiced velar plosive /k/ is another Central Anatolian Turkish dialect feature. In word-initial position, /k/ is voiced in some dialects and subsequently fricativized in others, e.g. Turkish *kardaş* “brother” → *gardáš* (Ulağaç) vs. *yardáš* (Mistiot).<sup>13</sup>

In Central Anatolian Turkish, post-vocalic and especially word-final /k/ are fricativized. The resultant unvoiced velar fricative /x/ is voiced to /ɣ/ in some dialects and often deleted, just like its Turkish counterpart ğ. In other dialects, /x/ becomes a voiced palatal fricative /j/ in intervocalic position, which is also frequently deleted. In still other dialects, /x/ remains an unvoiced velar fricative, even in intervocalic position. An example of this is Old Turkish *uvşak* “child” → Cappadocian *fšáx*, plural *fšayá* (Sílata), *fšáxa* (Aksó), *fšéa* (Ulağaç).<sup>14</sup>

### 3. Morphology

Cappadocian morphology is characterized by heavy Turkish interference. Turkish has no grammatical gender and there are only a few reminiscences of the original Greek gender distinctions left in Cappadocian. In Central and South Cappadocian, grammatical gender distinctions, if any, are found exclusively in the inflectional morphology of animate nouns belonging to the masculine and feminine classes.<sup>15</sup>

The definite article has no gender distinctions in South and only to a very limited extent in Central Cappadocian. Adjectives and other modifiers are always formally neuter, e.g. *itó du kaló néka* “that good wife”, pl. *itá da kalá(n) da nétšis* (Misti).

Most of the nouns, especially in South Cappadocian, have acquired agglutinative morphology using a single case suffix *-jú/-ju* for the genitive and a single number suffix *-ja* for the plural.<sup>16</sup>

The shift must have started in the genitive singular and nominative plural of masculine nouns in *-os*, where the apocope of unstressed /i/, /u/ resulted in zero endings. In Southeast Cappadocian, the original nominative singular endings were reanalysed as being part of the stem. The following (partial) paradigms illustrate the various stages (Janse 2009a: §3.2.2.1):<sup>17</sup>

| (1a) Delmesó              | (1b) Ulağaç                     | (1c) Turkish       |
|---------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|
| <i>áθrop-os</i>           | <i>átropos-Ø</i>                | <i>adam-Ø</i>      |
| man-NOM.SG                | man-N/A                         | man-NOM            |
| <i>aθróp-Ø (aθrop-jú)</i> | <i>átropoz-ju (atrop-jú)</i>    | <i>adam-in</i>     |
| man-GEN.(SG)              | man-GEN                         | man-GEN            |
| <i>aθróp-Ø</i>            | <i>átropoz-ja-Ø</i>             | <i>adam-lar-Ø</i>  |
| man-NOM.PL                | man-PL-N/A                      | man-PL-NOM         |
| <i>aθróp-Ø (aθrop-jú)</i> | <i>átropoz-ja-ju (atrop-jú)</i> | <i>adam-lar-in</i> |
| man-GEN.(SG)              | man-PL-GEN                      | man-PL-GEN         |

The nominative of masculine nouns in *-os* (as well as in *-is*) is also used for the indefinite accusative on the analogy of the Turkish indefinite accusative, which is identical with the nominative (Janse 2004: 7ff.).

The Greek possessive pronouns have become possessive suffixes, as in Turkish. In many dialects, the rules of vowel harmony and intervocalic voicing apply (cf. §1). Compare the following paradigms and note the similarities between the Cappadocian and the Turkish suffixes (Janse 2009a: §3.4.2.2):

|      |                                |                                |
|------|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| (2a) | Ulağaç                         | (2b) Turkish                   |
| 1sg  | <i>fšáy-īm</i><br>boy-POSS.1SG | <i>uşağ-ım</i><br>boy-POSS.1SG |
| 2sg  | <i>fšáy-īs</i>                 | <i>uşağ-ın</i>                 |
| 3sg  | <i>fšáy-īt</i>                 | <i>uşağ-ı</i>                  |
| 1pl  | <i>fšáy-īmas</i>               | <i>uşağ-ımız</i>               |
| 2pl  | <i>fšáy-īsas</i>               | <i>uşağ-ınız</i>               |
| 3pl  | <i>fšáy-ītne</i>               | <i>uşak-ları</i>               |

Agglutinative morphology is also found in the Cappadocian verb. The inflection of the copula is entirely agglutinative in the dialects of Aksó, Ferték and Semendere, and based on the 3rd person singular, as in Turkish (Janse 2009: §3.6.4). The following paradigms from Semendere (present and imperfect) and Turkish (perfective past) illustrate the parallelism:

|      |                           |                                   |                            |
|------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| (3a) | Semendere                 | (3b) Semendere                    | (3c) Turkish               |
| 1sg  | <i>ín-mi</i><br>be.PR-1SG | <i>í-tun-mi</i><br>be-IPF.PAS-1SG | <i>i-di-m</i><br>be-PF-1SG |
| 2sg  | <i>ín-si</i>              | <i>í-tun-si</i>                   | <i>i-di-n</i>              |
| 3sg  | <i>ín-Ø</i>               | <i>í-tun-Ø</i>                    | <i>i-di-Ø</i>              |
| 1pl  | <i>ín-misti</i>           | <i>í-tun-misti</i>                | <i>i-di-k</i>              |
| 2pl  | <i>ín-sti</i>             | <i>í-tun-sti</i>                  | <i>i-di-niz</i>            |
| 3pl  | <i>ín-di</i>              | <i>í-tun-di</i>                   | <i>i-di-ler</i>            |

The inflection of the passive imperfect is agglutinative in almost all the Cappadocian dialects, except in the 3rd person plural (Janse 2009a: §3.6.2.2). The following paradigm is from Aksó (*címe* “exist”), to which is added the perfective past of its Turkish near-equivalent (*olmak* “become”):

|      |   |      |                                 |
|------|---|------|---------------------------------|
| (4a) | Aksó                                      | (4b) | Turkish                         |
|      | 1sg <i>có-ton-me</i><br>exist-IPF.PAS-1SG |      | <i>ol-du-m</i><br>become-PF-1SG |
|      | 2sg <i>có-ton-se</i>                      |      | <i>ol-du-n</i>                  |
|      | 3sg <i>có-ton-Ø</i>                       |      | <i>ol-du-Ø</i>                  |
|      | 1pl <i>có-ton-meste</i>                   |      | <i>ol-du-k</i>                  |
|      | 2pl <i>có-ton-ste</i>                     |      | <i>ol-du-nuz</i>                |
|      | 3pl <i>có-tan-Ø</i>                       |      | <i>ol-du-lar</i>                |

Dawkins (1916: 144) records the occasional addition of the Turkish markers of the 1st and 2nd person plural to the Greek ones in the dialect of Semendere:<sup>18</sup>

|      |  |      |  |
|------|--|------|--|
| (5a) | <i>cé-tun-misti-c</i><br>exist-IPF.PAS-1PL-1PL | (6a) | <i>i-tun-misti-c</i><br>be-IPF.PAS-1PL-1PL |
| (5b) | <i>cé-tun-sti-niz</i><br>exist-IPF.PAS-2PL-2PL | (6b) | <i>i-tun-sti-niz</i><br>be-IPF.PAS-2PL-2PL |

Another remarkable example of heavy borrowing is the formation of the Cappadocian pluperfect and conditional on the basis of the imperfect of the copula, which is attached to the perfective past (Janse 2009a: §3.6.1.4). The inflection is still in vigorous use in Mistiot, as can be seen from the paradigm of the pluperfect (*érume*, perfective past *írta* “come”):<sup>19</sup>

|      |   |      |   |
|------|---|------|---|
| (7a) | Mistiot   | (7b) | Turkish                                       |
|      | 1sg <i>írt-a=dun-Ø</i><br>come.PF-1SG-be.IPF.CL-3SG |      | <i>gel-di-m-di-Ø</i><br>come-PF-1SG-be.PF-3SG |
|      | 2sg <i>írt-is=tun-Ø</i>                             |      | <i>gel-di-n-di-Ø</i>                          |
|      | 3sg <i>írt-i=dun-Ø</i>                              |      | <i>gel-di-Ø-ydi-Ø</i>                         |
|      | 1pl <i>írt-am=dun-Ø</i>                             |      | <i>gel-di-k-ti-Ø</i>                          |
|      | 2pl <i>írt-it=tun-Ø</i>                             |      | <i>gel-di-niz-di-Ø</i>                        |
|      | 3pl <i>írt-an=dun-Ø</i>                             |      | <i>gel-di-ler-di-Ø</i>                        |

Examples of convergence affecting the Cappadocian verb system are the disappearance of the Greek perfect, which has merged with the simple past (perfective), the neutralization of tense distinctions in the conditional and of aspectual distinctions in the imperative (Janse 2009a: §3.6). The imperatives in

the following example from Araván are formally perfective and imperfective respectively, whereas logically the aspects would have to be reversed:

- (8) *düsün-s-e*                      *ce*      *úřa*                      *lál-Ø*  
 think-PF-IMP.2SG      and      thus                      speak.PR-IMP.2SG  
 “think and speak accordingly!”

#### 4. Word Order

Animacy and definiteness play an important role in Cappadocian grammar. As already mentioned, the nominative of masculine nouns in *-os* and *-is* is used for the indefinite accusative as well (cf. §2). The following example is from Northwest Cappadocian (Sílata):<sup>20</sup>

- (9) *ena áθrop-os*    *i-fer-en=me*  
 a    man-N/A.INDEF.SG                                      PAST-bring-IND.3SG=1SG.CL  
*ena partřala-n-miř*    *áθrop-os*  
 a    cut to pieces-PAS-PART                                      man-N/A.INDEF.SG  
 “a man brought me a mangled man”

The association of the nominative case with indefiniteness has resulted in the omission of the definite article in the nominative of animate masculine and feminine nouns. In the case of inanimate and formally neuter nouns, on the other hand, the definite article is used for both the nominative and the accusative, as they are (and have always been) formally identical, viz. *to* (*do*), pl. *ta* (*da*) in both cases (Janse 2004: 12 ff.).

Definiteness also plays a major role in Cappadocian word order, which is determined by and large by considerations of information flow (Janse 2008). The unmarked order is SOV, as in Turkish. This is particularly evident if S and O are full (non-clitic) pronouns. In Greek, the non-clitic pronouns are always used for emphasis, but in Cappadocian they are also used non-emphatically, on the analogy of Turkish. Compare the following utterance from Ulağaç:<sup>21</sup>

- (10a) *itřá*                      *emás*    *ná=mas=skotó-s-on*  
 3PL.NCL                      1PL.ACC.NCL    PRT=1PL.ACC.CL=kill-PF-SUBJ.3PL  
 “they will *kill* us”



It should be noted that the non-clitic pronoun *emás* is doubled by the clitic pronoun *mas*, which indicates that it is not new information (Janse 2008). The use of the non-clitic pronouns and the SOV order replicates the Turkish unmarked order:<sup>22</sup>

- (10b) *onlar*            *bizi*            *öldür-ecek-ler*  
           3PL.NCL        1PL.NCL        kill-FUT-3PL  
           “they will *kill* us”

The frequency of SOV as the unmarked order is particularly evident in the heavily turkicized Southeast Cappadocian dialects (Janse 2009a: §4.2.3.1). In these dialects, OSV is used when the object is a left-dislocated topic and the subject is focused and hence placed in the immediately preverbal position. The same order is used for exactly the same purposes in both Greek and Turkish. The following contrasting pair is from Ulağaç:<sup>23</sup>

- (11a) [*do=peí*]            [*do=vava-t*]<sub>i</sub>            *çór-s-en=do*<sub>i</sub>  
           [the=child.N/A]    [the=father.N/A-POS.3SG]    see-PF-IND.3SG=3SG.CL  
           “the boy saw his father”

- (11b) [*do=peí*]<sub>i</sub>            [*vava-t*]            *çór-s-en=do*<sub>i</sub>  
           [the=child.N/A]    [father.N/A-POS.3SG]    see-PF-IND.3SG=3SG.CL  
           “as for the boy, it was his *father* who saw him”

Interrogative words are placed in preverbal position, as in Turkish. Compare the word order in the following example from Mistiot to the one in (9a):

- (12) *iší*            *emé*            *tín*    *á=mi=pítš-is*  
           2SG.NOM.NCL 1SG.ACC.NCL what PRT=1SG.ACC.CL=do.PF-SUBJ.2SG  
           “*what* will you *do* for me?”

Indefinite and contrastive objects are placed in postverbal position in Cappadocian as in (9). SVO is also the normal order in Greek for this purpose and is also found in Central Anatolian Turkish (as opposed to Standard Turkish which uses SOV).

Cappadocian shares a number of SOV characteristics with Turkish.

Modifiers, including adjectives, demonstratives and relative clauses, invariably precede the noun. The word order found in the following examples from Ulağaç, with two prenominal genitive noun phrases, is impossible in Greek:<sup>24</sup>

- (13a) [[[itópatisax-jú] [koritsj-jú-t]] [do=ándra]]  
 [[[DEMking-GEN] [girl-GEN-POS.3SG]] [the=man.N/A]]  
 “the man of that king’s daughter”

- (13b) [[[enadev-jú] [mana-jú-t]] [do=spít-Ø]]  
 [[[anogre-GEN] [mother-GEN-3SG]] [the=house-N/A]]  
 “the house of an ogre’s mother”

The position of the relative clause preceding the head noun is a very conspicuous Turkish feature (Janse 1999). The following proverb from Aksó has a left-dislocated topic with a prenominal relative clause, whereas the rest of the utterance has the unmarked SOV order:

- (14) [to=dé=kle-i to=fšáx]; mána-t viži dén=do<sub>1</sub>=dín-Ø  
 [REL=NEG=cry.PR-3SG the=child] mother-3SG breast NEG=3SG=give.PR-3SG  
 “a mother does not give the breast to a child that is not crying”

The following example from Ulağaç calques the Turkish word order completely. Note that the Cappadocian relative clause (15a) uses a finite verb and a seemingly extracted subject to replicate the Turkish relative participle (15b) (Janse 2009a: 4.2.4.3):

- (15a) [itó [da=lé-i da=lakurdú-ja]] ftí mé=kru-s  
 [DEM [REL=say.PR-3SG the=word-PL]] ear NEG=apply.PR-2SG  
 “don’t pay attention to the words that he [itó] is saying”

- (15b) [on-un [söyle-diğ-i lakırdı-lar-ı]] dikkat-eal-ma-Ø  
 [3SG-GEN [say-PART-3SG word-PL-ACC]] attention-DAT pay.IMP-NEG-2SG  
 “don’t pay attention to the words of his [onun] saying”

The attachment of the copula to nominal predicates is another Turkish

feature. The clitic forms of the copula are used, viz. *-me (-mi)* etc. for the present (3a) and *-ton-me (-tun-mi)* for the imperfect (3b). The following paradigm from Semendere (quoted by Dawkins 1916: 148) is very interesting, especially in the plural where the 1st and 2nd persons seem to replicate the Turkish pluperfect in *-mİş-tİ* as in (5) and (6):<sup>25</sup>

|       |                     |       |                     |       |                         |
|-------|---------------------|-------|---------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| (16a) | Semendere           | (16b) | Turkish             | (16c) | Turkish                 |
| 1sg   | <i>kaló=tun-mi</i>  |       | <i>güzel-di-m</i>   |       | <i>güzel-miş-ti-m</i>   |
|       | good.SG=be.IPF-1SG  |       | good-PF-1SG         |       | good-PF-PF-1SG          |
| 2sg   | <i>kaló=tun-si</i>  |       | <i>güzel-di-n</i>   |       | <i>güzel-miş-ti-n</i>   |
| 3sg   | <i>kaló=tun-Ø</i>   |       | <i>güzel-di-Ø</i>   |       | <i>güzel-miş-ti-Ø</i>   |
| 1pl   | <i>kalá=misti-c</i> |       | <i>güzel-di-k</i>   |       | <i>güzel-miş-ti-k</i>   |
|       | good.PL-1PL-1PL     |       | good-PF-1PL         |       | good-PF-PF-1PL          |
| 2pl   | <i>kalá=sti-niz</i> |       | <i>güzel-di-niz</i> |       | <i>güzel-miş-ti-niz</i> |
| 3pl   | <i>kalá=tan</i>     |       | <i>güzel-di-ler</i> |       | <i>güzel-miş-ti-ler</i> |

Note that the copula that is used to form the pluperfect (7a) and the conditional, and can be attached to a nominal predicate instead of to the finite verb as in the following example from Araván:

|      |   |  |                          |
|------|---|--|--------------------------|
| (18) | <i>an=dé=se=e-pk-am</i>   |  | <i>nif=tun-Ø</i>         |
|      | if=NEG=2SG.CL=PAST-make.PF-3PL                                    |  | bride=be.IPF-3SG         |
|      | <i>déška ná=se=dók-o=itun-Ø</i>                                   |  | <i>s=etó to=palikári</i> |
|      | now PRT=2SG.CL-give.PF-1SG=be.IPF-3SG                             |  | to=DEM the=boy           |
|      | “if we hadn’t made you a bride, I would give you now to that boy” |  |                          |

The copula is also attached to the negative particle *dé* on the analogy of the Turkish negative particle *değil*. The resulting combination is often used as a compound negative marker in Cappadocian as in the following example from Ulağaç:<sup>26</sup>

|       |                   |       |                            |
|-------|-------------------|-------|----------------------------|
| (19a) | Ulağaç            | (19b) | Turkish                    |
|       | <i>na=ért-o</i>   |       | <i>gel-eceğ-im değil-Ø</i> |
|       | PRT=come.PF-1SG   |       | come-FUT-1SG NEG-3SG       |
|       | <i>dé=ne</i>      |       | “I will not come”          |
|       | NEG=be.PR.CL.3SG  |       |                            |
|       | “I will not come” |       |                            |

The Turkish interrogative particle *mi* is normally attached to the verb and often subject to the rules of vowel harmony. The following examples are again from Ulağaç:

- |       |  |       |   |
|-------|--|-------|---|
| (20a) | <i>na=ért-iz=mi</i><br>PRT=come.PF.2SG=PRT<br>“will you come?” | (20b) | <i>na=ért-um=mu</i><br>PRT=come.PF.1PL=PRT<br>“will we come?” |
|-------|--|-------|---|

It should be noted that the order of the copula and the interrogative particle may vary. The following expression is used in Turkish (21a) and then translated in Cappadocian (21b) in the same text from Aksó:

- |       |  |  |   |
|-------|--|--|---|
| (21a) | <i>in=mi=sin</i><br>man=PRT-PR.2SG<br>“are you a man or are you spirit?” |  | <i>cin=mi=sin</i><br>spirit.PRT-PR.2SG    |
| (21b) | <i>ín=ne=mi</i><br>man=PR.CL.3SG=PRT<br>“is he a man or is he a spirit?” |  | <i>džín=ne=mi</i><br>spirit=PR.CL.3SG=PRT |

Cappadocian has retained the Greek prepositions, but adverbs used with prepositions are treated as postpositions on the analogy of Turkish as in the following example from Mistiot:

- |      |                                |                       |                                |
|------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|
| (22) | <i>su=spít</i><br>to.the=house | <i>apés</i><br>inside | <i>múlu-s-i</i><br>hide-PF-3SG |
|      | “he hid inside the house”      |                       |                                |

At Ulağaç, the prepositions are dropped altogether in such cases and the analogy is complete:

- |       |                                |                                    |                       |
|-------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| (23a) | <i>é-m-i</i><br>PAST-go.PF-3SG | <i>da=gonák-ja</i><br>the=house-PL | <i>mésa</i><br>inside |
|       | “[s]he went inside the houses” |                                    |                       |

- (23b) *kriv-íšt-e*            *do=jastík*            *píso*  
 hide-PF.PAS-3SG    the=cushion            behind  
 “[s]he hid behind the cushion”

## 5. Lexicon

The Cappadocian lexicon is replete with Turkish loans, both lexical and grammatical (Janse 2009a: §5.2).<sup>27</sup> To quote just one example from the kinship vocabulary: the word for “father” is *vavás*, but the general address term is *táta* ← Turkish *ata* “father”. Similarly, the word for “child” is *pe(j)í*, pl. *pe(j)á*, which is used alongside *fšáx*, pl. *fšéa* ← Old Turkish *uvşak* “child” (cf. footnote 14). Very remarkable is also the great number of verbal loans, e.g. *düşün-dú-zo* ← *düşün-mek* “think”, *ara-dĩ-zo* ← *ara-mak* “search”, *ulu-dú-zo* ← *ulu-mak* “howl” (all from Aksó).<sup>28</sup> Finally, there are the many Turkish function words which have found their way in Cappadocian, e.g. the interrogative particle *mI* → *mi* (20a) / *mu* (20b), where even the vowel harmony is respected (both from Ulağaç), or conjunctions such as *tşújci* ← *çünkü* “because”, *xem* ← *hem* “and” (both from Araván).

Turkish derivational suffixes are frequently attached to Greek stems (Janse 2009: §5.3), e.g. *-li* in *misti-lís*, the turkicized version of *mišóts* ← *mišótis* “Mistiot” (cf. footnote 6), but also *óima-li* “bloody” ← *óima* “blood”. Often the Greek and Turkish suffixes are used alongside: the word for “goodness” at Araván is both *kalo-şin* and *kalo-lúx*, where the former has the Greek suffix *-şin* ← *-sini* and the latter the Turkish equivalent *-lik* (here with the appropriate vowel harmony). In other cases the Greek and Turkish suffixes are almost identical such as the Turkish deverbal suffix *-ma* which coincides with the Greek suffix *-ma*, hence Mistiot *γavus-tí-zu*, *γavús-ti-ma* ← Turkish *kavuş-mak* “meet”, *kavuş-ma* “meeting” (cf. footnote 7). The combination of Greek and Turkish suffixes can be very extraordinary, e.g. *astenar-lan-dĩ-zo* “get sick”, from *astenár* ← Byzantine Greek *\*asθen-ár-ís* “sick (person)”, the Turkish deadjectival suffix *-len*, and finally the deverbal suffix *-dĩ-z-* (with vowel harmony, as if from a Turkish verb *\*astenar-lan-mak*), deverbal noun *astenar-lán-dĩz-ma* “sickness”, and its counterpart *kalo-lan-dĩ-zo* “get well”, *kalo-lán-dĩz-ma* (both from Araván).

## 6. Conclusion

The aim of this paper has been to illustrate an extreme case of language

contact referred to as “heavy borrowing” by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 215) on the basis of more extensive evidence from both secondary and primary sources. The data presented here shows how language contact can affect the affected language to the point of typological disruption and nongenetic development (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 94). The more turkicized Cappadocian dialects represented in this sample present such non-Greek features as vowel harmony, agglutinative morphology and SOV-type word order in addition to a number of other contact phenomena. The subgrouping of the Cappadocian dialects is seriously complicated by the nongenetic development of these dialects due to Turkish interference. The result is comparable to a creole continuum and raises the age-old question of the distinction between a language and a dialect. From a purely linguistic point of view, the Northern dialects remain Greek dialects in the full genetic sense, whereas the Central and especially the Southern dialects are typologically so much closer to Turkish that they have to be considered mixed languages. From a sociolinguistic point of view, the situation is no less complicated, because it raises questions of identity which cannot be answered here, but will be addressed elsewhere. The survival of Mistiot Cappadocian on Greek soil seems to suggest that the linguistic and sociolinguistic points of view might be reconcilable after all.

## Abbreviations

1pl first person plural 1sg first person singular ACC accusative CL clitic  
COND conditional DEF definite DEM demonstrative FEM feminine GEN  
genitive IMP imperative IPF imperfective past IND indicative INDEF  
indefinite MASC masculine N/A nominative/ accusative NCL non-clitic NEG  
negative particle NOM nominative PART participle PAS passive PF  
perfective past PL plural POS possessive suffix PPF pluperfect PR present  
PRT clitic particle REL relative marker SG singular SUBJ subjunctive.

## NOTES

1. For a linguistic history of Cappadocia see Janse (2002: 347ff.).
2. Figures extracted from Mourelos (1982), which match the number of Greek-speaking communities in Cappadocia given by Kitromilidis (1982: κζ'), viz. 32 (22 Cappadocian, 6 Farasiot, 4 Pontic).

3. Greek Κωνσταντινούπολη [konstandinúpoli], “City of Constantine”, generally referred to as η Πόλη [i póli], “the City”. The Turkish name İstanbul is adapted from the Greek στην Πόλη [*stimbóli*], “to the City”. In Cappadocian this became generally *somból*, occasionally *šimból* (Dawkins 1916: 636).
4. Even the names of the villages are Turkish: *ula ağaç* means “big tree”, *semendere* “jasmine valley”.
5. Cappadocian is listed as an “extinct language of Greece” which “has now died out since the 1960s under pressure from Standard Greek” in the 15th edition of the *Ethnologue* (Dallas: SIL International, 2005). Cappadocian is declared dead as well in Kontosopoulos’ succinct but authoritative survey of Greek dialects (1981: 6).
6. Mistiot Cappadocian is called *mišótika* by its speakers, who refer to themselves as either *mišótes* or *mistilides*. The latter is used only by elderly people who are bilingual in Turkish, *-li* being a very productive Turkish suffix indicating, amongst other things, origin or possession.
7. Mistiot *γavústima*, a deverbal noun derived from *γavustízu* (from Turkish *kavuşmak*, perfective past *kavuştı*, deverbal noun *kavuşma* “meeting, reunion”).
8. Turkish orthography {ö} /œ/, {ü} /y/, {ı} /w/ , represented in Cappadocian by /ö/, /ü/, /i/ respectively.
9. In Mistiot *düşünmek* appears as *duşundízu*, perfective past 2sg *duşúntsis*, 3sg *duşúntsi*, 2pl *duşúntsit*. Note that several Cappadocian dialects raise unstressed /e/, /o/ to /i/, /u/, whereas all the dialects delete unstressed /i/, /u/ in word-final and often also in word-medial position (*duşúntsis* ← *duşúndises*).
10. In Mistiot *çağürmak* appears as *tşiyurdízu*.
11. Compare Mistiot *tşı* “and” vs. *ti* “what?”
12. In Mistiot, [ð] is an allophone of /t/ in intervocalic position, e.g. *tşíði* ← *kite* “is (present 3sg)”.
13. The same alternation is found in words of Greek origin, e.g. *γaidúr* “ass” → *gaidúr* (Ulağaç) vs. *kaidúr* (Sílata).
14. More on Cappadocian *fšáx* and its plurals in Janse (forthcoming).
15. The grammatical distinction between animate and inanimate nouns is an innovation Cappadocian shares with Farasiot and Livisiot (Janse 2004: 7ff.).
16. These suffixes are derived from the inflection of neuter nouns, e.g. *mát* “eye”, genitive (singular) *mat-jú*, (nominative/accusative) plural *mát-ja* (Janse 2009a: §3.2.1.1).
17. Genitive singular *aθróp* ← *aθrópu*, which explains the intermediate agglutinative form *aθrop-jú*. Nominative plural *aθróp* ← *áθropi*, with shifted accent.
18. Probably due to the resemblance of *-mistí* with the Turkish pluperfect in *-mİş-tİ* to

- which the 1st and 2nd person plural markers *-k* and *-nIz* are added. The Semendere forms seem to replicate the Central Anatolian Turkish pluperfect in *-DI-mIş-tI*, e.g. *ol-du-muş-tu-k* → *cé-tun-mis-ti-c* (Janse 2009b).
19. The personal and copular suffixes can be reversed in Turkish (*gel-di-ydi-m* vs. *gel-di-m-di*), but not in Cappadocian. Note that the copula is a (n en)clitic, not a suffix, as it can be separated from the finite verb as in (18).
  20. Note that the indefinite article *ena* is neuter in both cases (cf. §2)
  21. Note that the demonstrative pronoun *išá* is neuter, although it refers to male persons.
  22. In the Turkish example, *onlar*, but not *bizi*, could be omitted in this particular context, whereas in the Cappadocian example both *išá* and *emás*, but not *mas*, could be omitted.
  23. Note the omission of the article in the animate nominative *vavát* in (11b). The left-dislocated topic *do pei* is separated by a boundary pause from the rest of the utterance (Janse 2008).
  24. The use of the possessive *-t* in *koritš-jú-t* and *mana-jú-t* is also a Turkish feature.
  25. On the basis of (5) and (6), one might have expected 1pl *kaló-tun-misti-c*, 2pl *kaló-tun-sti-niz*.
  26. Note that (19b) is not Standard Turkish, where the personal markers are always suffixed to the negative particle *değil*, e.g. *gel-ecek-Ø değil-im*. (19b) is probably Central Anatolian Turkish, but note the analogy of (19a) with the formation of the pluperfect (7a).
  27. Compare, from the examples quoted in the text, *düsünse* (8), *partšalanmíš* (9), *patišaxjú* (13a), *devjú* (13b), *lakurdíja* (15a), *gonákja* (23a), *jašík* (23b).
  28. For a more detailed description of morphological borrowing in Cappadocian see Janse (2001).

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Costakis, Athanase P. [Kostakis, Thanasis P.]. 1964. *Le parler grec d'Anakou*. Athens: Centre d'études d'Asie Mineure.
- Dawkins, R. M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor. A Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Janse, Mark. 1999. "Greek, Turkish, and Cappadocian Relatives Revis(it)ed". In: Amalia Mozer (ed.), *Greek Linguistics '97. Proceedings of the 3rd*



*International Conference on Greek Linguistics*. Athens: Ellinika Grammata, 1999, 453-462.

Janse, Mark. 2001. "Morphological Borrowing in Asia Minor". In: Yoryia Aggouraki, Amalia Arvaniti, J.I.M. Davy, Dionysis Goutsos, Marilena Karyolaimou, Anna Panagiotou, Andreas Papapavlou, Pavlos Pavlou, Anna Roussou (eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th International Conference on Greek Linguistics (Nicosia, 17-19 September 1999)*. Thessaloniki: University Studio Press, 2001, 473-479.

Janse, Mark. 2002. "Aspects of Bilingualism in the History of the Greek Language". In: J. N. Adams, Mark Janse & Simon Swain (eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society. Language Contact and the Written Word*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 332-390.

Janse, Mark. 2004. Animacy, "Definiteness and Case in Cappadocian and other Asia Minor Greek Dialects". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 3-26.

Janse, Mark. 2008. "Clitic Doubling from Ancient to Asia Minor Greek2". In: Dalina Kallulli & Liliane Tasmowski (eds.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008, 165-202.

Janse, Mark. 2009a. "Η καππαδοκική διάλεκτος" [The Cappadocian Dialect]. In: Christos Tzitzilis (ed.), *Νεοελληνικές Διάλεκτοι* [Modern Greek Dialects]. Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies (Manolis Triantafyllidis Foundation), in press [English translation in preparation].

Janse, Mark. 2009b. "Agglutination and the Psychology of Double Inflections in Cappadocian". In: Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph, Pavlos Pavlou & Angela Ralli (eds.), *Proceedings of the Third International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Nicosia: Research Centre of the Holy Monastery of Kykkos, in press.

Janse, Mark. Forthcoming. "The Etymology of Cappadocian *ἔσῆχ* 'child'". Manuscript submitted to the *Bulletin of the School for Oriental and African Studies*.

Janse, Mark & Papazachariou, Dimitris. Forthcoming. "Cappadocian (Asia Minor Greek). The Resurrection of an 'Extinct' Language". Manuscript submitted to *Language*.

Kesisoglou, I. I. 1951. *Το γλωσσικό Ιδίωμα του Ουλαγάτς* [The dialect of *Ulaghatsh*]. Athens: Institut français d'Athènes / Κέντρο Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών.

Kitromilidis, Paschalis M. 1982. “*Η έξοδος της κεντρικής και νότιας Μικρασίας*” [The Exodus of Central and Southern Asia Minor]. In: Mourelos (1982), κγ’-μ’.

Kontosopoulos, Nikolaos G. 1981. *Διάλεκτοι και ιδιώματα της Νέας Ελληνικής* [Dialects and Idioms of Modern Greek]. Athens: Grigoris [3rd ed. 2001].

Kostakis, Thanasis P. 1963. *Η Ανακού* [Anakú]. Athens: Κέντρο Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών.

Kostakis, Thanasis P. 1977. *Το Μιστί της Καππαδοκίας* [Mistí, Cappadocia]. Athens: Ακαδημία Αθηνών.

Mavrochalyvidis, G. & I. I. Kesisoglou. 1960. *Το γλωσσικό Ιδίωμα της Αξού* [The dialect of Aksó]. Athens: Institut français d’Athènes / Κέντρο Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών.

Mourelos, Giannis (ed.). 1982. *Η έξοδος. Τόμος Β΄: Μαρτυρίες από τις επαρχίες της Κεντρικής και Νότιας Μικρασίας* [The Exodus. Vol. 2: Testimonies from the Regions of Central and Southern Asia Minor]. Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies.

Phosteris, Dimitris & I. I. Kesisoglou. 1960. *Λεξιλόγιο του Αραβανί* [Vocabulary of Araván]. Athens: Institut français d’Athènes / Κέντρο Μικρασιατικών Σπουδών.

Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Geneti.*