

Bernt Brendemoen, Elizabeth Lanza
and Else Ryen (eds.)

Language encounters across time and space

Studies in language contact



Novus forlag – Oslo 1999

Greek and Turkish language encounters in Anatolia

Bernt Brendemoen, Universitetet i Oslo

Introduction

For quite some time it has been commonly accepted by scholars in contact linguistics that features in a language which are doubtlessly due to interference from another language (or, to put it in another way, features which have been copied from another language) may be explained in two different ways: The features have either been copied into the speakers' mother tongue A from the language B, with which the speakers have been in contact more or less extensively, or they may be the result of the more complicated process of a language shift, by which the speaker group in question for some reason or other have started to speak a new language B but have copied features from their original mother tongue A into that new language. The new variant of the B language may in some cases have spread to the original speakers of the B language in a more or less confined area. In the first case, the A language is the matrix language; in the second case, B is the matrix language and A, a substrate. Scholars working in this field seem to agree that provided the social interaction between speaker groups of two languages is intense enough, it is *a priori* not possible to ascertain whether the product is a result of features of a foreign language B having been copied into the mother tongue, or the result of a language shift with language A being a substrate language (Johanson 1992: 220). If the contact has been less intense, there generally seems to be a difference between the two types to the effect that copying from the target language B to A, maintaining A as the language spoken, mostly involves lexical interference while the copying from A to B in a language shift situation is more concentrated

in the areas of phonology and syntax (Thomason & Kaufman 1991:50). However, that this is a generalization with important exceptions becomes clear, for example, from Johanson's study (1992) on structural factors in contact situations between Turkic and other languages, where especially the phonological, morphological and syntactic impact of Turkic languages on neighbouring languages have been in focus. In none of the cases does the code-copying involve a language shift.

In many cases it is evident from historical – and not linguistic – reasons whether a language with a significant amount of borrowed features is the result of simple code-copying into a mother tongue or of a language shift. This is, however, not always the case. Are, for instance, the phonological features that characterize the Swedish spoken in Finland, and which obviously have been copied from Finnish, due to just interference from Finnish caused e.g. by widespread bilingualism, or have there also been groups of Finnish speakers who have shifted their language to Swedish and discontinued speaking Finnish in periods when Swedish was a prestige language?

In this article I would like to draw attention to four cases of Turkish-Greek language contact in Anatolia and classify them within the framework set up by scholars in the field of language contact. Especially I want to discuss whether the product language should be classified as an example of language shift or rather as interference from a B language, and to see whether the theories hitherto put forth may help us in the classification. In some of the cases, history and ethnological facts are of little help in deciding what has been the process in question. The four cases are Cappadocian Greek, the so-called Karamanli Turkish, Pontic Greek, and Pontic Turkish.

Central Anatolia

Anatolia, and especially Central Anatolia, has been a melting pot for languages and cultures since time immemorial. Although singular Turkic tribes penetrated into the area almost throughout the Middle Ages, the Turkish impact on Central Anatolian Greek (and other languages spoken in Anatolia) must have become significant only with the large-scale diffusion of Turkish tribes in Anatolia after the battle of Malazgirt in 1071, which meant the end of Byzantine rule in Anatolia. The necessity of communicating with the new rulers and with the newly settled neighbours must have caused bilingualism to become quite common among the original population within just a few generations. In some areas the dominance of Turkish seems to have resulted in the disappearance of Greek very early. An anonymous document from 1437 contains the following statement:

Notandum est, quod in multis partibus Turcie reperiuntur clerici, episcopi et arciepiscopi, qui portant vestimenta infidelium et locuntur linguam ipsorum et nihil aliud sciunt in greco proferre nisi missam cantare et evangelium et epistolas. Alias autem orationes dicunt in lingua Turcorum. (It is remarkable that in many parts of Turkey there are priests, bishops and archbishops who dress like the infidels and speak their language and cannot utter anything in Greek except chanting the Mass and the Gospels and the Epistles. Other speech they express in the language of the Turks.) (Cited by Dawkins 1916:1)

This signifies clearly that Greek was discontinued as a spoken language in areas where the cultural and linguistic dominance of the Turks was strong, or maybe one should rather say in districts where the Greeks were not numerous enough to maintain the Greek language within their own group. In this connection it should be pointed out that Central Anatolia soon became the stronghold of Turkishness – both during the Seljuk and later during the Ottoman period, so that the Turkish dominance must have been very strong indeed – unlike, e.g., the situation in the Balkans, where only marginal groups were linguistically turkicised.¹ The fact that the villages in question are situated in



- 1) However, certain population groups in the Balkans (or at least certain social classes) must have been strongly exposed to Turkish influence and must have had a high degree of bilingualism, too. Cf. the 18th century Greek epic *Alipaşıada* (Kappler 1993), which contains so many Turkish lexical elements that it would be unintelligible to a non-bilingual person.

the middle of huge plains, exposed to all kinds of impacts, may also have made them especially susceptible to external influence. This very central situation, so to say in the middle of Anatolian Turkish language development, must be one of the reasons why the Turkish language that eventually prevailed is so free of substrate features from Greek. If the area had been geographically more isolated this might not have been the case, as we shall see with the Pontic Turkish example discussed below.

Cappadocian Greek

On the other hand, there are certain varieties of Central Anatolian Greek that show very strong interference from Turkish. Cappadocian Greek is one of the examples of “heavy borrowing” (without a language shift) given by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:215-222). Cappadocian Greek refers to the Greek dialects which were spoken in Central Anatolia south of the city of Kayseri – Caesarea in Antiquity – up until the Greek-Turkish population exchange in 1923, and which are known to us in the form in which they were written down and published by Dawkins in 1916. As presented by Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 215-222), this language is a classic example of what they call “heavily structural borrowing under very strong cultural pressure”, which has characteristics such as:

Major structural features that cause significant typological disruption: added morphophonemic rules²; phonetic changes³...; loss of phonemic contrasts⁴ and of morphophonemic rules; changes in word structure rules⁵...; categorial as

- 2) E.g. vowel harmony in Greek suffixes added to Turkish loanwords, e.g. *añladızo* ‘I understand’, (from *añla-/añla-*), but *düşündüzo* ‘I think’ (from *düşün-*) and *istedizo* ‘I wish’ (from *iste-*), cf. Dawkins 1916:67-68. However, these forms could perhaps be interpreted as Turkish past tense forms + Greek *-zo*, since Greek verbs are integrated in Black Sea Turkish in a very similar way, i.e. the aorist stem + the auxiliary verb *etmek*, e.g. *alalays etmek* < Greek *alalazo*, cf. Tzitzilis 1990:208.
- 3) E.g., the addition of Turkish phonemes to the Greek phoneme inventory, cf. previous footnote.
- 4) E.g., interdental fricatives in Greek words have become dental stops or been replaced with other sounds, e.g. *daskalis* ‘schoolmaster’, Classical Greek *ḗskalos*, *dóyoka* ‘twelve’, Classical Greek *ḗdeka*, *mayíno* ‘I learn’, Classical Greek *maḗaino*.
- 5) E.g., the usage of Turkish derivational suffixes on Greek verb stems, which is, however, very rarely found, e.g. the verbal form *astenarlansé* ‘he became ill’ derived from the adjective *astenár* (‘ill’, Classical Greek *astenós*) by means of the Turkish derivational verbal suffix *-lan* (+ Greek aorist and 3. person sg. endings), cf. Dawkins 1916: 139).

well as more extensive ordering changes in morphosyntax⁶...; and added concord rules⁷, including bound pronominal elements.⁸ (Thomason and Kaufman 1988: 75.)

This description fits the Turkish interference indeed; nevertheless the presupposition that Cappadocian Greek is an example of interference under language maintenance, i.e. that no shift has taken place, is not a hundred percent certain. *A priori* one could very well imagine that the Greek-speaking villages where the Turkish interference is strongest could have originally been Turkish-speaking villages converted to Christianity, where Turkish would act as a strong substrate on the newly acquired second language Greek. The Orthodox Christian Karamanlis (cf. next section) also living in Central Anatolia must have felt a strong attraction to Greek language and culture, as Greek no doubt was the prestige language of the Orthodox, while Turkish was felt to be a language originally characteristic of the infidels. Could not the Cappadocians – or at least some of them – have been originally Turkish-speaking Christians?

In order to throw light on the question it should be mentioned that Johanson (1992:56), based on Hovdhaugen's (1976) study, in which the interference between Turkish and Greek and Armenian in Anatolia is discussed, doubts the existence of deep structural changes in the Cappadocian dialects, and suggests that several of the phenomena are confined to subsystems. (Hovdhaugen's article was obviously not brought to the attention of Thomason and Kaufman.) On this point, however, it is most important to point out – as is both mentioned explicitly by Dawkins and is quite evident from his texts – that there is vast dialectal variation as to the degree of Turkish interference in Cappadocia. This point seems to have been missed not only by Hovdhaugen, but also by Johanson, who partially uses Hovdhaugen's study as a source for his comments on Greek-Turkish interaction in Anatolia. In most villages the Turkish element is astonish-

-
- 6) Loss of grammatical gender (Dawkins 1916: 87), and tendencies to agglutinative structures (cf. especially Dawkins 1916: 97-98 and 143-143), not to speak of word order, cf. Dawkins 1916: 200-203, e.g. *tu pulidyú t-óima t-áksen don dópo* 'the place where the blood of the bird flowed', actually the 'bird's- the blood-its flowed-the place', corresponding exactly to the word-order in Turkish *kuşun kanının aktığı yerde*, while the regular Greek word-order would be 'the place where flowed the blood of the bird'.
- 7) E.g., the almost total loss of the Greek adjective-noun agreement (as to gender and case, but not number, Dawkins 1916:115-116). This is of course not an example of an added concord rule, but a lost one, as Turkish does not have concord.
- 8) As in nominal compounds of the Turkish type *yatak odası*, e.g. *kanıs qoqusú* "the smell of a man" (Dawkins 1916:201), literally "man smell-his".

ingly weak, but in some villages in southern Cappadocia, such as Ulağaç and Semendere (Dawkins 1916:209 and 346-384), the Turkish impact is extremely strong on all levels of the language. The claim made by Hovdhaugen that the Turkish influence in these dialects is similar to the position of Arabic and Persian in Classical Ottoman Turkish in that borrowings were confined to lexical elements but that the foreign morphological and syntactic rules remained as a non-integrated subsystem is not at all valid for the villages where the Turkish influence is strongest. It is noteworthy that these villages are the ones closest to ordinary Muslim Turkish areas and that a considerable part of their population is Muslim. (Going further north, however, the Turkish elements grow weaker and gradually fade out.) Thus, Ulağaç and Semendere constitute a nucleus area where interference features are strongest. If this nucleus area had had Christian monolingual Turkish-speaking villages as neighbours, we could perhaps have posed the question as to whether the dialect in Ulağaç and Semendere perhaps represents a language shift in which the Turkish elements could be ascribed to a Turkish substrate. In that case, the picture in this nucleus area could be regarded as an intermediate stage in an ongoing language shift process from Turkish to Greek. However, as indicated above, the neighbouring Turkish-speaking villages and the monolingual Turkish-speaking population element within the villages themselves were Muslim. Consequently, as Greek cannot have been a prestige language among others than the Orthodox, Ulağaç and Semendere do not represent a stage in a linguistic Hellenization process among Turcophones but rather a Turkization process among Greek-speakers. As could be expected, interference is especially strong in areas where the two languages continuously meet and bilingualism is a prerogative.⁹

As claimed by Thomason and Kaufmann, however, linguistic features in the

9) However, the view held by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:215) that the shift from Greek to Turkish was accompanied by a shift from Christianity to Islam is not correct, as is shown by the numerous Turcophone Christian population of Central Anatolia up to the 1920s, cf. next section. The fact mentioned by Thomason and Kaufman (*ibid.*) that there were approximately 38,000 fewer Greek speakers in Turkey in 1955 than in 1927 and approximately 25,000 fewer Greek Orthodox in 1955 than in 1927 does not prove that the Turkization process has been an ongoing process in the sense suggested by Thomason and Kaufman, as the decrease is mostly due to emigration of the Greek-speaking Orthodox population to Greece also after the population exchange. The apparent disproportion between the decrease in Greek speakers and Orthodox individuals is no doubt due to the concession of Hatay (i.e., the area around Antakya, Antioch of Antiquity) from Syria to Turkey in 1939, as this area has a conspicuous Greek Orthodox (but Arabic-speaking) population.

dialect, too, help us classify the Cappadocian dialects rather as examples of heavy interference without a language shift than as examples of a language shift from Turkish to Greek with Turkish as a substrate language. According to Thomason and Kaufman, language shift results in a relatively limited register of lexical borrowings from the substrate language, mostly within technical and other specialized fields such as agriculture, hunting, etc, while the heavy interference may cause the whole register of the lexicon of the target language to be used in the native tongue. This last-mentioned case is what we meet in Cappadocian Greek from the villages where the Turkish interference is strongest. It should be stressed that a prerequisite for such an extensive use of all parts of the lexicon of another language is a bilingual situation, which indeed must have been the case in these parts of Cappadocia. It is probably also possible to interpret extensive borrowing of all kinds of lexical elements alongside heavy morphological, syntactic, and phonological interference as an advanced stage of a development towards a language shift. However, it should be pointed out that it is of course not the heavy borrowings and the very mixed state of the language *per se* that makes it unsuitable to be used, but that the very mixed stage may be interpreted as a stage in a certain development which would have most probably ended with discontinuation of Greek if the population had remained in Anatolia.

Karamanli Turkish

The initial quotation in Latin from an anonymous source from 1437 is probably not a description of Christians in Cappadocia. As mentioned above, the neighbouring villages were Muslim, and the reason for bilingualism must have been the need to communicate with them and with the outer world. However, in Central Anatolia there were Christian groups which were monolingual Turkish speakers, too. Karamanli (or Karamanlidic) Turkish is a very imprecise designation of the not very homogeneous language found in Turkish texts written with Greek letters, dating from a period from 1455 until 1927; the main bulk of texts, however, are from the 18th and 19th centuries.¹⁰ These texts were written for use by Turkish-speaking Orthodox Christians in Anatolia. A large part of these texts were obviously written by the Orthodox clergy in Istanbul with the purpose of strengthening the religious belief of their flocks in Anatolia, who lived in isolated islands in an infidel sea. Thus, quite a number of the texts have a religious content. Since the Greek language enjoyed a very high prestige

10) Cf. the bibliographies made by Salaville and Dalleggio (1958-1974) and Balta (1987a and 1987b).

among the Orthodox – almost as a holy language in the same way as Arabic is for Muslims – it is obvious that the Karamanlidic texts were written for (and perhaps also by) people who did not know Greek well enough to function in that language. (Hence the deploring, almost lamenting, tone in the text from 1437 quoted above.) The designation ‘Karamanli’ comes from the district Karaman close to present-day Konya in Central Anatolia, or rather the medieval Turkish emirate based in that town. This is the alleged area of origin of this group, of which a major part is supposed to have been transplanted in the quarter of Yedikule in Istanbul after the Turkish conquest (Heffening 1942:5). However, Karamanli seems to be used as a designation for any Turcophone Orthodox person anywhere in Anatolia. The relevance of Karamanli Turkish to this subject depends totally on whether the speakers were originally Greeks who had changed their language to Turkish, in which case they constitute an example of a language shift, or if they were originally Turkish speakers who had adopted the Greek Orthodox faith. The first explanation is fervently defended by the Greeks, as almost all the Karamanlis, being Christians, were subject to the population exchange in the 1920s and resettled in Greece, where they constitute a quite important element in Greek social life. Authorities such as the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (Reed 1978) deny that they were Greeks, claiming that their ancestors were the Lacaonians of Antiquity – a claim probably having no foundation at all.¹¹ The idea that they are Turks who changed their religion is mostly defended by the Turks. In the beginning of the 20th century the Turkish origin of the Karamanlis became a vital issue to a group of them, as they formed a movement in Turkey after the first World War to establish a Turkish Orthodox church separate from the Greek one (cf. Knüppel 1996) – a nationalistic and patriotic Turkish Orthodox Church as opposed to the treacherous Greek church, which in the course of the Greek-Turkish war (1919-1922) had become the symbol of anti-Turkish activities. If the Karamanlis really are Turks, their ancestors could be Turkic tribes such as the Uz or the Pečenegs, who penetrated into Anatolia long before the main Turkish invasion, and who entered the service of the Byzantine Emperor and became *akritai* (‘frontier soldiers’) on the eastern border.¹² From registers containing the names of such soldiers one can conclude that some of them had become Christians (Knüppel 1996:20-23). After the main Turkish invasion (from 1071 onwards), the linguistic and

11) An excellent summary of the different views on the origin of the Karamanlis is found in Knüppel (1996:13-19).

12) Already under the emperor Herakleios (610-641), Turkic tribes were settled in Eastern Anatolia to protect the border (Knüppel 1996:20).

cultural identification they must have felt with the newcomers must have caused their linguistic development to follow the mainstream development of Anatolian Turkish.¹³ The fact that the traditional homeland of the Turkish-speaking Orthodox (except for the ones that had been settled in Istanbul) until they were deported in 1923 was mostly areas in Central Anatolia close to the earlier eastern frontier of the Byzantine Empire corroborates this explanation. If they really are Turks, their situation of course does not constitute any example of language shift. If they are originally Greeks, however, they must represent a development similar to the one we have observed in Cappadocia, but a much more subsequent stage. The Karamanlidic texts do not help us much in solving the problem. Because most of the texts have religious contents, they contain a lot of Turkish calques on Greek Orthodox religious terminology, but apart from this, the Turkish of the Karamanlidic texts is astonishingly free from Greek interference.¹⁴

-
- 13) There are examples of Christian Turks in the service of the Byzantine Emperor uniting with Muslim Turks in battles *against* the Byzantines (cf. Knüppel 1996:21).
- 14) The best study of the linguistic features of the Karamanlidic texts is still the one by Eckmann (1950), which also contains a survey of the texts, which the author classifies in three groups according to the degree of closeness to popular language. The most popular group, which consists of texts written between 1756 and 1818, shows numerous phonological features characteristic of West and Central Anatolian dialects and seems to have been written without any influence from Ottoman spelling. The only phonological feature which is not in accordance with what we find in Anatolian dialects is the frequent occurrence of epenthetic (and "epithetic") vowels (p. 179-181), especially in loanwords, both of the type where the vowel changes morphophonologically with zero in the standard language (henceforth ST) (such as *şehere* (ST *şehir*)), and between inlaut consonant groups such as *tılsım* (ST *tılsım* – however, a form with an epenthetic vowel must have been the basis for the shape in which the word has been borrowed into European languages: *talisman*). This epenthetic vowel also occurs in words of Turkish origin such as the verb *titiremek* (for ST *titirmek*; however, the form *titire-* is also found in dialect forms such as *titirek*: "1) Beceriksiz, dikkatsiz; 2) Sürekli titireyen" [DS 3941]), but mostly between / y / and a consonant, e.g. *uyuku* (ST *uyku*). It does not seem possible to ascribe this feature to any influence from Greek. Especially because the opposite, e.g. loss of vowels between consonants, also occurs quite frequently (p. 181), the phenomenon most probably is to be linked to the dialects of the authors; cf. a similar phenomenon in transcription texts of the 17th century (e.g. Hazai 1973: 339 where also the form *uyuk-* occurs in the form *uyuksiz*. In fact, **udı.ğü.* seems to be the original Old Turkic form; cf. Clauson 1972:46.) Eckmann mentions (p. 168) that his texts also show interesting morphological and syntactic features. Some of the morphological features have been treated in two articles, but Eckmann does not seem to have published anything on syntax. Unless any of these syntactic features clearly show influence from Greek, we may say that the Karamanlidic texts do not show any Greek influence whatsoever.

Some texts show influence from Central Anatolian Turkish dialects, and others abound in hypercorrect forms betraying a desire to copy the orthographical rules of Ottoman written with Arabic letters, but no Greek influence. This would of course be quite understandable if there had not been any language shift at all, if the language had been used by a monolingual Turkish group throughout history. If, however, one would have to presuppose a language shift – which would be a consequence of the Greek claim – one should ask whether or not the lack of Greek interference is conspicuous. If a language shift is the case, it would be difficult to imagine that the Turkish linguistic impact can have started before the Turkish invasion of Anatolia. Since the oldest Karamanlidic texts from the 15th century then would represent a stage at the most 300 years after this impact may have started, we should ask if it could be possible for all traces of the original Greek language to have disappeared without leaving any trace within such a short span of time. However, as shown by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:119), language shift without any substrate features is not impossible. The very central situation of the majority of the Turcophone Christians up to the population exchange in parts of Central Anatolia, where they would be exposed to a continuous influence from neighbouring Turkish communities, would explain the complete language shift. The theoretical conditions for a shift without interference are present in this case, i.e. the shifting group must have been relatively small in comparison with the numbers of target language speakers, and the shift must have taken place over a relatively long span of time.

The Black Sea Coast

If we turn our attention to the Eastern Black Sea Coast, another scene for Greek and Turkish language encounters, we meet a completely different picture. Here Greek has been the stable language while the Turkish dialect has been subject to profound changes due to influence from Greek. One of the questions posed by Hovdhaugen (1976:143), but which he does not answer, is why the Turkish interference is much less significant on Pontic Greek than is the case in Cappadocia. The causes have to do with the geographic conditions, the history, and the social structure of the area. The history of the Turkization of the region is completely different from the history of other parts of Anatolia, a fact most aptly emphasized e.g. by the British byzantologist Anthony Bryer (1975) in an article with the evocative title “Greeks and Türkmens – the Pontic Exception”. What is exceptional about the region according to Bryer was the ability of the Byzantine Kingdom of Trebizond to resist the Turks up to the Ottoman conquest

in 1461, a fact he ascribes to what he calls "intense localism". As I will illustrate, this resistance movement can also be seen in the endurance of the Greek language against Turkish and in the very special Turkish dialect that has emerged under Greek influence.

Before we proceed, a few words should be said about the geographic characteristics of the area. A high mountain ridge, the so-called Pontic Chain, has kept the area isolated from the interior, and deep valleys in a north-south direction flanked by high hills on both sides of the riverbeds have made both internal contact between the valleys and communication with the areas to the east and west extremely difficult. The littoral highway which links Trabzon not only to the coast further west, and from there to Ankara and Istanbul, but today also to the Caucasus and Russia, was completed only after World War II. Also, in earlier centuries the coastal region was dangerous because of swamps infested with malaria. Until this century, communication with the outside world was mostly by sea. Thus, the population in the different valleys stretching from the Black Sea in the north to the Pontic Ridge in the south was not exposed to major external impulses.

The geographical location explains why Pontic (or Black Sea) Greek has remained outside the development of Greek that took place in Mainland Greece. It also provides the main explanation for the complicated features of Eastern Black Sea Turkish, which is the Anatolian Turkish dialect that differs most from the general language development in Anatolia both because of the great number of archaisms and because of the fundamental innovations arising from profound interference from Pontic Greek. In contrast to Cappadocian Greek and Karamanli Turkish, both Pontic Greek and Eastern Black Sea Turkish have the scholarly advantage of being extant.

Pontic Greek

Pontic Greek was spoken in Turkey by a mainly Greek Orthodox population up to the population exchange in 1923 in great parts of the coastal region of the Eastern Black Sea. It is still – or was until very recently – also spoken in areas which were never inhabited by the Turks, i.e. parts of the coast of what is today Georgia, the Ukraine, and Russia. (However, most of the speakers at least in Southern Russia and the Ukraine were originally immigrants from the south side of the Black Sea, hence the Turkisms found there, too.)¹⁵ Greek colonization of the area had taken place in Antiquity. Here we shall concentrate

15) Cf. Dawkins 1937, especially pp. 17-18.

on Pontic Greek from the Black Sea coast of Eastern Anatolia. Most probably, the majority of the speakers were not originally ethnic Greeks but different Caucasian peoples who were Hellenized linguistically and religiously. In Brendemoen (1996) I have in fact proposed the idea that some features in the Turkish dialects today may be due to a Caucasian substrate that must have been transmitted through Greek. A long time before the arrival of the Turks on the Black Sea scene, the Greek language had stabilized itself on the Anatolian Black Sea coast at least in the regions surrounding the cities of Trapezus (Trebizond) and Rhizaion, the present Trabzon and Rize, where it seems to have been the main language spoken. Other minor languages may have also been spoken,¹⁶ but Greek was no doubt the most important language until Turkish became dominant. Pontic Greek is very different from mainland Greek and most Anatolian Greek dialects, and must have broken off from the main language development in the early Middle Ages.¹⁷ The layers of the language and possible substrate phenomena do not seem to have been studied sufficiently, but the important thing in this connection is that the language as it was spoken by the Orthodox population up to the population exchange seems to have undergone few changes due to Turkish influence; the main area in which interference is visible is the lexicon, where all kinds of Turkish words – both technical terminology and more ordinary words – may be found, but on a much smaller scale than is the case in Cappadocia.¹⁸ There are also quite a lot

16) Cf. Brendemoen 1996:54-56.

17) Mackridge (1991:337) suggests that Pontic was cut off from the general development of Greeks with the “invasion of the Seldjuk Turks into Asia Minor around the eleventh century”, but considering the fact that most of the communication with the outer world was by sea and that there must have existed a connection between the Byzantine Kingdom of Trebizond and Constantinople up to the 15th century, the Seldjuk invasions in themselves cannot have prevented linguistic interaction with the outer world (except with Cappadocia, of course, and other Greek-speaking communities in inner Anatolia). The preservation of the old η as / e / (also reflected in Greek loanwords in Turkish such as *serander* ‘storehouse on pillars, protecting victuals from moisture’ < $\xi\eta\pi\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\mu\iota\omicron\nu$) is an archaism that indicates that Pontic Greek was cut off from the general language development considerably earlier.

18) In the same way as in Cappadocia, e.g. Turkish verbal stems may be integrated by the use of special derivational suffixes, and there is also a transparent derivational suffix system for nouns. However, studies on Pontic Greek made by Greeks tend (for political reasons?) to underestimate the Turkish influence both on vocabulary and elsewhere; e.g., in Oeconomides 1908, there is a chapter on “Lehnwörter” (p. 129-130), dealing with words of Sanskrit, Armenian, and Slavonic origin, but nothing on Turkish words, which the author obviously pretends to be non-existent in the dialect.

of idiomatic loan translations, and also Turkish word order features attested in Pontic.¹⁹ Except for two small Greek-speaking pockets on the Eastern Black Sea coast in Turkey, where the language has changed considerably in this century (cf. below), Pontic Greek is still spoken in Greece by descendants of the population that was deported there in 1923, although the language today is under heavy influence from Standard Greek. However, dialect texts and studies have been published frequently since the population's arrival in Greece, and even before that, so the language is well attested.²⁰

Black Sea Turkish

Very little is known about the Turkization process in the area. It is generally assumed that Turkish did not spread very much among the Greeks until the 17th century, perhaps in connection with large-scale conversions to Islam which are supposed to have taken place.²¹ If this is true, the present population is to some extent constituted by the descendants of these converts. Those who remained Orthodox were the ones who were deported to Greece in 1923. The big crux, however, is the fact that the present Turkish dialect, alongside features due to

- 19) The best survey of this is probably Dawkins (1937), especially pp. 45-46. Dawkins bases his study on the Pontic dialect of Rostov, which is especially interesting because the Pontic immigration there must have taken place in the first part of the 19th century (Dawkins 1937:18, 46).
- 20) E.g. Kiepert 1890, Oeconomides 1908.
- 21) The Turkization and Islamization of the area is discussed especially by Meeker (1971:334-345). However, both he and Bryer (e.g. 1970:41-43) assume that the Turkization process started with the arrival of the Çepni tribe, who are known to have settled in great numbers in the southwestern parts of the province of Trabzon (i.e. in the Şalpazarı district, where they still live) at least as late as in the beginning of the 16th century. The Çepnis are also known for having raided the summer pastures on the Pontic Ridge on later occasions, and there must even have been Çepni settlements in the mountains further east. However, the Çepni dialect has nothing to do with the dialect in the more littoral parts of Trabzon, so they cannot have played any decisive role in the general Turkization process. (For the Çepnis, cf. further Brendemoen 1989.) Meeker and Bryer do not take into account the fact that the Akkoyunlu Turks, who must have come in contact with the Greeks already in the 13th century (cf. below), must have played a central role in the Islamization and Turkization process. As for persecutions of the Orthodox in the 17th century that may have led to large-scale conversions (cf. Bryer 1970:42-43), for which, however, very few sources are given. *Prima facie* one would believe that it was persecutions that led to the appearance of Crypto-Christians in great numbers. However, as shown by Bryer (1970:48), the motivations for becoming a Crypto-Christian may have been quite practical. By changing one's identity to Muslim and moving to the upper parts of the valleys, where one would not be recorded, one would neither pay the *baraç* as a Christian nor do military service as a Muslim.

Greek interference, has preserved archaisms dating back to the 14th century, three centuries before the language can have started spreading among the Greeks to any considerable extent. One may think of several explanations for this.

When Turkish tribes started to penetrate into the area in the middle of the 13th century, they must have been numerically inferior to the Greek speakers, and stayed so for a very long time. Thus, they would have to be the ones to become bilingual. The striking archaisms show that Turkish in this area must have become isolated from other Turkish dialects in the 14th century, and the fact that some of these archaisms must have been preserved thanks to similar features in Greek shows that the Turks must have acquired profound knowledge of Greek approximately at the same time. Elderly people in the area today have told me that they learned Greek from their Orthodox neighbours in the summer pastures, where they used to spend at least four months every year. A common Turkish-Greek mountain culture on the summer pastures can have been the case also in the late Middle Ages. This must have been the setting for the first encounters between Akkoyunlu Turks,²² who must have settled first on the South, later on the North side of the Pontic ridge, with the transhumant Greek-speaking population from further down the valleys on the northern slopes of the mountains.²³ It must have been primarily in this setting that the Turks became bilingual. The fact that old refugees from the area now living in

22) The Akkoyunlus were a Turkish tribal federation consisting of very different kinds of tribes; cf. Woods (1976), and Brendemoen (forthcoming).

23) Most probably the number of Akkoyunlu Turks who settled in rural districts of Trabzon in Byzantine times (i.e. before the Ottoman conquest in 1461) was considerably larger than usually assumed; cf. Shukurov (1995:98-99), and Brendemoen (forthcoming). It seems that the valleys on the northern side of the Pontic ridge at first seemed frightening to the Turks, who were more used to the wide plains of inner Anatolia; cf. the following words from *The Book of Dede Korkut*, pronounced by (the more or less mythical, or perhaps 13th century) Kaḡlı Koca to his son Turalı in order to warn him from going down to Trabzon to court the Christian king's daughter: "Oğul sen varaçak yirün / Tolamaç tolamaç yolları olur / Atlu batup çıkamaz anuḡ balçığı olur / Ala yılan sökemez anuḡ ormanı olur / Gök-ile pehlū uran anuḡ kal'ası olur / Göz kaḡuban köñül alan anuḡ görklüsi olur / Hay dimedin baş getüren celladı olur / Yağrınında kaḡkan oynar yayası olur / Yavuz yirlere yiltendünḡ kayıda döngil (Ergin 1989:186), and in Geoffrey Lewis' (1974:119) elegant translation: "Son, in the place where you would go, Twisted and tortuous will the roads be; Swamps there will be, where the horsemen will sink and never emerge; Forests there will be, where the red serpent can find no path; Fortresses there will be, that rub shoulders with the sky; A beautiful one there will be, who puts out eyes and snatches souls; An executioner there will be, whisking heads off in an instant; A soldier there will be, with shield dancing on his back. To a terrible place have you set your foot; stay!"

Greece can still speak Turkish alongside their Pontic Greek dialect indicates that the Orthodox population must have been largely bilingual, too, or at least that they knew Turkish quite well. This, however, must in most districts have been a development that took place relatively late, after the Turkish-speakers had outnumbered the Greek-speakers and knowledge of Turkish had become indispensable – if wide-spread bilingualism among the Orthodox were an old phenomenon, the lack of more fundamental interference from Turkish would be quite astonishing.²⁴ However, the not inconsiderable Turkish element in the Pontic Dialect of Rostov, which was separated from Anatolian Pontic at the beginning of the 19th century, shows that Pontic Greek had been exposed to some interference from Turkish by then (Dawkins 1937:18, 46). In order to understand the lack of extensive bilingualism among the original Orthodox population until quite recent centuries, it should be kept in mind that Turkish must have had a low status in the eyes of the Orthodox. In the same way as the Christians were somewhat looked down on by the Muslims, the Muslims were somewhat despised by the Greeks. Thus, in their own eyes, each of the two groups must have been superior to the other, but inferior in each other's eyes. Nevertheless, for the numerically inferior *Turks* in the late Middle Ages, knowledge of Greek would have been indispensable in order to survive.

Bilingualism among the Muslim population in the 14th century onwards and strong Greek interference in their Turkish must have been the first stage in the development of the Turkish dialect.²⁵ After that, however, it is debatable

24) One could perhaps assume that the reduction of gender opposition in Pontic Greek (as in Cappadocia) was caused by Turkish interference, but it may just as well have been caused by one of the Caucasian languages spoken in the area before Turkish. The existence of “typically Turkish” and “Ungreek” phonemes such as /tʃ/ and /dʒ/ is not caused by Turkish (even if found mostly in words of Turkish origin) but has arisen from internal assimilations and palatalization processes such as *fanízo* “to sprinkle” < *knízo* < *katanízo* (cf. the English word *canister*, which shows another development) (cf. Oeconomides 1908:41), and *anǰelos* “angel” < *angelos* (ibid., 46). The most recent work on the lexical influence from Turkish is Tzitzilis (1983), containing a survey on previous works (p. 436-437). Turkish lexical elements are attested in Greek texts written by historiographers of the court of the Byzantine kingdom of Trebizond from the 15th century, but these are typical loanwords that must have entered the court language through the contact (and intermarriages) with the chieftains of the Akkoyunlu Turks on the south side of the Pontic Mountain Ridge, cf. Bryer (1975:140).

25) However, one should of course ask if one could not instead imagine that Turkish was learnt directly by Greeks (in the same setting) already in the 14th century, in which case the dialect today would be a direct continuation of the archaic Turkish learnt by those Greeks, so that the reason for the heavy Greek interference would

what may have happened, because on this point historical sources do not help us much. The history of the area in the 16th, 17th and 18th centuries is extremely obscure because Ottoman archival material from the period has not yet been sufficiently examined. Turkish may be assumed to have spread by means of Turkish speakers slowly settling further down the valleys on the northern side of the mountains, in areas which were already inhabited by Greeks. Because of a possibly higher birth rate among the Turks, the Turkish-speaking population can be thought to have slowly outnumbered the Greeks. In this case no language shift would have been the case.²⁶ The other possible development could be that Turkish – as indicated above – started to spread among the Greeks only with conversions to Islam especially in the 17th century onwards,²⁷ when for political reasons Islam became a privileged religion in the area. (The problem is that it is quite obscure how extensive these conversions may have been.) This seems to have caused transplantations of Muslim Turkish-speaking villages from the mountains and down to more strategically central areas closer to the sea.²⁸ That would be the point when Greek started to exert its effect as a substrate language among converts, who now wanted to learn the language of their fellow believers. Because it was these local Turks who became the religious teachers (and no other kind of Turkish would be available in the area) and who thus suddenly attained a higher status, it would be their highly Hellenized Turkish the converts would learn. Among the converts, bilingualism must have become quite common. Since most of them remained in their original villages among their Christian relatives, they had to retain Greek in order to communicate with them; in order to display a Muslim identity, they had to learn Turkish.

be these persons' Greek substrate. The problem is that there was no obvious necessity for the Greeks – at least not for large groups of them – to become bilingual or to undergo a language shift at this early stage. However, the possibility should not be disregarded that the common Greek-Turkish life on the summer pastures may have caused some Greeks, too, to learn Turkish.

- 26) This theory is supported by Umur's study (1951) of the Ottoman tax registers for the Of district, cf. footnote 37. It is also important that the village structure of the district would not discourage newcomers to the same extent as the very nucleated Central Anatolian villages would. On the Eastern Black Sea coast, everybody's house is on the land he owns, thus giving a very scattered impression; cf. Meeker (1971:326-327).
- 27) These conversions most probably were caused by the persecution of Pontic Greeks during the reign of Mehmet IV (1648-1687), under which Islam became attractive for economic reasons, amongst others, since Muslims were taxed much less than Christians; cf. Bryer (1970: 43).
- 28) Bryer (1970:45-47).

Slowly, as whole villages converted, especially in centrally situated areas, Turkish would become the language most used, and in the end, Greek would be discontinued. The problem is, however, that not enough is known about conversions in the rural districts to assume an extensive language shift among the Greeks.²⁹

Is it possible that linguistic features of the Turkish dialect can help us to decide what kind of development it has gone through after the Turkish 13th century dialect was exposed to Greek interference, i.e., has it spread through a language shift in the 17th century, or is just language retention the case?

The main features of Black Sea Turkish dialects which are due to Greek influence or archaisms that have been preserved due to Greek influence are as follows:

A: Phonology:

A strong tendency towards velarization ("backing") of **ö** and **ü** (to **o** and **u**) and palatalization ("fronting") of **ı** (to **i**), probably as the result of an incompatibility between the vowel system in the substrate language and these "typically Turkish" phonemes. A tendency for the vowel inventory to approach the Greek one.³⁰

Virtual lack of labial harmony, or rather, vowel harmony at an early stage of development similar to what is found in Old Anatolian Turkish (13th - 14th. century). Disturbances also in the palatal harmony system.³¹

Absence of voicing as a distinctive feature in stops. This probably represents a stage in the development of Old Turkish unvoiced (especially initial) **t**- and **k**- in the South West Turkish (Oghuz) languages preserved due to the existence of unaspirated unvoiced stops in Greek.

Tendency of palatalization of stops as in Northern Greek dialects (including Pontic).

29) The Crypto-Christians must probably represent an example of a relatively early bilingualism among the Greeks. The fact that these persons were outwardly able to pretend that they were Muslims but in fact had retained their Christian religion perhaps indicates that they must have had a good command of Turkish, and that bilingualism must have become widely spread among the originally Orthodox population in the 17th century. The role played by the Crypto-Christians as a bilingual group should not be underestimated; when they were granted freedom of religion in 1856, it turned out that the higher settlements in Trabzon where there were Crypto-Christians had a population of 9,535 Muslims, 17,260 Crypto-Christians, and 28,960 regular Christians (Bryer 1970:48).

30) Cf. Brendemoen (1984).

31) Cf. Brendemoen (1992).

B: Morphology:

Past and conditional forms of the copula (and inferential forms of the copula, too, to the extent they exist at all), which are almost exclusively suffixes in Standard Turkish, are preserved as independent words based on the verbal stem *i-*.

The rarely used diminutive suffix in **-opo** (from Greek **-opoulos**).

C: Syntax:

The absence of pro-drop for objects and indirect objects: In Turkish in general, anaphoric pronouns may be dropped as objects or indirect objects when not emphasized, but not in the Eastern Black Sea dialects. This, along with the postverbal position of these pronouns, is due to influence from Pontic Greek.³²

Word order in general tends to follow a Pontic Greek pattern.³³

Strong tendency towards paratactic constructions, avoiding Turkish participial and converbial constructions.

The absence of inferential as a special verbal category.³⁴

Subordinate temporal clauses with the conjunction **haçan** (< **ka-ça-[-ğ]-[n]**), as in Old Anatolian Turkish. The preservation of this feature is due to the existence of similar constructions in Greek.

One of the features that may help us decide whether we are dealing with a language shift or language maintenance with heavy structural borrowing is the unaspirated unvoiced stops, or the absence of voicing as a distinctive feature in stops in large parts of the province of Trabzon (but not Rize), although it is distinctive in all other Anatolian dialects. This could be linked with the lack of voicing as a distinctive feature in Pontic Greek.³⁵ In Old Turkic it seems that initial dental and velar stops were unvoiced aspirated. In very early Anatolian Turkish, e.g. in the 13th century, an extremely complicated voicing process of these initial stops took place. In this voicing process of the initial unvoiced aspirated stops, loss of aspiration could be thought to be a transitional stage.

32) Cf. Brendemoen (1993).

33) Cf. Brendemoen (1998).

34) Cf. Brendemoen (1997).

35) Cf. Mackridge (1987:123). However, it seems that at least some of the Pontic Greek dialects had aspirated unvoiced stops as allophones in free variation with unaspirated ones in words of Turkish and (especially) Armenian origin; cf. Chatzisavvidis (1985:77-81), who describes the dialect of Maçka in Trabzon.

Thus, we could say that this unvoiced unaspirated stage has been preserved in the Turkish Trabzon dialects because this is the kind of stops in Greek. However, the question should of course be asked why we have to postulate a Greek interference in the 14th century – could we not rather say that the unaspirated unvoiced stops in the Trabzon dialects represent an innovation due to Greek interference at a subsequent stage, e.g. that it is a substrate phenomenon dating from the period when Greeks shifted their language in the 17th century?

There are additional features that indicate that the unaspirated unvoiced stops are not merely a feature copied from Greek, i.e. the *distribution* of the stops. As shown by Doerfer (1976:119-125), at a certain stage of development of Anatolian Turkish around the 13th century, it seems that *emphasis* was decisive for the choice of aspirated vs. unaspirated stops. Aspirated stops were mostly used in emphatic position or in words that naturally had a certain emphasis. It is also probable that the de-aspiration (and subsequent voicing) first affected initial dental and velar stops preceding front vowels, then later in front of back vowels.³⁶ The dialect in certain areas of the province of Trabzon resembles this picture very much. In emphasized position followed by front vowels, dental and velar stops are quite frequently aspirated, while they very frequently lose their aspiration in non-emphasized initial position. In front of back vowels, however, especially the velar stops much more frequently remain aspirated regardless of whether or not the word is emphasized. In a simplified version, the development in Anatolia and in Trabzon may be illustrated in the following way:

Old Turkic	12 century	13 century	13/14 century	15 century
tiz 'knee'	tiz	tiz/Điz	diz	diz
ket- 'to go'	kit-	kit-/Git-	git-	git-
tağ 'mountain'	tağ	tağ	tağ/Đağ	dağ
kar 'snow'	kar	kar	kar	kar/Gar
		Stage of development found in Trabzon		

It is not difficult to imagine that this subtle system can have been preserved in a Turkish dialect that underwent no shift, but in which the presence of unaspirated

36) In fact, velar stops in back vowel position must have been affected by the development only considerably later and within a more confined geographic area.

stops in the acquired language, Greek, preserved these stops. However, if we assume that Turkish was spread throughout the area through conversions and that a language shift took place among a large part of the population in the 17th century, we should ask if it is probable that such a subtle system would survive. In other words, is it probable that the Greeks could learn the principles of the distribution of the stops instead of letting levellings and generalizations take place so that their almost universal unaspirated unvoiced stops would replace all stops in their newly acquired language. Would it not be more probable that no language shift has taken place, and that Turkish has spread mostly through prolific births among the Turkish population? Against this it should be argued that the complexity of a system *per se* cannot be regarded as a hindrance for learning it, especially if we consider that the learning process in question may have stretched over a very long time. Thus, the complexity of the system is no argument.

An important feature we must take into consideration is the fact that the unaspirated stop system is mostly found in districts where Greek was most widespread alongside Turkish, and where there must have been a large Orthodox population in the 17th century among whom candidates for the alleged conversions could be found. It is interesting to note that in these districts, unaspirated dental, velar, and also labial stops are found in initial position more frequently than would be expected according to the rules above. In other words, there does seem to be a vague tendency to generalize the unaspirated labial and dental stops (while the velar ones are mostly found in front vowel words). It would seem most natural to interpret this as due to a language shift, i.e., the originally Greek speakers did learn the complicated Turkish stop system, but at the same time generalized the use of the typically Greek sounds due to their substrate. However, an opposite interpretation is also possible. The unaspirated unvoiced stops spread in the language of the original speakers of the Turkish dialect due to their daily contact with the Greeks, which was of course stronger in the areas where they lived in the same villages.

There is, however, one small feature that most probably indicates that no language shift has taken place. In Greek – both Pontic Greek and Mainland Greek – stops become voiced after nasals. This feature would most probably have been copied into Turkish if a language shift had been the case, but it is not. In the Turkish dialect, the stops usually are unaspirated unvoiced also after nasals.

On the other hand, the Greek *vocabulary* in the Turkish dialect could be said to indicate a language shift, as it is mostly limited to terminology – but a

vast lexicon of terminology, covering almost all kinds of technical and agricultural activities except for typically Turkish “specialities” such as husbandry and horsemanship. According to the criteria set up by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:39), this would indicate a language shift. However, if we take the long symbiosis of the Greeks and Turks into account, it is perhaps conceivable that this partition of the vocabulary could also arise without a language shift.

Because of the very scanty historical information we have for the 16th through 18th centuries, I doubt we can get much closer to a decision of whether we are dealing with a language shift or with language maintenance. As we see, there is nothing in the dialect itself that necessitates the postulation of a shift. The most probable solution is that there was a slow spread of Turkish in the originally Greek-speaking areas mostly through a high birth-rate among the Turks, but that there were also conversions in some places. Thus, the picture seen today is probably the result of a combination between maintenance of the strongly Hellenized Turkish mother tongue and a shift. However, it should be pointed out that the dialects in Trabzon are by no means homogeneous. In some areas, the dialect today shows very little interference from Greek, being rather the result of a separate development of a stage of Anatolian Turkish representing the situation in the 15th century illustrated in the table above. There are also small areas where especially the rules of vowel harmony, which have mostly remained at the 14th century stage of development, have been restructured in a quite astonishing way, betraying strong interference from a non-Turkic language (cf. Brendemoen 1992:55). Especially in these cases, I would say the probability of a language shift is especially strong.

It should also be pointed out that conversions to Islam did not *necessitate* the adoption of the Turkish language in this area – the existence of two small pockets of Greek-speaking Muslims in the area today shows that clearly. Bryer and Winfield (1985:324) suggest that districts such as Of (which includes the present-day Çaykara) became Muslim through a slow, undramatic process. Nevertheless, the notion that there were large-scale conversions in the 17th century is strengthened by local traditions (e.g. in my own dialect material) telling about missionaries from the South, the so-called *Maraşlılar*, who made the large parts of the Of-Çaykara valley Muslim within a short time.³⁷ That must

37) Cf. Albayrak (1986:155-164), who also gives a not very convincing discussion of the date of the conversions. As shown by Meeker (1971:342-344) based on Umur's studies of taxation protocols from the 16th century, in particular the eastern of the two valleys that constitute the district of Of acquired an increasing Muslim population during the 16th century. This is most probably due to the fact that this valley is

be the background of the present inhabitants of Çaykara, who are all very fervent Muslims, but who have retained their Greek language.

Pontic Greek today

As we have seen, the development that has produced the Turkish Black Sea dialects must have been quite complicated, especially when compared to the Central Anatolian Greek and Turkish dialects. Besides the sociological and geographical differences between the two regions, it is also an important difference that the Turkization process in the Black Sea area stretched over a longer span of time and took place within a confined area secluded from external influence. In fact, the Turkization process is still going on. As mentioned above, there are still two small pockets of a Greek-speaking population who were not deported to Greece because they were Muslims. Two generations ago these linguistic islands were larger. The population in these islands is now totally bilingual, but the Turkish they speak is different from the local Turkish dialect I have described, i.e., it is much closer to Standard Turkish, due of course to the fact that Turkization today is taken care of not by Turkish-speaking neighbours but by schools and the media. What is, however, most interesting to observe is the state of the Pontic Greek spoken by these individuals. My comments above on Pontic Greek being relatively free of Turkish influence are based on Pontic Greek as it appears in studies written after the transplantation to Greece in 1923-1925. Its present situation in Turkey, however, is very much comparable to the state of Cappadocian Greek at the turn of the last century in the villages where the Turkish interference was strongest. According to the study made by Mackridge (1987: 133-135), Pontic Greek in Turkey today shows interference on all levels and heavy lexical borrowing of both content words within all kinds of fields such as even the simplest of numerals and function words – exactly as described by Thomason and Kaufman (1988:74) under

very close to the İyidere river basin, which provides one of the few passages between the Eastern Black Sea coast and the Anatolian hinterland. The function of this pass as a funnel for immigration from the south becomes clear both from toponyms and from the dialect surrounding it (especially on the eastern side); cf. Brendemoen (1996:51), and Günay (1978:28). When Muslim newcomers who arrived through this passage settled in the Baltacı valley in Of, parts of the Christian population may have moved to the upper parts of the Of/Çaykara districts, which may explain the relatively strong increase in the Christian population there, which then in turn converted to Islam at the arrival of the Maraşlı missionaries in the 17th century. It must be the Maraşlı story which is the background for the Greek tradition that the bishop of Of, Alexander, apostatised with his flock to become İskender Paşa (Bryer 1970:45).

“Language maintenance” with “More intense contact”. Codeswitching is extremely common, too. The reason is no doubt that the social status of the language has been completely turned upside down. Greek no longer has any prestige; in periods it has even been a politically undesirable language, and besides, the population is too small to maintain it properly as it is not used in public contexts but almost exclusively in private homes. It is only a question of time before this language will be given up under the impact of Turkish, exactly as is the case also with its counterpart in Greece, which will be given up due to the pressure from Standard Modern Greek.

My aim with this paper was to show how difficult it is to make generalizations about the mechanisms and scope of language contact because social and geographic factors are of decisive importance.

References

- Albayrak, Haşim 1986: *Of ve Çaykara*. Cilt 1. Ankara.
- Balta, Evangelia 1987a: *Karamanlidika. Additions (1584-1900)*. *Bibliographie analytique*. Athens.
- 1987b: *Karamanlidika. XXe siècle*. *Bibliographie analytique*. Athens.
- Brendemoen, Bernt 1984: A note on the retraction of labial front vowels in the Turkish dialects of Trabzon. In: B. Brendemoen & al. (eds.) *Riepmočála - Essays in Honour of Knut Bergsland*. Oslo, 13-24.
- 1989: Trabzon Çepni Ağzı ve Tepegöz Hikâyesinin bir Çepni Varyantı. In: İ.G. Kayaoğlu & al. (eds.) *Trabzon Kültür- Sanat Yılığ 88-89*. Istanbul, 13-22.
- 1992: Some Remarks on the vowel Harmony in a Religious Dialect Text from Trabzon. In: G. Bethlenfalvy & al. (eds.) *Altaic Religious Beliefs and Practices – Proceedings of the 33rd Meeting of the PIAC (Budapest, June 24-29, 1990)*. Budapest, 41-57.
- 1993: Pronominalsyntax in den türkischen Schwarzmeerdialekten – syntaktische Innovation oder Archaismus? In: J.P. Laut & K. Röhrborn. (eds.) *Sprach- und Kulturkontakte der türkischen Völker – Materialien der zweiten Deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz, Rauschholzhausen, 13.-16. Juli 1990*. (= Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica Bd. 37.) Wiesbaden, 51-73.
- 1996: Case Merge in the Black Sea Dialects – A Kartvelian Substrate Feature? In: A. Berta & B. Brendemoen & C. Schönig (eds.) *Symbolae Turcologicae – Studies in Honour of Lars Johanson*. Stockholm, 41-59.

- 1997: Some Remarks on the -mİş past in the Eastern Black Sea Coast Dialects. In: *Turkic Languages* 1:2, 161-183.
- 1998: Einige Bemerkungen über die Wortstellung in anatolischen Dialekten. In: N. Demir & E. Taube (eds.) *Turkologie heute – Tradition und Perspektive. Materialien der 3. Deutschen Turkologen-Konferenz Leipzig, 4.-7. Oktober, 1994*. Wiesbaden, 27-46.
- forthcoming: Phonological Aspects of Greek-Turkish Language Contact in Trabzon. Paper presented at a symposium on Turkic language contacts at Wassenaar (Netherlands) 5.-7.2.1996. To be published in a book on Turkic language contact phenomena edited by Hendrik Boeschoten.
- Bryer, Anthony 1970: The Tourkokratia in the Pontos. In: *Neo-Hellenika* 1. Austin, Texas, 30-54.
- 1975: Greeks and Türkmens: The Pontic Exception. In: *Dumbarton Oaks Paper*. Washington D.C., 29, 115-148. Reprinted in Bryer 1980.
- 1980: *The Empire of Trebizond and the Pontos*. London.
- Bryer, Anthony & Winfield, David 1985: *The Byzantine Monuments and Topography of the Pontos I-II*. Washington D.C.
- Chatzisavvidis, Sofronis A. 1985: *Φωνολογική Ανάλυση της Ποντιακής Διαλέκτου, (Ιδίωμα της Ματσούκας)*. Salonica.
- Clauson, Gerard 1972: *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Dawkins, R.M. 1916: *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge.
- 1937: The Pontic Dialect of Modern Greek in Asia Minor and Russia. *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 15-52.
- Doerfer, Gerhard 1976: Das Vorosmanische (die Entwicklung der oghusischen Sprachen von den Orchoninschriften bis zu Sultan Veled). In: *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yılığ* – *Belleten* 1975-1976, 81-132.
- DS: *Türkiye'de Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü* I-XII. Ankara 1963-1976.
- Eckmann, Janos 1950: Anadolu Karamanlı ağzlarına ait araştırmalar, I. *Phonetica*. In: *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 8:1-2, 165-200.
- Ergin, Muharrem 1989: *Dede Korkut Kitabı* I (Giriş – Metin – Faksimile). Ankara.
- Günay, Turgut 1978: *Rize İli Ağzları*. Ankara.
- Hazai, György 1973: *Das Osmanisch-Türkische im XVII. Jahrhundert. Untersuchungen an den Transkriptionstexten von Jakab Nagy de Harsány*. The Hague.

- Heffening, W. 1942: *Die türkischen Transkriptionstexte des Bartholomaeus Georgievits aus den Jahren 1544-1548*. Leipzig.
- Hovdhaugen, Even 1976: Some Aspects of Language Contact in Anatolia. In: *Working Papers in Linguistics from the University of Oslo* 7, 142-160.
- Johanson, Lars 1992: *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. (Sitzungsberichte der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der J. W. Goethe-Universität Frankfurt a.M. XXIX, 5.) Stuttgart.
- Kappler, Matthias 1993: *Turcismi nell' "Alipasiadba" di Chatzi Sechretis*. (Eurasistica – Quaderni del Dipartimento di Studi Eurasiatici – Università degli Studi di Venezia, 31.) Venice.
- Kiepert, Heinrich 1890: Die Verbreitung der griechischen Sprache im pontischen Küstengebirge. *Zeitschrift der Gesellschaft für Erdkunde zu Berlin* 25, 317-330.
- Knüppel, Michael 1996: *Die Türkisch-Orthodoxe Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur türkischen Religionspolitik*. Göttingen.
- Lewis, Geoffrey 1974: *The Book of Dede Korkut*. London.
- Mackridge, Peter 1987: Greek-Speaking Moslems of North-East Turkey: Prolegomena to a Study of the Ophitic Sub-Dialect of Pontic. In: *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 11, 115-137.
- 1991: The Pontic Dialect: A Corrupt Version of Ancient Greek? *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4:4, 335-339.
- Meeker, Michael E. 1971: The Black Sea Turks: Some Aspects of their Ethnic and Cultural Background. In: *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 2, 318-345.
- Oeconomides, D.E. 1908: *Lautlebre des Pontischen*. Leipzig.
- Papadopoulos, Anthimos 1958: *Ιστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Ποντικῆς Διαλέκτου*, I. Athens.
- Reed, H.A. 1978: *Ḳarāmān* in *The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Edition*. Leiden 1960-, 4, 616-617.
- Salaville, Sévérien, and Dalleggio, Eugène 1958-1974: *Karamanlidika. Bibliographie analytique d'ouvrages en langue turque imprimés en caractères grecs*, I (1584-1850), II (1851-1856), III (1866-1900). Athens.
- Shukurov, Rustam 1995: Тюрки на православном Понте в XIII-XV вв. Начальный этап тюркизации? In: S.P. Кагров (ed.): *Причерноморье в средние века*. Moscow, 68-103.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Kaufman, Terrence 1988: *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley, University of California Press.

- Thumb, Albert 1912: *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular*. Edinburgh.
- Tzitzilis, Christos 1983: Συμβολή στην Ποντιακή Ετυμολογία. In: *Hellēnika* 34, 436-477.
- 1990: "Zur Problematik des Lehnguts im pontischen Türkisch." In: *Studies in Greek Linguistics. Proceedings of the 10th annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki 9-11 May 1989*. Supplement. Salonica, 179-214.
- Umur, Hasan 1951: *Of Taribi*. Istanbul.
- Woods, John E. 1976: *The Aqqyunlu - Clan, Confederation, Empire*. Minneapolis/ Chicago.