

## Greek and Turkish in contact: An excursus to two contact-induced varieties

Anthi Revithiadou

(in collaboration with: M. Georgalidou/ University of the Aegean, V. Spyropoulos /  
University of Athens, H. Kaili / University of the Aegean & A. Celtek)

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki  
revith@lit.auth.gr

### Part I: Rhodian Muslim Greek (& Turkish)<sup>1</sup>

#### 1. Introduction

This research aims at:

- exploring aspects of the linguistic repertoire of the bilingual in Greek and Turkish Muslim community of Rhodes,
- examining the structure of a Greek-based pidgin variety used by members of this community,
- describing the structure of this Greek-based pidgin variety with emphasis on the structural interference from Turkish and the sociolinguistic parameters of its use.

We also present some instances of interference of Greek to the Turkish variety used by these speakers.

(See also Georgalidou, Spyropoulos & Kaili 2004 and Georgalidou, Kaili & Celtek 2005)

#### About the community:

- ✓ Muslims of the island of Rhodes are Greek citizens of Turkish origin who have been living in the island since 1522.
- ✓ They mainly resided in the castle -today's Old Town- but smaller groups also settled in the country and engaged in farming.
- ✓ From 1522 till 1912 Dodecanese was part of the Ottoman Empire and the people of Turkish origin, or the Ottomans as some people even today call themselves, were the dominant group.

---

<sup>1</sup> The data sets and the analysis presented in this handout are drawn from Georgalidou, Spyropoulos, Kaili, Revithiadou & Celtek (2007, to appear) and is part of a research project on the sociolinguistic identity of the Muslim Community in Rhodes launched by Dr. Marianthi Georgalidou (University of the Aegean) and Hasan Kaili (University of the Aegean). The original research team was further extended with Dr. V. Spyropoulos (University of the Aegean/University of Athens), Dr. A. Revithiadou (University of the Aegean/ AUTH) and Dr. A. Celtek (University of the Aegean).

- ✓ In 1912 the Italians occupied the Dodecanese islands and the Ottomans (/Turks) were recognized as a religious community (1912-1943).
- ✓ They became Greek citizens after the annexation of the Dodecanese islands to Greece in 1947.
- ✓ The community – being under the Italian occupation – was not covered by the Treaty of Lausanne, but special status was acknowledged to it with respect to the Vakf and the schools.
- ✓ The teaching of the Turkish language in Muslim schools was *de facto* abolished in 1972 (Tsitselikis & Mavrommatis 2003).

**Today:**

- ✓ Estimated population: 2500-3000 people living in the island of Rhodes. (There is also a big community in the island of Kos).
- ✓ Muslim students of Turkish origin attend public schools. Turkish is mainly used within the community, as it is not formally taught or used in (formal/informal) transactions with the Greek-speaking population of the island.
- ✓ As a consequence, in the last 60 years almost the entire Muslim community has shifted from near monolingualism (Turkish) to bilingualism (Turkish and Greek).
- ✓ Older speakers, who are fluent in the local variety of Turkish, also use a pidgin variety of Greek (i.e., a *contact vernacular*, in the sense of Winford 2003: 236), based on the local Greek dialect of Rhodes with substantial interference from Turkish. Later generations use a variety of Greek with less traces of interference (named here the *intermediate variety*). This interference fades away to and is gradually replaced by Greek in the younger generation of speakers.
- ✓ There are different proficiency levels in Turkish among members of the community.
- ✓ Monolingualism in Greek has traditionally been the case for all members of the subgroup of Muslims of Cretan origin, as well as for Muslims that originate from specific rural areas with low population of Turkish origin.
- ✓ The shift towards native Greek varieties in urban settings precedes the shift in suburban and rural settings by one generation. This tendency is reinforced by the attendance of monolingual state schools which introduce children to literacy in the Greek language from a very early age.
- ✓ Linguistic competence in Turkish among members of the children generation group is a matter that requires further investigation. All children in our data show a strong preference for Greek and a passive knowledge of Turkish.
- ✓ As a consequence, there are different proficiency levels in Turkish among members of the community depending on historical, social and individual factors.

**The research procedure**

We examine two subgroups of the Muslim minority community of Rhodes, one residing in the city of Rhodes and the other in a suburban settlement a few kilometers away from the city.

- ✓ Linguistic and social information were derived from *participant observation* carried out by two of the researchers (both Rhodian natives, one of them member of the minority community and a bilingual himself), which has been going on for more than three years.
- ✓ Linguistic data were collected/recorded mainly during “coffee time”.

- ✓ The aim was mainly to collect linguistic data that would allow the analysis of patterns of language use by community members who belong to different age groups, so that they could be juxtaposed to the structure of their personal networks.
- ✓ The analysis is based on 20 hours of conversations with and among 17 speakers at the urban setting, members of 4 partially overlapping *exchange networks* (Milroy & Wei 1995) and 19 speakers at the suburban setting, all of them members of an overlapping kinship network that resides within a definable territory.
- ✓ The age span of the informants is as follows:
  - 13 speakers born between 1930 and 1954 who are now grandparents (6 in the suburban setting, 7 in the city) (*grandparents generation*)
  - 15 speakers born between 1955 and 1972 who are now parents (9 in the suburban setting, 6 in the city) (*parents generation*)
  - 8 speakers born between 1980 and 1990 who are the children and the grandchildren of the other two groups (4 in the suburban setting, 4 in the city) (*children generation*)

## 2. The pidgin variety

- ✓ Substratum: The Greek variety of Rhodes, which belongs to the South-Eastern dialectal group of Greek (Kontosopoulos 1994, Trudgill 2003).
- ✓ Interference: Phonological & morphosyntactic structure of Turkish.

Grammatical structures that exhibit interference from Turkish:

### **MORPHOLOGY**

Structure 1: Confusion and/ or avoidance of gender marking by using the default gender value of neuter:

- (1) a. evɣale                      to                      peθameno,    troi  
          take.out-past.3sg the-**nt.acc** dead-**acc.sg**    eat-3sg  
          'S/he dug out the dead and ate him'
- b. to                      iðia                      ora  
          the-**nt.sg** same-**fem.sg** time-**fem.sg**  
          'at the same time'
- c. a    proskalesume a    (e)rɥi                      o                      xotzas                      mia  
          subj invite-1pl    subj come-3sg the-masc.acc xotza-nom.sg a-**fem.sg**  
          **vradi**  
          night-**nt.sg**  
          'Let us invite the xotza to come one night...'

- d.      mia                      mera                      o                      liko endamose  
 one-fem.nom.sg day-fem.nom.sg the-masc wolf meet-past.3sg  
 me **to**                      **alepu**  
 with the-**nt.acc.sg** fox-**fem.acc.sg**  
 'One day the wolf met the fox'

- ✓ Greek: Nominal elements are morphologically specified for gender (masculine, feminine, neuter). Gender is marked on the article of the noun phrase.

- (2) a.      o                      kalos                      anθropos  
 the-masc good-masc man-masc  
 b.      i                      kali                      yineka  
 the-fem good-fem woman-fem  
 c.      to                      kalo                      peði  
 the-nt good-nt child-nt

- ✓ Turkish: There is no gender marking.

- (3) a.      iyi      adam  
 good man  
 b.      iyi      kadın  
 good woman  
 c.      iyi      çocuk  
 good child

Structure 2: Words consisting of a Turkish stem + Greek endings:

- (4)      *xazmevo* 'digest' ← xazm (< *hazmetmek* 'to digest') + evo

### **SYNTAX**

Structure 3: Omission or inconsistent use of the article:

- (5)      **yeneka**                      pjo      arya ekatse,                      nomizo,      **antras**                      pjo      yriyora  
 woman-nom.sg more late sit-past.3sg think-1sg man-nom.sg more quickly  
 'The wife sat down later, I think, and the husband earlier'

- ✓ Greek: Nouns are modified by articles when definite or plural generic (Holton et al. 1997).  
 ✓ Turkish: No articles (Lewis 2000, Göksel & Kerslake 2005).

Structure 4: No agreement between adjective and noun. Adjective in a fixed form of neuter nominative:

- (6) a.      **meyalo**                      **θia**  
 big-**nt.nom.sg** aunt-**fem.nom.sg**  
 'the elder aunt'

- b.      irte                      **skilos ... pinasmeno**                      ita  
 come-past.3sg dog-**nom.sg** hungry-**nt.nom.sg** be-past.3sg  
 'The dog came ... it was hungry'

- ✓ Greek: The adjective agrees with the noun in number, gender and case (see example 2).
- ✓ Turkish: The adjective does not inflect, so no agreement can be observed (see example 3).

Structure 5: The syntax of NPs with a numeral: [<sub>NP</sub> numeral + noun in singular]:

- (7)      ije                      **ðio tria**                      **peretria**  
 have-past.3sg two three-**masc.acc.pl** servant-**fem.acc.sg**  
 'S/he had a couple of servants'

- ✓ Greek: The noun agrees with the numeral in number:

- (8)      ixe                      ðio tris                      iperetries  
 have-past.3sg two three-fem.acc.pl servant-fem.acc.pl  
 'S/he had a couple of servants'

- ✓ Turkish: Numeral + Noun-singular:

- (9)      iki üç kitap aldım  
 two three book buy-past-1sg  
 'I bought a couple of books'

Structure 6: Verb final word orders:

- (10) a.      afto              nomizi      xotza                      **ine...**  
 it-nt.nom.sg think-3sg xotza-masc.acc.sg be-3sg  
 'S/he thought that it was the xotza...'
- b.      sineteros              tu                      **erkete**  
 partner-nom.sg cl:3-masc.sg come-3sg  
 'his partner came'
- c.      aftos                      **epese**              ke      eneka                      **epese,**  
 he-masc.nom.sg **fall-past.3sg** and woman-fem.nom.sg **fall-past.3sg**  
 orea **kimunte**  
 well **sleep-3pl**  
 'He went to bed and his wife went to bed and they slept well'

- ✓ Greek: Free word-order with predominant the SVO and VSO orders. Greek is a head initial language.
- ✓ Turkish: A head final language with SOV as the predominant order.

Structure 7: Omission of adpositions which mark the syntactic functions of indirect object and locative:

- (11) a. en imba mayazi tu eyo  
neg enter-past.1sg shop-acc.sg cl:3-masc.gen.sg I-nom.sg  
| Gr: sto mayazi tu  
'I didn't enter his shop'
- b. spiti tu itan ðipla minare  
house-nom.acc cl:3-masc.gen.sg be-past.3sg next minaret  
| Gr: sto minare  
'His house was next to the minaret'
- c. ipe yineka tu eyo a pao kinii  
say-past.3sg woman-acc.sg cl:3-masc.gen.sg I fut go-1sg hunting-acc.sg  
| Gr: sto kinyi  
'He told his wife "I will go hunting"'

- ✓ Greek: Locative and indirect object functions are marked by the preposition *se* 'in, to'.
- ✓ Turkish: Locative and indirect object functions are marked by locative and dative endings on the noun.

Structure 8: Postpositions instead of prepositions:

- (12)   ulo                    ruxa                    evale                    **nero**                    **mesa**  
all-nt.sg.acc clothes-nt.acc.pl put-past.3sg water-acc.sg inside  
'She put all the clothes in the water'

- ✓ Greek: Head initial language → prepositions
- ✓ Turkish: Head final language → postpositions

Structure 9: Omission of the subjunctive marker *na* in subordinate subjunctives:

- (13) a. **sikoθike** **xeretisi** mazi mbamba  
stand.up-past.3sg greet-3sg with father-acc.sg  
'He stood up in order to greet (somebody) with his father'
- b. **arkinikse** **munta**  
start-past.3sg attack-3sg  
'It started attacking (her)'

- ✓ Greek: Subordinate clauses may employ subjunctive verb groups (*na* + verb form).
- ✓ Turkish: Subordinate clauses employ either infinitive or verbal noun.

Structure 10: Omission of complementizers and conjunctions:

- (14) afto            **nomizi**    **xotza**            ine... | Gr: aftos nomizi oti ine o xotzas  
 it-nt.nom.sg think-3sg xotza-masc.acc.sg be-3sg  
 'she thought that it was the xotza...'

- ✓ Greek: Subordinate clauses are introduced by the relevant complementizer or conjunction.
- ✓ Turkish: No complementizers (with the exception of *ki*).

Structure 11: Confusion in the syntax of *exo* 'have' and *iparxi* 'there is':

- (15) a.    **ife**            **enan**            **antropo**,    peðia        en ife,  
 have-past.3sg a-masc.acc.sg man-acc.sg child-acc.pl neg have-past.3sg  
 ife            parayio,    ife            oreo            mayazi  
 have-past.3sg apprentice have-past.3sg nice-nt.acc.sg shop-nt.acc.sg  
 'There used to be a man, who had no children, (but) he had an apprentice  
 (and) he had a nice shop'
- b.    **lamba**        **ife**            palia  
 lamb-acc.sg have-past.3sg past(adv)  
 'In the past, there existed/used to be lambs'

- ✓ Greek: Two different verbs for each construction:

- possessive construction: verb *exo* 'I have'

- (16) exo/exis/exi/exume/exete/exun ena        kipo  
 have-1sg/2sg/3sg/1pl/2pl/3pl a-acc.sg garden-acc.sg

- existential construction: verb *iparxi* 'there is'

- (17) a.    iparxi enas        kipos  
 there.is a-nom.sg garden-nom.sg  
 b.    iparxun poli            kipi  
 there.are many-nom.pl garden-nom.pl

- ✓ Turkish: *var* for both the existential and possessive constructions:

- Possessive :

- (18) bir bahçe-m/-n/-si/-miz/niz/-leri var  
 a garden-1sg/2sg/3sg/1pl/2pl/3pl HAVE

- existential:

- (19) a.    bir bahçe var  
 a garden there is  
 b.    çok bahçe var  
 many garden THERE IS

Structure 12: Absence of weak pronouns (pronominal clitics):

- (20) a. evyale to peθameno, troi  
take.out-past.3sg the-nt.acc.sg dead-acc.sg eat-3sg  
'S/he dug out the dead and ate (him)'
- b. alá íxe brostá sto rofúdzó miá  
but have-past.3sg in.front to-the-nt.acc.sg shelter-acc.sg one-fem.acc.sg  
yramiθiá, tésera átoma agaliázane étsi  
oak tree-fem.acc.sg four-nt.nom.pl man-nt.acc.pl embrace-past.3pl so
- 'But there used to be an oak tree in front of the shelter, which four men could embrace it'

- ✓ Greek: Weak pronouns (clitics) are used to refer back to something present in the discourse:

- (21) efera ta vivlia ke ta evala  
bring-past.1sg the-nt.acc.pl book-nt.acc.pl and cl:nt.3.acc.pl put-past.1sg  
sto trapezi  
on-the-nt.acc.sg table-nt.acc.sg  
'I brought the books and put them on the table'

- ✓ Turkish: Strong pronominal form or no pronoun is used to refer back to something present in the discourse:

- (22) kitapları getirdim ve masaya koydum  
book-pl-acc bring-past-1sg and table-dat put-past-1sg  
'I brought the books and put (them) on the table'

**PHONOLOGY**Structure 13: Intervocalic /k/ voicing and /g, ɣ/ deletion (productive, categorical):<sup>2</sup>

- (23) *intervocalic voicing and deletion*
- a. ce<sup>ɣ</sup>enéka ce(j)inéka (Rh.Gr) 'and woman'
- b. a<sup>ɣ</sup>ámis na kámis (Rh.Gr) 'do-2sg.subj.pres'
- c. xrónja<sup>ɣ</sup>alatás xrónja ɣalatás (Rh.Gr) 'for many years he was a milkman'
- (24) *intervocalic deletion*
- a. élee éle(ɣ)e (Rh.Gr) 'say-3sg.past'
- b. aníi aní(j)i (Rh.Gr) 'open-3sg.pres'

- ✓ Greek: Intervocalic voiced fricative (e.g. /v, ð, ɣ/) deletion is a widespread phenomenon in the dialects of the Dodecanese, and, especially, in the dialect of Rhodes

<sup>2</sup> All speakers have it.



(Papachristodoulou 1986). The rule is attested in the speech of our informants as well. However, intervocalic /ɣ, g/ deletion applies to domains larger than the word, as shown by the examples in (23). This way it contrasts with intervocalic fricative deletion of the type attested in the dialect of Rhodes, which is limited to the domain of the *phonological word*, e.g. *foúme* /fovume/, *élee* /eleɣe/. More importantly, the rule applies to delete velars which are the product of intervocalic voicing (23b). It is likely that language contact in this respect was assisted by the existence of a similar rule in the substratum of the Rhodian variety.

✓ Turkish intervocalic voicing and deletion:

- (25) a. çocuk-l → çocuğu [tʃodʒuu]  
Child-acc  
'the child'
- b. jinekolog-A → jinekoloğa [ʒinekoloa]  
gynecologist-dat  
'to the gynecologist'

Structure 14: Interdental and velar fricatives → stops, especially before another C or word initially (variation).<sup>3</sup>

- (26) a. télo θélo (St.Gr) 'want-1sg.pres'  
b. mígdala amíɣðala (St.Gr) 'almond-nom.pl'  
c. févɟi févɟi (St.Gr) 'go away-3sg.pres'  
d. érkete érçete (St.Gr) 'come-3sg.pres'  
e. otomanós oθomanós (St.Gr) 'Ottoman-nom.sg'

✓ Turkish lacks fricatives.

Structure 15: Vowel harmony -- restricted to the first two or last two syllables of the word (unproductive):

- (27) a. jenéka jinéka (St.Gr) 'woman-nom.sg'(initial)  
b. zúlja zílja (St.Gr) 'envy-nom.sg' (final)

Cf. Cappadocian and Megisti Greek<sup>4</sup> (Revithiadou *et al.* 2005):

- (28) *initial domain harmony*
- a. tsunúrjo cenúrj-o 'new' Meg, P105  
b. luturja liturj-á 'liturgy' Meg, P105  
c. lakáni lekán-i 'basin' Sil, Ko30  
d. maɣalóna meɣalón-a 'first toe' Sil, Ko30

<sup>3</sup> Just a few examples in all the speakers examined.

<sup>4</sup> The Megisti data are drawn from Pantelis (2002) and the Silly data are drawn from Kostakis (1968).

(29) *final domain harmony*

a.	águra	ájir-a	'anchor' Meg, P102
b.	sutsá	sic-á	'fig tree' Meg, P108
c.	fúma	/fím-a/	'fame' Meg, P102
d.	ómurxa	/ómixl-a/	'mist' Sil, Ko61

**3. The intermediate variety**

- ✓ The most persistent interferences are those related to (a) gender confusion, (b) head final constituent order (SOV orders and postpositions), (c) special lexical items (*var* constructions and words with a Turkish stem and Greek endings) and (d) absence of weak pronouns.
- ✓ The specific status of each of the structures with interference
  - Structure 1 (gender marking): limited to a partial gender confusion
  - Structure 2 (Tk stem+Gr sfx): attested
  - Structure 3 (no article): disappears
  - Structure 4 (no agreement): disappears
  - Structure 5 (Num+N<sub>sg</sub>): disappears
  - Structure 6 (verb final): limited to copula, existential and possessive constructions (the last two correspond to *var* constructions)
  - Structure 7 (omission of adpositions in ind.obj & loc): disappears
  - Structure 8 (postpositions): attested
  - Structure 9 (no subj *na*): limited
  - Structure 10 (no compl/conj): limited
  - Structure 11 (exo/yparxi): limited to partial confusion
  - Structure 12 (no pron.clitics): attested
  - Structure 13 (intervocalic fricative deletion): attested (productive)
  - Structure 14 (stops instead of fricatives): limited appearance (variation)
  - Structure 15 (V-harmony): almost disappeared
- ✓ An additional interference: uvular /q/ before the back low vowel /a/:

(29)	a.	qátsane	kátsane	'sit-past.3pl'
	b.	qafé	kafé	'coffee-nom.sg'
	c.	vríqane	vríkane	'find-past.3pl'
	d.	miqrá	mikrá	'small-nom.pl'
	e.	qárvuna	kárvuna	'coal-nom.pl'

(30) *Turkish*

a.	kahve	[qavé]	'coffee'
b.	kar	[qar]	'snow'

**4. Interference of Greek to Turkish**

See Georgalidou *et al.* 2007, Celtek & Kaili 2010, Kaili *et al.* in press.

- Idiom transfer: Some idioms used in Greek are directly translated to Turkish. However, these idioms are not used in the same way in Standard Turkish.

- (31) a. *Rhodian Turkish*: telefon al-mak  
telephone take-inf
- b. *Greek*: perno telefono  
take-1sg telephone-acc.sg  
'I make a phone call'
- c. *Standard Turkish*: telefon et-mek  
telephone make-inf  
'to make a telephone call'
- (32) a. *Rhodian Turkish*: ayak-la git-mek (Kaili et al. in press)  
foot-instr go-inf  
'to go on foot'
- b. *Greek*: pao me ta poðia  
go-1sg with the-nt.acc.pl leg-nt.acc.pl  
'I go on foot'
- c. *Standard Turkish*: yürüyerek git-mek  
walk-ger go-inf

The following interferences of Greek to Turkish are related to the structures that exist in Turkish but are not realized in the same way in Greek.

- Avoidance of the question particle –mi:

- (33) a. *Standard Turkish*  
Ders-ler-in-i yap-tı-n mı?  
lesson-pl-2sg.poss-acc study-past.2sg mı?
- b. *Rhodian Turkish*  
\_\_\_\_\_ ↗ ↘ ↙  
Ders-ler-in-i yap-tı:-n?  
lesson-pl-2sg.poss-acc study-past.2sg?  
'Did you do your homework?'
- c. *Rhodian Greek*  
\_\_\_\_\_ ↗ ↘ ↙  
ekanes ta maθimatá su:?  
do-past.2sg the-nt.acc.pl homework-acc.pl cl:2-gen.sg  
'Did you do your homework?'

- ✓ Greek: Yes/No questions are formed with a special intonation contour, not with a special particle.
- ✓ Turkish: Yes/No questions are formed with the question marker *-mi*.

*Note:* Contact varieties of Greek (e.g. Pontic, Cappadocian, Silly, Farasa, etc.) provide evidence for this type of transfer. As illustrated by the following examples, the Turkish question particle is extensively used to render yes/no questions in all these systems.

▪ Ophis Pontic (Nea Trapezounta): -mi

- (34) a. efaikses mi ta zá? Dawkins 1914: 5  
 feed-past.2sg Q the animal-acc.pl  
 'Did you feed the animals?'  
 b. aúto to yomár<sup>l</sup> ki pulis me mi? Dawkins 1931: 109,13  
 this the mule-acc.sg neg sell-2sg cl:1-acc.sg Q  
 'Don't you sell this mule to me?'

- (35) a. éfaes mi? IV\_III\_165  
 eat-past.2sg Q  
 'Have you eaten?'  
 b. éfaes mi simera? EV\_III\_167  
 eat-past.2sg Q today?  
 'Have you eaten today?'

▪ Cappadocian (Anastasiadis 1976: 256) (*-mi* is subject to V-harmony)

- (36) a. efayez mi? Axos  
 eat-past.2sg Q  
 'Have you eaten?'  
 b. éferes ta mi? Ulaghatsh  
 bring-past.2sg cl:3-nt.pl.acc Q  
 'Have you brought them?'

▪ Silli (Dawkins 1916: 60-61, Anastasiadis 1976: 256) (*-mi* is subject to V-harmony)

- (37) éklepsiz mí ta ítu?  
 steal-past.2sg Q cl:3-nt.pl.acc aux  
 'Have you stolen them?'

▪ Pharasa (Anastasiadis 1976: 256) (*-mi* is subject to V-harmony)

- (38) mi se ðókan ta fjókka mu ma?  
 Q cl:2-acc.sg hit-past.3pl the boy-nom.pl cl:1-sg.gen Q  
 'Did my boys hit you?'

- Use of the past morpheme *-DI* instead of the evidential marking morpheme *-mİş* in situations where the event described by the utterance has not been eye-witnessed by the speaker.

(39) a. *Standard Turkish*

Anneanne-m                      bu   okul-da                      oku-muş.  
grandmother-1sg.poss      this   school-loc                      study-ev<sup>5</sup>/past.3sg

b. *Rhodian Turkish*

Anneanne-m                      bu   okul-da                      oku-du.  
grandmother-1sg.poss      this school-loc                      study-past.3sg  
'My grandmother has studied at this school.'

- ✓ Greek: It lacks evidential marking.
- ✓ Turkish: Evidential past is marked with the morpheme *-mİş*.

## 5. Results – Conclusions – Extensions

Table 1: The linguistic repertoire of the community

		Pidgin	intermediate	native (in Greek)
suburban	grandparents	✓		
	parents		✓	
	children			✓
Urban	grandparents		✓	
	parents			✓
	children			✓

Comments:

- ✓ The dominant Greek varieties quickly replace the pidgin variety used by older speakers.
- ✓ There is a difference in the linguistic repertoires of the grandparents and parents generations in relation to the urban vs. suburban setting. Grandparents and parents generations in urban settings have already abandoned the pidgin variety and progressed to the intermediate and native Greek varieties respectively.
- ✓ The younger generation in both groups (i.e., speakers bellow 30) exhibit native proficiency in Greek (and a variable degree of proficiency in Turkish).
- ✓ Concerning other aspects of the linguistic repertoire of this community, systematic code alternation is observed in the grandparent and parent generation groups in the urban networks, as well as in the parent generation group of the suburban network. Also, bilingual speakers switch to either Greek or Turkish to accommodate the addressee's preferred language or depending on the context of the interaction is performed (Georgalidou, Kaili & Celtek 2005).

Extensions for further research

- ✓ Examination of the Turkish variety of the island

<sup>5</sup> According to Göksel & Kerslake (2005: 356), "when speakers are transmitting information that they have received verbally from any other source (oral or written), they give their statement evidential marking (EV). Use of evidential marking is not a matter of choice in Turkish. "

- ✓ Greek interference in Turkish
- ✓ In-depth examination of the grammatical properties of the pidgin variety
- ✓ Other living forms of the Greek-Turkish contact

## References

- Anastasiadis, V. 1976. *The syntax of the Pharasa dialect of Cappadocia*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Ioannina.
- Celtek, A. & Kaili, H. 2010. In progr. *Bene telefon almadın*: Rodos'taki Türkçe-Yunanca ikidilli konuşucuların Türkçesinde Yunancanın etkisi. Paper to be presented at the *24th National Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, ÖDTÜ, Ankara, 17-18 May 2010.
- Dawkins, R.M. 1914. *Ὀφίς*, 17.VIII.14 – 21.VIII.14. Notebook. The Dawkins' Archive, Taylor Bodleian Slavonic & Modern Greek Library of the University of Oxford. ARCH.Z.DAWK. 7(5).
- Dawkins, R.M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A Study of the Dialects of Silly, Cappadocia and Pharasa with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Dawkins, Richard. M. 1931b. Folk tales from Sourmena and the valley of Ophis. *Αρχαίον Πόντου* 3: 79-122.
- Georgalidou, M., Spyropoulos, V., & Kaili, H. 2004. "Language shift in the bilingual in Greek and Turkish Muslim community of Rhodes". Paper presented in the 15 Sociolinguistic Symposium, 1-4 April, Newcastle, England.
- Georgalidou, M., V. Spyropoulos, H. Kaili, A. Revithiadou & A. Celtek. 2007. "Spoken varieties of Greek and Turkish in the bilingual community of Muslims in Rhodes" (In collaboration with: M. Georgalidou, V. Spyropoulos, H. Kaili & A. Celtek, University of the Aegean & Dokuz Eylül University). Paper presented at the *42nd Linguistics Colloquium Language Diversity and Language Learning: New Paths to Literacy*, University of the Aegean, Rhodes, September 27–30, 2007.
- Georgalidou, M. V. Spyropoulos, H. Kaili, A. Revithiadou & A. Celtek (to appear). "Spoken varieties of Greek and Turkish in the Muslim bilingual community of Rhodes." *Proceedings of the 42nd Linguistics Colloquium Language Diversity and Language Learning: New Paths to Literacy*.
- Georgalidou, M., Kaili, H. & Celtek, A. 2005. "Language choice and code-alternation patterns in the bilingual in Greek and Turkish Muslim community of Rhodes". Paper presented in the 5<sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Bilingualism, 19-23 March, Barcelona, Spain.
- Göksel, A. & Kerslake, C. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. New York: Routledge.
- Gumperz, J.J. 1982. *Discourse Strategies*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Holton, D, Mackridge, P. & Philippaki-Warbuton, I. 1997. *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London: Routledge.
- Kaili, H., Spyropoulos, V., Georgalidou, M., & A. Çeltek. In print. Causative constructions in the Turkish variety of the bilingual muslim community of Rhodes: A preliminary study. In S. Ay, Ö. Aydın, İ. Ergenç, S. Gökmen, S. İşsever & D. Peçenek (eds.), *Essays on Turkish Linguistics: Proceedings of the 14<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz-Verlag, 403-412.
- Kontosopoulos, N. 1994. *Dialekti ke Idiomata tis Ellinikis [Greek Dialects and Accents]*. Athina: Grigoris.
- Kostakis, T.P. 1968. *To Glosiko idioma tis Sillis [The Dialect of Silly]*. Athina: Center of Minor Asia Studies.
- Lewis, G. 2000. *Turkish Grammar*. Oxford: OUP.

- Milroy, L. & Li Wei. 1995. A social network approach to code-switching. In L. Milroy & P. Muysken (eds.), *One speaker, Two Languages*. Cambridge: CUP, 136-157.
- Milroy, L. 2002. Social Networks. In J.K. Chambers, P. Trudgill & N. Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The Handbook of Social Variation and Change*. Oxford: Blackwell, 549-572.
- Pantelis, P. 2002. *I Istoria ke i Dialektos ton Katikon tis Nisu Megistis (Kastellorizou) [The History and the Dialect of the People of the Island of Megisti – Kastellorizo]*. Athina: Eleftheri Skepsi.
- Papachristodoulou, C.I. 1986. *Leksiko Roditikon Idiomaton [Dictionary of the Rhodian Dialects]*. Athina: Stegi Gramaton ke Technon Dodekanisu.
- Revithiadou, A., M. van Oostendorp, K. Nikolou, M.-A. Tiliopoulou. 2005. Vowel harmony in contact-induced systems: The case of Asia Minor dialects of Greek. In Janse, M., B. Joseph, A. Ralli & (eds.) *Proceedings of the 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. University of Patras, Patras, 350-365. [Available also at ROA 731-0405.]
- Trudgill, P. 2003. Modern Greek dialects: A preliminary classification. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 4: 45-64.
- Tsitselikis, K. & Mavrommatis, G. 2003. *Turkish: The Turkish Language in Education in Greece*. Mercator-Education: European network for Regional or Minority Languages and Education.
- Winford, D. 2003. *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Zentella, A.C. 1997. *Growing up Bilingual*. Oxford: Blackwell.