



EUROPA-  
UNIVERSITÄT  
VIADRINA  
FRANKFURT  
(ODER)



IVANE JAVAKHISHVILI  
TBILISI STATE UNIVERSITY

ივანე ჯავახიშვილის სახელობის  
თბილისის სახელმწიფო უნივერსიტეტი

Universität Bielefeld

## The Impact of Socio-Political Transformations on Language and Identity

When: 18-20 February 2016

Where: Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University  
(Building VIII)

13, Ilia Chavchavadze Ave., 0179 Tbilisi, Georgia

# Abstracts



VolkswagenStiftung



## Content

Christoph Schroeder: <i>Clause combining in Turkish as a heritage language in Germany</i> .....	3
Astrid Menz: <i>Turkic and Slavic in contact: Examples from Gagauz and Karaim</i> .....	5
Kanavillil Rajagopalan: <i>Language as a reflex of changing geopolitical realities</i> .....	7
Vikalp Kumar: <i>Religious radicalization and linguistic identity: Sarazi and Kashmiri in Doda</i> .....	8
Manana Tandaschwili: <i>Endangered Caucasian Languages in Georgia: The Case of the Udi Language</i> .....	9
Peter Rosenberg: <i>Language islands in the flood: Language change and language contact in German speaking communities in Russia and Brazil</i> .....	10
Dionysios Zoumpalidis, Ekaterina Perekrest: <i>Georgian identity in Russian context: The case of Moscow school with a Georgian ethno-cultural component</i> .....	11
Tinatin Bolkvadze: <i>Diglossia and Bilingualism in Georgia</i> .....	12
Nika Loladze: <i>Greeks of Georgia: Characteristics of privileged labor migration</i> .....	13
Concha Maria Höfler: <i>Tracing the impact of socio-political transformations in the Greek community of Georgia</i> .....	14
Johanna Lorenz: <i>Subordination in a language contact situation: Complement clauses in Urum</i> .....	15
Stefanie Böhm: <i>Focus and word order - A comparative study of Turkish, Russian and Urum</i> .....	16
Marika Jikia: <i>Number in Turkish and Urum</i> .....	17
Ekaterine Kartvelishvili: <i>Interrelation between Language and Identity among the Georgian Greek Community in Greece</i> .....	18

Natia Jalabadze, Liana Melikishvili: <i>Some aspects of the correlation between heritage language and ethnic identity in multiethnic Georgia</i> .....	19
Zaal Kikvidze, Levan Pachulia, Nino Jikhvadze: <i>Urum Echo Reduplication within Typological and Areal Frameworks: Intra- and Extra-linguistic Factors</i> .....	20
Nutsa Tsetereli: <i>Affix Order in Nominal Inflection: Violation of cross-linguistic preferences and the dative in Urum</i> .....	21
Svetlana Berikashvili: <i>Accommodation of transferred verbs in Pontic Greek (spoken in Georgia)</i> .....	22
Rusudan Asatiani: <i>The Common Typological Feature for Languages from the Caucasus: The ‘Disappearance’ of Accusative</i> .....	23
Konstanze Jungbluth: <i>Convergence to an outgroup language? Identity construction in multilingual settings</i> .....	24
Jost Gippert: <i>Between co-existence and separation: the Ossetian case</i> .....	26
Moira Saltzman: <i>Language contact and morphological change in Jejueo</i> .....	27
Laurentia Schreiber: <i>The impact of socio-political factors on language vitality: An attitudinal study of Romeyka</i> .....	28
Ioanna Sitaridou: <i>Towards a new phylogeny of Pontic Greek</i> .....	29
Stéphane Voell: <i>Search for Identity in Space: Svan Spatial Practices in Multi-ethnic Southern Georgia</i> .....	31
Alexander Kartosia: <i>Observations on the modern use of the Georgian language</i> .....	32
Stavros Skopeteas: <i>Structure-building processes in language contact: on the emergence of head-initial verb phrases in Caucasian Urum</i> .....	33

**Christoph Schroeder:**

***Clause combining in Turkish as a heritage language in Germany***

University of Potsdam, Germany

Clause combining is understood here as a superordinate term referring to any linguistic means of connecting utterances. Turkish (of Turkey) is a language described as predominantly relying on non-finite subordination in the domain of clause combining (Göksel & Kerslake 2005, Kornfilt 1997). However, there are also strategies of finite subordination or co-subordination, as there are, obviously, strategies of paratactic as well as prosodic means of clause combining. The distribution between the different strategies has, for certain aspects of clause combining, repeatedly been described as a relationship of spoken and written register, whereby the non-finite structures rather belong to the written register and the finite structures rather to the spoken register (see Kerslake 2007 for non-finite versus finite strategies, Schroeder 2002 for clauses with the connector *ki*, Ozil 1993 and Erkman 1993 for the relationship between relative clauses and conditional clauses).

With regard to clause combining in Heritage Turkish in Germany, I assume a typological change at work in the system of clause combining in this variety of Turkish, from more non-finite to more finite means of clause combining. This typological change is an outcome of interplay between the following three dynamics:

- Generalization of structural elements of spoken Turkish,
- generalization of structures with a structural and functional correspondence in the contact language German and
- reduction or highly heterogeneous paths of acquisition concerning non-finite strategies of clause combining.

Changes identified in Heritage Turkish in the domain of clause combining are thus predominantly based on register variability and not on structural influence ("interference") from the contact language German.

## **References**

Erkman-Akerson, Fatma. 1993. Türkçede eş işlevli dilbilgisel yapıların kullanım değerleri. [The use of linguistic constructions with parallel functions in Turkish] In: İmer, Kâmile & N. Engin Uzun (yay.). *VII. Dilbilim Kurultayı bildirileri. 13-14 Mayıs 1993*. (Proceedings of the

- VII. Linguistics Conference] Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 95-103.
- Göksel, Aslı, Celia Kerslake. 2005. *Turkish. A comprehensive grammar.* (Comprehensive Grammars) London: Routledge.
- Kerslake, Celia. 2007. Alternative subordination strategies in Turkish. In: Rehbein, Jochen, Christiane Hohenstein, Lukas Pietsch (eds.). *Connectivity in grammar and discourse.* (Hamburg Studies on Multilingualism 5) Amsterdam: Benjamins, 231-258.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish* (Descriptive Grammars) London: Routledge.
- Ozil, Şeyda. 1993. Türkçede eş işlevli dilbilgisel yapılar. [Linguistic constructions with parallel functions in Turkish] In: İmer, Kâmile & N. Engin Uzun (yay.). *VII. Dilbilim Kurultayı bildirileri. 13-14 Mayıs 1993.* (Proceedings of the VII. Linguistics Conference] Ankara: Ankara Üniversitesi Basımevi, 85-97.
- Rehbein, Jochen; Herkenrath, Annette & Karakoç, Birsal. 2009. On contact-induced language change of Turkish as an immigrant language. *Language Typology and Universals* 62: 3, 171-204.
- Schroeder, Christoph. 2002. On the structure of spoken Turkish. *Essener Linguistische Skripte* 2: 1, 73-90 (Online).

**Astrid Menz:**

***Turkic and Slavic in contact: Examples from Gagauz and Karaim***

Orient-Institut Istanbul, Turkey

Turkic languages are in contact with Slavic languages for several hundred years but prevalent bi- or multilingualism with a Slavic language (mainly Russian) as the socially dominant language is comparatively recent. Nevertheless, all Turkic languages spoken on the territory of the former Soviet Union show traces of this contact. Since the beginning of the Soviet Union, the contact with Russian intensified significantly. In small linguistic communities, the competence in other than the native languages is even more important.

In my talk, I first will present the linguistic communities of the Gagauz, living mainly in Moldova and the Ukraine and the community of the Karaim, living in Lithuania. In this part I will also address the issue of identity, socio-political changes and heritage language regarding this two communities. I will then go on giving a short outline of most important typological features of Turkic in general. In the third – and main – part of my talk, I will discuss and compare examples of linguistic features in Gagauz and Karaim that developed due to contact with Slavic.

In the framework of Johanson's 1992 code-copying model, I will explain how copies from a socially dominant language are integrated in a copying language, which layers of a linguistic system are easily affected and which subsystems more or less resist copying. Linguistic examples are taken from my own work on Gagauz, fieldwork data as well as materials from written Gagauz. For Karaim I mainly rely on the extensive publications of Éva Á. Csató, who has herself done substantial fieldwork among the Karaims of Lithuania.

**References**

- Csató, Éva Á. 2002. Karaim: A high-copying language. In: Mari C. Jones & Edith Esch (eds.) *Language change. The interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors*. [= Contributions to the sociology of language 86]. New York & Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 315-327.
- Csató, Éva Á. 2006. Copying word order properties. In: Hendrik Boeschoten & Lars Johanson (eds.) *Turkic languages in contact*. (Turcologica 61) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. 152-157.

- Csató, Éva Á. 2010: *A typological coincidence: Word order properties in Trakai Karaim biblical translations*. Bengisu Rona & Eser Erguvanlı-Taylan (eds.) Festschrift for Karl Zimmer. *Turcologica*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Johanson, Lars 1992. *Strukturelle Faktoren in türkischen Sprachkontakten*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Menz, Astrid 1999. *Gagausische Syntax: eine Studie zum kontaktinduzierten Sprachwandel*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Menz, Astrid 2003. Endangered Turkic languages : the case of Gagauz. In: Janse, Mark 2003. *Language death and language maintenance : theoretical, practical and descriptive approaches*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

**Kanavillil Rajagopalan:**

***Language as a reflex of changing geopolitical realities***

State University at Campinas (UNICAMP), Brazil

In discussions about mono(vs.multi-)lingualism what one often tends to overlook is the fact that the so-called “natural languages” are anything but natural; rather they are all man-made in the sense that their identity as well as contours were fixed and delineated in response to political interests at play at given times. As these interests change with the passage of time, so do the interests that ensured the conditions of their demarcation and consolidation. All this has been going on ever since recorded history began but, once again, its true importance has been downplayed or simply ignored for reasons of (what else?) prevailing political interests.

Thanks to globalization, and the accompanying mass migrations of huge chunks of population right across the world, as well as increasing contact among peoples of different nations thanks to the internet and increasing movement of people across continents for business or pleasure, time-honoured ways of thinking of language are under strain. Language contact is no longer exceptional; rather, it is the norm in our globalized world.

In South America, where the present writer finds himself stationed, this has meant having to face up to multilingualism and language mixing which had been swept underneath the rugs in the name of nation-building by former European colonial powers, notably Spain and Portugal. But things are beginning to unravel rapidly as pretense gives way to inevitable recognition of reality on the ground below. My aim in the proposed presentation is to explore the mechanisms at work in this process whereby linguistics, history, and geography (to name only the most salient of all) are contributing to change the cultural landscape and what all this might ultimately mean to the way we conceptualize the very phenomenon we call language.

**Vikalp Kumar:**  
***Religious radicalization and linguistic identity:  
Sarazi and Kashmiri in Doda***  
University of Delhi, India

Sarazi and Kashmiri are the primary languages of Doda, a mountainous district in the Jammu and Kashmir state of India. Muslims make up 60 percent of the district's population and the rest are Hindus. Religion is a decisive factor in language use and identity. All Hindus speak Sarazi and Muslims equally speak Sarazi or Kashmiri. Historically majority of the Muslims too spoke Sarazi and use of Kashmiri was confined to the only urban centre of the district. Religious radicalization which happened in the neighboring Kashmir during the twentieth century spread to Doda whose Muslims always looked towards Kashmir for inspiration. Becoming more Islamic was probably associated with becoming more Kashmiri and hence the use of Kashmiri language spread even among rural Muslims and Sarazi acquired another name-Hindi or the language of Hindus. A historical analysis reveals that Sarazi itself probably developed from a creole which emerged from the language of Kashmiri Muslim migrants and Western Pahari (most likely Bhaderwahi) Hindus. The proposed paper will provide a first look at how religious radicalization has led to a large scale switching from Sarazi to Kashmiri which itself is quite influence by Sarazi in Doda.

**Manana Tandaschwili:**  
***Endangered Caucasian Languages in Georgia:***  
***The Case of the Udi Language***  
Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany

With respect to the variety of languages it hosts, Georgia is a typical country of the Caucasus. The languages spread in Georgia are very different and can be grouped according to several criteria: the different language families they pertain to (Caucasian, Indo-European, Semitic, Turkic languages), their official status, their sociolinguistic situation, the number of their speakers, and their degree of endangerment.

In my presentation, the question of endangerment of the Caucasian languages spoken in Georgia is considered from two perspectives: 1) "external" measures, which are carried out by the Georgian state in terms of language policy with respect to minorities (especially in the context of the national programme for the integration of minorities existing since 2012), and 2) "internal" measures taken by the minorities themselves with a view to revitalizing their languages. The presentation focuses on the Udi language, an East Caucasian language which is found in Georgia only since the beginning of the 20th century and which otherwise is spoken only in two villages in Azerbaijan and one in Armenia. Of all endangered languages in Georgia, Udi is certainly one of the most notable examples with respect to its present situation. Using voice recordings of Udi which were produced in the course of the project "Endangered Caucasian Languages in Georgia" (ECLING, DoBeS project), the degree of endangerment of the Udi language is analyzed, among others, on the basis of phenomena of Code switching.

**Peter Rosenberg:**

***Language islands in the flood: Language change and language contact  
in German speaking communities in Russia and Brazil***

European University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder), Germany

Today, German language islands in Russia and Brazil are on the way to language shift. On this way the varieties of these communities display certain features of decomposition and simplification in terms of morphology. Regular and irregular morphology, however, are developing differently: While reduction to a two-term (or even common case) system is the main characteristic of regular noun inflection, in personal pronouns two or three-term distinctions are maintained, mostly containing dative. How could these differences be explained? What is the impact of language contact? Which influencing factors (such as generation, ethnic distinctiveness, politics of the country, structure of the German variety) can be detected?

New data will be presented from a research project about language change in case morphology of German language islands with speakers living in close contact to the majority populations in Brazil and Russia. 120 speakers of three age groups speaking Low German and High German dialects in contact have been recorded in three settings (translation into intended dialect; interview narration; home conversation self-recorded by the speakers). Part of the study is a real-time panel study, i.e. tape-recordings of 16 speakers a second time after 15 years.

The core idea of the project is the assumption that we can learn as well from language obsolescence as from language emergence (standardization, koineization, dialect merger) which has been the subject of linguistic research in the past. Through its comparative perspective it seems possible to account for internally or externally induced linguistic change.

Language decay is apparently not just disorder, not amorphous, but somehow structured. Certain lexical classes are more subject to reduction than others, and some residual features retain morphological "core" functions (in terms of case semantics).

**Dionysios Zoumpalidis<sup>a</sup>, Ekaterina Perekrest<sup>b</sup>:**

***Georgian identity in Russian context:***

***The case of Moscow school with a Georgian ethno-cultural component***

<sup>a</sup>Research University Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

<sup>b</sup>Moscow School with a Georgian ethno-cultural component, Russia

Moscow is one of the most culturally diverse cities in the world. Apart from a large number of visitors that arrive in Moscow from all over the world, the city welcomes massive flows of immigrants mostly from the former Soviet republics. It is often the case that the newcomers and their children are only fluent in their native language and may possess limited knowledge of the language of the host country, a fact which considerably hampers smooth integration and access to education. It was precisely the lack of equal opportunities in primary and secondary education that forced the Moscow authorities to establish schools with an ethno-cultural component for the major ethnic minorities (Tatars, Georgians, Jews, Armenians, and Azerbaijanis among others) residing in Moscow on a long-term or permanent basis. Today, children of different ethnic backgrounds are offered the opportunity to attend schools where they are able not only to preserve their mother tongue but also learn and participate in national celebrations, dances, songs and, in this way, preserve their ethno-linguistic and cultural capital.

In this paper, we are going to examine the identity of students of Georgian descent in the Moscow secondary school with a Georgian ethno-cultural component and look at how it has been affected by the socio-geographic factors. It is true that identity is shaped and negotiated in social, political, geographical, economic, religious contexts which all may make it difficult for people to define who they are. The present study aims, therefore, to address such questions as: How can Georgian students preserve their identity in Moscow? What is the role of the Georgian language and culture in the construction/maintenance of ethnic identity in the school? How can the school help promote linguistic and cultural diversity?

In the present study, participant observation, quantitative (questionnaires) and qualitative (group interviews with students, individual/group interviews with teachers) methods of data collection are used.

**Tinatin Bolkvadze:**  
***Diglossia and Bilingualism in Georgia***  
Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Georgia is the only country that borders all countries in the Caucasus and this has an impact on the linguistic situation in the country. Georgia always was the multilingual and multicultural country. The migration of various nations and ethnic variety in antique Georgia are confirmed by Georgian and foreign sources. The paper deals with the two kinds of languages spreading in Georgia: the South Caucasian languages (i. e. Kartvelian languages) and non-Kartvelian languages spreading in Georgia.

According to the pursued language policy Georgia is an endoglossic state, where the official national language is the mother tongue of the majority of the population. According to Article 8 of the Georgian Constitution, the state language in Georgia is Georgian, and also Abkhazian in Abkhazia, while other minority languages are spoken by larger or smaller groups of minorities: Azerbaijani, Armenian, Ossetian, Hebrew, Russian, Ukrainian, and Kurdish. Some other languages are spoken by different smaller minority groups, making up 1 % of the population. The main direction of modern Georgian linguistic policy is to support multilingualism in Georgia and at the same time to support the speakers of minority languages of Georgia to become bilingual, where Georgian language should have the status of the second language because it's the state language of the country.

The relationship of Georgia with the other members of South Caucasian languages, i. e. Georgian-Megrelian, Georgian-Laz, and Georgian-Svan relationships should be described in terms of diglossia, and, in no ways, those of bilingualism, which we use for the description of Georgian-Azerbaijani or Georgian-Armenian language use.

The Kartvelian diglossia started many centuries ago, and the state prestige, also the sense of pride in this stable language have always been associated with Georgian. This language was of an ideologized value. It unified and unifies the country, has turned into a national symbol, and national values have been identified with it. This is how a great tradition creates an exoglossic society taking care of finding a respectable origin for its language, for the sake of which myths and genealogies have been composed and cultivated. In the Kartvelian diglossic hierarchy, this honor belonged to the Georgian language.

**Nika Loladze:**

***Greeks of Georgia: Characteristics of privileged labor migration***

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Massive migration from Georgia started in the 1990s, after the dissolution of the Soviet Union. The majority of the migrants went abroad seeking jobs, and like other ethnic groups residing in Georgia, Greeks were actively involved in this process. As a result, the portion of Greeks in the Georgian population decreased from 100,324 to 15,166 during 1989-2002 (National Statistics office of Georgia 2004). Moreover, the Greek community has further decreased since 2002 due to migration, and is currently comprised of 3,000 to 5,000 people according to local estimates.

This talk combines the neoclassical economic theory and social capital theory of migration to underline the economical or labor migration characteristics of the mass emigration process of Georgian Greeks (Massey 1993). From the close analysis of 50 interviews, it becomes clear that the push factors of Georgian Greeks migration were the crises following the break-up of the Soviet Union – economic collapse, low income, unemployment and, furthermore, the opening of borders. On top of that, the open door policy of the Greek government with regards to Greeks from the former Soviet countries gave Georgian Greeks privileged opportunities for migration. On the other hand, the issues of repatriation and return to the “historical homeland” play a surprisingly insignificant role in shaping the processes of migration.

**References**

- Massey, Douglas S. (1993) Theories of International Migration: A review and Appraisal. *Population and Development Review* 19(3) 431-466.
- National Statistics office of Georgia (2004) National Statistics Results of the First National General Census of Population of Georgia 2002. Vol. 3, part II: 147-150. Tbilisi. (in Georgian).

**Concha Maria Höfler:**

***Tracing the impact of socio-political transformations in the Greek community of Georgia***

European University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder), Germany

Even when “identity” or better “identification” are conceptualised as constantly changing processes of narrating the self and others (Georgakopoulou 2007; Hall 1996), focusing directly on shifts in identification afforded and necessitated by historical “turning points” enables a more thorough understanding not only of processes of identification but also how they are influenced by wider societal discourses (de Fina, Schiffrin & Bamberg 2006). In the case of Georgia’s Greek community, the most influential recent turning point has been the end of the Soviet Union. This not only profoundly transformed their political and economic surroundings but also questioned their identification as “Greeks” in unprecedented ways.

This paper proposes an ethnographically informed conversation analysis (Deppermann 2000) of 50 semi-structured interviews on community, family and individual experiences of these transformations with self-identifying members of Georgia’s Greek community. The focus will be on the interactive construction of belonging (Hausendorf 2000), on the turning points made relevant by the interviewees and on how they position themselves and their communities with regards to the changing challenges to their “Greek” identity.

**References**

- Deppermann, Arnulf (2000) Ethnographische Gesprächsanalyse: Zu Nutzen und Notwendigkeit von Ethnographie für die Konversationsanalyse. *Gesprächsforschung - Online-Zeitschrift zur verbalen Interaktion*, 1, 96-124.
- de Fina, Anna, Schiffrin, Debora, Bamberg, Michael (eds.) 2006 *Discourse and Identity* Cambridge: CUP.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra (2007) *Small Stories, Interaction and Identities*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hall, Stuart (1996) Who needs 'identity'? In: Stuart Hall, Paul du Gay (eds.) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage, 1-17.
- Hausendorf, Heiko (2000) *Zugehörigkeit durch Sprache. Eine Linguistische Studie am Beispiel der Deutschen Wiedervereinigung*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

**Johanna Lorenz:**

***Subordination in a language contact situation:***

***Complement clauses in Urum***

Bielefeld University, Germany

Caucasian Urum (henceforth Urum) is the language of a speech community characterised by bi- and multilingualism including both genealogically and typologically distinct languages. Urum is a variety of Anatolian Turkish spoken by ethnic Greeks in the Small Caucasus in Georgia. Almost every speaker is fluent in Russian and most are competent in Georgian as well.

Several studies report changes of subordination patterns in Turkish or Turkic languages in settings with dominant Indo-European languages. They claim that a growing realisation of finite complement clauses introduced by subordinating conjunctions substitutes the primarily synthetic and non-canonical morphological marking in Turkic complement clauses.

This talk discusses language change phenomena in the domain of complementation in Urum. Based on corpus data, the age of the speakers is analysed as a decisive factor reflecting on-going contact induced language change. The study identifies critical factors on different linguistic levels that determine the distribution of variations and tendencies among speakers.

**Stefanie Böhm:**  
***Focus and word order -***  
***A comparative study of Turkish, Russian and Urum***  
Bielefeld University, Germany

The purpose of the study presented in this talk is to analyse the effect of focus on the structure of the clause in Turkish, Russian and Caucasian Urum.

Previous studies on focus revealed two asymmetries with respect to the realization of focused constituents. The first is concerned with the focus-type: it has been observed that identificational instances of focus cross-linguistically occur more often with non-canonical structures than non-identificational instances of focus. The second asymmetry relates to the hierarchical position of the focused constituent: it has been observed that non-canonical structures are cross-linguistically more frequent if the focus is on subjects than if it is on objects.

The aim of this study is to compare the effect of the focus type (i.e. identificational vs. non-identificational) and focused argument (i.e. subject vs. object) on the linearization of arguments in three languages: Turkish, Russian and Urum. A comparison of these languages is of particular interest since previous studies have shown that the variety of Urum, which is currently spoken in Georgia, shares many similarities with Turkish, but also displays some striking differences, which result from the contact to the other languages of the Caucasus, primarily from Russian. A comparative study on Turkish, Russian and Urum is thus very fascinating, because it can provide insights into the current dynamic of language change.

**Marika Jikia:**

***Number in Turkish and Urum***

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

In Turkish and in Urum the category of number is expressed by the plural suffix *-LAR*. In both languages the nouns with cardinal numerals are always in singular. In Turkish this agreement is often neglected:

- (1) *Beşevler* 'five houses' (a district in Ankara)
- (2) *Dört Büyükler* 'four greats' (football teams)
- (3) *Yedi Meşaleciler* 'seven torch-bearer' (a literary group), etc.

By translation fore language is important and mostly noun phrase involving cardinal number head noun stays in plural:

- (4) *Üç silahşörler* 'Les Trois Mousquetaires' 'Three Musketeers'
- (5) *Yedi cüceler* 'Seven dwarfs', etc.

The Turkish noun phrases such as these indicate a concrete person or thing, that have attached some characteristic feature. To be more exact - when they say *üç ay*, it means any three months, yet, when they say (6) *Üç Aylar* these are the three months of Rejeb, Shakhban and Ramazan. All the three are Moslim calendar Holy months; Existing in Turkey a surname (7) *Altıoklar* 'six arrows' is associated with the Atatürk's policy, denoting six main orientations, that symbolically were expressed through six arrows.

Nouns determined by those kinds of numerals, as a rule, don't take plural suffixes. It is the same in Urum as well:

- |     |                   |            |            |     |                       |             |            |
|-----|-------------------|------------|------------|-----|-----------------------|-------------|------------|
| (8) | <i>ğırh</i>       | <i>beş</i> | <i>gün</i> | (9) | <i>ğırh</i>           | <i>älli</i> | <i>gün</i> |
|     | forty             | five       | day        |     | forty                 | fifty       | day        |
|     | 'forty five days' |            |            |     | 'forty to fifty days' |             |            |

Neither Urum language stayed beyond this process, even more, in the everyday speech it became possible to find more examples of agreement in plural of a determinant in indefinite numeral *çoğ* 'many' with determined:

- (10) *çoğ*      *muchenia-lar-ınan*  
many      torture-PL-INSTR  
'with many difficulties'

According to the examples of both languages and for better clarifying of the issue we can name synesis derived from Greek *σύνεσις* (influence of contents on the form), difference in nuances, to make the subordinate agree with it in number.

**Ekaterine Kartvelishvili:**

***Interrelation between Language and Identity among the Georgian Greek Community in Greece***

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

Since the late 1980s ethnic Greeks have migrated from the Former Soviet Union to Greece. Among them were Georgian Greeks — Pontic Greeks and Urum; the first speaking the Pontic Greek dialect and the second — Urum. Though they were linguistically diverse groups, their identity was Greek.

Identity involves a classification and categorization of the world around us which includes physical attributes, customs, cultural items and beliefs as well as language (Starks et al, 2005). In the Georgian Greek migrant communities individuals have defined their ethnic identities on the basis of these categories, though as compared with the Greek communities in Georgia, some of these categories have lost their importance in different generations of migrants. Communities which adopt and redefine themselves to new situations are predetermined to the constant identity shifts.

The proposed paper is based on the field materials collected in 2013-2014 in Greece among the Georgian Greek migrants within the frame of the project “The Impact of Current Transformational Processes on Language and Ethnic Identity: Urum and Pontic Greeks in Georgia”. The analysis of the oral narratives of Pontic and Urum Greek migrants reveal the specificities of language-identity interrelation in a comparatively new environment, the problems which migrant community faces due to their spoken languages that sometimes cause their marginality and otherness.

**Natia Jalabadze<sup>a</sup>, Liana Melikishvili<sup>b</sup>:**

***Some aspects of the correlation between heritage language and ethnic identity in multiethnic Georgia***

<sup>a</sup>Tbilisi State University, Georgia

<sup>b</sup>Georgian National Academy of Sciences

Georgian reality makes possible to identify some aspects of relationship between language and identity. Many densely populated ethnic groups in Georgia have preserved their traditional culture, heritage language and ethnic identity. However, there are also some groups whose identity has undergone transformation for various reasons.

In Georgia, due to the linguistic and religious situations and social and political conditions the degree of ethnic identity preservation is different in different ethnic groups. In some groups it is entirely preserved and in some it has changed, sometimes, even for several times.

In preserving ethnic identity in multiethnic environment in Georgia densely populated ethnic groups attach particular importance to the preservation of traditional culture and heritage language. In this case language equals ethnic identity (Armenians, Azerbaijanis).

However, if on the one hand, we have the so called Georgian Jews, who have preserved their ethnic identity, but their spoken language is Georgian, on the other hand, there is another group with Georgian ethnic identity, the family language of which is not Georgian (Tsova Tush). Besides, there is also an ethnic group, who because of political collisions has changed its ethnic affiliation several times (the so called Meskhetian Turks), bilingual Urums, who speak Turkish and Russian and have Greek identity, bilingual Assyrians (Assyrian -Georgian) whose identity is Assyrian, etc.

Based on Georgian reality it is possible to identify the factors that cause either preservation or change of ethnic identity :1. Ethnic environment 2. Language and religion 3. The type of culture 4. Political background 5. The time factor 6.The settlement type.

**Zaal Kikvidze<sup>a</sup>, Levan Pachulia<sup>b</sup>, Nino Jikhvadze<sup>c</sup>:**  
***Urum Echo Reduplication within Typological and Areal Frameworks:***  
***Intra- and Extra-linguistic Factors***

<sup>a</sup>Tbilisi State University, Georgia

<sup>b</sup>Sokhumi State University, Georgia

<sup>b</sup>Akaki Tsereteli State University, Georgia

Like other reduplicated formations, echo paired constructions consist of a Base and a Reduplicant; a Base is as a meaningful word while a Reduplicant is an emerging one in which a consonant (or a consonant cluster) appears to replace an initial consonant (or a consonant cluster), if any, of a Base. The phenomenon has been widely attested and thoroughly explored across various (genetically, typologically, geographically differing) languages of the world; the process has also been treated as a common behaviour for one of the two copies in morphological reduplication to undergo dissimilation. Echo pairs produce the meanings 'et cetera,' 'and the like,' 'associated with,' 'extremity,' 'concentration,' 'generality,' 'plurality,' and so on.

Based on *Urum Narrative Collection* (by Stavros Skopeteas and Violeta Moisiđi, 2011), we examined the occurrence and structure of echo paired words in Urum, a language which has not so far been among the ones studied in terms of constructions in point. It should be also noted that Urum echo pairs greatly resemble the most common typological pattern, that is, structurally they do not demonstrate any drastic differences from other languages like Hindi, Russian, etc., and, especially, Turkish; e.g.

- (1) *baja-maja*
- (2) *dyarmyan-myarmyan*
- (3) *gardof-mardof*
- (4) *shei-mei*
- (5) *ainoyun-mainoyun*

Structurally, the reduplicatives are formed by means of either adding the *m-* onto an onset or replacing of an initial consonant. The bases are free forms, while the reduplicants are bound ones. Thus, a base makes use of its own phonetic composition as a material for generating a morphemelike entity (morphemoid). A resulting echo formation has the following meaning: 'W(ORD) and the like.' The Urum data will be examined in parallel with those of some of the Caucasian languages with similar intra- and extra-linguistic factors in effect.

**Nutsa Tsetereli:**  
***Affix Order in Nominal Inflection:***  
***Violation of cross-linguistic preferences and the dative in Urum***  
Tbilisi State University, Georgia

The paper presents an empirical study on the Urum language morphologic peculiarity, in particular, violation of the suffix canonical order in the Dative case.

Urum people are Turkish speaking Greeks, who immigrated from Anatolia to Georgia in 1829- 30. The Urum language displays substantial similarities with the Standard Turkish; beyond these similarities it shows some unique developments and among them the violation of canonical affix order in nominal suffixes is significant from a theoretical point of view.

Non-canonical affix order appears only with the 2nd person possessive singular form. When 2nd person possessive suffix is followed by a Dative marker formally it coincides with the form of 3rd person possessive suffix in the Dative case, e.g.: *defter-in-e* 'to your note-book/to his note-book'. These, resulted from the specific diachronic changes, forms are homonyms, although they represent different structures. In Urum the change of the affix order is developed creating a new contrast: in the 2nd person possessive affix, the case marker precedes the possessive affix, e.g.: *defter-e-n* 'to your note-book' while in the third person it takes postposition: *defter-in-e* 'to his/her note-book'.

The analysis of the entire paradigms of possessive constructions in Urum sheds light that the presented developments serve to avoid morphological ambiguity and Urum employs two different strategies: either the case marker is dropped out (Genitive, Accusative) or the order is reversed (Dative). Further factors analyzed in the presented paper may account for the observed asymmetries: in Genitive, ambiguity is less likely through the syntactic construction; with Accusative the case maker is already optional, since bare nouns are generally characteristic for nonspecific indefinites. As for the Dative case, dropping the case marker in Dative would result into serious ambiguities. This may account for the fact that the phenomenon of affix reversion exactly appears with the Dative case.

**Svetlana Berikashvili:**

***Accommodation of transferred verbs in Pontic Greek (spoken in Georgia)***

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

The purpose of the presentation is to investigate how Turkish and Russian verbs are accommodated in Pontic Greek spoken in Georgia. The study is based on corpus data, which are collected through several fieldwork periods in the Pontic-speaking community of Georgia (by Evgenia Kotanidi, Svetlana Berikashvili & Stavros Skopeteas 2005, 2014).

Besides the belief that verbal borrowings are rare due to the morphological complexity of verbs, the study demonstrates that it is not difficult for verbs to be borrowed, provided that certain conditions are met. Though while transferring different incorporation strategies can be used taking into account the morphological type of the source language.

The claim is that Pontic Greek possesses different incorporation strategies to accommodate loan-verbs from languages with concatenative (i.e. Turkish) and non-concatenative (i.e. Russian) morphology. Thus, in the case of Russian there is direct insertion and light verb strategy, while in the case of Turkish - indirect insertion, that involves a verbalizer required for the verbs to inflect according to the patterns of Pontic Greek.

The novel contribution of this presentation is that it compares the morphological integration of verbs originating in concatenative language with verbs originating in non-concatenative language in order to disentangle the role of the source language in transference phenomena.

**Rusudan Asatiani:**

***The Common Typological Feature for Languages from the Caucasus:  
The 'Disappearance' of Accusative***

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

The common typological feature for the Caucasian languages defined as Ergative (or, in some cases as, so-called, split-ergative) languages is unmarkedness of the Patient. That is: no Accusative is found in the majority of the Caucasian languages.

Some languages from the Caucasus (Armenian, Azerbaijani, Ossetian, Turkish, Urum and Persian) reveal a tendency of accusative "disappearance" governed by the Silverstein's hierarchies (1976): the markedness of a Patient, which is a prototypically inanimate noun, is increasing (consequently, the possibility of accusative appearance is increasing as well) according to the following universal hierarchy:

*I-person//II-person > III-person > Proper Nouns > Persons > Animate (Definite) Nouns > // Animate (Indefinite) Nouns > Inanimate (Definite) Nouns > // Inanimate (Indefinite) Nouns*

In languages from the Caucasus the above given hierarchy has the controversial direction: first of all, the accusative disappears for inanimate (and/or indefinite) nouns and the process is completed when it disappears for I/II personal pronouns.

What causes the disappearance of accusative? In the cases of Armenian, Azerbaijani, Ossetian, Turkish, and Persian it could be the influence of the Caucasian languages; but, the same tendency takes place when such influence of non-accusative languages seems to be excluded: e.g. in English, Russian, Finno-Ugric, and others the accusative case is restricted and replaced by the nominative and/or genitive cases. So, it seems better to speak about the general tendency of dynamic processes of the linguistic structuring where the above given universal hierarchies play a critical role. Yet, it is absolutely clear that the language influences definitely give appropriate grounds for the realization of such universal tendencies.

**Konstanze Jungbluth:**

***Convergence to an outgroup language?***

***Identity construction in multilingual settings.***

European University Viadrina, Frankfurt (Oder), Germany

When times change, identity construction becomes more and more important not only for individuals but also for groups. My focus will compare the language use of people belonging to different generations in multilingual settings. The everlasting negotiation of self-identification and other-identification (Jungbluth 2015) depends on the others as much as on the self. In social contexts where several languages are in contact and used in one and the same space, the speaker's decision for one of them (or maybe two in case of a bilingual utterance) is already decisive. To whom does she accommodate (Giles/Coupland 1991)? It is well known that the very choice of the language itself may be interpreted differently by the speaker and by her listeners.

The interpretation of the act of identity performed (LePage/Tabouret-Keller 1985) varies considerably depending on their L1 and their competence of the one or several of the other languages involved (Boix i Fuster 1993). More precisely, I will focus on those interactions, where the speaker has chosen not her own L1 but an outgroup language (or at least some features of it), thus demonstrating convergence towards the other group (Bourhis/Genesee 1988). Does the following part of the ongoing conversation show whether her listeners accept this choice? In which circumstances is this rather unusual behaviour successful (Tajfel 2010)? Are there groups who give preference to this kind of language use? Does the young generation differ from the elder one in this respect? Is there a difference between societies with an extensive experience in multilingual contexts as is the case in the Caucasus region compared with other ones which are less heterogenous as for example the Pyrenees region?

## **References**

- Boix i Fuster, Emili (1993), *Triar no és trair. Identitat i llengua en els joves de Barcelona*, Barcelona: Ed. 62.
- Bourhis, Richard Y. / Genesee, Fred (1988), Evaluative Reactions to Language Choice Strategies: The Role of Sociostructural Factors, IN: *Language & Communication*, Vol. 8, No. 3, 229-250.

- Giles, Howard / Coupland, Joustine / Coupland, Nikolas. 1991. Accommodation Theory: Communication, Context, and Consequence. IN: Howard Giles / Joustine Coupland (Edd.), *Contexts of Accommodation*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Jungbluth, Konstanze. 2015. Creoles. IN: Jungbluth, Konstanze / Da Milano, Federica (Eds.), *Manual of Deixis in Romance Languages*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 332-356.
- Jungbluth, Konstanze. 2015. Crossing the Border, Closing the Gap: Otherness in Language Use. IN: Peter Rosenberg / Konstanze Jungbluth / Dagna Zinkhahn Rhobodes (Eds.), *Linguistic Construction of Ethnic Borders*, Bern/Frankfurt a.M.: Peter Lang, 209-227.
- Jungbluth, Konstanze. 2012. Aus zwei mach eins: switching, mixing, getting different. IN: Barbara Jańczak/Konstanze Jungbluth/Harald Weydt (Eds.), *Mehrsprachigkeit aus deutscher Perspektive*, Tübingen: Narr, 45-72.
- LePage, Robert B. / Tabouret-Keller, Andree. 1985. *Acts of Identity: Creole-based Approaches to Language and Ethnicity*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, Henri (2010), *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Jost Gippert:**

***Between co-existence and separation: the Ossetian case***

Goethe University Frankfurt, Germany

The presentation examines the circumstances and the development of the co-existence of Ossetes and Georgians and their respective languages south of the Caucasus before the outbreak of the war of 2008, which led to the de-facto separation of South-Ossetia from the Georgian state and to the expulsion of Georgians from the Tskhinvali region. On the basis of historical records covering more than one millennium, the history of the area in question and relevant migrations will be examined with a special view upon the status quo before the war.

**Moira Saltzman:**

***Language contact and morphological change in Jejueo***

University of Michigan, USA

Largely considered a dialect of Korean, Jejueo is the indigenous language of Jeju Island, South Korea. Jejueo has 5,000-10,000 speakers located throughout the islands of Jeju Province and in a small, diasporic enclave in Osaka, Japan. With fluent speakers over 75 years old, Jejueo was classified as critically endangered in 2010 (UNESCO). Due to an enforced diglossia in Jeju in the 20th century, Jejueo was not used in the media, education or any official capacities. In 1971 religious rituals allowing the multigenerational transmission of oral history through Jejueo were banned. The present situation in Jeju is one of language shift, where fewer than 10,000 people out of a population of 600,000 are fluent in Jejueo, and elements of Jejueo's lexicon, morphosyntax and phonology are rapidly shifting to Modern Standard Korean (Kang 2005). This paper discusses the cline of morphological attrition in Jejueo as it relates to the linguistic and extralinguistic forces of intensive contact pressure from Modern Standard Korean and Jejueo language ideologies.

**Laurentia Schreiber:**

***The impact of socio-political factors on language vitality:***

***An attitudinal study of Romeyka***

Freie Universität Berlin, Germany

The present paper aims to identify the factors favouring language shift by considering both language internal mechanisms (such as contact-induced change and attrition) and external forces (that is language attitudes and identity). A language vitality model including 8 language internal and external factors will be applied to the case of Romeyka, an endangered Greek variety spoken in the Black Sea region of Turkey. Linguistic vitality of Romeyka will be assessed by means of attitudinal data given the sociolinguistic nature of most vitality factors. In order to arrive at a clearer picture, I have designed a questionnaire in Turkish covering both intra- and extra-linguistic factors which was administered orally during two field trips in 2014. The questionnaire was presented to 25 Romeyka speakers who migrated to Istanbul in the 1980s. Qualitative as well as quantitative analysis controlled for the variables gender, age, education, and speech community. In order to account for deviating vitality patterns, data of Istanbulite Romeyka speakers were compared to those collected at a village in the Pontic Alps by Sitaridou (2014). In this paper, I will argue on the basis of the attitudinal study that Turkish language policy and identity highly influence vitality of Romeyka. In detail, the following variables appeared to affect language use in Romeyka: (i) age; the younger the respondents, the poorer language competence, (ii) language competence; the poorer language competence, the more negative the attitudes and the poorer identity, (iii) language attitudes; the more negative the attitudes, the poorer vitality, and (iv) gender; attitudes of males appeared to be more negative than those of females. Moreover, comparison to the village data suggests that (v) the more contact the community has to Turkish mainstream society, the worse vitality. These results show that language vitality is decisively influenced by socio-political factors.

## **References**

Sitaridou, Ioanna (2014). Greek-speaking enclaves in Pontus today: The documentation and revitalization of Romeyka. In: M. Jones & S. Ogilvie (Eds.). *Keeping Languages Alive: Documentation, Pedagogy and Revitalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Ioanna Sitaridou:**  
***Towards a new phylogeny of Pontic Greek***  
University of Cambridge, Queens' College

Romeyka belongs genetically to the PG group, along with Cappadocian, Marioupol Greek, Pharasiot, at the core of the AMG group (Andriotis 1995:100–107, Drettas 1999: 15, Horrocks 2010:398–404, Kontossopoulos 1981, Karatsareas 2011).

Affinities among AMG varieties led Dawkins (1931:399) to hypothesize that a medieval AMG koine must have existed, whose idiosyncratic development possibly preceded, and was facilitated by the incipient Seljuq invasions of the 11th c. (Dawkins 1916:205, 213, Browning 1983:130, Horrocks 2010:382). Some claim, however, that at least some distinctive AMG developments originate in the regional koine Greek spoken in Asia Minor and adjacent islands during Hellenistic and Roman times (Thumb 1914:199, Kapsomenos 2003:63, Drettas 1999:15). Nevertheless, according to Horrocks (2010:113–114), there is little relation between the grammatical innovations shared by the modern dialects and the region-specific characteristics of the Hellenistic (HelGr) Koine of Asia Minor recorded by Brixhe (1987).

Using Romeyka, I argue that AMG participated partially in the processes that resulted in the major MG dialect formations (Sitaridou 2014b); in particular, for Proto-Pontic, I claim that the *terminus ante quem* is the Hellenistic times (strong thesis), not the middle of the Late Medieval period, as claimed by Horrocks (2010: 382, Holton & Manolesou 2010) for other MG dialects. The weak thesis suggests that the *terminus post quem* was the 11th c. (Dawkins 1931).

The strong thesis is pursued here (Sitaridou 2014b). This does not imply that Greek in Pontus was not in contact with MedGr, but rather that the innovations spread in leap-frog manner (in the sense of Chambers & Trudgill 1980). Furthermore, I argue that PG branched out post-islamisation (17th C.) into: a variety spoken by Muslims (referred to as /romé(á)ika/ by its speakers and which I spell 'Romeyka' to distinguish it from other historical/contemporary varieties of AM/Caucasian Greek); and the one spoken by Christians, which through contact with 'high' Greek prior to the expulsion (through schooling and 19th c. immigration to Russia) has since aligned to MG.

This proposal reignites the debate concerning the emblematic connection between CG and MG and challenges the ideological bias of 'one language, one nation' (Mackridge 2011) since, essentially, PG points towards the existence of multiple Greek 'languages' (in line with the Romance languages all deriving from Latin). It will also pave the way for the comparative analysis of the linguistic features on the branches of the AMG phylogenetic tree in order to investigate the nontrivial diachronic question of 'homelands' (in the sense of Gray et al. 2007) of AMG language and the sequences of linguistic change between Cappadocian and Pontic Greek – a hotly debated issue.

**Stéphane Voell:**

***Search for Identity in Space:***

***Svan Spatial Practices in Multi-ethnic Southern Georgia***

Philipps-University Marburg, Germany

At the end of the 1980s Svans from the Georgian highlands had to be relocated because of severe natural calamities. Many of them did resettle to new built villages in the multi-ethnic region of Kvemo Kartli in the south of the country. In this presentation I discuss how Svans inscribe themselves into this contested space.

In the focus of the presentation are narrations concerning a battle around a Svan village at the beginning of the 1990s: Presumably large amounts of Greeks wanted to kick the newly arrived Svans out of their village. They were accused of robbery, racketing and were acting in these times as they were permitted to do everything. The Svan interlocutors told that they were sent to Kvemo Kartli in order to counter local ethnic balance to the Georgian side. The incident is consequently staged in narrations as arrival story in which Svans managed with guile-and-while to resist the Greek assault to stay in the region. The latter, however, have another version of this story.

The narrations around space are theoretically explained as 'spatialization of culture' (S. Low):

The relocated Svans enrooted in the new surroundings, reconstructed their conception of who they are in respect to their relocation and therefore invented their new role in the new environment.

Even though the 'battle' described took place at the beginning of the 1990s the Svan process of place-making continuous until nowadays. In the recent fifteen years additional Svans arrived because of economic reasons and others as IDPs from Abkhazia after the August War in 2008. The search for identity in space discussed here depicts how migration processes, which were in the beginning partly politically motivated, affects interethnic interrelation in post-socialist socio-political transformation processes.

**Alexander Kartosia:**

***Observations on the modern use of the Georgian language***

Tbilisi State University, Georgia

This talk aims to describe some of the changes that have occurred in the Georgian language use a quarter century after the end of the Soviet Union in comparison to the language use during Soviet times. Examples come from the areas of gesture, prosody, syntax and lexicon. These changes can be attributed to the language contact due to the opening of borders and the international mobility of Georgian citizens as well as to the country's political orientation towards the West and the concomitant reduction of influence of the Russian language in favor of an increase of influence of the English language (but also other European languages).

Whether these innovations are interpreted as a "sign of recognition" for belonging to the "Western" group and the non-adoption as "lack" of Western orientation respectively, requires further research.

**Stavros Skopeteas:**

***Structure-building processes in language contact:  
on the emergence of head-initial verb phrases in Caucasian Urum***

Bielefeld University, Germany

Language contact is an interesting empirical situation because it allows insights about the kind of linguistic entities that are transferred from one language to another. The crucial question is whether speakers of natural languages are creative, i.e., whether they participate to the structure-building processes based on the input of foreign languages, which is arguably more than replication. This presentation examines data from Caucasian Urum, a Turkish dialect spoken by ethnic Greek speakers on the Georgian Caucasus. In the current stage of the language, we observe a difference in the language of two generations: the most frequent word order in the language of the older speakers is OV, while the most frequent order in the language of the younger speakers is VO. The difference between the speakers of these two generations is that the competence in Russian increases in the younger speakers.

However, OV and VO are rather ‘observables’ than linguistic entities. The structural issue is the way speakers organize V projections. Evidence from corpus and acceptability judgments reveals that the behaviour of old Urum speakers indicate that the linearization of the constituents within the domain of the V is generally head-final – with some freedom in the placement of the verbal head. The behaviour of your Urum speakers indicates that the initial fronting of the V within the VP leads to a reanalysis of the directionality of the verbal domain, such that the verb governs its complement to the right. A part of this development superficially resembles to Russian, but a closer inspection of the properties of Russian as spoken in their environment shows that the emerging structure in the variety of the younger Urum speakers is not identical to the structure that triggers the change. The developments at issue involve structure-building processes that are not reducible to the replication of the perceived input from contact languages.

NOTES

