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Introduction

• The prepositional inventory of Ulaghátsh Cappadocian does not include se.

  – Dawkins (1916: 83): “complete disuse of the preposition εἰς”.

  – Κεσίσογλου (1951: 54): «ἡ κίνηση σὲ τόπο, ποὺ στὴν κοινὴ νεοελληνικὴ γίνεται μὲ τὸ στό, στὴν, κλπ., στὸ ἰδίωμά μας γίνεται μὲ τὸ δό, δά ἢ ἀσύνδετα»
Introduction

• In Ulaghátsh, all the functions that are normally encoded by *se* in other Cappadocian varieties are encoded by

  – bare accusative marked NPs: \([\text{NP}_{\text{ACC}}]_{\text{NP}}\)

  – postpositional phrases: \([\text{NP}_{\text{ACC}} + \text{adverb}]_{\text{PostP}}\)
Introduction

(1) Ulaghátsh Cappadocian
   a. émi [\textit{ta qonáca mésa}]_{\text{PostP}}, kiríʃde [\textit{to jasduúq píso}]_{\text{PostP}}. Tránse ci [\textit{to meidán}]_{\text{NP}} en ávja.

   ‘She went into the houses and hid behind the cushions. She saw that in the yard there is some game.’ (Dawkins 1916: 348)

   b. \textit{do korítf írte [éna isíz tópos]}_{\text{NP}}

   ‘The girl came to a deserted place.’
   (Kesisoglu 1951: 140)
Today’s talk

I. A diachronic account of the loss of se in Ulaghátsh Cappadocian.

II. A synchronic analysis of
   i. its ramifications for the encoding of the functions it had prior to its loss in Ulaghátsh Cappadocian;
   ii. the typological profile of the dialect.
The journey of *se* in Cappadocia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Variety</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 0</td>
<td>Most Cappadocian varieties</td>
<td><em>se</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Delmesó, Mistí, Axó, ...)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 1</td>
<td>Phloïtá Cappadocian, Silliot¹</td>
<td><em>se ~ Ø</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAGE 2</td>
<td>Ulaghátsh Cappadocian</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Κωστάκης (1968: 105): «ἡ κίνηση πρὸς κάποια κατεύθυνση ἢ ἡ στάση κάπου, ἐκφέρεται πολὺ συχνὰ χωρὶς πρόθεση». 
Theoretical premises

• Core components in a spatial situation (cf. Talmy 2000)
  – Figure
  – Ground
  – Spatial relation
    • Static (Place, aka Locative)
    • Dynamic
      – Allative (or Goal)
      – Ablative (or Source)
      – Perlative (or Path)
Theoretical premises

“The cool man walks from the playground through the park to the house”
Theoretical premises

“The cool man walks from the playground through the park to the house”
Theoretical premises

- Core components in a spatial situation:
  - Figure
  - Ground
  - Spatial relation
  - Spatial region
    - Front space
    - Top space
    - Inner space
    - Vicinity space
Theoretical premises

(2) Delmesó Cappadocian

a. \textit{anévin} \hspace{1cm} so \hspace{1cm} \textit{meiván} \hspace{1cm} \textit{apáno}

\begin{tabular}{lllll}
SpatialV/Dynamic-Goal & Goal & Ground & Region \\
\end{tabular}

‘he climbed up the fruit tree’ (Dawkins 1916: 308)

b. \textit{kaθótun} \hspace{1cm} so \hspace{1cm} \textit{meiván} \hspace{1cm} \textit{apáno}

\begin{tabular}{lllll}
SpatialV/Static & Place & Ground & Region \\
\end{tabular}

‘she was sitting on the fruit tree’ (Dawkins 1916: 310)
# Prepositional inventory (Goal, Place, Source)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>se, s_, z</td>
<td>‘at, to’</td>
<td>Goal, Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Capp, Sill)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APO</td>
<td>apo, apu, ap, ab, ape, pe, as, az (Capp), op (Sill)</td>
<td>‘from’</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>os, oz (Capp, Sill), us (Capp)</td>
<td>‘up to, until’</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TSAUS/TSAX</td>
<td>tfaus, tfax (Mistí)</td>
<td>‘up to, until’</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Adverbial inventory (selection)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Forms</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUPERIOR</td>
<td><em>apáno, abáno, apánu, apán, epáno</em> (Capp)</td>
<td>‘on top of, above’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFERIOR</td>
<td><em>apokáto, apkáto, aptágo, pokáto, káto, kádo, kat</em> (Capp), <em>katu</em> (Sill)</td>
<td>‘under’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERIOR</td>
<td><em>apéso, apés, béso, mésa, emésa, méfi, meʃ</em> (Capp), <em>apésu, apés</em> (Sill)</td>
<td>‘inside’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXTERIOR</td>
<td><em>okso, oksu</em></td>
<td>‘outside’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Goal–Place vs Source

(3) Delmesó Cappadocian
  a. *so aslánon embró índé líya dicéña*  PLACE
      ‘in front of the lion are a few thorns’
      (Dawkins 1916: 320)

  b. *θes ta so aslánon embró*  GOAL
      ‘put them in front of the lion’
      (Dawkins 1916: 320)

  c. *épar áso aslánon embró ta dicéña*  SOURCE
      ‘take the thorns from in front of the lion’
      (Dawkins 1916: 320)
Methodological tool: semantic maps

• “[A] geometrical representation of functions in ‘conceptual/semantic space’ that are linked by connecting lines and thus constitute a network” (Hasepelmacht 2003: 213)

• Leading idea: polysemy occurs only when the various functions of a word are similar.

• Similarity is expressed topologically by closeness of nodes in representational space.
Methodological tool: semantic maps

Fig. A semantic map of typical allative functions (Rice & Kabata 2007: 494)
The semantic map of *se*

- (4) on the handout.
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Sources of data: three corpora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Size (words)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Phloïtá</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(8 stories, Dawkins 1916: 410–441)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sílli (D)</td>
<td>2,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7 stories, Dawkins 1916: 284–304)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sílli (K)</td>
<td>2,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(9 stories, Kostakis 1968: 116–130)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- **Variants:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Simple</th>
<th>Conservative</th>
<th>Innovative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>([se + NP_{ACC}]_{PrepP})</td>
<td>([NP_{ACC}]_{NP})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complex</td>
<td>([se + NP_{ACC} + \text{adverb}]_{CircumP})</td>
<td>([NP_{ACC} + \text{adverb}]_{PostP})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- \(5)-(8)\) on the handout.
The variable use of se (Phloïtá, Sílli)

• Envelope of variation:
  – All clauses containing a phrase that expresses one of the spatial functions associated with se (both complements and adjuncts):
    i. ALLATIVE
    ii. DESTINATION
    iii. DIRECTION
    iv. GOAL
    v. LOCATIVE
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Envelope of variation:
  - Phrases encoding the **RECIPIENT**, **ADDRESSEE** and **BENEFICIARY** were excluded.
  - In their case, the use of bare, accusative-marked NPs could the diachronic result of
    a) the transfer of these functions from the dative to the accusative (Humbert 1930; Trapp 1965; Lendari & Manolessou 2003; Manolessou & Beis 2006; Georgakopoulos 2011, 2014); or,
    b) to the omission of *se*. 
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Envelope of variation:
  - All instances of pseudo-incorporation were also excluded:

(9) a. Phloïtá

\[ \text{epsés } \text{spit}=\text{mas } \text{írten saráfos me to néka}=t \]

‘Last night a money changer and his wife came to our house.’ (Dawkins 1916: 434)

b. Sílli

\[ \text{yo se } \text{ipáru } \text{xurjó}=\text{mu} \]

‘As for me, I will go to my village.’ (Dawkins 1916: 298)
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Envelope of variation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corpus</th>
<th>Phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Phloïtá</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sílli (D)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sílli (K)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- **Results:** the distribution of *se*- and *se*-less phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clauses without se</th>
<th>Clauses with se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phloïtá</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>91.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sílli (D)</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sílli (K)</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Observations:
  - The Phloïtá corpus represents an incipient stage in the loss of *se*.
  - The Sílli (D) corpus represents an intermediate stage.
  - The Sílli (K) corpus represents the most advanced stage.
  - In all three corpora, *se*-variants are in complementary distribution with *se*-less variants.
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Analysing the variable distribution:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure expressions</th>
<th>animacy definiteness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spatial verbs</td>
<td>(no) spatial complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of spatial relation</td>
<td>Goal vs Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground expressions</td>
<td>animacy definiteness semantic type attribution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Results: Goal vs Place in all *se*-less phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phloïtá</th>
<th>Sílli (D)</th>
<th>Sílli (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of use in each category.
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- **Results:** complements and adjuncts in *se*-less Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phloïtá</th>
<th>Sílli (D)</th>
<th>Sílli (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complement</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjunct</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- **Results:** the omission of *se* in simple and complex phrases

### Results Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phloïtá</th>
<th>Sílli (D)</th>
<th>Sílli (K)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PostP</strong></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average for all phrases</strong></td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NP</strong></td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- **Results:** different semantic types of Grounds

![Bar chart showing the variable use of se in Phloïtá, Sílli (D), and Sílli (K). The chart compares locations, objects, body parts, and humans.](chart.png)
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Results: phrases with abnominal genitives (10)
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ø</th>
<th><em>se</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Goal</td>
<td>Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Spatial complements</td>
<td>Spatial adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Prototypical locations (towns, cities, geographical spaces, buildings and parts thereof)</td>
<td>Non-prototypical locations (body parts, humans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Adnominal genitives and other modifiers</td>
<td>No adnominal genitives or other modifiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Region-encoding adverbs</td>
<td>No region-encoding adverbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The locus of the innovation

(11) a. Phloïtá
    *ce Ístera píjen so vuiní*
    ‘and afterwards he went to the mountain’
    (Dawkins 1916: 410)

b. Silli (D)
    *kóri pajeñni doyrú staxtidží stu spíťfi*
    ‘the girl goes straight to the house of the ash seller’
    (Dawkins 1916: 286)

c. Sílli (K)
    *érxumisti stun Íji-Vasíli brostá*
    ‘we come in front of the church of Saint Vasileios’
    (Kostakis 1968: 118)
The motivations of the innovation

• Lestrade (2010, 2013) and Stolz et al. (2014) account for the (syntagmatic or paradigmatic) omission of spatial markers such as *se* in terms of
  a. economy
  b. predictability.

• The use (or not) of zero markers is driven by the speakers’ preference to produce economical utterances while at the same time ensuring communicative success.
The motivations of the innovation

• In utterances in which the spatial relation between a Figure and a Ground is predictable (it can be recovered from the linguistic context, from world knowledge or a combination of the two), the overt marker that would otherwise be used to express this relation may seem redundant and be omitted by the speaker in an attempt to save the effort required for its pronunciation.
The motivations of the innovation

• In the case of spatial relations that are not intra- or extra-linguistically predictable and for which recoverability is therefore not possible, overt markers are retained as their omission would lead to communicative failure.
**Compare**

\[ \text{kóri pażeņni doyrú staxtidzí stu spítʃi} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>\text{kóri}</th>
<th>prototypical Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{pażeņni}</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(tu)</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\text{spítʃi}</td>
<td>prototypical Ground</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From less to more economical utterances

*kóri pajęñni doyrú*  
\([\text{staxtidží stu spítši}]_{\text{PrepP}}\)  

\[\rightarrow\]  

*kóri pajęñni doyrú*  
\([\text{staxtidží tu spítši}]_{\text{NP}}\)
What about genitives and adverbs?

• Adnominal genitives and spatial adverbs make considerable contributions to the informational load of Ground-encoding NPs:
  – Genitives provide additional information on the reference object of the spatial relation, which needs to be retrieved from the more or less immediate context.
  – Adverbs redundantly encode information on where the Figure is found alongside the spatial verb.
What about genitives and adverbs?

(12) ístera jyzbasís dwurmánsen anéven so duvár apáno

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jyzbasís:</th>
<th>prototypical Figure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>anéven:</td>
<td>Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goal + Region: superior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PrepP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s(o):</td>
<td>Goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>duvár:</td>
<td>prototypical Ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apáno:</td>
<td>Region: superior</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What about genitives and adverbs?

• The omission of se in these contexts can be thought of as an informational load relief strategy, which helps to produce more economical utterances.

• The formally and semantically most vulnerable element that redundantly encodes part of the spatial relational meaning is dispensed with.

• In Asia Minor Greek, the higher the informational load of the motion event encoding utterance, the more likely the omission of se.
Ulaghátsh Cappadocian: a se-less dialect

REUNDANCY

high    low

Goal    Place
Complements Adjuncts
Prototypical Grounds Non-prototypical Grounds
\( \text{NP}_{\text{GEN}} + \text{NP}_{\text{ACC}} \) \( \text{NP}_{\text{ACC}} \)
Spatial adverbs No spatial adverbs
Ulaghátsh Cappadocian: a se-less dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preposition</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ap/as</td>
<td>ABLATIVE</td>
<td>‘from’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>COMITATIVE</td>
<td>‘with’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>os</td>
<td>TERMINATIVE</td>
<td>‘up to, until’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>ALLATIVE/LOCATIVE</td>
<td>‘at, to’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Stolz *et al.* (2014): syntagmatic → paradigmatic zero
Goal–Place vs Source

(13) Ulaghátsh Cappadocian
   a. ecú to qutí mésa en tría tʃīnes
      ‘inside that box are three sparrows’
      (Dawkins 1916: 350)

   b. émi ta qonáca mésa
      ‘he went into the houses’
      (Dawkins 1916: 348)

   c. ap to qazán mésa píre éna dirém cırjás
      ‘from out of the cauldron he took a dirham of meat’
      (Dawkins 1916: 356)
Goal–Place vs Source

• The reorganisation of the system has a local effect:
  – the loss of \( se \)

• The original global picture remains intact:
  – \( \text{Place} = \text{Goal} \neq \text{Source} \)
Ulaghátsh Cappadocian: a se-less dialect

• Bare, accusative-marked NPs encode all spatial functions:
  – ALLATIVE
  – DIRECTION
  – GOAL
  – PURPOSE
  – LOCATIVE

• PostPs are used when Region needs to be additionally specified.

• (14)–(15) on the handout.
Ulaghátsh Cappadocian: a se-less dialect

- Bare, accusative-marked NPs additionally encode indirect object functions:
  - RECIPIENT
  - ADDRESSEE
  - BENEFICIARY

- (16) on the handout.
Fig. A semantic map of typical allative functions/ the boundaries of the accusative in Ulaghátsh (tentative map)
Ulaghátsh Cappadocian: a *se*-less dialect

- Bare, accusative-marked NPs additionally encode direct object functions:
  - PATIENT
  - THEME

- (17) on the handout.
Semantic maps

Fig. A semantic map of typical allative functions/ the boundaries of the accusative in Ulaghátsh
Semantic maps

• Malchukov (2010: 194):
  – “[S]emantic similarity is not the only factor that motivates polysemy patterns cross-linguistically.”
  – Gram replacements may lead to semantic map violations
Semantic maps

• In Ulaghátsh: gram replacement leads to a polysemy pattern similar to those found cross-linguistically.

  – A synchronic analysis could have attributed the linkage of the functions to such mechanisms as metaphor, metonymy, etc.

  – The actual diachronic scenario helps us avoid overgeneralizations.
Ulaghátsh Cappadocian: a se-less dialect

- Object = Dative = Allative = Locative

- Blansitt (1988): a rare type of language, only two other known cases (Guaraní, Tahitian).
Ulaghátsh Cappadocian: a se-less dialect

• Accusative forms are identical to nominative forms in both numbers across all inflectional classes (Table 1 on the handout).

• Subject = Object = Dative = Allative = Locative

• Semantic disambiguation is heavily dependent upon syntactic means and pragmatic inferencing.
Thank you for your attention!
Medieval roots?

• Tachibana (1994): \([\text{adverb} + \text{NP}_{\text{ACC}}]_{\text{PrepP}}\) was a substandard construction of the Late Medieval vernacular

(18)  

a. \(\text{Καὶ ἀποκάτου τὰ ξύλα ἐκεῖτοντα ἄνθρωποι, ἀποκάτου τὰ φύλλα καὶ εἰς τὲς ρίζες τους ἐξέβαιναν βρύσες καθαρὲς}
\(\text{(Historia Alexandri Magni } F 80, 3, 4–6)\)  
b. \(\text{κατέβημεν χαρζανιστοὶ ἀνάμεσα τὸν κάμπον}
\(\text{(Digenes Akritis E 509)}\)
(Un)related developments

• Pantelidis (in press): omission of se in both simple and complex PrepPs is attested, albeit marginally, in Peloponnesian varieties:

(19) Vrésthena, Laconia
emís sikoθíkame kampá katostí fabeľés ce páme ta tzíntzina, apó ci vjénome ton álí vasíli ti rematçá mésa
(Koukoules 1908: 249)
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudo-incorporation</th>
<th>Omission of <em>se</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Only locations, not parts of locations</td>
<td>Both locations and parts of locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Only prepositional complements</td>
<td>Both complements and adjuncts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does not introduce discourse referents</td>
<td>Introduces discourse referents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. No regular modifiers</td>
<td>Regular modifiers are fine</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Ioannidou & den Dikken 2009; Terzi 2010; Gehrke & Lekakou 2013)
The variable use of *se* (Phloïtá, Sílli)

- Results: complements and adjuncts (*se-less Places*)

![Graph showing the variable use of *se* in Phloïtá, Sílli (D), and Sílli (K).]