

WestminsterResearch

<http://www.westminster.ac.uk/westminsterresearch>

**The morphology of Silliot Greek: paradigmatic defectiveness,
paradigmatic levelling, and affix pleonasm
Karatsareas, P.**

This is a pre-publication version of a book chapter to be published by Brill, in: The Morphology of Asia Minor Greek Brill.

The WestminsterResearch online digital archive at the University of Westminster aims to make the research output of the University available to a wider audience. Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the authors and/or copyright owners.

Whilst further distribution of specific materials from within this archive is forbidden, you may freely distribute the URL of WestminsterResearch: (<http://westminsterresearch.wmin.ac.uk/>).

In case of abuse or copyright appearing without permission e-mail repository@westminster.ac.uk

**The morphology of Silliot Greek:
Paradigmatic defectiveness, paradigmatic levelling, and affix pleonasm**

Petros Karatsareas

University of Westminster

1. Introduction: the dialect and its speakers

Silliot Greek (henceforth Silliot) is the Modern Greek dialect that was spoken by the Orthodox Christian community of the village of Silli¹ or Sillia (pronounced ['sili] and ['siʎa], respectively; Turkish Sille), which lies about 10 kilometres northwest of the town of Ikonion (Turkish Konya) in the historical Lycaonia region in south-eastern Asia Minor. At the beginning of the 20th century, Dawkins (1916: 36) estimated the overall population of Silli to be approximately 8,000 inhabitants, of which 5750 (72%) were Muslim and Turkish-speaking and 2250 (28%) were Christian and Greek-speaking.² According to the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople, the Christian population of Silli in 1922 did not exceed 1518 inhabitants (Patriarcat Œcuménique, 1922: 267). Kostakis (1968: 12) reports that a maximum of 400 families relocated from Silli to Greece in 1924 in compliance with the *Convention Concerning the Exchange of Greek and Turkish Populations* that was signed in Lausanne in 1923.

Like the Greek-speaking communities of the Cappadocian plateau and the Phárasa area, the community of Silli traces its origin to the historical Byzantine population of Asia Minor and was affected in similar ways by the political, social, cultural, and linguistic changes that were triggered by the defeat of the Byzantine army at the battle of Manzikert in 1071 CE and the subsequent Turkish conquest of the wider region: the separation from the once contiguous Orthodox Christian and Greek-speaking communities of the west; the development of an inner Asia Minor Greek koiné in the Late Medieval period; and, the intense and long-standing contact with the Turkish varieties of the Seljuq and Ottoman rulers (Browning, 1983; Dawkins, 1916, 1940; Horrocks, 2010; Janse, 2002, 2009; Karatsareas, 2011a, 2013; Kostakis, 1968; Triantafyllidis 2002 [1938]). It should therefore come as no surprise that Silliot shares a significant number of archaisms, innovations, and contact-induced features with Cappadocian and Pharasiot Greek.

Unlike Cappadocia and Phárasa, however, in which the Greek-speaking enclaves were both relatively numerous and found in close proximity to one another, Silli was the only village in its wider environs with a Greek-speaking population. At the time of Dawkins's documentation, the distance between Silli and the westernmost Greek-speaking Cappadocian villages was approximately 250 kilometres. This offers a possible explanation for two facts: first, that Silliot has not undergone innovations that the other dialects of the inner Asia Minor Greek group all have in

¹ The names of the various Asia Minor Greek locations are given in Dawkins's (1916) transliteration.

² There is historical evidence to suggest that, in the not-so-distant past, the distribution of the two communities in Silli was markedly different. Niebuhr (1837: 126) records that, in 1766, Silli was exclusively Christian and Greek-speaking, and thence referred to as *Gâvurköy* 'Infidels' village' by the local Turkish population. Kostakis (1968: 11) attributes the increase in the number of Muslim inhabitants to the enhanced possibilities for movement within the Ottoman Empire that were granted to Christian populations during the *Tanzimât* period (1839–1876) and, especially, to the signing of the Ottoman Reform Edict of 1856 (*Islâhat Hatt-i Hümayûnu*); see also Dawkins (1916: 36).

common, most notably, the resemanticisation and restructuring of the inherited grammatical gender system that resulted in the use of neuter forms in agreement targets controlled by masculine and feminine nouns in Cappadocian, Phrasiot, and Pontic (Karatsareas, 2009, 2011a, 2014); second, that a number of innovations that are attested only sporadically in Cappadocian and Phrasiot developed into systematic and regular characteristics in Silliot including the rhotacisation of /ð/ to /r/ or the sibilantisation of /θ/ to /s/ (see Kostakis, 1968: 21–27). It is also interesting that Silliot does not retain a number of distinctive inner Asia Minor Greek archaisms found in the other dialects, showing instead evidence of developments that align it more closely with Modern Greek varieties spoken outside Asia Minor, including the standard language (Dawkins, 1916: 204). For example, the Ancient Greek eta <Η η> is pronounced [i] in all lexical items in which it occurs, and no traces remain of the ancient /ε:/ realisation; the forms of the possessive pronoun originate in Medieval (*i/e*)*ðikós* ‘own’ and not in Ancient Greek *emos/imeteros* and *sos*; and, the aorist passive is formed with the *-ik-* suffix.

In this chapter, I deal with the following three morphological characteristics of Silliot: the defective inflectional paradigm of the definite article (Section 2); the levelling of the so-called parisyllabic and imparisyllabic declensions in masculine and feminine nouns into two unified, innovative inflectional classes (Section 3); and, the formation of the imperfective past by means of the pleonastic suffixes *-inondzisk-* and *-inosk-* (Section 4). As will become clear in subsequent sections, all three phenomena have parallels in the other dialects of the inner Asia Minor Greek group. With the exception of the defective definite article paradigm, however, these crossdialectal parallels tend to be sporadic and to not exhibit the particular degree of systematicity and regularity that, as I will show, we find in Silliot.

2. The Silliot definite article: a morphologically defective lexical category

Dawkins records that, in Silliot, “the definite article only survives in the accusative” (1916: 46). This is confirmed by Kostakis, who also writes that “οἱ περιπτώσεις ὅπου τὸ ἄρθρο ἀκούγεται στὰ Σιλλιώτικα εἶναι ἡ ἐνικὴ καὶ πληθυντικὴ αἰτιατικὴ” (1968: 54). The two descriptions suggest that the forms that would fill all other possible gender/number/case combinations are lacking. This is shown in (1a), in which the only definite article form found is the accusative singular *tʃi* while no article forms precede nominative singular *perí* and genitive singular *mánas* despite the fact that both take a definite reading in the context in which they appear. Both Dawkins and Kostakis, however, admit that the nominative forms of the neuter article, in both singular and plural, may be occasionally used. This is usually found when a neuter noun is modified either by a prenominal genitive or by a demonstrative, in which case an overt definite article precedes the noun (1b, c).³ The definite article paradigm therefore has the form shown in Table 1.

(1) Silliot

a.	∅	<i>perí</i>	<i>jukíji</i>	∅	<i>mánas</i>	<i>tu</i>
		son(N).SG.NOM	hear.PRS.3SG		mother(F).SG.GEN	3SG.N.GEN

³ All data are given in broad phonetic transcription with the acute accent used to indicate stress. The following abbreviations are used in the glosses of all examples and linguistic data in the text: 3: third person, ABL: ablative, ACC: accusative, COMP: complementiser, DEF: definite, F: feminine, FUT: future, GEN: genitive, INDF: indefinite, INF: inferior, INT: interior, IPFV: imperfective, N: neuter, NACT: non-active, NOM: nominative, OBJ: object, PNP: perfective non-past, PROX: proximate, PRS: present, SG: singular, TE: thematic element.

tʃi *foní*
 DEF.F.SG.ACC voice(F).ACC
 ‘The son hears his mother’s voice.’ (Kostakis, 1968: 122)

b. *songrá* *patifaçú* *t* *perí* *laí*
 afterwards king(M).SG.GEN DEF.N.SG.NOM son(M).SG.NOM say.PRS.3SG
tu *ótfi...*
 3SG.M.ACC COMP
 ‘Afterwards, the king’s son tells him that...’ (Dawkins, 1916: 290)

c. *ro* *ta* *tékna* (...) *sorúfi* *énan*
 PROX DEF.N.PL.NOM child(N).PL.NOM see.PRS.3PL INDF.M.SG.ACC
ártupu
 man(M).SG.ACC
 ‘These children (...) see a man.’ (Dawkins, 1916: 286)

Table 1. The definite article paradigm in Silliot (Dawkins, 1916: 46–47; Kostakis, 1968: 54–55).

		MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
SG	NOM	∅	∅	∅ ~ <i>t(u)</i>
	ACC	<i>tu(n)</i>	<i>tʃi</i>	<i>tu</i>
	GEN	∅	∅	∅ ~ <i>tu</i>
PL	NOM	∅	∅	∅ ~ <i>ta</i>
	ACC	<i>tus</i>	<i>tes</i>	<i>ta</i>
	GEN	∅	∅	∅ ~ <i>tu</i>

This paradigm has clear parallels in the two larger members of the inner Asia Minor Greek dialect group, Pontic and Cappadocian. In most Pontic varieties, the nominative forms of the masculine and feminine definite articles, both singular and plural, are dropped before nouns that begin with a vowel. In all other gender/number/case combinations as well as before masculine and feminine nouns that begin with a consonant, the article is always present (Henrich, 1999: 661–667; Koutita-Kaimaki, 1977/1978: 264–266; Oikonomidis, 1958: 154–156; Papadopoulos, 1933: 17–20, 1955: 10; Tompaidis 1980: 225–227). This leads to a paradigm exemplified by Argyrópolis Pontic in Table 2.

Table 2. The definite article paradigm in Argyrópolis Pontic (Oikonomidis, 1958: 151–154).

		MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
SG	NOM	<i>o</i> ~ ∅	<i>i</i> ~ ∅	<i>to</i>
	ACC	<i>ton</i>	<i>tin</i>	<i>to</i>
	GEN	<i>ti</i>	<i>t(s)i</i>	<i>ti</i>
PL	NOM	<i>i</i> ~ ∅	<i>i</i> ~ ∅	<i>ta</i>
	ACC	<i>ti</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>ta</i>
	GEN	<i>ti</i>	<i>ti</i>	<i>ti</i>

In the more innovative varieties of Áno Amisós and Sinópe, the nominative forms of the masculine and feminine article are never used, which results in the paradigm shown in Table 3 with

the respective cells being filled by zero. The Cappadocian paradigm differs from the Áno Amisós and Sinópe Pontic one only with respect to the lack of the tripartite gender distinction (Karatsareas, 2009, 2011a, 2013). In all other respect, it too lacks the nominative forms to be used with historical masculine and feminine nouns that take a definite reading; see Table 4.

Table 3. The definite article paradigm in Áno Amisós Pontic (Oikonomidis, 1958: 151–154).

		MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
SG	NOM	∅	∅	<i>to</i>
	ACC	<i>ton</i>	<i>tin</i>	<i>to</i>
	GEN	<i>ti</i>	<i>tis</i>	<i>ti</i>
PL	NOM	∅	∅	<i>ta</i>
	ACC	<i>tus</i>	<i>tus</i>	<i>ta</i>
	GEN	<i>tu</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>tu</i>

Table 4. The definite article paradigm in Cappadocian (Dawkins, 1916: 87–89).

		HISTORICAL MASCULINE AND FEMININE	HISTORICAL NEUTER
SG	NOM	∅	<i>to</i>
	ACC	<i>to</i>	<i>to</i>
	GEN	∅ (~ <i>tu</i>)	∅ (~ <i>tu</i>)
PL	NOM	∅	<i>ta</i>
	ACC	<i>ta</i>	<i>ta</i>
	GEN	∅ (~ <i>tu</i>)	∅ (~ <i>tu</i>)

In Karatsareas (2011a, 2013), I proposed that the zero realisation of the non-neuter nominative forms of the definite article first emerged in the common linguistic ancestor of the modern inner Asia Minor Greek dialects as a hiatus resolution strategy. Support for this proposal comes from the fact that, in the more conservative Pontic varieties, the only forms of the definite article that are dropped are the ones that consist of a single vowel (masculine nominative singular *o*, feminine nominative singular *i*, masculine and feminine nominative plural *i*) and that they are dropped only when preceding vowel-initial nouns. In the more innovative Pontic varieties, the phonologically-conditioned distribution of the three article forms was reanalysed as a morphologically-conditioned distribution based on the values that the affected article forms had in common for the morphosyntactic feature of gender (masculine and feminine, i.e., non-neuter). Cappadocian continues this state of affairs, although in this dialect the feature that conditions the distribution of the article forms is inflectional class as gender has been lost. Finally, Silliot evidences an even more advanced stage in which the morphological condition is reanalysed as based on case. The zero form of the article therefore begins to extend to all nominative forms including those of the neuter subparadigm.

As shown in Table 1, the Silliot definite article paradigm also lacks genitive forms in both singular and plural. The same holds for Cappadocian, as well, with the exception of the Sinasós, Delmesó and Potámia varieties, which, according to Dawkins (1916: 87–88) preserve the form *tu* for the genitive singular. They, too, however, lack a genitive plural form. The extension of the zero article from the nominative to the genitive may be attributed to language contact with Turkish, which lacks definite articles altogether, an explanation that was first proposed to account also for the zero nominative forms by Dawkins (1916: 46) and was later espoused by Anagnostopoulos (1922:

246), Thomason & Kaufman (1988: 222), and Winford (2005: 406). For Dawkins (*ibid.*), Turkish influence also accounts for the preservation in Silliot of the accusative forms of the article. In Turkish, specificity, a semantic feature closely related to but distinct from definiteness, is overtly marked only by means of the accusative suffix *-(y)I*, which marks the direct objects of transitive verbs. This is also the prototypical function of the accusative in Silliot, which is the crucial similarity between the two languages that is thought to have protected the accusative forms from the loss that affected the nominative and genitive forms.

However, an examination of the Silliot texts included in Dawkins (1916: 282–304; approximate word count 2850) and Kostakis (1968: 116–130; approximate word count 2310) reveals that accusative forms of the definite article are also on their way out. It is, specifically, found that the head nouns of definite NPs that function as complements of region-encoding postpositions in postpositional phrases of the type [NP_{ACC} + POSTPOSITION]⁴ appear bare, that is, without a definite article preceding them; see the examples in (2).

(2) Silliot

a. *ta* *pará* *úla* *jemón:i=ta*
 DEF.N.PL.ACC money(N).PL.ACC all.N.PL.ACC fill.PRS.3SG=3PL.N.ACC

Ø *tercín=tu* *apésu*
 bag(N).SG.ACC=3SG.M.GEN INT

‘He packs all the money in his saddle bag.’ (Dawkins 1916: 294)

b. *pérnom* *cinonía* *ce* *paénom* *ton*
 take.PRS.1PL communion(F).SG.ACC and go.PRS.1PL DEF.M.SG.ACC

etáfio *se* *perásun* Ø *etáfio* *apkátu*
 Epitaphios(M).SG.ACC FUT pass.PNP.1PL Epitaphios(M).SG.ACC INF

meyálin *parasceví*
 big.F.SG.ACC Friday(F).SG.ACC

‘We receive communion and go to the Epitaphios, we will pass underneath the Epitaphios on Good Friday.’ (Kostakis 1968: 128)

The phenomenon, which is found in all three genders and in both numbers, is nascent in Dawkins but predominates in Kostakis, in which 16 out of the 22 Postpositional Phrases attested in the texts having a definite reading lack a definite article form; see the frequency distribution data in Table 5. In order to examine the association between the two corpora and the use or not of the definite article in Postpositional Phrases, a Fischer's exact test was performed due to the small sample size. The association between these variables was significant ($p = .002$), which can be interpreted as evidence that an innovation that was beginning to emerge at the time of Dawkins's

⁴ The set of Silliot postpositions includes *apánu* ‘on top of, above’, *ap(o)kátu* ‘under’, *ambrós* ‘in front of’, *(o)písu* ‘behind’, *apés(u)* ‘inside’, *mésa* ‘inside’, *óksu* ‘outside’, *ko(n)dá* ‘near’, and *anámsa* ‘between’. For this type of adpositional phrase in inner Asia Minor Greek and, especially, the lack of the preposition *se* in phrases such as *tercín=tu apésu*, *etáfio apkátu* and *ton etáfio* instead of *su tercín=tu apésu*, *sun etáfio apkátu* and *son etáfio*, see Karatsareas (2016) and Karatsareas & Georgakopoulos (2016).

documentation of Silliot (1909–1911) was finding its way to generalisation when Kostakis and his collaborators collected their Silliot data in Greece after the population exchange.

Table 5. The frequency distribution of definite Postpositional Phrases with and without a definite article in Dawkins (1916) and Kostakis (1968).

	Dawkins (1916)		Kostakis (1968)	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
With article	12	80	6	27.3
Without article	3	20	16	72.7
Total	15	100	22	100

Taken together, these data show that article drop in Silliot, especially as evidenced in the Kostakis corpus, is a systematic, regular and productive phenomenon in the sense of Himmelmann (1998) in that it is found with nouns that otherwise co-occur normally with the definite article when they take a definite reading in other syntactic contexts; compare, in that connection, *ton etáfio* with *etáfio apkátu* in (2b).

Greenberg has identified a “strong tendency” in locative and temporal constructions for “nouns governed by prepositions [to be] in the non-articulated form even when their meaning is specific, but the articulated form reappears when the noun has a qualifier such as an adjective or dependent genitive, even if the meaning is generic” (1978: 67). Greenberg’s observation was later corroborated by Himmelmann’s (1998) crosslinguistic study of a small sample of eight languages and seems to be further confirmed by the Silliot data as none of the articleless Postpositional Phrases in either of the two corpora is modified. Himmelmann also proposes that the crosslinguistic systematicity of article drop in adpositional phrases can be attributed to the grammaticalisation paths that definite articles typically follow in their diachronic development. He argues that adpositional phrases headed by primary adpositions, that is, monomorphemic and transitive adpositions such as English *in*, *on*, *at* are one of the last syntactic constructions to which definite articles spread diachronically. From that point of view, articleless adpositional phrases such as *in town*, *on foot*, *at dawn* are examples of such constructions, which the spread of the definite article never reached.

Himmelmann’s (1998) proposal cannot account for the Silliot data. The postpositions that participate in the relevant constructions are, by application of his criteria, secondary: they are all either bi- or trisyllabic, and can all be used intransitively as adverbials. More importantly, however, it can be safely reconstructed on the basis of both historical and comparative dialectal evidence that the definite article had reached Postpositional Phrases in its development within Silliot before it started to be dropped in this syntactic environment. This is clearly shown by the comparison of the Dawkins and Kostakis corpora, which are separated by a chronological distance of approximately 50 years. For the comparative dialectal evidence, see Karatsareas (2016) and Karatsareas & Georgakopoulos (2016).

It would therefore be tempting to attribute article drop in Postpositional Phrases to the influence of Turkish. As mentioned above, Turkish only marks specificity on the head nouns of direct object NPs. The head nouns of NPs that function as adpositional complements are never marked by the accusative in the language, which might explain why Silliot allows for the accusative forms of the definite article to be dropped in this particular syntactic context. This explanation, however, is challenged by cases in Silliot in which the head nouns of direct object NPs appear

without a definite article even though they take a definite reading. Examples of this are not numerous, they do, however, occur in both the Dawkins and Kostakis corpora; see (3).

(3) Silliot

- a. *op tfin iréan=tu* \emptyset *dadí*
 ABL DEF.F.SG.ACC thought(F).SG.ACC=3SG.M.GEN kindling(N).SG.ACC
zirmun:á=ta
 forget.PRS.3SG=OBJ
 ‘He lets the kindling slip from his mind.’ (Dawkins 1916: 284)

- b. *ovópurma érk^handa* \emptyset *k^hofíni* *píra=ta* *tí*
 in_the_morning early hamper(N).SG.ACC take.PST.1SG=OBJ DEF.F.SG.ACC
ráfi=mu
 back(F).SG.ACC=1SG.GEN
 ‘Early in the morning I took the hamper on my back.’ (Kostakis 1968: 124)

Turkish would overtly mark the head nouns of the direct object NPs in (3) with the accusative suffix *-(y)l*. It therefore appears that what we are dealing with in Silliot is the manifestation of a more general tendency for the loss of the definite article that cannot be attributed exclusively to the history of the dialect as a member of the inner Asia Minor Greek dialect group or to the effects of language contact with Turkish but, rather, to the interplay of multiple factors, both language-internal and -external. In any case, whatever the explanation for this recent innovation turns out to be, the use of zero in accusative-marked environments such as exemplified in (2) and (3) calls for a revision of the defective definite article paradigm that was given in Table 1 as shown in Table 6, an even more defective paradigm.

Table 6. The definite article paradigm in Silliot (revised).

		MASCULINE	FEMININE	NEUTER
SG	NOM	\emptyset	\emptyset	$\emptyset \sim t(u)$
	ACC	<i>tun</i> ~ \emptyset	<i>tí</i> ~ \emptyset	<i>tu</i> ~ \emptyset
	GEN	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset
PL	NOM	\emptyset	\emptyset	$\emptyset \sim ta$
	ACC	<i>tus</i> ~ \emptyset	<i>tes</i> ~ \emptyset	<i>ta</i> ~ \emptyset
	GEN	\emptyset	\emptyset	\emptyset

3. Paradigmatic levelling in the masculine and feminine inflectional classes

In most Modern Greek dialects, both within and outside Asia Minor, two inflectional classes (henceforth ICs), IC₁ and IC₂, can generally be identified for masculine nouns and one IC, IC₃, can be identified for feminine nouns based on the set of inflectional suffixes that are used to mark the whole set of case/number combinations of the Modern Greek nominal paradigm. ICs 2 and 3 can be further divided into two subclasses each based on whether the plural inflectional suffixes are added directly to the nominal root as in *mín-es* ‘month(M)-PL.NOM/ACC’, *kléft-es* ‘thief(M)-PL.NOM/ACC’, and *mitér-es* ‘mother(F)-PL.NOM/ACC’ or to a nominal stem composed of the root and a thematic element of the form *-Vð-* as in *pap-áð-es* ‘priest(M)-TE-PL.NOM/ACC’, *furnár-ið-es*

'baker(M)-TE-PL.NOM/ACC', and *cir-áð-es* 'lady(F)-TE-PL.NOM.ACC'. See Table 7; cf. Ralli's (1992, 2003b, 2005) and Ralli's (2000, 2002, 2003a) classification of Standard Modern Greek nouns into ICs; also Alexiadou & Müller (2008).

Table 7. The masculine and feminine ICs in Modern Greek.

		Masculine				
		IC1	IC2a	IC2b		
		<i>aðerf-</i> 'brother'	<i>mín-</i> 'month'	<i>kléft-</i> 'thief'	<i>pap-</i> 'priest'	<i>fúrmar-</i> 'baker'
SG	NOM	<i>aðerf-ó-s</i>	<i>mín-a-s</i>	<i>kléft-i-s</i>	<i>pap-á-s</i>	<i>fúrmar-i-s</i>
	ACC	<i>aðerf-ó(-n)</i>	<i>mín-a(-n)</i>	<i>kléft-i(-n)</i>	<i>pap-á(-n)</i>	<i>fúrmar-i(-n)</i>
	GEN	<i>aðerf-ú</i>	<i>mín-a-∅</i>	<i>kléft-i-∅</i>	<i>pap-á-∅</i>	<i>fúrmar-i-∅</i>
PL	NOM	<i>aðerf-í</i>	<i>mín-es</i>	<i>kléft-es</i>	<i>pap-áð-es</i>	<i>furnár-ið-es</i>
	ACC	<i>aðerf-ús</i>	<i>mín-es</i>	<i>kléft-es</i>	<i>pap-áð-es</i>	<i>furnár-ið-es</i>
	GEN	<i>aðerf-ón</i>	<i>min-ón</i>	<i>kleft-ón</i>	<i>pap-áð-on</i>	<i>furnár-ið-on</i>
		Feminine				
		IC3a	IC3b			
		<i>mitér-</i> 'mother'	<i>cir-</i> 'lady'			
SG	NOM	<i>mitér-a-∅</i>	<i>cir-a-∅</i>			
	ACC	<i>mitér-a(-n)</i>	<i>cir-á(-n)</i>			
	GEN	<i>mitér-a-s</i>	<i>cir-á-s</i>			
PL	NOM	<i>mitér-es</i>	<i>cir-áð-es</i>			
	ACC	<i>mitér-es</i>	<i>cir-áð-es</i>			
	GEN	<i>mitér-on</i>	<i>cir-áð-on</i>			

In many, especially traditional, descriptions of Modern Greek morphology (Holton et al., 1997; Klairis & Babiniotis, 1996, 2005; Mirambel, 1949, 1969; Thumb, 1912; Triantafyllidis, 1941), the five groups of nouns in Table 7 are further distinguished on the basis of the notion of (im)parisyllabicity, which concerns whether inflected noun forms have an equal or different number of syllables in the singular and plural. ICs 1, 2a and 3a are therefore considered parisyllabic in that inflected forms have the same number of syllables in both numbers. Compare nominative singular *a.ðer.fós* 'brother' with nominative plural *a.ðer.fti*, *mí.nas* 'month' with *mí.nes*, *klé.ftis* 'thief' with *klé.ftes*, and *mi.té.ra* 'mother' with *mi.té.res*. ICs 2b and 3b, in contrast, are imparisyllabic as plural forms are longer than singular forms by one syllable, owing to the presence of the -Vð- thematic element. Compare nominative singular *pa.pás* 'baker' with nominative plural *pa.pá.ðes*, *fúr.na.ris* with *fúr.ná.ri.ðes*, and *ci.rá* 'lady' with *ci.rá.ðes*.

In Silliot, the nominal inflectional system has undergone a rare type of restructuring as a result of which the parisyllabic–imparisyllabic distinction has been levelled. As shown in Table 8, there is only one, imparisyllabic IC, IC1, for all masculine nouns and one, imparisyllabic IC, IC2, for feminine nouns (Dawkins, 1916: 47–48; Kostakis, 1968: 56–64). In both ICs, the plural inflectional suffixes are added to a stem composed of the nominal root plus a thematic element of the form -Vr-, which corresponds to the thematic element -Vð- found in other Modern Greek dialects (though see

Dawkins 1916: 44 for exceptions; also Kostakis 1968: 39–41).⁵ The masculine IC is further divided into two subclasses based on the quality of the vowel of the plural thematic element. Throughout IC1b, the plural thematic element retains the thematic vowel found in the singular. In IC1a, however, this is only the case for nouns in which the singular thematic vowel *-o-* is unstressed and therefore surfaces as /u/ by application of the dialect’s unstressed mid-vowel raising rule; examples include *ánumus* ‘wind’, *ártupus* ‘man’, *próspus* ‘face’, *skórdus* ‘garlic’, *tfíxus* ‘wall’. In nouns in which the thematic vowel is stressed and surfaces normally as /o/, the plural thematic element is *-ír-* and not *-or-*, as would be expected; examples include *alefrós* ‘brother’, *kukuínós* ‘cockere!’, *pondzúkós* ‘mouse’, *simós* ‘winter’. The only exception to across-the-board imparisyllabicity are presented by IC1a nouns, in which the genitive singular markers *-ú* and *-iú*, and the genitive plural marker *-iú* (for which see below) can be directly suffixed to the root without the presence of a thematic element.⁶ A few high frequency nouns such as *mínas* and *enéka* ‘woman’ also occasionally preserve their inherited genitive plural forms *minó* and *enekó(n)*.

Table 8. The masculine and feminine ICs in Silliot.

		IC1a (masculine)		
SG	NOM	<i>alefr-ó-s</i> ‘brother’	<i>ártup-u-s</i> ⁷ ‘man’	
	ACC	<i>alefr-ó-∅</i> ⁸	<i>ártup-u-∅</i>	
	GEN	<i>alefr-ú ~ alefr-iú</i>	<i>ártup-u ~ artup-iú</i>	
PL	NOM	<i>alefr-ír-i</i>	<i>ártup-ur-i</i>	
	ACC	<i>alefr-ír-i</i>	<i>ártup-ur-i</i>	
	GEN	<i>alefr-iú</i>	<i>artup-ió ~ artup-iú ~ artup-ur-ió</i>	
		IC1b (masculine)		
SG	NOM	<i>kléftf-i-s</i> ‘thief’	<i>mín-a-s</i> ‘month’	<i>pap-á-s</i> ‘priest’
	ACC	<i>kléftf-i-∅</i>	<i>mín-a-∅</i>	<i>pap-á-∅</i>
	GEN	<i>kléftf-i-∅</i>	<i>mín-a-∅</i>	<i>pap-á-∅</i>
PL	NOM	<i>kléftf-ír-i</i>	<i>mín-ar-i</i>	<i>pap-ár-i</i>
	ACC	<i>kléftf-ír-i</i>	<i>mín-ar-i</i>	<i>pap-ár-i</i>
	GEN	<i>kléftf-ír-iú</i>	<i>mín-ó</i>	<i>pap-ár-iú</i>
		IC2 (feminine)		
SG	NOM	<i>if-á-∅</i> ‘fire’	<i>alefr-í-∅</i> ‘sister’	<i>mam-ú-∅</i> ‘midwife’
	ACC	<i>if-á-∅</i>	<i>alefr-í-∅</i>	<i>mam-ú-∅</i>

⁵ In Silliot, /ð/ has merged with /r/ in the majority of lexical items both word-initially and word-medially so that *-ur-* < *-uð-*, *-ír-* < *-ið-*, and *-ar-* < *-að-*. In a few cases, however, /ð/ has exceptionally merged either with /d/ or /z/. When followed by a glide, /ð/ has merged with /j/. See Dawkins (1916: 44) and Kostakis (1968: 39–41) for details.

⁶ Angela Ralli (personal communication) explains the lack of a thematic element in *r*-final stems such as *alefr-* in phonological terms, that is, as an avoidance of that successive *-r-* segments in forms such as **alefr-ír-iú*.

⁷ In Silliot, unstressed /e o/ raise to [i u], respectively, hence forms such as *ártupus* < *ánθropos* (Dawkins 1916: 42; Kostakis 1968: 30–31, 33–34).

⁸ Dawkins (1916: 47) records that accusative plural forms may marginally retain the inherited *-n* marker; for example, *ártup-u-n* ‘man(M)-TE-SG.ACC’ and *kléftf-i-n* ‘thief(M)-TE-SG.ACC’.

	GEN	<i>if-á-s</i>	<i>alefr-í-s</i>	<i>mam-ú-s</i>
PL	NOM	<i>if-ár-is</i>	<i>alefr-ír-is</i>	<i>mam-úr-is</i>
	ACC	<i>if-ár-is</i>	<i>alefr-ír-is</i>	<i>mam-úr-is</i>
	GEN	_____	_____	_____

Dawkins (1916: 43) accounted for the distribution of the two thematic elements in the plural of IC1a nouns in terms of vowel harmony. According to his proposal, *-ir-* is the general thematic element for IC1, which changes to *-ur-* when attached to roots that contain one of the vowels /a/, /o/, or /u/. Kostakis (1968: 58–59), however, argued convincingly that what conditions the distribution of the two elements is not the quality of the root vowel(s) but, rather, stress. In his description, he showed that *-ir-* is attached to unstressed roots such as *alefr-* ‘brother’ whereas *-ur-* is attached to stressed roots such as *ártop-*. His analysis is corroborated by forms such as *pondzuc-ír-i* ‘mouse(M)-TE-PL.NOM/ACC’ and *tsan:-ír-i* ‘crazy(M)-TE-PL.NOM/ACC’, in which the unstressed roots *pondzuc-* and *tsan:-* contain one (or more) of the vowels mentioned by Dawkins without triggering the change of *-ir-* to *-ur-*.

Dawkins’s intuition, however, may not have been completely wrong. Stressed roots such as *ártop-* preserve their stress throughout the paradigm unless a stressed inflectional suffix is added to the morphological form. This means that the thematic vowel *-o-* never receives stress and is therefore raised to /u/ throughout the singular subparadigm (4). The *-ur-* thematic element in the plural of IC1a nouns such as *ártupus* might therefore be interpreted as a copy of the thematic vowel as it surfaces in the singular, which in turn is in line with the wider tendency in the dialect for the plural thematic element to retain the singular thematic vowel as evidenced by IC1b nouns.

(4)		ROOT	+	THEMATIC VOWEL	→	STEM
	Underlying representation	<i>/ártop-</i>	+	<i>-o-</i>	→	<i>/ártopo-</i>
	Mid-vowel raising rule	<i>ártup-</i>	+	<i>-u-</i>	→	<i>ártupu-</i>
	Surface realisation	[<i>ártup-</i>	+	<i>-u-</i>]	→	[<i>ártupu-</i>]

Within each of the two genders, the inherited imparisyllabic group of nouns acted as the model for the analogical levelling. We can hypothesise based on the available data that, within the masculine gender, parisyllabic nouns ending in *-as* such as *mínas* ‘month’ first merged with imparisyllabic nouns with the same ending such as *papás* ‘priest’ (5a). Subsequently, parisyllabic nouns ending in *-is* such as *kléftis* ‘thief’ developed imparisyllabic plurals in the model of nouns ending in *-as*, which were all imparisyllabic (5b). Finally, parisyllabic nouns ending in *-os* such as *alefrós* ‘brother’ developed imparisyllabic plurals in the model of nouns ending in *-is*, which were all imparisyllabic (5c). This final stage in the development is evidenced by the fact that, unlike nouns ending in *-as* and *-is* in which the plural thematic element retains the singular thematic vowel, the thematic element in the plural nouns ending in *-ós* is not *-or-* but *-ir-*.

(5)	a.	NOM.SG		NOM.PL
		<i>pap-á-s</i> ‘priest’		<i>pap-ár-i</i>
		<i>mín-a-s</i> ‘month’		<i>x = mín-ar-i</i>
	b.	NOM.SG		NOM.PL
		<i>pap-á-s</i> ‘priest’		<i>pap-ár-i</i>

mín-a-s ‘month’ || *mín-ar-i*
kléftf-i-s ‘thief’ || $x = kléftf-ir-i$

c. NOM.SG NOM.PL
kléftf-i-s ‘thief’ || *kléftf-ir-i*
alefr-ó-s ‘brother’ || $x = alefr-ír-i$

Similarly, we can hypothesise that parisyllabic feminine nouns ending in *-a* such as *ifá* ‘fire’ first merged with imparisyllabic nouns ending in *-a* such as *oká* ‘oka’ (6a). Parisyllabic nouns ending in *-i* such as *alefrí* ‘sister’ must have developed imparisyllabic plurals at a later stage in the model of imparisyllabic feminine nouns in *-a* (6b).

(6) a. NOM.SG NOM.PL
ok-á-Ø ‘oka’ || *ok-ár-is*
if-á-Ø ‘fire’ || $x = if-ár-is$

b. NOM.SG NOM.PL
if-á-Ø ‘fire’ || *if-ár-is*
alefr-í-Ø ‘sister’ || $x = alefr-ír-is$

Turning now to the set of inflectional suffixes that mark the six case/number combinations of the Silliot nominal paradigm, shown in Table 9, we can identify three notable instances of paradigmatic levelling.

Table 9. The inflectional suffixes of ICs 1 and 2 in Silliot.

		IC1 (masculine)	IC2 (feminine)
SG	NOM	-s	-Ø
	ACC	-Ø	-Ø
	GEN	IC1a: $-u \sim -\dot{u}$ IC1b: -Ø	-s
PL	NOM	-i	-is
	ACC	-i	-is
	GEN	$-\dot{i}ó \sim -\dot{u} (\sim -o)$	(-o)

The first two instances involve the suffix *-i* that marks the two core cases, nominative and accusative, in the plural of masculine nouns. Historically, *-i* was used to mark only the nominative plural and only in masculine nouns ending in *-os*. The accusative plural of *os*-masculines was marked by *-us* whereas, in masculine nouns ending in *-as*, *-is*, *-es*, and *-us*, the nominative and accusative plural were syncretically marked by *-es*; cf. Table 7. In Silliot, both the intraparadigmatic nominative–accusative distinction between *-i* and *-us* and the interparadigmatic distinction between *-i* and *-es* have been levelled in favour of *-i* so that the suffix marks both core cases in the plural across all nouns, both historical *os*-masculines and historical *as*-, *is*-, *es*-, and *us*-masculines (7); see *alefr-ír-i*, *ártup-ur-i*, *kléftf-ir-i*, *mín-ar-i*, and *pap-ár-i* in Table 8.

(7) a. *os*-masculines
 NOM *-i* } → NOM *-i*

	ACC	- <i>us</i>		ACC
b. <i>os</i> -masculines				
	NOM			
	ACC	- <i>i</i>	}	all masculines
			→	NOM
				ACC
		- <i>i</i>		
		- <i>es</i>		

Following the analogical levelling illustrated in (5) and the paradigmatic levelling in (7), the plural inflection of masculine nouns in Silliot can be characterised as a hybrid of the historical parisyllabic and imparisyllabic declensions as it combines imparisyllabic stems of the form [ROOT + THEMATIC ELEMENT -*Vr*-] with the inflectional suffixes of historical parisyllabic nouns in *-os*. It should be noted, however, that these developments are not unique to Silliot. The syncretism of nominative and accusative in the plural of *os*-masculines in favour of a form that coincides with the original nominative and the spread of the *-i* suffix to the nominative/accusative plural of *as-*, *is-*, *es-*, and *us*-masculines are both widely found not only in the AMGr dialects but also more widely and especially in Northern Greek dialects.⁹ The development of imparisyllabic plurals in historical parisyllabic nouns is also well attested in Modern Greek with nominative/accusative plural forms such as *maθit-áð-es* ‘pupils’ and *ráft-ið-es* ‘tailors’ being fairly commonly used alongside inherited parisyllabic forms, in this case *maθit-és* and *ráft-es* (Thumb, 1912: 52; Hatzidakis, 1907: 17–20). It is the combination of the two that we systematically find in Silliot which is less widespread and found only in dialects originating in the western and southwestern coast of Asia Minor such as the dialect of Livísi, a village in the historical Lycia region (Andriotis, 1961: 59–64; Mousaios, 1884: 1–7).¹⁰ Livisiot forms such as *andr-áð-i*, *ajér-að-i*, *krit-áð-i*, and *náft-ið-i* in Table 10 parallel hybrid Silliot forms such as *mín-ar-i*, *pap-ár-i*, and *kléftf-ir-i* in a very straightforward manner. In Livisiot, however, the morphological innovation remains confined within *as-* and *is-* nouns and is not found either with *os*-masculine nouns or with feminine nouns, both of which retain parisyllabic plurals. Silliot is therefore unique with respect to the extent to which parisyllabicity has spread within the nominal system.

Table 10. Historical parisyllabic *as-* and *is-* masculine nouns in Livisiot.

		ending in <i>-as</i>		ending in <i>-is</i>	
SG	NOM	<i>ánder-a-s</i> ‘man’	<i>ajér-a-s</i> ‘wind’	<i>krit-í-s</i> ‘judge’	<i>náft-i-s</i> ‘sailor’
	ACC	<i>ánder-a-n</i>	<i>ajér-a-n</i>	<i>krit-í-n</i>	<i>náft-i-n</i>

⁹ For the AMGr dialects, see Dawkins (1916: 93–113) for Cappadocian; Dawkins (1916: 164–169) and Andriotis (1948: 35–41) for Pharsiot; Drettas (1997: 118–123), Oikonomidis, (1958: 156–169), and Papadopoulos, (1955: 36–41) for Pontic; Symeonidis & Tompaidis, (1999: 52) for Mariupolitan; and, Deligiannis, (2002: 95) and Konstantinidou (2005: 128) for Bithynian. For Northern Greek dialects, see Papadopoulos (1926: 59) for a general overview and, indicatively, also Anagnostou (1903: 16) for Lesbian and Sakkaris (1940: 104) for Aivaliot; Psaltis (1905: 65) for Thracian; and, Ntinis (2005: 111) for Kozanot.

¹⁰ Dawkins (1916: 48) and Kostakis (1968: 59) mention that nominative/accusative forms combining imparisyllabic stems with the *-i* suffix are also found in Chios and in Southern Italy, citing Hatzidakis (1907: 443) and Kapsomenos (1953: 332).

	GEN	<i>ánder-a-∅</i>	<i>ajér-a-∅</i>	<i>krit-í-∅</i>	<i>náft-i-∅</i>
PL	NOM	<i>andr-áð-i</i>	<i>ajér-að-i</i>	<i>krit-áð-i</i>	<i>náft-ið-i</i>
	ACC	<i>andr-áð-us</i>	<i>ajér-að-us</i>	<i>krit-áð-us</i>	<i>náft-ið-us</i>
	GEN	<i>andr-áð-un</i>	<i>ajér-að-un</i>	<i>krit-áð-un</i>	<i>náft-ið-un</i>

The third and instance of paradigmatic levelling concern the genitive singular/plural suffix *-iú* and the genitive plural suffix *-ió*, which are used in the inflection of IC₁ nouns. *-iú* and *-ió* are the product of a morphological reanalysis that operated on the genitive singular and genitive plural forms of neuter nouns ending in *-i* such as *spíti* ‘house’ whereby the thematic vowel *-i-* was taken to be part of the inflectional suffix as shown in (8) (Dawkins 1916: 98; Janse, 2004: 475–476, 2004: 6–7; Karatsareas, 2011a, b). Evidence of this development is found in all AMGr dialects as well as in a few Northern Greek dialects. Note that, in Silliot, the word-final *-n* of the plural suffix has been dropped.

(8)	Stage I		Stage II		
	SG	NOM/ACC	<i>spít-i-∅</i>	<i>reanalysis</i>	<i>spít-i</i>
		GEN	<i>spít-i-ú</i>		<i>spít-iú</i> > <i>-iú</i>
	PL	NOM/ACC	<i>spít-i-a</i>		<i>spít-ia</i>
		GEN	<i>spít-i-ón</i>		<i>spít-ión</i> > <i>-ión</i>

Following the reanalysis, the two novel inflectional suffixes were used to mark the genitive singular and plural in proparoxytone *os*-masculine and *o*-neuter nouns, and the genitive plural of parisyllabic *a*-feminine nouns that displayed a clash between the inherited, Ancient Greek rule of stress movement and the later Modern Greek tendency for columnar stress. The stress of *-iú* and *-ión* was, in contrast, stable and offered an alternative that helped to overcome the stress clash. This is illustrated in (9) by means of the *os*-masculine *ánθropos* ‘man’; cf. Silliot *ártupus* in Table 9.

(9)	SG	NOM/ACC	<i>ánθrop-o-s</i>			
		GEN	<i>ánθrop-u</i>	~	<i>ánθrop-u</i>	? → <i>ánθrop-iú</i> cf. Silliot <i>artupiú</i>
	PL	GEN	<i>ánθrop-on</i>	~	<i>ánθrop-on</i>	? → <i>ánθrop-ión</i> cf. Silliot <i>artupió</i>

From this initial locus, *-iú* and *-ión* spread within the nominal system of the AMGr dialects and began to be used in the inflection of different types of nouns belonging to different ICs and genders (see Karatsareas 2011a, 2011b for details). In Silliot, genitive singular *-iú* is found in both IC_{1a} and IC_{1b} in variation with the inherited suffixes *-ú* and *-∅*: *ártup-u* ‘man(M)-SG.GEN’ ~ *artup-iú*, *t^hopál-i-∅* ‘lame(M)-TE-SG.GEN’ ~ *t^hopál-iú*, *pap-á-∅* ‘priest(M)-TE-SG.GEN’ ~ *papar-iú*. The use of the genitive plural *-ió* is more extensive as it is found across the board for all IC₁ nouns with only a few conservative ones preserving their inherited suffixes such as *min-ó* ‘month(M).PL.GEN’. This is reminiscent of Pontic in which the genitive plural is formed with *-íon* in all nouns. As a result of the spread of *-iú* and *-ió* in the Silliot nominal system, the interparadigmatic distinction between the *i*-neuter IC and IC₁ has been levelled in the genitive singular and the genitive plural (10).

(10)		IC _{1a}	IC _{1b}	<i>i</i> -neuter	IC ₁				
	SG	GEN	<i>-u</i>	~	<i>-∅</i>	~	<i>-iú</i>	→	<i>-iú</i>
	PL	GEN	<i>-ó</i>	~	<i>-ió</i>	→	<i>-ió</i>		

The Silliot developments show a clear tendency for the reduction of morphological variation within the nominal system and for the unification of the inflection of masculine and feminine nouns under one IC for each gender. Inflectional unification is more advanced in the plural where it becomes evident both in the development of imparisyllabic stems by historical parisyllabic nouns and, as far as the masculine gender is concerned, in the levelling of inflectional suffix distinctions. As a result of these innovations, nominal inflection in ICs 1 and 2 becomes maximally iconic as the semantic opposition between singular and plural is matched by formal (morphological) marking. More importantly, gender becomes the key noun categorisation device in the dialect as it comes to control the assignment of nouns into ICs in addition to its already existing function as a controller of agreement between nouns and nominal elements such as articles, adjectives, pronouns, and participles.

The examination of neuter nouns helps to complete this picture. As shown in Table 11, there is only one set of inflectional suffixes for all neuter nouns, although three ICs are still distinguished within this gender based on stem allomorphy and on whether thematic vowels are used in inflection; see Table 12.

Table 11. The nominal inflectional suffixes in Silliot.

		IC1 (masculine)	IC2 (feminine)	ICs 3, 4, 5 (neuter)
SG	NOM	-s	-∅	-∅
	ACC	-∅	-∅	-∅
	GEN	IC1a: -u ~ -iú IC1b: -∅	-s	-u
PL	NOM	-i	-is	-a
	ACC	-i	-is	-a
	GEN	-ió ~ -iú (~ -o)	(-o)	-u

Table 12. The neuter ICs in Silliot.

		IC3	IC4	IC5
SG	NOM/ACC	<i>ɲar-ó-∅</i> ‘water’	<i>imátf-i-∅</i> ‘shirt’	<i>jen:ima-∅</i> ‘wheat’
	GEN	<i>ɲar-ú</i>	<i>imatf-i-ú</i>	<i>jen:imat-u</i>
PL	NOM/ACC	<i>ɲar-á</i>	<i>imátf-i-a</i>	<i>jen:ímat-a</i>
	ACC	<i>ɲar-ú</i>	<i>imatf-i-ú</i>	<i>jen:imat-u</i>

The Silliot innovations find a parallel in the developments that resulted in the restructuring of the nominal inflectional system of the Modern Greek dialect of Kydonías and Moschonísia, in which a very similar tendency for inflectional uniformity in the plural of masculine and neuter nouns has been identified and analysed by Ralli et al. (2003). It must be finally noted that not all masculine and feminine nouns in Silliot have undergone the developments illustrated above and that, in any case, there are no accurate statistics about the number of nouns subject to changes since the only available data come from a small number of written sources. As shown in Table 13, we find parisyllabic nouns in both genders that have not developed imparisyllabic plurals although a preliminary examination of Kostakis’s (1968: 150–205) glossary seems to suggest that the proportion of nouns that preserve their inherited, parisyllabic plurals is higher in the feminine than in the masculine gender. In the masculine, parisyllabic plurals are principally found with oxytone nouns like *nifalós* ‘navel’ and with nouns whose roots end in /r/ or /l/ like *yáidarus* ‘donkey’, where some

kind of phonological constraint disallowing the consecutive liquid onsets that would surface in imparisyllabic forms such as **γái.da.ru.ri* appears to be at play (Kostakis, 1968: 59).

Table 13. Inflectionally conservative nouns in Silliot.

		Masculine		Feminine	
SG	NOM	<i>nifal-ó-s</i> ‘navel’	<i>γáidar-u-s</i> ‘donkey’	<i>órnis-a-Ø</i> ‘chicken’	<i>kónir-a-Ø</i> ‘nit’
	ACC	<i>nifal-ó-Ø</i>	<i>γáidar-u-Ø</i>	<i>órnis-a-Ø</i>	<i>kónir-a-Ø</i>
	GEN	<i>nifal-ú</i>	<i>γáidar-u</i>	<i>órnis-a-s</i>	<i>kónir-a-s</i>
PL	NOM	<i>nifal-í</i>	<i>γáidar-i</i>	<i>órnis-is</i>	<i>kónir-is</i>
	ACC	<i>nifal-í</i>	<i>γáidar-i</i>	<i>órnis-is</i>	<i>kónir-is</i>
	GEN	_____	_____	_____	_____

4. *-inó(ndzi)sk-*: a pleonastic suffix

Moving on to the verbal domain, Modern Greek verbs are generally grouped into two main ICs: IC₁, which includes verbs whose roots or stems are stressed such as *ḍéno* ‘to tie’ (root *ḍén-*) or *ḍulévo* ‘to work’ (stem *ḍulév-* < root *ḍul-* + derivational suffix *-ev-*), traditionally called barytone verbs; and, IC₂, which includes verbs whose roots are unstressed such as *ayapó* ‘to love’ (root *ayap-*) and *ḡoró* ‘to see’ (root *ḡor-*), traditionally called contracted verbs. IC₂ verbs are further divided into two subclasses based on the vowel that is suffixed to the root, among other positions, in the second and third person singular of the active present: in IC_{2a}, that vowel is *-a-* as in *ayap-á-s* ‘love.PRS.2SG’ and *ayap-á(-i)* ‘love.PRS.3SG’; in IC_{2b}, that vowel is *-i-* as in *ḡor-í-s* ‘see.PRS.2SG’ and *ḡor-í-Ø* ‘see.PRS.3SG’.

In marking the imperfective past (henceforth imperfective), which is the focus of this section, the two verbal ICs have been historically kept distinct in the active voice and only in the perfective paradigms. IC₁ verbs form it by suffixing the past person/number markers (*-a*, *-es*, *-e(n)*, *-ame*, *-ate/-ete*, *-an(e)/-asi*) directly to the root with or without the addition of the prefixed augment *e-*. In IC₂, the person/number markers are suffixed to a morphological unit consisting of the root and a suffix, either *-us-* or *-ay-*. The two ICs, however, do not differ with respect to the way they form the imperfective in the non-active voice as the non-active past person/number markers (*-mun*, *-sun*, *-tan*, *-maste*, *-saste*, *-⁽ⁿ⁾dan/-⁽ⁿ⁾dusan*) are uniformly suffixed to a root or a root allomorph followed by a thematic vowel, either *-o-* or *-u-*. See Table 14.¹¹

Table 14. The morphology of the imperfective in Modern Greek.

	IC ₁ <i>ḍéno</i> ‘to tie’	IC ₂	
		IC _{2a} <i>ayapó</i> ‘to love’	IC _{2b} <i>ḡoró</i> ‘to see’
ACTIVE	<i>é-ḍen-a</i>	<i>ayap-ús-a</i> <i>ayáp-ay-a</i>	<i>ḡor-ús-a</i>
NON-ACTIVE	<i>e-ḍen-ú-mun</i>	<i>ayapí-ú-mun</i>	<i>e-ḡor-ú-mun</i>

¹¹ The table is meant to illustrate the main distinctions between IC₁ and IC₂ that generally hold in Modern Greek with respect to the formation of the imperfective and in no way is it to be considered exhaustive or even representative of the variation that is found in this morphological domain. The interested reader is referred to Thumb (1912: 152–153, 156, 170–172, 174–175) for an overview of imperfective formation in Modern Greek dialects.

	<i>ḑen-ó-mun</i>	<i>αγαπί-ό-mun</i>	
--	------------------	--------------------	--

AMGr differs considerably from the Modern Greek dialect core with respect to the formation of the imperfective as it is described above, especially in the active voice. While formations of the type exemplified in Table 16 by *éḑena* are found to various degrees in some dialects, in inner AMGr, including in Mariupolitan Greek, the imperfective active of IC1 verbs is widely formed by the addition to the root of the suffix *-isk-* (or any of the reflexes *-ifk-*, *-ifg-*, *-iks-*, and *-k-*) whereas, in IC2, *-an-* and *-in-* are used for IC2a and IC2b verbs, respectively (Dawkins, 1916: 132–135, 142, 180–183, 189–190; Fosteris & Kesisoglou, 1960: 12; Kesisoglou, 1951: 36–37; Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou, 1960: 61–63; Symeonidis & Tompaidis, 1999: 66–76; see also the recent overview by Papadamou & Tsalakanidou, 2016). *-an-* and *-in-* are also regularly used in Pontic for IC2 verbs whereas *-isk-* is found with some IC1 verbs in the variety of Oenóe (Drettas, 1997: 218–219; Oikonomidis, 1958: 280–282; Papadopoulos, 1955: 75–77). See the examples in (11).

(11) a. IC1

	PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE	
Phloità Cappadocian	<i>vrifko</i>	‘to find’	<i>vrifk-ifk-a</i>	(Dawkins, 1916: 134)
Ulaghátsh Cappadocian	<i>lino</i>	‘to unfasten’	<i>lin-ifk-a</i>	(Kesisoglou, 1951: 36)
Oenóe Pontic	<i>malóno</i>	‘to scold’	<i>emalón-isk-a</i>	(Oikonomidis, 1958: 280)
Mariupolitan	<i>kámu</i>	‘to do’	<i>kám-ifk-a</i>	(Symeonidis & Tompaidis, 1999: 69)

b. IC2a

	PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE	
Axó Cappadocian	<i>zolmonó</i>	‘to forget’	<i>zolmón-an-a</i>	(Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou, 1951: 62)
Malakopí Cappadocian	<i>ayapó</i>	‘to love’	<i>ayáp-an-a</i>	(Dawkins, 1916: 133)
Pontic	<i>ayapó</i>	‘to love’	<i>eyáp-an-a</i>	(Drettas, 1997: 218)
Mariupolitan	<i>rotú</i>	‘to ask’	<i>rót-an-a</i>	(Symeonidis & Tompaidis, 1999: 70)

c. IC2b

	PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE	
Axó Cappadocian	<i>laló</i>	‘to speak’	<i>lálna < lál-in-a</i>	(Mavrochalyvidis & Kesisoglou, 1951: 69)
Araván Cappadocian	<i>çoró</i>	‘to see’	<i>çór-in-a</i>	(Fosteris & Kesisoglou, 1960: 12)
Pontic	<i>filó</i>	‘to kiss’	<i>efíl-in-a</i>	(Papadopoulos, 1955: 76)
Mariupolitan	<i>filú</i>	‘to kiss’	<i>filna < fil-in-a</i>	(Symeonidis & Tompaidis, 1999: 70)

Oikonomidis (1958: 324–325) traced the origin of *-an-* and *-in-* to the third person singular of the imperfective active of historical IC2 verbs such as *timó* ‘to honour’ and *laló* ‘to speak’. In Medieval Greek, *-n* was suffixed to the relevant forms *etíma* and *eláli* resulting in *etíman* and *elálin*. These forms were reanalysed as consisting of the augment *e-* and a stem *timan-* and *lalin-*, which allowed for the subsequent suffixation of the third person singular past tense *-en*: *etímanen*, *elálinen*. On the basis of these innovative formations, the remaining person/number suffixes were added to the new base, yielding a new imperfective active inflectional paradigm (*etíman-a*, *etíman-es*, *etíman-en*; *elálin-a*, *elálin-es*, *elálin-en*) and the two new suffixes *-an-* and *-in-* (see also Pantelidis, 2016: 34, and Papadamou & Tsalakanidou, 2016: 318–319).

The origin of *-isk-* is discussed extensively by Pantelidis (2016: 36–38). As he notes, *-isk-* has been associated with the Ancient Greek iterative suffix *-sk-*, itself a reflex of an Indo-European **-sk^e/o-* (Chantraine, 1945: 258–263), since Karolidis (1855: 124). Drawing on Zerdin’s (2000, 2002) recent proposals on the function of *-sk-*, Pantelidis accepts the semantic similarity between Ancient Greek *-sk-* and AMGr *-isk-* but questions the direct connection of the two based on the lack of written attestations of imperfective forms containing *-isk-* in the historical record of AMGr, including in inscriptions, and on the fact that, in Ancient Greek imperfective active forms, the suffix is found as *-esk-* and not *-isk-* (see Chantraine, 1945: 260–263). As far as the former reservation is concerned, the lack of written attestations is not at all surprising. The historical record of the AMGr dialects is extremely scanty and lacks evidence for most of the distinctive innovations of the modern dialects. With respect to the latter reservation, a number of phonological explanations can be proposed to account for the formal difference between *-esk-* and *-isk-*. The [i] in *-isk-* could be the result of the raising of the unstressed [e] in *-esk-*. Alternatively, it is possible that AMGr did not inherit the suffix as *-esk-* but, rather, directly as *-sk-* and that the [i] in *-isk-* is the result of epenthesis applied at the boundary between consonant-ending verbal stems and *-sk-*.

In Silliot, the two imperfective suffixes *-in-* and *-isk-* have combined to produce two novel suffixes, *-inóndzisk-* and *-inósk-*. Dawkins (1916: 55–56) describes the two as being in free variation in verbs that only exhibit either active or non-active morphology. As shown in (11), the suffixes are used for both IC1 and IC2 verbs so that the distinction between the two ICs has been levelled in the imperfective. The suffixes are also used with deponent verbs, that is, verbs that only exhibit non-active morphology (12).

(11) Silliot (Dawkins, 1916: 54)

a. IC1

PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE
<i>kléyu</i>	‘to cry’	<i>kle-inóndzisk-a</i>
<i>pején:u</i>	‘to go’	<i>pejeɲ:-inóndzisk-a</i>
<i>pçén:u</i>	‘to drink’	<i>pieɲ:-inósk-a</i>
<i>séknu</i>	‘to put’	<i>sekn-inósk-a</i>

b. IC2

PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE
<i>porpató</i>	‘to walk’	<i>porpatɲ-inóndzisk-a</i>
<i>trayró</i>	‘to sing’	<i>trayɲ-inóndzisk-a</i>
<i>soró</i>	‘to see’	<i>sor-inóndzisk-a</i> and <i>sor-inósk-a</i>
<i>tɲaliftó</i>	‘to work’	<i>tɲal-inóndzisk-a</i> and <i>tɲal-inósk-a</i>

(12) Silliot (Dawkins, 1916: 55)

	PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE		
	<i>érxumu</i>	‘to come’	<i>erf-inóndzisk-a</i>	and	<i>erf-inósk-a</i>
	<i>fovúmu</i>	‘to fear’	<i>fov-inóndzisk-a</i>	and	<i>fov-inósk-a</i>
	<i>kásumu</i>	‘to sit’	<i>kas-inóndzisk-a</i>	and	<i>kas-inósk-a</i>

In the case of verbs that exhibit both active and non-active forms in their paradigm, *-inósk-* is, according to Dawkins, used to form the active subparadigm whereas *-inóndzisk-* is used in the non-active subparadigm (13).

(13) Silliot (Dawkins, 1916: 55)

	ACTIVE		NON-ACTIVE	
	PRESENT	IMPERFECTIVE	PRESENT	IMPERFECTIVE
‘to load’	<i>fortón:u</i>	<i>fortop:-inósk-a</i>	<i>fortón:umu</i>	<i>fortop:-inóndzisk-a</i>
‘to bind’	<i>rín:u</i>	<i>rij:-inósk-a</i>	<i>rín:umu</i>	<i>rij:-inóndzisk-a</i>
‘to comb’	<i>tarandó</i>	<i>tarandz-inóska</i>	<i>tarandúmu</i>	<i>tarandz-inóndzisk-a</i>

As Pantelidis (2016: 139) correctly points out, however, the fact that both suffixes are found with a number of active verbs such as the ones listed in (11) and also with deponent verbs as in (12) casts doubt on Dawkins’s proposed distribution. A more plausible explanation for the relation between the two suffixes seems to be that *-inóndzisk-* is the earlier formation and *-inósk-* the later formation, the latter having resulted from the former through a series of phonological changes involving the deletion of unstressed /i/ and the simplification of the resulting consonant clusters as follows: *-inóndzisk-* > *-inóndzsk-* > *-inóndsk-* > *-inónsk-* > *-inósk-* (Pantelidis, 2016: 140).

It is reasonable to assume that, before they combined, the two original suffixes appeared independently, *-isk-* with IC1 and *-in-* IC2 verbs as in other AMGr dialects. Indeed, Silliot retains a few IC1 forms such as *iksér-isk-a* from *kséru* ‘to know’, *pí-isk-a* from *pajénu* ‘to go’ and *pír-isk-a* from *péru* ‘to take’ (Kostakis, 1968: 81) as well as a few IC2 forms such as *porpátf-in-a* from *porpató* ‘to walk’ and *ayáp-in-a* from *ayapó* ‘to love’ (Dawkins, 1916: 53; Kostakis, 1968: 81). Forms such as *ayáp-in-a* evidence that, at some earlier stage in the history of the dialect, the distinction between IC2a verbs, which marked the imperfective with *-an-*, and IC2b verbs, which used *-in-*, had been levelled in favour of *-in-*. Compare, in that connection, Silliot *ayáp-in-a* with Malakopí Cappadocian *ayáp-an-a* and Pontic *eyáp-an-a* (11b). Corroborating evidence in favour of this proposal comes from Araván and Ulaghátsh Cappadocian, in both of which *-in-* has been generalised as the imperfective marker for all IC2 verbs; see the examples in (14) and also Dawkins (1916: 133–135) for more examples from Delmesó, Potámia, Sílata, Mistí and Ghúrzono.

(14) a. Araván Cappadocian (Fosteris & Kesisoglou, 1960: 12)

	PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE	
	<i>rotó</i>	‘to ask’	<i>rótf-in-a</i>	historically IC2a
	<i>dranó</i>	‘to see’	<i>dran-in-a</i>	historically IC2a
	<i>laló</i>	‘to speak’	<i>lál-in-a</i>	historically IC2b
	<i>pató</i>	‘to step’	<i>pátf-in-a</i>	historically IC2b

b. Ulaghátsh Cappadocian (Kesisoglou, 1951: 36–37)

PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE	
<i>rotú</i>	‘to ask’	<i>rót-in-a</i>	historically IC2a
<i>dranú</i>	‘to see’	<i>drán-in-a</i>	historically IC2a
<i>laxtú</i>	‘to kick’	<i>láxt-in-a</i>	historically IC2a
<i>aradú</i>	‘to look for’	<i>arád-in-a</i>	historically IC2a

The Silliot combination of *-in-* and *-isk-* into a novel, pleonastic imperfective suffix (in the sense of Gardani, 2015) is not unheard of in inner AMGr. It is attested in two Cappadocian varieties: in Ulaghátsh, in which all IC2 verbs can form the imperfective with the suffix *-inifk-/inifg-* in addition to a simplex *-in-* as exemplified in (14b), and in Ferték (15a, b). It is also attested in Pharasiot, in which both *-an-* and *-in-* have combined with *-isk-* to produce the phonologically reduced suffixes *-ánk-* (< *-ánsk-* < *-ánisk-*) and *-ínk-* (< *-ínsk-* < *-ínisk-*) (15c). As Papadamou & Tsalakanidou (2016: 325) note, these formations indicate that, at some point in the history of at least some dialects, the IC2 suffixes *-an-* and, crucially for Silliot, *-in-* lost part of their function of marking the imperfective and had to be reinforced by the addition of *-isk-*.

(15) a. Ulaghátsh Cappadocian (Dawkins, 1916: 134; Kesisoglou, 1951: 37)

PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE	
<i>tranó</i>	‘to see’	<i>trán-inifg-a</i>	
<i>puló</i>	‘to sell’	<i>púl-inifg-a</i>	
<i>laxtú</i>	‘to kick’	<i>láxt-inifk-a</i>	
<i>jazdú</i>	‘to write’	<i>jázd-inifk-a</i>	

b. Ferték Cappadocian (Dawkins, 1916: 135)

PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE	
<i>laló</i>	‘to speak’	<i>lál-inifk-a</i>	
<i>dranó</i>	‘to see’	<i>drán-inifk-a</i>	
<i>porpadó</i>	‘to walk’	<i>porpád-inifk-a</i>	
<i>parladó</i>	‘to shine’	<i>parlád-inifk-a</i>	

c. Pharasiot (Dawkins, 1916: 181–182)

PRESENT		IMPERFECTIVE	
<i>tfendáyo</i>	‘to prick’	<i>tfend-ánk-a</i>	
<i>meðáyo</i>	‘to get drunk’	<i>með-ánk-a</i>	
<i>θoró</i>	‘to see’	<i>θor-ínk-a</i>	
<i>zelmonó</i>	‘to forget’	<i>zelmon-ínk-a</i>	

The two Silliot suffixes, *-inóndzisk-* and *-inósk-*, however, differ from the Cappadocian and Pharasiot suffixes in three important respects: first, *-in-* and *-isk-* do not combine directly but a further element *-ond-* (> *-ondz-* by regular palatalisation of /d/ preceding /i/; Dawkins, 1916: 45; Kostakis, 1968: 45, 48–49) is found between the two; second, they are used with both IC1 and IC2 verbs; and, third, they are used in both the active and non-active paradigms. These differences allow us to reconstruct the unique history of the Silliot suffixes in the following way:

-ondz- is hypothesised by Dawkins (1916: 56) to originate in the suffix *-ondo*, which historically marked the third person plural in non-active imperfective forms such as *írxondo* from *érxome* ‘come’ or *stékondo* from *stékome* ‘stand’. According to Dawkins, the first step in the development of the novel Silliot suffixes was the addition of *-isk-* to such forms as shown in (16). Indeed, Kostakis (1968: 81) records two forms that confirm Dawkins’s hypothesis: *einóndiska* from *enískumu* ‘become’ and *stekóndiska* from *stékumu* ‘stand’. Pantelidis (2016: 40) proposes that, in these forms, *-ond-* lost its function as a marker of the imperfective (and also non-active, past, third person, and plural) and was reanalysed as part of the verbal stem. This allowed for the subsequent suffixation of *-isk-* and, of course, the appropriate tense, person, and number markers *-a*, *-is*, *-i*, *-ami*, *-ati*, *-an/-afi*.

- (16) *stékond(o)* + *-isk-* > *stekondísk-* > *stekondzísk-*
 stand.NACT.PST.IPFV.3PL IPFV

The second aspect of the Silliot suffixes that needs to be accounted for is that, while their initial element *-in-* was originally used to mark the imperfective only in IC2 verbs, *-inóndzísk-* and *-inósk-* are used for both IC1 and IC2 verbs. This suggests that, after spreading from IC2b to IC2a verbs, *-in-* spread further in the dialect’s verbal system and started to be used to form the imperfective of IC1 verbs. Indeed, Kostakis (1968: 81) records numerous examples; see (17). A similar development is found in Ulaghátsh Cappadocian, in which IC1 verbs whose stem includes the verbal root plus the derivational suffix *-ev-* form the imperfective by means of *-ín(ijk)-*; for example, *jeledzév-in(ijk)-a* from *jeledzévo* ‘speak’, *soróv-in(ijk)a* from *soróvo* ‘collect’, *xartzév-in(ijk)-a* from *xartzévo* ‘spend’ (Kesisoglou, 1951: 37); cf. (15a).

- (17) Silliot (Kostakis, 1968: 81)
- | PRESENT | | IMPERFECTIVE |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|
| <i>váfu</i> | ‘to paint’ | <i>váf-in-a</i> |
| <i>zénu</i> | ‘to warm up’ | <i>zén-in-a</i> |
| <i>krívu</i> | ‘to hide’ | <i>krív-in-a</i> |
| <i>náftu</i> | ‘to light up’ | <i>náft-in-a</i> |
| <i>péftu</i> | ‘to go to sleep’ | <i>péft-in-a</i> |
| <i>ftfánu</i> | ‘to make’ | <i>ftfán-in-a</i> |
| <i>tróyu</i> | ‘to eat’ | <i>tró-in-a</i> |

The final step in the creation of *-inóndzísk-*, was the combination of *-in-*, originally marking the imperfective only in the active paradigm (17), with *-ondzísk-*, the original non-active imperfective marker (16). One possible locus for the initial combination of the two are deponent verbs such as *érxumu* ‘to come’. Evidence in support of this hypothesis is scarce, but it would appear based on forms such as second person singular *érf-in-is* and third person plural *érf-in-an(i)* and *érf-in-asi* recorded by Kostakis (1968: 83) that deponent verbs may have originally formed the imperfective in the same way as active verbs, that is, by adding *-in-* to the verbal stem. At a later stage and due to the fact that they generally inflected according to the non-active paradigm, they allowed for the combination of both the active and non-active perfective markers yielding the pleonastic Silliot suffix *-inóndzísk-*. This was finally extended to the active paradigm, leading to the levelling of the distinction between the active and non-active in the imperfective.

The proposed hypothesis for the development of *-inóndzisk-* and *-inósk-* is summarised in Table 15.

Table 15. The development of the imperfective suffixes *-inóndzisk-* and *-inósk-* in Silliot.

Stage I	In the active, the imperfective is formed by adding <i>-isk-</i> to the stems of IC1 verbs, <i>-an-</i> to the stems of IC2a verbs, and <i>-in-</i> to the stems of IC2b verbs. In the non-active, all verbs form the imperfective without an overt suffix.												
	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>IC1</th> <th>IC2a</th> <th>IC2b</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ACTIVE</td> <td><i>-isk-</i></td> <td><i>-an-</i></td> <td><i>-in-</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NON-ACTIVE</td> <td>∅</td> <td>∅</td> <td>∅</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		IC1	IC2a	IC2b	ACTIVE	<i>-isk-</i>	<i>-an-</i>	<i>-in-</i>	NON-ACTIVE	∅	∅	∅
	IC1	IC2a	IC2b										
ACTIVE	<i>-isk-</i>	<i>-an-</i>	<i>-in-</i>										
NON-ACTIVE	∅	∅	∅										
Stage II	In the active, <i>-in-</i> is generalised as the imperfective suffix for all IC2 verbs. The distinction between IC2a and IC2b is levelled. No relevant changes in the active of IC1 verbs or in the non-active.												
	<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>IC1</th> <th>IC2</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>ACTIVE</td> <td><i>-isk-</i></td> <td><i>-in-</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NON-ACTIVE</td> <td>∅</td> <td>∅</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		IC1	IC2	ACTIVE	<i>-isk-</i>	<i>-in-</i>	NON-ACTIVE	∅	∅			
	IC1	IC2											
ACTIVE	<i>-isk-</i>	<i>-in-</i>											
NON-ACTIVE	∅	∅											
Stage III	In the active, <i>-in-</i> is generalised as the imperfective suffix for all verbs. The distinction between IC1 and IC2 is levelled. In the non-active, <i>-isk-</i> is suffixed to the third person plural marker <i>-ond-</i> , yielding <i>-óndzisk-</i> .												
	<table border="0"> <tbody> <tr> <td>ACTIVE</td> <td><i>-in-</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NON-ACTIVE</td> <td><i>-óndzisk-</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ACTIVE	<i>-in-</i>	NON-ACTIVE	<i>-óndzisk-</i>								
ACTIVE	<i>-in-</i>												
NON-ACTIVE	<i>-óndzisk-</i>												
Stage IV	No changes in the active. In the non-active, <i>-in-</i> is used as an imperfective marker in deponent verbs. <i>-óndzisk-</i> continues to be used.												
	<table border="0"> <tbody> <tr> <td>ACTIVE</td> <td><i>-in-</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NON-ACTIVE</td> <td><i>-in- ~ -óndzisk-</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ACTIVE	<i>-in-</i>	NON-ACTIVE	<i>-in- ~ -óndzisk-</i>								
ACTIVE	<i>-in-</i>												
NON-ACTIVE	<i>-in- ~ -óndzisk-</i>												
Stage V	No changes in the active. In the non-active, <i>-in-</i> is combined with <i>-óndzisk-</i> , which is used for all verbs.												
	<table border="0"> <tbody> <tr> <td>ACTIVE</td> <td><i>-in-</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>NON-ACTIVE</td> <td><i>-inóndzisk-</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	ACTIVE	<i>-in-</i>	NON-ACTIVE	<i>-inóndzisk-</i>								
ACTIVE	<i>-in-</i>												
NON-ACTIVE	<i>-inóndzisk-</i>												
Stage VI	<i>-inóndzisk-</i> spreads to the active. The distinction between the active and non-active is levelled												
	<i>-inóndzisk-</i>												
Stage VII	<i>-inóndzisk-</i> undergoes phonological simplification to <i>-inósk-</i> . The two suffixes exist in variation in the Silliot verbal system.												
	<i>-inóndzisk- ~ -inósk-</i>												

5. Concluding remarks

In this chapter, I discussed three features of Silliot morphology that give the dialect its unique character and differentiate it from other members of the AMGr dialect group: (a) the defective inflection of the definite article; (b) the paradigmatic levelling and the spread of imparisyllabicity in the masculine and feminine ICs; and, (c) the development of the pleonastic suffixes *-inóndzisk-* and *-inósk-* for the marking of the imperfective. In all three cases, the tendency of Silliot for the reduction of morphological contrasts and material is evident: in addition to the nominative and genitive forms of the definite article, which are generally absent in AMGr, the accusative forms also show signs of being on their way out; the distinctions between different masculine and feminine ICs have been levelled producing new, hybrid ICs that continue characteristics of the original ICs in terms of stem structure and inflectional endings; and, the use of the novel imperfective suffixes with verbs from both verbal ICs and across both the active and non-active paradigms also evidences a loss of inflectional distinctions. As became evident through the discussion and analysis of crossdialectal data and parallel attestations, all three Silliot developments continue tendencies and innovations that must have been set in motion at some earlier point in the history of the AMGr dialects. In Silliot, however, these tendencies find a unique degree of systematicity and evolution within the dialect's grammatical system. For the most part and with the exception of some aspects of the diachrony of the defective definite article, this has been achieved through language-internal processes of change as it is difficult to see how Turkish morphology would have provided the model especially for the developments in the masculine and feminine ICs or for the creation of the pleonastic imperfective suffixes. It should also be noted as a final remark that the dialect's record as it is documented by Dawkins (1916) and Kostakis (1968) displays a high degree of variability not only with respect to the three features discussed here but also more extensively in other domains of phonology, morphology and syntax, showing signs of a rapidly changing dialect found on the brink of extinction.

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis & Gereon Müller. 2008. Class features as probes. In Asaf Bachrach & Andrew Nevins (Eds.), *Inflectional Identity*, 101–155. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Anagnostopoulos, Georgios P. 1922. Περὶ τοῦ ἄρθρου [On the article]. *Ἀθηνᾶ* 34, 166–247.
- Anagnostou, Spyridon. 1903. *Λεσβιακά, ἤτοι συλλογὴ λαογραφικῶν περὶ Λέσβου πραγματειῶν* [Lesbiaca, that is, a collection of folklore treatises on Lesbos]. Athens: Konstantinidis.
- Andriotis, Nikolaos P. 1948. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῶν Φαράσων* [The dialect of Pharasa]. Athens: Ikaros.
- Andriotis, Nikolaos P. 1961. *Τὸ ἰδίωμα τοῦ Λιβισίου τῆς Λυκίας* [The dialect of Livisi in Lycia]. Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies.
- Browning, Robert. 1983. *Medieval and Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chantraine, Pierre. 1945. *Morphologie historique du Grec*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- Dawkins, Richard M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: a Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deligiannis, Kyriakos P. 2002. *Κουβουκλιώτικα: Τὸ Γλωσσικὸ Ἰδίωμα των Κουβουκλιῶν Προύσας* [Kouvouklian: the dialect of Kouvouklia in Bursa]. Adelaide: Webb & Son Inc. Claxton Press.
- Drettas, Georges. 1997. *Aspects pontiques*. Paris: Association de recherches pluridisciplinaires.

- Gardani, Francesco. 2015. Affix pleonasm. In Peter O. Müller, Ingeborg Ohnheiser, Susan Olsen & Franz Rainer (Eds.), *Word-Formation: An International Handbook of the Languages of Europe, Volume I*, 537–550. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Greenberg, Joseph H. 1978. How does a language acquire gender markers? In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsik (Eds.), *Universals of Human Language. Volume 3: Word Structure*, 47–82. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hatzidakis, Georgios N. 1907. *Μεσαιωνικά και Νέα Έλληνικά* [Medieval and Modern Greek]. Athens: P. D. Sakellarios.
- Henrich, Günther S. 1999. Γραμματικά των κριμαιοαζοφικών ή ταυρορουμαίικων διαλέκτων [Grammatical aspects of the Crimeoazovian or Taurorumeic dialects]. In Asterios Argyriou, Konstantinos A. Dimadis & Anastasia Danai Lazaridou (Eds.), *Ο Ελληνικός Κόσμος Ανάμεσα στην Ανατολή και τη Δύση. Πρακτικά του Α' Ευρωπαϊκού Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικών Σπουδών. Βερολίνο, 2-4 Οκτωβρίου 1998. Τόμος Α'* [The Greek world between east and west. Proceedings of the First European Conference of Modern Greek Studies. Berlin, 2–4 October 1998. Volume 1], 661–670. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Himmelmann, Nikolaus P. 1998. Regularity in irregularity: article use in adpositional phrases. *Linguistic Typology* 2(3), 315–353.
- Holton, David, Peter Mackridge & Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 1997. *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey. 2010. *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. Malden, MA/Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Janse, Mark. 2002. Aspects of bilingualism in the history of the Greek language. In James Noel Adams, Mark Janse & Simon Swain (Eds.), *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, 332–390. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Janse, Mark. 2006. Object position in Cappadocian and other Asia Minor Greek dialects. In Mark Janse, Brian Joseph & Angela Ralli (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, 115–129. Patras: University of Patras.
- Janse, Mark. 2009. Greek-Turkish language contact in Asia Minor. *Études Helléniques/Hellenic Studies* 17(1), 37–54.
- Kapsomenos, Stylianos G. 1953. Beiträge zur historischen Grammatik der griechischen Dialekte Unteritaliens. *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 46(1), 320–348.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2009. The loss of grammatical gender in Cappadocian Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 107(2), 196–230.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2011b. Neuter heteroclis in Asia Minor Greek: Origin and Development. *Νεοελληνική Διαλεκτολογία* 6, 111–135.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2013. Understanding diachronic change in Cappadocian Greek: The dialectological perspective. *Journal of Historical Linguistics* 3(2), 192–229.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2014. On the diachrony of gender in Asia Minor Greek: The development of semantic agreement in Pontic. *Language Sciences* 43, 77–101.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2016. The adpositional cycle in Asia Minor Greek: A tale of multiple causation. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 16(1), 47–86.
- Karatsareas, Petros. 2011a. *A Study of Cappadocian Greek Nominal Morphology from a Diachronic and Dialectological Perspective*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Cambridge, United Kingdom.

- Karatsareas, Petros & Thanasis Georgakopoulos. 2016. From syntagmatic to paradigmatic spatial zeroes: The loss of the preposition *se* in inner Asia Minor Greek. *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 69(2), 309–340.
- Karolidis, Pavlos. 1885. *Γλωσσάριον συγκριτικὸν ἑλληνοκαππαδοκικῶν λέξεων, ἧτοι ἡ ἐν Καππαδοκίᾳ λαλουμένη ἑλληνικὴ διάλεκτος καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ σφριζόμενα ἴχνη τῆς ἀρχαίας καππαδοκικῆς γλώσσης* [Comparative glossary of Cappadocian Greek words, that is, the spoken Greek dialect of Cappadocia and the surviving traces of the ancient Cappadocian language]. Smyrna: O Typos.
- Kesisoglou, Ioannis I. 1951. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τοῦ Οὐλαγάτς* [The dialect of Ulaghátsh]. Athens: Institut Français d’Athènes.
- Klairs, Χρήστος & Georgios Babiniotis. 1996. *Γραμματικὴ τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς: Δομολειτουργικὴ - Επικοινωνιακὴ. I. Το ὄνομα: Αναφορὰ στον Κόσμο τῆς Πραγματικότητος* [A grammar of Modern Greek: structural, functional, communicative. Volume I. The noun: reference to the world of reality]. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Klairs, Χρήστος & Georgios Babiniotis. 2005. *Γραμματικὴ τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς: Δομολειτουργικὴ – Επικοινωνιακὴ* [[A grammar of Modern Greek: structural, functional, communicative]. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.
- Konstantinidou, Magdalini. 2005. Μικρασιατικὰ ιδιώματα περιοχῆς Βιθυνίας καὶ Ἰωνίας (αποτελέσματα μίας γλωσσικῆς αποστολῆς) [The Asia Minor dialects of Bithynia and Ionia (results of a linguistic mission)]. *Λεξικογραφικὸν Δελτίον* 25, 119–148.
- Kostakis, Thanasis P. 1968. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Σίλλης* [The dialect of Silli]. Athens: Centre for Asia Minor Studies.
- Koutita-Kaimaki, Myrto. 1977/1978. Ἡ ὀνομαστικὴ σὲ -ν τῶν ἀρσενικῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς Ποντιακῆς [The nominative in -n of masculine nouns in Pontic]. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 34, 259–298.
- Mirambel, André. 1949. *Grammaire du grec moderne*. Paris: C. Klincksieck
- Mirambel, André. 1969. *Grammaire du grec moderne*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- Mousaios, Michael T. 1884. *Βατταρισμοί, ἧτοι λεξιλόγιον τῆς Λειβεισιανῆς διαλέκτου μετ’ ἐγχωρίων παροιμιῶν ἐν τέλει* [Stutterings, that is, glossary of the dialect of Livisi with local proverbs at the end]. Athens.
- Niebuhr, Carsten. 1837. *Reisebeschreibung nach Arabien und andern umliegenden Ländern. Volume III*. Kopenhagen/Hamburg.
- Ntinas, Kostas. 2005. *Τὸ Γλωσσικὸ Ἰδίωμα τῆς Κοζάνης* [The dialect of Kozani]. Kozani: Institutouto Vivliou kai Anagnosis.
- Oikonomidis, Dimosthenis I. 1958. *Γραμματικὴ τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Διαλέκτου τοῦ Πόντου* [Grammar of the Greek dialect of Pontus]. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Pantelidis, Nikolaos. 2016. Το ρηματικὸ ἐπίθημα -(ι)σκ- στὴν Καππαδοκικὴ [The verbal suffix -(ι)σκ- in Cappadocian]. *Proceedings of the 6th Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory Meeting (MGDLT6), Patras, 25–28 September 2014*, 133–142. Patras: University of Patras.
- Papadamou, Eleni & Kyriaki Tsalakanidou. 2016. Συγκριτικὴ ἐξέταση τῶν εἰδικῶν μορφημάτων ὀψης στὴν ποντιακὴ καὶ στὴν καππαδοκικὴ [A comparative examination of aspect morphemes in Pontic and Cappadocian]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 36, 315–330. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.

- Papadopoulos, Anthimos A. 1926. *Γραμματική τῶν Βορείων Ἰδιωμάτων τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς Γλώσσης* [Grammar of the northern dialects of the Modern Greek language]. Athens: P. D. Sakellarios.
- Papadopoulos, Anthimos A. 1933. Συμβολὴ εἰς τὴν ἔρευναν τῆς Ποντικῆς διαλέκτου (ἤτοι γραμματικὰ καὶ συντακτικὰ ζητήματα) [Contribution to the study of the Pontic dialect, that is, grammatical and syntactic matters]. *Athina* 45, 15–48.
- Papadopoulos, Anthimos A. 1955. *Ἱστορικὴ Γραμματικὴ τῆς Ποντικῆς Διαλέκτου* [Historical grammar of the Pontic dialect]. Athens: Epitropi Pontiakon Meleton.
- Patriarcat Œcuménique. 1922. *Les atrocités kémalistes dans les régions du Pont et dans le reste de l'Anatolie*. Constantinople.
- Psaltis, Stamatios V. 1905. *Θρακικὰ, ἢ μελέτη περὶ τοῦ γλωσσικοῦ ἰδιώματος τῆς πόλεως Σαράντα Ἐκκλησιῶν* [Thracian, or a study on the dialect of the city of Saranta Ekklesies]. Athens: P. D. Sakellarios.
- Ralli, Angela. 1992. Η Θεωρία των Χαρακτηριστικῶν καὶ ἡ δομὴ των κλιτῶν λέξεων τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς [Feature Theory and the structure of inflected words in Modern Greek]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 13, 193–212. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Ralli, Angela. 2000. A feature-based analysis of Greek nominal inflection. *Γλωσσολογία/Glossologia* 11/12, 201–227.
- Ralli, Angela. 2002. The role of morphology in gender determination: evidence from Modern Greek. *Linguistics* 40(3), 519–551.
- Ralli, Angela. 2003a. Morphology in Greek linguistics: the state of the art. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 4, 77–129.
- Ralli, Angela. 2003b. Ο καθορισμὸς του γραμματικοῦ γένους στα ουσιαστικά τῆς νέας ἐλληνικῆς [Grammatical gender specification in Modern Greek nouns]. In Anna Anastasiadi-Symeonidi, Angeliki Ralli & Despoina Chila-Markopoulou (Eds.), *Το Γένος* [Gender], 57–99. Athens: Patakis.
- Ralli, Angela. 2005. *Μορφολογία* [Morphology]. Athens: Patakis.
- Ralli, Angela, Dimitra Melissaropoulou & Thanasis Tsiamas. 2004. Φαινόμενα αναδιάρθρωσης του ονομαστικοῦ κλιτικοῦ παραδείγματος στη μικρασιατικὴ διάλεκτο των Κυθωνιῶν (Αἰβαλί) καὶ Μοσχονησιῶν [Phenomena of restructuring of the nominal inflectional paradigm in the Asia Minor dialect of Kydonies (Aivali) and Moschonisia]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 24, 568–579. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Sakkaris, Georgios. 1940. Περὶ τῆς διαλέκτου τῶν Κυθωνιῶν ἐν συγκρίσει πρὸς τὰς Λεσβιακάς [On the dialect of Kydonies in comparison with those of Lesbos]. *Mikrasiatika Chronika* 3, 74–141.
- Symeonidis, Charalampos & Dimitrios Tompaidis. 1999. *Ἡ Σημερινὴ Ἑλληνικὴ Διάλεκτος τῆς Ουκρανίας (Περιοχὴ Μαριούπολης)* [The present-day Greek dialect of Ukraine (Mariupol Region)]. Athens: Epitropi Pontiakon Meleton.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thumb, Albert. 1912. *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular. Grammar, Texts and Glossary*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Tompaidis, Dimitrios 1988. *Ἡ Ποντιακὴ Διάλεκτος: Διαλεκτικὰ Χαρακτηριστικά, Κατάταξη Ἰδιωμάτων, Διαλεκτικὰ Κείμενα* [The Pontic dialect: dialectal features, classification of varieties, dialectal texts]. Athens: Epitropi Pontiakon Meleton.

- Triantafyllidis, Manolis. 1941. *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική (τῆς Δημοτικῆς)* [Modern Greek grammar (demotic)]. Athens: Organismos Ekdoseos Scholikon Vivlion.
- Triantafyllidis, Μανόλης. 2002 [1938]. *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική. Πρώτος Τόμος: Ἱστορική Εἰσαγωγή* [Modern Greek grammar. First volume: historical introduction]. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Winford, Donald. 2005. Contact-induced changes: classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22 (2), 373–427.
- Zerdin, Jason R. 2000. *Studies in the Ancient Greek Verbs in -skō*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Oxford, United Kingdom.
- Zerdin, Jason R. 2002. The ‘iterative-intensives’ in -σκον. In Ina J. Hartmann & Andreas Willi (eds.), *Oxford University Working Papers in Linguistics, Philology & Phonetics* 7, 103–130.