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Cappadocian Greek

• Greek in Cappadocia developed for a significant amount of time

  (a) in (relative) isolation from the varieties spoken contiguously in other areas of the Eastern Mediterranean;

  (b) in the context of intense language contact with Turkish.
Cappadocian Greek

• Cappadocian Greek presents

  (a) numerous grammatical and lexical features reminiscent of earlier stages in the history of Greek (Late Medieval period, *i.e.* 1100–1500 CE);

  (b) a great deal of structural innovations that distinguish it from other Modern Greek dialects.
## Grammatical convergence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard ModGr</th>
<th>Cappadocian</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. interdental fricatives /θ ~ ð/</td>
<td>no interdental fricatives /t ~ d/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. three genders</td>
<td>no grammatical gender</td>
<td>agglutinative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. fusional</td>
<td>head-final</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. head-initial (VO, N + NGEN, N + REL)</td>
<td>(OV, NGEN + N, REL + N)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. prepositions</td>
<td>pre-, circum-, postpositions</td>
<td>postpositions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. no question marker</td>
<td></td>
<td>question marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. ACC–NEUTER marking</td>
<td></td>
<td>DOM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Today’s talk

1  The Turkish DOM system
2  The Modern Greek ACC–NEUTER system
3  The Cappadocian DOM system
   a.  its synchrony
   b.  its emergence
   c.  its decline
4  Conclusions
DOM in Turkish

- A textbook case: SPECIFICITY determines the marking of direct objects NPs.
- Specific direct object NPs are marked by -(y)I.
- -(y)I can co-occur with
  - the indefinite marker bir (< bir ‘one’);
  - definite determiners, e.g. demonstratives bu, şu, o;
  - universal quantifiers, e.g. her ‘every’, bütün ‘all’.
- Non-specific direct object NPs are zero-marked.
DOM in Turkish

(1)

a. Yasemin anahtar kaybetti.  ... keys.’

b. Yasemin anahtar-ı kaybetti.  ... the key.’

c. Yasemin bu anahtar-ı kaybetti.  ... this key.’

d. Yasemin bir anahtar kaybetti.  ... a key.’

e. Yasemin bir anahtar-ı kaybetti.  ... a certain key’
DOM in Turkish

- Definiteness Hierarchy (von Heusinger 2008: 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal pronoun</th>
<th>proper name</th>
<th>definite NP</th>
<th>indefinite specific NP</th>
<th>indefinite non-specific NP</th>
<th>non-argumental NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-(y)I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Head nouns of subject NPs in main clauses are also zero-marked:

(2) *Anahtar paspas-in alt-in-da.*

key doormat-GEN bottom-3SG-LOC

‘The key is under the doormat.’
ACC—NEUTER marking in ModGr

- ModGr is non-differential.
- The head nouns of all direct object NPs are uniformly marked by the ACC irrespective of their position or that of their referents on the Animacy and Definiteness Hierarchies.
- ModGr distinguishes between definite and indefinite NPs:
  - all definite NPs are marked by the definite article;
  - indefinite NPs are marked by the indefinite article or are zero-marked.
ACC–NEUTER marking in ModGr

• There is no grammaticalised means for the marking of specificity.

• Definite NPs generally have a specific reading except for generic NPs, which are—nevertheless—still marked by the definite article.

• Indefinite NPs marked as such by the indefinite article can have both a specific and a non-specific reading.

• Zero-marked indefinite NPs can be interpreted as either non-specific or generic.
ACC–NEUTER marking in ModGr

(2) a.  o  διμαρξος  ευγγελε
ART.DEF.M.SG.NOM  mayor(M).SG.NOM  give.PST.3SG

loγo  stin
speech(M).SG.ACC  PREP.ART.DEF.F.SG.ACC

platia
square(F).SG.ACC

‘The mayor gave a speech on the square.’
ACC–NEUTER marking in ModGr

(2) b. \textit{xriazome} \textit{xaraka} \textit{ja na} \textit{sčeđiaso}

\text{need.PRS.1SG} \text{ruler(M).SG.ACC} \text{COMP} \text{draw.PNP.1SG}

de\textit{phies} \textit{yrames}

\text{straight.F.PL.ACC} \text{line(F).PL.ACC}

‘I need a ruler in order to draw straight lines.’

c. \textit{θelo} \textit{na} \textit{ayoraso} \textit{enan}

\text{want.PRS.1SG} \text{COMP} \text{buy.1SG} \text{INDF.M.SG.ACC}

\textit{ektipoti}

\text{printer(M).SG.ACC}

‘I want to buy a printer (any printer).’
ACC–NEUTER marking in ModGr

(2) d. \(sina^{(n)}\)disa enan filo=mu,
meet.PRS.1SG INDF.M.SG.ACC friend(M).SG.ACC=1SG.GEN

to Manoli
ART.DEF.M.SG.ACC PN(M).SG.ACC

‘I met a (certain) friend of mine, Manolis.’

e. ŏen ton=troo ton
NEG 3SG.M.ACC=eat.PRS.1SG ART.DEF.M.SG.ACC

patsa
tripe(M).SG.ACC

‘I don’t eat tripe.’
ACC–NEUTER marking in ModGr

• In terms of Bossong (1991: 151), ModGr exhibits an ACC–NEUTER split:
  – only non-neuter (masculine or feminine) nouns have a distinct morphological form in the ACC;
  – neuter nouns have syncretic NOM/ACC forms.

• The ModGr ACC–NEUTER split is not DOM. It is strictly defined by inflectional class and, therefore, not based on semantic or pragmatic properties of the referents of direct object NPs.
DOM in Cappadocian: synchrony

• Cappadocian also distinguishes between definite and indefinite NPs:
  – all definite NPs are marked by the definite article, which has overt and zero forms (see Karatsareas 2013 for details);
  – indefinite NPs are marked by the indefinite article or are zero-marked.

• *Contra* Spyropoulos & Tiliopoulou (2006), there is no grammaticalised means for the marking of SPECIFICITY. Definite and indefinite NPs get the same specificity readings as their ModGr counterparts.
DOM in Cappadocian: synchrony

• Case marking in Cappadocian is differential and conditioned by DEFINITENESS (Dawkins 1916, Janse 2004).

• In the syntactic contexts in which the ACC is the only grammatical option in other ModGr varieties (direct object, indirect object, object predicative, preposition complement, adverbial NPs),
  – head nouns of definite NPs appear in the ACC;
  – head nouns of indefinite NPs appear in the NOM.

• In that sense, DOM is a misnomer for Cappadocian.
DOM in Cappadocian: synchrony

(3) a.  
ento  to  aθropo  mi
DEM.PROX.SG  ART.DEF.SG  man.SG.ACC  NEG

to=lalit
3SG.ACC=tell_off.IMPV.2PL

‘Do not tell off this man.’ (Tsitsopoulos 1962: 58)

b.  
ʝolatsan  ena  aθropos
send.PST.3PL  INDF  man.SG.NOM

na=to=tʃiʃirtif
COMP=3SG.ACC=call.PNP.3SG

‘They sent out a man to call him.’ (ibid.: 54)
DOM in Cappadocian: synchrony

(4) 

a. so filan son
PREP.ART.DEF.SG such.SG PREP.ART.DEF.SG
topo en ena koritʃ
place.SG.ACC COP.3 INDF girl.SG.NOM

‘In that place, there is a girl.’ (Dawkins 1916: 322)

b. esena pal se=salsan s=ena
2SG.ACC PTCL 2SG.ACC=send.PST.3PL.NOM PREP=INDF
batax topos
slippery.SG place.SG.NOM

‘As for you, they sent you to a slippery place.’ (ibid.)
DOM in Cappadocian: synchrony

• Owing to the collapse of the originally distinct masculine, feminine, and neuter forms of all agreement targets into a single, historically neuter form (Karatsareas 2009, 2014), the differential distinction between definite and indefinite NPs only becomes apparent on head nouns of NPs:

(5) salse ena allo numatfis
send.PST.3SG INDF other.SG man.SG.ACC
‘Send another man.’
(Phosteris & Kesisoglou 1960: 102)
DOM in Cappadocian: synchrony

- The **NOM vs ACC** distinction is morphologically marked only in the singular of three out of nine inflectional classes (Karatsareas under review):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IC1 ‘man’</th>
<th>IC2 ‘thief’</th>
<th>IC3 ‘priest’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SG</strong> NOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{a\theta\rho\rhoo-s}</td>
<td>\textit{klefti-s}</td>
<td>\textit{papa-s}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{a\theta\rho\rhoo-Ø}</td>
<td>\textit{klefti-Ø}</td>
<td>\textit{papa-Ø}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PL</strong> NOM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>\textit{a\theta\rho\rhop-i}</td>
<td>\textit{klefti}</td>
<td>\textit{papað-es}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## DOM in Cappadocian: synchrony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>neka</td>
<td>IC4 ‘woman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nec-es</td>
<td>IC5 ‘animal’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>spit</td>
<td>IC6 ‘ear’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>spit-ia</td>
<td>IC7 ‘house’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>para</td>
<td>IC8 ‘money’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>parað-ia</td>
<td>IC9 ‘cover’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>puma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>pumat-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

• It is not unheard of for a non-differential language to develop into a differential one in its history through language-internal processes:
  – Vulgar Latin > Spanish, Catalan, Sardinian
  – Proto-Semitic > Hebrew
  – Proto-Indo-European > Slavonic languages

• The possibility that Cappadocian DOM emerged language-internally should not be dismissed in principle.
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

• Aissen, drawing on Bossong (1985: 125):

“Overwhelmingly, DOM is implemented by overtly marking the marked class of objects, and leaving the unmarked ones with no morphological mark.”

(2003: 446, emphasis in the original; see also Comrie 1989 and Croft 2003).
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- Cappadocian DOM violates Aissen’s, Comrie’s and Croft’s generalisations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Formal markedness</th>
<th>Semantic markedness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-s</td>
<td>indefinite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>definite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- The overt, morphologically more complex element marks the unmarked class of objects.
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- This violation casts doubt on a hypothesis that would treat the emergence of DOM in Cappadocian as a language-internal development.
- If this had been the case, we would expect NOM forms ending in -s to be used for definite NPs and s-less, zero-marked ACC forms to be used for indefinite NPs.
- The comparison of the Cappadocian DOM pattern with that of Turkish supports a language contact hypothesis.
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- In Cappadocian, head nouns of indefinite NPs appear in a form that coincides with that in which head nouns of subject NPs appear:

(6) a. \( \text{jolatsan} \quad \text{ena} \quad \text{a} \theta \text{ropos} \)
   send.PST.3PL INDF man.SG.NOM
   ‘They sent out a man.’ (Tsitsopoulos 1962: 54)

   b. \( \text{eto} \quad \text{a} \theta \text{ropos} \quad \text{ðe} = \text{ne} \quad \text{xan} \)
   DEM.PROX.SG man.SG.NOM NEG=COP.3 SIM
   \( \text{ta} \quad \text{ala} \quad \text{ta} \quad \text{a} \theta \text{rop} \)
   ART.DEF.PL OTHER.PL ART.DEF.PL MAN.PL.ACC
   ‘This man is not like the other men.’ (ibid.: 58)
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

• The same pattern holds in Turkish:

(7) a.  \textit{Yasemin} \textit{bir} \textit{anahtar} \textit{Kaybet-ti}.
PN INDF key lose-PST
‘Yasemin lost a key.’

b.  \textit{Anahtar} \textit{paspas-in} \textit{alt-in-da}.
key doormat-GEN bottom-3SG-LOC
‘The key is under the doormat.’
DOM in Cappadoci an: emergence

• The emergence of DOM in Cappadocian is due to an instance of pattern replication (in the sense of Matras & Sakel 2007) or selective copying (in the sense of Johanson 1999, 2002a, 2002b).

• Cappadocian speakers replicated (or, copied) the Turkish DOM pattern without borrowing any of the forms used for its implementation in the model language, in this case -(y)I.
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- Instead, they drew upon the language’s own grammatical resources in order to establish

  \( (a) \) the referential property that would determine which NPs would be overtly marked and which would be left unmarked in the contexts in which DOM is active;

  \( (b) \) the formal means for the implementation of DOM.
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- Pattern replication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential property</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFICITY</td>
<td>SPECIFICITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

• Pattern replication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential property</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Cappadocian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFICITY</td>
<td></td>
<td>DEFINITENESS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- Pattern replication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential property</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Cappadocian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SPECIFICITY</td>
<td>DEFINITENESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal marking</td>
<td>non-specific $\Rightarrow$ NOM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specific $\Rightarrow$ ACC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- Pattern replication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential property</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Cappadocian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFICITY</td>
<td>non-specific ⇒ NOM</td>
<td>non-specific ⇒ NOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specific ⇒ ACC</td>
<td>specific ⇒ ACC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- Pattern replication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Referential property</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Cappadocian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPECIFICITY</td>
<td>non-specific ⇒ NOM -Ø</td>
<td>non-specific ⇒ NOM -s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>specific ⇒ ACC -(y)I</td>
<td>specific ⇒ ACC -Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: emergence

- (a) Turkish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal pronoun</th>
<th>proper name</th>
<th>definite NP</th>
<th>indefinite specific NP</th>
<th>indefinite non-specific NP</th>
<th>non-argumental NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-(y)I</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- (b) Cappadocian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal pronoun</th>
<th>proper name</th>
<th>definite NP</th>
<th>indefinite specific NP</th>
<th>indefinite non-specific NP</th>
<th>non-argumental NP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: decline

• Cases in which DOM does not operate as expected:

(8) a. qarfulatse to kleftfis
meet.PST.3SG ART.DEF.SG thief.SG.NOM
‘He met the thief’ (Dawkins 1916: 344)

b. na pan su milus
COMP go.PRS.3PL PREP.ART.DEF.SG mill.SG.NOM
‘that they go to the mill’ (Costakis 1959: 82)
DOM in Cappadocian: decline

- Nouns undergo shift from a wide variety of ICs to IC7 (Karatsareas 2011, under review), affecting their ability to distinguish morphologically between NOM and ACC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>GEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IC1 ‘mill’</td>
<td>mil-os</td>
<td>mil-o</td>
<td>mil-iu</td>
<td>mil-iu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PL</td>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>GEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mil-us</td>
<td>mil-us</td>
<td>mil-iu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: decline

- Nouns undergo shift from a wide variety of ICs to IC7 (Karatsareas 2011, under review), affecting their ability to distinguish morphologically between NOM and ACC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IC1 ‘mill’</th>
<th>IC7 ‘house’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SG</strong></td>
<td><em><strong>mil-os</strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong>milos</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td><em><strong>mil-o</strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong>spit</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td><em><strong>mil-o</strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong>spit</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td><em><strong>mil-iu</strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong>milos-iu</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em><strong>mil-us</strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong>milos-ia</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL NOM</td>
<td><em><strong>mil-us</strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong>spit-ia</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td><em><strong>mil-us</strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong>spit-ia</strong></em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td><em><strong>mil-iu</strong></em></td>
<td><em><strong>spit-iu</strong></em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DOM in Cappadocian: decline

(9) a. na itun yuwsmeʃ na pernisʃka
COMP COP.PST.3SG fate.SG.NOM COMP take.PST.IPV.1SG
to patisfaxo
ART.DEF.SG king.SG.ACC
‘If only I got married to the king.’ (Phosteris 1962: 162)

b. as pernisʃka c’ eyo
MOD take.PST.IPV.1SG and 1SG
to patisfaxios
ART.DEF.SG king.SG.NOM
‘If I got married to the king.’ (Phosteris 1962: 162)
DOM in Cappadocian: decline

• In the varieties in which IC shifts affected large numbers of nouns (Ulaghátsh, Ferték, Semenderé), DOM has fallen completely into disuse.

• The related dialect of Phárasa also developed DOM in a fashion similar to Cappadocian.

• Pharasiot nouns, however, did not undergo the morphological development of shifts to IC7.

• In Pharasiot Greek, DOM applies to all available nouns across the board and without exceptions.
DOM in Pharasiot

(10)  

\[ \text{iðe} \quad \text{o} \quad \text{vasilos} \]
see.PST.3SG ART.DEF.M.SG.NOM king(M).SG.NOM

\[ \text{an} \quad \text{ipnos} \quad (...) \quad \text{pitaksete} \]
INDF dream(M).SG.NOM send.IMPV.2PL

\[ \text{nomati} \quad \text{na} \quad \text{navrune} \quad \text{ton} \]
man(M).PL.ACC COMP find.PNP.3PL ART.DEF.M.SG.ACC

\[ \text{ipno}=\mu \]
dream(M).SG.ACC=1SG.GEN

‘The king had a dream (...) Send men to discover my dream.’ (Dawkins 1916: 542).
Conclusions

• DOM in Cappadocian (and Pharasiot) is determined by DEFINITENESS.
• The morphological implementation of DOM violates robust crosslinguistic generalisations regarding the matching of formal and semantic markedness.
• Cappadocian DOM developed as a result of language contact with Turkish.
Conclusions

- SPECIFICITY was matched with DEFINITENESS.

- The use of the NOM for the unmarked set of objects and the use of the ACC for the marked set of objects were adopted (non-specific :: indefinite; specific :: definite).
Conclusions

• The morphological material used for the expression of DOM was affected by morphological change.

• The NOM vs ACC distinction upon which DOM was based was lost.

• DOM was short-lived in Cappadocian but survived in Pharasiot as the latter did not undergo the morphological change that Cappadocian did.
Thank you for your attention!
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