1 Introduction

• This talk investigates polydefinites (or determiner spreading, DS) in two varieties of Modern Greek: Standard Modern Greek (SMG) and Cappadocian Greek (CG).
• DS / polydefiniteness: double or multiple occurrence of the definite article in a construction that is semantically monodefinite (terms due to Kolliakou 2004).
• In both CG and SMG, DS occurs in contexts of attributive adjectival modification:

(1) a. to omorfo to koritsi (SMG)
   the pretty the girl

b. du omurfu du kurif (CG)
   the pretty the girl
   ‘the pretty girl’

• Despite surface similarities, a number of differences exist between DS in SMG and in CG, which suggest a different analysis for each variety.
  o In SMG DS is an instance of close apposition (as in Lekakou & Szendrői 2007, 2009, 2012, 2014);
  o In CG adjectival determiners are agreement markers (cf. Karatsareas & Lekakou 2014).

• Despite the different structure underlying DS in CG and SMG, definiteness is encoded in the same way in both varieties: the locus of semantic definiteness is a head distinct from D, dubbed Def.

• Open questions are raised, including the role of contact with Turkish (for CG).
2    The data: polydefinites in SMG and CG

2.1    SMG


- Word order freedom only available to the polydefinite:

(2)  

  a. to omorfo to koritsi  
      the pretty the girl
  b. to koritsi to omorfo  
      the girl the pretty
      ‘the pretty girl’

(3)  

  a. i asimenia pena  
      the silver pen
      ‘the silver pen’
  b. *i pena asimenia  
      the pen silver

If a further adjective is present in polydefinites, it will feature its own determiner, and all possible word orders are acceptable (cf. Alexiadou & Wilder 1998; Lekakou & Szendrői 2007, 2012; Panagiotidis & Marinis 2011; contra Campos & Stavrou 2004):

(4)  

  a. to megalo to petrino to spiti  
      the big the stone the house
  b. to petrino to megalo to spiti
  c. to megalo to spiti to petrino
  d. to petrino to spiti to megalo
  e. to spiti to megalo to petrino
  f. to spiti to petrino to megalo
      ‘the big stone house’

- Restrictions on adjectives and adjective interpretations: only those that can be interpreted restrictively and intersectively:

(5)   Idame tis dilitiriodis (#tis) kobres.  
      saw.1pl. the poisonous the cobras
      ‘We saw the poisonous cobras.’  
      (Kolliakou 2004:216-217)

(6)   o proin (*o) prothipurgos  
      the former the prime minister
      ‘the former prime minister’
• No poly-in-definites:

(7) a. *mia pena mia asimenia  
    a pen a silver  
    b. *mia asimenia mia pena  
    a silver a pen

2.2 Polydefinites in CG

○ CG: cluster of ModGr varieties spoken, until early 20th century, by the Greek Orthodox communities of Cappadocia, in south-eastern Asia Minor (see map 1).

Map 1: Greek-speaking communities in Asia Minor, early 20th century (Karatsareas 2013)

○ After the exchange of populations in 1923 (Treaty of Lausanne), Greek-speaking communities have been displaced, mainly to rural Northern Greece. Remaining speakers of Cappadocian in Greece mainly represent the dialect of Mistí.

○ Data used in this paper: from primary data collection (summer 2014; first reported in Karatsareas & Lekakou 2014).  

1 CG distinguishes between two numbers and has essentially lost gender distinctions. Case distinctions survive to a very limited extent in comparison to SMG, and interact with factors such as Differential Object Marking. Nominative and accusative are distinct only on historically masculine nouns, genitive singular and plural have syncretized, and, in most varieties, there is no form of the genitive for the definite article. See Karatsareas (2011) for extensive discussion.
• DS is obligatory; there are no monadic definites in CG:

(8) a. du omurfu du kuritʃ
the pretty the girl
‘the pretty girl’
b. *du omurfu kuritʃ
the beautiful girl
c. *omurfu du kuritʃ
beautiful the girl

Cases of apparent non-doubling involve a null definite determiner, which Karatsareas (2013) argues surfaces in specific morphological contexts, namely in the nominative of historically masculine and feminine nouns:

(9) a. Ando irten aðelfos tun.
when came.3sg brother.NOM their
‘When their brother came’ (Karatsareas 2011: 322)
b. To meɣa aðelfos ipen.
the big brother.NOM said.3sg
‘The older brother said’ (Karatsareas 2011: 410)

• No word order freedom:

(10) a. du omurfu du koritʃ
the pretty the girl
‘the pretty girl’
b. *du koritʃ du omurfu
the girl the pretty

If a further adjective is present, it features its own determiner; both adjectives only appear prenominally, and may only re-order with respect to each other:

(11) a. du tʃenurju du prasinu du xuti
the new the green the box
b. du prasinu du tʃenurju du xuti

c. *du tʃenurju du xuti du prasinu
d. *du prasinu du xuti du tʃenurju
e. *du xuti du tʃenurju du prasinu
f. *du xuti du prasinu du tʃenurju

• No obligatorily restrictive interpretation of adjective:

(12) Ula spitçu da domata scepasin da d’ aspru du çon.
all houses.Gen the.pl roofs covered.3sg them the white the snow
‘The white snow covered all the roofs of the houses.’
3 Analysis

3.1 SMG


(14) a. o aetos to puli
    the-MASC eagle the-NEUT bird

b. to puli o aetos
    the-NEUT bird the-MASC eagle
    ‘the eagle that is a bird’

- Shared properties: word order freedom, see (14), restrictive interpretation, see (15), lack of poly indefinites, see (16).

(15) Sinandisa ton Antoniou to filologo, oxi ton Antoniou to mathimatiko.
    met-1SG the Antoniou the philologist not the Antoniou the mathematician
    ‘I met Antoniou the philologist, not Antoniou the mathematician.’

(16) a. *enas aetos ena puli
    an eagle a bird

b. *ena puli enas aetos
    a bird an eagle

L & S (2007, 2009, 2012): nominal close appositives and polydefinites are both instances of close apposition. Their only difference resides in the fact that DS in addition involves nominal ellipsis.

3.1.1 DS as close apposition with noun ellipsis

- Close apposition (CA): identification of two distinct R(eferential)-roles.
  The R-role is what enables a nominal element to act as a referential argument (Williams 1981, 1989; Higginbotham 1985; Zwarts 1993; Baker 2003 among others).
  - Only nominal phrases can partake in CA (in contrast to loose apposition (which arguably belongs to the family of parentheticals; see L & S 2007 for the distinction between close and loose apposition).

- R-role identification takes place among DP sisters (in SMG), thus creating a multi-headed syntactic structure; cf. Baker & Stewart (1998) for justification of this option on theoretical grounds.

- Identification of R-roles is semantically tantamount to set intersection (cf. Higginbotham 1985; Heim & Kratzer’s 1998 predicate modification).
• In DS, the adjectival DP contains an elided noun (construed as a phonologically null element).

(19) a. O aetos to puli ine megaloprepos/megaloprepo.
    the.MASC eagle the.NEUTER bird is majestic.MASC /majestic.NEUT

b. To puli o aetos ine megaloprepos/megaloprepo.
    the.NEUTER bird the.MASC eagle is majestic.MASC /majestic.NEUT

c. Emis i glosoloji piname/ *pinane.
    we.NOM the.NOM linguists are-hungry.1PL/are-hungry.3PL
    ‘We linguists are hungry.’

3.1.2 Deriving the properties
• Word order freedom: base-generated. Since neither subpart of CA is the head of the construction, no intrinsic ordering exists between the subparts.
When more than one adjective is present, R-role identification is iterated.

• Restrictive interpretation: R-role identification is subject to the restriction in (20).

(20) *Ban on Vacuous Application
R-role identification is banned if it yields an output identical to (part of) its input.

✓ Nominals whose R-roles are independently identical cannot form parts of CA, cf. (21) from Stavrou (1995: 225):

(21) *i sikaminja i murja
  the blueberry-tree_{dialectal} the bluberry-tree_{standard}

✓ Restrictive interpretation of one DP on the other in polydefinites:

(22) Idame tis dilitiriiodis (#tis) kobres.
  saw.1PL the-PL.ACC poisonous-PL.ACC the-PL.ACC cobras-PL.ACC
  ‘We saw the poisonous cobras.’

• Lack of polyindefinites: the Greek indefinite enas, mia, ena is not of the right semantic type to partake in R-role identification. It is not an indefinite determiner, but rather a numeral/quantifier, and does not occupy D (Giusti 1999, Stavrou 2009) – it can thus co-occur with the definite determiner:

(23) O enas drastis sinelifthi.
  the one perpetrator arrested.3SG.NONACT
  ‘One of the perpetrators was arrested.’

(24) To olo thema mu prokali aidia.
  the all topic me.GEN causes disgust
  ‘The whole thing disgusts me.’

The effects of nominal ellipsis

• Prediction about distribution of adjectives in DS: all and only adjectives that are licit in ellipsis contexts; this fares better than the prediction of predicative analyses (Alexiadou & Wilder 1998, Campos & Stavrou 2004, etc).

(25) a. O PROIGUMENOS o prothipurgos pethane!
  the previous the prime minister died
  ‘It is the previous prime minister that died.’

 b. O PROIGUMENOS pethane!
  the previous died
  ‘It is the previous one that died.’

 c. *O prothipurgos (pu pethane) itan proigumenos.’
  the prime minister that died was previous

See Lekakou & Szendrői (2012) for extensive discussion.
• The effects of ellipsis have been mis-analyzed as focus effects.
  • Theoretical qualms against a DP-internal Focus Phrase: Szendrői (2010).
    o The adjective is disanaphoric, in virtue of ellipsis (Williams 1997); see also Giannakidou & Stavrou (1999) for Greek.
    o Focus and disanaphora/non-givenness are not two sides of the same coin (Reinhart 2006, Krifka 2006, and also Neeleman & Szendrői 2004, Féry & Samek-Lodovici 2006; contra Schwarzchild 1999 and subsequent work).
  • Empirical qualms:
    o As noted by Kolliakou (2004: 276), the whole polydefinite itself can have discourse functions other than focus (e.g. contrastive topic).
    o Polydefinites do not display hallmark properties of focus, such as exhaustivity (Lekakou & Szendrői 2007, 2012):

      (26) a. O Yannis taise ta zoa. I mikres i gates itan pinasmenes, theYannis fed the animals the young the cats were hungry, opos episis ke i megales (igates).
          as also and the big the cats
          ‘Yannis fed the animals. The young cats were hungry, and so were the old ones.’

      b. O Yannis taise ta zoa. I MIKRES i gates itan pinasmenes, theYannis fed the animals the young the cats were hungry, #opos episis ke i megales (i gates).
          as also and the big the cats
          ‘Yannis fed the animals. #The YOUNG cats were hungry, and so were the old ones.’

      It is prosodic prominence, not polydefinite syntax, which induces the exhaustivity/contrastivity effects associated with focus.

3.2 CG
• The close appositive analysis does not apply. Close appositives in CG allow word order freedom unattested in DS (Karatsareas & Lekakou 2014):

      (27) a. du omurfu du kurif
          the pretty the girl
          ‘the pretty girl’

      b. *du kurif du omurfu
          the girl the pretty

      (28) a. Ato ailfi m Maria ni (iʒa m Maria de ni).
          this sister my Maria is aunt my Maria NEG is

      b. Ato Maria ailfi m ni (iʒa m Maria de ni).
          this Maria sister-my is aunt-my Maria NEG is
          ‘This is Maria my sister, not Maria my aunt.’
In virtue of being obligatory, DS is an instance of agreement (cf. Revithiadou & Spyropoulos 2012, Spyropoulos 2013 for DS in Pontic Greek).

### 3.2.1 DS as agreement in terms of definiteness

DS in Semitic languages is also taken to involve concord/agreement:

(29) a. **ha-Volvo ha-xadas** (Hebrew)

```
DEF Volvo DEF new
```

‘the new Volvo’  (Shlonsky 2004)

b. **det nya hus-et** (Swedish)

```
DEF new house-DEF
```

‘the new house’  (Delsing 1993)

Recall that multiple adjectives trigger multiple determiners in CG:

(30) du tʃenurju du prasinu du xuti

the new the green the box

‘the new green box’


(31) **ha-šulxan ha-šaxor ha-arox ha-hu** (Hebrew)

```
DEF-table DEF-black DEF-long DEF-that
```

‘that long black table’

(32) ***den gamle den snälle man(nen)** (Swedish)

```
DEF old DEF kind man.DEF
```

- On Sichel’s analysis, **ha** has a dual status:
  - It is either directly merged under N, and then it is the formal locus of definiteness (Borer 1988, 1999).
  - Or it is merged under (a possibly iterating) D, which selects for AP; it is semantically inert.
  - Cf. similarities with Androutsopoulou (1994) (see section 4).
- On the basis of Hebrew (see also Julien 2002, 2005 for Scandinavian), a low position for the definite determiner is postulated.
In the spirit of Alexiadou (2014) (see also Shlonsky 2004), the adjectival determiner is an exponent of agreement (concord) in terms of nominal features.

Definiteness agreement occurs post-syntactically: for Alexiadou (2014), it amounts to copying of features at PF.

Similarity with SMG, CG displays a Def-D split (see section 4).

### 3.2.2 Deriving the properties

- **Obligatoriness**: built into the agreement hypothesis.
- **Lack of semantic effects**: agreement relations do not yield interpretational effects.
- **Word order restrictions**: not unexpected.

Word order inside DPs in CG is regulated by the ‘head-parameter’ setting of this language: adnominal genitives and relative clauses are strictly prenominal in CG (Janse 2009 i.a.) – presumably due to contact with Turkish:

(34)a. Klatʃu du ʃalvar paɿo=ni.
   child-GEN the shalwar old=is
   ‘The child’s shalwar is old.’

b. *Du ʃalvar klatʃu paɿo=ni.
   the shalwar child-GEN old=is
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(35) a. Du irti du klatʃ ivri=mi ’na xuti lokumña.
   the child brought.3SG a box Turkish_delight
   ‘The child that came brought me a box of Turkish delight.’

   b. *Du klatʃ du irti ivri=mi ’na xuti lokumña.
      the child REL came-3SG brought-3SG=a box Turkish_delight

These modifiers all target SpecDP (which is thus not an A’-position – cf. Horrocks & Stavrou 1987 on SMG) – regardless of the presence/absence of an adjective:

(36) Spitçu=mas du pselon du tʃalui tʃuvurkoi.
    House-GEN=our the tall the tree withered.3SG
    ‘The tall tree of our house withered.’

• No poly-in-definiteness: the indefinite article is not under D (rather, external to DefP/DP); edge of DP is consistently marked by adnominal genitive:

(37) Extes su xoraf ivra ’na vaʃu tseradu.
    Yesterday at.the field found-1sg a buffalo-GEN horn
    ‘Yesterday, at the field, I found a buffalo’s horn.’

4 Definiteness in CG and SMG in view of DS

• A key question: how is definiteness encoded in DS?
  o A definite determiner normally conveys existence (by assertion or presupposition) and uniqueness.
  o This can’t be going on (uniformly) with the definite determiners in DS.
  o The context for (38d) from SMG may involve more than a single pen, and more than a single golden object (Kolliakou 2004):

(38) a. S1: Ti pires tu Janni ja ta christujena?
      what took.2SG the.GEN John for the christmas
      ‘What did you get John for Christmas?’

 b. S2: (Tu pira) tin asimenia pena.
      him.GEN took.1SG the silver pen
      ‘(I got him) the silver pen.’

 c. S1: Ti pires tis Marias?
      what took.2SG the.GEN Maria
      ‘What did you get for Maria?’

 d. S2: (Tis pira) tin pena ti chrisi.
      her.GEN took.1SG the pen the golden
      ‘(I got her) the golden pen.’ (Kolliakou 2004)

➢ Either one of the multiple articles is semantically inert, or all of them are.
(39) Alexiadou & Wilder (1998):
   a. \[ [\text{DP} \text{ the D} [\text{CP} [\text{IP} [\text{DP} \text{ the book}] [\text{AP} \text{ red}]]]] \]
   b. \[ [\text{DP} \text{ the D} [\text{CP} [\text{AP} \text{ red}] [\text{IP} [\text{DP} \text{ the book}] \text{tAP}]]] \]
      ‘predicate raising’
   c. \[ [\text{DP} \text{ the book} \text{ the D} [\text{CP} [\text{AP} \text{ red}] [\text{IP} \text{tDP} \text{ tAP}]]] \]
      DP-raising to SpecDP

(40) Androutsopoulou (1994):

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{D to} \\
\text{A megalo DefP} \\
\text{Def to} \\
\text{A kokino DefP} \\
\text{Def to} \\
\text{NP podilato} \\
\end{array} \]

(41) Campos & Stavrou 2004:

\[ [\text{DP} \text{ the penD} [\text{FP} [\text{PredP pro thePred} \text{AP silver}]]]] \]

(42) Ioannidou & den Dikken 2009:

\[ [\text{DP} \text{ D} [\text{FocP Foc} [\text{DxP} \text{ DxPERSON} [... \text{N...}]]]] \]

Shortcomings:
   o Massive lexical ambiguity, not independently motivated;
   o Which article is expletive and which is not?
     ▪ The definite operator (i.e. the semantically ‘real’ article) needs to scope over the intersection of NP and AP.
     ▪ Recall the word order freedom.
   o How do children acquire the two sets of articles?

Following (Lekakou & Szendrői 2009, 2012, 2014), we take the definite article to always realize D, and to be uniformly expletive.

This holds for both SMG and CG.

Independent evidence: obligatory definite article on proper names (see 43). Following Kripke (1980) and others, proper names are rigid designators, inherently definite – contra most recently Elbourne (2005) and Matushansky (2009) (see L & S 2014 in particular). Prepropriatal articles are expletive.
    met-1sg the-ACC Petro
    ‘I met Petros.’

    b. Du ήγονι=s du Proimu rantsa s strada. (CG)
    the grandchild=your the Prodromos saw.1sg at street
    ‘I saw your grandchild Prodromos in the street.’


**Unifying monadic definites and polydefinites in SMG (L & S 2012, 2014):**

(44)
```
  DefP  
  / \   
 Def  DP  
 /   \  
 Op   
 / \  
 D   NP  
  \   
 to  the N  
   \  
   puli
```

(45)
```
  DefP  
  / \   
 Def  DP  
 /   \  
 Op   
 / \  
 DP   DP  
 / \  / \  
 D   NP  D   NP  
  \  \  \  \  
 to  the  to  the  
   \  \  \  \  
   spiti  the  AP  N  
  \  \  \  \  
   Ø
```

"petrino" stone
(Poly)definiteness in CG:

\[(46)\]

\[
\text{DefP} \\
\text{Def'} \\
\text{Def} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{Op} \\
\text{D'} \\
\text{D} \quad \text{aP} \\
\text{AP} \\
\text{du omurfu} \\
\text{nP} \\
\text{n'} \\
\text{n} \quad \text{du} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{kuritʃ}
\]

Implementation in terms of features: \([u\text{Def}]\) on overt articles in SMG and on \textit{du} under \textit{n} in CG, \([i\text{Def}]\) on the phonologically null operator in Def; see L & S (2014) for such a proposal for SMG.

5 Concluding remarks

- Given the observed differences between DS in SMG and DS in CG, it is not likely that a common structure underlies both phenomena.
  - In SMG, DS patterns with close appositives.
  - In CG, DS is an instance of agreement in terms of definiteness.
- Lack of uniformity in determiner doubling constructions seems to be unavoidable (Alexiadou 2014, Lekakou 2014).
- However, there is a similarity between CG and SMG: in both languages D does not encode semantic definiteness.
- In both varieties, semantic definiteness is located in Def, which selects DP (Lekakou & Szendröi 2012, 2014).
- Word order in modified nominals in CG in general suggests that contact with Turkish has played an important role.
- To understand this better, it is important to investigate DS in Late Medieval Greek, i.e. the diachronic stage at which CG (Asia Minor Greek more generally) started to diverge from the rest of the Greek-speaking world.
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