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Main claims

- We investigate *apo-phrases* introducing nominal arguments in *Grevena Greek (GG)*

(1) Ta ruxa ap ta pedia
    the clothes apo the children
    ‘The children’s clothes’ [Thavoris 1980]

- We argue that *apo-phrases* exhibit a **morpho-syntactic strategy of introducing nominal arguments** distinct from inflected genitives in SMG, and akin to Romance *de/* *di-phrase*.

- We analyse *apo-phrases* in GG as **free genitives** in the sense of Longobardi & Silvestri (2013)
Outline
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The Dialect of Grevena (Grevena Greek)

- Usually considered as part of a bigger group comprising the Kozani/Grevena area. (Thavoris 1993, Ntinas 2012 a.o.)
  - Areas of Grevena, Kozani, Siatista, Tsotili and Velvento (Thavoris 1993)
  - And most of the villages around these areas (some of them with special characteristics, e.g. the villages of Mavranei Philipei in the Grevena preferecture (Ntinas 2012, more in a bit))

- In the literature it is found as Kozani Dialect (Condoravdi and Kiparksy 2002).

- In this paper, we mainly present data from the Grevena variety, so we refer to it as Grevena Greek.
The Dialect of Grevena (Grevena Greek)

- From a more general perspective, the dialect of Grevena is a **Northern Greek dialect** (Papadopoulos 1921, Ntinas 2012)

- Thus, it shares a number of **characteristics** with Northern Greek dialects

- In what follows, we give a **brief description** of the dialect.

- Note that this description is mostly (or wholly) relevant to the whole Kozani/Grevena dialect and not only Grevena Greek.
**Grevena Greek: Phonetics/Phonology**

- **Typical Northern Greek dialect**
  - Mid vowels /e o/ (unstressed) are raised (/i u/) and unstressed high vowels (/i u/) are deleted.
    - Deletion of /i/ in word final position leaves a trace of its co-articulation with the preceding consonant (this is not attested in Mavranei and Philipei villages of Grevena).
    - Deletion of /i/ may produce consonantal clusters that get then simplified: [vi'astike]>['vjastki]> 'vjaski'. In other cases an epenthetic consonant is added to help pronunciation: [mi'sos]>['mços]>['mpsos].
  - Palatization of /s z ts dz/ before /i/: [cera'sca]>[cira'sca]>[cira'ja].
Accusative is used for the expression of the indirect object.

(2) Mi lei xazamares
    me.cl-acc say.3sg nonsense
    ‘He speaks nonsense to me’

(3) Ipa t mana m
    said.1sg the.acc mother.acc my.gen

Weak object pronouns appear proclitic to the lexical verb rather than the auxiliary (Condoravdi and Kiparky 2002; Ntinas 2012)

(4) Ixan ts vaps
    had them painted
    ‘They had painted them’
Clitics get more quirky

- In cases of clitic clusters with auxiliaries, direct object appears proclitic to the auxiliary while the indirect proclitic to the participle.

\[(5)\] Si xa tu pi y ou d-acc ha d.1sg it d-acc sa id ‘I had told you this’ \hspace{1cm} (Christodoulou 2015)

- There are some examples, where the lexical V instead of the auxiliary is inflected for person/number.

\[(6)\] I xa tu d os umi lif ta ha d hi md-acc gi ven.1pl mo ney.acc ‘We had given him money’ \hspace{1cm} (Christodoulou 2015)
There is a tendency to replace inflected genitive phrases with apo-phrases to express possessives. (Thavoris 1980, Ntinas 2012)

(7) Tu samar' ap tu gumar'
the.nom saddle.nom apo the.acc donkey.acc
‘The donkey’s saddle’ (Thavoris 1980)

(8) Ta ruxa ap ta pedia
the.clothes apo the.children
‘The children’s clothes’ (Thavoris 1980)
Previous literature only considered possessives.

Phenomenon extends to all nominal arguments.

(9) Fotografies ap' ts pethamen' ts dimarxei
pictures apo the dead the mayors
‘pictures depicting the dead mayors’

(10) i perjrafi ap' twn dimarxu
the description apo the mayor
‘the description of the mayor’
‘the description by the mayor’
Grevena Greek: Promiscuous PPs (3)

- With one possible exception: apo-phrases are avoided in the case of proper names, for which speakers tend to use inflected genitives.

(11) ??Ta ruxa apo t Manol

the clothes apo the Manolis

‘Manolis’ clothes’
Collection of data was done using structured questionnaires. Individuals were asked to judge the grammaticality of various syntactic constructions and felicity in context. In case of gradience, the subjects were asked to rate grammaticality on a scale from 0-6 (0 a perfectly bad and 6 a perfectly good sentence respectively).

Five individuals (males and females) aged from 22-34 were interviewed (some of them with high school education but most of them with university education). All of them were born and raised in Grevena to at least one parent born and raised also in Grevena (or a village in the prefecture). These individuals are bilingual (attrited) speakers of SMG and GG. Non-attrited monolingual GG are quite rare to get. Furthermore, the questionnaire questions had cases where understanding would be quite difficult for older people. Comparison with data from other sources (e.g. texts by the Kozani dialect speakers) show a match with our findings. The next fieldwork trip is however planned to target monolingual GG speakers.
An example from the questionnaire put into context

Context: Back in 1995 when we had the big earthquake that we had these people from the prefecture that were checking the houses and classified them according to the level of damage incurred. Now, imagine that I examine all the houses of the employees myself. After the examination I say to you:

(12) Ta spitia ap ton ipalilo tadi itan intaks
    the house apo the. acc employee. acc x were ok

(13) Ta spitia ap merikus/ i ipalil’ itan intaks
    The houses apo some employees were fine

(14) Spitia ap ipalil’ vrethkan akatalila
    houses from employees were found unsuitable
No mere suppletion! (1)

- The use of PPs head by apo as *genitive substitutes* is not uncommon among *Greek dialects*.
  - **Suppletive forms** filling paradigmatic gaps, e.g. in the dialect of *Kavakli (Eastern Rumelia)*
  - *Roumloukiotika (Imathia)*: inflected (prenominal) *genitives restricted to bisyllabic nouns* in the singular, extensive use of apo-phrases or other singulars, exclusive use of *apo-prases for all plural genitives*.
  - *Italiot (Calabria) Greek* (Katsyannou 1996): *Ps* are common with nouns, esp. loanwords, not assimilated to any Greek *declensional classes* (e.g. *an du gurpi 'of-the fox' <volpe*) – but see also below
No mere suppletion! (2)

- In all these cases, use of PPs seems to be morphologically conditioned.

- On the contrary, GG features apo-phrases in all contexts in which a morphological genitive is allowed (if available at all). [With the possible exception of common names, to which we return later.]

- Moreover, we show that the semantic and syntactic properties of apo-phrases are different from inflected genitives.
Nominal arguments: preliminaries (1)

- **Meaning of possessives** involves three elements:
  - the **possessor**, an individual,
  - the **possessee**, a second individual,
  - a **Relation** between them (sometimes called ‘Possession Relation’, but not necessarily literal possession).

(15) a. the sister of John postnominal possessive
    b. John’s sister prenominal possessive

- With relational nouns the relation is supplied **lexically**

(16) a. the sister of John INHERENT
    b. John’s sister
If not, a number of regular relational information (QUALIA).

(17) John’s book
    ‘the book owned by John’                CONTROL
    ‘the book brought by John’              SOURCE
    ‘the book written by John’              AUTHOR

(18) John’s leg
    ‘the leg that is part of John’          PART-OF

The relation can be supplied pragmatically/ contextually

(19) Context: Helen and Mary are sisters. They are both sick and have visited a clinic. John is examining Helen and Bill is examining Mary.
    John’s sister is perfectly healthy.
Nominal arguments: preliminaries (3)

With *deverbal nominals* (and argument supporting nouns more generally) the relation specifies *event participants*.

(20)  
- a. the investigation of Bill  
- b. the investigation by Bill  
- c. Mary’s investigation of Bill

(21)  
- a. the picture of Bill  
- b. the picture by Bill  
- c. Mary’s picture of Bill
Morpho-syntactic variation

- **Great variation** in formal realization (Longobardi & Silvestri 2013)
  - Prepositions (e.g. English *of*, Romance *de/ di*)
  - Postpositions (e.g. Basque, Hindi)
  - **Inflectional genitives** (e.g. Standard Modern Greek)
  - Phrase-final affixes (e.g. Saxon genitive)
  - Word-final affixes (e.g. German *-s*)
  - Zero-realization (e.g. Hebrew construct states)
  - φ-feature concord with N (e.g. Romance possessive pronouns)

- We **compare** Grevena apo-phrases with
  - postnominal prepositional strategies
  - SMG inflectional genitives
Outline
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apo in GG vs apo in SMG (1)

apo-phrases in SMG seem to lexicalize the possession relation to that of SOURCE (and perhaps PART-OF).

(22) to vivlio apo ton J ani
the book apo the John

‘the book brought by John’
‘#the book owned by John’
‘#the book assigned to John’
‘#the book written by John’

(23) a. to podhi apo tin karekla
the leg apo the chair

b. to podhi apo ton J ani (unless severed)
the leg apo the John
With deverbal nominals the relation can only be that of **source/agent**.

(24) *perigrafi* apo *ton Jani* SMG

the description apo the John

‘the description by John’ **AGENT**

‘#the description of John’ **THEME**
apo in GG vs apo in SMG (3)

- **apo-phrases in GG** support the full range of relations.

(25)  
\[ \text{tu vivliu ap tun dhimarxu} \quad \text{GG} \]
the book apo the mayor

‘the book brought by the mayor’ SOURCE
‘the book owned by the mayor’ CONTROL
‘the book assigned to the mayor’ PRAGM
‘the book written by the mayor’ AUTHOR

(26)  
a. \[ \text{tu pod ap t karekla} \quad \text{PART-OF} \]
the leg apo the chair

b. \[ \text{tu pod ap tun dhimarxu} \]
the leg apo the mayor
apo in GG vs apo in SMG (4)

With deverbal nominals apo-phrases can introduce any event participant.

(27) i perigrafi ap tun dhimarxu GG
the description apo the mayor
‘the description by the mayor’ AGENT
‘the description of the mayor’ THEME

Conclusion:
The distribution of apo-phrases in GG is a superset of the distribution of apo-phrases in SMG.
apo in GG vs of in English (1)

- apo-phrases in English can only support lexical relations.
- They are mostly available with relational nouns.

(28) the sister of the mayor INHERENT
(29) the corner of the table PART-OF
(30) *the book of the mayor
apo in GG vs of in English (2)

- With deverbal nominals the relation can only be that of THEME/PATIENT.

(31) the description of John English

  ‘the description by John’ #AGENT
  ‘the description of John’ THEME

- As we saw, apo-phrases in GG show no such restrictions.

- Conclusion:

  The distribution of apo-phrases in GG is a superset of the distribution of of-phrases in English.
apo in GG vs de/ di in Romance (1)

- de/ di-phrases support the full range of relations.

(32) il libro di Gianni
     the book di John
     ‘the book owned by John’
     CONTROL
     ‘the book brought by John’
     SOURCE
     ‘the book assigned to John’
     PRAGM
     ‘the book written by John’
     AUTHOR

(33) a. la gamba del tavolo
     the leg di-the table
     PART-OF
b. la gamba di Gianni
     the leg of John
apo in GG vs de/ di in Romance (2)

- With deverbal nominals de/ di-phrases can introduce any event participant.

(34) la descrizione di Gianni Italian
    the description di John
    ‘the description by John’ AGENT
    ‘the description of John’ THEME

- Conclusion:
  The distribution of apo-phrases in GG is identical to the distribution of de/ di-phrases in Romance.
apo in GG vs inflected genitives (1)

- **Inflected genitives** support the full range of relations.

(35) to **vivlio tu** Jani SMG
the book the.G John.G
‘the book owned by John’ CONTROL
‘the book brought by John’ SOURCE
‘the book assigned to John’ PRAGM
‘the book written by John’ AUTHOR

(36) a. to **podhi tis** kareklas PART-OF
the leg the.G chair.G
b. to **podhi tu** Jani
the leg the.G John.G
With deverbal nominals inflected genitives can introduce any event participant.

(37) i perigrafi tu Jani SMG
the description the.G John.G
‘the description by John’ AGENT
‘the description of John’ THEME

Importantly, our speakers of GG do accept inflected genitives and they exhibit identical distribution as in SMG.

More on this in a bit...
apo_{GG} / de/ di vs. inflected genitives

- A **syntactic** difference: inflected genitives are **not iterable**, at least in process nominals.

  (38) *i polimini dierevrisi tu atiximatos tu Jani
  the lengthy investigation the.G accident.G the.G John.G
  ‘John’s lengthy investigation of the accident’

- apo_{GG}/ de/ di-phrases are **iterable and ambiguous**.

  (39) i perjrafi ap tun dhimarxu ap ta pidja GG
  the description apo the mayor apo the children

  (40) la descrizione del sindaco dei ragazzi Italian
  ‘the mayor’s description of the children’
  ‘(?)the children’s description of the mayor’
Two systems in GG (1)

- As before, our GG informants treat inflected genitives as in SMG, i.e. they are not iterable.

(41) *i polimini dierevrisi tu atiximatos tu Jani GG

"the lengthy investigation the.G accident.G the.G John.G

‘John’s lengthy investigation of the accident’"

- Further evidence, that
  - apo\(^{GG}\)-phrases are not just a different morphological realization of the genitive, but a different construction with independent syntax.
  - Inflected genitives in GG are an independent device to introduce nominal arguments available in the grammar of our speakers.
GG apo-phrases have all the defining properties of free genitives in Longobardi & Silvestri (2013).

- **adpositional**, with a unique adposition (‘uniqueness’)
- freely **iterable**
- **no ordering effects** between two (or more) PPs, though subject to strict thematic **hierarchical effects** with respect to higher genitive/possessive expressions (e.g. possessive pronouns)
Analysis (2)

- **Three distinct syntactic positions** hosting nominal arguments.
  (Longobardi & Silvestri 2013)

  (42) \[ D \ldots \text{[GenS [ (A*) [ N GenO ]_NP t_N \ldots (free-GEN) \]} \]

- **GenS** is a unique prenominal and pre-adjectival functional projection, instantiated by, e.g., the Saxon genitive or, in Greek, the possessive pronoun/ditic attaching to the pseudo-adjective dikos (or other, possibly emphatically raised, As)

  (43) i diki mu tholi fotografia tu topiu
       the own my blurry picture the.G landscape.G
     ‘my own blurry picture of the landscape’

- **GenO** is unique, non-iterable, functional position lower than all adjectival projections. N moves over GenO. Instantiated in Greek by SMG (and GG) inflected genitives.
Free-Genitives instantiate the thematic positions of the noun.

- i.e. there can be as many free-Genitives as there are roles.

- All three GENs can introduce all types of relations.*

- Different GENs, if available, can co-occur.

*(44) i diki μ_{GenS} fotografia tu dhimarxu_{GenO} SMG the own my picture the.G mayor.G

*The odd one out are of-phrases in English, which are subject to further restrictions.
When more than one GEN are present, interpretation is restricted by the following strict hierarchy:

\[ P > S > O \]

- **O**: object theta-roles in event nominals (themes/patients) and picture-nominals
- **S**: agent arguments in event nominals and AUTHORS
- **P**: possessors and all other possible relations (including pragmatic ones)
Analysis (4)

- Hierarchy predicts **range of possible interpretations**.

(45)  
idiki μuGenS fotografia tu dhimarxuGenO
the own my picture the.G mayor.G

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSS</th>
<th>AUTHOR/ THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUTHOR</td>
<td>THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*THEME</td>
<td>POSS/ AUTHOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*AUTHOR</td>
<td>POSS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Grevena **Greek** also respects the hierarchy.

(46)  
idiki mGenS fotografia apo tun dhimarxuFreeGen
the own my picture apo the mayor
Examples with SMG apo confirm that those are not free-Genitives.

If we were dealing with a co-occurrence of GenO and free-Gen, hierarchy predicts the unavailable interpretation in which apo introduces a THEME.

Instead, it obligatorily introduces SOURCE/ AUTHOR.

(47) SMG

i perigrafi tu dhimarxu apo ta pedja

the description the.G mayor.G apo the children

‘the children’s description of the mayor’

‘*the mayor’s description of the children’
Crucially, the judgment extends to Grevena Greek.

Even though we know that apo-phrases in GG can be free-Genitives, the hierarchy appears to be violated.

i.e., although our speakers employ a system in which inflected genitives can introduce an AGENT, and one in which apo_{GG}-phrases can introduce a THEME, and the result would respect the hierarchy, when both are used the result is unambiguous (in any order of arguments); apo is used to introduce SOURCE as in SMG.

(48) GG
   i perigrafi tu dhimarxu apo ta pidja
   the description the.G mayor.G apo the children
   ‘the children’s description of the mayor’
   ‘*the mayor’s description of the children’
The two systems are truly independent.

The moment an inflected genitive is present speakers employ an SMG system.

Speakers either employ a SMG system, where GenS and GenO are available, or a GG system, where GenS and free-Gen are available.
Diachronic trends (1)

- In written data documenting the **variety of Kozani**, proper names are the only category of referential expressions that seems to resist apo-phrases (data from Christodoulou 2015).

  (49) ki sta kiramidia ap tu bakalku t Manol and on the tiles apo the grocery-shop the.G Manolis.G ‘and on the tiles of the grocery-shop of Manolis’

- Evidence from the hierarchy shows that inflected genitives of proper names are **treated as GenO**.
Diachronic trends (2)

- It is likely that the dynamics of the system might have been such that, unaffected by SMG, apo-phrases would be the prevalent exponent of all genitive arguments, while GenO would be on its way out and restricted to one class of nouns, i.e. proper names.

- This pattern exactly (prepositional genitives coupled with a residual GenO for a limited number of noun classes) is found in the Romance variety of Verbicaro (S. Italy, see Silvestri 2013). So, the whole trend in GG might parallel the history (and the loss) of the genitive case in e.g. Italian.

- Possibly also similar to Calabria Greek (Katsoyannou 1996), although the pattern is not clear to us.
Grevena Greek employs two strategies to introduce nominal arguments.

The two strategies correspond to two different structures, as argued for on the basis of both semantic and syntactic evidence.

apo-phrases in Grevena Greek manifest free genitives in the sense of Longobardi & Silvestri (2013).

The pattern in GG is reminiscent of the development of diachronic trends in Romance languages.

This process seems to be hindered in GG by the influence of SMG.
Thank you!
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