

# DEMONSTRATIVE PRONOUNS SYNCHRONIC VARIATION AND DIACHRONIC EVOLUTION\*

TINA LENDARI  
IO MANOLESSOU

*University of Athens, Academy of Athens and University of Cambridge*

The present paper attempts a classification of Modern Greek dialectal demonstrative systems on the basis of their structure (tripartite vs. bipartite), function (proximal vs. distal, deictic vs. anaphoric) and diachronic evolution (retention, loss or merger of pronouns). It also examines the consecutive stages of evolution leading to the creation of ‘extended’ and reinforced demonstrative variant forms. The discussion draws on a broad range of modern dialectal as well as Medieval and Early Modern textual data.

## 1 Introduction

The present paper expands and elaborates on earlier research in the domain of demonstrative pronouns and in the development of Medieval Greek (Holton et al. forthcoming; Manolessou 2001) in order to provide an overview of the demonstrative systems of Modern Greek and its dialects, and of their evolution. Two sets of data are explored to this end: a) diachronic data collected for the project Grammar of Medieval Greek (University of Cambridge) and from the relevant secondary literature, b) dialectal data from the archive of the Research Centre for Modern Greek dialects (Academy of Athens) and the relevant secondary literature.

The treatment of this topic involves a number of *caveats*:

a) The availability of diachronic textual data is unevenly distributed, depending on period and geographical area. For example, textual sources are quite scarce in areas under Ottoman occupation, whereas areas under Venetian control provide abundant archival and literary

---

· Part of this research was conducted within the framework of the Grammar of Medieval Greek Project of the University of Cambridge ([www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek](http://www.mml.cam.ac.uk/greek/grammarofmedievalgreek)); the Medieval and Early Modern Greek data were drawn from the Project’s electronic corpus and database, which are the result of collective effort. We would like to thank our colleagues for their contribution.

Corresponding Author: [tlendari@phil.uoa.gr](mailto:tlendari@phil.uoa.gr) (Tina Lendari), [manolessou@academyofathens.gr](mailto:manolessou@academyofathens.gr) (Io Manolessou)

material.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, the availability of synchronic (post-1800) dialectal data is also unevenly distributed, as some areas are insufficiently researched; especially the older literature does not always offer comprehensive treatment of pronouns. Additionally, many dialectal varieties are in a process of obsolescence, which impedes the collection of new data.

b) In contrast to most grammatical constituents, the analysis of demonstrative pronouns requires additional evidence from the domains of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. The treatment requires information on the wider linguistic and extralinguistic context and details on discourse factors such as deixis and anaphora, speaker and hearer, topic and focus etc., which involve consideration of extensive textual and discourse extracts. The collection of such information would have been extremely time-consuming for the purposes of this paper, and in several cases well-nigh impossible (for example extralinguistic information or intonational focusing in historical texts, wider context in dialectal grammatical descriptions and examples) – therefore it has not been attempted. Also, many descriptions of textual sources and of dialects are written in a pre-theoretical framework which does not use the linguistic tools or types of data that a modern approach would require.

c) The influence of the learned language (for earlier periods) and of Standard Modern Greek (for modern dialects) is a factor that should always be taken into consideration.

d) Although Greek demonstratives present an enormous variety of forms and functions across dialects thus constituting, at least in our view, an excellent field for diachronic investigation in both morphology and syntax, the relevant literature is limited. Discounting a number of descriptions of individual texts or varieties which may offer a passing mention or a short section to demonstratives, there are no general overviews of Greek demonstrative systems. The two important exceptions are the descriptions of the dialects of Lesbos (Kretschmer 1905) and Chios (Pernot 1946) which offer ample comparative material on demonstratives from wide range of dialects, and make serious attempts at an etymology and dating of forms. However, both works are now more than a century old (Pernot's study was written in 1907 but was only published at his death); besides, the main etymological proposals still accepted today were formulated by Meyer (1889), Jannaris (1897) and Chatzidakis (1907). A re-evaluation of the topic was therefore felt to be a significant research desideratum.

## 2 The Modern Greek demonstrative system: typology and synchrony

### 2.1. Typological considerations

From a typological point of view,<sup>2</sup> Greek in all its varieties displays a two-person pronominal system: there are specific forms for personal pronouns for the 1st and 2nd person, but no special 3rd person personal pronouns. The function of the 3rd person personal pronoun is covered by the demonstrative pronouns (full forms) or by personal pronoun forms deriving from demonstrative (more specifically anaphoric) pronouns (the weak, clitic forms). See Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warbuton (1997: 95-97).

<sup>1</sup> For the nature, availability and distribution of the textual material see Holton et al. (forthcoming), Introduction.

<sup>2</sup> Adopting the recent framework of Bhat (2004).

The demonstrative system of Standard Modern Greek can be considered bipartite (αυτός-εκείνος), deriving from an earlier tripartite system (αυτός-τούτος-εκείνος), which in turn stems from an Ancient Greek tripartite system (ὅδε-οὗτος-ἐκεῖνος). The third demonstrative pronoun of Modern Greek, τούτος, is only marginally used, especially in a pejorative way.<sup>3</sup> In brief, the pathway of evolution can be interpreted in the following way: the strongly deictic ancient demonstrative ὅδε became obsolete, being replaced by οὗτος > τούτος. The latter assumed the mainly deictic function, changing its original function in Ancient Greek, which was mainly anaphoric. A new demonstrative, αυτός, originating from the ancient intensive pronoun (ὁ) αὐτὸς ('the same', 'himself') took over the uses of οὗτος/τούτος, originally only in anaphoric functions and later in all functions.<sup>4</sup> (Table 1)

|                | Proximal |           | Distal  |
|----------------|----------|-----------|---------|
|                | Deictic  | Anaphoric |         |
| Ancient Greek  | ὅδε      | οὗτος     | ἐκεῖνος |
| Medieval Greek | τούτος   | αὐτός     | ἐκεῖνος |
| Modern Greek   | αυτός    | αυτός     | ἐκεῖνος |

Table 1. Evolution of the Greek demonstrative system

Demonstrative systems can be distinguished in two main types: a) distance-oriented, i.e. proximal vs. distal and b) person-oriented, i.e. close to the speaker/1st person – close to the addressee /2nd person – far from the two interlocutors/3rd person).<sup>5</sup> In this respect, Modern Greek can be classified as a distance-oriented system, with *αυτός* 'this' as proximal and *εκείνος* 'that' as distal, a distinction that does not leave much room for *τούτος* 'this here' (very proximal?) and which perhaps partly explains its marginal status and gradual disappearance. Certainly it cannot be claimed that the Modern Greek demonstrative system is person-oriented, with *τούτος* as 1st person, *αυτός* as 2nd person and *εκείνος* as 3rd person, although for Ancient Greek, traditional grammars often do make a person distinction (ὅδε 1st, οὗτος 2nd, ἐκεῖνος 3rd).<sup>6</sup> *Τούτος* and *αυτός* are both proximal demonstratives, and the difference between them is rather one between clearly deictic and exophoric meaning for *τούτος* vs. both endophoric (anaphoric) and exophoric meaning for *αυτός*. However, the written nature of the sources and the practical difficulties of the research as described above, do not always allow a straightforward distinction. Furthermore, the system outlined here represents the final phase of a development of which Medieval Greek and most Modern Greek dialects constitute earlier phases.

<sup>3</sup> See the description in Mackridge (1985: 226), Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton (1997: 317), Clairis and Babinotis (2005: 299).

<sup>4</sup> For a detailed presentation of this evolution, see Manolessou (2001). The proposed analysis of the Ancient Greek demonstrative system is adopted in several recent linguistic and classics papers, e.g. Roberts (2007: 309), Stavinschi (2012: 77), Langslow (2009: 530), Jacobson (2011), De Jong (2012).

<sup>5</sup> Adopting the typological framework of Diessel (1997) and Lyons (1999).

<sup>6</sup> The traditional person-oriented analysis for Ancient Greek, involving the so called Ich-Deixis, Du-Deixis and Jener-Deixis going back to Brugmann, can be found in works such as Wackernagel (1924: 102-110; see now transl. and update in Langslow 2009: 528-537), Smyth (1956: 307-309), Schwyzer and Debrunner (1966: 207-210). A similar analysis is standardly adopted for the Latin tripartite system *hic-iste-ille*, although distance oriented analyses seem to be gaining favour recently; see Lyons (1999: 109, 111), Stavinschi (2012).

Again, from a typological point of view, tripartite person-oriented demonstrative systems usually correlate with tripartite personal pronoun systems; therefore, the reduction from a tripartite to a bipartite system in Greek, which, as set out above, exhibits a 2-person system of personal pronouns, is to a certain extent the “expected” path of evolution. In general, Indo-European languages show the same diachronic trend for reduction of the demonstrative system (Lyons, 1999: 110-111; Bhat, 2004: 181; Stavinschi, 2012); for example, the English system was reduced from three members to two (losing the pronoun, *yon*, *yonder*), and similar evolutions can be observed in French, Catalan and German.

## 2.2. Dialectal distribution

All dialectal demonstrative systems can be explained as deriving from the tripartite Medieval Greek system *αὐτός-τούτος-ἐκεῖνος*, with the possible exception of Tsakonian.<sup>7</sup> For the other MG dialects, the following developments may be distinguished:

a) **Retention of the tripartite system.** This evolution is attested in the majority of dialects. The first variety deserving comment in this respect is Pontic. Interestingly, the grammatical descriptions of Pontic do not agree with one another when it comes to the demonstrative system. According to Oikonomidis (1958: 239-243) there are only two demonstratives, proximal *αβούτος / αγούτος / αούτος / αούτος* (deriving from *οὔτος*) vs. distal *εκείνος/ ακείνος*. According to Papadopoulos (1958: 61-64), there are four demonstratives, *αβούτος / αγούτος / αούτος / αούτος* indicating first-person proximity, *ατός* indicating 2nd person proximity and *εκείνος* indicating 3rd person-distance, with a subcategory *ακείνος* which is more strongly deictic. According to Drettas (1997), the system is tripartite, with proximal *αβούτος / αούτος* and *ατός* contrasting with distal *εκείνος*, but *ατός*, although on the same level as *αβούτος* with respect to distance, shows a syntactic/semantic restriction in that it is only used anaphorically (1997: 182).<sup>8</sup> It is tempting to reinterpret Papadopoulos’ traditional person-oriented analysis of *ατός* (‘close to the addressee’) as identical to Drettas’ ‘anaphoric’ function. In this sense Pontic would represent an archaic stage of the Modern Greek system, where the “new” pronoun *αυτός* > *ατός* is still restricted to anaphoric uses, as documented from the early history of the language.

It is interesting to note that the Greek dialects of S. Italy, most of which also possess a tripartite system *τούτος / ετ-τούνος* (<*αυτούνος*) / *ετ/είνος*, are usually described as not making any distinction between the first two (Rohlf, 1977: 91-95; Katsoyannou, 1995: 224). However, Karanastasis (1997: 70) remarks, similarly to Papadopoulos, that *ετ-τούνος* is used for deixis of persons or things close to the hearer.<sup>9</sup> This person-related analysis can again be reinterpreted as deictic vs. anaphoric distinction, an analysis that would characterize S. Italian, like Pontic, as a conservative peripheral dialect which preserves an older stage of evolution, where *αυτός* is expectedly only anaphoric due its origin from Ancient *αὐτός*.

The distinction between a “second-person” *αυτός* and a “first-person” *τούτος*, in our terms between an originally anaphoric and now general demonstrative *αυτός* and a strongly deictic *τούτος*, can also be found in Samothraki, where the tripartite system takes the form *τούτους/έτους/τούτυνας – αυτός/έτους – κειός/έκειους/κείουνας* (Tsolaki, 2009: 295-301).

<sup>7</sup> Tsakonian has different and complex forms of dubious etymology and rather blurred functions, mostly indifferent to distance or person orientation (*έτενη – έντενη/έντερη –ετήνε*), see Liosis (2007: 413-421).

<sup>8</sup> “*atos* sera exclusivement employé dans la reprise anaphorique d’un terme déjà introduit” (Drettas 1997: 182).

<sup>9</sup> «για να δείξει πρόσωπο ή πράγμα που βρίσκεται προς το μέρος εκείνου προς τον οποίο μιλούμε».

Similarly, for the dialect of Mani, Bassea-Bezantakou (forthcoming) observes that *εούτος/ετούτος* is strongly deictic and is related to the 1st person, whereas *ετούνος* expresses 2nd person deixis, both contrasting with distal *ετσείνος*.

The tripartite system is retained in most of the Northern dialects (Kretschmer, 1905: 259-270; Papadopoulos 1926: 78-80, cf. also Dinas 2005: 124 for Kozani, Georgiou, 1962: 381-383 for Kastoria), in the Peloponnese (Pantelidis, forthcoming), the Cyclades and the Heptanese (Chytiris, 1978: 44-45) and in Bithynia (Danguitsis, 1943: 90-93, Deligiannis, 1999: 101). However, on the basis of the available dialectal descriptions and examples it is not possible to reach any conclusions concerning the different meanings/functions of *αυτός* vs. *τούτος*; in several areas there seems to be no clear distinction between them.

#### b) Reduction of the tripartite system.

i) through loss of *αυτός*. The most characteristic case of reduction through loss of *αυτός* is provided by the Cypriot dialect, where the process of gradual loss begins in the medieval period. In the *Assizes* and the *Chronicle of Machairas* the pronoun still exists, although in reduced frequency. In later texts such as Voustronios, *Fior di Vertu* and the *Cypriot love poems*, the use of the pronoun decreases further, up to the modern period where it has completely disappeared (Menardos, 1969: 63; Symeonidis, 2006: 215; Koundouris, 2009: 67-75; Holton et al, forthcoming). Modern Cypriot has a bipartite system *τούτος-ετφείνος*, a characteristic that does not seem to be shared by the other dialects of the Southeastern group, which mostly retain *αυτός*: for example, this is the case of Rhodes (Papachristodoulou, 1958: 55), Karpathos (Minas, 1970: 97), Kalymnos (Drakos, 1983: 53) and Astypalaia (Karanastasis, 1958: 129).

Similarly, the dialect of Silli has retained *τούτος* in regular use but employs *αυτός* only rarely (Dawkins, 1916: 50). However, in this case one cannot speak of reduction of the tripartite to a bipartite system, as *αυτός* is not in effect lost, but replaced through the locative adverb *εδώ* and the demonstrative reinforcer *-δα*, which in the dialect takes the form *-ρα* (see also Kostakis, 1968: 72-73).

ii) through loss of *τούτος*: as the disappearance of *τούτος* is the Standard MG tendency, and as many dialect descriptions fail to mention grammatical elements that do not present special dialectal features, it is hard to determine when *τούτος* is indeed absent from a dialectal pronominal system. For example, the description of the dialect of Samos (Zafeiriou, 1995: 96-97) simply does not list the form although Kretschmer does (1905: 266), but for Eastern Thrace Psaltis (1905: 68-69) specifically states that *τούτος* has been lost as a demonstrative.

In the same vein, the dialect of Pharasa preserves *τούτος* only vestigially: Dawkins (1916: 174) records only the gen. *τουτουῦ* used as a possessive pronoun, and Anastasiadis (1976: 154-157) notes that in the bipartite system *ατές/ατᾶς/ατός* vs. *ατφείνος/ατσείνες* the first pronoun is used for proximal deixis, corresponding to both *αυτός* and *τούτος* of Standard MG.<sup>10</sup> Other Cappadocian dialects seem to have merged the paradigms of *αυτός* and *τούτος*, but further research on this complex issue is required.

iii) through merger of *αυτός* and *τούτος*: Most Cappadocian dialects (Axos, Anakou) seem to have merged forms of *αυτός* and *τούτος*. Costakis (1964: 43) gives the mixed paradigm *ετό* nom. acc vs. *τούτου* gen. and Mavrochalyvidis and Kesisoglou (1960: 55) similarly record nom *ετό/ετά* vs. gen. *του τούτ'/τα τούτ'*; Dawkins (1916: 126) also records *ετούτα* only in the

<sup>10</sup> From the unclear descriptions of the Cappadocian dialects, it seems that *τούτος* is also absent from Ulagatsch (Kesisoglou, 1951: 88).

plural vs. *ετό* in the singular. In Dawkins' analysis (1916: 123-125) the various genitive forms deriving from *τούτος* (*τουτούτ*, *τουτουνού* etc.) are classified separately as possessive pronouns.

The Old Athenian group (comprising the mostly extinct dialects of Athens, Aegina, Megara, parts of Euboea) provides a special variant of the bipartite system which consists of the pronouns *τούνος* vs. *ἐτσεῖνος*.<sup>11</sup> Depending on the etymological interpretation of *τούνος* the system can be viewed as resulting from loss of *αὐτός* or from loss of *τούτος*. This issue will be discussed in the next section.

### 3. Morphological evolutions

The multiple morphological evolutions in the MG demonstrative sub-systems can be classified under two main headings:

- a) Mutual influence between paradigms, leading to “mixed” and “extended” forms, e.g.
  - τούτου* > *τουτουνού* (*τούτου* + *εκεινού*)
  - εκείνος* > *εκείός* (*εκείνος* + *αὐτός*)
- b) Emphatic reinforcement of demonstratives through various particles such as *-για*, *-δα*, *-να*, *-ε*, sometimes doubled or even tripled. Examples:
  - αὐτός* > *αὐτός-για*, *αὐτός-για-για*, *αὐτός-δα*
  - εκείνος* > *εκείνονα* > *εκείνονανα* > *εκείνονανανα*

#### 3.1 Extended paradigms

Mutual analogical influence between demonstrative pronouns has led to considerable morphological variety. Some forms, mostly in the oblique cases, appear in all dialects, whereas new nominative forms, and consequently the establishment of a full innovative paradigm, is geographically more restricted.

Such mutual influence is up to a point to be expected within closed and closely connected semantic sets, without any concomitant blurring of meaning or function (cf. the classic example *βαρῦς* ‘heavy’ - *ἐλαφρῦς* ‘light’ > *βαρῦς* - *ἐλαφρῦς*). However, the extensive restructuring of entire demonstrative paradigms requires, for its interpretation, more than the mere fact of belonging in the same semantic field; it cannot be dissociated from the general instability of the Medieval Greek tripartite system, in which the semantic and pragmatic roles of the three exponents of deixis, namely proximal *τούτος* and *αὐτός* vs. distal *εκείνος* and of deictic *τούτος* vs. anaphoric *αὐτός*, were transitional and to a certain extent not clearly defined (as evidenced by subsequent evolutions leading to various forms of bipartite systems).

These analogical influences were first studied by Meyer (1889: 169-171), Hatzidakis (1892: 439-330, reproduced in Chatzidakis, 1907: 155-156) and Thumb (1912: 92), see Holton et al. (forthcoming) for further discussion and examples from Medieval Greek. According to these analyses, analogical change was a multi-stage process, involving both accent and suffix exchanges.

The first stage in the overall evolution must have been the analogical influence of oxytone *αὐτός* on paroxytone *ἐκείνος*, which led to the oxytone forms *ἐκεινοῦ*-GEN.SG., *ἐκεινῶν*-GEN.PL., *ἐκεινούς*-ACC.PL. (1):

<sup>11</sup> See ILNE s.v. *αὐτός*; also, for Athens Kambouroglou (1910: 48); for Megara Benardis (2006, s.v. *τούνος*) and Syrkou (2006, s.v. *τούνος*); for Aegina Thumb (1891: 111); and for Euboea Favis (1911: 42).

- (1) αὐτός – αὐτοῦ :: ἐκεῖνος – ἐκεῖνου → αὐτός – αὐτοῦ :: ἐκεῖνος – **ἐκεινοῦ**  
 αὐτός – αὐτῶν :: ἐκεῖνος – ἐκεῖνων → αὐτός – αὐτῶν :: ἐκεῖνος – **ἐκεινῶν**  
 αὐτός – αὐτοῦς :: ἐκεῖνος – ἐκεῖνους → αὐτός – αὐτοῦς :: ἐκεῖνος – **ἐκεινοῦς**

The accent-shift may have been induced by an effort to disambiguate between the homophonous accusative singular and genitive plural of paroxytone o-stem nominal forms (2), (Meyer 1889: 170; Kretschmer 1905: 260-262; Henrich 1996: 14-16):

- (2) M.ACC.SG. τὸν χρόνον /ton 'xronon/ ~ M.GEN.PL. τῶν χρόνων /ton 'xronon/ →  
 M.GEN.PL. τῶν χρόνων /ton xro'non/

It must be noted that in the northern dialects, due to the regular raising of unstressed /o/ to /u/, even more forms would become homophonous and would require disambiguation, were it not for the innovative accent shift to the final syllable (3):

- (3) M.ACC.SG. κείνου [i'kinu]  
 N.NOM.SG. κείνου [i'kinu]  
 N.ACC.SG. κείνου [i'kinu]  
 M., N.GEN.SG. κείνου → κεινοῦ [iki'nu]

As a next stage, shift of the morpheme boundary between stem and suffix in the oblique cases of the pronoun ἐκεῖνος takes place, leading to the creation of the new suffixes -νοῦ, -νῶν, -νοῦς (4a). The morpheme boundary shift may have been prompted by the analogy to the locative demonstrative adverbs αὐτοῦ 'here' and ἐκεῖ 'there' (both attested since antiquity), which was reanalyzed as the stem morpheme of the pronoun, leading to a less opaque morphological structure. This is typical case of affix secretion, whereby a suffix is extended through incorporation of a root element (following the classification of Haspelmath, 1995: 8-10).<sup>12</sup> The newly created suffixes, were attached to the simple forms of other demonstratives (4b), as well as other (indefinite, interrogative etc.) pronouns and determiners (4c):

- (4) a. ἐκεῖ 'there' :: ἐκεῖνος 'that'  
 ἐκεῖν-ος → ἐκεῖν-νοῦς  
 ἐκειν-οῦ, ἐκειν-ῶν, ἐκειν-οῦς → ἐκει-νοῦ, ἐκει-νῶν, ἐκει-νοῦς
- b. αὐτοῦ 'here' – αὐτός 'this'  
 αὐτου-νοῦ, αὐτου-νῶν, αὐτου-νοῦς  
 τούτος – τούτου 'this-here'  
 τουτου-νοῦ, τουτου-νῶν, τουτου-νοῦς

<sup>12</sup> From a purely historical point of view, of course, if one accepts the standard etymology of Ancient Greek ἐκεῖνος from the elements \*ἐ-κε-ενος (Beekes, 2010 s.v. and references therein), the reanalysis of Medieval Greek ἐκεῖν-ος to ἐκει-νοῦς could also be seen as a case of affix extension via incorporation of a quasi-affix (in this case the opaque affix \*ένος, originally an independent word, subsequently incorporated into the stem). However, in view of the fact that the reconstructed form \*ἐ-κε-ενος belongs to the prehistory of Greek and that ἐκεῖν-ο-ς would have been the morphological structure of the word in Ancient Greek, an analysis of the evolution as affix secretion seems preferable.

c. ποιός- ποιουνοῦ ‘who’, ἄλλος-ἄλλονῶν ‘others’, ὅλος-ὅλονῶν ‘all’

A telling indication of the reanalysis of ἐκειν-οῦ as ἐκει-νοῦ is the analogical creation of the nominative ἐκειός, with the innovative form of the stem without final /n/, under the influence of the new forms of αὐτός (5):

(5) αὐτουνοῦ - αὐτός :: ἐκεινοῦ - ἐκεῖνος →  
αὐτουνοῦ - αὐτός :: ἐκεινοῦ - ἐκειός

ἐκεινῶν τῶν παιδόπουλων *Chronicle of Morea*, ms H, 4818  
ἐνι καὶ τέτοιοι ἀπὸ ἐκεινούς, *Asma tou Armouri*, 64  
τοῦ λεγομένου πραγμάτου ἐκεινοῦ (1608, document from Crete)  
ἐκεινοῦ καὶ ὄτινος ἄλλονοῦ (1623, document from Naxos)

ἐκειὸ πὸν ζητοῦσι (1509, document from Syros)  
ἐκειὸν πὸν σὲ κοιτάζει, Defaranas, *Logoi didaktikoi*, 461

Another factor that may have contributed to the development of the new pronominal suffix -νοῦ, -νῶν, -νούς can be seen in the independent inflectional changes taking place in the paradigm of the indefinite article εἷς/ἕνας ‘one’ and κανεῖς/κανένας ‘no-one’. Already since the end of the Koine period, third declension (consonant-stem) masculine and neuter nouns sporadically displayed second declension (o-stem) inflectional suffixes in the genitive singular (Dieterich, 1898: 163; Gignac, 1981: 44; cf. also Chatzidakis, 1907: 16, 93, and Holton et al, forthcoming),<sup>13</sup> e.g. (6):

(6) ἀλέκτωρ, ἀλέκτορος → ἀλεκτόρου *PMG* 12.313, 300-500 AD  
λιμήν, λιμένος → λιμένου *BGU* 1594.2 (3rd c. AD)

This phenomenon probably lies at the origin of the equivalent evolution in the genitive singular of the indefinite article εἷς/ἕνας ‘one’ and the indefinite pronoun κανεῖς/κανένας ‘no-one’, the first traces of which appear in the 12th c., earlier than the innovations affecting demonstratives as described above (7):

(7) NOM. εἷς, GEN. ἑνός → ἐνοῦ  
ἐνοῦ ἀμπελίου (doc. from S. Italy, ed. Trichera 1865: 241, 1175 AD)  
NOM. κανεῖς, GEN. κανενός → κανενοῦ

The indefinite pronouns thus acquired the variant ending -νοῦ (where [n] is part of the stem and [u] is the 2nd declension genitive suffix), homophonous with the -νοῦ ending of the demonstrative pronouns.<sup>14</sup> It would be reasonable to assume that the co-existence of these homophonous endings in two different pronoun categories contributed to the spread of the -νοῦ, -

<sup>13</sup> Cf. also the later formation τοῦ μηνός > τοῦ μηνοῦ (see Kriaras, s.v. μήνας).

<sup>14</sup> Kretschmer (1905: 273) erroneously attributes the innovation κανενός > κανενοῦ to the influence of ἐκεῖνος-ἐκεινοῦ, an unlikely scenario in view of the relative chronology of the two evolutions.



vōv suffixes to other pronominal categories, marking it as a “special” suffix family reserved for the pronominal and determiner domain.<sup>15</sup>

During the final stage of the evolution, in the case of αὐτός, paradigm levelling of all forms took place: the same stem allomorph extended throughout the paradigm, forming the full inflectional paradigms αὐτοῦνος (from the gen. sg. and acc. pl.) and αὐτόνος (from the gen. pl.) (8). It has been suggested that the form αὐτεῖνος also derives from such a levelling process, namely from the generalization of the feminine genitive singular αὐτηνῆς (Chatzidakis, 1907: 156); in view of the fact that analogies based on the feminine gender are comparatively rare in Greek, the form should best be viewed as deriving from the analogy of ἐκεῖνος (see also ILNE s.v. αὐτός, Kriaras s.v. αὐτεῖνος).

- (8) αὐτοῦ > αὐτουνοῦ > αὐτοῦνος, αὐτούνη, αὐτοῦνο  
αὐτῶν > αὐτονῶν > αὐτόνος, αὐτόνο

Alternatively, it has been proposed that these new forms were the result of an “emphatic” repetition of the final syllable of αὐτός in all case-forms followed by infixation of -n- (Jannaris, 1897: 161; Pernot, 1946: 170-172), an analysis which should be dismissed as it involves a reduplicative mechanism non-existent in Greek morphology. However, the homophony in some case forms (αὐτεῖνη, αὐτουνοῦ, αὐτονῶν) between the final vowel of the stem and the suffix vowel may have set in motion further analogical processes: a schema similar to that proposed by Jannaris and Pernot –only in so far as apparent vowel repetition is involved– would have been activated in the last stage of morphological levelling, where the analogical principle may have been copying of the vowel of the final syllable onto the stem (9):

- (9) αὐτεῖνη /a'ftini/  
αὐτουνοῦ /aftu'nu/  
αὐτουνούς /aftu'nus/  
αὐτονῶν /afto'non/ } aft-X<sub>α</sub>-n-X<sub>α</sub> → αὐτένες, αὐτόνο, αὐτάνα  
/a'ftenes/, /a'ftono/, /a'ftana/

The division into discrete consecutive stages, as outlined above, can be indirectly confirmed through Modern Greek data (both from Standard Modern Greek and its dialects). In Standard Modern Greek, the genitive sg. and pl. (αυτουνού, αυτηνής, αυτωνῶν) and the acc. pl. (αυτουνούς) are acceptable, though colloquial, variants of αυτός (Mackridge, 1985: 144; Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton, 1997: 96) whereas nominative forms like αυτεῖνος, αυτούνος, αυτόνος etc. are not. Similarly, in most dialects the extended forms appear only in the genitive singular & plural and the accusative plural. For example see the demonstrative paradigm for Naxos (10a), Bithynia (10b) and Kerkyra (10c):

- (10) a. Naxos (Oikonomidis 1952: 235-236)

|      | <b>Singular</b> | <b>Plural</b> |
|------|-----------------|---------------|
| NOM. | ευτός           | ευτοί         |
| GEN. | ευτεινού        | ευτεινώ       |
| ACC. | ευτόν           | ευτοί         |

<sup>15</sup> An interesting parallel can be provided by the special ‘pronominal’ declension in Latin where synchronically second-declension pronominal adjectives like *unus*, *totus*, *ullus* do not display the regular genitive in *-i* but a genitive *-ius* which has spread analogically from demonstrative and interrogative pronouns (see Baldi, 2002: 348).

- b. Bithynia (Deligiannis 1999: 101)
- |      | <b>Singular</b> | <b>Plural</b> |
|------|-----------------|---------------|
| NOM. | αυτός           | αυτοί         |
| GEN. | αυτουνού        | αυτουναρώ     |
| ACC. | αυτόνα          | αυτουνούς     |
- c. Kerkyra (Chytiris 1978: 44)
- |      | <b>Singular</b> | <b>Plural</b> |
|------|-----------------|---------------|
| NOM. | αυτός           | αυτοί         |
| GEN. | αυτουνού        | αυτουνώνε     |
| ACC. | αυτόνε          | αυτουνούς     |

The wider geographical distribution of the previous stage speaks for a chronological sequence, as described above. In the same vein, the grammatical descriptions of the 16th and 17th c. list only genitive sg. and pl. extended forms.<sup>16</sup> Another indication in the same direction is the existence of similar morphological variants in other pronominal paradigms, e.g. ποιουνοῦ, ἀλλουνοῦ/ἀλλουνώων, ὀλουνοῦ/ὀλουνώων, despite the absence of nominative forms such as \*ἀλλοῦνος, \*ποιοῦνος etc.

Despite its plausibility, the proposed schema of relative chronology by stages cannot be easily verified on the basis of textual data, because the nominative and accusative forms are attested simultaneously with the genitive, and, occasionally, later. It is equally difficult to establish whether any one of the three stem variants (αὔτειν-, αὔτουν- αὔτον-) appeared earlier than the others. An indirect indication is perhaps supplied by the relative frequency of the variants, since αὔτονος is much less common in texts than αὔτοῦνος and αὔτεινος. The relatively late (15th c.) spread of the innovative variant paradigms is supported by their absence from the Cypriot dialect. On the other hand, the presence of extended forms in the S. Italian dialects does not allow a later dating, since the evolutions must have begun before S. Italian was cut off from the rest of the Greek-speaking world, something which must have happened around the end of the Middle Ages.

In more detail, the textual sources record the new analogically reformed paradigms from the 15th c. onwards. Their first (and isolated) attestations are found in the *Chronicle of Morea*, the *War of Troy* and *Livistros & Rodamni*. They become more frequent in the 16th c. and are quite common in Cretan literature, as well as in documents from Crete and the Cyclades, but they are totally absent from dialectal texts from Cyprus, on a par with modern Cypriot<sup>17</sup> (11):

- (11) a. αὔτεινος ὁ μαρκέζης *Chronicle of Morea*, ms P, 1009  
 αὔτεινος ἦτον ὁ εὐγενής *Livistros & Rodamni*, ms. E, 1  
 ἐχρώστειε καὶ αὔτεινοῦ (1685, document from Naxos)

<sup>16</sup> Nikolaos Sophianos's Grammar (ca. 1550) lists the forms τουτουνοῦ, τουτηνής, τουτουνώων, αὔτουνώων, ἐκεινώων (see Legrand 1874: 7). The Grammar by G. Germano (1622) lists τουτουνοῦ, τουτονής, τουτονών, αὔτουνοῦ, αὔτονών, ἀλλουνοῦ, ἀλλονής, ἀλλονών, ὀλουνοῦ, ὀλονής (see Pernot 1907: 69-70) and the Grammar by S. Portius (1638) lists ἐνοῦ, τουτουνοῦ, τουτηνής, τουτονών, ἐκεινοῦ, ἐκεινής, ἐκεινώων (see Meyer 1889: 22, 23, 29).

<sup>17</sup> For a much fuller list of attestations by case-form and geographical area see Holton et al. (forthcoming).

- b. αὐτοῦνος ὁ μαρκέσης *Chronicle of Morea*, ms H, 1009  
 μετ' αὐτοῦνον *Digenis Akritis* ms. E, 1401  
 αὐτοῦνα τὰ χωράφια (1572, document from Andros)  
 c. αὐτόνο τὸν στρατιώτην *Achilleid* O 660  
 τὰ σάλια αὐτάνα Foskolos, *Fortunatos* I.139

For the extended forms of *τοῦτος*, the chronology is similar: the earliest available examples date from the 14th-15th c. (although very isolated). They become more frequent from the 16th c. onwards, mainly in the Heptanese and Chios (cf. the direct testimonies of Sophianos and Germano: Meyer, 1889: 78-79 and Pernot, 1907: 69), with occasional attestations from the Cyclades, the Peloponnese and Northern areas, including Constantinople (12):

- (12) ἀπὸ τουτουνοῦς *Polemos Troados*, mss. BX, 8059  
 τὰ μάγια τουτουνοῶν Dellaportas, *Erotimata* 2703  
 ἐτουτουνοῦ τοῦ ἐμπιστεμένου λαοῦ (1614, document from Tinos)  
 τοῦ τόπου ἐτουτουνοῦ (1688, document from Zakynthos)

The absolute and relative dating of the innovative forms *αὐτοῦνος*, *αὐτουνοῦ*, *τουτουνοῦ* etc. is rendered more complex through the mention of the form *ἀτοῦνος* by Michael Choniates, in a derogatory metalinguistic comment on the local dialect of Athens, which is contained in a letter dated 1185 (for the dating see Kolovou, 1999: 164), i.e. considerably earlier than any direct textual attestation (13):

- (13) καὶ τοῦ ὑποκορύζειν δενδρύφια, προβατύλλια, παιδύλλια καὶ τὰ γε λοιπά,  
 ὅτεῦτος καὶ ἀτοῦνος καὶ τὰ τούτοις σύστοιχα (Michael Choniates,  
*Epistulae*, 28. 21-22)

As already mentioned, the form *τοῦνος* is indeed regular in the Old Athenian dialect group (see above, section 2.2); it also occurs in the tripartite demonstrative systems of Kea (Kollia, 1933: 274) and S. Italy (Rohlf's, 1977: 95; Karanastasis, 1997: 69-70) (14a). Furthermore, the genitive forms *τουνοῦ*, *τουνοῶν* appear in Crete and some islands of the Cyclades as part of the paradigm of *τοῦτος* (see Lioudaki, 1938: 424 for Crete; Oikonomidis, 1952: 236 for Naxos; Thumb, 1897: 12 for Amorgos; Voyatzidis, 1925: 127 for Kimolos) (14b).

- (14) a. τοῦνος – ἐτσεῖνος (Old Athenian)  
 αὐτός – τοῦνος – ἐκεῖνος (Kea)  
 τούσο<sup>18</sup> – τούνο – ετσεινο (Puglia)  
 τούτο – εττούνο - ετσεινο (Calabria)
- b. τοῦτος, gen. τουνοῦ (Kimolos)  
 ἐτουτος/ἐτουτοσές, gen. ἐτουνοῦ (Crete)  
 ἐτουτος, gen. ἐτουνοῦ (Naxos)

<sup>18</sup> The form derives from a merger with the following definite article, i.e. nom. τούτος ο > τούος ο > τούσο, acc. τούτον τον > τούντον (Karanastasis Lex. s.v. τούτος).

On the basis of the distribution 14b in Crete and the Cyclades, Chatzidakis (1907: 156) suggested that the form (ἐ)τοῦνος derives from the genitive τουτουνοῦ > τουνοῦ through haplology. The Old Athenian and S. Italian forms on the other hand have been interpreted as deriving from an irregular phonetic evolution of αὐτοῦνος > ἀτοῦνος > τοῦνος (Favis, 1911: 42; Thumb, 1897: 12 and Rohlf, 1977: 95). Since Choniates does not provide any details about the demonstrative system of the vernacular Athenian of his time system (tripartite or bipartite, as well as the degree of the generalisation of the form throughout the paradigm),<sup>19</sup> it is not possible to readily subscribe to either. Whichever the origin of the form ἀτοῦνος, one is tempted to pre-date the second and third stage of the evolution as set out above about two centuries before it is recorded as part of the written vernacular.

### 3.2 Emphatic reinforcement

In order to increase deictic strength, demonstrative pronouns are frequently reinforced through a variety of deictic elements, mostly locative/gestural particles. This is well-known cross-linguistically (cf. Haspelmath, 1993; Bernstein, 1997; Diessel, 2006: 424), and has been a feature of Greek since the Ancient period (e.g. ὄδε, τοσόσδε, τοιόσδε, οὐτοσί). In Standard Modern Greek the reinforcers are usually the locative adverbs ἐδῶ - ἐκεῖ and, more colloquially, the suffixal -δα. In the Greek dialects, ἐδῶ and ἐκεῖ are also used, but δα seems to be more common. Furthermore, other suffixal reinforcers, such as -να, -για, -ε, are also common and attested already from the 17th c.<sup>20</sup> (15a). Indicative of the constant necessity for increased deictic strength is the fact that reinforcers in MG dialects often appear doubled (15b) or two different reinforcers appear in combination (15c):

- (15) a. ἐκεινονὰ ὀλονομπρὸς νὰ σώση Foskolos, *Fortunatos* II.287  
 Νά τουτονὲ τὸ χάρισμα! Chortatsis, *Katzourbos* III.467
- b. αὐτόσγιαγια Siatista (Tsopanakis, 1953: 286)  
 ἐκεῖν' νανα Bithynia (Danguitsis, 1943: 92)
- c. φτοσδανά (αὐτός-δα-να) Rhodes (Papachristodoulou, 1958: 55)  
 ετουτοσιάρε (ετούτος-για-ρε) Karpathos (Minas, 1970: 97)

Space limitations prevent us from presenting a full overview of the reinforced forms. Therefore, we will concentrate only on a specific issue which presents great interest for diachronic morphology: Greek dialectal demonstratives constitute a typical case of “diachronic externalization of inflection”: Haspelmath (1993) uses demonstrative pronouns to exemplify the phenomenon, noting how the suffixation of the uninflected reinforcer results in ‘undesirable forms’ in which the inflectional suffix is no longer the final morpheme of the word, something that renders its processing more difficult. The cross-linguistically observed path of change in such cases involves three stages: a) the external suffixation of the reinforcer with internal inflection of the form, b) the creation of ‘hybrid’ forms with double, pleonastic inflection, one

<sup>19</sup> It is quite possible that Choniates only heard a genitive form which he subsequently overgeneralized to a nominative ‘quotation’ form.

<sup>20</sup> For the etymology of these forms see Chatzidakis (1907: 132), Tsopanakis (1949: 51) and Kriaras Lex. s.v. για (II). The issue of deictic reinforcement through prefixation, mostly with prothetic [e], will not concern us here.

before and one after the suffix and c) the loss of the original, internal inflectional suffix leaving only the innovative word-final inflectional suffix.

This process is amply documented in the Modern Greek dialects. It is a comparatively recent evolution since there is no evidence in the Medieval period for the externalised forms. The second stage appears in many dialects (16):

- (16) a. Crete (Pangalos, 1955: 289, 299; Lioudaki, 1938):  
 NOM. SG. αυτό-νος → αυτονοσέ, αυτονοσά → αυτονοσές  
 ACC. PL. τούτους → τουτουσά → τουτουσές, τουτουσάς
- b. Chios (Pernot, 1946: 187)  
 NOM. SG. τούτσονα → τούτσονα-ς, gen. τούτουνου  
 NOM. PL. τούτοινοι, τούτεσνες, τούτανα
- c. Euboea (Favis, 1911: 42) and Lesbos (Kretschmer, 1905: 266-268)  
 NOM. SG. τούτσονα → τούτσονα-ς, ACC. SG. τουτονε-δά-νε  
 NOM. SG. τούτουςονα → τούτουςονα-ς, ACC. SG. τουτουσι-δά-νι

The most advanced stage, with externalised inflection is also well attested (17):

- (17) a. Livissi (Mousaios, 1884: 10):  
 GEN. SG. τουτουνά → NOM. τουτουνάς → τουννάς, GEN. SG. τατουννανού
- b. Mani (Bassea-Bezantakou, forthcom.)  
 τετοιισ-δά → τετοιισ-δός → Μ. τετοιιδ-ός, F. τετοιιδ-ή, Ν. τετοιιδ-ό

## Conclusion

Summing up, we hope to have provided a substantial overview of the evolutionary patterns attested in MG dialectal systems and to have touched upon some stimulating topics concerning diachronic morphology. The proposed analysis of the demonstrative system on the basis of the proximal vs. distal and deictic vs. anaphoric distinction aims at a more satisfactory interpretation of the diachronic evolution observable in the domain of Greek demonstratives that the traditional person-based model. A new and comprehensive classification of dialectal demonstrative sub-systems has been elaborated on the basis of both function and diachronic evolution. Also, a detailed investigation of the diachronic morphological processes leading to a wide variety of attested dialectal variant form has been attempted, supported by extensive textual research (conducted for the Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek).

## References

- Anagnostopoulos, Georgios. 1926. Περί τῆς ἐν Κρήτῃ ὀμιλουμένης καὶ ἰδίως περὶ τοῦ ἰδιώματος Ἁγ. Βαρβάρας καὶ περιχώρων. *Ἀθηνᾶ* 38: 141-193.
- Anastasiadis Vasileios K. 1976. *Ἡ σύνταξη στὸ φαρασιώτικο ἰδίωμα τῆς Καππαδοκίας. Σὲ σύγκριση πρὸς τὰ ὑπόλοιπα ἰδιώματα τῆς Μ. Ἀσίας καθὼς καὶ πρὸς τὴν ἀρχαία, τὴ μεσαιωνικὴ καὶ τὴ νέα ἑλληνικὴ γλῶσσα. Διατριβὴ ἐπὶ διδακτορία*. Thessaloniki.
- Baldi, Philip. 2002. *The Foundations of Latin*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bassea-Bezantakou, Christina. Forthcoming. Το ἰδίωμα τῆς Μάνης. In *Νεοελληνικὲς Διάλεκτοι*, ed. Christos Tzitzilis, Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἰνστιτούτο Νεοελληνικῶν Σπουδῶν.
- Beekes, R. S. P. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Leiden: Brill.
- Benardis, M. 2006. *Γραμματικὴ καὶ λεξικὸ τοῦ Μεγαρικοῦ ἰδιώματος*. Αθήνα: Λύκειον τῶν Ἑλληνίδων, Παράρτημα Μεγάρων.
- Bernstein, Judy. 1997. Demonstratives and reinforcers in Romance and Germanic languages. *Lingua* 102: 87-113.
- Bhat, D. N. S. 2004. *Pronouns* [Oxford Studies in Typology and Linguistic Theory]. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chatzidakis, G. N. 1907. *Μεσαιωνικὰ καὶ Νέα Ἑλληνικά*. Τόμος Β'. Αθήνα: Σακελλάριος.
- Chytiris, Gerasimos. 1978. Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Κέρκυρας. Γραμματικὰ στοιχεῖα. *Δελτίο Ἀναγνωστικῆς Ἑταιρίας Κερκύρας* 15: 29-74.
- Clairis, Christos and Georgios Babiniotis. 2005. *Γραμματικὴ τῆς νέας ἐλληνικῆς: δομολεειτουργική-επικοινωνιακή*. Αθήνα: Ἑλληνικά Γράμματα.
- Costakis, Athanase P. 1964. *Le parler grec d'Anakou*. Athènes: Centre d'Études d'Asie Mineure.
- Danguitsis, Constantin. 1943. *Étude descriptive du dialecte de Demirdesi*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- 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.
- De Jong, Irene. 2012. Double deixis in Homeric speech: on the interpretation of ὅδε and οὗτος. In *Homer, gedeutet durch ein großes Lexikon: Akten des Hamburger Kolloquiums vom 6.-8. Oktober 2010 zum Abschluss des Lexikons des frühgriechischen Epos*, ed. by Michael Meier-Brügger, 63-83. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Deligiannis, Kyriakos. 1999. Κουβουκλιώτικα. Ἐνα μικρασιατικὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Ioannina.
- Diessel, Holger, 1999. *Demonstratives: Form, Function and Grammaticalization*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Diessel, Holger. 2006. Demonstratives. In *Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown, 430-435. Oxford: Elsevier.
- Dieterich, Karl. 1898. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der griechischen Sprache von der hellenistischen Zeit bis zum 10. Jahr. n. Chr.* Leipzig: Teubner.
- Dinas, Kostas D. 2005. *Το γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Κοζάνης*. Κοζάνη: Ἰνστιτούτο Βιβλίου καὶ Ανάγνωσης.
- Drakos, Nikolaos. 1983. *Για τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Κάλυμνος*. Αθήνα: Ἀναγνωστήριο Καλύμνου «Αἱ Μούσαι».
- Drettas, Georges. 1997. *Aspects pontiques*. Paris: Association de Recherches Pluridisciplinaires.
- Favis, Vasileios I. 1911. *Γλωσσικαὶ ἐπισκέψεις ἀναφερόμεναι εἰς τὸ ἰδίωμα Ἀύλωναρίου καὶ Κονιστρῶν*. Αθήνα: τυπ. Παρασκευᾶ Λεῶνη.

- Georgiou, Christos. 1962. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα Γέρμα Καστοριάς*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐταιρεία Μακεδονικῶν Σπουδῶν.
- Gignac, Francis Thomas. 1981. *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. Volume II. Morphology. Milano: Istituto Editoriale Cisalpino – La Goliardica.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. The diachronic externalization of inflection. *Linguistics* 31: 279-309.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1995. The growth of affixes in morphological reanalysis. In *Yearbook of Morphology 1994*, ed. Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle, 1-29. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Hatzidakis, G. N. 1892. *Einleitung in die neugriechische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel.
- Henrich, Günther S. 1996. Ένας δωρισμός στα μεσαιωνικά και νέα ελληνικά: οι γενικές πληθυντικού του τύπου ‘κεινών’, ‘Σερβών’, ‘χρονών’. *Studies in Greek Linguistics 16. Proceedings of the 16th Annual Meeting of the Department of Linguistics, Faculty of Philosophy, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 4-6 May 1995*. Thessaloniki, 10-20.
- Holton, David et al. forthcoming. *A Reference Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Holton, David, Peter Mackridge and Philippaki-Warbuton. 1997. *Greek: A comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London: Routledge.
- ILNE. 1933- *Ιστορικὸν Λεξικὸν τῆς Νέας Ἑλληνικῆς, τῆς τε κοινῶς ὀμιλουμένης καὶ τῶν ἰδιωμάτων*. Ἀθῆναι: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν.
- Jacobson, David J. 2011. A Gestural Phallacy. *Didaskalia* 8.25 [http://www.didaskalia.net/issues/8/25/ ]
- Jannaris, Antonius N. 1897. *An Historical Greek Grammar, chiefly of the Attic dialect*. London: McMillan.
- Kambouroglou, D. 1910. *Δίπυλον* 1: 46-50.
- Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1958. Τὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Ἀστυπалаίας. *Λεξικογραφικὸν Δελτίον* 8: 59-144.
- Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1997. *Γραμματικὴ τῶν ἑλληνικῶν ἰδιωμάτων τῆς Κάτω Ἰταλίας*. Ἀθῆναι: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν.
- Katsoyannou, M. 1995. *Le parler gréco de Galliciano (Italie): description d’une langue en voie de disparition*. Doctoral dissertation, Université Paris VII – Denis Diderot.
- Kesisoglou, I. I. 1951. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τοῦ Οὐλαγάτς*. Ἀθῆναι: Γαλλικὸ Ἰνστιτούτο Ἀθηνῶν.
- Kollia, Angeliki. 1933. Τὸ γλωσσικὸν ἰδίωμα τῆς νήσου Κέας. *Ἀθηνᾶ* 45: 262-285.
- Kolonou, Foteini. 1999. *Μιχαὴλ Χωνιάτης. Συμβολὴ στὴ μελέτη τοῦ βίου του καὶ τοῦ ἐπιστολογραφικοῦ του ἔργου*. Ἀθῆναι: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν.
- Koundouris, Antonis. 2009. Οι αντωνυμίες σε μεσαιωνικά κυπριακά κείμενα. Unpublished Master’s thesis, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Kretschmer, Paul. 1905. *Der heutige lesbische Dialekt verglichen mit den übrigen nordgriechischen Mundarten*. Wien: Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Kriaras E. 1968- . *Λεξικὸ τῆς μεσαιωνικῆς ἑλληνικῆς Δημόδους Γραμματείας (1100-1669)*, Θεσσαλονίκη (18 vols., Α-ραβέντι).
- Langslow, David. 2009. *Jacob Wackernagel, Lectures on Syntax*. Ed. by -. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Legrand, Émile. 1874. *Nicolas Sophianos, Grammaire du grec vulgaire*. Paris: Maisonneuve et Cie.
- Kostakis, Thanasis P. 1968. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Σίλλης*. Ἀθῆναι: Κέντρο Μικρασιατικῶν Σπουδῶν.

- Liosis, Nikos. 2007. Γλωσσικές επαφές στη νοτιοανατολική Πελοπόννησο. Doctoral dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Lioudaki, Maria. 1938. Οι ανωμαλίες τῶν ἀντωνυμιῶν «ἐτοῦτος» καὶ «ἐκεῖνος» στὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Ἀνατολικῆς Κρήτης. *Ἐπετηρὶς Ἑταιρείας Κρητικῶν Σπουδῶν* 1: 421-424.
- Lyons, Christopher. 1999. *Definiteness* [Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1985. *The Modern Greek Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manolessou, Io. 2001. The Evolution of the Demonstrative System in Greek. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2: 119-148.
- Mavrochalyvidis, Georgios P. and Ioannis Kesisoglou. 1960. *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Ἀζοῦ*. Ἀθήνα: Γαλλικὸ Ἰνστιτούτο Ἀθηνῶν.
- Menardos, Simos. 1969. *Γλωσσικαὶ Μελέται*. Λευκωσία: Κέντρον Ἐπιστημονικῶν Ἐρευνῶν.
- Meyer, Wilhelm. 1889. *Simon Portius, Grammatica linguae graecae vulgaris. Reproduction de l'édition de 1638 suivie d'un commentaire grammatical et historique*. Paris: F. Vieweg.
- Minas, Konstantinos. 1970. *Τὰ ἰδιώματα τῆς Καρπάθου*. Ἀθήνα.
- Mousaios, M. I. 1884. *Βατταρισμοί, ἤτοι λεξιλόγιον τῆς λειβισιανῆς διαλέκτου*. Ἀθήνα: Παρνασσός.
- Oikonomidis, Dimitrios B. 1952. Περὶ τοῦ γλωσσικοῦ ἰδιώματος Ἀπεράθου-Νάξου. *Ἀθηνᾶ* 56: 215-273.
- Oikonomidis, Demosthenis I. 1958. *Γραμματικὴ τῆς ἐλληνικῆς διαλέκτου τοῦ Πόντου*. Ἀθήνα: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν.
- Pangalos, G. 1955. *Περὶ τοῦ γλωσσικοῦ ἰδιώματος τῆς Κρήτης*. Ἀθήνα.
- Pantelidis, Nikolaos. forthcoming. Πελοποννησιακὴ. In *Νεοελληνικὲς Διάλεκτοι*, ed. Christos Tzitzilis. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἰνστιτούτο Νεοελληνικῶν Σπουδῶν.
- Papachristodoulou, Christodoulos. 1958. Μορφολογία τῶν ροδίτικων ἰδιωμάτων. *Δωδεκανησιακὸν Ἀρχεῖον* 3: 9-106.
- Papadopoulos, Anthimos A. 1926. *Γραμματικὴ τῶν βορείων ἰδιωμάτων τῆς νέας ἐλληνικῆς γλώσσης*. Ἀθήνα: Γλωσσικὴ Ἑταιρεία.
- Papadopoulos, Anthimos A. 1955. *Ἱστορικὴ γραμματικὴ τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου*. Ἀθήνα: Ἐπιτροπὴ Ποντιακῶν Μελετῶν.
- Pernot, Hubert. 1907. *Girolamo Germano, Grammaire et vocabulaire du grec vulgaire, publiés d'après l'édition de 1622*. Fontenay-sous-Bois.
- Pernot, Hubert. 1946. *Études de linguistique néohellénique. II. Morphologie des parlers de Chio*. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Psaltis, Stamatios. 1905. *Θρακικά, ἢ μελέτη περὶ τοῦ ἰδιώματος Σαράντα Ἐκκλησιῶν*. Ἀθήνα: Σακελλάριος.
- Roberts, Ian G. and Robert Dixon. 2007. *Diachronic Syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rohlf, Gerhard. 1977. *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci*. München: Beck.
- Schwyzler, Eduard and Albert Debrunner. 1966. *Griechische Grammatik. Vol. II, Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. München: Beck.
- Smyth, Herbert W. 1956. *Greek Grammar*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.
- Stavinschi, Alexandra. 2012. On the development of the Romance demonstrative systems: Historical remarks and theoretical conclusions. *Diachronica* 29: 72-97.
- Symeonidis, Charalambos P. 2006. *Ἱστορία τῆς κυπριακῆς διαλέκτου. Από τον 7<sup>ο</sup> αἰῶνα προ Χριστοῦ ἕως σήμερα*. Λευκωσία: Κέντρο Μελετῶν Ἱερᾶς Μονῆς Κύκκου.
- Syrkou, Angeliki. 2006. *Το μεγαρικὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα*. Λεξικογραφικὴ μελέτη. Ἀθήνα: Νήσος.



- Thumb, Albert. 1891. Μελέτη περι τῆς σημερινῆς ἐν Αἰγίνῃ λαλουμένης διαλέκτου. *Ἀθηνᾶ* 3: 95-128.
- Thumb, Albert. 1897. Beiträge zur neugriechischen Dialektkunde. I. Der Dialect von Amorgos (Fortsetzung). *Indogermanische Forschungen* 17:1-37.
- Thumb, Albert. 1912. *A Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Tsolaki, Maria. 2009. Μορφολογία του ιδιώματος της Σαμοθράκης. Ονοματικό και ρηματικό κλιτικό σύστημα. Doctoral dissertation, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Tsopanakis, Agapitos G. 1949. *Τὸ ἰδίωμα τῆς Χάλκης (Δωδεκανήσου)*. Rhodes (Repr. in idem, *Συμβολές στὴν ἱστορία τῆς ἐλληνικῆς γλώσσας*, vol. 1, 435-572. Thessaloniki 1983: Επιστημονική Επετηρίδα Φιλοσοφικῆς Σχολῆς. Παράρτημα. Τιμητικός Τόμος Α. Γ. Τσοπανάκη).
- Tsopanakis, Agapitos G. 1953. Τὸ Σιατιστινὸ ἰδίωμα. *Μακεδονικά* 2: 266-298.
- Voyatzidis, I. K. 1925. Κίμωλος. Κεφάλαιον Ἑκτον: Περί τῆς γλώσσης τῶν Κιμωλίων. *Ἀθηνᾶ* 37: 108-160.
- Wackernagel, Jacob. 1924. *Vorlesungen uber Syntax* II. Basel: E. Birkhauser.
- Zafeiriou, Menekratis. 1995. *Το γλωσσικό ἰδίωμα τῆς Σάμου*. Αθήνα: Γρηγόρης.