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This is an initial attempt at a typological grouping of Modern Greek dialects by means of a comparative study of relative clauses. The dialects are divided into groups based on two criteria. The first involves the markers which introduce relative clauses, which may continue an inherited relative element or interrogative pronoun, or be of mixed origin, resulting from processes of reanalysis, reinforcement, hybridization etc. The second criterion examines the processes of relativization based on the Accessibility Hierarchy of relative clauses (Keenan and Comrie 1977). The aim is to determine the distribution of the relativizing elements chosen by each dialect in the syntactic roles which are relativized. The emphasis is on the dialects of Asia Minor, Southern Italian and Tsakonian, mainly because their peculiarities support the working hypothesis that they possess means of relativization which differ from those of SMG.

1 Introduction

Discussion of the typology of relative clauses in the Modern Greek dialects assumes that they differ amongst themselves in at least some of the following areas:
a) The way in which they are linked to the main clause (e.g. by an uninflected complementizer, by an inflected pronoun, without any linking word, by nominalization of the relative clause etc.).
b) The way that the syntactic role of the head noun is marked (e.g. by the case of the relative pronoun, by the use of a co-relative clitic, by an empty syntactic position, by repetition of the head noun etc.).
c) The positioning of the head noun in relation to the relative clause (e.g. preceding it, following it, inside it, in both the main clause and the relative clause etc.).

SMG makes use of only a small part of the wide spectrum of choices available, but in the dialects, especially those which for historical reasons have found themselves on the periphery of
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the Greek-speaking world and have been influenced by contact with other languages (e.g. Southern Italian and Asia Minor dialects) or have followed their own unique course of development (e.g. Tsakonian), we find considerable variety in terms of both morphological and syntactic characteristics. Here we present an examination of these dialects, emphasizing on the first two issues.

2 Typology of relativizers

Tzitzilis (to appear), in the context of the historical typology of relativizers in the Modern Greek dialects, proposes, regardless of the presence or absence of the head noun, a general schema (see figure 1 below) which is initially based on a binary division between those which originated as inflected pronouns and those which originated as uninflected words (i.e. adverbs of place). The inflected relativizers in their turn may be divided into two groups: simple relativizers, which are derived from a demonstrative or interrogative pronoun, and complex relativizers, which are composed of a relativizing element and an interrogative pronoun.

Figure 1. Typological schema of relativizers in MGD (Tzitzilis, to appear)
2.1 Simple relativizers from demonstratives

The only relativizer of demonstrative origin in free and non-free relative clauses is that which is to be identified with the forms of the definite article beginning with τ-. There are many examples in Hellenistic Koine and Medieval Greek, e.g.:

(1) τὸν χόρτον τὸν λαμβάνετε παρὰ Ἀπείτος
the grass.M REL.ACC.M.SG you.receive.PL from Apis
‘the grass you receive from Apis’

(P.Oxy. 14, 1678, 15; 3rd c. CE)

(2) οἱ καβαλλάριδες τοὺς εκράτησεν
the knights REL.ACC.M.PL he.kept
‘the knights he took’

(Machairas, 54.37; 15th c. CE)

But, as has often been noted in the literature (e.g. Dieterich, 1970:199, Bakker 1974:96, Manolessou 2004, among others), this form has left few traces in the Modern Greek dialects. Manolessou (2004) claims that this relativizer, as an alternative to an inflected pronoun, disappeared (except in Pontic) because it could not be used for relativization of the subject (masculine and feminine) or in non-restrictive relative clauses, and because it became phonetically and syntactically indistinguishable from the (now preposed) 3rd person clitic pronouns. This view is not adequately supported by the data from the dialects examined here. For example, the demonstrative relativizer has almost disappeared from Tsakonian too, even though this is one of the dialects in which clitic object pronouns remain in postverbal position, in addition to being phonetically and etymologically distinct from the relativizer in question. There are very few examples of this type of relativizer in this dialect, consisting solely of stereotyped free relative clauses, e.g.:

(3) τα ὃμε ζέροντε ὅμε αούντε σι
REL not.we.are knowing not.we.are saying them.N
‘that which we don't know we don’t say’

(Costakis 1987, 3:206)

Furthermore, the demonstrative relativizer is widely used not only in Pontic but also in the Cappadocian and Crimean-Azov dialects (cf. also Nicholas 1998:346, 506-521, who reaches the same conclusion). In all the examples in 4 the markers το and τα relativize subjects of both masculine and feminine grammatical gender, in 5 the relative clause is non-restrictive and in 6 both the clauses are free. In both 5 and 6a the two relativizers have the role of masculine and feminine subjects respectively:

(4) a. εγεῖ τα φυλάγνουν γιασαχτήδε λένε
there REL they.guard guardians they.say
‘those guards who are guarding say’

(Cappadocian; Dawkins, 1916:424)

1 Note the etymological difference between the relativizer τα and the co-referent personal pronoun σι.
b. \( \tau o\nu \) (< \( \tau o\) ) \( \pi\epsilon\rho\alpha\sigma\nu\) \( \mu\acute{h}n\alpha\zeta \)
   \( \text{REL} \) \( \text{it.passed} \) \( \text{month} \)
   ‘the month that passed’
   (Crimean-Azov; Tzitzilis & Zuravliova, to appear)

c. \( \sigma\circ \) \( \kappa\varepsilon\phi\acute{a}l\i\) \( \tau o\nu \) \( \tau\alpha \) \( \acute{h}\rho\tau\acute{a}v\varepsilon \) \( \tau\alpha \) \( \dot{d}\omega\upsilon\acute{e}i\acute{e}z \)
   \( \text{on.the head} \) \( \text{his} \) \( \text{REL} \) \( \text{they.came} \) \( \text{the works} \)
   ‘[he told them] the works that came upon his head’ (= ‘his sufferings’)
   (Pontic; \textit{Archeion Pontou} (\textit{AP})1:186)

(5) \( \epsilon\kappa\varepsilon\acute{i}n \) \( \alpha\varepsilon\lambda\phi\acute{h} \) \( \tau \), \( \tau o \) \( \epsilon\nu \) \( \sigma\circ \) \( \sigma\alpha\nu\delta\acute{e}x\nu \) \( \epsilon\mu\acute{e}\acute{s}i\acute{n} \) \( \tau \), \( \text{bagh}\acute{e}\acute{r}a\acute{e} \)
   "that sister his REL is in.the box middle of.it she.shouted"
   ‘his sister, who was inside the box, shouted’
   (Cappadocian; Dawkins, 1916:392)

(6) a. \( \sigma\tau\alpha \) \( \delta\acute{e}k\acute{\i}\acute{n}\acute{i} \) \( \tau o \) \( \text{ba}\acute{i}n \) \( \lambda\i\acute{a}r\acute{o} \) \( \acute{e}\acute{r}e\acute{t}a\acute{i} \)
   ‘whoever goes to the right comes back alive’
   (Cappadocian; Dawkins, 1916:414)

b. \( \tau o \) \( \phi\tau\acute{u}\acute{s}o \) ‘\( \kappa\varepsilon \) \( \gamma\lambda\acute{\o}\acute{f}\acute{e}\acute{o} \) \( \tau o \)
   \( \text{REL} \) \( \text{I.spit not} \) \( \text{lick} \) \( \text{it} \)
   ‘that which I spit I don’t lick’
   (Pontic; Oikonomidis, 1958:244)

These data can be interpreted as follows: in reality all that remains of the inflected
demonstrative pronoun is the uninflected grammaticalized form \( \tau o \) (originally neuter singular) or \( \tau\alpha \) (originally neuter plural) which is the equivalent of SMG \( \pi\omega\nu \), i.e. it has acquired the status of
a “general relative marker” (for the term see Tzitzilis, to appear). Only in two or three fossilized
examples, which are very similar to one another and come from metrical texts, do we find
preserved in Pontic and Crimean-Azov the accusative feminine form \( \tau\nu\nu \), e.g.:

(7) a. \( \epsilon\mu\acute{a}\acute{e}\acute{p}\acute{a}n \) \( \tau\nu\nu \) \( \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{o} \)
   ‘they.bewitched REL.ACC.SG I.love’
   ‘they cast a spell upon the one I love’
   (Pontic; Papadopoulos, 1955:67)

b. \( \beta\rho\varepsilon \) \( \acute{h}\rho\tau\acute{a} \) \( \nu\alpha \) \( \dot{d}\o\nu \) \( \tau\nu\nu \) ‘\( \gamma\o\nu \) \( \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\acute{o} \)
   ‘I came to see the one I love’
   (Crimean-Azov; Černyšova, 1958:48)
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Naturally then, το and τα show a strong tendency to become interchangeable, i.e. there can be no number distinction, as shown by the examples given below: in 8 τα relativizes the singular ψωµίον and in 9 το relativizes the plurals τα σταφύλια and τα µεσέλια respectively:

(8) σερέψανε τα ἔφαγαν ψωµίον τα πσία
they.gathered REL they.ate of.bread the crumbs
‘they collected the crumbs of the bread they had eaten’
(Cappadocian; Dawkins, 1916:400)

(9) a. το διλκίς το de ἵνταν να φάγτ’ τα σταφύλια,
the REL not it.gets to eat the grapes
ζάς’ τα σφρήνες
it.makes them sour.grapes
‘the fox, the grapes that he can’t manage to eat, pretends they are sour grapes’
(Cappadocian; Fosteris & Kesisoglou, 1960:90)

(10) *το ἔρθε / εἶδα η γυνή
REL she.came / I.saw the woman
‘the woman who came / who I saw’

A characteristic indicating that the demonstrative relativizer’s lack of the nominative forms ο, η, οι has left its mark in these dialects too is the fact that based on our data from Pontic and Crimean-Azov Greek, το/τα is not used to relativize [+human] masculines and feminines (as subjects or objects), e.g.:

(11) a. SUBJ ‘ζ έναν µαχαλάν τ’ ἐτον σοµµά
in a neighbourhood REL it.was near
‘in a neighbourhood that was nearby’
(AP 45:99)

as well as [+human] neuters, e.g.:

(12) a. SUBJ το παιδίν (ν)το εγκλότωσέν µας
the child REL it.saved us
‘the child who saved us’
(AP 7:105)
This is probably connected to the fact that in Pontic the neuter article has been extended to the nominative case of [–human] masculines and feminines (although only in the plural), e.g. τα δουλείες ‘the jobs’, τα γάμους ‘the weddings’.

In Pontic, το appears even in positions that are low on the accessibility hierarchy of Keenan and Comrie, as shown in the next example, where it relativizes the oblique case:

\[(13) \text{OBL: } με \text{ το σκοινίν τ’ ἐδέσαν εµὲν} \]

‘with the rope that they tied me with’

\[(AP 15:160)\]

Similarly, the ability of το/τα in Cappadocian to relativize [+human] subjects is not unconnected with the fact that homonymous forms of the nominative case of the definite article may be used for masculine and feminine [+human] nouns in this dialect, e.g. το γιασάχτη - τα γιασάχτηδε ‘the guard - the guards’ (see also Nicholas 1998:512, who links the prevalence of το in Cappadocian with the nominal participle of Turkish, and Janse 1999:460, who considers it a nominalizer that renders the Turkish relative participle).

In this dialect too it is able to relativize roles that are low on the hierarchy (i.e. indirect object, oblique case etc.), e.g.:

\[(14) \text{a. I.OBJ: } ἑρεται ζ το δῶκεν τα πρόβατα το πιστικό} \]

‘he comes to the shepherd who (=to whom) he gave the sheep’

(Mavrohalividis & Kesisoglou, 1960:204)

\[(14) \text{b. OBL: } εκού do λούστα do λερό} \]

‘that water which I washed with’

(Kesisoglou, 1951:158)

The conclusion reached through the examination of το/τα is that the demonstrative relativizer remains in use in the Asia Minor dialects, but only as an uninflected form; in Cappadocian it has been generalized as the only, uninflected option (except for in Northern Cappadocian, where we mainly find (ο)που (see section 2.3)), while in Pontic it appears to have survived alongside its competitor που because in this dialect it was used for marking animacy, i.e. [–human] [± neuter] or [+neuter] [± human] nouns.

### 2.1 Simple relativizers from interogatives

As already mentioned, the simple inflected relative pronouns also have their origins in interrogative pronouns, in this case τις and ποιος. Also to be included in this category are the products of the grammaticalization of cleft constructions with the interrogative pronoun τις, the
copula, and one of the relatives \( \tau o \) or \( \pi o u \), e.g. \( \tau i \; e i n a i \; \tau o \; > \; P o n t. \; \nu t o, \; \tau i \; e i n a i \; \pi o u \; > \; P o n t. \) (Oinoe) \( t s e m o u \) etc. Schematically:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{interrogatives} & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \\
\tau i & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \\
\nu t o & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \\
\text{cleft constructions} & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \\
\tau i \; e i n a i \; \nu t o & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \\
\tau i \; e i n a i \; \pi o u & \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \quad
\end{align*}
\]

Figure 2. Typological schema of relatives from interrogatives

We will not discuss clefts further, except to observe that \( \nu t o \) has merged with \( \tau o \) (see, for example 12a; cf. Drettas 1997:351 and Nicholas 1998:514, note 13) and, with the same constraints discussed above with regard to \( \tau o \) (i.e. subjects must be animate neuters, as in 15a below, or inanimate nouns of all genders), it extends even to syntactic roles that are very low on the Keenan-Comrie scale (i.e. genitive possessives, as in 15b), e.g.:

\[
(15) \begin{align*}
\text{a. SUBJ:} & \quad \tau o \; \mu o r o \; \nu t' \; \circ k \; \epsilon d o k e \; \tau' \; \alpha l l o \; \phi a e i \\
& \quad \text{the child REL not it.gave} \quad \text{the other food} \\
& \quad \text{‘the child that didn’t give food to the other one’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(16) \begin{align*}
\text{b. GEN:} & \quad \tau o \; k o r i t \sigma' \quad \nu t o \; \epsilon \chi' \; \alpha p \alpha n' \; \sigma h \; \tau s e m e \; \tau o n \; \k a n t r o n \; \alpha b e \\
& \quad \text{the girl that it.has up in.the fountain} \quad \text{the picture her} \\
& \quad \text{‘the girl whose picture is above the spring’}
\end{align*}
\]

2.1.1 The case of \( \tau i \)

\( \tau i \) is not used at all in Tsakonian, Cappadocian or Pharasiot. In Pontic, by contrast, it is used even in restrictive relative clauses as a manifestation of the strategy of using an inflected pronoun as opposed to the uninflected relativizers \( \pi o u \) and \( \tau o \), and indeed extends to positions that are very low on the accessibility hierarchy:

\[
(16) \begin{align*}
\text{a. SUBJ:} & \quad \tau s a \; \delta o u l e \circ \; \\alpha r b o p o n \; \pi a n t a \; \k e r d e m e n o s \; e n \\
& \quad \text{REL.NOM he.works man always won.PTCP he.is} \\
& \quad \text{‘the person who works always wins’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(\text{Oikonomidis, 1958:247})
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. OBJ:} & \quad \tau i n a n \; \k a t i g o r e \circ \; \tau s o \; \nu o f a d e s \\
& \quad \text{REL.ACC you.blame the daughters.in.law} \\
& \quad \text{‘the daughters-in-law you blame’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
(\text{AP 3:102})
\]

\[
(\text{AP 3:89})
\]
(Oikonomidis, 1958:244)

c) I.OBJ: η βροθάκα τίναν εδώκαμε τη θαγατέραν εμον
the frog REL.ACC we.gave the daughter ours
‘the frog to which we gave our daughter’

(AP 16:105)

d) GEN: ετοπλάεψεν τ’ αγούρτς τινός ἐχτήσεν τ’ οσπίτα
he.gathered the young.men REL.GEN built the houses
‘he gathered together the men whose houses he had built’

(AP 7:246)

As can be seen from the examples in (16), the types τσι, τινάν (τίναν), τινός are used exclusively for [+animate] nouns (see also Drettas, 1997:359-360, 364) and have become neutralized with regard to number and gender. This shows that the pronoun in question is in the process of developing into an uninflected relativizer. This cannot be the neuter form, as seen previously in the case of το/τα, because it would not agree with the characteristic of animacy that is relativized by this particular pronoun. Therefore, the prevailing form, and the best choice for becoming a general relative marker, would be the masculine / feminine accusative τινάν (τίναν) as shown in the following example, where it relativizes the head έρον as a subject:

(17) να δίν’ νεν ατην είναν ἠχέρον τίναν εθέλνεν ατέ
to he.was.giving her a widower.ACC REL he.was.wanting her
‘[her father] would give her to a widower who wanted her’

(AP 45:96)

The uninflected relative marker τινάν (τίναν) in (17) is rare in Pontic, but, according to Tzitzilis and Zuravliova (to appear), it is usual in the Crimean-Azov dialect (apart from the Urzuf-Yalta subdialect), where it is used for all syntactic roles as a relativizer for [+animate] heads:

(18) SUBJ: ας τα θηγούς τίνα κάθαναν απάς τον Ολύμπ
from the gods REL they.were.sitting on of.the Olympus
‘form the gods who sat on Mount Olympus’

(Tzitzilis and Zuravliova, to appear)

In this dialect, the only trace that remains of the earlier situation is the rare use of the nominative τις as a relativizer for [+animate] subjects:

(19) ἑνα παιδίτς τις πράτξιν ὄνημα Χιόυρα
a little-child REL he.was.carrying name Yura
‘a little child who bore the name Yura’

(Tzitzilis and Zuravliova, to appear)
It is evident that in Pontic and in the Urzuf-Yalta subdialect of Crimean-Azof Greek the uninflected τινάν (τίνα(v)) did not become established due to the generalization of the competing form που (see 2.3 below).

Let us now examine the corresponding paradigms from the Southern Italian Greek dialect of Calabria, based on the examples in Rohlfs (1950:120):

(20) a. SUBJ:  
  o ándra ti ļıte  
  the man REL he.came  
  ‘the man who came’

b.OBJ:  
  o ándra ti ļvra  
  the man REL I.found  
  ‘the man I found’

c. I.OBJ:  
  o áðrepo ti tu ľıdıka tin ľega  
  the man REL RESCL I.gave the goat  
  ‘the man I gave the goat to’
  (RESCL = resumptive clitic: ‘to him’)

d. OBL:  
  ta peďia me ti ľino ľpláteze  
  the children with REL.ACC he.talked  
  ‘the children he talked to’

e. GEN:  
  o ándra ti tu xórąsa to spíti  
  the man REL RESCL I.bought the house  
  ‘the man whose house I bought’

The marker τι which relativizes all the above syntactic functions (subject, object (direct and indirect), genitive possessive) is, most probably, not derived from the relativizer ὁ τι of the Hellenistic Koine, as proposed by Pernot (1946, 2:231) and accepted by Taibbi and Caracausi (1959:lxvii), Rohlfs (1964:372), and Nicholas (1998:524), but rather from the interrogative τις, as proposed by Kapsomenos (1953:334). This interpretation is confirmed by evidence from medieval Southern Italian Greek, as shown by Katsogiannou & Tzitzilis (to appear), where τις is indeed attested as a relativizer:

(21) της μεγάλης εκκλησίας τον Σωτήρος τις ανοικοδομήθη  
  of.the big church of.the Saviour REL was.built  
  ‘of the big church of the Saviour which was built [...]’
  (Cusa, 618 · 1146 CE).

The problem with the typology of Southern Italian Greek relatives concerns the oblique case με τίνο (20d), inasmuch as this represents a change of strategy with the use of an inflected pronoun: τίνο is the accusative form for both singular and plural and for all genders, cf. Pontic and Crimean-Azof τίνα. Although this strategy is justified crosslinguistically for positions that are low on the accessibility hierarchy (see e.g. Maxwell, 1982; Manolessou, 2004), it is
unexpected from a theoretical point of view that in this position we should find an interruption in
the strategy of using an uninflected relativizer + resumptive clitic, which is used for the
relativization of indirect objects (20c), and is subsequently resumed for the relativization of
genitive possessives (20e). But of course this inconsistency could be the result of insufficient
available material.

The use of the inflected τις in free relative clauses is also widespread in the dialects examined
here (examples 22-24 below), although in Pontic the nominative form (τς) is rare and the genitive
non-existent, e.g.:

(22) Pontic:

a. τς εξορεύει
   REL.NOM he.proceeds
   ‘whoever proceeds’
   (Oikonomidis, 1958:247)

b. τίναν πουλείς με το δουκάλ’ μη δίς ατον
   REL.ACC you.sell me the bridle don’t give to.him
   ‘whoever you sell me to don’t give him the bridle’
   (Oikonomidis, 1958:247)

c. ο χορτλάγιν φάνητ’ σην ανθρώπς και ίλλε
   the vampire he.appears to.the men and especially
   σίναν (< εις τίναν) φοβάτεν
   to.REL.ACC is.afraid
   ‘the vampire appears to people, and especially to whoever is afraid’
   (AP 26:258)

(23) Crimean-Azov Greek:

a. atós n dunja mabhēn tys pulá mabhēn
   he the world he.learns REL.NOM many he.learns
   ‘whoever learns a lot, gets to know the world’
   (Πιρνέξου Άστρου, 3)

b. gharípka astu zísu an týna aghapú
   in.poverty let I.live with REL.ACC I.love
   ‘let me live in poverty with the one I love’
   (Πιρνέξου Άστρου, 3)

(24) Southern Italian:

a. τις πάει ασσ’ αδεία πάει καλά
   REL.NOM he.goes from slowly he.goes well
   ‘whoever goes slowly goes well’
   (Karanastasis, 1992, 5:151)
b. **agápa tíno ttéli**  
love.IMP REL.ACC you.want  
‘love whoever you want’  
(Rohlfs, 1950:121)

c. **ímme lárga ázze tínon gapáo**  
I.am far from REL.ACC I.love  
‘I am far from the one I love’  
(Rohlfs, 1950:121)

2.1.2 The case of **ποίος**

An examination of the relativizer **ποίος** (ποιος) leads us to similar conclusions to those presented above in the case of **τις**: it is inflected as a free relativizer but uninflected as a bound relativizer and, in the Asia Minor dialects, is involved in the marking of animacy. In the examples in 25 and 26 below, **ποίος** (ποιος) is inflected and non-headed:

(25) Pontic:
   a. **ποίος θέλει ἐρται µεν**  
   REL.NOM he.wants he.comes with me  
   ‘whoever wants to comes with me’  
   (Oikonomidis, 1958:244)
   b. **ποίος τον θώρησε λέγει ατός Χριστός ἐν**  
   REL.NOM him he.saw was.saying he Christ he.is  
   ‘whoever saw him said “he is like Christ”’  
   (AP 1:188)

(26) Southern Italian:
   a. **ποίε σε κανοναία τον γαρό χχάνει**  
   REL.NOM you he.looks the time he.wastes  
   ‘whoever looks at you is wasting his time’  
   (Karanastasis, 1991, 4:237)
   b. **επιάνναϊ ας ποία εθέλαι**  
   they.were.catching from REL.ACC.PL they.wanted  
   ‘they were taking from whichever one they wanted’  
   (Karanastasis, 1991, 4:237)

It should be noted that based on the material we have examined we have not been able to confirm the presence in Pontic of forms other than the nominative **ποίος** (ποιος), although such forms are given in the grammars of Papadopoulos (1955:68) and Oikonomidis (1958:244). This pronoun also appears to be completely absent from Crimean-Azov Greek in the role of a free relativizer.

The same marginal functionality applies to Pontic headed **ποιος**, which relativizes only pronominal subjects; in the whole sample we found only the three examples given below:
(27) a.  
\[\text{εκείν’ \ ποιος \ είπαν \ ατό}\\ \text{those REL.NOM they.said it}\\ \text{‘those who said it’}\\ \text{(Oikonomidis, 1958:244)}\]

b.  
\[\text{όλ’ \ ποιος \ είν’ \ σιμά, \ θα \ αχουλλανείνε}\\ \text{all REL.NOM they.are near will they.be.advised}\\ \text{‘all those who are close by will start to think sensibly’}\\ \text{(Oikonomidis, 1958:244)}\]

c.  
\[\text{όλ’ \ ποιος \ έκουαν \ ατό \ έπρεξαν \ εκεί}\\ \text{all REL.NOM they.were.hearing it they.were.running there}\\ \text{‘all those who heard it ran there ’}\\ \text{(AP 16:98)}\]

Like τις, Pontic ποιος is associated with [+animate] referents, which might be the reason why its use has not prevailed: it was redundant. Interestingly, the form ποιος in (27), although originally a nominative singular, has became neutralized with regard to number and, probably, gender. In other words it shows all the signs of an ongoing process of demorphologization in a way comparable with the headed accusative τινάν in the same dialect (cf. examples 16 b and c above).

In contrast, in Crimean-Azov Greek, this pronoun, grammaticalized in the form πούγιο (neuter sg.) and πούγια (neuter pl.), is said by Tzitzilis and Zouravliova (to appear) to have taken on the relativization of syntactic roles for [−animate] heads in bound relative clauses, e.g.:

(28) a.  
\[\text{τον \ πάτου \ πούγιον \ δώκαν \ τον \ μας \ Ρούσς}\\ \text{the land REL.SG they.gave it to.us Russians}\\ \text{‘the land which the Russians gave us ’}\\ \text{(Tzitzilis & Zuravliova, to appear)}\]

b.  
\[\text{αγοραζιν \ εφιμεριδις \ πύja \ sorivinda \ pes \ δάντυt \ tu \ vivlioθiki}\\ \text{he.was.buying newspapers REL.PL were inside this the library}\\ \text{‘he was buying the newspapers which were in this library ’}\\ \text{(Πιρνέσοπ Άστρου, 3)}\]

The markers πούγιο and πούγια are in opposition to τις, which is [+animate] and [±bound], and for this reason their usage has become established here but not in Pontic.

In Southern Italian Greek, ποίο, within the framework of the same inflected pronoun strategy that we find in the case of τις (cf. example 20d), appears only in positions very low on the accessibility hierarchy (i.e. relativizing the role of genitive possessives) and evidently constitutes a calque of the Italian il quale, as Rohlfs correctly observes:

(29) GEN:  
\[\text{i \ jinéka \ ázze \ pía \ ivra \ tom \ bâte}\\ \text{the woman from REL.ACC.FEM.SG I.found the father}\\ \text{‘the woman whose father I met’}\\ \text{(Rohlfs, 1950:120)}\]
2.2 Relativizers of mixed origin

The richest category in our sample is that of inflected relativizers that originate from the combination of a relativizing morpheme and the interrogative pronoun τις or ποίος.

Figure 3. Typological schema of complex relativizers

As shown in figure 3, these relativizing morphemes are, according to Tzitzilis (to appear):

a) the ο- of the relative pronoun ὁτις, which also has the allomorphs ον- < acc. ὄντινα, ου- < gen. ὄντινος, and ουν-, showing generalization of the nasal element, cf. medieval Greek (Cypriot) μποίος (Machairas, 114.21). These elements were fossilized, became independent and were generalized when the first part of the complex pronoun ceased to be inflected.

b) ει-, deriving from the conditional conjunction εἰ, which was already being used in the Hellenistic Koine to form the indefinite relative pronoun εἴτις (Ljungvik, 1932:10), e.g. εἰ τις ἔχει ὀτα ακούειν, ἀκούετω ‘whoever has ears to hear, let them hear’. There is also the form είν-, showing, again, generalization of the nasal element.

As shown in table 1 below, this typology is exemplified most fully in Pontic and in the Asia Minor dialects more generally. In Tsakonian there are quite a few examples, while in Southern Italian and Crimean-Azov Greek the complex pronouns, including the very common ὁποίος, are completely absent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>τις</th>
<th>ποίος</th>
<th>Pontic</th>
<th>Cappadocian</th>
<th>Pharasiot</th>
<th>Tsakonian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>ο-τις</td>
<td>ο-ποίος</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>*ον-τις</td>
<td>ο-μποίος</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>ου-τις</td>
<td>ου-ποίος</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>ουν-τις</td>
<td>ουμποίος</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>ει-τις</td>
<td>ειποίος</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>ειν-τις</td>
<td>ειμποίος</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Distribution of complex pronouns
In 30 we have listed the examples of the various forms of the complex pronouns presented in the table:

(30) **I. o-τίς, o-ποιος**

a. Pontic:

i.  ὁ-τίς   να   παίρ’
REL-REL.NOM to take

‘whoever will take’

(Oikonomidis, 1958:246)

ii.  ζ  ὁ-τινος   κιφάλ’   επέγιναν
to  REL-REL.GEN  head  fell.on

‘whoever’s head they fell on’

(Oikonomidis, 1958:246)

iii.  ὁ-σουνοὺς²   τα   κορίτσ’   θωρήτε   σ’   ὅρωμά   σας
REL-to.REL.GEN  the  girls  you.see  to.the  dream  yours

‘whoever’s daughters you see in your dream’

(AP 1:185)

iv.  ὁ-τινα   ρούζ’   ας   εν   τ’   εκεῖνοῦ
REL-REL.ACC falls  let  it.be  of.the  his

‘whoever it falls to, let it be his ’

(AP, 3:86)

v.  ὁ-ποιος   θέλ’   ας   έρται
REL-REL.NOM  he.wants  let  come

‘whoever wants to, let him come ’

(Oikonomidis, 1958:245)

vi.  ὁ-ποιονος   θέλτς   ας   έν
REL-REL.GEN  you.want  let  be

‘let it be whoever’s you want’

(Oikonomidis, 1958:245)

vii.  ὁ-ποιωνόν  ἀρνίων  το  μαλλίν  εν  καλόν  κράτατο
REL-REL.GEN.PL  lambs.GEN  the  wool  is  good  keep.IMP.it

‘whichever lambs’ wool is good, keep it ’

(Oikonomidis, 1958:245)

² *μις τίνος > στίνος > ὁ-στίνος > ὁσουνοὺς, with prefixing of reinforcing relative marker o- and normal change st > s.
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b. Cappadocian:

i. ό-τίς κ’ ἐρέ / ό-τις ἐρεται
   REL-REL.NOM and come / REL-REL.NOM he.comes
   ‘whoever comes’
   (Dawkins, 1916:304 / 354)

   ii. ό-στίνος κιφάλ. κόνδανεν,
       REL-to-REL.GEN head was.doing.droppings
       ‘whoever’s head it did its droppings on’
       (Dawkins, 1916:424)

   iii. ό-τσίνα να πιάσουμ’
        REL-REL.ACC to we.catch
        ‘whoever we catch, we will find him a bride’
        (Fosteris and Kesisoglou, 1960:102)

   iv. ό-ποιος το βαίρ, εκείνο είνε εκουήζς
        REL-REL.NOM it take he is ox.driver
        ‘whoever takes it, he is the ox-driver’
        (Dawkins, 1916:424)

   v. ό-ποιος τσέρ να δικώσεις
        REL-REL.ACC stone to you.lift
        ‘whichever stone you lift, you find him underneath’
        (Mavrohalividis and Kesisoglou, 1960:174)

c) Pharasiot:

   ό-τις πίνει βερεσέ κρασί, μεθά δίο φορέδες
   REL-REL.NOM he.drinks on.credit wine gets.drunk two times
   ‘whoever drinks wine on credit gets drunk twice’
   (Loukopoulos and Loukatos, 1951:18)

d) Tsakonian:

   i. ό-τσδʰρε (< ό-τίς) μόον ταν στο χωρίο, θωρό τα σ’
      REL-REL.NOM coming was to.the village seeing was them
      ‘whoever came to the village saw them’
      (Costakis, 1986 2:371)

   ii. ό-τσδʰουνε (< ό-τίνος) ἐν α τσδʰία
       REL-REL.GEN is the pickaxe
       ‘whoever’s pickaxe this is, let him come and get it’
       (Costakis, 1999:87)

---

3 *είς τίνος > στίνος > ό-στίνος, with prefixing of reinforcing relative marker ό-.
iii. ό-τος ρε να θυρά

REL-REL.ACC to they see

‘whoever they see’

(Costakis, 1951:177)

iv. ό-per (< όποιος) aramάι cίsu θα i θίsome

REL-REL.NOM gets.left behind will her we.slaughter

‘whoever gets left behind, we will slaughter her’

(Liosis, 2007)

v. ό-κοια (< όποια) γοναιακα ενι θέλα, να μόλει

REL-REL.NOM,F woman is wanting to come

‘whichever woman wants to, let her come’

(Costakis, 1986 2:366)

II. *ον-τις, ομ-ποιος

a) Pontic:

i. όμ-ποιος λούσκεται δί’ έναν γορόσ

REL-REL.NOM he.washes.himself he.gives a ghrosi

‘whoever washes himself gives a coin’

(Athanasiadis, 1977:52)

ii. όμ-ποιον αγαπά ας παίρ

REL-REL.ACC she.loves let take

‘let her marry whoever she loves’

(Oikonomidis, 1958:245)

b) Pharasiot:

i. όν-δουνους (< όν-τινος) θόρι ’α δόσ’

REL-REL.ACC door to you.knock

‘whoever’s door you knock on’

(Loukopoulos & Loukatos, 1951:62)

ii. όν-σι-τινα⁴ ‘α νοίζεις γονί ’α νοίζουν τσαί το σον

REL-to-REL.ACC to open pit will open and the yours

‘whoever you dig a pit for, they will dig yours too’

(Louk.-Louk., 1951:31)

c) Tsakonian:

όμ-ποιος ε θέου ύο ενι κίνον

REL-REL.NOM is wanting water is drinking

‘whoever wants water, drinks’

(Costakis, 1986 2:366)

⁴ Cf. Pontic όσουνους (30, a, iii) and Cappadocian όστινος (30, b, ii), which are formed through the same process of affixing the preposition εις ( > σε) between the two relativizing elements, ό- and τις.
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III) **ου-της, ου-ποιος** (cf. medieval ούτι (Kriaras's Dictionary (KD), 5:341, entry είτι))

a) Pontic:

i. και εκεί ου-τσ-ον (< ουτις ον) πάσανε άλλου 'κι γυρίζων and there REL-REL.NOM-REL he.was.going more not was.coming

‘and whoever went there didn’t come back again’

(Athanasiadis, 1977:54)

ii. ου-τ’ εποίκε φαϊτάν 'κ εγένισε

REL-REL.ACC.N she.made foods not was.done

‘whatever food she made, it never cooked properly’

(Athanasiadis, 1977:54)

No examples of ου-ποιος, but this form is found in Papadopoulos’s (1961) dictionary, entry οποιος.

IV) **ουν-της, ουμ-ποιος**

Pontic:

i. ουν-τσ-αν (< ούντις αν) εξέρει γράμματα, πάντα τιμούν ατον

REL-REL.NOM-MPRT he.knows letters always honour him

‘whoever knows letters, they always honour him’ (MPRT = modal particle)

(Oikonomidis, 1958:246)

ii. ας εντάμε ουν-τάν (< ουντι αν) λέει μος

let we.do REL-REL.ACC.N.MPRT he.says us

‘let’s do what he tells us’

(Athanasiadis, 1977:54)

iii. ουμ-ποιος έρχοντον έλεγε

REL-REL.NOM was.coming she.was.saying

‘whoever came, she said’

(ΑΠ 7:231)

V) **ει-της, ει-ποιος**

There are no examples in our sample, but cf. medieval είτις and είτι(ν)6.

VI) **ειν-της, ειμ-ποιος**

Pontic:

i. ειν-τσ-αν (<ειντις αν) δουλεύ’, πεινασμένος 'κι απομέν’

REL-REL.NOM-MPRT he.works hungry not gets.left

‘whoever works does not get hungry’

(Oikonomidis, 1958:246)

---

5 For the uninflected relative marker ου see below, section 2.3.

6 e.g. να κονταροκτυπήσουσιν και ει-της να νικήσῃ to fight and REL-REL.NOM MPRT wins

‘let them fight a duel, and whoever wins’

(Imperios (Legrand, 1880), 359)
As can be seen from the examples, all the complex relativizers are free and remain inflected, but appear with the same form in the plural (except for the those which have the interrogative ποιος as their second component: cf. 30, I, a, vii and 30, VI, v), e.g.:

(31) είν-σα-ν γυναίκ’ είν’ ἐμφόρ-οι
REL-REL.NOM MPRT women are beautiful-PL
‘whichever women are beautiful’

(Pontic; Oikonomidis, 1958:246)

In Pontic the above typology also applies to spatial, quantitative, qualitative and manner relatives:
In reality, all the complex relativizers are nothing other than the products of reinforcement of the relativizing force of the simple τις and ποιος, which, as we have seen, are limited in their usage as free relatives, at least in Pontic. None of the complex relativizers is used in headed restrictive relative clauses. In the whole Pontic sample there is only one example that could be considered as such:

(32) OBL: τ’ αξινάρ με το-ποιόν επελέκανες ετσακώθεν
the axe with REL-REL.ACC you.were.chopping broke
‘the axe that you were chopping with broke’

(Athanasiadis, 1977: 53)

Here the form τοποιόν (note the relativizing first component which is here to be identified with the neuter article / demonstrative relativizer το) relativizes the oblique case, i.e. once again it concerns a position that is very low on the accessibility hierarchy. In two further examples, the head is a demonstrative or indefinite pronoun, which makes the relative clause semantically free (cf. similar constructions with simple ποιος in ex. 27):

(33) a. ας δί’ ένα παρά εκείνονα ό-ποιος φέρ’ τη διαταγή
let give one coin to.him REL-REL.NOM he.carries the order
‘let him give a coin to the one who brings the order’

(AP 3:120)

b. εφίνισκανε όλους φύ-το-ευ εθέλεινανε να επάγεινανε σο σπίτινανα
they.let all REL-REL.NOM-REL they.wanted to go to.the house.their
‘they let all those who wanted go to their house’

(AP 8:208)

---

7 cf. Medieval ουπού (KD, 14; entry όπου).
In another two examples the clause is headed but non-restrictive:

(34) a. ο κοιμιπάρος ατ', το δανεικό ο-ποιος εδόκε
the best.man his the loan REL-REL.NOM gave
‘his best man, who had given the loan’

(AP 3:87)

b. τα καμήλας επέμενανε εκείνονα τον εφτωχο, ο-ποιος
the camels were.left that the poor REL-REL.NOM
έστεκ απάν’ σο δρόμο
stood on to road
‘the camels were left to that poor man, who was standing in the road’

(AP 3:113)

2.3 Relativizers from adverbs of place

The final source of relative markers is to be found in the uninflated spatial adverbs (ὁ)πον and (ὁ)πη. Tzitzilis (to appear) also includes in this category the Pharasiot and Silliot relativizer του, as well as ου, which derives from the Ancient Greek spatial adverb οὐ and which appears in Medieval Pontic, as shown in 35:

(35) ακριβά πράγματα ου ου φθείρονται
expensive things REL not are.worn
‘expensive things which do not become worn’

(Book of the High Porte 31b, 3d;)

It is preserved as a suffix in the modern Pontic form ούτσ-ου (< ούτις ου, cf. examples 30 III, a, i, and 33b), where it plays a reinforcing role.

The Pharasiot and Silliot form του cannot have its origin in the relative / definite article, since the neuter article is to, not tu. Therefore, του derives from ου with the analogical addition of τ- (Tzitzilis, to appear), or, less likely, is the result of mixing to and ου. Interestingly, there is one example from a papyrus, which is remarkably similar to the situation in Pharasiot and Silliot (cf. examples 37, II and V below), both in terms of syntax and morphology:

(36) πέμψω δε σοι άργυριον εάν άντιπέμψης μοι
I.will.sent but to.you silver if you.resend to.me
‘but I will send you some money if you send me back

του οιησάς μοι άθονίδι-α
REL you.made for.me linen.cloth-N.PL
the linen cloths you sewed for me’

(P.Oxy. 20, 2273, 15-16; 3rd c. CE; cited in Kriki, 2013:310)

The relative clause in (30) is right-headed and, as Kriki observes, there is no morphological agreement of number and gender between the head άθονίδια (neuter plural) and the marker του. This allows us to hypothesize on the adverbial nature of the latter. The early appearance of such constructions seems to undermine the prevailing view among researchers that typical Asia Minor
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and especially Cappadocian and Pharasiot prenominal relative clauses are just the result of heavy structural borrowing from Turkish (e.g. Dawkins, 1916:200, Thomason and Kaufmann, 1988:221, Thomason 2001:74, among others). As Janse (1999:457) puts it, there is a crucial difference between the Cappadocian (and Pharasiot) relative clauses, at least in the “normal” cases, and their Turkish equivalent: since the Greek verb-second order is retained inside the relative clause (cf. example 37, II, b), “Cappadocian word order is calqued on the Turkish only as far as the order of the relative [clause] and its antecedent is concerned, i.e. on the level of noun phrase”. In our view, it is likely that under the influence of the Turkish word order an already existing tendency was eventually generalized (cf. also Tzitzilis, to appear).

Also to be included in this category of adverbial relativizers is the Pharasiot τζάπουν, which, according to Andriotis (1948:67), derives from the construction εκεί απου (literally: ‘there where’). The overall picture of relativizers of adverbial origin is shown in figure 4:

Figure 4. Typological schema of uninflected relativizers

Uninflected relativizers are widely used in the dialects we have examined for both free and headed relative clauses, restrictive and non-restrictive. As regards accessibility, they occur throughout the hierarchy, as shown in the following examples. Again, it is not always certain if the gaps in some positions are the result of insufficient available material, or of restrictions on relativization in positions low on the hierarchy:

(37) I. Pontic που (πη, π’):

a. η γυναίκα π’ έρθεν
   the woman REL she.came
   ‘the woman who came’
   (Oikonomidis 1958:244)

b. το ρασίν που έσ’ ματέν’
   the mountain REL it.has mineral
   ‘the mountain that has minerals’
   (AP 15:122)

c. απ’ εκείντς π’ εθαρείς
   of those REL you.think
   ‘of those who you think’
   (AP 15:199)

d. το κλαδίν π’ επάτνεν
   the brach REL he.was.treading.on
   ‘the branch he was treading on’
\[266\]

Nikos Liosis and Eirini Kriki

(\textit{AP} 7:113)

OBL

\textit{ε. με τα κλαδια που εστολιζαμε τα πόρτες} \\
\textit{with the branches \textit{were} decorating the doors} \\
\textit{‘with the branches with which we decorated the doors’}

(\textit{AP} 8:208)

GEN

\textit{f. η γαρη που ’κ επιανεν το κερίν ατς} \\
\textit{the woman \textit{not} was catching the candle \textit{res}} \\
\textit{‘the woman whose candle didn’t light’}

(\textit{AP} 27:64)

II. Pharasiot \textit{tou} and \textit{τσάπου}^8:

SUBJ a. \textit{τον γενήθη \textit{to μαχτσωμι}} \\
\textit{it was born the baby} \\
\textit{‘the baby that was born’}

(Dawkins, 1916:492)

OBJ b. \textit{αδείνο \textit{τον \textit{γινο} o βασιλός σο μαχτσωμι τo \textit{κελή}} \\
\textit{that \textit{he} stuck the king in the baby the knife} \\
\textit{‘that knife that the king stuck into the baby’}

(Dawkins, 1916:494)

OBL c. \textit{τσάπουμε \textit{πίταξες \textit{to φσαχόκ-κo \textit{ήφαρα}}\textit{ ta}} \\
\textit{me you sent the little lad I brought it} \\
\textit{‘I have brought the little lad you sent me to’}

(Anastasiadis, 1976:177)

III. (Northern) Cappadocian (\textit{ὅ})\textit{που}:

SUBJ a. \textit{τον \textit{αθρώπ}} \textit{όπου πήγεν να πανδρεψτή} \\
\textit{of the man’s \textit{he went} to get married} \\
\textit{‘of the person who went to get married’}

(Dawkins, 1916:456)

OBJ b. \textit{\textit{καλάτ} \textit{παλατ} τον είδε στ’ \textit{όρμα τ’}} \\
\textit{the palace \textit{he saw} in the dream his} \\
\textit{‘the palace he saw in his dream’}

(Sarantidis Archelaos, 1899:208)

IV. Crimean-Azov (Urzuf-Yalta) \textit{που}^9:

SUBJ a. \textit{as me \textit{kljé kurits jasútsku pu jen dődēka xurn-i}} \\
\textit{let me cry girl young \textit{is} twelve years old \textit{cry for me}} \\
\textit{‘let the young girl who is twelve years old cry for me’}

\[^{8}\text{τσάπου} \text{relativizes only syntactic roles that are low on the Hierarchy, cf. example c.}\]

\[^{9}\text{Relativization of the object (animate or not) probably requires the obligatory use of the resumptive pronoun, as in examples b and c.}\]
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(Kozmuku Pigað, 1994:19)

b. είδα τού νέου που 'ν αγαπήσω
I.saw the young REL RESCL I.love
‘I saw the young man who I love’

(Ashla, 1999:40)

c. τουν λόγου που τουν εἶπ’ συ
the word REL RESCL said you
‘the thing you told’

(Ashla, 1999:43)

V. Silliot (κεια) τ(ον):

SUBJ a. τούτους κα-τ’ (< εκεία του) ζέβκι, ρεν του ζέρου
he there-REL he came out not him I.know
‘the one who came out, I don’t know him’

(Costakis, 1968:75)

OBJ b. αυτό τ’ σωρείτ’ τ’ παιρί
this REL you.see the child
‘this child that you see’

(Costakis, 1968:75)

OBL c. ἥβρι τα σεράια κεια-του εἶπ’ χιζὔρης
he.found the palaces there-REL he.said holy.man
‘he found the palaces of which the holy man had told him’

(Dawkins, 1916:288)

VI. Southern Italian (Puglia) που

SUBJ a. to šiddi pu aliftái
the dog REL barks
‘the dog that barks’

OBJ b. to spíti pu afórasa
the house REL I.bought
‘the house I bought’

I.OBJ c. o ἁντρεπο pu tu púlisa tin ızza
the man REL RESCL I.sold the goat
‘the person I sold the goat to’

GEN d. ĉini pu tos afórasa to spíti
those REL RESCL I.bought the house
‘those people whose house I bought’

[+human/animate]

[–human/animate]

10 Obligatory use of the resumptive pronoun for positions lower than the direct object, cf. examples c and d.
VII. Tsakonian \((\hat{o})\pi^{h}(\eta)\):

SUBJ a. \(\hat{\sigma} \ \acute{\alpha} \beta \rho \omega \pi^{h} \ \pi^{h} \ \varepsilon \kappa \alpha \nu e\)  
the man REL he.came  
‘the man who came’

(Liosis, 2007:540)

OBJ b. \(\acute{\epsilon} \kappa i \ \pi^{h} \ \eta \ \nu t' \ \varepsilon \pi \kappa a\)  
that REL you I.told  
‘the thing I told you’

(Liosis, 2007:540)

I.OBJ c. \(\alpha \ \gamma \o \nu \alpha \acute{k} a \ \pi^{h} \ \eta \ \nu i \ \varepsilon \pi \kappa a\)  
the woman REL RESCL I.said  
‘the woman to whom I said’

(Liosis, 2007:540)

OBL d. \(\tau o \ \kappa a \mu \pi \zeta \iota \ \pi^{h} \ \iota k i \ \alpha \pi^{h} k \ \alpha \acute{\lambda} e\)  
the child REL she.was pregnant  
‘the child she was pregnant with’

(Costakis, 1987 3:409)

GEN e. \(\hat{o} \ \kappa o n t o \pi \acute{t} \theta o u \acute{l} e \ \pi^{h} \ \eta \ \acute{\epsilon} \kappa i \ \kappa \iota \nu \phi t^{a} \ \alpha \ \Pi e n t \acute{a} \mu \rho r \phi o \ \tau h o \ \sigma \rho \theta \iota \mu a \ \sigma i\)  
the dwarf REL she.was slept the Beauty in.the mattress RESCL  
‘the dwarf on whose mattress Beauty had slept’

(Liosis, 2007:540)

2.4 Combined relativizers

One final observation: the complex relativizers are not the only possible means of reinforcing relativization. In the course of our research we have encountered almost every possible combination of simple, complex and uninflected relativizers. In addition to the cases we have already examined (e.g. \(\acute{o} \nu \acute{t} \sigma o u\), cf. examples 25 III, a, i, and 27b), here we give a few representative examples that show the rich variety of constructions for introducing relative clauses that are available in the Modern Greek dialects:

(38) I) complex + simple relativizer:

a. \(\acute{o} \nu-\delta \nu a-\pi \acute{o} i o v\)  
REL-REL-ACC-REL-ACC  
‘whoever’

(Pharasiot, Andriotis, 1948:58-9),

b. \(\acute{o} \tau-\tau i \zeta (\prec \acute{o} \tau i \tau i \zeta)\)  
REL.N-REL.NOM  
‘whoever’

(Crimean-Azov, Tzitzilis & Zouravliova (to appear))
II) complex + uninflected:
\[\text{το-ποίε πράµα π' ώνι αναχΨάσσουντα}\]
REL.REL.NOM animal REL not.is chewing
‘whichever animal doesn’t chew the cud’

(Tsakonian; Costakis, 1987 3:72)

III) simple + uninflected:

a. \(\text{τις-που (}< \text{τις + που}) \text{ πάι \text{ ασσάδια} \text{ επάι \text{ καλά}}\)
REL.NOM-REL REL REL REL
‘whoever goes slowly goes well’

(S. Italian; Rohlfs, 1950:21),

b. \(\text{τσισ-κάν-τ' (}< \text{τις καν} \text{ του}) \text{ ενι}\)
REL.NOM-MPRT-REL REL
‘whoever it may be’

(Silliot; Costakis 1968: 75),

IV) simple + simple:
\[\text{του \text{ ψάρ}} \text{ πιάκα}\]
REL.REL.ACC.N REL
‘the fish that I caught’

(Crimean-Azov; Tzitzilis and Zouravliova (to appear))

V) relativizing prefix + complex:
\[\text{μ' ον-δα-ποίο (}< \text{ον- + ταποίο}) \text{ μασαίρ 'α ψόα'κ'}\]
with REL.REL.REL.ACC knife to you.slaughter
‘with whichever knife you slaughter with’

(Pharasiot; Loukopoulos and Loukatos, 1951:95)

3 Conclusions

This brief examination of the peripheral dialects has demonstrated that they present major differences from SMG. The general rule is that free relatives, except for those that are derived from uninflected forms, remain inflected. In contrast, headed relatives, even those that were originally inflected, generally end up as uninflected forms. Only Pontic and to a certain extent Southern Italian have developed a strategy involving an inflected headed relativizer, which is, however, based on the inflection of \(\tauις\), rather than that of \(οοποίος\) as found in SMG. A second point is that animacy has important consequences for the relativization strategies of the Asia Minor dialects, and cannot be ignored in any attempt at a typological categorization of these dialects. Finally, the historical development of the relativizers involves cycles of weakening and reinforcement, which is to be expected from a crosslinguistic and theoretical point of view. However, each dialect has chosen its own materials and mechanisms for the reinforcement of relativization.
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