

# REORGANIZATION OF GRAMMAR IN THE LIGHT OF THE LANGUAGE CONTACT FACTOR: A CASE STUDY ON GRICO AND CAPPADOCIAN\*

DIMITRA MELISSAROPOULOU  
*University of Patras & Open University of Cyprus*

This paper makes a contribution to the issue of the role of language contact in the reorganization of grammar in the light of the evidence provided by two Modern Greek contact induced dialects, i.e. Italiot varieties in contact with both the local Romance varieties and Standard Italian and Cappadocian in contact with Turkish. We claim that the attested phenomena of reorganization of nominal inflection can be accounted for as temporarily complexification always headed, however, towards the same direction, simplification in the paradigmatic relations. The amount and the type of temporary complexification diverge significantly depending on the compatibility or incompatibility factor among the systems in contact. Furthermore, we show that although replacement and loss of features are admittedly the commoner strategies on the level of morphology, addition is also very likely to appear when structural incompatibility is involved.

## 1 Introduction

The topic of reorganization of grammar in the light of the language contact factor has been treated both from a sociolinguistic and a typological viewpoint. In the sociolinguistic spirit, the general claim is supported that language contact is strongly related to simplification (cf. Kusters, 2003; Dahl, 2004; Trudgill, 2002, 2009, 2011), while from the typological viewpoint it is thought to lead to complexification (cf. Comrie, 1992).

Comrie (1992: 210) has argued that complexity could be thought of as what language evolution adds (for example morphophonemic alternation and suppletion), or in terms of language change and referring to contact factors, the burden of diachrony. Research in sociolinguistics, on the other hand, has shown, within the spirit of associating certain linguistic

---

· The author wishes to thank the audience of the 5<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory for helpful input and discussion.  
dmelissa@upatras.gr

features or tendencies with certain types of social structure, that specific types of social structure may pave the way towards lesser or greater language complexity (cf. Trudgill, 2004, 2009, 2011). One of the most prominent factors is that of the degree of contact<sup>1</sup> or the degree of isolation (first proposed by Lenneberg, 1967), often related to stability and the community size (cf. Trudgill, 2011). As regards the Modern Greek dialects, they are generally argued to constitute a very good example of the thesis that low-contact varieties are rather conservative systems (cf. Trudgill, 2004: 435), i.e. tend to preserve their structure, or archaisms (thus complexity).

The aim of this contribution is to investigate the extent, the strength and the implications of the influence of a particular linguistic system on another, emphasizing the reorganization of grammar, nominal inflection in particular in intense language-contact situations involving communities in isolation (cf. Trudgill, 2004, 2009), or at least in relevant isolation from the Greek mainland, in terms of simplification vs. complexification.

Claims and proposals put forward are exemplified through data from the contrastive investigation of two different contact-induced dialects of Greek. The reasoning behind this choice lies in our belief that simplification vs. complexification phenomena can be more effectively enlightened due to the close genetic affiliation and the common historical origin of these varieties. On the one hand, we examine the Asia Minor dialect of Cappadocia which was spoken for great many centuries in a Turkish spoken environment while, on the other hand, the dialects of Southern Italy, i.e. Italiot -Grico and Greacanico (Bovese)-, which are spoken for great many centuries as well in an Italian ground.

The data under investigation are extracted from the available written sources (cf. Karanastasis, 1997; Rohlf, 1977; Tommasi, 1996; Stomeo, 1996; Filieri, 2001; Katsoyannou, 1996; Dawkins, 1916; Kesisoglou, 1951; Fosteris and Kesisoglou, 1960; Mavrochalyvidis and Kesisoglou, 1960; Sasse, 1992; Janse, forthcoming, etc.), as well as from the oral corpora available at the Laboratory of Modern Greek dialects at the University of Patras. They are looked into not in a static perspective but in terms of language variation and change, in the sense that synchronic variation mirrors language change.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2, basic premises and assumptions on the notions of contact, reorganization of inflection and complexification vs. simplification are offered. In section 3, a sketchy description of the sociolinguistic background and all the relevant data are presented accompanied by generalizations on the attested phenomena. In section 4, discussion, by focusing on commonalities and particularities, specific claims and proposals are put forward in order to account for the contact induced changes in terms of simplification vs. complexification, while the section ends with some thoughts for future research.

## 2 Premises

No matter the linguistic perspective, language contact is thought to have two different types of implications for the organization of grammar:

a) It may lead to increase of complexification (due to borrowing effects). In Nichols's (1992: 193)<sup>2</sup> exact words “[...] *contact among languages fosters complexity, or put it differently,*

<sup>1</sup> Maintaining that linguistic change is favoured by contact situations, while lack thereof entails lack of change (cf. Trudgill 2011).

<sup>2</sup> Nichols also distinguished between spread zones and residual zones in the sense that “*residual zones show relatively high complexity[...]*” while “[...] *spread zones show somewhat average complexity*” (1992:192). In

*diversity among languages fosters complexity in each of the languages*”, often called *added complexity*. This type of implication is expected on the condition that the circumstances are of long-term contact, involve childhood (the so called *critical threshold*) and bilingualism occurs.

However, Kusters (2003:359) on the basis of a large-scale empirical study claims that languages experiencing a long history of intense contact show greater degrees of simplification, associating thus the amount of contact with the amount of simplification.

b) Language contact may lead to simplification usually associated with pidginization and as a result of imperfect post-adolescent or adult<sup>3</sup> learning (Lenneberg, 1967). In this perspective, it can be deduced that pidgin and creole grammars are the simplest grammars, since in this case adults are obliged to cope with the problem of learning another language after the critical threshold (McWorter, 2001: 372).

However, as correctly pointed out by Trudgill (2001: 372), simplification phenomena, or the simplest grammars are not confined to pidgins and creoles, they can be attested in other types of languages or varieties as well.

In this paper, the role of language contact among both typologically and genetically divergent systems in this process will be examined; the situation of long term contact, that in the relevant literature (cf. Nichols, 1992; Trudgill, 2009, 2011) is expected to lead to complexification phenomena, *added complexity* in Trudgill’s terms.

As regards the notions of complexification and simplification<sup>4</sup>, aligning with Sasse’s (1992: 15-16) thesis we do not advocate that simplification is necessarily linked with recession or language death. We rather conceive it as loss of complexity (in our case structural complexity) involving greater or lesser rearrangements in the structure of the language, i.e. restructuring phenomena which vary depending on the nature of the systems (and would entail repair -which could be seen as a chain reaction- or no repair in terms of Trudgill (2009:100)) but ultimately they balance out the system.

For the purposes of this paper the above mentioned notions are used to refer to irregularity vs. regularity, opacity vs. transparency and redundancy vs. loss of it (with or without repair in terms of Trudgill (2009:100) with a special focus on the reorganization of nominal inflection. In the particular case considered, it refers to systems without superfluous morpho(phono)logical alternations, i.e. loss of irregularity and redundancy in inflectional organization.

With respect to the notion of contact, contact induced changes can be conceived of as transfer phenomena of both direct and indirect nature. In direct transfer, what is borrowed from the donor to the recipient language is linguistic material (e.g. phonemes, morphemes), while in indirect transfer what is borrowed is structure, i.e. patterns that result in the rearrangement of the structure of the recipient language under the influence of the donor language (*model replica language* resulting to *grammatical pattern replication*, cf. Matras and Sakel, 2007)<sup>5</sup>. Grammatical patterns can be transferred with or without concomitant transfer of lexicon or morphemic material (for the relevant debate see among others Thomason, 2003; Aikhenvald,

Trudgill’s (2011) terms, in small and tightly-knit communities, complexities learning can be easily reinforced. In a similar vein Braunmüller (1995) argues that morphological opacity is a feature of small languages.

<sup>3</sup>Due to their inability for perfect language learning as is similar to the pre-critical threshold language acquisition.

<sup>4</sup>The notions of complexity - complexification and simplicity - simplification, having overcome their controversial status (due to their initial equation with higher and lower values respectively and the resulting chauvinistic overtones) have become hotly debated in the fields of dialectology, typology, and language contact (cf. Klein and Perdue 1997, Trudgill 1986, Kusters 2003, Dahl 2004, Miestamo 2006, Miestamo et al 2008, Trudgill 2009, 2011).

<sup>5</sup>The second type of change is often referred to in the relevant literature as *syntactic borrowing*, *loan-syntax*, *calquing* or *indirect diffusion* (see among others Clyne 1987, Silva-Corvalán 1995).

2003; Winford, 2003 etc.). It is true that approaches to contact-induced grammatical change vary from the statement that grammatical borrowing is unrestricted, supported by the extreme diffusionists (e.g. Wackernagel, 1926-8: 8; Thomason, 2001:63 to the thesis that it is not possible at all, supported by the extreme retentionists (e.g. Sapir, 1921: 203), the intermediate position holding scholars who argue that grammatical borrowing is possible only to the extent that the donor and the recipient languages are structurally compatible (cf. Meillet, 1921; Weinreich, 1953: 25 and Field, 2002: 42 on the *Principle of System Compatibility* (PSC))<sup>6/7</sup>.

The investigated phenomena are ascribable to indirect transfers resulting to the reorganization of structure either with the form of loss of features or categories (i.e. negative transfer, e.g. breakdown of case systems resulting to simplification of paradigms etc.) or with the form of addition, or replacement thereof (which may serve to compensate for a respective loss in the recipient language). In complexification vs. simplification terms, addition of features as such most probably leads to greater complexity of the influenced system (cf. Trudgill, 2011: 27) and loss of redundant features would most probably entail simplicity, while replacement might vacillate between the two, perhaps depending on the stage of the on-going process. However, in our view, addition of features could be seen as an intermediate stage towards replacement, especially in a diachronic perspective. Lastly, as noticed by Gardani (2008: 22), replacement is thought to be more common in morphology and syntax than the other two processes.

### 3 Data

Given that no specific studies on the organization of the above mentioned dialectal systems into inflection classes are available, we will not make any reference to particular inflection classes as are those of S(tandard) M(odern) G(reek) proposed by Ralli (2000, 2002). Nouns will be divided into groups on the basis of their different inflectional endings in the singular form in combination with their different grammatical gender values (as is suggested in some existing descriptions of the dialects). The corresponding SMG inflectional paradigms will be provided in a comparative column.

#### 3.1 Grico

Italiot varieties, Grico and Greacanico (or Bovese cf. Fanciullo, 2001) are spoken in Southern Italy, Grico in the area of Puglia, Salento, widely known as *Grecia Salentina* (cf. Karanastasis, 1984), while Greacanico in the area of Calabria (*Bovesia*). The sociolinguistic status of these Greek-speaking enclaves varied during centuries. Till the early 90s, in Calabria several villages were reported to be deserted (only in Gallicianó and Bova, the dialect is thought to be alive cf. Katsoyannou, 1995), while in Puglia, the dialect seemed to be more resisting (nine Grico-speaking villages were reported, cf. Profili, 1985), although confined mainly to people of advanced age. The last decades, the dialects, especially Grico, experience revitalization efforts

<sup>6</sup> The Principle of System Compatibility (Field, 2002: 42) predicts that the type of morphological structure of the languages involved in a language-contact situation constraints borrowability.

<sup>7</sup> Gardani (2008:29), examining direct grammatical borrowing (transfer) argues that typological divergence does not impede grammatical transfer although he acknowledges that the lack thereof favours the above mentioned process (grammatical borrowing).

(cf. Caratzas 1958; Profili, 1999a, b), having as a starting point their official recognition as minority languages (1999).

Being spoken for great many centuries in an Italian ground (see Minas, 1994, 2004; Manolessou, 2005 and references therein for the different opinions with respect to Grico origin, i.e. Ancient Greek vs. Byzantine Greek), Italiot varieties were in long term contact with Italian, not only in its standard form (the language of school and media), but in the local Romance varieties as well, (*dialetti salentini and calabresi*), used in every day speech (street conversations, local commerce), limiting the sphere of their usage to family situations (cf. Profili, 1985; Katsoyannou, 1999). Gricophons and Greacophons are aware of the fact that their code differs from Modern Greek (they say: *griko diko ma pero e?* ‘Greek, but our version of it<sup>8</sup>’) as well as of the divergence between *Grico di Puglia* (of Puglia) and *Grico di Calabria* (of Calabria)<sup>9</sup> (for relevant statements in the literature, cf. Rohlfs, 1933, 1997; Karanastasis, 1984, 1997). However, these differences are not so significant, especially in the domain of nominal morphology and nominal inflection that is of interest for the purposes of this paper, so as to treat them as distinct case studies. Divergence in inflectional markers and paradigms between the two varieties will be mentioned, when occurring.

More specifically, the nominal inflection of Italiot varieties is organized as follows:

Three groups of masculine nouns are distinguished in *-a*, *-i*, and *-o* which are inflected as shown in tables (1-3) respectively:

(1)<sup>10/11</sup> 'mina.M ‘month’

	Singular			Plural		
	Salento	Calabria	SMG	Salento	Calabria	SMG
Nom	'mina	'mina	'minas	'mini	'mini	'mines
Gen	'mina	'mina & 'minu & mi'nu	'mina	mi'no	'mino & mi'no	mi'non
Acc	'mina	'mina	'mina	'minu & 'mini	'minu	'mines
Voc			'mina			'mines

<sup>8</sup> This is part of recorded speech that was collected as part of the activities implemented for the research project “Recording and Analyzing the Grico dialect of South Italy”, Interreg II, 5.4. European Union - Ministry of Economy (2000-2001), and is stored at the under construction oral dialectal corpora database of the Laboratory of Modern Greek Dialects at the University of Patras.

<sup>9</sup> Gricophons make meta-linguistic judgments on the divergence of their Grico and *Grico di Calabria* (i.e. Bovesè). Here follows a typical example of a judgement in which a Gricophon comments the difference between the two varieties on a folk song: *e'yo 'leo 'ela 'elatu si'ma. In'vetse e'ci e'lene 'ela 'ela 'tu kon'da.* ‘I say: ‘come close / near here. On the contrary, they say: ‘come close’ (using another adverbial element). For the source of the above-mentioned utterance see the previous footnote.

<sup>10</sup> Abbreviations are used throughout the text following the list of Standard Abbreviations of the Leipzig glossing rules as follows: M(asculine), F(eminine), N(euter), Abs(olutive), Nom(inative), Gen(itive), Dat(itive), Acc(usative), Loc(ative), A(blative), Def(inite), Indef(initie), S(in)g(ular), Pl(ural).

<sup>11</sup> Dialectal data are transliterated throughout the paper in broad phonetic transcription.

## (2) 'ʃuri.M 'master'

	Singular			Plural		
	Salento	Calabria	SMG	Salento	Calabria	SMG
Nom	'ʃuri	'ʃuri	'ciris	'ʃuri	ʃu'ruði & ʃu'ruđja	'ciriðes
Gen	'ʃuri &'ʃuru	ʃu'ru &'ʃuru	'ciri	'ʃuro & ʃuri [attus 'ʃuri] <sup>12</sup>	ʃu'ruði & ʃu'ruđo	('ciriðon)
Acc	'ʃuri	'ʃuri	'ciri	'ʃuru	ʃu'ruđu	'ciriðes
Voc			'ciri			'ciriðes

## (3) 'milo.M 'mill'

	Singular		Plural	
	Salento-Calabria	SMG	Salento-Calabria	SMG
Nom	'milo	'milos	'mili	'mili
Gen	'milu	'milu	'milo & 'mili [attuz 'mili Salento]	'milon
Acc	'milo	'milo	'milu & 'mili	'milus
Voc		'mile		'mili

Apart from the generalized use of *-i* marker for the plural (e.g. *'mini* and *'ʃuri* instead of *'mines* and *'ʃuriðes*), which is a cross-dialectal phenomenon (cf. Melissaropoulou, 2012, in print), what can be seen from the examples (1) to (3) above is that there is a strong alternation between different inflectional forms which tend to generalize the nominative inflectional marker. In (1) for example, the noun *'mina* 'month' is realized in genitive singular as *'mina* and *'minu* in Calabria, while accusative plural as *'minu* and *'mini* in Salento. Similarly, in (2) the noun *'ʃuri* 'master' is realized in genitive singular as *'ʃuri* and *'ʃuru* in Salento, while genitive plural as *'ʃuro* and *'ʃuri* (both synthetic and analytic) in Salento and as *ʃu'ruði* and *ʃu'ruđo* in Calabria. In (3) the noun *'milo* 'mill' is realized both as *'milo* and *'milu* in genitive plural in both Salento and Calabria.

Masculine nouns preserve only to some extent their different inflectional markers in the different plural case forms. According to Katsoyannou (1996: 332), genitive case in particular shows serious signs of recession and seems to be restricted to possessive constructions and nouns denoting kinship, alternating with the corresponding syncretic nominative-accusative forms and with analytic expressions. However, as will be below, this is a general tendency that cross-cuts all groups of Italian nouns.

<sup>12</sup> Analytic expressions are put into squared brackets.

Feminine nouns seem to be confined basically to one group of nouns those in *-a*, since the vast majority of the former feminine nouns in *-i* are transferred to the *-a* group without the reverse tendency being seriously at play<sup>13</sup>. Crucially, this is the only innovation reported by Minas (2004) according to whom, the first attestations of this change were traced in the medieval Greek documents of Italiot and Sicilian Greek, where forms like *tin 'oxθa* instead of *tin 'oxθi* ‘the shore.Acc.’, *tin 'limna* instead of *tin 'limni* ‘the lake.Acc.’ are attested (cf. Minas, 2004: 88-89).

Their inflectional behavior can be seen under (4):

(4) *ji'neka.F* ‘woman’

	Singular			Plural		
	Salento	Calabria	SMG	Salento	Calabria	SMG
Nom	<i>ji'neka</i>	<i>ji'neka</i>	<i>ji'neka</i>	<i>ji'nece</i>	<i>ji'nece</i>	<i>ji'neces</i>
Gen	<i>ji'neka</i> [atti <i>ji'neka</i> ]	<i>jine'ko</i> <sup>14</sup> & <i>ji'neka</i>	<i>ji'nekas</i>	<i>jine'ko</i> & <i>ji'nece</i> [attes <i>ji'nece</i> ]	<i>jine'ko</i> & <i>ji'nece</i> [atze /afse <i>ji'nece</i> ]	<i>jine'kon</i>
Acc	<i>ji'neka</i>	<i>ji'neka</i>	<i>ji'neka</i>	<i>ji'nece</i>	<i>ji'nece</i>	<i>ji'neces</i>
Voc			<i>ji'neka</i>			<i>ji'neces</i>

As shown in the examples under (4) above, genitive plural only partially maintains its distinct inflectional marker since it competes with both the syncretic nominative-accusative (*tos ji'nece*) and the analytic forms (*atze /afse ji'nece*) and tends to be substituted by them.

Lastly, neuter nouns in Italiot consist of three subgroups, those in *-o*, *-i*, and *-a*. Their paradigms can be seen under (5) to (7) below:

(5) *'fsilo / 'fjilo.N* ‘wood’

	Singular			Plural		
	Salento	Calabria	SMG	Salento	Calabria	SMG
Nom	<i>'fsilo</i>	<i>'fjilo</i>	<i>'ksilo</i>	<i>'fsila</i>	<i>'fjila</i>	<i>'ksila</i>
Gen	<i>'fsilu</i> & <i>'fsilo</i> [atto'fsilo]	<i>'fjilu</i> & <i>'fjilo</i> [azze'fjilo]	<i>'ksilu</i>	<i>'fsilo</i> & <i>'fsila</i> [atta'fsila]	<i>'fjilo</i> & <i>'fjila</i>	<i>'ksilon</i>

<sup>13</sup> Only the noun *'tripi* instead of *'tripa* ‘hole’ is found in use in Salento. In Calabria the corresponding form is *'tripa*.

<sup>14</sup> Only the variety of Calabria seems to retain a distinct inflectional marker as well for the genitive singular, which is reminiscent of the Ancient Greek genitive singular form *τῆς γυναικός* and could be ascribed to the relatively greater isolation of Calabria compared to Salentino. However, this is far from being characterized a stable or systematic form. It alternates with the nominative form *ji'neka* as well as with analytic periphrastic structures (for similar examples see Katsoyannou, 1996: 332).

Acc	'fsilo	'fjilo	'ksilo	'fsila	'fjila	'ksila
Voc			'ksilo			'ksila

## (6) 'gala.N 'milk' 'stoma.N 'mouth'

	Singular			Plural		
	Salento	Calabria	SMG	Salento	Calabria	SMG
Nom	'gala	'stoma	'ɣala	'galata	'stomata	'ɣalata
Gen	ga'latu & 'gala [atto 'gala]	sto'matu & 'stoma [atto 'stoma]	'ɣalaktos	ga'lato & 'galata ['atta 'galata]	sto'mato & 'stomata [azza 'stomata]	ɣa'laton
Acc	'gala	'stoma	'ɣala	'galata	'stomata	'ɣalata
Voc			'ɣala			'ɣalata

## (7) kro'vatti /kre'vatti.N 'bed'

	Singular			Plural		
	Salento	Calabria	SMG	Salento	Calabria	SMG
No m	kro'vatti	kre'vatti	kre'vati	kro'vattja	kre'vattj/ia	kre'vatja
Gen	krova'ttiu & kro'vatti [atto kro'vatti]	kreva'ttiu & kre'vatti	kreva'tju	krova'ttio & kro'vattja [atta kro'vattja]	kreva'ttio & kre'vattj/ia [azza kre'vattja]	kreva'tjon
Acc	kro'vatti	kre'vatti	kre'vati	kro'vattja	kre'vattj/ia	kre'vatja
Voc			kre'vati			kre'vatja

In neuter nouns as well, apart from the syncretic nominative-accusative forms, common to all Modern Greek varieties (for a typological correlation see Baerman et al, 2005: 47) the genitive case is only partially realized with a distinct inflectional marker, alternating however with either the syncretic nominative-accusative form or with the analytic structures, showing strong signs of recession. Moreover, nouns that formerly followed the inflectional behavior of *'ðasos* (see the example under the SMG column in (8)), are following divergent directions in order to conform to the new dynamics of the system. They either become masculine (i.e. follow the behavior of *'milo* - *'mili* 'mill-mills') or follow the *-o - ja* neuter inflectional pattern (e.g. *'çilo* - *'çilia* 'lip-lips'),



due to their formal correspondence, or are substituted by loan elements (cf. Katsoyannou, 1996: 335). Thus, the subgroup of nouns shown in (8) does not appear in the Italiot varieties.

(8) 'ðasos.N 'forest'

SMG		
	Singular	Plural
Nom	'ðasos	'ðasi
Gen	'ðasus	ða'son
Acc	'ðasos	'ðasi
Voc	'ðasos	'ðasi

Generalizing our observations with respect to the Italiot morphological system, both Grico and Greacanico retain their tripartite gender categorization. Italiot inflectional markers are reminiscent of but not identical with the SMG inflectional affixes. This is mainly due to final *-s* dropping resulting from the preference of Italiot systems for open (CV) syllables.

On the other hand, Italian nominal inflection, both in its standard form and in the neighboring with Italiot Romance varieties, realizes the properties of number (singular, plural) and gender (masculine and feminine) both of them marked on the noun. However, none of the dominant varieties is inflected for case. Although the range of Italian inflection classes may vary from 3 to 10, depending on the analysis (cf. Dressler and Thornton, 1988; Acquaviva, 2008 and references therein), the most productive classes, shown under (9)<sup>15</sup> below, seem to coincide with the respective Italiot inflectional endings.

(9)	Productive inflection classes					
	Italian			Romance (Salentino)		
	Singular	Plural		Singular	Plural	
Feminine	X-a	X-e	Feminine	X-a	X-e	
	macchina	machine 'car'		igna	igne	'fire'
(Coinciding with Italiot ji'neka)						
Masculine	X-o	X-i	Masculine	X-u (< o)	X-i	
	marito	mariti		maritu	mariti	'husband'
(Coinciding with Italiot 'milo)						
Masculine	X-a	X-i	Masculine	X-a	X-i	
	poeta	poeti		pueta	pueti	'poet'
(Coinciding with Italiot 'mina)						

<sup>15</sup> The first two are thought to be the most productive ones, displaying maximum contrast of gender and inflectional markers final vowels. The situation is similar in the Romance varieties as well. Moreover, the masculine gender value, according to Dressler and Thornton (1988: 3) is thought to be unmarked, while the feminine one marked.

Crucially, a contrastive look at the Italiot vs. Romance nominal subgroups reveals that the notion of inflection class as well as formal correspondences between the two groups of systems cannot but have contributed to the reorganization of the Italiot inflectional system. In other words, the notion of inflection class and the correspondences of inflectional markers between the systems in contact have contributed significantly to restructuring of Italiot nominal inflection to this shape. Further support to this claim is offered by the loss of the subgroup of feminine nouns in *-i* and neuter nouns in *-o*. Crucially, while the levelling of neuter nouns is observed in other Modern Greek varieties, the levelling of feminines in *-i* is a purely Italiot innovation.

Bearing these in mind the above observations can be made:

-There is a strong tendency towards simplification of Italiot nominal morphological system (see also Katsoyannou 1996: 328, 338-339, Katsoyannou 1999) under the prevailing influence of the dominant Italian varieties that is realized as follows: gender and number distinctions are retained, while subgroups of nouns and case inflectional markers tend to eliminate, since

- (i) two subgroups of nouns (neuter in *-os* and feminine in *-i*) are lost,
- (i) vocative case is practically extinct (only some fixed expressions are recorded<sup>16</sup>),
- (ii) extended case syncretism is attested not only in the plural (occurring in other Modern Greek dialects, mainly those of the Northern group) but also in the singular of the vast majority of all subgroups of nouns,
- (iii) there is a strong tendency for substitution of genitive case (more intense in the plural but also in the singular) by the syncretic nominative-accusative or by an analytic structure, i.e. a preposition phrase, consisting of a preposition and a noun phrase in the invariable nominative-accusative case form. Generally speaking, genitive, as already noted in Katsoyannou (1996: 332), seems to be retained only in possessive constructions and especially when terms of kinship are involved. Further support to the observed tendency is offered by the fact that, according to same author, adjectives and pronouns are also gradually moving towards losing their case marking and retaining only the number one.

However, extended desystematization phenomena are attested which are as follows:

- Vacillation between syncretic and non syncretic forms (paving the way towards a one marker per number paradigm as is the case in Romance languages (e.g. *'mina & mi'nos*.Gen.Sg, *jine'ko & ji'nece*.Gen.Pl).
- Vacillation between fusional-synthetic vs. analytic constructions, showing signs of desystematization (*jine'ko & ji'nece*.Gen.Pl (synthetic) & *a'ttes ji'neke* (analytic)).
- Lack of regularity in the inflectional pattern of nouns belonging to the same group (e.g. *'milu & 'mili*.Acc.Pl., *'furi & fu'ruđja*.Nom.Pl).

The above mentioned instances of desystematization are accounted for as temporary complexification phenomena, since they violate economy and regularity and put extra burden to the system, paving however the way towards simplification in the paradigmatic organization of inflection under the influence of the dominant systems.

However, due to the morphological compatibility among the systems in contact, no radical changes, no other complexification phenomena are to be expected. The situation seems to be quite differentiated in Cappadocian.

<sup>16</sup> The vocative is recognizable only in fixed expressions like *Teemu* 'my God' or in some proper nouns.

### 3.2 Cappadocian

Cappadocian came under the Turkish influence during the late byzantine period, for the first time in the 11th century after the Seljuk invasion and subsequently in the 14th century after the conquest of Asia Minor by the Ottoman Turks. It was spoken till 1923 (i.e. till the exchange of populations that followed the treaty of Lausanne in the former Asia Minor (today's central Turkey) in an area that covered 32 communities approximately. The dialect is subdivided into two basic groups, North and South Cappadocian (cf. Dawkins, 1916) and an intermediate one, namely Central Cappadocian (cf. Janse forthcoming)<sup>17</sup> showing intra-dialectal divergence. Today it is spoken by descendants of Cappadocian refugees (second and third-generation refugees) in several parts of Northern Greece (Kavala, Alexandroupoli, Kilkis, Thessaloniki, Karditsa, Volos, Larisa).

Cappadocian is often used in the literature as a prototypical example of *heavy borrowing* in terms of Thomason and Kaufman's borrowing scale, referring to 'overwhelming long-term cultural pressure (Thomason and Kaufman, 1988: 50). The length and intensity of cultural and linguistic contact led Dawkins to the following statement about Cappadocian dialect "[...] *the body ha[d] remained Greek but the soul ha[d] become Turkish [...]*", Dawkins (1916: 198). It should be noted that, although Cappadocian is originally a Greek variety and its basic morphological structure is fusional, it displays some agglutinative patterns due to language contact with Turkish. More importantly, it is the only Greek variety where agglutinative inflectional structures are attested (cf. Dawkins, 1916 and Janse, 2004, forthcoming).

Our presentation of the Cappadocian nominal inflection follows the geographical distinction into North Central and South Cappadocian in order to be able to capture the intra-dialectal divergence and account for it in terms of mirroring the gradualness of linguistic change. The division of Cappadocian into zones is not clear cut and several contact zones between the different subvarieties are traced. Thus, examples and villages are chosen in order to depict the variation among the different zones and may vary depending on the available data.

Masculine nouns are inflected as follows:

Masculine nouns in *-os*

#### (10) 'aθropos 'man'

Northeast Cappadocian and Axó (Central) [+animate]			Northwest Cappadocian, Mistí [+animate]		SMG	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nom	'aθropos	a'θrop(<i)	'aθropos	a'θrop(<i)	'a(n)θropos	'a(n)θropi
Gen	a'θrop(<u) & aθro'pju		a'θrop(<u) & aθro'pju		a(n)'θropu	'a(n)'θropo n
Def Acc.	'aθropo	a'θropus & aθro'pjus	'aθropo	a'θrop(<i)	'a(n)θropo	a(n)'θropus
Indef. Acc	'aθropos	aθro'pjus	'aθropos			
Voc					'a(n)θrope	'a(n)θropi

<sup>17</sup> For a more detailed categorization of the Cappadocian varieties into zones see the Appendix 1.

In North and Central Cappadocian, nouns in *-os* are subject to what is called split animacy. Namely, animate nouns are treated as masculines, inanimate as neuters (cf. Dawkins 1916: 94-95), whereas domesticated animals vacillate between the two, showing intra-dialectal variation. Accusative singular coincides with nominative when indefinite, while it bears the accusative marker as well as the definite article in its definite realization (see Dawkins 1916, Janse 2004, forthcoming)<sup>18</sup>. Hence, Cappadocian inflection is organized in the light of this distinction. You can see the inflectional behavior of *'aθropos* in (10).

In Northeast Cappadocian and Axó (Central) genitive is realized for both numbers with the inflectional marker *-ju* (which is taken from the neuter nouns in *-i* along with *-ja* for the plural and is usually called *agglutinative inflection* in the relevant literature (cf. Dawkins 1916), alternating with the old form (*a'θrop(<u) & aθro'pju*), while in the accusative plural, on the analogy of this singular an alternative inflectional marker *-jus* along with *-us* (*a'θropus & aθro'pjus*) was created.

In Northwest Cappadocian, Mistí, the only difference seems to be that the accusative plural is identical with the nominative one, i.e. syncretism occurs. Crucially though, at Misti, following Dawkins (1916: 101) the distinction of animacy begins to disappear and the *-ja*<sup>19</sup>, *-ju* markers tend to spread gradually to all subgroups of nouns. This change will be seen completed in the South Cappadocian zone, i.e. Fertek. In Dawkins's exact words (1916: 101) "*Here we see the beginning of the complete victory of the agglutinative system which appears at Fertek*", Ulağaç as well, we would add. The inflectional behaviour of the animate noun *ael'fos* 'brother' in Mistí is indicative of the on-going change, since in this noun the old inflectional forms alternate with the innovative ones:

(11)

Mistí, Central Cappadocian [+animate]		
	Singular	Plural
Nom	ael'fos	ael'foja and a'elfja
Gen		-
Def Acc.	ael'fo	ael'foja and a'elfja
Indef. Acc		
Voc	-	

Inanimate nouns in *-os* in North Cappadocian<sup>20</sup>, seen in the example under (12), differ, compared to the animate ones, only in the realization of the plural which is based on the

<sup>18</sup> Turkish nouns take the accusative suffix *-(y)I* when definite (or specific cf. Kornfilt, 1997: 214)

<sup>19</sup> The semi-vowel /j/ of the *-ja*, *-ju* markers is realized either as /j/ or /ç/, showing intra-dialectal variation.

<sup>20</sup> However, in Silata (Northwest Cappadocia), in nouns without personality what is called agglutinative inflection is first met. Following Dawkins (1916: 98) personal nouns in Silata follow the old declension, while non personal nouns either the imperfect or the agglutinative pattern. E.g.

(i)

	Singular	Plural
Nom	'milos	'milus & 'milozja
Gen		'milozju

syncretism of nominative-accusative plural on the basis of accusative, for a relative interpretation of which see Janse (2004)<sup>21</sup>. However, in some North Cappadocian villages, e.g. in Sílata, according to Dawkins (1916: 98), non personal nouns vacillate between the old and the innovative inflection ('*milus* & '*milozja* in Silata), showing strong signs of an on-going change.

In Central Cappadocian, the innovative inflection invades and characterizes all non animate nouns in *-os* (see the forms '*milozja*.Nom/Acc.Pl and '*milozju*.Gen in the Central Cappadocian column under (12)), while the distinction between definite and indefinite accusative is only occasionally retained.

## (12) 'milos 'mill'

	North Cappadocian [- animate]		Central Cappadocian [- animate]		SMG	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nom	'milos	'milus (&'milozja: Sílata)	'milos	'milozja	'milos	'mili
Gen	'mil(<u) & mi'lju (&'milozju: Sílata)		'milozju		'milu	'milon
Def Acc.	'milo	'milus (&'milozja: Sílata)	'milo(s)	'milozja	'milo	'milus
Indef. Acc	'milos		'milos			
Voc					'mile	'mili

Crucially, in South (Southeast and Southwest) Cappadocian the distinction based on animacy and definiteness has disappeared and all nouns are formally neuter, attaching to the *-ja*, *-ju* markers, following thus the agglutinative inflection. See the examples under (13) below.

(13) 'aθropos<sup>22</sup> 'man'

South Cappadocian (Ulağác) <sup>23</sup>				
	[+animate]		[-animate]	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural

Acc def	'milo	'milus & 'milozja
Acc Ind	'milos	

<sup>21</sup> For a relative explanation see Janse (2004: 9) and for similar phenomena in other Greek dialects see Thumb (1910: 42).

<sup>22</sup> This example is cited in Sasse (1992) and was elicited by one of the last speakers from Ulağác.

<sup>23</sup> At Fertek, with the exception of very few oxytones, the vast majority of nouns follow the agglutinative pattern, as shown in '*jeros* 'old man' below:

## (ii)

	Singular	Plural
Nom	'jeros	'jerezja
Gen	'jerezju	
Acc	'jeros	'jerezja

Nom	'atropos	'atropozja	'γamos	'γamozja
Gen	'atropozju	'atropozjaju	'γamozju	
Acc	'atropos	'atropozja	'γamos	'γamozja
Voc				

Masculine nouns in *-is -as*

This subgroup of nouns includes animate nouns of Greek origin and Turkish animate loans that end in a vowel. In North, Central and Southwest Cappadocian their inflection follows the lines of masculine animate nouns in *-os* in that a) they are subject to split animacy, b) they have the so called agglutinative markers *-ju* and *-jus* in genitive singular and accusative plural respectively and c) in some cases tend to have a syncretic nominative-accusative plural or syncretic nominative-accusative plural as well (e.g. *pa'paðes* & *papa'ðjus*, *kle'ftjus* & *'kleftes*). Indicative examples can be seen under (14) and (15) below:

(14) *pa'pas* 'priest'

North, Central, and Southwest Cappadocian			SMG	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nom	<i>pa'pas</i>	<i>pa'paðes</i> (Potámya & Delmesó) <i>pa'paði</i> (Malakopí)	<i>pa'pas</i>	<i>pa'paðes</i>
Gen		<i>pa'pa</i> (Potámya) & <i>papa'ðju</i> (Delmesó & Malakopí)	<i>pa'pa</i>	<i>pa'paðon</i>
Def.Acc	<i>pa'pa</i>	<i>pa'paðes</i> (Delmesó & Potámya) & <i>papa'ðjus</i> (Potámya) <i>pa'paði</i> (Malakopí)	<i>pa'pa</i>	<i>pa'paðes</i>
Indef.Acc	<i>pa'pas</i>			
Voc			<i>pa'pa</i>	<i>pa'paðes</i>

(15) *'kleftis* 'thief'

North, Central, and Southwest Cappadocian			SMG	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nom	<i>'kleftis</i>	<i>kleft (&lt;i)</i> & <i>'kleftes</i> (Mistí: <i>kleft</i> & <i>'kleftja</i> )	<i>'kleftis</i>	<i>'kleftes</i>
Gen		<i>kle'ftju</i> & <i>kleft(&lt;i)</i>	<i>'kleftis</i>	<i>kle'fton</i>
Def.Acc	<i>'kleft</i>	<i>kle'ftjus</i> & <i>'kleftes</i> (Mistí: <i>kleft</i> & <i>'kleftja</i> )	<i>'klefti</i>	<i>'kleftes</i>
Indef.Acc	<i>'kleftis</i>			
Voc			<i>'klefti</i>	<i>'kleftes</i>

Generalizing, in the villages that according to Dawkins are less corrupted (1916: 112), nouns in *-is* or *-as* have not adopted the agglutinative pattern. They are levelled to the paradigm of nouns in

-os, e.g. *kleft(<i>i)</i>* ‘thieves’ or *pa'paði* ‘priests’, (a cross-dialectal phenomenon for a relevant analysis of which see Melissaropoulou, 2012, in print). However, in Axó, Central Cappadocian (in Misti as well although to a lesser extent, cf. Dawkins (1916: 113)) the agglutinative inflection has invaded this subgroup of nouns, which are inflected as shown under (16) below. What seems to be taking place is an on-going process of levelling of inflectional paradigms and their corresponding markers towards the generalized use of the *-ja, -ju* markers.

(16) a'fendis ‘master’ pa'pas ‘priest’

<b>Central Cappadocian (Axó)</b>				
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nom	a'fendis	a'fendizja	pa'pas	pa'paja & pa'paes
Gen	a'fendizju		pa'pa & papa'ju	pa'pajezju & papa'ju
Acc	a'fendi	a'fendizja	pa'pa	pa'paes
Voc				

In the Southeast Cappadocian zone and especially at Fertek, the agglutinative inflection, with the use of *-ja, -ju* markers is generalized in all nouns of this subgroup. Very few nouns seem to be resisting in this subdialect (e.g. *'adras* ‘man’) possibly due to frequency effects. The inflection behavior of the nouns *pa'pas* ‘priest’ and *ʃif'ʃis* ‘farmer’ can be seen under (17) below.

(17) pa'pas ‘priest’ ʃif'ʃis ‘farmer’

<b>Southeast Cappadocian</b>				
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Nom	pa'pas	pa'pazja	ʃif'ʃis	ʃif'ʃija
Gen	papa'zju		ʃif'ʃiju	
Acc	pa'pas	pa'pazja	ʃif'ʃis	ʃif'ʃija
Voc				

Due to space limitations we will not be able to make a thorough presentation of all different subgroups of nouns for Cappadocian as well, given the divergence among the different zones. However, we should say that the situation is similar, although the occurring phenomena were not completed or made the same progress for all different subgroups of nouns till the exchange of populations in 1923, when the sociolinguistic context changed radically.

Generalizing, what can be seen is that Cappadocian, especially those spoken in the central and Southern zone show remarkable divergence compared to the SMG fusional morphological organization of inflection. Moreover, in our view, the observed intra-dialectal divergence, conceived in terms of a dialectal continuum, seems to depict a gradual movement of the system from a mainly fusional organization with many different subgroups of nouns (i.e. classes) towards a rearrangement that, could be thought not of as leading to an agglutinative system,

identical with the Turkish one<sup>24</sup>, but to a system that would balance its organization between its original structure and the structure of the dominant language.

Generalizing, in the Cappadocian varieties the following tendencies are observed (Dawkins, 1916; Janse 2004, forthcoming):

- (i) Loss of the genitive plural marker and use of the corresponding genitive singular marker (*-ju*) instead.
- (ii) Nominative-accusative syncretism (which is not always ascribed to language contact but certainly facilitates the process of inflectional reorganization. For example the conflation of nominative and indefinite accusative singular<sup>25</sup> in North and Central Cappadocian results in the reanalysis of both cases (see also Janse 2004: 5).
- (iii) Loss of vocative case.
- (iv) Reorganization of nominal inflection in North and Central Cappadocian on the basis of animacy and definiteness. However, in the South Cappadocian zone these distinctions have been lost.
- (v) Formal paradigmatic distinctions corresponding to grammatical gender values are progressively lost and especially in South Cappadocian zone nouns are formally neuter, adopting the generalized *-ja*, *-ju* inflectional markers of the old inflection of neuter nouns in *-i* (cf. Dawkins, 1916: 87-116; Janse, 2004: 6-12, forthcoming).

Given that in the case of Cappadocian, contact between two genetically and typologically divergent systems is taking place, several temporary complexification phenomena are to be attested in the on-going simplification process. Indeed, the following phenomena are observed:

- a) Addition the extra category of animacy
- b) Addition of the extra category of (in)definiteness marking
- c) Vacillation between the old fusional and the innovative (so called) agglutinative inflectional pattern.

These phenomena are accounted for in terms of temporary complexification that is also depicted in the observed intra-dialectal divergence. In the admittedly less corrupted areas, in the words of Dawkins (1916: 101), nouns seem to adhere more persistently to the original fusional

<sup>24</sup> Turkish is a genderless agglutinative language displaying only one inflection macro-class. Its nominal inflection is organized on the basis of agglutination as follows:

(iii)

Turkish nominal inflection ( <i>ev</i> 'house' <i>-ler-</i> 'plural marker', <i>-i</i> , <i>-in</i> , <i>-e</i> , <i>-de</i> , <i>-den</i> 'case markers')		
	Singular	Plural
Abs (Nom)	<i>ev</i>	<i>ev-ler</i>
Gen	<i>ev-i</i>	<i>ev-ler-i</i>
Dat	<i>ev-in</i>	<i>ev-ler-in</i>
Acc	<i>ev-e</i>	<i>ev-ler-e</i>
Loc	<i>ev-de</i>	<i>ev-ler-de</i>
Abl	<i>ev-den</i>	<i>ev-ler-den</i>

<sup>25</sup> The Turkish absolutive is formally identical with the indefinite (and non-specific) accusative case form.



paradigmatic organization, while animacy (which is not found in Turkish) and definiteness under the Turkish influence come into play. In the intermediate, Central Cappadocian zone intensive mobility is observed, while the innovative categories of animacy and definiteness are becoming rather unstable and are only partially retained. Lastly, in the most corrupted South Cappadocian zone, the above mentioned complexification phenomena are either scantier (less alternations between the old and the innovative patterns) or are completely extinct.

On the other hand,

- the loss of formal grammatical gender distinctions and  
 - the tendency towards the establishment of a unique inflectional paradigm  
 are accounted for as simplification phenomena, since they lead into more regularity and loss of redundancy in the morphological realizations.

The emerging paradigm diverges from the fusional Greek organization, where an inflectional marker, for example *-os* in *'anθropos*, marks simultaneously the genitive case, the singular number and a specific inflection class. Here, features are realized by distinct inflectional markers, which are added to the new reanalyzed base (on the basis of the nominative form) and are the same for all groups of nouns. More specifically, we would say that in the emerging innovative paradigm, a zero-morpheme marks the nominative and accusative singular form, *-ju* is the inflectional marker for the genitive case and *-ja* the marker of plural (see also Karatsareas, 2011: 265).

(18) The emerging inflectional paradigm in Cappadocian

	Singular	Plural
Nom	∅	-ja
Gen	-ju	- (ja)ju <sup>26</sup>
Acc	∅	-ja

## 4 Discussion

A contrastive investigation on the reorganization of nominal inflection in the two contact induced varieties of Modern Greek reveals interesting correlations. Firstly, in both dialectal case

<sup>26</sup> The agglutination of these markers in forms like *'atropoz-ja-ju* is reminiscent of the respective Turkish agglutinative inflection in which the marker of the plural is *-lar-* and the marker of genitive case is *-in*, so the Turkish morphological structure of the word *adam* 'man' in Turkish is similar to that of *'atropos* (see Janse, 2001). However, the situation is not the same for all different case-number forms.

(iv)

atropos - adam 'man'	Singular		Plural	
	Nom/Acc	Gen	Nom/Acc	Gen
Cappadocian (Ulağaç)	'atropos	'atropozju	'atropozja	'atropoz-ja-ju
Turkish	adam∅	adamin	adamlar	adam-lar-in

studies intense language contact situations result into the reorganization of nominal inflection accounted for in terms of simplification.

As shown in the previous section, in the case of Italiot, the prevailing tendency is towards the establishment of a one marker per number inflectional paradigm, allowing however for several inflection classes as is the case in the dominant languages. What seems to play a crucial role in the case of Italiot is the role of interlingual correspondences (cf. Weinreich, 1953: 39-40), between items, patterns or sounds of the systems in contact, called *diaforms* (cf. Selinker, 1992: 83-84)<sup>27</sup>. Apart from the neuter subgroups of nouns which do not have a correspondent form in Italian, productive masculine and feminine subgroups that are retained in Italiot correspond to the most productive Italian inflection classes. Feminine nouns in *-i* shifted to the other group of feminine nouns, that of *-a*, which corresponds to the most productive Italian feminine inflection class. Furthermore, neuter nouns in *-o -i* (remember the example of *'ðasos* under (8)) either follow the inflectional behavior of masculine nouns in *-o* or of neuter nouns in *-o* due to their formal similarity. Thus, diamorphemic structural schemata, in this particular case what we would call *diaclasses*, are proven to influence the direction of reorganization in Italiot in a very important way. The role of *diaforms* in general seems to be crucial in the maintenance and strengthening of specific inflection classes and the loss of others, especially in circumstances of structural compatibility among the involved systems.

In Cappadocian on the other hand, the reorganization of nominal inflection, although also headed towards simplification in the paradigmatic organization, is realized differently under the prevailing influence of Turkish. In this dialect, the prevailing tendency is towards the establishment of a unique inflectional paradigm which is facilitated by the loss of formal grammatical gender distinctions and the generalization of the mostly productive paradigm of neuter nouns in *-i*, the so called agglutinative inflection<sup>28</sup>. Furthermore, although research suffers from lack of sources from earlier stages of the dialect, we cannot be in an insecure ground if we hypothesize that apart from reasons of repair of semantic or other prototypicality deviations by assigning the inanimate nouns to the appropriate (neuter) class (for which see Karatsareas, 2011: 8-9, 208) the generalization of these specific markers cannot but have been triggered -or triggered as well- by the massive influx of consonant-ending Turkish nominal loans into this class (i.e. due to reasons of formal correspondences cf. Melissaropoulou, in preparation).

The above mentioned changes do not imply that contact induced systems move towards becoming identical with the systems of the dominant languages or that all occurring divergences are accounted for in terms of contact<sup>29</sup>. In other words, languages in contact do not lose necessarily their distinct typological profile and identical grammars, i.e. isomorphism of grammatical structures, do not necessarily emerge. Our data show that the direction of linguistic

<sup>27</sup> Following Selinker (1992:43) diaforms are “[...] forms [...] identified consistently as same in translation and function from the source language to the target. The smallest dialinguistic unit is the ‘diamorpheme’ and the largest is the ‘diasentence’”. Diaforms can be established on the basis of similarity in function, isomorphism in structure or phonological isomorphism as well.

<sup>28</sup> This tendency offers further support to the claim made by Dressler and Thornton (1996: 23) “that languages without gender tend to have no more than one productive declension (microclass) and therefore no distinction of macroclasses”. Like Turkish, Cappadocian has gradually become a genderless system and the vast majority of nouns inflect via the attachment of the same small set of inflectional markers.

<sup>29</sup> Some of the cross-paradigmatic levelling phenomena that are observed in the above mentioned varieties are common tendencies of other Modern Greek dialects as well and are interpreted are not thought to be triggered by contact factors. These kind of phenomena are already mentioned in the data section and involve for example the levelling of the plural of nouns in *-is* to the *-os* group and the reanalysis and expansion of the allomorphic *-λ-* as part of the inflectional marker for a large group of nouns (cf. Melissaropoulou, 2012, in print).

change, complexification and / or simplification is heavily influenced by intense contact situations as are those occurring in both Cappadocian and Italiot dialects. However, all the relevant rearrangements are filtered by and adjusted in the system main intra-linguistic characteristics and tendencies in the spirit of Sasse (1992) that rearrangements aim to balance out the system.

However, the specific realizations of restructuring cannot but be accounted in terms of indirect (grammatical) influence from the dominant languages since in both cases, they seem to be headed towards the same direction, i.e. towards the emergence of a unique paradigm (on the basis of neuters in *-i*) in Cappadocian, as is the case in Turkish, and towards a one marker per number inflection classes in Italiot, as is the case in Italian.

Thus, we align with Kuster's (2003: 359) thesis claiming that languages experiencing a long history of intense contact show greater degrees of simplification, associating thus the amount of contact with the amount of simplification and we account for the observed complexity phenomena as intermediate stages in an on-going simplification process. The amount and the type of temporary complexification phenomena diverge significantly depending on the compatibility or incompatibility factor among the systems in contact.

In the case of Italiot dialects, less temporary complexifications are attested (involving mainly alternations between old and innovative forms of the same typological nature, or alternation between synthetic forms and analytic ones) since the two systems have many resemblances in their inflectional organization and in some extent share common tendencies. Namely, grammatical gender values are realized and different inflection classes are distinguished in which the notion of gender serves as an inflectional classifier.

On the contrary, in the case of Cappadocian, due to structural incompatibility new oppositions - categories are temporarily introduced which further complicate the system, i.e. definiteness and animacy, while alternations offer extra burden in the system, since they entail not only variation in terms of vacillating between different inflectional markers, but also in terms of vacillating between fusional and quasi agglutinative structural patterns.

In this spirit, reshaping the debate on the borrowability between structurally compatible and structurally incompatible systems, we would claim that in cases of structural compatibility (Meillet, 1921: 84-87; Weinreich, 1953: 25; Field, 2002: 42), i.e. contact among systems with typological affinity, complexification phenomena are expected to be more restricted in terms of number and repertoire and to involve mainly instances of alternation between old and innovative patterns or other intra-linguistic process (e.g. old vs. innovative allomorphy etc). Furthermore, in this case the role of *diaforms* or *diapatterns* is expected to be more prominent or generally more easily alerted.

On the contrary, in cases of contact between typologically divergent systems, increased and more intense complexification phenomena are expected to occur during the process of system reorganizing so as to balance the new-coming elements and / or patterns, let us the non compatible competing motivations.

In terms of loss, addition and replacement of grammatical categories, our data show that although replacement and loss are admittedly the commonest strategies on the level of morphology (cf. Gardani, 2008 on direct inflectional borrowing), addition is also very likely to appear when structural incompatibility is involved. More specifically, in the case of structurally compatible systems, i.e. the Italiot varieties, reorganization of nominal inflection involves feature loss and feature replacement. Both of them are accounted in terms of simplification. In the case of structurally incompatible systems, except for loss (gender distinctions, inflection classes,

inflectional markers) and replacement, feature addition (definiteness, animacy) was attested as well, offering extra distinctions, i.e. burden to the system, which, however, was accounted for as temporary complexification. In this case, addition was proved to be an intermediate stage, a transitory path towards replacement. The most striking innovation was the rearrangement of the notion of inflection class and inflectional paradigm, headed in both systems towards regularity, transparency and loss of redundancies, i.e. less inflection classes, in terms of Trudgill (2009: 100) simplification phenomena without repair.

It is true, that with respect to the well known debate on whether entire inflectional paradigms can be directly borrowed as a piece of structure, this study has nothing to offer. Nevertheless, in terms of indirect transfer, it can positively argue that the notion and the structure of inflection classes and inflectional paradigms can be affected by contact. Relating oppositions and distinctions can be introduced or lost in the recipient system inflection classes and certainly the lack thereof in the donor language may heavily influence the recipient system towards this direction.

However, the above mentioned claims do not entail that language changes in a mono-directional way, i.e. gets simpler and simpler. Under specific circumstances, the opposite direction, i.e. complexification may be preferred. So the question that remains to be answered is what may trigger language change in the opposite direction, i.e. complexification especially within a language continuum.

This brings us to future research. Given that this kind of research on the Greek dialectal landscape is at its starters, a wide scale comparative study is needed among all different dialectal varieties of Greek -Standard Modern Greek, high contact vs. low contact varieties, systems in isolation, immigrant Greek, prestige and not prestige varieties etc- in order to investigate what types of language -other than the widely discussed in the literature, pidgins and creoles- favour complexification or simplification phenomena.

## Appendix: Subgroupings of Cappadocian

- **North Cappadocian**
  - ✓ *Northwest Cappadocian*: Sílata, Anakú, Floyitá, Malakopí
  - ✓ *Northeast Cappadocian*: Sinasós, Potámya, Delmesó
- **Central Cappadocian**
  - ✓ Axó
  - ✓ Mistí
- **South Cappadocian**
  - ✓ *Southwest Cappadocian*: Araván, Ferték
  - ✓ *Southeast Cappadocian*: Ulağaç, Semenderé

(from Janse, forthcoming)

## References

- Acquaviva, Paolo. 2008. The Structure of the Italian Declension System In F. Montermini, G. Boyé, & J. Tseng (eds.), *Selected Proceedings of the 6th Décembrettes: Morphology in Bordeaux*, 50-62. Somerville, MA, USA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2003. Mechanisms of change in areal diffusion: new morphology and language contact. *Journal of Linguistics* 39, 1-29.
- Baerman, Matthew & Dunstan Brown. 2008. Case Syncretism. In M. Haspelmath, M. Dryer, D. Gil, & B. Comrie (eds.) *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Munich: Max Planck Digital Library. Available at <http://wals.info/feature/28>. Accessed on 30-08-2012.
- Braunmüller, Kurt. 1995. Zur Phonotaktik des Schwedischen: Prinzipien und Tendenzen. In K. Braunmüller (eds.), *Beiträge zur skandinavistischen Linguistik*, 9-52. Oslo: Novus. [a reprint from *Skandinavistik* 10, 1980, 29-60].
- Caratzas, Stamatis. C. 1958. *L'origine des dialectes néogrecs de l'Italie méridionale*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Clyne, Michael. 1987. History of Research on Language Contact. In U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier & P. Trudgill (eds.), *Sociolinguistics. An International Handbook of the Science of Language and Society*, 452-459. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1992. Before complexity. In J. Hawkins and M. Gell-Mann (eds.), *The Evolution of Human Languages*, 193-211. Redwood City, CA: Addison-Wesley.
- Dahl, Östen. 2004. *The growth and maintenance of linguistic complexity*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Dawkins, Richard. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A study of the dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Pharasa, with grammar, texts, translations and glossary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. & Anna M. Thornton. 1996. Italian nominal inflection. *Wiener Linguistische Gazette* 57-59: 1-26.
- Fanciullo, Franco. 2001. On the origins of Modern Greek in Southern Italy. In A. Ralli, B. D. Joseph and M. Janse (eds.), *Proceedings of the first international conference of Modern Greek dialects and linguistic theory*, 67-77. Patras: University of Patras.
- Field, Fredric. 2002. *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Context*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Filieri, Giorgio. V. 2001. I speak Grico. *A basic method on Greek of Salento in comparison with Standard Modern Greek* [Ivò milò to griko. Vasiki methodos ton Ellinikon tou Salento se sigkrisi me ta Nea Ellinika]. University of Ioannina, Center of Greek Language and Culture. INTERREG II, Greece - Italy - Action 5.4.
- Fosteris, Dimitrios & Ioannis. I. Kesisoglou. 1960. *Vocabulary of Aravani* [Leksilogio tou Aravani]. Athens: Institut Français d'Athènes.
- Gardani, Francesco. 2008. *Borrowing of Inflectional Morphemes in Language Contact*. Peter Lang.
- Janse, Mark. 2004. Animacy, Definiteness, and Case in Cappadocian and Other Asia Minor Dialects. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 3-26.
- Janse, Mark. 2009. Agglutination, Watkins' law, and the psychology of double inflections in Asia Minor Greek. In M. Janse, B. Joseph, P. Pavlou, A. Ralli & S. Armosti (eds.), *Studies in Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, 135-145. Nicosia: Research Center of the Holy Monastery of Kykkos.

- Janse, Mark. forthcoming. Cappadocian. In Tzitzilis (ed.), *The Greek language and its dialects* [I elliniki glossa kai oi dialektoi tis]. Thessaloniki.
- Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1984. *Historical lexicon of Greek Dialects of South Italy* [Istorikon Leksikon ton Ellinikon Idiomaton tis Kato Italias]. Vol. 1, Athens: Akadimia Athinon.
- Karanastasis, Anastasios. 1997. *Grammar of the Greek dialects of Southern Italy* [Grammatiki ton Ellinikon idiomaton tis Kato Italias]. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Karatsareas, Peter. 2011. A study of Cappadocian Greek Nominal morphology from a diachronic and dialectological perspective. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Cambridge.
- Katsoyannou, Marianna. 1995. *Le parler gréco de Galliciano (Italie): description d'une langue en voie de disparition*. Thèse de doctorat, Université de Paris VII – Denis Diderot.
- Katsoyannou, Marianna. 1996. Greek in Southern Italy: morphology of nouns and evolution of the nominal system [Ellinika tis Kato Italias: morfologia ton onomaton kai ekseliksi tou klitikou sistimatos]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 17, 328-341. Thessaloniki.
- Katsoyannou, Marianna. 1999. The idiom of Calabria [To idioma tis Kalavrias]. In A.F. Christides (ed.), *Dialectal enclaves of the Greek language* [Dialektikoi thylakoi tis ellinikis glossas], 39-45 / 113-119. Athens: Ypeth-Kentro ellinikis glossas.
- Kesisoglou, Ioannis I. 1951. *The dialecte of Ulagatch* [To glossiko idioma tou Ulaghats]. Athens: Institut Français d'Athènes.
- Klein, Wolfgang & Clive Perdue. 1997. The Basic Variety (or: Couldn't natural languages be much simpler?). *Second Language Research* 13, 4, 301-347.
- Kornfilt, Jaklin. 1997. *Turkish Grammar*. London: Routledge
- Kusters, Wouter. 2003. Linguistic Complexity; the influence of Social Change on Verbal Inflection. PhD Dissertation, University of Leiden.
- Lenneberg, Eric H. 1967. *Biological Foundations of Language*. New York: Wiley.
- Loveday, Leo. 1996. *Language Contact in Japan. A Socio-linguistic History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Manolessou, Ioanna. 2005. The Greek dialects of Southern Italy: an overview. *Cambridge Papers in Modern Greek* 13, 103-125.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel. 2007. Investigating the mechanisms of pattern replication in language convergence. *Studies in Language* 31, 4: 829-865.
- Mavrochalyvidis, George & Ioannis. I. Kesisoglou. 1960. *The dialect of Axos* [To glossiko idioma tis Axou]. Athens: Institut Français d'Athènes.
- McWhorter, John H. 2001. The world's simplest grammars are creole grammars. *Linguistic Typology*, 5, 125-166.
- Meillet, Antoine. 1921. *Linguistique historique et linguistique general*. Paris: Champion.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. 2012. Analogical levelling as optimization in Greek nominal inflection: a cross-dialectal case study. *US-China-Foreign-Language* 10, 10, 1636-1654. El Monte: David Publishing Company.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. in print. Analogical change as a gradual language simplification process. To appear in *Synchrony and Diachrony: a Dynamic Interface*. *Studies in Language Companion Series*. John Benjamins.
- Melissaropoulou, Dimitra. in preparation. Lexical borrowing bearing witness to the notions of gender and inflection class: a case study on two contact induced systems of Greek. Presented at the IGG39, 39<sup>th</sup> Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, 21-23 February 2013, Modena and Reggio Emilia. Italy.

- Miestamo, Matti. 2006. On the feasibility of complexity metrics. In K. Kerge & M-M. Sepper (eds.), *FinEst Linguistics, Proceedings of the Annual Finnish and Estonian Conference of Linguistics, Tallinn, May 6-7, 2004* [Publications of the Department of Estonian of Tallinn University 8], 11-26. Tallinn: TLÜ.
- Miestamo, Matti, Sinnemaki, Kaius & Karlsson, Fred. (eds.) 2008. *Language Complexity. Typology, Contact, Change*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Minas, Konstantinos. 1994. *The language of published Greek medieval manuscripts of South Italy and Sicily [I glossa ton dimosiemnon mesaionikon ellinikon eggrafon tis Kato Italias kai tis Sikelias]*. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Minas, Konstantinos. 2004. *Studies in Modern Greek Dialectology* [Meletes Neoellinikis Dialektologias]. Athens: Typothito.
- Nichols, Johanna. 1992. *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Profili, Olga. 1985. La romanisation d'un parler grec de l'Italie du Sud par les parlers romans environants. *Actes du XVIIe Congrès Inter-national de Linguistique et de Philologie romanes, Aix-en-Provence 29 août - 3 septembre 1983*, 129-39. Aix-en-Provence : Université de Provence.
- Profili, Olga. 1999a. Greek in Southern Italy [H elliniki sti Notio Italia]. In A.F. Christides (ed.), *Dialectal enclaves of the Greek language* [Dialektikoi thylakoi tis ellinikis glossas], 31-7. Athens: Ypenth-Kentro Ellinikis Glossas.
- Profili, Olga. 1999b. Revitalization of grico in Grecia Salentina [I anazoogonisi tis grico sti Grecia Salentina. In A.F. Christides (ed.), *Dialectal enclaves of the Greek language* [Dialektikoi thylakoi tis ellinikis glossas], 47-54. Athens: Ypenth-Kentro Ellinikis Glossas.
- Ralli, Angela. 2000. A Feature-based Analysis of Greek Nominal Inflection. 2000. *Glossologia* 11-12, 201-227.
- Ralli, Angela. 2002. The Role of Morphology in Gender Determination: Evidence from Modern Greek. *Linguistics* 40, 3, 519-551.
- Ralli, Angela. 2006. On the Role of Allomorphy in Inflectional Morphology: Evidence from Dialectal Variation. In G. Sica (ed.) *Open Problems in Linguistics and Lexicography*. Milano: Polimetrica.
- Ralli, Angela, Melissaropoulou, Dimitra & A. Tsiamas 2004. Cross-paradigmatic levelling phenomena on the nominal paradigm of the Aivaliot dialect [Phenomena anadiarthrosis tou onomatikou klitikou paradeigmatos tis dialektou Kydonion kai Mosxonision]. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 2003, 568-579.
- Rohlf, Gerard. 1933. *Scavi linguistici nella Maglia Grecia - Con una cartina geografica*. Dal manoscritto tedesco tradotto da Bruno Tomasini. Roma: Collezione di Studi meridionali Editrice.
- Rohlf, Gerard. 1977. *Grammatica Storica dei Dialetti Italogreci*. Munchen: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- Rohlf, Gerard. 1997. *Studi e ricerche su lingue e dialetti d'Italia*. Milan: Sansoni [1st ed. Florence 1972].
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language. An introduction to the Study of Speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Sasse, H. J. 1992. *Language decay and contact-induced change: similarities and differences*. In M. Brenzinger (ed.), *Language death*, 59-80. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Selinker, Larry. 1992. *Rediscovering interlanguage*. London: Longman.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1995. Lexico-Syntactic Modeling across the Bilingual Continuum. In J. Fisiak (ed.), *Historical Morphology*, 253-270. The Hague: Mouton.
- Stomeo, P. 1996. *Racconti greci inediti di Sternatia*. Lecce: Edizioni "La nuova Ellade".
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2001. *Language Contact: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 2003. What Motivates Changes That Occur in Emerging Pidgins and Creoles?. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 18:1, 107-120.
- Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Thumb, Albert. 1910. *Handbuch der neugriechischen Volkssprache: Grammatik, Texte, Glossar*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Tommasi, Salvatore. 1996. *Katalisti o Kosmo*. Ghetonia: Kalimera
- Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2001. Contact and simplification: historical baggage and directionality in linguistic change. *Linguistic Typology* 5 (2/3): 371-374.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2002. *Sociolinguistic variation and change*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press/Georgetown: Georgetown University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2004. Linguistic and Social Typology: The Austronesian migrations and phoneme inventories. *Linguistic Typology* 8: 305-320.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2009. Sociolinguistic typology and complexification. In: G. Sampson, D. Gil, and P. Trudgill (eds.), *Language Complexity as an Evolving Variable*, 98-109. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Trudgill, Peter. 2011. *Sociolinguistic Typology: Social Determinants of Linguistic Complexity* (Oxford Linguistics). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Wackernagel, Jakob. 1926-8. *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I-II. Basel. 1-II, Basel
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. New York: Publications of the Linguistic Circle of New York.
- Winford, Donald. 2003. *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.