THE POSITION OF THE NORTHERN GREEK DIALECTS OF KASTORIA AMONG THE MODERN GREEK DIALECTS[*]

ELENI PAPADAMOU
GEORGE PAPANASTASSIOU
Institute of Modern Greek Studies, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

This paper aims at reviewing the Northern dialects of Kastoria and their position among the Modern Greek dialects in general. The examination is based on the 24 key characteristics used by Tzitzilis (forth.) for the classification of the Greek dialects, on other selected features, and on phenomena attributed to language contact.

1 Introduction

The linguistic landscape of Kastoria is determined by the coexistence of the Northern Greek dialects, the Greek dialects of Asia Minor refugees, the Slavic dialects, and, to a lesser extent, the Aromunian dialects of the area. In most cases, these dialects are spoken in different villages, although mixed villages are not a rare occurrence. This survey does not include the city of Kastoria, where a semi-Northern Greek dialect is spoken, and other suburban centers such as Argos Orestiko.

Until recently, the Northern Greek dialects of Kastoria have not been systematically studied. In this paper, based on extensive fieldwork by Eleni Papadamou (Papadamou under prep.), a first attempt to determine their position in the landscape of Modern Greek dialects is made, according to the 24 isoglosses proposed by Tzitzilis (forth.) for the division and the description of the Modern Greek dialects, in combination with a number of other isoglosses arising from the analysis of the dialects in question, which have proved very helpful in determining small dialectal groups and in highlighting local contact zones. Among the latter, isoglosses attributed

to language contact hold a prominent position, and are included in Tzitzilis' (forth.) set of relevant morphosyntactic phenomena. Kastoria, as well as the entire region of Western Macedonia, has been an area of intense language contact; more specifically, it has been an area of intense language contact between Northern Greek dialects, Slavic dialects and, to a lesser extent, Aromunian dialects. It has also been an area of more recent language contact between Northern Greek dialects and the dialects of Greek refugees, and finally, an area of earlier contact between local Greek dialects and other Greek dialects of neighboring areas. From this perspective, the Northern dialects of Western Macedonia, and especially those of Kastoria, are very interesting, not only as members of the group of Northern Greek dialects in general, but also as dialects located in the core of the Balkan linguistic union.

The key questions that need to be addressed are: (a) Do the dialects of the area constitute one homogeneous group with no internal differences, or do they form smaller subgroups, which present such a great number of common features that they can be regarded as separate groups in their own right, distinct from those of neighboring dialects? (b) Does the geographical and administrative position of Kastoria on the border between two broader regions, i.e. Western Macedonia and Epirus, correspond to the position of the Northern dialects of Kastoria as dialects occupying a transitional space between the dialects of Western Macedonia and those of Epirus, or are they the tip of the dialects of Western Macedonia? (c) Are bundles of isoglosses present or not? If not, the position of the local dialects will be difficult to determine.

These questions are directly related to the wider question regarding the formation of the Greek Northern dialects of Kastoria: are they part of an earlier dialectal continuum interrupted by the emergence of Slavic and Aromunian dialects or even the emergence of Greek dialects from other areas, neighboring or not, or are they the end result of later displacements of people, and if so, did these populations come from one particular region or more, and which ones (see Tzitzilis forth.)? Pursuing the former line of inquiry, i.e. the postulation of the existence of an earlier dialectal continuum, which seems to be the most promising one, we need to examine whether we can identify earlier Northern dialects that emerged in the area, and, in particular, we need to investigate if some Northern dialects of Kastoria which share common features with neighboring Northern dialects of Epirus present these features because their speakers came from Epirus or because they form part of isoglosses dominant in the area of Epirus, which end in what are known as Grammochoria [villages of Grammos] (Kotili, Langa, Pefko, Chrisi, etc.); cf. the ending -κα in verbs like έφτιακα 'I made', έφτακα 'I arrived', έπιακα 'I caught', which is common in Epirus and also appears in Grammochoria in Kastoria, but not in the other dialects of Kastoria (Vogatsiko, Germa, Kostarazi, etc.).

Thomason (2005: 108), speaking of the dialect map of the Serbo-Croatian territory, states that "it shows extensive crosshatching of isoglosses rather than the more orderly bundled or parallel isoglosses that are characteristic of more settled regions". However, she also states that "the Serbo-Croatian dialect picture is not total chaos". Tzitzilis' findings are similar; according to him, the dialectal landscape, even in areas of intense language contact such as Western Macedonia, is far from chaotic. The internal 'homogeneity' of groups which speak the Northern dialects of Kastoria is interrupted by pockets of foreigners as well as pockets of Greek refugees displaced during the population exchange between Greece and Turkey. These pockets can easily be found. In contrast, areas in which populations settled years or perhaps centuries ago, are very difficult to detect since it is hard to identify the relationship between certain isoglosses and population movements for which there is no information.

2 The landscape of the Northern dialects of Kastoria based on the 24 key characteristics

According to Tzitzilis and Margariti-Ronga (forth.), the group of the 24 key characteristics used by Tzitzilis (forth.) for the classification of the Greek dialects can be divided into two subgroups: the first subgroup includes features which occur with or without exception in all Northern dialects, and thus, does not contribute anything either to the demarcation of Northern dialects in general or to the determination of their subgroups in particular. These features are:

(1) the narrowing of the unstressed /e/ and /o/ to /i/ and /u/ respectively, and the deletion of the unstressed /i/ and /u/. Narrowing is found everywhere in Kastoria. The elimination of the unstressed /i/ and /u/ is common at the end of words and in other morpheme boundaries, but occurs less frequently in root morphemes (Margariti-Ronga 1985: 163, Tzitzilis 1997-1998: 20).

(2) lack of discrimination between simple and double consonants. Double consonants are unknown to all Northern dialects, including those of Kastoria.

(3) the retention of /k/ and /x/ before front vowels. Peripheral Northern dialects, such as those of Tenedos, Kydonies, Moschonisia, etc., have been cited as exceptions. A specific form of tsitacism, sporadically documented in Western Macedonia, is the evolution of /k/ as the second member of primary and secondary /sk/ in /štš/. This phenomenon has already been observed in some dialects of Voio and we have also found it in a few words in Grammochoria. Regarding it as a special case of tsitacism, we rank it in the second subset of our second group of isoglosses (see infra).

(4) synizesis of the sequences /io/, /ia/ and /eo/, /ea/. The evolution of the sequences /io/, /ia/ and /eo/, /ea/ being different in some areas of Kastoria, we consider these developments to be special cases of synizisis, and we examine them in the second subset of our second group of isoglosses (see infra).

(5) no tendency towards open syllables, which is reinforced by the commonly occurring elimination of the unstressed /i/ and /u/.

(6) the elimination of the final -ν in neuter nouns. The elimination of -ν in this position is universal. If we take the general treatment of the final -ν in other morphological categories into account, we can observe that in some dialects of the area the final -ν occurs in the 3rd singular of the active past tenses and in the accusative singular of masculine and feminine nouns. However, given that this is a special case of final -ν retention, we regard it as one of the isoglosses belonging to the second subset of our second group of isoglosses.

(7) the lack of epenthesis of -γ- in verbs ending in -εύω (common characteristic of the Northern dialects of continental Greece).

(8) the use of the neuter interrogative pronoun τι (common characteristic of the Northern dialects of continental Greece, which generally ignore the form είντα).

(9) the formation of the passive aorist in -κα.

(10) the use of the verbal suffixes -ουν(ε) and -αν(ε) in the 3rd plural.

(11) the preposing of the weak forms of personal pronouns.

(12) the elimination of the unaccented augment.

(13) the use of the diminutive forms of certain words in place of the original ones (common characteristic of the Northern dialects of continental Greece).

The second subgroup includes features that are differentiated in the Northern Greek dialects themselves, thus enabling us to determine subdialects. With only one exception, the phenomena

of this subgroup are common in all Northern dialects of Kastoria as well as in the other neighboring dialects of Western Macedonia and Epirus. The features of the second subgroup are:

(1) the preservation of the nasal element in the clusters [mb], [nd], [ng], π.χ. αμπόλ΄ [ambóʎ] 'part of a shoot used for grafting', ντύνου [ndínu] 'to dress', etc.

(2) the presence of palatoalveolar consonants, e.g. šάλ΄ [šắʎ] 'a square fabric folded triangularly', but σάλ΄ [sáʎ] 'saliva'. This feature is common to all dialects of Kastoria, and places them in the broader group to which all continental Northern dialects belong.

(3) the presence of columnar stress and the violation of the trisyllabic rule of stress or the evolution of secondary stress, e.g. έκουφτέτι [ékuftéti] 'you cut (2nd plural, past)'.

(4) the absence of a morphological distinction between the nominative and the accusative plural in masculine nouns ending in -ος, e.g. οι δασκάλ΄ 'the teachers (nom.)' – τ'ς δασκάλ΄ 'the teachers (acc.)'.

(5) the use of the sigmatic imperfect in -ούσα for the old contracted verbs in -άω > -ώ, e.g. αγαπούσα 'I loved'. The sigmatic imperfect is found in all dialects of Western Macedonia and in one part of Epirus (Konitsa, Zagori, etc.), but not in Ioannina, where the suffix -αγα is used.

(6) the use of the suffix -ετε, usually in the form -ετι, for the active past tenses, e.g. έτριψέτι 'you rubbed'.

(7) the use of vocalic extensions in the 3rd sing. of oxytona, e.g. αγαπάει 'he/she loves'.

(8) the use of negative adjectives in -στος, e.g. αξούρ'στους 'unshaven'.

(9) the use of a system with three demonstrative pronouns αυτός, ιτούτους 'this one', ικείνους 'that one', without a clear distinction between the pronouns αυτός και ιτούτους, denoting near deixis. Instead, the tripartite distinction is clear in the case of the demonstrative adverbs ιδώ 'here', ικεί 'there', αυτού 'there (close to the listener)'.

(10) the expression of the irrealis by the marker χάνα and the less common ones χάλ΄να and θάνα, e.g. άμα δεν έβριχιν, χάνα πάου στου χουράφ' 'if it weren't raining, I would go to the field', which, as is the case with the majority of the Northern dialects, are past tense markers.

One of the isoglosses of the second subgroup presents dialectal differentiation. It involves the introduction of the indirect object by the accusative in the Northern dialects of the area, with the exception of the dialects of Chrisi and Eptachori, where the genitive is used instead, e.g. μού 'πι 'he/she told me'. Given that the indirect object is introduced by the genitive in Siatista and Katafygi, the question arises as to whether the dialects of Chrisi and Eptachori are exceptions, or pockets in the continuum of Western Macedonia, where the introduction of the indirect object by the accusative is prevalent, or, alternatively, whether they should be regarded as transition areas, given that in Epirus the indirect object is marked with the genitive case.

For a more detailed distribution of these isoglosses in the area of Northern Greece see Tzitzilis & Margariti-Ronga (forth.).

3 The landscape of the Northern dialects of Kastoria based on selected features

The second group includes isoglosses that do not belong to the aforementioned 24 ones and have been selected because we think that they can contribute to the internal categorization of the Northern Greek dialects of Kastoria into subgroups and can facilitate the determination of the position of the Northern Greek dialects of Kastoria in the wider landscape of Modern Greek

dialects. Data for the geographical distribution of these phenomena come from Tzitzilis & Margariti-Ronga (forth.). They can be divided into two subgroups. The first subgroup includes features that are common to all Northern dialects of Kastoria, e.g.:

(a) the formation of the 1st pl. of the mediopassive voice in -μέστι, e.g. ακού(γ)ουμέστι 'we are being heard'.

(b) the formation of the comparative with the suffix -τιρους and rarely with the particle πιο, e.g. τρανύτιρους 'bigger', βαρύτιρους 'heavier'.

(c) the use of the article ου for the nominative sing. of the masculine before both proper and common nouns (not ι or ø as in other Northern dialects), e.g. ου Γιάντς, ου γαμπρός.

(d) the formation of the plural in -αραί(οι) and not in -αροί, e.g. dζουμπαναραίοι 'shepherds', πιτ'ναραί 'roosters'.

(e) the formation of the feminine nouns in -άρου (and not in -άρα) for the masculine in -άρης, e.g. γκρινιάρου 'nagging woman'.

The second subgroup is more important because it includes features that are differentiated in the individual dialects of Kastoria and can therefore contribute to the internal categorization of this group of dialects. This subgroup consists of the following features:

(1) morphology:

(a) the choice of the ending -ένιους or -έινους/-έινιους for the formation of adjectives denoting material. In the Northern dialects, the suffix -ένιος of Standard Modern Greek is found in two forms: the earlier form -έινους (< -εα + -ινος) together with the more recent one -ένιους resulting from metathesis, and the form -έινιους, which derives from the contamination of the last two, e.g. τινικιδένιους 'tinny', but τινικιδέινους and τινικιδέινιους. The earlier form -έινους is also found in Kozani and Grevena. In the examined dialects, the distribution of these suffixes is as follows: the suffix -έινους/-έινιους is found in Vogatsiko, Germa and Kostarazi, while it is absent in Grammochoria, where the suffix -ένιους is used instead. Andriotis (1976: 224) considers -έινους to be an archaism and locates it mainly in Thrace.

(b) the use of the suffix -αμι or -αμαν in the 1st plural of the active past tenses, e.g. είχαμι/είχαμαν 'we had'. In the Northern dialects, we find the allomorphs -αμι και -αμαν in the 1st plural of the active past tenses. The suffix -αμι is more widespread, whereas -αμαν is mainly used in Epirus and the nearby areas. In the Northern Greek dialects of Kastoria, the distribution of these suffixes is as follows: the suffix -αμαν is found in Grammochoria, while the rest of the Northern Greek dialects of Kastoria ignore it. In this respect, the idioms of Grammochoria should be regarded as an expansion of those of Epirus.

(c) the formation of the active aorist in -κα or -σα of a particular group of verbs, e.g. έπιασα/έπιακα 'I caught', έφτασα/έφτακα 'I arrived', έφτιασα/έφτιακα 'I made'. The aorist formation in -κα of those verbs is found in Epirus and in the dialects of Grammochoria, while the other Northern Greek dialects of Kastoria form these aorists in -σα.

(d) the tripartite distinction of the possessive pronoun in the 3rd plural according to the gender of the owner: τ'ς (when the owner is masculine), e.g. οι άντρις ήπιρναν τα πιδιά τ'ς 'the men were taking their children', τις (when the owner is feminine), e.g. οι γυναίκις ήπιρναν τα κουρίτσα τις 'the women were taking their girls', τα (when the owner is neuter), e.g. τα πιδιά κάθουνταν στα γουνιά τα 'the children were sitting in their corner' (Germa, Kostarazi) (Georgiou, 1962: 377). This system is also found in some dialects of Kozani. In Grammochoria, it seems that a system with a common form for the masculine and the feminine and a different one for the neuter is used although the speakers do not fully reject the forms of the tripartite

gender distinction. The use of the pronoun τα when the owner is neuter has become generalized in the Northern Greek dialects of Kastoria.

(2) phonetics:

(a) the different evolution of the vowel sequences /io/, /ia/ και /eo/, /ea/ (Newton 1972: 47). In some places, namely in the Grammochoria group, the aforementioned sequences have the same evolution, e.g. χωρία > χωριά [xorjá] 'villages', παλαμαρέα > παλαμαριά [palamarjá] 'harvesting tool', whereas in the other idioms of the county the evolution is different, e.g. χωρία > χωριά [xorjá], but παλαμαρέα > παλαμαρ΄ά [palamarʲá]. The latter is also found in dialects of Kozani.

(b) tsitacism of the cluster /sk/ before front vowels, e.g. σκύβω > σ̌τσ̌ύβου [štšívu], etc. As previously mentioned in 2 (feature 3 of the first subgroup), in the examined area tsitacism has a special form, i.e. the evolution of the cluster /sk/ into /štš/. The phenomenon is not widespread as it occurs only in specific words, e.g. Παρασκευή > Παρασ̌τσ̌ουβή [paraštšuví] 'Friday', σκεπάρι > σ̌τσ̌ιπάρ' [štšipár] 'adz', σκύβω > σ̌τσ̌ύβου [štšívu] 'stoop', etc. This special case of tsitacism is also sporadically attested in Western Macedonia. It is unknown among the idioms of Kozani and Grevena, but it is found in some dialects of Voio. In Kastoria, it is found in Grammochoria, cf. στσυλλί [stsilí] 'dog' in villages of Pogonio (Xirovaltos, etc.), where its range is also very limited (Bongas 1964: 12).

(c) Based on the presence or absence of final -ν in the 3rd sing. of past tenses, the dialects of Kastoria can be dıvided into two groups: (1) Grammochoria, where no final -ν appears in the 3rd sing. of past tenses and in the accusative sing. of masculine and feminine nouns, (2) the remaining dialects of Kastoria, where final -ν appears in the 3rd sing. of past tenses, e.g. είχιν 'he/she had', and in the accusative sing. of masculine and feminine nouns, e.g. μάζουνάμι κόζμουν 'we brought people together', as is the case for most of the Northern dialects of Western Macedonia.

4 The picture of the dialects of Kastoria based on phenomena attributed to language contact

Particularly important for determining the position of the Northern Greek dialects of the area and that of the Modern Greek dialects in general is the group of isoglosses attributed to language contact. These consist of morphosyntactic features that, according to their geographical distribution, can be distinguished into three groups: (a) those that occur only in the Northern dialects of Kastoria and, more specifically, in a small number of these dialects in Grammochoria and in some other villages (e.g. Ampelokipi, Ammoudara), e.g. the prohibitive structures with φτάν' 'enough', (b) those that occur in the Northern dialects of Kastoria and in nearby dialects of Western Macedonia, e.g. the presence of ethical genitive/accusative, (c) those that also appear in other Northern dialects, e.g. desire denoting impersonal structures and the suffix -αβους.

All these morphosyntactic phenomena (with the possible exception of the ethical genitive/accusative) are due to Slavic influence. We should note that the influence of the Slavic languages on the other Greek dialects is usually confined to vocabulary, with the exception of the morphosyntactic borrowing of the diminutive suffix -ίτσα, which has multiple origins. The Slavic influence at the morphosyntactic level seems to be confined to some Northern dialects,

especially those of Western Macedonia and some dialects of Central Macedonia (see Tzitzilis & Margariti-Ronga forth.).

The picture of the Northern dialects of Kastoria based on phenomena attributed to language contact confirms what Joseph (2007: 119) states: "there can be dialect divisions within a language that indicate that one dialect or dialect area of a language has been influenced by neighboring Balkan languages while other dialects have not, or have not to the same extent".

4.1 Morphosyntactic phenomena found only in Grammochoria

4.2.1 Prohibitive structures with φτάν'

In Grammochoria and in some other villages (e.g. Ampelokipi, Ammoudara) we find the prohibitive structures φτάν' κρέντς 'you talked enough, do not talk (sing.)' and φτάν' κρέν'τι 'you talked enough, do not talk (plur.)'. Along with these second-person forms, however, which seem to correspond to μη κρέντς 'do not talk (sing.)' and μη κρέν'τι 'do not talk (plur.)', there are the less frequent structures φτάν' κρένου 'I should not talk anymore', φτάν' κρέν' 'he/she should not talk anymore', φτάν' κρένουμι 'we should not talk anymore', φτάν' κρένουν 'they should not talk anymore', namely the form φτάν' with the whole paradigm of the present indicative. We also find structures in which the form φτάν' is combined with the aorist, such as φτάν' έκρινα 'I spoke enough, I should not talk anymore', φτάν' έκρινις 'do not talk anymore', φτάν' έκρινι 'he/she should not talk anymore', φτάν' έκρινάμι, φτάν' έκρινέτι, φτάν' έκριναν. Finally, we find φτάν' in combination with the perfect: φτάν' έχου φάει 'I should not eat more'.

The structures with second-person forms are reminiscent of similar structures in other Modern Greek dialects, examined by Tzitzilis (forth.), in which κανεί, a synonym of φτάν', is used. Thus, in Silli we find the structure κανεί παίζεις 'you played enough, do not play'. Moreover, as Tzitzilis (forth.) states, "a parallel semantic and typological behavior is observed for the adverb αγάλια (γάλια, γάλι) 'bit by bit', gradually evolving into a deterrent adverb-interjection meaning 'stop, shut up' and then into a negative particle, for example γάλια πσῖνεις 'do not drink', γάλι ανοίζεις 'do not open' (Axos, Cappadocia)".

One could therefore come to the conclusion that the prohibitive structures of this type found in Kastoria are the result of internal evolution. However, these structures are reminiscent of similar structures with the same function in the local Slavic dialects, where instead of the verb φτάν' the adverb *dósta* 'enough' is used. In these Slavic dialects we find the following structures, which, in terms of meaning and function, correspond to the Greek structures under consideration: (1) *dósta* + 2nd sing. and plur. imperative, e.g. *dósta zbórvi, dósta zbórvite*, corresponding to the second-person negative forms φτάν' κρέντς and φτάν' κρέν'τι, (2) *dósta* + present indicative, e.g. *dósta zbórvam* = φτάν' κρένου 'I should not talk anymore', (3) *dósta* + aorist indicative, e.g. *dósta zborvá* = φτάν' έκρινα 'I spoke enough, I should not talk anymore', (4) *dósta* + perfect indicative, e.g. *dósta ímam zborváno* = φτάν' έχου κρέν' 'I spoke enough, I should not talk anymore'. We should note that in the local Slavic dialects the verb *ftásvam* (< Greek φτάνω) 'I arrive' is used, but the 3rd sing. *ftásvi* 'he/she arrives' is not grammaticalized and is not used in the sense '(that's) enough', in contrast to Bulgarian, where *stígam* 'I arrive' is used in the 3rd sing. *stíga* in the sense '(that's) enough'.

According to Tzitzilis (forth.), in some cases the same syntactic structure can be the result of language contact in one area and the result of internal evolution in another. Therefore, the structure φτάν' κρέντς (and φτάν' κρέν'τι) in the Northern dialects of Grammochoria in Kastoria

must be the result of Slavic influence, cf. *dósta zbórvi* and *dósta zbórvite* (*dósta* 'enough', *zbórvi* 'talk [2nd sing.-imperative]', *zbórvite* 'talk [2nd plur.-imperative]') in the local Slavic dialects, and *stiga govori* and *stiga govorite* (*stiga* 'enough', *govori* 'talk [2nd sing.-imperative]', *govorite* 'talk [2nd plur.-imperative]') in Bulgarian, whereas in Silli the structure κανεί παίζεις is the result of internal evolution. As Tzitzilis (forth.) states, the starting point of grammaticalization is common in both cases: the 3rd sing. of a verb or an adverb whose meaning is 'enough' evolves into a negative particle equivalent to μη, which is used in negative imperatives. It is noteworthy that in both cases the imperative is formed through reanalysis of infinitival forms.

Cross-linguistic research in the dialects of Kastoria has proved that similar structures are also found in the Aromunian dialects of the area, where, for the formation of second-person negative imperatives *dúre* (*dúri*) 'enough' (Papahagi, 1974: 509) is used as an index of negation, a form which goes back to Turkish *dur* 'stop' and the forms of the 2nd sing. and plur. of the present; e.g., *dúri zb(ə)rés´* (and *zb(ə)résts´*) = φτάν' κρέντς and *dúri zb(ə)ráts* = φτάν' κρέν'τι. We should also note that, in the case of the local Aromunian dialects, *dúri* is also used with the paradigm of the present and the aorist indicative, albeit less frequently. In this case, the grammaticalization process is reversed: a structure denoting dissuasion (Turkish *dur* 'stop') comes to mean 'repleteness' (*dúri zb(ə)rés´* 'do not talk anymore'), whereas in the case of φτάν' and *dósta* a structure meaning 'repleteness', 'termination', 'no more, that's enough' acquires the meaning of 'dissuasion': φτάν' κρέντς = *dósta zbórvi* 'do not talk' (Tzitzilis, forth.).

In addition, Papadamou's fieldwork in Grammochoria has shown that the use of φτάν', in a way similar to that of the Slavic *dósta* 'enough', exceeds the deterrent function and is also used with other functions such as the oppositional one: φτάν' έχουν παράδις κλαίγουντι κιόλας = *dósta íme páre i se plátše* 'it's not just that they have money; they have to whine about it' (Papadamou under prep.).

4.2 Morphosyntactic phenomena in neighboring Northern dialects

4.2.1 Ethical accusative

Tzitzilis and Margariti-Ronga (forth.) refer to some verbs which are followed by a direct object in Koine, but in the dialects of Kozani they are also accompanied by weak forms of the personal pronouns in the accusative case; these serve the function either of possessives or of the ethical accusative, e.g. δεν τ'ς ξέρου τα παρανόμια 'I don't know the nicknames they use for them', δε σ' το κατάλαβα αυτό που λες 'I do not understand what you are saying'. Similar structures are also found in the dialects of Kastoria: δεν τ'ς ξέρου (σ)τα παρατσούκλια πώς τ'ς λ´έν' 'I don't know the nicknames by which they call them', δε σ' του κατάλαβα αυτό που λ´ες 'I don't understand what you are saying' and αυτό που μί 'πις δε σ' του κατάλαβα 'I did not understand what you said to me'. In the variety used by the bilingual speakers of the area, the following phrases are found: δεν τους ξέρω (σ)τα ονόματα, and δε σ' το κατάλαβα αυτό που λες. The former corresponds to the phrase *ne mu i znam imeníštšata* of the local Slavic dialect (cf. *ne gi znam imenata* in Bulgarian), whereas the latter corresponds to the local Slavic phrase *ne ti ɣu rázbra mabiétut*.

These structures are but one aspect of the phenomenon of the wider use of the ethical genitive/accusative, which has been observed in the Aromunian dialect (see Katsanis & Dinas 1986: 183) and which seems to hold for the area's Greek and Slavic dialects as well, at least up to a point (see Tzitzilis, forth.).

4.3 Morphosyntactic phenomena with a wider distribution in Western dialects

4.3.1 Impersonal structures denoting desire

The most characteristic impersonal structure is of the type ethical accusative + verb in the 3rd sing. mediopassive voice, e.g. μι πίνιτι 'I want to drink', μι τρώγιτι 'I want to eat', μι κοιμάτι 'I want to sleep'. This construction is a loan translation from the Slavic impersonal structure *mi* (ethical dative) *se pie* (3rd sing. mediopassive voice of the verb), *mi se jade*, which is formed by the ethical dative and the verb in the 3rd sing. mediopassive voice and is used to denote desire ('I want to drink', 'I want to eat'). This structure, attested in all the dialects of the area, is more widely used in Central and Western Macedonia, and is also found in other Balkan languages belonging to the core of the Balkan linguistic union such as the Aromunian dialect. More specifically, with regard to the Greek area it seems to be widespread in the western part of Central Macedonia, i.e. the dialects of Thessaloniki and those farther west, as well as the dialects of Western Macedonia, with the dialect of Kozani being an exception. It is noteworthy that the dative of the Slavic structure is replaced by the accusative in Greek, as the Greek language lacks the dative case, and the Northern Greek dialects use the ethical accusative in the place of the ethical dative of the Modern Greek. The structurally closest syntactic form in Modern Greek is the accusative + the verb in 3rd sing. active voice, e.g. με διψάει 'I'm thirsty', με πινάει 'I'm hungry' (the Ionian Islands and the area around Mesolongi, see Triandaphyllidis 1993: 249).

Bousboukis (1982: 209) notes that he traced similar syntactic forms in the Aromunian idiom of Imathia, but points out that these are not used in other areas. Regarding the formation of this impersonal structure, he observes that Aromunian uses a personal pronoun in genitive-dative and the 3rd sing. of the middle voice: *ni si biá un kafé* = μας πίνουνταν ένας καφές 'we wanted to drink a cup of coffee', *nu l'* [i] *si fudj* = δεν τουν φεύγιτι 'he doesn't want to leave'. Papadamou's personal fieldwork has proved that the phenomenon is also known in the Aromunian dialects of Kastoria, cf. *nˊι si bjáu un kafé* = μι πίνιτι ένας καφές 'I want to drink a cup of coffee', *nu lu si fúdži di* [u]*á* = δεν τ'ς φεύγιτι απ' τ' ιδώ 'they don't want to leave the area', etc.

Sandfeld (1930: 151) implies that the phenomenon had a wider distribution in Aromunian and Meglenitic. He also observes that the same phenomenon is also found in the Albanians of Skopje, and he notes: "M. Skok a observé la même construction chez les Albanais de Skopje: *uji m pijet* 'j'ai envie de boire de l'eau'", whereas for Albanian he notes "et elle se trouve aussi ailleurs en albanais: *më qeshet* 'j'ai envie de rire'". These examples correspond to the structures μι πίνιτι and μι γιλιέτι of the Northern Greek dialects.

The occurrence of this phenomenon in all the Balkan languages found in the core of the Balkan Sprachbund has led Tzitzilis (forth.) to pose the question as to whether the phenomenon needs to be examined in the narrow context of the Greek-Slavic language contact or whether it should be investigated as a characteristic regarding the entire Balkan Sprachbund, and more presicely the core of the Balkan Linguistic union, where contact is much more intense. As Tzitzilis states, consideration of the Balkan dimension of the phenomenon is necessary because in conditions of multilingual contact it is difficult to exclude the possibility of indirect effects, in this case interference by the Aromunian dialect, at least in areas where the latter is prevalent.

4.3.2 The suffix -αβους

The suffix -αβους is usually used to form adjectives denoting negative qualities. Despite efforts (Promponas, 1989) for a Greek interpretation of the suffix, it is now widely accepted that it derives from the Slavic suffix *-av*. As concerns its distribution, it is found: (1) in words of Slavic origin, most of which are denominative adjectives: *liga* 'saliva' > *ligav* > λίγκαβους 'impure, dirty', *kora* 'crust' > *korav* > κόραβους 'tough', (2) in other adjectives of Slavic origin: χάβαβους 'soft', προύχαβους 'soft and bulgy', ζούδαβους 'peaky', (3) in adjectives of unknown origin: τσούκραβους 'frizzy', μπάγκαβους 'gaudy', (4) in adjectives formed from Greek nouns: μύξα > μύξαβους 'snotty', πρέκνα > πρέκναβους 'freckled', ζγκουριά > ζγκούραβους 'rusty', κλάψα > κλάψαβους 'crybaby', ψώρα > ψώραβους 'mangy', στάχτ' > στάχταβους 'ash-like', κουρκούτ' > κουρκούταβους 'mush-like', (5) in adjectives formed from other Greek adjectives: νιρουλός > νιρούλαβους 'watery', κ'τχ΄άρ'ς > κ'τχ΄άραβους 'box-shaped', etc.

Of particular interest for language contact and its importance for determining the position of the dialects of the area is the case of a small group of adjectives denoting colour or colour-related qualities, in which borrowing is not limited to the suffix *-av*, but concerns the entire derivational model according to which these adjectives are formed. According to Tzitzilis (1997-1998: 22), by analogy with the Slavic color adjectives, which are formed with adjective + the diminutive suffix + the suffix *-av*, similar adjectives are found in the Greek dialects of the area. Thus, in a manner similar to that of the formation of the adjective *zelen* 'green' > *zelen-ik* 'a little green' > *zelen-ik-av* 'greenish', its Greek counterpart πρασˇνούλ΄αβους is formed, in which the diminutive suffix -ούλ΄ corresponds to the Slavic suffix *-ik*, i.e. *zelen-ik-av* = πρασˇν-ούλ΄-αβους. The following adjectives, found in the Northern dialects of Kastoria, are formed in the same way: κιτρινούλ΄αβους 'yellowish', κουκκˊνούλ΄αβους 'reddish', ασπρούλ΄αβους 'sort of white', μαυρούλ΄αβους 'sort of black'. We should note that this model, known from Bulgarian, is also found in local Slavic dialects.

The case of πόταβους 'what kind' (Germa, Vogatsiko, Kostarazi, Ampelokipi, etc.) is particularly interesting; it is the only pronoun formed with this suffix. It is obvious that the formation of πόταβους is the same as that of the above-mentioned adjectives and, in particular, it is a different form of the adjective ποταπός / πόταπους (< Med. Gr. πόταπος < AGr. ποταπός), which is also found with the same meaning in other Greek dialects. According to Tzitzilis (forth.), the word πόταβους was formed by folk etymology or by partial loan translation on the basis of its Slavic equivalent *kakav*.

Taking Tzitzilis (2001) into account, who views morpheme borrowing as a procedure of partial translation in which the stem (base) is translated and the derivational element remains unmodified, we tried to find the Slavic derivational 'models' of the adjectives in -αβους with a Greek base. Our work revealed that most local Slavic dialects have forms that could be regarded as the direct 'models' for the Greek forms: *krasta* = ψώρα > *krastav* = ψώραβους, etc. Some of these forms seem to be repatriated loans, e.g. σούφρα > dial. Slav. *šúfra* > *šúfrav* > σούφραβους, πρέκνα > dial. Slav. *prénkl΄a* 'freckle' > *prénkl΄av* = πρέκναβους, etc.

Regarding the geographical distribution of the suffix outside Kastoria, which is particularly important in determining the position of the Northern dialects of the area, it is foundnd in some parts of Central Macedonia and in Western Macedonia (Kozani, Grevena, Kastoria); the form *-av* is also found in Aromunian, e.g. *bágav, prúhav, búhav, žúdav* (Papahagi, 1974 s.vv.).

5 Conclusion

As we have already mentioned, the position of the Northern Greek dialects of Kastoria is determined by three sets of isoglosses:

(1) those based on the 24 features used by Tzitzilis (forth.) for the classification of Modern Greek dialects. As expected, all the main phonetic and morphological characteristics of the first subgroup of this set, namely those that are common to all Northern Greek dialects, are found in Kastoria, and therefore they do not contribute much to the classification of the Northern Greek dialects themselves and to the determination of their dialectal subgroups. The isoglosses of the second subgroup of this set, namely the ones that differentiate the Northern Greek dialects themselves, are common to all the dialects of the region with the exception of one: the marking of the indirect object by the accusative case, which is common to all the dialects of the region except for the dialects of Chrisi and Eptachori, in which the indirect object is marked by the genitive case. The similarities of this subgroup of isoglosses ensures that all the dialects of the area constitute a homogeneous subgroup, which, together with neighboring dialects, form a larger group, different from that of other Northern dialects.

(2) a set of characteristics selected on the basis of special criteria, which, as the analysis of the data has proved, can give us useful information about the position of the Northern dialects of Kastoria. The analysis of the isoglosses of this set, in combination with the analysis of the isoglosses of the third set, i.e. those attributed to language contact, leads us to the conclusion that there is internal differentiation, but there are also many common characteristics that allow us to view the Northern dialects of Kastoria as a group. More precisely, the analysis of the aforementioned data leads us to the conclusion that the dialects of Kastoria can be divided into two subgroups: (a) the dialects of Grammochoria, and (b) the remaining dialects of Kastoria. Certainly, there are also internal differences in both subgroups, but, the stage of our research does not allow us to proceed to a more detailed classification of these dialects (cf. the transitional position of the dialect of Eptachori, which, though belonging to Grammochoria, presents features of both subgroups, or the position of the dialect of Ammoudara, which, though geographically belonging to the eastern area of the Prefecture of Kastoria, presents the basic characteristics of Grammochoria).

The question, then, as to whether the geographical and administrative position of Kastoria on the border between two broader regions, i.e. Western Macedonia and Epirus, corresponds to the dialectal position of the Northern dialects of Kastoria as dialects occupying a transitional space between the dialects of Western Macedonia and those of Epirus, can be given a positive answer. More precisely, the subgroup of Grammochoria can be regarded as the tip of the dialects of Epirus, while the subgroup of the remaining dialects can be viewed as the tip of the dialects of Western Macedonia. We should note that the term 'tip' in both cases is used conventionally as we do not know the direction of the isoglosses' spread.

(3) an equally important third set of isoglosses, on which we focused our attention, is the one regarding phenomena attributed to language contact and, more precisely, contact with the Slavic dialects of the area. These phenomena prove to be very illuminating as concerns the determination of the position of the Northern dialects of Kastoria, since they confirm the categorization of these dialects into two subgroups, one consisting of the dialects of Grammochoria and the other the consisting of remaining Northern dialects of Kastoria. A specific syntactic isogloss differentiates the group of Grammochria and some other dialects which are under strong Slavic influence from the remaining Northern dialects of Kastoria as well as from the Northern dialects of Western Macedonia in general: this is the prohibitive structure

with φτάν', but also the oppositional structure with φτάν', corresponding, as we mentioned above, to the Slavic structures with *dósta*.

References

Andriotis, N. 1976. *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten.* Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Bongas, A. E. 1964. *Τα γλωσσικά ιδιώματα της Ηπείρου (Βορείου, Κεντρικής και Νοτίου) Α΄.* Ioannina: Society for Epirus Studies.

Bousboukis, D. A. 1982. *Το Ρήμα της Αρωμουνικής.* Athens.

Georgiou, G. Chr. 1962. *Το γλωσσικό ιδίωμα Γέρμα Καστοριάς.* Thessaloniki: Society for Macedonian Studies.

Joseph, Br. 2007. Broad vs. Localistic Dialectology, Standard vs. Dialect: The Case of the Balkans and the Drawing of Linguistic Boundaries. In *Papers from INCLAVE 4 (International Conference on Language Variation in Europe)*, Lefkosia, 119-134.

Katsanis, N. & Dinas, K. 1986. Συμβολή στη λειτουργία της γενικής ηθικής κτλ. (Αντιπαραθετική αναφορά στα Ελληνικά και στα ΚΒλάχικα). *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 7:177-183.

Margariti-Ronga, M. 1985. *Φωνολογική ανάλυση του Σιατιστινού Ιδιώματος.* Thessaloniki.

Newton, B. 1972. *The generative Interpretation of Dialect. A study of Modern Greek Phonology*. Cambridge University Press.

Papadamou, E. (under prep.). *Μορφολογία των βορείων ιδιωμάτων του Νομού Καστοριάς.* Thessaloniki.

Papahagi, T. 1974. *Dictionarul Dialectului Aromân, Dictionnaire Aroumain (Macédo-Roumain)*. Editura Academiei Republicii Romania.

Promponas, I. 1989. Είναι σλαβική η κατάληξη -άβος; *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 9:87-97.

Sandfeld, K. 1930. *Linguistique balkanique: problèmes et résultats*. Paris: Société de Linguistique.

Thomason, G. S. 2005. *Language Contact. An Introduction.* Edinburg: Edinburg University Press.

Triandaphyllidis, M. 1993 (1938). *Νεοελληνική Γραμματική, Ιστορική Εισαγωγή.* Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.

Tzitzilis, Chr. 1997-1998. Griechisch, ein wenig bekanntes Mitglied des Balkansprachbundes. *Linguistique Balkanique* 39:17-27.

Tzitzilis, Chr. 2001. Methodische Bemerkungen zu den Lehnübertragungen in den Balkansprachen. *Linguistique Balkanique* 41:40-53.

Tzitzilis, Chr. (forth.). *Εισαγωγή στη μελέτη των Νεοελληνικών διαλέκτων.* Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.

Tzitzilis, Chr. & Margariti-Ronga, M. (forth.) Βόρεια Ιδιώματα. In *Νεοελληνικές Διάλεκτοι*, ed. Chr. Tzitzilis, Thessaloniki: Institute of Modern Greek Studies.