

Morphological contamination in dialectal Modern Greek: 'accusative-like' genitives

DIONYSIOS MERTYRIS
Ulster University

1. Introduction

The genitive plural has been expressed with the single morpheme *-ων* in all morphological paradigms of Greek since the late contractions of the Archaic period (6th c. BC)¹. However, the morphology of the genitive plural has been influenced by the accusative in a few instances in Modern Greek. More specifically, in all Modern Greek dialects (apart from Pontic) the accusative plurals *μας* “us” (acc.pl) and *σας* “you” (acc.pl) of the first and second person have replaced the ancient genitive forms *ἡμῶν* “of us” (gen.pl)/ *ὕμῶν* “of you” (gen.pl), while in most modern dialects the accusative *τους* of the third person has replaced *των* (Mertyris 2011):

(0) Ancient Greek <i>τὸ παιδίον ἡμῶν</i> “our child”	→	Modern Greek (all varieties) <i>το παιδί μας</i> →	Pontic <i>το παιδίν εμουν</i>
Ancient Greek <i>τὸ παιδίον ὑμῶν</i> “your child”	→	Modern Greek (all varieties) <i>το παιδί σας</i> →	Pontic <i>το παιδίν εσουν</i>
Ancient Greek <i>τὸ παιδίον αὐτῶν</i> “their child”	→	Modern Greek I ² <i>το παιδί των</i> →	Modern Greek II ³ <i>το παιδί τους</i>

Among the dialects that use the syncretic third person accusative plural *τους*, there are a few dialects where nominal accusatives of masculine (and feminine) nouns have replaced genitive plurals, e.g. *τα σπίτια των γειτόνων* (gen.pl) vs. Cypriot *τα σπίτια τους γειτόνους* (acc.pl) “the houses of the neighbors” (cf. Mertyris 2013).

This paper deals with another type of influence of the accusative on genitive forms. As will be shown, such changes reflect morphological contamination and do not constitute accusative-genitive syncretism, since accusatives and genitives remain morphologically distinct, although they are closely related to the syncretic developments mentioned earlier. According to Hock & Joseph (2009: 163), the phenomenon of contamination involves non-systematic analogical changes that usually affect lexical or morphological forms with a synonymous, antonymous or ordinal relationship. A well known example of this sort is the reshaping of *femelle* (Old French) on the basis of its antonymous and closely related form *male* that led to the much closer phonetically pair *male* and *female* in English. The term contamination was first described by Paul, who has provided the following definition (1920: §110):

¹ Namely the contraction of *-άων* to *-ῶν* of α -masculines and feminines (1st declension) in Archaic Greek.

² The third person genitive plural *των* can be found in a few variant forms (e.g. *τω/τωνε/τουν/ντουνε/νε* etc) in Southern Italy, Cythera, Crete, the Cyclades, Chios, Icaria, the Dodecanese, Lesbos, Bithynia, Cappadocia, Pharasa and Mariupol.

³ Including Common Modern Greek, the Peloponnese, the Ionian islands, Central Greece, Thessaly, Epirus, Macedonia, Thrace, Northern Aegean (apart from Lesbos), Samos, the Sporades, Kyzikos, Silli and Cyprus.

[...] den Vorgang, dass zwei synonyme oder irgendwie verwandte Ausdrucksformen sich neben einander ins Bewusstsein drängen, so dass keine von beiden rein zur Geltung kommt, sondern eine neue Form entsteht, in der sich Elemente der einen mit Elementen der andern mischen.⁴

2. Personal pronouns and definite articles

2.1 Third person genitive plural *τως* in Southern Aegean and Southern Italy

In Southern Italy (Karanastasis 1997: 67-68), Crete (Kontosopoulos 2008), the Cyclades, Icaria, Chios and the Dodecanese (Dieterich 1908: 118), the genitive plural of the third person pronoun is *τως* and it is used in parallel with the more traditional form *των(ε)*. This ‘accusative-like’ genitive form has deep roots in the system of these dialects, as it is also found in late Medieval and early Modern Greek vernacular texts:

- (1) *ἡμέρες τῆς χαρᾶς τως*
 “days of their joy”
Achilleis [Bodl], l. 687 (ms. 16th c.)

The origin of this form can be attributed to the influence of the final *-ς* of the syncretic first and second person accusative plurals *μας/σας* and the third person accusative plurals *τους/τες (τις)*, thus constituting a great example of morphological contamination that has led to further developments, as is shown in 2.2 and 2.3.

2.2 First person genitive plurals ending in *-ς* in the Dodecanese

Quite surprisingly, the Dodecanesian varieties that have maintained the first and second person genitive singulars *εμού (εμουνού)/εσού (εσουνού)*⁵ have also formed morphologically distinct strong genitive plural forms that are based on the syncretic accusatives *εμάς/εσάς*. According to Pernot (1946: 169), the genitive forms *εμανάς/εσανάς* are found in Symi and Icaria, while for the dialect of Astypalea has the forms *εμανώ(ς)/εσανώ(ς)* (Karanastasis 1958: 129) with analogical *-ς* from the third person genitive plural *τως*.

Apart from the influence of *τως*, the formation of morphologically distinct ‘accusative-like’ genitive plurals *εμανάς/εσανάς* (Symi and Icaria) and *εμανώ(ς)/εσανώ(ς)* (Astypalea) is based on the genitive singulars *εμουνού/εσουνού* (in turn based on demonstrative genitives like *αυτουνού/εκεινού*) and the stem of the accusative plurals *εμάς/εσάς*.

2.3 Genitive plural *τως* of the definite article in Southern Italy and Karpathos

In most varieties of Southern Italy (Karanastasis 1997: 51), the genitive plural of the definite article has the form *τως*, as can be seen in the following examples: from Calabria (Mergianou 2000: 145):

- (2) *είπε* *τως* *άδδω* *μόνεκω*
 say:3sg.PST the:GEN.pl other:GEN.pl.m monk:GEN.pl.m
 “He said to the other monks”
 Salento (Stomeo 1980: 288)

⁴ English translation (Fertig 2015: 217): “the process whereby two forms of expression that are synonymous or in some way related impose themselves simultaneously on the consciousness, so that neither is able to assert itself cleanly, but rather a new form arises in which elements of the one form are combined with elements of the other.”

⁵ They are the only Modern Greek varieties that have morphologically distinct ‘strong’ genitive singular forms (cf. Mertyris 2014: 121).

- (3) *τως μαστόρω*
 “of the craftsmen”
 Calabria (Mergianou 2000: 145)

The same phenomenon is found in all varieties of Karpathos apart from the village Elympos in the northern part of this Dodecanesian island, where *των* is maintained both in the third person and the definite article (Minas 1970: 95), which once again shows the influence of pronominal forms. The following example demonstrates the use of an ‘accusative-like’ genitive in the definite article:

- (4) *τως ξυλών*
 “of the pieces of wood”
 Minas (1970: 85)

The use of *τως* in the third person pronouns in both Southern Italy and Karpathos is the source of this development and it shows the influence of pronominal clitics on the forms of the definite article, as the genitive plural of the definite article acquired the final *-ς* and became *τως* from the original form *των*.

3. Genitive plural forms in *-ώνες/ -ούνες*

3.1 Corfiot varieties

Corfiot varieties offer a very interesting case, as they clearly demonstrate the process of the development of genitive forms that resemble accusatives. More specifically, the accusative-genitive syncretism has taken place in the definite article forms, where *τσου* (<*τους*) is used in par with *των* [and the variant forms *του(ν)*]. This syncretism in the definite article is obviously related to the syncretic third person plural masculine accusative *τσου* (<*τους*) and resulted in the development of genitives ending in the analogical suffix *-ς*. As can be seen in the following table, the variety of Argyrades exhibits the initial stage before the development of ‘accusative-like’ genitives in the variety of Liapades:

	Argyrades (Salvanos 1918)		Liapades (Repoulios 2011)	
nom.	<i>οι ανθρώποι</i>	<i>οι γυναίκες</i>	<i>οι σκύλοι</i>	<i>τα Βάγια</i>
gen.	<i>των/ τσ’ ανθρώπωνε</i>	<i>των/ τσου γυναικόνε</i>	<i>τσου σκύλωνες</i>	<i>τσου Βαγιώνες</i>
acc.	<i>τσ’ ανθρώπους</i>	<i>τσι γυναίκες</i>	<i>τσου σκύλους</i>	<i>τα Βάγια</i>
	“the people” (M)	“the women” (F)	“the dogs” (M)	“the Palms” (N)

Table 1: ‘Accusative-like’ genitives in Corfiot varieties

Even though these Corfiot varieties do not exhibit nominal syncretic accusative plurals, the accusative-genitive syncretism has taken place in the definite article forms, where *τους* (and its variant *τσου* [<*τους*]) can replace *των*. This syncretism in the definite article is obviously related to the syncretic third person masculine accusative *τσου* (<*τους*) and has resulted in the development of genitives ending in the analogical suffix *-ς*. The development of the ‘accusative-like’ genitive plural in *-ς* can be attributed to the use of the syncretic *τσου* with accusative forms, e.g. *τσου σκύλους* (acc.pl)/ *τσου σκύλωνε* (gen.pl) → *τσου σκύλωνες* (gen.pl).

Moreover, the following example is found in Alexakis (2005: 26):

- (5) *το άφηκε τσου μπαιδιώνες του*
 “he gave it to his children”

This can be considered an instance of double contamination, as the accusative plural suffix *-ς* is added to the nominal genitive and the voicing of initial /p/ is retained due to the influence of the original structure *των παιδιώνε* /ton peði'one/ [to^(m)be'ðjone], in which /p/ is voiced due to the preceding final /n/ of the definite article *των*. Thus, *των* is contaminated with *τσου* and produces *τσουν* in this case.

3.2 Samos, Sporades and Northern Euboea

The suffix *-ούνις* attaches to neuter nouns in Samos, the Sporades and Northern Euboea⁶, where there is accusative-genitive syncretism with masculine and feminine nouns. This suffix is very similar to *-ώνες* and it has undergone the following changes (Kretschmer 1905: 242):

- (6)
- a. **των παιδι-ών* →
 - b. **των παιδι-ώνε* (addition of *-ε* to avoid the closed syllable)⁷ →
 - c. **τουν πιδι-ούνι* (northern vocalism + shift of *-ων* to *-ου* following the gen.sg *-ου*) →
 - d. **τς πιδι-ούνι* (ACC-GEN syncretism in the definite article) →
 - e. *τς πιδι-ούνις* (addition of *-ς*)⁸

3.2.1 Samos

As can be shown in the following table, the genitive plural of neuter nouns is formed with the ‘accusative-like’ suffix *-ούνις*, while there is accusative-genitive syncretism in the genitive plural form of the definite article and the masculine and feminine nouns:

	SG	PL	SG	PL	SG	PL
nom.	<i>ου πετ'νός</i> ⁹	<i>οι πετ'νοί</i>	<i>η γ'ναίκα</i>	<i>οι γ'ναίκις</i>	<i>του πιδί</i>	<i>τα πιδιά</i>
acc.	<i>τουν πετ'νό</i>	<i>τς πετ'νοί</i>	<i>τη γ'ναίκα</i>	<i>τς γ'ναίκις</i>	<i>του πιδί</i>	<i>τα πιδιά</i>
gen.	<i>τ' πετ'νού</i>	<i>τς πετ'νοί</i>	<i>τς γ'ναίκας</i>	<i>τς γ'ναίκις</i>	<i>τ' πιδιού</i>	<i>τς πιδιούνις</i>
	“the rooster” (M)		“the woman” (F)		“the child” (N)	

Table 2: ‘Accusative-like’ genitive plurals of neuter nouns in Samos

The use of the suffix can be occasionally found with masculine nouns and adjectives as well, e.g.

- (7) *τς γουνιούνις μας οι κοπ'* [nom.sg *γουνιός* (M)]
 “the struggles of our parents”
 Dimitriou (1993: 279)

It is possible that these masculine genitive plurals are relics of a period when morphologically distinct genitive forms used the innovative genitive suffix *-ούνις*, as in Corfiot varieties, but due to the accusative-genitive syncretism in the definite article (in turn based on the syncretism in the third person) most masculine nouns acquired the common nominative/accusative/genitive form in the plural.

⁶ It is very likely that these varieties have a common origin (cf. Promponas 1998: 378 and Mertyrus 2013: 338).

⁷ This occurs in many dialects.

⁸ It can either be attributed to the *-ς* of masculine and feminine accusative plurals or the *-ς* of the syncretic *τς*.

⁹ <nom.sg *ο πετειν-ός, nom.pl *οι πετειν-οί, acc.pl *τους πετειν-οί (<πετειν-ούς), gen.pl *των πετειν-ών.

The suffix is also used with non-personal pronouns (e.g. *ποιανούνης* “of whom”, *αλλνούνης* “of others”, *αφνούνης* “of these”, *κ’νούνης* “of those”; Zafiriou 1914: 49) and adjectives:

- (8) *του ματ’ τσι*¹⁰ ***μικρούνης*** [nom.sg *μ(ι)κρος* (M)]
 “the eye of the young ones”
 Dimitriou (1993: 279)

3.2.2 Sporades

The situation in the Sporades¹¹ is very similar to the Samian dialect, as can be seen in the following example from Skiathos:

- (9) *η μάνα τς* ***κουρτσούνης*** [nom.sg *κουρίτς* (N)]
 “the mother of the girls”
 Skiathos (Rigas 1962: 32)

As regards Skopelos, Kretschmer (1905: 242) provides identical forms to Samos, e.g. *πιδί* “child”/ gen.pl *πιδιούνης*, but Sampson (1972: 100) mentions forms without raising of the unstressed *-ε-* of the suffix: *τς πιδιόνες*. What is more, he mentions that these peculiar ‘accusative-like’ genitives have been reanalyzed as nominative/accusative forms in the village Glossa of Skopelos, e.g. nom.pl *οι πιδιόνες* “the children”, gen/acc.pl *τς πιδιόνες*.

In Alonnisos, an earlier stage of the suffix is maintained, as it is found in the form of *-ώνης* instead of *-ούνης*:

- (10) *τς* ***πιδιώνης***
 “of the children”
 Alonnisos (ILNE 1488: 9).

3.2.3 Northern Euboea

Settas (1960) provides ‘accusative-like’ genitive plural forms of neuter nouns without raising of the unstressed *-ε-* of the suffix similarly to Sampson for Skopelos, e.g.:

- (11) *ο σανός τς* ***μλαριόνες*** [nom.sg *μλαρ* (N)]
 “the hay of the mules”
 Agia Anna, Northern Euboea (Settas 1960: 119)

It is possible that the inconsistent raising of unstressed */e/* in Northern Euboea and Skopelos is not due to the ‘semi-northern’ vocalism of these varieties, but to contact with Common Modern Greek.

Another interesting phenomenon of ‘accusative-like’ genitive plurals in this variety is the development of an innovative form that resembles feminine nouns for the demonstrative pronoun *αυτός* “this”:

- (12) *αυτνούδες τς* ***πιδιόνες*** [nom.pl *αυτά τα παιδιά*]
 “of these children”
 Settas (1960: 120)

¹⁰Note the maintenance of the unstressed *-ι* for the avoidance of the consonant cluster.

¹¹Skyros is not usually grouped in the Sporades and does not exhibit the phenomenon.

Again, similarly to Skopelos, these ‘accusative-like’ forms reminded speakers of feminine nouns, which led to the addition of *-δες* (quite possibly [-ðis]) to the masculine/neuter genitive singular *αυτοῦ*, cf. *γιαγιά* “grandmother” (F)/ nom.pl *γιαγιάδες*.

3.3 Corsican Maniot

In the dialect that used to be spoken in Cargèse until the early 20th c., the accusative-genitive syncretism in the definite article and the masculine nouns led to similar genitive forms (Blanken 1951: 95):

(13) *τους/ τις γυναικώνες* “of the women”

4. Genitive plural forms in *-ούς*

4.1 Vourbiani (Epirus)

The dialect of the village Vourbiani in Epirus exhibits accusative-genitive syncretism in the definite article and masculine nouns, while genitive plural forms of feminine and neuter nouns are formed with the suffix *-ιούς* (Anagnostopoulos 1928-9). What is even more peculiar about the nominal inflection of this variety is the fact that these ‘accusative-like’ feminine and neuter genitives can function as accusatives, following the syncretic pattern of masculine nouns:

	Masculines	Feminines	Neuters
nom.	<i>οι κληρονόμ’</i>	<i>οι γυναίκες</i>	<i>τα χωριά</i>
gen.	<i>τους κληρονόμ’ς</i>	<i>τις γυναικιούς</i>	<i>τις χωριοούς</i>
acc.		<i>τις γυναίκες/ γυναικιούς</i>	<i>τα χωριά/ τους χωριοούς</i>
	“the inheritors”	“the women”	“the villages”

Table 3: ‘Accusative-like’ genitives in Vourbiani

4.2 Kyzikos

The variety that used to be spoken in the village of Peramos in the Kyzikos peninsula (Turkish *Kapıdağ*) in the Sea of Marmara offers a similar situation, as there is accusative-genitive syncretism in the definite article and in masculine and feminine paradigms, while neuter nouns form the gen.pl with the suffix *-ούς* (Sgouridis 1968):

nom.	<i>οι δασκάλοι</i>	<i>οι μουριές</i>	<i>τα ψάρια</i>
gen.	<i>τους δασκάλοι</i>	<i>τις μουριές</i>	<i>τους ψαριοούς/ των ψαριών</i>
acc.			<i>τα ψάρια</i>
	“the teachers”	“the mulberry trees” (F)	“the fish” (N)

Table 4: ‘Accusative-like’ genitives in the variety of Peramos in Kyzikos

Similarly to the case of Vourbiani, it is possible that the shift of *-ω-* to *-ου-* was based on the definite article *τους* which could have been used in parallel with *τους*, when the deletion of high vowels had not yet been completed:

(14) *των παιδιών* → **τους/ τους παιδιών* → **τους/ τους παιδιοούς* → *τους παιδιοούς*.

5. Genitive plural forms in -ς in the eastern periphery of the Greek-speaking world

In the dialects of Central Asia Minor and Mariupol, the frequent overlap between the gen.sg and the gen.pl due to the shift of *-ω-* to *-ου-* and the loss of final *-ν* was occasionally raised by the addition of *-ς* as a plural marker (most likely based on nom/acc.pl forms), as is shown in examples from Silli, Pharasa (Central Asia Minor) and Mariupol (Southern Ukraine).

5.1 Silli

As was mentioned, the overlap of genitive singular and plural forms is quite common in this dialect:

- (15) *ρνο ματ/-ού*¹² [GEN] *του απέσ'* [rjo ma'tʃu tu a'pes]
 “the inside of his two eyes”
 Costakis (1968: 67)

Thus, it seems that the genitive plurals *αυτουνούς* and *αυτουνώς* mentioned by Costakis (1968: 71) involve the addition of *-ς*, which served for the distinction with the singular form *αυτουνού* of the demonstrative *αυτός* “this”. The same phenomenon is found in the following structure as well:

- (16) *κεινουνούς τα παιριά* [nom.sg (ε)κείνους “that”]
 “the children of those”
 Costakis (1968: 74)

Costakis (1968) mentions morphologically distinct forms for the accusative plural of these demonstratives, so it seems that this is not a case of accusative-genitive syncretism (cf. Mertyris 2013): nom.pl *αυτ/οί* “these” # gen.pl *αυτουνώς/ αυτουνούς* # acc.pl *αυτούς*, nom.pl *κείτινες* “those” # gen.pl *κεινουνούς* # acc.pl *κείτινες*.

5.2 Pharasa

Similarly to Silli, the overlap between the genitive singular and the genitive plural led to the addition of *-ς* to genitive plurals which are morphologically distinct from accusatives and thus do not involve accusative-genitive syncretism:

- (17) nom.sg *νομάτς* “person” # gen.sg *νοματού* # gen.pl *νοματούς* # n/a.pl *νομάτοι*
 Dawkins (1916: 167 & 169)

Grégoire (1909: 156) mentions the extension of *-ς* to the feminine *ναίκα* “woman” despite the lack of homophony with the genitive singular *ναίκας*:

- (18) 'ς *ναιτζιούς*¹³ *τα* *ρούχα*
 the:GEN.sg.f woman-GEN.pl the:N/A.pl.n clothing:N/A.pl
 “the clothes of the women”

The use of the feminine genitive singular of the definite article 'ς (<τς <της) with a plural feminine noun could be attributed to analogy, since the genitive of the masculine definite article is common for both numbers:

¹² <*ματι-ού(ν) <*ματι-ών. This genitive is identical to the gen.sg *ματ/-ού*.

¹³ <*ναιτζ-ιού (deletion of final /n/) <*ναιτζ-ιούν (affrication) <*ναικιούν (shift of /o/ to /u/ by analogy to the gen.sg suffix *-ου*) <*ναικ-ιών (deletion of unstressed first syllable, possibly began in the nom.sg *η ναίκα* <η γυνναίκα [ij'neka]) <*γυνναικ-ών (nom.sg *γυνναίκα*).

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| (19) masculines | feminines |
| a. gen.sg του νοματ-ού -
gen.pl του νοματ-ού(ν) | gen. sg 'ς ναίκα-ς -
gen.pl του ναιτζ-ιού(ν) |
| b. gen.sg του νοματ-ού -
gen.pl του νοματ-ού(ς) | gen.sg 'ς ναίκα-ς -
gen.pl 'ς ναιτζ-ιού(ς) |

5.2 Mariupolitan

Genitive and accusative plural forms of masculine nouns sometimes overlap in Mariupolitan varieties, which probably occurred in order to avoid homophony of the genitive plural with genitive singular and nominative plural forms (cf. Mertyris & Kisilier 2017)¹⁴. Quite interestingly, neuter nouns in this dialect can occasionally form the genitive plural through the mere attachment of -ς to their nominative/accusative plural forms in order to distinguish the genitive plural from the genitive singular:

- (20)
- n/a.sg τζαπ # n/a.pl τζάπ-ια # gen.sg/pl τζαπ-ί / gen.pl τζάπ-ια-ς
“mountain” (Tatar loanword)
Kiriakov (1988: 56)
 - πλίγιας πκαδ “flock of birds”
[ι-neuter: πλι/ n.a.pl πλί-για]
Henrich (1999: 669)
 - τα τφάλια μπαλάιδας “the heads of the children”
[Tatar loan (< bala): μπαλά/ n.a.pl μπαλάιδα [<*μπαλάδ-ια]/ gen.sg/pl μπαλαδ-ί]
Kiriakov (1993: 102)

In some cases, the addition of -ς is found with masculine genitive plurals, which are distinct from accusative forms, even though there is accusative-genitive plural overlap with masculine nouns in other instances:

- (21)
- πολλούς¹⁵ καρδίες [nom.pl.m πολός “a lot”]
“the hearts of many”
Arich (1935: 149)
 - δουλεφτάδς πολλοίς¹⁶ γω είδα
“I saw many workers”
Arich (1935: 55)

Furthermore, in Pappou-Zhuravliova (2009: 398) the numeral genitive *τρινούς* “of three” [<*τρινού <*τρινούν <*τρινών <*τριωνών (cf. *δουονών*) <*τριών] is mentioned, which is distinct from the nominative/accusative *τρεις* (M/F)/ *τρίγια* (N) “three”, while in the following

¹⁴ Cf. *ντουμάνο(ν)ς* “enemy” / gen.sg=nom.pl=gen.pl *ντουμάν* / acc.pl *ντουμάνς* → acc=gen.pl *ντουμάνς*.

¹⁵ <*πολλού <*πολλούν <*πολλών.

¹⁶ This is an instance of an accusative plural form that is not found anywhere in Modern Greek. Its origin could be sought in the addition of the accusative plural suffix -ς to nominative plural *πολλοί* following this pattern: nom.sg *ντουμάν-ο(ν)ς* “enemy”/ nom.pl *ντουμάν-Ø*/ acc.pl *ντουμάν-ς* [<*ντουμάνους].

example, there is a rare occasion of the addition of -ς to a genitive plural that has maintained final /n/:

- (22) *τα μάτια ουλνούς* “the eyes of all”
 [<*ουλνούν <*ολωνών<*όλων/ nom.sg *ούλος/όλος* “all”]
 Kiriakov (1988: 20)

6. Conclusions

The influence of the accusative-genitive syncretism in the personal pronouns, the definite article and the nominal inflection is a crucial factor for the development of the aforementioned contaminated forms. As the genitive plural is the most marked member of the case system of Greek, and due to the frequent loss of final -ν in dialectal Modern Greek, the need for iconic and explicit morphological marking was increased. Apart from the accusative-genitive syncretism, in the dialects of Silli, Pharasa and Mariupol the overlap between the genitive singular and plural led to innovative forms with the use of -ς, which in most cases served as a plural marker and it was based on accusative plural forms, which shows the dominance of the accusative in the hierarchy of the case system of Modern Greek.

1pl:ACC=GEN <i>μας</i> / 2pl:ACC=GEN <i>σας</i> → 3pl:GEN <i>τους</i> → DEF.ART:GEN.pl <i>τους</i> e.g. <i>τους μαστόρω</i> (Southern Italy)
3pl:ACC=GEN <i>τους</i> → DEF.ART:ACC=GEN.pl <i>σου</i> → GEN.pl suffix -ώνες e.g. <i>σου παιδιώνες</i> (Corfu) → DEF.ART:ACC=GEN.pl <i>ς</i> → GEN.pl suffix -όνις e.g. <i>ς παιδιόνις</i> (Samos) → DEF.ART:ACC=GEN.pl <i>ς/ τους</i> → GEN.pl suffix -ούς e.g. <i>ς παιδιούς</i> (Kyzikos)
GEN.sg=GEN.pl → GEN.pl suffix -ους, e.g. <i>αυτουούς</i> (Silli) → GEN.pl.n formed by the addition of -ς to the NOM=ACC.pl.n form, e.g. <i>πλίγια-ς</i> (Mariupol)

Table 5: ‘Accusative-like’ genitives in dialectal Modern Greek

Even though contamination is not a systematic analogical change, the importance of these ‘accusative-like’ genitives seems to have been great for nominal inflection system of these dialects. Initially triggered by the expansion of the accusative-genitive syncretism from the third person to the definite article, genitive forms like *ς γουνιόνις* “of the parents” in Samos (§3.2.1) most likely paved the way for the further expansion of the syncretic pattern to the noun, thus leading to the accusative-genitive form *ς γουνιοί* “of the parents/ the parents (ACC)”. In addition, some of the contaminated genitives seem to confuse speakers with regards to their gender, cf. the masculine-looking feminine and neuter genitives that also function as accusatives in Vourbiani (*ς γυναικιούς/ ς χωριούς*; Table 3), the feminine-looking genitive plural *αυτουόδες* of the neuter demonstrative *αυτά* in Northern Euboea (example 12), and the complete reanalysis of the neuter genitive *πιδιόνες* as a feminine nominative in Skopelos (village Glossa; §3.2.2).

Finally, the fact that these developments took place independently in many varieties that are so distant from each other and without the aid of dialect contact is extremely important, as it clearly depicts the dynamics and the status of the genitive and the accusative in the case system of Modern Greek cross-dialectally and diachronically.

References

- Alexakis, N. (2005) Paratirisis sti Fonitiki, ti Morfologia kai ti Sintaksi tou Kerkiraikou Idiomatos. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 25: 19-30.
- Anagnostopoulos, G. (1928-1929) Peri tou Idiomatos tis en Ipiro Vourbianis kai ton peri Aftin Komon. *Byzantinisch-neugriechische Jahrbücher VII*: 448-469.
- Arich, A. (1935) *Neotita*. Mariupol: Greek Publishing of Donbas (Ελληνικό εκδοτικό τυ Δουμπάς).
- Blanken, G. (1951) *Les grecs de Cargèse (Corse): recherches sur leur langue et sur leur histoire*. Leyde: Sijthoff.
- Costakis, T. (1968) *To glossiko idioma tis Sillis*. Athens: Centre of Asia Minor Studies.
- Dawkins, R. M. (1916) *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: C.U.P.
- Dieterich, K. (1908) *Sprach und Volksüberlieferungen der Südlichem Sporaden*. Wien: Alfred Holder.
- Dimitriou, N. (1993) *Laografika tis Samou, Vol. 6*. Athens.
- Fertig, D. (2015) Two Conceptions of Analogical Innovation/ Change. In: P. Auer, & R. Murray (Eds.), *Hermann Paul's 'principles of language history' revisited. Translations and reflections*. Mouton de Gruyter, 209-236.
- Grégoire, H. (1909) Notes sur le Dialecte de Farasha. *Bulletin de Corrépondence Hellénique* 33: 148-169.
- Hock, H. & B. Joseph (2009) *Language history, language change and language relationship*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- ILNE 1488: Beis, S. (2011) *Sillogi glossikou ilikou apo tin Aloniso*.
- Kiriakov, L. (ed.) (1988) *Пирнэшу Астру: Стихя, пшмата, дъшмата*. Donetsk: Donbas.
- Kiriakov, L. (1993) *Тарас Шевченко. Кобзар*. Kiev: Ukrainskii Pismennik.
- Kontosopoulos, N. (2008) *Dialektoi kai idiomata tis Neas Ellinikis*. Athens: Grigoris.
- Kretschmer, P. (1905) *Der heutige Lesbische Dialekt verglichen mit den übrigen nordgriechischen Mundarten*. Wien.
- Mergianou, A. (2000) Oi Grekanoi kai I Grammatiki tous. *Modern Greek Dialectology C'*. 141-150.
- Mertyris, D. (2011) Case Syncretism in the Personal Pronouns of Medieval Greek. In: K. Chatzopoulou, A. Ioannidou & S. Yoon (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*: 480-491.
- Mertyris, D. (2013) Accusative-genitive syncretism in the nominal inflection of Modern Greek dialects. In M. Janse, B. Joseph, A. Ralli & M. Bağrıaçık (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. Patras: University of Patras, 335-352.
- Mertyris, D. (2014) *The loss of the genitive in Greek: a diachronic and dialectological analysis*. Ph.D. thesis. Melbourne: La Trobe University.
- Mertyris, D. & M. Kisilier (2017) I Geniki sti Marioupolitiki Dialekto: diatirisi kai Apolia. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 37: 465-476.
- Minas, K. (1970) *Ta idiomata tis Karpathou*. Athens: Klapakis.
- Paul, H. (1920) *Prinzipien der Sprachgeschichte*. Halle: Max Niemeyer. [5th edn, 1st edn 1880]
- Repoulios, D. (2011) Η γραμματική για τσου παλαιούς. liapadesvillage.blogspot.com/2011/11/blog-post_07.html.
- Rigas, G. (1962) *Skiathou laikos politismos. Volume B'*. Thessaloniki: Society of Macedonian Studies.
- Salvanos, G. (1918) *Meleti peri tou glossikou idiomatos ton en Kerkira argiradon*. Athens.
- Sampson, A. (1972) *To glossikon idioma Skopelou kai Glossis*. Volos: Archive of Thessalian Studies.
- Settas, D. (1960) Glossa kai Laografia tis Evias. *Archive of Evoian Studies* 7: 40-126.

- Smith, O. L. (1990) *The Oxford version of the Achilleid*. Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum.
- Stomeo, P. (1980) *Racconti greci inediti di Sternatia*. Matino (Lecce): La Nuova Ellade.
- Sgouridis, G. (1968) *I Peramos tis Kizikou*. Athens: Association of Peramians of Kyzikos.
- Zafiriou, M. (1995) *To glossiko idioma ths Samou*. Athens: Grigoris.
- Zafiriou, N. (1914) *Peri tis sigxronou Samias dialektou*. Athens: P. D. Sakellarios.