The shift from enclisis to proclisis in older Tsakonian

Nick Nicholas

Education Services Australia

Σκιαγραφούμε την εξέλιξη της μητροπολιτικής Τσακωνικής από καθολικά εγκλιτική σύνταξη για τις αντωνυμίες και τα βοηθητικά της ρήματα, προς την προκλιτική σύνταξη της Κοινής Νεοελληνικής, με λεπτομερή εξέταση δεδομένων από όλα τα αξιόπιστα κείμενα που διαθέτουμε από το 1797 ως το 1950. Η μελέτη αυτή συμπληρώνει την προγενέστερη του Λιόση (Liosis 2017), με εκτενέστερα δεδομένα και με θεώρηση της παλαιότερης προκλιτικής σύνταξης και των βοηθητικών ρημάτων.

Keywords: clitics, Tsakonian, auxiliaries, diachronic syntax

1. Introduction

Tsakonian has attracted much attention for its lexical archaisms relative to the mainstream of Standard Modern Greek (SMG). Tsakonian has appreciable syntactic archaisms as well. The difficulty with investigating these syntactic archaisms is that they were among the first victims of language death, and by the time extensive texts were recorded in the 20th century, there was little evidence left of them.

Liosis (2007: 527–633; 795–801) has tracked language attrition in Tsakonian, and Liosis (2017) focuses on its most distinctive change: the shift in auxiliaries and pronominal clitics from post-verbal to pre-verbal. Liosis reviews the shift globally, including both Metropolitan Tsakonian (MTk), and Propontis Tsakonian (PTk), a colony formerly in northern Turkey, settled as early as the 16th century (Manolessou 2019: 291–292).

Liosis conducts a longitudinal study from 1870 to the present day for MTk, to understand the transition in auxiliary and clitic placement. In this study, I conduct a more extensive corpus analysis, from the earliest available texts, up to 1950. My corpus overlaps only partly with Liosis', and I have rejected a few texts he has used, as unreliable. This study aims to fill in early stages only partly visible in Liosis' data, and confirm his findings and reconstructions, using old MTk data rather than comparison with PTk. It also provides a more granular look at the linguistic conditioning in play.

2. Corpus

The earliest recorded texts of Tsakonian are the word lists compiled by Evliya Çelebi in 1667 (Manolessou 2019: 295–297), and by Jean-Baptiste-Gaspard d'Ansse de Villoison in 1784–1786 (Manolessou 2019: 299–305); the latter provided no instances relevant for this paper.

The corpus used in this paper includes the following texts:

(i) the word list by Çelebi;

(ii) a word list by Johan David Åkerblad, collected in either 1785–1788, or 1796–1797 (Manolessou & Pantelidis 2018);

(iii) a few words and phrases collected by Leake (1830: 506–507) in 1806;

(iv) a translation of the Lord's Prayer and two fairy tales (Thiersch 1832: 551–552);

(v) texts and word lists collected by Konstantinos Oikonomou ex Oikonomon in 1836 from literate Tsakonians (the priests Ioannis Altigos and Georgios Trochanis, and Stamatis Trochanis, see Costakis 1980: 22–25; 2004)[1];

(vi) a verse dialogue on the adoption of the Greek Constitution by Theodoros Oikonomou (1846: 19–25), local priest;

(vii) folk songs (Deville 1866: 134–138);

(viii) brief poems and dialogues by Theodoros Oikonomou (1870);

(ix) poems by Kleanthis Oikonomou (1888), son of Theodoros, and also local priest;

(x) a short narrative by Kleanthis Oikonomou, collected by Pernot (1914) in 1890;

(xi) texts in the "Tsakonian Diary of 1895" (Latsis 1895): two stories, two poems, some jokes, and a translation of the "Letter by Jesus Christ found in Jerusalem"[2]. (I've omitted the snippets of SMG given in the text as codeswitching);

(xii) five fairy tales (Scutt 1913–1914);

---

[1] I omit counts of repetitions of the longer texts, or citations from them. The collection also included two unpublished sketch grammars, by N. A. Zografos and G. S. Lampyriades, briefly described and excerpted in Costakis (1986; 2004).

[2] An exemplar of a *Himmelsbrief*/Letter from Heaven, an early form of chain letter (Goodspeed 1931: 105–106). For a brief history of Letters from Heaven, see VanArsdale (1998–2016);

(xiii) a collection of agricultural terminology (Deffner 1922);

(xiv) a collection of expressions and songs (Deffner 1923b). The two songs in Deffner (1923b) were gathered when Deffner first arrived in Tsakonia in 1875; the first song was dictated by the old local notary Nikolaos Zografos (Deffner 1996: 160 — possibly the author of the sketch grammar in the Oikonomou Archive)[3];

(xv) two short fairy tales (Anagnostopoulos 1926: 72–74);

(xvi) the novella "Tsuranna" (*Α Τσουράννα*) by Georgios Stratigis (Stratigis 1943; 2000). The story was likely written in 1927, when it was first mentioned publicly (Stratigis 2000: 32; Togias 1939: 26). I use the 1943 edition, a critical edition with translation into SMG, albeit not done by a native Tsakonian speaker (Phaidon Bouboulidis). The 2000 edition, with its own SMG translation, is based on a single manuscript, and was silently emended by a native speaker (Dimitris Houpis); it is clearly modernised, and drops many archaisms of the original;

(xvii) two songs, a fairy tale and a story elicited from Thanasis Costakis in 1930 (Pernot 1934: 23–37);

(xviii) a made up dialogue included in Pernot & Costakis (1933: 86–89);

(xix) a couple of texts collected by Costakis in 1942 from the villages of Pramatefti and Melana (Costakis 1980: 28–34, 36–37, 40–43).

This corpus is restricted to MTk; PTk was only discovered by scholars in 1953, and its corpus is quite small (a few fairy tales, an unpublished autobiography recorded by Costakis). Liosis (2017: 44, 53) also admits the possibility that PTk underwent influence from Eastern Greek dialect, or Bulgarian. I do not consider PTk in the prehistory of the phenomena investigated here.

From this corpus, for his Period 1, Liosis has used only #viii, #ix, #xii. He has also used Deffner's (1923a) dictionary, and the Brothers Grimm fairy tales from Deffner (1926), which include Deffner (1921). These are Deffner's translations from

---

for the original SMG text, see http://users.uoa.gr/~nektar/orthodoxy/prayers/epistolh_ khim _kibdhlos.htm (accessed on 05.12.2021).

[3] However the song seems translated from SMG: the Tsakonian is ametrical, and a metrical SMG original is easy to reconstruct.

German, as confirmed in Deffner (1922: 5). I accordingly exclude these from my corpus. For his Period 2, Liosis uses #xvi in Houpis' edition, which has modernised all auxiliary placement in the text.

In this corpus, the fairy tales are the kind of text that Greek dialectology typically relies on for syntactic investigation. A couple of texts are religious translations from archaic/Koine Greek, so they may inflate the extent of archaism. A couple are consciously literary creations, subject both to stylistic constraints, and to conscious modelling after SMG prototypes. Theodoros Oikonomou's texts display clear influence from Puristic Greek.

3. Analyses to date

3.1. Position of pronominal clitics

Greek clitic placement has undergone transition from the inherited, enclitic second position in a clause (X Cl V or V Cl), governed by Wackernagel's Law, to the SMG pattern of proclisis (ClV) for finite verbs, enclisis (VCl) for imperatives and participles. The former pattern occurs in Eastern dialects and Early Modern Greek (Liosis 2017: 38).

MTk, as Pernot (1934: 189) identifies based on 40 years of fieldwork, originally had VCl by default, like the Eastern dialects — although Pernot notes that VCl had already become more common. In interrogatives, imperatives, standalone participles, and negation, VCl was mandatory (Lekos (1920: 38) notes that clitics can occasionally precede the verb in interrogatives). If the clitic reduplicates a following noun, it must precede the verb. Thiersch (1832: 539) notes that the clitic can either precede or follow a conditional: *ean mi ðaroi ~ ean ðaroi mi* 'if they beat me'.

If VCl is the original default (Liosis 2017: 44), then PTk (Liosis 2007: 529) and Old MTk preserved it in interrogatives and imperatives, and PTk and Old MTk used the marked ClV order in subjunctives. Unlike PTk, MTk has moved to the new ClV ordering in auxiliaries (see below), in clitic–noun coreference, and increasingly in affirmatives.

Pernot had also noted a hybrid ordering, with both preceding and following pronouns; Liosis (2017: 63–67) considers these circumclitics. This only occurs with

plural or 3sɢ referents, although the preceding pronoun can be singular or plural
(Liosis 2007: 530):

(1) a. *mi   m   aliere   namu   tsʰipta*
        ɴᴇɢ.ɪᴍᴘ   me   tell.2sɢ.sᴜʙᴊ   us   nothing

      'Don't tell us anything'

    b. *eki   aua   enki   ts   enki   nam   empikai*
        ᴀᴜx.3sɢ   say.ᴘᴀʀᴛ   so   and   so   us   do.3ᴘʟ

        namu   katsʰi   aϑripi
        us   some   people

      'She was saying, "some people did this and that to us"'

    c. *ezae   tʰo   mpeϑere,   ɲ   epetse   ɲi*
        go.3sɢ   to.the   father-in-law   him   said.3sɢ   him

      'He went to his father-in-law, and told him…'

Terminal speakers now pattern fully with SMG, which postposes the clitic only
for imperatives and participles. Fluent current speakers prepose the clitic in affirma-
tives, and usually also in interrogatives; they even occasionally prepose clitics to ne-
gated auxiliaries (Liosis 2007: 799).

The old order occasionally surfaces among fluent speakers, in verb-initial
phrases: e.g. *unkiai exunte si katavite* 'ɴᴇɢ.ᴀᴜx.3ᴘʟ.ᴘsᴛ have.ᴘᴀʀᴛ them perceive.
ᴘᴀʀᴛ = they hadn't perceived them'. The ClVCl circumclitic, with singular proclitic
and (usually) plural enclitic, remains in use among the most fluent speakers (Liosis
2007: 796–799).

3.2. Mobility of Auxiliaries

The present and past imperfect in Tsakonian are formed using an auxiliary verb (the
copula) and the participle: *eɲi oru* 'ᴀᴜx.1sɢ.ᴘʀᴇs see.ᴘᴀʀᴛ = I see, I am seeing', *ema
oru* 'ᴀᴜx.1sɢ.ᴘsᴛ see.ᴘᴀʀᴛ = I was seeing'. The perfect and pluperfect are formed us-
ing the auxiliary *exu* 'have' (I do not consider verbal adjectives as participles, so I do
not treat the aorist passive equivalents, like *eɲi orate* 'I am seen', as compound verbs).
Only the aorist indicative and subjunctive are monomorphemic. AuxPart is now in-
separable (Liosis 2017: 48) — although formerly it could be separated, not just by dis-
course particles, as Liosis has found, but by nominals:

(2) a. *tanu   pʰ   eki   o   pantazi   simenu*
        above   REL   AUX.3SG.PST   the   Pantazis   strike.PART

    ta   kʰambana
    the   bell

    'up above, where Pantazis was striking the bell' (Oikonomou 1888: 48)

  b. *pʰ   eni   niutʰa   mera   ɣrafu*
    REL   AUX.3SG   night   day   write.PART

    'who writes night and day' (Oikonomou 1888: 54)

  c. *ezu   apo   nkana   rufalatsi   pʰ   ema*
    I   from   some   porridge   REL   AUX.1SG.PST

    ts   ezu   krefu
    also   I   steal.PART

    'I from a porridge which I too stole' (Scutt 1913–1914: 21)

As Liosis (2017: 45–57) argues, the auxiliaries of Tsakonian are clitics, subject to conditioning similar to pronominal clitics. In MTk, the contemporary ordering is AuxPart in finite verbs, i.e. proclitic, just like for pronouns; he finds Aux is always enclitic in PTk, for the same reason. The pronominal clitic always precedes the auxiliary, if both occur.

However, polar interrogatives are by default PartAux — although the affirmative AuxPart ordering was long noted for Declaratives As Interrogatives (Lekos 1920: 61; Pernot & Costakis 1933: 48; Liosis 2019).

Grammars of Tsakonian up to Pernot's claim the ordering of auxiliary and participle is in free variation in affirmative statements, although there is no trace of that in the contemporary language. Early PartAux in MTk is not considered in Liosis (2017), though touched on in Liosis (2007).

4. Historical data and analysis

4.1. Mobility of Auxiliaries

The distribution of orderings is given as n/n for PartAux/AuxPart. The criteria in the following bleed each other (in the order shown), so that instances are listed only once

(**Subord** includes subordinators and interrogatives such as 'where?' and 'what?', but not coordinating connectives. **Interrog** are only polar).

	Neg	Subord	Interrog	Default
Çelebi [1667]	0/1			
Åkerblad [1796?]		0/3		0/2
Leake [1806]		0/1		**1**/0
Thiersch (1832)		0/3		0/2
Oikonomou Archive [1836]: citation forms [4]	0/4	0/3		**23**/2
Oikonomou Archive [1836]: texts	0/7	0/29	**1**/1	**6**/47
Oikonomou (1846)	0/4	0/10		0/11
Deville (1866)	0/2	0/7		0/2
Oikonomou (1870)	0/4	0/4	**1**/0	0/16
Zografos [1875] (Deffner 1923b)	0/3	0/14		**3**/22
Oikonomou (1888)	0/13	0/24		**1**/46
Oikonomou [1890] (Pernot 1914)	0/1	0/7		**1**/4
Latsis (1895): misc	0/25	0/36	0/1	**3**/33
Latsis (1895): Jesus	0/14	0/24		0/28
Scutt [1913]	0/20	0/34		**1**/59
Deffner (1922): citation				**14**/0
Deffner (1922): other				**1**/2
Deffner (1923b)	0/5	0/7		0/2
Anagnostopoulos (1926)	0/5	0/5		0/10
Stratigis [1927?]	0/9	0/95	**3**/0	**4**/109
Costakis [1930] (Pernot 1934)	0/6	0/18		**2**/64
Pernot & Costakis (1933)	0/12	0/6		**1**/17
Pramatefti [1942]	0/10	0/13		0/91
Melana [1942]	0/10	0/8		0/20

Table 1: Auxiliary orderings in corpus

- AuxPart for negatives and subordinates is not once violated in the corpus.
- The few polar interrogatives in the corpus are consistently PartAux. Of the two potential counterexamples, (4a) is punctuated as an interrogative, but may be

---

[4] PartAux or AuxPart phrases given in isolation, as part of a word list.

a declarative. (4b) is a paratactic add-on to a dubitative question, and may not be an interrogative at all:

(4) a. *me **esi exa** anapaʃsimari mi?*
    'you are besmirching my reputation?!' (lit. '**do you have** me as my funeral prayer?') (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 2004: 19)

   b. *min eni sampa to atfʰe, min eni to parastsi, ts **iɲi enkunte** tʰon aɣie su aɣieliðoti pasi?*
    'Might it be Holy Saturday, might it be Good Friday, so that all the inhabitants of Leonidio *are going* to their church?' (Latsis 1895: 40)

As the data shows, the original default ordering of Tsakonian is PartAux, when the verb is initial in the phrase. When any element precedes the verb complex, Aux comes first. This is a straightforward survival of Wackernagel's Law, with the auxiliary considered a clitic (so Liosis (2007: 529): "the observations that can be made on the position of clitic pronouns in Tsakonian correspond to those on the auxiliary placement").

Wackernagel's Law is reflected in the very first auxiliaries attested in Tsakonian:

(5) a. *esuni agapo =*
    ezu   ɲi   aɣapo
    1SG   AUX.1SG love.PART
    'I love' (Manolessou & Pantelidis 2018 — Åkerblad [1796?])

   b. *etjou si agapo =*
    etiu   si   aɣapo
    2SG   AUX.2SG love.PART
    'You love' (Manolessou & Pantelidis 2018 — Åkerblad [1796?])

   c. *enkunter   eme   tan   tsean*
    go.PART   AUX.1PL (to).the house
    'Let us go home' (Leake 1830: 507)

This also explains the Tsakonian citation forms attested for verbs. Throughout the 19th century, citation forms are either Part, or PartAux — consistent with the citation verb being an isolated clause. AuxPart is always listed second in wordlists or grammars (Thiersch 1832: 534, 535, 544; Deville 1866: 115; Oikonomou 1846: 16 — who switches to PartAux for the imperfect; Oikonomou 1870: 33; Deffner 1881: 23ff). The only two exceptions in the Oikonomou Archive's grammars are

eɲi viazu ~ viazur eɲi 'I am rushing' (Costakis 1986: 67), and the compound auxil-
iary *ema exu aɣapi* 'I had loved' (Costakis 2004: 48), likely too heavy to be consid-
ered a Wackernagel clitic.

Zografos' sketch grammar from 1836 (Costakis 1986: 67) even speaks of a *-reni*
conjugation for verbs — i.e. Aux *eɲi*, linked to Part with a liaison consonant: *vi-
azureni = viazu-r eɲi* 'rush.PART AUX.1SG = I am rushing'. Citation forms are also
given as PartAux in the Oikonomou Archive word lists from 1836, and this is con-
tinued by Deffner (1922), who had moved to Tsakonia in the 1870s.

20th century grammars still allow both PartAux and AuxPart, but consistently cite
AuxPart first (Scutt 1912–1913: 168; Lekos 1920: 44; Pernot & Costakis 1933: 56; Pernot
1934: 222); exceptionally Anagnostopoulos (1926: 53–54) gives PartAux first for the
present, and AuxPart first for the imperfect, like Oikonomou (1846). As Pernot noted,
during his time in Tsakonia (so since 1892), the SMG ordering had become the default.

We can track enclisis through the 19th century:

• as Oikonomou (1846) and Anagnostopoulos (1926) hint, the imperfect goes
against the verb-initial default, so we consider present tense separately;

• when clauses are paratactically linked, the first clause may behave differently (6a, 6b);

• connectives make the verb non-initial (6c);

• when considering whether a verb is clause-initial, we ignore any clitics in the
start of a verb, since they innovate against an original Aux Cl Part ordering (dis-
cussed below): Cl Aux Part is a violation of verb-initial order, rather than a non-ini-
tial verb instance (6d, 4a).

(6) a. *ɣrapse mi an emaϑitsere nkanena tsinurtsi, nt   eni   parakau*
                                                      you   AUX.1SG ask.PART

    'write me if you have learned any news, I ask you' (Oikonomou Archive
    [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22)

    b. *tse ale ɲi,   ɲ   eɲi   proskinu   apo meri mi*
                   him AUX.1SG worship.PART

    'and tell him, I pay him my respects, for my part' (Oikonomou Archive
    [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22)

    c. *para   eɲi   parakau   ta ðespina na namu ði pariɣoria*
       but   AUX.1SG   ask.PART

    'but I beg Our Lady to give us solace' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] =
    Costakis 1980: 22)

d. *ɣrafu*   *m*   *esi*   *na mazume tse ali lekse*
   write.PART   me   AUX.2SG

‘you write me that we should gather more words’ (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22)

The resulting counts are:

Affirmative matrix clauses	Verb-initial present, first clause	Verb-initial present, later clauses	Verb-initial other tense, first clause	Verb-initial other tense, later clause	Verb not initial in clause
Åkerblad [1796?]					0/2
Leake [1806]	1/0				
Thiersch (1832)			0/2		0/1
Oikonomou Archive [1836]: texts	5/**8**	0/11	**1**/1		0/27
Oikonomou (1846)	0/**1**	0/4			0/6
Deville (1866)	0/**1**				0/1
Oikonomou (1870)	0/**2**	0/2			0/12
Zografos [1875] (Deffner 1923b)	1/0	**1**/1		**1**/1	0/20
Oikonomou (1888)	0/**1**	0/2		**1**/2	0/40
Oikonomou [1890] (Pernot 1914)	1/0	0/2			0/2
Latsis (1895): misc	3/0	0/4		0/3	0/26

Table 2: Auxiliary orderings against clause position

• If anything precedes participle + auxiliary in a clause (other than a clitic pronoun), the auxiliary comes first, without exception.

• What counts as a second paratactic clause is murky, since the comma/full stop distinction is arbitrary (Oikonomou 1846, Zografos [1875], Oikonomou 1888). Ordering also is distorted by verse. But second clauses only rarely have PartAux, and those that do all look like first clauses (7a).

(7) a. *o ðe vasiʎi apsea mpaitse ts ezvaie, t aɣie nikoa ϑavmata tse ole si to vie,* **mpanur eki** *ta ɣrusa si ts oʎu tsʰerokʰainu*

‘and Basil started reading loudly St Nicholas’ miracles and his whole vita; he **was sticking** out his tongue and kept gulping’ (Oikonomou 1888: 47)

• Sentence-initial position is the only place where PartAux regularly occurs. There are exceptions as early as 1836 (7b, 7d vs. 7c, 7e, all in the one letter), and Lampyriadis' North Tsakonian grammar appears to avoid it (7f); but the rule is still observed in the late 19th century (7g, 7h).

(7)   b. *esi   ɲirizu   pʰ eɲi exu trianta xronu xirefte*
        AUX.2SG   know.PART

      'you know that I've been a widower for thirty years' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22)

      c. *piur   eɲi   tse   ksene   nu*
        make.PART   AUX.1SG also strange mind

      'I try to put it out of my mind' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22)

      d. *emai   ϑente   na ɣrapsume*
        AUX.1PL.PST want.PART

      'we wanted to write' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22)

      e. *exunte   ɲ   emai   koleɣia ts emai kseðukʰunte*
        have.PART   him AUX.1PL.PST

      'we had him as company and we had fun' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22)

      f. *em enkunte na tʃʰaxitsume, em enkunte tʰa xura, eme parinte apo tʰon aɣie*
      'we go and run, we go into the village, we come by the church' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 2004: 46)

      g. *oruntar   esi   lipon kale mi kamzuʎi otsʰi eɲi exunta atʃʰa ðuʎia na piu*
        see.PART   AUX.2SG

      'so you see, my good child, that I have a lot of work to do' (Oikonomou [1890] = Pernot 1914: 178)

      h. *oru   eɲi   ʎiki atʃʰa tʰon aɣie liði tasu*
        see.PART   AUX.1SG

      'I see great sorrow in Leonidio' (Latsis 1895: 39)

      (7i) is a good illustration of the verb-initial condition:

(7)   i. *ukʰa   ɲ   esa   tʰa ʃkokina,*
        bathe.PART   her AUX.2SG.PST   in the dark

> ta ɲutʰa   ɲ   esa   preɣa
> the night   her   AUX.2SG.PST   plait.PART

'you bathed her in the dark, you plaited her hair at night' (Zografos [1875] = Deffner 1923b: 37)

And in the Oikonomou Archive, the auxiliary is enclitic in both seemingly formulaic expressions (Costakis 2004: 22: **ðiaur eni** *o protoɣere* 'the elder is passing', **diatasur eni** *o ðaskale* 'the teacher is preaching'), and prosaic utterances (Costakis 2004: 31: **exur eni** *suko smerðe* 'he has a good nose').

In the 20ᵗʰ century though, the regular ordering even in sentence-initial contexts is AuxPart:

(8)   a.   — *osi kseru tsʰi s im pinde? s* **iɲi ðeinte** *tʰu ði poðe tu aoɣu tse ena sako kaɹa, tse oni enkunta to sako,* **en enkunta** *to komaki tu aϑrupu*
            — *ɲ* **es ksera** *pʰi ɲ es tea ekiu*
            "'Don't you know what they do to them? **They bind** them to the two feet of the horse and a bag of walnuts, and the walnuts do not come, the piece of the man **comes**".
            "**You know** it, who want it"' (Scutt 1913–1914: 19)

The old ordering appears mostly in marked contexts. There are seven or eight such instances in the corpus (8b is ambiguous), ignoring the citation forms in Deffner (1922). Note that Houpis systematically modernizes the instances in Stratigis from PartAux to AuxPart.

(8)   b. *ma* **zua eni** *paʎi*
            'Why **she is alive** again.' (Scutt 1913–1914: 21; so translated by Scutt, but this could also be an interrogative expressing incredulity: 'Why, **is she alive** again?')

       c. *satsi oa ta ðentsika* **farsenkunta ɲi**
            'all the trees **are very productive** this year' (Deffner 1922: 31)

       d. **ortsiskumener emi** *ɲi emi ϑa nt aru ɣuneka mi ðixos aʎu* (Stratigis 1943: 12)
            em ortsiskumene *pʰi ϑa nti aru ɣuneka mi ðixos aʎu* (Stratigis 2000: 50)
            'I swear that I shall take you to wife, without question' [1927?] — emphasis?

       e. *eðari* **iɲi vante** *tse tsinko. ts eni kaʎitere, ɣiatsi mite* **katʃʰunumener eni** *tse ku-valikʰumener eni kaʎitera*

'nowadays **they put** zinc in too. And it's better, because **they** don't **break** —
and **they're** easier to **carry**' (Costakis [1930] = Pernot 1934: 32 — second
verb is a negation, and third may echo the syntax of the second)

f. *eŋi satsᵇi epekame na pᵇirome ts apotei tu steni ʃtanu, n arame an **iŋi pinte** —*
   ***pinter iŋi** m ii ʃozumeni tan kʒaða*
   'We thought we'd sow this year on those narrow parts above, to see if **they'll
   take** — Oh, **they'll take**, but they fear the cold' (Pernot & Costakis 1933:
   88 — contrast)

4.2. Post-position of clitics

The criteria in the following bleed each other (in the order shown), so instances are
listed only once. The distribution is given as n/n/n for VCl, ClVCl, ClV; where
ClVCl does not occur, n/n counts VCl, ClV. For auxiliaries, n/n counts AuxCl,
ClAux, and for coindexed following nouns, n/n counts VCl–N, ClV–N.

	Subj (*na, ϑa, mi*)	Imp, Part	With foll. N	Part with AUX	Neg	Subord	Inter-rog	Default
Åkerblad [1796?]	0/2	1/0				0/1		
Thiersch (1832)	**1**/0	3/0						0/1
Oikonomou Archive [1836]	0/29	16/0	0/1	0/10	**4**/0	0/13		**11**/13
Oikonomou (1846)	**1**/11	9/0		0/2		0/2		0/4
Deville [1866]		1/0		0/3	**2**/0	0/1		
Oikonomou (1870)	0/14	11/0		0/2				**1**/3
Zografos [1875] (Deffner 1923b)	0/11	9/0		0/10	**1**/1	0/1		**4**/4
Oikonomou (1888)	0/8	9/0	**1**/2	0/9	**1**/0	0/3		**14**/24
Oikonomou [1890] (Pernot 1914)	0/4			0/3				0/1
Latsis (1895): misc	0/0/19	9/0/**1**	0/2	0/13	**2**/0/1	0/0/8		0/**3**/55
Latsis (1895): Jesus	0/**11**/11			0/6	**2**/0/4	0/**2**/13		0/**5**/12
Scutt [1913]	**1**/45	15/0	**2**/12	0/16	**6**/2	0/1		**1**/92

	Subj (*na, ϑa, mi*)	Imp, Part	With foll. N	Part with AUX	Neg	Subord	Inter-rog	Default
Deffner (1923b)	0/76			0/2	**2**/0	0/4		0/5
Deffner (1926)[5]					**5**/0		2/0	**8**/193
Anagnostopoulos (1926)	0/4			0/1	**1**/0	0/2		0/9
Stratigis [1927?]	**2**/63	8/0	0/4	0/54	**3**/6	0/20		0/29
Costakis [1930] (Pernot 1934)	0/**1**/4	1/0/0		0/20		0/0/4		0/0/20
Pernot & Costakis (1933)	0/4	3/0		0/2	**1**/1	0/1		0/6
Pramatefti [1942]	0/17			0/33	**1**/0	0/3		0/12
Melana [1942]	0/7			0/1				0/14

Table 3: Clitic positioning in corpus

• Polar interrogatives are absent from our corpus, but as Deffner (1926) confirms, VCl applies. This is confirmed in Liosis (2017: 60): 12/2 for 1870–1925, 16/1 for 1925–1980, dropping to 7/5 for 1980–2007.

• VCl never occurs with subordination (outside of Thiersch's *ean ðaroi mi ~ ean mi ðaroi* 'if they beat me').

• VCl occurs with imperatives and participles, in common with SMG.

• The clitic never follows the auxiliary.

The two seeming exceptions are likely instances of a zero-auxiliary verb:

(9) a. *ts enomie, ots^h oniro t^hon ipre si   ɲ   orua*

        it ∅ see.PART

   'and she thought that [**she was**] **seeing it** as a dream in her sleep' (Latsis 1895: 36)

   b. ***namu   si   empoðizunte*** *etin op efiaɲi*

        us   them   ∅ block.PART

   tan iparksi tse tan zoi tse tan elefϑeria, is oɕi ða tur elini ta armata tan ϑia
   '[they are] **banning them** from us, those things that guard our existence and life and liberty, arms divine for all Greeks' (Oikonomou 1846: 21)

---

[5] Counts from Liosis (2007: 799), for Deffner's translation of "Snow White" (Α πεντάμορφο του κόσμου).

• The circumclitic ClVCl only occurs with 1PL and 2PL referents, and only turns up in Latsis (1895) and Costakis (Pernot 1934), although it is anticipated with an early Cl–Cl–Aux construction (9c)[6]. The relative infrequency of referents may have constrained its attestation (the Jesus Letter is throughout addressed to 2PL), but is consistent with it being a late entry into the language. Latsis features it (9d), though not consistently (9e), in affirmative, subordinate, and subjunctive contexts.

(9)   c. *apo   pʃuxa   nt   e   ɲumu   proskinu*
          from   soul   you.SG AUX.3SG you.PL worship

   'with all my soul I pay you my respects' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22 — annotated in Costakis (1980: 78) as "instead of *ɲum eni* 'you.PL AUX.3SG'")

   d. *ɣia   na   nti   lipiϑu   ɲumu   ts ezu*
      for   SUBJ   2SG   pity.SUBJ.1SG 2PL

   'so I too would pity you' (Latsis 1895: 43)

   e. *tse ϑa kserisu ϑeria fteruta tse animera   na   ɲumu   katafani*
                                                  SUBJ   2PL   devour.SUBJ.3PL

   'and I shall unleash wild and winged beasts to devour you' (Latsis 1895: 46)

• Costakis only produces the circumclitic in metatext (9f), and may well have avoided it as "improper" Tsakonian in his own work (cf. the correction in 9c) — though it is widespread outside his writings.

(9)   f. *ϑa   nt   aliu   ɲumu   ena paraiϑi tsʰakoɲiko*
          FUT   2SG   tell.SUBJ.1SG 2PL

   'I will tell you a Tsakonian fairy tale' (Costakis [1930] = Pernot 1934: 23)

• ClV is used throughout for the subjunctive. There are four seeming exceptions: (10a) translates the Lord's Prayer, slavishly following the Koine original, while (10b) is contamination from an adjacent identical imperative. The two instances in Stratigis might be derived from the circumclitic, since they involve 1PL and 2PL referents (10c). That is the only plausible pathway for this order to have spread to the subjunctive (10d).

---

[6] It is common in the corpus reviewed by Liosis (2017: 64–65), but only after 1925.

(10) a. *tse   mi   na   feritsere   emunane   s kirasmo*
       and   NEG.SUBJ   SUBJ   bring.SUBJ.2SG   us

       Koine:

       Καί   μή   εἰσενέγκης   ἡμᾶς   εἰς πειρασμόν
       kai   mɛ: e:senengɛ:is   hɛ:ma:s   e:s pe:rasmon
       and   NEG.SUBJ   enter.SUBJ.2SG   us

       'and lead us not into temptation' (Thiersch 1832: 551)

   b. *n   afit^h e   mi   s enteni to ʃina*
       (*SUBJ)   leave.SUBJ/IMP.2PL   me

       'leave me in this mountain' (Scutt 1913–1914: 27)

   c. *pier   en   ϑa   ksikaksi   namu*
       who   AUX.3SG   FUT   look.SUBJ.3SG   1PL

       'who will look after us?' (Stratigis 1943: 14 [1927?])

   d. Indicative: V 2PL

      Indicative circumclitic: 2SG   V 2PL

      Subjunctive circumclitic: 2SG   V 2PL

      ??Subjunctive: V 2PL

   • VCl–N occurs only occasionally, without a distinct environment:

(11) a. **katanitukame si** *to vane tse t^h u p^h entsitse oʎi*
       '**we poked at them** all over, the lamb and the partridges' (Stratigis 1943: 14
       [1927?])

   b. *ts eperatse ena kaitsi me tasu arakisi tse* **antse ɲi** *ta sati*
       'a caique passed by with Arabs on board and **took** the girl' (Scutt 1913–1914: 18)

   c. **epetse ɲi** *tu vaʃiʎia*
       '**she told** the king' (Scutt 1913–1914: 19)

   • Negative phrases in Tsakonian using *o-* generally follow VCl, but the
SMG ClV ordering correlates with the SMG *ðen* negator. This continues what
happened in Early Modern Greek, with the distribution of clitics with *u(k)*
(> Tsakonian *o-*) (12a, 12b) vs. *ðen* (12c), and indeed with the tight binding
of *u(k)* to the verb:

The traditional negative marker οὐ(κ) and its verb are often treated as a single unit within the verbal complex, thus forcing the clitic either to precede the negative or to follow the verb according to the immediate contextual requirements. This occurs mostly in early texts (Holton et al. 2019: 2036–2037):

(12) a. τόπον ἐκ τόπου μεριμνᾷς   καὶ   τόπος   οὐ   χωρεῖ   σε
     topon ek topu merimnas   *ke*   *topos*   *u*   *xori*   *se*
                               and   place   NEG   contain.3SG   you

    'you investigate place after place, and the place cannot contain you' (Michael Glycas "Prison Verses" 156 [1158–1159])

    cf. Tsakonian: *tse*   *o topo*   *o-*   *ni sunu*   *nti*

    b. γοργὸν   ἂν   σὲ   οὐκ   ἐκβάλουσιν
      yoryon   *an*   *se*   *uk*   *ekvalusin*
                if   you   NEG   take-out.3PL

    'if they don't take you out of there quickly' (Michael Glycas "Prison Verses" 229 [1158–1159])

    cf. contemp. Tsakonian:
              a   *nt*   *u-*   *ɲi mpanunte*

    c. αὐτοὶ   οὐδὲν   τὸ   ἠθέλησαν
      afti   *uðen*   *to*   *iθelisan*
        they   NEG   it   want.3SG

    'they did not want it' (Mt Athos [14th–15th c.])

    cf. Tsakonian:
    etini   *ðen*   *ɲi*   *inkiai θente*

This distinction is borne out in the corpus (see Table 4, p. 102).

(13) a. *oki*   *fiatʰa*   *mi*   *entai na ɲ aru yuneka*
      NEG.AUX.3PL   keep.PART   me

    'this one was not kept for me to take as wife' (Scutt 1913–1914: 18)

    b. *tse*   *ðe*   *mi*   *skotukane*
      and   NEG   me   kill.3PL

    'and they did not kill me' (Scutt 1913–1914: 28)

	o	*ðen*
Oikonomou Archive [1836]	4/0	
Deville (1866)	2/0	
Zografos [1875] (Deffner 1923b)	1/0	0/1
Oikonomou (1888)	1/0	
Latsis (1895): misc	2/0	0/1
Latsis (1895): Jesus	2/0	0/4
Scutt [1913]	6/0	0/2
Deffner (1923b)	2/0	
Anagnostopoulos (1926)	1/0	
Stratigis [1927?]	3/2	0/4
Pernot & Costakis (1933)	1/0	0/1
Pramatefti [1942]	1/0	

Table 4: Clitic positioning against negator

The distinction only breaks down in Stratigis: (13c) vs (13d, 13e):

(13) c. [*o*]   *oraka*   *ɲi*   *telia apo tʃʰir amere*
     NEG   see.1SG   her

    'I have [not] seen her at all in three days' (Stratigis 1943: 8 [1927?])[7]

  d. *ami*   *o*   *nt*   *epeka*   *tsʰita*
     but   NEG   you   say.1SG   nothing

    'but I didn't tell you anything' (Stratigis 1943: 10 [1927?])

  e. *istera*   *omi*   *nti*   *ɲi*   *nkrufa*
     then   AUX.1SG   you   it   hide.PART

    'and I won't hide it from you' (Stratigis 1943: 12 [1927?])

This leaves affirmative matrix clauses. Verb-initial position should be a differentiating factor, as it was for PartAux above. We only consider initial vs non-initial verb clauses as a criterion. We count paratactic connectives separately (*tse* 'and', *ala* 'but'), for whether a verb is initial to a clause.

---

   [7] I read *oraka ɲi* as *o oraka ɲi* 'I have not seen her', following the SMG translations in both editions.

We do not consider texts past Scutt, nor Latsis, since they no longer have VCl in affirmative matrix clauses. In addition, many clauses in the Oikonomou Archive word lists consist of just a verb and clitics: these need to be considered separately, as context-less.

With those adjustments, the counts pattern as follows:

Affirmative matrix clauses	Verb-initial, first clause	Verb-initial, later clauses	Connective + verb-initial clauses	Verb not initial in clause	Violations
Thiersch (1832)			0/1		0/1
Oikonomou Archive [1836]: citations	7/**2**				2/9
Oikonomou Archive [1836]: text	3/**3**		0/2	**1**/4	3/12
Oikonomou (1846)			0/1	0/3	0/4
Oikonomou (1870)	1/0		0/1	0/2	0/4
Zografos [1875] (Deffner 1923b)	1/0		**1**/0	**2**/4	3/10
Oikonomou (1888)		5/0	**8**/3	**1**/21	9/27 (or: 1/24)
Oikonomou [1890] (Pernot 1914)				0/1	0/1
Scutt [1913]	0/(many)	1/(many)	0/(many)	0/(many)	—

Table 5: Clitic positioning against clause position

Again, judging which clause is initial is difficult. And there is fluidity in clitic positioning in the earliest texts:

(14) a. *ɲ   ekataʄkiukai*
          him   mock.3sɢ

      'they mocked him' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 2004: 16)

      b. *ekatafxiukai   ɲi*
          mock.3sɢ   him

      'they mocked him' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 2004: 21)

      c. *sifovo   antse   namu*
          fear   take.3sɢ   us

      'fear took us' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] = Costakis 2004: 20)

    d. *o θeos ɲ eðutse, o θeos ɲe antse*
       God   him give.3sɢ God him take.3sɢ

       'the Lord giveth, the Lord taketh away' (Oikonomou Archive [1836] =
       Costakis 1980: 22)

    e. *anka si ts eðeika si pua me pua oʎi*
       take.1sɢ them and bind.1sɢ them

       'I took them all and bound them by the feet' (Oikonomou 1888: 46, both
       clauses VCl)

    f. *endufetsia si rita tse se epitixika*
       shoot.1sɢ them immediately and them hit.1sɢ

       'I shot them immediately and hit them' (Oikonomou 1888: 47, VCl then ClV)

There is nonetheless a clear pattern: in early Tsakonian, VCl appears when the verb is clause-initial, whether or not it is sentence-initial (14g). ClV appears consistently when the verb is not clause-initial (14h):

(14) g. *nkania voa oraka ɲ alepu exa ta tsʰufa mi;*
       eperikaleka ɲi na ɲi afi ta tsʰufa mi
       ask.1sɢ   it

       'At last I saw a fox with my head. I besought it to leave my head.' (Scutt 1913–
       1914: 25)

    h. *i ɣerani me ankai*
       the cranes me carry.ᴘsᴛ.3ᴘʟ

       '[Sparrow:] The cranes carried me' (Oikonomou 1888: 53)

Second paratactic clauses with connectives are ambiguous: the early data has ClV, but Oikonomou (1888) enthusiastically uses VCl (14e).

However there are no affirmative VCl after 1913. The usage of VCl in (14i) is so unfamiliar now, that Costakis (1980: 78) annotates it with "more usual: *nt apoʎikame*".

(14) i. *apoʎikame nti tse kʰampose lekse ɣrafte tʰa ɣrusa namu*
       send.1ᴘʟ   you

       'We also sent you several words written in our language' (Oikonomou
       Archive [1836] = Costakis 1980: 22)

In addition, there are no examples of Part Cl Aux after 1895 (14j), which itself sounds markedly poetic:

(14) j. *ðoksaza   nt   eɲi   ðespina, epets a ɣria vua*
         glorify.PART   you   AUX.1SG

    "'I glorify thee, Our Lady", said the old woman crying' (Latsis 1895: 36)

This indicates that postposing clitics had become unacceptable even if the clitic was accompanying an auxiliary, which could still be postposed.

There is roundabout confirmation of this in (14k).

(14) k. **emi mpenu** *tas tan psuxa tur aϑrupi.* **profitenkur emi** *ola* (Stratigis 1943: 22)
       emi mpenu *tas tan psiuxa tir aϑrupi.* **emi profitenku si** *ula* (Stratigis 2000: 58)
       '**I enter** into the souls of people. **I prophesy** all' [1927?]

The original text has 'I prophesy all', in an emphatic utterance. In SMG, such an emphatic would use a clitic in topic reduplication, 'I prophesy them all'. Both Bouboulidis and Houpis render the phrase in SMG with such a clitic, *ola ta profitevo* and *ta profitevo ola* respectively; and Houpis inserted it as *si* into his Tsakonian emendation. Given the influence Tsakonian had already undergone from SMG, we might well have expected Stratigis to have written it as **profitenku si emi ula*. That he didn't suggests that he couldn't.

The counts in Liosis (2017: 58) are less granular than these counts, but they are consistent with the larger corpus presented here (Subj, Subord are V–NonInit); the counts of non-initial VCl for my corpus are partial—but the low count of non-initial ClV make that moot:

	V–Init	V–NonInit
Nicholas [1796–1925]	124/274 (31 %)	16/319 (5 %)
Liosis [1870–1925]	50/354 (12 %)	0/837 (0 %)
Nicholas [1925–1950]	20/212 (8 %)	0/129 (0 %)
Liosis [1925–1980]	21/263 (7 %)	2/651 (0.3 %)
Liosis [1980–2007]	17/334 (5 %)	1/761 (0.1 %)

Table 6: Clitic positioning diachronically: quantitative

Liosis noted the early 12 % of initial VCl are "residual" instances of an earlier, Wackernagel enclisis: our 31 % count is artificially elevated by citation forms, but confirms that earlier state.

5. Conclusion

This paper tracks PartAux and ClV ordering in MTk, and their retreat in the face of SMG. Early Tsakonian followed Wackernagel's Law with clitic placement, so regardless of mood, the default ordering of Tsakonian was:

(15) Verb (Cl) (Aux)

If any element preceded the verb (function word or focused constituent), the ordering became instead:

(16) Element (Cl) (Aux) Verb

This applies to any subordinate clause, including subjunctives. It is also preferred even in verb-initial clauses later in the sentence, with paratactic connectives.

These orderings, reconstructed by Liosis (2017: 52) for early MTk, are confirmed by our data.

Negation falls between these two paradigms. SMG-derived *ðen* patterns with the non-initial ordering. Inherited negation using *o* behaves like Early Modern Greek: the negator is fused to the auxiliary, and the clitic follows the verb:

(17) Neg (Aux) Verb (Cl)

Of these patterns, the negated pattern (with *o*) has survived into contemporary Tsakonian, only disrupted in favour of Cl Neg (Aux) Verb among terminal speakers. The real shift has been in the retreat of the enclitic affirmative pattern, Verb (Cl) (Aux), in favour of the SMG pattern (Cl) (Aux) Verb. This change occurred early, albeit unevenly. Enclitic pronouns survive in Oikonomou (1888), but are absent in all subsequent text, including Latsis (1895), apart from a single instance in Scutt [1913].

On the other hand, affirmative enclitic auxiliaries persist throughout the corpus, though already marked by the 20th century. Enclitic auxiliaries have only fallen into disuse in contemporary Tsakonian, which increasingly avoids them in interrogatives as well.

So we have a transition in verb-initial affirmative clauses:

— **19th century Tsakonian**: Verb (Cl) (Aux)
— **Early 20th century Tsakonian**: (Cl) (Aux) Verb; marked: Verb (*Cl) Aux
— **Contemporary fluent Tsakonian**: (Cl) (Aux) Verb

accompanying an all-round retreat of the enclitic pattern:

	V-Init Affirm	X–V Affirm	Neg	Subord, Subj	Interrog	Imper
19th century Tsakonian	**V1** ~ V2	V2	**Vx**	V2	**V1** (V2)	V1
Early 20th century Tsakonian	V2 ~ **V1′**	V2	**Vx**	V2	**V1** (V2)	V1
Contemporary Tsakonian	V2	V2	**Vx** ~ V2	V2	V2 ~ **V1**	V1
SMG	V2	V2	V2	V2	V2	V1

Table 7: Clitic positioning diachronically, by environment

(18)   V1 = Verb (Cl) (Aux)
   V1′ = Verb (*Cl) Aux
   V2 = (Cl) (Aux) Verb
   Vx = (Aux) Verb (Cl)

Acknowledgements

References

Anagnostopoulos, G. P. 1926. *Tsakonische Grammatik*. Berlin & Athen: Urania & P. D. Sakellarios.
Costakis, Th. P. 1980. *Δείγματα Τσακωνικής διαλέκτου* [*Samples of Tsakonian Dialect*]. Athens: Tsakonian Archives [in Greek].
Costakis, Th. P. 1986. Ο Κωνσταντίνος Οικονόμος ο εξ Οικονόμων και τα Τσακώνικα [Konstantinos Oikonomos ex Oikonomon and Tsakonian]. *Chronika ton Tsakonon* 7: 64–69 [in Greek].
Costakis, Th. P. 2004. Το αρχείο Οικονόμου [The Oikonomou archive]. *Chronika ton Tsakonon* 17: 7–51 [in Greek].

Deffner, M. 1881. *Zakonische Grammatik*. T. 1. Berlin: Weidmann.

Deffner, M. 1921. Δείγματα τσακωνικῆς [Samples of Tsakonian]. *Laografia* 8: 159–180 [in Greek and Tsakonian].

Deffner, M. 1922. *Ἡ χλωρὶς τῆς Τσακωνιᾶς* [*Flora of Tsakonia*]. Athens: Stauros Christou & Sia [in Greek].

Deffner, M. 1923a. *Λεξικὸν τῆς Τσακωνικῆς διαλέκτου* [*Dictionary of the Tsakonian dialect*]. Athens: Estia [in Greek].

Deffner, M. 1923b. Χαιρετισμοὶ, εὐχαὶ, κατάραι, ὅρκοι καὶ ἄσματα τῶν τσακώνων. [Greetings, wishes, curses, oaths and songs of Tsakonians]. *Laografia* 7: 25–40 [in Greek and Tsakonian].

Deffner, M. 1926. *Ἑπτά ὡραία παραμύθια εἰς τὴν δημώδη νεοελληνικὴν καὶ τὴν τσακωνικὴν διάλεκτον* [*Seven Fine Fairy Tales in Vernacular Modern Greek and the Tsakonian Dialect*]. Athens [: n. p.] [in Greek and Tsakonian].

Deffner, M. 1996. Η δράσις των Τσακώνων κατά την Ελληνικήν Επανάστασιν [The actions of Tsakonians during the Greek Revolution]. *Chronika ton Tsakonon* 12: 160–183 [in Greek].

Deville, G. 1866. *Étude du dialecte Tzaconien*. Paris: Ad. Lainé & J. Havard.

Goodspeed, E. J. 1931. *Strange New Gospels*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Haralambopoulos, A. L. 1980. *Φωνολογική ανάλυση της τσακωνικής διαλέκτου* [*Phonetic Analysis of Tsakonian Dialect*]. Doctoral dissertation. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University [in Greek].

Holton, D., Horrocks, G., Janssen, M., Lendari, T., Manolessou, I. & Toufexis, N. 2019. *The Cambridge Grammar of Medieval and Early Modern Greek*. Vol. 4. Syntax. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Latsis, D. M. 1895. *Ἡμερολόγιον τσακωνικὸν τοῦ ἔτους 1895* [*Tsakonian Diary for the Year 1895*]. Athens: P. Leonis [in Greek and Tsakonian].

Leake, W. M. 1830. *Travels in the Morea*. Vol. 2. London: John Murray.

Lekos, M. A. 1920. *Περὶ Τσακώνων καὶ τῆς Τσακωνικῆς διαλέκτου* [*On Tsakonians and the Tsakonian Dialect*]. Athens: Papapaulou [in Greek].

Liosis, N. 2007. *Γλωσσικές επαφές στη νοτιοανατολική Πελοπόννησο* [*Language Contacts in Southeastern Peloponnese*]. Doctoral dissertation. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University [in Greek].

Liosis, N. 2017. Auxiliary verb constructions and clitic placement: Evidence from Tsakonian. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 17: 37–72.

Liosis, N. 2019. Από τον επιτονισμό της Τσακωνικής: οι μελωδίες των πολικών ερωτήσεων [From the intonation of Tsakonian: polar question contours]. In I. Kappa & M. Tzakosta (eds.), *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory (MGDLT 7). Rethymno, Greece. 6–8 October 2016.* Patras: University of Patras, 133–144 [in Greek].

Manolessou, I. 2019. Νέα δεδομένα για την ιστορία της τσακωνικής διαλέκτου [New data on the history of Tsakonian dialect]. In A. Arhakis, N. Koutsoukos, G. I. Xydopoulos & D. Papazahariou (eds.), *Γλωσσική ποικιλία: Μελέτες αφιερωμένες στην Αγγελική Ράλλη* [*Language Diversity: Studies Dedicated to Angela Ralli*]. Athens: Kapa, 289–312 [in Greek].

Manolessou, I. & N. Pantelidis. 2018. Από την ιστορία της τσακωνικής διαλέκτου: μια νέα άγνωστη πηγή [From the history of Tsakonian dialect: a new unknown source]. Presentation given at the 8th International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory (MGDLT 8). Gjirokastër, Albania, October, 4–8 2018 [in Greek].

Nicholas, N. 2019. A critical lexicostatistical examination of Ancient and Modern Greek and Tsakonian. *Journal of Applied Linguistic and Lexicology* 1(1): 18–68. Available at: https://journall.org/index.php/main/article/view/9 (accessed on 15.08.2022).

Oikonomou, K. 1888. *Ὁ Πολύδωρος: Ποίημα βουκολικὸν καὶ δεκαπέντε ποιήματα τῆς Τσακωνικῆς διαλέκτου* [*Polydoros, a Bucolic Poem, and Fifteen Poems in the Tsakonian Dialect*]. Piraeus: Sphera [in Greek].

Oikonomou, Th. M. 1846. *Πραγματεία τῆς Λακωνικῆς (Τσακωνικῆς) γλώσσης* [*Treatise on the Laconian (Tsakonian) Language*]. Athens: P. B. Melachoutis & Ph. Karampinis [in Greek].

Oikonomou, Th. M. 1870. *Γραμματικὴ τῆς Τσακωνικῆς διαλέκτου* [*Grammar of Tsakonian Dialect*]. Athens: L. Psylliakos & Sia [in Greek].

Pernot, H. 1914. Notes sur le dialecte tsakonien. *Revue de Phonétique* 4: 153–188.

Pernot, H. 1934. *Introduction à l'étude du dialecte tsakonien*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Pernot, H. & Th. P. Costakis. 1933. *Σύντομος γραμματικὴ τῆς τσακωνικῆς διαλέκτου* [*Brief Grammar of the Tsakonian Dialect*]. Athens: I. Karanasou [in Greek].

Scutt, C. A. 1912–1913. The Tsakonian dialect I. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 19: 133–173.

Scutt, C. A. 1913–1914. The Tsakonian dialect II. *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 20: 18–31.

Stratigis, G. 1943. *Ἡ Τσουράννα (τσακωνικὸ διήγημα): συμβολὴ στὴν τσακωνικὴ λαογραφία* [*Tsuranna (Tsakonian Novella): a Contribution to Tsakonian Folklore*]. Ed. by Ph. K. Bouboulidis. Athens[: n. p.] [in Greek].

Stratigis, G. 2000. *Η Τσουράνα (τσακωνικό διήγημα)* [*Tsurana (Tsakonian Novella)*]. Translated and edited by D. G. Houpis. Athens: Association of All Kastantitsa Residents [in Greek].

Thiersch, F. 1832. Über die Sprache der Zakonen. *Abhandlungen der philosophisch-philologisch Klasse der Königliche Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1: 513–582.

Togias, V. I. 1939. Ὁ Γ. Στρατήγης καὶ ἡ Κυνουρία [G. Stratigis and Kynuria]. *Kynouriaki Epitheorisi* 2(2): 25–26 [in Greek].

VanArsdale, D. W. 1998–2006. Chain Letter evolution. Available at: http://www.silcom.com/~barnowl/chain-letter/evolution.html#s2-1predecessors (accessed on 13.08.2022).