Relatives in Asia Minor Greek

Metin Bağrıaçık

Introduction   This talk is concerned with the diachrony of prenominal and postnominal headed relative clauses (HRCs) in Asia Minor Greek (AMG) dialects, with particular focus on the variety of Pharasiot Greek (PhG). In PhG, HRCs are finite structures introduced by the morpheme *tu*. In a corpus of texts written between 1886-1970s, HRCs are exclusively prenominal (1a). Today, however, both prenominal and postnominal (1b) HRCs are readily accepted by native speakers, without there being any obvious semantic difference:

(1) a. ær me ðos   [[tu kremázis so   ɣurɣúri s] to gerdannúɪxi]…
         if me give.2SG   TU hang.2SG on.the neck   your the necklace…
         ''if you give me the necklace you hang on your neck…'   [T2.328.6, 1964]

     b. ær me ðos   [to gerdannúɪxi [tu kremázis so   ɣurɣúri s]]…
         if me give.2SG   the necklace   TU hang.2SG on.the neck   your …
         ''if you give me the necklace you hang on your neck…'

The structure in (1a) is often attributed to interference with Turkish (cf. Dawkins 1916, Janse 1998, Nicholas 1998), a language in which relative clauses are obligatorily prenominal (not illustrated), similar to other AMG dialects; Cappadocian (2) and (certain) Pontic (varieties) (3):

(2) [[du ɣórais]   du basturmás]   (3) [[to érθen   so   kifáli mu] to kakón]
     the bought.2SG the pastrami   the came.3SG to.the head my   the harm

     'the pastrami you bought'   (*Capp.*)   'the harm that I suffered'   (*Pont.*)

I argue that (1a) cannot be explained (only) by word-order or structure copying from Turkish, and that it also does not have the same structure as (2)-(3). Instead, I propose that the element *tu* which introduces PhG prenominal HRCs was originally bimorphemic, and that it involves the merger of a generic complementizer *u* (*oὖ*) and the external definite determiner (*t-*). I trace this development back to Early Medieval Greek structures such as (4) (e.g. Medieval Pontic, cf. Liosis and Kriki 2013, 264), in which we see the generic complementizer *u*:

(4) akrivá   práɣmata u   u   fθíronde
     expensive things   that not wear.down.3PL

     'expensive things that do not become worn down.'

Prenominal HRCs   Cappadocian and (certain) Pontic (varieties) impose a definiteness restriction on the relative head (illustrated for Cappadocian only (5)), whereas PhG does not (6), neither today nor in the older texts:

(5) [[du den galačévi] {*éna/to} fšax]   (6) [[tu čo kačéf]   {a/to} čočúxi]
     the not speak.3SG {*a/the}   child   TU not speak.3SG {a/the} child

     '*a/the child that does not speak'   (*Capp.*)   'a/the child that does not speak'   (*Phar.*)

Under the analysis proposed, the definiteness restriction in Pontic/Cappadocian and lack thereof in PhG follow from their different structures. While in the former HRCs are introduced by a simplex determiner agreeing with the head noun in definiteness (similar to the case in other prenominal modifiers), in PhG they are introduced by *tu*, the output of the morphological merger of the external determiner *t-* and the generic complementizer *u*. I will adopt a unified account of raising and matching structures of HRCs (Cinque 2003 et seq.), which assumes HRCs to contain both an internal and an external nominal head, one of which is phonologically deleted under identity. Specifically, I propose that PhG HRCs derive from a structure involving raising of the internal head (which leads to the deletion of the external head under c-command) in a structure with the external determiner *to* and the complementizer *u*. The basic structure is shown in (7a):

(7) a. $[_{DP}[_{D^0}$ *to* $[_{CP}$ head$_{INTi}$ $[_{C^0}$ *u* $[_{IP}$ …t_i…$]]]$ $[_{nP}$ ⟨head~~EXT~~⟩$]]]$

Importantly, the combination of a D-head and the complementizer *u* was also available in headless relatives (strictly speaking, relatives with a silent head) (8). Crucially, in this context the two elements are linearly adjacent: I propose that in this environment *to* and *u* were morphologically merged to form the relative complementizer *tu*, in which the *t*-morpheme retains its definiteness.

(8) [tu póminan   so   xorío] pali írtsan   da   Túrči
     TU remained.3PL inthe village CONTR turned.3PL them Turks

    'as for the ones who/who(ever) remained in the village, they Turkified them.'   [T3.18,34, 1966]

In a next stage, *tu* became a generic relativizer used in HRCs too, but crucially not in the structure in (7a): given the amalgamation of D and C, there was no longer a landing site for the head$_{INT}$. The only available structure is one in which head$_{INT}$ stays in situ, and in which head$_{EXT}$ is spelled out (7b). As a result, HRCs are obligatorily prenominal and definite (9). I assume that these structures are until today preserved in Cappadocian and Pontic *to*-relatives (modulo the independent fact that these two varieties are characterized by obligatory definiteness spread, cf. the two occurrences of the article in both (2) and (3)).

(7) b. $[_{D^0}$ *t-* + $[_{C^0}$ $[_{IP}$ . . . ⟨head$_{INT}$⟩. . .]] $[_{nP}$ head$_{EXT}$]]

(9) [[tu poíe:ssás moi] ot^{h}onídia]
     TU made.2SG to.me linen.clothes

    'the linen clothes you made for me'   (P. Oxy. 20, 2273, 15-16, 3rd c. AD)

What sets apart PhG from the other AMG dialects is one further development, namely the loss of the D-feature of *tu* (and hence its definite character), which became a mere complementizer. Due to this development, in PhG the definiteness specification of the entire complex noun phrase could only be realized in the extended project of head$_{EXT}$, without any definiteness restriction:

(7) c. $[_{D^0}$ *t-* + $[_{C^0}$ *u* $[_{IP}$. . . ⟨head$_{INT}$⟩. . .]] $[_{nP}$ [±def] head$_{EXT}$]]

This analysis, if on the right track, assumes that the overt head is always external in PhG headed RCs. Facts obtained from amount reading, relativization of V+O idiom chunks, scope/binding interactions and lack of weak island sensitivity (cf. 10a) suggest that this is the case. Under this analysis, Turkish influence can only have reinforced the structure in (7c).

(10) a. $[_{RC}$ tu rótsa   ta $[_{Wh-is}$ tuz xa   nási e_i] o tópus$_i$] čav sérti ni
      TU asked.1SG him   how would plow.3SG   the field   very hard is

    'the field that I asked him how he would plow is rather hard.'   (*prenominal*)

Postnominal HRCs   On the other hand, PhG postnominal HRCs (1b) involve structure copying from MG, coupled with re-analysis of *tu* as a monomorphemic complementizer, by analogy with the MG complementizer *pu* (e.g., Alexiadou (1998)). Differences between prenominal and postnominal RCs regarding amount reading, reconstruction of V+O idiom chunks, scope/binding interactions and weak island sensitivity (10b) reveal that similarly to MG HRCs (without resumption), post-nominal HRCs in PhG involve head raising. It follows that the two types of HRCs in present day PhG (cf. (1)) correspond to different structural configurations.

(10) b. * $[_{RC}$ o tópus$_i$ tu rótsa   ta $[_{Wh-is}$ tuz xa   nási t_i]] čav sérti ni
      the field   TU asked.1SG him   how would plow.3SG   very hard is

    int. 'the field that I asked him how he would plow is rather hard.'   (*postnominal*)

References

Alexiadou, Artemis. 1998. On the structure of Greek relative clauses. *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 18:15–29.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 2003. The prenominal origin of relative clauses. Paper presented at the 'Workshop on Antysimmetry and Remnant Movement', New York University, October 31, November 1, 2003.

Dawkins, Richard McGillivray. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A study of the dialects of Síli, Cappadocia and Phárasa, with grammar, texts, translation and glossary*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Janse, Mark. 1998. Le grec au contact du turc: le cas des relatives en cappadocien. In *Proceedings of the 16th international congress of linguistics, 20-25 july 1997*, ed. Bernard Caron, Paper No. 393. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Liosis, Nikos, and Eirini Kriki. 2013. Towards a typology of relative clauses in Modern Greek dialects. In *Online proceedings of the 5th international conference on Modern Greek dialects and linguistic theory*, ed. Mark Janse, Brian D. Joseph, Angela Ralli, and Metin Bagriacik, 245–271. Patras: University of Patras.

Nicholas, Nick. 1998. The story of pu: The grammaticalisation in space and time of a Modern Greek complementizer. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Melbourne, Melbourne.