

***The story of pu***  
***The grammaticalisation in space and time***  
***of a Modern Greek complementiser***

December 1998

*Completed in partial fulfilment of the degree of Doctorate of  
Philosophy (with coursework component)*

*Department of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics  
The University of Melbourne*

Nick Nicholas, B.E.E. (Hons.), B.Sc., M.Eng.Sc. (Cog.Sc.) (Melb.)



# ΓΕΩΡΓΙΩΙ ΜΠΑΛΟΓΛΟΥ ΧΟΡΗΓΗΣΑΝΤΙ

Οὔτε ζωγράφος δύναται ποσῶς νὰ ἱστορίσῃ,  
ἐὰν μὴ βάλῃ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ τρίχαν εἰς τὸ κονδύλιν  
καὶ κάμνει ἄλλα ὑψηλὰ καὶ δεύτερα καὶ τρίτα·  
καὶ ὅσα βούλεται ποεῖν, ὅλα διὰ τὴν τέχνην.

*(Quadr 392–395)*

## ABSTRACT

This work is concerned with tracing the historical development of the various functions of the Modern Greek connective *pu*. This connective has a considerable range of functions, and there have been attempts in the literature to group together these functions in a synchronically valid framework. It is my contention that the most illuminating way of regarding the functional diffusion of *pu*—and of any content word—is by looking, not only at one synchronic distribution (that of Standard Modern Greek), but at the full range of synchronic distributions in the sundry diatopic variants (dialects) of Modern Greek, and that such a discussion must be informed by the diachrony of the form.

This I attempt to do within the framework of grammaticalisation theory, whereby the development of grammatical forms is considered in the context of reanalysis and analogical extension of forms. As a diachronicist model, this allows for fluidity between function distinctions, and puts in place a historically-oriented alignment of semantic transitions which a strictly synchronicist account would miss. Work on *pu* has already been done in this framework; however, such work has considered the distribution of *pu* in Standard Greek alone, with only a brief consideration of its ancient antecedents. I contend that the picture formed of its distribution under such constraints leads to several false generalisations.

In order to arrive at a truer picture of the factors determining the development of *pu*, there are three facets that need to be considered in detail:

- (a) its synchronic distribution in Standard Modern Greek, a variant for which extensive corpora and native speaker judgements are readily available;
- (b) its distribution in the various modern dialects—to establish the possible diversification of developments for the particle, and to ensure that one potential pathway is not privileged as a universal tendency at the expense of other, divergent developments (a problem identifiable in treatments of this topic, hitherto looking only at the standard language);
- (c) a detailed investigation of the use of the etymon of the particle—*hópou*—in Ancient Greek. It is one of the major contentions of grammaticalisation theory that the past meaning of a particle influences its subsequent meanings. In order to test the relevance of this principle fully, it is necessary to investigate the functionality of *hópou* not in isolation, but in the context of the entire Ancient Greek grammatical system.

Due to time and scope constraints, I attempt only these first three tasks in this thesis. I do not attempt a detail look at areal diffusion or the mediaeval Greek semantic transitions involved, nor at the use of *pu* in collocation.

## DECLARATION

*This is to certify that*

- (i) the thesis comprises only my original work,*
- (ii) due acknowledgement has been made in the text to all other material used,*
- (iii) the thesis is less than 100,000 words in length, exclusive of tables, maps, bibliographies, appendices, footnotes, block quotations, captions, and linguistic examples.*

Nick Nicholas.  
Melbourne, November 1998.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract .....	iv
Declaration .....	vi
Table of contents .....	vii
List of figures, maps, and tables .....	xii
Acknowledgements .....	xiv
Conventions and abbreviations .....	xvi
1. Introduction .....	1
1.1. Methodology .....	5
2. Grammaticalisation .....	9
2.1. What is grammaticalisation? .....	9
2.2. How is <i>pu</i> a grammaticalisation: a checklist .....	11
2.2.1. Lehmann's parameters .....	11
2.2.2. Other characteristics .....	18
2.3. The cyclicity of grammaticalisation .....	22
2.4. Metaphor and metonymy .....	24
2.4.1. Reanalysis and analogy .....	24
2.4.2. Implicature and grammaticalisation .....	26
2.4.3. Metaphor .....	27
2.4.4. Metonymy .....	29
2.4.5. The relative status of metaphor and metonymy .....	32
What is left for metaphor to do? .....	34
Level and metalevel .....	36
2.5. Conclusion .....	39
3. The functions of <i>pu</i> .....	41
3.0. Overview .....	41
3.0.1. The Greek verb system .....	45
3.1. Relative locative adverb .....	48
3.1.1. Indefinite locative .....	48
3.1.2. Definite locative .....	49
3.2. Relativiser .....	50
3.2.1. Simple relativiser .....	50
Rival relativisers .....	52
Syntactic behaviour of relativiser- <i>pu</i> .....	52
3.2.2. Pseudo-relativiser .....	53
3.2.3. Cleft .....	56
3.2.4. Inverse cleft and pseudo-cleft .....	58
3.3. Complementiser .....	59
3.3.1. Syntactic issues involving <i>pu</i> -complements .....	59
3.3.2. Emotive complements .....	61
3.3.3. Cognitive-Physical factive complements .....	64
3.3.4. Non-factive complements .....	66
3.3.5. Subject complements .....	67
3.4. Adjuncts .....	68
3.4.1. Introducing cause or reason clauses .....	69
3.4.2. Introducing circumstance clauses .....	71
3.4.3. Introducing result clauses .....	75
3.4.4. Introducing contrast clauses .....	76
3.4.5. Introducing realis concessive clauses .....	77
3.4.6. Introducing temporal clauses .....	81
3.5. Discourse connective .....	82
3.5.1. <sup>1</sup> <i>opu</i> .....	82
3.5.2. <i>pu</i> .....	84
3.6. Subjunctive marker .....	86
3.7. In combination with <i>na</i> .....	88

3.7.1. Generalising relative clauses .....	88
3.7.2. Purposive relative clauses .....	90
3.7.3. Potential result clauses .....	92
3.7.4. Unrealisable concessive clauses .....	92
3.7.5. Optative clauses .....	94
3.7.6. Exclamatory clauses .....	96
3.8. Irrealis <i>pu</i> .....	99
3.8.1. Irrealis <i>pu</i> <i>tha</i> .....	99
3.8.2. Irrealis bare <i>pu</i> .....	104
3.9. Definite article + <i>pu</i> .....	108
3.10. “Too-hard basket” .....	112
3.11. Summary .....	113
4. Factivity .....	115
4.1. Factivity .....	115
4.1.1. Factivity proper .....	115
4.1.2. Semi-Factivity .....	116
4.1.3. Assertivity .....	118
4.2. A semantic framework for verb complementation .....	120
4.3. Complementiser competition .....	127
4.3.1. Overall complementiser competition .....	127
Indeterminate and Action .....	128
Non-Predetermined Occurrence and Future Truth .....	128
Predetermined Occurrence and Future Truth .....	129
Undetermined Truth .....	135
Predetermined Truth .....	135
Determined Truth .....	138
Comparison with English .....	139
Summary of Greek complementation .....	139
4.3.2. Complementiser competition between <i>pu</i> and <i>oti</i> .....	143
4.3.3. <i>The Third Wedding</i> .....	149
4.3.4. Makriyannis’ <i>Memoirs</i> .....	151
4.4. The factivity of <i>pu</i> .....	153
4.4.1. Christidis .....	153
<i>pu</i> .....	153
<i>pu</i> vs. <i>na</i> .....	155
Nominals and definiteness .....	157
4.4.2. Other accounts .....	159
Markedness of complementiser- <i>pu</i> .....	161
Predicates taking complementiser- <i>pu</i> .....	162
4.5. Conclusion: Implications for semantics of <i>pu</i> .....	163
5. Ancient & Middle Greek .....	165
5.1. The history of <i>hópou</i> .....	165
5.1.1. Indo-European antecedents .....	165
5.1.2. Early Greek locative relativisation .....	167
5.1.3. The function of the <i>ho-</i> prefix .....	170
<i>hóstis</i> .....	172
<i>hopóteros</i> .....	175
Locatives .....	177
5.1.4. Locative Endings .....	179
<i>o</i> -stem Locatives .....	179
<i>a</i> -stem Locatives .....	182
Locative endings in Attic-Ionic .....	186
5.1.5. Semantic broadening of <i>hópou</i> .....	190
5.1.6. The history of <i>hína</i> .....	194
5.2. Middle Greek <i>hópou</i> .....	200
5.2.1. Continuation of classical extensions .....	200
5.2.2. Pathway to relativiser .....	203
Papyri .....	203
Rejected by Bakker .....	203
Accepted by Bakker .....	207
5.2.3. Other pathways .....	210
5.3. Ancient Greek expressions corresponding to Modern <i>pu</i> .....	211
5.3.1. <i>hóti</i> .....	211



5.3.2. <i>ho:s</i> .....	212
5.3.3. <i>hós, hóstis</i> .....	215
5.3.4. Participle.....	218
Attributive participle .....	218
Circumstantial participles .....	219
Modality and factivity of circumstantial participles .....	220
Supplementary participle .....	224
5.4. Middle Greek <i>status quo ante</i> .....	231
5.4.1. Relativisers.....	231
5.4.2. Participle .....	234
5.4.3. <i>hóti</i> .....	239
5.4.4. <i>ho:s</i> .....	246
5.4.5. Parataxis .....	249
5.4.6. Diachronic complementation systems.....	251
5.5. Tzartanos' internal reconstruction .....	255
5.6. Conclusion .....	260
6. Diatopy of complement- <i>pu</i> .....	265
6.1. Thracian.....	266
6.1.1. Psichari .....	270
6.1.2. Cavafy .....	276
6.1.3. Folk texts.....	278
6.2. Tsakonian.....	285
6.3. Cappadocian .....	290
6.4. Pontic .....	297
6.5. Livisi.....	302
6.6. Mariupolitan .....	305
6.7. Italiot.....	308
6.8. Corfiot .....	314
6.9. Macedonian .....	319
6.10. Other .....	328
6.10.1. Emotive <i>pos</i> .....	328
6.10.2. Cognitive Predetermined <i>pu</i> .....	332
6.10.3. Linguistic <i>pu</i> .....	334
6.10.4. Perception <i>pu</i> .....	335
6.10.5. Other classes .....	337
6.11. Conclusion .....	338
7. Diatopy of <i>pu</i> by itself.....	341
7.1. Relative locative adverb .....	341
7.1.1. Headless locative .....	341
7.1.2. Bounded locative .....	344
7.2. Relativiser .....	345
7.2.1. Simple relativiser .....	345
Rival relativisers .....	345
<i>o opios</i> .....	345
<i>to</i> .....	346
Syntactic behaviour of relativiser- <i>pu</i> .....	348
7.2.2. Pseudo-relativiser .....	349
<i>eki pu</i> .....	349
Diatopy .....	349
Reinforcements and renewals .....	354
<i>etsi pu</i> .....	356
Others .....	358
<i>here</i> .....	358
Miscellaneous temporal.....	358
<i>then</i> .....	359
<i>now</i> .....	360
7.2.3. Headless relative .....	361
Semantics.....	362
Diatopy .....	362
Relic survivals .....	365
7.2.4. Cleft .....	366
Cypriot clefts .....	369
Semantics .....	369

	History .....	370
	Syntax .....	371
	Zero-copula clefts .....	372
7.3. Complementiser .....		372
7.3.1. Syntactic issues involving <i>pu</i> -complements .....		372
<i>pu na</i> -complements.....		372
Preposed <i>pu</i> -complements .....		373
7.3.2. Subject complements .....		375
<i>since</i> -constructions.....		376
7.4. Adjunct- <i>pu</i> .....		381
7.4.1. Introducing cause or reason clauses .....		381
<i>ine pu</i> .....		384
7.4.2. Introducing circumstance clauses .....		384
Justify- <i>pu</i> .....		385
Tautologous relativisations .....		386
Underspecified circumstances .....		388
7.4.3. Introducing result clauses .....		390
7.4.4. Introducing contrast clauses .....		394
7.4.5. Introducing realis concessive clauses .....		396
7.4.6. Introducing temporal clauses .....		399
Tsakonian.....		400
Cypriot .....		401
Preposed temporals: other dialects.....		401
Irrealis temporals .....		402
Non-Punctual temporals .....		403
7.5. Discourse connective .....		405
7.6. Subjunctive marker.....		410
7.6.1 Free relatives.....		410
7.6.2 Indefinite collocations.....		412
7.6.3 <i>pu = pu na</i> .....		413
7.6.4 Irrealis connectives .....		414
7.7. In combination with <i>na</i> .....		416
7.7.1. Irrealis relative clauses.....		416
7.7.2. Potential result clauses.....		417
7.7.3. Unrealisable concessive clauses .....		419
7.7.4. Optative clauses .....		421
Diatopy.....		421
Semantics & syntax.....		422
<i>Anathema</i> .....		426
Cypriot .....		427
Cretan .....		430
Apiranthos .....		431
Pontic .....		432
Conclusion .....		432
7.7.5. Exclamatory clauses .....		432
Uncleft.....		433
Introductory interrogative.....		437
Bare exclamatories .....		442
7.8. Irrealis <i>pu</i> .....		443
7.8.1. Irrealis <i>pu tha</i> .....		443
7.8.2. Irrealis bare <i>pu</i> .....		446
7.9. Definite article + <i>pu</i> .....		447
7.10. “Too-hard basket” .....		451
7.11. Summary of deviations .....		454
8. Synthesis: The Story of <i>pu</i> .....		456
8.1. The diachronic story .....		456
8.2. Previous accounts .....		467
8.3. Consequences for grammaticalisation theory.....		472
Appendix A. History & Diatopy of Greek .....		476
A.1. A brief history of Greek .....		476
A.2. A dialect survey of Modern Greek.....		481
A.2.1. Dialects not mutually intelligible with CSMG .....		482
Tsakonian.....		483

Cappadocian .....	485
Pontic .....	486
Italiot .....	490
A.2.2. Dialects barely mutually intelligible with CSMG .....	491
Cypriot .....	491
Cretan .....	492
A.2.3. Dialects mutually intelligible with CSMG .....	492
A.3. The Balkan Sprachbund .....	499
A.4. Further dialect scope .....	502
Appendix B. Other Words .....	506
B.1. Cappadocian .....	506
B.2. Pontic: <i>ndo</i> .....	514
B.3. Italiot .....	521
B.4. Allomorphs of <i>pu</i> .....	527
B.4.1. <i>po</i> .....	527
B.4.2. <i>apu</i> .....	530
B.4.3. <i>'opu/opu</i> .....	532
B.5. Conclusion .....	534
Appendix C. Text counts .....	537
C.1. Makriyannis corpus (1829–1851) .....	537
C.2. Tahtsis: <i>The Third Wedding</i> (1963) .....	540
C.3. Constantinopolitan corpus .....	544
C.3.1. Psichari: <i>My Voyage</i> (1888) .....	544
C.3.2. Psichari: <i>Historical &amp; Linguistic Questions</i> (1886) .....	547
C.3.3. Cavafy: <i>Collected Poems</i> (1896–1933) .....	549
C.4. Corfiot corpus .....	551
C.4.1. Theotokis: <i>Honour and Money</i> (1912) .....	551
C.4.2. Theotokis: <i>Hamlet</i> (1916) .....	552
C.5. Tsakonian corpus .....	553
C.6. Cappadocian corpus .....	555
C.6.1. Silli .....	555
C.6.2. Western Cappadocia .....	556
C.6.3. Pharasa .....	557
C.7. Livisi corpus .....	559
C.8. Pontic corpus .....	560
C.9. Italiot corpus .....	567
Appendix D. Texts .....	573
Appendix E. Maps .....	585
References .....	589

## LIST OF FIGURES, MAPS, AND TABLES

Figure 1. Developments in functionality of <i>pu</i> .....	114
Figure 2. Information Modalities .....	121
Figure 3. Evaluation Modalities .....	122
Figure 4. Assertivity and factivity in Ransom's semantic scheme .....	126
Figure 5. Distribution of Modern Greek complementisers .....	141
Figure 6. Distribution of <i>oti</i> .....	142
Figure 7. Distribution of <i>na</i> .....	143
Figure 8. Modified complementiser- <i>pu</i> grid .....	149
Figure 9. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in <i>The Third Wedding</i> .....	150
Figure 10. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in Makriyannis' <i>Memoirs</i> .....	152
Figure 11. Attic infinitive; Koine infinitive .....	252
Figure 12. Attic <i>hína/hópos</i> ; Koine <i>hína/hópos</i> .....	252
Figure 13. Modern <i>na</i> .....	253
Figure 14. Attic <i>hóti/hos</i> ; Koine <i>hóti</i> .....	253
Figure 15. Modern <i>oti/pos</i> .....	254
Figure 16. Ancient participle; Koine participle .....	254
Figure 17. Modern <i>pu</i> ; Modern <i>ke</i> .....	255
Figure 18. Tzartanos' account of <i>pu</i> .....	256
Figure 19. The diachrony of <i>hópou</i> .....	261
Figure 20a. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in <i>Historical &amp; Linguistic Questions</i> (1886): CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	271
Figure 20b. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in <i>Historical &amp; Linguistic Questions</i> (1886): All realis .....	271
Figure 21a. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in <i>My Voyage</i> (1888): CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	272
Figure 21b. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in <i>My Voyage</i> (1888): All realis .....	273
Figure 22. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in <i>My Voyage</i> (1905): CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	274
Figure 23a. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in Cavafy: CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	277
Figure 23b. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in Cavafy: All realis .....	277
Figure 24a. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in Marmara: CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	280
Figure 24b. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in Marmara: All realis .....	280
Figure 25a. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in Lemnos: CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	282
Figure 25b. Complementiser- <i>pu</i> in Lemnos: All realis .....	282
Figure 26a. Propontis Tsakonian complementation: CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	287
Figure 26b. Peloponnesian Tsakonian complementation: CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	287
Figure 27a. Livisi complementation: CSMG <i>pu</i> -grid .....	303
Figure 27b. Livisi complementation: All realis .....	303
Figure 28. Filiation of historical variants of Greek .....	477
Figure 29. Cappadocian paradigms .....	513
Map 1. Regions of deviant complementation discussed .....	265
Map 2. Weak Assertive and Linguistic <i>pu</i> in Thrace, Bithynia, and the North-Eastern Aegean .....	268
Map 3. Corfu and adjacent islands .....	314
Map 4. Greek Macedonia .....	320
Map 5. Greek-speaking regions, 1900 .....	482
Map 6. Regions where Tsakonian is/was spoken .....	483
Map 7. Cappadocia .....	485
Map 8. Pontus .....	487
Map 9. Italiot (Salentine, Calabrian) .....	491
Map 10. Mainstream Modern Greek Dialect Groups .....	494
Map 11. Northern, Southern, and Semi-Northern dialects, and Albanian-speaking zone in Central Greece .....	495
Map 12. Characteristic isoglosses of Greek: genitive ( <i>su</i> ) vs. accusative ( <i>se</i> ) for dative, and <i>ida</i> vs. <i>ti</i> for 'what' .....	498

Map 13. Calabrian Italiot villages .....	523
Map 14. Distribution of <i>apu</i> .....	531
Map 15. North-Eastern Greece .....	585
Map 16. South-Western Greece .....	586
Map 17. South-Eastern Greece .....	587
Map 18. North-Western Greece.....	588
Table 1. Greek phonetics and transliterations .....	xviii
Table 2. <i>Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek</i> transcriptions.....	xx
Table 3. Rohlf's Italiot transcriptions.....	xx
Table 4. Mariupolitan Cyrillic.....	xx
Table 5. Abbreviations used.....	xxii
Table 6. Parameters and processes of grammaticalisation.....	12
Table 7. Exclamatory usages of <i>pu</i> .....	108
Table 8. Some representative predicates classed according to assertivity .....	120
Table 9. Semantic classifications of complement-taking verbs .....	125
Table 10. Distribution of complementisers in English.....	139
Table 11. Papadopoulou's distribution of Modern Greek complementisers.....	139
Table 12. Semantic factors determining <i>pu/oti</i> complementiser choice.....	153
Table 13. Ancient Greek correlative pronouns .....	167
Table 14. Relativiser/Interrogative counts in Homer for <i>*yo + *k<sup>w</sup>o</i> locatives .....	177
Table 15. Relativiser counts in Monteil's corpus by function.....	178
Table 16. Relativiser counts in Monteil's corpus by author .....	190
Table 17. Counts of <i>hó pou</i> and <i>hoû</i> in the New Testament.....	200
Table 18a. Factivity of participles in Classical poetry .....	223
Table 18b. Factivity of participles in Classical prose.....	223
Table 19. Diachronic participle frequency counts .....	237
Table 20a. Western Cappadocian complementisers.....	292
Table 20b. Pharasiot complementisers .....	292
Table 21. Pontic complementisers .....	297
Table 22. Corpus counts of realis adjunct- <i>pu</i> .....	382
Table 23. Diatopy of functional deviations of <i>pu</i> .....	455
Table 24. Mainstream Modern Greek Dialect Groups .....	493

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*This dissertation has been in progress for the past four and a half years; having concluded this phase, at least, of the research, I am proud to acknowledge the contribution others have made to its fruition.*

*On the outset, I wish to thank my supervisors, Dr Jean Mulder of the Department of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics at the University of Melbourne, and John Burke, formerly of the Department of Language Studies (Modern Greek) at the University of Melbourne, for their contribution in steering my dissertation to its final form. Jean's insistence in particular on structure and illustration has proven invaluable, and without it my thesis would have been even more of a chore to plough through. In my supervisory committee, I also wish to thank Dr Dominique Estival, formerly of the Department of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics. Her forthright and constructive advice has helped me on my way on more than one occasion.*

*Amongst the scholarly community outside the University of Melbourne, I wish to thank Professor Elizabeth Closs Traugott, of Stanford University, for originally inspiring me to choose this topic for investigation—however different the endpoint has turned out to what I first envisaged; and Professor Brian Joseph, of Ohio State University, for being what I have often described as 'the only guy in the West who cares about Mediaeval Greek syntax', and for providing collegial support with modesty and amicability. I also wish to acknowledge the support of my fellow researchers of Greek, Dr Bob Ingria (Boston); Dr Mark Janse, of the University of Ghent; Dr Michael Jeffreys, of the University of Sydney; Dr Konstantinos Minas, of the University of the Aegean; and Dr Iris Papadopoulou (Salonica).*

*I conducted research in Greece from October 1995 to February 1996; for their financial assistance in enabling this field-trip, I thank the Faculty of Arts at the University of Melbourne, and the University of Melbourne Travelling Fund. I wish to acknowledge the generosity of Dr Eleftheria Giakoumaki and the staff of the Centre for the Compilation of the Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek at the Academy of Athens, in allowing me access to their dialectological archives, which have proven so crucial to the completion of this work. I also thank Dr Tassos Karanastassis and the staff at the Mediaeval Philology Section of the Centre for Byzantine Studies, Salonica—particularly Tasos Kaplanis, my 'fellow οπουτζίης'—for granting me access to their comprehensive collection of mediaeval vernacular Greek texts; I have not had the opportunity to exploit those resources for this phase of the research, but am looking forward to doing so soon. And I thank those doyens of Modern Greek dialectology, the former directors of the Historical Dictionary—Nicholas Contossopoulos, Thanasis Costakis, Dimitris Krekoukias, and Dikeos Vayacacos—who looked kindly on the arrival of an upstart ομογενής from the other side of the world, and were generous to me with their time, their help, and their knowledge. During my stay in Greece, my relatives discharged their familial duties impeccably and with much patience; I wish to make particular mention of my aunt, Dimitra Biliouli.*

*The assistance of university libraries has also been crucial to the successful completion of my research, and I wish to thank especially Vija Pattison and the staff of the Interlibrary Loans Service of the Baillieu Library at the University of Melbourne for cheerfully carting over book after book from campuses as far flung as the Ukraine and Massachussets.*

*These are days in which the scholarly republic is under savage and unprovident attack from many quarters—not least from the governance of our societies. This attack has had no little impact in my own department. Yet scholarship resides in scholars, and community in peers. It has been my honour to count as my peers and my friends the postgraduate students of the Department of Linguistics and Applied Linguistics, who have offered me both their support and their exasperation at various stages of the past six years. Enumeration does them little justice, but they each know how fully I appreciate them: Dr John Bowden (ANU), Lisa Crosbie (Sydney), Christina Eira (to whom especial thanks for extensive proofreading and comments), Fern Francey, Anthony Jukes, Leslie Layne, Dr Mohammad Mahdiraji (Adelaide), Andrew*

Malone, Katia Margolis (*Moscow*), Dr Paul Sidwell (*ANU*), Dr Tonya Stebbins, Tania Strahan, Dr Marija Tabain (*Macquarie*), Fiona Watson (Malone). *Outside the department, I also mention Neile Kirk (Russian), who proofread this work, Katherine Phelps (Multimedia, RMIT), Dr Elizabeth Reid (Steere) (Cultural Studies; UCLA), and Maria Tumarkin (History).*

*For fiscal assistance during my candidature, I thank my sundry academic employers—Dr Mark Durie (formerly of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics), Dr Dominique Estival (formerly of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics), Dr John Hajek (French & Italian), Dr Ilia Peiros (formerly of Linguistics & Applied Linguistics)—who have proven that ‘once a programmer, always a programmer’; Dr Nick Evans and Dr Jean Mulder, for whom I have tutored in linguistics—and my students for allowing me the joy of teaching; and my ‘other’ family, Derek Fonnle and the staff of the Technical Support Group (Helpdesk), Information Technology Services at the University of Melbourne. I also thank Dr Robert Dale and the students at the Natural Language Group of the Microsoft Research Institute in Sydney, with whom I held an internship in early 1995.*

*The individual due the most thanks for his contribution to this thesis and my research is Associate Professor George Baloglou, of the Mathematics Department at the State University of New York at Oswego. George, with whom I have worked on translating The Entertaining Tale of Quadrapeds, is an amateur in the best sense of the word; someone whose love for his language, literature and people has far outstripped mine, and who has been unstintingly generous and industrious in supplying me with texts, clarifications, and support. The dedication of my dissertation is but a small repayment for his investment in it.*

*In a more abstract sense: this thesis would not have been possible without the technological innovations of our age, and I thank here the countless individuals who have selflessly brought into being the Internet; the creators of the various public domain fonts used in this work (particularly Nikos Goulondris for *Ismini* [αβγδε], and the Summer Institute of Linguistics for *SILDoulos IPA93* [αβζδε]); the Summer Institute of Linguistics for the concordance program *Conc*; XEROX PARC for their online mapping facility; the listowners of *Hellas-L* and *DejaNews* for archiving the *Hellas-L* mailing list (and its subscribers for providing such a boisterous corpus); *ACI*, the creators of the 4th Dimension database system; *Niles & Associates*, the creators of the bibliographical software *Endnote*; *Maui Software*, the makers of the search tool *Find In Files*; *Mark Nodine* for creating the *WordRef* cross-referencing system; and most importantly *Apple* and the *Macintosh* user community, the band of true believers in the best of all possible computing devices.*

*The modern conveniences I have been fortunate enough to have at hand make me admire all the more those grand old men of Modern Greek linguistics, who undertook their work with no such shortcuts, but achieved much more than I can ever hope to. Their shades are to be discerned in many of these pages; and though on occasion I express disagreement with them, my debt to them is immense: Nicholas Andriotis, Robert Browning, Richard Dawkins, Michael Deffner, Karl Dieterich, George Hatzidakis, Dirk Hesseling, Anthony Jannaris, Gustav Meyer-Lübke, André Mirambel, Anthimos Papadopoulos, Hubert Pernot, Jean Psichari, Gerhard Rohlf, Nicholas Sofianos, Albert Thumb, Manolis Triandafyllidis, and Achilles Tzartanos.*

*Lastly, I acknowledge my indebtedness to the very subject of my study: the generations of those who have spoken Greek and its neighbour languages, in and around Modern Greece. Times change and level; where a high-bred Atticist disdained the vernacular, and a ludicrous and προγονόπληκτη Puristic battled with Demotic, now a colourless televised urban standard is wiping out the remains of the erstwhile linguistic diversity of Greece—Tsakonian and Heptanesian, Arvanitika and Cretan, Aroumin and Pontic, Chiot and Thessalian alike. The diversity of the Modern Greek language, centuries in the moulding, is no more. This dissertation chronicles, at its end days, a little of that diversity; and I salute those who—unwittingly—brought it about.*

And then, what though Death's scythe  
comes! Earth will have woken  
from the deceptive nightmare of life and death—  
and in the light above the dark killer  
will reap only empty air!

—Nikos Kazantzakis; *Terzinas: To Himself.*

Και τότε πια του Χάρου το δραπάνι  
δεν πάει να 'ρθεί! απ' το βραχνά τον πλόνο  
ζωής και χάρου θα 'χει η Γης ξυπνήσει—  
κι ο σκοτεινός φονιάς στο φως απάνω  
άδειο μονάχα αγέρα θα θερίσει!

—Νίκος Καζαντζάκης; *Τερτσίνες: Εις Εαυτόν.*

## CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Centuries are given in lowercase roman numerals; thus *xix* AD = nineteenth century. Frequently a vernacular mediaeval text is preserved in manuscripts dating much later than the putative date of authorship. Given the tendency of scribes to modify vernacular texts, the work as given to us may reflect the language situation of its date of copying more faithfully than it does its date of authorship. For that reason, text datings are given in the format (*Date of Authorship/Date of Manuscript*). Where a date occurs at some unknown time between *x* and *y*, it is given as *x~y*; where a text is known to have been written over the period between *x* and *y*, it is given as *x–y*. Thus, the Paris manuscript of the *Chronicle of Morea* can be dated as (1370~1388/*xv*), while Makriyannis' *Memoirs* are dated as (1829–1851). *~x* means *around date x*.

Transliteration of Greek over the range of times covered in this work raises several problems. The phonetic change-over between Ancient and Modern Greek took place over an extended period; as a result, any phonetic transcription of texts between *v* BC and *x* AD is tentative, and would have to be either modified from century to century, or conventionalised and treated as more of a transliteration than a transcription. For instance, the singular accusative noun γυναίκα 'woman' has at various times been pronounced /gunaíka/, /gynaíka/, /gy'naika/, /gy'neka/, /ɣy'neka/ and /ɣi'neka/ (its spelling remaining constant), which in Standard Modern Greek is realised as [ji'neka], and in other dialects as [zi'neka], [zi'neka] or [yu'neka].

Problems remain after *x* AD: for example, it is impossible to know when gemination died out in Early Modern Greek texts, given that it still survives in South-Eastern dialects. The phonetic transcriptions done by modern Greek dialectologists present problems of their own. For instance, *ǰ* is used to transcribe the front allophone of /k/, where it is further front than Standard Modern Greek [c]; but we seldom have any way of knowing whether the allophone involved is [tʃ] (as in Cypriot), [tɕ] (as in at least some varieties of Cretan), or some other posterior coronal.

In the face of such complications, transcription offers few benefits to the kind of study undertaken here; phonetics is not particularly relevant to this study, and phonology is relevant only as far as the phonological reduction concomitant with the grammaticalisation of *pu*. The only real use for transcription is in citing linguistic forms in discussion, which would otherwise be hard to keep track of for readers unfamiliar with the Greek alphabet. Since text examples are glossed where appropriate, they give rise to no such need, and transliteration would impede legibility of extended texts for readers already familiar with Greek. On the



other hand, Greek-alphabet-only examples would make it difficult for non-hellenists to keep track of examples from this work. For that reason, textual citations are given in both Greek alphabet and transliteration, while individual forms under discussion are transliterated. The subject matter of this thesis thus appears in examples as ὄπου, οπού or που, while in-line instances in discussion appear as *hórou, opu* or *pu*.

The problem of what kind of transliteration to adopt remains. Given that phonetic accuracy is not essential for this study, two different transliterations are used. The first is used for Ancient Greek; the second, a broad phonemic transliteration, is used for Modern Greek.<sup>1</sup> Texts from before 1100 AD are transliterated as if they were Homeric Greek. So υ is transliterated as /u/, not (Attic) /y/, ου as /ou/, not /ɔ:/, ει as /ei/, not /ɛ:/, and so on. It might be argued that the latter two choices are factitious, since most instances of orthographic ου and ει were never diphthongal; but the aim here has been a graphemically close transliteration, rather than historical phonetic accuracy. For vowels whose length was not orthographically indicated (α, ι, υ), the vowel is given as long only where this is immediately obvious—when the vowel has a circumflex accent and is not part of a diphthong. Vernacular texts from after 1100 AD are transliterated as if they were CSMG (Contemporary Standard Modern Greek)—e.g. without gemination; the cut-off point is necessarily arbitrary. Both transliterations use the IPA, and are detailed in Table 1. The unmarked allophone is listed first in the Modern phonetics value(s) column, and is always used in transliteration. Modern proper names are transliterated in a more conventional manner, also given in Table 1.

Greek grapheme	Ancient phonetic value(s)	Modern phonetic value(s)	Proper Name translit'n	Greek grapheme	Ancient phonetic value(s)	Modern phonetic value(s)	Proper Name translit'n
α	a, a:	a	a	αι	ai	e	e
β	b	v	v	ει	ei	i	i
γ	g	ɣ [j, j]	g	οι	oi	i	i
γ <sup>ι</sup>	gi	ɣi [j]	y	υι	ui	i	i
δ	d	ð	d	αι	ai	a	a
ε	e	e	e	η	ei	i	i
ζ	zd	z	z	φ	o:i	o	o
η	e:	i	i	αυ	au	af, av <sup>2</sup>	af, av
θ	t <sup>h</sup>	θ	th	ευ	eu	ef, ev	ef, ev
ι	i	i [j, ø]	i	ηυ	e:u	if, iv	if, iv
κ	k	k [c]	k	ου	ou	u	ou
λ	l	l, [ʎ]	l	μπ	mp	b [ʰb, mp]	mb, b, mp

<sup>1</sup>Thus, no distinction is made between vowel /i/ and glide /j/; nasal sandhi and velar/ palatal allophony are not indicated. In the controversy of the phonemic status of [j], I have abided with the historical and orthographical rendering /ɣi/. For simplicity's sake, I have chosen to omit prenasalisation for voiced stops (see Arvaniti (1994) for the current sociolinguistic standing of prenasalisation.)

<sup>2</sup>/af/ obtains before voiceless consonants, while /av/ obtains before voiced consonants and vowels; the same holds for /ef, ev/ and /if, iv/.

μ	m	m	m	ντ	nt	d [ʰd, nt]	nd, d, nt
ν	n	n [ɲ, ŋ, m]	n	γγ	ŋg	g [ʰg, ŋg, ʲj, j, ɲj]	ng
ξ	ks	ks	x	γκ	ŋk	g [ʰg, ŋg, ʲj, j, ɲj]	ng
ο	o	o	o	γξ	ŋhs	ŋks	nx
π	p	p	p	γχ	ŋk <sup>h</sup>	ŋx	nh
ρ	r	r	r	τσ	ts	ts	ts
σ, ς	s	s [z]	s	τζ	zd	dz	tz
σχ	sk <sup>h</sup>	sx	sch	ρ	r	r	r
τ	t	t	t	ϵ	h	∅	—
υ	u	i	y	ϵ	∅	∅	—
φ	p <sup>h</sup>	f	f	~	^	ˊ	—
χ	k <sup>h</sup>	x [ç]	h	ˊ	ˊ	ˊ	—
ψ	ps	ps	ps	ˋ	ˋ	ˋ	—
ω	o:	o	o				

Table 1. Greek phonetics and transliterations<sup>3</sup>

Traditionally, Greek is written in the polytonic system—marking stress with the three distinct pitch accents of Ancient Greek, and using the rough and smooth breathing marks to indicate the presence or absence of /h/ word-initially. The distinctions made in the polytonic system are not pertinent in Modern Greek, and in the last two decades the monotonic system has become widely adopted, using only the acute to mark stress, and dispensing with breathing marks. The monotonic system is being increasingly used for Early Modern Greek works as well (notably in the *Dictionary of Mediaeval Greek Vernacular Writing*—though not without controversy), and I use it for all vernacular text extracts dating from after 1100 AD, while retaining polytonic stress for archaistic texts.

Where an individual has chosen their own transliteration for their name (e.g. *Cavafy* rather than *Kavafis*), that transliteration is followed. For place names, I have used common non-Greek variants in wide use (e.g. *Zante*, *Corfu*, *Rhodes* rather than *Zakinthos*, *Kerkira*, *Rodos*), and I have preferred Classical transliterations over transliteration directly from Modern Greek, where these are likewise well-known (e.g. *Euboea*, *Aegina*, *Elis* rather than *Evia*, *Egina*, *Iliia*.) Greek names have also been preferred for places no longer under Greek dominion, since the Greek linguistic literature uses these names (e.g. *Philippoupolis*, *Argyroupolis*, *Himara* rather than *Ploudiv*, *Gümüřhane*, *Himerë*); I append the contemporary placenames on first mention.

Dialect texts are cited in the transcription given in the source texts; this is usually the Greek alphabet with diacritics, though Italiot Greek texts use Italian

<sup>3</sup>Stress is usually not marked in transliterating Modern Greek; I have marked stress where necessary to distinguish between contrastively stressed lexemes—in particular, stressed and unstressed lexemes such as (polytonic/monotonic/transliterated) *πού/πον/pu* (the particle investigated in this thesis) and *ποῦ/πού/ˊpu* (‘where?’); *πόζ/πωζ/pos* (‘that’, complementiser) and *πῶζ/πῶζ/ˊpos* (‘how?’). I also distinguish between deictic *νά/ˊna* ‘behold!’ and connective *να/na* ‘subjunctive marker’, although the two are not so distinguished in official modern orthography.

orthography embellished with diacritics and Greek letters. Where Greek texts are transcribed in a non-IPA roman orthography (as is regularly the case for Italiot, and in some instances Tsakonian, Mariupolitan and Cypriot), an IPA transcription is adjoined. Consistent with practice elsewhere in this work, I cite dialect texts in monotonic rather than polytonic.<sup>4</sup> Allophonic variation already present in Standard Modern Greek (in particular, palatal allophones of velars and alveolars) is seldom made explicit in the transcriptions. Furthermore, while dialectologists transcribe phonetically, native speakers usually transcribe phonologically—and since few dialects differ phonologically from SMG, they employ the Greek alphabet without diacritics.<sup>5</sup> The approach taken here has been to transliterate the Greek literally, even though the transliteration clearly mixes phonemic and allophonic levels.<sup>6</sup>

Although transcription is idiosyncratic, a de facto standard for Greek-script transcription is the system employed in the Academy of Athens’ *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek* (*Ιστορικό Λεξικό της Νέας Ελληνικής*).<sup>7</sup> For Italiot, the system in Rohlfs’ (1950) *Historische Grammatik der unteritalienischen Gräzität*, using the conventions of Italian dialectology, is widespread, though not universal. Mariupolitan in recent years is transliterated in Cyrillic. These are the transcriptions most frequently encountered, and are outlined below:

Symbol	Common variants	IPA	Comments
ǎ	ǻ	æ	
b		b	
γ̃		j	Used where CSMG would use the allophone [ɣ]
g		g	
ḡ		ɟ	Used where CSMG would use the allophone [g]
d		d	
ḏḏ		ɖ;	
ə		ʊ	
ζ̃	ζ̂	ʒ, ʒ̥	Greek dialectologists rarely distinguish between palato-alveolars (as in Cyprus) and alveopalatals (as in at least some parts of Crete); I thus transcribe this sign as ʒ, unless an explicit phonetic description indicates otherwise.
ᶶ		j	

<sup>4</sup>One further intervention I have made in the texts is to regularise the notation of yod: ᶶ, ᶶ, ᶶ and ᶶ are all rendered as ᶶ.

<sup>5</sup>For example, while Standard Greek realises /k/ as [c] before front vowels, Cretan realises it as [tɕ]. A dialectologist would thus transcribe Cretan /keri/ [tɕe'ri] ‘candle’ as κερί, while lay Cretans have no difficulty with transcribing it as κερί, though in Standard Greek this would be pronounced [ce'ri].

<sup>6</sup>For instance, Standard Greek κοιμήθηκε /ki'miθike/ [ci'miθice] ‘she slept’ is transliterated as *kimiθike*; the Northern Greek equivalent [c'miθci] is written by Greeks as κμοίθκι (since /ki/ > [ci]) is assumed); this is transliterated accordingly as *cmiθki*. There are instances in Greek dialects where e.g. /ki/ is realised as [ki] (for instance, Northern Karpathos); I ignore those instances here, although the unpalatalised diacritics are kept in the source text.

<sup>7</sup>Deffner’s (1923) phonetic symbols for Tsakonian, used in the Dictionary, have been widely criticised, and have been tacitly substituted by Costakis’ (1986) phonemic symbols, which have prevailed since the inception of the Historical Dictionary.

C <sup>l</sup>	C <sub>l</sub> , C'	C	Usually used to indicate that the preceding consonant is palatal rather than alveolar or velar, when the vowel conditioning the palatalisation has been dropped
κ̂		c	Used where CSMG would use the allophone [k]
κ̂ <sup>h</sup>		k <sup>h</sup>	
λ̂	λ̃	Λ	Used where CSMG would use the allophone [l]
λ̂		ɹ	
λ̂		l	Used where CSMG would use the allophone [Λ]
ν̂	ν̇	n	Used where CSMG would use the allophone [ɲ]
ν̂		ɲ	Used where CSMG would use the allophone [n]
ξ̂		kʃ, kç	Transcribed here as kš
ο̂	ω̂	ø	
π̂		p <sup>h</sup>	
σ̂	σ̃, χ̃	ʃ, ç	Transcribed here as š
τ̂		t <sup>h</sup>	
τ̂	τ̃, τ̃̇	tʃ, tç	Transcribed here as tš
τ̂	τ̃̇, ζ̃, τ̂	tç	In his phonological analysis, Haralambopoulos (1980) treats this as /ts <sup>h</sup> /
υ̂		y	
χ̂		ç	Used where CSMG would use the allophone [x]
ψ̂	ψ̃	pʃ, pç	Transcribed here as pš
C-C		C:	

Table 2. *Historical Dictionary of Modern Greek* transcriptions

<i>Symbol</i>	<i>IPA</i>	<i>Symbol</i>	<i>IPA</i>
ḍ	ɖ	ć	tʃ
θ	θ	ǰ	dʒ
ð	ð	χ	x
č	c	ɣ	ɣ
ǰ	ʃ	χ̃	ç
ň	ɲ	y	j
š	ʃ	ł, ł̃	Λ
ž	ʒ		

Table 3. Rohlfs' Italiot transcriptions

<i>Cyrillic</i>	<i>IPA</i>	<i>Cyrillic</i>	<i>IPA</i>	<i>Cyrillic</i>	<i>IPA</i>	<i>Cyrillic</i>	<i>IPA</i>
а	a	з	z	о	o	х	x
б	b	и	i	п	p	ц	ts
в	v	й	j	р	r	дз	dʒ
г	ɣ	ы	i	рѣ	r <sup>j</sup>	ч	tʃ
кг	g	к	k	с	s	дж	dʒ
д	d	л	l	т	t	ш	ʃ
дѣ	d <sup>j</sup>	лѣ	Λ	тѣ	t <sup>j</sup>	щ	ʃtʃ
дѣ	ð	м	m	тѣ	θ	я	ja
э	e	н	n	у	u	ю	ju
е	je	нѣ	ɲ	ф	f		

Table 4. Mariupolitan Cyrillic

Greek texts originating in the Internet—especially in electronic mail and news—typically appear in *ad hoc* romanisation. Such texts are quoted here in the romanisation they originally appeared in, and in typewriter font. Romanisation is inconsistent from user to user, relying on either phonetic or visual affinity; to give the most extreme examples, θ can be romanised as any one of ϰ, 8, 9, 0,

υ, ς, or τh, while ξ can appear as j, 3, x, \$, or ks.<sup>8</sup> Thus, such texts are still accompanied by IPA transcription, as well as Standard Greek orthography.

Consistent with the above, texts are uniformly given in their original script as well as transcription; for example, Arabic script for the proto-Cappadocian of the Sufi poets, or Linear B for Mycenaean Greek. Examples from other languages are given in the orthography/transliteration they were published in; non-Greek texts transcribed in Greek (Arvanitika, Aroumin) are also transliterated in the orthography of their corresponding literary language (Albanian, Romanian)—a practice more usual for Aroumin than Arvanitika.

When the date of a textual example is pertinent, the date is given in the right margin, as follows:

- (1) (1886)  
 Μπορεί να με γέλασαν τα μάτια μου, μα σαν μπήκα στο παλιό μας το σπίτι,  
 θαρρούσα *που* με γλυκοκοίταζαν οι τοίχοι.  
 bori na me yelasan ta matia mu, ma san bika sto palio mas spiti, tharusa *pu* me  
 ylikokitazan i tixi.  
 [Psichari expresses his joy at returning to Istanbul.] My eyes may have deceived  
 me, but when I entered our old house, I thought [*that*] the walls were sweetly  
 gazing at me. (PsichHLQ:83)

For some texts, a printed translation is available in English. In such cases, I note the translation in the list of texts (Appendix D); otherwise, translations are my own. On occasion, I give both a printed translation and my own for clarification. I distinguish my translations of the Greek from others' by placing the latter in italics, as below:

- (2) (1829)  
 Ποτέ δεν μολύνθηκαν τ' αρχεία της πατρίδος μου· ούτε εις την κυβέρνησιν, ούτε εις  
 επαρχίες, ούτε εις άτομα, *οπού* αγωνιστήκαμε εις την Ρούμελη, Πελοπόννησον και  
 νησιά και Σπάρτη, δεν είναι πουθενά κατηγορία παραμικρή δια εμάς.  
 pote den molinθikan t' arxia tis patriδος mu; ute is tin kubernisin, ute is eparxies,  
 ute is atoma, *opu* agonistikame is tin rumeli, peloponison ke nisia ke sparti, den  
 ine puθena katigoria paramikri dia emas.  
 The archives of my country were never sullied; neither in the government, nor  
 in the districts, nor in individuals, *when* we fought in Roumeli, the  
 Peloponnese and the islands and Sparta, nowhere is there the slightest accusa-  
 tion against us.  
*And we have never befouled the pages of our country's history. In our conduct  
 to the Government, to the provinces, to individuals, when we fought in  
 Roumeli and the Peloponnese and the islands and Sparta, not the slightest ac-  
 cusation can be made against us.* (MakM 7)

---

<sup>8</sup>There is often no one predominant romanisation used. For instance, for θ, θ is used 34% of the time, θ 26% of the time, and both τh and ς 16%. Similarly, for ξ, 3 is used only 65% of the time. (Counts done on *Hellas-L* archives, with probe words θα and ξέρω.) Peoples' romanisations are not necessarily even internally consistent; one will see words like xexasa ξέχασα 'I forgot', where x transliterates both ξ /ks/ and χ /x/. This means that reading Internet-romanised Greek is impossible for someone who does not already know Greek.

Standard Greek glosses of dialect texts given in the sources, and cited here for contrastive illustration, are also italicised. Citations from non–English-language scholarship are consistently given in my own translation.

The term *Macedonian* is used in this work to refer to both the northern Greek dialect and the Slavonic language spoken to its north; where confusion might result, the terms *Macedonian Greek* and *Macedonian Slavonic* are employed.

The following abbreviations are used in the text; for abbreviations used to refer to texts, see Appendix D.

ea.	early	la.	late
ACC	Accusative	ACT	Active
CSMG	Contemporary Standard Modern Greek	EMG	Early Modern Greek
FEM	Feminine	GEN	Genitive
HDMS	Historical Dictionary Centre Manuscript	IMPERI	Imperative Imperfective
IMPERP	Imperative Perfective	IMPPF	Imperfective Past
IMPFS	Imperfective Simplex	INF	Infinitive
MASC	Masculine	N/AP	Not marked for Aspect, Past
N/AS	Not marked for Aspect, Simplex	NEUT	Neuter
NOM	Nominative	PART	Participle
PASS	Passive	PERFP	Perfective Past
PERFS	Perfective Simplex	PL	Plural
PLUP	Pluperfect	SMG	Standard Modern Greek
SG	Singular	VOC	Vocative
+>	Conversational Implicature	>>	Presupposes
↗	Does not presuppose	‡	Semantically entails
‰	per thousand		

Table 5. Abbreviations used