GREEK AND TURKISH IN CONTACT IN ASIA MINOR:  
DEFINITENESS AND CASE IN CAPPADOCIAN GREEK

INTRODUCTION
Structural interferences have been considered to occur as long-and-short term effects in language contact situations. In such cases, a certain linguistic structure (phonological, morphological, syntactic) is transferred from one language to the other and is incorporated in the system. The extent and the scale of structural interference have been examined a lot in the relevant literature, mainly as an instance of structural borrowing (Thomason & Kaufman 1988, Appel & Muysken 1987, etc.). In this paper, we investigate a very interesting situation of structural interference, which involves the grammatical marking of definiteness and the encoding of the structural relations of subject and object, in some dialectal varieties of Cappadocian Greek. We will argue that definiteness marking in these dialects by means of case as a result of Turkish influence cannot be considered simply a structural borrowing, because it interacts in a very complex way with the encoding of the grammatical relations of subject and object, which are unambiguously marked by case distinctions in the Greek substratum.

THE RELEVANT STRUCTURES
Cappadocian Greek is a Greek dialect, which was spoken in Asia Minor until the ’20s and had been greatly influenced by Turkish at all levels (phonology: vowel harmony; morphology: agglutination; syntax: head-final constructions, e.g. OV order) as a result of their contact for centuries (Dawkins 1916, Kesisoglou 1951). One of the most interesting features of Cappadocian, which is more salient in the varieties spoken in the areas of Potamia and Delmeso, is the grammatical marking of definiteness. Potamia/Delmeso Cappadocian marks definiteness by facilitating both the substratum Greek mode of article and the imposed Turkish mode of case. More specifically:
A) Greek marks definiteness – indefiniteness by means of a specific article. Thus, Greek employs both a definite and an indefinite article, which inflect for gender, number (the indefinite article inflects only for singular number) and case (Holton et. al. 1997).
B) Turkish marks definiteness by means of case. More specifically, accusative case marks definite objects and nominative case marks subjects (definite and indefinite) and indefinite objects (Lewis 2000).
C) Potamia/Delmeso Cappadocian, as mentioned before, employs a combining mode of marking definiteness and indefiniteness: Although, it retains the substratum Greek mode of article, it also facilitates the case distinction between nominative and accusative, which is used in Turkish. This combination results in a pattern that incorporates the following generalizations:
• Definite article in accusative + noun in accusative  → definite NP as subject and object:
(1) a. to milo en makrja the-ACC.SG mill-ACC.SG is far away ‘The mill is far away’
b. to laγo eskotosen the-ACC.SG rabbit-ACC.SG killed-3SG ‘He killed the rabbit’
ii) Definite article in accusative + noun in nominative  → definite NP as subject and object
(2) a. na par ke sas to δjavolos SUBJ take-3SG and you the-ACC.SG devil-NOM.SG ‘The devil take you’
b. ivren to milos found-3SG the-ACC.SG mill-NOM.SG ‘He found the mill’
v) Indefinite article in accusative + noun in nominative/accusative  → indefinite NP as object
DISCUSSION
The data from Potamia/Delmeso Cappadocian exhibit a very complex pattern, which cannot be explained by the process of simple structure borrowing. Thus, although the generalizations in (i) and (ii) suggest a neutralization of the case marking of the grammatical relations of subject and object in favour of the grammatical marking of definiteness, the generalization in (iii) indicates that case marking of object in terms of accusative is still operative in the dialect, since it is encoded on the indefinite article, irrespective of the case of the head noun. A detailed examination of the relevant data will reveal that other grammatical factors, such as animacy, gender and the inflectional class of the noun, also determine the definiteness patterns. All these facts lead to the conclusion that the interference from Turkish structure was not simply an instance of structure borrowing, but it had the effect of reanalyzing the mode of the grammatical marking of definiteness and of subject – object distinction, resulting in a system that is internally defined by its own dynamics and determinants. It will be suggested that such complex patterns are better explained in terms of a theory of language change and creolization within the parameter-setting framework of generative grammar, as suggested by Lightfoot (1998) and DeGraff (1999).
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