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The paper examines a major syntactic isogloss in Modern Greek (MG) dialectology: the case realisation of the indirect object. It traces the isogloss line dividing MG dialects into genitive-IO and accusative-IO, and focuses in those areas where the realisation is the reverse of the expected one (i.e. genitive instead of accusative and accusative instead of genitive).
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0. Introduction

It has been 40 years since A. Mirambel’s seminal survey of MG dialectal syntax (Mirambel 1963), and most of his claims still hold: 1) although the picture is changing, syntax is the least investigated area of dialectal grammar¹ and 2) although there is interesting comparative work done in dialect syntax, there have been no systematic attempts to use it for the classification of MG dialects, which remains based mainly on phonological criteria (cf. Trudgill 2003). The main cause of this, apart from the general orientation of dialectological research in the past (cf. Tzitzilis 2000a), is the nature of the data: whereas for phonological, morphological and lexical differentiation a few forms from each area are sufficient to identify a feature, syntactic analysis requires a running text of some length, as well as grammaticality judgements from native speakers - something not so readily available.

The present paper, then, is more programmatic than interpretative in nature: it attempts to show what could be done in the way of MG comparative dialectal syntax. This is in the spirit of a recent upsurge of interest in dialectal syntax in Europe, where several "Syntactic Atlas" projects are in progress in the Netherlands, Italy, England and German-speaking Switzerland.²

The feature we investigate is one of the two major syntactic characteristics differentiating MG dialects (the other being verbal clitic positioning): the realisation of the indirect object, which appears in the genitive case in Standard MG and in southern varieties but in the accusative in northern dialects and in Asia Minor. Most of the data discussed here are not
mentioned in standard accounts, and rely on primary research, from the
dialectal archive of the Historical Dictionary of the Academy of Athens
(referred to here with manuscript (ms.) number, date and page).

1. The Indirect Object Isogloss

The Ancient Greek dative case, the original expression of the indirect
object, was progressively lost as a morphological category, and its functions,
both adverbial and grammatical, were transferred to the accusative or genitive
and to various prepositional constructions (Horrocks 1997: 216). The final
disappearance of the dative from the spoken vernacular can be dated around
the 10th c. AD (Humbert 1930:1930). It was replaced, by the accusative in the
northernmost and easternmost Greek-speaking areas, and by the genitive in the
southern and western areas. It is very difficult to date the final choice between
the genitive or the accusative variant in each area, since medieval texts show a
surprising fluctuation, with genitive and accusative realisations or even
genitive, dative and accusative, side by side - cf. (1a, b)³.

(I) (a) παρακαλεῖ καὶ λέγει τον ἄλογον να τοῦ δώσῃ
  He begs and tells him-ACC to give him-GEN horses.
  Chronicle of the Morea, version H, v. 2293

(b) “Λέγε μοι, ξενοδόχισσα, λέγε με να σοῦ λέγω”.
  Tell me-DAT, lady innkeeper, tell me-ACC so that I tell you-GEN
  Livistros & Rodamni, version N, v.2864

Standard Modern Greek has genitive IOs, but the dating of this option is also
questionable; thus, dialectal variation in IO realisation is a crucial factor for
evaluating the linguistic processes that led to the genesis of Standard MG.⁴

The syncretism of genitive and dative is a key convergence feature of
the Balkan Sprachbund (Sandfeld 1930: 185), occurring in all the relevant
languages (Greek, Albanian, Romanian, Aromanian, Bulgarian and
Macedonian)⁵. Since the phenomenon appears in Greek already in the first
centuries AD (Dieterich 1898, Humbert 1930), much earlier than the first
attestations of most Balkan languages, it has been claimed that genitive /
dative syncretism is a feature that spread from Greek (Sandfeld, 1930: 187).
However, the Greek dialects that were in immediate contact with other Balkan
languages (i.e. the Greek dialects of Macedonia and Thrace, and the dialect of
Constantinople), a contact seen as the source of several balkanisms⁶ in fact
display indirect objects in the accusative. This is an important issue
concerning the birth and spread of the Balkan Sprachbund, which, to our
knowledge, has not been investigated (this point is also made in Tzitzilis
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In detail, the genitive – accusative indirect object isogloss can be described as follows:

I. Mainland Greece & Ionian Sea: According to standard handbooks (Triantafyllidis 1938: 66-8, Kontossopoulos 2001: 101), the southern limits of accusative indirect object usage in mainland Greece are geographical features, i.e., the mountain ranges of Pindus and Othrys. Within these limits are encompassed the areas of Thessaly, Macedonia and Thrace. Therefore the IO isogloss does NOT bundle with the main phonological characteristic of the northern dialects, the raising of unstressed mid-vowels and loss of unstressed high vowels. Thus, although the dialects of Epirus and Sterea Ellada have a stable “northern” vowel system, they display genitive indirect objects. The commonly accepted “ancestors” of Standard MG, the Peloponnesian and Heptanesian varieties, are both Genitive IO dialects.

II. Aegean islands: The line falls somewhere between Lemnos and Lesbos, leaving the northernmost islands (Thasos, Samothrace, Imbros etc.) and the Northern Sporades in the accusative area, while the Cyclades, the Dodecanese and Cyprus have genitive IO dialects.

III. Asia Minor: All local dialects, including Pontus, Bithynia, Ionia, Cappadocia, as well as Constantinople itself, have accusative IOs. A systematic preference for the accusative is well attested in medieval documents from Constantinople already from the 5th – 6th c. AD, and medieval literary texts of Constantinopolitan provenance show no fluctuation between the genitive and accusative variants, in contrast to the bulk of medieval literature (Lendari & Manolessou 2003). It is thus quite possible that the accusative variant may have spread from Constantinople, the major cultural center of the Byzantine Empire, towards the more distant areas of mainland Greece.

IV. S. Italy: Both Greek dialects of this peripheral area, Apulian and Calabrian, have genitive indirect objects.

2. Discussion

The first problem with this classification is the chronological incompatibility of the data: for some areas, the differentiation is a real one, involving current variation. For other areas, mainly Asia Minor and Thrace, the situation described reflects the dialectal status before the 1922 events. This is a methodological problem already recognized in Trudgill (2000) when discussing the classification of MG dialects, but in our case it is not possible to restrict the description to an “idealised” 19th c. situation: several of the problems involved in the genitive / accusative IO alternation are due to sociolinguistic concerns such as the influence and spread of Standard MG. With this caveat in mind, let us take a closer look at the areas delimited by the
traditional classification, paying particular attention to areas where the IO surfaces in a case different from the expected one:

2.1 Accusative instead of genitive IO
2.1.1 Tsakonian

Tsakonia is an isolated area in southern Peloponnese, one of the strongholds of the genitive realisation. The standard descriptions of Tsakonian, however, agree that the indirect object appears in the accusative, cf. Pernot (1934), Kostakis (1951: 136), Mirambel (1963). Examples (2a, b):

(2) (a) Νιάν αμέρα εμπαίδε, νεπέτε τον όνε.

One day he went out and said to-the donkey-ACC

(Kostakis 1987 §4. α, Melana, 1972, p.398)

(b) Λέω τον άλλε το σύντροφο σ’

I say to your other companion-ACC

(Kostakis 1987, §12. a, Havoutsi, 1960, p.421)

Kostakis (1951: 136) claims that genitive IOs appear occasionally, as an influence from SMG. And indeed, they are present even in the earliest written monuments of the dialect, though, interestingly, only in the Peloponnesian variety. (3a, b):

(3) (a) Απολύκαμε ντί τάι κάμποσε λέξε... να σι δείε τον γέρου 'Κονόμου

We also sent you a few words... to give them to old Mr. Oikonomos-GEN

(Kostakis 1987, §1. α, 1833, p.391)

(b) Α βασίλειας σ’ έδωτζε του μαγέρου να σ’ ακίστιζε

The queen gave them to-the cook-GEN to spic them

(ms. 243, 1920, p. 17)

Tsakonian has a history which is wholly different from that of other Greek dialects: it is not descended from the Koine, but from a variety of ancient Laconian. It is thus considered a conservative dialect, preserving a large number of phonological, morphological and syntactic archaisms. In this context therefore, the accusative realisation of the IO could be considered an archaic retention. Alternatively, the accusative in Tsakonian could be seen as an independent evolution, diverging from Koine Greek, which, in this area, seemed to favour the genitive. However, the fact that the case system of
Tsakonian is a very reduced one (there are no case distinctions in oblique personal pronouns and very little in nouns, only in the singular of the definite article) renders the traditional description of Tsakonian syntax problematic, and thus more fieldwork is required in order to settle the status of IO realisation in this dialect.

2.1.2 Mani

Mani presents a unique situation, in that accusative IO objects appear only with 1st and 2nd person clitic pronouns (4a, b), but not with 3rd person pronouns or with full lexical phrases (4c, d) (Bassea to appear b)⁷. This happens only in the speech of western Inner Mani (Mesa Mani)⁸, one of the two sub-dialects of Maniot.

(4)   (a) Θα με δώσεις λιγά σωμί
       You will give me-ACC some bread

       (b) Δε ζε τό 'πα
           I didn’t tell you-ACC

       (c) Φαϊ δεν είχα να δουν αφήκου
           I didn’t have any food to leave them-GEN

       (d) Τα φέρνανε του δασκάλωνε
           They brought them to the teachers-GEN
           (Bassea-Bezantakou to appear a)

The supposition that the phenomenon might have been more widespread in Mani in the past is not supported by earlier documents⁹ (5)- only Inner Mani presents it.

(5)   (a) ἔδωσε μου τὸ δικό του να τὸ ὀρίζω
       He gave me-GEN his [field] to own
       (Skopetees 1950, XII, 1677)

       (b) νὰ μοῦ δίδου τὴν ἀποκοπὴ μου
           That they give me-GEN my share
           (Skopetees 1950, XXVI, 1733)

The appearance of accusative IOs in a second Peloponnesian dialect, which, moreover, is generally considered a conservative and isolated one, raises even more questions concerning the realisation of the indirect object in earlier
Greek in the Peloponnese. As already discussed in Lendari & Manolessou (2003) there is a discrepancy between the main literary source from the period, the Chronicle of the Morea, which, like most vernacular medieval texts (cf. Trapp 1965) shows fluctuation between genitive and accusative\textsuperscript{10}, and the few non-literary documents (Kleinchroniken, wills, private letters) of Peloponnesian origin, which exhibit the genitive exclusively.

2.1.3 Standard Modern Greek in general

Accusative IOs may appear (albeit rarely) in Peloponnesian dialectal speech even nowadays (Pantelidis p.c.), and they occasionally crop up in 18\textsuperscript{th} c. documents (6a,b). On the contrary, earlier documents from the area show only genitive, as was established through additional research in 17\textsuperscript{th} c. monastery archives (7a, b)\textsuperscript{11}.

(6) (a) ἀπὸ τὸ ποτιστικὸν μερίδιον τοῦ Νικολοῦ, ὅποι τὸν λείπει, ὅποι δὲν εἶχεν ὁ Θανάσης νὰ τοῦ τὸ σώσῃ

(Giannaropoulou 1970, 50, 1792)

From the irrigation share of Nikolos, which is lacking him-ACC, which Thanasis did not have to give him-GEN

(b) μὲ ἐδωσαν ἐν κομμάτι χωράφι κείμενον εἰς τὴν θέσιν λεγομένην ὑλήν... ὅθεν... ζητῶ νὰ μοῦ παραχωριστῇ

(Giannaropoulou 1970, 56, 1835)

They gave me a plot of land in the area called Ili... which I ask that it be delivered to me-GEN

(7) (a) γιὰ νὰ μὴν ἔχωμε ἁσπαρά νὰ τοῦ δώσωμε τοῦ ἐπονομάζουμε τὸ χωράφι

(Gritsopoulos 1950, 6, 1645)

Since we did not have money to give him-GEN we sold him-GEN the field

(b) μοῦ ἐδωσαν οἱ πατέρες τοῦ μοναστηρίου

(Gritsopoulos 1958, II.B.33, 1694)

The fathers of the monastery gave me-GEN

In order to interpret this discrepancy both with the standard view that the Peloponnese is an invariably genitive IO area and with the evidence of earlier documents which do show it to be so, one has to go back to the formation of Standard MG. In an article written in 1936, Manolis Triantafyllidis, one of its main researchers and normalisers, claims that even in Athens it was possible to
hear accusative IOs from older speakers and that this usage was widespread in newspapers and literary writings of various provenance and must be consciously eradicated:

'Ακόμη καί ώς τίς μέρες μας ἀκούεις κανείς καί ἀκούει ἀκόμη καί σήμερα -

ὁχί μόνο ἀπὸ νεόφηρους βόρειους ἄλλα καί ἀπὸ ἐγκαταστημένους ἀπὸ

tρεῖς γενεές στὴν Ἀθήνα- να μεταχειρίζονται τὴν αἰτιατική... Ὄπως καί να

εἶναι, οὐκ ἔκτισεν οἱ σημειώνοι λογοτέχνες τὰ παρέθυσον να

μεταχειρίζονται τὴν ἐμπειρίαν αἰτιατική. Θα ἔπρεπε γὰ' αὐτὸ νὰ ἔγραφαν

κάποιος προσεχτικότερα τὴν κοινή μας στὸ γραμματικό τόπο που

dιαμορφώθηκε μὲ τὴν καλλιέργεια τῆς ἀπὸ γενεές λογίων τῆς παλιάς

Ἐλλάδας.

(Triantafyllidis 1936: 204-5)

It has long been accepted that Peloponnesian and Heptanesian have
formed the basis of the MG Koine. However, this has been contested in recent
years, one of the arguments being that many characteristic features of the
Peloponnesian dialect do not appear in SMG. It would be perhaps more natural
to assume that SMG in its first stages was rather more heavily based on the the
dialect of Constantinople, which was for more than a millennium the center of
Greek civilisation, and which was much more important, culturally and
politically, than the newly-founded capital, Athens, or the rural Peloponnesian.

Some early demotic writers of the 18th c. enlightenment state explicitly that their
basis is the dialect of Constantinople. Furthermore, the sociopolitical elite of
the new Greek state, and thus the first models of written language, were of
Constantiotopolitan origin- the so-called "Fanariotes".

Constantiotopolitan, crucially, has accusative IOs, and it is this usage
that must have affected dialectal Peloponnesian and even Athenian written
demotic, something that Triantafyllidis (1936) openly admits. One should bear
in mind that most representatives of the Enlightenment, e.g. Korais (9), also use
the accusative, and, more importantly, that several 19th c. grammars of MG state
that both realisations, genitive and accusative, are equally possible, cf. Pernot
(1907: 6-7), Legrand (1878: 136-7), Chryssovergis (1839: 32), Talbert (1874:
10), David (1827: 79).

(9) Δὲν μὲ λέγεις, ἄν ἔστηλες τὴν πρὸς τὴν Βουλὴν ἐπιστολὴν.

(A. Korais, in Prassakakis 1885, p. 18)

You don’t say to me-ACC whether you have sent the letter to the
Parliament

It is thus important to distinguish phases in the establishment of SMG, at
least with respect to specific linguistic features. In the 18th and early 19th c. the
model towards which the language verged may have been one of accusative realisation, and the reasons behind the change of orientation (perhaps even a conscious political decision of distancing / differentiation of the new free lands from the old capital?), should be investigated in detail. Similar attention should be paid to the the pattern of change as reflected in written demotic of the 19th and early 20th c. This change of model should also be taken into account when attempting to interpret dialectal fluctuation.

2.1.4 Rhodes and Dodecanese

Rhodian is a classic Dodecanesian dialect, presenting all the typical phonological and syntactic features associated with this area (geminate consonants, retention of final –n, clitic postposition etc.). However, it is divided by an syntactic isogloss line: the northeastern part of the island has accusative indirect objects, nowadays in free variation with the genitive (cf. 11a, b).

(11) (a) πρέπει να μου κάνει, λέει, κλικ. Λέω τον ἀντρα μου, Γιώργο, εσύ μ’ αυτό το κλικ τι εννοείς; ... Εγώ δεν την δίνω ἄντρα με το ζόρι.
[discussing a potential husband]: *he must, she says, click to me-GEN. I tell my husband-ACC, Giorgo, what do you understand by this “click”?... I'm not giving her-ACC a husband by force.

(b) της λέω Σοφία, αυτό είναι t’ αφ-φαλάτσι το δικό σου... και τη λέω, Ροδούλα, αυτό είναι το δικό σου.
*I tell her-GEN Sophia, this is your little navel... and I tell her-ACC, Rodoula, this is yours.

(ms. 1406, Rhodes, Koskinou, 1999, p. 56, 72)

Tsopanakis (1940) explains this as a result of migrations from Constantinople after its fall in 1453. Nevertheless, it is much more likely that the accusative is the result of the much more contiguous (and continuous) influence of the neighbouring dialects of Asia Minor, and esp. Makri, the port of Livissi. Further investigation is required in order to establish whether these accusative indirect objects appear in other Dodecanesian islands as well10. For example, although this is not mentioned in the standard literature, the accusative is the regular realization of the IO also in the island of Kastellorizo (cf. 12a, b).

(12) (a) Στειλείσκει λοιπόν το παιδάτσιν της εις τον καφετσή για να τομ πει ότις είναι μεάλη ανάντζη να τοδ-δει. Ε καφετσής ως ήρτεν, ε γυναίκα λέει τον.
So she sends her child to the inkeeper to tell him-ACC that it is necessary to see him. The inkeeper, when he came, the woman tells him-ACC.

(b) Τις λίρες έφτιαξεν-με τας ιμιά αρκοντοπούλλα. Είπε-με να την πάω αύριον το’ άλλα ψάρια
This money was given to me-ACC by a lady. She told me-ACC to take more fish to her-ACC tomorrow.

(ms. 1390, Kastellorizo, 1998, p. 185, 202)

A different case is presented by Chios. According to Kontossopoulos (2001), there are instances of accusative IO realisation on the eastern side of the island (Kardamyla). However, earlier documents from this area and 19th c. samples of dialectal speech show little evidence of such usage. If Kontossopoulos' observation is true, the accusative realisations are probably due to the recent influx of refugees from Asia Minor.

2.2. Genitive instead of accusative IO

Since Standard MG has genitive IOs, a variation between genitive and accusative is natural and expected in all areas north of the isogloss; this variation should be interpreted as a result of syntactic borrowing from the higher variety of Standard MG. The strong influence of SMG affects all dialects through education, the mass media and literature and leads to their gradual obsolescence (cf. Malikouti 2000). The factors influencing the choice of the accusative vs. the genitive variant deserve detailed sociolinguistic investigation which has not, to our knowledge, been carried through yet. Parameters such as specific linguistic context, emotive content of the utterance, situation, register etc. need to be evaluated. In the present paper, we shall not discuss this issue; instead, we shall concentrate on other, less obvious, factors that complicate the picture presented by the isogloss map. What also deserves systematic/ statistical investigation is a whether the variation is more frequent a) in urban centres as opposed to rural areas b) in some geographical regions rather in others.

2.2.1 Smyrna and Tsesmes

The language of Smyrna (13a, b) and of nearby Tsesmes/Krini (14a, b) constitutes the unique exception among the dialects of Asia Minor, in that it has exclusively genitive indirect objects, without any signs of variation.

(13) (a) Όλα τα φουρνιμέντα τα είναι κρουσταλένια και φαφρουρένια. Την τα φέρανε απόξω...
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All her ornaments are made of crystal and porcelain. They have been brought to her-GEN from abroad.

(ms. 745, Smyrna, 1959, p.21)

(b) Ἐνα ζαχαρωτό μού. Δωκε η καρσινή και το πιπιλάω, δεν έχω άλλο να σου δώκω

The neighbour has given me-GEN just one sweet and I’m sucking it, I don’t have another one to give you-GEN

(ms. 798, Smyrna, 1961, p. 95)

(14) (a) τως ηζητήσεςε σαράντα γρόσα... και τού 'πανε πως θα του τα δώκουνε

He asked them-GEN for 40 grossia... and they told him-GEN that they’d give them to him-GEN

(b) το κασσαπάκι λέει του βασιλέ: να τας πω καλησπέρα

The butcher’s boy says to the king-GEN: I want to tell her-GEN good evening

(ms. 248, Tsesmes/Krini, 1885, pp. 172, 188)

This is explicitly mentioned in descriptions of the dialect (Kontossopoulos 2001: 120) and appears clearly in the primary sources (Giakoumaki 2003). The explanation may lie in the cosmopolitan character of this area and the subsequent long-term presence of immigrants from Southern Greece and the nearby islands of the Aegean.

2.2.2 Thessaly

Standard accounts disagree on the precise southern limits of the IO isogloss. Thus, Kontossopoulos (2001) claims that genitive IOs appear as far north as the shores of the Pineios river, while Triantafyllidis (1938: 67) places it more to the south, in Mt. Othrys. Fieldwork undertaken for the purposes of this paper indicates that Triantafyllidis’ account is the correct one: Thessalian speech belongs to the accusative area, even in its southernmost reaches. A characteristic proof is provided by the local dialect of the district of Domokos, part of the Region of Continental Greece (Stere Ellada), according to the modern administrative division, which has accusative IOs. Interestingly, according to the older administrative divisions, Domokos was formerly a part of Thessaly, and became a part of the Greek State only in 1881, along with the rest of Thessaly. Thus, for the purposes of tracing the exact limits of an isogloss, knowledge of local history is necessary.

Of course, the statement that Thessaly has accusative IOs needs to be qualified: while the older generations have the unmixed accusative variant, the younger ones, esp. in urban centres, present the expected variation between genitive and accusative due to the influence of SMG.
2.2.3 Macedonia

A major exception in the accusative realisation of northern dialects are the areas inhabited by former Slav-Macedonian speakers (Florina, Edessa, Veroia, Kastoria), cf. (15a, b). Since these speakers acquired Greek as a second language through the medium of compulsory school education, the form of Greek they speak is very close to the Standard and thus displays genitive IOs.

(15) (a) την φωνάξανε και δεν της είπανε τίποτα
    They called her and didn’t tell her-GEN anything

    (b) της λέω «Παντρέψου τώρα»
        I said to her-GEN “marry now”
        (ms. 1325, Akritas – Florina, 1992, pp. 163, 168)

A different case is constituted by Siatista, a town in the Prefecture of Kozani. Older research (Tsopanakis 1950: 298) as well as current fieldwork Tsouknidas 2004, p.c.) indicate that the Siatista area is an island of genitive usage in an area far to the north of the accusative isogloss limit (cf 16a vs. b, c).

(16) (a) λέει ου ένας τουν άλλουν
        one says to the other-ACC

    (b) κι τούπιν τα τρίτα
        and he said to him-GEN for the third time

    (c) ου άντρας τς λέει τς ’υναίκας
        The husband says to the wife-GEN
        (ms. 395, Siatista, 1923, pp. 178, 179, 180)

Furthermore, it is a town without important refugee settlements, and without native Slav speakers. A possible explanation could lie in Vlach origin of the settlement (Wace & Thompson, 1914: 211) and thus the potential substratum influence of Aromanian, which, like most Balkan languages, has genitive IOs.

3. Conclusions

Summing up, we hope to have shown that there is considerable primary research, both synchronic and diachronic, to be done even on such
comparatively well-known dialectal syntactic features as the genitive/accusative IO variation. The precise geography of the isogloss can only be traced through contemporary fieldwork, especially the boundaries within mainland Greece. The traditional descriptions such as Mirambel (1963) – our point of origin for this discussion - are no longer sufficient. “Problem” areas and potential factors of influence have been identified, and some tentative solutions proposed. The closer investigation of this issue will have crucial bearing both on the classification of MG dialects and the research on the origins and establishment of Standard MG.

4. Notes
1 Cf. the survey of dialectal work in Tzitzilis (2000a), and the paucity of syntactic information in Kontossopoulos (2001). However, Greek is not unique in this, as a comparison with English dialectal research shows (Kortmann 2002: 2): "The study of dialect grammar, especially of the syntax of regional varieties, neither plays nor ever has played a major role in English dialectology".

2 Cf. the Dialect Syntax archive at the homepage of the Meertens Institute,

3 The whole issue is discussed in detail in Lendaris & Manolessou (2003), on the basis of a large corpus of literary and non-literary texts.

4 The dialectal provenance of Standard MG features has not been examined in detail. Discussion on the genesis of the MG Koine are usually limited to ideological issues such as diglossia, katharevousa vs. dimotiki etc. (cf. Delveroudi 2000).

5 In the case of Bulgarian, a caseless language, the syncretism of genitive and dative consists in the use of the same preposition “я” for the expression of possession and the indirect object (Sandfeld 1930: 85).

6 See cf. Joseph’s (1983) illuminating discussion of the spread of infinitive loss as a “central Balkan feature” where each of the neighbouring languages influences the others.

7 Thus the description in Kontossopoulos (2001: 79), according to whom Maniot has accusative IOs "with certain verbs", without distinction of person, is incorrect.

8 And in a small area in E. Mani, Kolokynthion. Such forms are attested at least since the 19th c., e.g. μὲ ἀποκρίθη ἐγγράφως νὰ μοῦ ἐξεμπερδέψῃ τὸ νιτερέσιο, ὅπου μὲ χρεωστεῖ, Skopetias (1955, β’, 1829).

9 Cf. the evidence from 16th-19th c. documents in Bassea-Bezantakou (to appear b).
In point of fact the fluctuation is not random: there is a distinct preference for the genitive in full lexical noun phrases and for the accusative in 1st and 2nd person clitics—similar to the Maniot situation.

Gritsopoulos (1950, 1958), Tselikas (1985-86). We thank N. Pantelidis for these references.


For example, Dimitrios Katartzis explicitly claimed to be writing in the language of the national capital, which he proposed as a model in his MG grammar of 1790 «άκολουθησαμεν τὸν ιδιωτικὸν τῆς μητρόπολης του έθνους... δεν είν' ἰκανὸς λόγος να προτιμηθη αυτ' ἢ ἐκείνη ἢ ἐπαρχία, κι ὅχι ἢ μητρόπολι οἶκων, μᾶλλον εὐλογώτερον κρίνεται να τὴν ἀκολουθοῦν αὐτήνα διάλες”». Dimaras 1957. We are indebted to Prof. P. Mackridge for this reference. Cf. also Delveroudi (2000: 51).

In fact, his article was a response to complaints that the written demotic language was “infested” with accusatives. Triantafyllidis refers to Thumb’s description of MG, according to which several MG writers such as Psycharéis, Rhigas Fereios, Zalokostas and Soutsos employ the accusative, influenced by their native local dialect (Thumb 1910: 36).

We thank N. Pantelidis for the last two references.

Triantafyllidis (1936: 1469) notes some instances of accusative realiseion in demotic songs from Nisiros, which he initially rejects, but subsequently reconsider in view of the Rhodian evidence.

As recorded in Vios (1920) and Kanellakis (1890). There is none in the first, and three dubious examples in the second: Furthermore, the early grammars of Germano (1622) and Portius (1638), which are based on the dialect of Chios state that the indirect object is expressed in the genitive, although this is not so in other areas: Pernot (1907: 103-4).
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6. Περίληψη
Το παρόν άρθρο εξετάζει μια βασική συντακτική ισόγλωσσο της νεοελληνικής διαλεκτολογίας: την πραγμάτωση του έμμεσου αντικειμένου (γενική έναντι αιτιατικής). Χαράσσει την ισόγλωσσο και επικεντρώνεται στις περιοχές όπου η πραγμάτωση είναι αντίθετη της αναμεμονωμένης: αιτιατική έναντι γενικής στα Δωδεκάνησα, την Πελοπόννησο και την κοινή νέα ελληνική, και γενική έναντι αιτιατικής στη Μικρασία, τη Θεσσαλία και τη Μακεδονία.