7. DIATOPY OF *pu* BY ITSELF

In §6, a longitudinal study was made of complementation paradigms across Greek deviating from CSMG. This chapter covers the remainder of the functions of *pu* by itself in Modern Greek dialects.[1] It is more akin to a survey, as the discussion is organised according to linguistic function, rather than region. Such a survey has never been attempted to date, and the diatopic heterogeny in functionality of *pu,* as well as the unifying factors in its use, can only emerge after a full survey of this kind.

7.1. Relative locative adverb

7.1.1. Headless locative

In archaic dialects of Greek, a *pu*-cognate can be used on its own to introduce headless locatives—a function normally performed in CSMG by ꞌ*opu.* This happens in Tsakonian with *pʰi,* even though 'where(ever)' is normally expressed there by *okia,* cognate to ꞌ*opu,* or the pseudo-relative *orpa pʰi,* corresponding to CSMG *eki pu* 'there that'.

(1a)   Εζάκαϊ *ṗ'* είνι καταφιασκουμένοι τσ̂' είνι έγγουντε ἰον Κάτου Κόσμο τσ̂' είνι ορούντε του πενατοί τσ̂' είνι παρίντε κίσου.
ezakai *pʰ* iɲi katafiaskumeni tɕ iɲi eŋgunde tʰon katu kosmo tɕ iɲi orunde tu penati tɕ iɲi parinde kisu.
They went ***where*** people fall into comas and go into the Underworld and see the dead and come back. (CostS §12; Melana, Southern Tsakonia)

In fact, *orpa pʰi* is juxtaposed with the older headless *pʰi* in (1b):

(1b)   Εζάτσ̂' ο νηχανικό, *ṗ'* έκ' έχου ο γέρου Παύλο πρώτα ένα μαγαζί, ***όρπα ṗ'*** έκι α πλατεία, δίπλα.
ezatɕ o ɲixaɲiko, *pʰ* ek exu o ɣeru pavlo prota ena maɣazi, ***orpa pʰ*** eki a platia, ðipla.
The mechanic went ***where*** old Paul used to have a shop, next to ***where*** the square used to be. (CostD §9d; Kastanitsa, Northern Tsakonia)

This also occurs in Cappadocian; the example below originates from Misti, where *pu* is also in use as a temporal (§B.1)—uncharacteristic for Cappadocia, where *pu*-cognates are usually phonologically unreduced (*op, opu, ap, apu*).

---

[1] The functions of *pu* in collocation have been excluded from this work due to space constraints (Nicholas 1998b).

(2a)   *Που* τ κλώϊχ, εχ ένα čιράχ.
         pu t kloix, ex ena tʃirax.
         Where *she is walking, there is a servant.* (Dawk 386; Misti)

In fact, locative *pu* appears in reduced form as early as the Turco-Persian Sufi poets (2b); this seems to testify to an early independent development in Old Anatolian Greek.

(2b)   (*xiii* AD)

         يَالى پين ستا پِسلَا يُو پلَاستِكِن

         pᵓaly pyn stᵓa psilᵓa **puw** plᵓastikin.
         Πάλι πήγεν στα ψηλά *που* πλάστηκεν.

         pali piɣen sta psila **pu** plastiken.
         *de nouveau elle est montée dans les hauteurs **où** elle a été créée.*
         Again it goes to the heights ***where*** it was created. (Valed Rebâbnâme)

The presence, however, of temporal *pu* in Misti makes it possible that the re-analysis went in a direction opposite to the usual—from temporal to locative.

   A third dialect with headless locative *pu* is Mariupolitan, related to Cappadocian on independent evidence (§6.6):

(3a)   **Pu** *sma na stykit 'to tu fos, 'ti sma vals futyja.*
         pu sma na stɨkit to tu fos, ti sma vals futɨja.
         *Near **where** the light stands, there you shall make a fire.* (AbrM 35)

(3b)   **Pu** *en pulá luxtórja, at'í arɣá ksymiréf.*
         pu en pula luxtorja, atʲi arɣa ksɨmiref.
         ´*Οπου* είναι πολλοί κοκόροι, εκεί αργά ξημερώνει.
         ˈ**opu** ine poli kokori, eki arɣa ksimeroni.
         Where there are many roosters, there it dawns late. (Pappou-Zhuravliova 1995:50)

And unsurprisingly, given the affinity of the three dialects, this usage also turns up (though only twice) in the Pontic corpus:

(4a)   Εγώ *που* ζω εσύ 'κ' επορείς.
         eɣo **pu** zo esi k eporis.
         Where I live, you cannot. (KandilF 131; Chaldia)

(4b)   Αρ' έλα ψη και μ' εβγαίντ'ς *πού* είσαι;
         ar ela pʃi ke m evɣents ˈ**pu** ise?
         *Λοιπόν να μη βγει η ψυχή σου **εκεί** που είναι;*
         lipon na mi vɣi i psixi su **eki pu** ine?
         *So would your soul not come out (of your body, from rage) **right where** you stand?* (FotD 269)

One more dialect it turns up in has significant affinity with Anatolian Greek: Cypriot.

(5)   *na páme **pó**-ši nerón krió na ton issáksume na kámumen oftó na* fáme
         na pame **po** ʃi neron krio na ton isːaksume na kamumen ofto na fame
         *Let's go **where** there's cold water, let's slaughter it, let's make roast meat, let's eat.* (Newton §7.1.4; Pano Panaya, Central Cyprus)

These dialects all have distinct headless locatives corresponding to ˈ*opu* (*okia* in Tsakonian), so there can be no question of a merger between ˈ*opu* and *pu*. Yet in all instances but (3b), the *pu*-headless locatives are definite—contrasting with ˈ*opu,* which is indefinite. The CSMG equivalent of this *pu* is not ˈ*opu,* but the pseudo-relative *eki pu* 'there where' (§3.2.2: CSMG pseudo-relatives act as the definite equivalents of indefinite headless relativisers.) So headless-*pu* seems to fulfil a distinct semantic function in these dialects.

There are two conclusions one can draw about this *pu*. First, the only explanation for its semantics is an analogical development from its more widespread counterpart and reflex, the headed and definite relativiser *pu*. This is a neat reversal of the usual grammaticalisation process. Usually, the reflex preserves semantic properties of the etymon through persistence. Here, it seems, the reflex has passed the semantic property of definiteness back onto the etymon, distinguishing locative *pu* from ˈ*opu*. This is the only justification for headless-*pu*—unusual as it may be. There is no phonological reason why the indefinite ˈ*opu* would retain sentential stress, and thus preserve its initial vowel, but the definite *pu* lost sentential stress and its initial vowel. The only form of ˈ*opu* which could lose sentential stress through widespread use was the relativiser, and the relativiser must be the antecedent of locative-*pu*.

The second conclusion is that headless definite locative *pu* is an archaism, even if it represents an innovative extension of *pu* compared to mainstream Greek. The ambit of the form is Tsakonian, and the descendants of Old Anatolian Greek—together with Cypriot, related to them at a further remove.[2]

There is only one dialect in which dropping the initial vowel of ˈ*opu* has become regular: Calabrian Italiot, for which *pu* is the only locative form (6a). In Apulian Italiot, *pu* is also in use (6b), alongside *epu* and *ipu* (Rohlfs 1977:138).

(6a)   κ̇αι δύο ποταμοί, ένα εκείτθε, ο Φουρ-ρία, κ̇αι ένα απ-πˮ ώδε, η Αμυδ-δαλία,
        ζμίδζονδο ***που*** τεγ-γε̬ών-νει ʼο παΐσι.
        tʃe ðio potami, ena ekitθe, o furːia, tʃe ena apːʰ oðe, i amidːalia, zmidzondo ***pu***
        tejːoni o paisi.
        και δύο ποταμοί, ένας εκίθεν, ο Φουρ-ρίας, και ένας απ᾽ εδώ, η Αμυγδαλιά [...]
        *ενώνονται **εκεί, που** τελειώνει το χωριό.*
        ke ðio potami, enas ekiθen, o furːias, ke enas ap eðo, i amiɣðalia [...] enonode ***eki,
        pu*** telioni to xorio.
        And two rivers, one over there, the Furria, and one over here, the Amiddalia,
        meet ***where*** the village ends. (HDMS 924:53; Rochudi, Calabria)

(6b)   Τέλω σέμπρε ***που*** πάω να πονώ για σένα,/ τσαι σου να μη πονή για μένα.
        telo sempre ***pu*** pao na pono ɣia sena,/ tse su na mi poni ɣia mena.
        I want always, ***wherever*** I go, to ache for you, and for you never to ache for
        me. (Lampakis 47; Sternatia, Apulia)

Since ˈ*opu* is not extant in the dialect, there is no phonological distinction between indefinite and definite locatives—unlike the eastern outlier dialects: (6a)

---

[2]It would not be a surprise if something similar turned up in Livisi; but I have not found any such instances in my (rather extensive) corpus.

is definite, while (6b) is indefinite. No such functional distinction seems to have developed between *pu* and the Apulian forms *ipu* and *epu,* either.[3]

7.1.2. Bounded locative

The function of a bounded locative is properly relativising rather than explicitly locative (cf. *the place **that** I sat*); this function of *pu* is thus omnipresent in Greek.[4] If another indeclinable relativiser, with no locative etymology, is extant in a Greek dialect, one would expect it to do the same bounded locative work. This is the case for Pontic *ndo,* Cappadocian *to,* and Italiot *ti:*

(8a)   Ν' αὰζ τα χώματα *ντο* κεῖται!
         n aæz ta xomata ***ndo*** kite!
         Hallowed be the ground ***where*** he lies! (KandilE 126; Chaldia, Pontus)

(8b)   εκεί *το* να υπάμ' το τόπος σο χύρα ομβρό εν' πουχωμένο ένα ναίκα ως το μέϸη τ'.
         eki ***to*** na ipam to topos so xira ambro en puxomeno ena neka os to meʃi t.
         There at the place ***where*** we will go, in front of the door there is a woman buried up to her waist. (AravanF 170; Aravani, Western Cappadocia)

---

[3]The use of *pu* instead of ˈ*opu* extends further in Italiot to locatives formed from *(o)pu: pukambu* 'anywhere' < ˈ*opu k an* ˈ*opu, punane* and *pukanene* 'everywhere' < ˈ*opu (ke) na ne* 'wherever it may be; anywhere', and variants of *pupote* 'nowhere' < ˈ*opu pote* 'where never' (extant in Eastern Greek as *pupetis*).

This elision of the initial vowel of ˈ*opu* is reminiscent of the elision of a similar connective, *pos*. In CSMG, the triplet ˈ*opos*/ˈ*pos*/*pos* is distinguished along lines similar to ˈ*opu*/ˈ*pu*/*pu: opos* is the manner correlative 'as' to the interrogative ˈ*pos* 'how?', while the unstressed version, which in Ancient Greek would have been the indefinite 'somehow', takes on a novel function—in this case, as a realis complementiser. *pos* is formed through the phonological attrition of ˈ*pos,* as I have argued elsewhere (Nicholas 1996); in some dialects, ˈ*opos* has also undergone this attrition, giving ˈ*opos> opos> pos* 'as'. This occurs in Italiot (Rohlfs 1964:πῶς), just as it has with ˈ*opu> opu> pu,* although not, it seems, in Tsakonian or Pontic.

The use of ˈ*opu* to express temporal and circumstance meanings, as well as strictly local meanings, naturally persists in Modern Greek; it can be mentioned without further comment:

(7)   ῞Οπου δεν είναι δυνατό ν᾽ἀκολουθήϸῃ κανείς τους φωνολογικούς νόμους, *όπου* καταντά δύσκολο να καταλάβουμε τον κανονικό τύπο, πρέπει να ταιριάξουμε τουλάχιστο το τυπικό.
         ˈ*opu* ðen ine ðinato n akoluθisi kanis tus fonoloɣikus nomus, ˈ*opu* katada ðiskolo na katalavume ton kanoniko tipo, prepi na teriaksume tulaxisto to tipiko.
         Where it is not possible for one to follow the development of the phonological laws, ***where*** it becomes difficult for us to work out which is the regular form, we must at least keep the morphology consistent. (PsichHLQ 155)

[4]Tzartzanos claims that Thessalian distinguishes between ˈ*opu* and *apu* as locatives on the basis on sentence position:

         With locative meaning in the beginning of a sentence, *op* (= ˈ*opu*) is used. e.g. ***op** ki an pis* 'wherever you might say'; ***op** na paenis* 'wherever you might go' etc. But *iki,* ***apu** ipis* 'there, where you said'; *iðo,* ***ap** kaθumi* 'here, where I sit' etc. (Tzartzanos 1989 [1909]:60)

The distinction is valid, but the basis Tzartzanos identifies is not. His instances of locative *ap* are associated with definite locatives—more specifically, pseudo-relatives—which are necessarily not sentence-initial, since they follow their antecedent in Greek syntax. His instances of locative *op,* by contrast, are indefinite and free relativisers; it is a fact of Greek syntax that these are clause-initial. So the Thessalian distinction between *op* and *ap* is entirely contingent on semantics, and is parallel to the distinction in CSMG between ˈ*opu* and *pu,* stemming from divergence in grammaticalisation between etymon and reflex.

(8c)   Τες άφηκα κ̔αι κονδόφερα ’ς τε σχόλε, *τι* είχε εκείνοι, τι ήσ-σα φ-φύγονδα αν δα σπίτ̬α

tes afika tʃe kondofera s te sxole, *ti* ixe etʃini, ti isːa fːiɣonda an da spitja

*Τες αφήσα κ’ εγύρισα στα σχολεία, **όπου** ήσαν εκείνοι, που είχαν φύγει από τα σπίτια*

tes afisa k eɣirisa sta sxolia, ˈ*opu* isan ekini, pu ixan fiɣi apo ta spitia

I left them and returned to the schools, ***where*** there were those who had fled their houses (HDMS 924:56; Rochudi, Calabria)

7.2. *Relativiser*

7.2.1. Simple relativiser

Rival relativisers

o   o p i o s

The Puristic declinable relativiser *o opios* competes with *pu* in CSMG; but *pu* remains the major relativiser of Greek. While Makriyannis' morphology was affected by the Puristic used around him, for instance, he does not once use *o opios*. Even in Tahtsis' text, which makes significant concessions to Puristic, there are only 50 instances of *o opios,* as against 838 instances of relativiser *pu*—a proportion close to 17 to 1.

As a Puristic relativiser, *o opios* does not itself form part of the dialectal picture. However, it became incorporated into the language of dialect speakers in *xix* AD, and the resulting hypercorrective doublet *o opios pu* joins a long list of connective doublets in Modern Greek (Kapsomenos 1968). For instance, in the Marmara texts (HDMS 756), the speaker Mistolis Youvarlakis uses *o opios pu* no less than 9 times in 21 pages (3‰)—although it is used by noone else in the text:

(9a)   Κ’ ύστερα ήρθανε δυο̩ ιατροί, ένας Τούρκος ιατρός, Θωμανός, κ’ ένας ΄Ελληνας, ***οποίος που*** ’ταν αιχμάλωτος.

k istera irθane ðjo jatri, enas turkos jatros, θomanos, k enas elinas, ***opios pu*** tan exmalotos.

Then two doctors came, one Turkish doctor, an Ottoman, and one Greek, ***the which that*** was a prisoner of war. (HDMS 756:153)

This confirms that *o opios* is a hypercorrection, and not a real part of the contemporary dialect; if it was, it would not be restricted to idiolects.[5]

_____

[5]*o opios* in this collocation normally agrees grammatically with its head, although in one instance in the text agreement breaks down:

(9b)	εμείς είμαστε	ένα δάγμα		στρατού,
	emis imaste	ena daɣma		stratu,
	we were	a batallion (NEUT.NOM.SG)		army (MASC.GEN.SG)
	οποίος που		ήμαστε	πιστοφυλακή.
	opios pu		imaste	pistofilaki.
	the which (MASC.NOM.SG)		we.were	rear-guard (FEM.NOM.SG)

We were a battalion of the army, ***the which that*** was acting as the rear-guard. (HDMS 756:164)

The breakdown points to *o opios* not being fully integrated into the speaker's grammatical system—further proof of *o opios pu* being a hypercorrection.

t o

The survival of the EMG relativiser *to* in Cappadocian, Pontic, and Mariupolitan is discussed in §B.1 and §B.2. There are also traces of survival of *to* in Eastern Greek, which is more archaic than Western Greek. However, not all Eastern Greek dialects preserve *to* equally well.

Thus, *to* survives in proverbial use in Livisi (27 instances in MousP). Outside proverbs, there is only one instance which might not be formulaic; even then, *ta* is juxtaposed with the more usual 'headless' relative, the pseudo-cleft *afta pu* 'that which':

(10a)   *Αυτά που* σ' έκαμα είν' ιλλία. *Τα* θα σι κάμου να δεις!
          afta pu s ekama in il:ia. *ta* θa si kamu na ðis!
          What I have done to you (until now) is nothing. Wait and see ***what*** I will do to
          you! (MousT 63)

Similarly in Cypriot, there are hints of a survival of *to* outside proverbs, in Mihailidis' narrative poetry; while traditional poetic speech is archaic, and I have not identified survivals in prose, instances like the following are in dialogue, and this is eponymous literary writing rather than folk song. So *to* is probably in productive use here:

(10b)   *Τα* είπες έν αληθινά, αφέντη, μαρτυρώ *το*
          ta ipes en aliθina, afendi, martiro to
          What you have said is true, my lord, I lay witness to it (Mihailidis 217)

(10c)   Βρύξε, τζι εμείς *το* πεθυμάς ευτύς να σου το πούμεν
          vrikse, dʒi emis *to* peθimas eftis na su to pumen
          Be silent, and ***what*** you wish, we shall immediately tell you (Mihailidis 220)

In the Dodecanese *to* has remained fully productive to this day; in Symi Karanastasis (1974:128) gives such prosaic examples as (10d), and there are several instances from DawkD, from Astypalaea, Leros, and Kos.

(10d)   Έπηε στην Αμερική g' έφερε bι̱ο *da* βάλ-λει ο νου σ-σου
          epie stin ameriki g efere bjo *da* val:i o nu s:u
          He went to America and he brought back ***whatever*** you can think of (Symi)

(10e)   Κατά που τον είδεν ο βασιλτσάς με το μήλον, ηρώταν τον· τσ' είπεν του *τα* τούπεν ο
          άνντζελος, τσ' ήδωτσέν του το μήλον.
          kata pu ton iðen o vasiltsas me to milon, irotan ton; ts ipen tu *ta* tu pen o andzelos,
          ts iðotsen tu to milon.
          When the king saw him with the apple he questioned him, and the priest told
          *him **what** the angel had said, and gave him the apple.* (DawkD 41; Astypalaea)

(10f)   αμμ' ο κύρης της ηφώναξέν της ξεχωριστά κ' ήλεέν της, πως δεν ηκατάλαβεν ίντα
          είπασι τότες, ως και *τα* τούπε το βασιλόπουλο 'ς τοδ δρόμο.
          am: o kiris tis ifonaksen tis ksexorista k ileen tis, pos ðen ikatalaven inda ipasi
          totes, os ke *ta* tu pe to vasilopulo s toð ðromo.
          but her father called her aside and said to her that he had not understood
          *what they were saying, nor **what** the king's son had said to him on the road.*
          (DawkD 247; Leros)

(10g) ῎Αμα νέβηκε ᾿ς τ᾿ αδέρφια του, δηγιάται τος *τα* είδε κ᾿ ήκουσε πόξω ᾿πο τομ πύργον
τος, και καταθαμάξαν κ᾿ εκείνα
ama nevike s t aðerfja tu, ðijate tos *ta* iðe k ikuse pokso po tom piryon tos, ke
kataθamaksan k ekina
When he went up to his brothers, he narrates to them ***what*** *he had seen and
heard outside their tower, and they too were filled with wonder* (DawkD 134;
Asfendiou, Kos)

In Rhodes, *to* survives at least in proverbs, as many instances from Yannakou
show (e.g. p. 55: *ta γapa i karðia t aθ:ropu/ ta kalitera tu kosmu* '***what*** a person's
heart loves is (for it) the best in the world').

In Cretan, *to* certainly survives in folksong (Kafkalas 1992:31); it is also abun-
dant in Psyhoundakis' contemporary translations of Homer into Cretan:

(10h) Τότ᾿ η Παλλάδα η γιΑθηνά με *τα* τσ᾿ αναθιβάνει/ κι εξοργισμένη *στα* γρικά, γυρίζει
και του κάνει
tot i palaða i γi-aθina me *ta* ts anaθivani/ ki eksorγismeni s*ta* γrika, γirizi ke tu
kani
Then Athena Pallas, after ***what*** *he said, and enraged with* ***what*** *she heard,
turns and says to him...* (Psyhoundakis 9)

As discussed in §7.7.5, there also appears to be a survival in Cretan exclamatory
constructions, where the relativiser *to* is used instead of *pu*. As a productive free
relativiser in dialectal prose, however, evidence is slight:

(10i) *Τα* μου ᾿ταξε ο γέρος θέλω...
ta mu takse o γeros θelo...
I want ***what*** *the old man promised me...* (Dound 184; Arhanes)

In all, there are signs of survival of *to* throughout Eastern Greek; outside the
Dodecanese, however, *to* has been confined to the poetic or proverbial regis-
ters—a development which has probably taken place only quite recently.

In Tsakonian, which is in most ways outside the East/West split but is in
contact with Western Greek, *to* survives only in fixed phrases: *ta iɲi ta ðen iɲi*
'what exists, what doesn't exist = everything', *tʰo peratɕe* 'in what has passed =
last year', and *ta oɲi kseru oɲi au* 'what I don't know, I don't say' (Costakis
1951:131). This appears to be a genuine archaism in conventional utterances
rather than an importation, because in Western Greek dialects, there is not even
this much survival: *to* is completely absent.[6] *t o* has not been displaced in

---

[6]Even the counterexamples ultimately prove this rule. For example, there is one Macedonian in-
stance of relativiser-*to* I know of; it is a riddle in a story, so it is both an old formula, and one
which would have travelled along with the story:
(10j) *τα* μασώ, πατώ· *τα* θουρώ, φουρώ
ta maso, pato; *ta* θuro, furo
What *I chew on, I tread on;* ***what*** *I see with, I wear* (Karayannis 1986:30;
Portaria, Chalcidica)
That this is a recurring formula is confirmed by the fact that the same formula shows up in the
same story as recorded in the Cyclades a century before:

Modern Greek by *pu,* which has died out in most Greek dialects as a free rela-tiviser (§7.2.3), and which at any rate was a predominantly animate relativiser, whereas *to* was frequently inanimate. It has rather been displaced by the inani-mate free relativiser 'oti—a Classical word which never truly had died out. So *to* and *pu* have only been partially in competition—although the inanimate predilection of Pontic *ndo* appears to have had an effect on the relative distribu-tion of *pu* against *ndo* in Pontic (§B.2).

*Syntactic behaviour of relativiser-*pu

Throughout Greek, *pu*-relative clauses follow their head, except where the influ-ence of Turkish has lead to a reversal, in Pontic and Cappadocian. In the fol-lowing instance from Marmara (too westerly to count as Anatolian Greek, and properly considered Thracian), the relative clause seems to be preposed:

(11a)   Ἤρθαμε με τρία χρόνια στο Μαρμαρά πίσω, ούτε πόρτα ούτε τζάμ' ούτε παράθυρο
         ούτε ρούχα ούτε ***που είχαμε*** ένα σουρί κρυμμένα: πιάτα, όλα τι ἐχ̃' το σπίτι μέσα, δεν
         ηύραμ' το τίποτα.
         irθame me tria xroɲa sto marmara piso, ute porta ute dzam ute paraθiro ute ruxa
         ute ***pu ixame*** ena suri krimena: piata, ola ti eç to spiti mesa, ðen ivram to tipota.
         In three years we came back to Marmara; neither door nor window-pane nor
         window nor clothes nor ***that we had*** a whole heap of stuff hidden: plates,
         anything a house contains—we found absolutely nothing left. (HDMS 756:105;
         Marmara)

Influence from Turkish (which preposes its relative clause equivalents) is un-likely, given the overall status of Marmara Greek. This seems rather to be an in-stance of syntactic contamination; first from the collocation *ute pu* 'not that' (which is clearly not the meaning here), and second with the circumstance/ con-trast meaning of *pu* ('nor, ***although*** we had a whole heap of stuff hidden... did we find anything'). The following example (for which Dawkins analyses *pu* as a free relative) represents much the same structure:

(11b)   «Με τες χαρές τσας», λέει ο παπάς, τσαι παίρνει ***που*** του δώκασι μοσκολίβανον,
         τσερνζτά, τύπωσιν, ανάμα, τσ' έν' ασημένο θυμντσαστήρι
         "me tes xares tsas", lei o papas, tse perni ***pu*** tu ðokasi moskolivanon, tserndza,
         tiposin, anama, ts en asimeno θimntsastiri
         *"Whatever will please you", says the priest, and he accepts **what** they gave*
         him: incense, tapers, bread with the stamp, wine for the Mass, and a silver
         censer (DawkD 41; Astypalaea)

The infrequency of such examples indicates that there is no serious disruption of the syntax of relativisers in Greek outside Anatolian Greek (§6.3, §6.4).

(10k)   *Τα* θωρείς φορώ. *Τα* μασσείς πατώ.
         ta θoris foro. ***ta*** masis pato.
         What you see with, I wear. ***What*** you chew on, I tread on. (ParnassosA 31;
         Melos)

7.2.2. Pseudo-relativiser

Pseudo-relativisers are a characteristic feature of Greek, used where other languages use correlatives ('there that' vs. 'there where', 'then that' vs. 'then when', 'now that' vs. 'now when' etc.); and it is no surprise that pseudo-relatives are attested throughout the dialects of Modern Greek. Amongst the pseudo-relatives, *eki pu* 'there that' deserves special mention, both as the most widely diffused pseudo-relative, and the pseudo-relative with the most semantic depth.

eki pu

eki pu is the oldest of the Greek pseudo-relatives. Several observations justify this claim. First, *eki pu* is primarily a locative: the expression *eki (o)pu* 'there where' is a correlative strategy, and *opu* does not have to be analysed as a general relativiser for it to make sense. The expression may thus predate *opu* becoming a general relativiser. Second, it is the most widespread of pseudo-relatives; there are some dialects where *eki pu* is the only attested pseudo-relative. Third, it is the pseudo-relative whose semantics has diversified the most; *eki pu* has temporal and concessive meanings, alongside its original locative meaning. The antiquity of the pseudo-relative is confirmed by the fact that these secondary meanings are also present in outlier dialects, which diverged from Standard Greek over the past millennium.

D i a t o p y

eki pu, or other constructions with an expression for 'there' pseudo-relativised, are omnipresent amongst Greek dialects as a locative, although its attestation in my Western Cappadocian corpus is limited to a verse from a Delmeso folksong:[7]

(12)   *εκεί* για *που* στράφτουν τα γιαλιά, λαμπρίζουν αι κασσίδες,/ *εκεί* για *που* φορούν
κουλκούλια, όλα είνται αδελφοί και ανεψιοί μου.
eki γia *pu* straftun ta γialia, lambrizun e kasiðes,/ *eki* γia *pu* forun kulkulia, ola
inde aðelfi ke anepsii mu.
Now ***where*** the glass glitters, the helmets shine, ***where*** they wear hoods, they
are all my brothers and nephews. (Lagarde 21)[8]

The meagre presence of *eki pu* in Western Cappadocian is compensated for in Pharasiot, where the *eki pu*-expression has grammaticalised the furthest as a distinct connective. In Pharasa, *dʒapu< dʒi* 'there'[9] + *apu* 'where' is widely used as a locative relativiser. Three aspects of its use indicate further development from *eki apu*. First, *dʒapu* has been univerbated; there is no trace of the final

---

So (10j) cannot count as an indigenous Macedonian instance of *to.*

[7]Since Western Cappadocian has an instance of *eðo pu* 'here where', one would expect *eki pu* to turn up more frequently; however, one of the most important locative functions of *eki pu*—as a definite counterpart to the indefinite ꞌ*opu*—is usurped in Western Cappadocian by *pu* (§7.1.1); so there is less of a functional pressure for *eki pu* to be used.

[8]It should be noted that the Greek of Lagarde's Western Cappadocian folksongs is suspiciously extrametrical and close to mainstream Greek.

[9]*dʒi*< [eci] < *eki.*

vowel of *dʒi* in the connective. This has not happened in any other dialect; there is no form like *[ecapu] or *[ecipu] attested. There are counterexamples to this univerbation within Pharasiot—*atʃi pu* 'there where' is attested (LoucLouc §455)—but at least in the proverbial corpus, LoucLouc, *dʒapu* is predominant.

Second, the normal definiteness distinction between ꞌ*opu* and *eki pu* is effaced: *dʒapu* can be indefinite in denotation (13a) as well as definite (13b):[10]

(13a)   **Τŏάπου** ꞌα υπά, ένι α ꞌνγάθι ḇρον δου.
        tʃapu a ipa, eni a ŋgaθi bron du.
        ꞌΌπου να πάει, είναι ένα αγκάθι μπροστά του.
        ꞌ**opu** na pai, ine ena aŋgaθi brosta tu.
        Wherever he goes, there is a thorn in front of him. (LoucLouc §11)

(13b)   **Τŏάπου** τζο τρώꞌ σε, μη κνήθεσαι σον άνεμο.
        tʃapu dʒo tro se, mi kniθese son anemo.
        Εκεί που δε σε τρώει, μην ξύνεσαι άδικα.
        eki pu ðe se troi, min ksinese aðika.
        Don't scratch yourself for nothing **where** you don't have an itch. (LoucLouc §423)

Finally, a *dʒapu*-clause can have a head; this means that *dʒi* 'there' is no longer construed as the head of a relativiser, but the pseudo-relative is itself considered a relativiser—which, consistent with Pharasiot word order, precedes its referent:[11]

(13c)   **Τŏάπου**   τζ ομδιέζεις   ꞌς τον τζαλού,   ḇγαίνꞌ αν ꞌαγός.
        tʃapu   dʒ omðiezis   s ton dʒalu,   vgen an aɣos.
        there where   you don't expect out of the bush
        *Από το χαμόκλαδο **που** δεν περιμένεις, βγαίνει ένας λαγός.*
        apo to xamoklaðo **pu** ðen perimenis, vɣeni enas laɣos.
        Out of the bush **where** you least expect it, out comes a hare. (LoucLouc §463)

(13d)   τζε πέτε του σπητού τον αφέντη Ο χότζας λέτι Πού ένι τꞌ οταδόκκο, **τζάπι** αφάμες το
        Πάσκα μοτό τοις τζιράχοι μου;
        dze pete tu spitu ton afendi o xodzas le ti ꞌpu eni t otaðoko, **dzapi** afames to paska
        moto tis dziraxi mu?
        and tell the householder, 'The teacher says to you, Where is the guest room,
        ***where** I am to eat the passover with my disciples?'* (Lagarde 10: Luke 22:11)

These developments may have been prompted by the decreasing productivity of *pu* as a relativiser in Pharasiot: if *pu* was not immediately recognised as a rela-

---

[10]The effacement of the definiteness distinction is a development in the opposite direction of Western Cappadocian *pu*.

[11]This analysis assumes that the *dʒapu*-clause in (13c) is not in apposition with *s ton dʒalu* 'out of the bush'. I believe it is not: if the two locatives are in apposition, preceding the specific with the general in this context (where the specific illustrates the general) is odd.

At any rate, (13d) is without doubt a headed relativiser. Its orthographical realisation as *dzapi* is not alarming—Greek orthography cannot render palatoalveolars, and this is a parish Gospel translation rather than a transcription by a trained linguist. The final vowel is odd: it is reminiscent of the Pontic relativiser *pi,* given the affinity of Pharasiot and Pontic; but there is no independent evidence that *pi* was ever used in Pharasa. Still, there is no reason to doubt that *dzapi* is the same word as *dʒapu*.

tiviser, *dʒapu* might no longer be treated compositionally. But there is one way *dʒapu* does remain compositional where other dialects' *eki pu*-expressions have not: as far as I can tell from my corpus, *dʒapu* is not in use as a temporal or concessive. This is also the case for Silli, and shows that the pseudo-relative paradigm has not spread outside the locative domain of *opu* in Cappadocia.

(13f)   Πείνασαμι, νιαρό ρεν είχαμι να πιούμι, ψωμί ρεν είχαμι να φάμι, φωνάξαμι ***εκεί που*** κάτσαμι.
pinasami, niaro ren ixami na piumi, psomi ren ixami na fami, fonaksami ***eki pu*** katsami.
We were hungry, we had no water to drink, we had no bread to eat, we called out ***where*** we sat. (Silli 116)

Pontic broadly follows Cappadocian in its treatment of *eki pu* in having an underdeveloped pseudo-relative class. With the exception of (14a), all Pontic pseudo-relatives in my corpus have locative antecedents; Pontic thus groups with the other Anatolian dialects in keeping close to the correlative origins of the pseudo-relative:

(14a)   ***ατώρα π'*** είδες όλα, κατ' θα δείκνω σε και θ' ερωτώ σε
atora p iðes olæ, kat θa ðikno se ke θ eroto se
Now that you have seen everything, I will show you something and ask you about it (KandilF 109; Chaldia)

Furthermore, consistent with the overwhelmingly locative provenance of pseudo-relatives, only *pu/pi* is used with Pontic pseudo-relatives; the relativiser *ndo* is not featured at all. This strongly supports the case that pseudo-relatives are locative in origin; there is no other reason for the non-locative *ndo* not to have entered the paradigm, when the only difference between *ndo* and *pu/pi* is their etymology.[12]

However, unlike Pharasiot, and like CSMG, *eki pu* in Pontic has also gained a temporal and contrast meaning (14b, 14c):

(14b)   Έγγεψεν 'ς σα ποίον μήναν ερρώστεσεν και ντό μήναν και ημέραν επέθανεν και τελευταία ***εκεί που*** ετελείωνεν κ' έστεκεν το μαλλίν ατ'ς είπεν κ' έναν μοιρολόϊαν
eŋgepsen s sa pion minan erostesen ke 'ndo minan ke imeran epeθanen ke teleftea ***eki pu*** etelionen k esteken to malin ats ipen k enan miroloian
She mentioned what month he got sick in and what month and day he died, and finally ***just as*** she was finishing with her wool, she also sang a lament (Papad 174; Stavrin)

(14c)   ***Εκεί ποι'*** εθέλνεν να εφτάει κέρατα, εχάσεν και τ' ωτία.
eki pi eθelnen na eftai kerata, exasen ke t otia.
Whereas he wished to gain horns, he ended up losing his ears. (Parot 47)

---

[12]Drettas (1997:349) claims that in the collocation *atora to* (= *ndo*), the use of *ndo* rather than *pu* is obligatory. This claim is belied by (14a); yet it proves, if anything, the strong locativity of Pontic pseudo-relative–*pu*. As Drettas claims, *pu*-clauses in Pontic tend not to have abstract, inanimate reference; so one would normally expect pseudo-relativisation, which relativises abstractions, to use *ndo*. The pseudo-relatives in my corpus consistently use *pu;* but they are also consistently locative, and this is the only apparent reason why *pu,* which is also locative, is preferred over *ndo*.

Mariupolitan has one instance of a pseudo-relative, and that is *eki pu* (*'ti pu*). While my Mariupolitan corpus is very small, the result is consistent with Pharasiot and Pontic:

(15)   *Na si tu pu, γlusa-m t' θa klos, **'ti pu** θa pajs 'ndu ny-su.*
        na si tu pu, γlusa m tʲ θa klos, ***ti pu*** θa pajs ndu nɨ su.
        *I will tell you—my tongue cannot utter the words—take care **where** you go.*
        (AbrM 75)

The Anatolian restrictions on *eki pu* do not obtain for the other outliers. Tsakonian, both on the Propontis and in the Peloponnese, uses its 'there that'-expression in all the functions it has in CSMG: locative (16a, 16b), temporal (16c, 16d), and contrast (16e):

(16a)   ῎Αμα τα ἰακά γκαμά ἰαλοματίδα, **τσα πη** ἤταρ τήνα α ἰαλοματίδα τι κόψωι το τσάβαλα τὄαι νι ξαλήτσωι.
        ama tʰa tʰaka ŋgama tʰalomatiða, ***tsa pi*** itar tina a tʰalomatiða ti kopsoi to tsavala tɕe ɲi ksalitsoi.
        ῎Αμα είχε στάξει καμμιά σταλαματιά (από την άγια κοινωνία), **εκεί που** ήταν κείνη η σταλαματιά θα 'κοβαν το ρούχο και θα το 'καιγαν.
        ama ixe staksi kamia stalamatia (apo tin aγia kinonia), ***eki pu*** itan kini i stalamatia θa kovan to ruxo ke θa to keγan.
        If a drop (of communion wine) had dripped, **where** the stain was they would cut the cloth and burn it. (HDMS 754:173; Havoutsi, Propontis Tsakonian)

(16b)   εζάι τα σύνταχα, ῀῀ ερέτσε το μουαρόπουλε ψόιθε ἰαν τὄυλίστρα, **όρπα π̔'** έκι 'καλινούμενε, όρπα 'τσεράἰε, ενιάτὄερε;
        ezai ta sindaxa, ɲ eretse to muaropule psoiθe tʰan tɕilistra, ***orpa pʰ*** eki kalinumene, orpa tseratʰe, eɲatɕere?
        *πήγε το πρωί, το βρήκε το πουλαρόπουλο ψόφιο στην κυλίστρα, **εκεί που** κυλιόταν, εκεί ξεράθηκε, άκουσες;*
        piγe to proi, to vrike to pularopulo psofio stin kilistra, ***eki pu*** kiliotan, eki kseraθike, akuses?
        he went in the morning, he found the colt dead in the rolling grounds—**where** it would roll around, there it died; do you hear? (CostD §2a; Lenidi, Southern Tsakonia)

(16c)   *Οπά π̔'* έκι ανεμούἰα τον πέτὄε, εκόφτε το κοκάλι τῶ' εδενάε το στήθι σι.
        opa pʰ eki anemukʰa ton petʃe, ekofte to kokali tɕ eðenae to stiθi si.
        Εκεί που πετούσε το λιθάρι, κόπηκε το κουμπί και φάνηκε το στήθος της.
        eki pu petuse to liθari, kopike to kubi ke fanike to stiθos tis.
        Just as she was throwing the rock, her button fell off and her breast appeared. (CostD §4c; Melana, Southern Tsakonia)

(16d)   *Τὄιά πη* 'τα τραβότ', κόφτε α τριχέα, καφτώκαϊ όλ' τ' ανάσκεοα, ποό χτυπήκαϊ.
        tɕia pi ta travot, kofte a trixea, kaftokai ol t anaskeoa, poo xtipikai.
        Εκεί που τραβούσαν, κόπηκε η τριχιά, πέσαν όλοι ανάσκελα, πολλοί χτύπησαν.
        eki pu na travusan, kopike i trixia, pesan oli anaskela, poli xtipisan.
        Just as they were pulling, the rope broke, they all fell on their backs, many were hurt. (CostD §11c; Vatika, Propontis Tsakonian)

(16e)   ***pa pʰi** na záu kopéʎi kaʎítera náɲafeɲɟikó*
        ***pa pʰi** na zau kopeʎi kaʎitera na ɲ afeɲɟiko*
        Εκεί που να πάω υπάλληλος, καλίτερα να είμαι αφεντικό
        eki pu na pao ipalilios, kalitera na ime afediko

> ***Rather than*** going to become a clerk, it is better that I be my own boss (Har 161; Vaskina, Southern Tsakonia)[13]

As for Italiot, Taibbi & Caracausi (1959) list *etʃi pu* (< *eki pu*) for Calabrian Italiot as a temporal connective, meaning 'while' (17a), so there is no doubt that the collocation is entrenched in Italiot. However, the connective does not seem to have the connotation of suddenness of the matrix (= 'just as') that it does in CSMG:

(17a) ***Eĉì pu*** *éχise* bisóňo, *kráše emména.*
    etʃi pu eʃise bisoɲo, kraʃe em:ena.
    Quando *hai bisogno, chiamami.*
    When you are in need, call me. (TNC 94.4; Roccaforte, Calabria)
    (CSMG: ***ama/*eki pu*** *exis anaŋgi, fonakse me*)

The collocation also surfaces in Apulian, as both a temporal and a contrast marker; in Apulia the temporal does retain a connotation of suddenness (or at least, there is not sufficient evidence in my corpus to dispute this):

(17b) *Ma tua pu leo i' ssan ìpuno/ pu fei* ***'ĉi pu*** *'o ttorì'*
    ma tua pu leo i s:an ipuno/ pu fei ***tʃi pu*** o t:ori
    Ma queste cose che io dico sono come un sogno/ che svanisce ***nell'attimo in cui*** *lo vedi*
    But these things I say are like a dream that vanishes ***the moment*** I see it
    (Palumbo 59; Calimera, Apulia)

(17c) *i̯atì,* ***ĉi pu*** *χerèamo/ 'ti s'iχa sto grattài,/ farìamo 'ti mu fènato/ 'ti, nà, tosso mmu pai'.*
    jati, ***tʃi pu*** xereamo/ ti s ixa sto grat:ai,/ fariamo ti mu fenato/ ti, ˈna, tos:o m:u pai.
    perchè, nel ***mentre*** *godevo/ che ti avevo nel lettuccio,/ temevo, perchè mi sembrava/ che tu, ecco, d'un tratto mi sfuggissi.*
    for ***just as/whereas*** I was glad that I had you in my little bed, I was fearful, because it seemed to me that, lo!, just like that you could flee from me.
    (Palumbo 56; Calimera, Apulia)

These usages sit alongside locative *etʃi pu,* which remains extant in Italiot—in indefinite as well as definite use, as (17e) shows:

(17d) *Ćе tósson eporpatíai pu* arrivéspai ***eĉì pu*** *íto o áḍḍose* peniténtis*e, pu íto pléo véččose pára tom brotinó.*
    tʃe tos:on eporpatiai pu ar:ivespai ***etʃi pu*** ito o aḍ:ose penitentise, pu ito pleo vec:ose para tom brotino.
    E tanto camminarono che arrivarono ***là dove*** *era l'altro penitente, che era più vecchio del primo.*
    And they walked so far that they arrived ***where*** the other penitent was, who was older than the first. (TNC 42.8; Roccaforte, Calabria)

---

[13](16e) is noteworthy in its archaic use of *na* to introduce a conditional, where CSMG would use *θa* and a past tense. This is not, however, conclusive proof that *pa pʰi* is native to Tsakonian, particularly since there are other conditionals in CSMG introduced with *na* (e.g. *prokimenu na...*) Indeed, the long-lasting contact between mainstream Greek dialects and Tsakonian reduces its value as an independent witness of the spread of *eki pu*.

(17e)   *ćì pu* pao, *ćì pu* sirno, pu steo,/ sti kkardìa panta sena vastò.
          tʃì pu pao, *tʃì pu* sirno, pu steo,/ sti k:ardia panta sena vasto.
          e **dove** vado, **dove** mi reco, dove sto,/ porto sempre te nel mio cuore.
          and **wherever** I go, **wherever** I head to, wherever I stand, I always bear you
          in my heart. (Palumbo 26; Calimera, Apulia)

Cypriot temporal *eki pu* lacks the connotation of suddenness ('just as'), just as
with Italiot (17a); this is obvious in the ensuing examples, which sound odd to a
CSMG-speaker:

(18a)   Λέει ας πάω 'ς το σπίτιν ν' ασκοπήσω, ίσως την εύρω. **Κει 'που** ήρτεν εις το σπίτιν
          συλλοάται μόνος του· λαλεί ας πάρω την σούχλαν μου αναμμένην και να πάω να
          κάμω παρατήρησιν καλήν 'ς τον καμηλάρην.
          lei as pao s to spitin n askopiso, isos tin evro. **ki pu** irten is to spitin sil:oate monos
          tu; lali as paro tin suxlan anam:enin ke na pao na kamo paratirisin kalin s ton
          kamilarin.
          He thought, "I'll go home and look; I might find her there." **When** he came
          home, he thought to himself; he thought, "I'll take my lit torch and go have a
          stern word to the camel-driver." (Aetos 195)

(18b)   *κει που* μας είδεν νιǫύλλικος, επροσηκώθηκέν μας.
          ki pu mas iðen ɲul:ikos, eprosikoθiken mas.
          When the young man saw us, he rose to greet us. (Loukas B24.60)

In Cretan, *ekia pu* is used as both a temporal (19a) and contrast (19b) marker;
Kafkalas (1995:29) glosses it as 'then, at that time, at that moment', and the ex-
amples he adduces suggest that Cretan *ekia pu* retains the connotation of sud-
denness it has in CSMG:

(19a)   κι *εκειά που* κουβεδιάζαμε ξάφνου εκοιμηθήκα
          ki *ekia pu* kuveðiazame ksafnu ekimiθika
          and **just as** we were talking they suddenly fell asleep (Kafkalas 1995:29)

(19b)   αυτός μ' εβλαστήμανε, *εκειά που* τον επαρτόπαιρνα
          aftos m evlastimane, *ekia pu* ton epartoperna
          he was swearing at me **whereas** I was taking his side (Kafkalas 1995:30)

It goes without saying that both the temporal and contrast meanings of *eki pu*
are plentifully attested in Western Greek.[14]

R e i n f o r c e m e n t s   a n d   r e n e w a l s

apo eki pu turns up in the Dodecanese as a reinforcement of temporal *eki pu:*
apo eki pu> potsia/poki pu. While *apo* means 'from, since', there is no strong in-
dication that the time point is 'after' rather than punctual:

(20a)   *Ποτσειά που* τǫ̈δεν, εφτάγιανος γένητσε.
          potsia pu to ðen, eftajanos ɣenitse.

---

[14]Temporal: e.g. Cephallonia: Skiadaresis 382; Zante: MinA 387. Contrast: e.g. Cephallonia:
Skiadaresis 383; Chalcidica: Karayannis 1986:93; Lemnos: Kontonatsiou 199; Ioannina: HDMS
1203:135.

As soon as he saw the bullnut, he had his health again sevenfold. (DawkD 83; Astypalaea)

(20b)   Εκεί, νά, και ξεφαίνονται και οι άθθρωποι του βασιλέα. **Ποκεί που** τους είδε, λέει τους·
eki, ˈna, ke ksefenonde ke i aθːropi tu vasilea. **poki pu** tus iðe, lei tus;
*Lo! the king's men again show themselves, and **when** he saw them he says*
(DawkD 188; Leros)

This seems to be a simple reinforcement, as *potsia* has replaced *tsia< eki* as a locative adverb in the Astypalaean texts.[15] The other 'there'-expression in Astypalaea is *ata,* a word attested (in sundry allolexes) in various parts of Eastern Greek. As the following example shows, the temporal meaning of the 'there that' expressions is not restricted to the particular lexeme *eki,* and can also be expressed with *ata:*

(21a)   Μντσαν ημέρα **ατά που** ψάρευτσε με τημ ψαροπούλταν του, ξορίντζει τον ο πουνέντος
mntsan imera **ata pu** psareftse me tim psaropultan tu, ksorindzi ton o punendos
*One day **when** he had gone fishing in his little boat, the west wind drives him along* (DawkD 31; Astypalaea)

While other 'there' lexemes are extant elsewhere in Greek, however, they do not seem to have spread beyond a locative meaning; this holds for *aftu* 'there' in particular:

(21b)   *Αυτουϊά απ'* κάθισι θα κρυώ'ης
aftuia ap kaθisi θa kriois
You'll get a cold **where** you are sitting (HDMS 1088:32; Phthiotis, Roumeli)

(21c)   Χάρε μου **αυτού που** 'θελα πας…
xare mu **aftu pu** θela pas…
Death, **there where** you are going… (HDMS 622:120; Messenia, Peloponnese)

It seems that in Astypalaea, the elimination of *tsia< eki* contributed to a functional transfer from *eki pu* to *ata pu*. In Western Greek, *eki* remains extant

---

[15]A superficially similar construction turns up in the Peloponnese, though it is not temporal:

(20c)   Τώρα όποιοι ήταν φρόνιμοι **από 'κει που να** χάσουνε τη ζωή τους, είπανε πως είναι καλλίτερο να μουντζώσουνε και τη βασιλοπούλα και τα καλά της και να φύγουνε·
tora opji itan fronimi **apo ki pu na** xasune ti zoi tus, eipane pos ine kalitero na mudzosune ke ti vasilopula ke ta kala tis ke na fiɣune;
Now those who had any sense, **rather than** lose their lives, thought it better to give the finger to both the princess and what she was worth, and leave;
(ParnassosA 36; Peloponnese)

In this context, *eki pu* introduces a contrast clause, but it is irrealis; since the matrix is in fact a comparative (*kalitero na… apo…* 'better to… than…'), this construction conflates the comparative and contrast constructions.

The other interesting aspect of the sentence is its archaic use of *na* to introduce a conditional utterance, where CSMG would use *θa:* the CSMG equivalent to this phrase would be *eki **pu θa** exanan ti zoi tis* 'there **where** (whereas) they **would** lose their lives'. As noted with (16e), however, there are other comparative conditional expressions in Greek based on *na: para na* 'rather than', *prokimenu na* 'given the possibility that'. So while this is an instance of *pu na, pu na* is not used to introduce either a conditional expression (which it cannot do in CSMG), or a concessive, but a contrast clause, which here happens to be irrealis.

alongside *aftu;* so the temporal meaning may have remained specific to *eki pu,* which was no longer analysed compositionally, and the temporal meaning was not transferred to *aftu pu*. This is obviously a contingent truth, however, and nothing intrinsically prevents a form like *aftu pu* from developing temporal or contrast meanings, just as has happened with *ata pu*.

The foregoing discussion confirms the initial assumptions: *eki pu* is old enough to have been univerbated in Pharasa, to have spread throughout the Greek-speaking world, and to have even its secondary meanings diffuse everywhere except the most remote Anatolian dialects.

The last remaining puzzle is the absence of the connotation of suddenness or unexpectedness for temporal *eki pu* in Italiot and Cypriot. If this absence is a shared innovation, its geographical distribution is odd; and since there is nothing intrinsic in the lexical semantics of 'there that' to account for a connotation of suddenness, the natural conclusion is that suddenness is the innovation,[16] which has not displaced the older straightforward temporal meaning in Cypriot and Italiot. The acquired connotation distinguishes *eki pu* from the plethora of other temporal connectives in Greek.

Why the archaism of no suddenness is not also attested in Pontic is not clear. Overall *eki pu* is much less frequent in Pontic than in other dialects,[17] and there are only a few temporal instances in the corpus. So the archaism may be present in Pontic but unattested in my corpus; or Pontic may simply have happened to have access to the innovation of suddenness, which Cypriot and Italiot did not.

etsi pu

etsi pu 'thus that, the way that' is less widespread regionally than *eki pu:* amongst the outliers, it is only attested for Propontis Tsakonian (22b)—which leads one to suspect a calque from Thracian. This is consistent with it being far removed from the locative origins of pseudo-relatives: *etsi pu* is a manner connective, and can be considered equivalent to 'as':

(22a)   *Ετσεά* πιο *βου* καταφέρτημ-μ' όοντη δη παλοαρρώστειαν, έ-ϙαμνω δουλειές και
κάομαι σταυράκια, γούλη δην ημέρα
etsea pio ***bu*** katafertim m oonti di paloarostian, e gamno ðulies ke kaome
stavrakia, ɣuli din imera
Έτσι πια ***που*** *κατήντησα μ' αυτήν την σιχαμερήν αρρώστεια δεν κάνω δουλειές και*
κάθομαι όλην την ημέρα
etsi pia ***pu*** katidisa m aftin tin sixamerin arostia ðen kano ðulies ke kaθome olin tin
imera

---

[16]The implicature arises straightforwardly through Gricean relevance/quantity: if the contiguity of the matrix and adjunct is emphasised by including the redundant *eki* along with the connective *pu,* then the contiguity is to be understood as marked in some way—i.e. unexpected.

[17]0.070‰ in Pontic against 0.11‰ for *The Third Wedding,* 0.31‰ for *My Voyage,* 0.39‰ for Makriyannis' *Memoirs,* 1.1‰ for Apulian Italiot, 1.4‰ for Peloponnesian Tsakonian. There are 763 instances in the Hellas-L corpus (not removing duplicates), which amount to 0.053‰; whether this is an artefact of Internet discourse, I cannot presently tell.

> **The way** I have ended up with this damned illness, I don't do any work but sit around all day (HDMS 1104:59; Symi, Dodecanese)

(22b) *Τρα πη'ῇ' πααίνα, θ' απορρίξ*
      tra pi ɲ paena, θa aporiks
      Έτσι που πάει, θ' αποβάλη
      etsi pu pai, θ apovali
      The way she is acting, she will end up miscarrying (HDMS 754:172; Havoutsi, Propontis Tsakonian)

(22c) γιατί *έτσι που* μας ξεκληρίζει η ξενητειά δε θα μείνει κλήμα μα όρκο από το φυγιό.
      γiati *etsi pu* mas kseklirizi i ksenitia ðe θa mini klima ma orko apo to fiɣio.
      because, **the way** emigration is decimating us, there will not be a vine left standing, by my oath, with all the people deserting us. (HDMS 787:333; Ithaca, Heptanesa)

(22d) Τουν ʎ'πάμι τουν έρ'μου, *ιέτσ' απ'* κατάντ'σι
      tun ʎpami tun ermu, iets ap katantsi
      I pity the poor man, **the way** he has ended up. (HDMS 895:34; Moschato, Karditsa, Thessaly)

etsi pu is also interesting because it is the only other pseudo-relative to have developed a substantial secondary meaning: it is also used as a temporal. This development from manner adverb to temporal is cross-linguistically widespread (cf. English *as*), and is also frequent in Greek (*san, kata pu, etsi*). As a temporal, *etsi pu* is attested in Eastern Greek:

(23a) *έτσα που* γλάκανε σκοντάφτει και πέφτει
      etsa pu ɣlakane skodafti ke pefti
      As he was running, he trips and falls (Kafkalas 1995:97; Crete)

(23b) είχανε κάνει εκεί στην αυλή ένα λάκκο μεγάλο και *ετσά που* έπαιζε το κοπέλι πέφτει μεσ' στον ασβέστη, χώθηκε το κοπέλι στον ασβέστη, πάει το κοπέλι.
      ixane kani eki stin avli ena lako meɣalo ke *etsa pu* epeze to kopeli pefti mes ston asvesti, xoθike to kopeli ston asvesti, pai to kopeli.
      They'd made a big hole out there in the yard, and **just as** the child was playing he fell into the quicklime, the child was stuck in the quicklime, and that was the end of the child. (HDMS 1281:161; Anticythera)

(23c) γ-υ παράς, *έτσει π'* πέ·σ', τι δε κά·ν'!
      ɣi paras, *etši p* peš, ti ðe kaɲ!
      When money changes hands, what can it not do! (Anagnostou 165; Mandamados, Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

(23d) *Τσαγά 'που* (γ)ύριζε, βρίστσει ένα καλοφορεμένον ομπρός του τσαι λέει του·
      tsaɣa pu irize, vristsi ena kaloforemenon ombros tu tse lei tu;
      As he was wandering, he found a well-dressed man in front of him who told him... (Dieterich 469; Kalymnos, Dodecanese)[18]

In (23c), *etsi pu* takes a further step characteristic of temporals, but not of *pu*-expressions: from temporal to conditional. Consistent with its irrealis denotation, (23c) has PERFS tense rather than PERFP, and corresponds to the CSMG collocation *etsi ke*. The transition is drastic by CSMG standards, and indicates

---

[18]*tsaɣa< etsa ða* 'just thus'

that *etsi pu* was already entrenched as a temporal in Lesbos; *pu* on its own would be hard placed to make the transition to being an irrealis connective (but see §7.4.6, §7.6.4).

Others

Other pseudo-relatives are neither as old nor as entrenched in Greek as *eki pu;* nor is their meaning as prone to secondary developments as either *eki pu* or *etsi pu.* In both Pharasiot and Pontic, for instance, pseudo-relatives are restricted to locatives; when the temporal expressions *adʒi* 'then' and *are* 'now' are modified in Pharasiot, they are not relativised with either *pu* or *tu,* but are instead qualified by with correlative temporal relativisers ('when'): *adʒi fotes* (TheodB 280, 298, 324), *are sam* (TheodB 322). And (14a) is the unique instance in my Pontic corpus of a non-locative pseudo-relative.

The most prominent instances of other pseudo-relatives are given below.

'h e r e'

The counterpart to *eki pu, eðo pu* 'here that', is attested throughout Greek dialects, including instances where *eki pu* is the only other pseudo-relative—*aða tu* 'here that' in Pharasa (TheodA 236), *eðo pu* in Western Cappadocia (Dawk 448; Silata). However, *eðo* has not taken on any of the non-locative meanings of its counterpart, in any dialect of Greek.[19]

Of course, other spatial adverbs may also be relativised:

(24b)   Για να μονιάσωϊ ἐριχναμ νερέ απά' στα μελισσάε, ***αχαμά πη*** ήταν̃, για να μονιάσωϊ.
        ɣia na moniasoi erixnam nere apa sta melisae, ***axama pi*** itaɲ, ɣia na moniasoi.
        *Για να μονιάσουν, ρίχναμε νερό πάνω στις μέλισσες, **κάτω** (στη γη) **που** ήταν, για να μονιάσουν.*
        ɣia na moniasun, rixname nero pano stis melises, ***kato*** (sti ɣi) ***pu*** itan, ɣia na moniasun.
        To merge (the swarms) together we would throw water onto the bees, ***down*** (= on the ground) ***where*** they were, to merge them. (HDMS 754:129; Havoutsi, Propontis Tsakonian)

M i s c e l l a n e o u s   t e m p o r a l

Sundry temporal adverbs can also be pseudo-relativised. For instance, day adverbs are pseudo-relativised in both Cypriot and Italiot, as well as mainstream Greek:

(25a)   ***Πόψε πο*** νϊα 'ρτης ἐσ-σω να βάλης τζαι το ρομανίσιν της πόρτας γιατί φοούμαι
        popse po nːa rtis esːo na valis dʒe to romanisin tis portas ɣiati foume

---

[19](24a) seems to be an exception, but *eðo* here is already temporal in the collocation *eðo k embros* 'here and forward = from now on', so *pu* is itself a temporal connective in apposition.

(24a)   Από ***δω*** κ' εμπρός ***που*** αρχίζει το κρύο, ο Σπύρος το πρωί μουλώνει στο κρεβάτι.
        apo ***ðo*** k embros ***pu*** arxizi to krio, o spiros to proi muloni sto krevati.
        From ***here*** on in ***when*** the cold starts, Spiro curls up in bed in the mornings.
        (HDMS 956:16; Sinarades, Corfu, Heptanesa)

> **Tonight when** you come home bolt the door because I am afraid (HDMS 963:8; Cyprus)

(25b) **echtè, pu** *ìchame bisògno, invèci ìmmasto plen umàni*
exte, pu ixame bisoɲo, invetʃi imːasto plen umani
ieri che *avevamo bisogno, invece, eravamo più umani*
On the contrary, **yesterday** (= yesteryear) **when** we were in need, we were more human (DGC 40; Chorio di Rochudi, Calabria)

(25c) Πρόδρουμους ήτανι τσιράϰ̌ τ' Πουστόλ̌', κι **προυψές 'π'** 'dάμουσα του λάλα τ', μ' είπι ότ' ά̃ν̌ξι θ'κή τ' δ'λει̯ά.
proðrumus itani tsirac t pustoʎ, ki **prupses p** damusa tu lala t, m ipi ot aɲksi θki t ðʎa.
Prodromos was an apprentice with Apostolis, and **the night before last when** I met his grandfather, he told me that he's started his own business. (HDMS 1168:237; Agia Paraskevi, Serres, Macedonia)

(25d) ῎Αδι, λɛj, **σήμιρα, πού**νι καλή μέρα, τσι ταχά, σα βρέχ̌, μη πας!
adi, lej, **simira, pu** ni kali mera, tsi taça, sa vreç, mi pas!
"Go," he said, **"today, while** it is a good day, and tomorrow if it rains, don't go!" (Kretschmer 522; Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

'then'

Amongst the more frequent temporal pseudo-relatives, *tote pu* 'then that = when' is attested for Cypriot, Apulian Italiot, and Tsakonian, as well as mainstream Greek dialects. The wide distribution of *tote pu* is consistent with its close correspondence to *eki pu* 'there that = where'.

(26a) Αι, **τότες 'που** ήρτεν η ώρα η διωρισμένη 'που πααίννασι κη επλαγιάζασιν, επήασι και κείνοι να πλαγιάσουσι καθώς και ούλοι του βασιλείου επλαγιάσασιν.
e, **totes pu** irten i ora i ðiorismeni pu paenːasi ki eplaɣiazasin, epiasi ke kini na plaɣiazusi kaθos ke uli tu vasiliu eplaɣiasasin.
Well, **when** the appointed time came for them to go to bed, they went to bed just like everyone in the kingdom did. (Aetos 197; Cyprus)

(26b) *ti fsichimmu echasa evò/* **toa pu** *immu pedi.*
ti fsixi mːu exasa evo/ **toa pu** imːu pedi.
io perdetti la mia anima/ **quando** *ero fanciullino.*
I lost my soul **when** I was a child. (Lefons 1959:5; Calimera, Apulia)

(26c) Το Σάμπα τα νιούτ̇α, **τότ̇ε π̇'** ήγκι φυάτ̇ουντε τουρ αμπέλε, ν̑' ενιάκαϊ π̇' έκι σφυ ζίζου τσ̂' ήγκι γρουλίζουντε οι παράδε.
to samba ta niutʰa, **totʰe pʰ** iŋgi fiatʰunde tur ambele, ɲ eɲakai pʰ eki sfiʒizu tɕ iŋgi ɣrulizunde i paraðe.
Το Σάββατο τη νύχτα, **τότε που** *φύλαγαν τ' αμπέλια, τον άκουγαν που σφύριζε και βροντούσαν τα χρήματα.*
to savato ti nixta, **tote pu** filaɣan t abelia, ton akuɣan pu sfirize ke vrodusan ta xrimata.
On Saturday night, **when** they would keep watch over the vineyards, they would hear him whistling and the money jangling. (CostD §4f; Melana, Southern Tsakonia)

(26d) Τα μαλλιά πέσανι απ' του πατσί μ' απού **τότι, π'** αρρώχτ̇'σα απού ιλουνουσία.
ta maʎa pesani ap tu patsi m apu **toti, p** aroxtsa apu ilunusia.

My hair has fallen off my head since **the time that** I got sick with malaria.
(HDMS 1168:375; Sisamia, Serres, Macedonia)

(26e)   *τότες πο* ζούσε η νόνα μου
          totes po zuse i nona mu
          Back then when my grandmother used to be alive (HDMS 423:64; Ithaca,
          Heptanesa)

(26f)   *Τότενες που* παντρεύτηκα
          totenes pu padreftika
          When I got married (HDMS 957:45; Valti, Aetolia & Acarnania, Roumeli)

' n o w '

The same holds for *tora* 'now'—including allolexes of *tora* (27d, 27e):

(27a)   *Τώρα απ'* γέρασα θα πιάσου του νουντούλ̃' μ' κι θα κάτσου θα αφήκου τα πιδιά μ' να
          κάν' κουμάντου
          tora ap ɣerasa θa piasu tu nuduʎ m ki θa katsu θa afiku ta piðia m na kan kumadu
          Now that I have grown old I will take my *nuduli* (?) and I will rest and let my
          children run the farm (HDMS 1135:19; Dasohori, Grevena, Macedonia)

(27b)   Εν να πάω να γαλέψω τις κουδέλ-λες *τωρά πον* πρωί
          enːa pao na ɣalepso tis kuðelːes **tora po** n proi
          I will go milk the sheep **now while** it's still morning (HDMS 800:76;
          Pedoulas, Cyprus)

(27c)   *Τώρα που* γυρνάμε, κάτι θα μας τύχει…
          tora pu ɣirname, kati θa mas tixi…
          Now that we are wandering, something will happen to us… (HDMS 787:335;
          Ithaca, Heptanesa)

(27d)   Βγάτϛ' το φεγγάρι δαδά, είν' ντο μερού, τρει μερού, *δαδά πη* γυρνώντα είν' ντο μερού
          nɣatϛ to feŋgari ðaða, in ndo meru, tri meru, **ðaða pi** ɣirnonda in ndo meru
          The moon is coming out now, it is two or three days old; **now that** it is
          turning, it is two days old (HDMS 754:128; Havoutsi, Propontis Tsakonian)

(27e)   *εδά που* θ' αρχινίξει να βρέχει
          eða pu θ arxiniksi na vrexi
          now that it will start raining (Kafkalas 1995:59; Crete)

In Italiot, the 'now that' expression has gone a step further in its semantic development: *arte pu* 'now that' in Apulian has become a general temporal connective:

(28a)   **arte pu** *'o ttoró tu miló*
          arte pu *o tːoro tu milo*
          appena che *lo vedo gli parlerò*
          As soon as I see him, I will talk to him (Rohlfs 1977: 206; Sternatia, Apulia)

(28b)   **árte pu** *éftase*
          arte pu *eftase*
          quando *arrivò*
          When he arrived (Rohlfs 1977: 206; Apulia)
          (not: '**now that** he has arrived')

This means that *arte pu* has been generalised from a temporal connective introducing a present event to a tense-independent marker of simultaneity. So *arte pu* is no longer compositional, but represents a sign in its own right. The collocation thus joins *etsi pu* and *eki pu* as a conventionalised connective.

Pseudo-relatives are a significant category in Greek, giving rise to several wide-ranging semantic shifts. However, the correlative is never far behind the pseudo-relative: *eki pu* means 'there where' as much as 'there that', since *pu* is also locative, and *tote pu* means 'then when' as much as 'then that', since *pu* is also temporal. This is vividly illustrated in the following, where *pu* is temporal, and the *pu*-clauses are closer to being in apposition to the temporal adverbs, than relativising them:[20]

(29)   ***Príta, pu** s' íχa, ti kalòn íχa? **Árte, pu** e ss' éχo, ti kakòn éχo?*
         ***prita, pu** s ixa, ti kalon ixa? **arte, pu** e s: exo, ti kakon exo?*
         ***Prima, quando** t'avevo, che bene n'avevo? **Ora, che** non ti ho, che male n'ho?*
         ***Beforehand, when** I had you, what good was it to me? **Now that** I don't have you, what bad is it to me? (TNC 391.59; Bova, Calabria)

This basic ambiguity of pseudo-relatives may have been crucial in the development of *pu* as an adjunct marker, allowing it to become dissociated from its head. For instance, in the case of *tora pu* 'now that', the connection between head and relativiser is not as strong for adverbial heads as nominals, and the construction can be interpreted as a correlative (with *pu*< ˈ*opu* an autonomous connective); *pu* is thus likely to be detached from *tora pu* as an independent temporal connective. This is a possibility inherent in the temporal nominal relativiser, but reinforced by this and other pseudo-relatives; the looseness of the head–relativiser connection is crucial here.

7.2.3. Headless relative

The headless relativiser function is amongst the first for which *opu* is attested in EMG; indeed, the first known instance of relativiser-ˈ*opu* after the Greek Dark Ages is headless:

(30)   (970/la *xvi*)
         η Θεοφουνού επόθειν πίτταν κ' η Καλή την έφαγεν./ ***οπού** 'φόρειν το διβίκιν τώρα δέρμαν έβαλεν.*
         *i θeofunu epoθin pitan k i kali tin efaγen./ **opu** forin to ðivikin tora ðerman evalen.*
         Theophano wanted a pie and Kale ate it. ***Who*** wore the ceremonial robe has now put on hides. (SatSong 4)

The headless relative has died out in CSMG, presumably around *xvii* AD (it is absent in Makriyannis), replaced by *opios* and ˈ*oti*. So instances of its survival in dialects are archaisms, and are identified with archaic dialects.

---

[20]In this instance *prita pu* and *arte pu* are not behaving as autonomous connectives ('before', 'as soon as'), although they do elsewhere in Italiot (Nicholas 1998b).

Semantics

Inasmuch as it survives, *opu* as a free relative has overwhelmingly animate de-
notation: of the 176 instances in my HDIC corpus, only 4 are inanimate. This
points to the results of an earlier functional competition between *to* and *opu* in
EMG: *to* became associated with inanimates, being largely restricted to non-
subject roles (in which inanimates are more frequent than animates, according
to the Animacy hierarchy (Comrie 1981:121)), and was reinforced in that role by
the neuter article *to*.[21] The restriction on *to* resulted in a tendency towards
complementary distribution, with *opu* remaining animate even in dialects where
to has long since died out.

   This result is irrelevant to the etymology of the two forms; whereas *opu* origi-
nated in an inanimate (being locative), *to* originated in a demonstrative, which
could be either animate or inanimate. Etymology would have made *opu* the
inanimate; that it has not shows how crucial the synchronic grammatical system
and paradigmatic opposition are in determining the meaning of grammatical
forms.

   Just as EMG *to* remained in the lower part of the case hierarchy—from direct
object downwards—*opu* has remained in the upper part of the hierarchy, consis-
tent with its animacy. Almost always, *opu* as a free relative relativises either a
subject or direct object. Unlike EMG *to,* it does not enter into combination with
prepositions;[22] and even without prepositions, instances where *opu* relativises
an indirect object are quite rare, the following being one of the few counterex-
amples:

(31)   Πούρι καλά κατέχεις το, πως είμαι ’γώ ζηλιάρης/ κι **όπου** δε θέλω, μη μιλείς, μουδέ μη
         ροζονάρης.
         puri kala katexis to, pos im eɣo ziliaris/ ki **ˈopu** ðe θelo, mi milis, muðe mi
         rozonaris.
         You indeed know well that I am a jealous man, so do not talk **to whomever** I
         don't want you to, nor exchange pleasantries. (Lioudaki 1971:240; Stavrohori,
         Lasithi, Crete)[23]

Diatopy

Headless-*(o)pu* survives in archaic dialects. There are a couple of instances of
what may be headless *pʰi* attested for Tsakonian:

---

[21]Of course, the masculine accusative article *ton* is phonologically the same as the relativiser *ton*
as well; I would contend it is the use of neuter *to* in the nominative (the relativiser has no
masculine or feminine nominative) that pushed the relativiser towards inanimate contexts.
Although I have not conducted an EMG survey, I doubt this complementary distribution
extends to bounded relativisers; it does seem to do so, however, in Pontic (§B.2).

[22]For a very small number of exceptions, see §7.9.

[23](31) is striking in how close the free relative is to the original locative meaning of *ˈopu* ('do not
speak **where** I do not want you to'); indeed, since Cretan tends to use *apu* rather than *ˈopu* for
the relative and free relative, this may in fact constitute a locative rather than a free relative.

(32a) νι̭ εσ   ξέρα   **π΄οι** νι̭ εσ   τέα   εκι̭ού
       ɲ es   ksera   **pʰi** ɲ es   tea   ecu
       it you.are knowing   who   it you.are wanting you
       *You know it, **who** want it.* (Scutt 19; Lenidi, Southern Tsakonia)

(32b) *Πη΄τα μενίσκοντα, ερίχναμ' ίνι το κότο*
       ***pi** ta meniskonda, erixnam iɲi to kotʰo*
       αυτό-που έμεινε, το ρίχναμε στις κότες
       ***afto pu** emine, to rixname stis kotes*
       ***What** was left, we'd throw to the hens.* (HDMS 906:7; Vatika, Propontis
       Tsakonian)[24]

For headless relativisers in Cappadocian, see §B.1. The headless relativiser *pu*
also survives in extensive use in Pontic, predominantly introducing animate ref-
erents (33a) (but cf. 33b):

(33a) ΄Ημαρτα, ήμαρτα, ντ' άγνα προφέρκουνταν, **που** έχ̇νε απραζοβάνιαν και εξέρ΄νε τάξην
       και πράξην τεμά̇κ.
       imarta, imarta, nd aɣna proferkundan, **pu** exne aprazovanian ke ekserne taksin ke
       praksin temæk.
       ΄Ημαρτον, ήμαρτον, τι παράξενα φέρονται **αυτοί που** έχουν μόρφωση και ξέρουν την
       τάξη και την πράξη δηλαδή.
       imarton, imarton, ti paraksena ferode **afti pu** exun morfosi ke kserun tin taksi ke
       tin praksi ðilaði.
       Lord have mercy, how strangely then act **they who** have an education and
       know order and action. (FotD 265)

(33b) Εσύ τέρεν **πού** θα φέρω σε και ᶘάᶘεψον.
       esi teren **pu** θa fero se ke ʃaʃepson.
       Θα τα χάσεις, μ' αυτά που θα σου πω.
       θa ta xasis, m **afta pu** θa su po.
       You watch **what** I will bring you (=tell you), and marvel at it. (FotD 265)

Pontic headless *pu* (and *pi*) are in productive use: they occur in normal prose,
they are not confined to proverbial or poetic speech, and they are rather fre-
quent—56 instances outside Parotidis' proverb collection, giving it a textual fre-
quency of 0.3‰.[25]

---

[24]Ostensibly, (32a) looks like a non-restrictive relative clause preceding its referent *ecu* 'you';
but since Greek generally does not prepose its relative clauses, it is easier to understand this as a
headless relative in apposition with its emphatic referent, Tsakonian being pro-drop like
Standard Greek. One might thus gloss this as 'You know it, who want it yourself.' Still, this does
not count as strong evidence of a productive free relative *pu* in Peloponnesian Tsakonian.
(32b), on the other hand, is uncontroversially a free relative, with no coindexed referent in the
clause. This is consistent with Propontis Tsakonian being in several respects more archaic than
Peloponnesian Tsakonian.
[25]The one part of the Pontus where headless *pu/pi* is not attested in my corpus in prose use is
Nikopolis. However, the Nikopolitan corpus is rather small, and the following example shows *pi*
used at least in a proverbial context:
(33c) Μίαν **ποι** μαθάν' τσατίνα̇ απομαθάν'.
       mian **pi** maθan tsatinæ apomaθan.
       ***Who** learns once, unlearns with difficulty.* (HDMS 911:26)
So there is no reason to think Nikopolis forms an exception to the general Pontic pattern.

Italiot does not use *pu* as a free relativiser, although one of its free relativisers, Apulian *tʃispu,* is derived from a *pu*-expression: *tʃis pu< eki(n)os pu* 'he that' (Rohlfs 1950:121).[26]

ʹ*opu, opu,* and *pu* as headless relativisers are extensively attested in proverbs and songs from throughout the Greek speaking world.[27] However, the linguistic conservatism of proverbs and song means that they do not attest spontaneous contemporary Greek dialect; this holds even for Livisiot and Cypriot, the dialects closest to Cappadocian and Pontic. The domain of productive use of *opu* is thus Tsakonian (vestigially) and Anatolian Greek; it does not encompass Italiot, or the mainstream dialects.

Outside the proverb genre, headless-*pu* is rather infrequent in mainstream Greek. The following are representative occurrences, and may be regarded as isolated instances, with the possible exception of the Diapontii islands (34e), where there are relatively numerous instances (note that the Diapontii islands lie on the very edge of the Greek-speaking world):

(34a) *Απού* ξέουν τα ʼχουν επιταυτού τα στιγάδɩα
     apu kseun ta xun epitaftu ta stiɣaðja.
     Those that know have permanent sheep pens for that reason. (HDMS 839:192; Samothrace)

(34b) Νίκου, ε Νίκου! *Πο* ʼδιναμʼ του διμάτʼ πώς το ʼλιγαμʼ;
     niku, e niku! *po* ðinam tu ðimat ʹpos to liɣam?
     Nick! Hey, Nick! ***What*** we used to bind the parcel ***with***—what did we call it? (HDMS 952:67; Kozakas, Varna, Eastern Rumelia)

(34c) Ιγώ έχου ακʼστά να τʼ αρɩώσʼς τα κʼτάβɩα κι να λύσʼμι τʼ σκύλλα να ιδούμι πɩο θα πιρπατήσʼ. Του πρώτου πʼ πήρι η σκύλλα, κείνο πήρα. ʹ*Οπου* πάρʼ κι φύγʼ η σκύλλα, ικείνο, θα γέ͂νʼ πɩο καλό.
     iɣo exu aksta na t arjoss ta ktavja ki na lismi t skila na iðumi pjo θa pirpatis. tu protu p piri i skila, kino pira. ʹ*opu* par ki fiž i skila, ikino, θa ɣęŋ pjo kalo.
     I have heard that you should scatter the pups and let the bitch loose, to see which one she will walk to. The first one the bitch took was the one I took. ***Whichever one*** the bitch picks up and leaves will turn out to be the best. (HDMS 925:194: Sykaminea, Larisa, Thessaly)

(34d) Ρόκα τʼ λέμʼ αυτή͂νʼ, για τα μάλ̃λʼνα τσοράπια. Φουρκόρουκα είνʼ *απʼ* έχʼ δυο χαλιά.
     roka t lem aftịŋ, ɣia ta maʎna tsorapia. furkoroka in *ap* eç ðio xalia.
     We call it a distaff, for woolen socks. The *fourkoroka* is ***the one that*** has two carpets (?). (HDMS 789:64: Trikeri, Magnesia, Thessaly)

(34e) πετυχαίνουνε και κάτι κοτσάρες που *όπου* τσι φάει δε τʼς αλησμονάει
     petixenune ke kati kotsares pu ʹ*opu* tsi fai ðe ts alismonai
     and they find some flatfish that ***whoever*** eats them will never forget them (HDMS 841:121: Erikoussa, Heptanesa)

---

[26]In turn, *tʃispu* is further reduced to *ispu* (Rohlfs 1977:98)—although cf. Apulian *tis> is* 'who?', where *tis* is also used as a free relative.
[27]I have found instances from Livisi, Cyprus, Dodecanese, Chios, Crete, Cyclades, Peloponnese, Heptanesa, Thessaly, Epirus, and Macedonia.

In CSMG, *opu* does not survive as a free relativiser even in proverbs, having been fully displaced by *opios*. The only phrase in common parlance where it does survive (fossilised) is the cliché ˈ*opu fiɣi fiɣi* 'whoever leaves, leaves = he/they ran for their lives'. As the following Cretan instance shows, ˈ*opu* in the construction is a free relative, since the Cretan version has *apu,* corresponding to CSMG *pu* and not the locative (**'wherever** they left to, they left'):

(34d)   όδαν ήκουσε πως εφώνιαξα τσ' Αγίους *απού φύγει-φύγει*
         odan ikuse pos efoniaksa ts ažius **apu fiži fiži**
         When he heard that I called for the saints, **he ran for his life** (HDMS 988:140; Eastern Crete)

Relic survivals

Although free relative-*pu* by itself has died out in most Greek dialects, it has left behind relic forms, or survivals in restricted contexts, which are important for the overall development of *pu*. One is the ˈ*opu fiɣi fiɣi* construction just mentioned. Another, more decisive in the overall development of *pu,* is in optative constructions. This usage is widespread amongst Greek dialects—including dialects where the productive free relative has died out:

(35a)   *Mavri na fanì **pu** se cratì!*
         mavri na fani **pu** se krati!
         *Nera diventi **chi** ti tiene!*
         May **she that** has you turn black! (DGC 102; Chorio di Rochudi, Calabria)

(35b)   Να σε χαίρουνται *που* σ' έχουν
         na se xerunde **pu** s exun
         May **those that** have you rejoice in you! (HDMS 1076:48; Nisyros, Dodecanese)

(35c)   ανάθ-θεμα να 'χη *απού* σ' ήκαμε
         anaθːema na xi **apu** s ikame
         May **she who** gave birth to you be damned! (HDMS 804:145; Elymbos, Karpathos, Dodecanese)

(35d)   Να ζήσουν *που* μας αντάμωσαν
         na zisun **pu** mas adamosan
         May **those that** have met us live long! (HDMS 1010:138; Mega Peristeri, Ioannina, Epirus)

Such free relatives can also be associated with single exclamations as matrices:

(36a)   *Αλλοίμονο που* λείπει από το γάμο του
         alimono pu lipi apo to ɣamo tu
         Woe to him that is absent from his own wedding! (HDMS 524:132; Aegina, Old Athenian)

(36b)   *Ανάθεμα που* λυμπιστεί ψαρά και πουλολόο.
         anaθema pu limbisti psara ke puloloo.
         Damn her who falls in love with a fisherman or a bird-hunter. (Yannakis 139; Pyrgi, Chios, Central Aegean)

(36c)   *Ανάθεμα που* φύτευε μηλιά στον Κάτω Κόσμο.
         anaθema pu fiteve milia ston kato kosmo.
         Damn him who was planting an apple-tree in the Underworld. (Tarsoulis
         158; Pylia, Messenia, Peloponnese)

In such constructions *pu* is already ambiguous with its function as an emotive complementiser: cf. *alimono pu lipi* 'woe to him that is absent', *krimas pu lipi* 'what a pity that he is absent', *lipame pu lipi* 'I regret that he is absent'. It thus represents a salient pathway for reanalysis.[28]

The following utterance I have heard my (Cypriot) father utter may also constitute a relic survival:

(37a)   Έχει   *που*   ζούνε,   έχει   *που*   δε ζούνε
         exi   *pu*   zune,   exi   *pu*   ðe zune
         it has   who   live   it has   who   don't live
         There are ***those who*** survive, and there are ***those who*** don't survive.

This looks like a formulaic expression, with the existential predicate *exi* 'it has = there are'; but as we have seen, Cypriot has hung on to headless *pu* in productive use, so this may be a dialect survival.[29]

In all, the old use of *opu* as a free relative survives in the periphery of Greek (Western Cappadocia, Pontic, Propontis Tsakonian), with isolated instances of productive use scattered amongst more mainstream dialects, and with plentiful fossilised instances. In constructing a prototype view of *pu,* with older functions at the centre of a graph and newer functions in the periphery, the free relative would be quite near the core, as both an older function and a function which has engendered several other usages. The elimination of *pu* as a free relative shows that what is older, or has more reflexes in the development of a polysemous word, is not necessarily what is more widely used, or even what survives in use at all; it is as if the core has been taken out of the prototype diagram, with the outer shell left standing.

7.2.4. Cleft
Clefts are attested throughout Greek. Clefts also occur in Classical Greek,[30] so their diffusion is not surprising. It seems, on the other hand, that clefts are

---

[28]But in CSMG, *alimono* at least must be accompanied by a clitic indirect object, making the *pu*-clause look less like a complementiser:

(36d)   Αλλοίμονό *του που* πνιγή στη πρώτη δαγκωνιά
         alimono **tu pu** pniɣi sti proti ðagonia
         Woe **to him who** chokes at the first bite (HDMS 524:132; Aegina, Old
         Athenian)

(36e)   Αλλοί *του απου* δεν έχει ανύχια να ξυστή!
         ali **tu apu** ðen exi anixia na ksisti!
         Woe **to him who** has no nails to scratch himself with! (HDMS 429:14; Karya,
         Corinthia, Peloponnese)

[29]The only example of this construction I have found on *Hellas-L* from November 1996 to January 1998 was also written by a Cypriot:

(37b)   `Twra bebaia` **`exei pou`** `tous aresei, den eida gw... 3erw gw ti bitsia`
         `exei o ka0enas;`

wholly absent from the Balkans outside Greek and languages in its immediate orbit (Aroumin) (Feuillet 1987:37). Clefts are thus a distinctive Greek feature. The only dialect group where clefts do not appear is Cappadocian, and this may be attributed to Turkish influence. There are a couple of apparent instances of clefts in the Pharasiot gospel translations, but these are presumably translation effects:[31]

(39)   τζε σεις είστε σ' άργα ταμά *του* βρίσκετε
        dze sis iste s arɣa tama *tu* vriskete
        and it is you ***who are found*** together in trials/ and you are ***those who*** are found together in trials
        ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε *οἱ διαμεμενηκότες* μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τοῖς πειρασμοῖς μου· (Koine original)
        humeîs dé este ***hoi diamemene:kótes*** met emoû en toîs peirasmoîs mou;
        and you are the stayers (PARTICIPLE) with me in my trials;
        *You are **those who have continued** with me in my trials;* (Lagarde 11: Luke 22:28)

Clefts are attested in all other outlier dialects, including Tsakonian:

(40a)   *ðekapénde íɲɲai tse i ðekapénde aɣrámati íɲɲai **p**ezákai tan ameritsí.*
        ðekapende iɲɲai tɕe i ðekapende aɣramati iɲɲai ***p*** ezakai tan ameritɕi.
        There were fifteen of them, and it was the fifteen illiterates ***that*** went to America. (Har 163)

Livisi:

(40b)   Τούτου του πιδίν είνιμ ***βου*** μας ιξιμαρμάρωσιν.
        tutu tu piðin inim ***bu*** mas iksimarmarosin.
        It is this lad ***that*** has reversed us turning into stone. (MousT 26)

and Pontic. *ndo*-based clefts in the dialect are discussed elsewhere (§B.2); Pontic also builds clefts on *pu* and *pi:*

(40c)   Περιμένω σε και 'κ' έρχεσαι, ξέν' είναι ***που*** περνούνε!
        perimeno se ke k erxese, ksen ine ***pu*** pernune!
        I wait for you and you do not come; it is strangers ***that*** go past! (FotM 454)

Τώρα βέβαια ***έχει που*** τους αρέσει, δεν είδα γω... ξέρω γω τι βίτσια έχει ο καθένας;
tora vevea ***exi pu*** tus aresi, ðen iða ɣo... ksero ɣo ti vitsia exi o kaθenas?
Now of course ***there are those who*** like it, I can't tell... How should I know each person's kinks? (Constantine A. Constantinides, `Re: me tous tourkous eimaste una fara una cara? -Reply -Reply`; Hellas-L, 1997–05–07)

[30]For instance:

(38)   Ἦ που σοφὸς ἦν *ὅστις* ἔφασκεν·/ «Πρὶν ἂν ἀμφοῖν μῦθον ἀκούσῃς, οὐκ ἂν δικάσαις.»
        ê: pou sopʰòs ê:n ***hóstis*** epʰasken;/ "prìn án ampʰoîn mû:tʰon akoúse:is, ouk àn dikásais."
        He must have been wise ***that*** said: "Before you hear the story from both sides, do not judge."
        Never prejudge the issue, they say./ Hear both sides of the argument first. (Ar V 725)

[31]Since the Pharasiot gospel was translated from an unknown Turkish translation, this is hard to confirm directly; but the absence of clefts in any other Cappadocian texts makes this a necessary conclusion.

(40d)   βασιλέα πολυχρονεμένε, άρ' αβούτος έν' **πη** 'κ' εκράτεσεν την δạταγή σ' και φυλάττ'
            τον κύρ'ν ατ'
            vasilea polixronemene, ar avutos en **pi** k ekratesen tin ðætaɣi s ke filat ton kirn at
            Your Majesty, it is this person **who** has not obeyed your order and has kept his
            father alive (KandilF 115; Chaldia)

This is interesting, in light of the fact that Pontic does not have cleft exclamatories (§7.7.5): having clefts in the dialect does not necessitate that its exclamatories also be cleft.

Clefts are well attested in both Apulian (41a) and Calabrian Italiot (41b). Italiot *pu*-clefts are also interesting because, unlike Pontic, *pu* is not extant as a free relativiser; so despite the Italian gloss in (41a) (*quello che* = 'that which'), a free relativiser is not a possible synchronic analysis of the construction.

(41a)   *Ene e agàpi, kalèḍḍa-mu,/ **pu** 'tikanè oriàdzi,/ **pu** dì dzoi sta pràmata,/ **pu** 'a
            kanni ola krusà.*
            ene e agapi, kaleḍːa mu,/ **pu** tikane oriadzi,/ **pu** di dzoi sta pramata,/ **pu** a kanːi ola
            krusa.
            *E' l'amore, bella mia,/ **quello che** abbellisce tutto,/ **che** dà vita alle cose,/
            che le fa tutte d'oro.*
            It is love, my beauty, **that** commands everything, that gives things life, that
            makes everything golden. (Palumbo 47; Calimera, Apulia)

(41b)   *T'* animáli *immone egò **pu** to éspaša, ðen íto túto* karbunáro.
            t animali imːone ego **pu** to espaʃa, ðen ito tuto karbunaro.
            *Sono io **che** ho ucciso l'animale, non fu questo carbonaio.*
            The beast—it was me **that** killed it, it was not this coalminer. (TNC 161.33;
            Roccaforte, Calabria)

Incidentally, the affinity of the cleft to relativisation is shown by the form used in Calabrian Italiot; clefts use the same morpheme as relativisation. In Roccaforte, where the only relativiser is *pu,* there are at least 23 instances of *pu*-clefts in TNC, whereas for Bova, where the main relativiser is *ti,* and whose corpus is 0.7 as large as that from Roccaforte, there is only one instance of a *pu*-cleft.

Clefts are even attested in Macedonia, although the neighbouring Macedonian Slavonic lacks them; so on this level at least, the two Macedonian languages are independent:

(42)   Ου Γκόγκανας στη Γιράνεια κι' ου Μπαλαμπάντς στη Χώρα, αυτοί οι δυο ήταν **π'**
            ξισιούκουναν του ντουνιά στου πουδάρ' ν' απουκρά.
            u goganas sti ɣirania ki u balabants sti xora, afti i ðio itan **p** kisiukunan tu dunia stu
            puðar n apukra.
            Goganas at Gerania and Balabanis in town—it was those two **that** made the
            world topsy-turvy at Mardi Gras. (Papanaoum 56; Siatista, Kozani)

Cypriot clefts

S e m a n t i c s

Of all the Greek dialects, cleft constructions are most prominent in Cypriot.[32] Andriotis (1960:143–147) contends that Cypriot uses clefts[33] "where Standard Modern Greek and the other dialects use the verb alone". The examples Andriotis gives for Cypriot include the following:

(44a) ο τέμπελος *έν'* την κλεψιάν *που* 'ὄει στην συλλοήν του
      o tembelos **en** tin klepsian **pu** ʃi stin sil:oin tu
      A lazy man—**it is** theft **that** he has in his mind

(44b) κείνη του Γιάννη 'εν πρέπει, του Διενν' *έν' που* πρέπει
      kini tu ɣian:i en prepi, tu ðien: **en pu** prepi
      She is not for the likes of John; **it is** the likes of Digenis **that** she is for[34]

Andriotis claims clefting occurs in Cypriot without any motivation of contrastive emphasis—that is to say, the cleft in Cypriot is no longer a vehicle of thematic meaning, unlike other Greek dialects.

Andriotis' claim is surprising. Even if *pu* did undergo obligatorification (§2.2.1) in Cypriot, becoming semantically blanched and more frequent in the construction of verb phrases, it is difficult to credit that the Cypriot cleft is not synchronically marked in some way, as clefts still constitute the minority of all clauses. The folksong provenance of all the examples Andriotis gives is also suspect. Text counts in my corpus confirm this suspicion. Even without counting clefts involving *inda* 'what'—which should be considered a separate construction (Nicholas in prep.)—clefts are extremely frequent in the folksong corpus, Loukas (57 instances in 42,000 words, excluding repeated verses: 1.4‰); and more often than not, there is indeed no discernable thematic motivation for the cleft (45a, 45b).

(45a) Ο ήλιος *έν'*, *πὄ*δυσεν, 'γεννήθην το φεγγάριν,/ επέζεψεν ο τάτταρης, διά τους το
      φερμάνιν
      o ilios en, **po** ðisen, ɣen:iθin to feŋgarin, epezepsen o tat:aris, ðia tus to fermanin.
      It was the sun **that** did set, the moon came out; the courier dismounted from
      his horse, he hands them the order (Loukas B9.187)

---

[32]These constructions are often actually inverse clefts, given the Cypriot propensity to VSO word order (Vassiliou 1995). Inverse clefts are occasionally attested for other Greek dialects, but their underlying SVO order renders them thematically marked, just as in CSMG:

(43) *Ἦδα* ο καραβοκύρ'ς *που* 'χε το γρίπο.
      ida o karavokirs **pu** xe to ɣripo.
      It was THE CAPTAIN **that** had the dragnet. (HDMS 756:175; Marmara)

[33]Or, as he puts it, "periphrases with the verb *en* 'is', the relative pronoun *pu* and the verb."

[34]Andriotis also gives the following example:

(44c) έ το *που* χάραξε το φως να πα' να ξημερώσει
      e to **pu** xarakse to fos na pa na ksimerosi
      Lo, the dawn has come, it will be day (Cyprus)

But *e to pu* corresponds to CSMG ˈ*na (to) pu* 'Behold (it)! that', so that *e pu* here is a deictic collocation (Nicholas 1998b), and has nothing to do with either copula or a cleft.

(45b) Κόρ’, ετσακκίστην το σταμνίν κι̯’ εράην το χανάππιν,/ κι̯’ εώ νερόν έν’ ***πὄν*** έχω εσέναν να γροσίσω·

kor, etsak:istin to stamnin c erain to xanap:in,/ c eo neron en ***po*** n exo esenan na ɣrosiso;

Lass, the pitcher has smashed and the cup has cracked, and me, it is water ***that*** I haven't got to give you; (Loukas B25.22)

In the prose of Newton, by contrast, there are just 4 cleft instances in 12,000 words—at 0.3‰, over four times less than in folksong. And unlike the folksongs, all prose instances of clefts are well justified thematically:

(45c) ꞡáole. *en antrépese ta* mútra *su? enna-n* esú ***pu*** *tó-kames.*

caole. en antrepese ta mutra su? en:a n esu ***pu*** to kames.

*Devil! Aren't you ashamed to look me in the face (lit. of your face). It must be you **who** did it.* (Newton §7.4.0.4; Yalusa, Karpas, Cyprus)

(45d) é. *is tim pollin óran afu tin ekatálaven oti-tum me ta* kalá *tis i kopélla* ***pú***-*xelen, ípen tis o* papás

e. is tim pol:in oran afu tin ekatalaven oti tum me ta kala tis i kopel:a ***pu*** xelen, ipen tis o papas

Well. After a long time, when he realised about her that it was with her good (=seriously) ***that*** the girl wanted it, the priest said to her...

Well, after a long time, since he realized that the girl seriously wanted it, the priest said to her... (Newton §7.4.4.11; Karpas, Cyprus)

So the desemanticisation of the cleft is a genre-specific effect only.

H i s t o r y

Andriotis (1960:144) dismisses the obvious potential source for the construction which differentiates Cypriot from other Greek dialects—Old French influence. Before *xvi* AD, the French cleft is used only as an emphatic, and the dethematicisation of the cleft characteristic of Modern French took place only after Cyprus had already been ceded to the Venetians. Furthermore, as Andriotis also points out, the cleft is not particularly prominent in Old Cypriot texts; so it must be an internal development subsequent to the period of French rule. To support this, Andriotis (1960:145–6) supplies instances from other dialects where the cleft ("emphatic periphrasis") is used in contexts where "the emphasis is more moderate"; his list (which consists entirely of folk song verses) is reproduced below:

(46a) βαρειαρρωστιά ***είν’ που*** ’πεσεν απάνω του

variarostia ***in pu*** pesen apano tu

It was a bad disease ***that*** befell him (Apiranthos, Naxos, Cyclades)

(46b) ο χάρος ***έ’ που*** πλάκωσε τσου κάμπους καβαλλάρης

o xaros ***e pu*** plakose tsu kabus kavalaris

It was Death ***that*** rode down onto the plains (Lefkada, Heptanesa)

(46c) Σαββάτον εγεννήθηκε, την Κερεκήν βαφτίστη,/ Δευτέραν απού το πωρνό κουκκιά ***’τον που*** δρακούνιε

sav:aton eɣen:iθike, tin kerekin vaftisti/ ðefteran apu to porno kuk:ia ***ton pu*** ðrakunie

> On Saturday was he born, on Sunday was he christened, on Monday from the morning on *’twas* beans *that* he chewed on (Rhodes, Dodecanese)

This list shows that the Cypriot use of clefts is not an isolated phenomenon amongst Greek dialects, although it has clearly gone further in Cypriot.[35] It also confirms the genre restriction of such clefts already discussed.

So clefting is an established means of emphasis in Cypriot; it is much more prevalent than in Balkan Greek (cf. the count of 0.3‰ for Cypriot prose with 0.01‰ for Tahtsis, 0.012‰ for *Hellas-L*,[36] 0.03‰ for Makriyannis’ *Memoirs,* and 0.1‰ for Peloponnesian Tsakonian—but 0.44‰ for PsichHLQ, 0.34‰ in PsichV1).[37] But the desemanticisation Andriotis found is a stylistic artifice restricted to poetic language, as is the attendant more extensive use of the structure.

S y n t a x

Notwithstanding, even in prose Cypriot clefting is more flexible syntactically than in CSMG. The following example is instructive: it involves the clefting of a clause headed with *intalos* ‘what sort = how’:

(46d)   kalá *lalí tis č-o xóčas, allá pu mésa tu elálen* **íntalos *em po**-nna évro torá na yinó yatrós.*
    kala lali tis tʃ o xotʃas, alːa pu mesa tu elalen ***intalos em po*** nːa evro tora na jino jatros.
    “All right,” the hoja says to her, but to himself (inside him) he was saying,
    *“**How** shall I manage (literally, find) now to become a doctor?”* (Newton §7.3.2.1; Tsadha, South Paphos, Cyprus)

The Cypriot literally says ‘how is it that I will find now to become a doctor’. While such a construction is unremarkable in English, the CSMG equivalent, **¹**pos ine pu** θa katafero tora na ɣino ɣiatros,* is ungrammatical. Similarly, the following example clefts an adverb, and would again be unacceptable in CSMG:

(46e)   Τ’ αφεντικόν του είπεν του:— *Ἔσ’ σωστά που* λαλείς
    t afendikon tu ipen tu:—*es sosta pu* lalis.
    His boss told him: *“**It is correctly that** you have spoken”* (=You have spoken *correctly*) (HDIC, cited from *Κυπριακές Σπουδές* 13; Lefkoniko, Nicosia, Cyprus)

---

[35] Whether the VSO ordering of Cypriot might have encouraged this development in that dialect in particular, it is difficult to say. The VSP ordering of the Cypriot inverse cleft is the same as the VSO ordering of the unmarked Cypriot sentence—then again, the SVP ordering of the standard Greek cleft is the same as its unmarked SVO ordering. So VSO does not seem to be especially privileged as a source for clefts.
Apiranthos and Rhodes may form part of a more general South-Eastern Greek desemanticisation of the cleft in song; I have not investigated this possibility yet. This would not explain the Lefkadian song, but I have not investigated that instance in context, and semantic focus is not as unreasonable for (46b) as it is for (46a) and (46c).

[36] 103 instances of cleft `einai pou,` `htan pou` and `itan pou` from November 1996 to January 1998, a corpus of around 8.5 million words.

[37] It is tempting to attribute Psichari’s love of clefting to his being a French national.

Z e r o - c o p u l a   c l e f t s

Cypriot clefting also allows the construction of clefts without the copula:[38]

(47b)   éθ *θélo yatrón,* epérasem *mu,*   *če*   *óti č-an épaxa*   *ya*   *llóussu*
         eθ θelo jatron, eperasem mu,   tʃe   oti tʃ an epaxa   ja   lːousːu
                                               and   whatever I suffered   for   your.sake

         ∅   *pu*   *tó-*   *paxa.*
         ∅   *pu*   to   paxa.
         COPULA   REL   it   I.suffered
         I don't want a doctor, it's over, and whatever happened to me was for your
         sake. (Newton §7.4.4.2; Karpas, Cyprus)

There is no phonological remnant of a copula here: the Cypriot copula *en* would
give /llousu en pu/ > [lːousːu m bu].

   The zero-copula cleft is a construction which could cause major expansions in
the functionality of *pu:* since much of the syntactic marking of the cleft is no
long overt, *pu* in instances like (47b) has no other obvious function than to con-
nect a focus to a predicate. One could even envision *pu* developing into a focus
marker in Cypriot, as has happened with other clefts (Harris & Campbell
1995:160). It does not seem that *pu* has become conventionalised in this role,
however. And outside Cyprus, clefts have undergone no such idiosyncratic or
remarkable development—with the possible exception of the *qu'est-ce que*–col-
location (Nicholas in prep.): they have not contributed significantly to the fur-
ther functional development of *pu,* unlike the headless relative.

7.3. Complementiser

7.3.1. Syntactic issues involving *pu*-complements

pu na-*complements*

There is an instance in the corpus of what appears to be a *pu na*-complement:

---

[38]This claim is made by Andriotis (1960:144), who contends the verb of the Cypriot cleft
'phonologically' disappears; he gives the following example:
(47a)   φτερνιστηρκάμ ***που***   τ᾿   αχτυπά,   έκοψε ϭίλια μίλλια.
         fternistirkam ***pu***   t   axtipa   ekopse ʃilia milia.
         spur-strike   REL   it   he.strikes
         With one strike of his spurs, he rode a thousand miles (*Λαογραφία* **10**:563; cited
         in Andriotis 1960:144)
Andriotis clearly analyses the above as /fternistirkan (n) pu/ '[it was with] a spur-strike **that** he
strikes it (his horse)'. But the first clause is an adjunct to the second; and it seems easier to ana-
lyse this as a *pu*-temporal clause ('with a spur-strike **when** he strikes it'), with the adjunct
nominal moved to focal position before *pu*. This occurs routinely with *pu*-clauses in Pontic, and
is also possible with connectives in Greek in general (CSMG *me mia fternia **otan** to xtipa* 'ibid.')—
certainly in folk-song, with its freer word order. It is unnecessary to postulate a zero-copula cleft
here.

(48) Είπανε **που** δυ̥ο μήνες **να** φάνωμε κ' εκάναμ' έξι χρόνι̥α.
      ipane **pu** ðjo mines **na** ganome k ekanam eksi xroɲa.
      they said *pu* two months *na* we spend
      They said ***that*** we were to spend two months, and we spent six years. (HDMS 756:290; Marmara)

This is reminiscent of the frequent use in EMG of *oti na*-complements. In EMG, *oti na*-complements arose out of several factors: *na* being used as a future marker, as well as a modal marker; *oti* being used as a quotative; and *oti* being used in linguistic action contexts juxtaposed with the irrealis *na,* where CSMG would use *na* alone. (So EMG would have *ton ipa oti na ipaɣi* 'I told him that to go', where CSMG has *tu ipa na pai* 'I told him to go'.)

A similar portmanteau between Action *na* and Linguistic *pu* (characteristic of Thracian) is apparent in (48). (48) shows that the modal realis complement pattern is still productive; but *pu na-* and *oti na*-complements are very infrequent (I do not know of another instance of a *pu na*-complement), and given that Marmara was dependent on Constantinople, and hardly a dialectal backwater, I suspect this is a haphazard local reanalysis, rather than an EMG survival.[39]

The absence of *pu na* in the Greek complementiser paradigm is significant. It is not a necessary result that *pu* and *na* are in complementary distribution in the complementiser paradigm—although Christidis and Papadopoulou have portrayed it as inevitable, because of the complementarity of their putative etyma. In EMG, *oti* and *na* were certainly not in complementary distribution; the combination *oti na* was frequent. The reason why a nesting like *oti na* was possible is that *na* has a double function: as an index of complementation, and as an index of irrealis modality. In certain EMG contexts, like verbs of commanding, the irrealis modality of *na* was not incompatible with the the quotativity of *oti*.

In CSMG *pu na* is impossible as a complementiser because its *pu*-complements are factive: they admit no irrealis counterparts. This is a more restrictive purview for *pu* than in adjuncts, which is why *pu na* is extant as an adjunct connective. In other dialects where *pu* is not so restricted, but holds general dominion over realis complements—as in Thracian—*pu na*-complements indeed become possible, just as *oti na*-complements were possible in EMG. So the fact that *pu* and *na* are mutually exclusive in CSMG is a contingent result—as indeed is the fact that *oti* and *na* are also mutually exclusive in the modern language. This is not an inherent feature of *pu* or *na*—although by the same token, the fact that *na* grammaticalised much earlier than *pu,* and is thus bound more tightly to the verb, has determined the subsequent interaction of the two particles.

Preposed pu-*complements*

pu-complements are not preposed in CSMG; this is a straightforward consequence of *pu*-complements in CSMG not being assertive (§4.4.1). In dialects

---

[39]An alternative analysis of the construction would be that *na* here is a future marker; but this is similarly archaic, and unlikely so close to Constantinople.

where complementiser-*pu* is in wider use than in CSMG, and is used assertively, this barrier breaks down. So in the following Corfiot example, not only is a *pu*-complement preposed, but it is followed immediately by a preposed *pos*-complement of the same weak assertive:

(49a)   μα ***που*** αγαπώ ας ***πιστεύεις!***—Ω αγαπημένη Οφέλια, χάνω το μυαλό μου με αυτά τα μέτρα· δεν έχω την τέχνη να μετρώ τους στεναγμούς μου, αλλά ***πως*** σ' αγαπώ εσένα, ακριβότατη, πάρα ακριβότατη, ***πίστευέ*** το!
ma ***pu*** aɣapo as ***pistevis!***—o aɣapimeni ofelia, xano to mialo mu me afta ta metra; ðen exo tin texni na metro tus stenaɣmus mu, ala ***pos*** s aɣapo esena, akrivotati, para akrivotati, ***pisteve*** to!
But never doubt I love. (here: But ***that*** I love, may you ***believe*** it.)—*O dear Ophelia, I am ill at these numbers. I have not art to reckon my groans. But **that** I love thee best, O most best, **believe** it.* (TheotH 91–92)

Subject *pu*-complements in Corfiot can also be preposed:

(49b)   ***Που*** εγώ για του πατέρα σου/ το θάνατο δε φταίω και ***που*** για τούτο/ κατάκαρδα λυπιέμαι και τον κλαίω,/ πρέπει στο νου σου ολόισα να χωρέσει/ καθώς μπαίνει στα μάτια μας η μέρα.
pu eɣo ɣia tu patera su/ to θanato ðe fteo ke ***pu*** ɣia tuto/ katakarða lipieme ke ton kleo,/ prepi sto nu su oloisa na xoresi/ kaθos beni sta matia mas i mera.
That *I am guiltless of your father's death,/ and* ∅ *am most sensibly in grief for it,/ it shall as level to your judgement 'pear/ as day does to your eye.* (TheotH 199)

This preposing confirms the breakdown of the *pu/pos* distinction in Corfiot (§6.8): since *pu* and *pos* can appear in the same syntactic contexts, and are no longer differentiated semantically or pragmatically, the other syntactic differences between *pu*- and *pos*-complements disappear.

The same tendency turns up in Psichari—with the added feature that the preposed complements here, though topicalised, are not only not presupposed, but are in fact negated:[40]

(49c)   ***Που*** είναι ντροπή να γράφῃ κανείς την εθνική του γλώσσα, ***που*** η γλώσσα μας είναι βάρβαρη, ποιος Γραικός θα τολμήσῃ πια σήμερα να το πῃ και ποιος Γραικός να τἀκούσῃ;
pu ine dropi na ɣrafi kanis tin eθniki tu ɣlosa, ***pu*** i ɣlosa mas ine varvari, pios ɣrekos θa tolmisi pia simera na to pi ke pios ɣrekos na t akusi?
That *it is a shame for someone to write in his national language,* ***that*** *our language is barbaric—what Greek would today dare say so, and what Greek would dare hear it?* (PsichHLQ 157)

---

[40]There are instances where preposed *pu*-complements are ambiguous with other usages of *pu*. These present a less severe challenge to the semantic status of *pu*, relative to CSMG. Thus, in the following instance in a Cypriot folk song, *pu* could be analysed as a temporal ('now that...') as well as an emotive complementiser:

(49d)   ***που*** φεύκω 'που την γειτονιάν, τωρά χαρήτε ούλοι.
pu fefko pu tin ɣitoɲan, tora xarite uli.
That I am leaving from the neighbourhood, now all of you rejoice. (Loukas B17.36)

At any rate, given the freer syntax associated with the metrical constraints on the poetic register, such examples do not count for much.

So the syntax of *pu* changes where its semantics changes, and is not autonomous from its paradigmatic standing.

7.3.2. Subject complements

While CSMG prefers *to oti* to introduce subject complements, and nominalisations in general other than predicate complements, colloquial Greek and the dialects overwhelmingly favour *pu* in this function:

(50a)   μα 'να κακό που έκαμες συχωρεμούς δεν έχει:/ **που** τρούπησες τη φύλακη, της Πύλος το μπουντρούμι.

ma na kako pu ekames sixoremus ðen exi:/ **pu** trupises ti filaki, tis pilos to budrumi.

But one evil deed you have done allows no forgiveness: **that** you have made a hole in the gaol, in the dungeon of Pylos. (Tarsoulis 178; Pylia, Messenia, Peloponnese)

(50b)   Μου 'σπασε καημένη η μία ποδαρίτσα και δε μπορώ να κάμω δουλειά μου… Φτούνο, ή **που** μου κόπηκε και το σκοινί του ποδαρικού και δε βρίσκω κανά κομποσκοίνι να do ξαναφκειάσω

mu spase kaimeni i mia poðaritsa ke ðe boro na kamo ðulia mu… ftuno, i **pu** mu kopike ke to skini tu poðariku ke ðe vrisko kana koboskini na do ksanafkiaso

One of my distaffs broke, dear, and I can't do my work… That, or **the fact that** the rope off the leg of my piece of furniture has broken, and I can't find a knotted rope to fix it (HDMS 818:170; Verestia, Triphyllia, Messenia, Peloponnese)

(50c)   Μουναχά ώρα τ-ς καμπάνας ηύραν μπρουστά τουν κἄτ' πρα·σ-νάδης, που άλλου **π'** σας λέγου, τσ' άλλου να τ-ς βλέπατη!

munaxa ora ts kabanas ivran brusta tun kat prašnaðis, pu alu **p** sas leɣu, tš alu na ts vlepati!

Only at the hour the bells toll did they find in front of them such greenery, that it is one thing for me to tell you about it, and another for you to actually see it ('that it is one thing **that** I am telling you, and another thing that you should see them') (Anagnostou 168; Mandamados, Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

(50d)   Αμ' άλτο **που** σου το λέμεν, τσερά, τσ' άλτο να το δης.

am alto **pu** su to lemen, tsera, ts alto na to ðis.

*But it is one thing **for** us **to** tell you of it, my lady, and another for you to see it.* (DawkD 109; Astypalaea, Dodecanese)

(50e)   Ημάς ένα ήτανι του παράπουνό μας, **απ'** αργήσαμι.

imas ena itani tu parapuno mas, **ap** arɣisami.

There was just one complaint that we had, **that** we were late. (Rigas 1962:16; Skiathos, Thessaly)

(50f)   Ένα μοναχά με σκιάζει, **που** εσύ δεν μπορείς να ιδείς θάλασσα.

ena monaxa me skiazi, **pu** esi ðen boris na iðis θalasa.

Only one thing worries me, **that** you cannot see the sea. (MinB 455; Lithakia, Zante, Heptanesa)

(50g)   θάμα θεού **που** ξεγλύτωσε από το ναυάγιο

θama θeu **pu** kseɣlitose apo to navaɣio

[It was] a miracle of God **that** he survived the shipwreck (HDMS 614:42; Paros, Cyclades)

since-*constructions*

The 'since'-construction with an antecedent (*exi/ine* TIME.LENGTH *pu* X =
it.has/it.is TIME.LENGTH that X 'it has been TIME.LENGTH since/that X') appears
in various Greek dialects and CSMG. Here *pu* is most easily treated as a temporal relativiser ('it has been TIME.LENGTH during.which X').

(51a)   *Είναι* τώρα δυο-τρεις μέρες ***που*** 'χει φαγωθεί με το Θόδωρο.
         ine tora ðio tris meres ***pu*** xi faγoθi me to θoðoro.
         It has been now been two or three days ***that*** she has been at odds with
         Theodore.
         It's two or three days now since she's been fed up with Theodore. (Tah 12)

(51b)   `Exei` twra gurw sta 5 xrovia `pou` eimai stnv hellas kai .. gia to
         megalutero meros autwv twv 5 xrovwv, ntav polu snmavtikn autn n
         nlekrovikn listouda gia' meva.
         Έχει τώρα γύρω στα πέντε χρόνια ***που*** είμαι στην *Hellas* και... για το μεγαλύτερο
         μέρος αυτών των πέντε χρόνων, ήταν πολύ σημαντική αυτή η ηλεκρονική λιστούδα για
         μένα.
         exi tora γiro sta pede xronia ***pu*** ime stin *Hellas* ke... γia to meγalitero meros afton
         ton pede xronon, itan poli simadiki afti i ilekroniki *(sic)* listuða γia mena.
         It has been now been around five years ***that*** I have been subscribed to *Hellas*
         and... for the greater part of those five years, this little mailing list has been very
         important to me. (Elia Petrou: `Apoxairetizw…`; Hellas-L, 1996–05–10)

In Apulian Italiot, however, this expression is not always treated as a relativisation: *pu* is the only relativiser extant in the dialect, yet the construction there appears, not only with *pu* (52a), but also with the complementiser *ti* (52b).

(52a)   Έχει πλέο π-που χρόνο, ***που*** 'ε σ-σε τωρώ
         exi pleo pːu xrono, ***pu*** e sːe toro
         It has been more than a year ***that*** I have not seen you (Karanastasis 1991:που)

(52b)   ***Echi*** *tris ore* ***ti*** *o mèno, ce en ertomèna ancora*
         exi tris ore ***ti*** o meno, tʃe en ertomena aŋkora
         Ha *tre ore* ***che*** *lo aspetto, e non è venuto*
         It has been three hours ***that*** I have been waiting for him, and he has not
         come (Cassoni 1990 [1937]:116)[41]

However, the non-punctual meaning involved is marked for *pu* (§7.4.6), and a temporal meaning is unattested for *ti* in Italiot (although *ti* introduces other adjuncts, such as causals, in both Calabrian and Apulian: §B.3.) The most reasonable explanation of *ti* here, then, is as a subject complementiser.

   This is corroborated by the evidence from Cypriot. There is a related construction, popular in that dialect but also extant in CSMG: *exi apo X pu Y* 'it.has

---

[41]That the expression appears also with *ka* is no proof one way or the other of the status of *pu,*
since *ka* in Apulian is both a relativiser and a complementiser:
(52c)   Πόσον *έχει* *κα* σε παρακαλώ/ να κάω ν' αλλάτσω άσ' είττα μαddία;
         poson ***exi*** ***ka*** se parakalo/ na kao n alːatso as itːa madːia?
         Πόσος καιρός ***είναι*** ***που*** *σε παρακαλώ/ να δώσω ν' αγοράσω αυτά τα μαλλιά;*
         posos keros ***ine*** ***pu*** se parakalo/ na ðoso n aγoraso afta ta malia?
         How long ***is it that*** *I beg you/ to let me buy this hair* (HellSI 13)

since X that Y = Y has been going on since X'—best described as a special case of subject complementation. In this instance, the *pu*-clause is the subject of the existential predicate *exi* 'it has', interpreted as a temporal predicate: 'it has been the case'.[42] So in (53a), for instance, 'beasts have surrounded me' is the subject of the predicate 'has been (the case) since then'.

(53a) Ἔσιει που τότες, βρε Χαρή, που την ημέραν τζιείνην/ **που** με δκιαζώννουσιν θερκά
      eʃi pu totes, vre xari, pu tin imeran dʒinin,/ ***pu*** me ðkiazonːusin θerka
      It has been since then, Haris, since that day, ***that*** beasts have surrounded me
      (Lipertis 233)

(53b) ἔσει'που την Ανάστασιν **πȭ'** άπλυτα τ' αντζειά μου.
      eʃi pu tin anastasin ***po*** n aplita t andʒja mu.
      It has been since Easter ***that*** my vessels have been unwashed. (Loukas 43.73)

If this construction involves a complementiser, the closely related *exi/ine X pu Y* construction we have been considering can be analysed similarly.

    This construction is also in place in Lesbos. Here, however, it has adopted a much more extensive role, taking part in auxiliary-like formations. Anagnostou (1903:48) goes so far as to claim that it is the indigenous way of expressing the past continuous, giving the following examples:

(54a) έχ'   που   χουρίζ   ως τώρα   δυο γ-ναίτσης
      eç   ***pu***   xuriz   os tora   ðio ɣnetsis
      he.has   that   he.divorces   until now   two wives
      He has divorced two wives by now

(54b) έχου   'που   ζημιώνουμη   τώρα   τρία ταξείδια
      exu   ***pu***   zimionumi   tora   tria taksiðia
      I.have   that   I.am.damaged   now   three trips
      I have been financially burdened with three trips now

There are some salient differences between the Lesbian construction and its CSMG counterpart.

- Unlike the *exi… pu* construction in other dialects, the verb *exi* in the Lesbian construction agrees with the subject of VERB: thus, *exu pu zimionumi tria taksiðia* 'I.have that I.am.damaged three trips' in (54b), rather than CSMG *exi tria taksiðia pu zimionome* 'it.has three trips that I.am.damaged'. By making *exi* coindexical with the following verb, the *exi pu* VERB combination behaves like a verbal unit.[43]

---

[42]The reanalysis proceeds something like this: *exi krasi* 'it has wine (object)'; *exi krasi* 'there is wine (subject)'; *exi ðio mines* 'there are two months (subject)'; *exi ðio mines pu irθe* 'there are two months (subject) that he has come (temporal adjunct)'; *exi ðio mines pu irθe* 'there is for two months (temporal adjunct) the state that he has come (subject)'; *exi apo ðio mines pu irθe* 'there is since two months (temporal adjunct) the state that he has come (subject)'.

[43]There are temporal *exi*-expressions in CSMG in which *exi* agrees with a personal referent: *exo ðio mines na ton ðo* 'I.have two months IRR him I.see = I haven't seen him in two months'. But this is the *na*-counterpart to the expression in question, where the temporal expression states the duration for which an action has *not* occurred. In the *pu*-expression, *exi* is always 3.SG; one

- The notion of temporal duration is rather loosely treated in (54a, 54b); they correspond to something like *two wives ago* and *three trips ago*. Such atypical temporals would not be used in CSMG. The temporal adjunct in these two instances can also be interpreted as the complement of the verbs—direct object (*divorce two wives*), or complement of extent (*am burdened by three trips*). This interpretation is reinforced by verb agreement: *exo pu* 'I.have' makes it likelier for the adjunct to be interpreted as a direct object of the 'have'-verb ('I have two wives that I have divorced', 'I have three trips that I am burdened with'), and the adjuncts can be the objects of relative clauses. If the temporal adjuncts are reanalysed as complements, then the *exi pu* VERB combination can be reanalysed as a single verb unit, with the valency of VERB. This would make it look a lot more like an auxiliary formation.

- The Lesbian construction puts the temporal adjunct at the end of the phrase, rather than between *exo* and the *pu*-phrase, as in CSMG. This is consistent with sentential focus being drawn to the temporal adjunct—or alternatively, with the predicate of the phrase being topicalised. If the construction is indeed on its way to becoming an auxiliary formation, it would make sense for the verb to be adjoined to the *exi pu* element, so that the *exi pu* VERB phrase forms a single unit, rather than the verb being contrastively emphasised relative to the *exo pu* TEMPORAL unit.

  Now, while other Greek dialects do have topicalised versions of the *exi… pu* construction—and indeed, of the *exo… pu* construction (55a), they displace the adjunct to the left of *exo,* not the right:

(55a)   Σαράντα μερονύχτια—*ἔχω που* πορπατώ.
        saranda meronixtia—***exo pu*** porpato.
        It has been forty days and nights ***that*** I have been walking. ('Forty days I have that I walk') (Dieterich 353; Sifnos, Cyclades)

(55b)   Λία χουόνι̯α ἴ̯ *ἔχ̑ απού* παδέεν'κε
        lia xuoɲa ž ***eç apu*** padeefke
        It has been only a few years ***that*** he has been married ('A few years he has that he married') (HDMS 839:131; Samothrace)

(55c)   Στάθη τέσσερα χρόνια εκεί κι' ολίγον καιρόν *έχει οπού* 'ρθε.
        staθi tesera xronia eki ki oliɣon keron ***exi opu*** rθe.
        He stayed four years there and ***it has been*** a small time ***that*** he has came.
        He stayed four years there and has only just come back. (MakM 154)

  Topicalisations like these are consistent with the temporal expression being reanalysed as the direct object of *exi/exo,* and thus fronted. As alluded above, the *exo* construction, with its non-3.SG

---

cannot say in CSMG **exo ðio mines pu ðen ton vlepo* 'I have two months that I do not see him = I haven't seen him in two months'.

subject, also encourages such reanalysis. Moving the putative direct object of *exo* after the *pu*-expression, however, would not be consistent with Greek topicalisation strategies, and points not so much to a focalised temporal as to a topicalised *exo pu* VERB.

The peculiarities of the Lesbian construction mean that Anagnostou's intuition seems well-founded: it is a different construction to the collocations considered until now, in which *exo pu* VERB behaves as a verbal unit. If so, it is a striking development for *pu:* it has become involved (if only as a linking element) in a Tense-Aspect-Mood marker.[44] The example given by Kretschmer (1905: 310), *exo pu xalo* 'I.have that I.destroy'= 'I intend to destroy' and 'I have destroyed' strongly suggest that such a development has indeed taken place.

The problem is that Kretschmer's glosses are different from Anagnostou's Past Continuous; one is an intentional future (cf. English *going to*), and the other a present perfect. Kretschmer's description of the phenomenon is as follows:

> Alongside it, yet another paraphrastic expression is used in Lesbos (and elsewhere):[45] *exu p xalo= exo pu xalo* means both *ich habe im Sinne zu verderben* 'I have it in mind (intend) to destroy' and *ich habe verdorben* 'I have destroyed'. The literal meaning is 'I have, i.e. I find myself in a situation where I destroy': this can mean the same as 'I am willing or inclined to destroy', but also 'I destroy' in the durative sense, 'I am a destroyer'. The connection with *exo* 'I have (a situation)' gives *xalo* a durative meaning, and as a long-lasting action extends from the past into the present, a perfective meaning can evolve out of a durative: one usually says 'he is a destroyer' of someone who has already destroyed something. The Lesbian expression forms an interesting parallel to [CSMG] *exo ɣrapsi* 'I.have write.INF = I have written', which originally meant 'I have to write' but now, as is well known, means 'I have written'. (Kretschmer 1905:310–311)

Kretschmer's analysis of the construction is different to mine: he does not draw an analogy with the *exi X pu Y* construction, but analyses *exo pu xalo* as 'I have (a situation) in which I destroy'. But '(a situation) in which' is much too abstract to be a reasonable explanation for *pu,* particularly if the putative head has then gone missing, and *pu* as a free relative tends not to have abstract reference. If *pu* is a relativiser, one needs to find an expression in which *exo, pu,* and something like a relativiser head are present, and then describe a reanalysis in which the relativiser head was no longer an essential part of the construction.

---

[44]The CSMG *exi... pu* construction is also extant in Lesbos:

(55d)   **Εχ́** *anáms χrónu,* **pu** *írti s t mádra m.*

       eç anams xronu, **pu** irti s t madra m.

       It has been one and a half years **since** he came to my sty. (Kretschmer 476)

But the *exi... pu*- and *exo pu*-constructions could have easily diverged, so this does not disprove the origin of the former in the latter.

[45]I have not found anything like the Lesbian construction attested anywhere else; either Kretschmer is conflating the Lesbian construction with the more general *exi... pu* construction, or this is an expression which died out relatively early in the other Greek dialects, before it could be recorded in the sources I have had access to.

I have given such an account above.[46] But there is another way to understand *pu* in the construction—as a nominaliser; and a comparison with other *exo*-based tenses in Greek is instructive. Both of Kretschmer's *exo pu*-tenses, the intentional future and the present perfect, are expressed in Greek with other *exo*-constructions. The intentional is expressed with *exo na+* PERFS—a form widespread in Italiot, but extant also in other dialects. The perfect is expressed in two ways, both of which involve verbal nominals: *exo+* INFINITIVE, a form extant in CSMG and preferred in Northern Greek; and *exo+* PAST.PASSIVE.PARTICIPLE, a form preferred in Crete—and Lesbos, although not as frequent as *exo pu* in that dialect according to Kretschmer (1905:310).

We know of an (active) participle calqued by a *pu*-clause in the Albanian-derived *me to pu*-Absolutive (Nicholas 1998b) and the Italiot *steo pu*-construction (§6.7). Such a calque may also have taken place here, with a verbal nominal supplanted by a *pu*-nominalisation.[47] Under this account, the past continuous would have been derived from this original present perfect *exo pu* (the reanalysis PRESENT PERFECT ↔ PAST CONTINUOUS should be reversible.) And with *exo+* INFINITIVE, *exo na,* and *exo+* PARTICIPLE all extant tenses, it would not be surprising if *exo pu* also expanded to other tenses in the *exo*-tense paradigm, supplanting *exo na* as an intentional future, with the semantic distinction between *exo pu* and *exo na* eroded—particularly in the case of *exo pu* IMPFS, a tense common to realis and irrealis in Greek.

So there are two possible reanalyses producing Kretschmer's forms as an endpoint; they would have run something like this:

(a) *Reanalysis of* exi... pu

it.has		TEMPORAL ADJUNCT	*pu*	VERB.1SG		(52a)
		↓		*topicalisation of verb*		
it.has	*pu*	VERB.1SG	TEMPORAL ADJUNCT			
		↓		*reanalysis of adjunct as verb complement*		
it.has	*pu*	VERB.1SG	COMPLEMENT			(54a)
		↓		*reanalysis of verb phrase as single unit*		
I.have	*pu*	VERB.1SG	COMPLEMENT			(54b)
		↓		*dropping of optional verb complement*		
I.have	*pu*	VERB.1SG	—	Past Continuous (Anagnostou)		
		↓		*reanalysis preserving stativity*		
I.have	*pu*	VERB.1SG	—	Perfect (Kretschmer)		
		↓		*analogy with* exo na *formations?*		
I.have	*pu*	VERB.1SG	—	Intentional (Kretschmer)		

(b) Reanalysis of participial perfect

I.have	PAST PASSIVE PARTICIPLE			
		↓	*reformulation of participle as relative clause*	
I.have	*pu*	VERB.1SG	—	Perfect (Kretschmer)

---

[46]Anagnostou's Continuous *exo pu* is included in Krestchmer's account, as an antecedent of the Present Perfect; bypassing the temporal particulars of the two (Anagnostou's is a past tense, Kretschmer's reconstruction a present), it suffices to appeal to stativity as the common link between the Past Continuous and the Present Perfect.

[47]Admittedly, the passive adjectival participle survives in Greek where its active counterpart did not (cf. *exo+* PAST.PASSIVE.PARTICIPLE); so the motivation for the calque is not as great.

				↓	*reanalysis preserving stativity*
I.have		*pu*	VERB.1SG	—	Past Continuous (Anagnostou)
				↓	*analogy with* exo na *formations?*
I.have		*pu*	VERB.1SG	—	Intentional (Kretschmer)[48]

7.4. Adjunct-*pu*

The use of *pu* as a connective introducing adjuncts is a characteristic of informal CSMG and Greek dialects. Conversely, it is drastically curtailed in more formal CSMG: temporal, causal and contrast *pu*-adjuncts make up 0.8‰ of Makri-yannis' text, but only 0.07‰ in Tahtsis' text. The old tendency to use *pu* to loosely string together clauses, so noticeable in Makriyannis, is in abeyance in written CSMG. In Puristic there is a clear preference for more explicit markers of semantic relations; this can be assumed to have affected higher-register CSMG. The only connective to have survived this onslaught in CSMG is resulta-tive-*pu;* even there its use is explicitly signalled textually by a correlative.

7.4.1. Introducing cause or reason clauses

Causal-*pu* is attested widely amongst Greek dialects, including Tsakonian and Italiot:

(56a) Τ̂σ' ο κούε εδάτσε με ταν κολιούρα π̄η ν̂' ανεμούκαϊ τσι ν̂' ε̇κακίτσε ***π̄'*** ε̇κι κεινού, τ̂σ' εδάτσε τ̂σ' ε̇κι κουΐζου.
τς o kue eðatçe me tan koλura pʰi ɲ anemukai tçi ɲ ekʰakitçe ***pʰ*** eki kinu, tç eðatçe tç eki kuizu.
And the dog got burnt by the cake they threw it, and it swallowed it ***because*** it was hungry, and it got burnt and was howling. (CostS §4; Lenidi, Southern Tsakonia)

(56b) *anašiporéi ećínose na su δói kanè* indítsyo, ***pu*** *è pléo* véčcose *pára emména.*
anaʃiporei etʃinose na su ðoi kane inditsjo, ***pu*** e pleo vecːose para emːena.
saprà egli darti qualche indizio, ***poiché*** *è più vecchio di me.*
I know he'll be able to give you some clues, ***because*** he's older than me (TNC 43.10; Roccaforte, Calabria)

In Cappadocia there is only one instance of causal *op* (§B.1); given the restricted distribution of *pu*-cognates in Cappadocian, this is not surprising. Perhaps more surprising is the absence of causal-*pu* from the Pontic corpus, although there are instances of causal *ndo* (§B.2). There is no intrinsic reason why *ndo* would de-velop to become a fully-fledged causal connective, but *pu* would not; this is in-dicative of the preponderance of *ndo* over *pu* in general in the dialect, and given the infrequent appearance of causal-*ndo,* causal-*pu* may well also be marginally present in the dialect.

---

[48]*exo pu*-tenses are not represented in text available to me: neither Anagnostou's nor Kretschmer's texts (14,000 and 32,000 words respectively) have any examples, although the latter has four instances of an *exo/ime+* PARTICIPLE perfect, the verb form *exo pu* is supposed to have supplanted. (*ime+* PARTICIPLE, using the copula *ime,* is the passive counterpart to *exo+* PARTICIPLE.) So frustratingly, the only evidence we have at hand for the existence of the con-struction lies in grammars, and not in autonomous texts.

This does, however, indicate that the causal function is less widespread for *pu* in Pontic than other adjunct functions, and this is result holds for Greek in general:

	Causal	Temp.	Circum.	Result	Corpus Size
Makriyannis	61	28	32	15	143,000
Tahtsis	8	2	15	26	118,000
Psichari: *My Voyage*	2	4	4	15	65,000
Peloponnesian Tsakonian	3	35	11	0	19,000
Pontic	0	4	5	1	200,000
Apulian Italiot	2	11	3	16	26,000
Calabrian Italiot	>5	11	>3	>29	104,000

Table 22. Corpus counts of realis adjunct-*pu*

With the exception of Makriyannis and Tahtsis, causal-*pu* is overall the least prominent of the four adjunct functions; and the CSMG text, Tahtsis, with its decimation of temporal-*pu,* is unusual by Greek dialect standards. The only real exception to the trend, which is probably idiosyncratic, is Makriyannis.

As a result of causal-*pu* having a reduced foothold in Greek, there has been less autonomous development of causal-*pu* than for other adjunct functions. Most instances of causal-*pu* behave in a way consistent with CSMG, and indicative of arrested grammaticalisation: causal *pu*-adjuncts are not free of their matrix, and are often reminiscent of dislocated relative clauses. This is a significant contrast with temporal-*pu,* where a good deal of autonomous development may be observed (§7.4.6).

So although there are instances of causal-*pu* attested from many mainstream dialects,[49] few of them display any noteworthy features relative to CSMG. For instance, as discussed in §3.4.1, *pu*-causals in CSMG are more tightly bound to their matrix than *epiði*- or *ɣiati*-causals, and (I would contend) more than other *pu*-adjuncts; they cannot be preposed, clefted, or otherwise separated from their matrix. It goes without saying, then, that a *pu*-clause cannot answer a 'why'-question. There is slight evidence that this binding is relaxed in Greek dialects— Thracian in particular, possibly linked with the expansion of complementiser-*pu* there:

(57a)   «Ι̱ατί δεν ήρθις;» «*Απ* δεν είχα παράδις.»
              "jati ðen irθis?" "*ap* ðen ixa paraðis."
              "Why didn't you come?" "***Because*** I didn't have any money." (HDMS
              1268:269; Kavakli, Eastern Rumelia)

(57b) shows a preposed *pu*-cause; but the syntactic complexity of the example, involving both coordination and an embedded predicate, make this a minor infringement on the CSMG distribution.

---

[49]These include Cyprus (Aetos 197, Netwon §7.4.4.9), Lesbos (Anagnostou 199), the Dodecanese (Dawk 138), Macedonia (HDMS 1082:67), the Heptanesa (HDMS 805A:56), Roumeli (HDMS 1007:152), and Apiranthos (HDMS 571:501).

(57b) Κεῖνος ο μακάργιος δε bίστευε τίποτα και, λέει, ***που*** δε bίστευε, καταχωνιάστηκε και κεῖνος ο ίδιος

kinos o makarɣios ðe bisteve tipota ke, lei, ***pu*** ðe bisteve, kataxoɲastike ke kinos o iðios

God rest his soul, he did not believe in anything; and, so they say, ***because*** he did not believe, he himself ended up buried (HDMS 738:106; Verestia, Triphyllia, Messenia, Peloponnese)

The meaning of causal-*pu* does not display any remarkable variation diatopically, either. The semantic differentiation between *pu* and its competitors is relevant in determining the semantics of *pu,* as discussed in §3.4.1: *afu* 'since' and *pu* express unique cause, while *ɣiati* 'because' expresses simple causation. This is not surprising: *afu* is originally temporal, and *pu* is ambiguous between temporal and causal; causality is a tree-structure (multiple causes and effects), while time is linear, so the notion of a unique temporal precedent carries over into a unique causal precedent.

With *afu,* the carry-over is etymological, an instance of persistence. The temporal meaning of *pu* is not in any sense prior to its causal sense, however, and this is far more likely an instance of contamination—the temporal meaning of *pu* informs its causal use, something which can occur simply if the two meanings coexist in the paradigm. Contamination is likely to be important in determining where causal-*pu* appears in general—particularly contamination from the emotive complementiser, where *pu* introduces a cause, and the causation is instantaneous (emotive reactions tend to be immediate), uncontrolled and direct. This is why the following instance of causal-*pu* is odd by CSMG standards, even though it expresses unique causation—the causation is not immediate, and deliberation is involved:

(58a) και σε λιγάκι εφάνηκεν ένας ομπρός του και ζητούσε να τομ προσκυνήσῃ, ***οπού***δε πως ήπιασε το μάρμαρον όπου ρίχναν οι πιο μπροστά δυο του σύντροφοι με δύναμίν τος πολλήν.

ke se liɣaki efaniken enas ombros tu ke zituse na tom proskinisi, ***opu*** ðe pos ipjase to marmaron ˈopu rixnan i pjo mbrosta ðjo tu sindrofi me ðinamin tos pol:in.

*and in a little while one of them appears before the prince and begged to do him homage,**for** he had seen how he had caught the marble slab which the two foremost of his comrades were using all their strength to pitch.* (DawkD 138; Asfendiou, Kos, Dodecanese)

It also explains why the following is acceptable in CSMG: causation is not immediate here either (the beardless men have to be hunted down before they are lynched), and deliberation is involved, but the matrix is presented as an emotive response to the *pu*-cause, so that the analogy to the emotive complementiser is strong:

(58b) Είδαν οι σπανοί του παρακακό, ·σ-κουθήκαν, φύγαν, γιανά μη τ-ς κρημάσην, ***'που*** κάναν φου·ν-κό.

iðan i spani tu parakako, škuθikan, fiɣan, ɣiana mi ts krimasin, ***pu*** kanan foɲko.

The beardless men saw the disaster, got up, and left, to avoid being hanged ***for*** committing murder. (Anagnostou 199; Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

Another function of *pu* may play a similar role: circumstance-*pu* may inform the use of *pu* introducing causes which—conversely to those discussed above—are indirect, and involve background causation:

(58c)   Ξέρ᾽ς, να dου boύμι Γ̟άῗ᾽ *πȭ̔* πουλλές γ̟ιουρτάδις τη χρουν̟ιά τ᾽ ἅι-Γ̟αννιού
         ksers, na du bumi ɟaɲ *po* ç pules ɟurtaðis ti xruɲa t ai ɟaɲu
         You know, we should call him John, **as** there are many feast days in the year for
         St John (Anagnostou 199; Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

ine pu

Like causal-*pu,* the collocation *ine pu* 'it's that, it's because' holds few surprises; it is attested throughout mainstream Greek, and is particularly prominent in Cypriot:

(59)   τζι᾽ αν σ᾽ άφηκεν να φύης που κοντά του,/ *έν που* το σκέφτηκεν ᾽ς την υστερκάν.
        dʒ an s afiken na fiis pu konda tu,/ *en pu* to skeftiken s tin isterkan.
        and if He let you leave from His side, ***it's because*** He thought it latterly
        (=afterthought) (Lipertis 241; Cyprus)

In all, the causal is not one of the more salient functions of *pu;* its development compared to temporal-*pu* is limited, and *pu* is not as autonomous from its matrix as with other functions. One might argue that the development of adjunct-*pu* in general is restricted; with the exception of the resultative and the circumstance, *pu* is not the major connective for any adjunct class in most Greek dialects. While *pu* naturally flows into adjunct functions through the intrinsic modality of relative clauses (causal, temporal, contrastive relativisation, etc.), its ambiguity gives it little communicative advantage over unambiguous connectives such as *ɣiati* and temporal *otan.*

   This cannot be a complete solution, however, since *pu* has become entrenched in the resultative paradigm;[50] and it does not explain why causal-*pu* has fared worse than temporal-*pu*. The ill-defined semantics of *pu* may be important here: as discussed with (58a) and (58c), causal-*pu* may be susceptible to contamination from its other functions, and these can in fact lend causal-*pu* contradictory meanings. This means that causal-*pu* is particularly unsuccessful as a *distinctive* linguistic sign; and though this might not preclude causal-*pu* developing successfully in some dialects, it is consistent with its overall retardation.

7.4.2. Introducing circumstance clauses
The circumstance class of *pu* is a grab-bag by definition: it includes all those adjuncts to which none of the more well-defined semantic relations (causality, temporality, contrast, result) apply. In contrast to causal-*pu,* where vagueness seems to have interfered with its further spread, vagueness is an advantage for this function; a more semantically explicit connective would be misleading in expressing such a tenuous connection between adjunct and matrix. Where

---

[50]But see further discussion in §7.4.3.

English would use such semantically explicit connectives as *when* or *in that* to introduce circumstances, Greek uniformly uses *pu,* and pre-literary language at least does not conscript other connectives for the job (as against e.g. Puristic *eno* 'while'.)

Justify-pu

That said, a few subclasses of circumstance-*pu* are well-delimited, and can be discussed separately. Foremost amongst these is Justify-*pu,* introducing the illocutionary cause of a non-declarative speech act. This class is widespread (counting for 24 out of the 37 unambiguous instances of circumstance-*pu* in my HDMS corpus), including instances from Pontic (60a), Italiot (60b), and Tsakonian (60c—probably a CSMG calque):

(60a)   Κουτρούμ και σιρατσάν να εβγάλλ᾽νε τα γλώσσας ατουν ***που*** επρόφτασαν και εστυχαρίασαν ατον.
kutrum ke siratʃan na evɣalne ta ɣlosas atun ***pu*** eproftasan ke estixariasan aton.
May their tongues give forth pitch and pus, ***for*** going up and congratulating him. (FotM 516; Pontic)

(60b)   Ka *póse fégwome,* ***pu*** *san delégwete o ćúrimmu, mas imbénni t' apíssu će, po mmas* arrivé*gwi, mas tróǵi?*
ka pose fegwome, ***pu*** san delegwete o tʃuri mːu, mas imbenːi t apisːu tʃe, po mːas arːivegwi, mas troɟi?
Come possiamo fuggire, ***poiché***, *quando ritorna mio padre, ci viene appresso e, come ci raggiunge, ci mangia?*
How can we run away, ***when*** as soon as my father returns, he will chase after us and, when he catches up to us, he will eat us? (TNC 78.7; Roccaforte, Calabria)

(60c)   *"ts^{h}í na mbáu" ɲepéka "p^{h}óɲéxu ðekára."*
"tsi na mbau" ɲ epeka "p^h oɲ exu ðekara."
*"Τι να μπω" του είπα "****που**** δεν έχω δεκάρα."*
"ti na bo" tu ipa "***pu*** ðen exo ðekara"
"How am I supposed to go in," I told him, "***when*** I don't have a dime?" (Har 156; Vaskina, Southern Tsakonia)

This distribution shows that Justify-*pu* is an old component of Modern Greek; its absence in Cappadocian is presumably a Turkism.

Since Justify-*pu* has an unconventional illocutionary range of matrices (non-declarative), and its link to its matrix is illocutionary rather than formal-semantic, the morphosyntax of its matrix can also be unusual compared to the usual environment for *pu*. The matrix of Justify-*pu* can indeed be reduced to a single-word interjection:

(61a)   Ἄχου, γιούκα μου, ***που*** πέρασ᾽ απ᾽ ατά ένα παλτηκαράτσιν ώμορφο σαν εσένα τσαι σαν την νύφφην Τσυρα-σελήνη
axu*, ɟuka mu,* ***pu*** *peras ap ata ena paltikaratsin omorfo san esena tse san tin nifːin tsira selini*
Alas*, my son, ∅ there has come this way a young lad as handsome as you are and my daughter-in-law the Lady Moon;* (DawkD 36; Astypalaea, Dodecanese)

(61b)   ´Αχχου, γιούκα μου, **που** μου ᾽πόμεινε τ᾽ αργκάρτι μου μέσα.
         ax:u, juka mu, **pu** mu pomine t arŋgarti mu mesa.
         Oh, my son, ∅ I have left my spindle inside him. (DawkD 176; Antimahia, Kos,
         Dodecanese)

And the matrix can be an echoic citation of another's opinion, contradicted by
the *pu*-clause which justifies the citation.

(61c)   Τι αδρεφή τίμια έχεις, **που** εγώ οπότε θέλω την έχω!
         ti aðrefi timia exis, **pu** eγo opote θelo tin exo!
         What sort of an honourable sister do you have, **when** I can have her whenever I
         please! (MinA 389; Zante, Heptanesa)

The semantic distance between adjunct and matrix, on the one hand, and the
reduction of the matrix to a non-clausal entity, on the other, make Justify-*pu* a
class where the *pu*-clause goes a long way towards being fully separate from any
matrix. Only *pu na*-optatives (§7.7.4) display a greater extent of clausal inde-
pendence.

Tautologous relativisations

Another distinct class of circumstance-*pu* involves clauses which syntactically
are identical to relative clauses, in that they have nominal heads, with copula
predicates. Semantically, however, they are implausible as relativisations: the
copula connects the head to another nominal giving information about the
head, but the information is not only already known (62a), but most often
tautological, with the predicative complement identical to the head. For ex-
ample, (62b): *dʒe to xtinon **po ni xtinon*** 'even a beast **that is a beast**…'

(62a)   *e ta kopéllya kséni **pu**-tun* epinásasi, *epían če* číni *na fási.*
         e ta kopeʎ:a kseni **pu** tun epinasasi, epian tʃe tʃini na fasi.
         *Well, the boys, strangers **that** they were, were hungry and they went also to
         eat.* (Newton §7.4.5.16; Karpas, Cyprus)

(62b)   τζιαι το χτηνόν **πώ**νι χτηνόν της μάνας του κλουθά της.
         dʒe to xtinon **po** ni xtinon tis manas tu kluθa tis.
         Even a beast, beast **that** it is, follows its mother. (Lipertis 237, Cyprus)

(62c)   Και τα πουλιά, **πού**ναι πουλιά, και ᾽κείνα έχουν πάθη
         ke ta pulia, **pu** ne pulia, ke kina exun paθi
         Even birds, birds **that** they are, have passions (Vlahou 1975 [1894]:77; Hili,
         Constantinople)

(62d)   Ο Θεός **πού**νε Θεός συχχωρά και γαπά, και συ θέλεις να παρακούσῃς και να παραβῇς
         τα θεοτικά;
         o θeos **pu** ne θeos six:ora ke γapa, ke si θelis na parakusis ke na paravis ta
         θeotika?
         *God, **who** is God indeed, gives pardon and love, and can you wish to disobey
         and go beyond the ways of God?* (DawkD 140; Asfendiou, Kos, Dodecanese)

(62e)   Ο ασιλεάς **που**β᾽ βασιλεάς, τσαι ᾽ρίζει τα νησιά μας,/ έν έχει τηπ παρέα μας, μήε τησ
         συντορφιά μας.
         o asilεas **pu** v vasilεas, tse riz:i ta nisja mas,/ en exi tip parea mas, mie tis sindorfja

mas.
Even the king, **who** is the king and rules our islands, has not our company and our fellowship. (Mih-Nou 234; Central Karpathos, Dodecanese)

So although these are structurally relativisations, they do not fulfil the relativiser function. Their function is rather to highlight that the predicative complement is germane to the matrix claim: a beast is a beast indeed (i.e. irrational), yet it still has filial instincts; God is God indeed (i.e. omnipotent), yet He still gives pardon. The emphasis on the predicative complement being germane is explicit in (62a), the only example where the predicative complement is not identical to the antecedent: the complement *kseni* 'strangers' is placed in focus position before the copula.

This class is similar to the CSMG *san… pu* collocation ('like the… that s/he is'), which also highlights a germane predicative complement (Nicholas 1998b). In *san… pu,* however, the predicative complement, while given, is not tautologous. And in the instances considered here, the tautologous relativisation is akin to nominal emphasis: *to xtinon **po ni xtinon**=* the beast **that is a beast** = **even** a beast'; this is confirmed in (62b, 62c), where the emphatic *ke* 'and; even; also' precedes the construction's antecedent.

There is another semantic field the tautologous relativisation comes close to: contrast. This is evident in (62b): even a beast, **though** it is irrational, has filial instincts. Contrast is less evident in (62d), where the meaning is perhaps more 'God also, who is a paragon, gives pardon' than 'although God is omnipotent, He still gives pardon'; then again, the formal semantics of EVEN has an inherent notion of contrast.[51]

---

[51]I am reticent to call this construction contrastive, if only because (62a) is not contrastive; then again, (62a) may not be an instance of tautological relativisation at all.

The construction is also reminiscent—and possibly related—to demonstrative circumstances like *tetios pu ine* 'such that he is' (§3.4.2).

The same expression turns up in Pharasa and the Pontus, but there it uses the temporals *fotes* and *sitæ* 'when':

(63a) Το ᾿ρνίθι, **φότεζ** έν ᾿ρνίθι, πίνει νερό, τσαι γρεύει πανουφόρου το Θεό.
to rniθi, **fotez** en rniθi, pini nero, tʃe γrevi panuforu to θeo.
*Η κότα, **που** είναι κότα, πίνει νερό και κοιτάζει ψηλά το Θεό.*
i kota, **pu** ine kota, pini nero ke kitazi psila to θeo.
The hen, hen **that** she is, drinks water and looks up to God. (LoucLouc 325)

(63b) Η πεθερά, **σείτια** έν᾿ πεθερά, ασ᾿ ατέν πολλά διάκρισην εχ!
i peθera, **sitia** en peθera, as aten pola ðiakrisin eʃ!
*Η πεθερά, **αν και** είναι πεθερά, έχει περισσότερη διακριτικότητα απ᾿ αυτήν!*
i peθera, **an ke** ine peθera, exi perisoteri ðiakritikotita ap aftin!
A mother-in-law, mother-in-law **that** she is, has more discretion than her! (FotM 450)

The contrastive nature of the construction is highlighted by the CSMG gloss of (63b), which uses the explicit concessive *an ke*. While the Anatolian temporal is equivalent to the tautologous relativisation, I do not think this warrants analysing *pu* in the latter as a temporal; a temporal makes no more sense in the construction than a causal or a relativiser.

Underspecified circumstances

Besides these well-defined classes of circumstance-*pu,* the more vague instances of the circumstance connective are also in wide use, including in Pontic and Italiot:

(64a)   κι ατόσον έμορφος ***που έσον*** και γυναίκα να έλεπεν ατεν θ᾽ εζέλευεν ατεν.
         ki atoson emorfos ***pu eson*** ke ɣineka na elepen aten θ ezeleven aten.
         And ***as*** she was so beautiful, even if a woman saw her, she would envy her.
         (KandilF 110; Chaldia, Pontus)

(64b)   *Na kuo kanè fsema/ pu è' nna pis esù,/ **pu** fsèmata 'o llemò/ će 'a ammàddia*
         eχi' 'ngomàta?
         na kuo kane fsema/ pu e nːa pis esu,/ ***pu*** fsemata o lːemo/ tʃe a amːadːia exi
         ŋgomata?
         *udire qualche bugia/ che mi dirai tu,/ **che** di bugie hai tutti pieni/ gli occhi e la*
         bocca?
         Am I to hear some lie you might tell me, ***when*** your eyes and mouth are full of
         lies? (Palumbo 77; Calimera, Apulia)

The use of circumstance-*pu* is particularly characteristic of Makriyannis, and no doubt has greatly contributed to the perception of his work as quintessentially demotic; it thus points to a more general characteristic of pre-literary discourse style. In the text, *opu* is used to loosely link up factive adjuncts to a main phrase, without the connection being made explicit:

(65a)   (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 ðen molinθikan t arxia tis patriðos mu; ute is tin kivernisin, ute is eparxies,
         ute is atoma, ***opu*** aɣonistikamen is tin rumeli, peloponison ke nisia ke sparti, ðen
         ine puθena katiɣoria paramikri ðia 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)

(65b)   (1829–1840)
         Έκαμε να ρίξη το νερό κάτου εις τον δρόμο, η κακή τύχη πέρναγε εκείνη την ώρα ο
         μπουρλοτιέρης, ***οπού*** τότε σ᾽ εκείνη την περίστασιν ο κάθε μπουρλοτιέρης ήταν μισός
         θεός, το νερόν οπού 'ρριψε το παιδί έπεσε απάνου εις τον μπουρλοτιέρη, χωρίς να τον
         ιδή το παιδί.
         ekame na riksi to nero katu is ton ðromo, i kaki tixi pernaɣe ekini tin ora o
         burlotieris, ***opu*** tote s ekini tin peristasin o kaθe burlotieris itan misos θeos, to
         neron opu ripse to peði epese apanu is ton burlotierin, xoris na ton iði to peði.
         He went to throw the water onto the street; unfortunately, at that time the bru-
         loteer was passing by, ***where*** in that situation at the time, each bruloteer was
         half a god; the water the child threw fell onto the bruloteer, without the child
         seeing him.
         He went to throw the water down into the street and as ill-luck would have it

at that moment this bruloteer was passing. ∅ At that time in our state of af-
fairs every bruloteer was a demi-god; and that water the lad threw out fell on
the bruloteer without his seeing the lad. (MakM 121)

Although circumstance-*pu* is semantically underspecified, there are still some
meanings it does not normally extend to. Thus, unlike the ancient participle, *pu*
does not introduce manner adjuncts; the following is the closest one gets in the
corpus, and could easily refer to time rather than manner:

(66)   Τσαι τότε να κρυφτή μέσα ΄ς την τσοιλτσάν τ᾽ αλοατατσού, τσαι το πάρουσι ΄ς τον
        πύργκον της, να φτση ***που*** θα νοίξη με την τρίχα, τσαι με τες μαρντζολτσές του να
        τσερντίση τημ Παράμορφην.
        tse tote na krifti mesa s tin tšiltsan t aloatatsu, tse to parusi s ton pirŋgon tis, na ftsi
        pu θa niksi me tin trixa, tse me tes marndzoltses tu na tserndisi tim paramorfin.
        Then he must conceal himself in the belly of the little horse, and they bring it
        *into her tower, and he come out, open**ing** it by the spring, and then by his*
        cunning he will win the Most Fair. (DawkD 46; Astypalaea, Dodecanese)

Circumstance-*pu* offers many ambiguous examples allowing reanalysis. For in-
stance, there is a clear pathway from the reanalysis-rich optative free relatives
(§7.2.3) to Justify-*pu:*

(67a)   να κουτσαθή ***που*** τάσπερνε/ και ***που*** τα μα(γ)ερεύγει.
        *na kutsaθi **pu** ta sperne/ ke **pu** ta maerevɣi.*
        *May **he who** sowed them and **who** cooks them become lame/ May he become*
        *lame**for** sow**ing** them and **for** cook**ing** them.* (Yannakou 210; Rhodes,
        Dodecanese)

(67b)   Να καή τα χείλη του, ***που*** θέλει σε φιλήσει
        *na kai ta xili tu, **pu** θeli se filisi*
        *May his lips be burned **who** would kiss you* (MinA 403; Mouzaki, Zante,
        Heptanesa)

Another such pathway is from justifications of incredulity exclamations to ir-
realis-*pu* (§7.8):

(67c)   Να κ΄μηθώ, λέει, ***απ᾽*** θα μι φάη ου πατέρας σ᾽;
        *na cmiθo, lei, **ap** θa mi fai u pateras s?*
        *"Am I to fall asleep," he says, "**when** your father is going to eat me?"* (Rigas
        1962:17; Skiathos, Thessaly)

And in the following, there is a three-way ambiguity between linguistic comple-
ment ('a telegram came, saying ***that***...'), circumstance ('a telegram came for the
prince to go, ***where*** if he did not go...'), and relativiser ('a telegram came for the
prince to go, ***who,*** if he did not go, would lose...'):

(67d)   Εκορετάρησε για δύο χρόνια, ως που ήρθε ένα τηλεγράφημα να πάη το βασιλόπουλο,
        που αν δεν πάη, χάνει την καλύτερή του χώρα, κι α πάη, την κερδίζει.
        *ekoretarise ɣia ðio xronia, os pu irθe ena tileɣrafima na pai to vasilopulo, **pu** an*
        ðen pai, xani tin kaliteri tu xora, ki a pai, tin kerðizi.
        He stayed in mourning for two years, until a telegram came for the prince to go,
        ***that** if he did not go, he would lose his best territory, and if he did go, he would*
        gain it. (MinA 389; Volimes, Zante, Heptanesa)

In the right contexts, finally, a headed relative clause can behave as a circumstance. This has already been seen for tautologous relativisations; but the following is not such a relativisation, and the noun phrase *ta kavatça pi ftækat* 'the somersaults that you made' seems to be missing the prepositional equivalent of a circumstance marker, *me* 'with'. The fact that *pu* is a circumstance marker as well as a relativiser presumably led to *pu* functioning as a portmanteau of the two in this instance:

(67e)   Τσα ου να περάμ'; Δε μα πινιτούμ'; Εμείνε τα καβάτὸα **πη** φτάκατ' δε θα πινητέτ'.
         tsa u na peram? ðe ma pinitʰum? emine ta kavatça **pi** ftækat ðe θa pinitʰet.
         *Πώς θα περάσουμε; Δε θα πνιγούμε; Εσείς τις τούμπες **που** κάνατε δε θα πνιγήτε.*
         ˈpos θa perasume? ðe θa pniɣume? esis tis tubes **pu** kanate ðe θa pniɣite.
         How will we go across? Won't we drown? You, (with) the somersaults **that** you
         made, you won't drown. (HDMS 754:33; Havoutsi, Propontis Tsakonian)[52]

There exist types of adjunct-*pu* which have no well-defined semantics; this fact underlies the claim that adjunct-*pu* is not polysemous, with a range of established distinct meanings, but semantically underspecified, with a minimal meaning encompassing that range as well as these less well-defined instances. Underspecification is a central synchronic property of adjunct-*pu,* and it inheres in the circumstance function. It is also a central synchronic property of several other connectives seen in this work, such as Modern Greek *ke* (Canakis 1995; Ingria in prep.) and Ancient Greek *hoːs* (§5.3.2).

Yet underspecification need not be a diachronic reality; *pu* did not become reanalysed all at once from a relativiser into a vague adjunct connective, encompassing temporal, causal and resultative meanings as well as contrasts and circumstances. It is much likelier that *pu* was first reanalysed into specific connectives: causal, temporal, contrast, background. It is only after the event—and the intervention of some analogical levelling—that a semantic common class emerged between the sundry instances of adjunct-*pu,* and one could start speaking of an underspecified connective.

7.4.3. Introducing result clauses
In preliterary/dialectal Greek, result adjuncts often appear without a preceeding correlative; this is unusual for CSMG. Thus, in *The Third Wedding,* 23 of the 26 resultative *pu* are preceded by a demonstrative correlative, while the remaining 3 are preceded by an antecedent with the indefinite article, which acts as a quasi-demonstrative ('a' = 'such a'). By contrast, 5 of the 15 resultatives in *My Voyage* have no correlative, as do 3 of the 11 resultatives in Catargi's *Essays.* Resultatives without correlatives also persist in dialectal texts:

(68a)   Γ̦α να μην τα πολυλογούμε κάθουνται και τα μελίσσ̦α και φάγανε και ξεγλύψανε
         ούλα τα πιθάρ̦α το μέλι, **που** αν έβανε κανείς γ̦α δοκιμή εκεί τη γλώσσά του δε θα
         καταλάβαινε καθόλου πως πρώτα ήτανε 'κει μέσα μέλι.
         ȷ̦a na min ta poliloɣume kaθude ke ta melisja ke faɣane ke kseɣlipsane ula ta

---

[52]This is acceptable in English (and CSMG) as an elliptical expression.

piθarja to meli, **pu** an evane kanis ja ðokimi eki ti ɣlosa tu ðe θa katalavene kaθolu
pos prota itane ki mesa meli.
To cut a long story short, the bees also set off and ate and licked out all the bar-
rels of honey, **so that** if someone stuck their tongue there to check, they would
not realise at all that there used to be honey in there. (ParnassosA 54;
Peloponnese)

(68b)   Σε αγαπώ, **που** χάνομαι,/ μα να στο πω δε θέλω
se aɣapo, **pu** xanome,/ ma na s to po ðe θelo
I love you **so much that** I perish, but I do not want to tell you (HDMS
780:222; Folegandros, Cyclades)

CSMG has no such correlative requirement for irrealis resultatives. Presumably,
the *pu na* combination is adequate by itself to flag the construction as resulta-
tive; overall *pu na* has a much narrower range of functions than realis *pu*.

Resultative-*pu* is the only adjunct-*pu* which survives in wide usage in CSMG;
indeed, whereas in other domains Puristic connectives have supplanted *pu,* this
has not happened with the resultative.[53] The disambiguating correlative must
have contributed to the survival of resultative-*pu;* resultative-*pu* with no correla-
tive has died out in CSMG.

By contrast, the resultative is one of the less widely distributed functions of
adjunct-*pu* amongst Greek dialects. However, this probably has more to do with
the influence of Turkish than any relative newness of the resultative. The resul-
tative is present in the two outlier dialects not in contact with Turkish. While
there are no instances of resultative-*pu* in my Tsakonian corpus, both Deffner's
(1923) and Costakis' (1986) dictionaries give resultative instances:

(69a)   Το μάλι έκη τόσου φαρμακουτέ, **οπή**, αν έσα τɕου, τɕα στιγμή έσα πενάκου
to mali eki tosu farmakute, **op^hi,** an esa tʃu, t^ha stiɣmi esa penak^hu
The apple was so poisoned **that**, if you ate it, you would die instantly (Deffner
1923:οπ´η)[54]

(69b)   Τσ' εφαήτɕερε **π̇'** έσι όλιου ρεγγούμενε
ts efaitçere **p^h** esi oʎu reŋgumene
What have you eaten **so that** you keep burping? (Costakis 1986:πη)

While Deffner's two examples have a correlative, Costakis' two instances do not;
so the CSMG pressure to have a correlative with resultatives is likely alien to
Tsakonian.

Resultative *pu* also occurs in Italiot, both with (70a, 70b) and without a cor-
relative (70c, 70d). The latter two cases would be unacceptable in CSMG.

---

[53]The Puristic resultative *oste* occurs only twice in Makriyannis' text, constituting 12% of all re-
sultatives. In Tahtsis' text, which can be taken to represent CSMG, *oste* occurs 14 times, and in 8
of those instances, it is a sentence-initial discourse connective ('so'), and not a resultative at all.
Resultative *pu,* on the other hand, occurs 24 times; thus, *oste* still comprises only 20% of all re-
sultatives.

[54]This example is suspect—as with much of Deffner's work: it has *op^hi,* which is not certain to
have ever existed in Tsakonian (Nicholas 1998f), and the CSMG loanword *stiɣmi.*

(70a) *íssa **tóssese** i* bellíttsese *ašíndim* billétta ***pu** tos éperre tim* bísta *to*
       χχristyanóne.
       isːa *tosːese* i belːitːsese aʃindim bilːetːa ***pu*** tos eperːe tim bista to xːristjanone.
       *erano **tante** le bellezze di quella villetta **che** toglieva la vista ai cristiani.*
       there were ***so many*** beauties in that villa ***that*** it took the people's breath
       away. (TNC 48.27; Roccaforte, Calabria)

(70b) *Ta lòi̯a pu su mûpe 't' ad̠d̠on vrai/ isa' **ttosso** kkalùd̠d̠ia će glićèa/ **pu** kàmaa*
       quasi quasi *na mu pai/ a'tti kkardìa e* pèna-*mu palèa.*
       ta loja pu su mu pe t ad̠on vrai/ isa *tːosːo* kːalud̠ːia tʃe glitʃea/ ***pu*** kamaa kwazi
       kwazi na mu pai/ a tːi kːardia e pena mu palea.
       *Le parole che tu mi dicesti l'altra sera/ erano **così** graziose e dolci/ **che** quasi*
       quasi mi fecero andar via/ dal cuore l'antica mia pena.
       The words you spoke to me the other night were ***so*** gracious and sweet ***that***
       they almost made my ancient sorrow pass from my heart. (Palumbo 31;
       Calimera, Apulia)

(70c) Ma *púpote tin ívre, će tin éperre pánda klónda, **pu** ta ðáklya tu ekatevénnai*
       póse katevénnusi δίo kannúl´ *a neróne.*
       ma pupote tin ivre, tʃe tin eperːe panda klonda, ***pu*** ta ðaklja tu ekatevenːai pose
       katevenːusi ðio kanːuʎa nerone.
       Ma non la poté trovare in nessun luogo, e se la passava sempre piangendo,
       ***così che** le lacrime gli scendevano come due canali d'acqua.*
       But he couldn't find her anywhere, and he was always overcome by tears, ***such***
       that his tears flowed like two canals of water. (TNC 48.27; Roccaforte,
       Calabria)

(70d) *'E mmilìs, 'en ğelà',/ stei' mm' 'i ććofàli ad̠d̠ù,/ **pu** pistèo 'ti votà',/ nna pis:*
       «Amo 'pu ttu».
       e mːilis, en ɟela,/ stei mː i tːʃofali ad̠ːu,/ ***pu*** pisteo ti vota,/ nːa pis "amo pu tːu."
       *Non parli, non ridi,/ stai con la testa altrove,/ **si che** mi sembra che ti volga/*
       per dirmi: «Vai via di qui!»
       You do not speak, you do not laugh, you stand with your mind somewhere else,
       so that I believe that you wish to say to me "Go away!" (Palumbo 65; Calimera,
       Apulia)

In the outliers in contact with Turkish, on the other hand, resultative connec-
tives are conspicuous by their absence. But for a single instance of *op* in Ulagaç
(§B.1), *pu* is not used as a resultative in Cappadocia; Cappadocian resultatives
are introduced either with a zero connective, paratactically with *tʃe* 'and', or with
the Turkish particle *ki* (Anastasiadis 1976:235):

(71a) Μα πεινάνϰ̇αμε ατσ-τσέ, ∅ *να* ψοφήσουμ' 'ς' την πείνα.
       ma pinankʰame atːse, ∅ ***na*** psofisum s tin pina.
       We were not so hungry ***that*** we ***would*** starve to death. (Anastasiadis
       1976:235)

(71b) Δίτεις δίτεις σον κόσμον *τõαι* σε σέν' τίπος τ̣ο 'πόμειν̇ιν.
       ðitis ðitis son kosmon *tʃe* se sen tipos dʒo pominin.
       You keep giving and giving to people ***and/so that*** there is nothing left for you.
       (Anastasiadis 1976:235)

(71c) 'Γω είμαι ά' 'νομάτ̇'ς *ϰι,* τõαπ 'ά σηκώσης ά' θάλι, α βκω 'πουπουκάτου.
       ɣo ime a nomatʰs ***kʰi,*** tʃap a sikosis a θali, a vko pupukatu.
       I am such a man ***that,*** any stone you uncover, I will emerge underneath it.
       (Anastasiadis 1976:235)

Pontic likewise tends not to use a resultative marker; results are consistently marked by simple parataxis, with either zero (by far the most frequent strategy) or *ke* 'and' connecting the two clauses. This development is distinct from the rest of Greek, in which a resultative marker is obligatory.[55]

(72a)   επήεν επλύστεν καλά καλά κ' έρθεν εφόρεσεν κ' ενέλλαξεν κι ατόσον κ' έμορφος
έεντον, εκείν' τ' απέσ' έστραψεν ας σην εμορφάδαν ατ'ς.
epien eplisten kala kala k erθen eforesen k enelaksen ki atoson k emorfos eendon,
∅ ekin t apes estrapsen as sin emorfæðan ats.
She went and washed thoroughly, and came and changed and put those clothes on, and she became so beautiful ***that*** the house shone from her beauty. (FostA 185; Imera)

(72b)   Εσύ τέρεν Λαζάραγα, αέτσ' έμορφα θα δᾰ̃σ̌κεύω το κορτσόπον ***κι αρτούχ*** μοναχόν να έρται ρούζ 'ς σην αγκάλια σ'.
esi teren lazaraγa, aets emorfa θa ðæʃkevo to kortsopon ***ki artux*** monaxon na erte ruz s sin aŋgalia s.
You watch me Lazaraga, and I will instruct the girl so well ***that*** she will come of her own will and fall into your embrace. (FotD 282)

There are few exceptions to this generalisation for Pontic; resultative-*pu* turns up only twice in my corpus, and only (72d) is certain; (72c) is probably better analysed as a relativisation:[56]

(72c)   Ογώ ας πάγω ας ιμπώ 'ς σου βασιλέα κόρης 'ς σην κοιλία, ταράζω το και δίγω το ένα πόνο ***που*** 'κι πορεί να το γιατρέψη κανείς γιατρός.
oγo as paγo as imbo s su vasilea koris s sin kilia, tarazo to ke ðiγo to ena pono ***pu*** ki pori na to γiatrepsi kanis γiatros.
Let me go and enter the king's daughter's belly; I will upset it and give her (such) a pain ***that*** no doctor can cure it. (Valav 116; Upper Amisos)

(72d)   Ατείνοι ατόσον μεγάλοι έταν, ***που*** ας σην ρίζαν του βουνού εφτάνεναν ως την κορφήν
atini atoson meγali etan, ***pu*** as sin rizan tu vujnu eftanenan os tin korfin
They were so big ***that*** they reached from the foot of the mountain to its peak (Papadopoulos 1955:192; Kerasunta)[57]

Athanasiadis (1977:113) confirms that resultative-*pu* is extant in Pontic, giving as an example the (unattributed) sentence *eγapanen aten atoson,* ***pu*** *k eθelnen na tiræniz æten kamian* 'he loved her so much, ***that*** he never wanted to torment her'; likewise, Drettas (1997:351) speaks of a consecutive *atoson pu* 'so much

---

[55]Pontic resultative clauses are frequently introduced by the adverb *artux* < Turkish *artιk* 'finally'. It is unlikely *artux* itself is a resultative connective, since it can occur in combination with the paratactic *ki* (72b), and it is a member of the same class as *ar* 'therefore' in introducing logical contingency. According to Papadopoulos (1955b:172), Pontic very rarely uses the explicit resultative *oste* (Athanasiadis (1977:102) concurs), and frequently makes use of connectives expressing logical contingency instead, such as *ar* 'therefore' and *artux*.

[56]Recall that in CSMG an emphatic indefinite article can behave as a demonstrative; it is hard to tell whether there is such emphasis in (72c), and the sentence is entirely acceptable with *pu* as a relativiser.

[57](72d) was collected by I. Valavanis, who died in 1899; so it represents Kerasunta Pontic *in situ*. However, influence from Standard (Constantinopolitan) Greek cannot be ruled out, particularly if the text was collected from the town itself, as opposed to the surrounding countryside.

that' collocation, although his example is more of a circumstance: *i peθeram* **atoson** *kakesa* **pu etone***, sa selenæ voskison lejme ke sa rakanæ menon* 'my mother-in-law, **so** cruel **that she was***,* she told me: go graze at the slopes and stay at the mountaintops'.

Yet for all that, resultative-*pu* is remarkably infrequent in Pontic, compared to other Greek dialects. Given the circumstances of Pontic and Cappadocian, and the vestigial presence of resultative-*pu* in Pontic, the omission of a resultative marker is probably an innovation in the direction of Turkish.

Resultative-*pu* is presumably of comparable antiquity to the other adjunct functions of *pu;* there is no inherent reason why it should develop any differently from temporal or causal-*pu*. That it has been so successful in CSMG, and so unsuccessful in Pontic and Cappadocian, has to do with the linguistic systems it found itself in, and not with any inherent properties of *pu:* in Anatolian, contact with Turkish (note that *ndo,* the other Pontic relativiser, is also not used as a resultative); in CSMG, the requirement of perspicacity on a literary language, satisfied by correlative resultative-*pu* alone amongst all adjunct-*pu*.[58]

7.4.4. Introducing contrast clauses

Contrast-*pu* turns up in most, but not all Greek dialects. I have no evidence for it in Tsakonian, and only one Ulagaç instance for Cappadocian; as the usage is generally infrequent in Greek, this is not cause for alarm. There is at least incipient use of *pu* as a contrast marker in Pontic:

(74) Αράπ'ς **π'** έσυρεν το σπαθίν ατ' ας σ' ημ'σόν το θεκάρ' εσέγκεν ατο κα
araps **p** esiren to spaθin at as s imson to θekar eseŋgen ato ka
The black man, **who** had drawn his sword halfway out of his scabbard, put it down (KandilF 110; Chaldia)

However, this instance is still too close to a relativisation for one to speak of an established contrast-*pu* in Pontic.

Contrast-*pu* is entrenched in all other dialects. It turns up in Italiot—clearcut in (75a), while in (75b) the context points more to a concessive (although the explicit concessive *ke pu* would be unacceptable in CSMG here):

(75a) *Tì práma è ettepurrò će ékraše* dúppyo *kafè će glićía će eyérti tósso sírma,* **pu** *emíse eyerrómasto* ðío órese iméra*, će ećíni ećumáto*
ti prama e etːepurːo tʃe ekraʃe dupːjo kafe tʃe glitʃia tʃe ejerti tosːo sirma, **pu** emise ejerːomasto ðio orese imera, tʃe etʃini etʃumato
Che cosa accade questa mattina che ha ordinato doppio caffè e dolci e si è

---

[58]Resultative *pu* faces competition from the older form *oste* in the Greek mainland:

(73) Νια βουλά είχε ρμώσ' ου τόπους κι γίν′κι ούλου δάσους, ούλου πυκνό, τόσου πυκνό, **ώστι** ένα κλαρί να έσ′γις σειέταν ούλου του δάσους.
nia vula ixe rmos u topus ki ɣiɲki ulu ðasus, ulu pikno, tosu pikno, **osti** ena klari na esʲɣis sietan ulu tu ðasus.
Once the place was deserted and became all forest, all dense—so dense **that** if you shook one branch, the entire forest would shake. (LoucA 18; Lampiris, Aetolia, Roumeli)

This competition has engendered the hybrid *oste pu* (Nicholas 1998b).

*svegliata così presto, **mentre** noi ci svegliavamo due ore prima di giorno, ed essa dormiva*
What has happened this morning to have made her order a double coffee and sweets and have woken up so soon, ***whereas*** we would normally awake two hours before dawn while she still slept (TNC 202.12; Roccaforte, Calabria)

(75b)   *Yatì érčesso na mu fáise te kkóftese, **pu** emména tútese én' i* sperántsa*mu na zío to x̌x̌imóna?*
jati erces:o na mu faise te k:oftese, ***pu*** em:ena tutese en i sperantsa mu na zio to ç:imona?
*Perché venivi a mangiarmi le pere secche, **che** per me sono la speranza di vivere nell'inverno?*
Why have you come to eat my dry pears, ***which/though*** they are my only hope to survive winter? (TNC 24.6; Roccaforte, Calabria)

Contrast also turns up in Cypriot, with (76b) moving close to a concessive ('although'):

(76a)   σιαστίζω, ***πᾦν*** εσιάστισα ποττέ μου.
ʃastizo, ***po*** n eʃastisa pot:e mu.
I am stunned—***whereas*** I have never been stunned before. (Lipertis 238)

(76b)   ασκόπα τούτα τα δεντρά τα δῠο τ' αγαπημένα,/ ***πᾦν*** εφιλούσαν ζωντανά, φιλούσιν ποθαμμένα.
askopa tuta ta ðendra ta ðjo t aɣapimena,/ ***po*** n efilusan zondana, filusin poθam:ena.
Look at these two beloved trees; ***although/whereas*** they did not kiss while still alive, they kiss now that they are dead. (Loukas 25.59)

Likewise in Cretan:

(77a)   Φαινότανέ ντου παράξενο του μιτσού Κωσταντή που δεν εθώριε στο χωριό ντους βασιλικούς, ***από*** αλλού πλατύφυλλοι και σγουροί αθούσαν και μοσκομυρίζανε τσοι τόπους.
fenotane du parakseno tu mitsu kostadi pu ðen eθorie sto xorio dus vasilikus, ***apu*** alu platifili ke sɣuri aθusan ke moskomirizane tsi topus.
It seemed strange to Kostandis that he did not see any basil in the village, ***whereas*** elsewhere they flowered wide-leaved and dense, and perfumed the place. (GrigB 3; Hania)

(77b)   Γιάδα 'ποζυγώνεις το κοπέλι μου ***από*** 'ναι μικιό;
ɣiada poziɣonis to kopeli mu ***apu*** ne mitšio?
Why do you persecute my child ***though*** it is small? (HDMS 988:47; Eastern Crete)

And the contrast meaning is widespread amongst mainstream Greek dialects:

(78a)   Μας όκαμις του σκυλλί, μας όκαμις του γατί, τώρα μας όκαμις κι τουν ουχτρό, ***απ'*** θαλά κάμς τα ξα κι τα ξουμιλ′ᶃάτα πιδιά.
mas okamis tu skili, mas okamis tu ɣati, tora mas okamis ki tun uxtro, ***ap*** θala kams ta ksa ki ta ksumiʎɡata piðia.
You have given birth to the dog, you have given birth to the cat, now you have given birth to the serpent, ***whereas*** you were supposed to have given brith to the golden and gold-templed children. (Rigas 1962:12; Skiathos, Thessaly)

(78b)   Τι καυχιέσαι πως έχεις την τιμιότερη γυναίκα τση χώρας, ***που*** εγώ έχω το δαχτυλίδι τση και τη χρυσή τρίχα, που είχε στην αμασχάλη.

ti kafxiese pos exis tin timioteri ɣineka tsi xoras, ***pu*** eɣo exo to ðaxtiliði tsi ke ti
xrisi trixa, pu ixe stin amasxali.
How can you boast that you have the most honest wife in the land, **when** I have
her ring and the golden hair she had in her armpit? (MinA 392; Volimes, Zante,
Heptanesa)

(78c)   γιατί δεν πας τον ίσιο δρόμο, ***που*** πας το στραβό;
jati ðen pas ton isjo ðromo, ***pu*** pas to stravo?
Why won't you go on the straight path, **in** going down the crooked path ***instead?*** (HDMS 587:129; 'Pallpoul.' (Pappoulia, Messenia?), Peloponnese)

(78d)   Ἰέ χίρσα να τα χάνου. ***Που*** η Φίλου στα νειάτα τ'ς, τα είχιν τιτρακόσια...
ie xirsa na ta xanu. ***pu*** i filu sta niata ts, ta ixin titrakošia...
Look, I've started to forget things. ***Whereas*** Filo (= I) in her youth was so
smart... (HDMS 955:53; Roumlouki, Imathia, Macedonia)

Both (78b) and (78c) are ambiguous between contrast and circumstance, and
this points to the most salient characteristic of contrast-*pu:* it has come into
such wide use, not as a distinct function of *pu,* but as a straightforward semantic
extension of extant usages of the particle; contrastive *pu*-clauses are little more
than relative or circumstance clauses whose content happens to contrast with
the matrix. It does not represent a significant semantic enrichment in *pu,* and
with the arguable exception of tautologous relativisations, has not become conventionalised.

7.4.5. Introducing realis concessive clauses

The notion of concession inheres in that of contrast, and since contrast-*pu* is so
widespread in Greek, one would expect the reanalysis of contrast to concession
to also be widely attested. Some incipient cases of this have already been seen in
§7.4.4.

In CSMG, the concessive meaning of connectives is made explicit by prefixing
the focus particle *ke* (*ke pu*= 'even though', after *ke na, ke as, ke an*); so one
would expect concessive instances both with and without *ke* amongst Greek dialects. But as discussed in §3.4.5, *ke pu* holds a restricted niche amongst the
many Greek concessive markers: it is illocutionary, like *ke as,* but asserts the potential relevance of antecedent to consequent, unlike *ke as*. This restricted niche
is borne out in the distribution of *ke pu,* and *pu* as a concessive marker on its
own: (76b) is the closest to a concessive-*pu* in my dialectal corpus, and *ke pu* is
not in evidence at all. There are no instances of *ke pu* in Makriyannis or Tahtsis,
and in the corpus of *Hellas-L* from November 1996 to January 1998, there are
just 4 potential instances of concessive `kai pou` from a corpus of around 8.5
million words.[59] So *ke pu* is severely underused.

The four instances of *ke pu* are worth citing, to gain a clearer picture of why it
is so infrequent:

---

[59]This contrasts markedly with the counts for other explicit concessive markers—812 for `an
kai`, and 214 for `kai as` in particular.

(79a) pare to tsimpoukaki sto stoma esu kai to Dallas olo giati **kai pou** sas
       paizoume xarh sas kanoume.

       πάρε το τσιμπουκάκι στο στόμα εσύ και το *Dallas* όλο γιατί *και που* σας παίζουμε
       χάρη σας κάνουμε.

       pare to tsibukaki sto stoma esi ke to *Dallas* olo γiati **ke pu** sas pezume xari sas
       kanume.

       You and the whole of Dallas can suck my dick, because we're doing you a favour
       even by play**ing** your team. (Vasilios Pierre Iskos, Re: 37-10 baby!; Hellas-L,
       1996−12-22)

(79b) **Kai pou** Brizete ton Troxava ti exete petyxei?

       Και που βρίζετε τον Τροχανά τι έχετε πετύχει;

       ke pu vrizete ton troxana ti exete petixi?

       And in swear**ing** at Trohanas, what have you accomplished? (Nick Triandos,
       Re: AEK-Bayevic Sxolia; Hellas-L, 1997−01−11)

(79c) Giannh, an se apokaloun "Amerikanaki" mh to dineis kai poly shmasia.
       Kai pou se lene etsi, ti egine? Epese to cashe sou?

       Γιάννη, αν σε αποκαλούν «Αμερικανάκι» μη το δίνεις και πολύ σημασία. *Και που* σε
       λένε έτσι, τι έγινε; Έπεσε το *cashé* σου;

       γiani, an se apokalun 'amerikanaki' mi to ðinis ke poli simasia. **ke pu** se lene etsi,
       ti eγine? epese to *cashé* (sic) su?

       John, if they call you a dumb Yank, don't pay it too much mind. ***Even if*** they
       call you that, so what? Has your cachet fallen? (Costa Flocas, Re: ELLADA n'
       AMERIKH; Hellas-L, 1997−08−28)

(79d) **Kai pou** tis dineis to id sou gkiouleka na leei tetoies malakies, Qa
       eprepe na ntrepesai.

       Και που της δίνεις το *ID* σου Γκιουλέκα να λέει τέτοιες μαλακίες, θα έπρεπε να
       ντρέπεσαι.

       ke pu tis ðinis to *ID* su giuleka na lei teties malakies, θa eprepe na drepese.

       Just for giv**ing** her your account, Gioulekas, to post bullshit like that, you
       should be ashamed of yourself. (Nick Gavrielatos, gamhmenoi turks; Hellas-L,
       1997−10−16)

The examples show well that *ke pu* has not taken off in Greek as a concessive.[60]
This is apparent in the semantics of the examples. There is a significant se-
mantic difference between conditional *an* and concessive *an ke* or *akoma ke an,*
and between hortative *as* and concessive *ki as:* the concessive forms are seman-
tically enriched relative to their non-concessive, non-focussed counterparts. By
contrast, *ke pu* in these examples is entirely compositional. But for a difference
in thematic meaning, brought about by the focus particle *ke* (hand-in-hand with
the preposed *pu*-clause), these sentences are not very different from their cir-
cumstance-*pu* equivalents.[61]

---

[60]One might compare it to Harris & Campbell's (1995:72−75) *exploratory constructions,* the
precursors to linguistic innovations which do not always prosper in a language.

[61]Thus, *xari sas kanume **pu** sas pezume* 'we're doing you a favour **by** play**ing** your team'; *ti exete
petixi **pu** vrizete ton troxana* 'what have you gained **by** swear**ing** at Trohanas?'; *ti eγine **pu** se lene
etsi* 'so what **if** (given that) they call you that?'

For (79d), we could even call the *pu*-clause a preposed emotive complement; but without *ke,* the
sentence is ungrammatical in CSMG, which does not allow preposed *pu*-complements, and the
matrix of (79d) could just as easily be *ðixnis poso afelis ise* 'you show how naive you are', a non-
emotive predicate which does not take a *pu*-complement. So *ke pu* in this instance is best ana-
lysed as a focussed causal.

There is a difference between *ke pu* and *pu; ke pu* makes (79d) grammatical, and makes it easier in all instances for the *pu*-circumstances to be preposed. But even in these instances with *ke,* all we have are focussed circumstances and causes: 'even by playing', 'even for giving'.[62] And the examples do not have uniformly concessive force. So a sentence like (79c) or (79e) is reasonably close to being concessive.

(79e)   *Και που* πήγα και τον παρακάλεσα, τίποτε δε θέλησε να μου κάμη.
          ke pu piγa ke ton parakalesa, tipote ðe θelise na mu kami.
          Even though I went and asked him, he was unwilling to do anything for me.
          (Tz §282 LXXXIV iii 4; unattributed)

On the other hand, there is little concessive force in (79a) and (79d).[63]

The best proof of these instances of *ke pu* not being strongly concessive is by substitution: both *an ke* and *ke as* would only be acceptable for (79c) and (79e). In the other sentences, they would be rather akin to 'missing the joke'; for example, in (79a), *an ke sas pezume, xari sas kanume* 'although we're playing your team, we're doing you a favour' makes 'playing your team' sound like a grudging admission, as opposed to the intended flippant comment.

Clearly, *ke pu* is not a conventionalised concessive like *an ke, akoma ke an,* or even *ke as*. With only one clear instance (79c) in an 8.5 million word corpus, and with such compositionality in its semantics making it little more than a focussed circumstance—not to mention the semantic restrictions placed on the connective as discussed in §3.4.5—*ke pu* is not a significant component of the concessive paradigm. Concessiveness in turn is a marginal feature of contrast-*pu* and circumstance-*pu,* and has nowhere become semanticised to the extent it has for temporal, resultative, or even causal meanings; so concession is not a salient characteristic of *pu*.[64]

The failure of *pu* to take hold as a concessive undermines the underspecification view of adjunct-*pu*. If *pu* is underspecified and covers all realis adjuncts, concession is a realis function *pu* should be taking on. This shows that there is a difference between the latency of a function in underspecification, and its explicit expression in a way salient to the paradigm. Concession does indeed inhere in contrast, circumstance, and relativisation; but for *pu* or *ke pu* to become

---

[62]In (79c) and (79d), there is not even much of a consequent to have been made unexpected by the 'concessive' antecedent: the consequent is in fact a question—although, admittedly, a rhetorical question.

[63](79a) is arguably concessive on the illocutionary level ('granted, we're playing your team; but we're just doing you a favour'). (79d) is barely concessive even on that level ('your sin was only allowing your girlfriend terminal access; I will still claim, though, that you should be ashamed of yourself'); given the context (Lefteris Gioulekas' anti-nationalist statements have made him as much of a pariah on the mailing list as his Turkish girlfriend posting anti-Greek messages), 'you should be ashamed of yourself *also* for giving her access' is likelier, and 'also' involves focus, not concession.

[64]Oddly, concession *is* salient in its irrealis garb: the unrealisable concessive (§7.7.3) may not be that much more frequent in text than concessive-*ke pu,* but it cannot be mistaken for any other *pu na*-function, and it occurs in very distinctive contexts.

salient expressions of concession, they need to establish a distinct semantic niche or paradigmatic preponderance. The Greek concessive paradigm is rich, particularly as concession is a less 'basic' semantic relation than time or cause, and thus experiences less functional pressure for paradigmatic refinement. And unlike the *pu na*-concessive, *(ke) pu* has no distinctive semantic niche. So *pu* has not prospered as a concessive; and the reason lies in the linguistic system it is enmeshed into, and not its external or original history.

7.4.6. Introducing temporal clauses

Temporal-*pu* is entrenched in Greek dialects, including Cappadocian (§B.1), Tsakonian (see below), Pontic (rarely),[65] and Italiot:

(80a) ας σ' όλον οπίσου *'που* να εκούπιζαν απάν' ατου τρία τάδα νερό, εκείνα τα τρία τασέες τα νερά αν 'κ' εσταύρωναν ατα με την πλάκαν ατουνα, 'κ' εξύνισκαν ατα 'ς σο μωρόν ατουνα απάνου.
   as s olon opisu *pu* na ekupizan apan atu tria taʃa nero, ekina ta tria tasees ta nera an k estavronan ata me tin plakan atuna, k ekʃiniskan ata s so moron atuna apanu.
   Last of all, ***when*** they were to pour onto the baby three cupfuls of water, they would not pour them onto the baby unless they crossed them with their palm. (Siviridis 1938:210; Oinoe, Pontus)

(80b) κ' οι καλοέρ' 'ς έναν χρόνον απάν' εποίκαν ατον τσαλπαρατσήν, κέλλαρον, επίτροπον, οικονόμον κι όλων ύστερα *π'* εκοιμήθηκεν ο γούμενον εποίκαν ατον και γούμενον.
   k i kaloer s enan xronon apan epikan aton tsalparatsin, kelaron, epitropon, ikonomon ki olon istera *p* ekimiθiken o ɣumenon epikan aton ke ɣumenon.
   and in one year the monks made him bell-ringer, cellarer, church warden, head priest, and finally ***when*** the abbot passed away, they made him the abbot. (KandilB 192; Chaldia, Pontus)

(80c) *Èftase **pu** stee ègg̲uenne 'asteràì,/ će pirte—'ti nnorìdzato kkalà—/ târtèa sto ffilo*
   eftase *pu* stee eg:wen:e asterai,/ tʃe pirte—ti n:oridzato k:ala—/ta rtea sto f:ilo
   *Giunse **quando** stava per spuntare per spuntare la stella del mattino/ e andò direttamente—chè conosceva bene il luogo—/ verso l'amico*
   He arrived ***when*** the morning star had started coming out, and he went directly—for he knew the place well—to a friend (Palumbo 135; Calimera, Apulia)

(80d) *San epasséspai áɖɖe ddío, trís' iméri, **pu** o ðɣávolo íšere ti i ňúratu íto proparésponda ta sekúnda faɟía, pu íӡe na fái o mónako, tu ípe tu ňúritu*
   san epas:espai aɖ:e d:io, tris imeri, *pu* o ðjavolo iʃere ti i ɲuratu ito proparesponda

---

[65]Contrary to other dialects considered here, temporal-*pu* is extremely infrequent in Pontic—four examples in a corpus of 200,000 words (0.02‰), of which only (80a), from the westerly Oinuntiac, is a clearcut example. Indicative of this avoidance of temporal-*pu* is an instance where Pontic avoids a use of *pu* universal in Greek, extending even to Tsakonian and Cappadocian. A phrase present in almost every Greek fairy tale (with attendant dialectal variation) is *sto ðromo **pu** piɣene* 'on the road ***as*** (where, on which) s/he went…', used to introduce a problem in the story as the protagonist encounters a deuteragonist. In this phrase, *pu* is ambiguous between being locative and temporal. In at least two instances, a Pontic tale replaces *pu* with the explicit temporal *sitæ;* this is unheard of in other Greek dialects:
(81) Ση στράταν *σίτε* επήνεν, επήρεν έναν λουχούμ' και είπεν…
   si stratan *site* epinen, epiren enan luxum ke ipen…
   As he was going on his way, he took a Turkish delight out and said… (Fosteris 1959:286; Buga Madeni)

> ta sekunda faɟia, pu iҫe na fai o monako, tu ipe tu ɲuritu
> *Quando passarono altri due, tre giorni, **allorché** il diavolo seppe che la*
> *padrona aveva preparato il secondo pranzo, che doveva mangiare il monaco,*
> *disse al padrone*
> When another two or three days had passed, **when** the devil knew that the mistress has prepared the second meal the monk was to eat, he told the master
> (TNC 137.7; Roccaforte, Calabria)

Tsakonian

While temporal-*pu* is attested widely, there is more heterogeny amongst Greek dialects in the extent *pu* spreads into the temporal paradigm than for any other adjunct function. The temporal paradigm is the only one for which ˈ*opu* has an appreciable presence in Cappadocia (§B.1), making it the unmarked temporal in Ulagaç. The Tsakonian temporal connective paradigm is also quite different to that of CSMG. Whereas CSMG mostly uses *otan* and *ama* as temporal connectives, Tsakonian mostly uses *ama* and *pʰi*.[66]

Temporal *pʰi* stands out in two regards. First, it is much more frequent in Tsakonian than in CSMG. In Makriyannis' *Memoirs* (a text which favours adjunct-*pu* compared to CSMG texts) temporal *pu* occurs as 0.19‰ of all words; in Peloponnesian Tsakonian temporal *pʰi* occurs ten times more often—1.8‰; in Propontis Tsakonian, the count is 1.5‰.

The other salient property of Tsakonian temporal *pʰi* is that it is frequently sentence-initial. This contrasts with CSMG, where sentence-initial temporal-*pu* is at best marginal. Seven of the 35 Peloponnesian Tsakonian instances are sentence-initial, compared with none of the 28 instances in Makriyannis. In most of those instances, *pʰi* is glossed in CSMG as *ama* or *otan,* rather than *pu*—confirming that this behaviour is uncharacteristic of CSMG *pu:*

(82a)   *Π̇ʹ* ἐνʹ ἔγγα α μανή, ῂ̓ ἔνι δία λιγάτῖι κανέα, γαρούφα
          pʰ en eŋga a maɲi, ɲ eni ðia liɣatҫi kanea, ɣarufa
          Που (=όταν) πάει η μαμή, της δίνει λίγη κανέλα, γαρίφαλα
          pu (=otan) pai i mami, tis ðini liɣi kanela, ɣarifala
          When the midwife goes, she gives her some cinnamon, some cloves (CostD
          §3a; Pragmatefti, Southern Tsakonia)

Furthermore, 28 of the 35 Peloponnesian instances precede their matrix, as against only 3 of the 28 instances in Makriyannis. So while both in CSMG *pu* and Tsakonian *pʰi* has been reanalysed as a temporal connective, the reanalysis has progressed much further than in CSMG, where the adjunct still tends to follow a putative antecedent, like relativiser-*pu* does. This discrepancy means that sentences like the following would be misunderstood in CSMG, which would associate the *pu*-adjunct with the preceding *if*-clause, rather than the ensuing consequent.

---

[66]The use of *ama* in CSMG is constrained by its polysemy as a conditional marker. These constraints do not operate in Tsakonian, so that *ama* is often used in contexts it would be avoided in CSMG, presumably for fear of ambiguity.

(82b)   να ζάρε τσαι σ' εξεχάρε, **π'οι** να μόλερε τ'α μισά τα πορεία να σταμακήση το βαπόρι
τσαι να μην βορήνερε να ταξιδέψερε
na zare tse s eksexare, **pʰi** na molere tʰa misa ta poʒia na stamakisi to bapoʒi tse na
min boʒinere na taksiðepsere
*if you go and forget them, **when** you have come half your way, may the boat
stop, and may you not be able to travel* (Scutt 19; Lenidi, Southern Tsakonia)

Cypriot

Cypriot resembles Tsakonian with regard to preposing, although *pu* is not quite
as widespread in that dialect. Like Tsakonian *pʰi,* Cypriot *pu* is at times sen-
tence-initial: in the prose corpus (Aetos, Newton), 3 of the 19 instances are sen-
tence-initial (83).

(83)   *lali tu če činos **pu**-nna ppésis pu ka... káto pu to* ðentrón, *na... enna se párun na se*
xápsun, *enna* pexánis.
lali tu tʃe tʃinos **pu** nːa pːesis pu ka... kato pu to ðentron, na... enːa se parun na se
xapsun, enːa pexanis.
*The other says to him, "**When** you fall down... down from the tree... they will
take you to bury you. You will die."* (Newton §7.3.3; Tsadha, South Paphos,
Cyprus)

Furthermore, there are 19 temporal instances in a prose corpus of some 21,000
words (0.90‰); this is not far from the Tsakonian figure of 1.5–1.8‰, com-
pared to the proportions in other Greek dialects.

Preposed temporals: other dialects

By contrast, in other Greek dialects preposed temporal-*pu* is infrequent. To
work out the diatopy of temporal-*pu,* I analyse in detail its distribution in my
HDMS corpus.

   Of the 45 HDMS instances of temporal-*pu* outside Tsakonian, Cappadocian
and Cypriot with adequate context provided, 20 are preposed, and 9 are sen-
tence-initial.[67] Now, of these examples, 6 are preceded by nominals or temporal
adverbs, and are straightforward reanalyses of relative clauses:

(84a)   Οι νουνοί **π'** βάφτ'ζαν τα πιδγιά γνώρ'ζαν τι όνουμα θα τ' βγάλ'ν
i nuni **p** vaftzan ta piðɣia ɣnorzan ti onuma θa t vɣaln
Godfathers, **when** they (or: who) christened children, knew what name they
would give them (HDMS 1203:26; Artopoula, Ioannina, Epirus)

Two others display idiosyncratic formations: the *opo rθi* 'when it comes' desig-
nation of an upcoming holiday in Apiranthos, and the temporal/conditional ˈ*opu*
from Cythera (§7.6); these are local innovations, with no global implications.
Another two examples can be ruled out as being conventionalised; one is a
proverb (HDMS 1069:119; Chios, Central Aegean), and another a folk song

---

[67]As the compilers of the HDMS indexcards concentrated on exceptional instances of common-
place words, sentence-initial–*pu* would be expected to be overrepresented in the indexcards.

(CPMS 282:44; Tilos, Dodecanese), so that their word order is not subject to normal prose rules.

There remain ten examples of preposed temporal-*pu,* and their distribution points again to local effects; two are from Messenia in the Peloponnese, two from Othoni in the Heptanesa, and three from Apulia—all areas already noted as featuring idiosyncratic usage of *pu:*

(84b)   *Που* θα κάνουμε γάμο στα λεβέτια τα βράζουμε τα φαγιά
         pu θa kanume γamo sta levetia ta vrazume ta faγia
         When we hold a marriage, it's in the cauldrons that we boil the food (HDMS 622:54; Messenia, Peloponnese)

(84c)   ´*Οπου* με πήρε η Κουδέσαινα έφλαγα τσι χήνες
         '*opu* me pire i kudesena eflaγa tsi xines
         When Koudesis' wife found me I was minding the geese (HDMS 793:205; Othoni, Heptanesa)

(84d)   Καιρόμ βρίτα, σαν ήμ-μομ βλέν ɡιόβανο, ***που*** ήσων-να, έσπερ-ρα, άλουν-να με τα βου
         kerom brita, san im:om blen ɟovano, ***pu*** ison:a, esper:a, alun:a me ta vu
         *Πολύ καιρό πριν, όταν ήμουν πιο νέος, **που** μπορούσα (είχα δυνάμεις), έσπερνα, ώργωνα με τα βόδια*
         polu kairo prin, otan imun pio neos, ***pu*** borusa (ixa ðinamis), esperna, orγona me ta voðia
         A long time ago, when I was younger, ***when*** I was physically able, I sowed, I ploughed with the oxen (HDMS 924:5; Martano, Apulia)

This data seems to show that, while the phenomenon of preposing a temporal *pu*-clause is not unknown to mainstream Greek, instances where there is full preposing (i.e. the *pu*-clause is not just a reanalysed relative clause) are infrequent, and many of them (though by no means all) represent local developments.[68]

Irrealis temporals

Amongst the many possible developments for a temporal, one that is cross-linguistically common is the transition from temporal to conditional. This occurs in CSMG for *ama* 'when; if' < *háma* 'at the same time, jointly with'. Temporal-*pu* is a candidate for such a reanalysis, but the transition of *pu* into irrealis territory would violate the factivity so characteristic of its distribution in most Greek dialects. The transition has occurred (for some examples, see §7.6 and §B.1), but is

---

[68]There is a preposed temporal collocation in Apulian Italiot which is peculiar compared to other Greek collocations: *pu* is combined with *ke* 'and' to mean 'as soon as'.

(85)   *Που κ̓' ην είδα, 'ην ɡάπησα.*
         pu tʃ in ida, in gapisa.
         As soon as I saw her, I fell in love with her. (Karanastasis 1991:που)

The only function *ke* can have here is as a focus particle, although it is in an odd place for it, following rather than preceding the connective. (*ke* cannot be placing the clitic into focus, as a clitic pronoun is too weak to receive such emphasis.) The meaning is odd too: a focussed *pu*-adjunct is normally a concessive in Greek (§7.4.5). Still, this can only count as an idiosyncratically emphasised temporal-*pu,* rather than a novel collocation.

infrequent, and this may be attributed to persistence in *pu*. The following are further instances of this transition; (86b) is more an irrealis temporal ('whenever') than a conditional, or even a pseudo-relative, while Pharasiot *s opu* (86c) is reminiscent of Ulagaç *op* (§B.1).

(86a)   *Però, **pu** ìssai calabrisi, **pu** ìssai siciliani, **pu** ìssai asciùnde mmerìe, den tus ispàzzame*
pero, ***pu*** isːai kalabrisi, ***pu*** isːai sitʃiliani, ***pu*** isːai aʃunde mːerie, den tus ispatsːame
*Però, **quando** erano calabresi, **quando** erano siciliani, **quando** erano di queste parti, non li ammazzavamo*
However, ***when*** they were Calabrians, ***when*** they were Sicilians, ***when*** they were from those parts, we would not kill them (DGC 172; Gallicianò, Calabria)[69]

(86b)   *Pánda **pu** θélite na tin ívrite, ti ssónnite ívri, ti ećíni ston ǵípo e ppánda.*
panda ***pu*** θelite na tin ivrite, ti sːonːite ivri, ti etʃini ston dʒipo e pːanda.
*Sempre **che** la vogliate vedere, la potete vedere, perché essa è sempre nel giardino.*
Always ***whenever*** you wish to see her, you can, because she is always in the garden. (TNC 50.33; Roccaforte, Calabria)

(86c)   Το γαϊρίδι ***σόπου*** ’α νδα τϭενδείς πολύ, για ’α σε ϭέσει, για ’α σε ’αχτίσει.
to ɣairiði ***sopu*** a nda tʃendis poli, ɣia a se ʃesi, ɣia a se axtisi.
When/If you poke a donkey a lot, it will either shit on you or kick you.
(LoucLouc §122; Pharasa)

That these instances are restricted to outliers is significant; there appears to have been room for these developments to take place there without the constant reinforcement of factivity from standard Greek.

Infrequently, such usage also turns up in mainstream Greek, where it must be regarded as an on-the-spot reanalysis, rather than a global tendency:

(86d)   (1829–1840)
Δόλιος και αιμοβόρος, ***οπού*** το ’λεγες να κάμη κανάν Τούρκον χριστιανόν, αυτός τον τούρκευε χειρότερα.
ðolios ke emovoros, ***opu*** to leɣes na kami kanan turkon xristianon, aftos ton turkeve xirotera.
He was cunning and bloodthirsty; ***if/when*** you told him to make a Turk into a Christian, he made him a worse Turk than before. (MakM 104)

Non-Punctual temporals

Another aspect in which there is some variation is the temporal reference of *pu*. Almost always, *pu* is a punctual temporal, equivalent to 'when'. This is an unmarked value, and is to be expected for *pu,* which has little explicit temporal semantics associated with it. There are, however, exceptions. The Pharasiot temporal *s opu*[70] (86c) means 'while' rather than 'when'; this is uncharacteristic

---

[69]This instance would at first glance be interpreted as a free relative; but we have no evidence for such a form in Italiot.
[70]Apparently, < *s* 'to, at' + ꞌ*opu*. Andriotis (1948:68) lists *sopu* as a quantitative connective, but the gloss *oso* is both quantitative and temporal in CSMG ('however much; while'), and the four instances of *sopu* in the corpus are all temporal.

of *pu,* and may be explained by a closer connection of *s opu* to indefinite ꞌ*opu* ('wherever' can cover an interval of space) than punctual-*pu*. This affinity is explicit in the iterative usage in (87a):

(87a)   *'Σ όπου* κάδζεψ' η'ναίκα του, ατός κατέβη
          s opu kadʒeps i neka tu, atos katevi
          While his wife spoke, he beat her/***Whenever*** his wife spoke, he beat her
          (TheodB 298)

Such a connection may also be invoked in Italiot, where ꞌ*opu* > *pu* is phonologically regular; in (87b), however, *pu* is closer to 'until'—although it might be replacing *na* as a complement here (see §6.7), so that this is not definitely a temporal instance.

(87b)   *Mino,* ***pu*** *arte su nifto.*
          mino, ***pu*** arte su nifto.
          Μείνε (περίμενε) ***νἄρθω*** *να σ' ανοίξω.*
          mine (perimene) ***na*** rθo na s anikso.
          Wait ***until*** I (come and) open for you/Wait ***for*** me ***to*** (come and) open for you.
          (Dizikirikis 17; Apulia)

In the following two instances, finally, *pu* appears to mean 'since'; both instances are from idiosyncratic mainstream Greek dialects, Apiranthos (well-known for innovating its own solutions), and Othoni, at the northwest end of the Greek-speaking world, where relativiser-ꞌ*opu* survives (§B.4.3).

(87c)   Ποτέ δου, πρέπει, πως δεν είχε μ' όροξη 'ελασμένα, ***πο*** 'εννήθηκε
          pote du, prepi, pos ðen ixe m oroksi elasmena, ***po*** eniθike
          It seems that he had never had a proper laugh ***since*** he was born (HDMS 571:496; Apiranthos, Naxos, Cyclades)

(87d)   Δε ματακοτάει ο Μήτσης να πάη για ψάρεμα, ***που*** είδε το αγριόψαρο
          ðe matakotai o mitsis na pai ja psarema, ***pu*** iðe to aɣriopsaro
          Mitsis does not dare go fishing again, ***since*** he saw the shark (HDMS 817:298; Othoni, Heptanesa)[71]

So there is deviation from the realis, punctual temporal of CSMG; what matters is not so much that the deviation is there, as that there is so little of it, restricted to dialects divergent from the mainstream—Pharasa, Ulagaç Cappadocian, Italiot, Othoni, Apiranthos. Dialects cut off from the Greek mainstream were able to apply to *pu* developments which are cross-linguistic commonplaces. Dialects remaining in touch with the mainstream, which seems to have reinforced the factivity of *pu,* have not done this. Such dialects have also not permitted the further expansion of *pu* in the temporal paradigm to non-punctual meanings, or encouraged its emancipation as a linguistic sign from the persistence of postposition; the exceptions to this, Tsakonian and Cypriot, have also been cut off from the mainstream to a degree. The restrictions on temporal-*pu,* which have arrested its grammaticalisation, have taken place in mainstream Greek, and have

---

[71](87d) may be causal rather than temporal; but (87c) is certainly temporal.

preserved the temporal paradigm from admitting a substantial new member. These restrictions are probably fairly recent (failing as they have to get to Othoni and Cyprus),[72] but they have been communicated amongst the various mainstream dialects effectively.[73]

7.5. Discourse connective

As seen in §3.5, the discourse connective function of *opu* attracted Tzartzanos' attention through its frequent use in texts from Zante. In this function, *opu* is sporadically attested elsewhere. It is attested in Cephallonia, the next island along from Zante:

(88a) Την άλλη μέρα το λοιπό, μπονόρα-μπονόρα, μπαρκάρανε ο Χριστός κι οι δώδεκα Απόστολοι στο κανό τ' ΄Αη-Πέτρου κι εβάλανε πλώρη για την Κεφαλονιά. [¶] *Οπού* λοιπό, να μην τα πολυλογάμε, το ταξίδι, με τη βοήθεια του Παντοκρατόρου και τ' αφεντός του Χριστού, πήαινε πρίμα.

---

[72]The isolation of Apiranthos from Western Cretan is only three centuries old, but Apiranthos consistently goes its own way, and so cannot be used to date the change.

[73]Just as there are outliers that have embraced temporal-*pu* more than the mainstream, so too there are outliers—namely Pontic—which have embraced it less; still, as Table 22 above makes clear, *pu* has been singularly unsuccessful as an adjunct connective in Pontic in general.

Andriotis (1960:135–139) provides a derivation of temporal *pu* which should be mentioned for completeness, but which I find implausible. Middle and Early Modern Greek had an Absolutive temporal construction, consisting of the definite article and the infinitive: *tó ideîn/to iðin* 'the see.INF = upon seeing, when s/he saw'. As the infinitive died out in EMG, the infinitive in this absolutive construction started being replaced by the equivalent *na*-clause, consistent with the replacement of the infinitive by *na* in irrealis complements. Thus, *to iðin* is replaced by *to na iði* 'the IRR s/he.sees = upon seeing, when s/he saw'.

In the Dodecanese and Cyprus a temporal *na* is extant with the meaning 'as soon as', although the contemporary construction does not use the definite article. Andriotis derives this construction from the EMG absolutive (in my view unnecessarily.) Andriotis then goes on to say that, since *na* and *pu* are in complementary distribution so often, temporal *pu* developed as an equivalent to temporal *na,* with both connectives equivalent to the Ancient participle.

But a derivation involving the reanalysis of the temporal relativiser to a temporal connective is much more straightforward than Andriotis' derivation. There are a number of other problems with this derivation. First, there is no trace of EMG *to na* or **to pu* as a temporal connective anywhere in Modern Greek. Second, while temporal *na* is restricted to South-Eastern Greek, temporal *pu* is found all over Greek; if *pu* was derived from *to na,* it is hard to see why temporal *na* would be regionally restricted, while temporal *pu* has spread to relic dialects like Cappadocian. Finally, there is no reason why temporal *pu* should be subject to a special analogical derivation like Andriotis', while the sundry other adjunct functions of *pu* exploit straightforward reanalyses of relativisers or other adjunct connectives.

Andriotis' argument highlights the dangers in analogical argumentation; it can easily become too abstract and schematic, particularly when linguistic change is viewed as a blanket transfer between equivalent forms, without regard for actual reanalyses involved, or competing and simpler derivations. Admittedly, the equivalence of the Ancient participle with *pu* has been appealed to in this work more than once. Andriotis' account, however, is problematic: it invokes mechanical substitutions—DETERMINER + INFINITIVE → *na*→ *pu~ na*—showing a superficial appreciation of the *pu~ na* opposition in Modern Greek: it is a long way from *mexri pu~ mexri na* and the complementary distribution of complementisers, to *pu* being conscripted out of thin air to complement temporal-*na*. And in giving an old pedigree to temporal-*pu* and *na* at any expense (even if the pedigree in this instance is Middle, and not Classical Greek), Andriotis' account fails to look for much simpler solutions closer to home—solutions which would have been obvious to Andriotis, if he had looked at how *pu* works in Greek as a system, rather than establishing a distinct lineage for a particular subsystem.

tin ali mera to lipo, bonora-bonora, barkarane o xristos ki i ðoðeka apostoli sto kano t ai petru ki evalane plori ɣia tin kefalonia. [¶] ***opu*** lipo, na min ta poliloɣame, me ti voiθia tu padokratoru ke t afedos tu xristu, piene prima. So, the next day, early in the morning, Christ and the twelve Apostles set sail in St Peter's boat, and headed for Cephallonia. [Paragraph] **Well,** not to make a long tale of it, the voyage, with the help of God Omnipotent and Christ's Father, was going fine. (Skiadaresis 380)

And it was recorded for Kythnos in the Cyclades by I. Voyatzidis in 1920, who explicitly identified it as a narrative connective:

(88b)   *όπου = τότε εν διηγήσεσιν.* «άνοιξε, γιατί θ' ανεγκαστώ να σπάσω την πόρτα· ***όπου*** έσπασε λοιπό την πόρτα...» «έχασα τη γυναίκα μου· όποιος τη βρη θα του δώσω μεγάλο ριγάλο. ***όπου*** τότε το λοιπό τρέξανε όλοι...»
'*opu = tote en ðiiɣisesin.* "anikse, ɣiati θ anegasto na spaso tin porta; '***opu*** espase lipo tin porta..." "exasa ti ɣineka mu; opios ti vri θa tu ðoso meɣalo riɣalo. '***opu*** tote lipo treksane oli..."
'*opu= then in narratives.* "Open up, or I'll be forced to break the door down. **So** he broke the door down..." "I have lost my wife; whoever finds her, I will give him a great reward. **So** then they all ran..." (HDMS 283:372)

In both these examples, '*opu* appears in combination with the discourse connective *lipon* 'so, well'. This is also frequently the case in Minotou's texts, and confirms that the function of '*opu* is not so much semantic (what little semantic content it has is echoed in *lipon*), as emblematic of the story-telling genre. This is illustrated in the texts from Marmara (HDMS 756), which have ten instances of discourse-connective '*opu:*

(89a)   Λέω, θα πάω πάλι, αν είναι χωμένα πουθενά, θα τα βρω· α δεν είναι... ´*Οπου,* πήα την άλλη μέρα... πήα την άλλη μέρα; Εγώ πήα κοιμήθ'κα.
leo, θa pao pali, an ine xomena puθena, θa ta vro; a ðen ine... '***opu***, pia tin ali mera... pia tin ali mera? eɣo pia kimiθka.
I said, "I'll go again; if they're hidden anywhere, I'll find them; if not..." **So**, I went the next day... did I go the next day? I went and slept! (HDMS 756:7)

Nine of these instances were produced by Ioannis Andreou, whose text encompasses 18,000 words (textual frequency: 0.5‰). Eight of those instances are concentrated in seven pages (1,000 words; 8‰—cf. around 1.7‰ for Minotou's texts), and those very seven pages (HDMS 756:48–54) contain a fairy tale Andreou interpolates into his autobiographical narrative. Clearly, not only is connective-'*opu* associated with narrative genres, but it can be further restricted to fictional texts as opposed to running talk, and can be exploited to delimit texts of different genre from each other. Furthermore, this is not at all a semanticised or obligatorified device; it is very much a matter of individual choice (none of the other narrators in HDMS 756 use it).

There are only few instances where *opu* is used in real-life rather than fictional accounts. The following is one of these exceptions:

(89b)   Είμαστε στη δάνα και περιμέναμε όρdινο, ***όπου*** με το καταπώς πίναμε ένα ποτήρι σε μια bάρα στα δόκουρα νά σου και μας ακοστάρει ένας άθρωπος
imaste sti dana ke perimename ordino, '***opu*** me to katapos piname ena potiri se

mia bara sta dokura ˈna su ke mas akostari enas aθropos
We were at the port waiting for our orders, ***when*** just as we were having a drink at a bar by the docks, a man came up to us (HDMS 787:311; Ithaca, Heptanesa)

The individual variability in the use of ˈ*opu* may be illustrated by an extreme instance: in a narrative in Heisenberg, there are 7 instances of connective-ˈ*opu* in 23 narrative sentences (500 words) in his recorded version, and 9 instances in 20 sentences (500 words) in his dictated version. The speaker is clearly using ˈ*opu* just about anywhere he can.

It also shows that *opu* does not correspond to salient narrative units such as paragraphs or topic shifts, but can be used between individual sentences of narrative. Indeed, in several instances in Minotou, *opu* links the first sentence of the narrative with the second:

(89c)   Μία φορά κ' ένα καιρό ήθε είναι ένας βασιλέας. ***Οπού*** εχήρεψε ο βασιλέας.
mia fora k ena kero iθe ine enas vasileas. ***opu*** exirepse o vasileas.
Once upon a time there was a king. ***And*** the king became a widower. (MinA 437; Katastari, Zante)

In one instance in Heisenberg, the sentence linked with ˈ*opu* does not even advance the narrative, but rather provides background information:

(90a)   *etśíni ti vraðjá, jóka mu, síbtosis tśe ðem bíźasi na tiráksusi sto drínika. **ópu** i ʒaiðurókleftes íχasi bi sto drínika pritú pésj o íljos tśe tus varésasi éksi tufetśés monokopanjá, tśe tus skotósasi ólus ósi tśumúdasi sti gamarúla.*
etšʲini ti vraðja, joka mu, sibtosis tšʲe ðem biɣasi na tiraksusi sto drinika. ˈ***opu*** i ɣaiðurokleftes ixasi bi sto drinika pritu pesʲ o iʎos tšʲe tus varesasi eksi tufetšʲes monokopaṇa, tšʲe tus skotosasi olus osi tšumudasi sti gamarula.
That evening, son, by coincidence, they did not go look at the ground floor. ***Now*** the donkey rustlers had entered the ground floor before sundown, and they shot them six gunshots at once, and they killed all those who were sleeping in the little room. (Heisenberg 30; Dobra, Laconia, Peloponnese)

This presumably represents an overgeneralisation, with *opu* ambiguous with circumstance-*pu*. Being a one-off, this is unlikely to reflect the derivation of connective-*opu*. Other more prototypical instances, however, are illuminating. For instance, in the following *opu* is ambiguous between a resultative and a discourse connective:

(90b)   Αμέ μεις μια 'που γνωρίστημεν, θα σου παραγγείλωμεν να την νικήσης, και να γίνη πάγια καταδική σου για πάντα, ***όπου*** τότες ορπίζομεν να λυτρώσης και μας από τες καθημερινές αγγαριές της.
ame mis mja pu ɣnoristimen, θa su paraŋgilomen na tin nikisis, ke na ɣini paṇa kataðiki su ja panda, ˈ***opu*** totes orpizomen na litrosis ke mas apo tes kaθimerines aŋgarjes tis.
*But we, now that we know one another, will instruct you how you may conquer her, and she will become truly yours for ever, **and** then we hope that you will release us too from the daily labours she imposes on us.* (DawkD 138; Asfendiou, Kos, Dodecanese)

There are frequent examples of this ambiguity in Minotou's texts:

(90c)   Κλάφτηκε ο κακομοίρης ο βασιλιάς, εδάρθηκε, *οπού* να μη σ' τα πολυλογώ, τον άφησε
το φείδι να κόψη το τριαντάφυλλο
klaftike o kakomiris o vasilias, eðarθike, *opu* na mi s ta poliloγo, ton afise to fiði
na kopsi to triadafilo
The poor king wept and beat himself, ***and*** ('so that/until') to cut a long story
short, the serpent let him cut the rose (MinA 434; Katastari, Zante)

(90d)   Ξύλο μέρα νύχτα. Μέρα νύχτα τήνε παίδευε, *οπού* η κοπέλλα εβαρέθηκε, εβαρέθηκε
πλέο.
ksilo mera nixta. mera nixta tine peðeve, *opu* i kopela evareθike, evareθike pleo.
Beatings day and night. She tormented her day and night, ***until*** the girl was
sick of it, quite sick of it. (MinA 413; Volimes, Zante)

A second potential origin is as a relativiser (as already seen for other modern
relativers—*pu* and *o opios: §3.5.2*)

(90e)   Ήτουνα μία φορά μία μάνα κ' είχε δώδεκα παιδιά σερνικά και ένα θηλυκό. *Οπού*
είχανε κ' ένα χτήμα πέρα στην οξοχή.
ituna mia fora mia mana k ixe ðoðeka peðia sernika ke ena θiliko. *opu* ixane k ena
xtima pera stin oksoxi.
There was once a mother and she had twelve male children and one female.
And they ('who') also had a farm out in the countryside. (MinA 394; Mouzaki,
Zante)

The final derivation is the one Papadopoulou (1994a) has highlighted in her lo-
calist approach: the locative use of ʹ*opu*. Several factors argue in favour of this.
First, the phonological form of the connective points to ʹ*opu* rather than *pu;* in-
stances with *pu* are very infrequent, and not only is unstressed *opu* far more fre-
quent in these texts as a connective than in the other functions of *pu,* but ʹ*opu* it-
self is frequently used as the connective, in dialects where ʹ*opu* is not a relativiser
allomorph.

A locative also makes sense in connecting pieces of running discourse, both as
a circumstance marker and as a narrative-sequence connective. These usages
exploit the metaphor SPACE → DISCOURSE, which Papadopoulou appeals to for
much of her discussion; the metaphor is far more successful here than for the
other functions of *pu*. In the case of a circumstance marker, a circumstance or
background clause is connected to its matrix by analogy to a small entity (the
circumstance clause is peripheral) being located at a larger entity (the matrix
clause is the frame of reference). This conceptual metaphor is pervasive—com-
pare the expression the *circumstance is situated in the matrix,* or even the term
*frame of reference—*and English uses *where* as such a circumstance marker
(*This cost 10,000 drachmas, **where** 180 drachmas are worth one dollar*).

Narrative sequence is also expressed naturally by a locative: if one wishes to
express the close connection between two sentences, one can highlight their
narrative or cognitive contiguity by analogy with spatial contiguity. This is an-
other pervasive metaphor—witness the locative terms *connection* and *conti-
guity*—and one can invoke the English connective *whereupon.*

So we have in place a pathway from space to discourse. Yet there is a compli-
cation in that narrative contiguity, while metaphorically locative, is in actuality

temporal. If two sentences are linked in narration, by default they occur in temporal sequence; cases where they do not are not only marked for narration, but require a non-narrative connective.[74] So as a narrative connective, *opu* is implicitly temporal. And there is nothing unusual about the metaphor SPACE > TIME: *whereupon* is primarily a temporal connective, and there are many examples of locatives being used as temporals, including in Greek (e.g. the collocations *apano pu* 'on that = just as', *eki pu* 'there that = where = just as').

So is connective-*opu* a locative turned temporal, like *eki pu,* rather than a locative turned discourse marker? The evidence shows that it is not. In examples like the following, *opu* is used in combination with explicit temporal connectives, so that *opu* itself is unlikely to be doing temporal work:

(90f)   ῎Επειτα ξεθηλυκώνεται στον άντρα τση και του εφανερώθηκε. *Οπού ετότες* την επήρε
πάλι κ' εζήσανε εκείνοι καλά κ' εμείς καλύτερα.
epita kseθilikonete ston adra tsi ke tu efaneroθike. **opu etotes** tin epire pali k
ezisane ekini kala k emis kalitera.
Then she dropped her male disguise before her husband and revealed herself to
him. ***And then*** he took her back and they lived happily ever after. (MinA 392;
Volimes, Zante)

In an example like (89c) or (90e), moreover, there is very little sense of temporal sequence, although there is a sense of narrative sequence (crucial new information is being presented.) So although the sequence SPACE > TIME > DISCOURSE is plausible, a direct transition SPACE > DISCOURSE explains the data better; moreover, it explains why the phonological form of the connective has remained so strongly locative.[75]

In any case, the development of connective-*opu* is not crucial to any investigation of the development of *pu*—even though the significance invested in it by Papadopoulou makes this survey necessary. Developments in *pu* can all ultimately be traced to the relativiser *hópou* first used around 500 AD, whereas the connective is derived directly from the locative *hópou,* and not from the relativiser; connective-*opu* is thus a cognate of relativiser-*pu,* and not its reflex. So connective-*opu* does not participate in the thrust of developments considered here; it lies outside them, although it quite possibly has undergone some contamination from resultative or circumstance usages of *pu*. And though it is amenable to localist analysis, this does not make a localist analysis of the overall functionality of *pu* any more necessary.

The connective is, at any rate, a marginal feature of CSMG, whose use is idiolectal and genre-restricted; its function is rarely salient, although it does turn up in a range of mainstream dialects, with no areal factor more unifying than them being all southern Greek. And in collocation with discourse connectives like

---

[74]So in English *and* or *and then* connects narrative sentences in temporal succession; if the second sentence precedes the first, or provides background information, *and* is unlikely to be used by itself, and we have already seen that *opu* is unusual as a background marker (90a).

[75]Of course, I would not claim that the mechanism actuating the metaphor does not have some metonymic correlate.

lipon and temporals like *etotes,* it shows itself to be semantically vacuous; all *opu* does is link narrative sentences. Its development is distant from what *pu* normally does in Greek, and does not form part of the same account.

7.6. Subjunctive marker

As *pu* is predominantly factive in Modern Greek, it is not associated with irrealis contexts (unless *na* intercedes); as a result, it is not associated with PERFS (subjunctive) clauses. The set of connectives which do introduce PERFS clauses is restricted in the modern language, and includes irrealis connectives and markers (*an* 'if', *na, θa, prin* 'before', *as* 'let') and indefinite or headless relatives (*opios* 'whoever', *otan* 'when', *'opu* 'where', *oso* 'however much').

The membership of *pu* in the class of subjunctive markers is thus precluded in CSMG by virtue of its factivity. Yet the instances we have seen so far show that this factivity is a contingent reality: if *pu* is involved in a construct with either irrealis or free-relative meaning, then it can very easily join the class of subjunctive markers. Sporadic instances have already been seen for CSMG (§3.6); these instances are much more frequent for dialects, just as the violation of the factivity constraints on *pu* is much more frequent.

7.6.1 Free relatives

Free relatives in Greek take PERFS generally, and where *(o)pu* survives as a free relative, it follows this trend. The same holds for *pu* redundantly used after free relatives (91a).[76]

(91a)   *ό,τ' που κηρδίσην* απ' του τα·ξείδ', 'που θα κάνην, να τα μοιραζώ·την 'ς τ' μέ·σ'.
         ot pu kirðisin (PERFS) ap tu takšið, pu θa kanin, na ta mirazodin s t meš.
         Whatever they ***would earn*** in the trip they would make, they were to split in
         half. (Anagnostou 167; Mandamados, Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

(91b)   *Που γεννηθή* στηφ φυλακή τηφ φυλακίθ θυμάται.
         pu yen:iθi (PERFS) stif filaki tif filakiθ θimate.
         Whoever is born in prison remembers the prison. (Yannakou 125; Rhodes,
         Dodecanese)

(91c)   Διαταή ταλοιπονί βασιλική, ***οπού βρεθή*** και κάμη τηφ φορεσιά, να του δίνουν όσες
         χιλιᾴδες.
         ðiatai taliponi vasiliki, ***opu vreθi*** (PERFS) ke kami tif foresja, na tu ðinun oses
         xiʎaðes.
         *So there went out a royal decree that **whoever could be found** to make this
         dress, he should be given so many thousand pieces.* (DawkD 183; Leros,
         Dodecanese)

(91d)   Καₐjα ***'που γαϊδουροδέσῃ,/*** Παρά 'που γαϊδαροκυνηγᾴ.
         kaₐja ***pu ɣaiðuroðesi*** (PERFS),/ para pu ɣaiðarokiniɣa.
         *Besser, **wer** einen Esel **anbindet,**/ Als wer einen Esel jagt.*
         Better ***he who ties up*** a donkey, than he who chases a donkey. (Dieterich 386;
         Siphnos, Cyclades)

---

[76]Redundant use of *pu* with free relatives is discussed in Nicholas (1998b); this is a fact with abundant precedent in EMG.

(91e)   Καλότυχος που την θωρεί,/ κακότυχος ***που*** την ***γευτή*,/από τον κόσμον θα χαθή.
         kalotixos pu tin θori,/ kakotixos ***pu*** tin ***yefti*** (PERFS),/ apo ton kosmon θa xaθi.
         Fortunate is he who sees her, unfortunate is ***he who tastes*** her—he will perish
         from this world. (Loukas B38.81; Cyprus)

(36d)   Αλλοίμονό του ***που πνιγή*** στη πρώτη δαγκωνιά
         alimono tu ***pu pniɣi*** (PERFS) sti proti ðaɣonia
         Woe to him ***who chokes*** at the first bite (HDMS 524:132; Aegina, Old
         Athenian)

The same phenomenon is productive in Cretan, as Kafkalas (1992:30) notes, describing it as "the omission of the particle *θa* […] always with the relativiser *pu* being used." The future meaning Kafkalas sees in an omitted *θa* is consistent with the generalising role of the relativiser ('he who will/would do X = whoever does X'): future time is coextensive with indefinite time. The construction occurs both with exclamatory sentences (in which *pu* is close to being a free relativiser)—

(92a)   Βρύση φουντάνα η ζωή το γ-κόσμο δροσερεύγει/ κι ανάθεμά τονε ***που πει*** πως δε διψά
         οντε φεύγει
         vrisi fudana i zoi toŋ gosmo ðroserevɣi/ ki anaθema tone ***pu pi*** (PERFS) pos ðe
         ðipsa ode fevɣi
         Life is a spurting fountain, it refreshes the world, and damn him ***who says***
         that he doesn't thirst when he leaves it. (Kafkalas 1992:69.7)

and relativisations proper, such as *ekinos **apu** rθi* (PERFS) 'he ***who*** will come; ***whoever*** comes'. In the latter instance, although there is a headed relativisation, the denotation of the clause is indefinite and the head semantically vacuous; so it is not surprising that PERFS also appears in such clauses, by close analogy with free relatives.

I have not found in my corpus examples like the following, cited in §3.6, where a headed relative clause with a non-trivial head appears in PERFS:

(92b)   (1886)
         Κλέφτης ***οπού επιχειρήσει*** κ' εκτελεί μ' επιτηδειότητα και μ' επιτυχίαν μίαν
         καλοσχεδιασμένην έχπαγλη κλεψιά, ομοιάζει στρατηγόν οπού σχεδιάζει και εκτελεί
         έχπαγλη μάχη.
         kleftis ***opu epixirisi*** (PERFS) k ekteli (IMPFS) m epitiðiotita ke m epitixian mian
         kalosxeðiasmenin expaɣli klepsia, omiazi stratiɣon opu sxeðiazi ke ekteli expaɣli
         maxi.
         A thief ***who*** purposefully and successfully ***attempts*** and executes a well-
         planned and marvellous theft resembles a general who plans and executes a
         marvellous battle. (LaskEcce 86)

Here again, however, the generic reference of the head (underlined by the absence of a definite or indefinite article) makes it equivalent to a headless relative: *opios kleftis epixirisi* 'whichever thief attempts'. Such relative clauses are thus part and parcel of free relative *pu* and its associated indefinite modality.

7.6.2 Indefinite collocations

In several instances, a *pu*-collocation can end up having indefinite (rather than properly irrealis) denotation, and take PERFS accordingly. Thus, in Eastern Greek, *kata pu* 'according to that = as; when' can take PERFS, by virtue of its indefinite denotation, just like its equivalent *opos* in CSMG:

(93a)   να πάρη καθένας μας το μερίδιόν του, να πασκίση να ζήση **κατά που** του **δόξῃ** το καλλιώτερο.
να pari kaθenas mas to meriðion tu, na paskisi na zisi **kata pu** tu **ðoksi** (PERFS) to kal:iotero.
*and each of us take his share, and do what he can to live **as may seem** to him best.* (DawkD 318; Leros, Dodecanese)

(93b)   *Κατά που πατήσῃς* του κουμβάκιν, βγαίν-νει το νερόν και πίν-νεις
kata pu patisis (PERFS) tu kumbakin, vɣen:i to neron ke pin:is.
As soon as you press the little button, the water comes out and you drink it (HDMS 996:177; Evdilos, Icaria, Central Aegean)

(93c)   *Κατά που στρώσεις,* θα ἠσεις.
kata pu strosis (PERFS), θa pʰesis.
´*Οπως στρώσεις,* θα κοιμηθείς.
opos strosis (PERFS), θa kimiθis.
As you lay your blanket, so will you sleep. (MousP §1096; Livisi)

(93d)   *Κατά που δῃς* του φατρέφτ, θα σι δῃ.
kata pu ðis (PERFS) tu gatreft, θa si ði.
Wie du den Spiegel **ansiehst,** *sieht er dich an.*
The way you look at the mirror, it will look at you. (Kretschmer 575; Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

The same holds for other Eastern Greek temporal *pu*-collocations with potentially indefinite denotation; e.g. *kaθe pu* 'each that = every time that', *etsi pu* 'thus that = as; when':

(94)   Τίνους πουλιού κελάηδισμα τα δυο σου χείλη λένε/ και **κάθε που** τ' **αφουκραστώ** καρδιά και μάθια κλαίνε
tinus puliu kelaiðisma ta ðio su xili lene/ ke **kaθe pu** t **afukrasto** (PERFS) karðia ke maθia klene
*What bird's song do your two lips utter? For **every time I hear** it, my heart and eyes weep.* (Kafkalas 1992:72.56; Crete)

(23c)   γ-υ παράς, **έτ·σει π'** πέσ', τι δε κά·ν'!
ɣi paras, **etši p peš** (PERFS), ti ðe kaŋ!
When money changes hands, what can it not do! (Anagnostou 165; Mandamados, Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

In these constructions, *pu* is still akin to a headless relative; the denotation is indefinite in both cases, and the modality of the clause is unrealised, rather than counterfactual. So the use of PERFS here does not represent a significant change from its use with headless relatives, and is clearly driven by the analogical force

of comparable subjunctive connectives (*otan* 'when', *opote* 'whenever', *opos* 'as').[77]

7.6.3 *pu= pu na*

Rarely, a *pu*-clause does not involve a free relative, or a collocation with a subjunctive marker equivalent; rather, the *pu*-clause is irrealis independent of any equivalent connective, and is properly rendered by a *pu na*-clause in CSMG.

This class represents a much more significant break with mainstream factivity. The classes above are subjunctive because *pu* finds itself in constructions with subjunctive marker equivalents. Thus, *kata pu* takes PERFS, because its equivalent *opos* 'as' already takes PERFS; free relative *pu* takes PERFS because all Modern Greek free relatives take PERFS. In the former instances, *pu* shifts into an irrealis subjunctive category *only* in collocation; the factivity of *pu* on its own is not affected. In the free relative instances, there is an expansion of *pu* into irrealis territory, but the complementary distribution of *pu* and *pu na* is not itself affected: *pu* is not entering territory normally covered by *pu na*.

In the following example, on the other hand, *pu* introduces an optative—something universally done amongst Greek dialects by *pu na:*

(95a) **Pu** su **fási** *tá ndera i šíḍḍi.*
       pu su **fasi** (PERFS) ta ndera i ʃiḍ;i.
       Che *ti* **mangino** *le budella i cani.*
       May the dogs **eat** your bowels. (TNC 391.61; Bova, Calabria)

This may well be a simple calque of the Italian, which does not have a particle equivalent to *na*. It is an odd calque, since Italiot is normally quite scrupulous about using *na*—and has indeed passed on the use of subjunctive rather than infinitival complements to Calabrese. It is a serious disruption nonetheless: it represents the effacement of the complementary distribution of factive *pu* and irrealis *pu na*.

The break is so serious, in fact, that there are only two instances in my corpus: overall in Greek, the factive/irrealis complementary distribution of *pu~ pu na* is preserved. The other instance, (95b), which has *ospu* where CSMG would have *ospu na* for an 'irrealis' endpoint, is probably metrically motivated; unlike cases like *kata pu~ opos* and *kaθe pu~ opote* discussed above, there is no 'until'-expression amongst the Greek subjunctive markers which *ospu*+ PERFS could have analogically patterned itself after.

(95b) και θα χτυπά ο μερακλής στο χώμα τα τακούνια,/ που ο μανές με στρίγλισμα θα πάρει
       και θα δώκει,/ **ως που ξεσπάσουν** στο χορό κι οι γέροι κολομπόκοι.
       ke θa xtipa o meraklis sto xoma ta takunia,/ pu o manes me striɣlisma θa pari ke
       θa ðoki,/ **os pu ksespasun** (PERFS) sto xoro ki i ɣeri kolomboki.
       and the *bon vivant* will strike the ground with his heels, so that the tune will go

---

[77]This is a force which operates synchronically: for example, I have heard on Greek-Australian radio 3XY in a news report the utterance *se periptosi pu aɣnoiθi* 'in case it is ignored'; the collocation *se periptosi pu* 'in case that' takes PERFS, by analogy with other conditionals like *an* 'if'.

about screeching, ***until*** even the old men ***will break out*** dancing (Yannakis 74; Pyrgi, Chios, Central Aegean)

7.6.4 Irrealis connectives

The final class of *pu+* PERFS clauses is the most interesting: *pu* is a fully irrealis connective, without reference to either indefinite relativisation, indefinite collocation, or *pu na*. In this instance, *pu* acts as a connective, but rather than link a factive adjunct to a matrix, it links an irrealis adjunct.

This development strikes at the core of the factivity of *pu;* so it is not surprising that it occurs (a) very infrequently, and (b) in a domain for which there is strong linguistic motivation and abundant cross-linguistic parallels: the chain TEMPORAL > FUTURE TEMPORAL > CONDITIONAL (cf. German *wenn* 'when' > 'if', Modern Greek *ama* 'as soon as' > 'if').

It is common for temporals to develop into conditionals; but for this to occur, the temporals need to be of indefinite or irrealis denotation, and this is rarely the case for Greek *pu:* overwhelmingly, *pu* refers to a past, factive event. Yet the reanalysis from past temporal to future or general temporal is not impossible, and has in fact occurred in at least one dialect of Greek. That dialect, unsurprisingly, is the eccentric dialect of Apiranthos. In this dialect, *opu+ erθi* 'it.comes (PERFS)' is the standard way of referring to an upcoming holiday or month:

(96a)   *Οπώρθη* του Σταυρού θα τελειώσε είκοσι χρονώ.
          opo rθi tu stavru θa teliose ikosi xrono.
          When the Feast of the Holy Cross ***comes****, it will have been twenty years.
          (HDMS 571:145; Apiranthos, Naxos, Cyclades)

The temporal clause has future reference, so CSMG would require *θa* here. But PERFS follows *opu* unintroduced; the mood by itself makes clear the irrealis/future reference involved. In this, *pu* behaves just like the unmarked temporal *otan* (*otan θa erθi~ otan erθi*). Elsewhere in the Cyclades, PERFS can be used when a *pu*-clause has indefinite temporal denotation:

(96b)   ύστερι, (τη δαμαλίδα) *απού γίνη* ενούς χρονού, το λέμε μαζέττα.
          isteri, (ti ðamaliða) ***apu yini*** (PERFS) enus xronu, to leme mazeta.
          Then, ***when*** it (the calf) ***turns*** one year old, we call it a *mazetta*. (HDMS 813A:123; Anaphe, Cyclades)

So Apiranthos may be generalising a tendency it already found in place in the Cyclades, from indefinite to future denotation—in the idiosyncratic manner associated with the colony.

Once future temporal meaning is expressed by *pu,* one can expect more conditional shades of meaning. In the following example from Cythera, ˈ*opu* is used as a temporal/conditional, the odd use of parataxis in the utterance notwithstanding.

(96c)   Εσκότωσες πολλά ορδύκια σήμερα;— Ὅπου πιάσω τούτο απού κυνηγώ κι άλλα εννεά και κάνω δέκα
          eskotoses pola orðica simera?—ˈ***opu*** pjaso tuto apu kiniɣo ki ala enẹa ke kano ðeka

"Have you killed many quail today?" ***"When*** I catch this one that I'm hunting
and with another nine, and that makes ten." (HDMS 559:114; Cythera)

The temporal/conditional ʼ*opu* is distinct here from the relativiser *apu;* as also
speculated for Cappadocian (§B.1), ʼ*opu* as an indefinite locative is more liable to
reanalysis as an irrealis than *pu*. The process reaches its apparent endpoint in
the following:

> ʼ*opu*. This indeclinable word replaces the relative pronoun *hóstis*. But sometimes it
> is difficult to explain, and in the phrase *opu to vris* (PERFS) [it means] 'if you find
> it': *opu to vris inda xo mesa sti fuxta mu* 'that/if you find it what I have in my fist =
> guess if you can what I am hiding in my palm'. (HDIC: D. Poulakis, *Λέξεις εκ Τσεσμέ
> και άλλων μερών* (MS), 1884; Tsesmes)

Tsesmes (Çeşme) is a town on coastal Asia Minor opposite Chios and near
Smyrna (Izmir), and its erstwhile Greek dialect was South-Eastern. The ap-
parent conditional use of *opu* is not productive here, but restricted to a conven-
tionalised expression equivalent to *guess what!*—not least because the condi-
tional clause has no apodosis.

This could be either a relic form (as the limited distribution suggests), or an
idiosyncratic innovation. If the former, then one may point to Ulagaç in Cap-
padocia, the only other place where the temporal > conditional process has
taken place for *opu* (§B.1). Even though coastal Asia Minor was repopulated
from the Aegean in recent times, this may represent an innovation of Old Ana-
tolian Greek which survived only in those two places. If the formation is an in-
dependent innovation, on the other hand, it might be a fragment of an originally
temporal expression ('***when*** you guess this, you will be rewarded'), or a reana-
lysis of an original free relative or optative ('good for him ***who*** will guess this').

Pace Mackridge (1985:258), the use of PERFS *pu*-clauses is quite old and
widespread in Greek, and the strong barrier between *pu na* and *pu* may be a re-
cent obligatorification—postdating the extinction of free relative *pu,* which had
kept *pu* strongly associated with PERFS. But PERFS is only widespread when it
does not disrupt the functionality of *pu* significantly: in instances of indefinite,
rather than outright irrealis denotation.

It has proven possible for *pu* to acquire such irrealis denotation; there is a
clear instance in the Italiot optative (although this may be a calque), and in the
Eastern Greek TEMPORAL > CONDITIONAL axis (echoed in Ulagaç.) Yet it is still
remarkable how infrequent such a shift is in Greek, compared to other instances
of temporals—including *ama* in Greek itself. The persistence of factivity makes
pu overwhelmingly a past, factive temporal in Greek; and while reanalysis into
the irrealis domain is possible, persistence usually blocks it.

7.7. In combination with na

7.7.1. Irrealis relative clauses

All Greek dialects have *pu*-relative clauses, all Greek dialects have *na* as a marker of irrealis modality, and all Greek dialects associate intensional relative clauses with irrealis modality. *pu na*-clauses are thus attested throughout the Greek-speaking world; I give examples only from outlier dialects:

(97a)   Ετό το κορίč ένα φοράς άσομ baπά τ κǝρεψεν ένα φιστάν, ***όπου να*** έkh βούλα τα άστρα σον ουρανόν όπου είνδαι, και ένα άλο φιστάν, ***όπου να*** έkh ση θάλασσα όπου είνδαι ούλα τα ψάρι̣α.
eto to koritʃ ena foras asom bapa t kɯrepsen ena fistan, ***'opu na*** eχ vula ta astra son uranon 'opu inde, ke ena alo fistan, ***'opu na*** eχ si θalasa 'opu inde ula ta psarja.
This girl once asked her father for a skirt, ***which should*** *have on it all the starts which are in the sky, and another skirt* ***which should*** *have all the fish that are in the sea.* (Dawk 444; Silata, Western Cappadocia)

(97b)   Εβάλλειναν καν'να, ας σ' όσους εδουλεύανε 'ς σο σπίτι, ***που να*** είχεν καλό λαλίαν, και εχούλιζε
evalinan kanna, as s osus eðulevane s so spiti, ***pu na*** iʃen kalo lalian, ke exulize
They appointed one out of those working on the house ***who*** *had a good voice, and he shouted out* (Vamvak 65; Oinoe, Pontus)

(97c)   *ston gózmo δen éǯi δè mástoruse će mayístrese,* ***pu na*** *ti ssóusi arivéspi ya túndo mistéri će ćóla y' áḍḍese δulíese.*
ston gozmo ðen eçi ðe mastoruse tʃe majistrese, ***pu na*** ti sːousi arːivespi ja tundo misteri tʃe tʃola j aḍːese ðuliese.
nel mondo non c'erano maestri, né maestre, ***che*** *la potessero eguagliare in questo mestiere ed anche in altri lavori.*
There are neither male nor female tradespeople in this world ***who*** *are fit for this task and other jobs as well.* (TNC 50.32; Roccaforte, Calabria)

(97d)   *panta è nnân ìu? 'En è' nnârtune/ 'isi ćerì vvloimèni/* ***pu na*** *mi ssiri o àntrepo/ to derma tu 'derfù?*
panta e nːa n iu? en e nːa rtune/ isi tʃeri vːloimeni/ ***pu na*** mi sːiri o antrepo/ to derma tu derfu?
Sempre sarà così? Non verranno/ quei tempi benedetti/ ***che*** *l'uomo tirerà/ la pelle al fratello?*
Will it always be like this? Won't that blessed time come ***such that*** *people will not tear their brother's skin off?* (Palumbo 118; Calimera, Apulia)

I do not have any examples from Tsakonian; given how closely its syntax follows that of Standard Greek, and the small size of my Tsakonian corpus compared to the other dialects (a third the size of the Cappadocian corpus, which is the next smallest), this is presumably an accident of data collection.

Although *'opu na*-relative clauses are attested in Western Cappadocian, in Pharasa the relativiser is omitted in at least one instance where CSMG would normally require it, in an intensional relative clause:[78]

---

[78]But there is precedent in Greek for intensional relative clauses being introduced by *na* alone (Tzartzanos 1991 [1946, 1963] §282 LXXVII 3). Although in many instances a relative *na*-clause is more of a purposive, there are clear intensional instances (98b), and even extensional instances, where *na* takes on a modal function; e.g. (98c), where *na* means 'which one may':

(98a)   Πανδικός τ῾ζο ῾νι **να** μη ξειλήσει ῝ση μάγγανα.
          pandikos dʒo ni **na** mi ksilisi ʃi magana.
          *Ποντικός δεν υπάρχει **που να** μην πέσει στη φάκα.*
          podikos ðen iparxi **pu na** min pesi sti faka.
          There is no mouse **that** does not fall into a trap. (LoucLouc §647)

There are also occasional instances in the corpus of purposive relative clauses:

(98d)   Απουφάϊση να πα γκι Ρουδουπαππούδα ῾ς ένα μέρους, **᾽που να** μη ξέρ᾽ πλεια να γυρίσ᾽
          ξουπίσου ῾ς του σπί·κ, γιανά χαθή καλά-καλά.
          apufaisi na pa ɟ ruðupapuða s ena merus, **pu na** mi kseri pʎa na ɣiris ksupisu s tu
          spic, ɟana xaθi kala kala.
          She decided to take Rodopappouda to a place **such/so that** she would not
          know how to return home, so she could get really lost. (Anagnostou 184;
          Northern Lesbos, Northern Aegean)

This development is a quite predictable result of allowing modal relative clauses, and is not particularly frequent in the corpus; I do not pay it any further attention here.

7.7.2. Potential result clauses

The potential result *pu na* is less widespread amongst Greek dialects than other *pu na*-constructions; this is consistent with resultative *pu* itself not being widespread (§7.4.3). As seen there, the available Tsakonian corpus is too small to allow for abundant resultatives, and the resultative is largely absent in Pontic and Cappadocian.

There is one instance in Mariupolitan of what seems to be an irrealis result introduced by *na* instead of *pu na:*

(99a)   *Irtyn dauš ap uranu, uryz-mi **na** trumazu.*
          irtin dauʃ ap uranu, uriz mi **na** trumazu.
          *A voice from heaven came and orders me **so that** I am terrified.* (AbrM 45)

In CSMG, *na* would be avoided in this context, as it would unambiguously mark the clause as a complement ('orders me **to** be terrified') rather than a result. The avoidance of resultative *pu* in Mariupolitan is consistent with its archaism and its relatives Pontic and Cappadocian. It may point to a stage of Late Middle Greek where *na* (*hína*) rather than *pu* was the resultative marker (§5.4.3), exploiting the reanalysis of purpose to result; but this is speculation.

(98b)   Δε θα βρεθή ένας ποταμός, **να** ῾ναι για μας πλωτός;
          ðe θa vreθi enas potamos, **na** ne ɣia mas plotos?
          Won't we come across a river **that** we can cross? ('Will a river not be found **to**
          be navigable for us?') (Tz §282 LXXVII 3; Seferis)
(98c)   Το τραίνο, ευτυχώς, δεν είναι αυτοκίνητο **να** το σταματούν όπου θέλουν και **να**
          μαγαρίζουν.
          to treno, eftixos, ðen ine aftokinito **na** to stamatun ῾opu θelun ke **na** maɣarizun.
          A train, fortunately, isn't a car, **to** be stopped wherever people please and ∅
          have them befoul it. (Mack 291; Ioannou)
As the glosses show, these are equivalent to the English infinitival relative. So although CSMG prefers *pu na* against *na* for intensional relative clauses, there is a fluidity between the two for most dialects, so that (98a) is not in itself exceptional.

On the other hand, this more recent instance seems to show *pu na*-resultatives very much alive in Mariupolitan—all the more surprising as *pu* is largely absent from the dialect:

(99b)　Лон акриво тема, пас пую графтны румей пииты, афто инэ пас ту ису ки
ахилдарку советыко интернационализм, пас ту мега Патриотыко агап,
пас тын перестройка, *пу* советыки козмус *на* зисны тялу пула кала ки
омурфа.
lon akrivo tema, pas puju ɣraftni̇ rumej piiti̇, afto ine pas tu isu ki axildarku
sovetiko internatsionalizm, pas tu meɣa patriotiko aɣap, pas ti̇n perestrojka, ***pu***
sovetiki̇ kozmus ***na*** zisni̇ tjalu pula kala ki omurfa.
The most wonderful subjects on which the Greek poets have written; that is, on
egalitarian and wise Soviet internationalism, on great patriotic love, on
Perestroika, ***so that*** the Soviet world ***may*** live even better and more decently.
(Kiryakov 1988:2)

In Italiot, *pu na*-results are attested for Calabrian; since there is even less Apulian text in my corpus than there is Tsakonian, and Apulian is in many ways closer to CSMG than Calabrian, the absence of *pu na*-resultatives in my Apulian corpus may well be accidental:

(99c)　*Na peθáno egó, θéli na pyáusi éna aspári íyo će na m'alíspu me ćíndo éma, će
o íl′o tósso* fortsáto ***pu na*** *klái te* rrókke, *će voréa* ***pu na*** *sikói te* rrókke *spilá,
će* yeláta ***pu na*** *píši ti θθálassi tría ćentinárya kalámya, će* dóppu *egò peθéno.*
na peθano ego, θeli na pjausi ena aspari ijo tʃe na m alispu me tʃindo ema, tʃe o
iʎo tosːo fortsato ***pu na*** klai te rːokːe, tʃe vorea ***pu na*** sikoi te rːokːe spila, tʃe jelata
pu na piʃi ti θːalasːi tria tʃentinarja kalamja, tʃe dopːu ego peθeno.
*Perché io muoia, si richiede che piglino un pesce vivo e mi ungano con quel
sangue, e (si richiede) il sole così forte* ***da*** *spaccare le pietre, e vento* ***che*** *alzi le
pietre in alto, e gelo* ***da*** *ghiacciare il mare tre centinaia di canne, e poi io
morrò.*
For me to die, they must catch a live fish and smear me with its blood, and (if
they ask for) the sun so strong ***that*** it cracks the stones, and a north wind (so
strong) ***that*** it lifts the stones in the air, and a frost (so strong) ***that*** it freezes
the sea to a depth of three hundred canes—only then I will die. (TNC 91.28;
Roccaforte, Calabria)

In mainstream Greek, *pu na*-results are readily available, as one would expect:

(100a)　θέλου να μι κάν΄ς ένα κουστούμ' βασιλ'κό κι ένα σπαθί τόσου κουφτιρό, ***που να*** κόβ'
τ'ν τρίχα.
θelu na mi kans ena kustum vasilko ki ena spaθi tosu kuftiro, ***pu na*** kov tn trixa.
I want you to make me a royal suit and a sword so sharp ***that*** it can cut a hair.
(Karayannis 1986:57; Portaria, Chalcidica, Macedonia)

(100b)　Δέν ήρνταν τότι ξέν΄ ουρίστις, τώρα που έρντιν, ***που να*** μουλυθεί του κλίμα.
ðen irdan toti kseɲ uristis, tora pu erdin, ***pu na*** muliθi tu klima.
Foreigner tourists wouldn't come here as they do now, ***so that*** the climate
would be polluted. (Kontonatsiou 208; Sardes, Lemnos, Northern Aegean)

(100c)　Τη στουμουσάν τσου θα την έσης κατεβασμένη πλτσό κάτω 'πο την εδιτσήμ μου, νά,
που να μη φαίνετσι το πρόσωπόν τσου
ti stumusan tsu θa tin esis katevasmeni pltso kato po tin eðitsim mu, ˈna, ***pu na*** mi
fenetsi to prosopon tsu

> *Your kerchief you can have brought down lower than mine, thus, **so that***
> *your face will not show* (DawkD 66; Astypalaea, Dodecanese)

pu na marks irrealis results as distinct from other irrealis adjuncts, marked by *na* alone. However the boundary between these different types of adjunct is fluid, and *pu na* can at times come close to being purposive. This is particularly noticeable in Catargi; in (101a), for instance, the *pu na*-clause could just as easily be describing a motive as a result:

(101a) παλ᾽ εσάς τυχαίνει για το ίδιο ιντερέσσο σας να τους κάμετε σοφούς και δασκάλους
με την ευκολία της σοφίας στη γλώσσα τους, ***που να*** σας κάμουνε κ᾽ εκείνοι
πλούσιους με τα δίδακτρά σας.
pal esas tixeni ɣia to iðio intereso sas na tus kamete sofus ke ðaskalus me tin
efkolia tis sofias sti ɣlosa tus, ***pu na*** sas kamune k ekini plusius me ta ðiðaktra sas.
Once more, it is up to you for your own interest to make them scholars and
teachers through the ease of wisdom in their own language, ***so that*** they may
make you rich in turn through your tuition fees. (Cat 69)

There is also ambiguity between resultative and other *pu na*-adjuncts; the following irrealis result attested for Macedonia, for instance, is quite close to an optative:

(101b) Αδιρφή είϗει ϗυ, ουβριός είϗει ***π να*** ϗηκουθώ να πααίνου.
aðirfi iši ši, uvrios iši ***p na*** šikuθo na paenu.
Are you a sister? You are a jew, ***such that*** I should get up and leave.
(Adamopoulos 1988:37; Melissohori, Salonica)

As the irrealis counterpart to the factive resultative *pu,* the development of a *pu na*-resultative is no surprise. Indeed, since the other adjunct functions of *pu* do not have straightforward irrealis equivalents,[79] the function of result is not even especially privileged to have a *pu na*-expression—as seen immediately below, it is joined in this status by concession.

7.7.3. Unrealisable concessive clauses

The unrealisable concessive, so salient a *pu na*-form in CSMG, is wholly absent from my dialect corpus; this strongly suggests that the form is a recent innovation—perhaps even specific to CSMG.

Interestingly, the form is none the less salient enough that *pu na* by itself, and dissociated from any ensuing clause, could act as an unrealisable concessive exclamation. As discussed by Anthimos Papadopoulos (1955a:116)—significantly, a discussion of CSMG expressions, rather than dialect-specific forms:

> After a negative sentence the expression *pu na* is equivalent to the concessive connective *ke an* 'even if', e.g. *ðe to θelo **pu na**!* 'I do not want it ***even if**!'*, *ðen ton perno **pu na**!* 'I will not marry him ***even if**!*' etc. As anyone can see, the elliptical concessive clause can be completed arbitrarily, e.g. *ðen to troɣo **pu na** ksero pos θa peθano apo tin pina* 'I will not eat it ***even if*** I know I will starve', *ðen ton perno **pu na** xalasi*

---

[79]A conditional is not merely an irrealis cause; a future temporal is not merely an irrealis temporal—and in any case the development of *θa* has forestalled a *pu na* temporal, and an irrealis temporal in general outside exceptions like Apiranthos (§7.6).

o kosmos 'I will not marry him **even if** it's the end of the world' or ***pu na*** *me skotosi* '**even if** he kills me' or ***pu na*** *ne xrisos ke aɣios* '**even if** he's golden and saintly' etc. But however the completion is made, the meaning of the expression *pu na* is equivalent to the phrase 'in no way', e.g. *ðen to leo **pu na*** 'I will not say it **even if** = 'there is no way that I can be forced to say it'.[80]

I doubt this expression is still extant in CSMG; it is certainly not in my idiolect, and I have not found any instances on *Hellas-L*. Given that it was extant in early *xx* AD, we have a surprising turn of events: *pu na* becomes an unrealised conditional marker very recently in Greek, and—such *pu na*-clauses being highly marked as emotive—*pu na* by itself becomes an interjection marking the scornful rejection involved. This development wrests *na* away from its ensuing verb—startling, given that *na* has the highest degree of syntactic bondedness of any Modern Greek particle, as the modal particle most closely associated with its argument. Yet within a generation or two, this innovation has apparently vanished.

A decrease in syntactic bondedness is uncharacteristic of grammaticalisation, but not unknown (see Traugott (1995) on Japanese discourse markers.) This is, however, an extreme case: *pu na* goes from extreme bondedness—close to being an affix—to having no bondedness—being part of an interjection barely subject to constituency analysis at all.[81]

This is an instance of an elliptical *pu*-expression.[82] Interestingly, while *na* lost is bondedness with what followed, it kept its bondedness with what preceded—*pu*. The development is a nice illustration of something already adumbrated above, that *pu na,* in its various functions, grammaticalises as a strongly cohesive unit.

In line with *pu na*-clauses forming the irrealis counterparts of *pu*-clauses, the following appears to be an instance of an irrealis *eki pu*-contrast clause:

(20c)   Τώρα όποιοι ήταν φρόνιμοι ***από 'κει που να*** χάσουνε τη ζωή τους, είπανε πως είναι καλλίτερο να μουντζώσουνε και τη βασιλοπούλα και τα καλά της και να φύγουνε· tora opji itan fronimi ***apo ki pu na*** xasune ti zoi tus, eipane pos ine kalitero na mudzosune ke ti vasilopula ke ta kala tis ke na fiɣune; Now those who had any sense, **rather than** lose their lives, thought it better to give the finger to both the princess and what she was worth, and leave; (ParnassosA 36; Peloponnese)

The sentence uses *na* to introduce a conditional utterance, where CSMG would use *θa:* the CSMG equivalent to this phrase would be *eki **pu θa** exanan ti zoi tis* 'there **where** (whereas) they **would** lose their lives'. But there are other comparative conditional expressions in Greek based on *na: para na* 'rather than', *prokimenu na* 'given the possibility that'. So while this is an instance of *pu na, pu*

---

[80]I have not sighted the article, and am citing from HDIC.
[81]It is not an isolated instance in language; one might compare the colloquial English exclamation *as if!*—semantically equivalent, although *na* is more tightly bound to its matrix than *if,* being a modal marker rather than a simple conditional.
[82]More such instances are discussed in Nicholas (1998b).

na is not used to to introduce either a conditional expression (which it cannot do in CSMG), or a concessive, but a contrast clause, which here happens to be irrealis.

7.7.4. Optative clauses

Diatopy

Optative *pu na*-clauses, being a straightforward extension of optative relative clauses, are found throughout Greek, including Tsakonian, Livisiot, Apulian and Calabrian Italiot, and at least some variants of Cappadocian:

(102a) Επέτσε, χα, *πη να* νι φάει ο λιούκο!
 epetçe, xa, *pʰi na* ɲi fai o ʎuko!
He said, get a move on—***may*** the wolf eat you! (CostD §4d; Melana, Southern Tsakonia)

(102b) Έρχιτι του πιδίν, φέργει τα μήλα στημ μάναν dου, τα τρώει—*που να* φάει τουμ βιρίδρομουν ɡι τουν στρόφουμ μέσα της—κι την άλλην δην ημέραν, χαν έφυϊν εις του κυγήϊν, βγαίγγει η δράκους πάλι κι λέει την:
erxiti tu piðin, ferni ta mila stim manan du, ta troi—*pu na* fai tum piriðromun ɡi tun strofum mesa tis—ki tin alːin din imeran, xan efiin is tu kiniin, vɣenːi i ðrakus pali ki lei tin:
The lad comes, brings apples to his mother, she eats them—***would that*** she ate her stomach lining inside-out—and the next day, when he left to go hunting, the ogre came out again and said: (MousT 58; Livisi)

(102c) *pu na* *íχa tòssa pedía*
pu na ixa tosːa pedia
hätte *ich* ***doch*** *so viele Kinder!*
If only I had that many children! (Rohlfs 1950:224; Calimera, Apulia)

(102d) *pu na* *se piái vrondí*
pu na se piai vrondi
möchte *dich der Donner packen!*
May the thunder take you! (Rohlfs 1950:224; Bova, Calabria)

(102e) *Επ να* λέξῃ μάνα μας και βαβά μας.
ep na lekʃi mana mas ke vava mas.
May *our mother and father howl like dogs (if we will endure this!)* (Dawk 318; Delmeso, Western Cappadocia)

(102f) Το 'μο 'ναι, *οπ' να* μη έν-νε.
to mo ne, *op na* mi enːe.
It's mine—***would that*** it were not! (AravanFK 116; Aravani, Western Cappadocia)

The exception to this distribution is formed by Pontic. In Pontic, *pu na* optatives are completely absent, even in the echoic contexts which force *pu na* to appear in CSMG:

(103a) εγροίκ'σα το θα χάμαι, ∅ ο Θεόν *να* χάν' ατον!
eɣriksa to θa xame, ∅ o θeon na *xan* æton!
I now realise I will perish—***may*** God perish him! (KandilE 100; Chaldia)

One might attribute the absence of *pu na* optatives to the fact that Pontic already has an explicit optative marker, *laʃ*. But as discussed below, the appearance of an explicit optative marker in Cypriot has not displaced *pu na* in that dialect—on the contrary, *pu na* has developed into novel locutions.

The absence of *pu na* optatives in Pontic should rather be viewed in light of its archaism, and its connection with Cappadocian. While some Cappadocian dialects do feature a form of *pu na* (§B.1), others do not, and instead use *ot na:*

(103b)   *Οτ’ να* σε φαγ᾽ λύκο
          ot na se faɣ liko
          May the wolf eat you (HDMS 812; Phloita, Western Cappadocia)

This usage is all the more surprising as *oti* has died out as a complementiser in Western Cappadocian (§6.3). That such a clearly relic form has survived in Phloita shows that *pu na* was a relatively novel competitor to established optative forms (like *oti na,* which is presumably quotative in origin) by the time Old Anatolian Greek was cut off from the rest of the language. Not being an entrenched part of the language, as it became everywhere else, it prospered only sporadically in Cappadocia, and nowhere (it would seem) in the Pontus.

An optative relative clause is something of a compositional inevitability, so that an utterance like *eɣriksa to erθen o ɣiorikas—p o θeon **na** xan æton* 'I heard that George—***whom may*** God perish—has arrived' may well be acceptable in Pontic. Yet such a turn of phrase has clearly not attained the degree of conventionalisation or autonomy that it has elsewhere in Greek; its absence in my extensive Pontic corpus speaks for itself.

Semantics & syntax

Negative optative *pu na* is much more prevalent than positive *pu na* throughout Greek; positive instances are infrequent:

(104a)   Πώς πας, γέροντά μου, ***που νά̆χω*** τη νευτσή σου;
          'pos pas, ɣeronda mu, ***pu na*** xo ti neftsi su?
          *How are you, elder? **So may** I have your blessing.* (DawkD 124; Kos Town, Kos, Dodecanese)

(104b)   Πιάνει ούλα τα ζέματα—***που ν᾽*** αγιάσουν τα χέρια του—και τα πετάει σ᾽ ένα πηγάδι
          pjani ula ta zemata—***pu n*** aɣiasun ta xeria tu—ke ta petai s ena piɣaði
          He grabs all the reins—***may*** his hands be blessed!—and throws them into a well. (HDMS 1254:29; Lithakia, Zante, Heptanesa)

(104c)   Ἦταν καλός παππάς ***που να*** ’χουμε την ευχή του.
          itan kalos papas ***pu na*** xume tin efxi tu.
          He was a goodly priest—∅ his blessing upon us! (HDMS 842:262; Othoni, Heptanesa)

(104d)   Ιξίασάμουσ σι, ***που να*** σι ξιάσει κι η χάρους!
          iksiasamus si, ***pu na*** si ksiasi ki i xarus!
          We forgot you—***and may*** Death forget you too! (MousP §1442; Livisi)

This result applies in even the most far-flung dialects: a count in TNC shows that, of the 12 instances of optative *pu na* attested in that Calabrian Italiot corpus, ten are curses rather than positive wishes.

There is no obvious reason why this imbalance between *pu na*-optatives and *na*-optatives has arisen. It might be that, at least at some stage, it was culturally appropriate to utter wishes in isolation, but curses only as an adjunct to some interjection or matrix predication. There is no real difference between the two types of optative, other than the presence of *pu* as a marker of syntactic dependency.

Such a distinction is now at any rate obsolete; while *pu na*-optatives originated as relative clauses, they can now be used as independent clauses throughout Greek, with no matrix nominal they could be considered as relativising:

(105a) Βρε, άνοιξε, ***που να*** νοίξῃ το ταφκιό σου!
        vre, anikse, ***pu na*** niksi to tafco su!
        hey   open!   OPT   your grave open
        *Open, boy, **and may** your grave open for you.* (DawkD 184; Leros, Dodecanese)

(105b) Εχάθην ο Δυσσέας πια, καλά το συλλογίσου,/ ***που να*** 'θελε χαθείς κι εσύ, μαζί του να μην ήσου
        exaθin o ðiseas pia, kala to siloɣisu,/ ***pu na*** θele xaθis ki esi, mazi tu na min isu
        *Odysseus has now perished, consider it well—**and would that** you too had perished, and had not been with him.* (Psyhoundakis 21; Western Crete)

(105c) Ε ***π' να*** σι φάη η αχιδήτ'ς η μαούουους αb' βγαίνει 'ς τα Πιζούλια
        e ***p na*** si fai i axidits i mauwus ab vɣeni s ta piziuʎa
        *Oh **may** the black viper that comes out at Pezoulia eat you!* (HDMS 839:290; Samothrace, Thrace)

(105d) Νά, ***π' να*** μη σώσ'ς να του φας!
        ˈna, ***p na*** mi soss na tu fas!
        *There—**and may** you not live long enough to eat it!* (HDMS 789:57; Trikeri, Magnesia, Thessaly)

(102a) Επέτσε, χα, ***π̇η να*** νι φάει ο λιούκο!
        epetɕe, xa, ***pʰi na*** ɲi fai o ʎuko!
        *He said, get a move on—**may** the wolf eat you!* (CostD §4d; Melana, Southern Tsakonia)

(102d) ***pu na** se piái vrondí*
        ***pu na** se piai vrondi*
        ***möchte** dich der Donner packen!*
        ***May** the thunder take you!* (Rohlfs 1950:224; Bova, Calabria)

This syntactic autonomy of optatives includes the fixed phrase *pu na pari ke na sikosi* 'may (the Devil) take him/her and lift him/her', extant in CSMG (usually abbreviated to *pu na pari*) as an exclamation of exasperation equivalent to English *damn it!*

(106a)   Τούτη η κουφή (προβατίνα) σηκώνει τα μπροστινά της ψηλά και κατεβάζει τις κλάρες
          των ελιών σα γίδα, *που να πάρη και να δη σηκώση*
          tuti i kufi sikoni ta brostina tis psila ke katevazi tis klares ton elion sa γίδα, *pu na
          pari ke na di sikosi*
          This deaf one (ewe) lifts her front legs and eats olive branches like a goat—*may
          the Devil take her and lift her away!* (HDMS 1055:8; Trifyllia, Messenia,
          Peloponnese)

(106b)   `Ki an ayto pou krataw sto xeri mou einai to laxano, ti ton ekana ton`
          `lyko ?` *`Pou na parei`*`, mexri edw kala ta phgaina. As ta paroume ap thn`
          `arxh.`
          Κι αν αυτό που κρατάω στο χέρι μου είναι το λάχανο, τι τον έκανα τον λύκο; *Που να
          πάρει,* μέχρι εδώ καλά τα πήγαινα. Ας τα πάρουμε απ’ την αρχή.
          ki an afto pu kratao sto xeri mu ine to laxano, ti ton ekana ton liko? *pu na pari*,
          mexri eδo kala ta piγena. as ta parume ap tin arxi.
          And if what I am holding in my hand is the cabbage, then what did I do with the
          wolf? *Damn it*, I was going all right up to here. Let’s start from the beginning.
          (S.M.: `<no subject>`; Hellas-L, 1997–07–30)

Still, as the examples given imply, it is more usual for *pu na* to be employed
when it follows some kind of matrix, even when there is no nominal in that ma-
trix to act as a relative head. The two more frequent alternatives are that the
‘matrix’ is an interjection (102a, 107a; 105c, 105d), or a predicate echoed in the
pu na-curse—the echoic optatives mentioned in §3.7.5 (107b, 107c).

(107a)   Μπα! *που να* ξεράσῃς το αίμα ’ς τη γάστρα.
          ba! *pu na* kserasis to ema s ti γastra.
          Hah! *May* you vomit out the blood in your belly. (Salvanos 1929 [1917]:136)

(107b)   Εβγήκε, *που να* μην είχε βγη.
          evγike, *pu na* min ixe vγi.
          He went out—*would that* he did not go out. (Salvanos 1929 [1917]:136)

(107c)   Και για τούτο θα χάσω εγώ το άλογό μου, *που να* σας χάσει ο Θεός;
          ke γia tuto θa xaso eγo to aloγo mu, *pu na* sas xasi o θeos?
          And is it for this that I am to lose my horse?—*would that* God lost you!
          (=destroyed you) (Polyl 65)

(Echoic optatives are omnipresent in mainstream Greek,[83] and need not be
analysed further.) Indeed, of Salvanos’ (1929 [1917]:135–137) 91 curses from
Argyrades in Corfu, of which all but a couple are subjunctive, only three *pu na*-
curses are given, and all fall in the aforementioned categories.

  This restriction is consistent with the origin of *pu na* as a relativiser: it re-
quires a matrix of some description to be anchored to. Since *na* can be used in
main clauses as e.g. an imperative, *na*-optatives do not have this restriction.[84]
This means that *pu na* introducing independent optatives is an innovation. The

---

[83]e.g. Lesbos (Anagnostou 198); Macedonia (Vaglis 1986:149, Chalcidica; Papanaoum 51,
Kozani; Adamopoulos 75, Salonica); Cyclades (ParnassosA 14); Dodecanese (DawkD 115, Asty-
palaea; DawkD 184, Leros); Crete (Psyhoundakis 21).
[84]*hína* also started life as a subordinator; so there is no etymological reason why *na* can be inde-
pendent of a matrix but *pu* cannot. The determining factor here, of course, has not been etymo-
logy but synchronic function: *na* is a modal marker in Modern Greek, while *pu* is not.

evidence, however, suggests that it is not regionally restricted as a result; the *pu na*-optatives in HDMS data which are truly independent (isolated *pu na*-clauses—if one can trust that they are actually used in discourse in isolation as recorded) originate from throughout mainstream Greek and beyond:

(108a) *Που να* βγάλης βλάττες στη bλάτης-σου
       pu na vɣalis vlatːes sti blatis su
       May you grow boils (?) on your back. (HDMS 1063:277; Symi, Dodecanese)

(108b) Ο καιρός ήτο κατά τη στεριάν, κ' η σανίδα μου ήρριψέ με όξω 'ς την ακρογιαλιάν. ***Που***
       να δήτε μειάλα καλά 'ς το καλόμ που μου κάμετε!
       o keros ito kata ti sterjan, k i saniða mu irːipse me okso s tin akrojaʎan. **pu na** ðite
       miala kala s to kalom pu mu kamete!
       *The wind was blowing towards the land, and the plank cast me up on the shore. **And may** you see much good fortune for the kindness you have done me.* (DawkD 142; Asfendiou, Kos, Dodecanese)

(108c) *Που να* σε φάη ο λύκο
       pu na se fai o liko
       May the wolf eat you (HDMS 828:102; Calimera, Apulia)

(108d) *Που να* βγάλης το καρφί
       pu na vɣalis to karfi
       May you get anthrax (HDMS 787:375; Ithaca, Heptanesa)

(108e) *Απ' να* σι φάη του γιράκ'
       ap na si fai tu ɣirak
       May the hawk eat you (spoken to chicken) (HDMS 855:32; Alonnisos, Thessaly)

(108f) *Που να* μη βραδυαστής!
       pu na mi vraðiastis!
       May you not live till nightfall! (HDMS 847:106; Melos, Cyclades)

(108g) *Που να* φάης το μουσούδι σου!
       pu na fais to musuði su!
       May you eat your goatee! (HDMS 685:132; Cythera)

(108h) *oπ' να* βγάλης τα κέμια
       op na vɣalis ta kemja
       May you take out the horse's bit (?) = Get lost (HDIC; unnamed CPMS; Aravani, Western Cappadocia)

Syntactically, *pu* and *na* are almost always a unit. This holds for *pu na*-constructions in general (see the elliptical *pu na* expression in §7.7.3), although with *pu* a complementiser and *na* a modal marker, there is no reason an NP cannot be interpolated between the two under thematic motivation. Such interpolations, however, turn out to be rare:

(109a) Μου το βρίζουνε το παιδί μου οι παλιοξοbλιάστρες φρυδά,   ***που***   ***άδρα***
       mu to vrizune to peði mu i paʎoksobʎastres friða,   **pu**   **adra**
                                               pu   man

       γεννημένονε ***να***   μην   ιδούν στ' ασκέλια τους οι παλιοσκυλλοπηδημένες.
       ɣenimenone na   min   iðun   st askeʎa tus i paʎoskilopiðimenes.
       born   IRR   not   see

Those damned gossips are insulting my child horribly (?)—**may** they never see ANY **man born on earth** between their legs, those dirty dog-fuckers! (HDMS 1017:53; Paidemeno/Flesias, Messenia, Peloponnese)

It is also possible (but rare) for an element to be extraposed before the *pu na* clause. This makes the *pu na*-clause look like a relativisation, with the extraposed element the head; but as the putative head is syntactically disjoint from the remainder of the matrix clause, this resemblance is fortuitous:

(109b) Σ̌κώνιτει κι γαμπρός, η σ̌μαδιακός,   *σ̌κλια*   *π*   *να*   τουν   φαν,
        škoniti ki ɣabros, i šmaðiakos,   *šklia*   *p*   *na*   tun   fan,
                                              dogs   REL   IRR   him   eat

στουν καρσ̌ιλαμά.
stun karšilama.
And the bridegroom, that wretch—**may** dogs eat him!—got up to dance the *karshilama*. (Adamopoulos 69; Melissohori, Salonica, Macedonia)

Anathema

The most salient instance of optative *pu* divorced from a *na*-clause is the expression *p anaθema* 'that anathema = damn!' This expression is also noteworthy for the univerbation of *pu* with the exclamation. As discussed in §3.7.5, the interjection *anaθema* is a predicate which takes direct objects; yet being non-verbal, it is incompatible with a verbal modal marker like *na*. So instead of the expected **pu na anaθema,* one gets *pu anaθema:* the *pu na* template is applied incompletely to the exclamation.

In (110a) taken from Theotokis (1914), *pu anaθema* (here taking the direct object *ton patera tu* 'his father') is still not lexicalised to *panaθema,* although this could reflect an orthographic artefact; (110b), recorded on Theotokis' native Corfu in 1917, shows that *panaθema* was already pronounced as such there:

(110a) Το καΐκι τὄπιακε γιομάτο πράμα, αυτός ο νωμοτάρχης ο διαολεμένος, *που ανάθεμα*
        τον πατέρα του.
        to kaiki to piake ɣiomato prama, aftos o nomatarxis o ðiaolemenos, *pu anaθema*
        ton patera tu.
        He seized the boat full of contraband, that infernal sergeant, **damn** his father.
        (TheotM 58)

(110b) βρίσκουμε κ' ένα ξύλο, που το λέμε γκρινιόξυλο, μα δε το κόβουμε, γιατί έχουμ'
        ακουστά πως 'ς το σπίτι που θα μπη, φέρνει όλη τη γρίδα, *π' ανάθεμά* το.
        vriskume k ena ksilo, pu to leme grinioksilo, ma ðe to kovume, ɣiati exum akusta
        pos s to spiti pu θa mbi, ferni oli ti ɣrida, *p anaθema* to.
        we also find a kind of wood we call grumblewood, but we don't cut it, because
        we've heard that the house it goes into, it brings all discord along with it—**a
        pox on** it. (Salvanos 1929 [1917]:160)

Instances like (110a) are in fact entirely absent in my corpus: *panaθema* consistently turns up univerbated. This includes Tsakonian (Costakis 1951:135); the univerbation there has further encompassed the 3.SG clitic *ɲi,* so that *pʰ anaθema ɲi* is used with other referents: *pʰ anaθemaɲi ndi* 'damn-him you = damn you!', *pʰ anaθemaɲi ɲumu* 'damn you all!'

Such examples show that *panaθema* is an old expression in Greek; it is certainly at least as old as *xvii* AD:

(110c)   (~1610)

Δέκά 'μεσταν κ' εκείνοι δυο, **π' ανάθεμα** την ώρα

ðeka mestan k ekini ðio, **p anaθema** tin ora

We were ten and they were two, **damn** the hour (Erotok I 617)

The function of *pu* was no longer transparent in the collocation, once *na* was dropped through syntactic incompatability; this may have made it easier for *p* to end up as a semantically empty phoneme prefixed to the exclamation, and thereby subject to univerbation.

Cypriot

pu na-optatives prosper in Cypriot (111a),[85] even in the absence of a matrix (111b), despite competition from an alternative optative marker, *na(i)n< na ixen* 'would that it had' (111c):

(111a)   *lai tu á. **pu na**-n xarrámi su to ɣálam pu-vízases pu ta* viʒá *mu.*
          lai tu a. **pu na** n xarːami su to ɣalam pu vizases pu ta viʒa mu.
          She says to him, "Oh, ∅ a curse on the milk you took at my breast" (Newton §7.4.5.40; Rizokarpasso, Karpas, Cyprus)

(111b)   *Που να* χαρής τ' αμμάδκι̯α σου, έλα να σε φιλήσω/ 'ς τα χείλη σου τα κόκκινα, γιατ' έννα ξιψυχίσω.
          pu na xaris t amːaðca su, ela na se filiso/ s ta xili su ta kokːina, jat enːa ksipsixiso.
          May you rejoice in your eyes, come let me kiss you on the lips, for I will die. (Loukas B42.22)

(111c)   Έκαμες με κι̯' εξέρανα 'που τον τοδ̥ουντισμόν σου,/ και **ναν** σε κάμω ττενεχάν, να κόψω τον λαιμόν σου.
          ekames me c ekserana pu ton toʃundismon su, ke ***nan*** se kamo tːenexan, na kopso ton lemon su.
          You have made me dry up with worry for you, and ***would that*** I could get you alone, and cut your throat. (Loukas B42.9)

There is a third optative strategy, apparently unique to Cypriot, which I have only sighted in poetic texts. It is a reinforcement of the *pu na*-strategy: *pu na* is preceded by *na tan* 'SUBJ it.was = would that it were'. The resulting *na tan pu na* thus contains two optative *na* (112a). If the *na tan pu na*-clause happens to have a copula predicate, then the clause also contains two copulas (*na tun pu na tun* 'would that it were that it were') (112b).

(112a)   *Να 'ταν απού να* 'γίνετουν το γάλαν σαν την βρύσιν,/ να φτάση και την κόρην του να την ποχαιρετήσῃ·
          na tan apu na ɣinetun to ɣalan san tin vrisin,/ na ftasi ke tin korin tu na tin poxeretisi;

---

[85]We can dismiss the etymology given by Loukas (1979 [1865–1898]:57) of optative *apu* as the exclamation *a* plus *pu; apu* is a variant of *pu* throughout South-Eastern Greek (§B.4.2), and there is no reason to think optative *apu* need be distinct from optative *pu*.

> **Would that** milk could run like a fountain, and that he could reach his
> daughter and bid her farewell (Loukas B33.177)

(112b)   *Νά 'τουν που νά 'τουβ* βουλετόν τούτ' η καρκιά ν' ανοίξει/ τζι *να 'τουν που να* γίνετουν
          να μεν την τρώει η πλήξι,/ ήθεν ν' αρκέψω να τους πω τζιαι να τους καταγνώσω,/ τζιαι
          ναύρω λόγια του πρεπού τζιαι να τους ποστομώσω.
          na tun pu na tuv vuleton tut i karkia n aniksi/ dʒi ***na tun pu na*** ɣinetun na men tin
          troi i pliksi,/ iθen n arkepso na tus po dʒe na tus kataɣnoso,/ dʒe na vro loɣia tu
          prepu dʒe na tus postomoso.
          Would that (if only) it were so willed that this heart would open up, and
          would that (if only) it were possible that sorrow would not gnaw at it, I
          would start speaking to them and giving them my mind, and I would find fitting
          words and silence them. (Mihailidis 224)

The syntax of such constructions is difficult. It is tempting to consider a con-
struction as sonorous as *na tun pu na tun* as an irrealis counterpart to the VERB
pu VERB construction of Greek (Nicholas 1998b), and *na tun pu na* VERB as an
analogical generalisation of it. But it is also possible that this is simply a port-
manteau of the two optative expressions, *na tun* and *pu na*. A coherent syntactic
analysis of the construction is still possible—the *pu na*-clause might be the sub-
ject of the *na tun* copula. So in (112a), *apu na ɣinetun to ɣalan san tin vrisin*
'would that milk could run like a fountain' would be the subject of *na tan* 'if only
it were (the case)'. But there is no precedent in Greek for *pu na* acting as a com-
plementiser (§7.3.1); so the other, less syntactic explanations given are more at-
tractive.

The case for contamination is reinforced by the following example, where *pu
na* has undergone contamination with another optative expression, *makari na,* to
give *makari pu na*—quite possibly *metri causa:*

(112c)   *μακάρι που* και *νά*χαμεν ακόμα δέκα χέρια.
          makari pu ke *na* xamen akoma ðeka xeria.
          Would that we had ten hands more. (Yannakis 97; Pyrgi, Chios, Central
          Aegean)[86]

(112b) illustrates something further; while in (112a) the *na tan apu na*-clause is
straightforwardly optative, here the clause has a consequent ('I would start
speaking to them...') to which it acts as antecedent: the optative connective
('would that') is starting to turn into an optative conditional ('if only'). This con-
ditionality inheres in the first *na* of *na tun pu na tun,* since *na* can act as a condi-
tional as well as an optative marker. Such a reanalysis would not normally be
possible for a *pu na*-optative, since *pu na* is not reanalysable as a conditional
(but see below.)[87]

---

[86]The presence of *ke* 'and' implies there might even be a third optative expression involved: *ax
ke na* 'oh, and IRR = oh, if only'.
[87]The conditionality of *na tun pu na* is not universal; the very next verse from Mihailidis' poem
is a *na tun pu na*-clause with no consequent. Yet, in a poem by Mihailidis' younger contemporary
Lipertis, titled *Νάτουν (Would that),* there are three eponymous *na tun pu na*-clauses, one per
stanza, each with a consequent.

The account of *na tun pu na* is murky; it is made even murkier by the fact that it occasions variants. As shown in the same poem by Mihailidis, *pu* is not a necessary element in the construction, and can be omitted—as independently confirmed in (113b):

(113a) *Νά 'τουν που νά 'τουβ* βουλετόν να 'μαι σαν ήμουν τότες,/ τζαι να 'χα τζείν τες αρκονκιές, τζειν τες χαρές τες πρώτες,/ τζαι να 'χα τζειν τηφ φορεσιάν τζιαι τζείν τ' αλλαξιμάριν,/ τζιαι *να 'τουν να* συντύχαινα με τζείν τημ πρώτην χάριν,/ εκάνεν τους να βρύξουσιν το πειν τζι η συντυσσιά μου/ τζαι πούμαν του στομάτου τους εκάνεν η θωρκά μου.

na tun pu na tuv vuleton na me san imun totes,/ dʒe na xa dʒin tes arkoŋkies, dʒin tes xares tes protes,/ dʒe na xa dʒin tif foresian dʒe dʒin t al:aksimarin,/ dʒe *na tun na* sindixena me dʒin tim protin xarin,/ ekanen tus na vriksusin to pin dʒi i sintiʃa mu/ dʒe puman tu stomatu tus ekanen i θorka mu.

If only it were so willed that I could be as I was then, and had that majesty, those erstwhile joys, and had that dress and that change of clothes, and *if only* I could speak with that erstwhile grace, my eloquence and speech would make them fall silent, and my appearance would be a stop to their mouths. (Mihailidis 225)

(113b) Μμα *νἄτουν να* θωρούσατε τα μέσα την καρκιάν μας,/ έθεν να μείνετε τσhαι σεις ούλοι σας ξηστιτσhοί

m:a *na tun na* θorusate ta mesa tin karkian mas,/ eθen na minete tʃe sis uli sas ksistitʃi

But *if only* you could see within your hearts, you too would all be stunned (Lipertis 246)

How are *na tun na* and *na tun pu na* to be related? If the latter is the original, then the obscurity of *pu* in the construction would lead it to be dropped. Indeed, *na tun na* VERB is amenable to the syntactic analysis so awkward for *na tun pu na: na* VERB can be the subject of the *na tun* copula, without trouble.[88] If *na tun na* on the other hand is the (syntactically plausible) original, then *na tun pu na* can only be explained by contamination with the *pu na* optative.

The following example shows a further variation on the optative clause: *pu tun na* 'that it was to (be the case that)'. This also seems to introduce an optative conditional; the conditionality, being irrealis, is incompatible with *pu* itself, and seems to have arisen through a reanalysis of the temporal meaning of *pu* (*'when/if* they sunk in the sea, the others would have been saved'):

(113c) *που 'τουν να* 'χαν βουλλήσει τούτοι 'ς την θάλασσαν,/ να μεν είχαν βρεθούσιν μήτε τα πλοία τους,/ 'γλυτώνασιν οι άνθρωποι και τα παιδία τους!

pu tun na xan vul:isi tuti s tin θalas:an,/ na men ixan vreθusin mite ta plia tus,/ ɣliton:asin i anθropi ke ta peðia tus!

if only these men had sunk into the sea, and neither they nor their ships had turned up, those people and their children would have been saved! (Loukas B11.36)

The directionality of change seems to have run in opposite directions in *na tun pu na* and *pu tun na*. *na tun pu na* starts as an optative, and ends up a condi-

_____

[88] In fact, whereas *na tun pu na* is decidedly odd to CSMG speakers, *na tun na* sounds more normal.

tional; *pu tun na* seems to have started as a conditional, and is optative only sec-ondarily, through context (and possibly contamination with *na tun pu na*.)[89]

This development is remarkable, since *pu* is so infrequently involved in condi-tional expressions in Greek (by contrast with *na tun pu na,* where the condition-ality inheres in *na,* not *pu*.) If *pu tun na* is an autonomous expression, and not parasitic on *na tun pu na,* then *pu tun na* must be an expression of long standing in Cypriot as a temporal, to have been reanalysed in this fashion. I have no evi-dence of this; but the Cypriot version of the future particle *θa, enːa< θenna,* is susceptible to reanalysis as *en(i) na* 'he is to',[90] and it is not impossible that this triggered the backformation of COPULA + *na* as a future tense construction (with an analogy to the EMG future *exo na* 'I.have to'); *etun na* 'it was to', as the past version of *en na,* would be a conditional to the future of *enːa,*[91] and its combina-tion with temporal *pu* would give the irrealis temporal posited in §7.7.2.[92]

Cretan

While Cretan has regular optative *(a)pu na*-clauses—

(114)   Ε *που να* ǩεδήσης ǩαι να καρβουνιάσης!
           e *pu na* tšedisis tše na karvuniasis!
           May you burn and turn into coal!
           (HDMS 988:56; Eastern Crete)

there is a fixed expression in which *apu na* has developed idiosyncratically. Whereas CSMG expresses the notion 'serves you right!' as *kala na paθis* 'well may you undergo', Cretan uses the expression *kala ki **apu na** paθis* 'well and ***that*** you ***may*** undergo' (Contossopoulos 1970:273). The parataxis of the ad-verb *kala* and the remainder of the sentence is odd, although *apu na* now clearly introduces an independent optative. Compared to CSMG, this construction draws attention to the optativity of the sentence (*pu na*), which has been con-ventionalised in the CSMG equivalent.[93] One should also not rule out the ana-logical influence of other Cretan expressions using *kala ke* instead of *kala pu* (e.g. *kala ke to θimiθika* 'well and I remembered it = it's just as well that I re-membered it', where CSMG would use *kala pu to θimiθika*): *kala ki apu na paθis*

---

[89]Alternatively, *pu tun na* might be an elaboration of *pu na* (optative).

[90]In fact, this is what I assumed the dervation of *enːa* was until I sighted instances of *θenːa* in Loukas (1979 [1865–1898]).

[91]Cf. English *would,* EMG *iθele* 'it wanted' + INF, CSMG *θa*+ IMPFP. *etun na* as a conditional tense formant is extant in both Cappadocian and Cypriot.

[92]Whether this much of a conclusion is warranted by what is effectively the Cypriot equivalent of William McGonagall is something I do not currently have enough of a command of Cypriot to judge.

[93]Since the referent of the sentence is in the past, and the verb *paθeno* refers to 'undergoing' some experience, rather than reflecting on it ('suffering') subsequently, it is easy for this optative meaning to have been effaced in favour of past reference: the CSMG expression is understood as 'it is good that you have undergone', rather than 'may you have undergone'. Of course, the Cretan expression (which I have not myself heard in Crete) may have been just as convention-alised.

might be a portmanteau of *kala pu epaθes* 'it's good that you have undergone', *kala ki epaθes* 'ibid.', and *apu na paθis* 'may you undergo'.

The following Cretan examples feature a fixed interjection, of a conventionalised type described by Kafkalas (1992:60–62); they are optatives in all but their form, *na* being absent.

(115a) Ανάθεμά με—***απού*** παίρνω τ' ανάθεμα—α δεν επέρασες λώϐις απού το λουφαλωτό...
        anaθema me—***apu*** perno t anaθema—a ðen eperases lobis apu to lufaloto...
        Damn me—***and*** may I suffer damnation—if I don't reckon you passed by the tree hollow (HDIC; from G. Mathioudakis: *Λούλουδα* 27)

(115b) Ανάθεμά με—***απού*** παίρνω τ' ανάθεμα—α δε γενεί φονικό
        anaθema me—***apu*** perno t anaθema—a ðe γeni foniko
        Damn me—***and*** may I suffer damnation—if there won't be a murder (Kafkalas 1992:62)

apu perno t anaθema 'that I take the anathema' is a ritual abjuration after a speaker says *anaθema me* 'damn me'. There is some uncertainty about the proper analysis of such clauses, however; they may still be considered realis circumstances ('***whereupon*** (in saying 'damn me') I take on/am willing to take on damnation').

Apiranthos

There is two instances in the corpus where a clear optative is introduced by *pu* alone, rather than *pu na*. One is (95a); the other is the following:

(116)   Ω Παναγιά μου, και ***πο*** μ' έπαιρνες! γιατί δε ϐορώ πια, δεν αδέχω πια να 'μ' επά μες στο σπίτι
        o panaγia mu, ke ***po*** m epernes! ʝati ðe boro pja, ðen adexo pja na m epa mes sto spiti
        Oh Our Lady, ***would that*** you would take me away! for I cannot stand it any more, being inside the house. (HDMS 571:410; Apiranthos, Naxos, Cyclades)

The idiosyncracies of the dialect of Apiranthos have occupied our attention more than once. In this instance, the usual Apiranthos exclamation according to the text collector would be *o xriste mu **c** epare me* 'Oh Christ ***and*** take me!' The verb *epernes* is IMPFP, the tense associated with unrealised wishes (CSMG *as m eperenes* 'would that you took me', with the hortative *as*). The likeliest explanation for (116) is that it too is a portmanteau, of a *pu na*-optative (which normally has future reference, and takes PERFS) and *as* + IMPFP (which has past unrealised reference).

This would explain the tense, but not the absence of *na;* and the use of the allolexe *po,* which implies a following *e* (*?pu eme epernes*) (§B.4.1), is of no more help in this matter. We already know that Apiranthos drops *na/θa* in future temporal *pu*-clauses (§7.6.4); this may represent some idiosyncratic local expansion of dropping *na* in *pu na* from PERFS to IMPFP contexts, particularly as *na* is not as strongly associated with IMPFP as with PERFS.

Pontic

There is an expression in Fotiadis' Pontic plays, *pun ke na* 'would that' which seems like an expansion of the *pu na*-optative:

(117)   *Πουν και να* επαλαλούμ', *πουν και να* εστραβούμ' και 'κ' έλεπα τ' εσά τα ατιμίας και τη θυγατερός-ι-μ' τα ρεζιλούκια.
          pun ke na epalalum, *pun ke na* estravum ke k elepa t esa ta atimias ke ti θiɣateros im ta rezilukia.
          Would that I were mad, *would that* I were blind, not to see your crimes and my daughter's downfall. (FotD 325)

The expression does not occur anywhere else in my Pontic corpus, and though it looks like *pu na,* it cannot be the same syntactically: *pu na* is simply a relativiser plus a modal marker, whereas the most obvious etymology for *pun ke na* is *pu eni ke na* 'pu it.is and IRR'.[94] A relativiser in such a construction makes little sense ('X that it is, and may it...'); there are echoes of both tautologous relativisation circumstances (§7.4.2), and the VERB *pu* VERB topicalisation construction (Nicholas 1998b), but neither seems a plausible explanation. *pu* could just as easily be the locative interrogative ʹ*pu* (used in Greek as a marker of incredulity): thus, 'where is it? and IRR = since when? and may it...', with the interrogative evoking the unreality of the referent.

Conclusion

Optative-*pu na* is a widespread and distinctive class of *pu*-functions. Its origins are straightforward and compositional—there is nothing exceptional about an optative relative clause. Yet in contrast to other irrealis relative clauses, such as purposives, the optative has undergone precocious and wide-ranging development, which undermine the compositionality of the construction, and show it to have developed into an autonomous sign. It is found in all Greek dialects outside the Pontus; it is imprecative throughout Greek; it is more syntactically autonomous than any other function of *pu;* it only infrequently allows *pu* and *na* to be split apart; and it has engendered idiosyncratic formations in Cyprus, Crete, Apiranthos, and the Pontus. These facts show the optative to be a very important stage in the grammaticalisation of *pu.*

7.7.5. Exclamatory clauses
The exclamatory cleft construction is an instance of clefting; but it has wider scope than clefting proper. For instance, a predicative adjective cannot normally be cleft (**kalos ine pu ine o ɣianis* 'It's good that John is'), but quite normal for the exclamatory (*[ti] kalos pu ine o ɣianis* 'How good John is'). However, the constituency restrictions on what can be exclamatorily cleft match the general

---

[94]This construction is similar to the EMG and Pontic conditional *an en ke* 'if it.is (the case) and', although this does not explain the construction.

restrictions on Greek clefting. Thus, the exclamatory cleft does not separate an adjective from its head; the following is a rare exception:

(118a) Τουτοδά το βουνί   ίντα ώμορφην   απούχει   κορφήν.
        tutoδa to vuni   inda omorfin   apu xi   korfin.
        this mountain   what beautiful REL it.has peak
        This mountain, what a fine crest it has! (DawkD 137; Asfendiou, Kos, Dodecanese)

Exclamatory clauses in CSMG are cleft by *pu,* and this is a distinctive feature of Greek in the region: its Balkan neighbours lack cleft exclamatories, with the exception of Standard Albanian, Arvanitika, and Aroumin;[95] the latter two have obviously calqued the cleft from Greek, being in such intimate contact with the language.

Furthermore, it is extremely rare for exclamatories to be introduced by any interrogative other than *ti* 'what' in Greek—unlike Albanian, which uses *sa* 'how much'. The following instance is one of the few Greek exceptions:

(118b) Αχ **πόσο** καλότυχη **πού**μαι δανά!
        ax **poso** kalotixi **pu** me δana!
        Oh, **how** *('how much')* *fortunate ∅ I now am!* (Dawk 194; Leros, Dodecanese)

So the Greek cleft exclamatory is distinct from Albanian, and represents a Greek innovation. However, the introductory interrogative is optional in Greek, and this differentiates the diatopy of the construction according to the two features used to mark the exclamatory: the introductory interrogative, and the cleft. At least one of these must be present in the exclamatory, otherwise the clause is unmarked as to its illocution.

Uncleft

Amongst the outlier dialects, Cappadocian studiously avoids clefting its exclamatories; the five exclamatory instances in the Cappadocian corpus have an exclamatory introduced by *ti* or an equivalent, but no cleft.

(119a) Αν δε σε έπκαμ' ὺυφ' 'τουν, déδκα να σε δώκω ητουν 'ς ετό το παλικάρ', **τὅι** καλό ∅ να ἐὐ-ὐεί 'τουν.
        an de se epkam nif tun, deʃka na se doko itun s eto to palikar, **tʃi** kalo ∅ na enːi tun.
        *Αν δε σε είχαμε παντρέψει, τώρα θα σ' έδινα σ' αυτό το παλικάρι, τι καλά **που** θα ήταν.*
        an δe se ixame padrepsi, tora θa s eδina s afto to palikari, **ti** kala **pu** θa itan.
        If we hadn't married you off, I would now have given you in marriage to that lad; **how** nice that would have been! (AravanFK 110; Aravani, Western Cappadocia)

---

[95]Albanian: **sa** *bukur* **që** *është!* '**how** beautiful ∅ it is!' (Feuillet 1987:40); Arvanitika: τσε τὲ μπούκουρα ὀ̇τολ̇jí τσὲ jáνὲ **ce** *të bukura stoli* **çë** *janë* '**what** pretty dresses ∅ they are' (Mihail-Dede 1978–1981:I 65); Aroumin: **tsi** *darácu̯* **i̯u** *n´i̯-aflái̯* '**what** a devil ∅ I have found' (Koltsidas 1993 [1976–1978]:484).

This indicates that the innovation of clefting exclamatories must date from after Cappadocian becoming cut off from the rest of Greek.[96] The innovation must also date from after Pontic being cut off: Pontic also avoids clefting its exclamatories, not only in Chaldiot (120a), but even in Oinuntiac, which is normally much closer to CSMG (120b):

(120a)   μέτα τάη, αβούτο η κουκούλα **ντ'** έμορφα ∅ ίγεψε σε!
meta tai, avuto i kukula **nd** emorfa ∅ iɣepse se!
Oh uncle, **how** nice that hood looks on you! (Nymf 183; Santa, Chaldia)
(CSMG: *vre θio, afti i kukula* **ti** *orea* **pu** *su pai!*)

(120b)   να μη ματάεσαι, μωρή, ατά **τι** πάχα και κάλλα ∅ είναι;
na mi mataese, mori, ata **ti** paʃa ke kalæ ∅ ine?
May you not suffer the evil eye! **What** a fat and beautiful baby that is! (Siviridis 1938:204; Oinoe)
(CSMG: *na mi matiastis, mori,* **ti** *paxia ke orea* **pu** *ine afto!*)

The only cleft exclamatory in Pontic is the collocation *ndo eɣenesne* 'that you have become' (§B.2), which is quite close to a straightforward relative clause. This fixed expression is not in itself adequate proof that Pontic ever had productive cleft exclamatories.

Tsakonian appears to use cleft exclamatories: there is one cleft exclamatory apiece attested for Propontis and Peloponnesian Tsakonian, but no uncleft exclamatory.

(121a)   Το χαρτί γράβ'τα 'ταν: πολλά σκατά **πη** θα τρώχ', μυλωνά, τ'σ' α κότ'α τ'σ' α πίτ'α είν' το καβγί.
to xarti ɣravta tan: ∅ pola skata **pi** θa trox, milona, tɕ a kotʰa tɕ a pitʰa in to kavɣi.
The paper wrote: Much shit **that** you will eat (= the shit that you will eat!), miller, and the chicken and the pie go to the boy. (CostF 106; Havoutsi, Propontis Tsakonian)

(121b)   Μα, για ξείκα, Τζελ'ίνα, καμάζ'ι **π'οι**ν'' έν' έχα α ν'υιθη
ma, ɣia ksika, dzeλina, ∅ kamaʒi **pʰi** ɲ en exa a ɲiθi
But, look, Angelina, **what** pride ∅ the bride has on her! (Latsis 1895, cited in Triandafyllidis 1981 [1938]:305; Lenidi, Southern Tsakonia)

Given how intimately Tsakonian syntax follows CSMG, the presence of the cleft exclamatory in Tsakonian does not reflect on the antiquity of the construction.

Italiot has clefting exclamatories. However, there is a divergence between those cases introduced by an interrogative and not. Where an interrogative is absent, the cleft is present, as would be expected.

---

[96]There is a counterexample in (119b), but Sinasos was subject to extensive Constantinopolitan influence in modern times, and the song in question (a plaint on the fall of Hagia Sophia, with many formulaic verses familiar from mainstream Greek variants of the song) could have carried the expression with it in its travels.
(119b)   μάνα κλαυμός **που** γένηκεν εκείνην την ημέρα.
mana ∅ klavmos **pu** ɣeniken ekinin tin imera.
Oh mother, **what** a lamentation ∅ there was that day. (Lagarde 30; Sinasos)

(122a)   *ášimi χőra* **pu** *éne kutrofyána,/ ólo* patúla *će poḍḍi fsiχró!*
     ∅ aʃimi xora ***pu*** ene kutrofjana,/ olo patula tʃe poḍːi fsixro!
     Brutto paese **che** *è Cutrofiano,/ Tutto paludi e molto freddo!*
     What a horrible region ∅ Cutrofiano is, full of swamps and so cold!
     (RohlfsGRU 162; Calimera, Apulia)

(122b)   *ehórtase? to paḍḍali* **pu** *isso! i ḍihatera-su me eḍe s tin aɟrapp'iḍía!*
     ehortase? ∅ to paḍːali ***pu*** isːo! i ðihatera su me eðe s tin aɣrapːʰiðia!
     Ti sei saziata?—Il babbione **che** *sei! Tua figlia mi legò al pero selvatico!*
     Are you full?—**What** a fool ∅ you are! Your daughter tied me to the wild pear
     tree! (Falcone 162; Gallicianò, Calabria)

Where the interrogative is present in Calabria, the exclamatory is also cleft:

(122c)   **Ti** *máňo iplo* **pu** *ékama egó!*
     ti maɲo iplo ***pu*** ekama ego!
     Che *bel sonno* **che** *ho fatto!*
     What a fine sleep ∅ I had! (TNC 211.14; Roccaforte, Calabria)

But when an introductory interrogative is present in Apulia (and occasionally also in Calabria), the exclamatory is not cleft:

(122d)   **T'èn** *glićèa tusi nifta,* **t'èn** *òria!*
     t en ɡlitʃea tusi nifta, **t** ∅ en oria!
     Com'è dolce questa notte, **com'**è bella!*
     How sweet the night is, **how** beautiful it is! (Palumbo 26; Calimera, Apulia)

(122e)   *O lípimmu,* **ti** *éne* brútto *to yenári!*
     o lipi mːu, ***ti*** ∅ ene brutːo to jenari!
     O povero me, **come** *è brutto gennaio!*
     Alas, **how** cruel January is! (TNC 273.9; Condofuri, Calabria)

The discrepancy between the two dialects is made explicit in a bidialectal text Rohlfs offers:

(122f)   *O* kumpáre *líko, vréte* **ti** máña *áloga* **ti** *éçi óðe.*
     o kumpare liko, vrete ***ti*** maɲa aloga ***ti*** (REL) eçi oðe. (Condofuri, Calabria)
     O kumpáre *líke, torí* **ti** *órya ampárya* ∅ *éçi ettú?*
     o kumpare like, tori ***ti*** orja amparja ∅ eçi etːu? (Calimera, Apulia)
     O compare lupo, vedete **che** *be' cavalli* ∅ *vi sono qui!*
     Wolf, my compadre, look **what** fine horses ∅ there are here! (RohlfsGRU 159)

The uncleft pattern is clearly a contact phenomenon, given comparable constructions in Italian. Whereas mainstream Greek clefts the exclamatory by putting the focus word between the interrogative and the copula, Italian unclefts it by placing the focus word after the copula. Thus, there is a word for word equivalence in (122d) of *t en ɡlitʃea* and *com'è dolce* 'how/what it.is sweet'.

    The remaining complication is that, while Apulian calques Italian, it still uses *ti* 'what' as an introductory interrogative, while Italian uses *come* 'how'. It seems that the use of *ti* as an introductory interrogative has survived in Apulian, and has been conscripted into the latterday Italian calque.

    To summarise: of the outlier dialects, clefts are not used in Cappadocian and Pontic; they are also not used in Apulian Italiot, but this is transparently a con-

tact phenomenon. I am not aware of any comparable feature of Turkish which could have led to the same result in Pontic and Cappadocian; but such a development cannot be ruled out, in light of the general absence in Turkish of relativisers or clefts.

Outside the outliers, instances of uncleft exclamations turn up, but are very infrequent. The examples are of two kinds: one is, relatively infrequently,[97] Eastern Greek, and must be regarded as an autonomous development.

(123a)   Μάνα! *τι γλυκά* ∅ ικοιμούμουσταν!
          mana! *ti* ɣlika ∅ ikimumustan!
          Μάνα! Τι γλυκά που κοιμόμασταν!
          mana! *ti* ɣlika *pu* kimomastan!
          Mother! **How** sweetly ∅ we were sleeping! (MousP 14; Livisi)

(123b)   Νᾶτο βολετόν να πααίναμεν τσαι μέσα, *ίντα* καλά θᾶτον!
          na to voleton na paenamen tse mesa, *inda* kala ∅ θa ton!
          *If it were also possible for us to go on board, **how** fine ∅ that would be!*
          (DawkD 66; Astypalaea, Dodecanese)

(123c)   Ω χαρώ τα τα μαγερῥά σου *είδα* λιπαρά 'ναι
          o xaro ta ta mažerža su *ida* lipara ∅ ne
          Oh, bless your cooking—**how** tasty it is! (HDMS 988:67; Eastern Crete)

The other group is Western Greek. There is an instance in Macedonian Greek (124a), where one might suspect Macedonian Slavonic influence (Macedonian Slavonic does not have cleft exclamatories).[98]

(124a)   *Τι* δλειά γυρέβ, τι πχαλητό ια να μαυρίσ^ε¹ η ρόγα!
          ti ðlia ∅ ɣirev, ti pxalito ia na mavriš^j i roɣa!
          What work ∅ the grape requires, what running around, for it to ripen!
          (Adamopoulos 1983:22; Melissohori, Salonica)

But it also occurs in Skiathos (off the coast of Thessaly), which speaks a northern dialect, but which is rather removed from the Slavonic-speaking zone:

(124c)   «Αχ!» λέει «*τι* γλυκά κ'μώμταμι κι μι ξύπνησις!»
          "ax!" lei "*ti* ɣlika ∅ cmomtami ki mi ksipnisis!"
          "Oh!" he said, "**how** sweetly ∅ I was sleeping, and you woke me up!" (Rigas 1962:5)

Skiathos is an Aegean island, and in contact with other islands—the Eastern Greek interrogative *ida* reached as far as Skyros, 75 km east of Skiathos. So it is not impossible that this infrequent Eastern Greek formula travelled as far north as Skiathos, particularly since it is here used in a formulaic expression of a fairy tale (cf. 123a).

---

[97]But in Zarraftis' texts from Astypalea, there are 3 instances of uncleft exclamatories to 8 cleft.
[98]However, the normal Western Greek exclamatory is also present in Melissohori:

Introductory interrogative

In many dialects, the introductory interrogative may be absent from the exclamatory; this holds not only when the cleft element is an adverb or adjective (the most usual case), but also when the cleft element is a noun:

(125)　Μα διε τση Ευδοξίας τα παιδιά, τ' αδρέφια, τη ɣαθαριότης **πὄχ**ουνε!
　　　　ma ðje tsi enðoksias ta peðja, t aðrefja, ti ɣaθriotis **po** xune!
　　　　But look at Eudoxia's children, the brothers—the cleanliness ∅ they have!
　　　　(HDMS 756:272; Marmara)

Amongst the outliers, Pontic and Cappadocian retain *ti;* this is unsurprising, since they lack clefting as a distinguishing feature of their exclamatories. As already seen, Italiot has exclamatories both with and without *ti;* the differentiation in Apulian of *ti*-uncleft and zero-cleft appears to be a latter-day normalisation.

　　The Maniot of Corsica, although a relative newcomer to the Romance-speaking region compared to Italiot, nevertheless patterns with that dialect: it has cleft exclamatories both without (126a) and with an introductory element.

(126a)　μαύρο **που** είναι!
　　　　∅ mavro **pu** ine!
　　　　How unfortunate ∅ it is! (HDMS 835:12)

Unlike Italiot, the introductory element is not *ti* but *tseða* 'this way', presumably as a calque from Corse (cf. Italian *come* 'how', *si* 'so', French *comme, si*) (126b). So in this dialect the introductory interrogative has not resisted the pressure to calque, and this is the only regional exception to the Greek use of *ti:*

(126b)　***Τσεδά*** όμορφο **όπου** έναι!
　　　　tseða omorfo ¹**opu** ene!
　　　　Comme *c'est beau!*
　　　　How beautiful ∅ it is! (Blanken 1951:280)

Tsakonian does not use *tsi* 'what' in its exclamatories. Thus Propontis Tsakonian avoids *tsi* (127—a pseudo-cleft exclamatory), and the only instances of true cleft exclamatories in Tsakonian feature bare noun phrases (121a, 121b):

(127)　Θεέ μ', σ'υχώρεσέ μ', ∅ κακό 'ταν τητά **πη**φτιάκα εγώ τσ'αι παρακαλέκα τσ'αι
　　　　φτιάτ'σ' τον πετρά άρχοντα!
　　　　θee m, ʃixorese m, ∅ kako tan tita **pi** ftiaka eɣo tɕe parakaleka tɕe ftiatɕ ton petra
　　　　arxonda!
　　　　Θεέ μου, συχώρεσέ με, τι κακό ήταν αυτό που έκανα εγώ και παρακάλεσα και έκανες
　　　　τον πετρά άρχοντα!
　　　　θee mu, sixorese me, **ti** kako itan **afto pu** ekana eɣo ke parakalesa ke ekanes ton
　　　　petra arxoda!
　　　　God, forgive me, ***(what)*** a bad thing was ***that which*** I have done, to have
　　　　asked you to make the stonecutter a nobleman! (CostF 102; Havoutsi, Propontis
　　　　Tsakonian)

(121a)　Το χαρτί γράβ'τα 'ταν: πολλά σκατά **πη**θα τρώχ', μυλωνά, τ'σ' α κότ'α τ'σ' α πίτ'α
　　　　είν' το καβγί.

to xarti ɣravta tan: ∅pola skata ***pi*** θa trox, milona, tɕ a kotʰa tɕ a pitʰa in to kavɣi.
The paper wrote: Much shit ***that*** you will eat (= the shit that you will eat!),
miller, and the chicken and the pie go to the boy. (CostF 106; Havoutsi,
Propontis Tsakonian)

(121b)   Μα, για ξείκα, Τζελ′ίνα, καμάζ′ι ***π′οι*** ν″ έν′ έχα α ν′υιθη
          ma, ɣia ksika, dzeʎina, ∅kamaʒi ***pʰi*** ɲ en exa a ɲiθi
          But, look, Angelina, ***what*** pride ∅ the bride has on her! (Latsis 1895, cited in
          Triandafyllidis 1981 [1938]:305; Lenidi, Southern Tsakonia)

So amongst the outliers, the following situation obtains:

	ti	Cleft
Pontic	+	−
Cappadocian	+	−
Tsakonian	−	+
Italiot	+	+

In clefting exclamatories, Italiot to the west optionally uses *ti;* Tsakonian, adjacent to both Eastern and Western Greek, does not use it. This allows a hypothesis to be formulated: Western Greek in general optionally uses *ti;* Eastern Greek avoids it—except for the far east, Anatolian Greek, where the absence of the cleft forces *ti* to be used.

This supposition is borne out by the data. In HDIC data, *ti* is attested for Thrace (1:0) and Eastern Rumelia (1:0), the Heptanesa (2:1), Roumeli (1:0), and the Cyclades and Macedonia (in both of which exclamatories without *ti* are also attested: 1:2 and 2:5, respectively.)[99] Of these regions, Thrace and Eastern Rumelia are under the cultural influence of Constantinople, and as seen in Psichari, *ti* is quite healthy in Constantinopolitan itself.

Other than that, what these exclamatories have in common is that they are all from Western Greek—whence it has ended up in CSMG. Consistent with this division, there are no instances of *ida... pu* exclamatories, where *ida* is the Eastern form for *ti;* all exclamatories are introduced by *ti*. This occurs even for the Cycladean exclamatory:

(128)   *τι* δύναμ′ ***πο***′χ′ αλήθεια, το ανεμοστρόφλο!
          ti ðinam ***po*** x aliθia, to anemostroflo!
          What strength ∅a tornado truly has! (HDMS 361:193; Komi, Tinos)

It is no surprise that in fact, Tinos has Northern Greek vocalism, although its native form for 'what' is *ida*—and furthermore, that the Cyclades underwent CSMG influence quite early. So Tinos can hardly count as prototypical Eastern Greek. So Western Greek and CSMG optionally use *ti*.

(123b)   ***Τι*** καλά ***που*** τουν ίλιγαν τουν λόγου τουν παλιό ζΜπάλτζια οι μπάμπις οι μανές
          ti kala ***pu*** tun iliɣan tun loɣu tun palio zm baldzia i babis i manes
          How well ∅ the old grandmothers used to say the proverb in Melissohori in
          times past (Adamopoulos 1983:81; Melissohori, Salonica)
[99]So too, Lemnos (*ti...pu:* Kontonatsiou 192; bare *pu:* Kontonatsiou 205.)

By contrast, introductory interrogatives are largely absent in Eastern Greek. The four Cypriot instances in my corpus drop *inda:*

(129a) Ω τζιαι καλώς ήρτεν ο Γιάννης!/ Τζιαιρόν *από* 'σιει να σε δούμεν!
        o dʒe kalos irten o ɣian:is!/ ∅ dʒeron *apo* ʃi na se ðumen!
        Oh, welcome, John! ***How*** long has it been since last we saw you! (Mihailidis 228)

(129b) Μερκέζιν έν' που 'στείλασιν ευθύς εις το Κυλάνιν,/ οι μάρτυρες για να 'ρτουσιν κι' ο ταβατ ζής να πάῃ·/ ∅ πολλά *που* είπεν ο Καλλής, δια να τον κρεμμάσῃ,/ κι' ο παντοκράτωρ ο θεός θέλει να τον ποσπάσῃ.
        merkezin en pu stilasin efθis is to kilanin,/ i martires ja na rtusin c o tavadʒis na pai;/ ∅ pol:a *pu* ipen o kal:is, ðia na ton krem:asi,/ c o pandokrator o θeos θeli na ton pospasi.
        It was a summons that they sent straightaway to Kylanin, for the witnesses to come and the plaintiff to go; ***how*** much Kallis said, to get him hanged; yet God Omnipotent wants to save him. (Loukas B34.76)

This also holds for Chios and the Dodecanese, the other major constituents of South-Eastern Greek:[100]

(130a) Μπρούτσα πήαμε, χορόν *που* τόνε τόνε, τόνε σύραμε.
        brutsa piame, ∅ xoron *pu* tone tone, tone sirame.
        We went to Brutsa; ***what*** a dance ∅ we danced! (Yannakis 41; Pyrgi, Chios, Central Aegean)

(130b) Χάρε, κακόν *που* το 'καμες στην ακριβήμ μου κόρη
        xare, ∅ kakon *pu* to kames stin akrivim mu kori
        Death, ***what*** an evil ∅ you have done to my dear daughter! (HDMS 1280:33; Castellorizo, Dodecanese)

(130c) Μάκρος *που* 'χει αυτός!
        ∅ makros *pu* xi aftos!
        What tallness ∅ he has! (= How tall he is!) (HDMS 1246:101; Soroni, Rhodes, Dodecanese)

(130d) κέφιμ *που* το 'χεις
        ∅ kefim *pu* to xis
        What a good mood ∅ you are in! (HDIC; from 'Zogr.' 236; Symi, Dodecanese)

(130e) Όμορφο *που* 'ν το φαΐ σας, σα φουρνιστό μιάζει
        ∅ omorfo *pu* n to fai sas, sa furnisto miazi
        How nice ∅ your food is; just like it's out of the oven! (HDMS 1076:14; Nisyros, Dodecanese)

The counterexamples in the corpus from the Dodecanese are from Karpathos and Kasos, islands which retained *ti* rather than accepting *inda* like the rest of the Dodecanese (Nicholas in prep.) It is hardly surprising that they are also archaic relative to the rest of Eastern Greek in retaining *ti*-exclamatories:

(131a) Είες *τι* άενος *απού* 'ναιμ με τητ-τσαούνατ του;
        ies *ti* aenos *apu* nem me tit tsaunat tu?
        See ***how*** beardless ∅ he is with his chin? (Minas 1970:116; Karpathos)

_____

[100]I have no instances of exclamatories from Icaria.

(131b)   ´Ακου η αχρόνιστη *τι* κακούργα *πού* ’το!
          aku i axronisti *ti* kakurγa *pu* to!
          Listen ***how*** evil ∅ the ill-fated woman was! (Sofos 12; Kasos)

That said, Zarraftis' texts from Astypalaea, a Dodecanesian island solidly using *inda*, have both exclamatories with and without an introductory interrogative, in comparable proportions (3:5 for DawkD):

(132a)   Αμμ' *ίντα* παράμορφο θάμα *πού*νε, Πεντάμορφή μου, τσαι να τώβλεπες τσαι συ!
          am: *inda* paramorfo θama *pu* ne, pendamorfi mu, tse na to vlepes tse si!
          *But **what** a very fine marvel ∅ she is, my Five Times Fair and I wish you could see her too.* (DawkD 66; Astypalaea)

(132b)   ´Αχχου, άχχου, ο ’φτακακόμοιρος, δουλτσάν *απού*παθα!
          ax:u, ax:u, o ftakakomiros, ∅ ðultsan *apu* paθa!
          *Alas, alas, seven times unhappy that I am! **What** trouble ∅ has befallen me!*
          (DawkD 87; Astypalaea)

So the Dodecanese are heterogeneous: there is persistence of an introductory interrogative. Such heterogeny does not appear to my knowledge in Cretan, which uniformly lacks an introductory interrogative; (133) is the only exception I know of, and has been collected rather late:

(133)   ´Ιντα όμορφα *που* κράζεις, πετεινέ μου
          ida omorfa *pu* krazis, petine mu
          How beautifully ∅ you crow, dear rooster (Dound 157; Arhanes)

So there is a division between Western and Eastern Greek. Now, in many features, Western Greek is innovative, and Eastern Greek archaic. One would thus be tempted to call the development of the introductory interrogative an innovation. It seems, however, that the reverse is the case, and Eastern Greek has innovated in dropping the interrogative.

   There are several pieces of evidence for this. First, the interrogative survives in Anatolian Greek, Pontic and Cappadocian, where it presumably does not consitute an independent innovation. Second, Karpathos and Kasos retain *ti*-exclamatories along with *ti,* as an archaism. Third, *inda* is used in Astypalaea to introduce exclamatories; Astypalaea, like Karpathos and Kasos, was not under Hospitaller rule like the rest of the Dodecanese during the Middle Ages (Nicholas in prep.); so its *inda*-exclamatories could easily be a (grammatically necessary) relexicalisation of the old *ti*-interrogative, which stayed in place in the isolated island. Fourth, *ti* must be at least old enough to have made it to Italiot, as there is no exclamatory construction in Italian which could explain its use there.

   The problem with such an account is that exclamatories without *ti* are extant in Western as well as Eastern Greek:

(134a)   Ω γιε, κάζο *πό*παθα ο έρημοοος, ω γιεεε!
          o γie, ∅ kazo *po* paθa o erimos, o γie!
          *O alas, **what** a thing **that** has happened to me, poor man, o alas!* (Skiadaresis 381; Cephallonia, Heptanesa)

(134b) Ω, λέει, παλιάθρωπος **που** είναι!
o, lei, ∅ paliaθropos **pu** ine!
Oh, she says, **what** a scoundrel ∅ he is! (MinB 530; Gerakario, Zante,
Heptanesa)

(134c) Μάννα μ' κούασ' **απ'** έχει
mana m ∅ kuas **ap** exi
Mother, how tired he is ('tiredness **that** he has') (HDMS 839:208; Samothrace,
Thrace)

(134d) Μούκινα όλ μέρα λέει χός'κα, ρε ζβουριά **που** έχ'.
mukina oλ mera lei xoska, re ∅ žvurja **pu** eç.
Moukina tells jokes all day; what a chatterbox she is! ('chatter **that** she has')
(HDMS 1168:259; Agia Paraskevi, Serres, Macedonia)

If non-*ti*–exclamatories are spread throughout mainstream Greek, but *ti*-ex-
clamatories are restricted to Western Greek, this would *prima facie* suggest that
ti was the innovation, which did not spread as far as its non-*ti* counterpart.
Since the other evidence suggests the contrary, it seems the dropping of *ti*
spread throughout Greek and originated in Eastern Greek, so that it has almost
fully displaced *ti*-exclamatories in its region of origin (but for places like Asty-
palaea—and given the gaps in my corpus, possibly elsewhere.)[101]

------

[101]Cretan has cleft exclamatories in which *pu* does not feature at all:

(135a) μάνα μου, ονοστομιά **την** έχει
mana mu, onostimia ∅ **tin** exi
Lord, how tasty it is! (Kafkalas 1992:31)

(135b) Για δε 'κειε χάλι **το** 'χουνε τ' απατού ντως καωμένο…
γia ðe kie xali ∅ **to** xune t apatu dos kaomeno...
Look there what a mess ∅ they have made for themselves... (Dound 174;
Arhanes)

Kafkalas (1992:31) interprets this as an "omission of *pu*"; that is, in (135a) *pu* is omitted from the
phrase *onostimia pu tin exi* 'tastyness that it has it', making *tin* here an accusative clitic. But cleft
exclamatories do not usually feature topicalising clitics like this (there are counterexamples, but
a detailed investigation would range beyond the scope of this research); and an empty clefting
element would be far-fetched, when there is a much simpler explanation: *tin* here is a relativiser
(FEM.ACC.SG), equivalent in function to *pu,* and consistent with the survival of *to*_{REL} in Cretan
folksong.
Indeed, some of Kafkalas' other examples look even more like straightforward relativisations: *na
iðis lefta **ta** xi* 'you should see the money ∅ he has!', *ðiale to kako **to** xi* 'Devil! The evil ∅ he has!',
*kako ke kako **do** paθa* 'evil and evil **that** has befallen me = oh **what** an evil has befallen me!'
The same construction turns up in the adjacent Dodecanese, where *to* remains productive as a
relativiser

(136a) Κακόν **τώ**παθα 'ς τον ακριβόμ μου!
kakon **to** paθa s ton akrivom mu!
What I suffer for my darling son! ('The evil **that** I have suffered!') (DawkD 76;
Astypalaea)

(136b) Δέτε δανά δουλιές **τες** κάμνει το μαστοράκι μου.
ðete ðana ðuλes **tes** kamni to mastoraki mu.
See now, the work ∅ my little apprentice does!
Look now what my prentice has done. (DawkD 190; Leros)

(136c) Για 'ε κυνήι **το** 'καμα ετούτητ την ημέρα.
γia e kinii **to** kama etutit tin imera.
See what a hunt ∅ I had today! (Mih-Nou 102; Elymbos, Karpathos)

Tzartzanos' (1991 [1946, 1963] §282 LXXXIV iv b) hypothesis, finally, that exclamatory clefts are derived from reanalysis of interrogative clefts (*ti in to kako pu paθame* 'what is the evil that we have suffered' > *ti kako pu paθame* 'what an evil we have suffered!'), is unlikely to be true for several reasons. The Pontic and Cappadocian data strongly imply that the introductory interrogative is prior to the clefting; so an interrogative cleft is not a necessary element in the derivation. There is no discernable trace amongst the Greek dialects of the postulated copula or determiner, held to have been elided from the etymon. Furthermore, *ti* makes sense on its own in the construction, as an adjectival interrogative (*ti kako* 'what sort of evil'); to make it a nominal in the derivation is roundabout and unnecessary. It seems safer to make this an analogical extension of clefting to the preexisting uncleft exclamatory, as preserved in Anatolian Greek.

Bare exclamatories

The foregoing discussion has concentrated on cleft exclamatories. The bare realis exclamatories of §3.7.6 are largely absent in the dialect corpus. (137a) is of interest because it is intermediate between bare *pu*-realis and bare *pu*-irrealis:

(137a)   Λέω μιάνανε, λίη βοήθεια ήθελα από το φόβο μου. ***Που*** δε χωρούσανε! ***Που*** δε τζ έπαιρνε!
         leo mjanane, lii voiθia iθela apo to fovo mu. ***pu*** ðe xorusane! ***pu*** ðe dz eperne!
         (Narrator is trying to load her children onto a cart to flee Asia Minor.) I told one of them I needed some help, so great was my fear. ***That*** they wouldn't fit! ***That*** he wouldn't take them! (HDMS 756:221; Marmara)

Compare this to a bare-*pu* realis exclamatory and a bare-*pu* irrealis exclamatory:

(137b)   Μ' έχει κάνει ρεζίλι στη γειτονιά. Τον πεζεβέγκη! ***Που*** μου θέλει και παιδί! Το μάτι θα του βγάλω! Αύριο κιόλας θα πάω να κάνω έκτρωση…
         m exi kani rezili sti γitonia. ton pezevegi! ***pu*** mu θeli ke peði! to mati θa tu vγalo! avrio kiolas θa pao na kano ektrosi…
         He's made me the laughing stock of the whole neighbourhood, that's what he's done. The bastard! ***And*** *then he gives me another brat of his!* ('That he wants a child, too!') *I'll scratch his bloody eyes out! Tomorrow first thing I'll go and get an abortion, that's what I'll do!…* (Tah 94)

(137c)   Τι αλλάξαμε, λοιπόν; ΄Αντε, ρε, *που* αλλάξαμε…
         ti alaksame, lipon? ***ade,*** re, ***pu*** alaksame (PERFP)…
         [***'Go on,*** hey, ***that*** we have changed…']
         So how have we changed, then? Yeah, *sure* we've changed… (TsifM 302)

Like bare-*pu* realis exclamatories, these *pu*-clauses are full sentences, and not dependent on a full matrix. Like the irrealis-*pu* exclamatories, on the other hand, these clauses do not express mere disbelief, but actual untruths: the children did fit into the cart in the end (137a).

What all these exclamatories have in common is that they are in some way quotative: speakers exclaim another's opinion and disassociate themselves from it. In the realis case, they express contempt for a cited fact which is nonetheless true (the speaker's husband wants a child in (137b).) In the irrealis case, they

express ridicule for an erroneous belief they attribute to someone else. In (137a), the narrator is quoting the excuses she was being given for refusing her children to get on. This works exactly the same way as the other two instances, the only difference being the syntactic scope of *pu*—the *condensation* of *pu,* in Lehmann's terms (§2.2.1).

Such exclamatories are like bare *pu*-irrealis in that they exclaim against an untruth expressed in a *pu*-adjunct; but unlike them, the matrix is zero. This means that, while the semantics of (137a) resembles irrealis (137c), its rhetorical force resembles realis (137b): the speaker's contempt is not explicitly verbalised in an exclamation, and is thus conveyed more indirectly. The effect is akin to using a whining quotative tone to denigrate the person quoted. ('"They wouldn't fit", she said!' '"He wants a child", he says!')

The bare realis exclamatory is a minor function of *pu,* whose realishood is contingent on context; in its development it has proven to be quite similar to irrealis bare *pu* and *pu θa,* with which it lies in paradigmatic relation.

7.8. *Irrealis* pu

7.8.1. Irrealis *pu θa*

The category of irrealis *pu*-adjuncts is important as the only clear instance in CSMG where *pu* on its own has an irrealis function. Irrealis *pu*-adjuncts of this kind are largely absent in outlier dialects—although the relatively small corpora and their genre may contribute to this: this is a combative conversational move, not always appropriate in story-telling.

There are two exceptions. There is a definite instance of irrealis-*pu θa* in (138a), from Fotiadis' Pontic play *Darkness*.[102]

(138a) Αρ' εγώ κλάνω, με συγχώρησην, αγίκον ελευθερίαν, ***που θα*** πάγω γίνουμαι εκράν μετ' είναν χωρέτεν, είναν προστόι καμέντσικον, είναν τσερνοραπότσικον.
ar eɣo klano, me siŋxorisin, aɣikon elefθerian, ***pu θa*** paɣo ɣinume ekran met inan xoreten, inan prostoi kamentʃikon, inan tʃernorapotʃikon.
Well I fart (pardon the expression) on such liberty, ***if*** I ***will*** go and be compared with a peasant, a simple worker, an unskilled labourer. (FotD 272)

And the construction surfaces in Tsakonian, although with it following a calque of CSMG *am 'pos* 'well how? = yes' (cf. American English *and how!*), and with Tsakonian in general closely following CSMG syntax, this is probably a recent calque (though the particular construction **am 'pos pu* would not be used in CSMG.)

---

[102]The speaker in his passage repudiates Greece in favour of Russia, and is barely familiar with the Neo-Classical modern name of Greece (*Hellas*—calling it instead by its Russian name *gretsia*). So it is unlikely that this usage is borrowed from Standard Greek; it should rather be taken on face value as an extant Pontic colloquialism, predating the displacement of Pontians to Greece (although Fotiadis did spend some time as a journalist in Athens, and would have known Standard Greek.) The play was written in 1907, and the Pontians were displaced in 1922.

(138b) Ἀπού δα, *ἠ θα* ντι δου παράδε
         apʰu ða, *pʰi θa* ndi ðu paraðe
        Sure, ∅ I'll give you money! (sarcastic) (Costakis 1986:III 83)

Outside Pontic and Tsakonian, the construction is attested throughout main-stream Greek, with the distinction between controlled and uncontrolled *pu θa*-adjuncts as established in §3.8.1.

(139a) Ρέξε ρα αϛ̌ϛ̌ημοθκιάρτιστη *πον' να* πης τιη κόρημ μου τριμιυθθόμματη.
        rekse ra aʃːimoθkiartisti *po nːa* pis tiŋ ɡorim mu trimiθːomːati.
        Get lost, ugly-face; *that* you would call my daughter small-eyed! (HDMS 995:9;
        Nicosia, Cyprus; Uncontrolled)[103]

(139b) Δε ιά, *που θα* δώσωμεν ʼς τἀλάφι το μαργαριτάρι
        ðe ia, *pu θa* ðosomen s t alafi to marɣaritari
        Look, *as if* we will give the pearl to the deer! (Dieterich 461; Kardamena, Kos,
        Dodecanese; Controlled)

(139c) Μπα! Δε βαρειέσαι *που θα* το πάρεις. Διώξε τη
        ba! ðe variese *pu θa* to paris. ðiokse ti
        Bah! Why would you bother taking it ('Aren't you bored, *that* you will take it').
        Drive her away. (MinB 435; Pisidonda, Zante, Heptanesa; Uncontrolled)[104]

(139d) Πάει λοιπόν ο (γ)έρος στοχ χρουσαφό σε μιαν εβδομά(δα), λέει: —«(Δ)ώτσε μου τοπ
        πετεινό», λέει: —«Φύ(γ)ʼ από για, παλιό(γ)ερε, *που θα* σου (δ)ώκω πετεινό».
        pai lipon o eros stox xrusafo se mian evðoma, lei: "otse mu top petino," lei: "fi apo
        ɣia, palioere, *pu θa* su oko petino."
        So the old man goes to the goldsmith in a week, and he says: "Give me the
        rooster." He says, "Get out of here, you old coot; *as if* I will give you a rooster!"
        (Sofos 47; Kasos, Dodecanese; Controlled)

(139e) Με βλέπ' με τα σκόρδα, α, με λέει, τα μισά θα με δώϗ̂ς. Λέω, *μπράβο που θα* σε δώκω
        τα μισά.
        me vlep me ta skorða, a, me lei, ta misa θa me ðocs. leo, *mbravo pu θa* se ðoko ta
        misa.
        He sees me with the garlic, 'Ah!', says he, 'you'll give me half.' I say (to myself),
        'as if ('bravo that') I'm going to give you half!' (HDMS 756:14; Marmara;
        Controlled)

A volitive origin can be postulated for the construction to explain its irrealis-hood. Other than the spectacular level of its invective, the following example is of interest in that it supports such a volitive origin. The example uses the verb *θelo* 'want' rather than *θa;* yet it behaves as an (uncontrollable) *pu θa*-adjunct, rather than an irrealis bare *pu*-adjunct, in two crucial ways: (a) the speaker admits the truth of the *pu*-clause, and expresses contempt for it, rather than denying it as in an irrealis bare *pu*-adjunct; (b) whereas irrealis *pu*-adjuncts involve the quotative denial of facts (§3.8.2), this clause involves the ridicule of an event, just as with a *pu θa*-irrealis.

---

[103]*po nːa< pu enːa< pu θenːa* is the Cypriot equivalent of *pu θa*.

[104]Though this example is uncontrolled, it comes across as a discouragement to carry out an action, rather than a belittling of an action. *ðe variese* is an idiomatic expression; but similar data suggests that, while controlled *pu θa* and bare *pu* are anti-factive, both factive and anti-factive readings are available for uncontrolled *pu θa;* this is a topic I have not yet explored thoroughly.

(140a) Μωρ' θέατρο, μωρ' τομάρι του κερατά, μωρ' αδρεφογάμη, άει στο διάτανο, άει στη
λίγνη, ***που θέλεις να*** μου φέρης προξενε̯ό̯ γι̯α τον αδρέφουλι̯ά σου.
mor θeatro, mor tomari tu kerata, mor aðrefoγami, ai sto ðjatano, ai sti liγni, ***pu
θelis na*** mu feris prokseŋo ja ton aðrefuʎa su.
You laughing-stock, you cuckold hide, you brother-fucker, go to hell, go to
perdition, ***who would*** matchmake your big lug of a brother! (HDMS 1017:165;
Paidemeno/Flesias, Messenia, Peloponnese)

The *pu θelis*-clause in (140a) is not much removed from a straightforward relative clause, and is glossed accordingly. This shows all the more clearly that the *pu θelis*-clause here is an embryonic version of the *pu θa*-irrealis clauses considered above, and admits of the same pragmatics and structure (follows an invective, is tenuously connected to its antecedent, matches the uncontrolled-*pu θa* semantics.)

A similar volitive may be discerned in the following: while *θena* (> *θa*) was certainly still extant as a future marker in *xix* AD Cyclades, *θe na* is closer to the volitive origins of the future than *θa,* and the clause can be read as a volitive relative clause just as easily as another uncontrolled *pu θa*-clause.

(140b) Γκρημνίσ' από 'δώ ρετεκλιάρη παληόερε ***που θενά*** δειπνήσης το βασιλιά!
grimnis apo ðo retekliari palioere ***pu θena*** ðipnisis to vasiʎa!
Get lost, you dirty old man dressed in rags, ***who would*** invite the king to
dinner! (Analects 60; Naxos, Cyclades)

The volitive account is the only clear way to understand why the irrealis *pu*-clause in this construction appears in the future tense (*pu θa+* PERFS: *who will...*), rather than the conditional (*pu θa+* IMPFP: *who would...*)[105] Initially, there would have been uncontrolled volitive relative clauses like (140a) and (140b). These volitives, conventionalised after invectives, would have expressed the speaker's contempt for the non-speaker action, highlighting their intentionality ('who wants to...') in doing so. The volitives were generalised to first-person actions, or actions in any case under the speaker's control. The controlled *pu θa/pu θelo na* implicature discussed in §3.8.1 then took over: a speaker would not want to do an action she is denigrating; so the action must not have happened.

The second-person volitive thus became a first-person irrealis, without meanwhile switching grammatical mood from realis to conditional: the tense of the two expressions was not differentiated between *θelis na* PERFS 'you want to...'

---

[105]In fact, when the characteristic combination of invective and *pu θa* IMPFP occurs, the resulting clause is not interpreted as an irrealis *pu θa* clause at all (refusal to carry out controlled event; belittling of occurring uncontrolled event); it is instead equivalent to the bare *pu* irrealis adjunct, which denies a fact:

(140c) γιατί αλλιώς ο γιόκας μου, είναι γλέπεις βεβερίνος ο φωστήρας, ðγιάουλε παρ το κειο
που θα 'φινε στάλα.
γiati alios o γiokas me, ine γlepis beverinos o fostiras, ðγiaule par to kio ***pu θa***
fine stala.
because otherwise my darling son—he's a drunkard, you see, that genius; the
devil take him ***if*** he'd leave a single drop. (HDMS 787:325; Ithaca, Heptanesa;
Uncontrolled)

and something like *iθela na* IMPFP 'I would want to', as the two were considered members of the same paradigm. Somewhere along the line, the volitive *θelis na* in the expression was conflated with the future marker *θelis na> θa;* this was possible as the volitive component of the construction became effaced—thanks to the non-volitive controlled cases. The underlying volitivity of the construction also explains why it selects for volitional actions as its argument, as opposed to the facts selected by the bare-*pu* construction.

The development would have been helped along by cases where an exclamation is followed by a *pu θa*-circumstance or relative clause with indefinite rather than irrealis denotation. Such constructions are similar and would have reinforced the emerging pattern. Thus, the following example is not an irrealis *pu θa*-adjunct, but an indefinite free relative:

(141)   Πρέπει να ποτιστού οι πλατάνες. Να κοπού τα χέρια *απού α* κόψη πλατάνες, από δω
         και κάτω!
         prepi na potistu i platanes. na kopu ta xerja *apu a* kopsi platanes, apo ðo ke kato!
         The plane trees must be watered. May his hands be cut *who will* cut plane
         trees from now on! (HDMS 1224:254; Amalo, Icaria, Central Aegean)

The free relative refers to some undesirable eventuality; the *pu θa*-event is uncontrolled (it is a third-party action the speaker is not necessarily in a position to prevent.) Yet the *pu θa*-clause really does have irrealis, future denotation, whereas an uncontrolled *pu θa*-irrealis adjunct would express contempt for an event that has already happened. So in (141) *θa* really does have future reference, whereas in (140a) it is volitive and factive. (141) does not follow the established modality for *pu θa*-adjuncts. Still, it is an easy step from undesirable eventuality (141) to undesired event (140a), with both introduced by a volitive/future expression like *θe na*. This conflation enabled *pu θa*-clauses to be used with a denotation that has nothing to do with the future, but is very much irrealis.

7.8.2. Irrealis bare *pu*

Irrealis bare *pu*-exclamations are attested in a number of Greek dialects; they are quite frequently coupled with the modal particle *more,* a marker of social closeness and impatience:

(142a)   ´Ανдες, μωρέ, *που* ΄ταν η γυναίκα μου! Η γυναίκα μου κάθιτι στηγ γούβαν γι φαίνει.
         andes, more, *pu* tan i ɣineka mu! i ɣineka mu kaθiti stiɣ ɣuvan gi feni.
         As if ('Go on, that') that was my wife (being publically humiliated)! My wife is
         sitting at the loom weaving. (MousT 244; Livisi)

(142b)   Σώπα *που* είχιν παράσημα ου μπαμπάς σ!
         sopa pu ixin parasima u babas s!
         As if ('Be silent, that') your father had medals! (Kontonatsiou 254; Karpasi,
         Lemnos, Northern Aegean)

(142c)   Καλέ δε, *πού*θρευκα γω τομ μονακριβόμ μου για τηφ φτωχοκόρην της!
         kale ðe, pu θrefka ɣo tom monakrivom mu ja tif ftoxokorin tis!
         Can it be that ('Why look, that') *I have brought up my one and dear son to*

marry this woman's poor penniless daughter? (DawkD 298; Astypalaea, Dodecanese)

(142d) —«Ξέρεις πού ᾿τον ο α(δ)ερφός σου τσι ήλειπε μνιάν εβδομά(δα); Φλουργιά επή(γ)ε τσι ήφερε.» Λέει: —« Άντε, μωρέ, **πού** ᾿φερε φλουργιά ο κακόμοιρος! Τσαι πού ᾿το να τα βρει τα φλουργιά;»
'kseris 'pu ton o aerfos su tsi ilipe mnian evðoma? fluɾɣia epie tsi ifere." lei: "**ande**, more, **pu** fere fluɾɣia o kakomiros! tse 'pu to na ta vri ta fluɾɣia?"
"Do you know where your brother was away to for a week? He went and got gold coins." He says: "**As if** the poor man got gold coins! And where would he find such coins?" (Sofos 51; Kasos, Dodecanese)

(142e) Νά το μου λέει αυτό που είναι εκεί στη μέση είναι σταματόχορτο. **Πάψε** μωρέ **που** είναι σταματόχορτο. Δα δε ϱατέω εγώ μου λέει;
'na to mu lei afto pu ine eki sti mesi ine stamatoxorto. **papse** more **pu** ine stamatoxorto. da ðe gateo eɣo mu lei?
"There it is," he says to me, "that thing there in the middle is 'stop-grass'." "**As if** ('Be silent, that') that's 'stop-grass'!" "Why, don't I know?" he tells me. (HDMS 1281:166; Anticythera)

The examples I have gathered are Eastern Greek (Lemnos lying just outside the *ti/ida* isogloss.) However, since the construction is in productive use in CSMG, which does not have any Eastern Greek antecedents, I believe it was in use throughout mainstream Greek, and that its absence in my Western Greek corpus is accidental.[106]

As discussed with realis bare exclamatories, irrealis bare *pu* is quotative; but in its dependence on an imprecative matrix, it is like *pu θa*. The construction thus appears to originate in a contamination of the two.

7.9. *Definite article* + pu

The instances of *to pu* in Greek I am aware of are almost all drawn from folk song, and may be considered *metri causa:*

(144a) Τι να σε κάμω, μαδάμα μου χρυσή μου,/ όπου δε θελήσανε οι δίγνωμοι γονοί μου;/ **Το που** με φυλάανε και μ' είχα κοδομάτσα,/ να μη υρίσω και σε διω στα μάτια;
ti na se kamo, madama mu xrisi mu,/ 'opu ðe θelisane i ðiɣnomi ɣoni mu?/ **to pu** me filaane ke m ixa kodomatsa,/ na mi iriso ke se ðjo sta matja?

---

[106]*pu* being anti-factive here, and factive in all other contexts, can lead to some real ambiguities. For instance, superficially, (143) is identical to (142b); one would assume it meant 'Be silent, you! As if the priest's wife is blind.'
(143) **Σώπα**, του λέει καϊμένε, **που** η παπαδία είναι στραβή.
sopa, tu lei kaimene, **pu** i papaðia ine stravi.
Be silent, he said, poor man; **for** the priest's wife is blind. (MinB 513; Belousi, Zante, Heptanesa)
As it turns out from context, however, the speaker does believe the priest's wife to be blind (although in fact she is just pretending), and *pu* here is a quite factive justification for the exclamation. So while in CSMG the *pu*-adjunct to a *sopa*-matrix is conventionally irrealis (so that the interpretation given of (143) is not possible in CSMG), this is not universally the case amongst Greek dialects; and (143) exploits the Justify-*pu* usage, which in this instance gives the diametrically opposite interpretation to CSMG. Context appears to be have been judged adequate in most Greek dialects to resolve any attendant difficulties with ambiguity between these polar opposite meanings; and the restriction of their distribution through conventionalisation has performed the same function in CSMG.

What am I to do with you, my lady, my golden one, when my two-faced parents were unwilling? **Who** kept watch over me and held me close to them, lest I turn around and look you in the eye. (HDMS 756:258; Marmara)

(144b)   Ἦρθιν κιρός *το που* θα χουριστούμι/ έλα άντρα μ' να λύσουμι τουν όρκου.
irθin kiros **to pu** θa xuristumi/ ela adra m na lisumi tun orku.
The time has come **that** we must part; come, husband, let us dissolve our oaths. (HDMS 1066:84; Galatini, Kozani, Macedonia)

(144c)   Καημένοι χρόνοι και καιροί *το που* 'στε περασμένοι,/ τάχα δεν εγυρίζατε τα μαύρα νειάτα πίσω,/ τα νειάτα και τη λεβεντιά και το ζαριφιλίκι...
kajmeni xroni ke keri **to pu** ste perasmeni,/ taxa ðen eɣirižate ta mavra ɲata pišo,/ ta ɲata ke ti levedja ke to zarifiliki...
Alas, times and seasons **that** are past, why won't you return poor youth to us, youth, bravery, and grace... (HDMS 701:71; Divritsa (Achaea?), Peloponnese)

(144d)   Δε με βαραίνουν τα φλωριά, δε με στενεύ' η φούστα,/ μον' με βαραίνει το παιδί, *το που* είμαι γκαστρωμένη.
ðe me varenun ta floria, ðe me stenev i fusta,/ mon me vareni to peði, **to pu** ime gastromeni.
It's not the gold coins that are heavy on me, it's not my dress that is tight on me,/ rather it is the child **that** I am pregnant with, weighing down on me. (HDMS 907:150; Lalas, Elis, Peloponnese)

While *to pu* is apparently a metrical convenience, the choice of determiner is rule-bound: *pu* is always preceded by a neuter singular definite article, whatever the referent of the *pu*-clause may be.[107] Now, when complementisers take a determiner in Greek, that determiner is *to: to na* and *to oti* are both extant in CSMG, and *to pos* was in extensive use in EMG. Furthermore, folksong frequently prefixes *to* before direct and indirect interrogatives—what Tzartzanos (1991 [1946, 1963] §126) calls "pleonastic" usage of the definite article, a convention ungrammatical as far as I can tell in any dialect prose. It seems *to pu* was formed by analogy with these sundry embedded clause markers, and then applied indiscriminately to all instances of *pu* in the folksong genre.

On occasion, one also finds the definite article before other functions of *pu;* in the following, for instance, *pu* is arguably causal:

(144e)   Φέρε μου γλυκό κρασί, να βρέξω τη λαβωματιά, *το που* 'μαι λαβωμένος
fere mu ɣliko krasi, na vrekso ti lavomatia (FEM), **to** (NEUT) **pu** me lavomenos
Bring me sweet wine, to moisten my wound, **for** I am wounded. (Tz §126; Passow)

Exceptions to the folksong genre restriction on *to pu* are scarce, and still suggest aping of folk song style, rather than spontaneous diction:

(145a)   Με τούτα συμφωνάει *το που* διαβαίνει/ το θιαμαστό το φάντασμα μπροστά μας
me tuta simfonai **to pu** ðiaveni/ to θiamasto to fadasma brosta mas
*Well may it sort **that** this portentous figure/ Comes armèd through our watch* (TheotH 29)

---

[107]Thus, in (144a), the *pu*-relative clause has a plural animate referent, yet *i pu* (MASC.PL.NOM) is not used; in (144b), the *pu*-relative clause has a masculine singular nominative referent, yet *o pu* (MASC.SG.NOM) is not used.

(145b) «Συφορά» έκραξε ο Αρτέμις· «*το **που** θέλω δεν το μπορώ».
        "sifora" ekrakse o artemis; *"to **pu*** θelo ðen to boro."
        "What a disaster!" Artemis exclaimed; *"**What** I want, I cannot do."* (TheotC
        102)

(145c) Τα βλέπεις, Ευτυμιά; Το αίμα νερό δε γίνεται· *τα **που*** εκάμαν τα αδέρφια σου, τα
        κάνει και τούτος.
        ta vlepis, eftimia? to ema nero ðe ɣinete; *ta **pu*** ekaman ta aðerfia su, ta kani ke
        tutos.
        See, Euthymia? Blood's thicker than water; *****what***** (PL) your brothers did, he's
        now doing too. (TheotC 166)

(145a) accords with the judgement reported in §3.9, that some Greek speakers
accept *to pu*-subject complements, by analogy with *to oti*. Even though there are
many instances in which the factivity of *pu* (which renders any definite deter-
miner redundant) is overridden by analogy, I can only report that I have sighted
no such complements in my dialect corpus, nor in in the corpus of *Hellas-L*
from November 1996 to January 1998. This analogical development is thus ex-
tremely infrequent, and seems restricted to only some speakers' CSMG; it pre-
sumably has the status of an exploratory construction.

   to pu can also represent a portmanteau between the two relativisers *to* and *pu*
(as already seen in 145b, 145c):

(146a) Κ'   εκάτεχε   *τα*   *που*   'πρεπε να κάμει
        k   ekatexe   *ta*   *pu*   prepe na kami
        And   he knew   the (NEUT.PL)   REL   he had to do
        And he knew *****what***** he had to do (Cretan folk song; heard October 1995,
        transmitted on Sitia local radio.)

(146b) Μ' αν μελετά τους Αχαιούς στα βάσανα να τσ' έχει/ με τα χαρίσματα πολύ, *τα **που** 'χει*
        και κατέχει
        m an meleta tus axeus sta vasana na ts exi/ me ta xarismata poli, *ta **pu*** xi ke katexi
        But if she intends to keep the Achaeans in torment, with her many graces *****that*****
        she has and possesses... (Psyhoundakis 19; Western Crete)

(146c) Κι ουδέ μηνούν μαντάτο/ όρνια *τα **που*** πετούν πολλά στον ήλιο από κάτω.
        ki uðe minun madato/ ornia *ta **pu*** petun pola ston ilio apo kato.
        Nor do the many birds *****that***** fly beneath the sun give any portent.
        (Psyhoundakis 21; Western Crete)

In this case, both *to* and *pu* have referents, and so *to* is not invariant; in the ex-
amples above, it is plural.

   When *pu* acts as a headless relativiser and an indirect object, it is usually pre-
ceded by the preposition + article combination *s to* 'to the', rather than *se* alone:

(147a) Ολίς *στομ **που*** λείπει που τους γάμους του.
        olis *stom **pu*** lipi pu tus ɣamus tu.
        Woe *****to him that***** is absent from his own wedding. (Yannakou 116; Rhodes,
        Dodecanese)

This may ultimately be a reanalysis of another formation. There are many exclamations followed by clitics, which may be in apposition with *pu*–free-relatives (§7.2.3):

(147b)   Ο Θειός συγχωρέση *την απού*' η αιτία της εξορίας μου.
         o θjos six:oresi **tin apu** n i etia tis eksorias mu.
         *May God pardon **the woman*** ('her') ***who*** *was the cause of my banishment.*
         (DawkD 409; Astypalaea, Dodecanese)

The clitic may then have been reanalysed as a definite article, to which *se* could then be prefixed. *s to* cannot be a clitic pronoun; Greek uses the genitive or accusative clitic, *tu/to,* as an indirect object instead, as can be seen in the following:

(36d)   Αλλοίμονό *του που* πνιγή στη πρώτη δαγκωνιά
        alimono tu pu pniɣi sti proti ðagonia
        Woe ***to him who*** chokes at the first bite (HDMS 524:132; Aegina, Old
        Athenian)

Whatever the reason, oblique free relative *pu* in general takes the article. The motivation for this, even if it did result from a reanalysis of another formation, is unclear. I would speculate that, since indefiniteness, low animacy and oblique case are all correlated in their respective hierarchies, an indefinite oblique free relative would have been associated with inanimates, and the article inserted as a reminder of animacy, even though it is semantically inappropriate. However, cases like these are extremely infrequent in modern dialects, and a proper explanation must await a detailed examination of EMG instances of this construction. One fact that may well be relevant is the tendency of *pu* overall in Greek not to be the object of a preposition; with **se pu* unacceptable, *s to pu* provides enough of a buffer to counter this tendency.[108]

In all, the definite article + *pu* combination is a marginal feature of Greek, for the most part analysable as one of three developments independent of any notion of definiteness: metrical convenience (by analogy to other articles pre-

---

[108]I should finally note that one sees with monotonous frequency in publications of folk songs and proverbs the spelling ο που of *opu* as a free relative, which would imply that *opu* had in fact been reanalysed as article (MASC.NOM.SG) + *pu:*

(148a)   *Ο πού*ναι καλορρίζικος γεννά κι' ο πετεινός του.
         o pu ne kalorizikos ɣena ki o petinos tu.
         He who is lucky—even his rooster lays eggs. (Yannakou 186; Rhodes,
         Dodecanese)

(148b)   *Ο που*'χει ρούχα ας τα φορεί, κι άρματα ας βασταίνει
         o pu xi ruxa as ta fori, ki armata as vasteni
         He who has clothes, let him wear them, and arms, let him carry them (HDMS
         787:495; Ithaca, Heptanesa)

(148c)   *Ο που* πεινά για ν' αρχοντύνη, μόνο η πείνα του πομένει
         o pu pina ɣia n arxondini, mono i pina tu pomeni
         He who starves to become rich is left only with hunger (HDMS 859:146;
         Fourni, Central Aegean)

But there is no evidence that such a reanalysis has in fact taken place outside the minds of the nineteenth-century Greek scholars who first transcribed such texts.

ceding subordinators), conflation with the relativiser *to,* and the article as a buffer between prepositions and the free relative *pu*. That *pu*-clauses do not in general take on a definite marker in Greek, though other complementisers routinely do or did so, confirms the conclusion of contemporary Greek linguists that the factivity of *pu* blocks such an eventuality; the violations of factivity observed in foregoing discussion do not seem to have been extensive enough to affect this conclusion.[109]

7.10. "Too-hard basket"

There remain a few cases of *pu* in my corpus where it is not immediately obvious what function *pu* has. I give these cases here, along with my best guess as to their nature.

Twice in the Pharasa corpus, *pu* precedes a verb and is glossed as *olo ke* 'all the time' by the editor, Theodoridou. The problem is murky, since in both cases the *pu*-clause could be analysed as a relative clause, rather than a matrix; furthermore, the Pharasiot predicate is in both cases followed by the progressive auxiliary *dʒe kame* 'and sit = keep doing', which Theodoridou glosses separately (*ke kaθome (sinexos)* 'and I sit (=continuously)'):

(149a) για το κορίτσι **που** φοβείται **δζ**αι κλαί' **δζ**αι κά'ται κι, π' 'α ποί**δζ**ῃ μο το φίδι, **δζ**αι τους **δ**ιλλίκ' 'α ποί**δζ**ῃ;

γia to koritsi **pu** fovite dʒe kle dʒe kate kʰi, p a pidʒi mo to fiði, dʒe tus dilik a pidʒi?

αλλά το κορίτσι όλο και φοβάται και κλαίει και κάθεται (συνεχώς), τι θα κάμῃ (πώς θα ζήσῃ) με το φίδι, και τι συμβίωσι θα κάμῃ;

ala to koritsi **olo ke** fovate ke klei ke kaθete (sinexos), ti θa kami (ˈpos θa zisi) me to fiði, ke ti simviosi θa kami?

But the girl **keeps being** afraid and cries and sits (all the time); what is she to do with the snake, and what sort of a life will they have together?/ But the girl **who** is afraid and cries all the time, what is she to do with the snake, and what sort of life will they have together? (TheodB 312)

(149b) ο τατάς του **δζ**' η μά' του, **που** νανούσαντε **δζ**αι καθούσαντε, να 'ούμε π' 'α χα ν' τα ποίκουν;

o tatas tu dʒ i ma tu, **pu** nanusade dʒe kaθusade, na ume p a xa n ta pikun?

ο πατέρας του κι' η μάνα του όλο και νοιάζονταν (εσκέπτοντο) και καθούνταν, να δούμε τι θα τον κάμνανε;

o pateras tu ki i mana tu **olo ke** niazodan (eskeptodo) ke kaθudan, na ðume ti θa ton kamnane?

his father and mother **kept** thinking and sat (= all the time); let's see, what will they do with him?/ his father and mother, **who** were concerned all the time— let's see, what will they do with him? (TheodB 320)

A development of *pu* which took it into the field of aspect marking would be prodigious; a development of Turkish *bu* 'this' (which appears in TheodA 246 as *pu*) in this direction would be no less surprising. Since the texts already have a progressive marker in *ke kaθome,* the simplest explanation here is misleading

---

[109]I exclude from consideration the CSMG connective *me to pu* 'with the that = as soon as'; its use of the determiner is odd by Greek standards, and there is overwhelming evidence for it being an Albanian calque (Nicholas 1998b).

glossing on the part of Theodoridou, who glossed the progressive twice, once literally (*ke kaθodan* 'and sat') and once semantically (*olo ke* 'all the time'), while failing to gloss the relativiser.

Another puzzling instance of *pu* arises in Theodoridou's corpus:

(149c)   Ω τατά, σο χαίρι σου, 'πέ με τα μέν' το δάρδι σου· 'γω **που** να σε βγάλω απιδού 'ς τον ταλασά.
          o tata, so xairi su, pe me ta men to dardi su; γo **pu** na se vgalo apiðu s ton tʰalaʃa.
          Πατέρα, να 'χῃς καλό, πες μου το μένα αυτό το βάσανό σου. Εγώ, μη σε νοιάζει, θα σε βγάλω απ' αυτή τη στεναχώρια.
          patera, na xis kalo, pes mu to mena afto to vasano su. eγo, **mi se niazi,** θa se vγalo ap afti ti stenaxoria.
          Oh father, for your own good, tell me your trouble; I, **don't you worry,** will get you out of your sorrow./ Oh father, for your own good, tell me your trouble; I, **who** will get you out of your sorrow. (TheodA 250)

Again, Theodoridou's gloss is clear: *pu* means 'don't worry'; again, however, it is not clear how *pu* could have come to this meaning, and the most plausible interpretation for *pu* is as a relativiser, a circumstance connective, or a zero-copula cleft.

The following is classed in the HDIC as an instance of *pu* from Macedonia:

(150a)   Χαραή χαλβάν, ιόμα χαλβάν; **Νε bου.**
          xarai xalvan, ioma xalvan? **ne bu**.
          Halva for breakfast, halva for lunch? **Impossible**. (HDMS 967:61; Siatista, Kozani, Macedonia)

This looks strange as a development of *pu,* and negative *ne* is not a native Greek word.[110] One would suspect Turkish *ne* 'nor', which is extant in Northern Greek (*ne bu* is Turkish for 'nor this'); but the likeliest interpretation, given the provenance of (150a), is that this is a loan from Macedonian Slavonic meaning 'it is not, no way', equivalent to Turkish *olmak* 'it is not' and CSMG *ðe ɣinete* 'it does not happen' (with which (150a) is glossed.)[111]

In the following, ˈ*opu* indicates not location, but manner:

(150b)   Είνι κόκκινου απ' τ' βηγή. Ικεί πιρνά του νιρό βάφτουνι οι πέτρις ικεί **όπου** 'ν' τα νύχια σ'.
          ini kokinu ap t biɣi. iki pirna tu niro vaftuni i petris iki ˈ**opu** n ta nixia s.
          It (the water) is red from the spring. The water passes through there; the rocks are dyed (red) there **like** your nails. (HDMS 1035:32; Melivia, Larisa, Thessaly)

Although the headed relativiser *pu* can indicate manner, for the headless ˈ*opu* the transition from 'where' to 'as' is without equal in Modern Greek—although it is reminiscent of some developments in Ancient Greek dialects. Since the

---

[110]There is the native Greek word *ne* 'yes', but the context here is clearly negative.

[111]It must be said that the Slavonic grammars I have access to do not give close enough equivalents: the Standard Macedonian Slavonic for 'it isn't', 'it wasn't' and 'wouldn't' are, respectively, *ne e, ne beše/bi/bide,* and *ne bi.* Bulgarian has *ne šte bəde* 'it will not be', but this seems removed from *ne bu*. Still, one cannot rule out Slavonic influence before a look at the Slavonic dialects of the particular region—information I currently do not have access to.

Northern Greek for 'as' is *opus*< ˈ*opos*, it is likeliest that this is in fact not the lexeme ˈ*opu*, but a phonological variant of *opos*.

Pellegrini (1970 [1880]:211) lists a meaning for *pu* in Calabrian Italiot which it does not have elsewhere in Greek: an epistemic clitic meaning 'perhaps' ("per avventura, mai forse"). He gives the following examples in his dictionary:

(151a) *An ecíno **pu** den érchete*
        an etʃino ***pu*** den erxete
        *Se **mai** quello non viene*
        If ***perchance*** he does not come

(151b) *An ecíni **pu** s'arotísi*
        an etʃini ***pu*** s arotisi
        *Se **mai** essi t'interrogano*
        If ***perchance*** they ask you

Such an epistemic function has as little to do with CSMG *pu* as the putative aspectual meaning for *pu* discussed in relation to Pharasiot above. However, it matches precisely the Classical usage of *pou* 'somewhere' as an epistemic clitic. If Pellegrini's testimony is reliable, then this can be explained as a continuation of that *pou*, and is independent of the developments of *pu* from *hópou* considered in this study.

Three of the five instances in TNC which its concordance characterises as "not clearly definable" fall into this category (TNC 287.13, 287.13, 324.29). All three involve the same structure, IF S/HE *pu* VERB. This points to another possible derivation of the construction: the construction *etʃino pu* 'he that' became overgeneralised from a relative clause head to a nominal, possibly for metrical convenience, in a particular song, and then became entrenched as a feature of Calabrian song—particularly as all three TNC examples are from song, and TNC 287.13 is almost identical to (151b) (*tʃe, an etʃini pu na s arotisi*). The restricted distribution of the formation leads one to suspect the latter.

One more use of *pu*/ˈ*pu* akin to Ancient *pou* arises in Gellini and Trikala of Corinthia: *to pu* is used to mean 'somewhere':

(151c) επήγαιναι ***το πού*** τŏαι τον είδαι bροστά μου τŏ' εξανάψανε
        epiɣene ***to ˈpu*** tše ton iðe brosta mu tš eksanapsane
        He was going ***somewhere*** and he saw him in front of me and they started fighting again (HDMS 420; Gellini, Corinthia, Peloponnese)

But whereas Italiot is known to be a relic area, not only is Corinthia in the linguistically innovative Peloponnese, but it is also a region heavily populated by Arvanitika-speakers. This feature is thus suspect as an Albanism, although Arvanitika does not conflate 'where?' and 'somewhere'. In any case, 'the where' as an expression for 'somewhere' is a plausible generalisation of determiner + interrogative expressions so widespread in Greek folksong.

7.11. Summary of deviations

The foregoing survey points out the various deviations of Greek dialects—mostly outliers, but frequently enough mainstream dialects as well—from the distribution of *pu* sketched in §3. By way of introduction into the next chapter's synthesis, I outline the findings made in this chapter, in table form:

Function	Deviation	Region[112]
Headless Locative	*pu* alongside ˈ*opu*	C(w)E(c)MPT
Simple Relativiser	Survival of *to*	CE(d)MP [E(ck)LT]
Pseudo-Relativiser	Locative only	C [P]
eki pu	Absent	[C(w)]
	Univerbated	C(p)
	Indefinite	C(p)
	Headed	C(p)
	No secondary meanings	C
	No suddenness	CE(c)I(a)
etsi pu	Absent	CIPT(ns)
	Temporal	E
arte pu	General Temporal	I(a)
Headless Relativiser	Survival	C(w)P [ETW]
Clefts	Absent	C
	Widespread in frequency	E(c)
	Widespread syntactically	E(c)
	Zero-copula	E(c)
Complements	Preposed *pu*	W(t,Corfu)
	Auxiliary formation	E(Lesbos)
Causal	Absent	CP
	Separable	W(t)
Circumstance	Absent Justify-*pu*	C
Result	Correlative required	S
	Absent	C [P]
Contrast	Absent	CT
Temporal	Widespread	E(c)T
	Frequently Preposed	E(c)I(a)TW(Messenia,Othoni)
	Irrealis	C(pu)E(a, Cythera, Tsesmes)I(c)
	Non-Punctual	C(p)E(a)I(a)W(Othoni)
Subjunctive Marker	Free relative	AE
	Indefinite Collocations	EL
	pu = pu na	E(a, Chios)I(c)
Intensional Relativisers	Absent	T? [C(p)]
Potential Results	Absent	CI(a?)P [M]
Optatives	Absent	P [C]

[112]The following abbreviations are used:

A: Old Athenian

C: Cappadocian (p: Pharasa; s: Silli; u: Ulagaç; w: Western Cappadocia);

E: Eastern Greek (a: Apiranthos; c: Cyprus; d: Dodecanese; k: Crete)

I: Italiot (a: Apulian; c: Calabrian);

L: Livisi;

M: Mariupolitan

P: Pontic;

S: CSMG

T: Tsakonian (n: Northern; p: Propontis; s: Southern);

W: Western Greek (e: Epirus; h: Heptanesa; m: Macedonia; p: Peloponnese; r: Roumeli; s: Thessaly; t: Thrace)

Entries in square brackets represent partial exceptions—e.g. stylistically marked.

	Innovative collocations	E(ck)P
Exclamatories	Non-Cleft	CP [EW(m)]
	Interrogative Non-Cleft	I(a) [I(c)]
	No Introductory Interrog.	ET [W]
Irrealis *pu θa*	Absent	CI

Table 23. Diatopy of functional deviations of *pu*

Forty features are enumerated in the foregoing table; Cappadocian is the area with the most frequent deviations, with 21 instances, followed by Eastern Greek with 19—17, if one collapses the three features for the Cypriot cleft. The other outliers count as follows: Pontic 11, Italiot 10, Tsakonian 9. There are only 7 instances of Western Greek deviations, and even these are mostly regionally limited (Thrace, Othoni–Corfu, Messenia).

Grosso modo, this confirms our picture of Cappadocian as the most archaic and isolated of Greek dialects, with Tsakonian too long in contact with mainstream Greek to be appreciably autonomous. It also confirms that Eastern Greek is much more heterogeneous than Western Greek, undertaking several independent developments which have undermined the factivity of *pu* and its other characteristic traits—traits which have been substantially restored in Western Greek. With the fragmentary attestation of Greek dialects, one should not place too much store on such figures, of course;[113] and the account that arises from this survey is one of divergent and often quite complex developments.

The deviations have been outlined here; in the following and concluding chapter, I discuss the unifying factors in the distribution of *pu,* and how they have been actuated.

---

[113]Not to mention that these forty traits do not constitute independent variables, and partial attestations have been weighted the same as full attestations. These counts are meant to be merely indicative, and I am not attempting to set up a 'grammaticostatistics' of *pu*.