

## An Individual Twist on the Individualizing Suffix: Definite *n*-Stem Nouns in Pontic Greek\*

By RONALD I. KIM, Wrocław

*Abstract:* A peculiarity of Pontic Greek morphology is that masculine nouns in *-os* take the ending *-on* in the nominative singular when accompanied by the definite article, e.g. *o filon* ‘the friend’; the genitive of non-oxytones may end in *-onos* or *-u ~ -∅*, e.g. *ti filonos ~ ti fil(u)*. Previous treatments have assumed that definite nom. sg. *-on* was generalized from the accusative, and gen. *-onos* was backformed to *-on* on the model of inherited *n*-stem nouns such as γείτ-ων, gen. γείτ-ονος ‘neighbor’. I argue instead that the Proto-Indo-European individualizing suffix *\*(o)n-*, found in ancient Greek mainly in derived personal names (e.g. Στράβων, Φίλων, Ζένων), came to be used as a redundant marker of definiteness with the article in the dialects ancestral to Pontic; from such constructions as \*ὁ καλ-ών ὁ φίλ-ος ‘the good one, the friend’, gen. \*τοῦ καλ-ώνος τοῦ φίλ-ου, the endings *-ων, -ωνος* spread to the following noun, whence (*o kal-ón*) *o fil-on* ‘the good friend’, gen. (*ti kal-ú*) *ti fil-onos ~ ti fil(-u)*. This process probably began in late Hellenistic or Roman times, and may formerly have encompassed much of Asia Minor and Cyprus. The association of *-ων, -ωνος* with definiteness, although unique

---

\* I wish to thank Professor Günther S. Henrich for kindly sending me a copy of his articles and relevant portions of his 1976 monograph; Don Ringe for helpful discussion of the Indo-European comparanda, particularly the Germanic weak adjective; and Brian Joseph and Peter Mackridge for their valuable comments and suggestions. All opinions and errors remain entirely my responsibility.

Greek forms are mostly cited in the orthography of the sources from which they are taken, but some have been transliterated for clarity or consistency (e.g. the adjectives in §7) or to avoid prejudicing the historical discussion. Thus the nominal endings under study here are rendered *-on, -onos* in §§1–3, rather than *-ov, -ovos* or *-ων, -ωνος*, which would imply a particular view of their origin. For uniformity of reference, all premodern Greek forms (including reconstructed pre-Pontic) are given in the traditional system of accents and breathings.

Additional abbreviations: Arm(enian), Av(estan), G(āthā), Goth(ic), Hitt(ite), I(ndo-)E(uropean), Lat(in), Lith(uanian), O(ld), O(ld) E(nglish), O(ld) S(axon), O(ld) H(igh) G(erman), P(roto-), Sl(avic), T(ocharian) A/B, T(urk(ish)), Ved(ic).

within Greek, may be compared with the evolution of the Germanic “weak” adjectival inflection.

Since all living languages<sup>1</sup> change over time, it goes without saying that historical linguists interested primarily in reconstructing the prehistory of a language, or a family of languages, focus their attention (almost) exclusively on its earliest recorded stages. Thus Indo-Europeanists, for instance, attach relatively greater weight to the evidence of Homeric Greek and Vedic Sanskrit than to that of classical Attic and Sanskrit, and are generally less concerned with the later fate of Greek or Indo-Aryan; likewise, all scholars of comparative Semitic are conversant with Biblical Hebrew, ancient (e.g. Biblical and Imperial) Aramaic, and Koranic and Classical Arabic, but are not necessarily as familiar with contemporary Israeli Hebrew or the enormous dialectal diversity of modern Aramaic and Arabic.

This emphasis on the oldest (sufficiently) attested stages of individual branches is entirely understandable – not least because of the enormous amount of training necessary to learn all the major ancient Indo-European or Semitic languages! – but runs the risk of overlooking and developments in later periods which are nevertheless of great interest for the linguistic historian. In the following, I discuss a morphological peculiarity of the modern Greek dialects of the Pontos region along the Black Sea coast of northeastern Anatolia, which, although not widely known among classicists or Indo-Europeanists, can only be understood as an idiosyncratic development of a suffix inherited from Proto-Indo-European.

---

<sup>1</sup> I.e. all living languages transmitted from one generation to the next in speech communities, and acquired naturally by children born into and raised in those speech communities.

### 1. *Definite o-stem masculine nouns in -on, gen. -onos*

Like other modern Greek dialects, Pontic has a large and productive class of nouns continuing ancient Greek non-neuter *o*-stems of the second declension. These were overwhelmingly of masculine gender in antiquity, and have become exclusively masculine in the modern language except for reintroduced classical forms such as ἡ ὁδός ‘the road’, ἡ διάλεκτος ‘the dialect’.<sup>2</sup> But whereas the ancient case/number endings are faithfully reflected in standard modern Greek and with minor alterations in virtually all other dialects,<sup>3</sup> the Pontic endings differ strikingly in several respects. The following paradigms of some typical nouns of this class are taken from Drettas (1997:119); his fundamental study describes the principal Pontic subdialect of the Khaldía district, centered around the city of Argyrópolis (Gümüşhane) inland from Trebizond (Trabzon).<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Triantaphyllides 1941:246, 1993:93–4, Mackridge 1985:147, Holton et al. 1997:58–9, 2004:39. On the fate of ancient feminine nouns in -ος, see Hatzidakis 1892:23–8, Thumb 1912:46, 58, Browning 1983:59.

<sup>3</sup> The principal innovations are loss of -ς, e.g. in southern Italy or the Mani; and generalization of pl. nom. -οι to the acc. (replacing -ους) in many of the Aegean islands and northern mainland Greece (Hatzidakis 1892:371–2, Thumb 1912:45, Dawkins 1940:31), as well as Phárasa (Dawkins 1916:164–9, Andriotes 1948:35). In addition, the gen. pl. had largely disappeared by the 19th century from the colloquial language in much of the Greek-speaking world (Thumb 1912:31, 33, 34), but has been restored in modern spoken Greek under the influence of the education system and καθαρεύουσα, as well as Western languages; cf. the comments in Mackridge 1985:60–1.

Only in Cappadocian was the inherited system of *o*-stem inflection, and of nominal inflection in general, subject to more fundamental changes: here the division between animate and inanimate nouns was of primary importance, the former tending to generalize the nom. pl., the latter the acc. pl. for both cases (e.g. Silata λύκ ‘wolves’ [< λύκοι], πονδικοί ‘mice’, Αχό λυκιούς or λύκ, διασκαλιούς or διασκάλ ‘schoolmasters’, vs. πάλους ‘pegs’, τόπους ‘places’, μύλους ‘mills’). In dialects which were more heavily influenced by Turkish, an agglutinative system of number and case marking was incipient in masc. nouns such as Silata *milos*, gen. *miloz-yu*, pl. nom./acc. *milus* ~ *miloz-ya*; note especially Ulağaç *átropos* ‘man’, gen. *átropoz-ju*, pl. *átropoz-ja*, gen. *átropoz-ja-ju*, Ferteke *néka* ‘woman’ (< γυναικά), gen. *néka-ju*, pl. *nék-es*, gen. *nék-ez-ju*. For details, see Dawkins 1916:93ff., Janse 2004:7ff.

<sup>4</sup> Final -n in the nom./acc. sg. and gen. pl., as well as in neut. nom./acc. sg. -o(n), -i(n), -ma(n), is preserved in Kerasund (Giresun), Trípolis (Tirebolu),

	'the fool, madman'	'the friend'	'the Greek'	'the (school)teacher'
nom. sg.	<i>o palalón</i>	<i>o filon</i>	<i>o roméon</i>	<i>o déskalon</i>
acc.	<i>ton palalón</i>	<i>ton filon</i>	<i>ton roméon</i>	<i>ton déskalon</i>
gen.	<i>ti palalú</i>	<i>ti fil</i> <i>ti filonos</i>	<i>ti roméj</i> <i>ti roméonos</i>	<i>ti deskál</i> <i>ti déskalonos</i>
nom. pl.	<i>i palalí</i>	<i>i fil</i>	<i>i roméi</i>	<i>i deskál</i>
acc.	<i>ti palalús</i>	<i>ti filts</i>	<i>ti roméjs</i>	<i>ti deskálts</i>
gen.	<i>ti palalion</i>	<i>ti fil</i> <i>ti filíon</i>	<i>ti roméj</i> <i>ti roméon</i>	<i>ti deskál</i> <i>ti deskalion</i>

Most of the endings regularly continue their historical sources, such as acc. sg. *-on* < *-ov*, gen. sg. *-ú*, *'-Ø* < *-ou*, nom. pl. *-í*, *'-Ø* < *-oi*, acc. pl. *-ús*, *'-s* < *-ous*; gen. pl. *-íon* < *-íων* has been taken over from ancient nouns in *-ios*, as has the alternative gen. sg. ending *-í* < *-ίου* of e.g. *ti anθropí* 'of the man', *ti δävolí* 'of the devil' beside *ti anθróp*, *ti δävól*.<sup>5</sup> Two others, however, have no

---

Trebizond, and inland in Sánta, Matzouka (Maçka), the Khaldía district, and Nikópolis, but lost to the west in Inépolis, Amisós (Ano Sampsoún, the upper town of Samsun), some areas around Oinóe (Unye), and Kotýora (Ordu), and to the east in Souřmena (Sürmene) and Ophis (Of); cf. Papadopoulos 1955: 25–6, Oikonomides 1958:113–9, Kontosopoulos 1994:14. Hence e.g. *o liko* 'the wolf', *o θεó* 'God', *o pontikó* 'the mouse' in Oinóe and Souřmena, corresponding to *o líkon*, *o θεόν*, *o pontikón* in Trebizond and Khaldía. (On the complex distribution of reflexes of neuter *-iv* [< ancient *-iov*], see Oikonomides 1908:89–90, 1958:65–6, 115–6, Dawkins 1937:29–30, Papadopoulos 1955:18, 20–1, 22, Mackridge 1987:124fn.14, 132; typical of Khaldía and Trebizond is the alternation of e.g. *t' ospít* 'the house', *t' ospíti-m*, *-s* 'my, your house', *t' ospítin-at*, *-ats*, *-emun*, *-esun*, *-atun* 'his, her, our, your (pl.), their house'.)

The Khaldía dialect has merged the gen. sg., masc./fem. acc. pl., and gen. pl. article as *ti*, as in the paradigms above (Drettas 1997:110ff.). Other Pontic varieties retain older forms, e.g. gen. sg. masc./neut. *tu*, fem. *tsi*, acc. pl. *tsu* or *tsi* (Oikonomides 1958:151–4).

<sup>5</sup> This influence is even greater in neuter nouns, where most case endings were originally proper to stems in (ancient) *-iov*: gen. sg. *-í* < *-ίου*, nom./acc. pl. *-á* < *-ια*, gen. *-íon* < *-ίων* (cf. Hatzidakis 1934:278–9, 287, Papadopoulos 1955:47, Oikonomides 1908:211–2, 1958:9, 149–50, 184). – The dialect of Phárasa likewise has extended gen. pl. *-íun* < *-ίων* to other nouns, e.g. *τοῦν ἀφτενδίου*, *τοῦ Τουρτσίου*, *τοῦ ναιτσίου*, *τοῦ θυρίου* to *ὁ ἀφτέν* 'the master' (def. acc. *τον ἀφτένδη*), *ὁ Τουρκος*, *ἡ ναικα* (< *\*γυναικα*), *το θύρι* 'the door' (Andriotes 1948:35–6, 83, Anastasiades 1995:82–3).

equivalents in the masculine *o*-stem inflection of any other dialect, namely nom. sg. *-on* and the gen. sg. variant *-onos*. Of these two peculiarities, the nom. in *-on* is common to all nouns of this class, but gen. *-onos* does not occur with oxytone stems, so that to *o palalón* the only gen. sg. is *palalú*, with retention of final stressed *-ú* < *-oũ*; similarly for other end-stressed nouns of this type such as *o adelfón* ‘the brother’, *o tranón* ‘the old man’.<sup>6</sup>

Posttonic *i* and *u* are lost in most varieties of Pontic, including (from west to east along the Black Sea coast) Kotýora, Trebizond, Sóurmena, and Ophis, and (inland from Trebizond) Sánta, Matzóuka, Krómne, and all of the Khaldía district around Argyróupolis; they are preserved in Inépolis, Amisós, Oinóe, Kerasund, and Trípolis, and inland in Nikópolis. See Oikonomides 1908:79ff., 201ff. (syncope), 93ff. (apocope), 1958:57–62, 65–8 (*i*), 63–4, 68–70 (*u*); Hatzidakis 1913, 1977; Papadopoulos 1955:17–22; Kontosopoulos 1994:14. Word-final *-i(n)* is frequently preserved at line-end in verse, and *-i* may be added when an extra syllable is required (Papadopoulos 1955:22–3, Antoniadou-Kesidou 2002:27).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Dawkins (1937:31): “I do not find this genitive in adjectives, nor any examples from oxytone words.” Oikonomides (1958:149, 183–4, 190) limits *-onos* to paroxytones, but on p. 184 gives “ὁ Φίλ'ππων, τοῦ Φίλ'ππουος” ← Φίλιππος and “[ο]ὔτω δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀνέφορον τ' ἀνέφορονος, ὁ κατέφορον τὶ κατέφορονος.” The ending has spread to a few neuters in *-ον*, e.g. *t(o) ástron* ‘the star’, *to xoríon* (or *o xoríon*) ‘village’, gen. *t(i) ástronos*, *ti xoríonos* ~ *ti xori(u)* (ibid.; Papadopoulos 1955:48).

The gen. in *-onos* is not found in Oinóe; its loss there, like that of other typical Pontic features such as iptv. sg. *-on* and plurals in *-ant-*, is presumably recent and may reflect assimilation to the common spoken language. Cf. the comments in Oikonomides 1908:77fn.3 and Dawkins 1937:37 (“...we are told that Greek was lately going back because of the number of Turks, and that education, whilst helping to preserve Greek, was destroying the local dialect. The sailors and traders too were much europeanized.”). According to Peter Mackridge (p.c.), gen. *-onos* also does not occur in the archaic Ophitic subdialect of Pontic still spoken today by several thousand Muslims in the provinces of Of and Çaykara.

Tompaides (1995:56–7 with refs.) remarks upon the loss of masc. *o*-stem gen. sg. *-onos*, the pl. suffix *-ant-*, the fem. adjectival suffix *-esa*, *-isa* (see below, §7), and other marked features of Pontic among descendants of Pontic refugees in Greece today. Antoniadou-Kesidou’s textbook also seems to imply that nom. sg. *-on* with the article is now a variant alongside *-os*: “Τα ουσιαστικά σε -ος όταν είναι έναρθρα, λήγουν και σε -ον - όταν είναι άναρθρα σε -ος” (2002:88–9; emphasis mine). I cautiously suggest that the same phenomenon of convergence to standard modern Greek might underlie the loss of the infamous Pontic infinitive, a topic of controversy in recent years (cf. Tompaides 1977 and Mackridge 1995:158–9, 1999:27 [102–3], but see now Tompaides 1998–9). – On the other hand, the Muslim Pontic of present-day Turkey is naturally subject to ever greater influence from Turk-

Along with *-on*, the nom. sg. in Pontic may also take the familiar ending *-os* of ancient and standard modern Greek. The distribution of the two variants is not random, but depends on the presence or absence of the definite article *o* (< *ó*): the noun ends in *-on* when accompanied by *o*, otherwise in *-os*.<sup>7</sup> For example, in the sentence *t' emón o škilon kalós škilos en* 'my dog is a good dog',<sup>8</sup> definite *t' emón o škilon* '(my) dog, il (mio) cane' contrasts with *kalós škilos* 'a (good) dog, un (buon) cane'. This pattern was already discerned by Hatzidakis (1892:372) and reiterated by Oikonomides (1908:124–5, 124fn.3, 222; 1958:145–6, 149, 183), Thumb (1912:45), and Dawkins (1931:394, 1937:31); but there arose a competing view that *-on* and *-os* were instead correlated with subjects and predicates respectively (Papadopoulos 1953:90, 1955:30, 159; Andriotes 1992:103).<sup>9</sup> Examples such as the following (adapted from Tompaïdes 1964:153–5) demonstrate that the choice of ending is indeed governed by the presence or absence of the definite article, rather than the syntactic role of the noun phrase.<sup>10</sup>

---

ish, both the standard language and local dialects; for details, see Mackridge 1987, 1995, 1999.

<sup>7</sup> In dialects which lose final *-n* (see fn. 4), synchronically the *-s* of nom. sg. *-os* is dropped after the article (Oikonomides 1908:124–5).

<sup>8</sup> From Oikonomides 1908:222; quoted by Dawkins (1916:94, 1937:31), who gives the same sentence in the dialect of Sóurmena as τ' έμό ό σκύλο καλόσ σκύλοσ έν (1931:394), and also cites λύκοσ, ό λύκον, gen. τί λύκονοσ ~ τί λύκ', γέροσ 'old man', ό γέρον, gen. τί γέρονοσ, etc. for the dialect of Sánta and the surrounding villages.

<sup>9</sup> So also Topkharas (1932:17) in his long-lost Soviet Pontic-language grammar: “Έκι άμαν οπυ το ονομαν εν κατιγορυμενον τονομαστικον τιν πτοσιν λεοματο κε με το παλεον τον τιπον λ. χ. Ντο εν ατοσ πυ ερθεν? ανθρωποσ εν. Κε κι ζιμεν αδακα ο αθροποσ-ζυ, ονταν εν κατιγορυμενον οποσ ζαυτο τιν περιπτοσιν...ονταν εν ιποκιμενον το ονομαν, λεχκετε ζονομαστικον τιν πτοσιν με ν.” (“But where the noun is a predicate, we say the nominative case with the old form, e.g. Ντο εν ατοσ πυ ερθεν? ανθρωποσ εν ‘What’s this that came? It’s a man.’ And it doesn’t mean ο αθροποσ-ζυ ‘your man’, when it’s a predicate as in this case...when the noun is a subject, it’s said in the nominative case with ν.”)

<sup>10</sup> So also Drettas (1997:120) for Khaldía: “Le nominatif singulier de ce type a la particularité d’être marqué par la désinence /-os/ lorsque le nominal n’est pas déterminé...et, plus spécialement, lorsqu’il fonctionne dans un énoncé équatif.” The latter is simply an automatic consequence of the fact

## Subject without article:

*yirevós krúi sin pórtan* 'a beggar suddenly approaches the door'

*apés' ekáthetun énas yéros* 'inside an old man was sitting'

*ínas kalóyeros...eðóke mas* 'a monk...gave us'

*ekáthun entáman sin éθraen kotzós, kofós, tiflós ke kseróšeros* 'a limping man, a deaf man, a blind man, and a man with a crippled (or missing) hand/arm were sitting together outdoors'

## Predicate with article:

*esí ise as ólon o mizóteron* 'you are the best of all'

*esí ise t' eméteron o kalón o traγοδιάνον* 'you are our good singer'

*atós o dēfteron éton* 'he was the second one'

*úlæ atá...en o íðion* 'all this...is the same (one)'

Most exceptions to this pattern are readily explained: thus instances of definite *-on* without the article result from the variable elision of *o* before a following vowel-initial noun, e.g. *o árkon* ~ *árkon* 'the bear', *o orfanón* ~ *orfanón* 'the orphan' (Tompaïdes 1964:156, 1980:225–7; cf. Papadopoulos 1955:10, Oikonomides 1958:154–6, Drettas 1997:111–3);<sup>11</sup> and sporadic examples of

that predicates tend not to be marked with the article, as in Drettas's examples: *o palalón ípen palalós kh-íme* 'the crazy man said "I'm not crazy"'; *o túrkon pánta túrkos en* 'the Turk is always a Turk'; and *o θánaton évren-aton so-podár apán* 'Death found him upon his feet (i.e. standing)' vs. *son-kózmon én ke θánatos* 'in the world there is also death', where *o θánaton* 'Death (as if personified)' contrasts with *θánatos* 'death (in general)'. – In his survey of modern Greek dialects, Kontosopoulos combines both restrictions on the occurrence of *-on*: "Τὰ έναρθρα άρσενικά όνόματα σε *-ος*, όταν είναι ύποκείμενα λήγουν σε *-ον* (*ó λύκον, ó διάβολον, ó Γιάννης ó Χρυσόστομον* = *ó λύκος, ó διάβολος, ó Γιάννης ó Χρυσόστομος*)" (1994:15).

<sup>11</sup> Cf. reduction of *ti, to, ta* to *t'* before vowels (Oikonomides 1908:75–6, 198–9, 1958:70–2, Drettas 1997:101–3, 111). – Pace Oikonomides 1908:77, 199, elision of prevocalic *o* is not a regular process; see the discussions in Tompaïdes 1980:226–7 and Drettas 1997:111–3. The latter restricts elision to sequences of *o o-* and *i i-*; before other vowels, *o* "subit très souvent une altération phonique (abrégement notable de la durée, plus modification du timbre) qui le rend parfois à peine audible, sinon inaudible, pour le non pontiophone."

The variable deletion of the article *o* before vowels (and more generally in Sinópe and Amisós; Dawkins 1937:23, 27, 36, Papadopoulos 1955:157, Oikonomides 1958:154–5, Tompaïdes 1980:225–6), along with loss of word-final *-n* in certain Pontic dialects (see above and fns. 4, 7) and generalization of the pattern *filos, o filon* to other masculine nouns in Oinóe and Ovaçuk (see

-os after the article betray the inevitable influence of the church language and καθαρεύουσα and, especially in recent decades in Greece, common spoken Greek (Tompaïdes 1964:158).<sup>12</sup>

## 2. A similar pattern in Cappadocian?

Dawkins (1937:31-2) raised the possibility that the pre-1922 Greek dialects of Cappadocia might also have featured a similar paradigm marked for definiteness, but the data is far from clear. No nominatives in -on or genitives in -onos are attested in Cappadocian, only what appear to be accusatives in -ona: in his fundamental study of the Greek of central Asia Minor, Dawkins (1916:103-4) gave the forms Τούρκονα, λύκονα, ἄρωπονα (= ἄνθρωπον) from the village of Araván, and speculated that they might “be from the old 3rd decl.” *n*-stem paradigm underlying Pontic *o líkon*, gen. *ti líkonos* (103fn.1; see below, §§3ff.); later he compared the Araván forms with τὴν τιμήνα, τὸν καιρόνα from Oinóe in the western Pontos (1937:32).<sup>13</sup> Yet as he notes, the Oinóe variety of Pontic lacks the genitives in -onos (see fn. 6 above), and the antiquity of Araván -ονα is not above question: “it must be admitted that this -να ending may be from the -να of ἔνα, κανένα, ἄτόνα (= αὐτόν), etc., which is certainly the origin of the Thracian ending -να, especially as it is confined to adjectives” (1937:32).<sup>14</sup>

fn. 36), led Koutita-Kaïmake (1977-8) to the mistaken conclusion that -os, -on, and -o are in free variation both with and without preceding article in Pontic; cf. the discussion in Tompaïdes 1980:222-4. On the pragmatics of determination in Pontic, see Drettas 1997:113-5.

<sup>12</sup> The ending -os does however occur beside -on before possessive pronominal clitics, e.g. *o filon-ats* ~ *o filos-ats* ‘her friend’, *o filon-emun* ~ *o filos-emun* ‘our friend’. On this variation and its historical significance, see §6 (end).

<sup>13</sup> I have however been unable to find confirmation of these Oinóe accusatives in -να in the scholarly literature available to me.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. the orthotonic 1, 2sg. oblique pronouns, ancient acc. ἐμέ, σέ → ἐμέν, ἐσέν → ἐμέν-αν, ἐσέν-αν > (ἐ)μένα, (ἐ)σένα (Browning 1983:62-3, Horrocks 1997:126-7). (Thanks to Brian Joseph for reminding me of this



Dawkins (1916:94, 1937:31) also connected Pontic definite nom. *-on* with the morphosyntactic peculiarity of Cappadocian and the dialect of Phárasa, by which “the ending of the acc. sg. is very rarely used except after the def. article...the acc. ha[s] its proper ending only when the noun is definite” (1916:94; cf. 93ff., 164–8). Thus one would say *το λαγό έσκότωσέν* do ‘he killed the hare’ but *δέκε ένα λαγός* ‘he struck a hare’ in the Cappadocian dialect of Delmesó; similarly in Phárasa, e.g. *Ἦβρανε λέμ βαβάς. Πήρανε ἵαι ἵεῖνο τομ βαβά* [‘ivrane ‘lem bab’as. p’irane dze-dz’ino tom-bab’a] ‘They found another priest. They took that priest as well...’ (1916:550; quoted in Janse 2002:218).<sup>15</sup> However, this pattern has an exact match in Turkish, where definite predicates take the “definite accusative” ending *-i* (*-ü, -ı, -u*) while indefinite predicates are unmarked (Lewis 2000:26, 34–5): cf. *güzel kız-ı görüyorum* ‘I see the beautiful girl’ vs. *güzel kız görüyorum* ‘I see a/some beautiful girl’. It therefore seems likely that the restriction of acc. *-on* to definite direct objects in Cappadocia and Phárasa is one of many examples of the pervasive influence of Turkish on the Greek of central Anatolia at all levels of grammar, including morphosyntax:<sup>16</sup> so Dawkins himself (1916:94),<sup>17</sup> Horrocks 1997:314, Janse 2002:218–9.

---

case.) No parallel examples are securely attested for Pontic: according to Oikonomides (1908:100–1, 1958:79–81), paragogic vowels occur only after pro-nouns, e.g. *άτον-α, -ε, άτουv-α, -ε* ‘him’ (as also in standard modern Greek, e.g. *τον-ε, άτόv-ε, Salonica τον-α, άτόv-α*; Mackridge 1985:157), and verbal endings, particularly pres. 3pl. *-ne < -un* (e.g. Khaldía, Trebizond *τρώγ-νε* ‘they eat, are eating’, *μέν-νε* ‘they stay, are staying’ vs. Amisós, Kerasund *-ουv*; Oikonomides 1908:85, 1958:63–4).

<sup>15</sup> This feature is not mentioned by Andriotes in his grammar of the Pharasiot dialect (1948:35ff.).

<sup>16</sup> For other examples of Turkish influence, see Dawkins 1916:197–204, Thomason and Kaufman 1988:93–4, 215–22. The latter (222) also hold Turkish responsible for the reduction of the article in Cappadocian and the dialect of Silli near Konya (Dawkins 1916:46, 87–9), but this may be due in large part to language-internal developments. Note that aphaeresis of *ο* (*ό*) and *ι* (*ή, οι*) in the nom. of animate masc. and fem. nouns would have left neuter *το, τα* as the only nom. articles; the latter were then extended to animates in the most innovative dialects (Ulağaç, Fertek), where the distinction of animacy had largely broken down. In Silli, which lacks the indefinite acc.

Although a system comparable to that of Pontic may have existed in central Asia Minor at an earlier period, early 20th-century Cappadocian thus provides no unambiguous evidence for a distinction between definite *-on* and indefinite *-os* in the nominative of masculine *o*-stems, nor for acc. *-ona* or gen. *-onos*. Within the contemporary Greek-speaking world, both the opposition of nominative definite *-on* vs. indefinite *-os* and the genitive ending *-onos* (alongside *-u*, *-Ø*) are confined to the varieties of the Pontos.

---

in *-s*, the article occurs for the most part only in the acc., but the occasional use of *το*, *τα* in the nom. with neuters points to an earlier stage comparable to that of Cappadocian. On the other hand, Pharasiot, which shares indefinite acc. *-s* with Cappadocian, retains the article in both nom. and acc. (op. cit. 163). These facts speak against Janse's view that "the nominative being formally identical with the *indefinite* accusative was considered incompatible with the *definite* article" (2004:12–4). – On the disuse of *ὁ*, *ἡ*, *οἱ* in the Pontic dialects of Sinópe and Amisós, see fn. 11 above; there too it has been ascribed to the absence of a definite article in Turkish (Papadopoulos 1955: 157, Oikonomides 1958:154–5, Tompaides 1988:31, Menas 1996–7:6–7).

Dawkins (1916:94; cf. Janse 2004:14, 18–9) notes that definite acc. *το* + ending *-o(v)* in Cappadocian was sporadically used for definite subjects as well, e.g. *Ποτάμια το μύλο ἔν μακρειά* 'the mill is distant' (vs. *χτίνου ἀδὰρὰ μύλος* 'they are now building a mill'), *Αχὸ ἐκί το μίλο djavoljú jatáx ton* 'that mill was a devil's haunt'. Conversely, *-s* was occasionally suffixed to neuters (!) as a marker of indefiniteness, as in *Delmesó so peyáθ* 'to the spring', *so kujú* 'to the well' vs. *s'éna peyáði-s* 'to a spring', *s'éna kujú-s* 'to a well', *Φάρασα σο χωρίο* 'to the village' vs. *ἡ ἄ χωρίο-ς* 'to a village' (Dawkins 1916:92, 94, 164, 165, Janse 2004:14–5, 20–1). Although it is just possible that definite nominatives like *το μίλο(n)* have been remodeled from a Pontic-like *\*o milon* – and hence that this usage is a relic of an earlier innovation common to Pontic and Cappadocian (and eastern Asia Minor in general) – I find it more likely, following Dawkins, that the opposition of definite acc. *το* + *-V(n)* vs. nom., indefinite acc. *Ø* + *-Vs* was in the process of being reinterpreted as "definite" vs. "indefinite" in certain Cappadocian dialects at the turn of the 20th century, with the former beginning to be introduced into the nom., and the latter into other noun classes such as neuters in *-i*. See also fn. 40.

<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, Dawkins would continue to compare Pontic definite nom. *-on* with these dialects: "Here [i.e. in Cappadocian – RIK] the nominative ending has spread to the accusative, instead of the other way, but the same principle is involved: the defined has a different ending from the undefined noun" (1937:31).

### 3. Previous analyses

Previous treatments of the Pontic masculine *o*-stem endings *-on* and *-onos* have in the main posited a two-step analogical process. Beginning with Hatzidakis (1892:372, 1907:68-9; cf. 1934:276, 287), most scholars have assumed that the acc. sg. in *-ον* [-on] of *o*-stem masculines was extended to nominatives marked for definiteness with the article *ὁ*.<sup>18</sup> This innovative nom. sg. was then reinterpreted as the ending *-ων* of *n*-stem nouns such as *ἄκμων*, gen. *ἄκμονος* ‘stone, anvil’ or *δαίμων*, gen. *δαίμονος* ‘god(dess), divinity, (evil) spirit’, and a corresponding genitive in *-onos* was subsequently created. In the words of Hatzidakis (1934:272),

“Ἐπειδὴ δ’ ὅμως παρατηρεῖται ὅτι, ὅταν τὰ δευτερόκλιτα *-ος* ὀνόματα ἐκφερόμενα [ἐ]νάρθρως λήγωσιν εἰς *-ον* (ιδεὲ κατωτέρω), τότε ἡ γενικὴ σχηματίζεται κατὰ τὴν τρίτην κλίσιν εἰς *-ονος* (ἢ *-ωνος*), διὰ τοῦτο φαίνεται ὅτι μᾶλλον κατ’ ἀρχαῖα πρότυπα, ἐρρυθμίσθησαν ταῦτα, ἤτοι κατὰ παλαιότερα πρότυπα Πλάτων-Πλάτωνος, Σόλων-Σόλωνος, δαίμων *-ονος*, σώφρων *-ονος*, τέκτων *-ονος*, γείτων-γείτονος κτλ. ἐλέχθη καὶ ὁ λύκων - τὶ λύκονος, ὁ ἄρκων - τ’ ἄρκονος, ὁ ψύλλον - τὶ ψύλλονος, ὁ κόσμων - τὶ κόσμωνος κτλ.”<sup>19</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Oikonomides 1908:216 (“man gebraucht nämlich den Akk. sing. mit dem Artikel *ὁ* für Nominativ”), 221 (“Akkusativformen der Substantiva mit dem Artikel *ὁ*”), 1958:145, 149, 183; Thumb 1914:199 (“coincidence of nominative and accusative singular”); Tompaides 1964:152. The same hypothesis has been adopted by those who associate nom. *-ον* and *-ος* with subject and predicate, respectively: cf. Papadopoulos 1955:30 (“Τὸ ν μετέβη εἰς τὴν ὀνομαστικὴν ἀπὸ τὴν αἰτιατικὴν”), 159; Andriotes 1992:103. For another view, see below on Henrich 1976:242ff.

On the other hand, Semenov (1935:100) considered *-on* to be the *neuter* ending: “Zuweilen bleibt der Artikel im männlichen Geschlecht und das Substantiv erhält die Endung des Neutrums: *ὁ ἀνθροπον, ὁ καπνον*.”

<sup>19</sup> “But since it is observed that, while the second-decl. nouns in *-ος* end in *-ον* when construed with the article (see below), the genitive is formed according to the third declension in *-ονος* (or *-ωνος*), it thus appears rather that these were organized according to ancient patterns, i.e. according to the older patterns Πλάτων-Πλάτωνος, etc. were said also ὁ λύκων - τὶ λύκονος, etc.” In the same passage, Hatzidakis also considered the possibility that the gen. ending *-onos* was a relatively recent innovation and spread

Likewise, Dawkins stated of the Pontic type of *o likon, ti likonos* that “such forms can hardly have come into existence, except at a time when the paradigm δαίμων, δαίμονος, was still in current use, a paradigm now entirely dead in the modern spoken language” (1937:31). Cf. also Oikonomides 1908:124–5fn.3 (“manche Subst. konnten daher leicht in die 3. Decl. übergehen”), 216; 1958:149, 183–4, 190, 198; and Papadopoulos 1955:47–8 (“κατ’ ἐπίδρασιν ἀρχαίων, ὡσὰν νὰ πρόκειται περὶ τριτοκλίτων εἰς -ων -ονος”).

Although superficially appealing, this hypothesis suffers from several weaknesses. First, why would the accusative ending have been generalized to nominatives only when accompanied by the definite article? The history of Greek offers numerous instances of nominative-accusative syncretism in the plural: aside from standard modern Gr. acc. pl. -ες for -ας to nouns in -α(ς) or -η(ς), e.g. τοὺς πολῖτες, πατέρες, τὶς θάλασσοι, νύχτες,<sup>20</sup> acc. -us and -as have spread to the nom. pl. of inanimate nouns in Pontic (§8, fn. 54), and other dialects have generalized -οι or -οὺς in *o*-stem masculines (fn. 3). In the singular, however, collapse of masc. nom. and acc. endings is for the most part confined to those dialects in which final -ς and -ν are lost, e.g. southern Italian (Rohlf’s 1977:69–73),<sup>21</sup> and the conditioned merger alleged for Pontic finds no parallel in any other variety of Greek. Hatzidakis (1934:287) suggested that since the article

---

from pronominals such as *inos* ~ *inonos*, *tinós*, *kátinós* (gen. respectively of *m. is, inas, énas*, n. *énan* ‘one’, *pios*, n. *pion* ‘who, which?’, *kápios* ~ *káts*, n. *ká pion* ~ *kát* ‘each’; for variants see Papadopoulos 1955:56, 64ff., Oikonomides 1958:222–3, 249, 254, Drettas 1997:173, 184ff.), but then opts for this hypothesis.

<sup>20</sup> Attested already in Hellenistic times; see Hatzidakis 1892:139–41, Schwyzer 1939:563–4, Gignac 1981:46–7, Horrocks 1997:66–7, 218.

<sup>21</sup> Although the difference is of course preserved in the article, e.g. nom. *o liko*, acc. *tol liko* or Calabria nom. *o áthropo*, acc. *ton áthropo*, Salento *o ántropo*, *ton ántropo*. Phrase-final -n and -s are sporadically preserved as -ne, -se in the smaller Greek-speaking villages of Calabria, e.g. Galliciano *me nan áddone* ‘with another, μ’ ἕναν ἄλλο’, Roccaforte *énas ándrase* ‘a man, ἕνας ἄνδρας’, Chorío di Rochudi *o xristianóse* ‘man, *cristiano*’ (Rohlf’s 1977:40, 48). Rohlf’s, writing a generation ago, said of -se for -s only that “[a]nche oggi la finale non è del tutto scomparsa” (48); I do not know to what extent such forms are still current among the remaining speakers today.

already served to set off nom. from acc. (ὁ vs. τόν), replacement of nom. -ος with acc. -ον would not have led to morphological merger of the two cases.<sup>22</sup> Yet just because identity of case endings would not have endangered the nom.-acc. distinction in the presence of the article hardly suffices to explain *why* the acc. ending was generalized. Above all, none of the previous proposals addresses an obvious question: why were masculine nouns with nom. sg. in -ος the only ones affected, and not those in -ας, -ες, or -ς (< \*-is), e.g. *o popás* ‘the priest’, *o jítonas* ‘the neighbor’, *o xorétes* ‘the peasant’, *o arménts* ‘the Armenian’?<sup>23</sup>

It is also highly unlikely that a genitive ending -onos would have been backformed to nom. -on on the model of *n*-stem nouns such as δαίμων, gen. δαίμονος. Although nasal stems were (after *nt*-stems, including participles) the most numerous class of consonant-stem nouns, and retained their ancient para-

<sup>22</sup> “Δηλουμένης δηλ. σαφῶς διὰ τοῦ ἄρθρου ὁ τῆς συντακτικῆς σχέσεως τῆς ὀνομαστικῆς, ἐλήφθη, ὅπως καί ἐπὶ τῶν οὐδετέρων καί ἐπὶ τοῦ πληθ. τῶν ἄρσ. καί θηλ., ἐπὶ ἀμφοτέρων τῶν σχέσεων ὁ αὐτὸς τύπος τοῦ ὀνόματος ὁ λήγων εἰς -ον.” Similar arguments are adduced by Henrich (1976:244 [cited in Tompaïdes 1990–1:341], 1979:161), although he takes -on to be at least partly from *n*-stem nom. -ων; see below.

I do not understand Tompaïdes’s assertion that after the merger of nom. and acc., the “need” to distinguish the two functions was filled by the definite article (“[μ]ετά τῆς σύμπτωσης δηλαδή ἀπὸ μορφολογικῆς ἀποψη τῆς ὀνομαστικῆς καί τῆς αιτιατικῆς (πάππον = ὁ πάππον καί τὸν πάππον) ὑπάρχει ἀνάγκη νὰ διακρίνεται ἡ συντακτικὴ λειτουργία τῶν πτώσεων, καί αὐτὸ γίνεται με τὸ ἄρθρο: ὁ πάππον”; 1990–1:341–2). Surely the article has been present throughout the history of Pontic from ancient times and, as per Hatzidakis, would have clearly marked the nom. and acc. of masculine nouns.

<sup>23</sup> Forms such as ὁ κλέφταν, ὁ Νικόλαν in the dialect of Oinóe are certainly a later innovation; see fn. 36 below. – Dawkins (1931:394fn.4), despite considering gen. -onos to be analogical to definite nom. -on, was aware that the origin of the latter posed difficulties: “The forms like ὁ λύκον and the genitive τὶ λύκονος, as well as the Aravan accusative in -ονα, of which I have as examples ἄρωπωνα (man), Τούρκονα and λύκονα, all seem to me to derive from the characteristic confusion of the second and the third declension. So far there is no difficulty; the puzzle is the differentiation between the undefined use of the old second declension nominative in -ος and the use of the third declension form in -ον (-ων) for the defined noun.”

digm mostly intact through the Hellenistic and Roman periods,<sup>24</sup> they were no longer a productive morphological class by this time; along with other non-neuter consonant stems, they eventually gave up their inflection and were absorbed into the first declension, probably by the Middle Byzantine period.<sup>25</sup> Certainly the massive analogical remodeling of *o*-stems presupposed by the above scholars would be entirely without parallel at any stage in the history of Greek. I therefore find it far more probable that Pontic *-on*, *-onos* represent *survivals* of original *n*-stem inflection, a view to which I will shortly return (§§4ff.).

In contrast, Henrich (1976:242–4, 246–7) thought that there was confusion (“συμφυρισμός”) in pre-Pontic of the 2nd and 3rd declensions, i.e. masculine *o*- and *n*-stems, and that the latter was the direct source both of nom. *-on* with definite article and

<sup>24</sup> Thus Gignac (1981:65–6) observes for Roman and early Byzantine papyri that “[m]ost *n*-stem names...are declined *-ωνος, -ωνι, -ωνα*, with only occasionally variant spellings in *-ονος, -ονι, -ονα*”; the latter, along with the occasional variants in *-ων-* of oblique forms of *Εὐδαίμων, Χαιρήμων*, result from the merger of *ο* and *ω* (Gignac 1976:275–7, contra Thumb 1901:143fn.2 [“analogische(r) Umbildungen des Suffixvocalen”]).

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Browning 1983:58–9, Horrocks 1997:69–70, 218–9. The first step in this process was the addition of *-v* to acc. sg. *-α* on the pattern of e.g. *τιμήν, χώραν, λόγον, πόλιν*, attested already in Hellenistic papyri (Schwyzer 1939:563, 586; cf. Gignac 1976:45–6); the same change affected e.g. neuters with nom./acc. sg. in *-μα* → *-μαν* after *o*-stem neuters in *-ον*, so that the ancient *contrast* of *-v* vs. *-∅* in these categories was fully leveled by late antiquity. (On loss of final *-v* in postclassical Greek, see Schwyzer 1939:410 with refs. and especially Gignac 1976:111–4.) Subsequently, the nom. and gen. were backformed on the pattern of preexisting first-declension nouns in *-ας* and *-α*: hence e.g. masc. nom. *πατέρ-ας*, acc. *-αν*, gen. *-α* ‘father’, fem. nom. *μητέρ-α*, acc. *-αν*, gen. *-ας* ‘mother’, whence modern standard nom. *πατέρ-ας*, acc./gen. *-α* vs. nom./acc. *μητέρ-α*, gen. *-ας*. The ever-present influence of the literary/archaizing language has of course been responsible for the retention of the older forms, e.g. *Ἑλλάς* ‘Greece’, gen. *Ἑλλάδος* vs. popular *Ἑλλάδα, Ἑλλάδας*.

Aside from Pontic *-ονος* – and standard *-(μ)ατος* to neuters in *-(μ)α*, which has largely ousted popular *-(μ)άτου* (Thumb 1912:65) – reflexes of the ancient consonant-stem gen. sg. *-ος* do survive elsewhere in modern Greek, especially in Tsakonian (e.g. *kun-é* < *κυν-ός* to *κῦε* ‘dog’) and the Ionian islands (especially to nouns in *-α*, e.g. *τῆς μερὸς, νυχτός, θυγατερός, πορτός* for standard *τῆς μέρας, νύχτας, θυγατέρας, πόρτας*; Kontosopoulos 1994:68–9), but in neither area does this ending exhibit any affinity for old *n*-stems.

of gen. *-onos*. This view does not require analogical creation of gen. *-onos* to nom. *-on*, and explains why masculine nouns not ending in *-os* lack a separate definite form in the nom. (see above), but it too suffers from a major weakness, viz. the assumption that *n*-stem nom. sg. *-ων* was extended to *all* masculine *o*-stems, and gen. *-onos* to all non-oxytones. Later on, he offered a revised hypothesis: after loss of posttonic \**u* in the 2sg. possessive clitic σου resulted in homonymy of e.g. ὁ πάππος ‘the grandfather’ and ὁ πάππος σ(ου) ‘your (sg.) grandfather’, the influence of acc. πάππον *and* of old *n*-stems like ὁ γέρων ‘the old man’ provided a means of disambiguating the two, namely *o pápon* vs. *o pápos* + poss. clitic (Henrich 1979, 2000: 53–4); gen. *-onos* was then formed to the innovative nom. in *-on*, as per Hatzidakis and others (1979:162n.11). Note however that masc. nom. sg. *-on* with definite article is also found in other Pontic dialects which preserve posttonic \**u*, e.g. Kerasund, Trípolis, and Nikópolis (fn. 5; pace Henrich 1979:163fn.18). The two processes thus were not causally linked, and in fact probably belong to different periods: even if syncope of posttonic \**u* may be traced back to the 12th c. AD (Henrich 2000: 49–53), I will argue below that the grammaticalization of masc. *o*-stem definite nom. sg. *-on* began much earlier (§§6ff.) and, unlike syncope, took place across the whole of the Pontos region.

Finally, Horrocks (1997:314–5) proposes that the creation of a distinctive definite ending in the nom. sg. was motivated by

“a need to re-mark the definiteness of subjects involving nouns ‘of personality’ in a dialect area where the definite article with nominative forms of this class was increasingly dropped (with some spread to masculine and feminine *ἀψυχα* [‘apsixa] too, if they retained their masculine/feminine articles). This was presumably connected with the inherent phonological weakness of *ο/η/οι* [ο/ι/ι]...which we must suppose were locally so prone to crasis and/or loss when in contact with words beginning or ending in a vowel that they eventually all but disappeared.”

Although loss of the article *o*, *i* does seem to be more frequent in Pontic than in most other modern dialects (except for Cappadocian, on which see fn. 16), it is not obvious that this alone would have led to a “need” to create a new inflectional ending to mark definiteness<sup>26</sup> – and once again, why only for masculine nouns in *-os*? In any case, Horrocks offers no source for the innovative nom. sg. *-on*, and he follows previous scholars in proposing that this ending “engendered paradigmatic interference with 3rd declension masculine in  $-\omega\nu$ /gen.  $-\omicron\nu\omicron\varsigma$  and neuters in  $-\omicron\nu$ ” (315).<sup>27</sup>

Any account of the Pontic masc. *o*-stem endings must therefore address both inflectional endings together, definite nom. sg. *-on* and gen. sg. *-onos*, and seek a unitary historical explanation if at all possible. The proposed development must be consistent with known morphological trends in the evolution of post-classical Greek, and should also ideally refer to diachronic and typological parallels from other varieties and/or stages of Greek and from other IE languages.

#### 4. Whence the *n*-stem endings?

From a diachronic point of view, sg. nom. *-on* and gen. *-onos* – and, if it is historically related, the Cappadocian acc. *-ona* –

---

<sup>26</sup> One could argue that a higher rate of deletion of the article [o], [i] in pre-Pontic could have led to the reinterpretation of other, formerly redundant morphology as the primary marker of definiteness. Cf. the grammaticalization of French *pas*, English *not*, German *nicht*, etc. as a result of the phonetic weakening and frequent loss of the original negator (Fr. *ne*, now almost categorically deleted in Québec; OE *ne*, OHG *ni*); or the greater frequency of subject pronouns in Caribbean Spanish, surely connected to the higher incidence of loss of final *-s* (Labov 1994:569ff. with refs., esp. 595–7). Even so, the same problems remain as under the earlier hypothesis: whence the definite nom. sg. ending *-on*, and would an analogical *n*-stem gen. sg. *-onos* have been created to it?

<sup>27</sup> The last part of Horrocks’s statement is false: as seen above, Pontic neuter nouns in *-o(n)* have been almost completely assimilated to the pattern of those in *-i(n)* <  $-\iota\omicron\nu$ , and gen. sg. *-i* <  $-\iota\omicron\nu$ , pl. *-ion* <  $-\iota\omega\nu$  have been adopted by a number of masculines in *-os/-on* (§1, fn. 5).



are clearly the endings of ancient Greek *n*-stems such as Στράβ-ων, gen. Στράβ-ωνος (see below) or γείτ-ων, gen. γείτ-ονος 'neighbor', with suffix -ων- or -ων ~ -ον- and stressed root syllable. Taken by themselves, such correspondences do not automatically imply the prior existence of a complete *n*-stem paradigm: after all, individual *n*-stem endings have spread to other inflectional classes in many IE languages, including Germanic (OE *-ana*, *-ena* for *-a* in strong nouns, e.g. *dazana* 'of days', *zifena* 'of gifts') and Tocharian (e.g. pl. masc. nom. \**-ñə* < PIE \**-n-es*, fem. nom./obl. \**-na* ← PIE neut. \**-n-h<sub>2</sub>*). Yet the cooccurrence of distinctive *n*-stem nominative and genitive endings in Pontic makes it difficult to escape the conclusion that forms such as *o filon*, gen. *ti filonos* or *o roméon*, *ti roméonos* do reflect full paradigms \*φίλ-ων, \*Ῥωμαί-ων, gen. \*φίλ-ωνος, \*Ῥωμαί-ωνος (rather than -ονος; see below) alongside the familiar *o*-stems φίλος, Ῥωμαῖος.

It therefore appears that at a relatively early date – probably already in the Roman period, if not before – the variety of Greek ancestral to the modern Pontic dialects began to form *n*-stems with suffix -ων- to an ever greater number of masculine *o*-stems, e.g. \*φίλων, \*λύκων, \*Ῥωμαίων to φίλος, λύκος, Ῥωμαῖος. Judging from the contemporary evidence, the former were used only with the article and denoted a particular individual, e.g. 'the friend (of ours)', 'the wolf over there', 'the Greek (man) whom we saw yesterday in town', etc. The latter, on the other hand, eventually came to be restricted to indefinite function, i.e. non-specific reference: '(a, any) friend', '(a) wolf', '(a) Greek man'.

### 5. The PIE individualizing suffix in Greek

The Indo-Europeanist will at once recognize the Pontic formation as a reflex of PIE individualizing \*-(o)n-, known from ancient Greek and Latin derived proper names such as Στράβ-ων (gen. -ωνος) or *Cat-ō* (gen. -ōnis), respectively 'the

squint-eyed one, Squinty' and 'the clever one, Smarty' (cf. στραβός 'squint-eyed', *catus* 'clever, shrewd').<sup>28</sup> This ablauting suffix appears to have had an affinity for *o*-stem adjectives, so that the original paradigm of individualizing derivatives of *o*-stems probably had \*-o-on- (\*[-ōn-]) in the nom./acc. and \*-o-n- in the oblique cases (Nussbaum 1986:255fn.25). For the most part, however, its inflection has been influenced by that of the semantically related possessive suffix \*-H(o)n-, established by Hoffmann (1955) on the basis of forms such as GAv. *mąθrān-* 'prophet, preacher' (nom. *mąθr-aā*, gen. *-ānō*) to *mąθra-* 'thought', which formed derivatives to *o*-stem bases with nom./acc. \*-o-Hon- ~ obl. \*-o-Hn-; hence the invariant \*-ōn- of the Greek and Latin forms just cited, as well as in e.g. OLith. *pirmuo* 'first-born', pl. *pirmuones* to *pirmas* 'first' and PSI. pl. grad'-an-e 'townspeople' (OCS *graždane*) < \*gordyōn- ← \*gord-yo- 'city-dwelling' (Jasanoff 1980:379).<sup>29</sup>

As just noted, individualizing -ων- in Greek is especially characteristic of personal names, including e.g. Φίλων, Ζένων (fem. Φίλαινα, Ζέναίνα), and Ἀγάθων, Λεύκων (respectively short for e.g. Ἀγάθιππος, Ἀγαθοκλῆς and Λευκόδωρος,

<sup>28</sup> The same suffix appears to underlie the Lycian proper names *Xudaliḡ* 'the nimble one (or sim.)' alongside *Xudali* (cf. Hitt. *hūda-* 'alacrity'), the formation of which parallels Homeric Κρονίων 'son of Kronos' ← Κρόνιος 'of, belonging to Kronos', and *Pigrēi* 'the splendid one' (← \*Pigrē with "motion suffix" -i) to \*pigre (cf. Milyan *Pixre*); see Hajnal 1997:43–4fn.11, Melchert 2000:70.

As Melchert rightly observes (70fn.44), the generally pejorative connotation of names in Gr. -ων-, Lat. -ōn- is a secondary pragmatic effect; cf. Hitt. "stigmatizing" -ant- in e.g. *ammiy-ant-* 'immature', *warg-ant-* 'fat'. Rohlfs's remarks on Latin -ōn- (and Italian -one, -ona) apply equally well to Greek and Anatolian: "si esprimeva una particolare caratteristica di una persona... Caratteristico è sempre ciò che è vistoso. Da qui dev'essersi sviluppata ben presto l'idea d'una grossezza inconsueta, dal momento che *naso* prendeva sempre più a significare un naso insolito o particolarmente grosso" (1969: 414–5).

<sup>29</sup> Pace Hoffmann 1955:36, the ablaut in e.g. Av. *marātān-* ~ *marāθn-* 'Sterblicher' (nom. *marāta*, gen. *marāθnō*, pl. nom. *marātānō*) ← \*mṛto-(o)n- to *marāta-* 'mortal' (Ved. *mārta-* 'id.') < PIE \*mṛ-to- could have been introduced from primary amphikinetic *n*-stems which shared nom. sg. \*-ō(n) (Nussbaum 1986:255fn.25). Similar modifications of ablaut are attested in all IE languages, including Greek (Peters 1980:160ff.).

Λευκοκόμας) το φίλος, ξένος, ἀγαθός, λευκός (Solmsen 1922:125ff., 130, Schwyzer 1939:487).<sup>30</sup> Similarly, Latin derivatives in *-ōn-*, both individualizing and possessive, are principally “Spitznamen, meist herabsetzenden Inhalts” (Leumann 1977:239). In addition to *Catō*, cf. *Rūfō* ‘Red(head)’ to *rūfus* ‘red’ < PIE \*h<sub>1</sub>re/owd<sup>h</sup>-o-, *Varrō* to *vārus* ‘bent outwards, bow-legged’, *Aquilō* ‘North Wind’ to *aquilus* ‘dark, swarthy’; and possessive *Labiō*, *Nāsō* ‘having (thick) lips, a (big) nose’ to the nouns *labia*, *nāsus*. The function and force of this suffix have survived from colloquial Latin into modern Romance languages such as Italian: just as Ovid was known as (*Pūblius Ovidius*) *Nāsō*, so someone with a big, ugly, or otherwise prominent nose (*naso*) is *un nasone*, and a man known among his friends for his beard (*barba*) may be called *Il Barbone*.<sup>31</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Also formed with *-ων-* are a number of names for concrete objects, e.g. κῦφων ‘crooked piece of wood, bent yoke of a plow; pillory, etc.’, φείδων ‘narrow-necked oil can’ to κῦφός ‘bent forwards, stooping’, φειδός ‘sparing, thrifty’ (cf. Φειδώνιος ‘Thrifty’; Schwyzer 1939:487).

The large number of personal names in *-ων* must have contributed to the preponderance of vocative *-ο* among paroxytone masculine names in *-ος* in the modern language, e.g. Παῦλος, Ἀλέκος, voc. Παῦλο, Ἀλέκο on the pattern of Νίκων → Νίκος, voc. Νίκων > Νίκο. This pattern, along with the almost complete restriction of voc. *-ο* (and the rarer genitives in *-ο*) to paroxytone substantives in medieval and dialectal Greek, supports Henrich’s thesis (1976) that *-ο* continues earlier [-on] < ancient *n*-stem *-ων*, voc. *-ων*, *-ον*.

<sup>31</sup> A common nickname for Joseph Stalin in postwar Italy was *Il Baffone*, or “Mr. Moustache” (cf. *baffa* ‘moustache’). As the premier “suffisso accrescitivo”, *-one* and innovative fem. *-ona* may be built to a wide range of nouns, adjectives, and even adverbs, e.g. *cavallone*, *ragazz-one*, *-ona*, *frescone*, *facilone*, dialectal *tardone* ‘tardissimo’ to *cavallo* ‘horse’, *ragazzo* ‘boy’, *-a* ‘girl’, *fresco* ‘fresh, cool’, *facile* ‘easy’, *tardi* ‘late’ (Rohlf’s 1969:414–5). The same suffix is also found in other Romance languages: in Spanish, *-ón* (*-ona*) may be added to nouns or adjectives and is “generally pejorative, and augmentative in the sense that it implies an ‘increase’ or ‘excess’ of some quality”, e.g. *mujerona* ‘big woman’, *feón* ‘very ugly’, *maricón* ‘pansy’, *valentón* ‘(very) boastful; braggart’, *gotón* ‘big drop’, *novelón* ‘long boring novel’, *narizón* ‘big-, long-nosed’ (to *mujer* ‘woman’, *feo* ‘ugly’, *marica* ‘maggpie; sissy’, *valiente* ‘brave’, *gota* ‘drop’, *novela* ‘novel’, *nariz* ‘nose’; Penny 2002: 297). As these examples illustrate, the original locus of this suffix has been extended in Romance: derivatives in It. *-one* (*-ona*), Sp. *-ón* (*-ona*) may now be formed to bases ending in *-a* and It. *-e*, Sp. *-el*-Ø as well as those in *-o*.

Italian deverbal derivatives such as *mangi-one* ‘big eater, glutton’, *grid-one* ‘crier, screamer’ to *mangiare*, *gridare* (Rohlf’s 1969:416) are also of an-

The individualizing value of the suffix underlying Στράβων, *Catō*, etc. was recognized already by Osthoff (1876:45ff.) in his investigation of the origins of the Germanic definite *n*-stem (“weak”) adjectival declension, e.g. Goth. sg. masc. nom. *blinda*, acc. *blindana*, masc./neut. gen. *blindins* vs. indefinite (“strong”) *blinds*, *blind*, *blindis*, OHG *blinto*, *blinton* (-*un*), *blinten* (-*in*) vs. *blint(ēr)*, *blintan*, *blintes* (see below, §6); cf. also Solmsen (1922:128–9), who compared Gr. ἄγαθός vs. Ἀγάθων with Goth. strong *liufs* ‘dear’ vs. weak *liuba*. It has been argued that PIE \*-(o)n- merged formally and functionally with possessive \*-H(o)n- in Germanic (Jasanoff 1980:379–81, Hajnal 1997:45–6), so that e.g. masc. nom. sg. \*-ō(n) (> Goth. -*a*, e.g. *guma* ‘man’) continues the former and \*-ō̄(n) (> OHG, OS -*o*, OE -*a*, e.g. OHG *gomo*, OS *gumo*, OE *guma*) the latter; but Jasanoff (2002) now believes that the disparate *n*-stem nom. sg. endings in the old Germanic languages may all be derived by a plausible sound change and series of analogies from the inherited PIE endings \*-ō (< \*\* - ōn) and \*-ēn.

### 6. Grammaticalization of the individualizing suffix in Germanic and Pontic

The grammaticalization of PIE individualizing derivatives as weak adjectives in Germanic offers a suggestive parallel for the development of the Pontic *o*-stem endings. I propose that Pontic Greek has not only maintained the derivational pattern of ancient Στράβων, Φίλων, and the like, but extended it to *all* masculine *o*-stems. In striking contrast to the situation in ancient Greek, where individualizing derivatives are characteristic of proper (nick)names and names of objects (§5), the suffix -ων has become generalized as a redundant marker of definiteness with the definite article. The contrast of indefinite *o*-stem and

---

cient date; cf. Lat. *com-bibō* ‘drinking companion’, *mandūcō* ‘glutton’ to *bibere* ‘drink’, *mandūcāre* ‘chew, eat’ (Leumann 1977:239).

definite *n*-stem survives today only in nom. *-os* vs. *-on*; in the genitive, the semantic distinction between indefinite *-ου* (> *-ú*, *-Ø* in Khaldía) and definite *\*-ωνος* has been effaced, and both endings may now be used with or without the article. Acc. *\*-ωνα* has presumably disappeared in favor of (indefinite) *o*-stem *-on*, if the final *-α* of Araván Τούρκονα, λύκονα, ἄρωπονα is not old (§2, fn. 14).

The nominal system of Pontic, then, has expanded the semantic domain and morphological role of the PIE individualizing suffix to an extent rivaled only by the Germanic weak adjective declension. The semantic development, however, is somewhat more difficult to assess than in the case of Germanic. As the “weak” *n*-stem adjective declension is fully attested in all old Germanic languages, it may be securely reconstructed for Proto-Germanic; its definite-marking function can have arisen from an earlier individualizing value, e.g. *\*jungō gumō* ‘the young one, the man’ > ‘the young man’, vs. “strong” *o*-stem (> PGmc. *a*-stem) *\*jungaz gumō* ‘(a, the) young man’. Although the latter had not yet been restricted to indefinite reference, the morphology of definiteness at this stage was otherwise similar to that in Proto-Balto-Slavic, where definiteness is marked on adjectives, but unmodified substantives cannot be marked as definite or indefinite: cf. Lith. *sėnas vyras* ‘(an) old man’, *senàs-is vyras* ‘the old man’ but *vyras* ‘(a, the) man’; PSl. *\*stára ženà* ‘(an) old woman’, *\*stára-ja ženà* ‘the old woman’ but *\*ženà* ‘(a, the) woman’. Only later, after the breakup of PGmc., did the Gmc. languages evolve a definite article through the semantic weakening of demonstrative adjectives, namely *\*sa-* ~ *\*θa-* ‘that’ in Gothic and West Gmc. and *\*hin-* in North Gmc.: hence e.g. PWGmc. *\*sa jungo gumo* ‘the young man’, beside which *\*jung gumo* came to mean only indefinite ‘(a) young man’. As a result, the functional load for the expression of definiteness shifted to the newly grammaticalized article, which could now also mark unmodified nouns (e.g. Goth. *sa dags*, OE *se dæg*, ON *dag-inn* ‘the day’), and the weak adjective declension became morphologically redundant: speakers of an older Germanic language, or of

modern German or Icelandic,<sup>32</sup> must learn to use a particular set of endings on the adjective with the article, demonstratives such as ‘this’, ‘that’, and a few other modifiers.<sup>33</sup> Relics of the older system survive especially in Old English poetry: cf. e.g. *Beowulf* 1801 *op-þæt hrefn blaca heofones wynne blīðheort bodode* ‘until the black raven joyfully proclaimed the delight of heaven’, 1791-2 *wolde blondenfeax beddes nēosan / gamela Scylding* ‘the grey-haired one wanted to visit (= go to) bed, the old Scylding’, 2844 *hefde æzhwæðer ende gefēred lānan lifes* ‘each one had reached the end of (his) transitory life’ (Delbrück 1909:191-4), in which the weak adjective alone, unaccompanied by the article, signals definiteness.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>32</sup> And to a greatly reduced extent, Dutch and modern Scandinavian languages as well, e.g. Du. *de groote huis* ‘the big house’ vs. *een groot huis* ‘a big house’.

<sup>33</sup> Standard German now has a three-way distinction, having introduced masc. nom. sg. *-er* and neut. nom./acc. sg. *-es* from the “strong” inflection after *ein*, *kein*, and the possessives *mein*, *unser*, etc., but not after *der* and the demonstratives *dieser*, *jener*, *welcher*, etc.

An interesting parallel to the evolution of definite marking in Germanic is provided by Bulgarian, which preserves a reflex of the PSl. definite adj. inflection in masc. sg. definite *-ija(t)* [-ijə(t)] < PSl. \**-ŭjī* + \**-tŭ* vs. indefinite *-Ō* < \**-ŭ* (cf. SC *-ī* vs. *-Ō*). While the postposed demonstrative \**to-* was grammaticalized as a definite article during the Middle Bulgarian period, contraction of vowels across intervocalic \**j* and loss of phonemic vowel length led to the merger of definite and indefinite endings outside the masc. sg.: fem. \**a-ja* > \**-ā* > \**-a*, neut. \**-o-je* → \**-ō* > \**-o*, pl. masc. \**-ijj* > \**-ī* > \**-i* fell together with short \**-a*, \**-o*, \**-i* (cf. SC fem., pl. neut. *-ā* vs. *-a*, pl. masc. *-ī* vs. *-i*, etc.). As a result, definiteness is now signaled by the article, and the contrast of masc. sg. indef. *-Ō* /-ə/ vs. def. *-ija-t* /-ijə-tə/, e.g. *bjal zəb* ‘white tooth’ vs. *béljja-(t) zəb* ‘the white tooth’ (cf. *bjála kəšta* ‘(a) white house’ vs. *bjála-ta kəšta* ‘the white house’), has to be learned as a synchronic morphological idiosyncrasy.

<sup>34</sup> Mitchell (1985:56-8, 65-7) is somewhat skeptical of such archaisms, but rightly emphasizes the need for a careful examination of all extant manuscripts. The only data inconsistent with the above hypothesis would be instances of weak adj. + noun which have to be read as indefinite (excluding the numerous cases of *-an* for strong dat. sg. masc./neut. and dat. pl. *-um*; Funke 1949:151-3).

On the evolution of the Gmc. strong and weak adj. inflection and definite article, see also Osthoff 1876:101ff., Delbrück 1909:196-9. Note that possessive compound adjectives such as Goth. *laus-handja* ‘empty-handed’ (Zucha 1989) could simply have adopted the inflection of individualizing *n*-stems (> weak adjs.) in pre-PGmc. I do not understand Hajnal’s reasoning when he

On the other hand, Pontic did inherit a definite article from ancient Greek, so that any innovative use of distinct inflectional endings would have been morphologically redundant from the beginning.<sup>35</sup> Furthermore, definiteness is marked not on the adjective, as in PGmc. (or, as a result of univerbation with the relative pronoun \*ja-, in Balto-Slavic; Hajnal 1997:47–52 with refs.), but on the noun itself – as far as I am aware, a unique situation among IE languages.

The only plausible explanation, it seems to me, is that the varieties of Hellenistic and Roman-era Greek ancestral to Pontic underwent an innovation parallel to that of pre-Proto-Germanic. First, the ancient Greek individualizing suffix *-ων-* was gradually extended to most (if not all) adjectives in *-ος*, producing e.g. \*μαύρων, Ῥωμαίων, \*κάλων to μαῦρος ‘black’, Ῥωμαῖος ‘Roman’ (> ‘Byzantine’ > ‘Greek’), καλός ‘good’. These then came to be used in apposition with masculine substantives, and were eventually grammaticalized as definite adjectival forms in opposition to the preexisting *o*-stem endings *-ος*, acc. *-ον*, gen. *-ου*: \*ὁ κάλων ὁ φίλος ‘the good one, the friend’ → ‘the good friend’; similarly acc. \*τὸν κάλωνα τὸν φίλον, gen. \*τοῦ κάλωνος τοῦ φίλου. Finally, the definite endings were copied from the adjective to the following governed noun if the latter ended in *-ος*, resulting in phonetically identical agreement markers, e.g. \*ὁ κάλ-ων ὁ φίλ-ος → \*ὁ κάλ-ων ὁ φίλ-ων → *o kal-ón o fil-on* ‘the good friend’, corresponding to indefinite *kal-ós fil-os* ‘(a) good friend’.<sup>36</sup> For whatever reason, the old *n*-

---

says of these adjs. that “[d]ie prädikative Stellung... zeigt, daß es sich bei dieser Bildung bereits seit alters um ein echtes Adjektiv handelt” (1997:46).

<sup>35</sup> Unless the article was phonetically reduced and/or deleted to the point that some other morphological peculiarity could be reinterpreted as marking definiteness (see fn. 26). This seems unlikely, however, as nom. sg. *o*, *i* have remained in use down to the 20th century in all Pontic dialects: see the references above in §1, fn. 11.

<sup>36</sup> IE languages offer numerous parallels for the spread of nominal case/number endings from pronoun to adjective to noun, the most widely attested being the replacement of PIE *o*-stem nom. pl. \*-ōs by originally pronominal \*-oy in the prehistories of Greek, Latin, Insular Celtic, Balto-Slavic, and Tocharian. – Note that other classes of masculine nouns were not remodeled

stem gen. ending  $-\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$  was eventually lost in adjectival inflection, but survives as an alternant of  $-u \sim -\emptyset < -ou$  in non-oxytone nouns: hence  $*\tau\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\text{-}\omicron\upsilon \rightarrow *\tau\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \rightarrow ti \textit{kal-}\acute{u} \textit{ti fil-onos} \sim \textit{ti fil(-u)}$  (cf. indefinite  $\textit{kal-}\acute{u} \textit{fil-u} \sim \textit{fil-onos}$ ).<sup>37</sup> Both adjectives and nouns also completely eliminated  $-\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$  in the plural, if it had ever existed there.

The sole exception to the generalization of  $-\omega\nu$  with the article was before the possessive pronominal clitics  $\mu\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\delta$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\eta}\mu\omega\nu$ ,  $*\acute{\eta}\sigma\omega\nu$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$  ( $> m(u)$ ,  $s(u)$ ,  $at(u)$ ,  $at(i)s$ ,  $emun$ ,  $esun$ ,  $aton$ ). In this environment, contemporary Pontic allows both  $-os$  and  $-on$  in the nom. sg., so that for ‘my, your, his/her, our, your (pl.), their friend’ one may say either 1sg.  $o \textit{filos-im}$ , 2  $-is$ , 3 m.  $-at$ , f.  $-ats$ , 1pl.  $-emun$ , 2  $o \textit{filosun} < *-os-$  (e)sun, 3  $o \textit{filos-atun}$ , or 1sg.  $o \textit{filom} < *-on-m(u)$ , 2  $o \textit{filos} <$

at that stage, so that e.g. contemporary Pontic  $o \textit{kalón jítonas}$  ‘the good neighbor’,  $o \textit{kalón xorétes}$  ‘the good peasant’ and  $kalós \textit{jítonas}$  ‘(a) good neighbor’,  $kalós \textit{xorétes}$  ‘(a) good peasant’ are distinguished only by the form of the adjective (and presence vs. absence of the article). In the dialects of Oinóe and of Ovaçuk near Nikópolis, the pattern  $-os : -on$  was extended to masculine nouns in  $-as$ , e.g.  $\acute{o} \textit{kléftan}$  ‘the robber’,  $\acute{o} \textit{Nikólan}$  ‘Nicholas’ (Oikonomides 1908:124fn.2, 221–2, 1958:116, 146, Dawkins 1937:31, Papadopoulou 1953:90, 1955:30, 40, 159, Henrich 1979:163fn.17).

Much less likely than this hypothesis is in my opinion is that Pontic generalized the pattern of ancient Greek names such as  $\Lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\omega\nu$ ,  $\text{Πολέμ}\omega\nu$  to  $\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\text{πόλεμ}\omicron\varsigma$ . These do not continue the PIE possessive suffix (\*‘having a wolf’ or sim.), but merely illustrate the extension to substantives of the derivational process  $\text{φίλος}$ ,  $\text{λευκός} \rightarrow \text{Φίλ}\omega\nu$ ,  $\text{Λεύκ}\omega\nu$ , etc.; parallels in other IE languages, e.g. Lat.  $\text{Ner}\acute{o}$  (originally Sabellic)  $\leftarrow \text{ner-}$  (cf. Oscan  $\text{niir}$  ‘vir, princeps, procer’, Umbrian acc. pl.  $\text{nerf}$  ‘principēs, optimātēs’, both titles of rank)  $<$  PIE  $*h_2ner-$  ‘man’ or OHG  $\text{Wolfo}$  beside  $\text{wolf}$  (Solmsen 1922:129), are probably independent developments.

<sup>37</sup> The restriction of gen. sg.  $-onos$  to non-oxytones (see §1) suggests that individualizing derivatives to adjs. in  $-\acute{o}\varsigma$ , e.g.  $\Sigma\tauράβ\omega\nu$ ,  $\text{Ἄγ}\acute{\alpha}\theta\omega\nu$  to  $\sigma\tau\text{ραβός}$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\text{αθός}$ , were still stem-stressed at this stage – like e.g.  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\omega\nu$ ,  $\xi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\nu$  to  $\mu\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\xi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma$  – and only later brought their stress into line with the base forms, whence Pontic  $o \textit{kalón}$ ,  $o \textit{tranón}$ , to  $\text{καλός}$ ,  $\text{tranός}$ , etc. Thus  $-\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma$  was copied to barytone nouns in e.g.  $*\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}\lambda\text{-}\omicron\upsilon \rightarrow *\tau\omicron\upsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\rho\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\acute{\kappa}\acute{\iota}\lambda\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \rightarrow ti \textit{mávr-u} \textit{ti škil-onos} \sim \textit{ti škil(-u)}$  ‘of the black dog’,  $*\tau\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\text{-}\omicron\upsilon \rightarrow *\tau\omicron\upsilon\kappa\acute{\alpha}\lambda\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \rightarrow ti \textit{kal-}\acute{u} \textit{ti fil-onos} \sim \textit{ti fil(-u)}$  ‘of the good friend’, but not to oxytones in e.g.  $*\tau\omicron\upsilon\xi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\text{-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\text{πεθερ-}\omicron\upsilon, *\tau\omicron\upsilon\text{τράν-}\omega\nu\omicron\varsigma \tau\omicron\upsilon\acute{\alpha}\delta\epsilon\lambda\phi\text{-}\omicron\upsilon \rightarrow ti \textit{ksén(-u)} \textit{ti peθer-}\acute{u}$  ‘of the foreign father-in-law’,  $\textit{ti tran-}\acute{u} \textit{ti aðelf-}\acute{u}$  ‘of the old(er) brother’.



\*-on-s(u), 3 m. *o filon-at*, f. *-ats*, 1 pl. *-emun*, 2 *-esun*, 3 *-atun*.<sup>38</sup> As *-os* is not otherwise found with the definite article, this usage must reflect an older state of affairs, when the two endings were in more general competition.<sup>39</sup> Henrich (1979, 2000:53–4; see §3) argues that Pontic eliminated the potential confusion between e.g. \*ὁ φίλος ‘the friend’ and \*ὁ φίλος σ(ου) ‘your (sg.) friend’ by extending the *-on* of acc. φίλ-ον and masc. *n*-stems like ὁ γέρ-ων to the former, creating an opposition of \**o fil-on* vs. \**o fil-os* + poss. clitic; the variants *o filon-at*, *-ats*, etc. (not mentioned by him) would then have to be later creations on the basis of *o filon*. More likely in my opinion is that the pre-Pontic fluctuation between inherited *-os* and innovative *-ων* (see above) persisted in nouns accompanied by a possessive clitic, but otherwise was resolved in favor of the latter.

However it arose, the contrast between \**o filon* and \**o fil-os* + poss. clitic recalls that of το βαβᾶ ‘the father’ (← βαβᾶ) vs. βαβᾶ μ ‘my father’ in the most innovative Cappadocian dialects of Ulağaç and Fertek, where neut. το, τα have spread to animate nouns “especially when no possessive follows” (Daw-

<sup>38</sup> By themselves, the contracted 1sg. *o filom*, 2 *o filos* may reflect either \*-os-mu, \*-os-su or \*-on-mu, \*-on-su: for the phonetic changes involved, cf. nom. 1sg. *o pop-ám*, 2 *o pop-ás* < \*-as-mu, \*-as-su (beside *o popás-im*, *-is*), acc. 1sg. *ton pop-ám*, 2 *ton pop-ás* < \*-an-mu, \*-an-su to *o popás*, *ton popán* ‘the priest’ (Drettas 1997:135, 140). The variants *o filos-im*, *o filos-is* have been restored on the basis of *o filos-at*, *-ats*, etc.

<sup>39</sup> Attempts to explain away one or the other variant through (recent) analogy are in my opinion unconvincing. Pace Tompaides 1964:156–7, it is extremely unlikely that all the variants in *-os-* were created on the basis of 2sg. *-os* < \*-on-su, reanalyzed as underlying /-os-s/. Also improbable is Oikonomides’s suggestion that acc. 1sg. *-om* < \*-on-mu was generalized to the nom., whence by analogy 2sg. *-os* (1908:124–5fn.3); later, in his historical grammar (1958:115–6, 146), he assumed not only second-declension nom. 1sg. *o filom*, 2 *o filos* < \*-on-mu, \*-on-su, but also *o patéram*, *o patéras* ‘my, your father’ < \*-an-mu, \*-an-su, even though definite *-an* to nouns in *-as* is otherwise found only in the dialects of Oinóe and Ovaçuk (where it is clearly an innovation; see fn. 36 above). For arguments against the common assumption that definite nom. *-on* is in origin in the accusative ending, see §3. – Pace Janse (2002:218), Drettas’s paradigm *o déskalos-im*, *-is*, *-at* ‘my, your, his teacher’ (1997:141) need not be “corrected” to definite *o déskal-om*, *-os* (< \*-on-mu, \*-on-su), *-on-at* and indefinite *o déskalos-im*, *-is*, *-at*; the latter forms are ungrammatical in any case, as pronominal clitics are (almost?) always accompanied by the article (see the exx. in Oikonomides 1958:232ff.).

kins 1916:87; see fn. 16 above).<sup>40</sup> Omission of definite marking with a possessive pronoun is of course found in many languages, e.g. English *the house* vs. *my house*, Spanish *la casa* vs. *mi casa* (← Old Spanish *la mi(e) casa*, cf. Italian *la mia casa*), Arabic *al-baytu* vs. *baytu-ka* ‘your (m.) house’.<sup>41</sup> What makes the Pontic case interesting is that it is not the old article *o* which is optional when definiteness is implied by a possessive pronoun, but rather the redundant definite nom. sg. ending *-on*.

7. *A parallel to appositive -ων-: feminine adjectival endings in Pontic and standard modern Greek*

In support of the appositive use of individualizing *-ων-* with masculine substantives, note that precisely the same development is presupposed by the Pontic feminine adjectival endings *-esa* (*-isa*) and *-ena*, which clearly reflect the ancient Greek nominal suffixes *-ισσα* and *-αινα*.<sup>42</sup> The latter was originally

<sup>40</sup> Janse (2004:15–6) reports that the dialect of Axó contrasts animate and inanimate nouns with the possessive, e.g. animate 1sg. *bašá-m*, 2 *bašá-s* ‘my, your elder brother’, acc. def. *to bašá-m*, *to bašá-s* (*to bašás*, acc. def. *to bašá*) vs. inanimate *to melóz-um*, *to lóγoz-us* ‘my brain, your word’. If so, this dialect must have (partly) reinterpreted the contrast of definite *-V* vs. indefinite *-Vs* (see fn. 16) as one of animate vs. inanimate.

<sup>41</sup> And often more generally when one noun is governed by another: cf. English *a young girl’s heart*, German (poetic) *des Knaben Wunderhorn* ‘the boy’s wonder-horn’, and especially the Semitic “construct”, e.g. Arabic *baytu l-maliki*, Hebrew *bēt ham-mélek*, Syriac *bēt malk-ā* ‘the king’s house’ (lit. ‘house (of) the-king’).

<sup>42</sup> For Pontic adjective inflection in general, including the various patterns of feminine marking discussed below, see Papadopoulos 1955:51–6, Oikonomides 1958:206–19, Drettas 1997:160–4 (summarized in Antoniadou-Kesidou 2002:112, 118, 121–2). Fem. adjs. in *-i* (*-η*) have been introduced under the influence of common spoken Greek and the literary/archaizing language (Papadopoulos 1955:53–4).

Despite the obvious phonetic similarity between *-ισσα* and Pontic *-esa*, the origin of this suffix has not been generally acknowledged. Tompaides (1988–9:11) rightly remarks that borrowing from medieval Italian dialects (cf. Hatzidakis 1934:274, Papadopoulos 1955:136 “ξενικής προελεύσεως”, 1958–60:321 s.v. *-εσσα* “Η Ἰταλ. κατ. *-essa*”) is virtually excluded on historical grounds, but his own account of the ending is also problematic; see be-

associated with stems in \*-n-, e.g. τέκταινα ‘female carpenter, craftswoman’, δράκαινα ‘female serpent’, θεραπαινά ‘maid (servant), female slave’ to τέκτων, δράκων, θεράπων ‘attendant, servant, companion’ (the latter two remade as *nt*-stems). Subsequently, -αίνα was generalized to other names for female persons, animals, and so forth, e.g. Φίλαινα, μαγειράινα ‘female cook’, λύκαινα ‘she-wolf’, ύαινα ‘hyena’ (to Φίλων, μάγειρος, λύκος, ύς ‘swine, pig’); in modern Greek it characterizes female married names such as Γεώργαινα ‘wife of Γεώργος’, Κώσταινα ‘wife of Κώστας’.<sup>43</sup> Similarly, -ισσα < \*-ικ-ια was at first limited to stems in -ικ-, e.g. ἀμφιέλισσα ‘curved at both ends’ [Hom.], Κίλισσα ‘Cilician woman’ (cf. ἔλιξ, -ικος ‘spiral, curl’, Κίλιξ, -ικος), but later spread to βασίλισσα ‘queen, princess’<sup>44</sup> and gradually became more productive during the Hellenistic and Roman periods, e.g. ἱέρισσα ‘priestess’ (beside ἱέρεια, ἱερίς), οἰκονόμισσα ‘female estate manager’, Ἀντιόχισσα ‘Antiochene’; it occurs today in γειτόνισσα ‘neighbor’, συγγένισσα ‘relative’, etc.

---

low and fn. 46. Menas (1996–7:8–9) proposes that -ésa was generalized from -ésa < \*-é-issa to adjs. in -es, but the data in Oikonomides 1958:213 suggests that those with -es < -ös < -ιος have fem. -esa < \*-ιέσσα, e.g. ἀγρ-ός, -es, n. ἀγρ-όν, -en ‘wild, fierce, harsh’, but f. only ἀγρ-εσα, not “ἀγρ-όσα”; the relatively few adjs. with -es not from -ιος are Turkish loanwords, e.g. τάζ-ές, f. -ésa ‘fresh’ ← Tk. *taze*. As observed already by Oikonomides (1908:201), unstressed -esa is found only where syncope of \*i would have resulted in an impermissible consonant cluster, e.g. ἐμορφ-εσα, ἀσχημ-ισσα (see below); this could then have spread to oxytone adjs. such as καλέσα, τρανέσα (similarly Horrocks 1997:312–3).

On -ισσα, -αίνα in general, and their productivity in postclassical and medieval Greek, see Hatzidakis 1892:26–7, Chantraine 1933:107–10, Schwyzer 1939:475; cf. also the remarks in Peters 1980:150. The complex evolution of -αίνα < \*-an-ya < PIE \*-én-ih₂- ~ \*-ḡ-yéh₂- is discussed at length by Peters (1980:151ff.).

<sup>43</sup> A similar suffix -ῖνα occurs in Pontic, e.g. *Lazarína* ‘wife of Lázaros’, *Maxmutína* ‘wife of Maxmút’, *İşobanína* ‘shepherd’s wife’ to *İşobános* ‘shepherd’ (Papadopoulos 1955:136, Oikonomides 1958:376, Drettas 1997:125), and other dialects such as Chiot (Hatzidakis 1892:27).

<sup>44</sup> Censured in the 2nd c. AD by the Atticist Phrynichos: “βασίλισσα ὀυδεις τῶν ἀρχαίων εἶπεν, ἀλλὰ βασιλεια ἢ βασιλῖς” (Fischer 1974:80 [no. 197]; cf. also 83 [no. 231]).

In Pontic, reflexes of  $-ισσα$  mark the fem. sg. of adjectives in masc. nom. sg.  $-os$  ( $-on$ ), as in oxytone *kalós* (*o kalón*), *kalésa*, *kalón* ‘good’, *tran-ós* (*o -ón*),  $-ésa$ ,  $-ón$  ‘big, great; elder’ and paroxytone *mávr-os* (*o -on*),  $-esa$ ,  $-on$  ‘black’, *ksén-os* (*o -on*),  $-tsa$ ,  $-on$  ‘foreign’, *roméos* (*o roméon*), *roméj-sa*,  $-kon$  ‘Greek’, including past passive participles in  $-ménos$  ( $-ménon$ ), e.g. *xaménos* (*o xaménon*), *xaméntsa* (< \**xaménisa*), *xaménon* ‘lost’, *pinazmén-os* (*o -on*),  $-tsa$ ,  $-on$  ‘hungry’. Proparoxytones exhibit variation between the archaic pattern, with identical masc. and fem., and explicitly marked fem. in  $-esa$ , e.g. *émorfos* (*o émorfon*), fem. *émorfos* ~ *émorfesa*, neut. *émorfon* ‘beautiful’, *áškem-os* (*o -on*),  $-os$  ~  $-esa$ ,  $-on$  ‘ugly, plain, coarse, bad’ (< εὔμορφ-ος, -ον, ἄσχημ-ος, -ον).<sup>45</sup> This pattern has been extended to adjectives in stressed  $-ás$ ,  $-ís$ ,  $-lús$ , which have become extremely numerous through borrowing of Turkish adjectives ending in  $-a$  and  $-li$  ( $-lü$ ,  $-lu$ ,  $-lu$ ): cf. *kak-ás*,  $-ása$ ,  $-án$  ‘sick, ill, weak’, *fukar-ás*,  $-ása$ ,  $-án$  ‘poor, unlucky’ (←Tk. *fukara*), *empaθ-ís*,  $-isa$ ,  $-ín$  ‘terminally ill’, *sevda-lís*,  $-lisa$ ,  $-lín$  ( $-lús$ ,  $-lúsa$ ,  $-lún$ ) ‘in love’ (← Tk. *sevdatı*).<sup>46</sup> The remaining class,

<sup>45</sup> Cf. standard ὄμορφ-ος, -η, -ο, ἄσχημ-ος, -η, -ο. As there is no obvious reason why only paroxytone adjectives in  $-os$  would have completely generalized the masc. endings to the fem. even with sg. human referents, e.g. *émorfos jinéka* ‘beautiful woman’, *i áškemos i nifē* ‘the ugly girl’, I conclude that the ancient Greek two-ending adjective declension has indeed been preserved in Pontic (so already Hatzidakis 1892:28, 1934:273; tentatively Dawkins 1937:29). The restriction of  $-on$  with article to the masculine (Henrich 1979:162fn.11, Drettas 1997:161) is hardly surprising: m. *émorf-os*, *o émorf-on* but f. *émorf-os* (~  $-esa$ ), *i émorf-os* (~  $-esa$ ).

<sup>46</sup> Tompaides’s suggestion (1988–9:12–4) that the pattern of adjectives in masc.  $-ás$ ,  $-ís$ ,  $-lús$  with fem.  $-ás-a$ ,  $-ís-a$ ,  $-lús-a$  was extended to adjs. in  $-os$  to create new fems. in  $-esa$  is morphologically implausible; outside of the most Turkish-influenced Cappadocian dialects (see fn. 3 ad fin), addition of a suffix to the nom. sg. rather than the nominal base is unparalleled in the history of Greek (Menas 1996–7:8). As the adjs. in  $-ás$ ,  $-ís$ ,  $-ús$ ,  $-és$  are obviously innovations of the Byzantine and Ottoman periods, it stands to reason that their feminines were formed on the pattern of preexisting masc.  $-os$  ~ fem.  $-esa$ , without the vocalic alternation. – The peculiar fem. endings  $-éosa$ ,  $-eósa$ ,  $-iós-a$  of adjs. in ancient  $-ús$  in the western Pontic dialects of Inépolis and Sinópe, e.g. Sinópe *γλυκέος* ~ *γλυκεός*, *μακρίοσα*, *πλατιόσα* (~ *μακρίός*, *πλατιός*?) to *γλυκός* ‘sweet’, *μακρός* ‘long’, *πλατύς* ‘wide’, Inépolis *μακρέος*, *πλατέος* (vs. *μακρέσα*, *πλατέσα*, etc. elsewhere; Papadopoulos 1955:

stem-stressed adjectives in *-(i)s*, form their fem. sg. in *-ena*: aside from compounds such as *anixtomát-(i)s*, *-ena*, *-(i)kon* ‘open-eyed, with eyes (wide) open’ (Papadopoulos 1955:51), these are also largely of Turkish origin, and reflect adjectives ending in a consonant: cf. Tk. *zengin* ‘rich’ → *zenkin-ts*, *-ena*, *-Ø*, Tk. *kâvur* ‘infidel, non-Muslim’ → *kjavúr-ts*, *-ena*, *-kon*, etc. (Drettas 1997:163–4).<sup>47</sup>

In the near-absence of premodern Pontic documents, the most likely interpretation of these facts is that the suffixes *-ισσα* and *-αινα* were first introduced from nouns such as *árk-(i)sa*, *-ena* ‘she-bear’, *yitónisa* (*yitóntsa*) ‘female neighbor’, *filena* ‘female friend’ to substantival \**καλ-ίσσα* ‘the good’, \**Ῥωμαί-ισσα* ‘the Greek’, *ἀνοιχτομάτ-αινα* ‘the open-eyed one’, and the like, and remained confined to substantival usage for some time; only at a later stage were they grammaticalized as the regular feminine adjectival endings, replacing *καλ-ή*, *Ῥωμαί-α*, and *ἀνοιχτομάτ-α*.<sup>48</sup> The first of these two steps is paralleled in

---

55–6, Oikonomides 1958:215), have perhaps been built to masc. variants in *-εος*, *-ιος* (Tompaides 1988–9:14; false Papadopoulos 1955:56 [*-eos* ← ancient masc./neut. gen. sg. *-έος*]).

Adjs. in *-lís*, *-lús* can also take the fem. ending *-lú*, e.g. *sojlís*, *sojlú*, *sojlin* ‘from a prominent family’, *poj-lús*, *-lú*, *-lún* ‘big, respected’ (← Tk. *soy-lu* ‘noble’, *boy-lu* ‘tall, high’), *yarš-lís* ~ *-lús*, *-lú*, *-lin* ~ *-lún* ‘person/thing from Kars, Karshl’. Cf. also ethnonyms in *-ós* (*-ón*) such as *lazós* (*o lazón*), *lazú*, *lazikón* ‘Laz’ (Drettas 1997:161, 163; or *láz-os*, *-ena*, *-(i)kon* like *rús-os*, *-ena*, *-(i)kon* ‘Russian’, Oikonomides 1958:212).

<sup>47</sup> Adjs. in *-síjs*, *-síjs* ← Tk. *-síz* (*-süz*, *-síz*, *-suz*) ‘-less’ form feminines in *-síz-ena*, *-süz-ena* or *-sij-sa*, *-súj-sa* in the Khaldía dialect, e.g. *arsújs* ‘impudent, insolent’ (← *ar-síz*), f. *arsúzena* ~ *arsújsa*, n. *arsúzkon*; *etep-síjs* ‘ill-mannered, shameless’ (← *edep-síz*), *-sízena* ~ *-síjsa*, *-sízkon* (Drettas 1997:163). These reflect competition between the underlying forms */-síz-s/* (*/-suz-s/*) and */-sij-s/* (*/-suj-s/*): the former correspond to the older masc. endings *-síz-is*, *-süz-is*, preserved in dialects such as Kerasund which retain posttonic *i* (*arsízis*, *etepsízis*), whereas the latter are based on the syncopated masc. *-síjs*, *-síjs*. (For the sound change, cf. Papadopoulos 1955:26–7, Oikonomides 1958:111–2, Drettas 1997:59 vs. Symeonidis 1971–2:165–7).

Many other Pontic adjectives exhibit variation among *-(i)sa*, *-ena*, and other fem. endings, e.g. *-ú*, *-ía*; for some examples, see fns. 46, 50, Oikonomides 1958:208ff., and the individual entries in Papadopoulos 1958–61.

<sup>48</sup> The basic insight was seen by Papadopoulos with respect to *-ισσα*: “ὀρηθεῖσα ἀπὸ τὰ ἀρχαῖα Ἀράβισσα, βασιλίσσα, Κίλισσα κτλ. καὶ χρησιμεύουσα εἰς τὸν σχηματισμὸν θηλυκῶν προσηγορικῶν ὀνομά-

other varieties of Greek, including the standard language. In contemporary spoken Greek, adjectives ending in unstressed -ης [-is] form their fem. in -α and neut. in -ικο: these mainly “denote physical appearance, character or mood” (Holton et al. 1997:82, 2004:60), and include e.g. ἀκαμάτης ‘lazy’ and Turkish loanwords such as τεμπέλης ‘lazy’, τσιγκούνης ‘miserly, mean’ (← Tk. *tembel*, *çingene* ‘Gypsy; miser’); derivatives in -(ι)άρης (-ούρης) and hypocoristics in -ούλης, e.g. ζηλιάρης ‘jealous’, γκρινιάρης ‘grumbling, nagging’, μικρούλης ‘tiny’ (the latter with alternative neuter in -ούλι, e.g. μικρούλι); and compounds whose second element is a body part, e.g. μαυρομάτης ‘dark-eyed’, μακρολαίμης ‘long-necked’ (ibid.; Triantaphyllides 1941:266–7, 1993:111–2).<sup>49</sup> Such forms are used only with personal referents: “[w]hen they do not refer to persons, these adjectives have masculine forms in -ικος and feminine ones in -ικη...e.g. μια τεμπέλικη ζωή ‘a lazy life’” (Holton et al. 2004:60). Similarly, adjs. in -ᾶς/-ῆς (pl. -ᾶδες/-ῆδες), fem. -οῦ (pl. -οῦδες), neut. -ᾶδικο/-ῆδικο (or -οῦδικο), e.g. φαγάς ‘gluttonous’, πολυλογᾶς ‘chattering’, καβγατζῆς ‘quarrelsome’, μερακλῆς ‘choosy, enthusiastic’ (← Tk. *kavga-ci*, *merak-li*; Triantaphyllides 1941:267, 1993:112), “also mainly denote aspects of physical appearance, character or behaviour” and modify humans only; otherwise they take masc. and fem. endings in -δικος, -δικη, e.g. μερακλήδικος καφές ‘gourmet coffee’ (Holton et al. 2004:60).

---

των, ἐπιθέτων, μετοχῶν, ἐθνικῶν καὶ δηλωτικῶν τόπου καταγωγῆς” (1955:134; sim. 1958–60:367 s.v. -ισσα). The same ending is also found in the dialect of Silli with adjs. not ending in -us < -ος: cf. *genür-is* (< καινούριος; pl. -iri as if \*-ιδοι), -isa, -i ‘new’, *paš-is* (< παχύς; pl. -iri), -ása, -í ‘fat’, and borrowings such as *bašq-ás*, -ása, -á ‘other’, *zurl-ús*, -úsa, -ú ‘strong’ (← Tk. *baška*, *zorlu*), vs. *múčik-us* ‘small’, -i, -o (Dawkins 1916:48). In Phárasa, -isa apparently functions only as a nominal suffix, e.g. ὁ τυφλός ‘the blind man’, fem. ἡ τύφλισα (Andriotes 1948:37, 82, pace Anastasiades 1995:82; cf. Dawkins 1916:170).

<sup>49</sup> These adjectives have alternative fems. in -οῦσα and -οῦ, e.g. ξανθομάλλα ~ ξανθομαλλοῦσα ~ ξανθομαλλοῦ to ξανθομάλλης ‘blond-haired’ (Triantaphyllides 1941:267, 1993:112, Holton et al. 1997:83).

The restricted usage of *τεμπέλ-ης*, *πολυλογ-ᾶς* and their feminines *τεμπέλ-α*, *πολυλογ-οῦ* strongly suggests that they were originally substantival ('lazybones', 'chatterbox'), and acquired their adjectival character through frequent appositive use, e.g. *ἡ τεμπέλα δούλα* 'the lazybones (of a) maidservant' > 'the lazy maidservant'.<sup>50</sup> This process is already attested in ancient times: cf. Herodotos 8.14 dat. pl. *νησι Κιλίσσησι* 'Cilician ships', or *ἵππος μελανοσπαλάκισσα* 'dark mole-colored mare' in a 3rd c. BC papyrus (GEL:1095). Spoken Greek of the early 20th century allowed a wider range of feminine adjectival endings, including *-ισσα* and *-τρα*; these obviously correspond to the numerous derivational suffixes for feminine nouns in the language (cf. Mackridge 1985:160–1).<sup>51</sup> All of these feminine

<sup>50</sup> To an apparently greater extent than the type of *ζηλιάρης*, "[t]he masculine and feminine forms of these adjectives are also regularly used as nouns, e.g. *ο φαγάς* 'the glutton'" (Holton et al. 2004:60), i.e. occur less often in apposition than the more "adjectivized" *ζηλιάρης*, *τεμπέλης*, etc. Probably for this reason, they were treated by Thumb (1912:72) as substantives with a formally adjectival neuter: "Masc. substantives in *-ᾶς* have corresponding fems. in *-οῦ* (§88) and neuts. in *-άδικο*: e.g. *ψωμάς ψωμοῦ ψωμάδικο*; those in *-άδικο* designating the place where a trade is carried on; as, *ψωμάδικο* "bakery," "bake-shop," *ψαράδικο* "fishmonger's shop."

Confusion of originally nominal *-έας*, fem. *-ύ* with adjectival *-ᾶρ(i)s*, *-ᾶρτις* (< *-εάρης*), f. *-αρία* ~ *-ᾶρ-ενα*, n. *-ᾶριν* ~ *-ᾶρ(i)κον* has given rise to the Pontic pattern of e.g. *vrom-έας*, *-αρία* (*-ύ*, *-ᾶρενα*), *-ᾶρ(i)κον* 'dirty, smelly', *οκν-έας* (*-ᾶρις*), *-αρία* (*-ύ*, *-ᾶρενα*), *-ᾶρ(i)κον* 'lazy' (Papadopoulos 1955:51–2, Oikonomides 1958:213, Drettas 1997:162). Cf. the separate entries in Papadopoulos's dictionary for *βρωμάρης* "...*Θηλ. βρωμαρία, βρωμαρ-αίνα*. Οὐδ. *βρωμάριν, βρωμάρ', βρωμάρ(ι)κον*. Ἀπὸ τὸ μεσ. ἐπίθ. *βρωμάρης*, οὐ καὶ *θηλ. βρωμιαρέα* παρὰ Προδρ[όμου]... 1) Ἀκάθαρτος ρυπαρός. 2) Δυσώδης: *βρωμάρ' νερόν'* and *βρωμέας* "...*Θηλ. βρωμοῦ* *Τραπ.* Ἀπὸ τὸ οὐσ. *βρώμα* καὶ τὴν κατ. *-εας*. Ἐκείνος ποὺ βρωμᾷ, ἀποπνέει δυσσομίαν" (1958-60:205); similarly for *ὀκνέας* and *ὀκνιάρης* (1961:105).

<sup>51</sup> For example, Thumb (1912:71–3) divided adjectives ending in unstressed *-ης* [-is] into two groups, with fem. *-α* (e.g. *ζουλιάρ-ις*, *-α*, *-ικο* 'jealous', pl. *-ιδες*, *-ιδες*, *-ικα*) and with fem. *-ισσα*; the latter includes *ἀκαμάτης* 'lazy', *κανακάρης* 'darling', *μακαρίτης* 'blessed; late', *μακρολάιμης* 'long-necked'. He also noted fluctuation in the fem. of e.g. *ζουλιάρα* ~ *ζουλιάρισσα* or *κοκκινομύτα* ~ *κοκκινομύτισσα* (also *κοκκινομυτοῦ*) to *κοκκινομύτης* 'red-nosed', and added that "ἀκαμάτης even forms a fem. *ἀκαμάτρα*, and *ψεύτης* "lying," *ψεύτρα*" (72). The ending *-α* seems to have been gaining the upper hand by the time of Trianta-

markers, earlier Demotic -ισσα, -τρα as well as contemporary standard -α, -οῦ, -οῦσα (in τεμπέλ-α, ζηλιάρ-α, μικρούλ-α, πολυλογ-οῦ, μαυρομάτ-α ~ μαυροματ-οῦ(σα), etc.), straddle the line between derivational substantival suffixes and fully grammaticalized inflectional adjectival endings.<sup>52</sup>

Similarly, only to a much greater extent, Pontic has expanded the domain of the feminine substantival suffixes -ισσα and -αινα to encompass most adjectives; ancient *-e* < *-η* survives only in pronominals such as *ál-e*, *ál-æ* ‘other’ (beside *álesa*, *álena*), *avút-e* ‘this’, *at-é* ‘that; she’, *ekín-e* ‘that (over there)’ (Oikonomides 1958:181–2, 212). Unlike masc. *-on*, these fem. endings are used both with and without the definite article, e.g. *ínas* (*ís*, *énas*) *roméjsa yari* ‘a Greek woman’, *i roméjsa i yari* ‘the Greek woman’. The origin of the distribution of *-(i)sa*, *-esa* and *-ena* is unclear, but may involve prosodic and semantic as well as morphological factors.

### 8. The gender system of Pontic and its consequences

One might still object to the presumed use of individualizing derivatives in *-ων-* in apposition with masculine nouns, and their consequent reinterpretation as adjectives (as seems to have occurred in the prehistory of Germanic; §6). Although there is no reason in principle why e.g. \*μίκρων ‘the little one’ (→ \*μικρών, see fn. 37) could not have referred to any relatively

---

phyllides’s 1941 grammar, in which the default inflection of adjs. in *-ης* is the familiar contemporary *-ης*, *-α*, *-ικο*, pl. *-ηδες*, *-ες*, *-ικα* (266–7), but he still allowed *-ισσα* as a possible ending with e.g. *λεβέντης* ‘dashing’, *σακάτης* ‘cripple’, and *άκαμάτρα* as a variant of *άκαμάτα* (“μὲ σημασία μᾶλλον οὐσιαστικοῦ”; 267). Among recent grammars, *-ισσα* receives no mention in Mackridge 1985:142 (ζηλιάρης: fem. *-a* or *-iki*, neut. *-iko*), 152–3, and Triantaphyllides (1993:111–2) and Holton et al. (1997:82–3) give only the type of *ζηλιάρ-ης*, *-α*, *-ικο*; Holton et al. (2004:60) also have only *-ης*, *-α*, *-ικο* alongside fully “adjectivized” *-ικος*, *-ικη*, *-ικο*.

<sup>52</sup> For a parallel from Romance, cf. Italian adjectives in *-tore*, fem. *-trice* from Latin agent nouns in *-tor*, *-trix*, e.g. *un governo conservatore* ‘a conservative government’, *la politica conservatrice* ‘(the) conservative politics’ (sim. French *conserva-teur*, *-trice*).



little object, the ancient Greek evidence indicates that such formations most often designated humans (§5). It must not be forgotten, however, that gender in Pontic (and Cappadocian) has largely evolved toward a new system of ἔμψυχα vs. ἄψυχα, or animate vs. inanimate:<sup>53</sup> not only have many non-animate masculines and feminines shifted to neuter gender by means of the originally diminutive suffix -ιον (to a greater degree than in standard modern Greek), but those remaining have generalized the accusative plural to the nominative and so have a single form for both cases, like neuters; they also take neuter agreement, e.g. nom./acc. *ta traná ta kósmus* ‘the big worlds’, *ta mikrá ta kosáras* ‘the little hens’ to masc. *o kósmos*, fem. *i kosára*. Animate masc. and fem. nouns may optionally follow the same pattern, so that ‘the old Greek men’ is either nom. *i traní i roméi*, acc. *ti tranús ti roméjs* (< \*-jus) or nom./acc. *ta traná ta roméjs*. Furthermore, feminine nouns with non-human referents exhibit neuter adjectival concord in the singular as well, e.g. nom. *to mikrón i kosára*, acc. *to mikrón tin kosáran* ‘the little hen’; and those referring to humans may also, e.g. nom. *i mikrésa i yarí* ~ *to mikrón i yarí* ‘the little woman’.<sup>54</sup> These innovations are illustrated in the paradigms below.

<sup>53</sup> In the sense of having vs. lacking a ‘soul’, thus in practice usually human vs. nonhuman.

<sup>54</sup> For details, see Hatzidakis 1934:276, 283, Dawkins 1937:27–9, Oikonomides 1958:10, 140–3, 146, Mackridge 1987:128, Drettas 1997:167–9, Horrocks 1997:313–4. According to Drettas, the difference between *i kalésa i yarí* and *to kalón i yarí* is one of “spécifique” vs. “générique”, or “singulárisant” vs. “plurálisant”.

Pace Janse (2002:224), the use of the acc. pl. for nom. cannot be connected to masc. *o*-stem definite nom. sg. *-on* (see §3 above), but is rather to be compared with the Cappadocian tendency to generalize the nom. and acc. pl. of animate and inanimate *o*-stems, respectively (see fn. 3); cf. Dawkins 1916:115–6, Janse 2004:9 on animacy and agreement in the dialects of central Asia Minor. I see no need to assume Turkish interference in this case: generalization of oblique case forms to the nom. (especially in inanimate nouns) has occurred independently in many other IE languages, from western Romance to eastern South Slavic to Tocharian.

	‘the old Greek man/men’			‘the big world(s)’	
nom. sg.	<i>o tranón</i>	<i>o roméon</i>	vs.	<i>o tranón</i>	<i>o kósmon</i>
acc.	<i>ton tranón</i>	<i>ton roméon</i>		<i>ton tranón</i>	<i>ton kósmon</i>
nom. pl.	<i>i traní</i>	<i>i roméi</i>		<i>ta traná</i>	<i>ta kósmus</i>
	<i>(ta traná</i>	<i>ta roméjs)</i>			
acc.	<i>ti tranús</i>	<i>ti roméjs</i>		<i>ta traná</i>	<i>ta kósmus</i>
	<i>(ta traná</i>	<i>ta roméjs)</i>			
	‘the little woman/women’			‘the little hen(s)’	
nom. sg.	<i>i mikrésa</i>	<i>i yarı</i>	vs.	<i>to mikrón</i>	<i>i kosára</i>
	<i>(to mikrón)</i>				
acc.	<i>tin mikrésan</i>	<i>tin yarin</i>		<i>to mikrón</i>	<i>tin kosáran</i>
	<i>(to mikrón)</i>				
nom. pl.	<i>i mikr-i</i>	<i>i yarıdes</i> <sup>55</sup>		<i>ta mikrá</i>	<i>ta kosáras</i>
	<i>(ta mikrá</i>	<i>ta yarıdas)</i>			
acc.	<i>ti mikrús</i>	<i>ti yarıdas</i>		<i>ta mikrá</i>	<i>ta kosáras</i>
	<i>(ta mikrá</i>	<i>ta yarıdas)</i>			

Thus masculine adjectives most often modify male humans, and feminine adjectival agreement is restricted to the singular with nouns denoting women.<sup>56</sup> Under these circumstances, the grammaticalization of *-ισσα* and *-αινα* as fem. adjectival suffixes would have entailed little more than that of *-α* and *-οῦ* (and formerly also *-ισσα*, etc.) in standard modern Greek, where *ζηλιάρ-α*, *μερακλ-οῦ*, like their masc. correspondents *ζηλιάρ-ης*,

<sup>55</sup>According to Dawkins (1937:29), fem. personal nouns are construed with masc. adjectives in the plural, e.g. *i estoí i jinék* ‘the poor women’, but Drettas (1997:162, 169) restricts this to participles in *-ménos*, e.g. *i nenkazmén i yarıdes* ‘the tired women’; I infer from his discussion that e.g. ‘the good women’ may be realized as either nom. *i kalésas i yarıdes*, acc. *ti kalésas ti yarıdas* or nom./acc. *ta kalá ta yarıdas* (rarely *ta kalésas ta yarıdas*; cf. Janse 2002:223–4). It is unclear to me how much of this variation was correlated with geographic and/or social factors in pre-1922 Pontos, and to what extent contact with standard Greek or local (e.g. Macedonian) dialects since the Catastrophe has influenced the system of gender agreement.

<sup>56</sup>Cf. Dawkins (1937:29): “The feminine article and the feminine adjective, and these only in the singular, are the only grammatically feminine forms that have survived, and, as we have seen, the feminine adjective is used only for persons, not at all for things.”

μερακλ-ῆς, are used only of persons. In like fashion, appositional phrases such as \*ὁ τρανῶν ὁ Ῥωμαῖος ‘the old-one, the Greek (man)’, \*ὁ εὐμορφῶν ὁ ἀδελφός ‘the handsome-one, the brother’ could readily be reinterpreted as sequences of adjective + noun. As argued above, the ending *-on* was then transferred from adjectives to nouns in *-os*, whence contemporary Pontic (*o tranón*) *o roméon* ‘the old Greek (man)’, (*o émorfon*) *o adelfón* ‘the handsome brother’.<sup>57</sup>

### 9. Implications for Greek historical dialectology

Since Greek of the classical period already attests a sizable number of *n*-stems in *-ων-* derived from *o*-stem adjectives and nouns, and the inherited *n*-stem inflection – along with that of other consonant-stem nouns – was already beginning to be remodeled in late antiquity (§3) – it follows that the expansion and grammaticalization of *-ων-* as a productive definite-marking suffix in the forerunner of Pontic must have begun at an early stage after the linguistic Hellenization (or Koineization) of the Pontos, perhaps already in Roman or even late Hellenistic times.<sup>58</sup> Highly suggestive, then, are Thumb’s comments on the nominative form *ο κρᾶτερον* ‘the better one’ in a Cypriot

<sup>57</sup> These semantic restrictions on masc. and fem. agreement in Pontic somewhat weaken the parallelism with the Germanic weak adjective, which according to the standard view was generalized from individualizing *n*-stem derivatives in apposition before *all* nouns (§6). Nevertheless, both Pontic and Germanic independently took the initial step of marking definiteness through apposition of individualizing *n*-stems – redundantly in pre-Pontic, which already had a definite article, but creating a new inflectional category in Germanic. Subsequently they followed different paths: Pontic generalized the endings nom. *-on*, gen. *-onos* from apposed definite adjs. to masc. *o*-stem nouns, whereas the Germanic languages developed a definite article which made the *n*-stem adjectival inflection morphologically redundant.

<sup>58</sup> If not earlier: as most of the major settlements along the Pontic coast were founded by Ionic-speaking colonists from the 8th c. BC onwards, it is not wholly inconceivable that we are dealing with an idiosyncratic tendency of ancient Pontic Ionic which only later became generalized and fully grammaticalized in the centuries after Alexander. On the scanty traces of Ionic dialectal features in Pontic, see Hatzidakis 1892:160–5, Thumb 1901:87–8.

inscription of the 3rd century AD: “Dieser Zusammenfall von Nominativ und Akkusativ Singularis der *o*-Stämme war meines Wissens aus Κοινή-Texten bisher nicht bekannt und ist heute ein wichtiges Kennzeichen der pontischen Mundarten” (1906: 258). As already noted (§3), this ending cannot simply be a generalized accusative; since the distinction between *o* and *ω* had long since been lost, *-ov* here can just as well continue *-ων*.

To be sure, late medieval Cypriot, as represented in vernacular works such as the *Chronicle* of Leontios Makhairas, offers no evidence for an innovation similar to that hypothesized above for Pontic. The Cappadocian parallels too are far from secure (§2). Nevertheless, the conjunction of this peculiarity of Roman-era Cypriot with the possible Cappadocian comparanda suggests the alluring possibility that the Pontic definite masc. *o*-stem nominal declension in *\*-ων-* “may well once have characterized much of the eastern Koine” (Horrocks 1997:314). If this hypothesis is correct, we are dealing here with a common innovation of the Greek of Roman Cyprus and Asia Minor, which would accord well with what we know of the dialect geography of the Koine; their modern descendants, “archaizing dialects of the eastern area”, share a range of lexical and morphological features which distinguish them from the circum-Aegean core, and date back at least to the early Middle Ages, if not to late antiquity (cf. Dawkins 1921, 1925–30:318–9).

Despite the absence of secure parallels from other modern Greek dialects (e.g. those of Asia Minor) or earlier stages of the language, we may conclude that the Pontic paradigm of *o filon*, gen. *ti filonos* has developed from the Proto-Indo-European individualizing suffix *\*(o)n-*. Although the intervening stages cannot be reconstructed with certainty, I have argued above that *-ων-* had its origin in individualizing derivatives which were used in apposition as adjectives, particularly with nouns denoting persons; from such constructions as *\*ὁ καλ-ών ὁ φίλ-ος*, gen. *\*τοῦ καλ-ώνος τοῦ φίλ-ου*, the endings *-ων*, *-ώνος* spread to the following noun, whence (*o kal-ón*) *o fil-on*, gen. *\*(tu kal-ónos) tu fil-onos* → (*ti kal-ú*) *ti fil-onos* ~ *ti fil(-u)*.

The beginnings of this process must go back at least to the Roman period, and the dialects of much of central and eastern Asia Minor, and perhaps also Cyprus, may have shared in it to at least some extent.

Pontic thus presents us with a startlingly idiosyncratic transformation of an inherited derivational suffix into an inflectional marker of definiteness in one class of nouns. This treatment is wholly unique within postclassical Greek, but finds a parallel farther afield in – and offers an interesting contrast to – the Germanic weak adjective declension. By examining the Pontic Greek facts within a wider comparative perspective, we obtain not only a plausible hypothesis of their origin, but also a fuller picture of the rich variety of morphological change to be found across the Indo-European languages from ancient times to the present day.

### *Bibliography*

- Αναστασιάδης, Β. Κ. (1995): Μερικές ομοιότητες της ποντιακής διαλέκτου με νεοελληνικά μικρασιατικά γλωσσικά ιδιώματα. *Αρχαίον Πόντου* 46, 73–124.
- Ἀνδριώτης, Ν. Π. (1948): *Τὸ γλωσσικὸ ἰδίωμα τῶν Φαράσων*. (Collection de l'Institut Français d'Athènes, 8. Archives de Musique Populaire et de Folklore d'Asie Mineure, Vol. 4, Cappadoce 2.) Ἀθήνα: Ἴκαρος.
- (1992): *Ἱστορία τῆς ἐλληνικῆς γλώσσας (τέσσερις μελέτες)*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἰνστιτούτο Νεοελληνικῶν Σπουδῶν.
- Αντωνιάδου-Κεσίδου, Β. (2002): *Μαθήματα ποντιακῆς διαλέκτου. Κείμενα - Λεξιλόγιο - Γραμματική*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Εκδοτικός Οἶκος Ἀδελφῶν Κυριακίδη α.ε.
- Browning, R. (1983): *Medieval and Modern Greek*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Chantraine, P. (1933): *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. (Société de Linguistique de Paris, Collection Linguistique XXXVIII.) Paris: Champion.
- Dawkins, R. M. (1916): *Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A Study of the Dialects of Silli, Cappadocia and Phárasa, with Grammar, Texts, Translations and Glossary*. With a chapter on subject-matter of the folktales by W. R. Halliday. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.

- (1921): Cyprus and the [Asia Minor] dialects of Asia Minor. *Ἀφιέρωμα εἰς Γ. Ν. Χατζιδάκιν. Διατριβαὶ φίλων καὶ μαθητῶν ἐπὶ τῇ τριακοστῇ πέμπτῃ ἐπετείῳ τῆς ἐν τῷ πανεπιστημίῳ καθηγεσίας αὐτοῦ*, 42–59. Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Σακελλάριος.
  - (1925–30): The vocabulary of the mediaeval Cypriot chronicle of Leontios Makhairas. *TPS* (1925–30), 300–30.
  - (1931): Notes on the study of the Modern Greek of Pontos. *Byzantion* 6, 389–400.
  - (1937): The Pontic dialect of Modern Greek in Asia Minor and Russia. *TPS* (1937), 15–52.
- Delbrück, B. (1909): Das schwache Adjektivum und der Artikel im Germanischen. *IF* 26, 187–99.
- Drettas, G. (1997): *Aspects pontiques*. Paris: Association de Recherches Pluridisciplinaires, publié avec le concours du Centre National du Livre.
- Fischer, E. (hrsg.) (1974): *Die Ekloge des Phrynichos*. (Sammlung griechischer und lateinischer Grammatiker, Band 1.) Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Funke, O. (1949): On the use of the attributive adjective in OE prose and early ME. *English Studies* 30, 151–6.
- GEL: (1996): Liddell, Henry George, Robert Scott, Sir Henry Stuart Jones et al.: *Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon; New York: Oxford U. Press.
- Gignac, F. Th. (1976): *A Grammar of the Greek Papyri of the Roman and Byzantine Periods. Volume I: Phonology*. (Testi e Documenti per lo Studio dell'Antichità, LV.) Milano: Cisalpino-La Goliardica.
- (1981): –, *Volume II: Morphology*. –.
- Hajnal, I. (1997): Definite nominale Determination im Indogermanischen. *IF* 102, 38–73.
- Hatzidakis, G. N. (1892): *Einführung in die neugriechische Grammatik*. Leipzig: Breitkopf und Härtel. (Reprinted 1977, Hildesheim/New York: Olms.)
- (1907): [Χατζιδάκις, Γ.], Περὶ τῆς μεταβολῆς τοῦ γένους τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐν τῇ νεωτέρᾳ Ἑλληνικῇ. *Μεσαιωνικά καὶ Νέα Ἑλληνικά*. Τόμος Β', 47–70. Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Σακελλάριος.
  - (1913): Der Ausfall der Vokale im pontischen Dialekt. *ZVS* 45, 245–52.
  - (1934): Περὶ τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου καὶ ἰδίᾳ περὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ ἀναλογικῶν σχηματισμῶν. *Γλωσσολογικαὶ Ἔρευναι*, Τόμος Α', 265–91. Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Βιτσικουνάκης. (Reprinted as *Λεξικογραφικὸν Δελτίον*, Παράρτημα 4. Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν, Κέντρον Συντάξεως τοῦ Ἱστορικοῦ Λεξικοῦ, 1980. Originally published in *Ἐπιστημονικὴ Ἐπετηρὶς Πανεπιστημίου Ἀθηνῶν* 7:2 (1912), 1–27.)

- (1977): Ποντικά. Εισαγωγή. Περί τῆς κατὰ συστολήν ἀπωλείας τοῦ ἀτόνου *ι* καὶ *ου* ἐν τῇ ποντικῇ διαλέκτῳ. *Γλωσσολογικαὶ Ἔρευναι*, Τόμος Β', 144–54. (Λεξικογραφικὸν Δελτίον, Παράρτημα 2.) Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν, Κέντρον Συντάξεως τοῦ Ἱστορικοῦ Λεξικοῦ. (Originally published in «*Πεντηκονταετηρίς*». Ὁ ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει Ἑλληνικὸς Φιλολογικὸς Σύλλογος 34 (1913–21), 263–74.)
- Henrich, G. S. (1976): *Κλητικές καὶ γενικές σέ-ο ἀπό ἀρσενικά σέ-ος στά μεσαιωνικά καὶ νέα ἑλληνικά*. Θεσσαλονίκη.
- (1979): Zwei Phänomene des Pontischen und ihr chronologisch-kausales Verhältnis: ὁ πάππον (neben πάππος) und der Schwund von nachtonigem [u]. *Actes du 5<sup>ème</sup> Colloque International de Linguistique Fonctionnelle (Ioannina, 10–15 Juillet 1978)*, 158–64. Paris (Sorbonne).
- (2000): Διαλεκτοῖστορικά. 1) Μια περίπτωση τῆς ποντιακῆς ἀποβολῆς τοῦ ἐπίτονου [u] στον 12ο αἰῶνα. 2) Τα συντάγματα «τις το, τις τα» ἀντὶ «του το, του τα» τῆς βορειοδυτικῆς Ρόδου (Τριάντα, τουλάχιστον 17ος–20ός αἰῶνας). *Νεοελληνικὴ Διαλεκτολογία. Τόμος Τρίτος: Πρακτικά Τρίτου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Νεοελληνικῆς Διαλεκτολογίας. Κάλυμνος 20–23 Οκτωβρίου 1998*, 49–60. Αθήνα: Κέντρο Συντάξεως τοῦ Ἱστορικοῦ Λεξικοῦ με δαπάνη τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν.
- Hoffmann, K. (1955): Ein grundsprachliches Possessivsuffix. *MSS* 6, 35–40. (Reprinted in *Aufsätze zur Indoiranistik I*, hrsg. von Johanna Narten, 378–83. Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1976.)
- Holton, D., P. Mackridge, and I. Philippaki-Warbuton (1997): *Greek: A Comprehensive Grammar of the Modern Language*. London/New York: Routledge. (Reprinted 1999, 2002.)
- (2004): *Greek: An Essential Grammar of the Modern Language*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Horrocks, G. (1997): *Greek: A History of the Language and Its Speakers*. Harlow: Longman.
- Janse, M. (2002): Aspects of Pontic grammar (review of Drettas 1997). *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 3, 203–31.
- (2004): Animacy, definiteness, and case in Cappadocian and other Asia Minor Greek dialects. *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 5, 3–26.
- Jasanoff, J. H. (1980): The nominative singular of *n*-stems in Germanic. *American Indian and Indoeuropean Studies: Papers in Honor of Madison S. Beeler*, ed. by Kathryn Klar, Margaret Langdon, and Shirley Silver, 375–82. The Hague: Mouton.
- (2002): The nom. sg. of Germanic *n*-stems. *Verba et Litterae: Explorations in Germanic Languages and German Literature (Festschrift for Albert L. Lloyd)*, ed. by Alfred R. Wedel and Hans-Jörg Busch, 31–46. Newark, DE: Linguatext.

- Κοντοσόπουλος, Ν. (1994): *Διάλεκτοι και ιδιώματα της νέας ελληνικής*. Ανανεώμενη έκδοσις. Ἀθήνα.
- Κουτίτα-Καϊμάκη, Μ. (1977–8): Ἡ ὀνομαστική σέ -ν τῶν ἀρσενικῶν ὀνομάτων τῆς ποντιακῆς. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 34, 259–98.
- Labov, W. (1994): *Principles of Linguistic Change*. (Language in Society, Vol. 20.) Oxford: Blackwell.
- Leumann, M. (1977): *Lateinische Laut- und Formenlehre*. (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, Abteilung 2, Teil 2, Band 1.) Neuausgabe, 5. Auflage. München: C.H. Beck.
- Lewis, G. (2000): *Turkish Grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Oxford U. Press.
- Mackridge, P. (1985): *The Modern Greek Language: A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek*. Oxford: Oxford U. Press.
- (1987): Greek-speaking Moslems of north-east Turkey: prolegomena to a study of the Ophitic sub-dialect of Pontic. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 11, 115–37.
  - (1995): Τα Ποντιακά στη σημερινή Τουρκία: αρχαία στοιχεία στο ιδίωμα του Ὄφη. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 46, 153–61.
  - (1999): Η ελληνοφωνία στην περιοχή του Ὄφη (Πόντος). Διαλεκτοί Θύλακοί της Ελληνικής Γλώσσας/*Dialect Enclaves of the Greek Language*, 25–30. Ἀθήνα: Ελληνική Δημοκρατία, Υπουργεῖο Εθνικῆς Παιδείας και Θρησκευμάτων. (English version: “The Greek spoken in the region of Of (Pontus)”, 101–5.)
- Melchert, H. C. (2000): Tocharian plurals in -nt- and related phenomena. *TIES* 9, 53–75.
- Mitchell, B. (1985): *Old English Syntax. Volume I: Concord, the Parts of Speech, and the Sentence*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Μηνάς, Κ. (1996–7): Ψηφίδες στη μελέτη της ποντιακῆς διαλέκτου. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 47, 3–15.
- Nussbaum, A. (1986): *Head and Horn in Indo-European: The Words for “Horn,” “Head,” and “Hornet”*. (Untersuchungen zur indogermanischen Sprach- und Kulturwissenschaft, Neue Folge, 2.) Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.
- Oikonomides [Oeconomides], D. E. (1908): *Lautlehre des Pontischen*. Leipzig: Deichert. (Reprinted 1973, Hildesheim: Gerstenberg.)
- (1958): *Γραμματική τῆς ἐλληνικῆς διαλέκτου τοῦ Πόντου*. (Λεξικογραφικόν Δελτίον: Παράρτημα 1.) Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Ἀκαδημία Ἀθηνῶν.
- Osthoff, H. (1876): *Forschungen im gebiete der indogermanischen nomina- len stamm- bildung. Zweiter teil: Zur geschichte des schwachen deutschen adjectivums*. Jena: Costenoble.
- Παπαδόπουλος, Α. Α. (1953): Χαρακτηριστικά τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 18, 83–93.



- (1955): *Ιστορική γραμματική τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου*. (Περιοδικοῦ «Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου» Παράρτημα 1.) Ἀθήναι: Ἐπιτροπὴ Ποντιακῶν Μελετῶν.
- (1958-61): *Ιστορικὸν λεξικὸν τῆς ποντικῆς διαλέκτου*. Τόμος Πρῶτος: Α-Λ (1958-60). Τόμος Δεύτερος: Μ-Ω (1961). (Ἐπιτροπὴ Ποντιακῶν Μελετῶν, Περιοδικοῦ «Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου» Παράρτημα 3.) Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Μυρτίδης.
- Penny, R. (2002): *A History of the Spanish Language*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press.
- Peters, M. (1980): *Untersuchungen zur Vertretung der indogermanischen Laryngale im Griechischen*. (Sitzungsberichte der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 377. Band.) Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Rohlf, G. (1969): *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti. III: Sintassi e formazione delle parole*. Traduzione di Temistocle Franceschi e Maria Caciagli Fancelli. Torino: Einaudi.
- (1977): *Grammatica storica dei dialetti italogreci (Calabria, Salento)*. Nuova edizione interamente rielaborata ed aggiornata. Traduzione del manoscritto tedesco di Salvatore Sicuro. München: Beck. (Reprinted 2001, Galatina: Congedo.)
- Schwyzler, E. (1939): *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik. Band I: Allgemeiner Teil, Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. München: Beck.
- Semenov, A. (1935): Der nordpontische Dialekt des Neugriechischen. *Glotta* 23, 96-107.
- Solmsen, F. (1922): *Indogermanische Eigennamen als Spiegel der Kulturgeschichte*. Hrsg. und bearbeitet von Ernst Fraenkel. (Indogermanische Bibliothek, Vierte Abteilung, Zweiter Band.) Heidelberg: Winter.
- Symeonidis, Ch. (1971–2): Lautlehre der türkischen Wörter im neugriechischen Dialekt des Pontos. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 31, 19–234.
- Thomason, S. Grey and T. Kaufman (1988): *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley/Los Angeles: U. of California Press.
- Thumb, A. (1901): *Die griechische Sprache im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Beiträge zur Geschichte und Beurteilung der Κοινή*. Straßburg: Trübner.
- (1906): Prinzipien der Κοινή-Forschung. *Neue Jahrbücher für das Klassische Altertum* 17 (9), 246–63.
- (1912): *Handbook of the Modern Greek Vernacular. Grammar, Texts, Glossary*. Translated from the second improved and enlarged German edition by S. Angus. Edinburgh: Clark. (Reprinted 1964, Chicago: Argonaut.)
- (1914): On the value of Modern Greek for the study of Ancient Greek. *Classical Quarterly* 8:3, 181–205.

- Τομπαΐδης, Δ. (1964): Ποντιακά γραμματικά. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 26 (Ἀφιέρωμα εἰς Α. Α. Παπαδόπουλον), 150–8. (Reprinted in Τομπαΐδης 1996, 13–21.)
- (1977): L’infinitif dans le dialecte grec du Pont Euxin. *Balkan Studies* 18, 155–74.
  - (1980): Συμβολή στὴν ἔρευνα τοῦ ὀνοματικοῦ συνόλου τῆς Ποντιακῆς. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 36, 220–37. (Reprinted in Τομπαΐδης 1996, 92–110.)
  - (1988): *Ἡ ποντιακὴ διάλεκτος*. (Περιοδικοῦ «Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου» Παράρτημα 17.) Ἀθήνα: Επιτροπὴ Ποντιακῶν Μελετῶν.
  - (1988–9): Ποντιακά γραμματικά Β'. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 42, 7–14. (Reprinted in Τομπαΐδης 1996, 134–41.)
  - (1990–1): Review of Henrich 1976. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 43, 336–42. (Reprinted in Τομπαΐδης 1996, 177–83.)
  - (1995): Ἡ ἔρευνα τῆς ποντιακῆς σήμερα. *Ἑλληνικὴ Διαλεκτολογία*. Τόμος 4, 1994–5: Ἀφιέρωμα στὴν Ποντιακὴ, 49–60. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικὸς Οἶκος Ἀδελφῶν Κυριακίδη. (Reprinted in Τομπαΐδης 1996, 248–59.)
  - (1996): *Μελετήματα ποντιακῆς διαλέκτου*. Θεσσαλονίκη: Κώδικας.
  - (1998–9): Πάλι γιὰ το ἀπαρέμφατο στὴν ποντιακὴ διάλεκτο. *Ἀρχεῖον Πόντου* 48, 5Θ.14.
- Τοπχαρᾶς, Κ. (1932): *Ἡ γραμματικὴ τῆς ρομεικῆς τῆς ποντικῆς τῆς γλοσας*. Ροστοβ Τον: Ἐκδοτικὸν „Κομμουνιστῆς“. (Reprinted as *Ἡ γραμματικὴ τῆς Ποντιακῆς*. Εἰσαγωγικὸ σημεῖωμα Βασιλείου Δ. Φόρη. Θεσσαλονίκη: Ἐκδοτικὸς Οἶκος Ἀδελφῶν Κυριακίδη, 1988.)
- Τριανταφυλλίδης, Μ. (1941): *Νεοελληνικὴ γραμματικὴ (τῆς δημοτικῆς)*. Ἐν Ἀθήναις: Ὄργανισμὸς Ἐκδόσεως Σχολικῶν Βιβλίων.
- (1993): *Νεοελληνικὴ γραμματικὴ. Ἀναπροσαρμογὴ τῆς Μικρῆς Νεοελληνικῆς Γραμματικῆς τοῦ Μανόλη Τριανταφυλλίδη*. Ἀθήνα: Ὄργανισμὸς Ἐκδόσεως Διδακτικῶν Βιβλίων.
- Zucha, I. (1989): Zum schwachen Adjektiv in prädikativer Stellung. *IF* 94, 301–5.