

Tom Bossuyt/Eline Daveloose

Cappadocian concessive conditionals

Divergence from Greek and contact with Turkish

Keywords: concessive conditionals; Cappadocian Greek; language contact; typology

In this talk we present preliminary results from an ongoing investigation into concessive conditionals (CCs) in Cappadocian, a near-extinct variety of Greek spoken in Asia Minor until 1923–1924 which has been heavily influenced by Turkish. We investigate whether Cappadocian CCs deviate from their Standard Modern Greek counterparts and, if so, whether the deviations can be attributed to language contact with Turkish.

CCs are a special type of conditionals which express not one antecedent p , but a set of antecedents that all lead to the same consequent q : ‘if $\{p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots\}$, then q ’ (König 1986; Leuschner 2006, 2020). Three quantificational strategies are distinguished (ibid.): scalar concessive conditionals (SCCs) mention an extreme value p_n and imply that q also holds for other, less extreme values (cf. English *even if* p_n); alternative concessive conditionals (ACCs) express a disjunction which exhausts the scale at hand (cf. English *whether* p_1 or p_2); universal concessive conditionals (UCCs) express free-choice quantification over instantiations of a variable, often realized as an interrogative-like pronoun (cf. English *WH-ever*).

Under Haspelmath & König’s (1998) typology of CCs in European languages, Turkish qualifies as uniformly-coding, i.e. as a language that encodes all CCs as conditionals, while Standard Modern Greek is differentially-coding, i.e. a language in which only SCCs have overt conditional coding, while ACCs and UCCs have primarily quantificational, e.g. interrogative-like, coding. This typological divide makes Cappadocian an interesting case study.

We investigate the coding strategies of Cappadocian CCs in a corpus of 58 folktales from 11 villages (ca. 50,000 words, the largest Cappadocian text collection to date). While Cappadocian CCs are differentially coded like their Standard Modern Greek counterparts, the actual coding is distinct between both varieties. In part, these differences are due to Turkish influence, as Turkish loan words are found in ACCs, e.g. *jáxot ... jákot ...* ‘whether ... or ...’ < Tr. *yahut* ‘or, else’, cf. example (1), and sporadically in UCCs, e.g. *-dak* in *ótia-dak* ‘whatever’ < Tr. *dek* ‘until, as far as’, cf. example (2). Mostly, however, Cappadocian CCs differ from their Standard Modern Greek equivalents in ways that cannot be attributed to Turkish. In Cappadocian SCCs, the focus particle *ke* ‘even’ (or one of its alternative forms *ge*, *ki* or *gi*) invariably follows the conditional conjunction *an* ‘if’, cf. example (3), whereas *ke* precedes *an* in SCCs in Standard Modern Greek (where *an ke* is purely concessive). And whereas Haspelmath & König (1998) suggest that Standard Modern Greek UCCs usually contain focus particles like *-đipote* ‘ever’ or *ke* ‘even’ and/or conditional *an*, Cappadocian UCCs lack any overt coding other than the WH-word in 68% of all instances, cf. example (4).

In future steps we will investigate whether these differences are a consequence of changes in Modern Greek, with Cappadocian preserving coding strategies from earlier stages of Greek due to its relative isolation from mainstream Greek since Byzantine times. We will

also account for SCCs in the Floïta dialect, which are introduced by *an gi* like exceptive conditionals, cf. example (5). In the latter, *gi* is usually not analyzed as a scalar-additive focus particle ('even'), but as a negator (e.g. Dawkins 1916: 412, 609). To our knowledge, concessive and exceptive conditionals are not coded identically in any other varieties of Greek nor, indeed, any other languages. We suggest this overlap can be explained either in terms of accidental homonymy or as scale/polarity reversal.

Examples

- (1) alternative concessive conditional

Béjense éna palikár, [jáxot patišaxjú perí=ne,
 choose.IMP.2SG ART.INDF young_man [or king.GEN.SG son=be.PRS.3SG
jáxot sadrazamnú=ne, ja ó-tšina grévis.]
 or general.GEN.SG=be.PRS.3SG or REL-who.ACC.SG want.PRS.2SG

'Choose a young man, whether it's the son of a king or a general or whoever you want.'

- (2) universal concessive conditional (WH-*dak*)

Sona [ó-tia-dak málja ítan,] éperén=da.
 afterwards [REL-what-until goods be.IPFV.PST.3PL] take.PFV.PST.3SG=it.ACC.PL

'Afterwards, whatever goods there were, he took them.'

- (3) scalar concessive conditional

[An ge axí dé pat s-o=patišáxo,]
 [if even soon NEG go.PRS.2PL to-ART.DEF=king]
ešít to=ksévrit, na ennit pišménis.
 you it=know.PRS.2PL FUT become.SBJV.PFV.2PL regretful

'Even if you don't go to the king soon, you know it, you will regret it.'

- (4) universal concessive conditional (no overt coding other than WH-word)

[Ó-ti na jení] az jení eki.
 [REL-what FUT happen.SBJV.PFV.3SG] HORT happen.SBJV.PFV.3SG there

'Whatever will happen, let it happen over there.'

- (5) exceptive conditional (Floïta dialect)

[Etó to=fšax an gi ksévrišken to=pulí,]
 [DEM ART.DEF=boy if not know.IPFV.PST.3SG ART.DEF=bird.ACC]
đen kóndanen s-o=kifáli=t.
 NEG perch.IPFV.PST.3SG on-ART.DEF=head.ACC=POSS.3SG

'Unless the boy knew the bird, it would not have perched on his head.'

References

- Dawkins, Richard M. (1916): *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Haspelmath, Martin/König, Ekkehard (1998): Concessive conditionals in the languages of Europe. In van der Auwera, Johan (ed.): *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 563–640.
- König, Ekkehard (1986): Conditionals, concessive conditionals and concessives: Areas of contrast, overlap and neutralization. In: Traugott, Elizabeth Closs/ter Meulen, Alice/Snitzer Reilly Judy/Ferguson, Charles A. (eds.): *On conditionals*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 229–246.
- Leuschner, Torsten (2006): *Hypotaxis as building-site: The emergence and grammaticalization of concessive conditionals in English, German and Dutch*. Munich: Lincom Europa.
- Leuschner, Torsten (2020): Concessive conditionals as a family of constructions. In: *Belgian Journal of Linguistics* 34, pp. 234–246.

Contact information

Tom Bossuyt

Ghent University

Tom.Bossuyt@UGent.be

Eline Daveloose

Ghent University

Eline.Daveloose@UGent.be