

## Standard Greek, Cypriot Greek and in-between: evidence for separationist morphology

Tsiplakou (in press; 2009) observes that in certain registers of Cypriot Greek (CG henceforth) forms and features from CG and from Standard Greek (SG henceforth) co-exist *within constituents*, thus challenging an analysis of such mixing as standard code-switching. Some examples focusing on morphological aspects of this co-occurrence follow, all data are from Tsiplakou (2009):

- (1) tʃe mas efoítʃazen proclisis (SG)  
and us.ACC.CL scare. PAST.IMPF.3<sup>RD</sup>SG  
'and s/he was scaring us'
- (2) stis proinés esí íne pu n na íse. θa ti válume túti ðóðeka. SG 'θa' instead of CG 'enna'  
in.the morning.ones you is that is to be.2<sup>ND</sup>SG. will put this.FEM twelve  
'it's who'll be in the morning slots. Her, we'll put for twelve.'
- (3) na e<sup>n</sup>dopísume tis ðinatótites ce tes aðinamíes SG 'tis' and CG 'tes'  
to spot.1<sup>ST</sup>PL the strengths and the weaknesses  
'in order to spot the strengths and the weaknesses''

In all the above examples we have SG morphological characteristics within CG utterances, well below the level of phrasal constituents. Tsiplakou (2009) analyzes these and similar data as instances of *interlanguage* effects – apparently under the tacit assumption that SG is acquired by CG speakers as an L2 during childhood.

What is striking, however, is the absence of any mixing of morphological exponents in syntactic environments exclusive to CG, such as cleft-like *wh*- questions with *embu* (Grohmann, Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou 2006; Gryllia & Lekakou 2006). This fact, coupled with the dissociation between terminal syntactic terminal nodes and their morphological exponents, could potentially lead us to a different hypothesis: speakers of CG have a repertory of forms including both CG exponents, (e.g. *tes* in (3)) and SG ones, e.g. *tis*, to match the syntactic terminal nodes generated by their native CG grammar.

Still, there is an obvious constraint: the feature content of the syntactic node must *match* that of the morphological exponent, as per the standard workings of the Elsewhere and the Subset Principle (see Harley 2008 on keeping the two distinct). Therefore, in (2), in order to express – say – a [future] feature on a T head, a CG speaker can use either the native *enna* or the SG *θa* exponent. In the same vein, CG *embu* (or *en pu*, if bimorphemic) cannot be expressed with any SG form, given the former's feature content, which is not matched by any SG exponent. Finally, the option of using SG clitic placement, as in (1), follows if clitic placement (enclisis vs. proclisis) is not a purely syntactic issue but decided by morpho-phonology.

### References

- Grohmann, Kleanthes K., Panagiotidis, Phoivos & Tsiplakou, Stavroula 2006. Properties of Wh-Question Formation in Cypriot Greek. In Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, & Angeliki Ralli (Eds.) *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*. 83-98
- Gryllia, Stella & Lekakou, Marika. 2006. *Syntax reflects information structure: evidence from Cypriot Greek*. Talk delivered at the 27<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Dept. of Linguistics, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- Harley, Heidi 2008. When is a syncretism more than a syncretism? Impoverishment, syncretism, and underspecification. In D. Harbour, D. Adger and S. Béjar (eds.) *Phi Theory*. OUP.251-294
- Tsiplakou, S. (in press) Competing Grammars in Cypriot Greek? Evidence from language alternation. *Proceedings of the 18<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tsiplakou, S. (2009) Code-switching and code-mixing between related varieties: establishing the blueprint. *The International Journal of Humanities* 6: 49-66