ΑΡΧΕΙΟΝ ΠΟΝΤΟΥ

ΤΟΜΟΣ ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΣΤΟΣ ΟΓΔΟΟΣ

ΑΡΧΕΙΟΝ ΠΟΝΤΟΥ

ΤΟΜΟΣ ΠΕΝΤΗΚΟΣΤΟΣ ΟΓΔΟΟΣ

ΠΙΝΑΚΑΣ ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΩΝ

ΒΙΒΛΙΟΚΡΙΤΙΚΟ - ΒΙΒΛΙΟΓΡΑΦΙΚΟ ΔΕΛΤΙΟ

ΧΡΟΝΙΚΑ - ΕΠΕΤΕΙΟΙ - ΝΕΚΡΟΛΟΓΙΕΣ

SVETLANA BERIKASHVILI

SEVERAL FEATURES OF AORIST AND VERBAL SYSTEM IN PONTIC GREEK SPOKEN IN GEORGIA

1. Introduction

One Pontic Greek (PG) variety is still spoken by Pontic-speaking community of Georgia. For the clearness I will call this variety Romeika of Georgia (RomGe), for Romeika is the label called by the native-speakers, while geographical place is added to avoid any confusion on the one hand with Romeyka used to indicate a variety spoken by Muslim population of the three enclaves in North-Eastern Turkey[1] and on the other hand with other Greek varieties of Asia Minor also termed Romeika by speakers (e.g. Instanbulite Greek). In this article the term Romeika covers Caucasus PG, spoken by Pontic Greeks who live or have lived in Georgia.[2]

PG is known for the conservative traits and the preservation of several properties of Ancient and Medieval Greek, furthermore this dialect has always been in the multilingual environment having extensive contact with Turkish, Armenian, and also with Kartvelian

---

[*] Svetlana Berikashvili currently works at the Iv. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, at the Department of Modern Greek Studies.

[1] See I. Sitaridou, 'Greek-speaking enclaves in Pontus today: The documentation and revitalization of Romeyka', in M. C. Jones and S. Oglive (eds.), *Keeping Languages Alive. Documentation, Pedagogy, and Revitalization* (Cambridge 2013) 98-112 and I. Sitaridou, 'The Romeyka infinitive. Continuity, contact and change in the Hellenic varieties of Pontus', *Diachronica* 31-1 (2014) 23-73.

[2] For the discussion on chosen nomenclature see S. Berikashvili, *Morphological Aspects of Pontic Greek Spoken in Georgia* (Munich 2017) 16-17.

languages, especially Laz.[3] Some scholars assume that it is largely derived from the Koine and has a lot of characteristics of the Ancient Ionic dialect,[4] others find mostly Medieval Greek elements that set Pontic apart from other Modern Greek (MG) dialects.[5]

RomGe, the PG spoken by Pontic-speaking community of Georgia, differs from the other PG varieties spoken in Turkey or by Pontic Greek speakers in Greece, in the terms of contact-induced changes. It was used within a different language situation and besides borrowings inherited in the language due to the extensive contact with Turkish, it has a lot of embedded elements from Russian and Georgian.[6] After the emigration to Greece the significant impact is also that from Standard Greek (SG) and Pontic multidialectal environment. RomGe also preserves several features of Ancient and Medieval Greek.

Several archaic features, like the ancient imperative, the vocalic temporal augment, the ancient aorist passive, infinitive, etc. are documented and studied in the verbal system of the different varieties of Pontic. The available publications and resources about this issue relate to the varieties spoken in Turkey or by Pontic Greek speakers in Greece. RomGe has been less systematically investigated, subsequnetly this is the first attempt to investigate several ancient traits in the verbal system of the understudied variety based on the corpus data. The methods used for the investigation are the corpus-based approach, used to reveal different archaic features in RomGe and contrastive analysis, which includes description, juxtaposition

---

[3] See M. Janse 'Aspects of Pontic Grammar', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 3 (2002) 203-31.

[4] N. Kontossopoulos, 'Ποντιακή και Καππαδοκική', in M. Kopidakis (ed.), *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής γλώσσας* (Athens 1999) 192-3.

[5] P. Mackridge, 'Greek-speaking Moslems of north-east Turkey: Prolegomena to a study of the Ophitic sub-dialect of Pontic', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 11 (1987) 121 (hereafter 'Prolegomena').

[6] See S. Berikashvili, 'Morphological integration of Russian and Turkish nouns in Pontic Greek, *STUF – Language Typology and Universals 69:2* (2016) 255-76; S. Berikashvili 'Loan verbs adaptation in Pontic Greek (spoken in Georgia)', in Kh. Tzitzilis and G. Papanastasiou (eds.) *Language Contact in the Balkans and Asia Minor* (Thessaloniki forthcoming).

and comparison to show differences between Ancient Greek (AG), Standard Modern Greek (SMG), PG and RomGe. While noting the examples two different systems were adopted transliteration for AG and the phonemic transcription for Pontic and SMG.

The research is based on the corpus data, collected through several fieldwork periods in the Pontic-speaking community of Georgia by Skopeteas, Kotanidi and Berikashvili.[7] All the data, archived according to the existing standards of linguistic resources and glossed morphologically by Berikashvili, using ELAN and Toolbox software, are available from the TLA archive, Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics (Nijmegen, Netherlands).[8]

The corpus includes 435 media files (approximately 54 230 words) of narratives and semi-spontaneous speech recorded in Georgia and Greece, and is divided into three stages: Stage A – Homeland (original settlement areas in Georgia), Stage B – Internal migration (urban centres in Georgia) and Stage C – Emigration (Greece). In whole 57 native-speaking informants of different ages have been recorded reproducing texts on the same topics: Ancesotrs, Family, Language etc., hence the data are maximally comparable between stages.

The article is organized as follows. Section 1 is an introductory part, which outlines the main peculiarity of RomGe and includes methodology of data collection; section 2 provides a description of the Greek verbal system comparing AG, PG and SMG basic features, while section 3 outlines basic facts about the RomGe verbal system; section 4 focuses on aorist use in Pontic contrasting it to RomGe, and providing a detailed analysis of the AG traits preserved in Pontic aorist; and, section 5 summarizes the main findings.

2. Greek verbal system in AG, PG and SMG

The verbal morphosyntax of Greek is realized by grammatical

---

[7] The final versions of the data collection are presented as follows: S. Berikashvili, *Interviews in Pontic Greek* (Bielefeld 2016); E. Kotanidi, S. Berikashvili, S. Böhm, J. Lorentz and S. Skopeteas, *Pontic data collection* (Bielefeld 2016); S. Skopeteas and S. Berikashvili, *Interviews in Pontic Greek* (Bielefeld 2016).

[8] Corpus resource: TLA, Donated Corpora, XTYP Lab available at https://tla.mpi.nl/resources/data-archive/.

categories and their corresponding values, which can be defined as follows: voice, aspect, tense, agreement with the subject and mood. In AG they are mostly pure morphological phenomena, while in Pontic and SMG all these categories are realized by the combination of morphology and syntax. MG in comparison with Ancient has become more analytical, as it uses more periphrastic forms, like those of subjunctive (*na* + V) mood, future tense (*θa* + V), or perfect forms (*éxo/íxa* + V). The tendency of the morphology simplification and its replacement with syntax begins from the period of the Hellenistic Koine, thus e.g. the future form of the AG verb *lúo* 'unfasten, untie, solve' – *lúso*, in the Koine has been replaced by the periphrastic forms: *éxo* 'have' + INF: *éxo lúsein*, or *méllo* 'intent to…/ready to…' + INF: *méllo lúsein*, later in the period of Medieval Greek it was changed by the verb *θélo* 'want' + INF, which became particle *θa* in MG[9]. In Pontic pure morphological categories are voice, aspect and agreement with the subject; tense is defined only by the opposition of past and non-past, while mood by that of imperative and non-imperative. All other categories, those of future tense and subjunctive mood are realized by the combination of syntax and morphology.

Person values are the same in Ancient, Pontic and SMG, while number values of Pontic and SMG differ from those of Ancient where singular and plural are supplemented by dual. The dual number disappears in Koine, it has not survived in MG and is not attested in any of the Pontic varieties.

The TAM system also differs in Ancient, Pontic and SMG. These grammatical categories usually are discussed together as the boundary between tense, aspect and mood is fluid. Tense, which is divided notionally into present, past and future (whether these forms are inflectional or not), bears also the functions which can be indicated by the means of the different traits combination: those of time, aspect and

---

[9] For the development of the future particle *θa* from the verb *θélo* 'want' used with finite phrases (*na* + SUBJ): *θélo hína* > *θélo na* > *θé na* > *θá na* > *θá / θa* see P. Chantraine, *Ιστορική μορφολογία της ελληνικής γλώσσας* (Athens 1990) 303; A. Moser, *The History of the Perfect Periphrases in Greek.* PhD dissertation (Cambrdige 1988) 5; A. F. Christidis, *Ιστορία της αρχαίας ελληνικής γλώσσας* (Thessaloniki 2010) 184.

modality. Table 1 presents the TAM system in Ancient, Pontic and SMG.

Table 1. TAM system in AG, PG and SMG

	AG	PG	SMG
Tense	Present	Present	Present
	Imperfect	Imperfect	Imperfect
	Future	Future	Future Continuous
			Future Immediate
	Aorist	Aorist	Aorist
	Perfect	(Perfect	Perfect
	Past Perfect	Past Perfect	Past Perfect
	Future Perfect	Future Perfect)	Future Perfect
Aspect	Imperfective	Imperfective	Imperfective
	Perfective	Perfective	Perfective
	Perfect		
Mood	Indicative	Indicative	Indicative
	Subjunctive	Subjunctive	Subjunctive
	Optative	(Optative)	(Optative)
	Imperative	Imperative	Imperative

The labels given in the table are those attested in the descriptions of AG, PG and SMG, however some of the mentioned categories are the same in functional terms, but morphologically are different. Thus, e.g. the AG future is morphologically different from its MG and PG counterparts. That means that there is continuity in the functional category, even if there has been formal replacement.

Tense and aspect systems are closely connected in Greek. Both tense and aspect are concerned with time, but in very different ways, the difference is "as one between situation-internal time (aspect) and situation-external time (tense)".[10] Greek as assumed possesses a verbal system organized on the basis of aspect, with tense playing

---

[10] B. Comrie, *Aspect. An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems* (Cambridge 2001) 5.

only a secondary part,[11] and it does have morphological means of expressing aspectual opposition.

AG possessed a tripartite aspectual system, expressed by the three stems of the verb: a) the stem of present (i.e. imperfective) for duration, b) the stem of perfect for results, and c) the stem of aorist (i.e. perfective) for completeness. From these stems the forms of infinitive, participle, optative, subjunctive and imperative were formed. MG has lost the perfect stem, and there is only binary opposition of PFV/IPFV, running through all tenses, moods and nonfinite forms. In PG the distinction of stems is also distributed between imperfective and perfective.

AG formed all perfect tenses monolectically, except of the future perfect tense of active verbs, SMG has only periphrastic formation, while Pontic lacks perfect tenses. However some scholars regard the syntagms consisting of the auxiliary verbs *éxo* 'I have', *íme* 'I am' in corresponding tense for active and passive respectively, and passive participle of the main verb, as perfect forms.[12] In comparison with SMG perfect, all these forms are more static, rather than dynamic. It is worth mentioning that the forms with the auxiliary verbs *eimí* 'I am' and *éxo* 'I have' used with participles or infinitive are found in AG as well and used to denote present, past and future perfect, see, *eíxe labón, eíxe katastrepsaménos, esómeta egnokótes* etc.[13]

One of the main innovations is formation of future. In AG future tense is pure morphological category with no aspectual distinctions, while is SMG and Pontic it has become morphosyntactic. The

---

[11] A. Moser, 'The changing relationship of tense and aspect in the history of Greek', *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 61:1 (2008) 3.

[12] See R. Dawkins, 'Notes on the study of the Modern Greek of Pontos', *Byzantion* 6 (1931) 389-400; D. Oikonomidis, *Γραμματική της ελληνικής δια-λέκτου του Πόντου* (Athens 1958) 285-6; A. Revithiadou and V. Spyropoulos, *Οφίτικη, Πτυχές της γραμματικής δομής μιας ποντιακής διαλέκτου* (Athens 2012) 84-6; K. Topkhara, *Ι γραματικη τι Ρομεικυ τι Ποντεικυ τι γλοσας* (Rostov-Don 1932) 57.

[13] The examples adapted from A. Floros, *Ιστορικό και συγκριτικό συντα-κτικό αρχαίας, νέας ελληνικής και λατινικής* (Athens 1988) 161-5 and Chantraine, *Ιστορική μορφολογία*, 242.

development of future periphrases caused the spread of aspectual distinctions to the future tense, which is often seen "as a sign of the growing importance of aspect"[14] in Greek. However, this distinction is not characteristic to Pontic, where the aspectual opposition of PFV/IPFV, is restricted only to the past tense. See table 2 for the formation of future in Ancient, Pontic and SMG.

Table 2. Future formation in AG, PG and SMG

	AG morphological	PG morphosyntactic	SMG morphosyntactic
future tense	*yrápso*	*θa yráfto*	*θa yráfo* *θa yrápso*
aspectual distinction	neutral	neutral	PFV/IPFV
stem	PFV	IPFV	PFV/IPFV

In AG Future stem is formed by adding the suffix -s, which is used also for formation of the first aorist stem, however, morphologically they seem to be different: many verbs which are formed in the future with suffix -s, do not possess that suffix in aorist, e.g. *ákso, eleúsomai, peísomai* and *θéso* have nothing common with aorists égagon, *élθon, épaθon* and *eθéka*.[15] The suffix -s could be regarded as an aspectual marker, i.e. marker of one member of an aspectual opposition, namely of the PFV, but the AG future is aspectually neutral. So, it can be only etymologically derived from the aorist (i.e. perfective) stem.[16]

In AG perfective non-past developed into future tense irrespective of aspect. In SMG on the contrary the development of syntactic formation caused differentiation of aspects in the future, subsequently changing basic tense distinction, from past – non-past to present – past

---

[14] Moser, 'The changing relationship', 5.

[15] Chantraine, Ιστορική μορφολογία, 292.

[16] This explanation seems to be plausible to Comrie, *Aspect*, 67.

– future. In Pontic the formation of future is periphrastic without aspectual differentiation. As a result of this formation, basic tense distinction in Pontic is between past and non-past, just as it was in AG.

The future tense is closely connected with the subjunctive mood, the periphrastic future formation originates in ancient subjunctive forms, thus in the example *θa δίδο, θa δόso* 'I shall give', *δίδο* and *δόso* are ancient subjunctive mood forms of the verb *δίδomi* 'to give'[17] and even particle θa etymologically is connected with the subjunctive particle na (see note 9). In PG subjunctive mood often replaces future tense to denote future action, in Romeyka, Pontic variety spoken by Muslims, "*na*-clauses are mainly used as future tense and more marginally as a complementation strategy".[18] Thus, the differentiation of the subjunctive mood and future tense is only in negative forms, where the negative particle min is used with subjunctive, while uk with the future.

Looking at the affinity of the future tense and subjunctive mood it seems to be natural that both future tense and subjunctive mood generalize one aspectual form, namely imperfective. However, some varieties of Pontic, do have perfective subjunctive mood, those of Tripolis, Amisos and Inepolis, e.g. *n' aníkso* 'to open'. In the varieties where perfective subjunctive is in use there also can be found PFV future, e.g. *θa anísko* 'I shall open', *θa kremáso* 'I shall hang' etc. Otherwise, PG has no PFV/IPFV distinction.[19]

The AG morphological formation of optative is not preserved not in SMG and neither in Pontic. However, according to Papadopoulos,[20] PG possesses optative, only formation of optative is periphrastic. It is formed by the particles *as* or *na* and RPS or PST of the main verb, e.g. *as élepa to peδí* 'I wish I had seen the child'. But, in such

---

[17] Chantraine, *Ιστορική μορφολογία*, 303.

[18] Sitaridou, 'The Romeyka infinitive', 36.

[19] See A. Papadopoulos, *Ιστορική γραμματική της Ποντικής διαλέκτου* (Athens 1955) 69-70; Oikonomidis, *Γραμματική*, 282; D. Tombaidis, *Η Ποντιακη διάλεκτος. Διαλεκτικά χαρακτηριστικά, κατάταξη ιδιωμάτων, διαλεκτικα κείμενα* (Athens 1988) 51-2.

[20] Papadopoulos, *Ιστορική γραμματική*, 70.

case, if we mean by the optative '*as*' periphrases, it can be find in MG as well. The most important is that there is no AG optative morphology involved not in Pontic neither in SMG. That means that optative use in Pontic is just an innovation, to which some scholars give the same label.

Voice system of AG is not preserved neither in SMG, nor in Pontic. Pontic and SMG are assumed to have morphological category of active and passive and semantic category (diathesis) of active, passive and middle. Sometimes the morphological category of passive is referred as medio-passive in grammatical descriptions of MG and Pontic, because it combines morphological and semantic features of AG passive and middle voice. There are also deponent verbs, both in Pontic and SMG.

The obvious differences of SMG from AG are also the loss of the infinitive and of most of the participles, which were inflected systematically for tense and aspect. In PG, the infinitive is still active in some varieties. Tombaidis[21] claims that infinitive forms are rarely used, and considers them not to be functional elements of the dialect. Still, the infinitive is productively used in Romeyka, spoken today in Turkey.[22]

The use of the infinitives in Pontic is subdivided into several cases, mainly:

(a) as complement to verbs expressing wishes, so called volitionals; In Romeyka they are restricted to past tense volitionals, e.g. *utš eθélesa* 'I didn't want'[23];

(b) as complement to modals *eporó* 'can/may' and *prépi* 'must'. In

[21] D. Tombaidis, 'L'infinitive dans le dialecte grec du Pont Euxin', in *Balkan Studies 18* (1977) 155-74; Tombaidis, Η Ποντιακή διάλεκτος, 58-9.

[22] See Mackridge, 'Prolegomena', 115-37; P. Mackridge, 'Τα Ποντιακά στη σημερινή Τουρκία: Αρχαία στοιχεία στο ιδίωμα του Όφη', Αρχείον Πόντου 46 (1995) 153-61; Sitaridou, 'The Romeyka infinitive', 23-73 and I. Sitaridou, 'Modality, antiverdicality and complementation: The Romeyka infinitive as a negative polarity item', *Lingua 148* (2014) 118-46.

[23] See P. Mackridge, 'The Greek spoken in the region of Of (Pontus)', in A.-F. Christidis, M. Arapopulu and J. Janulupulu (eds.) *Dialect Enclaves of the Greek Language* (Athens 1999) 102; Sitaridou, 'Modality', 126.

Romeyka they are again restricted to negated past tense modals;

(c) as part of syntagms with *íxa* 'I had': *an íxa* 'if I had', *na íxa* 'even if' in counterfactuals;

(d) after conjunction *prin* 'before'[24];

The *prin* clauses are regarded as especially striking by Sitaridou because it is a continuation of the 'prin cum Aorist infinitive construction' of Classical Greek, which was extremely productive in Hellenistic Greek, and became obsolete by medieval times.[25]

It is assumed that the survival of the infinitive must be archaic feature that shows continuity with AG.

There are also examples when the infinitive form agrees with the subject by adding the suffixes of the past tenses. Thus, it loses the non-finite function, if one defines non-finite as 'non-indicating person'.[26] Romeyka, in addition to plain (prototypical) infinitives, has also inflected and personal infinitives.[27] The last ones could be also a result of Turkish influence, because it also possesses inflected infinitives,[28] though they are inflected not for verbal, but for nominal agreement in person and number. This issue has been investigated in details by Sitaridou,[29] who showed with straight argumentation line, that the Romeyka infinitive is not the result of contact with Turkish.

In MG the infinitive does not exist. Some scholars[30] try to find traces of the historical infinitive in perfect forms, where it survives as a perfect participle, e.g. in the forms like *éxi yrápsi* 'he has written'

---

[24] Oikonomidis, *Γραμματική*, 271-2; Revithiadou and Spyropoulos, *Οφίτικη*, 111-12; Sitaridou, 'Modality', 135-6.

[25] Sitaridou, 'The Romeyka infinitive', 27, 46-8; Sitaridou, 'Modality', 135-6.

[26] Mackridge, 'Prolegomena', 127.

[27] Sitaridou, 'The Romeyka infinitive', 48.

[28] See J. Kornfilt, *Turkish* (London/New York 1997) 51, 55, 384, 392 for the agreement of non-finite forms in Turkish.

[29] Sitaridou, 'The Romeyka infinitive', 48-56.

[30] Moser, *The History of the Perfect Perifrases*, 1-5, 205-43; U. Hinrichs, *Handbuch der Südosteuropa-Linguistik* (Weisbaden 1999) 61-2.

and *éxi yraftí* 'it has been written', indicating the two voices active and medio-passive respectively.

As it can be observed the verbal system of AG is not preserved in whole not in SMG, neither in Pontic. The obvious changes are the development of various periphrases, those of future and perfect, and the loss of some categories, like optative, non-finite forms, the aspectual category expressed by the perfect stem. The main differences are focused in: (a) formation of future tense in Pontic and SMG, (b) existence of PFV/IPFV distinction in future in SMG, (c) lack of perfect tenses in PG, (d) formation of perfect tenses in SMG, (e) lack of ancient optative both in Pontic and SMG, (f) survival of infinitive in some varieties of Pontic, otherwise extinct in PG and SMG.

3. An overview of the RomGe verbal system

The aim of this section is to show how RomGe fits in the above described picture of the Greek verbal morphology. Generally, RomGe typologically shows all the traits characteristic to Pontic. In RomGe the basic tense distinction morphologically is between past and non-past, just as it is in Pontic. Consider the following examples for active voice instances: *kalachévo* 'to talk' – *ekaláchevna, ekaláchepsa; evtáyo* 'to do, to make' – *epína, epíka; eyrikó* 'to understand' – *eyríkana, eyríksa; teró* 'to look, to see' – *etérna, etéresa*, etc. RomGe has also passive voice and deponent verbs as well, like *asxolúme* 'to deal', *afukrúme* 'to listen', *vóskume* 'to graze', etc.

The marker of passive *-ume/-úme* in RomGe often appears in different form owing to phonological alterations:

(a) with epenthesis: *-y-* between vowels, after the change of the stem of the word, generally in the verbs ending in *-ízo/-ázo*, e.g. *alázo → alá-y-ume* 'to change', *furkízo → furki-y-ume* 'to sink';

(b) with epenthesis: *-k-*, generally in the verbs ending in *-évo*, e.g. *mazévo → mazév-k-ume* 'to collect', *yurévo → yurév-k-ume* 'to set', *toplaévo → toplaév-k-ume → toplaéfkume* 'to gather'. There are also instances of adding *-k-* to the aorist stem of the verb, e.g. *klóθo → klós-k-ume* 'to return', *lúzo → lús-k-ume → lúshkume* 'to bath', thus ressembling the AG formation with *-sk*;

and *éxi γraftí* 'it has been written', indicating the two voices active and medio-passive respectively.

As it can be observed the verbal system of AG is not preserved in whole not in SMG, neither in Pontic. The obvious changes are the development of various periphrases, those of future and perfect, and the loss of some categories, like optative, non-finite forms, the aspectual category expressed by the perfect stem. The main differences are focused in: (a) formation of future tense in Pontic and SMG, (b) existence of PFV/IPFV distinction in future in SMG, (c) lack of perfect tenses in PG, (d) formation of perfect tenses in SMG, (e) lack of ancient optative both in Pontic and SMG, (f) survival of infinitive in some varieties of Pontic, otherwise extinct in PG and SMG.

3. An overview of the RomGe verbal system

The aim of this section is to show how RomGe fits in the above described picture of the Greek verbal morphology. Generally, RomGe typologically shows all the traits characteristic to Pontic. In RomGe the basic tense distinction morphologically is between past and non-past, just as it is in Pontic. Consider the following examples for active voice instances: *kalachévo* 'to talk' – *ekaláchevna, ekaláchepsa; evtáyo* 'to do, to make' – *epína, epíka; eγrikó* 'to understand' – *eγríkana, eγríksa; teró* 'to look, to see' – *etérna, etéresa*, etc. RomGe has also passive voice and deponent verbs as well, like *asxolúme* 'to deal', *afukrúme* 'to listen', *vóskume* 'to graze', etc.

The marker of passive *-ume/-úme* in RomGe often appears in different form owing to phonological alterations:

(a) with epenthesis: *-γ-* between vowels, after the change of the stem of the word, generally in the verbs ending in *-ízo/-ázo*, e.g. *alázo → alá-γ-ume* 'to change', *furkízo → furki-γ-ume* 'to sink';

(b) with epenthesis: *-k-*, generally in the verbs ending in *-évo*, e.g. *mazévo → mazév-k-ume* 'to collect', *γurévo → γurév-k-ume* 'to set', *toplaévo → toplaév-k-ume → toplaéfkume* 'to gather'. There are also instances of adding *-k-* to the aorist stem of the verb, e.g. *klóθo → klós-k-ume* 'to return', *lúzo → lús-k-ume → lúshkume* 'to bath', thus ressembling the AG formation with *-sk*;

(c) with epenthesis: -*i*- in the verbs of second conjugation, e.g. *aɣapó* → *aɣap-í-ume* 'to love', *eɣrikó* → *eɣrik-í-ume* 'to understand';

(d) in some verbs, namely those ending in -*óno*, it is added directly to the stem without derivational affix, e.g. *skotóno* → *skot-úme* 'to kill', *telióno* → *teli-úme* 'to finish', *tsakóno* → *tsak-úme* 'to break', *tsupóno* → *tsup-úme* 'to close, to lock'. This formation is regarded by Horrocks[31] as one of the archaic features preserved in Pontic, as these verbs originally had ending in -*óo* and then have been replaced by formation in -*óno*.

In RomGe there is a tendency of replacement of the derivational verbal affixes, namely, -*áz*-, -*íz*-, -*on*-, by the passive voice markers. Sometimes these affixes are fully replaced, as in the case with -*on*-, as shown in the above examples, sometimes only consonant part of the derivational affix is replaced by the epenthesis of the passive voice markers.

Comparing the general categories of Greek TAM system presented in the table 1, the following findings should be mentioned with regards to the RomGe verbal paradigm:

(a) RomGe possesses the tense system of PG, including the loss of perfect tenses and aspectually neutral periphrastic future, with one peculiarity – the use of different forms of the particle *θa*, namely: *θa/θ-/a*, characteristic to the variety of Chaldia[32] and parallel use of *na*-clauses to denote future, characteristic to Romeyka[33]; see (1a, b, c and 2) for the examples

(1) a.

ke	*eɣó*	*pu*	*θa*	*páɣo*
and	1:SG.NOM	where	FUT	go:1.SG

'and where shall I go?'

---

[31] G. Horrocks, *Greek. A History of the Language and its Speakers* (West Sussex 2010) 399.

[32] G. Drettas, 'The Greek-Pontic dialect group', in A.-F. Christidis, M. Arapopulu and J. Janulupulu (eds.) *Dialect Enclaves of the Greek Language* (Athens 1999) 94.

[33] See Mackridge, 'The Greek spoken in the region of Of (Pontus)', 102; Sitaridou, 'The Romeyka infinitive', 36.

[Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-CL-00000-C16]

b.

do	*θ=evtáyo*	*na*	*min*	*voiθóy=ats*
what	FUT=do:1.SG	to	NEG	help:1.SG=3:M./F.PL.ACC

'What shall I do? Shall not I help them?'

[Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B25]

c.

ki	*ópu*	*a*	*pas*	*ðéva*
and	where	FUT	go:2.SG	go:IMP.PFV:2.SG

'You can go whenever you want'

[Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-A10]

(2)

tris	*fitités*	*na*	*evyálts*
three:M./F/NGEN	student:M.PL.NGEN	FUT	take out:2.SG

as=ospít

from=house:N.SG.NGEN

'You will take out three students from house'

[Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-B25]

The aspectual distinction of perfective and imperfective is restricted only to the past tenses and indicative mood. The imperative mood is formed from the PFV or IPFV stem, mostly from PFV, but it does not implicate aspectual opposition, one form is generalized for the whole paradigm. Imperative of the perfective stem is formed by adding AG imperative marker of aorist -(s)on (see discussion in the section 4) or without this marker for a subset of irregular verbs, see (3) and (4) respectively. The IPFV stem is used only in the verbs of second conjugation, they are formed by adding thematic vowel -a or -i /-ei/, the last one is often omitted, see (5a and b).

(3)

mi	*kles*	*mana=m*	*de*
NEG	cry:2.SG	mother:F.SG.NGEN=CL.1.S	what
		G:GEN	

epéθana	*klápson*	*men*	*do*
die:PFV.PST:1.SG	cry:IMP:2.SG	1:SG.ACC	what

epóna
hurt:IPFV.PST:1.SG

'Don't cry mother, because I died, cry, because I suffered'

[Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-CL-2-000-A03]

(4)

épar	*óti*	*θelts*
take:IMP:2.SG	that	want:2.SG

'Take whatever you want'

[Skopeteas and Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B21]

(5)

a.

oróta	*atén*	*natéla*	*do*	*xronía*
ask:IMP:2.SG	3:F.SG.ACC	natela:F.SG.NGEN	what	year:N.PL.NGEN

en
be:3.SG

'Ask her, Natela, what year is'

[Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TXT-AN-2-000-B25]

b.

téren[34]	*t=emétera*	*ta*	*frúktän*
see:IMP:2.SG	DEF:N.PL.NGEN=POSS.1.PL:N.PL	DEF:N.PL.NGEN	fruit:N.PL.ACC_Russian
do	*kalá*	*in*	
what	good:N.PL.NGEN	be:3	

'See, what good fruits we have'

[Skopeteas and Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B21]

The AG perfect stem is lost, just as in SMG and PG;

(b) RomGe has four moods: two of them are morphologically marked: indicative and imperative, while two others

---

[34] Tombaidis mentions that the imperative of the verb *teró* 'to see', is *téri* with contracted form *tér*, or *téren*, see Tombaidis, *Η Ποντιακή διάλεκτος*, 54. In RomGe only the last one exists.

subjunctive and optative have periphrastic formation. There is no AG optative preserved, RomGe optative follows the patterns of Pontic, it is used with particle *na* (of subjunctive mood) and *as* (of optative). Both particles are used with main verb in PRS.IPFV or PST.IPFV, mostly in the PST, see (6) & (7).

(6)

o	*ðéskalon*	*epínen=ats*	*maθímata*
DEF:M.SG.	teacher:M.SG.	make:IPFV.PST:3.SG=3:M.	lesson:N.PL.NG
NOM	ACC	/F.PL.ACC	EN
na	***maθénan***	*ta*	*kirchítika*
SUBJ	learn:IPFV.PS	DEF:N.PL.NGEN	Georgian:N.PL.
	T:3.PL		NGEN

'The teacher gave them lessons so that they could study Georgian.'

[Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-PP-00000-C09]

(7)

mánaxon	*éleyan*	***as***	***en***	*nerón*
only	say:IPFV.PST:3.PL	OPT	be:3.SG	water:N.SG.NGEN
ke	*ksíla*			
and	wood:N.PL.NGEN			

''It must have only water and wood' - they used to say'

[Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TXT-AN-00000-B25]

The interesting examples have been attested in corpus, where optative mood is expressed with the both particles *na/as* and AG imperfect of the so called contract verbs *teró/léyo* albeit without augment, see 8a & b)

(8) a.

pros	*mían*	*epíya*	***na***	***terón***
towards	once	go:PFV.PST:1.SG	SUBJ	see:IPFV.PST:1.SG
do	*en*	*ekeká*		
what	be:3.SG	there		

'Once I went to see what is there'

[Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-FM-00000-A04]

b.

do	*atóra*	***as***	*léyon*
what	now	OPT	say: IPFV.PST:1.SG

'What to tell you now?'

      [Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-LG-00000-A04]

(c) No infinitive forms are attested in RomGe unlike other PG varieties. In RomGe the traces of infinitive could be find in some examples, namely those of nominalized infinitives.[35] The use of the articular infinitive is characteristic to Medieval Greek.[36] However, these forms can be replaced by subjunctive mood as well. The peculiarity of RomGe is that it often uses Russian infinitives in the same syntactical environment, which can be replaced by subjunctive clauses.[37]

The main findings about the RomGe verbal system within Pontic are summarized in the table 3.

Table 3. The typology of RomGe

	PG	RomGe	SMG
Use of different particles to denote future	√ $\theta a/a$ (Chaldia variety)	√ $\theta a/a$	X θa
Using of na clauses in future	√ (Romeyka)	√	X
No distinction of PFV/IPFV except of past tenses	√	√	X
Stem in the future	IPFV (cf. AG: PFV)	IPFV	PFV/IPFV

[35] See Berikashvili, *Morphological Aspects*, 72.

[36] Sitaridou, 'The Romeyka infinitive', 44.

[37] See Berikashvili, 'Loan verbs adaptation' for the discussion.

Loss of ancient perfect stem	√	√	√
Lack of perfect tenses	√ (traces of some AG forms, regarded as perfect)	√	X
Morphological distinction past – non-past	√	√	√
Morphological formation of indicative and imperative	√	√	√
Use of AG imperative marker for aorist	√	√	X
Periphrastic formation of subjunctive and optative	√	√	√
Sporadic use of ancient imperfect (with PG optative)	X	√	X
No ancient optative preserved	√	√	√
Infinitive retention	√ (Romeyka)	X (traces: nominalized form of INF)	X (traces: fossilized form in perfect

			periphrases)
Active and (medio)-passive voice	√ (unlike AG)	√	√
Use of the ancient passive in -úme	√	√	X
Use of AG passive forms in aorist	√	√	X
Use of temporal augment	√	√	X

From the results of our investigation it can be observed, that RomGe has all characteristic features of Chaldia sub-dialect. This claim is based on different factors, namely: (1) historical, as the most of the settlements in Georgia were founded by the Refugees from Chaldia; and (2) typological as most descriptive grammars of Pontic (those of Papadopoulos, Oikonomidis and Drettas[38]) reflect the data mostly from this variety.[39] Still RomGe has some peculiarities that distinguishes this variety from others and in some cases brings it closer to Romeyka, which typologically is different. The other peculiarity is the influence of contact languages, however the further investigation yet is needed to reveal how big is the impact on verbal level.

4. Aorist in PG

PG aorist refers to events that have taken place in the past, without regard to the state resulting from them. It shows completed action and includes past tense and perfective aspect, which are expressed by means of inflectional morphology. Tense is mainly expressed in the ending, which also encodes subject-agreement, while aspect mainly in the suffixes -s and -θ for active and passive voice respectively or in alterations and suppletions of the stem. Based on the corpus, the

---

[38] G. Drettas, *Aspects Pontiques* (Paris 1997).

[39] See Berikashvili, *Morphological Aspects*, 102-9 for the detailed discussion.

observed data of aorist formation in active verbs reflect the following tripatrite distinction in RomGe:

a) a subset of verbs, which follow sigmatic formation, see (9)

(9) *araévo – eráepsa* 'to search', *ðevázo – eðévasa* 'to read', *ðulévo – eðúlepsa* 'to work', *eɣrikó – eɣríksa* 'to understand', *eporó – epóresa / epórtsa* 'can', *orotó – erótisa* 'to ask' etc.

b) a subset of verbs which add past inflectional markers directly to stem or with stem alteration, see (10a and b respectively)

(10) a. *epéro – epéra* 'to take', *evɣálo – é(v)ɣala* 'to take of', *kativéno – ekatíva* 'to come down', *stílo – éstila* 'to send', etc.

b. *afíno – eféka* 'to leave', *apoðávéno – epiðéva* 'to leave', *evrísko – évra / ívra* 'to find', etc.

and, c) a subset of verbs which use suppletive stems to form aorist, see (11)

(11) *elépo – íða* 'to see', *evtáɣo – epíka* 'to do/to make', *féro – énga* 'to bring', etc.

However, there are some verbs which possess more than one options to form aorist, this can be explained mainly by the influence of SMG, because one of the options is generally that of SG see (12).

(12) *ðíɣo – eðéka / éðosa* 'to give', *embéno – eséva / mbíka* 'to come in', *enjéno – ekséva / vɣíka* 'to go out', etc.

Functionally, there are instances of the inceptive, terminative and telic actions, which are captured by aorist in RomGe, otherwise it is exponent mainly of perfectivity. The difference of PG from SMG as mentioned in the sections 2 and 3 for Pontic and RomGe respectively is that it lacks perfect tenses. In RomGe perfect is generally replaced by perfective past, i.e. aorist. This tendency generally is characteristic to SMG as well, where perfect normally can be replaced by perfective without any change of meaning. However, this cannot be equally

acceptable in all cases. Actually, in comparison with perfect, aorist does not show explicit link with the present. For the comparison of SMG[40] use of perfect and aorist with Pontic, namely RomGe see (13a and b) and (14a and b)

(13) a.

kurástika	/	**éxo**	**kurastí**	(SMG)
get_tired:PASS.PFV.PST:1.SG		have:1.SG	get_tired:DEP:3.SG	
polí		*símera*		
much		today		

'I got tired today'

b.

to	koríts	[...]	káθese	(RomGe)
DEF:N.SG.NGEN	girl:N.SG.NGEN		sit:PFV.PST:3.SG	

enengásten
get_tired:PASS.PFV.PS
T:3.SG

'The girl [...] sat down, (she) got tired.
[Skopeteas and Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TRA-PC-00000-B21]

(14) a.

o	*Kazantzákis*	**éɣrapse**	/	(SMG)
DEF:M.SG.NO	Kazantzakis:M.SG.N	write:PFV.PST:3.		
M	OM	SG		
éxi	**ɣrápsi**	*ðéka*		*miθistorímata*
have:3.SG	write:DEP:3.SG	ten		novel:N.SG.NG
				EN

'Kazantzakis wrote ten novels.'

b.

avtó	to	**éɣrapsen**	o	(RomGe)

---

[40] For use of perfect and aorist in SMG see P. Mackridge, *The Modern Greek Language. A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek* (Oxford 1985) 116-17, 129; D. Holton, P. Mackridge and E. Φιλιππάκη-Warburton, *Γραμματική της Ελληνικής Γλώσσας* (Athens 2000) 229-30. The examples adapted from mentioned works, transcription and glosses inserted.

3:N.SG.NGEN	DEF:N.SG.NG EN	write:PFV.PST:3 .SG	DEF:M.SG. NOM
ksakustós	*siɣraféas*	*o*	*kanonídis*
famous:M.SG. NOM	writer:M.SG. NOM	DEF:M.SG.NOM	Kanonidis: M.SG.NOM

'This was written by the famous writer Kanonidis.'

[Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-CL-2-000-B03]

Formally, aorist has preserved a number of archaic features, which are not attested in SMG, but are common for other Pontic varieties. Among the archaic features which are characteristic to the PG aorist system and are mentioned in different works[41] are:

1. AG temporal augment, cf.

    lúo – *élusa* 'to unfasten, untie, solve'; *ágo* – *égagon* 'to take smb./smth' (AG)

    serévo – *esérepsa* 'to gather'; *aɣapó* – *eɣápesa* 'to love' (PG)

    ɣráfo – *éɣrapsa* 'to write'; *arxízo* – *árxisa* 'to begin' (SMG);

2. archaic suppletions, some of which are ancient survivals, while others are "due to a post-Classical merger between two separate verbs"[42]

    féro – *énga* 'to bring' (PG), cf. *énenga* (AG), *éfera* (SMG)

    válo – *esénga* 'to put' (PG), from *eís* 'in' + *énenga* (AG), *évala* (SMG);

3. the ancient imperative in -(*s*)*on*, cf.

    eftáɣo – *píson* 'to do/make' (PG), *poiéson* (AG), *káne* (SMG)

    válo – *válon* 'to put' (PG), *bálon* (AG), *vále* (SMG);

4. the ancient aorist passive forms, which have resisted the insertion of -*ik* unlike MG, cf.

    foɣúme – *efovéθa* 'to be afraid', *ephobéthen* (AG), *fovíθika* (SMG);

---

[41] Mackridge, 'Prolegomena', 125-7; Tombaidis, *Η Ποντιακή διάλεκτος*, 49, 53, 58; G. Argiriadis, *Νεοελληνική γλώσσα, ιστορικές και γλωσσολογικές διαστάσεις* (Thessaloniki 1990) 197-8; N. Andriotis, *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής γλώσσας (τέσσερις μελέτες)* (Thessaloniki 2005) 101-2; P. Bortone, 'Greek with no models, history or standard: Muslim Pontic Greek', in A. Georgakopoulou and M. Silk (eds.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present* (London 2009) 84-5; Horrocks, *Greek*, 398-404.

[42] Mackridge, 'Prolegomena', 126.

5.   the relic of the aorist middle form in the verb yínome[43]
     yínome – ejéndone / éndone 3.SG 'to become' (PG), cf. *egéneto* 3.SG
     (AG), *éjine* 3.SG (SMG);

The archaic features which could be added on the basis of our
investigation in RomGe, and which, to my knowledge, are not
mentioned in other works, are:

1.   the use of reduplicate form of temporal augment in the
     preverbian verbs, cf.
     amphignoéo – ēmphegnóisa 'to doubt', *amphisbetéo – ēmphesbétesa* 'to
     dispute' (AG)
     anaspálo – enéspala 'to forget', *apoméno – epémna* 'to stay' (PG)
     amfiválo – amfévala 'to doubt', *apolamváno – apólavsa* 'to enjoy'
     (SMG)

2.   second aorist forms of ancient verbs on *-mi*, cf.
     ðíyo – eðéka 'to give' (PG), *édoka* (AG) from ancient verb *dídomi*,
     éðosa (SMG)
     afíno – eféka 'to leave' (PG), *ephéka* (AG) from ancient verb *aphiémi*,
     áfisa (SMG)

For more clear evidence of the AG traces attested in the aorist
formation in PG and contrasting it to RomGe consider table 4.

Table 4. Archaic features in PG aorist

	PG	RomGe	SMG
Temporal augment	√	√	X
Reduplicated temporal augment in compound verbs	√	√	X
Archaic suppletions	√	√	X
Ancient imperatives in *-(s)on*	√	√	X

---

[43] Mackridge, op.cit., 126.

Ancient aorist passives	√	√	X
II aorist of ancient verbs on -*mi*	√	√	X

The exponent of the past tenses in PG, like Ancient and Modern is the augment *e-*, it is used in both: past perfective and past imperfective and is a consistent marker of past time reference. It was used in AG and is a functional part of MG as well, but in SMG augment appears in order for antepenultimate stress to be attained. In RomGe the augment *e-* appears throught the whole paradigm and has not function of the stress carrier, cf. *edúlepsa*:PFV.PST:1.SG - *edúlepsame*:PFV.PST:1.PL 'to work'. Moreover, there is no restriction of assigning stress to the untepenultimate syllable in past tenses, e.g. *ekséva*:PFV.PST:1.SG 'to go out' – *echátepsen*:PFV.PST:3.SG 'to meet' – *ekatástrepsane*:PFV.PST:3.PL 'to destroy'.

The lack of the window restriction in some other Pontic varieties gives another picture. Thus, in Ophitic Pontic the augment *e-* shows up stressed throught the paradigm.[44] In RomGe, there are instances of stressed augment, see (15), although the stress is not obligatory.

(15)

ólä	*t-ála*	***éklepsane***
all:N.PL.NGEN	DEF:N.PL.NGEN-other:N.PL.NGEN	steal:PFV.PST:3.PL

'All other things have been stolen'

[Skopeteas and Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TXT-VL-00000-B21]

So, there seems to be variation with regards to the use of augment in Pontic varieties, in some varieties it is obligatory and stressed (as in Ophitic), others preserve this past tense exponent through the paradigm, but the stress is optional (as in RomGe), whereas in several varieties it alternates with zero, depending on stress, but not on word-size conditions (as in Amisos variety).[45] Generally it is assumed

---

[44] V. Spyropoulos and A. Revithiadou, 'The morphology of past in Greek', Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα 29 (Thessaloniki 2009) 115; Revithiadou and Spyropoulos, Οφίτικη, 52-3.

[45] Papadopoulos, Ιστορική γραμματική, 71.

that PG has obligatory use of the augment *e-*, the retention of unstressed augment depends also on PG general tendency to keep unstressed initial vowels, as e.g. in the word *ospít(in)* 'home'.[46]

PG has temporal augment, as in AG.[47] The same feature is attested in RomGe, see (16)

(16) *aftíno – épsa* 'to light', *andrízo – éndrisa* 'to marry', *aroθimó – eroθímesa* 'to become ill', *atlávo – etlápsa* 'to rename', etc.

In a similar way it might be with (a) the verbs beginning with *-o*, replacing it with the long *-ō* or (b) with the diphthong *-ei* in examples, which is pronounced as *-i* like *íða* 'I saw', *ípa* 'I said', etc. However, as Pontic generally, and RomGe specifically is spoken variety, it can not be distinguished by the pronunciation and there is hardly any writing system accepted for Pontic which can prove this.

Interestingly, in the preverbian forms, the temporal augment is reduplicated both at the beginning of the word and between the two parts of compound, just as it was in some verbs of AG, see (17a and b) for comparison of RomGe and AG.[48]

(17)   a. *amphignoéo – ēmphegnóisa* 'to doubt', *amphisbetéo – ēmphesbétesa* 'to dispute',
        anéchomai – ēneschómen 'to bear', *enoxléo – ēnōxlesa* 'to bother', etc. (AG)

        b. *anaspálo – enéspala* 'to forget', *apoðävéno – epiðéva* 'to leave', *apoméno – epémna* 'to stay', *apoθáno – epéθana* 'to die', etc. (RomGe)

Conversely if preverb begins with consonant, only one internal or external augment is attested, cf. *periéɣrafan* 'to describe' and *epróftasane* 'to manage'.

---

[46] Horrocks, *Greek,* 399.

[47] For augment in AG see E. Schwyzer, *Greichische Grammatik, Bd. 1* (Munich 1953) 650-7.

[48] The AG examples adapted from M. Oikonomou, Γραμματική της αρχαίας ελληνικής (Thessaloniki 2008) 149.

Except of the instances of the temporal augment charachteristic to AG, a lot of archaic suppletions are used in RomGe, for more clear evidence from the corpus data see table 5.

Table 5. Archaic suppletions in RomGe

	PG	AG	SMG
válo 'to put'	*esénga*	from *eís* 'in' + *énenga* and not aorist of the same verb *ébalon*	*évala*
embéno 'to come in'	*eséva*	*esében*	*mbíka*
evjéno 'to go out'	*ekséva*	*exében*	*vyíka*
evyálo 'to take out'	*eksénga*	from *ek* 'out' + *énenga*	
eftáyo 'to do/make'	*epíka*	*epóiesa* aorist and perfect merged from the verb *poiéo, epoiēsa* (PFV.PST), *pepoiēka* (PRF)	*ékana*
krúo 'to hit'	*endóka*	from aorist of the verb *endídomi, enédoka* and not aorist of the same verb *ekroústhen*	*ékrusa*
féro 'to bring'	*énga*	*énenga*	*éfera*

It is worth mentioning that "one of the characteristic features of southeastern dialect complex is the retention of an ancient final nasal in various groups of words'.[49] PG preserved word-final -*n* with the PST.3.SG ending -*e*, see (18) for the example, just as it was used in the Ionic dialect of AG.[50]

(18)
éngen	*ta*	*kartófä*
bring:PFV.PST:3.SG	DEF:N.PL.NGEN	potato:N.PL.NGEN

'(He) brought potatoes'

[Berikashvili, Pontic interviews, PNT-TXT-TR-00000-B25]

---

[49] B. Newton, *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect* (Cambridge 1972) 99.

[50] See Argiriadis, Νεοελληνική γλώσσα, 43.

One other archaic feature is the use of ancient imperative (sigmatic and asigmatic) with the ending *-(s)on*. The formative *-on* is expressed without *-n* in the Ophitic variety, as there is generally a tendency to drop the original final *-n* not only in the verbs, but also in nouns.[51] In RomGe no examples are attested with droped *-n*, because it mainly preserves the last final *-n* in all variations both in nouns and verbs. See (19a and b) for the attested in the corpus ancient sigmatic and asigmatic imperatives respectively

(19) a. *aníkson* 'open', *aráepson* 'search', *kaláchepson* 'talk', *klápson* 'cry', *klíson* 'close', *kópson* 'cut', *rúkson* 'throw', *píson* 'do', *púltzon* 'sell'

   b. *Θékon* 'put', *féron* 'bring'

There are also other ancient imperatives preserved in Pontic and mentioned by Mackridge,[52] like ipé from the verb *léγo* 'to say/tell', which are not attested in RomGe, cf. *léγo – ipé* (PG Ophitic/Romeyka), *pea / péi* (RomGe) see (20) for the example, *eipé* (AG), *pes* (SMG).

(20)

δéa	*péi*	*ató*	*to*
go:IMP:2.SG	say: IMP:2.SG	3:N.SG.NGEN	DEF:M.SG.ACC
kíri=m			
father:M.SG.NNOM=C			
L.1.SG:GEN			

'Go and tell that to my father'
      [Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-CL-00000-A13]

There are also instances of the ancient imperative forms on *-s* formed from the second aorist of the ancient verbs on *-mi*, see (21)

(21) *δíγo – eδéka* 'to give' (PG), *édoka* (AG) from ancient verb dídomi, *éδosa* (SMG)
   IMP: *δos* (PG), *δos* (AG), *δos* (SMG)

---

[51] See Mackridge, 'Prolegomena', 124-5; Revithiadou and Spyropoulos, Οφίτικη, 80; Tombaidis, Η Ποντιακή διάλεκτος, 53.

[52] Mackridge, op.cit., 125.

afíno – *eféka* 'to leave' (PG), *ephéka* (AG) from ancient verb *aphiémi*, *áfisa* (SMG)

IMP: *afés* / *afs* (PG), *phes* (AG), *áfise* (SMG)

but cf. (22) where imperative follows asigmatic formation with the ending -*on*

(22) *θéko* – *eθéka* 'to put' (PG), *ethéka* (AG) from ancient verb *tithémi*, *éθesa* (SMG)

IMP: *θékon* (PG), *thes* (AG), **θése* (SMG)

The ancient aorist passive forms in Pontic are formed by adding passive marker -*θ*- to the stem, like AG -*θe*/-*θē*. In contrast with SMG, PG aorist passive has not merged with the perfect, resisting thus the insertion of -*ik*. These forms are productively used in Pontic, including the RomGe variety. For the evidence of the ancient aorist passive forms attested in the RomGe corpus data, consider table 6.

Table 6. AG aorist passives in RomGe

	PG	AG	SMG
γomúme 'to be filled'	*eγomóθa*	*egomóthen*	*jemístika* from *jemízo*
jenúme 'to be born'	*ejenéθa*	*egenéthen*	*jeníθika*
θimúme 'to remember'	*eθiméθa*	*enthiméthen*	*θimíθika*
kimúme 'to sleep'	*ekiméθa*	*ekiméthen*	*kimíθika*
pulíume 'to be sold'	*epuléθa*	*epoléthen*	*pulíθika*
skúme 'to stand up'	*eskóθa*	*eskóthen*	*sikóθika*
stékome 'to stand'	*estáθa*	*estáthen*	*stáθika*
foγúme 'to be afraid'	*efovéθa*	*ephobéthen*	*fovíθika*

The tendency to keep ancient passives in SMG was also expressed by some scholars, but although these forms were highly recommended by purists, they never have been used in spoken language.[53] On the contrary it is common and productive formation in Pontic. Moreover, one can observe pontic innovation of inserting -*γ*- in many verbs,

---

[53] Bortone, 'Greek with no models', 84.

where SMG has -*st*- or -*xt*- before the infix -*ik*-.[54] This peculiarity can be explained by the formation of passive verbs with the epenthesis of -*ɣ*- between vowels (see discussion in the section 3), which is kept in aorist as well, see table 7 for the aorist formation of such verbs in RomGe.

Table 7. Aorist passives with the epenthesis of -*ɣ*- in RomGe

		PG	SMG
PRS Active	PRS Passive	PFV.PST Passive	PFV.PST Passive
alázo 'to change'	*aláɣume*	*eláɣa*	*aláxtika*
axparázo 'to be frigthened'	*axparáɣume*	*exparáɣa*	–
kolízo 'to glue'	*kolí(ɣ)ume*	*ekolí(ɣ)a*	*kolíθika*[55]
tarázo 'to mix'	*taráɣume*	*etaráɣa*	*taráxtika*
tilízo 'to wrap'	*tilíɣume*	*etilíɣa*	*tilíxtika*
tserízo 'to tear'	*tseríɣume*	*etseríɣa*	–
xaláno 'to destroy'	*xaláɣume*	*exaláɣa*	*xalástika*
xorízo 'to divide, to separate'	*xoríɣume*	*exoríɣa*	*xorístika*

Two peculiarities can be also mentioned with regards to aorist of these verbs, namely (1) the stress is always penultimate to distinguish forms of the active imperfective past and passive perfective past, like, *exálaɣa*:ACT.IPFV.PST:1.SG 'I destroyed / I used to destroy' – *exaláɣa*:PASS.PFV.PST:1.SG 'I have been destroyed', and (2) there is a subset of verbs which have ancient aorist passive formation and use parallel form with the -*ɣ*-, like *stéko* 'to stand' from the PRS.PASS *stékume* – *estáθa*, *estáɣa*, cf. *stáθika* (SMG), see for the example (23)

(23)

ke	*bíka*	*puðén*	*estáɣa* [...]
NEG	come_in:PFV.PST:1.SG	nowhere	stand:PFV.PST:1.SG

---

[54] See Mackridge, 'Prolegomena', 126.

[55] The form *kolíθika* is from the verb *koláo* and not *kolízo* in SG. That is the reason for having -*θ*- and not -*st*- or -*xt*- in front of the infix -*ik*-.

'I did not enter anything, I stood [...] '

[Kotanidi et al., Pontic data collection, PNT-TXT-LG-00000-B08]

One generalisation that can be driven out from the observations is that contracted verbs (-áo, -éo, -óo, the last one in SMG was replaced by -óno) form passives by ending -θ- to the stem, thus repeating the AG formation, also some deponent verbs belong to this group, whereas those on -ázo, -ízo and some others (namely those on -áno) – by adding the epenthesis -γ-, following the innovation of PG. However, both groups resist the insertion of the infix -ik-, thus showing that ancient perfect forms have not merged with the aorist in Pontic.

The synchronic analysis of the dialect although implicated some instances used by the influence of SMG. Interestingly, there are not only parallel uses of Pontic and SMG forms, but also merged forms. The instances attested in the RomGe corpus show the process of alternation that happens in the dialect, see passive forms of jenó 'to born': ejenéθa → ejenéθika → ejeníθika → jeníθika.

5. Conclusion

In this article it was shown that one PG variety, Romeika, still spoken by Pontic-speaking community of Georgia, contains a lot of archaic features generally in verbal system and particularly in formation of aorist. It was also outlined that mostly these features are attested in all Pontic varieties with a little bit difference one from another and that RomGe typologically belongs to Chaldia sub-dialect of Pontic.

The main findings can be summarized as follows: (a) the AG verbal system is not preserved in whole not in SMG, neither in Pontic; (b) the obvious changes in SG are the development of various periphrases, those of future and perfect tenses, and subjunctive. In Pontic periphrases are used in future tense and subjunctive mood; (c) the AG future tense formation is not preserved neither in SMG, nor in Pontic. SMG future has aspectual distinction of perfective and imperfective, while Pontic has not; (d) the peculiarity of PG is apectual distinction restricted only to past tenses; (e) the difference of

PG system is the loss of perfect tenses (not AG, neither SMG perfect tenses are attested in Pontic); (f) the AG optative formation is lost both in Pontic and SMG; (g) RomGe has all characteristics of Pontic, however some of them are preserved only in some varieties, for instance, RomGe possess both *θa/a* and na formation of future, *θa/a* is characteristic to Chaldia sub-dialect, while *na* to Romeyka; (h) RomGe has a lot of archaic features, characteristic to Pontic as well, like, ancient passives, ancient imperatives, temporal augment etc.; (j) in aorist formation RomGe shows the following archaic features: archaic suppletions, ancient imperative in -s(*on*), ancient aorist passive forms, second aorist forms of ancient verbs on -*mi*.

The discussion was based on the corpus data, collected as a result of the original fieldwork in Georgia and Greece and covered mostly three points (a) comparison of Pontic verbal system with SMG, outlining the AG features; (b) investigation of RomGe typology, contrasting it to other PG varieties to reveal whether differences are attested; and, (c) analysis of the AG traits preserved in Pontic aorist in general, and contrasting it to RomGe. Made observations are essential for understanding the typology of verbal system in PG spoken by Pontic-speaking community of Georgia.

REFERENCES

1. Andriotis, N. *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής γλώσσας (τέσσερις μελέ-τες)*, Thessaloniki 2005.
2. Argiriadis, G. *Νεοελληνική γλώσσα, ιστορικές και γλωσσολογι-κές διαστάσεις*, Thessaloniki 1990.
3. Berikashvili, S. 'Morphological integration of Russian and Turkish nouns in Pontic Greek', *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 69:2, 2016.
4. Berikashivili, S. *Interviews in Pontic Greek*, (Corpus resource: TLA, Donated Corpora, XTYP Lab), Bielefeld 2016.
5. Berikashvili, S. *Morphological Aspects of Pontic Greek Spoken in Georgia*, Munich 2017.
6. Berikashvili, S. 'Loan verbs adaptation in Pontic Greek (spoken in Georgia)', in Kh. Tzitzilis and G. Papanastasiou (eds.) *Language Contact in the Balkans and Asia Minor*, Thessaloniki forthcoming.
7. Bortone, P. 'Greek with no models, history or standard: Muslim Pontic Greek', in A. Georgakopoulou and M. Silk (eds.), *Standard Languages and Language Standards: Greek, Past and Present*, London 2009.
8. Chantraine, P. *Ιστορική μορφολογία της ελληνικής γλώσσας*, Athens 1990.
9. Christidis, A. F. *Ιστορία της αρχαίας ελληνικής γλώσσας*, Thessaloniki 2010.
10. Comrie, B. Aspect. *An Introduction to the Study of Verbal Aspect and Related Problems*, Cambridge 2001.
11. Dawkins, R. 'Notes on the study of the Modern Greek of Pontos', *Byzantion* 6, 1931.
12. Drettas, G. *Aspects Pontiques*, Paris 1997.
13. Drettas, G. 'The Greek-Pontic dialect group', in A.-F. Christidis, M. Arapopulu and J. Janulupulu (eds.), *Dialect Enclaves of the Greek Language*, Athens 1999.
14. Floros, A. *Ιστορικό και συγκριτικό συντακτικό αρχαίας, νέας ελ-ληνικής και λατινικής*, Athens 1988.
15. Hinrichs, U. *Handbuch der Südosteuropa-Linguistik*, Weisbaden 1999.

16. Holton D., Mackridge P. and Φιλιππάκη-Warburton, E. *Γραμματική της Ελληνικής Γλώσσας* (Athens 2000)
17. Horrocks, G. Greek. *A History of the Language and its Speakers*, West Sussex 2010.
18. Janse, M. 'Aspects of Pontic Grammar', *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 3, 2002.
19. Kontossopoulos, N. 'Ποντιακή και Καππαδοκική', in M. Kopidakis (ed.), *Ιστορία της Ελληνικής γλώσσας*, Athens 1999.
20. Kornfilt, J. *Turkish*, London/New York 1997.
21. Kotanidi E., Berikashvili S., Böhm S., Lorentz J. and Skopeteas, S. Pontic data collection (Corpus resource: TLA, Donated Corpora, XTYP Lab), Bielefeld 2016.
22. Mackridge, P. *The Modern Greek Language. A Descriptive Analysis of Standard Modern Greek*, Oxford 1985.
23. Mackridge, P. 'Greek-speaking Moslems of north-east Turkey: Prolegomena to a study of the Ophitic sub-dialect of Pontic', *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 11, 1987.
24. Mackridge, P. 'Τα Ποντιακά στη σημερινή Τουρκία: Αρχαία στοιχεία στο ιδίωμα του Όφη', *Αρχείον Πόντου* 46, 1995.
25. Mackridge, P. 'The Greek spoken in the region of Of (Pontus)', in A.-F. Christidis, M. Arapopulu and J. Janulupulu (eds.) *Dialect Enclaves of the Greek Language*, Athens 1999.
26. Moser, A. *The History of the Perfect Periphrases in Greek*. PhD dissertation, Cambrdige 1988.
27. Moser, A. 'The changing relationship of tense and aspect in the history of Greek', *STUF – Language Typology and Universals* 61:1, 2008.
28. Newton, B. *The Generative Interpretation of Dialect*, Cambridge 1972.
29. Oikonomidis, D. *Γραμματική της ελληνικής διαλέκτου του Πόντου*, Athens 1958.
30. Oikonomou, M. *Γραμματική της αρχαίας ελληνικής*, Thessaloniki 2008.
31. Papadopoulos, A. *Ιστορική γραμματική της ποντικής διαλέκτου*, Athens 1955.
32. Revithiadou A. and Spyropoulos, V. Οφίτικη, *Πτυχές της γραμ-*

ματικής δομής μιας ποντιακής διαλέκτου, Athens 2012.

33. Sitaridou, I. 'Greek-speaking enclaves in Pontus today: The documentation and revitalization of Romeyka', in M. C. Jones and S. Oglive (eds.), *Keeping Languages Alive. Documentation, Pedagogy, and Revitalization*, Cambridge 2013.

34. Sitaridou, I. 'The Romeyka infinitive. Continuity, contact and change in the Hellenic varieties of Pontus', *Diachronica* 31-1, 2014.

35. Sitaridou, I. 'Modality, antiverdicality and complementation: The Romeyka infinitive as a negative polarity item', *Lingua* 148, 2014.

36. Skopeteas S. and Berikashvili, S. *Interviews in Pontic Greek (Corpus resource: TLA, Donated Corpora, XTYP Lab)*, Bielefeld 2016.

37. Spyropoulos V. and Revithiadou, A. 'The morphology of past in Greek', *Μελέτες για την ελληνική γλώσσα* 29, Thessaloniki 2009.

38. Schwyzer, E. *Greichische Grammatik*, Bd. 1, Munich 1953.

39. Tombaidis, D. 'L'infinitive dans le dialecte grec du Pont Euxin', in *Balkan Studies* 18, 1977.

40. Tombaidis, D. Η *Ποντιακή διάλεκτος. Διαλεκτικά χαρακτηριστικά, κατάταξη ιδιωμάτων, διαλεκτικά κείμενα*, Athens 1988.

41. Topkhara, K. Ι *γραματικη τι Ρομεικυ τι Ποντεικυ τι γλοσας*, Rostov-Don 1932.