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Abstract

We investigate case and clausal complementation systems in Cunda Turkish spoken in Western Turkey by refugees relocated from Crete (Greece) in and after 1923. Unlike
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Standard Turkish, Cunda Turkish exhibits unpredictable dative–locative and dative–accusative shifts. We claim these shifts are due to interference of the heritage language, Cretan Greek. Cunda Turkish subordination patterns also differ from those of the standard variety. Contrary to the case in Standard Turkish, nominalizing suffixes are employed only when selecting (matrix) predicates are non-factive veridical ones. Non-veridical predicates, on the other hand, select subordinate clauses that are in optative mood, a preexisting Turkish pattern which has nevertheless been reinforced by Cretan Greek impact. Finally, clauses that are complements to factive predicates are indicative clauses headed by an optional complementizer, a pattern which is extended to these clauses from factive adverbial clauses.

1 Introduction

Though early generative framework assumed an ideal speaker-listener environment where interlocutors are monolingual and are not affected by grammatically irrelevant conditions (cf. Chomsky 1965: 3), this paradigm has recently been shifted to a focus on multilingual societies where more than one language are spoken next to each other, and to multilingual speakers, who possess more than one language at some level of proficiency (a.o. Roeper 1999, Muysken 2000, Alexiadou & Lohndal 2016). A multilingual society inevitably brings language contact (Matras 2009 et seq) and a multilingual mind induces code-mixing (Muysken 2000, Alexiadou & Lohndal 2016). Both cases bring about the question as to which areas of grammar are resilient and which ones are vulnerable to contact/mixing. In this context, our aim is to provide a case study on language contact in a bilingual environment and to show in particular how a heritage language can influence two domains of grammar, case system and subordination strategies, of the target language. The languages in question are Cunda Turkish (hereafter CT) and Cretan Greek, which belong to distinct language families; Altaic and Indo-European respectively.

CT exhibits remarkable differences from Standard Turkish (henceforth ST) in its case system and subordination patterns, which, we propose, can be accounted for only if we invoke an analysis based on interference from the heritage language, Cretan Greek, which speakers are also fluent in. More specifically, we will first show that even though CT has exactly the same inventory of case markers as ST, there are unpredictable shifts between dative and locative, and dative and accusative. These shifts, however, are easily accounted for once we assume the influence of the Cretan Greek case system on the CT one. Second, we will show that CT shows considerable differences than ST in terms of subordination strategies by employing (i) finite indicative subordinate clauses and (ii) finite non-indicative subordinate clauses in environments in which ST
employs non-finite ones. Concerning the first difference, we will show that this is due to an extension of an already existing subordinate (adverbial) clause to complement clauses. Concerning the second one, we will argue that this is due to influence of Cretan Greek which uses subjunctive complement clauses in precisely the same environment. We will ultimately show that while ST makes a three-way distinction between complement clauses, CT makes a four-way distinction which can only be understood by taking into consideration the Cretan Greek interference.

The organization of the paper is as follows: In the rest of section 1, we will provide background information on Cunda Island, CT and its speakers, data collection methods as well as a brief list of differences between ST and CT. In section 2 we will focus on the case system of CT and its differences from that of ST, which, we will argue, are due to interference of Cretan Greek. In section 3 we investigate subordination patterns in CT. More specifically, in section 3.1, we will provide an overview of non-finite subordination strategies in this variety, which show little difference from those of ST. In section 3.2, we turn to finite subordinate clauses and analyze them as either extensions of a pre-existing pattern or as novel patterns emerged due to Cretan Greek influence. Section 4 concludes.

1.1 Cunda and CT

Cunda — also known as Moschinisi and Alibey Island — is within the Balıkesir province of Turkey on the Northern Aegean coast (Figure 1). CT, which constitutes the empirical focus of this paper, is spoken in Cunda island by a few hundred Muslim refugees relocated from various villages/towns of Crete (Greece) following the population exchange between Greece and Turkey, enacted by a supplementary protocol to the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923.2 3

![Figure 1. Cunda island where CT is spoken (small square) and the island of Crete where CT speakers are originally from (the rectangle).](image)

---

2 The term “Muslim refugees” is preferred by the authors to emphasize the fact that the population exchange that was enacted was based on religion (Muslim vs. Orthodox), although the informants may or may not identify themselves as such.

3 Around 500 of the local Orthodox Greek population in Cunda survived the annihilation that took place in September 1922 and escaped to the Greek island of Lesbos (Ralli 2006[1995], 2016; Clark 2006: 25)
1.2 Speaker profile and data collection

The claims and discussions throughout this paper are based on a fragment of a corpus of naturalistic recordings — mostly historical and personal narratives — collected in October 2009. More specifically, we took into consideration 2.5 hours of recordings with one first- and three second-generation female refugees. The informants were, self-reportedly, between 69-86 years of age at the time of recording. Two of them have not gone through formal education. All are originally from one village in Crete, Armenoi (Rethymno), and are bilinguals of CT and Cretan Greek. They all learnt CT at a relatively late age, presumably through their children who were schooled or through later immigrants to the island. Their heritage language, which they prefer to use at home and among friends is Cretan Greek (Kaya 2011, Kaya & Akar 2011).

1.3 Elements of dialectal variation

The overriding conclusion is that the Greek of our informants is indistinguishable from Cretan Greek, and the influence of Cretan Greek is observed at all levels of their CT. It is, we argue, due to this interference that CT exhibits remarkable differences from ST. The list below is a fragment of these differences:

- CT speakers have lexical /i/ in suffixes where in ST such occurrence of /i/ is expected only as a result of fronting harmony. Rounding harmony does not follow the ST pattern either.
- Headed relative clauses in CT are often finite whereas their ST counterparts are dominantly non-finite.
- CT word order and prosody are strikingly different than their counterparts in ST.
- Case systems in CT and ST do not overlap.
- Subordination strategies in CT and ST do not entirely overlap.

Since a full account of these differences cannot be duly provided in a single paper, we limit our focus here to the last two differences, i.e., differences in case systems and subordination strategies. Before the discussion of these two differences, however, one methodological issue has to be clarified. Given the fact that CT is spoken on the western shore of Turkey, it is reasonable to assume that, rather than ST, Western Anatolian Turkish dialects spoken around Cunda Island should be taken as a point of comparison. As far as the purposes of this specific paper are concerned, we take this issue to be only extraneous since it has been noted since Aksan (1977: 145) that most salient differences between ST and Western Anatolian dialects surface in phonology and lexical stock. Moreover, recent work entirely devoted to Western Anatolian dialects provide negative evidence against variation between ST and these dialects in terms of
subordination strategies and case systems (Özden 2009, İmer 1998).\textsuperscript{4} Hence, in the remainder of this study, we use ST to refer to both ST and Western Anatolian dialects.

2 Case mismatches

There are differences in the case inventories of Cretan Greek, the heritage language of CT speakers, and ST. Cretan Greek has a four-way difference in its case system; nominative, accusative, genitive, and vocative; whereas ST differentiates between six cases; nominative (–$\emptyset$), accusative (–(y)l), dative (–(y)A), locative (–DA), ablative (–DAn) and genitive.\textsuperscript{5,6} CT aligns with ST and makes a six-way distinction in its case system. The case systems of three varieties are given in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cretan Greek</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>–</td>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>Ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocative</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though CT and ST are identical in their respective case inventories, they differ vastly in terms of the functions these cases assume. As shown in Table 2, dative, accusative and locative case markers in CT realize multiple functions which are each realized by separate case markers in ST.

\textsuperscript{4} However, the phonological shape of the suffixes may vary. See especially İmer (1998), for a general account of phonological differences between Western Anatolian dialects and ST.

\textsuperscript{5} We exclude from our survey the genitive case which establishes a semantic and syntactic relation between two nouns. We also exclude the associative marker -(y)lA which behaves slightly differently from the other case markers.

\textsuperscript{6} The letters in capitals denote archiphonemes whose surface value is defined by well-defined assimilatory rules (vowel harmony in case of vowels and anticipatory assimilation to the adjacent consonant, (de)voicing in particular, in case of consonants). The glide in parentheses surfaces only intervocally.
Table 2. Functional mismatches in the case systems of CT and ST.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cretan Greek</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>Accusative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative</td>
<td>Dative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td>Ablative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.2 Structural accusative – dative mismatches

There are also differences between CT and ST with respect to the uses of structural accusative and dative cases. In many instances, a nominal in CT is marked in accusative in positions where it would be assigned dative case in ST.

(5) Baba-lar-i hasta-ydi-Ø, bu bak-ar-di-Ø
cocuk-lar-i.
father-PL-POSS.3PL ill-PST-3SG this look.after-AOR-PST-3SG
child-PL-ACC
‘Their father was ill, she used to take care of the children.’

(6) Babaanne-m de öl-diü-Ø dayan-a-ma-di-Ø
şey-in-i, ayril-ma-sin-i.
grandmother- POSS.1SG also die-PST-3SG bear-ABIL-NEG-PST-3SG
tingy-Poss.3SG-ACC part-MA-POSS.3SG-ACC
‘My grandmother died too, she couldn’t bear the ... the departure.’

2.3 Discussion

Section 2.1-2.2 briefly showed that there are mismatches between CT and ST in terms of environments in which locational (adverbial) cases, i.e., the dative and locative cases, and the structural cases, i.e., the accusative and the dative cases are legitimately employed. Concerning locational ones, we saw that dative and locative in CT are employed unsystematically where the other case is required in ST. This unsystematic use of dative-locative cases should be interpreted as interference of the heritage language,
Cretan Greek. As stated in section 2, there is no overt morphological distinction between locative and dative functions in Cretan Greek. Both are expressed with the preposition s(e) ‘in/on/at’ which selects an accusative-marked noun phrase:

(7) Póasas kopeljés ... úla pijénane s-to
    how.many children all go.ipfv.pst.3pl to-the.acc
    sxolíó.
    school.acc
    ‘So many children ... they all used to go to school.’
    (~dative) [Cretan Greek. ZS. 2. 9.51]

(8) I Ismet ítane polá šénisa, s-to baxché
    the Ismet was a.lot cheerful in-the.acc garden.acc
    na xorévun, na trayuðúne.
    subj dance.3pl subj sing.3pl
    ‘Ismet was a very cheerful woman, they would dance and sing in the garden.’
    (~locative) [Cretan Greek. ZS. 2. 12.28]

In both (7) and (8) the same prepositional phrase realizes two different functions; dative (7) and locative (8). It is due to lack of a morphological distinction between these two cases in the heritage language that our informants use dative and locative case markers somehow unsystematically in CT. It should be noted that this dative-locative transition is by no means unique to CT among various Turkish contact varieties, and it has been noted as a salient phenomenon among Turkish varieties of the Balkan peninsula (e.g., Ohrid Turkish and Gostivar Turkish in FYROM, Kakuk 1972: 245, Tufan 2008; Prizren Turkish in Kosovo, Jusuf 1987: 89, or Deliorman Turkish in Bulgaria, Kowalski 1949[1933]: 491), which have been influenced by languages which do not distinguish dative and locative overtly, such as Serbian, Macedonian, Greek, Bulgarian and Albanian. Based on the individual case studies, Friedman (2003: 60) takes this frequent dative-locative shift to be a salient phenomenon of Western Rumelian Turkish (WRT). CT, although clearly not a WRT variety, shares this certain feature with the members of the WRT group, since part of what defines the group is the contact with Greek.

Although the dative-locative alteration can be immediately attributed to the interference of the case-system of Cretan Greek as a whole, the alteration between dative and accusative cases cannot, since dative function is morphologically differentiated in noun phrases from the accusative by the preposition s(e) that selects the latter in turn. Therefore, to account for the cases in (5–6), where accusative-dative alteration occurs, we need to look at each predicate and its lexical specification in turn. Even though in ST the predicates bak- ‘look after’ and dayan- ‘bear’ assign dative case to their arguments (cf. (5-6)), Cretan Greek predicates with the
meaning ‘look after’ and ‘bear’ assign accusative case to their internal arguments, cf. *dajándó* ‘bear’ and *dušudízo/kanakévo* ‘look after’). Therefore, we can conclude that although the predicates used in CT are form-wise Turkish, their lexical specifications are of Cretan Greek and thus they assign accusative case to their internal arguments.

### 3 Subordination strategies

Unlike ST, in which subordination is almost exclusively based on nominalizing suffixes that render subordinate predicates non-finite, CT makes use of both finite and non-finite subordination strategies. In this section, we will provide an overview of subordination patterns in CT and argue that the high prevalence of finite subordination is due to Cretan Greek interference in CT. The details of this analysis have been discussed in Bağrıaçık & Göksel (2016).

#### 3.1 Non-finite subordinate clauses

Subordinate clauses in ST are almost exclusively marked with nominalizing suffixes (a.o., Aygen 2002, Kornfilt 2007) and precede their superordinate predicates, conforming to OV pattern of ST. The most commonly occurring suffixes in ST are *-mA*, *-mAk*, and *-DIK*.

*-*mA in ST forms subordinate clauses selected by non-factive predicates, i.e., predicates that do not presuppose the truth of the proposition in their complement. This is often characterized as the counterpart of the subjunctive mood in European languages, but it cannot occur in obligatory subject control constructions (9). The suffix exists in CT as well and, similar to its counterpart in ST, it marks non-factive subordinate clauses with non-subject control (10):

(9) gel-me-sin-i/*gel-me-m-i  
    come-MA-POSS.3SG-ACC/come-MA-POSS.1SG-ACC  
    go-NEG-PST-1PL  
    ‘I did not want him/her to come.’  
    int.: ‘I did not want to come.’

    [ST]

(10) ... ayril-ma-sin-i  
    part-MA-POSS.3SG-ACC  
    dayan-a-ma-di-Ø.  
    bear-ABIL-NEG-PST-3PL  
    ‘... she could not bear his departure.

    [CT, ZS 33.28]

*-mAK*, in ST is often treated as the infinitival marker, and is employed in obligatory subject control environments with non-factive predicates (Erguvanlı-Taylan 1996). In CT as well, *-mAK* assumes precisely the same

---

7 In looking at subordination, we restrict ourselves to clausal internal arguments of verbs.
function (11). Further, notice in (11) that the subordinate clause follows its matrix predicate:

    start-PST-3PL affection show-MAK-DAT Cretan-PL-DAT  
    ‘They started showing affection to Cretans.’  
    [CT, AÖ 35.23]

-DIK in ST occurs in subordinate clauses selected by factive predicates (a.o., Borsley and Kornfilt 2000):

(12) Gel-diğ-im-i gör-diį-Ö.  
    come-DIK-POSS.1SG-ACC see-PST-3SG  
    ‘He saw that I came.’  
    [ST]

Unlike ST, no -DIK marked subordinate clause is found in the CT corpus.

To summarize, between ST and CT there is no difference in terms of functions of -mA and -mAK, though subordinate clauses marked by these suffixes in CT may precede, as well as follow, the matrix predicate by which they are selected. There is, however, a remarkable difference in terms of -DIK: The suffix, which marks clauses embedded under factive predicates in ST, is absent in CT and subordinate clauses in CT selected by factive predicates remain finite. This point will be taken on in the next section.

3.2 Finite subordinate clauses

Finite subordinate clauses in CT are (i) either in indicative mood and are headed by an optional final complementizer, (ii) or are non-indicative without an overt complementizer.

3.2.1 Indicative subordinate clauses

Subordinate clauses in CT are finite and they are headed by the optional overt complementizer diye (and its various idiosyncratic forms) if they are selected by factive predicates. Unlike ST, these are in indicative mood (cf. (12) with (13)) and they follow their superordinate predicates, yielding VO pattern:

(13) a. gör-diį-Ö gel-diį-Ö deyi.  
    see-PST-3SG come-PST.3SG COMP  
    ‘She saw that he came.’  
    [CT, ZS 37.46]

b. inan-ir-im koca-m git-ti-Ö İzmir-e.  
    recall-AOR-1SG spouse-POSS.1SG go-PST-3SG İzmir-DAT  
    ‘I recall that my husband had gone to Izmir.’  
    [CT, KD 1.08.19]
A summary of the complementizers is given in Table 3.

Table 3. Non-finite subordinating suffixes in ST and CT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complement type</th>
<th>ST</th>
<th>CT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Form</td>
<td>W.O.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−factive]: [−subj.] control</td>
<td>[−finite]: -mA</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[−factive]: [+subj.] control</td>
<td>[−finite]: -mAK</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[+factive]</td>
<td>[−finite]: -DIK</td>
<td>OV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2.2 Non-indicative subordinate clauses

Certain examples of subordinate clauses selected by non-factive predicates in the corpus involve finite predicates marked with the optative marker (hence we characterize them as non-indicative). These clauses always follow the matrix predicate. Predicate types that select optative-marked subordinate clauses are bouletic verbs (iste- ‘want’), achievement verbs (bak- ‘try, endeavour’), non-factive emotive verbs (sev- ‘like’, kork- ‘fear’), and objective modal verbs (bil- ‘know how to’). These are obviously non-factive predicates:

(14) a. Ban-a [...] iste-me-di-Ø gel-sin.  
I-DAT want-NEG-PST-3SG come-OPT.3SG  
‘She did not want to come to me.’  
[CT, ZS 22.30]

I try-IPFV-PST-1SG work-POSS.1SG-ACC do-OPT.1SG  
‘I was trying to do my work.’  
[CT, ZS 48.25]

The questions emerging now are:

1. Is there a principled reason for why these predicates select optative-marked complements, or are non-finite subordinate clauses (cf. section 3.2.1) and finite subordinate clauses with optative-marked predicates in free-variation?
2. What is the source of this optative-marked subordinate clauses?

We claim that answers to these questions can be given only by first looking at subordination strategies in the heritage language, Cretan Greek.

### 3.3 Cretan Greek influence on CT subordination

Subordination in Cretan Greek is always finite with bipartite mood system: indicative and subjunctive. All complement clauses follow their associate matrix predicates. Subordinate clauses selected by non-factive (and to a
certain extent) factive predicates are introduced by the complementizer pos ‘that’ (Pangalos 1955, Contossopoulos 2001) (15a). Subjunctive subordinate clauses are marked by the complementizer na and they are typically selected by bouletic, modal and directive verbs (15b):

(15) a. Ípa pos dé gáyome apó čiá
    say.PST.1SG COMP not leave.1PL from there
    me ta siñalá mas.
    with the right.mind our
    ‘I said that we will not leave there in a good shape.’
    [Cretan Greek, Contossopoulos 2001: 149]

b. θa θélo na kámo pitarákia.
    will want.1SG SUBJ make.1SG cheese.pies
    ‘I will want to make cheese pies.’
    [Cretan Greek, Contossopoulos 2001: 150]

Predicates that select subjunctive clauses in Cretan Greek fall under the rubric of non-veridical predicates, as they are discussed in Giannakidou (1998 et seq). According to Giannakidou (ibid.) mood choice between indicative and subjunctive is the direct outcome of whether a truth inference of the complement clause is available at least to one epistemic agent (the speaker or the subject of the main verb). In cases where such commitment to the truth is available, the predicate is veridical and in cases where no such commitment is obtained, the predicate is non-veridical. In Cretan Greek, complement clauses to veridical predicates are headed by pos and complement clauses to non-veridical predicates are headed by na. Non-veridical predicates are mostly future-oriented predicates whose event in the complement is located in the interval that starts at now and stretches into the future. In other words, the point of time set by the matrix clause precedes the one set by the complement clause.

Returning back to CT, we see that it is only non-veridical/future oriented predicates (bak- ‘try/endeavor’, iste- ‘want’, bil- ‘know (how to)’) that select a finite subordinate clause whose predicate is marked in optative. This yields a perfect match between the choice of Cretan Greek subjunctive clauses and CT optative-marked finite subordinate clauses, and also yields a perfect distinction between the choice of CT optative marked finite subordinate clauses and non-finite subordinate clauses with –mA/–mAK: Only the optative can occur if the matrix predicate is non-veridical. Non-finite subordinate clauses can be complements only to veridical (and control) predicates. The final summary of subordination patterns in CT is provided in Table 4.
Table 4. Complementation patterns in CT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix predicate</th>
<th>Clausal complement</th>
<th>W.O.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[+factive], [+veridical]</td>
<td>[+finite], [+indicative], optional COMP</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-factive] [+veridical]</td>
<td>[+subj control] [+finite] : -mAK</td>
<td>OV/VO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-subj control] [-finite] : -mA</td>
<td>OV/VO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[-veridical] [± control]</td>
<td>[+finite], optative marking</td>
<td>VO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We propose that the “match” between Cretan Greek subjunctive and CT optative complement clauses is based on the use of subjunctive in Cretan Greek and the optative in CT in root contexts. In Cretan Greek, subjunctive clauses that function as root clauses can express commands, requests, wishes, incredulity, etc. (precisely as in Modern Greek, cf. Joseph & Philippaki-Warburton 1987: 180-181):

(16) Na mì ziò!  
SUBJ not live.1SG  
′I shall not live!’ [Cretan Greek, Contossopoulos 2001: 149]

The optative marker in CT can express what is expressed by subjunctive morpho-syntax in Cretan Greek in root contexts, e.g., command, request, wish, consent, promise, unfulfilled obligation, incredulity, and the like. Most of these meanings are also conveyed by the optative morphology in ST:

(17) Gel-sìn!  
come-OPT.3SG  
′He shall come!’ [CT/ST]

Based on the identity of functions of optative and subjunctive in CT and Cretan Greek respectively in root contexts, we claim that optative in CT is further extended to embedded environments which require subjunctive mood in Cretan Greek. A salient support for this claim comes from the use of optative in narrations. In Cretan Greek, subjunctive clauses are also employed “[...] in narratives in order to give a dramatic effect to the description of a progressive or iterative action in the past” (Mackridge 1985: 284–285 for Modern Greek) (8). Though the use of optative in this context is marginal in ST, it is well attested in CT, suggesting that optative is identified with subjunctive in CT in this context too (19):8

---

8 The identification of optative with subjunctive is not unique to CT but is observed in various other Turkish varieties in contact with languages with subjunctive mood (e.g., Cypriot Turkish; Demir 2002, Fiorina Turkish; Mollova 1968).
Even though Cretan Greek interference can be held responsible for the morpho-syntax of subordinate clauses selected by non-veridical predicates in CT, it should be noted that finite subordinate clauses selected by factive predicates cannot be accounted for as outcomes of Cretan Greek influence. This is legitimately so since the optional factive complementizer diye in CT is clause-final, whereas the (factive) complementizer pos in Cretan Greek is clause-initial. We, therefore, tentatively propose that the use of indicative mood with an optional clause-final complementizer diye is a Turkish strategy possibly extended from factive adverbial clauses whose events are temporally and logically presupposed:

(20) Can iş-ten ayrıl-di-Ø diye hep-imiz çok
Can work-ABL quit-PST-3SG COMP all-1PL a.lot
üzül-di-¥k.
become.upset-PST-1PL
‘We became very upset since Can quit (the) job.’

4 Conclusion
In this paper, we presented an overview of the Cunda Turkish (CT) case and subordination systems, which are influenced by the heritage language, Cretan Greek. We have shown that CT case system differs from that of Standard Turkish (ST) in two respects: First, adverbial locative and dative cases are used in CT unsystematically and interchangeably due to Cretan Greek interference, in which both case functions are expressed periphrastically. Second, structural accusative and dative cases are also used unsystematically in CT; however, this is due to the fact that predicates that assign these cases in CT are morpho-phonologically identical to ST ones but their lexical specifications are identical to their counterparts in Cretan Greek.

Concerning subordinate clauses in CT, we showed that subordinate clauses selected by factive predicates are post-verbal finite indicative clauses, which are sometimes headed by the complementizer diye. We
argued that the Turkish strategy of forming factive adverbial clauses headed by the complementizer diye is extended to subordinate clauses forming internal arguments of factive predicates in CT. Subordinate clauses selected by non-factive predicates, on the other hand, are (i) either pre- or post-verbal non-finite clauses or (ii) post-verbal clauses whose predicate bears optative marker. We argued that the former type comprises subordinate clauses selected by veridical predicates, while the latter are selected by non-veridical predicates. The latter form has emerged due to the overlapping range of uses of the optative in Turkish and the subjunctive in Cretan Greek.

Looking at the data from the perspective of tendencies in language contact where one of the main issues is whether all borrowing is lexical or whether there is also rule borrowing between languages (cf. Heine & Kuteva 2005, Matras 2007, Thomason forthcoming among others), we can surmise that Cunda Turkish has borrowed rules for its word order system resulting in OV structure. In both its case system and subordination system, CT has mapped the functions of the heritage language on to existing categories from the surrounding language, ST. In the process, the distinctions and categorizations of ST have been redrawn to accommodate the categorizations of the heritage language. This, again points to the presence of rule borrowing, alongside the undeniable presence of lexical borrowing attested in many language contact situations.
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