Pronominal Affixes in Modern Greek: The Case Against Clisis*

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University

1. INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The occurrence in natural languages of elements usually referred to as "clitics"--entities lying somewhere between free, independent words at one end of a scale of morphological classification, and bound, dependent affixes on the other end--has long sparked the interest of linguists, as the proliferation of theoretical and descriptive works dealing with clitics (e.g. Zwicky 1977, Jaeggli 1982, Borer 1983, Klavans 1985, Nevis 1985, to name but a few) in recent years would seem to indicate. Primarily because they are word-like in some respects but affix-like in others, these little units have commanded such attention; their ambiguous status represents an implicit challenge to a good many aspects of standard linguistic theory. Nonetheless, many claims and generalizations have begun to emerge concerning the cross-linguistic behavior of clitics, and their treatment in Universal Grammar.

However, before any such claims can have real empirical content, it is essential that one be able to identify clearly whether a given element is in fact a clitic or an affix or a word, for only then is it possible to formulate explicit statements about clitic behavior universally. As Zwicky 1985 points out, for example, in order to test the generalization about clitics made in Kaisse 1982 (a modified version of Wackernagel's Law) that sentential clitics occur in second position within their clause, the analyst must be certain that a true clitic element is involved in the construction or language in question. Moreover, it would be desirable for there to be some consensus as to what constitutes a clitic or an affix, to allow for comparability of claims regarding these elements made in different frameworks. For instance, the assumption in Borer (1983: 41) that "clitics [are] affixes", and the general treatment there of clitics as "syntactic affixes", while meaningful within the theoretical framework she assumes, would be incoherent within a framework, such as Zwicky's, which makes an explicit distinction between clitics and affixes as theoretical constructs and which handles the distribution of affixes in the morphology but the distribution of clitics in the syntax.[1]

Accordingly, in the discussion that follows, a set of criteria is adopted that can provide for a decision as to the categorial status of a given element. Although many such criteria for distinguishing among words, clitics, and affixes have been proposed, the collection put forth in recent work by Zwicky (e.g., Zwicky 1985, Zwicky 1987, Zwicky & Pullum 1983) is adopted here. The "Zwicky criteria" overall present the strongest basis for making categorial decisions, for they are internally consistent and they all correspond to generally well-known and widely recognized facts about morphology. And, most important, virtually all can be derived from the architecture of the overall theory of grammar that Zwicky assumes, specifically a highly modular system, in which the modules in part correspond to different "components" of grammar recognized in traditional frameworks, with a very restricted interaction among the different modules, and with a monostratal phrase-structure syntax that is maximally general in that it

refers to classes of items and not to individual lexemes per se in its statements and further has a rule-to-rule mapping between syntax and semantics and a rich sub-system of grammatical features.

Among the criteria that Zwicky proposes for distinguishing words, clitics, and affixes from one another are those given in (1), with an indication in parentheses of what the criterion distinguishes between:

1. a. strict ordering (nonword/word)
    b. phonological dependence (nonword/word)
    c. high degree of selectivity in combinatory possibilities (affix/nonaffix)
    d. occurrence of gaps in combinatory possibilities (affix/nonaffix)
    e. morpho(phono)logical idiosyncrasies (affix/nonaffix)
    f. semantic idiosyncrasies (affix/nonaffix)
    g. parallel to morphophonological process (affix/nonaffix).

There are many more, but these are the ones that are most relevant for the discussion below. It is important to note that there are two main types of criteria--ones that distinguish between words and nonwords and ones that distinguish between affixes and nonaffixes. In general, the criteria can be interpreted to mean that affixes are characterized by a high degree of idiosyncrasy in their realization and behavior, and nonaffixes, i.e. clitics and words, by a high degree of regularity and predictability in realization and behavior. This general characteristic falls out from the theory because in Zwicky's model of grammar, the occurrence of clitics and words in particular phrasal positions is licensed by the syntax, and all such syntactically licensed elements must correspond to overt and fully regularly derived phonological material and must have a direct and transparent, hence nonidiosyncratic, semantic translation; other behavioral characteristics, such as extent of independence of one sort or another, most typically of a phonological nature, provide the basis for distinguishing between clitic and word.

With these criteria in place, various claims about the behavior of clitics can be explicitly formulated and thus explicitly tested. One such claim is the suggestion that among the possible positionings that clitics may take with respect to their "host"--the element upon which they are dependent--one particular type of positioning of a clitic, that referred to as "endoclitic" by Zwicky 1977, is not to be found in the languages of the world (so Klavans 1983, Zwicky 1987). An endoclitic is a clitic which occurs within the word it associates with (and is thus to be distinguished from enclitics, which follow their host, and proclitics, which precede their host). For example, if the English element 'll, the clitic variant of the future auxiliary will, which is normally enclitic, could occur grammatically as in (2), a hypothetical variant of the acceptable string Bob'll come, it would be said to be endoclitic:

2. *Bo-'ll-b come.

Although there are some apparent endoclitics in various languages, upon closer inspection each putative case examined so far has turned out to be better analyzed in some other way (see e.g. Nevis 1984, Klavans 1985, McCauley 1986), so that at present the claim of nonoccurrence for endoclitics is a relatively secure working hypothesis. Moreover, it is desirable to maintain a ban on endoclitics on

theoretical grounds, within Zwicky's framework, under an assumption for instance that words, as the output of the morphological component, have an internal integrity[2] that cannot be altered by the syntactic component, the domain of grammar that most generally is responsible for the distribution of syntactically defined classes, including clitics, and for the internal structure of phrases, but not for the distribution of word-formative elements and the internal structure of words.

Still, apparent cases of endoclisis are not restricted to those already discussed in the literature, and any further such cases need to be subjected to some scrutiny. As it happens, Modern Greek presents a situation with apparently endoclitic weak pronominal elements, and it turns out, as the discussion below indicates, that applying the Zwicky criteria to the Greek facts allows one to make sense of their otherwise problematic appearance. The benefits of using these criteria, moreover, turn out to extend well to other claims concerning the behavior of clitics, in particular in the Greek counterpart to the so-called "Clitic Doubling" constructions exemplified in (3) from Spanish:

    3. Lo   vimos   a   Juan
        him/ACC.CLIT saw/1PL OBJ.MRKR Juan
        'We saw Juan'.

2. APPARENT ENDOCLISIS IN MODERN GREEK

The weak object pronouns of Modern Greek, traditionally referred to as "clitics", present an apparent case of endoclisis, if the traditional designation has some basis in truth as far as categorial status is concerned. The elements in question are listed in the table in (4), and they typically serve in various pronominal functions:

    4. Weak ("Clitic") Object Pronouns of Modern Greek (Standard
        Athenian dialect):

1SG.GEN/ACC	mu /me	1PL.GEN/ACC	mas / mas
2	su / se	2	sas / sas
3	tu / ton (MASC)	3	tus / tus
	tis / tin (FEM)		tus / tis
	tu / to (NTR)		tus / ta

Some examples of these pronominal elements in the expression of arguments of verbs and, for the genitive forms, of (at least some) prepositions as well, are given in (5):

    5. a. tin   vlépo   mazí tu   polí sixná
           her/ACC.WK see/1SG.PRES with him/GEN.WK much often
           'I see her with him very often'
        b. férte   mas   álo uzáki
            bring/IMPV.PL us/GEN.WK other-ouzo/ACC
           'Bring us another ouzo!'
        c. sas   to   férame
           you/GEN.WK it/ACC.NTR.WK brought/1PL.AOR
           'We brought it to you'
        d. stékeste   metaksí tus

stand/2PL.PRES between them/GEN.WK
'You are standing between them'.

The examples in (5) all involve Greek tense systems, present and aorist, and moods, imperative and indicative, which do not obligatorily or cannot occur with inflectional prefixes; also, the forms in (5) are all affirmative. These observations are important, for another tense system in Greek, the future, is formed with an inflectional prefix, the element θa, and negation, at least for the indicative mood, is marked by another inflectional prefix, the element ðen.[3] Examples of these affixal formations are given in (6) for the verb vlépo 'I see':[4]

6. a. ðevlépo 'I don't see'
   b. θavlépo 'I will see'
   c. ðeθavlépo 'I won't see'.

When weak pronominal forms cooccur with the future marker θa and/or the negator ðen, the result is apparent endoclisis, with the weak pronominals occurring within the word-unit defined by ðen/θa and the verb, as in (7):[5]

7. a. ðen do vlépo 'I don't see it'
   b. θa to vlépo 'I will see it'
   c. ðe θa to vlépo 'I won't see it'

The Modern Greek weak pronominals therefore present a challenge to the ban on endoclisis, if the traditional labelling of these elements as clitics is grounded in the details of their behavior.

3. GREEK "CLITIC" PRONOUNS AS AFFIXES

As it happens, however, the endoclisis in (7) is only apparent and not actual, for the traditional label by which the weak pronouns are called "clitics" can be shown not to be justified by their properties. That is, through the application of the criteria listed in (1), it can be determined that the weak pronouns are, in fact, affixes and not, in the strict sense permitted by Zwicky's framework, clitics.

First, it is clear that these elements show nonword properties. They are strictly ordered with respect to the other elements they occur with, always being positioned immediately next to the verbal base,[6] and after ðen and/or θa:[7]

8. a. θa to vlépo / *θa vlépo to /*to θa vlépo 'I will see it'
   b. ðen do vlépo / *ðe vlépo to /*to ðe vlépo 'I don't see it'.

Also, they are phonologically dependent and are not able to stand alone, for example as an answer to a question (and thus are unlike the strong pronominal forms, such as aftó in (9b)):[8]

9. a. pjó vlépis? 'Which do you see?'
   b. aftó 'It.' / *to 'It.'

Second, the weak pronouns show idiosyncrasies of the various types referred to in the criteria in (1), properties which distinguish between clitics, which typically show no idiosyncrasies inasmuch as they are licensed by the syntax, and affixes, which can and generally do show such irregular behavior. For example, the weak pronouns show a high degree of selectivity, in general occurring only with verbs. There are exceptions to this, i.e. instances in which the weak pronouns occur with elements other than verbs, but these tend to be highly sporadic in distribution, thus giving the occurrence of gaps in the range of combinatory possibilities, a property typical of affixes but not clitics. Thus, the accusative weak pronouns can occur with the high-style adverb kalós 'well' to form a phrase meaning roughly 'welcome', as in kalós ton(e) 'welcome to him!', but not with adverbs in general and not even with kalá, the colloquial variant of kalós (i.e. *kalá ton(e) 'welcome to him!'). Similary, while the weak genitives can occur with some prepositions, as indicated above in (5) (e.g. metaksí tus 'between them', mazí tu 'with him'), they do not occur with all prepositions (e.g. *apó tu 'from him'), and while they occur with a few adjectives (e.g. mónos 'alone', in expressions such as mónos tu 'on his own'), they do not occur with all adjectives. Thus, even if the occasional occurrences with adverbs, prepositions, or adjectives show a lesser degree of selectivity on the part of the weak pronouns, they also give rise to a large number of gaps in combination. Therefore, on the criteria of selectivity and gaps, taken together, the weak pronouns are more affix-like than clitic-like.

With regard to morphophonological idiosyncrasies, there are two that are relevant to the present discussion. First, the genitive singular second person weak form, /su/, when it combines with any third person accusative, all of which begin with /t-/, the -u- of /su/ is generally suppressed, even though, in Standard Athenian Greek at least, unstressed high vowels are not regularly deleted.[9] For example, /θa su to ðóso/ 'I will give it to you' is generally realized as [θa sto ðóso]. Also, for at least some speakers and in some speech styles, but perhaps only for Northern (urban) standard Greek, one finds voicing triggered on weak 3SG/PL pronouns by the future marker θa and the modal (roughly, subjunctive) marker na. Thus, the sequence /θa to káno/ 'I will do it' can be realized as [θa do káno], even though in general there is no process in Greek that voices a voiceless stop between vowels.[10] This idiosyncratic behavior is of the sort expected, in Zwicky's framework, for affixes but not for clitics.

Finally, semantic idiosyncrasies are to be found with the weak pronouns. In particular, there are expressions with totally nonreferential uses of these forms, as in (10a) where the pronoun cannot refer to any specific or definite individual and still allow for an idiomatic reading, and expressions, as in (10b), in which the pronoun occurs with an intransitive verb, yielding an intransitive meaning, and thus is not only referentially empty but also grammatically empty:

10.a. ti   vríkame
       her/ACC.WEAK found/1PL
       'We're happy' (literally: "We found her")
    b. pu   θa tin   pésume
         where FUT her/ACC.WEAK fall/1PL
         'Where will we go?' (literally: "*Where do we fall her").

As with other types of idiosyncratic behavior, the anomalies in (10) are characteristic more of affixes than of clitics.

The last relevant criterion, the possible realization of affixes, but not clitics, by a phonological process rather than by segmental material, finds some application to the facts of standard Greek. In particular, the masculine/neuter distinction in the third person singular pronouns is realized, for many speakers, at least in rapid or casual speech styles, as voicing on initial segment of verb. Thus, the distinction between for example /ton píraksa/ 'I bothered him' and /to píraksa/ 'I bothered it' can be realized on the surface as [to bíraksa] versus [to píraksa]. Admittedly, this does not constitute full processual realization of the whole pronoun, but it is at least partial processual realization, and as such is in keeping with the other indications noted above of affix-like behavior for the weak pronouns.

Based on these considerations, it appears that a solution to the apparent endoclisis of Greek weak pronouns is readily available: the weak pronouns can be taken to be affixes and not clitics. As such, they do not present endoclitic positioning in strings such as those in (7), but rather just ordinary affixation (prefixation or infixation, depending on the nature of and interactions among the relevant combinatory rules).[11]

4. DIALECTAL INDICATIONS FOR WEAK PRONOUNS AS AFFIXES

The conclusion reached in the previous section that the weak pronouns are affixal from a categorial standpoint is based on data from the standard language, in both its northern and its southern (i.e. Athenian) form. While this result seems reasonably well-motivated for that data, there are some indications that the affixal analysis may not be appropriate for all speakers of the standard language. For example, the processual realization criterion is instantiated only partially, not for an entire pronominal form, and the morphophonological idiosyncrasies are partly geographically and partly sociolectally restricted in distribution. The absence of positive indications for all the criteria does not in itself argue against an affixal analysis, and it is significant that there are in general no counterindications to an affixal treatment.[12]

Still, one wants to present the strongest case possible in support of a claim such as this, especially since it runs counter to traditional practice. Thus it becomes interesting to examine certain facts from various regional dialects of Modern Greek, for they present especially clear indications of weak pronouns as affixes. While the dialect evidence on its own cannot decide the case for the standard language,[13] its availability certainly makes the overall case more plausible, and at the very least shows that there are dialects of the language with unmistakably affixal pronouns.

Three sets of facts are relevant in this context. First, in certain regions of the northern dialect zone, e.g. Thessaly and Macedonia (see Thavoris 1977) plural imperatival forms are to be found in which a first person singular weak pronoun occurs inside of the plural subject suffix -ti. Examples of this phenomenon are given in (11), where the pronoun has the shape [m] when unstressed, [me] when stressed:

11.a. pé-m-ti [= 'tell/IMPV + 'me' + PL]   '(You/PL) tell me!'
   b. ðó-m-ti [= 'give/IMPV + 'me' + PL]   '(You/PL) give (to) me!'
   c. féri-mé-ti [= 'bring/IMPV + 'me' + PL] '(You/PL) bring (to) me!'.

The importance of these examples lies in the fact that -ti is clearly an inflectional affix, and can determine with the verbal root, e.g. pe- 'say', well-formed word, e.g. the imperative péti '(you/PL) say!' . Thus, given the well-motivated ban on endoclisis, the interior position of -m(e)- points directly to an affixal interpretation of the weak pronominal form in these dialects.[14] Since interior position for affixes is generally associated with derivational affixes, it is possible that -m(e)- is a derivational affix, essentially an element that creates a new verb stem. This conclusion is suggested by the fact that the internal -m(e)- can cooccur with an externally-placed weak pronominal form and a strong pronominal form, as in (12):

12. ðó-m-ti   mi   ki   ména
    give/IMPV + me + PL me/WEAK even me/STRONG
    '(You/PL) give (to) me!'.

Such an analysis would presuppose a reanalysis at some point in the development of these dialects by which the pronominal -m(e)-, perhaps in the imperative singular where there is no number ending (i.e. pé-m '(You/SG) tell me!'), was taken to be part of the stem; such a development would be in keeping with the affixal analysis, for it points to the exactly the sort of idiosyncratic and nontransparent behavior that is expected of affixes but not of clitics.

A similar phenomenon is reported by Pernot 1934 for Tsakonian Greek, a highly divergent dialect of Greek spoken in the southeastern Peloponnesos. In this dialect, a reduced form of the singular accusative weak pronoun typically cooccurs with a plural accusative weak form, with the reduced form placed before the verb and the other weak form after, as in (13):

13. tsi   m   epétsere námu
    what me/ACC.SG.WEAK said/2SG us/ACC.PL.WEAK
    'What did you say to us?' (literally: "What did you tell me to us?").

Thus in essence, this Tsakonian pattern presents an instance of nonagreeing weak pronouns cooccurring. Since the singular form does not contribute to the overall meaning (the pronominal reference is first person plural), this pattern exhibits just the sort of special semantics--here of the singular weak pronoun plus verb combination--that is expected with affixes. Moreover, if, as Pernot suspects, the origins of this pattern lie in a reanalysis of an original doubling structure with a singular object as having the reduced weak pronoun as part of the verb stem, then Tsakonian would present a case of reanalysis similar to the northern dialect one discussed above and thus also indicative of affixal status for the weak pronouns at a relatively recent stage in the dialect.

The third piece of relevant data comes again from the northern dialect zone, in particular from the dialect of Tírnavo, in Thessaly, as recorded in Tzartzanos 1909. In this dialect, the feminine singular accusative weak pronoun, which has the shape [tn] before vowel-initial verbs, is realized in a fully processual manner, appearing as voicing on the initial segment of its

controlling verb, when that verb begins with a dental stop. Examples of the resulting contrast between object-less uses of dental-initial verbs and uses with an implicit object are given in (14):

14.a. [táraksi] 'he disturbed' vs. [dáraksi]   'he disturbed her'
    b. [tsákusi] 'he caught'   vs. [dzákusi]   'he caught her'
    c. [tsímsi]   'he pinched' vs. [dzímsi]   'he pinched her'.

Even if the forms with the voiced initial derive, possibly synchronically but certainly diachronically, from a series of steps such as those outlined in (15):

15. /tn + táraksi/ ---> tn dáraksi ---> ddáraksi ---> [dáraksi]

what is crucial is the resulting surface contrasts in which a phonological process is the sole marker of an object argument with the verb. Clitics and words, inasmuch as they are lexical items that fit into phrasal "slots" licensed by the syntactic component, must, in Zwicky's framework, be realized segmentally. Thus, in Tírnavo Greek, the processual realization of at least one of the weak pronominals is strong evidence in favor of an affixal treatment for these elements.

Given all these indications, it can safely be concluded that in many dialects of Greek, perhaps even more clearly than in the standard language, the so-called "clitic pronouns" are not clitics in Zwicky's sense, and instead are best treated categorially as affixes.

5. A POSSIBLE EXTENSION OF THE AFFIXAL ANALYSIS

With the affixal analysis of weak pronouns in Greek reasonably well-established, it is possible to examine potential extensions of the analysis to other domains in which apparent clitics are to be found. In particular, in most recent treatments within the Government-Binding framework of the so-called "Clitic Doubling" phenomenon such as the Spanish example cited in (3) and repeated here:

3. Lo   vimos   a   Juan
    him/ACC.CLIT saw/1PL OBJ.MRKR Juan
    'We saw Juan'

it has been assumed that the clitic element is a type of affix, what Borer 1983, for instance, refers to as a "syntactic affix", as noted above. It is now possible, with the criteria that have been applied to the question of the apparent endoclisis in Greek, to go beyond the mere assumption of affixal status for so-called "clitics" in "Clitic Doubling" constructions, and actually demonstrate this status. That is, as far as Greek, a language that shows "clitic-doubling", as in (16):

16.a. tus   vlépo   ton yáni   ke ton pétro
    them/ACC.WEAK see/1SG the-John/ACC and the-Peter/ACC
     'I see John and Peter' (literally: "I see them John and Peter")
    b. me   vlépun   eména
     me/ACC.WEAK see/3PL me/ACC.STRONG
    'They see me'

is concerned, one can truly say that the "clitics" are affixes, and are demonstrably so by a variety of criteria.

The ability to demonstrate this claim is advantageous not just from the methodological standpoint of bolstering with empirical considerations an otherwise bare unsupported assertion, but it also may help resolve a problem posed by a key difference between the Greek construction in (16) and the Spanish one in (3). The Greek construction differs from the Spanish one in that the doubled noun phrase is not marked with a prepositional element (a in the Spanish example). This feature in Greek is problematic for what has come to be called "Kayne's generalization" (e.g. by Jaeggli 1982), namely that a lexical noun phrase may be doubled by a clitic only if it is preceded by a preposition. The preposition is necessary for the assignment of Case to the noun phrase,[15] if the Case assigning properties of the verb are absorbed by the "clitic".

While the problematic nature of the Greek facts regarding "Clitic Doubling"--and similar facts from other Balkan languages--has been recognized, e.g. by Borer (1983: 89n. 5), and attempts have been made to account for them, e.g. by Rudin (1986, 1988), the affixal analysis of the weak pronominal "doubling" elements provides another avenue for resolution of the difficulty they pose. In particular, if the demonstration that these are affixes is taken seriously, within a Zwicky-type framework, then these elements must be morphological elements, and thus not a matter of syntax, not distributed or licensed by the syntax, and perhaps, therefore, not subject to the same sorts of constraints that purely syntactic elements are. In particular, if they are morphological affixes, then the weak pronouns are clearly not noun phrases, and thus perhaps should not behave like noun phrases as far as properties such as Case absorption or Case assignment is concerned.[16] Admittedly, this step would appear merely to push the problem of the occurrence of these affixes off onto the morphological component, but unless or until it can be demonstrated that morphological elements must be responsive to the same principles as purely syntactic ones, this path seems to be a promising one.

While details about this proposal clearly need to be worked out further, it is equally clear that there are some benefits to be reaped from an affixal analysis of Modern Greek weak pronouns. This conclusion holds certainly with regard to claims about the nonoccurrence of endoclisis cross-linguistically, but potentially also for the analysis of the so-called "Clitic Doubling" construction. The application of Zwicky's criteria to Greek, therefore, is not merely an exercise in classification, but instead provides insights into the grammar of Greek and into Universal Grammar.

NOTES

friendship they offered during my stay there, and for their comments on my presentations of this and related material. Audiences at Cambridge University, Reading University, and the University of Kentucky have also provided important feedback to presentations of different aspects of this overall study. I have also benefitted immeasurably from discussions with my good friend and colleague, Arnold M. Zwicky.

1. To be fair to Borer, she was undoubtedly using the term "clitic" in a pretheoretical sense in this assertion, but still the use of similar terminology, even if differently defined, can lead to potential problems when assessing the validity of hypotheses.

2. See Kanerva 1987 for some discussion of this theoretical point.

3. For reasons that go well beyond the scope of the present paper, but which are to be discussed in the fuller study alluded to at the outset (and indeed have been discussed in various presentations of this material elsewhere), it seems that the future marker θa and the indicative negator ðen are best treated categorially as affixes. In particular, they both show some of the dependent and idiosyncratic behavior with respect to the Zwicky criteria presented above that is characteristic of affixes. Admittedly, an affixal analysis of these elements is counter to traditional views of Greek grammar, but it seems well-supported by the available evidence.

4. The final -n of ðen is usually omitted before continuants, thus giving the form ðeθa- with the future marker.

5. The final -n of ðen regularly voices the initial stop of weak pronominal forms, thus giving ðendo- in (7a) from underlying /ðen + to-/; before a voiced stop, the -n- may be further omitted, subject to a complex array of dialectal, social, and stylistic conditions.

6. As indicated by a comparison of (5a,c, d) with (5b), weak pronouns are positioned before finite verbs but after nonfinite verbs (imperatives being best taken as nonfinite--see Joseph (1983: Chapter 2) and Joseph 1985 for some discussion). This mobility, being grammatically determined, need not stand in the way of an affixal analysis for the weak pronouns, for there is no reason *a priori* not to allow suffixes with one verbal type but prefixes with another. See Blake and Mallinson (1987: 615) for similar remarks on the treatment of French weak pronouns as affixes. One other type of apparent mobility for the weak pronouns, namely the fact that after at least some imperatives the innovative order 3.ACC-1/2.GEN (e.g. fér-to-mu 'bring it to me') is found alongside the order 1/2.GEN-3.ACC (e.g. fér-mu-to 'bring it to me'), may be irrelevant here or possibly even argue for affixal status, if it is somehow analogically based on the plural imperatives with the (plural subject) affix -te (e.g. férte mu 'bring to me!'); see Joseph

1988 for some discussion of this point.

7. Note that ðen and θa also show strict ordering with respect to one another and with respect to verbal bases and weak pronouns; these facts

constitute part of the evidence that these elements too are not independent words and thus conceivably affixal in nature.

8. Similarly, neither ∂en nor θa, at least in the standard language, can stand alone, a further indication that they are not words in Zwicky's sense.

9. In northern varieties of Greek, unstressed high vowels are regularly deleted, but this regularity does not extend to Standard Athenian Greek, since it is based on a southern dialect. There are occasional, mostly lexicalized, instances of high vowel deletion in Standard Athenian, e.g. perpató '(I) walk' from earlier peripató, but these do not provide any index of productivity for this process in the standard language. Thus, the deletion of -u- of /su/ in combination with 3.ACC /t-/ in the (southern, i.e. Athenian) standard language indeed qualifies as a morphophonological idiosyncrasy.

10. This voicing process has its origins in the fact that the future θa derives from earlier θan (itself from earlier θéli na 'it wants to'--see Joseph (1983: Chapter 3) for details), and thus was originally of a form that would trigger voicing of voiceless stops via contact with a nasal (see footnote 5). There is no synchronic evidence for positing a final -n underlyingly with θa, however; for example, an -n does not occur with θa before vowels (though one does with the negator ∂en, suggesting an underlying final /-n/ with that form). The triggering of this voicing by the modal marker na is the result of analogical extension of this property through the system of preverbal modifying elements.

11. It is not entirely clear what type of affix these elements are. Since they correspond to a grammatical function of marking arguments on the verb, they are probably inflectional and not derivational affixes. I hesitate to call them "agreement markers" since they are not obligatory; with full noun phrases as arguments to the verb, the weak pronominal forms need not occur (hence, so-called "clitic doubling"--see below--is optional). They may be, in the terminology of Stump 1980, "category-changing affixes".

12. But see footnote 6.

13. Although in principle I agree with the assertion I have made here regarding the general futility of arguing from regional dialects for an analysis of the standard language, my feeling is that such argumentation may in fact be more justified in the context of analyzing Greek, a language with a long diglossic tradition. Since the regional dialect versus standard dialect dimension, in part as a modern transformation of a rural versus urban distinction, plays a role currently in the diglossia, all speakers now are essentially bi-dialectal between at least their own regional dialect and the standard language. Thus, there seems to be a greater closeness between regional dialects and the standard language in the case of Greek than perhaps obtains in other situations, so that such argumentation might be warranted. And certainly, it has been used elsewhere. Philippaki-Warburton (1987: 307), for instance, mentions the fact that "in some dialects, such as Cypriot and Cretan, the clitics [= weak pronouns/BDJ] follow rather than precede the verb" as part of an argument that the weak pronouns "are base-generated postverbally" for Greek in general. Still, what is presented here can be taken as being valid only for the dialects in question, and

not for the language as a whole, and the argument for weak pronouns as affixes for standard language can stand on its own merits.

14.   Athanasios Kakouriotis of the Department of English of the Aristotelian University of Thessaloniki has reported to me that he once heard the phrase éxe-mú-te embistosíni '(You/PL) Have trust in me!' (literally: "have/IMPV + me/GEN.WK + PL trust") on a radio broadcast. Such an expression in the standard language, even if somewhat marginal (i.e. it may have been a playful usage), is entirely in keeping with the affixal analysis of the weak pronouns, in the same way as these dialect forms. I am indebted to Dr. Kakouriotis for bringing this information to my attention.

15. A key asssmption here is that a string containing a noun phrase that has not been assigned Case is not well-formed and thus is marked ungrammatical by the so-called "Case filter".

16. Jaeggli (1986: 19) essentially takes this step, by asserting that "the requirement that a clitic be assigned Case is a parameterized option ... [so that] ... previous analyses which have considered all clitics to be obligatory Case absorbers ... will have to be abandoned." He further realizes that "the Case requirement of a particular constituent cannot be assumed to follow simply form the lexical status of that constituent, as there will be lexical elements which db not fall under the Case filter". One could say instead, the approach taken here, that these elements are not lexical, but rather are morphological, and that aspect of their nature is responsible for their non-Case absorbing properties.

REFERENCES

Blake, B. and G. Mallinson. 1987. "Review Article on Shopen (ed.): Language Typology and Syntactic Description", Language 63.606-619.

Borer, H. 1983. Parametric Syntax. Case Studies in Semitic and Romance Languages. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Jaeggli, O. 1982. Topics in Romance Syntax. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

Jaeggli, O. 1986. "Three Issues in the Theory of Clitics: Case, Doubled NPs, and Extraction", in H. Borer, ed., Syntax and Semantics Volume 19: The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics. New York: Academic Press, Inc., pp. 15-42.

Joseph, B. 1983. The Synchrony and Diachrony of the Balkan Infinitive. A Study in Areal, General, and Historical Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics, Supplementary Volume).

Joseph, B. 1985. "Complementizers, Particles, and Finiteness in Greek and the Balkans", Folia Slavica 7.390-411.

Joseph, B. 1988. "Diachrony and Linguistic Competence--The Evidence from Morphological Change", paper presented at Conference on the Theory and Practice of Historical Linguistics, University of Chicago (to appear in conference proceedings).

Kaisse, E. 1982. "Sentential Clitics and Wackernagel's Law', in Proceedings of the First West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics. Stanford, pp. 1-14.

Kanerva, J. 1987. "Morphological Integrity and Syntax: The Evidence from Finnish Possessive Suffixes", Language 63.498-521.

Klavans, J. 1983. "The Morphology of Cliticization", <u>Papers from the Parasession on the Interplay of Phonology, Morphology, and Syntax</u>. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, pp. 103-121.

Klavans, J. 1985. "The Independence of Syntax and Phonology in Cliticization", <u>Language</u> 61.95-120.

McCauley, M. 1986. "Karok <u>avis</u>: Endoclitic vs. Suffix", paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Linguistic Society of America, New York.

Nevis, J. 1984. "A Non-Endoclitic in Estonian", <u>Lingua</u> 64.2/3.209-224.

Nevis, J. 1985. <u>Finnish Particle Clitics and General Clitic Theory</u>. Ph. D. Dissertation, The Ohio State University (<u>Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics</u> Volume 33).

Pernot, H. 1934. <u>Introduction à l'étude du dialecte tsakonien</u>. Paris: Société d'Éditions "Les Belles Lettres".

Philippaki-Warburton, I. 1987. "The Theory of Empty Categories and the pro-Drop Parameter in Modern Greek", <u>Journal of Linguistics</u> 23.289-318.

Rudin, C. 1986. "Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages and the Theory of Case", paper presented at Balkan Linguistics Panel of Annual Meeting of AATSEEL, New York.

Rudin, C. 1988. "On Clitic Doubling in Some Balkan Languages', paper presented at 6th Balkan and South Slavic Conference, University of Chicago.

Stump, G. 1980. "An Inflectional Approach to French Clitics". In A. Zwicky, ed., <u>Clitics and Ellipsis (Ohio State University Working Papers in Linguistics</u> 24), pp.1-54.

Thavoris, A. 1977. 'Morfolojiká merikón iðiomáton tis ðitikís makeðonías", in <u>A' Simbósio γlosolojías tu vorjoeladikú xóru. (Ipiros - Makeðonía - Θráki) 28-30 Apilíu 1976. Praktiká.</u> Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies, pp. 75-95.

Tzartzanos, A. 1909. <u>Pragmatía perí tis sinxrónu θesalikís ðialéktu.</u> Athens: P. A. Petrákos.

Zwicky, A. 1977. <u>On Clitics</u>. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Zwicky, A. 1985. "Clitics and Particles", <u>Language</u> 61.283-305.

Zwicky, A. 1987. "Suppressing the Zs", <u>Journal of Linguistics</u> 23.133-148.

Zwicky, A. & G. Pullum. 1983. "Cliticization vs. Inflection: English <u>n't</u>", <u>Language</u> 59.502-513.