

Clitics in Greek

Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today (LA)

Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today (LA) provides a platform for original monograph studies into synchronic and diachronic linguistics. Studies in LA confront empirical and theoretical problems as these are currently discussed in syntax, semantics, morphology, phonology, and systematic pragmatics with the aim to establish robust empirical generalizations within a universalistic perspective.

General Editors

Werner Abraham
University of Vienna /
Rijksuniversiteit Groningen

Elly van Gelderen
Arizona State University

Advisory Editorial Board

Josef Bayer
University of Konstanz

Cedric Boeckx
ICREA/Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Guglielmo Cinque
University of Venice

Liliane Haegeman
University of Ghent

Hubert Haider
University of Salzburg

Terje Lohndal
University of Maryland

Christer Platzack
University of Lund

Ian Roberts
Cambridge University

Lisa deMena Travis
McGill University

Sten Vikner
University of Aarhus

C. Jan-Wouter Zwart
University of Groningen

Volume 160

Clitics in Greek. A minimalist account of proclisis and enclisis
by Marios Mavrogiorgos

Clitics in Greek

A minimalist account of proclisis and enclisis

Marios Mavrogiorgos

University of Cambridge

John Benjamins Publishing Company

Amsterdam / Philadelphia



™ The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences – Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Mavrogiorgos, Marios.

Clitics in Greek : a minimalist account of proclisis and enclisis / Marios Mavrogiorgos.

p. cm. (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today, ISSN 0166-0829 ; v. 160)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Greek language, Modern--Clitics. 2. Greek language, Modern--Enclitics. I. Title.

PA1061.M38 2010

489'.359--dc22

2010014657

ISBN 978 90 272 5543 3 (Hb ; alk. paper)

ISBN 978 90 272 8803 5 (Eb)

© 2010 – John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

Table of contents

| | |
|--|-----|
| Preface | IX |
| CHAPTER 1 | |
| Introduction | 1 |
| CHAPTER 2 | |
| The properties of Greek clitics and their structural analysis | 5 |
| 2.1 Introduction | 5 |
| 2.2 Greek personal pronouns: Clitics vs. strong pronouns | 5 |
| 2.2.1 Some basic properties of Greek personal pronouns | 5 |
| 2.2.2 Strong vs. clitic/weak pronouns: The issue of deficiency | 12 |
| 2.2.2.1 The partition of pronouns into types: Kayne (1975), Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) | 12 |
| 2.2.2.2 Partition criteria applied to Greek | 13 |
| 2.2.3 The morpho-syntactic status of clitics: affixes or words? | 41 |
| 2.3 A dynamic approach to the structure of personal pronouns | 52 |
| 2.4 Conclusions | 55 |
| CHAPTER 3 | |
| Internal structure of clitics and cliticization | 57 |
| 3.1 Introduction | 57 |
| 3.2 Analyses proposed for personal pronouns | 57 |
| 3.3 Type A: DPs | 58 |
| 3.3.1 Sub-type (a): Pronouns as intransitive D ⁰ -heads projecting a DP | 58 |
| 3.3.2 Sub-type (b): Pronouns as transitive/complex DPs | 63 |
| 3.3.2.1 Uriagereka (1995): Pronouns as transitive – DPs which differ in their internal structure | 63 |
| 3.3.2.2 Panagiotidis 2002 a uniform transitive D ⁰ approach. | 76 |
| 3.3.3 Sub-type C: Pronouns as heads in the extended verbal projection | 91 |
| 3.3.4 Sportiche's account | 102 |
| 3.4 Type B: Pronouns as transitive XPs | 103 |
| 3.4.1 Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) | 104 |
| 3.4.2 Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002) | 107 |
| 3.5 Summary | 111 |

CHAPTER 4

Derivation of proclisis 113

- 4.1 Introduction 113
- 4.2 Properties of clitics 113
 - 4.2.1 Clitics: Movement vs. base generation 113
 - 4.2.2 XP vs. X^0 118
 - 4.2.3 Clitic placement: Adjunction or incorporation? 119
- 4.3 Clitics as non-phases 127
 - 4.3.1 Derivation of proclisis 127
 - 4.3.2 The Syntax-Morphology mapping: Words as m-phases and clitics 131
 - 4.3.3 The effect on the outcome: LF and PF saturation of clitics 134
 - 4.3.3.1 PF valuation 134
 - 4.3.3.2 LF valuation 134
- 4.4. Have – constructions 134
 - 4.4.1 Other clitic climbing constructions 137
- 4.5. Indirect object constructions 137
- 4.6 Clitic doubling 138
- 4.7 Conclusions 143

CHAPTER 5

Patterns of proclisis/enclisis and the role of V-movement 145

- 5.1 Introduction 145
- 5.2 De-limiting the phenomenon 145
- 5.3 Different types of enclisis: Syntax vs. PF 146
- 5.4 Finiteness: A rather problematic notion 157
- 5.5 V-movement 168
- 5.6 Conclusions 191

CHAPTER 6

Enclisis in Greek: The role of CM in deriving enclisis 193

- 6.1 Introduction 193
- 6.2 The finiteness gradation: From indicatives to gerunds/absolutives 193
 - 6.2.1 Some preliminary remarks on verbal marking in Greek 194
 - 6.2.2 Mood types and their finiteness properties 195
 - 6.2.2.1 Indicative forms 195
 - 6.2.2.2 Subjunctive clauses 203
 - 6.2.2.3 Imperatives 206
 - 6.2.2.3.1 Positive imperatives 207
 - 6.2.2.3.2 Negative imperatives 217
 - 6.2.2.4 Gerunds/Active participles as absolutives/free adjuncts 220
 - 6.2.3 Summary of empirical points 224
- 6.3 EPP and head movement: Extending the V domain 225

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 6.3.1 | Preliminary remarks | 225 |
| 6.3.2 | The analysis | 231 |
| 6.3.2.1 | Assumptions | 231 |
| 6.3.2.2 | CM and enclisis | 236 |
| 6.3.3 | Further instances of the proclisis-enclisis alternation in Greek | 250 |
| 6.3.3.1 | Negated imperatives/gerunds in Greek | 250 |
| 6.3.3.2 | Surrogate imperatives | 254 |
| 6.3.3.3 | Clitic switch | 255 |
| 6.4 | Conclusions | 266 |
| CHAPTER 7 | | |
| | Concluding remarks | 269 |
| | References | 271 |
| | Index | 287 |

Preface

This book is based upon an original version finalized in 2009 (Mavrogiorgos 2009). Several changes have been made. Chapter 3 has been added from scratch, while minor revisions have been made in Chapters 2, 4, 5 and 6. This book aims at providing a principled analysis for two interrelated phenomena in the morpho-syntax of Greek clitic pronouns: proclisis (1) and enclisis (2), respectively:

- (1) When the verb is in the indicative or the subjunctive, the clitic pronoun precedes the verb, and nothing may intervene between it and the verb.
 - a. *To* katharisa. (indicative)
It.cl cleaned.1sg
'I cleaned it.'
 - b. Thelo na *to* kathariso. (subjunctive)
Want.1sg subj. it.cl clean.1sg
'I want to clean it.'
- (2) When the verb is in the imperative or the gerund, the clitic pronoun follows the verb, and nothing may intervene between it and the verb.
 - a. Katharise *to*! (imperative)
Clean.2sg.imp it.cl
'Clean it!'
 - b. Katharizondas *to* katalava oti... (gerund/absolute)
Cleaning it.cl understood.1sg that
'While I was cleaning it, I realized that...'

It is argued that clitic pronouns are topicalizers, namely optional determiner heads that are merged in the left periphery of the (direct or indirect) object DP of the clause. They encode familiarity/prominence/topicality, as opposed to the lower/internal determiner which encodes definiteness (see Alexiadou, Haegeman & Stavrou 2007 on the internal and external determiner). In doubling structures the two determiners appear together in the numeration, while in non-doubling structures only the lower D-head appears. By being at the edge of a minimal phase, the external D-head is probed by v^* -transitive, to which it moves and incorporates, giving rise to a proclitic doubling structure. Given that the clitic acts as a scope marker, movement of the clitic to v^* equals to movement of the whole DP to the periphery of v^* . Accordingly, the clitic pronoun is analyzed as the highest/external D-head that may merge within the DP, which marks the DP as

familiar, and which connects it with the outside world both semantically/pragmatically and syntactically. As far as the semantic restrictions on doubling are concerned, I assume that these follow from the interaction of the two D-heads.

I further argue that syntactic cliticization follows from syntactic agreement between the clitic pronoun and a phase head. For Greek and for other languages with adverbial clitics which are sensitive to finiteness with respect to the proclisis/enclisis alternation I propose that the relevant phase head is v^* -transitive and not Tense (T) (contrary to Kayne 1991, Philippaki-Warbuton 1995, Terzi 1999a, among many others). The derivation proceeds as follows: following Kayne's (1975) movement hypothesis, I take the clitic to be merged as/within a DP/D in the complement position, its phi-features being visible to appropriate probes higher up in the clause. V (or some higher v head), being a phase head by inheritance, attracts the clitic to its (external) specifier, building an A-chain. At the same time, an optional EPP feature on v^* , which is linked to a familiarity/-focus/old information D feature, probes the clitic forming a parallel A'-chain. The clitic moves as an XP/X to the left edge of v^* , where it incorporates, yielding proclisis. The incorporated clitic moves along with the v^* -V complex to T. v^* in this case is a minimal morpho-syntactic phase which is transparent at the edge. In this sense it allows non-phases (such as clitics for example) to incorporate into it under certain conditions (e.g. sisterhood and proper subset-hood in terms of features). Incorporation is allowed for two interrelated reasons. On the one hand, the clitic contains only a subset of features of those contained by v^* . This allows incorporation, according to an incorporation law which claims that incorporation is allowed only if the features of the incorporee are not different from that of the incorporator (Roberts 2009). On the other hand, incorporation into v^* is allowed, even though v^* is a minimal phase, because its edge is still accessible, due to the fact that v^* has not checked all its features as yet.

In enclisis the generalization is that person agreement on T is restricted/ defective, while the verb must check verbal inflection on the higher Complementizer Modal head (CM). The clitic pronoun targets the v^* head, as in proclisis, however it does not incorporate into it, because CM is the new phase head by being the highest inflectional verbal head in a chain of verbal heads (phase sliding). The verb moves to CM and the clitic merges with it from the lower specifier of vP/TP . In this way we get the generalization that enclisis obtains when the verb moves across the cliticization site to a V-related site, i.e. to a site where a verbal inflectional head is found. This allows us to differentiate between imperatives which have V-to-C movement and take enclitics, from interrogatives, which in some languages have V-to-C movement, but take proclitics.

The advantage of this analysis is that it can be generalized across constructions and across languages without great difficulty, since it is based on the general principles of (i) subset of features, and (ii) edge availability/accessibility. Moreover, by linking cliticization to agreement with phase heads, and given Chomsky's theory on phase heads, it is flexible enough to be able to account for a plethora of distinct clitic constructions both within a single language and cross-linguistically, which is something previous theories lacked.

Introduction

16 years ago Luigi Rizzi (see Rizzi 1993) claimed that the study of Romance cliticization must, at least, deal with the following four questions:

- (1) a. What is the categorial status of clitics?
- b. What makes clitics move?
- c. What is the landing site of cliticization?
- d. What determines encliticization and procliticization?

Since then, but even before (see e.g. Kayne 1975), these questions have been challenging the minds of linguists investigating the different aspects of the syntax of clitic pronouns, not only in Romance but also in other languages. The aim of this monograph is to try to give an answer to each one of these questions for Standard Modern Greek (henceforth, Greek), and even to a few more. But before we go into what this monograph is all about, let me briefly point out what it is not about. This book does not contain a literature review of different theories of cliticization, clitic structure and the proclisis-enclisis alternation. Readers are referred to van Riemsdijk's (1999a) Eurotyp edition, and to the (2006) *Blackwell Companion to Syntax* (see especially vol. I) (but see also Chapter 3). Moreover, I have not included a detailed comparison between Romance and Greek, as such a comparison was not among my aims. Rather, I mainly focused on Greek, and used Romance for comparison only in minor cases. Finally, I assume that the reader is acquainted with Chomsky's papers from 2000 onwards (Chomsky 2000, 2001a,b, 2005, 2006), and I therefore introduce his theoretical notions with little if any explanation.

Having discussed what this monograph is not about, let us move to what it is about. This monograph aims at providing a principled and novel analysis for two inter-related phenomena in the morpho-syntax of Greek clitic pronouns, namely proclisis (2) and enclisis (3) respectively, and as a result, at providing an answer to the 'what', 'why', 'where' and 'how' questions asked by Rizzi in (1) above:

- (2) Proclisis: when the verb is in the indicative or the subjunctive, the clitic pronoun precedes the verb, and nothing may intervene between it and the verb.
- (3) Enclisis: when the verb is in the imperative or the gerund, the clitic pronoun follows the verb, and nothing may intervene between it and the verb.

Starting with proclisis, it is argued that the clitic pronoun is a topicalizer, namely a definite head that is optionally merged in the left periphery of the (direct or indirect) object DP of the clause rendering it a topic. v^*/T (that is v^* in T , following Gallego's

2006 analysis of phase sliding in Null Subject Languages) probes into the v^*/T /TP phase and finds the clitic pronoun with which it agrees in phi-features. The clitic moves to v^*/T due to an EPP feature that comes along with it. When the clitic moves to the left edge of v^*/T , it incorporates into it, yielding proclisis. This happens for two interrelated reasons. On the one hand, the clitic contains only a subset of features of those contained by v^*/T . This allows incorporation, according to an incorporation law which claims that incorporation is allowed only if the features of the incorporee are not different from that of the incorporator (Roberts 2009). On the other hand, incorporation into v^*/T is allowed, even though v^*/T is a minimal phase, because its edge is still accessible, due to the fact that v^*/T has not checked all its features as yet. A minimal phase is defined as a minimal lexical category that is a lexical phase (i.e. v , n , a , etc.) or that contains one. Being a phase, it also has an edge which remains accessible until all its features have been checked off. Then, it can be sent to Spell-Out.

In enclisis the generalization is that restricted person agreement on T is associated with [+ imperative]/[+ gerund] paradigm and an inflectional/ V -related CM(odal) head. This means that in enclitic environments the verb must target the higher CM head in order to check the special verbal morphology. The clitic pronoun targets the v^*/T head, as in proclisis, however it does not incorporate into v^*/T , because the edge of the phase is not accessible; the phase in this case includes the CM head, given that the latter is inflectional/verbal, part of the INFL domain of the clause. As a result, the edge will be transferred to the CM head, and that is where the clitic will be able to incorporate from the specifier of v^*/T , yielding enclisis.

The advantage of this analysis is that it can be generalized across constructions and across languages without great difficulty, since it is based on the general principles of (i) subset of features, and (ii) edge availability/ accessibility. This means that the host/edge and the features involved may be different allowing us in this way to capture clitic structures from a number of different languages, as well as different structures from within one and the same language.

The structure of the remaining chapters is as follows:

In Chapter 2 I present the main properties of Greek personal pronouns, following the criteria and the observations made by Kayne (1975) and Cardinaletti & Starke (1999). Their criteria are applied to the Greek pronouns, and it is shown that full/tonic pronouns are strong pronouns while weak/atonic pronouns are clitic pronouns. The morpho-syntactic status of clitics is also discussed and it is argued that Greek clitics are words. Finally, the status of Greek clitics as determiners/definite heads is argued for.

In Chapter 3 I present a number of distinct proposals that have been put forward in the literature with regard to the internal structure of clitics and its relation to cliticization. I show that most of these analyses are inadequate on both empirical and theoretical grounds, a fact which further supports my proposal that Greek clitics are DPs/Ds that move from the object position, incorporating into their host.

In Chapter 4 the derivation of proclisis is discussed. It is argued that clitics A-move as XPs/Xs to the specifier of v^*/T into which they incorporate because on the one hand

the edge is accessible while on the other they are minimal non-phases, i.e. they only have a subset of the features contained within the phase head. Incorporation has an effect on the outcome, because it satisfies the LF and PF properties of the clitics. It satisfies their PF properties by providing them with a PWD into which they can incorporate. It also satisfies their LF properties by providing them with a familiarity/topic interpretation. Periphrastic constructions with the auxiliary *echo* (“have”) are also discussed where it is argued that *echo* basically copies the v-features of the v^* on the participle, which results in the clitic incorporating into *echo*. Indirect object constructions are also discussed, where I follow the analysis proposed by Anagnostopoulou (2003a), as well as doubling constructions, in which it is argued that the doubling clitic is an external determiner on the doubled DP that is probed by v^*/T ’s phi features and the EPP feature.

In Chapter 5 I discuss the proclisis-enclisis alternation, as it appears in Greek and other languages that follow the so-called ‘(non-)finiteness’ pattern. I attempt to define the level of finiteness which appears to be relevant to the alternation. Also, the V-movement theory is discussed (see Kayne 1991), and it is shown that movement across the cliticization site is neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition for enclisis. Instead, I claim that movement to the cliticization site along with resolution of proclisis-enclisis on the basis of finiteness at the clitic incorporation site are necessary conditions for the derivation of proclisis or enclisis.

In Chapter 6 I discuss the role of finiteness, and in particular, of CM (which corresponds to Rizzi’s 1997 CFin) in the proclisis-enclisis alternation. More specifically, I investigate the finiteness properties of a series of mood structures in Greek, and I formulate the following two generalizations:

Generalization A: Absence of a syntactically active (i.e. unvalued) person feature on the T/Agr head (i.e. restriction on person agreement) correlates with enclisis, + imperative mood and V-to-CM movement (obligatory). Presence of full agreement on the T/Agr head correlates with proclisis, – imperative mood and V-to-T movement (obligatory).

Generalization B: Proclisis correlates with non-restricted/full person agreement on T, while enclisis correlates with restricted person agreement on T. Non-restricted agreement is associated with the [– imperative] paradigm and a non-inflectional CM head (and, thus, with non-obligatory movement to C), while restricted agreement is associated with the [+ imperative] paradigm and an inflectional CM head (and, thus, with obligatory movement to C).

In other words, for enclisis to obtain, the verb must move to CM, a V-related site, across the initial cliticization site (in this case v^*/T), while the clitic moves to the edge of CM, the new cliticization site. At the end of the chapter I also discuss negated imperatives, which I claim are impossible in Greek due to the fact that the negation morpheme is merged in CM. I also discuss surrogate imperatives which I claim may have an imperative syntax since they realize a subset of the features of a true imperative form. Finally, I discuss free clitic ordering in enclisis in Greek, where I claim that in accusative genitive orders, the genitive pronoun is a weak pronoun rather than a clitic.

Finally, Chapter 7 contains the conclusions of this monograph.

The properties of Greek clitics and their structural analysis

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter I will present the main properties of Greek personal pronouns, following the criteria and the observations made in Kayne (1975) and Cardinalletti & Starke (1999). I will apply their criteria to the Greek pronouns and I will show that full/tonic pronouns are strong pronouns while weak pronouns are clitic pronouns. I will also discuss the morpho-syntactic status of clitics as words, as well as their categorial and functional status as DPs.

2.2 Greek personal pronouns: Clitics vs. strong pronouns

2.2.1 Some basic properties of Greek personal pronouns

Standard Modern Greek¹ (henceforth, Greek) has two series of overt personal pronouns, namely strong and weak pronouns (also known as tonic vs. atonic or non-clitic vs. clitic pronouns; see Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 1997).² As the names themselves suggest, one of the main (and also mostly widely known) differences between these two pronominal sets is that strong, although not weak, pronouns carry inherent lexical stress. According to traditional grammar weak pronouns, as opposed to strong ones, cannot stand alone in the sentence, but need to attach/cliticize to a phonological host in order to be felicitously pronounced (hence the name *clitic*).

Greek is surely not the only European language that makes such a distinction in the personal pronoun paradigm, as similar parallel pronominal series are found in Romance, Germanic and Slavic languages (as well as in Semitic languages, or even in Chichewa) (see Cardinaletti & Starke 1999, van Riemsdijk 1999b and references therein for European languages, Ritter 1995 for Hebrew, and Bresnan & Mchombo 1987 for Chichewa). Nevertheless, it also differs from them in that, for example, it does not employ any other types of clitic category, such as auxiliary and complementizer clitics

1. Standard Modern Greek refers to the official form of the language that is spoken in Athens and a big part of Southern Mainland Greece (e.g. the Peloponnese) and which is taught in school.

2. Besides strong and clitic pronouns Greek also has *pro* subject pronouns. I am going to discuss their properties in relation to the strong and weak series later on in this chapter.

found in Slavic languages, or pro-PP clitics of the *en/y* and *ne* type, which are found in French, Italian, Barcelona among others (see Vos & Veselovská 1999 for details).³

Both strong and weak personal pronouns are fully marked for nominal inflectional features such as number (*singular/plural*), person (1st, 2nd, 3rd) and gender (*masculine, feminine* and *neuter*, but only in the third person), as well as for case (*nominative, accusative* and *dative*, which surfaces as genitive⁴). The forms of the third person singular and plural are in essence demonstrative forms (which are declined as adjectival forms ending in *-os, -i, -o*) (similar to what we find e.g. in Romance languages like Spanish or French). These (main) properties are illustrated in the following table, which contains the two pronominal series⁵ (cf. Drachman 1997: 221. See also Vos & Veselovská 1999: 915 and Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warbuton 1997):

- (1) Table 1: Paradigm of the two series (strong vs. weak) of the personal pronoun in Greek

| CASE | STRONG/ FULL PRONOUNS | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------|---------------------|----------|------|------|------|-------|------------|-------|
| nom | ego | esi | aftos | afti | afto | emis | esis | afti | aftes | afta |
| gen | emena | esena | aftu | afti | aftu | emas | esas | afton | afton | afton |
| | (ne) | (ne) | (nu) | (ni)s | (nu) | | | (on) | (on) | (on) |
| acc | emena | esena | afton | aftin | afto | emas | esas | aftus | aftes | afta |
| | (ne) | (ne) | (e) | (e) | | | | | | |
| WEAK/ SHORT PRONOUNS | | | | | | | | | | |
| nom | – | – | tos | ti | to | – | – | ti | tes | ta |
| gen | mu | su | tu | tis | tu | mas | sas | tus | tus | tus |
| acc | me | se | ton(e) ⁶ | ti(n)(e) | to | mas | sas | tus | tis/ (tes) | ta |
| PER | 1 sg | 2 sg | 3 sg | 3 sg | 3 sg | 1 pl | 2 pl | 3 pl | 3 pl | 3 pl |
| NUM | | | masc | fem | neut | | | masc | fem | neut |
| GEND | | | | | | | | | | |

3. Note that Greek also has so-called PF clitics, such as the definite determiner *o, i, to*, or the preverbal particles like *tha, na, as, dhen, min*. For more information see Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki – Warbuton (1997).

4. In Standard Greek, the genitive form has taken over the uses of the old dative, as opposed to Northern Greek dialects, in which accusative has taken over this role.

5. Horrocks (1997) actually claims that third person clitics are historically descendant from the ancient Greek deictic pronouns (cf. *a(u)tos*).

6. The alternative forms with a final (e) are used in every day, non-careful speech, both with enclitics as well as with proclitics (in the latter case certain morpho-phonological conditions must be met).

A few things should be noted here. First of all, as the highlighted parts within the cells⁷ illustrate, strong and weak/clitic pronouns are morphologically related, in the sense that the weak forms are morphologically reduced in relation to the strong ones. Typically, and putting aside the additional endings within the parentheses which are added for metrical reasons only (see Drachman & Malikouti-Drachman 1999), strong pronouns are (at least) bisyllabic, as opposed to weak ones which are in most cases monosyllabic.

Second, the nominative clitic pronouns, which are only possible in the third person singular and plural, are extremely rare, used with the demonstrative forms *pu(n)* (meaning ‘where is?’; *pu* < *pu* + ‘n < *pu ine* (literally, ‘where is’) and *na* (meaning ‘there/here’, depending on person) (see Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warbuton 1997, Joseph 1994 for both, and Christides 1990 for deictic *na*):

- | | | |
|--------|--------------------------------|-------|
| (2) a. | na - <i>tos</i> ! | Greek |
| | There-he.nom | |
| | ‘There he is’ | |
| b. | pun - <i>ta</i> ⁸ ? | Greek |
| | Where-them.nom.neut. | |
| | ‘Where are they?’ | |

Pun and *na* may also take accusative clitics, nominative full Noun Phrases (NPs) (i.e. pronouns and NPs accompanied by the definite article), as well as nominative clitics doubling full NPs⁹:

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------|-------|
| (3) a. | Pun- <i>tin(a)</i> ? | Greek |
| | Where- her.cl.acc | |
| | ‘Where is she?’ | |
| b. | Na- <i>me</i> ! | Greek |
| | Here-me.cl.acc | |
| | ‘Here am I!’ | |

7. Cells here refer to cells of a paradigm (that of personal pronouns). Note, however, that no theoretical implications with regard to the notion of paradigm are intended by this discussion: paradigms are used only for informal expository reasons.

8. Optionally, the initial /t/ of the clitic may be voiced with or without subsequent assimilation of the final /n/ of *pun*, so that the whole [wh-word-clitic] cluster would be pronounced as: *pu⁽ⁿ⁾ da?*. Here, I will abstract away from such optional morpho-phonological processes (but see main text below for some discussion, and Revithiadou 2006 for sandhi (and other morpho-phonological) operations taking place within the host-clitic cluster).

9. Although not all combinations are possible (cf. for example the ungrammaticality of **na-mas*/**na-sas*, or *pu(n)-mas*/* *pu(n)-sas*, as against to the grammatical ones *na-maste* (‘here we-are’) or *pu-saste* (‘where you-are’)).

- c. Pun(e)- / na o Nikos?/! Greek
 Where-/there the Nick.nom
 'Where is Nick?/ There is Nick coming!'
- d. Pun-*ti* i Maria ? /Na-*ti* i Maria! Greek
 Where-she.cl.nom the Maria.nom?/there-she.cl.nom the Maria.nom!
 'Where is Maria? / There is Maria!'

Third, some cells share the same form, as e.g. the nominative and accusative forms of singular and plural, neuter, 3rd person strong and weak pronouns (*afto* vs. *afto*/ *afta* vs. *afta*/ *to* vs. *to*/ *ta* vs. *ta*), a phenomenon which is quite widespread, and is typical for adjectives and nouns taking the -*os*, -*i*, -*o* endings. The same appears to apply for *emena* and *esena* (namely, the accusative and genitive/dative, 1st and 2nd person singular forms of the strong personal pronoun), as well as for *emas/esas* (the respective forms of the plural), *mas/sas* (namely, the corresponding clitic forms), or *tus/tus/tus* (genitive plural, 3rd person, masculine, feminine and neuter clitic pronouns). The default assumption for all these cases is that they are syncretic forms, i.e. forms that spell-out more than one cells in the paradigm (based on such features as case, or gender). As syncretism is widespread in pronominal paradigms across languages, this is not an unusual phenomenon (see e.g. Cysouw 2003 on possible pronominal paradigms on a cross-linguistic basis). On the other hand, syncretism does not appear to make the right predictions in all cases. To give one example, Tsakali (2004, 2006) has convincingly shown that the *emena/esena* forms are not syncretic for case; rather, they are accusative forms, since they are not grammatical with verbs or prepositions taking a genitive complement:

- (4) a. Miluse *emena / √ tu Petru. Greek
 Was-talking.3sg *me.gen/acc.str / √ the Peter.gen
- b. Itan iper *esena / √ tu Petru. Greek
 Was.3sg in-favor-of *you.gen/acc.str / √ the Peter.gen
 'He/she was in favor of you/Peter.'
- c. Idhe √emena / √ ton Petro. Greek
 Saw.3sg me.gen/acc.str / √ the Peter-acc
 'He/she saw me/ Peter.'

On the other hand, the corresponding (plural) clitic forms, although homonymous, appear to be syncretic, given that they are equally acceptable with accusative and genitive taking predicates:

- (5) √ *mas* milise / √ *mas* idhe. Greek
 Us.cl.acc/gen talked.3sg / us.cl.acc/gen saw.3sg
 'He/she talked to us/ saw us.'

Although the actual facts are more complex than what is suggested here,¹⁰ it remains a fact that in some cases we have syncretism while in others we don't (simply there is an empty cell in the paradigm). Accordingly, the table in (1) could be restructured as follows (the change in the order of cases as well as of the 3rd person forms has been made in order to facilitate the illustration of the syncretic cases, as well as those of unoccupied cells):

10. First of all, as Tsakali (2004, 2006) points out, the ungrammatical instances of strong genitive 1st and 2nd person pronouns are rendered grammatical if doubled by a clitic pronoun (so that '*mu milise emena*' is ok, as opposed to '* *milise emena*' (recall that *milao* ('to talk to someone') takes a genitive complement); in fact only when an appropriate clitic is present is the structure acceptable). In these cases, her claim is that the doubled pronoun does not take case. Putting aside the problems her analysis seems to face, her observation is essentially correct. Furthermore, she also argues that the corresponding plural forms of the strong personal pronoun are accepted as complements of genitive taking predicates (a fact which suggests that these forms, namely *emas/esas*, are (case) syncretic). However, I do not agree with her judgements, since I find examples like '*milise emas*' ('talked.3sg. us.gen/acc') or '*xarise emas lefta*' ('gave.3sg us.gen/acc money') equally ungrammatical (a doubling clitic or the use of a periphrastic PP would render these examples grammatical – cf. '*mas milise emas*'; '*milise me emas*' (us.cl.gen/acc talked.3sg us.strong.gen/acc; talked.3sg with us.strong.gen/acc) (the preposition *me* takes an accusative complement – cf. *me ton Petro* (with the Peter.acc))). Similar effects with those of *emena/esena* (or *emas/esas*) are also found with the non-augmented 3rd person genitive forms of the strong pronoun (both in the singular and in the plural): cf. - * *milisa aftis/aftu/afton* vs. ✓ *milisa aftinis/aftunu/aftonon*. Cliticization or the use of a PP-periphrasis renders the examples much more acceptable in most cases: '*tis milisa aftis*'; '*milisa me aftin*', but '??* *tus milisa afton/aftonon/ton pedhion*'. Furthermore, if the offending pronoun is focalized (i.e. moved to the left periphery of the clause (see Tsimpli 1995)), the sentence is acceptable: '*EMENA milise*' (note that clitics are not allowed with focalized constituents for independent reasons, while the PP-periphrasis sounds better than the focalized non-cliticized strong pronoun). In addition, not all predicates taking a genitive complement are equally bad with non-cliticized genitive strong pronouns. For example, the verb *dhino* ('to give') sounds much better to my ear than e.g. *milao* ('to talk to') or the more archaic *ipertero* ('to be better than'), although in both cases the use of an appropriate clitic or a PP-periphrasis is much better:

- (i) ??Edhose emena ta lefta.
Gave.2sg me.gen/acc.str the money.acc
'He/she gave the money to me.'
- (ii) *?Milai emena/iperteri emena.
Talks.3sg me.gen/acc.str/ is better than me.
'He/she talks to me/ is better than me.'

(6) Table 2: Strong and weak personal pronouns in Greek (revised)

| CASE | STRONG/ FULL PRONOUNS | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-----------------------|-------|--------|------|----------|------|------|-------|------|-----------|
| nom | ego | esi | aftos | afto | afti | emis | esis | afti | afta | aftes |
| acc | emena | esena | afton | | aftin | emas | esas | aftus | | |
| | (ne) | (ne) | (e) | | (e) | | | | | |
| gen | Ø | Ø | aftu | | afti | Ø | Ø | afton | | |
| | | | (nu) | | (ni)s | | | (on) | | |
| WEAK/ SHORT PRONOUNS | | | | | | | | | | |
| nom | Ø | Ø | tos | to | ti | Ø | Ø | ti | ta | tes |
| acc | mu | su | ton(e) | | tis | mas | sas | | | tis/(tes) |
| gen | me | se | tu | | ti(n)(e) | | | tus | | |
| PER | 1 sg | 2 sg | 3 sg | 3 sg | 3 sg | 1 pl | 2 pl | 3 pl | 3 pl | 3 pl |
| NUM | | | masc | neut | fem | | | masc | neut | fem |
| GEND | | | | | | | | | | |

A fourth point, which has often been used as an argument in favor of the hypothesis that Greek 3rd person clitics are categorically determiners (see, among others, Drachman 1997; Anagnostopoulou 1999; Tsimplici & Stavrakaki 1999; Alexiadou 2001; Panagiotidis 2002; Alexiadou, Haegeman & Stavrou 2007) is also the fact that the biggest part of the third person clitic paradigm (including both dative/genitive and accusative forms) is homophonous with that of the definite article (only the genitive plural, and the nominative masculine/feminine singular and plural forms are realized differently). Note, that (partial or full) homonymy is also frequently found in many Romance languages, although in most cases it seems to be restricted to the accusative paradigm only (see e.g. Uriagereka 1995; Bleam 1999 for discussion). The definite article paradigm is given below:

(7) Table 3: Greek definite article

| Singular | Masculine | Feminine | Neuter |
|------------|-----------|----------|--------|
| Nominative | o | i | to |
| Genitive | tu | tis | tu |
| Accusative | to(n) | ti(n) | to |
| Plural | | | |
| Nominative | i | i | ta |
| Genitive | ton | ton | ton |
| Accusative | tus | tis | ta |

Moreover, as Drachman (1997) has pointed out, sub-parts/morphemes of the personal pronouns (especially the 1st and the 2nd person) are also found in the present tense of the copula, as well as in medio-passive (i.e. non-active) present forms. This is shown below (see also Drachman 1997: 223)¹¹:

- (8) Table 4: Copula (present tense of ‘to be’) medio-passive/non-active form of ‘to be written’

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|---------------------|----------------------|
| ime | I am | | |
| ise | You are | grafome | I am written |
| ine | He/she/it is | grafese | you are written |
| imaste | We are | grafete | he/she/it is written |
| is(a)ste | You are | grafomaste | we are written |
| ine They are | | grafosaste/grafeste | you are written |
| | | grafonte | they are written |

Although a detailed and successful decomposition of personal pronouns and the relevant verbal agreement endings into morphemes is not a trivial task at all (raising important issues such as the internal morpho-syntactic structure of these constituents (e.g. whether they involve the projection of multi-head constructions, or alternatively of single heads containing feature bundles (at least for the case of clitics, which do not seem to license specifiers – see discussion below))), the strong resemblance between these items lends support to the claim that they share (some) morpho-syntactic features. For example, all first person forms share the /m/ segment, second person ones the /s/ segment, while third person ones the /t/ segment.¹² As a result, it becomes quite

11. Note that the present tense of the copula verb seems to have similar endings with the medio-passive/non-active form (only 3rd person singular and plural are different). Moreover, in Greek the same passive morphology is used for passive, reflexive (both inherent and *afto*-reflexives, inchoative/anticausative, and even active meanings (in the case of deponents)). For example, *plen-ome* (‘to be washed’ – cf. active ‘*pleno*’ (‘to wash’)) has a reflexive or passive meaning, *dex-ome* (‘to accept’) has an active meaning, while *kegh-ome* has an inchoative/anticausative meaning. See Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2004) for this kind of syncretism in Greek and other languages, as well as Theophanopoulou-Kontou (2000).

12. Here, I abstract away from the well-known debate about the status of third person in the grammar (see Nevins 2007 for a recent discussion, and references therein). I will come back to this later on. Also note that the analysis of /m/, /s/ and /t/ as person morphemes is further corroborated by the fact that the same morphemes are found in possessive pronouns, which also encode person. Note, on the other hand, that the active forms of the verb (cf. the verb *grafo* (‘to write’): *graf-o*, *graf-is*, *graf-i*, *graf-ume*, *graf-ete*, *graf-un*) do not seem to contain the same morphology (in fact the presence of /t/ in the second person is not expected, given the corresponding non-active and pronominal forms). Nevertheless, given the striking resemblance between the personal pronoun forms and the medio-passive endings, as well as the fact that the

plausible to assume that these segments are morphological exponents of a person feature. Judgements for other features (e.g. number, gender or case) are much trickier, given the fusional character of Greek (see, though, Drachman 1997 for a morphological decomposition of these forms into all the relevant features).

2.2.2 Strong vs. clitic/weak pronouns: The issue of deficiency

2.2.2.1 *The partition of pronouns into types: Kayne (1975), Cardinaletti & Starke (1999)*
 Besides these fairly obvious differences, strong and weak personal pronouns also differ in other important respects, namely syntactically, semantically, phonologically, pragmatically and possibly also structurally (depending on whether their differences imply a structural difference or not). The general observation is that weak pronouns are more restricted or more deficient (with regard to their properties) in relation to strong ones. This is a fairly well established phenomenon, and it has been extensively discussed in the generative literature. Kayne (1975) and Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) are two of the most widely cited works in this respect. Kayne (1975) has shown that French distinguishes between two series of subject and object personal pronouns, namely strong pronouns and clitics, based on a number of distributional, syntactic, and morpho-phonological criteria, such as coordination, modification, focalization, and distribution. His main claim was that strong pronouns pattern like full NPs in all these respects, as opposed to clitics, which appear to have a special status.¹³

Since the publication of Kayne's seminal work on French pronouns, many researchers have observed that other Romance languages also make a distinction between strong and weak personal pronouns, with similar (if not identical) properties to those observed in French (e.g. Spanish, Italian, and Romanian). Furthermore, systematic research into the properties of pronouns in Germanic languages in the late '80's and early '90's (see e.g. Holmberg 1986; Cardinaletti & Starke 1996, 1999 and references therein for more references on Germanic; Cardinaletti 1999) has revealed that they also distinguish between (at least) two classes of pronouns, although there also appear to be some differences in relation to Romance. For example, in some Germanic

same segments mark person across paradigms, any other hypothesis looks less plausible and less interesting. Although the distinct active and medio-passive endings could probably be amenable to a diachronic explanation (possibly involving incorporation of nominative vs. accusative forms of the personal pronoun – cf. the -o ending of 1st singular vs. ego; and see Givón 1976, Roberts & Roussou 2003: Chapter 4 for an account of how personal endings arise in languages), the question remains how one can capture this difference in synchronic terms. A morphological approach (e.g. the presence of an active feature may regulate the exponence of the person feature) would probably work, however this issue is beyond the scope of this discussion.

13. In fact, Kayne (1975, 1983) argued that subject clitics are in reality strong pronouns that undergo P(honological) F(orm) cliticization, as opposed to object clitics which are true syntactic clitics. In this way he was able to account for the XP vs. X⁰ properties of subject and object clitics respectively. See also Cardinaletti & Starke (1996) for a critique of Kayne's approach.

languages (e.g. Mainland Scandinavian languages, Standard German, and English) two distinct series of pronouns have been distinguished (namely strong and weak), however their weak series seems to share properties with both strong and weak pronouns in languages like French (cf. e.g. the properties of German *es*, according to Cardinaletti & Starke 1996). In addition, some Germanic languages, like Colloquial Standard German (see e.g. Grohmann 1997), West Flemish (see Haegeman 1993), and Tirolese German (see Cardinaletti & Starke 1996) have been shown to have a third type of pronoun (besides the two 'standard' strong/weak types), which has such clitic properties that make it look quite similar to weak pronouns in Romance languages.

Based on these properties of personal pronouns in Germanic languages (as well as on the properties of pronouns in Romance and other languages), Cardinaletti & Starke (1996, 1999), have argued that cross-linguistically pronouns can be classified in three distinct sub-types, namely strong, weak and clitic pronouns, which form a gradation of structural deficiency (with morphological, syntactic, phonological and semantic repercussions), in the sense that clitic pronouns are more deficient than weak pronouns which are more deficient than strong pronouns. Not all languages display all three types (e.g. Standard German appears to have only strong and weak pronouns, while Greek has only strong and clitic (object) pronouns – although for Greek see also discussion below and Chapter 6), while on the other hand distinct types are not necessarily marked differently. The latter fact is quite important, given that morphology had been taken up to that point as one of the most salient criteria for distinguishing between distinct pronoun types (cf. Cardinaletti 1999 on the delay in the discovery of distinct pronoun types in Germanic languages, especially with regards to the strong-weak distinction). Despite all this, it seems that each type has a predictable behavior which is shared up to a large extent across all languages. I will come back to their theory when I will discuss the issue of the internal structure of clitic pronouns as opposed to strong pronouns in Greek.

2.2.2.2 *Partition criteria applied to Greek*

Greek strong and weak pronouns appear to display the properties of strong and clitic pronouns respectively, following the tripartite typology of Cardinaletti & Starke (1999), or those of strong pronouns and syntactic X^0 clitics in Kayne's (1975) analysis. In particular, the following criteria have been proposed in order to distinguish between different types of pronouns:

- a. *Morphological* criteria (morphological deficiency)
- b. *Syntactic* criteria (distribution, coordination, modification, X^0 vs. XP properties)
- c. *Semantic* criteria (animacy/human, referential properties, impersonal, expletive and non-referential uses)
- d. (*Morpho*)*phonological* criteria (sandhi rules, prosodic restructuring, inherent stress)

A. *Coordination* (syntactic) and *human reference* (semantic)

First of all, strong and clitic pronouns fall into the two distinct pronoun classes (class 1 and class 2) proposed by Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) on the basis of coordination and

human reference. In particular, Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) have pointed out that in many languages pronouns appear to be divided into two distinct classes (even if they are morphologically non-distinct): class 1 pronouns may be coordinated but can only have human referents, as opposed to class 2 pronouns which cannot be coordinated but which may refer to both human and non-human entities. This distinction becomes fully transparent when we look at third person pronouns, and is able to distinguish between strong vs. weak/clitic pronouns¹⁴:

- (9) a. Quiero a *ella* y a éstas dos aquí. Spanish (Spain)
 Want.1sg her and those two here
Ella: class 1 pronoun (strong); coordination: $\sqrt{}$; + human reference only
- b. *Pedro *la* y estas dos quiere. Spanish (Spain)
 Peter her and those two wants.3sg
La: class 2 pronoun (clitic); coordination: *; \pm human reference
 ‘Peter wants her and those two here.’
- c. *Hu* gadol. (*hu* = Dani/ shulxan = table) Hebrew (Israel)
 He big.masc
 ‘He is big.’
Hu: class 2 pronoun (weak); coordination: –; \pm human reference)
- d. *Hu* vezeh gdolim. (*hu* = Dani) Hebrew (Israel)
 He and-this-one.masc big.pl.masc
 ‘He and this one are big.’
Hu: class 1 pronoun (strong); coordination: $\sqrt{}$; + human reference only)
- e. **Il* et celui de Jean sont beaux. French (France)
 He and the.one of John are pretty
Il: class 2 pronoun (weak); coordination: *; \pm human reference
- f. *Lui* et celui de Jean sont beaux. French (France)
 He and the.one of John are pretty
Lui: class 1 pronoun (strong); coordination: $\sqrt{}$; + human reference
 (examples taken from Cardinaletti & Starke 1999: 149 (their (10b) and (10d))

Greek clitic pronouns certainly fall into class 2 (no coordination; \pm human). (3rd person) strong pronouns, on the other hand, may be coordinated but do not appear to be restricted in terms of reference. This is not peculiar, since 3rd person pronouns are really demonstratives,¹⁵ which typically do not exhibit a non-humanness restriction on a

14. I.e. class 2 pronouns may be either weak or clitic pronouns, whereas class 1 pronouns are exclusively strong pronouns.

15. Demonstratives may be used either as pronouns, or as adjectives within a noun phrase. In both cases they may have a deictic or an anaphoric usage (see also Alexiadou et. al. 2007). Typically, in the former case they pick up their referent through the extra-linguistic context, while in the latter the referent is provided by previous linguistic context. In their deictic use they

cross-linguistic level (cf. Cardinaletti & Starke 1999 for a discussion). For this reason, they seem to share properties from both classes. Cardinaletti & Starke argue that demonstratives do not fall into the same paradigm with (true) personal pronouns. Although, strictly speaking, this is correct, here I will use a demonstrative pronoun in its personal pronoun use in order to illustrate its difference from clitic pronouns in terms of coordination:

- (10) a. *Idha afton ke aftus eki.* Greek
 Saw.1sg him.str and them.str there
 'I saw him and those over there.'
Afton: demonstrative pronoun (strong); coordination: $\sqrt{\text{ }}$; \pm human reference
- b. **I Maria ton ke aftus eki idhe.*
 The Mary.nom him.cl and them.str there saw.3sg
 'Maria saw them and those over there.' Greek
Ton: class 2 pronoun (clitic); coordination: *; \pm human reference

Of course, 1st and 2nd person strong pronouns can only have a [+ human] reading (for obvious reasons – cf. the fact that they realize the speaker and the addressee respectively (putting the issue of number aside for the moment)), and they can also be coordinated. The corresponding clitic pronouns also have (only) the [+ human/animate] reading but cannot be coordinated:

- (11) a. *I Alexandhra kerase emas ke tus ghitones tis.* Greek
 The Alexandra.nom treated.3sg us.str and the neighbours.acc her.cl
- b. **I Alexandhra mas ke tus ghitones tis kerase.*
 The Alexandra.nom us.cl and the neighbours.acc her.cl treated.3sg Greek
 'Alexandra treated us and her neighbours.'
Mas: class 2 pronoun (clitic); coordination: *; \pm human reference

B. *Morphological deficiency* (morphological)

A second major difference between full and clitic pronouns is that they are morphologically distinct. In particular, clitics and strong pronouns are morphologically related in an asymmetric way, in the sense that clitics typically are reduced morphological variants of the corresponding strong forms. This is immediately obvious if one looks at the table of personal pronouns given in (1). Here, I give an example from the 2nd person singular:

- (12) *Esas dhen sas ksero kala.* Greek
 You.pl.str not you.pl.cl know.1sg well
 'You, I don't know well.'

can be accompanied by so-called reinforcers, like *edho* ('here') and *eki* ('there'). Finally, in their anaphoric usage as pronouns they typically have an emphatic reading, as is the case for all other strong pronouns in languages with (subject/object) clitics and null pro subjects.

This is a so-called Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) construction (see Anagnostopoulou 1994 for Greek, and more generally Cinque 1990), which involves a strong personal pronoun, presumably adjoined to IP, and a clitic pronoun within the IP constituent (note that this is only one possible way of analyzing this construction – see Iatridou 1991 for a dislocation analysis of CLLD, and Cecchetto 1999, 2000; Belletti 2005 for an alternative, movement analysis for Italian).¹⁶ It is fairly obvious that the clitic is morphologically reduced in comparison with its strong counterpart.

Note that the same asymmetric relationship between strong and clitic pronouns is quite common cross-linguistically. For example, in French *moi ~ me* (to me – me) is such a minimal pair (see also Kayne 2000 for an analysis which takes *moi* to be bi-morphemic as opposed to *me* which is mono-morphemic), and the same applies to the Spanish pair (*a*) *nosotros ~ nos* (to us – us). Similar remarks have also been made for the morphological relationship between strong and weak pronouns, i.e. weak pronouns may also be morphologically reduced with regard to strong pronouns (cf. e.g. *a loro ~ loro* (to them – them) in Italian). Finally, a clitic may be more reduced than a weak pronoun, as e.g. *'m ~ ihm* (him-him) in Colloquial Standard German. These two facts are illustrated below:

- (13) a. Non dirò mai tutto *a loro*. Italian (Italy)
 Not will-say.1sg. never everything to them
- b. Non dirò mai *loro* tutto. Italian (Italy)
 Not will-say.1sg never them.weak everything
 'I will never say everything to them.'
- c. Daß Maria *ihm* gestern das Buch gegeben hat. German
 That Maria him.weak yesterday the book.acc given has
- d. Daß *'m* Maria gestern das Buch gegeben hat. German
 That him.cl Maria yesterday the book.acc given has
 'That Mary has given him the book.'

In this respect, one can find examples of strong-weak-clitic triplets, where each pronoun type is morphologically (more) reduced with respect to the other one (so that strong is less reduced than weak which is less reduced than clitic). This is, for example, the case of *a loro ~ loro ~ gli* in Standard Italian. As a final point, we should add that morphological asymmetry is only a tendency: although clitics tend to be more reduced than weak and strong pronouns, and although weak pronouns tend to be more reduced than strong ones, there are many cases where this is not true, in that some or all pronouns within a tripartition/bipartition may be identical in form. This is especially quite common between strong and weak pronouns, although it is less common for clitic-strong

16. Adam Ledgeway asks why one would want to argue that *esas* in (12) is adjoined to IP, rather than in the left periphery. As I also point out in the text, adjunction to IP is one plausible account of the position of the Clitic Left Dislocated pronoun. Movement to a Topic position within the Left Periphery is another possible analysis. Which one is to be chosen will depend on further evidence, however it is not important for the point being made here.

pairs. Examples include the French strong-clitic pair *nous* ~ *nous*, or the German strong-weak pair *ihn* ~ *ihn* (for more examples see Cardinaletti & Starke 1996, 1999).

C. *Modification* (syntactic)

A third difference is that strong pronouns can be modified, whereas clitics (and weak pronouns in languages that have them) cannot. This is illustrated in the following example:

- (14) a. Skeftete [esena mono] / [emas tus dhio] / [aftin me to kokino forema].
 Thinks.3sg[only you.str] / [us.str the two] / [her.str with the red dress]
 b. * [Se mono] / [mas tus dhio] / [tin me to kokino forema] skeftete.
 [You.cl only] / [us.cl the two] / [her.cl with the red dress] thinks.3sg
 'He/she only thinks about you / the two of us / the one with the red dress.'
 Greek

In this respect, strong pronouns pattern with full noun phrases:

- (15) Vlepi [ti Theopula mono]. Greek
 Sees.3sg [the Theopula only]
 'He/she sees only Theopula.'

D. *Distribution* (syntactic)

Moreover, clitic pronouns appear to have a quite restricted distribution, since they may only appear in particular positions within the clause, whereas strong pronouns and full noun phrases are much freer in this respect. In particular, clitics (and clusters thereof) must immediately precede or follow the verb (or the auxiliary, if the sentence contains an auxiliary), largely depending on the finiteness properties of the latter: they precede indicatives and subjunctives and follow imperatives and gerunds. Nothing may intervene between the clitic and its host:

- (16) a. I Korina *ton* ithele san trelī. Greek
 The Korina.nom him.cl wanted.3sg like crazy.nom
 'Korina wanted him like crazy.'
 b. *Mu to* iche pi to koritsi su. Greek
 Me.cl it.cl. had.3sg. said.inf. the girl.acc your.cl
 'Your girl had said it to me.'
 c. O Bilis (**to*) tha (√*to*) (**tora*) Greek
 The Bilis.nom (it.cl) FUT (it.cl) (now)
 dhiri (**to*) (√*tora*) to Mitsaki.
 beat.3sg. (it.cl) (now) the Mitsaki.acc
 'Bilis will beat Mitsaki now.'
 d. (**To*) kane (**tora*) (√*to*) (tora) to pastitsio Eli! Greek
 (It.cl) do.2sg.imp. (now) it.cl now the pastitsio.acc Eli.voc
 'Do it now Eli the pastitsio!'

(Strong) object pronouns and full noun phrases do not need to be adjacent to the verb, and moreover they cannot appear in the same position as proclitics:

- (17) a. *To* pire o Kostas. Greek
 It.cl took.3sg the Kostas.nom
 'Kostas took it.'
- b. Pire o Kostas *to kinito*. Greek
 Took.3sg the Kostas.nom the mobile.acc
 'Kostas took the mobile phone.'
- c. **To kinito* pire o Kostas. Greek
 The mobile.acc took.3sg the Kostas.
 'Kostas took the mobile phone.'

Given that clitics can only immediately precede or follow their host, it follows quite straightforwardly that they also cannot appear in the theta-position (external merge position), as well as in peripheral positions, such as clitic left dislocated positions, and left and right dislocated positions (i.e. hanging topic positions) (see Anagnostopoulou 1997, 2005a, Español-Echevarría & Ralli 2000 for some properties of clitic dislocated and hanging topic positions). Full pronouns and noun phrases can appear in these positions without any problems. However, note that a clitic is required in conjunction with CLLD and Left Hanging Topics. Topicalized indefinite DPs do not have such a requirement (see also Giannakidou & Merchant 1997 for indefinite topicalization in Greek):

- (18) a. [Tin Katina/emena/**me*] i ghonis tu Marku Greek
 [The Katina.acc/me.str/me.cl] the parents.nom the Mark.gen
 *(*tin/me*) proskalesan sto parti gia ta saranda xronia ghamu tus.
 (her.cl/me.cl) invited.3pl to-the party for the fourty years marriage.gen
 their.cl
 'Mark's parents have invited Katina/me to their fourty years of marriage party.'
 [Clitic Left Dislocation]
- b. [I Katina/aftos/**tos*], i Marina *(*tin/ton*)
 [The Katina.nom/he.str.he.cl] the Marina.nom (her.cl/him.cl)
 kalese.
 invited.3sg
 'Katina/he, Marina invited her/him.' Greek
 [Hanging Topic Left dislocation]
- c. I Marina *(*tin/ton*) kalese, tin
 The Marina.nom (her.cl/him.cl) invited.3sg the
 Katina /afton /**ton*.
 Katina.acc/him.str/him.cl
 'Marina invited, Katina/him.' Greek
 [Right dislocation]

- d. *Fraules/*tis* i Adonia dhen pulai. Greek
 Strawberries.acc/them.cl the Adonia.nom not sells.3sg
 [Indefinite topicalization]
- e. *Tis* milise o Markoras tis Marinas/aftis/*tis. Greek
 Her.cl talked.3sg the Markoras.nom the Marina.dat/her.dat.str/her.cl
 'Markoras talked to Marina/her.' [Clitic doubling]

Clitics cannot focalize to the left periphery of the sentence, as opposed to strong pronouns and full nouns phrases (definite and indefinite ones)¹⁷:

- (19) *Tis* VALITSES sas /AFTES /*TES parte! Greek
 The BAGGAGE.acc your.cl/THEM.str/THEM.cl take.2pl.imp.
 'Take your LUGGAGE/THEM!'¹⁸

A further difference between clitics and strong pronouns/noun phrases is also the fact that the former, but not the latter, cannot be used in isolation (for example, as answers to (narrow focus) questions)¹⁹:

- (20) *Pjus* zografise i Flora? –Emas/*mas/tus filus tis. Greek
 Who.acc painted.3sg the Flora.nom? – Us.str/us.cl/the friends.acc her.cl
 'Who did Flora paint?' – Us/Her friends.'

17. Note that typically clitics are not compatible with a focalized pronoun/noun phrase, in that they cannot double the latter (see Tsimpli 1995):

- (i) TON JANI (*ton) xastukise i mana mu. Greek
 THE JOHN.acc (him.cl) slapped.3sg the mother.nom me.gen.cl
 'It was JOHN that my mother slapped.'

18. Note that strong pronouns and full noun phrases may also receive (contrastive) focus in situ (see Tsimpli 1995), and, as expected, clitics are equally ungrammatical in this position:

- (i) Parte tis VALITSES sas/AFTES/*TES. Greek

19. Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) take isolation to be a peripheral position as well, possibly a case of dislocation. Here, I do not intend to make any comments on the structural nature of isolated constituents, although it seems fairly clear to me that at least answers to narrow focus questions must involve some form of PF deletion, as shown by the existence of question-answer pairs. What matters is that clitic pronouns cannot be uttered on their own, contrary to other word constituents. This could be related to the inherent incompatibility of clitics with focus (given that these constructions typically involve focus), although the impossibility of clitics in non-focalized peripheral (and non-peripheral) positions makes this assumption much less plausible. See also Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) and discussion in main text below.

E. *Semantic properties of clitics* (semantic)

Turning now to their semantic properties, clitic pronouns can be referential or non-referential. In their referential use²⁰ they are typically anaphoric, in the sense that they pick up their referent via a prominent antecedent, which is provided by the previous immediate linguistic context (discourse).²¹ However, quite rarely they may be also used deictically (or, more appropriately, ostensively), in which case they may pick up their referent by ostension²² (although pointing is not a necessary condition if the antecedent is salient enough in the discourse):

- (21) a. Chtes sinandisa ti Meri_i. Greek
 Yesterday met.1sg the Mary.acc.
Tis_i milisa jia ti mitera tis.
 Her.cl talked-to.3sg for the mother.acc her.cl
 ‘Yesterday, I met Mary. I talked to her about her mother.’
- b. Kala, dhen vlepis oti *tu_i* milao? (accompanied by pointing)
 Well, not see.2sg that him.cl.dat. talk.1sg
 ‘Can’t you see that I am talking to him?’ Greek
- c. Na min *ton_i*
 Subj not him.cl
 ksanadho! (uttered immediately after a certain man has left)
 again-see.1sg
 ‘I would not like to see him again.’ Greek

20. Or, more precisely, their co-referential use, given that (clitic) pronouns refer by sharing the same referential index with a prominent/salient antecedent (either via simple co-reference, or via syntactic/semantic binding – cf. the semantic distinction between free and bound pronouns (see Heim & Kratzer 1998 for an overview)).

21. Prominence is a necessary condition for the antecedent of (referential) clitic pronouns (see also Heim 1982 for the Prominence Condition which pronominal definite NPs must obey). This is, for example, obvious from the fact that they cannot be accommodated: in ‘O Nikos dhiavase ena vivlio gia ton Perikli, ke tu eghrapse ena gramma’ (‘The Nikos.nom read.3sg a book. acc for the Pericles.acc, and him.cl wrote.3sg a letter.acc’// ‘Nick read a book about Pericles, and wrote him a letter’), *tu* can only refer to Pericles, the most salient antecedent in the discourse, and not to the author of the book about Pericles. Finally, note that doubling is not compatible with a novel definite reading (see Anagnostopoulou 1999 for extensive discussion).

22. For the difference between deixis (which involves the use of linguistic expressions/categories that relate what is talked about to a spatio-temporal centre) and ostension (which involves pointing, i.e. expressions that direct the addressee to a particular antecedent) see Lyons (1999). Note that as Heim & Kratzer (1998) correctly point out, anaphoric and deictic uses do not seem to involve an actual distinction, given that in both cases a (referential use of a) pronoun picks up its referent via coreference with a prominent antecedent.

Clitics can also have a number of non-referential uses. The most typical case is when they are variables bound by a non-referential antecedent such as a quantifier:

- (22) *Kathe anthropos pistevi oti ton aghapane.* Greek
 Every man.nom thinks.3sg that him.cl love.3pl
 ‘Every man thinks that they love him.’
 [For every *x*, *x* a man, *x* thinks that they love *x*]

Since variable binding is contingent on syntactic/semantic binding (Reinhart 1983), clitic pronouns may receive a bound variable interpretation even when their antecedent is referential (e.g. a proper noun), as long as the latter binds it. This is illustrated below, where in the second elided conjunct *tu* (a possessive clitic) can receive a sloppy identity reading according to which *tu* is bound by (the index of) Kostas²³:

- (23) *O Janis pire telefono ti jineka tu ke o Kostas*
 The John.nom took.3sg phone the woman.acc his.cl and the Kostas.nom
episis.
also
 ‘John called his wife, and also did John.’ Greek
 = Janis₁ called his₁ wife, and Kostas₂ called his₂ wife, too. (sloppy identity)
 = Janis₁ called his₁ wife, and Kostas₂ called his₁ wife, too. (strict identity)

3rd person clitics may also be used non-referentially in idiomatic constructions, which are very productive in Greek (see Bibis 2002 for details):

- (24) *Mu tin espase.* Greek
 Me.cl her.cl broke.3sg
 ‘He/she really got on my nerves/annoyed me.’

23. Possessive pronouns involve clitic genitive pronouns, which are homophonous with those used in the verbal domain in dative and (other) applicative constructions (e.g. benefactives, malefactives, and non-argumental datives). However, there is evidence that these are not the same underlying element, since in Northern Greek dialects, which use accusative instead of the dative, only genitive clitics/pronouns are possible with nominals. Moreover, as I show in Chapter 6, there is additional evidence that these are not clitics, but weak pronouns. If this is true, then it would be more appropriate to use an unambiguous example, such as the following:

- (i) *O Janis nomize oti ton parakoluthi i astinomia, o*
 The John.nom thought.3sg that him.cl watch.3sg the police.nom, the
Kostas episis. Greek
Kostas.nom also
 = John₁ thought that he₁ was being watched by the police, and Kostas₂ thought that he₂ was being watched by the police, too. (sloppy identity)
 = John₁ thought that he₁ was being watched by the police, and Kostas₂ thought that he₁ was being watched by the police, too. (strict identity)