Brian D. Joseph: "Deixis and Person in the Development of Greek Personal Pronominal Paradigms"

In: Deixis and Pronouns in Romance Languages (SLCS 136), ed. by Kirsten Jeppesen Kragh & Jan Lindschouw, 19-32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishers (2013).

Studies in Language Companion Series (SLCS)

This series has been established as a companion series to the periodical *Studies in Language*.

For an overview of all books published in this series, please see *http://benjamins.com/catalog/slcs*

Volume 136

Deixis and Pronouns in Romance Languages
Edited by Kirsten Jeppesen Kragh and Jan Lindschouw

Deixis and Pronouns in Romance Languages

Edited by

Kirsten Jeppesen Kragh
Jan Lindschouw
University of Copenhagen

John Benjamins Publishing Company
Amsterdam / Philadelphia

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

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Deixis and Pronouns in Romance Languages / Edited by Kirsten Jeppesen Kragh and Jan Lindschouw.
p. cm. (Studies in Language Companion Series, ISSN 0165-7763 ; v. 136)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
1. Romance languages--Pronoun. 2. Romance languages--Deixis. 3. Romance languages--Grammar. I. Kragh, Kirsten Jeppesen. II. Lindschouw, Jan.
P141.D45 2013
440'.04555--dc23 2013019633
ISBN 978 90 272 0603 9 (Hb ; alk. paper)
ISBN 978 90 272 7160 0 (Eb)

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

Introduction to deixis and pronouns in Romance languages

Kirsten Jeppesen Kragh & Jan Lindschouw
University of Copenhagen

1. Introduction

This book presents a selection of revised and elaborated papers read at the seminar on *Deixis and Pronouns in Romance Languages,* at the University of Copenhagen, May 2011. It offers insights on the current linguistic debate on deixis and variation in the pronominal system of Romance languages. The underlying research question concerns the problem of whether linguistic structures are culture-dependent or not. We have sought to investigate this question, employing a detailed study of linguistic expressions regarding the extra-linguistic dimensions of *person, place,* and *time*. These concepts, which constitute fundamental relations for any speaker who wishes to position him- or herself in regard to the surrounding world, comprise deictic references, i.e. references to be used in specific communicative situations. These concepts are conceptual anchors so to speak, and can be used as a *tertium comparationis* in regard to the linguistic expressions, which are subject to change or variety. Deictic elements only attain meaning by being located in a certain context. It is exactly the use of these elements that explains why expressions such as *We will meet here again next week*, with references to *person* (*we*), *time* (*next week*) and *place* (*here*), have no meaning without the communicative context in which they arise. Our hypothesis is that the study of these basic dimensions and their linguistic expressions will reveal similarities and differences, between Romance languages, as well as set the stage for comparisons between Romance and non-Romance languages. We further hypothesize that these similarities and differences are subject to change in connection with cultural developments in society. In order to test this, we have initiated a coordinated effort in exploring the linguistic expressions of these extra-linguistic concepts.

PART I

Deixis and grammatical paradigms

Deixis and person in the development of Greek personal pronominal paradigms

Brian D. Joseph
The Ohio State University

The historical development of the singular personal pronouns in Greek from the Classical language into Modern Greek is presented here with attention first of all to the ways in which sound change, analogy, and semantic change shape the paradigms. In addition, the role that the notions of deixis and person have played in these processes of change is examined, and claims that have been made in the literature, especially by Haiman 1991, about the principles that guide the emergence of weak ("clitic") pronouns in a language are tested against the Greek developments, and ultimately found to be inadequate. Of particular note is the unusual development in latter Greek by which a weak subject pronoun was created with two, and only two, predicates. It is shown too that Modern Greek provides a basis for distinguishing between syntactically weak forms and forms that are merely phonologically weak.

1. Preliminaries

The personal pronouns of Greek show a number of changes over the course of some 2500 years of development that provide an interesting vantage point from which to gain insight into the role of deixis and person in the shaping of pronominal paradigms. The Ancient Greek system of personal pronouns showed paradigms with a large number of distinct forms, whereas the Modern Greek system maintains some, but not all, of the distinctions, and moreover shows various elaborations to the forms themselves and to the distinctions. In what follows, the broad outlines of the changes between these temporally quite removed systems are presented, and then, drawing on Joseph (1994, 2001), details are given on the emergence of a special set of pronominal forms, since these forms invite overt consideration of the role of deixis and person in their development, especially regarding how sets of paradigmatic oppositions arose and were altered or maintained in the general organization of the pronominal paradigms; by extension, therefore, some insight is offered into the role of these key notions in other languages, e.g. Romance, and in general.

2. Outlines of the history of the Greek personal pronouns

The Ancient Greek distinctions found for the personal pronouns include three persons (first, second, third), three numbers (singular, dual, plural), and four cases (nominative, accusative, genitive, and dative). Leaving out the dual, as it was always relatively rare and eventually completely lost, and focusing just on the singular as especially illustrative, for reasons that become clear below, the following paradigms occur, with first person and second person given in (1) and third person in (2):

(1)

		Strong	Weak			Strong	Weak
1SG	NOM	egō	Ø	2SG	NOM	sü	Ø
	ACC	emé	me		ACC	sé	se
	GEN	emoû	mou		GEN	soû	sou
	DAT	emoî	moi		DAT	soî	soi

(2)

		Strong	Weak
3SG	NOM	Ø	Ø
	ACC	hé	he
	GEN	hoû	hou
	DAT	hoî	hoi

By contrast, in Modern Greek, the following are found, with first person and second person shown in (3) and third person in (4):

(3)

		Strong	Weak			Strong	Weak
1SG	NOM	eγó	Ø	2SG	NOM	esí	Ø
	ACC	eména	me		ACC	eséna	se
	GEN	eména	mu		GEN	eséna	su

(4)

		Strong			Weak		
		M	F	N	M	F	N
3SG	NOM	aftós	aftí	aftó	Ø	Ø	Ø
	ACC	aftón	aftín	aftó	ton	tin	to
	GEN	aftú	aftís	aftú	tu	tis	tu

Two points of explanation are needed about the ancient forms. First, there were several clear demonstrative pronouns, including *hoûtos* 'this one', *hóde* 'this one', *ekeînos* 'that one', *autós* 'this one (as opposed to someone else)', and *ho* (*men … ho de*) 'the one (… the other)', that could be used in ways that fill in functionally for the strong 3rd person nominative, though without being paradigmatically linked to the other forms. That is, grammars of Ancient Greek (e.g. Smyth 1920; Goodwin & Gulick 1930) are quite explicit about these nominatives *not* being 3SG personal pronouns per se, even when they seem to be translatable as emphatic versions of 'he' or 'she', but rather still being deictic/demonstrative in nature; the sense of emphasis thus presumably comes from the deixis, thus '*this* one (as opposed to others)'. They can be referred to as "surrogate nominatives", in that they are functionally linked to the paradigms but are not fully a part of the paradigm, certainly not from a morphological standpoint. Second, weak nominatives, marked here as "Ø", i.e. "zero", can actually be taken as "null subjects" resulting from "pro-Drop", by which unemphatic subject pronouns are suppressed, the strong forms being the emphatic ones; from a morphological standpoint, however, there are no special forms.

A comparison of the ancient forms in (1) and (2) with the modern forms in (3) and (4) shows that several changes occurred, all of which are explained below. These involve regular sound change, analogy, category loss, and what might be called "redeployment" via semantic change. For some of these changes, the chronological order is irrelevant, and they are presented here in an order that works from an expository standpoint alone.

First, within Classical Greek itself, oblique forms of *autós* replace the strong forms *hé*/*hoû*/*hoî*, thus giving the paradigm in (5), illustrated with the masculine forms:

(5)

		Strong	Weak
3SG	NOM	Ø	Ø
	ACC	autón	he
	GEN	autoû	hou
	DAT	autōî	hoi

This change entailed a semantic shift, from demonstrative to simple pronoun, and a concomitant shift in function, that is to say, a redeployment, of the forms of *autós*. From a paradigmatic standpoint, a new strong morphologically coherent paradigm emerges, though with a mismatch between strong and weak in terms of the shape of the forms themselves.

Second, there were a number of sound changes in Post-Classical Greek that in a sense, when viewed from the perspective of the historical morphology or syntax of these forms, are trivial or mechanical but nonetheless real, and these had an effect on the phonological shape of the forms themselves. The changes in question are listed in (6):

(6) Relevant Sound Changes between Classical Greek and Post-Classical Greek

g	>	γ
au	>	af /__[-voice]
ü	>	i
ou	>	u
ō	>	o (as part of general loss of length)

Thus, for example, a form like Classical Greek *egṓ* 'I/NOM' became *eyó* in later Greek by regular sound change.

Third, there was a general loss of the dative case, affecting both singular and plural forms. This occurred across all categories of words, thus in nouns and adjectives and not just in pronouns. In that sense, therefore, it is not something that needs to be accounted for as far as the pronouns are concerned but rather the pronominal developments with the dative can be folded into the more general development.

Fourth, several analogies and reanalyses led to the reshaping of the Ancient Greek forms. For instance, 2SG nominative *sü* became *si* by regular sound change, and by analogy to *egō*, whether in its Classical form or its later form *eyó*, was reshaped to *esí*. In the case of the accusative *emena*/*esena* as strong forms deriving from earlier *emé*/*sé*, Ancient Greek *sé* acquired an initial *e-* cross-paradigmatically by analogy with *emé* or paradigm-internally from the model of *esí*. Moreover, *emé* and (*e*)*sé* were treated like vowel-stem accusatives and acquired the regular vowel-stem accusative ending *-n*, giving *emén*/*esén*. These forms must have been reanalyzed as stems, a development that was aided no doubt by the opacity of the morphological parsing of *emén*/*esén* compared to their nominative counterparts (*eyó*/*esí*) and the resulting difficulty of parsing these innovative accusatives. That is, they came to be treated like consonant-stem accusatives; as such, they added the regular consonant-stem accusative (singular) ending *-a*, giving the modern forms. It is interesting to note that these processes of reanalysis and reconstitution of the endings recycled, since the accusative form *eménan* also occurred; the addition of *-n* was aided no doubt by the variable deletion (alternatively, variable retention) of word-final *-n* at various points in Post-Classical Greek.

Further steps leading to the modern forms included some changes in the early Post-Classical Greek pronominal system, e.g. as seen in the period of the Hellenistic Koiné, as outlined by Dressler (1966). In the Koine period, as an extension of the developments seen above in (5) with the oblique cases, the nominative *autos*, previously a demonstrative 'this', began to be used as the 3rd person nominative subject pronoun. This reflected a narrowing of the range of surrogate nominatives in Ancient Greek that were noted above.

Also, a set of weak accusative pronouns, e.g. masculine singular *tón*, was beginning to emerge. This particular development involved the redeployment of a form that was originally a demonstrative in early Greek, e.g. in Homeric Greek of the 8th century BC, but which had become a definite article by the Classical period. Even so, there are still some pronominal uses of this form to be found in Classical Greek, such as *ho* in the contrastive construction noted above, *ho men … ho de* 'the one … the other' (literally "this-one but (on-the-one-hand) … this-one but (on-the-other)"). It is also the case that the definite article was encroaching

on the old relative pronoun, giving an innovative pronominal usage for accusative forms like *tón*, thus meaning 'the-one-which'; this usage is found in some Classical authors, especially Herodotos, and becomes more widespread in post-Classical times. From a paradigmatic standpoint, this led to a better fit in actual form – which undoubtedly aided the development – between the strong and the weak set of pronouns in the 3rd person, e.g. masculine singular accusative *autón* ~ *tón*; this fact figures importantly in another key innovation discussed below.

It is worthwhile reviewing at this point the status of this distinction of strong versus weak forms and functions in the pronominal system, since it plays such a key role in the pronominal paradigms. As an organizing principle in the pronouns, this distinction has been present from the beginning of Greek, as weak pronouns are evident in Homeric usage. Moreover, it is surely inherited from Proto-Indo-European, since parallel distinctions are found in the oldest layers of Indo-Iranian, Hittite, Balto-Slavic, and Celtic. And, inasmuch as it is a key organizing parameter for Romance pronominal systems, seeing how it manifests itself in Greek can shed some light on how Romance systems operate.

The changes described above had several effects on this key distinction. In the Classical Greek system, oblique cases (accusative, dative, genitive), in all persons, manifested a distinction of strong vs. weak pronouns (e.g. 1st person accusative singular *emé* vs. *me*, 3rd person accusative singular masculine *hé* versus *he*), so that this trait can be said to have provided a point of connection uniting the three person categories for pronominal forms. However, for nominative forms, there were no persons that manifested a weak vs. strong contrast via overt forms; rather, strong vs. zero was the relevant contrast and that held only for 1st and 2nd persons, since in the 3rd person there were no overt strong nominatives, only the "surrogate nominatives" referred to earlier. In that sense, then, this trait, of strong vs. weak, i.e. zero, nominatives, divided the three person categories, with 1st/2nd standing in contrast to 3rd as far as the nominative was concerned.

In the Koine period, however, the increased use of *autós* as a strong nominative subject pronoun extended the strong vs. weak (zero) contrast in the nominative of 1st and 2nd person categories into the 3rd person. Moreover, it made the nominative in all persons parallel to the oblique cases in that there was now such a distinction in the 3rd person, though it did mean that the distinction in the nominative in all persons was not realized by overt weak material, as it was in the oblique cases. Further, as noted above, as the definite-article-partially-relativizing-pronominal-former-demonstrative-pronoun forms such as *ton* began to take on fully anaphoric functions as weak forms, then purely in terms of their form, they fit well into the emerging system as weak counterparts to strong forms. That is, once forms like the once-demonstrative (accusative) *autón* began to supplant the older *hé*, the transparent connection in form between *autón* and *ton* surely

enhanced the viability of having both *autón* and *ton* in the system; it is noteworthy that in the 1st person, the oblique strong vs. weak distinction was realized by the presence of more material in the strong form, specifically an initial *e-* (e.g. accusative *emé* vs. *me*), and that with the introduction of that initial *e-* into 2nd person forms, the same held, or was beginning to hold, for the 2nd person (e.g. accusative *esé* vs. *se*), and moreover that with *autón*/*ton*, this was so also in the 3rd person.

Thus as the Modern Greek system was emerging, it seems that various kinds of paradigm pressures uniting person categories and/or case categories in accordance with the extent to which and exactly how they realized the distinction of strong vs. weak were at work. These pressures helped to shape the system as it took hold on the way into Modern Greek. Still, there are a few loose ends that need to be noted, even if they cannot be knitted up neatly. First, even if the *autón*/*ton* distinction seems quite viable, the replacement of strong *hé* by *autón* in the first place is not that easy to motivate, since *hé* fit so well into the system of marking the strong vs. weak distinction via [+accent] vs. [–accent]; compare the equivalent 2nd person forms (*sé* vs. *se*). Nonetheless, it happened, and the same happened in the 2nd person, for instance in the accusative, with (eventually) *eséna* vs. *se* supplanting the older *sé* vs. *se* distinction. Second, there was an eventual merger of genitive and accusative strong forms, with the form of accusative taking over at the expense of the older genitive. It is well known that in the northern dialects of Modern Greek, the accusative is used as the case of the indirect object, a function that is expressed by the genitive in the south, with that function having been taken over from the defunct dative. Thus, this may be a case of dialect borrowing from the northern dialects into the southern dialects, which served as the basis for the standard language. The northern development may have some affinity to developments in South Slavic, so that some later Balkan Sprachbund involvement cannot be completely ruled out for the north, but the appearance of this merger in the southern-based standard language in the pronominal system may reflect the encroachment of northern habits in the south in this one small area of the case system, affecting just the personal pronouns.

3. More on third person developments and their history

There are some further interesting developments involving 3rd person forms that are part of the ultimate reshaping of the personal pronoun paradigms and shed light on the strong-weak distinction and on the role of deixis and person. In particular, Modern Greek has an overt weak nominative, i.e. subject, pronoun that fits into the scheme of the strong-weak opposition in ways that are innovative from the perspective of earlier Greek. The form in question is fully distinct from

the accusative only in masculine forms though for most dialects also in feminine plural forms; the full set of forms is given in (7):

(7) MASC.SG *tos* FEM.SG *ti* NTR.SG *to*
MASC.PL *ti* FEM.PL *tes* NTR.PL *ta*

The masculine singular *tos* is taken in what follows as representative of the entire set of forms; whatever is said about *tos* therefore holds for all of the forms in (7).

There are two essential facts regarding the synchronic situation with *tos* (etc.) that turn out to be crucial to understanding their history. First, there are restrictions on the occurrence of *tos* (etc.) such that these forms are found in two and only two constructions: a deictic (presentational) construction headed by *ná* 'here is/are!', illustrated in (8a), and a locative interrogative construction headed by *pún* 'where is/are?' (with voicing of *t* => *d* induced by final *n*), illustrated in (8b); the use of *tos* (etc.) with other verbs is ungrammatical, as shown in (8c):

(8) a. ná tos 'Here he is!', ná ta 'Here they are', etc.
b. pún dos 'Where's he?', pún di 'Where're they?/Where's she?'
c. *méni tos eðó/*tos méni eðó 'He lives here'
*févji tos tóra/*tos févji tóra 'He is leaving now'.

The etymology of the elements heading these constructions figures in the ultimate account of the history of *tos*. There is some controversy concerning the source of *ná* but it has been suggested to be either a borrowing, most likely from Slavic, where a deictic element *na* occurs widely, though Albanian – whereby *ná* would be an old imperative of the Indo-European root *nem- 'take' – is another possible source, or from a Greek-internal source, possibly an earlier *ēní*, abstracted out of *ēníde* (= *ēn* 'behold!' + *íde*, the IMPV of 'see'). Things are a bit clearer with *pún*, as it is generally taken to be from *pú* 'where?' with a reduced form of the 3SG form of 'be', Modern Greek *íne* (earlier *éni*), a derivation that squares perfectly with its meaning ('where is?').

The second essential fact about constructions involving *tos* is that there is considerable structural variability in the range of patterns possible with the two predicates, *ná* and *pún*, that *tos* (etc.) can occur with. These patterns are given in (9), where the marking "%" signals that particular pattern is acceptable to some speakers (though not to all):

(9) a. i. *ná* + ACCUSATIVE of full NP, e.g. *ná ton jáni* 'Here's John'
ii. %*pún* + ACCUSATIVE of full NP, e.g. *pún ton jáni* 'Where's John?'
b. i. *ná* + NOMINATIVE of full NP, e.g. *ná o jánis* 'Here's John'
ii. %*pún* + NOMINATIVE of full NP, e.g. *pún o jánis* 'Where's John?'

c. i. *ná* + ACCUSATIVE of WEAK PRONOUN, e.g. *ná ton* 'Here he is'
ii. %*pún* + ACCUSATIVE of WEAK PRONOUN, e.g. *pún don* 'Where is he?'

d. i. *ná* by itself, e.g. *ná* 'Here!', or *pú íne o jánis? Ná.* 'Where is John? Here (he is)!'
ii. **pún* by itself, e.g.: *Ná o jánis. *pún* 'Here's John! Where is he?' (vs. *pú* 'Where?', which is acceptable alone).

These curious synchronic facts – the highly restricted distribution of *tos* and the wide range of synchronic variation with *ná* and *pún* – raise some interesting diachronic questions about this innovative weak subject pronoun. In particular:[1]

(10) a. How did *tos* (etc.) arise?
b. How does deixis play a role in this?
c. How are interrelations of the categories of person within the pronominal systems affected by reconfigurations of pronominal forms?
d. How does it fit into the strong/weak organizing principle for pronouns?

In Joseph (1981), an account was given of *ná* that had consequences for the diachrony of *tos* (etc.), allowing for the later elaboration, focusing specifically on *tos*, found in Joseph (1994, 2001); the account of *tos* is summarized in what follows. The basic insight that informed this account is that the origin of *tos* must be sought in the highly restricted contexts in which it occurs, thus looking to *ná* and/or *pún*, and the variability that these predicates show.

In particular, the restricted distribution of *tos* provides the basis for a starting point for the developments leading to it, and the wide-ranging structural variation in (9) exhibited by the predicates *tos* occurs with provides the means by which it could arise. The account depends on determining an orderly and motivated progression from a single well-motivated starting point to the variability of (9), and it is here that deixis comes into play in a significant way. As becomes clear below, interplay between nominative and accusative syntax with *ná* and *pún* is what ultimately seems to have allowed for the creation of *tos* via analogy. The display in (9) shows that both nominative and accusative – with both full noun phrases and pronouns – can occur with both *ná* and *pún*. Nonetheless, the best starting point for understanding the emergence of *tos* is *ná*, and not *pún*, especially if *ná* + ACC is taken as the original syntagm, so that from that collocation, innovative patterns with the nominative, and ultimately *tos*, could arise. Understanding the role of deixis and presentation allows for a motivated decision about starting with *ná*, and

1. Other questions, of course, could be asked. See Joseph (2001), for instance, for a consideration of what *tos* reveals about how weak pronouns, both weak subjects and weak objects, in general arise.

allows for a justification of this particular starting point that was not made explicit in earlier accounts.

First, though, it should be pointed out that the assumption of original accusative syntax is reasonable no matter what the etymology of *ná* is. If it is a borrowing from Slavic, ACC can be assumed, given that ACC with deictic particles is a widespread pattern in South Slavic (Schaller 1970, 1975); if *ná* is a borrowing from an Albanian imperative of *nem-, ACC can also be assumed, given the expected syntax with an imperative verb; and, finally, the same holds if *ná* is from an earlier Greek *ēní*, since *ēní* was presumed to have been abstracted out of *ēníde*, which itself contained an imperative, *íde*, the imperative of 'see'.

From the *ná* + ACC starting point, the *ná* + NOM pattern arose, first for full NPs, as the result of the reinterpretation of post-*ná* neuter nouns; neuter is the locus of the reinterpretation because in Greek (as in all Indo-European languages) accusative and nominative are syncretic in the neuter. Thus, in a string such as *ná to peðí* 'Here's the child', the post-*na* noun could in principle be either NOM or ACC. The reinterpretation of the original accusative as nominative was aided by the semantics of deixis and presentation.

As noted above, the predicate *ná* can be characterized in terms of its meaning as deictic or presentational. Deixis, or presentation, in this case can be understood as a way of bringing an entity – the post-*ná* noun phrase, the "pivot" of the construction – into view linguistically. In that way, the function of *ná* somewhat emphatically predicates the existence of that entity, the existence of the pivot. A useful perspective on the passage from accusative syntax with *ná* to nominative syntax comes from a consideration of existentials cross-linguistically.

In particular, there are existential constructions in which the existent noun phrase, the pivot, is a direct object; a case in point is the source of Romance existential constructions such as French *il y a* and Spanish *hay*, namely Late Latin *habet ibi*, literally 'it-has there', which took an accusative NP object,[2] and Greek itself has such a construction, in Modern Greek *éxi* + ACC:[3]

(11) *eéxi* *axinús* *s ti θálasa*
has/3SG sea-urchin/ACC.PL in the sea
'There are sea-urchins in the sea.'

2. A trace of the accusative usage is still evident in Spanish, despite the fact that Spanish does not have nominal case, in that object pronouns can occur with *hay*, e.g. *Lo hay*, where the sense is 'there is one (i.e. an instance of some such thing)'.

3. Though I cite here a Modern Greek example, this construction first shows up in Greek in Post-Classical times, in the form *ékhei* 'it has' with the accusative; it may have been a calque on the Late Latin construction.

Nonetheless, there are also languages in which the pivot in existentials shows subject properties; for instance, in English sentences with *there*, the pivot nominal controls verb agreement, as the plural verb *are* in the gloss to (11) shows. In some instances, such a construction is an alternative to the accusative construction. For instance, alongside an existential in French such as *Il y a un solution* 'There is a solution', with the *il y a* construction, there is also a parallel sentence with an overt verb of existence, *viz. Un solution existe* 'A solution exists'. A more revealing situation is seen in Modern Greek, a language with nominal cases as part of its morphosyntactic repertoire, for a parallel to a sentence like (11) occurs with an existential verb where the pivot shows the clear subject properties of nominative case and control of verb agreement, as in (12):

(12) *ipárxun* *axiní* *s ti θálasa*
exist/3PL sea-urchin/NOM.PL in the sea
'There are sea-urchins in the sea.'

It thus seems reasonable to assume that a formally ambiguous pivot NP, such as a neuter noun in Greek, could be reanalyzed as a subject in a presentational construction because of the existential predicational semantics of deixis and presentation, and if the pivot functions as a subject, then nominative would be the expected case that it would appear in. Being able to exploit the semantics of deixis and presentation in this interpretation justifies the assumption of *ná* rather than *pún* as the ultimate starting point because of the relative ease of motivating both accusative and nominative as pivots with a predicate of (emphatic) existence; *pún* does not carry the same semantics of deixis and existence, so that an original accusative syntax is difficult to motivate, though it could arise as a secondary development.[4]

To return to the innovations that led specifically to the form *tos*, if the reasonable assumption is made that third person strong pronouns had the same distribution as ordinary nouns, and could thus occur with *ná*, then once nominative pivots became possible with *ná* as an alternative to accusatives, presumably both accusative third person strong pronouns, e.g. MASC.ACC.SG *aftón*, as the older construction, and nominative third person strong pronouns e.g. MASC.NOM.SG *aftós*, as the innovative construction, co-occurred. The coexistence of *ná* + NOM

4. This is as the etymology would suggest, if the verb 'be' is indeed involved in the formation of *pún*. The accusative syntax of (9aii) and (9cii) would seem to have been the last of the variants to arise, via a reanalysis, as suggested in Joseph (1994), whereby *pún* was separated from its historical derivation from 'be' and functioned simply as a monomorphemic predicate, like *ná*.

with *ná* + ACC patterns would have allowed for a proportional analogy that would have yielded *tos*, as schematized in (13):[5]

(13) *ná aftón* : *ná aftós* :: *ná ton* : *ná X, X => tos*
ACC.STRONG NOM.STRONG ACC.WEAK NOM.WEAK

In this way, therefore, Greek has innovated a three-way contrast in pronominals:

(14) STRONG, i.e. *aftós*
vs. WEAK(ER), i.e. *tos*
vs. WEAK(EST), i.e. Ø ("*pro*-Drop")

with this contrast, however, being restricted just to the 3rd person. Greek at this stage thus shows a split within person categories:

(15) 1st/2nd person with STRONG/WEAK (Ø)
vs. 3rd person with STRONG/WEAK(ER)/WEAK(EST)

and in this way, once again returned to a system with 1st and 2nd person aligned together against 3rd person as to the way in which the strong/weak distinction was realized.

4. The role of person in the shaping of pronominal systems

The displays in (14) and (15) show how changes in the pronouns could lead to realignments of the interconnections between and among the categories of person in the pronominal system. Claims involving the opposite direction, namely of person playing a role in shaping pronominal usage, have also been made, specifically by Haiman (1991).

Haiman drew in part on observations of Brandi and Cordin (1981) and others regarding a three-way contrast in pronouns in North Italian dialects that is similar to the three-way distinction in Greek noted in (14). In these Romance varieties, such as Fiorentino,[6] illustrated in (16), the appearance of a strong subject pronoun

5. As discussed in Joseph (2001), there are various problems associated with deriving the innovative weak subject form via phonological reduction from nominative strong pronoun (i.e. *ná aftós* —> *ná tos*), so that a different sort of account is needed, specifically an analogical one (as summarized here).

6. By "Fiorentino", Brandi and Cordin here are referring not to "italiano standard", which is based historically on the Florentine dialect, but rather to "il fiorentino parlato a Vaiano, località di campagna a circa 40 Km da Firenze, che presenta aspetti talvolta più conservativi del fiorentino di città" (p. 76). This variety shows some differences from standard Italian, particularly with regard to weak subject pronouns, the feature of interest here.

is possible only if there is as well a weak subject pronoun that "doubles" it; the weak pronoun can occur on its own with the verb, but the absence of a pronoun altogether, a *pro*-Drop option, is not possible. Thus, the relevant morphological distinction is DOUBLED vs. STRONG vs. WEAK, as in (16a); the syntax of these forms is shown in (16b), where the strong form of the pronoun appears only with the "support" of a weak pronoun and *pro*-Drop is not permitted:

(16) a. Te tu parli 'You speak'/*Te parli/Tu parli/*Ø Parli
you/STRONG you/WEAK speak

b. *te tu* — *te* — *tu*
you/DOUBLED you/STRONG WEAK

Based on his analysis of such doubled pronominal marking systems, Haiman (1991) puts forth various claims concerning how languages can come to require the appearance of some form of pronoun with a verb, that is, how a language can become a non-*pro*-Drop language, like Fiorentino. One such claim pertains to the role of person:

(17) Second person forms play a leading role in subject-pronoun formation.

The developments with *tos* in Greek are highly relevant to (17). The construction with *pún* requires *tos*, as shown in (9dii), so that for that one construction at least, Greek is a non-*pro*-Drop language. The construction with *ná* favors the presence of an overt subject, and historically, in the account given here, was the locus for the creation of *tos*, so that it too, at least at first, was a non-*pro*-Drop construction. However, contrary to (17), in the subject-pronoun formation process that led to *tos*, the second person played no role at all, since these new Greek weak subject pronouns are only found in third person.[7]

5. Conclusion – Further perspectives on "Strong" vs. "Weak" pronouns

The preceding discussion makes it clear that deixis and person figure prominently in the innovative emergence of a new category within the Greek personal pronouns, namely a weak nominative. By way of conclusion, and by way of gaining further perspective on the strong/weak distinction, it is instructive to examine one additional development with nominative pronouns in Greek.

7. Hittite, in the account of Garrett (1990), also has a three-way distinction like Greek, and may well have had a similar history; it too would be a counter-example to (17), as discussed in Joseph (2001).

In particular, 1st and 2nd person nominative pronouns have forms with initial *e*- and without initial *e*-, as given in (18):

(18) 1SG *yo* (vs. strong *e*γó) 1PL *mis* (vs. strong *emís*)
2SG *si* (vs. strong *esí*) 2PL *sis* (vs. strong *esís*)

Mirambel (1959) referred to these #*e*-less forms as "weak". However, there is a key fact about their distribution that shows that their "weakness" is of a different kind from what is seen with *tos*. That is, the phonologically reduced (#*e*-less) forms occur only after vowel-final forms, as in (19):

(19) tí θélete sís 'What do you (PL) want?'
*tí θélis sí 'What do you (SG) want?'

Given this distributional fact, it seems best to take these forms merely as phonologically elided variants of strong pronouns. Moreover, from a semantic standpoint, these "weak" forms are emphatic, in the same way that the strong forms are; it is the absence of a nominative pronoun that is parallel to the use of weak non-nominative forms. Thus they do not occupy the same sort of position in the realization of the strong/weak distinction as *tos* does.

What these forms mean, then, taken together with the account of the origin of *tos* given here, is that just as not all weak pronominal forms come about via phonological reduction, since *tos* has an analogical origin, not all phonological reduction of pronouns creates true weak – i.e. semantically unemphatic and prosodically dependent – pronominal forms, since *si* (etc.) in (18) is reduced but strong; presumably, more is needed to create weak forms.

References

Brandi, Patrizia & Cordin, Luciana. 1981. Dialetti e italiano: Un confronto sul parametro del soggetto nullo. *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 6: 33–87.

Dressler, Wolfgang U. 1966. Von altgriechischen zum neugriechischen System der Personalpronomina. *Indogermanische Forschungen* 71: 39–63.

Garrett, Andrew. 1990. Hittite enclitic subjects and transitive verbs. *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 42: 227–242.

Goodwin, William W. & Gulick, Charles B. 1930. *Greek Grammar*. Boston MA: Ginn and Company.

Haiman, John. 1991. From V/2 to subject clitics: Evidence from Northern Italian. In *Approaches to Grammaticalization,* Vol. II: *Focus on Types of Grammatical Markers* [Typological Studies in Language 19:2], Elizabeth Closs Traugott & Bernd Heine (eds), 135–157. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Joseph, Brian D. 1981. On the synchrony and diachrony of Modern Greek *na*. *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 7: 139–154.

Joseph, Brian D. 1994. On weak subjects and pro-drop in Greek. In *Themes in Greek Linguistics* [Current Issues in Linguistic Theory 117], Irene Philippaki-Warburton, Katerina Nicolaides & Maria Sifianou (eds), 21–32. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Joseph, Brian D. 2001. Is there Such a Thing as "Grammaticalization"? *Language Sciences* (Special Issue – Grammaticalization: A Critical Assessment, ed. by L. Campbell), 23.2–3: 163–186.

Mirambel, André. 1959. *La langue grecque moderne. Déscription et analyse*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Schaller, Helmut. 1970. Die syntaktische Verwendung der Demonstrativpartikeln in den südslavischen Sprachen. *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie* 7: 141–149.

Schaller, Helmut. 1975. *Die Balkansprachen. Eine Einführung in die Balkanphilologie*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Smyth, Herbert W. 1920. *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. New York, NY: American Book Company.

First person strong pronouns in spoken French

A case study in cliticization

Ulrich Detges
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München

In this article it will be argued that both from a syntactic and a prosodic point of view, the so-called disjoined or tonic pronouns of Modern Spoken French are neither necessarily disjoined nor stressed elements any more. Based on syntactic and phonetic corpus data, I will show that especially the first-person form *moi* is currently undergoing a process of cliticization.

1. Introduction

The status of the conjoined, clitic, or *weak* subject pronouns of French (*je, tu, il* etc.) is one of the most debated issues in French linguistics. Are these elements clitic pronouns (Kayne 1975; De Cat 2005) or must they be regarded as agreement markers (Culbertson 2010)? By contrast, the disjoined, tonic, or *strong* pronouns (*moi, toi, lui* etc.) are a rather uncontroversial topic to which little attention has been paid. Work on phonetic properties of the strong pronouns has shown that they are not always stressed (Léon 1972; Martin 1975; Carton 2009). Recent corpus-linguistic approaches either focus on special constructions (e.g. Caddéo 2004) or on the paradigmatic heterogeneity of these elements, especially on the asymmetries between the first and second person on the one hand and the third person on the other (Blasco-Dulbecco 2004; Cappeau 2004). In this article, I will show that both from a syntactic and a prosodic point of view, the so-called disjoined or tonic pronouns of Modern Spoken French are neither necessarily disjoined nor stressed elements any more. In the following section, I will briefly address some of their most salient discourse functions, Section 3 is devoted to their distribution in the syntactic organization of the clause in spoken French. Finally, the main arguments of this article concerning the prosodic properties of the so-called "strong" pronouns and their syntactic status are developed in Section 4 and 5.