

B. JOSEPH "On The Synchrony and Diachrony of Modern Greek NA"

VOLUME 7 • 1981

BYZANTINE
AND
MODERN
GREEK
STUDIES

BASIL BLACKWELL

On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Modern Greek NA*

BRIAN D. JOSEPH

0. *Introduction*

The Modern Greek particle *na* has two main uses, as a subordinating particle and as a deictic particle. In this first use, it occurs with verbs in a variety of complement structures, as in (1), as well as with some apparent main-clause verbs, as in (2), that have special (i.e. non-declarative) illocutionary force, and may be derivable from underlying abstract complement structures:

- (1) a. *θέλο na φύι ο Yάνis* 'I want John to leave'
b. *καλίτερα na φύυμε τόρα* '(It is) better that we leave now'
c. *ίνε ζίτιμα tú na ίνε ένοχι* 'It's a question of their being guilty'
d. *apofasisame na ayorasume ekino to spiti* 'We decided to buy that house'
- (2) a. *na sas pliróso tora?* 'Shall I pay you now?'
b. *na mu fêris éna uzáki!* 'Bring me one ouzo (please)!'

That *na* in this use is not a true complementizer in the sense of a delimitor of sentence boundaries, but rather really is a marker of the subordinate nature of the verb it occurs with; is shown by a sentence like (3) in which a subordinate-clause subject occurs to the left of *na* (cf. (1a), by way of comparison):

* A preliminary version of this paper was read at the MIT Conference on the Modern Greek Language, January 24, 1980, organized by Robert Ingria of MIT and Dia Phillipides of Harvard University. Many useful comments and suggestions from the audience have been incorporated here. Thanks are also due to Kostas Kazazis of the University of Chicago for reading and commenting upon an earlier draft of this paper.

(3) *θέλο ο Yánis na fiyi* 'I want John to leave'

In its other main use, as a deictic particle, *ná* serves to point out or introduce some individual or object, and is loosely translatable as 'Here is . . .' or '(Here), take . ..'. Deictic *ná* occurs with full noun phrases (NP), as in (4):

- (4) a. *ná to flidzáni* 'Here's the cup; take the cup'
b. *ná to leoforío* 'Here's the bus; here comes the bus'
c. *ná o Yánis* 'Here's John'

and with unstressed clitic pronouns, both accusative and nominative (the nominative clitics are restricted to use with *ná* in this construction and *pín* 'where is . . .?'), as in (5):

- (5) a. *ná to* 'Here it is; take it'
b. *ná ton (ACC.MASC)* 'Here he is'
c. *ná tos (NOM.MASC)* 'Here he is'

These two uses of *na* are distinguished by virtually all traditional descriptive accounts of Modern Greek. However, this descriptive unanimity is overshadowed by taxonomic chaos – there is very little agreement as to what types of elements these two *na*'s are and even as to whether they are distinct items or merely differing functions of one and the same particle. For example, Monogios et al. (1976: p. 148) classify both uses of *na* under the category of 'mório' (particle), thus taking the 'unified *na*' approach. Pring (1975: p. 127), on the other hand, lists both uses of *na* under the same dictionary entry (this may of course just be a space-saving device), but calls the *na* of sentences like (1) through (3) a 'particle of subordination' and the deictic *ná* of sentences like (4) and (5) a 'preposition'. Similarly, Babiniotis and Kondos (1967: p. 9) treat deictic *ná* as merely a pronominal prefix, because of its use with nominative clitic pronouns as in (5c), and they give the following paradigm for a 'deictic' pronoun:

- (6) MASC. *nátos* 'here he is'
FEM. *náti* 'here she is'
NTR. *náto* 'here it is'

illustrating its use with sentences like:

- (7) *nátos érxete* 'Here he comes; here he is, coming (now)'

They seem to say nothing, though, about uses of *ná* with an accusative clitic pronoun, as in (5b).

One area in which there is agreement regarding *na* is the etymology of the different uses. Subordinating *na* is clearly from the earlier Greek subordinating conjunction *hina* 'so that, in order to' by regular loss of initial *h-*, a sporadic stress shift (see Trypanis [1960]) to *iná*, and then the regular aphaeresis of an unstressed initial vowel. The standard view for the etymology of deictic *na*, that proposed by Hatzidakis (*Athēna*, I [1889], 322 ff., reiterated in Hatzidakis (1905: II, pp. 100, 400)) and adopted by Andriotis (1967, s.v.), runs as follows: the Classical Greek form *ēnide* 'see there!', composed of the interjection *ēn* 'see there' plus the imperativ form *idé* 'see!' was reanalyzed as *ēní* plus *de*, with the result that a new form *ēní* was abstracted from *ēnide*. Then, by the substitution of the final *-a* of adverbs (as in *akóma* < *akómē* 'still, yet', for example) and other particles (as in *dá* < *dē* 'so', *eḏá* < *édē* 'already') for the *-i*, along with the regular aphaeresis of the unstressed initial vowel *ē-* (phonetically [i]), the form *ná* arose. Though generally accepted, this etymology is not without problems. Most obviously, it is a very complicated etymology for what appears to be a very simple word. Furthermore, it is not at all clear why a particle like *ēní* (or even *dē*, for that matter) should have been influenced by the form of adverbial elements like *kálista* 'very well', *katakéfala* 'on the head', *akóma*, and so forth. The semantic and functional connections simply are not strong enough to motivate such a formal analogy.

The synchronic and diachronic status of deictic *ná*, therefore, is far from clear. An examination of its synchronic properties is thus in order – such a study should shed some light on the question of what deictic *ná* is synchronically and, furthermore, may well provide some clues as to its etymology. This investigation of *ná* is taken up in the sections that follow.

1. *The Synchronic Properties of na.*

Despite the 'unified *na*' approach taken by some grammarians, there are actually rather good reasons for treating deictic *ná* and subordinating *na* as distinct elements, for they contrast on a number of synchronic phonological and syntactic properties.

First, with regard to stress, subordinating *na* is a proclitic element and is generally unstressed or weakly stressed (the written

accent mark it receives in standard Modern Greek orthography is purely a graphic convention with no phonetic significance; note its omission from the roughly phonemic transcription used here); as such, it is especially susceptible to contraction with a following vowel-initial verb, as in (8):

(8) *den thélo nakúso aftá = ... na akúso ...* 'I don't want to hear that.'

Deictic *ná*, on the other hand, receives a normal word stress and can even occur by itself, i.e. *ná!* 'Here!' (though this is not especially polite).

Second, they differ in their co-occurrence patterns. Subordinating *na* always occurs either directly before a verb (which may of course be negated with the negative particle *mí*), as in the previous examples, or directly before a clitic pronoun which is governed by the following verb, as in:

(9) *thélo na mu to dósi o Yánis* 'I want John to give it to me'.

Deictic *ná*, on the other hand, never occurs immediately before a verb, and generally occurs only before an NP, either a full noun or a pronoun.¹ Furthermore, when it does occur with a clitic pronoun, that pronoun is not ostensibly governed by any verb. This is in itself a synchronic oddity in the grammar of Greek, one which is dealt with below (section 2), for the clitic pronouns generally only occur when controlled by some verb;² even pro-

1. As noted above, *ná* can also occur by itself. Similarly, uses like *ná, páre* 'Here, take (it)' involve independent *ná*, as indicated by the necessary pause after the *ná*. Furthermore, although sentences like *nátos érxete* 'here he comes', mentioned above, superficially have deictic *ná* plus clitic pronoun plus verb, they are actually quite different from a sequence like *na mu to dósi*. See the discussion in section 4.

2. This generalization excludes such derived patterns as *meyalíterós mu* 'bigger than me' (derived by a syntactic reduction of *meyalíteros apó óti íne* 'bigger than (what) I am') and the use of clitic pronouns in exclamations, e.g. *brávo su* 'good for you' or *kalós ton(e)* 'welcome to him', which admittedly are problematic for any account of the control of clitic pronouns in Modern Greek. However, the nominative clitics mentioned earlier that occur with *pun* 'where is...?' are best analyzed as being controlled by a verb – the *-n* which voices the initial *t-* of the nominative clitics is a reduced form of *íne* 'is, are'; thus *pú(n)dos* 'Where is he?' actually stands for *pú-íne-tos*.

nominal objects of prepositions must be the nonclitic form when accusative.³

- (10) a. sé 'ména (STRONG) / *sé me (CLITIC) 'to me'
b. apó aftón (STRONG) / *apó ton (CLITIC) 'from him'

Third, subordinating *na* generally does not occur sentence-initially, except when it introduces verbs with nondeclarative illocutionary force, as in (2) above. Deictic *ná*, on the other hand, generally does occur sentence-initially, and in fact seems to be a root clause phenomenon, i.e. generally restricted to occurrences in nonsubordinate clauses.

Finally, deictic *ná* offers a dialectal peculiarity which is not found with subordinating *na*. Thumb (1964: p. 155) notes with regard to imperative verb forms like *éla* 'come' (Singular) ~ *eláte* (Plural) 'come', that 'the [deictic] particle *ná* "there is (are), behold" takes, according to such models [*éla/eláte*], a plural *náte*'. No such 'plural' forms occur with subordinating *na*.⁴

2. *The Analysis of na.*

These differences in synchronic properties show clearly that deictic *ná* and subordinating *na* are distinct elements in Modern Greek. Thus the 'unified *na*' approach taken by some grammarians must surely be wrong. Furthermore, these properties allow one to rule out one of the classifications of deictic *ná* mentioned above, that of Pring (1975: p. 127) in which deictic *ná* is called a preposition. As the facts of (10) show, deictic *ná* behaves differently from prepositions like *sé* 'to, at, in' or *apó* 'from', in allowing accusative clitic pronominal forms to occur after it; thus, treating *ná* as a preposition would complicate the syntax of prepositions in Greek considerably.

That being the case, what is the proper classification for *ná*? It is clear now that the two *na*'s must be different and that deictic

3. There are, of course, a few prepositions which take genitive (possessive) clitic object pronouns, e.g. *brostá mu* 'before me', *mazi mu* 'with me'; however, no prepositions which govern accusative objects allow accusative clitic forms.

4. The troublesome form *námaste* 'here we are!' is taken up in section 5, especially with regard to whether it is in any way connected with the apparent 'plural' form *náte*.

ná is not a preposition, but what exactly are they? Since the status of subordinating *na* is fairly clear, i.e. that of a verbal particle, analogous to an element like English *to*, the question really comes down to what the status of deictic *ná* is. I should like to propose that deictic *ná* is a verb in Modern Greek, and more specifically, in most of its uses, is a nonfinite verbal form, an imperative.⁵ Such an hypothesis accounts neatly for the synchronic properties of deictic *ná* given above.

First, with regard to stress, one would assume an imperative form to be stressed by virtue of its imperatival nature, and within Greek, there are many stressed monosyllabic imperative forms, such as *δés* 'see!' Also, the fact that *ná* can occur independently (albeit with an impolite connotation) would be expected inasmuch as an imperative like *δés* can occur by itself.

Second, the fact that *ná* generally occurs sentence-initially and appears to be a 'root' phenomenon would follow from its being an imperative form, for imperatives are generally sentence-initial and do not readily occur in embedded contexts (except perhaps direct quotation, which may not truly be an 'embedding').

Third, this analysis accounts straightforwardly for the dialectal 'plural' *náte* form cited above, for *-te* is the regular marker of plural imperatives, e.g. *δés* (SG) ~ *δέστε* (PL), *έλα* (SG) ~ *ελάτε* (PL), etc. Furthermore, if *náte* is formed from *ná* on the model of imperatives like *έλα/ελάτε*, it would seem that a necessary condition allowing such an analogy to take place would be the assignment by Greek speakers of imperative status to *ná*, i.e. the same status as the model form.

Fourth, this analysis of *ná* explains its occurrence with accusative NPs, especially with the clitic accusative forms (*ná* with nominative NPs is discussed below in section 4), and moreover, explains the position of these clitics with respect to *ná*. If *ná* is an imperative, one would expect that, just as with all nonfinite verbal forms in Greek, clitics would occur after it; compare the clitic placement with imperatives, active participles, and middle participles shown in (11):

5. Although it may seem unusual to classify imperatives as nonfinite, this is a step which other linguists have taken. The important thing here is that imperatives pattern with clearly nonfinite elements (the participle) in terms of clitic pronoun placement.

- (11) a. δός μου το / *μου το δός 'Give it to me!'
 b. δίνοντας tu το / *tu το δίνοντας 'giving it to him . . .'
 c. δεχόμενος το / *το δεχόμενος 'receiving it . . .'

Furthermore, with *ná* analyzed as an imperative verb form, the anomaly of 'free' (i.e. ungoverned) pronominal clitics vanishes, for the clitics in expressions like *ná to* 'here it is; take it' are governed by the verb *ná*, under this analysis.

Thus, on several counts, the analysis of *ná* as a verb, and more particularly as an imperative, is supported by a series of otherwise unrelated and independent facts from the language.

The analysis of an apparent 'particle' as a verb may seem radical or abstract from a synchronic standpoint, but there is a parallel to this analysis. Perlmutter and Postal (1979: p. 33 ff.) have argued that the French deictic elements *voici* 'here is . . .' and *voilà* 'there is . . .' are to be synchronically analyzed as verbs,⁶ specifically as nonfinite verbs. The evidence for this analysis comes from sentences like:

- (12) Les conditions nécessaires, ne les voilà-t-il pas réunies?
 'Aren't the necessary conditions brought together there?'

which, they say (fn. 11, p. 72) 'provides three distinct arguments that *voilà* is a verb: (i) it appears in the "inverted form" with /t/ and with the clitic reflex of the pronominal copy of the final I [= subject] following; (ii) the clitic *les* is attached to it; (iii) it is flanked by the negative morphemes *ne . . . pas*. (i)-(iii) are all properties of verbs in French, but never of elements which are not verbs'. Thus the analysis of *ná* as a verb in Modern Greek finds further support in a similar type of analysis proposed for deictic elements in another language.

3. *The Etymology of ná*

With the synchronic analysis of *ná* established, the question of its etymology can now be addressed. An examination of the languages immediately around Greek, namely Albanian, Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian, Romanian and Turkish, reveals that these

6. Historically, *voilà* and *voici* are verb forms, deriving, interestingly enough, from imperatival forms of the verb 'see', as Kostas Kazazis has kindly pointed out to me. Still, since synchronic analyses need not always be accurate reflections of diachronic facts, Perlmutter and Postal's arguments for taking *voilà* as a nonfinite verb form provide a striking parallel to the analysis of Greek *ná* given here.

languages all have a deictic particle *na* with roughly the meaning 'here (it is); take (it)'.⁷ Thus, deictic *ná* appears at first to be a Balkan phenomenon, one not just restricted to Greek. That in itself, though, does not answer the question of the source of *ná*, for the word could have originated in Greek and spread to these other languages.

What is decisive in determining the direction of the movement of *na* is the fact that forms corresponding to South Slavic *na* are to be found in other, specifically non-Balkan, Slavic languages. Miklosich (1970, s.v.) notes this particle in Slovenian, Byelorussian, Ukrainian, Czech, and Polish, and it is found in Russian and Slovak as well. Because of these non-Balkan Slavic forms, it is most reasonable to assume that *ná* was borrowed into Greek from the Slavic languages, rather than vice versa, since the linguistic influence of Greek did not generally extend beyond the Balkans. Furthermore, Greek has borrowed a number of interjectional elements from languages around it, e.g. *áide* 'come on!' (cf. Turkish *haydi*, Macedonian (*h*)*ajde*, Albanian *hajde*), *amán* 'expression of disgust' (cf. Turkish *aman*), and others, so that positing deictic *ná* as a borrowing from the Balkan Slavic languages into Greek is in keeping with other intimate borrowings by Greek speakers.

Moreover, Schaller (1970) in a discussion of the syntax of demonstrative particles in the South Slavic languages, has shown that the most normal and common use of demonstrative particles, such as *ná*, in South Slavic, is with an accusative clitic object pronoun. As noted earlier, this pattern occurs in Greek, e.g. *ná ton*, and from a purely impressionistic standpoint this use of *ná* seems quite common and 'normal' for Greek as well. The parallel syntax of South Slavic demonstrative particles and Greek deictic *ná*, then, provides further confirmation of the etymology suggested here for Greek *ná*.

Actually, this etymology for deictic *ná* in Greek, taking it to be a borrowing from South Slavic, is not new. It was proposed at least as early as 1879 by A. Cihac in his *Dictionnaire d'étymologie daco-romane*, in which he places the Romanian interjection *na* 'voilà, voici, tenez' under the heading of 'éléments slaves' and connects it with both Slavic *na* and Greek *ná*. Cihac's proposal apparently fell on deaf ears among contemporary Greek linguists, who sought

7. Standard dictionaries of these languages provided this information.

first and foremost to find Ancient Greek sources for as many Modern Greek elements as possible; this desire led Greek linguists of the 19th and early 20th centuries to overlook many etymologies in favor of Ancient Greek sources,⁸ and it seems that Hatzidakis' explanation of *ná* from *ēni(de)* is another case in point.

I therefore propose that Greek deictic *ná* is a borrowing from South Slavic *na*, and that, furthermore, the pattern *ná* plus accusative clitic pronoun was the original pattern in Greek (based on the most common South Slavic construction with demonstrative particles). This common construction, having the form of an imperative verb plus clitic object pronoun, was interpreted as such, with *ná* as a verb; in addition, the semantics of an expression like *ná to* 'Here, take it!' were such that an interpretation of *ná* as an imperative would have been highly motivated. This reanalysis fostered the creation of apparent 'plural' forms like *náte* in some of the Greek dialects, since *náte* would have been the appropriate plural to a singular *ná* (cf. *éla/eláte*).⁹

4. Further Constructions with *ná*

As noted earlier, *ná* in Greek occurs in constructions other than that taken in section 3 as the original type, namely *ná* plus accusative clitic pronoun. Besides phrases like *ná ton* 'Here he is; take it (him)', there are also *ná* expressions with a full NP in the accusative case, mentioned in Householder et al. (1964: p. 34), *ná* expressions with a full accusative NP object plus an accusative clitic pronoun copy of that object,¹⁰ as well as *ná* expressions with the

8. See Herzfeld and Joseph (1978) for some discussion of this phenomenon with regard to two forms in the Rhodian dialect of Greek.

9. There are apparent 'plural' forms of *na* attested in non-Balkan Slavic languages, e.g. Ukrainian *nate*, Byelorussian *nace*, Czech *nať*, and Polish *nać*. However, none of the Balkan Slavic languages (Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian, or Macedonian) show such forms, having only the 'singular' form *na*. Thus it seems that the Greek 'plural' form *náte* and forms like Ukr. *náte* are unrelated and show the effects of independent but parallel developments. Given the imperative-like nature of *na*, such a parallel development need not be too surprising. Furthermore, it has been suggested (by Prof. Kenneth E. Naylor of the Ohio State University Slavic Department) that the **-te* found in Ukr. may reflect an emphatic particle added to strengthen *na* (compare Russian *tot* < **тъ-тъ*.) and so may not be 2 PL ending *-te*. The *-te* of Greek *náte*, though, could only be the 2 PL ending.

10. This represents a construction type commonly found in Greek with definite NP objects, and for many speakers, this construction is obligatory; hence (13a) is rejected by some Greek speakers because it lacks the clitic pronominal copy of the direct object.

following NP in the nominative case. These nominative *ná* expressions involve both full NPs, as well as a set of nominative clitic pronouns used only with *ná* and the interrogative expression *pún* 'where is . . .?'. Finally, the nominative clitic may co-occur with a nominative NP after *ná*. These various types are illustrated in (13):

- (13) a. *ná ton musaká* (ACC) 'Here, take the moussaka'
 b. *ná ton(e) ton Yáni* (ACC CLITIC plus ACC NP)
 'Here's John' (cf. *ton vlépo ton Yáni* 'I see John')
 c. *ná tos* (NOM CLITIC) 'Here he is'
 d. *ná o Yánis* (NOM NP) 'Here's John'
 e. *ná tos o Yánis* (NOM CLITIC plus NOM NP)
 'Here's John'

In this section, the question of how to reconcile these additional *ná* patterns with the *ná* plus accusative clitic pronouns pattern is addressed.

The step from *ná* plus accusative clitic pronoun to *ná* plus accusative full NP is really almost too trivial to discuss. Given the occurrence of *ná* plus pronoun, the generalization to *ná* plus any NP is to be expected because pronouns, of course, are NPs. Thus it is probably not even necessary to talk in terms of one type stemming from the other – both may well have co-existed from earliest times in Modern Greek. In terms of the extension of NP types that occur with *ná*, though, the use of *ná* mentioned by Babiniotis and Kondos (1967), e.g. *nátos érxete* given in (7) above, becomes especially interesting. Such an expression can be analyzed as *ná* plus a sentential complement, the sentence being (*af*)*tós érxete*. Such an analysis would mean that *ná* could occur with virtually any type of NP-pronoun, full noun, or sentence – as its complement. Furthermore, the South Slavic demonstrative particles can take sentential complements, as shown by Schaller (1970), e.g. Bulgarian *ej gi bjagat* 'Hey, look, they're running!/Look at them, (they're) running!'; so this Greek extension could be taken as being parallel to uses of particles like *ná* found in South Slavic.

The occurrence of *ná* with nominative NPs, though, unlike the case of *ná* with accusative NPs, requires somewhat more attention. Under the analysis given here whereby *ná* is a verb, in particular an imperative, accusative NP complements as object of that verb are to be expected. Even the *ná* plus sentence analysis of *nátos érxete* poses no problems, for a sentential complement could receive

standard analyses, and is certainly a subject at the level of analysis relevant for semantic interpretation (e.g. the initial syntactic level in an extended 'Generative Semantics' model). A reanalysis of *ná* plus accusative to *ná* plus nominative would thus lessen the 'distance' between underlying and surface forms, here making the surface form reflect the underlying representation more closely. This case in Greek, then, seems akin to the situation described by Hale (1974) for Maori, in which Maori speakers restructured the base forms of certain verbs, with a resulting lessening of the discrepancy between underlying representations and surface forms. Although the object of reanalysis is different in each case (surface forms in Greek, underlying forms in Maori), the principle of reducing the disparity between deep and superficial forms is the same.¹²

Second, the effect of the reanalysis and the interpretation of the post-*ná* NP as a subject is to furnish a *finite* form of *ná* to supplement the nonfinite imperatival form. As argued above, *ná* plus accusative is best treated as a nonfinite expression, while *ná* plus nominative, on the other hand, has the form of a *finite* verbal expression, with the nominative NP serving as the surface subject of *ná*. The existence of third person present forms in *-á* in Standard Modern Greek and in earlier stages of the language as well, e.g. *rotá*, may well have provided a formal parallel for treating *ná*, with the same final vowel, as a finite form. The creation of a finite *ná* can be viewed as a 'filling out' of the paradigm of *ná* – *ná* as just a nonfinite form is isolated in the verbal system of Greek, but with both a finite and a nonfinite form, *ná* becomes less isolated and less anomalous.¹³

12. Although it was argued above that the meaning of an expression like *ná to* 'Here; take it' was appropriate to an imperative and may well have triggered the reinterpretation of the Slavic particle *na* as a Greek imperative verb and the subsequent creation of plural forms like *náte*, there is no contradiction in taking the presentational meaning as a motivating force for a different reanalysis. The surface expression *ná* plus NP subsumes both the imperatival meaning 'Take . . .' and the presentational meaning 'Here is/comes . . .' (i.e. corresponds to two distinct deep structures), so either meaning could figure prominently in reanalyses of surface expressions with *ná* by speakers of Greek.

13. Moreover, the order Verb plus subject is appropriate for a presentational expression such as *ná* plus NP ('here comes . . .'). Compare (i), where verb-subject seems preferable to subject-verb order as a response presenting new information:

- | | | |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------------|
| (i) a. | tí sinévi tóte? | 'What happened then?' |
| b. | éfiye o Yánis | 'John left' |
| c. | ?o Yánis éfiye | 'John left'. |

The proposed reanalysis, thus, was triggered by the formal ambiguity of *ná* with a neuter NP complement and was motivated by semantic and systemic pressures such as those just described. Moreover, it allows for a straightforward account of the *ná* plus nominative phrases in Modern Greek and for their co-existence with *ná* plus accusative phrases.

5. Conclusion

The analysis given for deictic *ná*, treating it as a verb with both finite (as in *nátos*) and nonfinite (as in *ná ton*) forms, covers the vast majority of situations in which it is found in Modern Greek. By taking *ná* plus accusative clitic pronouns to be the 'basic' *ná*-pattern from an historical (and perhaps even synchronic) standpoint, and by taking the other *ná*-phrases, especially *ná* plus nominative, to be secondary developments from *ná* plus accusative clitics, one can make some sense out of a synchronic situation that could otherwise only be described as chaotic. This account rests on an etymology for *ná*, first proposed over a hundred years ago, whereby it is a borrowing from South Slavic, since that etymology, coupled with Schaller's findings regarding the syntax of the South Slavic demonstrative particles, allows one to treat phrases like *ná ton* as having historical priority.

This analysis, though, is not without some problems. In particular, if *ná* is a verb, and is imperatival in some of its uses, why can it not co-occur with the particle *ya*, which can introduce clear imperatives? For example,

- (16) a. *ya δés* 'See, look!'
 b. *ya stásu* 'Hold on (there)! Stop!'
 but: c. **ya ná*

Second, if *na* plus accusative is an imperatival expression, one would expect that it could not occur freely with second person object pronouns, inasmuch as ordinary imperatives cannot freely do so; phrases like:

- (17) *pístepsé se* / *pístépste sas*
 'Believe you (SG)' / 'Believe you (PL)'

are generally unacceptable, and can be used only in certain

situations for special effect.¹⁴ However, *ná* with second person object pronouns, i.e.:

- (18) *ná se* / *ná sas*
'Here you (SG) are' / 'Here you (PL) are'

is generally accepted by most speakers of Greek (though some do find it less than perfectly normal) and is even sanctioned by one pedagogical grammar of Modern Greek (Bien, et al., (1972)).

In addition, there is one quite common *ná*-phrase which does not fit in with the analysis given here. This is the expression *námaste* 'here we are!'. This is often written as if it were a contraction of *na ímaste* 'let us be, shall we be' with subordinating *na*. However, in view of the semantics of this phrase (it has the presentational sense of *ná*), it is likely that it involves deictic *ná* instead. In that case, it is not at all clear how to analyze *námaste*; it may well involve the first person accusative clitic object pronoun *mas* with deictic *ná*, maybe even the 'plural' form *nate* with the object pronoun interposed between *ná* and the plural ending – one is reminded of the plural forms like *δός-mu-te* 'give (PL) me!' (for standard *δóste-mu*) reported by linguists in the late nineteenth century¹⁵ for some dialects of Modern Greek – but beyond that, the analysis of *námaste* remains a mystery.

The first two problems represent ways in which *ná* behaves unlike the imperatival verb form which it is here claimed to be in part. The *námaste* problem shows that there are uses of *ná* which the analysis offered here cannot easily accommodate. What these problematic data actually point out is the fact that there may well be a degree of fluidity in Modern Greek concerning the analysis of *ná*. In particular, it may be the case that not all speakers of Greek analyze *ná* in the same way – for example, the 'verbiness' of *ná* may differ somewhat from speaker to speaker, and some speakers may even connect deictic *ná* with subordinating *na* (as in *námaste*, with the superficial form of subordinating *na* but the meaning of deictic *ná*). Indeed, it is even hard always to get a clear distinction in use between *ná ton* and *ná tos*, even though under the analysis pre-

14. I am indebted to Kostas Kazazis for this observation.

15. For example, Karl Brugmann noted the existence of *δósmute* during the scholarly exchange in the nineteenth century on the question of infixes in Indo-European. Kuiper (1937: Chapter 1) is my source for this.

sented here one might expect such a dichotomy, depending on the desired meaning.

Thus the findings presented here, i.e. that deictic *ná* is distinct from subordinating *ná* and is best analyzed as a verb synchronically, with a finite form (as in *ná tos*) and a nonfinite imperativ form (as in *ná ton*), probably do not represent the last word on the particle *ná*, though it is hoped that they have helped to bring a degree of order to an otherwise much-disputed area of Greek grammar. From a wider perspective, though, that of linguistics in general, part of the problem with analyzing *ná* is that elements like 'particles' have no real place in a generative grammar and merit only minimal attention in most traditional grammars. Thus perhaps the real lesson to be learned from *ná*, especially from the standpoint of general linguistics, is that little words like the so-called 'particles' really do deserve the attention of linguists, and if examined carefully, may well provide some interesting linguistic insights.

The Ohio State University

Bibliography

- Andriotis, N. (1967): *Ἑτυμολογικὸ Λεξικὸ τῆς Κοινῆς Νεοελληνικῆς* (Thessaloniki, 1967).
- Babiniotis, G. and P. Kondos (1967): *Συγχρονικὴ γραμματικὴ τῆς κοινῆς ἐλληνικῆς* (Athens, 1967).
- Bien, P. et al. (1972): *Demotic Greek* (Hanover, NH, 1972).
- Cihac, A. (1879): *Dictionnaire d'étymologie daco-romane* (Frankfort, 1879).
- Hale, K. (1974): 'Deep-Surface Canonical Disparities in Relation to Analysis and Change: An Australian Example', *Current Trends in Linguistics*, XI (1974), 401-57.
- Hatzidakis, G. (1905): *Μεσαιωνικά και νέα Ἑλληνικά*, 2 vols. (Athens, 1905).
- Herzfeld, M. and B. Joseph (1978): *Γύρω ἀπὸ δύο μορφῆς στὴ Ροδίτικὴ διάλεκτο ὄχλος και ὄχνος, Δωδεκανησιακὰ Χρονικά*, IV (1978), 1-7.
- Householder, F., K. Kazazis, and A. Koutsoudas (1964): *A Reference Grammar of Literary Dhimotiki* (Bloomington, Indiana, 1964).
- Kuiper, F. B. J. (1937): *Die indogermanische Nasalpräsentia* (Amsterdam, 1937).
- Miklosich, F. (1970): *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen* (Amsterdam, 1970 [originally published in Vienna, 1886]).
- Monogios, D., B. Moskovis, E. Prevalakis, and G. Philaktopoulos (1976): *Συντακτικὸ τῆς Δημοτικῆς* (Athens, 1976).
- Perlmutter, D. and P. Postal (1979): 'Some Proposed Laws of Basic Clause Structure', to appear in D. Perlmutter, ed. *Studies in Relational Grammar*, I (in press).

- Pring, J. (1975): *The Oxford Dictionary of Modern Greek (Greek-English)* (Oxford, 1975).
- Schaller, H. (1970): 'Die syntaktische Verwendung der Demonstrativpartikeln in den Südslavischen Sprachen', *Zeitschrift für Balkanologie*, VII (1970), 141-9.
- Thumb, A. (1964): *A Handbook of the Modern Greek Language* (Chicago, 1964).
- Trypanis, C. (1960): 'Early Medieval Greek *hina*', *Glotta*, XXXVIII (1960), 312-13.