"On Defining 'Word' in Modern Greek"

Christos CLAIRIS
Editeur

RECHERCHES
EN LINGUISTIQUE GRECQUE

I

Actes du 5e Colloque international de linguistique grecque
Sorbonne, 13–15 septembre 2001

ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΚΕΣ ΕΡΕΥΝΕΣ
ΓΙΑ ΤΗΝ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ

I

Πρακτικά τοῦ 5ου Διεθνοῦς Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας
Σορβόννη, 13–15 Σεπτεμβρίου 2001

plekke(n) heb ik toch maar mooi [ˈʋɛxəkɔpst] < *weg* + κόβω 'j'ai bien coupé les pourris, n'est-ce pas?'

Je n'ai noté que deux exceptions à la règle générale. Dans le premier cas, il s'agit du radical imperfectif de πέρτω : *gisteren ben ik me toch op m'n smoel* [xəˈpɛft] / *[pɛft] *precies op m'n verjaardag* 'ça tombe hier', *dat* [pɛft] / *[pɛft] 'je me suis cassé la gueule exactement mon anniversaire'. L'emprunt du radical perfectif [pes] prêterait à confusion, parce que le néerlandais connaît un radical quasi-homonyme [pes] du verbe *pesten* 'embêter'. H, mon informatrice principale, par contre, invoque des raisons euphoniques : «[pɛft] *sonne bon!»* Dans le deuxième cas, il y a désaccord entre deux informatrices. Quand G remarquait : *ik heb de hele nacht legge(n)* [klɔ:nə], H la corrigeait comme suit *ik heb de hele nacht legge(n)* [klasə] < κλάνω 'j'ai pété toute la nuit'.

Je finis avec quelques exemples d'interférence lexico-sémantique (recherchée ou non) : *ik heb 'n nieuwe* [pandɔʔɔn] *gekocht* < παντελόνι 'j'ai acheté un nouveau pantalon'∞ *broek* [bruk] (*pantalon* [pantalɔn] étant archaïque en néerlandais standard), *ik neem nog 'n* [sixɔ:r] < τσιγάρο 'je prends encore une cigarette'∞ *sigaret* [sixaret] (*sigaar* [sixaːr] = 'cigare'), *die parkeer ik wel effe in de* [apouteik] < αποθήκη 'celui-là, je le logerai [litt. garerai] dans le débarras'∞ *berghok* [ˈbɛrxhɔk] (*apotheek* [apoˈteːk] = 'pharmacie'), *geef me de* [kɔ:təxoul] *effe* < κατάλογος 'donne-moi la carte (menu) / le bottin'∞ *menu* [məˈnü] / *telefoonboek* [teːləfoːnbuk] (*catalogus* [kata:loːxəs] = 'catalogue'), *ik heb 'n nieuwe* [kökə] *gekocht* < κουζίνα 'j'ai acheté une nouvelle cuisinière'∞ *fornuis* [fɔrnœis] (*keuken* [kökən] = 'cuisine'), *geef me de* [mɯnü] *effe* < μουνί 'con'∞ μουνί / *menu* [məˈnü] 'carte, menu', *daar heb je de* [pɯtsaman] < πούτσα 'bit(te)'∞ *pizzaman* [pitsaman] 'livreur de pizza'.

ON DEFINING "WORD" IN MODERN GREEK

Brian D. JOSEPH

Ohio State University, Columbus, OH

Some of the claims in Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos 1999 regarding the identification of word in Modern Greek are reconsidered, and a framework is outlined that recognizes only affixes and words as basic elements, and renders the intermediate category of "clitic" they argue for unnecessary as a morphosyntactic primitive.

Introduction

The construct *word* has long been a key element in linguistic theorizing, from the Alexandrian grammarians to the present day. Certain theoretical constructs, such as the Lexical Integrity principle (ruling out the possibility of a syntactic rule operating into or disrupting a properly constituted word), are defined in terms of *word*, so the determination of what a word is, for any language, has great significance. However, this seemingly straightforward task turns out to be filled with potential for false steps and misanalyses.

This is especially true for Greek, with its rather large set of "little elements" that serve crucial grammatical functions but are not clearly independent elements that can stand alone and pass all typical tests for word-level status (e.g. conjoinability freedom of combinatorics, etc.). A representative listing of these elements is given in (1):

1. a. verbal modifiers : *na* (general irrealis) ; *as* (hortative) ; *θa* (future) ; *ðen* (indicative negation) ; *mi(n)* (subjunctive negation)
b. object pronouns, e.g. 1SG.ACC *me*, 1SG.GEN *mu*
c. weak 3rd person nominative markers, e.g. MASC.SG *tos*
d. "weakened" (NB, not weak) subject pronouns, e.g. 1SG *ɣo*
e. attitudinal marker of impatience, e.g. with imperatives *dé*
f. possessive pronouns, e.g. 1SG *mu*
g. definite article, e.g. NOM.PL.M *i*
h. locative/dative preposition *s(e)* 'to ; in ; on ; at'
i. marker of comparative and superlative degree, *pjo*
j. imperatival *ja*, used for greater emphasis and vividness.

Many of these elements have been called "clitics" in recent discussions of Greek, but that term itself is rejected here, for two reasons. First, it is overly vague and uninformative, since many

linguists use this label for any short word-like entity with some grammatical function and some prosodic deficiencies, without providing any justification. Second, it is unnecessary because, following Arnold Zwicky (1994),[1] one can argue that "a variety of phenomena [that] have appeared under the clitic umbrella ... merely have marked properties in one or more components of grammar" (xv). Therefore, instead of recognizing "clitic" as part of a three-way division of morphological/syntactic primitives into *affix, clitic,* and *word,* in this framework, all that is needed is the recognition of just *affix* and *word,* and the further recognition of degrees of "typicality", i.e., *typical* ("core") versus *atypical* ("marginal" or "marked"), for members of each category. This latter assumption is needed independently of the decision regarding clitics, i.e., even if there were a basic 3-way affix/clitic/word distinction).

A recent paper by Eirene Philippaki-Warburton & Vassilis Spyropoulos,[2] however, (hereafter P-W&S) represents an important departure from earlier practices, as they apply criteria in a principled way to arrive at the proper classification of these "little elements". Still, problems remain with their claims, especially in light of Zwicky's framework, so that correctives to their analysis are needed.

P-W & S 1999 on Word in Greek

P-W&S focus just on the verb-modifying elements of (1ab), and argue that all are to be analyzed as words, differing from "full" words such as *jós* 'son' by virtue only of their phonological dependence on a "host" element. They put forward a number of arguments and treat a wide range of elements, so that all that can be covered here are counter-arguments to their claims about segmental morphophonology of the weak object pronouns.

P-W & S on Morphophonological Irregularities

P-W&S rightly observe that affixes typically show various types of irregularities and idiosyncratic traits, whereas words typically do not. Moreover, they say (p.65fn.5) that "in Greek ... there are no ... special irregularities in the morphophonology of the clitic[pronoun]s", and conclude as a result that these elements should

1 Zwicky, Arnold M., 1994, What is a clitic?, Nevis, Joel A., et al., eds. *Clitics : A Comprehensive Bibliography 1892-1991.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. xii-xx.
2 Philippaki-Warburton, Irene & Vassilis Spyropoulos, 1999, On the boundaries of inflection and syntax: Greek pronominal clitics and particles, *Yearbook of Morphology 1998,* pp. 45-72.

not be treated as affixes since they show no positive evidence for affixal status. Yet, there are in fact irregularities in the morphophonology of the weak pronouns that P-W&S overlooked. In particular, in the combination of 2SG.GEN *su* + any 3rd person form, the *u* may be deleted, thus : *su to stélno* 'to-you it I-send'—> *sto stélno* 'I send it to you'. However, there is no general process in Standard Modern Greek that elides (unaccented) *u* in such a context, so this deletion is actually an irregularity. There is of course a regular process eliminating unaccented high vowels in northern dialects, and in the Standard language there is deletion of unstressed high vowels in fast speech. However, a deleted *u* typically leaves a "mark" on a preceding *s* in the form of rounding, e.g. /sutárizma/ 'shooting' can — > [s^wtárizma]), showing that the absence of *u* here is not phonologically induced.

Also, in the combination of any 3rd person form with the markers *na* and *θa,* the initial *t-* of the pronoun may (optionally), with considerable idiolectal variation) be voiced to [d]; thus *θa to stélno* 'FUT it I-send'—> *θa do stélno* 'I'll be sending it', even though intervocalic *t* in Greek is not usually distinctively voiced and *na* and *θa* do not canonically end in *-n* (the typical voicing element in Greek ; *θa* did end in a nasal in earlier stages of Greek but *na* never did and in any case there is no sign of a nasal before a vowel (where it would be expected if there were one with these forms canonically) — contrast *θa stélno* 'I will be sending'/ *θa alázo* 'I will be changing'(not **θan alákso) with *θe stélno* 'I do not send'/ *θen alázo* 'I do not change'(not **θe alázo).

Therefore, there is morphophonological idiosyncrasy associated with the weak pronouns, as would be expected if they were affixes, contrary to what P-W&S claim.

Other segmental phenomena

P-W&S (p.54) further claim that the phenomenon of "euphonic -e" in Greek argues for a word-level treatment of the weak pronouns and against an affixal analysis. Claiming "a strong preference for open syllables in word-final position", they say that when a word "terminates in final -n, there is a tendency for a euphonic -e to be added after it in order to obtain a word final open syllable", e.g. *milún / milúne*'they speak'. Affixes, they claim, "have no need for such a constraint nor do they show such a tendency". Noting that "clitic pronouns may appear with such final euphonic -e", e.g. *tone vlépo*

'him I-see', P-W&S argue that these facts support word-level status for the weak pronouns.

Quite apart from the vagueness of arguing from a "tendency" (P-W&S themselves admit that "not all words ending in -*n* will add a euphonic -*e*"), their argument can be countered. First, there are indeed words ending in -*n* that never take -*e*, e.g. *betón* 'cement', *enðiaféron* 'interesting/NTR.SG'(i.e. **bétone*, **enðiaférone*), but also elements (e.g. the indicative negator *ðen* 'not') which P-W&S themselves call words that cannot take -*e*, so it is not at all clear that euphonic -*e* is a useful test of anything. Moreover, in any case, the real generalization is not that words can take this -*e* but rather that inflexional morphemes can. The best cases of euphonic -*e* are with, e.g., 3PL.PST -*an*, 3PL.PRES -*un*, and GEN.PL -*on*, and in forms like *betón* and *enðiaféron*, the -*n* is arguably part of the word-stem, not part of an inflexional element, so no -*e* would be expected. Thus, "euphonic -*e*" actually provides an argument that accusative singular weak pronouns *ton/tin* are inflexional, since they can take the -*e*.

Conclusion

To be sure, there are further questions to resolve with these and the other "little elements". For instance, do accentual differences between postposed pronouns and case suffixes (with accent addition, e.g. *kitaksé me* 'Look at me!'versus accent shifting, as in *ónoma/onóma-tos* 'name-NOM/GEN') fall within the range of typical and atypical affixal behavior? Is the failure of negative *ðen* to take "euphonic -*e*" an index of idiosyncrasy (inasmuch as P-W&S might expect it to behave like *ton/tin*) and thus consistent with, and even an argument for, affixal status for it? And so on. But the general thrust of the present discussion, namely that P-W&S's arguments for word-level status for the "little elements" of Greek are far from compelling, should be clear. More discussion of these and related issues is to be found in two forthcoming works.[1]

---

[1] Brian D. Joseph, 2001, Defining "Word" in Modern Greek: A Response to Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos, submitted to *Yearbook of Morphology*; Joseph, 2002, Word in Modern Greek. To appear in *Proceedings of International Workshop on the Status of 'Word'*, ed. by Alexandra Aikhenvald & R. M. W. Dixon, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

ON REPORTED DISCOURSE : RECORDING SPEECH & THOUGHT IN MODERN GREEK LITERARY AND PRESS NARRATIVE

Maria KAKAVOULIA
Panteion University, Athens

This paper discusses types of reported discourse (RD) in literary and press narratives. In particular, it examines the ways in which written and spoken inputs are incorporated into stories. The unexpected richness and complexity of RD practices suggests a rethinking of the subtypes of speech and thought presentation model and discourse embedding structures.

Introduction

Analysis of literary speech presentation has already been fruitfully applied to the analysis of speech reporting in news narrative. The model of speech and thought presentation used is based upon the work of Geoffrey Leech & Michael Short.[1] In particular, the paper focuses on direct speech (DS), free direct speech (FDS) and free direct thought (FDT). It also explores the complex issue of discourse embedding structure (DES). Press data were collected from three newspapers (*Τα Νέα, Απογευματινή, Το Βήμα*), all published on 7-8 August 2001. The samples of 20th century Greek literature were all extracted from the novel of Melpo Axioti (1905-1973) *Δύσκολες Νύχτες*,[2] specifically selected as a first person 'difficult' narration.

Truthfulness in reporting

One difference between literary and non literary speech presentation is that the words reproduced by the press reporter have been first reproduced elsewhere, whereas fictional reporters create simulated conversations or speech presentations, giving 'voice' to fictional 'personas'. In the press, DS presupposes that the reporter represents faithfully 1) the words and structures used by the original speaker, 2) the propositional content, and 3) the illocutionary force of the speech event.[3] DS in press texts is marked off by the use of

---

[1] Geoffrey Leech and Michael Short, 1981, *Style in Fiction*, London, Longman.

[2] Melpo Axioti, 1964, *Δύσκολες Νύχτες.Μυθιστόρημα*. Athens, Kedros, (1st edition 1938).

[3] Michael Short,1988, Speech presentation, the novel and the press, v. Peer, W (ed.), *The taming of the text*. New York, Routledge, 61-80