AMSTERDAM STUDIES IN THE THEORY AND
HISTORY OF LINGUISTIC SCIENCE

General Editor
E. F. KONRAD KOERNER
(University of Ottawa)

Series IV – CURRENT ISSUES IN LINGUISTIC THEORY

Advisory Editorial Board

Henning Andersen (Los Angeles); Raimo Anttila (Los Angeles)
Thomas V. Gamkrelidze (Tbilisi); John E. Joseph (Edinburgh)
Hans-Heinrich Lieb (Berlin); Ernst Pulgram (Ann Arbor, Mich.)
E. Wyn Roberts (Vancouver, B.C.); Danny Steinberg (Tokyo)

Volume 159

Brian D. Joseph, Geoffrey C. Horrocks
and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton (eds)

Themes in Greek Linguistics II

THEMES IN
GREEK LINGUISTICS II

Edited by

BRIAN D. JOSEPH
Ohio State University

GEOFFREY C. HORROCKS
University of Cambridge

IRENE PHILIPPAKI-WARBURTON
University of Reading

JOHN BENJAMINS PUBLISHING COMPANY
AMSTERDAM/PHILADELPHIA

CAPPADOCIAN CLITICS AND THE SYNTAX-MORPHOLOGY INTERFACE

MARK JANSE

Bibliographie Linguistique (The Hague) and University of Ghent

Magistro amicoque E. M. Uhlenbeck

1. *Introduction*¹

The grammatical status of clitics is a matter of debate in current linguistic theories. Clitics are typically defined as "elements with some of the properties characteristic of independent words and some characteristic of affixes, in particular, inflectional affixes, within words. Such elements act like single-word syntactic constituents in that they function as heads, arguments, or modifiers within phrases, but like affixes in that they are 'dependent', in some way or another, on adjacent words" (Zwicky 1994:xii). Traditionally, clitics have been considered a category *sui generis*, neither word nor affix. In fact, it seems to be universally accepted that clitics generally develop historically from autonomous words and frequently develop into inflectional affixes. From the perspective of grammaticalization theory, clitics fall somewhere halfway in between autonomous words and inflectional affixes on the word-to-affix cline (Hopper & Traugott 1993:132).

Since the 1970s, clitics have aroused a great deal of interest in linguists working within the framework of generative grammar and related models. Their behaviour has been viewed from both a syntactic and a morphological perspective, but the distinction between syntax and morphology is sometimes blurred. One now encounters statements like "the syntax of words" (Anderson 1993:95)

¹ Parts of this paper were presented at the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics in Reading (Janse 1994) and at the Second International Conference on Greek Linguistics in Salzburg (Janse 1996). I gratefully acknowledge the support of the Permanent International Committee of Linguists and to its secretary-general, Professor Piet van Sterkenburg, for travel grants which enabled me to attend both conferences. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Linguistic Seminar of the Department of Linguistics of the University of Manchester on 12 March 1996. I would like to thank the convenor, Dr Alan Cruse, for his invitation. Thanks are also due to Dr phil. Rolf Ködderitzsch M.A. (Bonn) for advice on the Albanian data and especially to Professor Brian D. Joseph (Columbus, Ohio) for helpful comments and suggestions on an earlier version of this paper.

or "the morphology of cliticization" (Klavans 1985:96). Influential cliticologists like Klavans (1985:100) have introduced the term "phrasal affix" to capture the morphological behaviour of clitics in syntax and Anderson (1992:223) has recently proclaimed that "clitics are to be seen as the phrasal analog of word-level morphology" and that "the mechanisms appropriate to the description of affixation and of clitic placement are quite comparable". Specifically, he stresses the fact that "the relative ordering of affixes and of clitics are typically both quite rigid", a point which he says "contributes to the conclusion that clitic placement and word-level morphology are parallel phenomena" (1992:222). In the same vein, Halpern (1995:191) proposes "a model for dealing with groups of clitics which may be applied to groups of inflectional affixes as well" the main concern of which is "the orders in which clitics (or inflectional affixes) occur with respect to one another". Like Anderson, Halpern (1995:192) contends that "[c]litics generally appear in a fixed, at least partially arbitrary, order with respect to one another entirely parallel to the ways in which groups of inflectional clitics interact".

If clitics indeed behave like inflectional affixes in any principled way, one would expect them, first, to attach uniformly to one type of host, since the position of clitics has to be syntacticized first before a further process of morphologization can be triggered. Second, one would expect multiple clitics to invariably cluster together to form a template, the order of the constituent clitics being fixed.

In this paper, I present a descriptive, synchronic account of the placement and linearization of clitic pronouns in the Cappadocian dialect of Modern Greek with a view to refuting the claim that cliticization and affixation are in fact parallel phenomena. I argue that the label "clitic" does not refer to a single discrete cluster point on the word-to-affix cline which, as Hopper & Traugott (1993:7) point out, can be thought of synchronically as a "continuum". Specifically, I show that the Cappadocian clitic pronouns behave in some contexts more like full-fledged words, in others more like full-fledged affixes.

The data on which the present paper is based is taken from the collection of folk tales recorded by Richard Dawkins in central Asia Minor during the years 1909-1911, i.e., shortly before the great population exchange between Greece and Turkey in the 1920s. This exchange effectively put an end to 3,000 years of Greek presence in Asia Minor. Following the fall of Constantinople, the Asia Minor Greek populations were practically cut off from the rest of the Greek-speaking world and their dialects developed more or less independently, albeit under the increasingly strong influence of the surrounding Turkish.² After their

² See Janse (1997b; forthcoming b) for a case study of contact-induced change in Cappadocian.

forced migration to Greece, the Cappadocians were too dispersed to be able to maintain their group identity and consequently their dialect has become extinct. The importance of Dawkins' collection cannot be underestimated, being both the last *in situ* testimony and testament of a peculiar dialect on the verge of extinction.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, I present an overview of the distribution of clitic pronouns in Cappadocian. In section 3, I give a full description of the linearization of multiple clitic pronouns in Cappadocian, including two intriguing, but so far undocumented cases which I have termed "metacclisis" or "clitic metathesis" and "diacclisis" or "split cliticization" respectively. In section 4, I discuss two apparent cases of "endocclisis" or "clitic infixation".

2. The distribution of clitic pronouns³

The Cappadocian clitic pronouns have the following forms (Dawkins 1916:119-120):

1SG <i>me / mi</i>	2SG <i>se / si</i>	3SG <i>to (do) / tu (du)</i>
1PL <i>mas</i>	2PL <i>sas</i>	3PL <i>ta (da)</i>

Table 1. *The Cappadocian Clitic Pronouns*

The Cappadocian clitic pronouns have no distinctions of case: the same forms are used for direct and indirect objects alike. There are no distinctions of gender either, except at the village of Delmesó where a feminine form of the 3SG is found: *čín (džín)*.⁴ Even the distinctions of number are sometimes blurred in that *ta (da)* may be used to refer to singular referents. The mid front vowel /e/ of the first and second-person singular is locally raised to the high front vowel /i/, the mid back rounded vowel /o/ of the third-person singular to the high back vowel /u/. The voiceless apico-dental stop /t/ of the third-person singular and plural is voiced obligatorily after nasals and optionally after vowels.

³ This section is based on Janse (1994).

⁴ The clitic pronouns are referred to by person and number, e.g., 1SG = first person singular, 1PL = first person plural. The following abbreviations are also used: ACC = accusative, DAT = dative, FEM = feminine, GEN = genitive, MSC = masculine, NEG = negative, NOM = nominative, NTR = neuter, PRT = particle, REFL = reflexive.

The distribution of the clitic pronouns in Cappadocian is characterized by what has been called "clitic float" (Rappaport 1989:308). What is meant by clitic float is that clitics, in this particular case clitic pronouns, are attached either to the verb on which they depend syntactically or to another word which comes earlier in the clause. Specifically, Cappadocian clitic pronouns encliticize to the verb, unless the latter is preceded by some other word attracting the clitic pronouns in preverbal position. This is quite unlike the situation in Standard Modern Greek, where the clitic pronouns obligatorily procliticize to finite verbs, but encliticize to nonfinite forms, viz. imperatives and participles (Joseph & Philippaki-Warbuton 1987:212–213).⁵ Compare, for instance, the Cappadocian equivalents (1b) and (2b) of the Standard Modern Greek examples (1a) and (2a):⁶

- (1) a. su to õíxni
2SG.GEN 3SG.ACC.NTR he-shows
'he shows it to you'

- (2) a. õíkse mú to
show! 1SG.GEN 3SG.ACC.NTR
'show it to me!'

- (1) b. õíxni se to
he-shows 2SG 3SG
'he shows it to you' (D322)

- (2) b. õíkse me to
show! 1SG 3SG
'show it to me!' (D422)

It seems reasonable to conclude that the predominance of postverbal placement of clitic pronouns in Cappadocian is a sign of the progressive syntacticization of word order in the Asia Minor dialects. In Pontic, a neighbouring dialect, the process has culminated in the morphologization of the erstwhile clitic pronouns, which have developed into full-fledged suffixes. In Cappadocian, however, there is still ample evidence of clitic float. In fact, Dawkins's texts provide some 500 instances of preverbal clitic pronouns as against some 900 instances of postverbal clitic pronouns. For a better understanding of the distribution of the Cappadocian clitic pronouns, it is necessary to distinguish between syntactic constraints on the one hand and discourse constraints on the other.

⁵ It may be noted that Joseph (1988), using criteria originally proposed by Zwicky (1985:286–289), analyzes the Standard Modern Greek situation as involving pronominal *affixes* rather than clitics.

⁶ Cappadocian examples are quoted after D[awkins 1916] or M[irambe]l 1963].

As in Standard Modern Greek, the Cappadocian clitic pronouns are always adjacent to the verb, i.e., they are either post- or preverbal. If the clause consists of just the verb and one or two clitic pronouns, the latter invariably follow the former. In other words, preverbal clitic pronouns are never found in clause initial position. The reason for this is that the Cappadocian clitic pronouns are always enclitic. Preverbal clitic pronouns procliticize to the verb in Standard Modern Greek, whereas they encliticize to an immediately preceding host in Cappadocian.⁷ It stands to reason to assume that there is a special connection between preverbal position and the nature of the word or words preceding the clitic pronouns. Put differently, I assume that preverbal clitic pronouns have been attracted to certain types of hosts. Some of these belong to specific syntactic categories and obligatorily attract clitic pronouns into preverbal position, thereby imposing a syntactic constraint on the position of clitic pronouns.

2.1 Syntactic constraints

The following categories can be distinguished: modal and negative particles, subordinating conjunctions, relative pronouns and interrogative words. The following are just a few examples out of many:

- (3) a. ás to fáyo m?
PRT 3SG I-will-eat PRT
'will I eat him?' (D336)

- b. mí to fáyo m?
NEG 3SG I-will-eat PRT
'will I not eat him?' (D336)

- (4) a. án du vyális ná mi páris
if 3SG you-take-out PRT 1SG you-will-marry
'if you take it out, you will marry me' (D386)

- b. án dén du vyális ná si píku dželét
if NEG 3SG you-take-out PRT 2SG I-will-make executioner
'if you don't take it out, I will cut off your head' (D386)

- (5) avúca tó me píken ekučz ne
thus REL 1SG he-made ox-driver he-is
'he who treated me like this is the ox-driver' (D422)

- (6) tí to píkes?
what 3SG you-did
'what have you done to him?' (D436)

⁷ In this respect, Standard Modern Greek resembles the South Slavic languages Macedonian, Serbo-Croatian and Bulgarian (Bubeník 1995:109, 111).

2.2 Discourse constraints

There are, however, other words attracting clitic pronouns into preverbal position which do not belong to any of the categories just mentioned, particularly subject pronouns. The problem is that the presence of a subject pronoun is not a necessary condition for preverbal placement. The most conspicuous instances of attraction involve what could be termed "echo structures" (Janse 1994:439), i.e., utterances echoing the word order of a preceding question:

- (7) a. *čís s épke mávro?*
 who 2SG he-made black
 'who made you black?' (D334)
 b. *etá m épke mávro*
 DEM 1SG she-made black
 'she made me black' (D334)
- (8) a. *tís t álakse?*
 who 3PL he-changed
 'who has changed them?' (D356)
 b. *oyó d álaksa*
 I 3PL I-changed
 'I have changed them' (D356)

The subject pronouns in the above examples constitute the information focus of the respective utterances, since they carry new information. In four cases, all from the same text, the focused subject pronouns answer the question implied in the king's proclamation that whoever killed his lion will marry his daughter:

- (9) *eyó to skótoša*
 I 3SG I-killed
 'I killed it' (D394 *bis*)
- (10) *eší to skótošes*
 you 3SG you-killed
 'You killed it' (D394, 396)

Echo structures can also be detected in the following examples:

- (11) a. *tíala du píris?*
 how 3SG you-took
 'how did you win her?' (D388)
 b. *mí du meló s tu píris*
 with the brains your 3SG you-took
 'with your brains you won her' (D388)

- (12) a. *pjós se píken na jelášis?*
 who 2SG he-made PRT you-laughed
 'who made you laugh?' (D452)
 b. *éna maimún me jélasen*
 a monkey 1SG he-laughed
 'a monkey made me laugh' (D452)
- (13) a. *itó to ráma atí do sardás?*
 this the yarn why 3SG you-wind
 'why are you winding this yarn?' (D356)
 b. *na fotiš to sardó*
 PRT it-will-give-light 3SG I-wind
 'for it to give light I am winding it' (D356)

In these cases, the preverbal position of the clitic pronouns is triggered by a whole phrase or, in the last example, a whole clause, although the focused element is in each case a single word. Focused constituents occasionally attract clitic pronouns in other contexts as well. In the following example, the focused word refers to the principal character of the story:

- (14) *etó páli ekučís to píken*
 this again ox-driver 3SG he-did
 'this again the *ox-driver* has done' (D424)

I have used the word "occasionally" to stress the optionality of the attraction of clitic pronouns to focused constituents. This is clear from the following contrasting pair from the same text:

- (15) a. *mána m éna forás me jénen*
 mother my one time 1SG she-bore
 '(as for) my mother, *once* she bore me'
đío forás đén me jénen
 two time NEG 1SG she-bore
 'twice she did not bear me' (D448)
- b. *mána m éna forás jénse me*
 mother my one time she-bore 1SG
 '(as for) my mother, *once* she bore me'
đío forás đén me jénen
 two time NEG 1SG she-bore
 'twice she did not bear me' (D448)

The same variation occurs in the following example, where the focused adjective *vula* has attracted the clitic pronoun in the first instance, but not in the second:

- (16) a. itúta ta prámata vula ta pírin
 these the things all 3PL he-took
 'these things, he took them all' (D406)
 b. itúta vula laxtá ta s ikínu mésa
 these all he-pushed 3PL in this inside
 'all these he pushed into it' (D406)

2.3 Conclusion

As has become clear, clitic float in Cappadocian is determined partly by syntactic, partly by discourse constraints. From a diachronic point of view, preverbal placement can be considered a relic of Wackernagel's Law which is essentially a prosodic phenomenon triggered by discourse pragmatic factors such as focus (Janse 1993a). In Ancient and Medieval Greek, clitic pronouns were regularly attracted to the first word or constituent of the sentence or any constituent intonation unit under the same conditions as those discussed above.⁸ The progressive syntacticization of postverbal placement seems to have originated in the Eastern Koiné, i.e., the Greek spoken in the eastern provinces of the Roman Empire, possibly under the influence of the Semitic substrate languages (Janse 1993b:86). In Standard Modern Greek and most of the modern dialects, on the other hand, Wackernagel's Law has been syntacticized in that the pre-positioning of the clitic pronouns is no longer a matter of prosodic, but rather of syntactic conditions, particularly the finiteness parameter referred to above.⁹

It has also become clear that the mechanisms appropriate to the description of the placement of clitic pronouns in Cappadocian are quite distinct from the mechanisms appropriate to the description of affixation. Affixes are subordinate to the word they are part of and syntactic rules apply to the combination as a whole. From a semantic perspective, affixes contribute to the meaning of the word. (Uhlenbeck 1978:6) Clitics, on the other hand, are not part of the word they are attached to and syntactic rules do not apply to the combination as a whole. In fact, the Cappadocian clitic pronouns are subject to the same (morpho)syntactic rules as full pronouns and nouns, with the exception of word order, of course. The fact that their distribution is at least in part determined by discourse constraints makes them even less affix-like.

⁸ Cf. Horrocks (1990), Janse (1993b; in preparation), Mackridge (1993).

⁹ Cf. Janse (1993b:107–113; in preparation).

3. The linearization of multiple clitic pronouns¹⁰

I now turn to the linearization of multiple clitic pronouns in Cappadocian. In Standard Modern Greek, multiple clitic pronouns make up a cluster of which the order is fixed, both internally and externally, a phenomenon referred to as "synclisis". Their order is fixed internally with the following morphosyntactic restrictions: (i) first- and second-person pronouns do not co-occur, (ii) a first- or second-person pronoun precedes a third-person, and (iii) a genitive pronoun precedes an accusative pronoun.¹¹

The order of multiple clitic pronouns is fixed externally in that clitic float must apply to the cluster as a whole, not to either of the constituent pronouns. In other words, both must float, or neither can. Clitic float does not affect the relative order of the clitic pronouns, as can be gathered from examples (1a) and (2a).

As already remarked, restrictions on the relative order of clitic pronouns and of clitics in general have been labelled "template constraints" and are often used as conclusive evidence in morphological approaches to cliticization.¹² There is, however, one well-known exception to the template constraints on the relative order of clitic pronouns in Standard Modern Greek: with monosyllabic imperatives, the order of the first- and third-person pronouns or, alternatively, of the genitive and accusative pronouns may be reversed.¹³ The following examples illustrate this phenomenon of "metacclisis" or "clitic metathesis":

- (17) a. ðós mu to
 give! 1SG.GEN 3SG.ACC.NTR
 'give it to me!'
 b. ðós to mu
 give! 3SG.ACC.NTR 1SG.GEN
 'give it to me!'
 (18) a. pés mu to
 say! 1SG.GEN 3SG.ACC.NTR
 'say it to me!'
 b. pés to mu
 say! 3SG.ACC.NTR 1SG.GEN
 'say it to me!'

¹⁰ This section is based on Janse (1997a).

¹¹ Cf. Mackridge (1985:222–223), Joseph & Philippaki-Warbuton (1987:213–214).

¹² Cf. Simpson & Withgott (1986), Spencer (1991:213, 356–357, 374), Zwicky (1994:xix).

¹³ Cf. Wanner (1978:276), Joseph & Philippaki-Warbuton (1987:213).

Clitic clustering with template constraints is by no means typical of Standard Modern Greek. A comparable situation obtains in the Romance and Slavic languages (Spencer 1991:351–375). Cappadocian provides some additional evidence against cluster and template approaches to multiple cliticization.

3.1 *Synclisis*

The Cappadocian folk-tale texts in Dawkins's grammar include seventeen instances of multiple clitic pronouns. Since Cappadocian does not distinguish between genitive and accusative pronouns, their relative order has to be stated either in terms of their respective function (direct or indirect object) or in terms of their respective person.

Just as in Standard Modern Greek, first- and second-person pronouns do not co-occur. In fourteen cases, a first- or second-person indirect object pronoun precedes a third-person direct object pronoun, again paralleling the situation in Standard Modern Greek. Examples (19) to (21) illustrate this familiar form of synclisis:

- (19) léo se ta
I-say 2SG 3PL
'I will tell it to you' (D322)
- (20) dókan me ta
they-gave 1SG 3PL
'they gave them to me' (D400)
- (21) ófnis me to
you-give 1SG 3SG
'you give it to me' (D458)

The same relative order is found with preverbal clitic pronouns, which have been attracted to modal particles in examples (22) and (23), and to an interrogative pronoun in (24):

- (22) á se to ófkso
PRT 2SG 3SG I-will-show
'I will show it to you' (D308)
- (23) ná mu to féris
PRT 1SG 3SG you-will-bring
'bring it to me' (D410)
- (24) pjós se ta óóken?
who 2SG 3PL he-gave
'who gave you this?' (D448)

3.2 *Metaclisis* or "clitic metathesis"

There is, however, evidence of what could be termed "metaclisis" or "clitic metathesis". The first example involves a monosyllabic imperative and is equivalent to the Standard Modern Greek example (17b):

- (25) óós to me
give! 3SG 1SG
'give it to me' (D410)

It may be noted that metaclisis results in potential ambiguity (Mirambel 1963:110–111): example (25) could theoretically be taken to mean 'give me to him', since *to* is used indiscriminately for direct and indirect objects (Dawkins 1916:120). The dialect of the nearby Fárasa area, on the other hand, provides an equivalent of the Standard Modern Greek example (18a):

- (26) pé me ta
say! 1SG 3PL
'say it to me' (D516, 536, 538)

Metaclisis with imperatives is *per se* not unparalleled, as can be seen in the French translations of (21) vs. (17b) and (25), where the relative order of the clitic pronouns is determined syntactically:

- (27) tu me le donnes
you 1SG 3.SG.ACC.NTR give
'You give it to me.'
- (28) donne-le-moi
give!-3SG.ACC.NTR-1SG.DAT
'Give it to me.'

More interesting, if problematic, is the following example:

- (29) emé dínis to mi to čiráq?
me you-give 3SG PRT the apprentice
'will you give the apprentice to me?' (D366)

Dawkins has written an accent on *mi* in his transcription, which would make it the Turkish interrogative particle *m(i)*, as in (3) and (30):

- (30) émaxés to mí?
 you-learnt 3SG PRT
 'have you learnt it?' (D364)

Alternatively, *mi* in (29) could theoretically be interpreted as a clitic pronoun, which would make sense in view of the presence of the emphatic pronoun *emé*, which is normally doubled by a clitic pronoun. If this interpretation is correct, Cappadocian would provide an example of metacclisis with a finite verb, which would be impossible in Standard Modern Greek. Additional evidence of metacclisis with finite verbs comes from the Fárása dialect, which provides the contrasting pairs (31a)–(31b) and (32a)–(32b). It should be noted that in each pair, the (b) utterances respond to the (a) utterances:

- (31) a. ifarés ta mas
 you-brought 3PL 1PL
 'you brought it to us' (D474)
 b. ifará sis ta
 I-brought 2PL 3PL
 'I brought it to you' (D474)
- (32) a. džó puás ta mas?
 NEG you-sell 3PL 1PL
 'will you not sell it to us?' (D518)
 b. á se da pulíso
 PRT 2SG 3PL I-will-sell
 'I will sell it to you' (D518)

It should be noted that negatives do not attract clitic pronouns in this particular dialect, as can be seen in example (32a), which means that the syntacticization process has entered a new stage. As noted earlier, the culmination of this process is the Pontic situation, where the postverbal position of the clitic pronouns has been generalized and the erstwhile clitic pronouns have become full-fledged suffixes. Example (32a) is all the more remarkable as it contrasts with (33) from another text from Fárása, elicited from a different informant, where the negative has again failed to attract the clitic pronouns, but the relative order of the latter is again as expected:

- (33) džó puá mes ta?
 NEG you-sell 1PL 3PL
 'will you not sell it to us?' (D510)

Although the evidence is too scanty to permit any firm conclusions, it may be noted that metacclisis, in the Cappadocian and Fárása dialects as in Standard Modern Greek, is found only with first-person indirect object clitic pronouns or, alternatively, with third-person direct object clitic pronouns.

Metacclisis has been attested in other languages as well. Consider, for instance, the following contrasting pair from the 13th century Italian poet Jacopone da Todi, cited in Hetzron (1977:194):

- (34) a. bene lo me pensai
 well 3SG 1SG I-thought.PRETERIT
 'I was sure of it'
 b. ben me lo pensava
 well 1SG 3SG I-thought.IMPERFECT
 'I was sure of it'

Hetzron (1977:195) also quotes the following pair from Languedocian, an Occitan dialect:

- (35) a. te la dirai
 2SG 3SG I-will-say
 'I will say it to you'
 b. la te dirai
 3SG 2SG I-will-say
 'I will say it to you'

The same variable order has been reported by Penner (1991:255) for Bernese Swiss German:

- (36) a. i weiss dass er im s zeigt het
 I know that he 3SG.DAT.MSC 3SG.ACC.NTR shown has
 'I know that he has shown it to him'
 b. i weiss dass er s im zeigt het
 I know that he 3SG.ACC.NTR 3SG.DAT.MSC shown has
 'I know that he has shown it to him'

In all of the cases just quoted there seems to be free variation, at least to some degree. It would, therefore, be misleading to describe this phenomenon as "clitic reordering", as Wanner (1977:115) has done. It seems preferable to reserve this term for cases where clitic metathesis is functionally motivated. Simpson &

Withgott (1986:164) quote the following examples from Gallo, a French dialect spoken in Brittany, which may be compared with the Standard French examples (27) and (28):

- (37) tu me le donnes
you 1SG 3SG.ACC.NTR give
'You give it to me.'

- (38) donne-moi-le
give!-1SG.DAT-3SG.ACC.NTR
'Give it to me!'

In this particular dialect, the dative-accusative order has been syntacticized, resulting in sequences such as (38) and (39):

- (39) il lui le donne
he 3SG.DAT 3SG.ACC.NTR gives
'He gives it to him/her.'

Simpson and Withgott (1986:163) consider the possibility of functionally motivated clitic reordering as a "morphological property of templates". It should be clear, however, that Cappadocian metaclisis and the other cases of clitic meta-thesis discussed so far pose serious problems for template approaches to multiple clitic pronouns.

3.3 Diacclisis or "split cliticization"

Much more problematic is the existence of another phenomenon in Cappadocian, which could be termed "diacclisis" or "split cliticization". In the following contrasting pair, the direct object clitic pronoun is attached to the modal particle *as*, but the indirect object clitic pronoun to the verb in (40a), whereas both appear in synclisis in the familiar relative order in (40b):

- (40) a. *ás to ðíkso se*
PRT 3SG I-will-show 2SG
'I will show it to you' (D308)
b. *á se to ðíkso*
PRT 2SG 3SG I-will-show
'I will show it to you' (D308)

Mirambel (1963:109) quotes two more instances of diacclisis:

- (41) *ás to dókum se*
PRT 3SG we-will-give 2SG
'we will give it to you' (M109)
(42) *fovúme ná to pó se*
I-am-afraid PRT 3SG I-will-tell 2SG
'I am afraid to tell it to you' (M109)

Mirambel seems to suggest that the placement of the indirect object clitic pronoun is analogous to that of the indirect object *orthotonic* pronoun, as in examples (43) and (44):

- (43) *ás to dékum esás*
PRT 3SG we-will-give you
'let us give her to you' (D350)
(44) *ón do dékis emé ná se vyálo*
if 3SG you-give me PRT 2SG I-will-pull-out
'if you give it to me, I will pull you out' (D352)

However, examples (29) and (45) show that this is not necessarily the case, since the use of an *orthotonic* pronoun usually involves clitic doubling:

- (45) *pé me ta ména*
say! 1SG 3PL me
'tell it to me' (D536)

Finally, example (46) illustrates diacclisis in the subordinate clause combined with clitic doubling in the main clause:

- (46) *án da fériz me ná se dóko s esé*
if 3PL you-bring 1SG PRT 2SG I-give to you
'if you bring me them, I will give [her] to you' (D340)

Although the evidence is again very scanty, it should be noted that in each case it is the post-positioning of the indirect object clitic pronoun which is remarkable, rather than the pre-positioning of the direct object clitic pronoun (Mirambel 1963:109). Whichever explanation one may wish to offer for the examples just discussed, it should be obvious that diacclisis poses serious problems for cluster and template approaches to cliticization.

I conclude with some miscellaneous examples of split cliticization, in order to show that the phenomenon is not limited to Cappadocian. The first example

Finally, it is also worthy of note that split cliticization is attested in genitive absolute constructions in Ancient Greek as well:

- (55) pleonákis mou geographēkótos soi
 frequently 1SG.GEN having-written 2SG.DAT
 'although I have frequently written you'

It should be noted, however, that the examples discussed so far are very different from the Cappadocian cases of diacclisis. The latter are unique in that two clitic pronouns are split around a *finite* verb which is not a (quasi-)auxiliary. Note, however, that East Flemish provides similar cases. Compare, for instance, the following variant of (53a), where one clitic pronoun is attached to the verb together with the doubled subject clitic pronoun *d*, whereas the other is attached to the orthotonic subject pronoun *gij*:

- (56) a. zeg-d-'t gij 'em?
 say-2SG.NOM-3SG.NTR you 3SG.MSC
 'are you going to say it to him?'

In the Standard Dutch equivalent (56b), both clitic pronouns are attached to the orthotonic subject pronoun *jij*:

- (56) b. zeg jij 't 'm?
 say you 3SG.NTR 3SG.MSC
 'are you going to say it to him?'

The Cappadocian examples quoted so far all testify to the existence of competing motivations in the linearization of clitic pronouns, viz. the ongoing grammaticalization of postverbal encliticization versus the surviving attraction of clitic pronouns to modal particles, which is a relic of Wackernagel's Law.

4. Two cases of "endocclisis"

I conclude with two cases of apparent "endocclisis" or "clitic infixation". I start with the more familiar case of the aorist imperative of the verb *đino/đino* 'I give'. The Cappadocian forms are:¹⁵

- (57) đés / dés / đós / dós
 'give!' (2SG)

¹⁵ Note that here, as elsewhere, the voiced apico-interdental fricative /ð/ is locally realised as a voiced apico-dental stop [d] in Cappadocian, e.g., *dén* (4) vs. *đén* (15a-b), *dókan* (20) vs. *đóken* (24), *đfnis* (21) vs. *dfnis* (29), etc.

- (58) đéset / déset / đóset / dóset
 'give!' (2PL)

At Ferték, Dawkins (1916:139) has recorded the following contracted form:

- (59) dém < *dème < dés me
 'gimme!' < 'give (2SG) me!'

According to Dawkins, this is the only attested form of the second-person singular aorist imperative, which means that there is no contrast between *dém* and, say, *dés* (*me*). As a result, the plural ending has been suffixed to this monolithic form, which was apparently no longer analyzable as *dés me*. Etymologically, this form can be reconstructed as follows:

- (60) demét < *de(s)-m(e)-ét
 give.1SG.2PL
 'give (2PL) (me)!'

The question is, however, if it is correct to analyze this form synchronically as such. For one thing, there is no paradigmatic opposition at Ferték between *dém* / *demét* on the one hand, and *dés* / **desét* on the other. More importantly, there is no paradigmatic dimension whatsoever, for there are no forms such as the following:

- (61) a. *dét < *déto < dés to
 'give (2SG) him'
 b. *detét < *de(s)-t(o)-ét
 'give (2PL) him'
 (62) a. *démas < dés mas
 'give (2SG) us'
 b. *demasét < *de(s)-mas-ét
 'give (2PL) us'

And there are no such forms with other verbs either:

- (63) a. *pém < *pème < pés me
 'tell (2SG) me'
 b. *pemét < *pe(s)-m(e)-ét
 'tell (2PL) me'

It seems safe to conclude that *demét* is only an apparent case of "endocclisis" or clitic infixation. The same phenomenon has been reported for some northern Greek dialects, where one finds forms like the following (Thavoris 1977:86-87; see also Joseph 1989):

- (64) a. *đómti* < **đó(s)-m(i)-ti*
 'give (2PL) (me)'
 b. *pém̃ti* < **pé(s)-m(i)-ti*
 'tell (2PL) (me)'

Judging from the examples quoted by Thavoris, the pattern must have attained a level of limited productivity. Most important, however, is the fact that the same forms occur with other pronouns, which seems to confirm the hypothesis that they are really considered unanalyzable synchronically:

- (65) a. *đómti mas*
 'give (2PL) us'
 b. *pém̃ti mas*
 'tell (2PL) us'

On the other hand, we do know that there exist fully productive patterns of "endocclisis" or clitic infixation with erstwhile clitic pronouns. In Albanian, for instance, the formation of the second-person plural imperative with infixed clitic pronouns (or perhaps, rather, pronominal infixes?) is fully productive (Demiraj 1985:1125):

- (66) *merreni* < *merr-e-ni*
 take!-3SG-2PL
 'take it' (2PL)

It should be noted that the Albanian clitic pronouns, with the exception of the third person singular *e*, may also procliticize to the imperative, as in the following contrasting pair:

- (67) a. *jepmani* < *jep-më-e-ni*
 give!-1SG-3SG-2PL
 'give it to me' (2PL)

- b. *ma jepni*
 1SG.3SG give-2PL
 'give it to me' (2PL)

Finally, there is the much more familiar case of the synthetic future in Portuguese, which has developed from an original Vulgar Latin analytic construction in which the infinitive was followed by the present or imperfect tense forms of the verb *habere* 'to have'. This is, of course, the same formation as is found in the other Romance languages, but what is peculiar about Portuguese is the fact that if the synthetic future is combined with clitic pronouns, these are infixed between the stem and the ending. Compare, for instance, the following paradigm (Spencer 1991:365-366):

(68) <i>levar-ei</i>	<i>leváloe</i> < <i>leva-lo-ei</i>
raise.FUT.1SG	raise.3SG.FUT.1SG
'I will raise'	'I will raise him'
<i>levar-ás</i>	<i>levá-lo-ás</i>
<i>levar-á</i>	<i>levá-lo-ás</i>
<i>levar-emos</i>	<i>levá-lo-emos</i>
<i>levar-eis</i>	<i>levá-lo-eis</i>
<i>levar-ão</i>	<i>levá-lo-ão</i>

As with the Albanian imperative, it is not easy to decide whether to treat the clitic pronouns in these particular cases as infixes or, alternatively, to treat the endings as enclitics, which, at least in the case of the Portuguese future, would not be totally implausible. In Serbo-Croatian, for instance, the auxiliary clitics can be attached to any full word, including the verb, which may be a participle, an infinitive, or even be included in a finite subordinate clause introduced by *da* 'that', although in clitic clusters the auxiliary obligatorily precedes the clitic pronouns.

I conclude with another apparent case of "endocclisis" of infixation which is found in an idiomatic expression at Ulagátsh (Dawkins 1916:138):

- (69) *ne ó to* < **na ijó to*
 PRT I-see 3SG
 'shall I do it?'

The first thing to notice about this particular expression, apart from the shape of the subjunctive *ó*, is the post-positioning of the clitic pronoun in the presence of the modal particle *ne* < *na*. More important, however, is the form of the first person plural, which is *ne ó tom* instead of the expected **ne óm do*:

- (70) *ne ó tom* < **na ijó to-m*
 PRT I-see 3SG.1PL
 'shall we do it?'

One would have expected the first person plural ending *-m* to be suffixed to verb, as in the third person plural:

- (71) *ne jín do* < **na ijún do*
 PRT they-see 3SG
 'will they do it?'

As with the apparently infixed first person singular clitic pronoun in *demét*, I conclude that what we have here is a highly idiosyncratic expression, both phonologically and semantically, which, having acquired an idiomatic meaning, is no longer analyzable. As a result, the first person plural ending *-m* is now suffixed to what must have been considered a monolithic form *óto*.

5. Conclusion

The Cappadocian clitic pronouns are far from being morphologized.¹⁶ They behave in sometimes very unpredictable ways. Their distribution is determined partly by syntactic, partly by discourse constraints. Multiple clitic pronouns cannot be described in a template framework, since their relative order is not fixed once and for all. Moreover, multiple clitic pronouns do not necessarily cluster together, but are sometimes split around the verb.

I conclude, then, that the Cappadocian clitic pronouns are clitics in the traditional sense: they constitute a category *sui generis*, somewhere halfway between full words and affixes on the pronoun-to-affix cline. At the same time, there is ample evidence of progressive syntacticization, most importantly the fact that postverbal position is generalized to a very high degree. If the generalization had been completed, then no doubt the Cappadocian clitic pronouns would have been morphologized like the erstwhile Pontic clitic pronouns. Unfortunately, history has decided otherwise and the history of Cappadocian has come to an end in the twentieth century. But the evidence which has been handed down

¹⁶ But see Janse (forthcoming a).

to us by Dawkins shows that grammatical categories are never clearly demarcated and that there may be considerable overlap between one category and another. In fact, it seems reasonable to use the term continuum, because, as we have seen, the Cappadocian clitic pronouns behave like full words in some respects, like clitics in others, and like affixes in yet others.

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Stephen R. 1992. *A-Morphous Morphology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1993. "Wackernagel's Revenge. Clitics, Morphology, and the Syntax of Second Position". *Language* 69. 68–97.
- Bubeník, Vít M. 1995. "Proleptic Use of Pronouns in Greek and South Slavic Languages." *Studies in Greek Linguistics* 15, 102–113.
- Dawkins, R. M. 1916. *Modern Greek in Asia Minor*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Demiraj, Shaban. 1985. *Gramatikë historike e gjuhës shqipe*. Tiranë: 8 Nëntori.
- Drettas, Georges. 1997. *Aspects pontiques*. Paris: Association de recherches pluridisciplinaires.
- Everett, Daniel L. 1996. *Why There are no Clitics. An Alternative Perspective on Pronominal Allomorphy*. Dallas, Texas: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Halpern, Aaron. 1995. *On the Placement and Morphology of Clitics*. Stanford, CA: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- Hetzron, Robert. 1977. "Clitic Pronouns and their Linear Representation". *Forum Linguisticum* 1:3. 189–215.
- Hopper, Paul J. & Elizabeth Closs Traugott. 1993. *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey C. 1990. "Clitics in Greek. A Diachronic Review". *Greek Outside Greece II* ed. by Maria Roussou & Stavros Panteli, 35–52. Athens: Diaspora Books.
- Janse, Mark. 1993a. "The Prosodic Basis of Wackernagel's Law". *Les langues menacées. Actes du XV^e Congrès international des linguistes, Québec, Université Laval, 9–14 août 1992* ed. by André Crochetière, Jean-Claude Boulanger, & Conrad Ouelton, vol. 4, 19–22. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- . 1993b. "La position des pronoms personnels enclitiques en grec néo-testamentaire à la lumière des dialectes néo-helléniques". *La Koiné grecque antique I. Une langue introuvable?* ed. by Claude Brixhe, 83–121. (Travaux et mémoires, Études anciennes, 10). Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy.

- . 1994. "Son of Wackernagel. The Distribution of Object Clitic Pronouns in Cappadocian". *Themes in Greek Linguistics. Papers from the First International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Reading, September 1993* ed. by Irene Philippaki-Warbuton, Katerina Nicolaidis, & Maria Sifianou, 435–442. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- . 1997a. "Synclisis, Metacclisis, and Diaclisis in Cappadocian". *Greek Linguistics '95. Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Salzburg, 22–24 September 1995*, ed. by G. Drachman, A. Malikouti-Drachman, C. Klidi, & J. Fykias, 695–706. Graz: W. Neugebauer.
- . 1997b. "Le grec au contact du turc. Le cas de la relative en cappadocien". Paper read at the Sixteenth International Conference of Linguists, Paris, 20–25 July 1997 (to appear in the Conference proceedings).
- . Forthcoming a. "Variation et changement linguistiques. Morphologisation dans les dialectes néo-grecs micrasiatiques". *Variation linguistique et enseignement des langues* ed. by Rosanna Sornicola. Napoli.
- . Forthcoming b. "Cappadocian Relatives". Paper read at the Third International Conference on Greek Linguistics, Athens, September 1997 (to appear in the Conference proceedings).
- . In preparation. "Convergence and Divergence in the Development of the Greek and Latin Clitic Pronouns".
- & Sijmen Tol. Forthcoming. "A Discourse Approach to Polish Clitic Placement". Paper read at the Sixteenth International Conference of Linguists, Paris, 20–25 July 1997 (to appear in the Conference proceedings).
- Joseph, Brian D. 1988. "Pronominal Affixes in Modern Greek. The Case against Clisis". *CLS 24. Papers from the 24th Annual Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society. Part One: The General Session* ed. by Lynn Macleod, Gary Larson & Diane Brentari, 203–215. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- . 1989. "I erminía merikón voríon típon tis prostaktikís katá ti simeriní morfologikí teoría." *Eliniki dialektología* 1, 21–26.
- . 1990. *Morphology and Universals in Syntactic Change. Evidence from Medieval and Modern Greek* (Outstanding Dissertations in Linguistics). New York: Garland.
- . & Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 1987. *Modern Greek*. London: Croom Helm.
- Kayne, Richard S. 1991. "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO". *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 647–686.
- Klavans, Judith L. 1985. "The Independence of Syntax and Phonology in Cliticization". *Language* 61, 95–120.
- Mackridge, Peter. 1985. *The Modern Greek language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Mirambel, André. 1963. "Dialectes néo-helléniques et syntaxe". *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris* 58:1, 85–134.
- Penner, Zvi. 1991. "Pronominal Clitics in Bernese Swiss German and their Structural Position. Jakob Wackernagel and Language Acquisition". *Clitics and their Hosts* ed. by Henk van Riemsdijk & Luigi Rizzi 253–268. Tilburg: Tilburg University.
- Rappaport, Gilbert C. 1989. "On the Relationship between Prosodic and Syntactic Properties of Pronouns in the Slavic Languages". *American Contributions to the Tenth International Congress of Slavists, Sofia, September 1988, Linguistics* ed. by Alexander M. Schenker 301–327. Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- Simpson, J. & M. Withgott. 1986. "Pronominal Clitic Clusters and Templates". *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics* ed. by Hagit Borer, 149–174. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Spencer, Andrew. 1991. *Morphological Theory. An Introduction to Word Structure in Generative Grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Thavoris, Antonios I. 1977. "Morfologiká merikón iðiomáton tis ðitikís Makeðonías". In: *A 'Simpósio glossologías tu Vorjoellaðikú xóru (Ípiros-Makeðonía-Θράκι)*, 28–30 Aprilú 1976. *Praktiká*, 75–95. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.
- Wanner, Dieter. 1977. "On the Order of Clitics in Italian". *Lingua* 43, 101–128.
- . 1978. "Modern Greek Clitics. Placement, Order, and Function". *Proceedings of the Fourth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Feb. 18–20, 1978* ed. by Jeri J. Jaeger (et al.), 268–282. Berkeley, California: Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Uhlenbeck, E. M. 1978. *Studies in Javanese Morphology*. The Hague: Nijhoff.
- Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. "Clitics and Particles". *Language* 61, 283–305.
- . 1994. "What is a Clitic?" *Clitics. A Comprehensive Bibliography 1892–1991* ed. by Joel A. Nevis, Brian D. Joseph, Dieter Wanner, & Arnold M. Zwicky, xii–xx. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.