

## Patterns of cliticization in Greek and its dialects

Anthi Revithiadou/Aegean University

1. INTRODUCTION. The status of clitic group in the prosodic hierarchy (Nespor & Vogel 1986, Hayes 1989) has been put into question by several researchers (among others, Booij 1988, 1995, Zec 1988, 1993, Inkelas 1989). Selkirk (1995) proposed that the cross-linguistic variety in the prosodization of function word-lexical word sequences can be accounted for by means of different rankings of (a) *constraints on domination*: NONREC(ursivity) [No  $C_i$  dominates another  $C_i$ ], EXH(austivity) [No  $C_i$  immediately dominates  $C_k$ ,  $k < i-1$ ], and (b) *constraints on the alignment* of prosodic and morphosyntactic structure: WdCon [Align Lex, L/R; PrWd, L/R], PrWdCon [Align PrW, L/R; Wd, L/R]. This paper examines patterns of clitic prosodization in three Greek dialects: Central Macedonian (CM), Pontic (P) and Cappadocian (C). In these dialects, enclitics incorporate into the host in one of three ways [§2]. In all three dialects, however, proclitics (if binary) form independent PrWs, thus suggesting an asymmetry in prosodic parsing of pre- and post-host elements. We propose that variation in enclitic patterning results from reshuffling of the above set of constraints. In addition, the prosodic independence of proclitics is examined as one aspect of the preference of Greek to left-align a PPh with a PrW and, moreover, in relation with other forms of left-right asymmetries.

2. DATA. In CM, stress is trochaic and limited to the last three syllables of the word. Enclitics incorporate into the PrW causing main stress to shift onto the penultimate syllable (1). *s*-voicing applies within the domain of the PrW, e.g. *prozmeno* /pros-meno/ '(I am) waiting for'. Based on this evidence, we can safely infer that in (1a-b) host+clitic forms are parsed into one PrW. Pontic is a lexical accent system with word-initial default stress, e.g. *álales*a 'mute-fem.NOM.sg'. The addition of the clitic does not trigger any stress shifts (2), even when the clitic satisfies prosodic minimality conditions (2b). It is worth mentioning that words in P have rhythmic stress, e.g. *éklapsefe* '(you) cried'. The absence of secondary stress in clitic constructions lead to the conclusion that enclitics are incorporated prosodically at the level of the Phonological Phrase (PPh). In Cappadocian, on the other hand, enclitics adjoin recursively to the PrW, unless the host is stressed on the antepenultimate syllable, e.g. *éripsen* '(s/he) threw'. In this case, the clitic forms a foot together with the final syllable of the host and incorporates into the PrW. It is not clear which of the two stresses is more prominent. *s*-voicing (3a) and nasal-stop voicing (3b) indicate that the clitic belongs to the same PrW with the host. What suggests that the clitic does not incorporate into the PrW but is attached recursively to it is the lack of secondary stress in forms like (3c). Despite their diversity in host+clitic prosodization, all three dialects display a common picture in proclitic parsing. As shown in (4), proclitics incorporate into the PrW, if monosyllabic (4a), but form independent PrWs, if they are binary (4b). Besides the presence of stress, the autonomous prosodic status of proclitics is evidenced by the failure of the V-deletion rule to apply in the forms in (4b).

3. THE PROPOSAL. As evidenced from the above, different stress behaviors follow from different representations. In an Optimality Theoretic framework (Prince & Smolensky 1993) variation is translated as constraint reranking. More specifically, this paper focuses on two forms of variation: (a) cross-dialectal variation and (b) structural variation (i.e. the proclitic-enclitic asymmetry). Starting from the first one, ranking EXH above NONREC and the alignment constraints gives rise to the CM internal clitics (5a). The free clitics of P, however, are the result of top ranking alignment and NONREC over EXH (5b). Moreover, the highly recursive structure of Cappadocian enclitics is due to the ranking in (5c). Finally, proclitics form independent prosodic words when both domination constraints outweigh alignment (5d). With respect to structural variation, the reluctance of left edges of hosts to incorporate

material will be examined in relation with other forms of left-right asymmetries (e.g. prefix-suffix) as well as the tendency of Greek to left-align PPh with PrW boundaries.

4. CONCLUSION. Novel data raise important questions about cross-linguistic variation in clitic patterning and the prosodization differences between proclitics and enclitics.

#### EXAMPLES

##### (1) *Central Macedonian internal enclitics*

- |   |               |               |   |                     |
|---|---------------|---------------|---|---------------------|
| a | /Dós mu/      | [Dózmu]       | [( @ CL)] <sub>PrW</sub>                              | 'give me-IMP'       |
| b | /Dáskalos mu/ | [Da\$kalózmu] | [( \$)( @ CL)] <sub>PrW</sub>                         | 'my teacher-NOM.sg' |
| c | /Dóse mu to/  | [Do\$emúto]   | [( \$ <sub>H</sub> @ <sub>L</sub> CL)] <sub>PrW</sub> | 'give it to me-IMP' |

##### (2) *Pontic free enclitics* (Papadopoulos 1955)

- |   |                    |                  |  |                         |
|---|--------------------|------------------|--|-------------------------|
| a | /ípame sas/        | [ípamesas]       | [( @ <sub>H</sub> )] <sub>PrW</sub> CL] <sub>PPh</sub> | '(we) told you-PL'      |
|   | /Ta Dexkúndane me/ | [TaDexkúndaneme] |  | '(they) will accept us' |
| b | /Díos ekun/        | [Díosekun]       | [( @ <sub>H</sub> )] <sub>PrW</sub> CL] <sub>PPh</sub> | 'the two of them'       |
|   | /ípen aton/        | [ípenaton]       |  | '(s/he) told him'       |

##### (3) *Cappadocian mixed (affixal-internal) enclitics* (Dawkins 1916)

- |       |              |             |   |                                   |
|-------|--------------|-------------|---|-----------------------------------|
| a     | /afínis me/  | [afínizme]  | [[[( @ <sub>H</sub> )] <sub>PrW</sub> CL] <sub>PrW</sub> ] <sub>PPh</sub> | '(you) leave me'                  |
| b     | /éripsen ta/ | [éripsénda] | [( @)( @ CL)] <sub>PrW</sub> ] <sub>PPh</sub>                             | '(s/he) threw them'               |
| [vs.] | /rípse ta/   | [rípseta]   |   | 'throw them-IMP' without voicing] |
| c     | /léo se ta/  | [léoseta]   | [( @) <sub>H</sub> CL] <sub>PrW</sub> CL] <sub>PrW</sub> ] <sub>PPh</sub> | '(I) tell you these'              |

##### (4) *proclitics as prosodic words*

- |   |                           |                          |  |                     |           |
|---|---------------------------|--------------------------|--|---------------------|-----------|
| a | /me orízi/                | [morízi]                 | [morízi] <sub>PrW</sub>                    | '(s/he) elects me'  | <i>CM</i> |
|   | /to aníksi/               | [taníksi]                | [taniksi] <sub>PrW</sub>                   | '(s/he) opens it'   | <i>C</i>  |
|   | /Ta a apó se/             | [Ta apóse]               | [Ta apó] <sub>PrW</sub> Se] <sub>PPh</sub> | '(I) will love you' | <i>P</i>  |
| b | [(Ta\$ne)] <sub>PrW</sub> | [(orízi)] <sub>PrW</sub> | '(s/he) will elect me'                     | no vowel deletion   | <i>CM</i> |
|   | [(más ta)] <sub>PrW</sub> | [(ípen)] <sub>PrW</sub>  | '(s/he) told us these'                     | no vowel deletion   | <i>C</i>  |

##### (5) *constraint rankings*

- |   |                                 |  |
|---|---------------------------------|--|
| a | EXH >> NONREC >> WdCon, PrWdCon | <i>CM internal enclitics</i>             |
| b | WdCon, PrWdCon, NONREC >> EXH   | <i>P free enclitics</i>                  |
| c | EXH >> WdCon, PrWdCon >> NONREC | <i>C mixed enclitics</i>                 |
| d | EXH, NONREC >> WdCon, PrWdCon   | <i>CM, P, C prosodic word proclitics</i> |