

# The morphosyntax of *-nde* and post-verbal clitics in Cypriot Greek

Natalia Pavlou and Phoevos Panagiotidis

University of Chicago, University of Cyprus

npavlou@uchicago.edu, phoevos@ucy.ac.cy

## *Abstract*

This paper explores pronominal clitic placement in a mixed clitic placement variety, Cypriot Greek, and the restrictions of it in the presence of the dialectal element *-nde*. *-Nde* appears as a verb suffix, but imposes syntactic and morphological restrictions in the clause. We argue that *-nde* is a borrowed element from Turkish and it behaves as a *validational* marker (Weber 1986) in Cypriot Greek, expressing the truth validity of the speaker's judgment. Challenging the true nature of clitics and affixes, the discussion focuses on the possibility of clitic-like elements to appear as suffixes. The ungrammaticality yielded with both *-nde* and post-verbal object clitics leads to the observation that the two need to appear adjacent to the verb.

Keywords: affix, clitics, Cypriot, *-nde*, *validational*

## 1. Introduction

<sup>1</sup>This article intends to present a first account of the morphosyntactic distribution of the marker *-nde* in Cypriot Greek (hence, CG) and the syntactic implications drawn from the constraints it imposes on post-verbal clitic placement. The main aim of this paper is the distribution of this marker, which appears as a verb suffix, but it affects the syntax of the clause by disallowing post-verbal clitic placement.

(1) a. Ipcame-nde to krasin  
*drank.nde-1PL the-ACC wine-ACC*  
'We drank the wine'

b.\* Ipcame-nde to  
*drank.nde-1PL it-ACC*  
'We drank it'

(CG)

CG is a mixed clitic placement variety, which has however only recently been extensively studied (Terzi 1999a, 1999b, Grohmann 2011, Grohmann et al., 2012) with regard to this topic. Consequently, this study is the first to refer to the constraints of *-nde* in post-verbal clitic placement and will be drawing data from a limited number of clitics studies in CG, which mainly refer to L1 acquisition as well as presenting some new data related to this paper.

Clitic placement in Cypriot Greek is mixed; that is, it allows for both pre-verbal and post-verbal clitic positioning in specific syntactic environments (see

---

<sup>1</sup> We would first like to thank the anonymous reviewers and editors of our paper for their insightful feedback and suggestions for improvement. We also thank the audience of the Challenging Clitics workshop (University of Oslo, 27<sup>th</sup> -28<sup>th</sup> October, 2011) for their valuable feedback. We especially thank Paco Fernández-Rubiera, Mohamed Jlasi and Alexandra Galani for their suggestions. Thanks also go to Evelina Leivada, Theoni Neocleous and Elena Papadopoulou for their judgments of the SMG and CG examples included in the text, as well as their detailed suggestions.

Section 2 for further details). Most of the studies on clitics in CG have focused on the acquisition of the mixed system based on the complex sociolinguistic status of Cyprus (Rowe & Grohmann, 2012, Grohmann & Leivada, 2012) and the process under which children switch from post- to pre-verbal clitic placement due to the school factor (Grohmann 2011, Grohmann et al., 2012). Syntactic accounts of mixed clitic placement in CG have also been proposed (Terzi 1999a, 1999b, Agouraki 2001) and they are going to be discussed in more detail in Section 2.

Our interest in the dialectal element *-nde* stems from the fact that it seems to be one of the purely Cypriot-specific characteristics, which undergo a process of ‘death’, as it appears to be used less by the young population. In fact, Rowe and Grohmann (2012), following Auer (2005), predict that CG undergoes ‘dialect moribundity’, in the sense of ‘dialect loss’ associated with loss of specific features. In Section 3 below, we present the morphological and syntactic specificities of *-nde* in different environments.

The main conclusions of this paper in Section 4 are the revealing implications of the constraints that *-nde* imposes on post-verbal object clitic placement. In the presence of *-nde*, post-verbal object clitic placement is not allowed (see Section 3.2). Given the fact that *-nde* seems to behave as a suffix, the restriction in this environment emphasizes the subtle line between clitics and affixes, even if they are interpreted in fundamentally different ways. It also contributes to related work on other mixed clitic placement languages, suggesting that post-verbal clitic placement may be related to phrasal affixes (Galves, Ribeiro & Moraes 2005, Galves & Sândalo 2004), or affixes in general.

Finally, we conclude with some further questions on the issue that await future research and may be addressed with input from other languages showing the same phenomena.

## 2. Clitic placement in Cypriot Greek

The linguistic status of the Republic of Cyprus is traditionally described as diglossic, with a sociolinguistically ‘low’ variety of CG co-existing with the ‘high’ Standard Modern Greek (SMG), a variety spoken in Greece. Cyprus exhibits *de jure* bilingualism (Greek, Turkish; referring to the standard varieties in both cases) and *de facto* trilingualism in Greek, Turkish and English (Arvaniti 2002) or bilingualism in SMG and CG (Newton 1972, Vassiliou 1995) or bidialectism in SMG and CG (e.g. Pavlou & Christodoulou 2001, Yiakoumetti et al. 2005) or more generally a ‘bi-*x*’ context (Grohmann 2011, Grohmann & Leivada 2012, Grohmann et al., 2012) proposed to cover any possible mixing of language-dialect. A more recent approach (Rowe & Grohmann 2012) suggests that a *co-overt prestige* of CG has prevented its death and that diglossia in Cyprus relates to a type B diglossia. Type B (medial) diglossia refers here to dialect moribundity with a high degree of entropy. In this sense, the individual speakers of this society are identified as (discrete) ‘bilectal’.

The defined linguistic environment clarifies that we have at least two linguistic codes (whatever their status is), whose grammars, even if not clearly defined, can intervene with one another, as SMG input is copiously available through the medium of television programs, books, and education. The co-existence of two varieties results in a complex interplay between certain morphosyntactic properties of the two

varieties. As Grohmann & Leivada (2012) point out, in contexts that involve the coexistence of a standard and a regional variety, syntactic differences fade away with the passing of time in favor of an intermediate (Cornips 2006) or ‘diglossic’ speech repertoire (Auer 2000, 2005), based on a more standard/dialect continuum.

The two varieties show many differences in all aspects of grammar. One of the more studied ones is the syntax and L1 acquisition of pronominal clitics (Grohmann et al. 2010, Leivada et al. 2010, and Grohmann et al., 2012, Grohmann 2011). Clitic placement in CG is mixed; clitics can appear pre-verbally or post-verbally depending on the syntactic environment.

More particularly, post-verbal clitics cannot appear in *na*-clauses, negative environments and *wh*-questions (2–4), whereas post-verbal clitics can appear in simple declaratives (6) – cf. the situation in SMG in (5). Moreover, both placement options are possible with the complementizers *oti* ‘that’ and *jati* ‘because’ (7–8). Finally, in imperative sentences<sup>2</sup>, only post-verbal clitics are allowed (9).

(2) Thelo        na to        pco (\*to)        CG *na*-clause

*want-1SG to it-CLI.3SG drink-1SG*

‘I want to drink it’

(3) En        to        pino (\*to)        CG negation

*not-NEG it-CLI.3SG drink-1SG*

‘I am not drinking it’

(4) Pcos/Pu/Pote/Jati        to        pini        (\*to)? CG *wh*-question

*who/where/when/why it-CLI.3SG drink-3SG it-CLI.3SG*

‘Who is drinking it/ Where/when/why is he drinking it?’

---

<sup>2</sup> Bošković (2006) argues that ‘affix hoping + copy and delete’ accounts for postverbal clitics in imperatives, with special reference to the possible appearance of dative-accusative and accusative-dative clitic orders in Greek. Postverbal clitic placement in imperatives is a matter of a switch forced by PF considerations, and not syntax.

(5) To ipje SMG declarative  
*it-CLI.3SG drank-3SG*  
‘S/he drank it’

(6) Ipcen <sup>n</sup>do CG declarative  
*drank-3SG it-CLI.3SG*  
‘S/he drank it’

(7) Kseri oti (to) ipces (to) CG *oti*-complementizer  
*knows-3SG that it-CLI.3SG drink-2SG it-CLI.3SG*  
‘She knows that you drank it’

(8) Kseri jati (to) ipces (to) CG *jati*-complementizer  
*knows-3SG because it-CLI.3SG drank-2SG it-CLI.3SG*  
‘She knows because you drank it’

(9) Fa’ to CG imperative  
*eat-2SG it-CLI.3SG*  
‘Eat it’

Syntactic analyses of mixed clitic placement in CG (Agouraki 2001, Terzi 1999a, 1999b) suggest that the verb in CG moves to a higher position and generates the verb-clitic order. Agouraki proposes that the verb moves to C<sup>0</sup> in order to satisfy the ‘filled C’-criterion in CG. On a feature-based account, Terzi suggests that the verb needs to move to the Mood<sup>0</sup> to satisfy strong V features. In both cases though, verb movement is assumed for the possibility of generating both positions.

(10) @@ Insert (PAV.jpg) here.

**Picture 1** Terzi (1999a, 1999b) and Agouraki's (2001) accounts

(Neocleous 2012)

Placement of clitics has been a central issue in the acquisition literature on Cypriot Greek. Acquisition findings (Grohmann 2011, Grohmann et al., 2012) led to the hypothesis of a socio-syntactic factor in diglossic environments such as the one in Cyprus. The possible diglossic context and the competence of bilectal speakers has become relevant in many studies following Grohmann et al. (2012). For the sake of providing a complete picture of clitic placement in CG, we will review some of the basic conclusions in a number of relevant studies.

A longitudinal study (Petinou & Terzi 2002) showed that children acquire CG clitic production at 32 to 36 months of age. Based on a picture-based task administered in Greek Cypriot children aged 2;0 and 6;11 years of age, Grohmann et al. (2012) investigate the acquisition of direct object clitics and suggest that acquisition of object clitics in indicative clauses is acquired by age 3;0. By replicating

the same experiment, Leivada et al. (2010) collected data from (i) Hellenic Greek children (children from mainland Greece, who were born in Greece and at the time of the experiment, the majority schooled in Cyprus), (ii) Greek Cypriot children and (iii) binational children (born in either Greece or Cyprus, with one parent from each country, and schooled in Cyprus) This study presented two different versions of the same task to the three different populations. Greek Cypriot children were observed to increase the proclisis answers after their presence in school, where only the ‘high’ variety is used. Neocleous (2012) also concludes that in the first years, Greek Cypriot children misplace the clitic. Last, an ongoing study (Papadopoulou, Leivada & Pavlou, 2012) is testing the hypothesis whether Greek Cypriot speakers base their decision for pre-verbal or post-verbal placement in mixed environments on the syntactic and lexical input they get. The study so far has shown that Greek Cypriot adults identify the difference and switch from pre-verbal to post-verbal placement, or the opposite, on the basis of two different blocks in the experiment, one with CG lexical and syntactic input and the other one with SMG.

Based on the aforementioned studies, it appears that mixed clitic placement, especially in diglossic contexts, is a complex matter and different syntactic environments intervene with its syntax. One of these is the use of *-nde*, which, as explained below, is problematic in the presence of clitics. Let us now examine the morphosyntactic distribution and pragmatic functions of *-nde* in CG, as well as its relevance to the Turkish clitic *dA*.

### **3. *Validational markers: A cross-linguistic overview***

Classification of markers characterized by a certain way a speaker treats the statement has been expressed very early on (Bally 1932/1965:36) with the notion of *Dictum* and *Modus*. The first one was thought as the representation of the sentence itself, whereas the modus involved other operations carried by the utterer of the sentence.

Since then, a number of speech act markers in the form of affixes, particles or clitics have been identified and discussed in a number of languages. These range from the Turkish topic introducing marker *ee* ‘so’, focus marker *ya* ‘well’, *iste* ‘you know’, clarification marker *yani* ‘I mean’ (Özbek 1995), the Romanian pragmatic marker *hai* expressing a strong speaker-oriented interpretation (Hill 2009), the Hungarian formal/informal markers *nánk/-nénk* and *nók/-nók* (Kiefer 1998), the Penutian Wintu non-visual sensory evidence suffix *-nthEr*, the hearsay markers *-kee*, *-ree* and *-?el* (Willett 1988:64–5), and many others.

For the purposes of this paper, we will retain the meaning of the *evidential*, or even better *validational* (Weber 1986) function of discourse markers. We follow Weber’s definition as such; an *evidential* marker indicates the source of the information (Anderson 1986), but a *validational* marker indicates the degree of certainty and the truth of the proposition uttered. The *validational* aspect has been argued to come from an extralinguistic axiom that defines one’s own experience as reliable. In Karaja, spoken on and around the Bananal island in the Araguaia rive in Brazil, the marker *-tyhy* is used as a verb form and is used to attest the veracity of a statement. Similarly, in Quechua, spoken in Cusco, the enclitic *-mi* (11) has been classified as *validational* (Nuckolls 1993) based on the criteria above and on the fact that *-mi* is used even if the speaker has not witnessed the action uttered (but, it could be that someone else, who is trustworthy, has

witnessed it). Similarly, Nuckolls notes that utterances concerning future happenings which cannot be directly witnessed express the assertion of the *validational* markers, even if appearing as *Affirmative suffixes*. *Affirmative suffixes* have been argued to be *evidential* (Muysken 1995, Weber 1986) or *validational* (Nuckolls 1993, Floyd 1997).

(11) Pilar-mi llalli-rqa-n.

*pilar-mi* *win-PST.3*

‘Pilar won’

(Quechua)

These morphological markers can show characteristics of grammaticalization ranging from free functional morphemes to bound forms appearing as inflectional paradigms. In other cases, grammaticalization occurs so that a bound form becomes a lexical unit. In Karaja, the bound form *-tyhy* can also appear as a noun form *inatyhy* ‘truth’ (Maia 2004). CG also shows lexicalised forms, such as *imishi* ‘supposedly’, borrowed from the hearsay Turkish marker *mis*. In addition, the Turkish clitic *dA* has shown grammaticalization (Schiering 2006) characterized by its insertion between the converb marker and the second verb stem (this is possible with *-A-dur-*, less acceptable with *-Abil-* and presumably ungrammatical with *-Iyor-*). As argued in the same study, grammaticalization in mora- and syllable-based languages keep the phonological substance of cliticized elements, which leads to disyllabic clitics and affixes, whereas in stress-based languages it reduces the phonological substance of cliticized elements resulting in ‘*subminimal clitics and affixes in the course of morphologization*’ (Schiering 2006:2).

The sharing of common properties between the markers mentioned above can help us identify the universal grammatical properties of these elements.

### 3.1 The marker *-nde* in Cypriot Greek

Greek discourse markers have not been extensively studied, with the exception of the distribution of *re* in SMG, which seems to be used in the contexts where a speaker wishes to bring the hearer into the conversation (Sifianou 1992, Archakis & Tzanne 2009).

SMG also uses *(n)de*, as a prosodically prominent lexical item, which plays an important role in the meaning of the sentence. Consider the following:

(12) a. Kala *fine-ADV*  
                  ‘Fine’

b. Kala      de!  
                  *fine-ADV de*  
                  ‘Yeah, fine.’

(13) a. Ela  mou?  
                  *come me-DAT.CLI*  
                  ‘Excuse me?’

b. Ela  mou      de!  
                  *come me-DAT.CLI de*  
                  ‘Fancy that!’

(14) a. Siya  
                  *slowly-ADV*  
                  ‘Slowly’

b. Siya      de  
                  *slowly-ADV de*  
                  ‘Take it easy!’

SMG (*n*)*de* could possibly be related to *lipon* (which has a direct translation ‘so’) (Leivada, pc), but is uttered in contexts where it appears at the clause-final position and comes as an objection to the previously uttered statement. In SMG,

(n)de is purely a discourse particle which possibly adds emphasis to the context in certain occasions. In all the examples above, it is used in the final position in the clause and does not appear to be affected by the preceding item. SMG (n)de can also be found in initial positions in the clause as the following examples show:

(15) a. De ke kala (na pame ekdromi)  
*de and well-ADV (to go-1PL excursion-ACC)*  
 ‘We should go to the excursion’ [lit. whatever happens]<sup>3</sup>

b. De ke soni  
*de and enough-ADV*  
 ‘whatever happens’ (Leivada, pc)  
 (SMG)

It seems from the example in (15) that (n)de imposes a certain meaning in initial positions in the clause, but due to the limited number of examples we could find, we will make no further claims. The similarity we can observe with the CG - nde lies on their common property to add or alter meaning of the sentence they occur.

In contrast, CG -nde behaves very differently. Agouraki (2010) lists -nde (mentioned as -te) as an optional marker of V-in-C checking Emphasis on C. First, it always appears as a bound form and can only take a verb as its host.

---

<sup>3</sup> *De ke kala* and *de ke soni*, (‘no matter what’) can be translated as ‘willy-nilly’, to express that an action will happen whether you desire it or not.

(16) Efame-nde

*ate.nde-1PL*

‘We ate’

(CG)

Grammatically, it can only attach to inflectional suffixes expressing 1<sup>st</sup> person PLURAL, as in (17d):

(17) a. \*Ipca-nde pollin.

*drank.nde-1SG much*

‘I drank too much’

b. \*Ipces-nde pollin

*drank.nde-2SG much*

‘You drank too much’

c. \* Ipce-nde pollin.

*drank.nde-3SG much*

‘S/he/it drank too much’

d. Ipcame-nde pollin

*drank.nde-1PL much*

‘We drank too much’

e. \*Ipcete-nde pollin

*drank.nde-2PL much*

‘You drank too much’

f. \*Ipcasi-nde pollin

*drank.nde-3PL much*

‘They drank too much’

(CG)

Additionally, it cannot be incorporated into a verb carrying the PLURAL ending -

*an*, which is the past tense suffix used for non-active voice in CG:

(18) a.\*Emaxumasta-nde pollin ora

*were.kept.busy.nde-1PL much time-ACC*

‘We were kept busy for a long time’

b.\*Esazumasta-nde ullen to apoyevma.

*get.ready.nde-1PL all the-ACC afternoon-ACC*

‘We were getting ready all afternoon’

(CG)

The distribution of *-nde* with deponent verbs<sup>4</sup>, such as *peripiume* ‘take care’, shows that it is not the case that *-nde* cannot appear with non-active morphology, but with non-active syntax/semantics. Deponent verbs are transitive and active in meaning, but show non-active morphology, so we get the following:

(19) Peripiumaste-nden ton kipo

*take-care.nde-1PL the-ACC garden-ACC*

‘We take care of the garden’

(CG)

---

<sup>4</sup> We would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for pointing this condition as a diagnostic test to identify the syntactic/morphological inability of *-nde* with Voice.

However, if we consider the past form of the same verb *peripiumastan/un-nde* ‘take care’, judgments vary among the speakers, but the ungrammaticality is not as strong as the case in (18).

Based on what we have said above, *-nde* cannot be assumed to be an inflectional suffix, since the 1st person plural suffix *-me* already carries the inflection features. It should also be noted that *-nde* cannot appear before *-me* (e.g. *\*ipcandeme*), so it always need to appear after inflection has taken place (either that is a procedure in the lexicon or the syntax). Inflectional clitics are argued to be lexical clitics, only if they can interact with canonically distributed inflectional affixes and appear inside of other inflections (Halpern 1995). By arguing that *-nde* is an inflectional affix, there are two problems occurring. One problem is the redundancy of the assumption that there are two suffixes for 1<sup>st</sup> person PLURAL suffixes in Cypriot Greek, with one of them appearing optionally or with both of them appearing at the same time. The other problem is that, if *-nde* is an inflectional affix and can affect the distribution of pronominal clitics, then this should be the case for other inflectional affixes as well.

The CG marker *-nde* does not show any restriction to tense, as it can be used to refer to the past (20), the present (21) or the future (22).

(20)      Epiame-nde    sto            panairin.

*went.nde-1PL to-the-ACC feast-ACC*

‘We went to the feast’

(21)      Pame-nde    sto            panairin.

*go.nde-1PL    to-the-ACC    feast-ACC*

‘We are going to the feast’

(22) Enna pame-nde sto panairin.

*will go.nde-1PL to-the-ACC feast-ACC*

‘We will go to the feast’

(CG)

The grammatical properties of *-nde* can be revealing with regard to its semantic or pragmatic function. Given that an evidential marker designates a grammatical element that indicates the speaker’s source of information (Anderson 1986) and it requires direct experience, *-nde* is not included in this classification based on its lack of tense restrictions. Consider the following, where a speaker, who has not experienced an action, can use *-nde* for a future event:

(23) Enna pame-nde sto horkon

*will go.nde-1PL to-the-ACC village-ACC*

‘We will go to the village’

(CG)

Similarly, the Quechua suffix *-puni*, which has been classified as a pure *validational* discourse marker and has the meaning of ‘definitely/certainly’, can be used with future actions:

(24) Papa-ta-n/-s/-chá wayk’u-nqa-puni.

*potato-ACC-mi/-si/chá cook-3FUT-puni*

‘She will definitely cook potatoes’

(Faller 2003)

(Quechua)

In addition, the example in (25) is grammatical in a context where the speaker refers to the future in the present by using the past form of the verb to express that the action has supposedly been completed:

(25) Ate        efiame-nde!

*come.on left.nde-1PL.*

‘Let’s go’ [lit. ‘We left’]

(CG)

So, *validational* markers can be argued to share the property of ‘unspecified’ direct experience, meaning that direct experience comes from the speaker, but the actual time of the action is irrelevant for the truth value of the proposition. In other words, CG *-nde* assigns the speaker/speakers himself /themselves as a reliable source of information, gained in unspecified time, who believes in the proposition expressed (p) (26).

(26) Direct Evidence (s,p) → Believe (s,p)

(Faller 2003)

Further, the restriction of the *validational -nde* to attach only to 1<sup>st</sup> PLURAL can be explained with the assumption of the relation of direct experience expressed by the speaker with the uttered proposition. We could not find any further support to explain why *-nde* cannot occur with 1<sup>st</sup> person SINGULAR, but we expect to address this issue in future work.

It could be generalized then that *-nde* performs the following functions:

(27)

a)     Assigns a commitment to the truth value of the proposition.

- b) The proposition is associated with personal (direct) experience.
- c) The truth validity is not based only on (past) experience (but, also maybe on trustworthiness of the speaker).

Experience is hereby not related to the actual details of the happening of the action, since *-nde* can also appear with *wh*-questions. In these cases, the speaker asserts certainty that the action which *-nde* suffixes has (or will) happen. CG *validational -nde* is optionally used and it mainly strengthens the certainty of a statement.

CG is a variety without a rich repertoire of modality markers. We argue that *-nde* has been borrowed from neighboring (Standard) Turkish, a variety which Cypriot Greek has had contact with since 1570. More specifically, we claim that *-nde* is a Turkish loan, from the Turkish clitic *dA/dE*. Standard Turkish here refers to the Turkish spoken in Turkey, whereas Cypriot Turkish refers to the variety spoken by Turkish Cypriot speakers on the north territory of Cyprus. We refer to Standard Turkish, as the data were drawn from Turkish grammar books, and not from personal communication with any speaker.

Turkish *dA* is a multi-function particle (Göksel & Özsoy 2002, Özbek 1995), which acts as a discourse connective through its additive, adversative, continuative and enumerating function<sup>5</sup>. Göksel & Özsoy (2003) explain that the additive function is not given with *dA* alone, but with the presupposition of *dA* interpreted with the rest of the sentence. It shows vowel harmonization with the preceding syllable (Göksel & Kerslake 2005), as in (28):

---

<sup>5</sup> An example for its additive function is given in (29), even though we will not expand on this point.  
 (29) *seyretmedim de*

‘and moreover I didn’t watch (it)’

(Göksel & Kerslake 2005)

(28) a. Annem de 'my mother too'  
 b. Yaparım da 'I will do [it], too'

(Turkish)

The Turkish *dA* is found in the right outermost boundary of a word, it follows other markers such as number, person and Case and it cliticizes onto any type of phrase. Most important though is the fact that when the host of *dA* is focused, *dA* can occur anywhere in the pre-verbal position, but not in the post-verbal position.

(30) a. Ahmet bu arada SNAV-A da hazırlan-acak-tı.

*Ahmet in.the.meantime exam-DAT dA prepare-FUT-P*

'In the meantime, Ahmet was supposed to get prepared for the exam.'

b.\*Ahmet bu arada hazırlan-acak-tı SNAV-A da.

*Ahmet in.the.meantime prepare-FUT-P exam-DAT dA (Turkish)*

(Göksel & Özsoy 2003)

When the host of the Turkish *dA* is not focused, it can only occur in clause initial position or post-verbal position. Both of these have been argued to be associated with background information or 'after-thought' (Erguvanlı 1984).

Semantically, *dA* is argued to assert the truth in Turkish (Göksel & Özsoy 2003), in the presence of an existential operator, as opposed to analyses claiming that *dA* is a focus particle.

Given the above, Turkish *dA/dE* and CG *-nde* (but, no form of *\*-nda*) display similar semantic properties. The fact that two varieties have been in long and steady contact may have resulted in the borrowing of the Turkish 'multi-function' particle *dA*, which has only maintained the characteristics mentioned above about the CG *-nde*. The CG marker *-nde* has been classified in this section

as *validational* based on the truth value that it shows associated with personal experience and the need of direct experience or trustworthiness of the speaker.

### 3.2 *The validational -nde and clitic placement*

We have presented in the previous section a rounded picture of the grammatical properties of *-nde* in order to provide the reader with a better knowledge of the kind of restrictions it imposes.

While *-nde* seems to be cross-linguistically similar with other markers of its kind, it also happens to appear in a language that follows a mixed system of clitic placement (see Section 2). As also mentioned in (5–6), and repeated below in (31a & b), pronominal object clitics can be post-verbal in CG and pre-verbal in SMG:

(31) a. (To) ipje SMG– simple clause

*it-CLI.* *drank-3SG*

‘S/he drank it’

b. Ipcen <sup>n</sup>do CG– simple clause

*drank-3SG it-CLI*

‘S/he drank it’

Interestingly, *-nde* is not allowed in the presence of a post-verbal clitic, as follows:

(32) \*Ipcame-nde to

*drank.nde-1PL it-CLI.ACC*

‘We drank it’ (CG)

In obligatory proclisis contexts, ungrammaticality as in (32) does not appear (Neocleous, pc):

(33) Speaker A: Idete to ergo?  
*saw-2PL the-ACC movie-ACC*  
'Have you seen the movie?'

Speaker B: Theloume na to dume-nde.  
*want-1PL to it-CLI.ACC see.nde-1PL*  
'We want to see it'

(CG)

In other proclisis environments, like *wh*-questions, *-nde* can also be used:

(34) a. Pcoi epiame-nde taksidi to perasmeno kalotzieri?  
*who went.nde-1PL trip-ACC the-ACC last-ACC summer-ACC*  
'Who went on a trip last summer?'

b. Pci embu epiame-nde taksidi to perasmeno  
*who embu went.nde-1PL trip-ACC the-ACC last-ACC*  
kalotzieri?  
*summer-ACC*  
'Who went on a trip last summer?'

(CG)

In the same context, *wh*-questions can appear with clitics with the use of *-nde*:

(35) Pci to idame-nde?

*who it-CLI.ACC saw.nde-1PL*

‘Who saw it?’

(CG)

In negative environments, *-nde* can appear with a full DP (36).

(36) En efame-nde to psomi

*not-NEG ate.nde-1PL the bread-ACC*

‘We did not eat bread’

(CG)

With regard to clitic appearance and negation, variation can appear among the speakers (37).

(37)(?) En to efame-nde

*not-NEG it-CLI.ACC ate.nde-1PL*

‘We did not eat it’

(CG)

Some speakers claim that the example above can be grammatical, while others claim that in negative environments, they would omit *-nde*. In case that *-nde* in indicatives with negation is grammatical, then we assume that the analysis provided in this paper applies in this case as well. If it is ungrammatical, then it could relate to the semantics imposed by *-nde* and the negative value of the clause.

In this paper, we nevertheless focus mainly on the ungrammaticality of *-nde* with post-verbal clitics in simple indicative clauses and the syntactic restrictions appearing in that environment. In the following section, we will attempt to explain

the ungrammaticality of *-nde* with post-verbal clitics by exploring the literature on languages with mixed clitic placement.

#### 4. The boundaries between clitics and affixes

For a long time, discussions related to the nature of clitics and affixes have focused on the subtle line distinguishing them. According to Muysken (2008), clitics can vary between discourse connectives and many other functional categories with the common characteristics of being reduced phonological forms, allomorphs or bound forms. Even the common Latin inscription in (38) shows a form of affixation showing that the range of possible affixes is very wide.

(38) Senatus populus-que romanus  
*senate* *people-and* *roman*  
'the Senate and the people of Rome' (common inscription)

One of the most cited works (Zwicky & Pullum 1983) provides some diagnostic conditions for the distribution of cliticised and inflected forms, but these do not necessarily exist in all languages. Based on these diagnostics, one can find support for the argument that *-nde* is an inflectional affix. The counter-evidence to that is the already checked inflectional feature related to number and person on the verb in a feature-based model. In later work, Zwicky (1985) claims that words that are bound should be labelled as clitics and that the items labelled as particles are dependent. In fact, the conjunctive particle *-que*, the Tagalog clitic particles and the English possessive 's have been classified as special clitics (Zwicky & Pullum

1983), because they do not correspond to a full form or they do not have the same distribution as full forms.

As Hogeweg, de Hoop & Malchukov (2009) explain, it happens that certain suffixes appear as enclitics, which may or may not be restricted to verbs as their host and can often add to the discourse interpretation of the clause. They further argue that epistemic and evidential modality is expressed by means of enclitics, just as event modality is expressed by means of affixes.

CG object clitics may differ substantially from the kind of possible clitics that appear as affixes which are briefly mentioned above. The example in (32), however, indicates that the *validational* marker *-nde*, which appears as a suffix on the verb cannot occur with a post-verbal object clitic. In order to explain this phenomenon, we will focus on the possibility of the cliticization of clitics in some languages.

European Portuguese, which is also a mixed clitic placement language with certain restrictions on the syntactic environment (Lobo and Costa 2012), has pronominal object clitics as mentioned for CG, but can also have clitics attaching to auxiliary verbs in the following contexts:

(39) a. tinha-me dado

*had-me-CLI given*

‘has given me’

b. Vai-me dar

*go-me-CLI give-INF*

‘is going to give me’

c. vai dar-me

*go give-me-CLI*

(European Portuguese)

(Lobo, pc)

Similarly, French clitics attach to auxiliaries:

(40) Il me l'a dit

*he-NOM me it-CLI has-AUX say-3SG*

‘He told me’

(anonymous reviewer)

(French)

These examples show how clitics can attach to their host in certain syntactic environments, but they are not given in this paper to provide any arguments for the syntactic position of European Portuguese clitics. Galves, Ribeiro and Moraes (2005) claim in fact that clitics in European Portuguese can be classified as Infl-clitics and have a morpho-phonological property, subject to word formation rules like any other affixes. In their paper, they also include the possibility of a clitic attaching to an auxiliary:

(41) tinham-se entendido perfeitamente

*and had-CLI.3SG understood perfectly*

‘and they had understood each other perfectly’

(European Portuguese)

(Galves, Ribeiro and Moraes 2005)

They also argue that enclitics can attach to auxiliaries in examples with a preposition appearing before the verb:

(42) O senhor está-me a guiar em silêncio  
*the sir is-CLI.1SG to lead in silence*

‘You are leading me in silence’ (European Portuguese)

(Galves, Ribeiro and Moraes 2005)

Given the examples in (41-42), Galves, Ribeiro and Moraes (2005) claim that a late syntactic or post-syntactic process reorders the syntax so that the phonological or morphological criteria are satisfied and that the special feature involved is responsible for this. In their analysis, the position of clitics is defined by morphological rules, like word affixes.

Additionally, other forms that have been argued to be cliticized in the form of suffixes include the English and French pronouns. The English 3<sup>rd</sup> person singular and 3<sup>rd</sup> person plural pronouns have phonological reduced clitic forms Déchaine & Wiltschko (2002) (43).

(43) I like [<sub>ø</sub> ‘em]

(Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002: 422)

The French *l*-clitics are also argued to function as bound variables:

(44) a. [Chaque homme]<sub>i</sub> pense qu’ [il]<sub>i</sub> est intelligent  
*each man thinks that he is intelligent*

b. [Chaque homme]<sub>i</sub> pense que Marie [l]<sub>i</sub> 'a vu  
each man thinks that Marie him has seen

(Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002: 429)

(French)

It seems that based on the discussion above pronominal clitics can be found in bound forms in some languages, just as discourse connectives (Muysken 2008).

With regard to the case of *-nde* in CG, we already argued that this is a borrowed element from the Turkish *dA*, which harmonizes its vowel according to the preceding word. *DA* in Turkish does not appear as a pronominal clitic, but as a multi-function particle with discourse properties. So, the restriction of the CG *-nde* with post-verbal pronominal clitics does not seem to originate from *dA*. It should be noted that vowel harmonization, which appears in the Turkish *dA*, can also be found in Italian enclitics. In other words, elements that attach to their host can show vowel harmonization.

(45) Metto-lo

*puts-it*

Mettu-lu

*puts-him*

(Vogel 1997)

(Italian)

This case too shows enclitics in a bound form as previously presented for European Portuguese, English and French.

Assuming that *-nde* is a borrowed element from *dA*, or the harmonized Turkish form *dE*, the ungrammaticality appearing with the non-active suffix *-an* in (17), repeated as (43), initially appeared as a possible result of this phonological

process. However, CG does not show any other instances of *vowel harmonization*, so we refrain from making strong claims about the phonological relations of *-nde* with other segments in its environment. As argued in Section 3.1, CG *-nde* is not allowed when there is non-active syntax, not simply non-active morphology (e.g. *-an*).

(46) a. \*Emaxumasta-nde      pollin      ora  
*were.kept.busy.nde-1PL      much      time-ACC*  
*'We were kept busy for a long time'*      (CG)

It is clear at this stage that the originating position of a post-verbal pronominal clitic and *-nde* is definitely a different one. We argue, however, that on the basis of the common property of enclitics to attach to their host as bound forms, pronominal enclitics in Cypriot Greek compete with the *validational* marker *-nde* for the same adjacent position to their host.

To give a clearer picture of the position of *-nde*, we assume that it attaches to the verb before any movement, and not after movement to a higher position like  $C^0$  (Agouraki 2010) or  $Mood^0$  (Terzi 1999a, 1999b), since it can appear with pre-verbal object clitics. Generating the clitic–verb or verb–clitic structure has been argued to depend on the movement of the verb to higher projections, which is commonly assumed to be the case in feature-driven verb movements in null-subject languages. For the purposes of this paper, we will not make any claims regarding the possible structures for generating pre-verbal or post-verbal clitics. The grammaticality of *-nde* with a pre-verbal clitic in (33), repeated in (47), indicates that *-nde* can be inserted in the vP (48) and not in any other particular

position to satisfy features (Agouraki 2010). If verb movement triggers the post-verbal placement in Cypriot Greek, it could be argued that the adjunction of *-nde* on the verb prevents verb movement to a higher position and only proclisis is allowed. Future research can address the question regarding the kind of features that could possibly trigger this.

(47) Theloume na to dume-nde.

*want-1PL to it-CLI.ACC see .nde-1PL*

‘We want to see it’

(CG)

(48) [CP...[FP it[TP (we)<sub>i</sub> [vP [we]<sub>i</sub> see-nde]]]]

Last and with respect to the other environments imposing restrictions to post-verbal clitic placement, we argue that the existence of *-nde* in the clause differs substantially from the obligatory proclisis environments, such as *wh*-questions, *na*-clause and negative environments, and rather emphasize the arguments previously mentioned. This is also evident from the observation<sup>6</sup> that all the environments restricting post-verbal clitic placement are found pre-verbally, whereas the *validational* marker *-nde* is found post-verbally.

In this section, we presented data from other clitic languages, showing the possibility of clitic affixation on a host and we have argued that despite the different discourse properties of the *validational* marker *-nde* and pronominal clitics in CG, the two compete for the same adjacent position with their host.

---

<sup>6</sup> We would like to thank João Costa for his observation and feedback.

## 5. Conclusion

This paper is a first attempt to provide the morphosyntactic properties of the Cypriot Greek suffix *-nde*. This marker appears to be in a process of ‘death’ in CG, as is found more and more rarely in everyday’s speech. The identification of CG as the low variety (L) in Cyprus suggests that it may undergo a process of ‘death’ (Rowe and Grohmann 2012) and therefore the most dialectal elements will be the first candidates for loss (see Leivada et al., to appear).

The grammatical distribution of *-nde* classifies it as a suffix, appearing only in 1<sup>st</sup> person PLURAL and without any tense restrictions. Semantically, *-nde* has been argued to belong in the list of *validational* markers, which assert a truth value on the proposition expressed (Weber 1986) and is associated with (unspecified) direct experience by the speaker.

Most importantly, the syntactic restriction imposed by *-nde*, brings up the interesting discussion on the difference between clitics and affixes. Post-verbal object clitics cannot appear in the presence of *-nde*, which may suggest that the clitic property of affixation identified in other languages for enclitics may also appear for the CG enclitics. Pronominal object clitics in CG cannot appear as bound forms, but their ungrammaticality with the *validational* marker *-nde* shows that not only overt bound forms need adjacency with their host in post-verbal positions. We argue that the *validational* marker *-nde* attaches to the verb within the vP domain. Pre-verbal object clitics can appear in the presence of *-nde*, which indicates that *-nde* attaches to the verb, before the verb moves to a higher

projection to satisfy any strong features (Terzi 1999a, 1999b), as commonly assumed for null-subject languages.

This study has provided a first picture regarding the distribution of the suffix *-nde* in CG. The purpose was to provide a first insight on the ungrammaticality observed with post-verbal clitics by analyzing the properties of *-nde* and search for findings or relevant phenomena in other languages. The detailed analysis provided has shown that phenomena like this enhance the possibility of the appearance of gaps in the knowledge of the characteristics of affixed elements and clitics. Mavrogiorgos (2010) identifies the ‘highly hybrid status of clitics’ and points out that ‘the hallmark of clitics is that they are both word-like and affix-like’. As pointed in the previous sections, the case studied here can have two possible scenarios. The one is that *-nde* satisfies certain features F, which disallow the movement of the verb to a higher position and therefore no post-verbal clitics can appear in its presence. The other is that *-nde* and post-verbal clitics ‘fight’ for an adjacent position to the verb, but the status of the position is still unclear. If this claim is on the right way, there should be a feature that both *-nde* and post-verbal clitics share.

The study contributed to the fact that morphological idiosyncracies are more prominent in affixes than clitics, and that the first can show more complex semantic peculiarities than the latter. It is because of such unexpected grammatical discoveries that we can challenge the nature of each element in the clause and provide comparisons between similar phenomena across languages.

## References

Agouraki, Yorgia. 2001. The position of clitics in Cypriot Greek. *Proceedings of the First International Conference of Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory*, Angela Ralli, Brian Joseph & Mark Janse (eds), University of Patras, p. 1–17.

Agouraki, Yorgia. 2010. It-clefts and stressed operators in the pre-verbal field of Cypriot Greek. *Lingua*, 120 (3): 527–554.

Anderson, Lloyd B. 1986. Evidentials, Paths of Change and Mental Maps: Typologically Regular Assymetries. In *Evidentiality: The linguistic code of epistemology*, Wallace Chafe and Johanna Nichols (eds), 273–312, Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Archakis, Argiris. & Tzanne, Angeliki. 2009. Constructing Social identities through storytelling: Tracing Greekness in Greek Narratives, *Pragmatics* 19(3). 343–362.

Arvaniti, Amalia. 2002. *The maintenance of diglossia in Cyprus and the emergence of Cypriot Standard Greek*. Ms., University of California, San Diego.

Auer, Peter. 2005a. The construction of linguistic borders and the linguistic construction of borders. In *Dialects across Borders: Selected Papers from the 11th International Conference on Methods in Dialectology (Methods XI)*, Markku Filppula, Juhani Klemola, Marjatt Palander & Esa Penttilä (eds), John Benjamins, Amsterdam: 3–30

Auer, Peter. 2005b. Europe's sociolinguistic unity, or: A typology of European dialect/ standard constellations. In *Perspectives on Variation (Trends in*

*Linguistics: Perspectives on Variation)*, Nicole Delbecque et al. (eds), Berlin: 7–42.

Bally, Charles. 1932. *Linguistique générale et Linguistique française*, Paris: Leroux, 2éd. 1944, Bern : A. Francke.

Bošković, Željko. 2004. On the clitic switch in Greek imperatives. In *Balkan syntax and semantics*, Mišeska Tomić Olga (ed). John Benjamins, Amsterdam: 285–310.

Cornips, Leonie. 2006. Intermediate syntactic variants in a dialect-standard speech repertoire and relative acceptability. In Gisbert Fanselow, Caroline Féry, Ralph Vogel & Matthias Schlesewsky (eds.), *Gradience in Grammar: Generative Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 85–105

Courtney, Ellen H. 1999. Child acquisition of the Quechua affirmative suffix. Proceedings from the second workshop on American Indigenous Languages, Santa Barbara papers in Linguistics, 9: 30–41 (<http://works.bepress.com/ellenhcourtney/5>).

Déchaine, Rose-Marie & Wiltschko, Martina. 2002. Decomposing Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 33 (3), 409–442.

Erguvanlı, E. 1984. The Function of Word Order in Turkish Grammar. *University of California Publications in Linguistics*, 106, Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Faller, Martina. 2003. The evidential and *validational* licensing conditions for the Cusco Quechua enclitic *-mi*. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, 16, 7–21 ([www.mpi.nl/world/persons/private/marfal/publicat.htm](http://www.mpi.nl/world/persons/private/marfal/publicat.htm)).

Floyd, Rick. 1997. *La estructura categorial de los evidenciales en el quechua wanka*. Ministerio de Educación (Instituto Linguístico de Verano), Lima, Peru.

Galves, Charlotte, Ribeiro, Ilza & Moraes, Maria Aparecida Torres. 2005. Syntax and Morphology in the Placement of Clitics in European and Brazilian Portuguese. In *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*, 2(4), 143–177.

Galves, Charlotte. and Sândalo, Filomena. 2004. Clitic-Placement in European Portuguese and the Syntax-Phonology Interface. In *Collected Papers on Romance syntax*, A. Castro, M. Ferreira, V. Hacquard and A. P. Salanova. (eds.,) Romance Op. 47, , MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 47:115–128.

Göksel, Aslı & Kerslake, Celia. 2005. *Turkish: A Comprehensive Grammar*. USA: Routledge.

Göksel, Aslı. & Özsoy, A. Sumru. 2003. dA: a focus/topic associated clitic in Turkish. *Lingua* 113, 1143–1167.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2011. Some directions for the systematic investigation of the acquisition of Cypriot Greek: A new perspective on production abilities from object clitic placement. In *The Development of Grammar: Language Acquisition and Diachronic Change*, Esther Rinke and Tanja Kupisch (eds), Amsterdam: John Benjamins: 179–203.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. & Leivada, Evelina. 2012. Interface ingredients of dialect design: Bi-x, socio-syntax of development, and the grammar of Cypriot Greek. In *Towards a Biolinguistic Understanding of Grammar: Essays on Interfaces*, A.M. Di Sciullo (ed.), Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K., Theodorou, Eleni, Pavlou, Natalia, Leivada, Evelina, Papadopoulou, Elena, & Martínez-Ferreiro, Silvia. 2012. The development of object clitic placement in Cypriot Greek and the Romance connection. In *Selected Proceedings of the Romance Turn IV*, Sandrine Ferré, Philippe Prévost,

Laurie Tuller, and Rasha Zebib (eds), Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Halpern, Aaron. 1995. On the Placement and Morphology of Clitics. Stanford, Calif: CSLI Publication

Hill, Virginia. 2009. Pragmatic Markers as Syntactic Heads: A Case Study from Romanian. In *Selected Papers from the 2006 Cyprus Syntaxfest*, Grohmann, Kleanthes K. & Phoivos Panagiotidis (eds), Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 1–10.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 1998. Morphology and Pragmatics. In *The Handbook of Morphology*, Andrew Spencer and Arnold M.Zwicky (eds.). Oxford: Blackwell: 66–84.

Leivada, Evelina, Papadopoulou, Elena & Pavlou, Natalia. To appear. The Gray Area of Acceptability Judgments: Clefts and Exhaustivity in Cypriot Greek. In Kelechukwu U. Ihemere (ed.), *Language Contact: A Multidimensional Perspective*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Leivada, Evelina, Paraskevi Mavroudi, & Epistithiou, Anna. 2010. Metalanguage or bidialectism? Acquisition of clitic placement by Hellenic Greeks, Greek Cypriots and binationalis in the diglossic context of Cyprus. In *Proceedings of the 3rd ISCA Workshop ExLing 2010*, Antonis Botinis (ed), Athens: University of Athens, 97–100.

Lobo, Maria & Costa, João. 2012. *Acquisition of Clitic Placement in European Portuguese*. Paper presented in the CYCL1A Workshop on the Acquisition of Clitics, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, (25–26 May).

Lotte, Hogeweg, de Hoop, Helen and Malchukov, Andrej. 2009. *Cross-linguistics semantics of Tense, Aspect and Modality*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Maia, Marcus. 2004. Evidential Processes in Karaja. In *Sur le médiatif II*, Z. Guentcheva & J. Landaburu (eds), Paris, CNRS.

Mavrogiorgos, M. 2010. *Clitics in Greek. A minimalist account of proclisis and enclisis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Muysken, Pieter. 1995. Focus in Quechua. Discourse Configurational Languages, In Discourse configurational languages K. É. Kiss (ed). New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press: 375–393.

Muysken, Pieter. 2008. *Functional Categories*. Cambridge University Press

Neocleous, Theoni. 2012. *Πρώιμα στάδια γλωσσικής ανάπτυξης. Η περίπτωση των κλιτικών αντωνυμιών της Κυπριακής* [First stages of language development: The case of Cypriot Greek object clitics]. Σεμινάρια στη Διδακτική της Γλώσσας: Δομή, Ποικιλία και Διδασκαλία. [Seminars in Language Teaching: Structure, Variation and Teaching], University of Cyprus, Nicosia.

Newton, Brian. 1972. *Cypriot Greek: Its Phonology and Inflections*. The Hague: Mouton.

Nuckolls, Janis B. 1993. The semantics of Certainty in Quechua and its Implications for a Cultural Epistemology. *Language in Society*, 22, 235–255.

Özbek, Nurdan. 1995. *Discourse Markers in Turkish and English: a comparative study*. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Nottingham, UK.

Papadopoulou, Elena, Leivada, Evelina & Pavlou, Natalia. 2012. *Clitic placement in Cypriot Greek: A matter of lexical and syntactic stimulation?* Paper presented in the CYCL1A Workshop on the Acquisition of Clitics, University of Cyprus, Nicosia, (25–26 May).

Pavlou, Pavlos & Christodoulou, N. 2001. Bidialectism in Cyprus and its impact on the teaching of Greek as a foreign language. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 11, 75–91.

Petinou, Kakia & Terzi, Arhonto. 2002. Clitic misplacement among normally developing children and children with specific language impairment and the status of Infl heads. *Language Acquisition* 10, 1–28.

Rowe, Charley and Grohmann, Kleanthes. 2012. *Testing the state of diglossia in Cyprus: Cypriots, binationalis, and diglossic shift*. Ms, University of Cyprus.

Schiering, René. 2006. Morphologization in Turkish: Implications for Phonology in Grammaticalization. Paper presented at *13th International Conference on Turkish Linguistics*, Uppsala, 16–20 August.

Sifianou, Maria. 1992. *Politeness Phenomena in England and Greece. A cross-cultural perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Terzi, Arhonto. 1999a. Clitic combinations, their hosts and their ordering. *Natural Language and Linguistic Inquiry*, 17, 85–121.

Terzi, Arhonto. 1999b. Cypriot Greek clitics and their positioning restrictions. In *Studies in Greek Syntax*, Artemis Alexiadou, Geoffrey Horrocks and Melita Stavrou (eds.), , Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers: 227–240.

Vassiliou, Elena. 1995. Cypriot as a VOS language. *La Trobe Working Papers in Linguistics* 8, 135– 149.

Vogel, Irene. 1997. Prosodic Phonology. In *The dialects of Italy*, Martin Maiden, and Mair Parry (eds.), Routledge.

Weber, David. 1986. Information Perspective, Profile, and Patterns in Quechua. In *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology*, Wallace Chafe and J. Nichols, (eds), 137–155, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.

Willet, Thomas L. 1988. A cross-linguistic survey of the grammaticalization of evidentiality. *Studies in Language*, 12, 51–97.

Yiakoumetti, Androulla, Evans, Michael & Esch, Eiff. 2005. Language awareness in a bidialectal setting: The oral performance and language attitudes of urban and rural students in Cyprus. *Language Awareness* 14, 254–260.

Zwicky, Arnold M. & Pullum, Geoffrey K. 1983. Cliticization vs. Inflection: English N'T, *Language*, 59 (3), 502–513.

Zwicky, Arnold M. 1985. Clitics and Particles. *Language*, 61, 283–305.