On the Synchrony and Diachrony of Modern Greek NA*
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0. Introduction

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

(1) a. θέλω να φύγει ο Υάνης ‘I want John to leave’
   b. καλύτερα να φύγει το άριστο ‘(It is) better that we leave now’
   c. ίνε ζητίμα τού να ίνε ενοχή ‘It’s a question of their being guilty’
   d. αποφάσισαμε να αγοράσουμε κινόντο σπίτι ‘We decided to buy that house’

(2) a. Να σας πληρώσω το έργο? ‘Shall I pay you now?’
   b. Να μου φέρεις ένα ούζο! ‘Bring me one ouzo (please)’

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

* A preliminary version of this paper was read at the MIT Conference on the Modern Greek Language, January 24, 1980, organized by Robert Ingria of MIT and Dia Philippides of Harvard University. Many useful comments and suggestions from the audience have been incorporated here. Thanks are also due to Kostas Kazazis of the University of Chicago for reading and commenting upon an earlier draft of this paper.
(3) θέλω ο Υάνις να φυγε ‘I want John to leave’

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

(4) a. *ná* to flidzání ‘Here’s the cup; take the cup’
   b. *ná* to leoforio ‘Here’s the bus; here comes the bus’
   c. *ná* o Υάνις ‘Here’s John’

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

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

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

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

illustrating its use with sentences like:

(7) *nátos érχετε* ‘Here he comes; here he is, coming (now)’
They seem to say nothing, though, about uses of ná with an accusative clitic pronoun, as in (5b).

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

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

1. The Synchronic Properties of na.

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

First, with regard to stress, subordinating na is a proclitic element and is generally unstressed or weakly stressed (the written
accent mark it receives in standard Modern Greek orthography is purely a graphic convention with no phonetic significance; note its omission from the roughly phonemic transcription used here); as such, it is especially susceptible to contraction with a following vowel-initial verb, as in (8):

(8) δεν θέλω να κάνω α' = . . . να ακύσο . . . 'I don’t want to hear that.'

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

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

(9) θέλω να μου το δώσι ο Υάνις 'I want John to give it to me'.

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

---

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

2. This generalization excludes such derived patterns as megalíteros μου 'bigger than me' (derived by a syntactic reduction of megalíteros apó ὅτι έμε 'bigger than (what) I am') and the use of clitic pronouns in exclamations, e.g. bravo σου 'good for you' or kalíst toν(το) 'welcome to him', which admittedly are problematic for any account of the control of clitic pronouns in Modern Greek. However, the nominative clitics mentioned earlier that occur with ὅποι 'where is . . . ?' are best analyzed as being controlled by a verb – the -n which voices the initial t- of the nominative clitics is a reduced form of ὅν 'is, are'; thus πο(n)δες 'Where is he?' actually stands for πο(π)δες.
nominal objects of prepositions must be the nonclitic form when accusative.\(^3\)

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

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

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

2. The Analysis of na.

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

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

---

3. There are, of course, a few prepositions which take genitive (possessive) clitic object pronouns, e.g. brosí μu ‘before me’, μasí μu ‘with me’; however, no prepositions which govern accusative objects allow accusative clitic forms.

4. The troublesome form námaste ‘here we are!’ is taken up in section 5, especially with regard to whether it is in any way connected with the apparent ‘plural’ form náte.
na is not a preposition, but what exactly are they? Since the status of subordinating na is fairly clear, i.e. that of a verbal particle, analogous to an element like English to, the question really comes down to what the status of deictic na is. I should like to propose that deictic na is a verb in Modern Greek, and more specifically, in most of its uses, is a nonfinite verbal form, an imperative. Such an hypothesis accounts neatly for the synchronic properties of deictic na given above.

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

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

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

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

5. Although it may seem unusual to classify imperatives as nonfinite, this is a step which other linguists have taken. The important thing here is that imperatives pattern with clearly nonfinite elements (the participle) in terms of clitic pronoun placement.
(11) a. ὁσ μυ to / *μυ to ὁσ ‘Give it to me!’
   b. σινονδας τυ to / *τυ to σινονδας ‘giving it to him . . . ’
   c. σεξομενος το / *το σεξομενος ‘receiving it . . . ’

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

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

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

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

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

3. The Etymology of ὅνα

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

6. Historically, voilà and voici are verb forms, deriving, interestingly enough, from imperative forms of the verb ‘see’, as Kostas Kazazis has kindly pointed out to me. Still, since synchronic analyses need not always be accurate reflections of diachronic facts, Perlmutter and Postal’s arguments for taking voilà as a nonfinite verb form provide a striking parallel to the analysis of Greek ὅνα given here.
languages all have a deictic particle na with roughly the meaning ‘here (it is); take (it)’. Thus, deictic ná appears at first to be a Balkan phenomenon, one not just restricted to Greek. That in itself, though, does not answer the question of the source of ná, for the word could have originated in Greek and spread to these other languages.

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

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

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

7. Standard dictionaries of these languages provided this information.
first and foremost to find Ancient Greek sources for as many Modern Greek elements as possible; this desire led Greek linguists of the 19th and early 20th centuries to overlook many etymologies in favor of Ancient Greek sources, and it seems that Hatzidakis’ explanation of ná from èmil(De) is another case in point.

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

4. Further Constructions with ná

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

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

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

10. This represents a construction type commonly found in Greek with definite NP objects, and for many speakers, this construction is obligatory; hence (13a) is rejected by some Greek speakers because it lacks the clitic pronominal copy of the direct object.
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following NP in the nominative case. These nominative ná expressions involve both full NPs, as well as a set of nominative clitic pronouns used only with ná and the interrogative expression pin 'where is . . . ?', Finally, the nominative clitic may co-occur with a nominative NP after ná. These various types are illustrated in (13):

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

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

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

The occurrence of ná with nominative NPs, though, unlike the case of ná with accusative NPs, requires somewhat more attention. Under the analysis given here whereby ná is a verb, in particular an imperative, accusative NP complements as object of that verb are to be expected. Even the ná plus sentence analysis of nátos éryete poses no problems, for a sentential complement could receive
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no case-marking. However, *ná* plus nominative, e.g. *ná tos* or *ná o Yánis*, is problematic, at first, because nominative is not the expected case for a verbal object.11

The solution to this problem lies in taking *ná* plus nominative to be a later, secondary, development caused by a reanalysis of certain *ná* plus accusative phrases as being instead *ná* plus nominative. The *ná* plus accusative phrases which would have been susceptible to such a reanalysis are those with neuter nouns as object, for neuter nouns in Greek show no formal distinction between accusative and nominative; the same neuter form can serve as a nominative or as an accusative, e.g.:

(14) a. *to leoforio* in *s to staðmó* ‘The bus is at the station’
   the-bus/NOM
   
   b. *iða to leoforio* ‘I saw the bus’.
   the-bus/ACC

Thus, in the phrase *ná to leoforio* ‘Here comes the bus!’, *leoforio* is formally ambiguous between accusative and nominative. I propose that neuter nouns used as accusatives with *ná*, parallel to the *ná* (*tome*) *ton Yánis* type mentioned above, were reanalyzed as *ná* plus nominative, and that this triggered the creation of the new type, *ná o Yánis*, where the NP after *ná* is unambiguously nominative. Schematically, this can be represented as follows:

(15) *ná to leoforio* REANALYSIS
     ACC or NOM

This reanalysis is certainly plausible on formal grounds, owing to the ambiguity of case to be found with neuter nouns. Moreover, this proposed reanalysis would have been facilitated and motivated by two additional factors.

First, the semantics of expressions with *ná* would have facilitated the reanalysis. The presentational meaning of *ná* plus NP, i.e. ‘Here is . . . ’ or ‘Here comes . . . ’, lends itself well to an interpretation of the post-*ná* NP as a subject, and nominative case marking would be appropriate for the subject NP. The NP in a presentational sentence like *Here comes John* or *Here he comes* is a subject in most

11. The actual form of the nominative clitics *tos*, etc. is probably due to a formal analogy *ná aftõn* : *ná ton* : : *ná aftõau* : *X, X* : *ná tos*, possible only after the pattern *ná* plus nominative became a part of the language.
standard analyses, and is certainly a subject at the level of analysis relevant for semantic interpretation (e.g. the initial syntactic level in an extended ‘Generative Semantics’ model). A reanalysis of ná plus accusative to ná plus nominative would thus lessen the ‘distance’ between underlying and surface forms, here making the surface form reflect the underlying representation more closely. This case in Greek, then, seems akin to the situation described by Hale (1974) for Maori, in which Maori speakers restructured the base forms of certain verbs, with a resulting lessening of the discrepancy between underlying representations and surface forms. Although the object of reanalysis is different in each case (surface forms in Greek, underlying forms in Maori), the principle of reducing the disparity between deep and superficial forms is the same.\footnote{12}

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

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

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

(i) a. ti sincví tôá? ‘What happened then?’
   b. efýe o Yánis ‘John left’
   c. ?ó Yánis efýe ‘John left’
The proposed reanalysis, thus, was triggered by the formal ambiguity of ἃ with a neuter NP complement and was motivated by semantic and systemic pressures such as those just described. Moreover, it allows for a straightforward account of the ἃ plus nominative phrases in Modern Greek and for their co-existence with ἃ plus accusative phrases.

5. Conclusion

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

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

(16) a. ἅτε ἅτε ‘See, look!’
    b. ἅτε στάσει ‘Hold on (there)! Stop!’

but:

(17) *ἀτε ἁτε

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

(18) πιστεύσε σε / πιστεύστε σας
    ‘Believe you (SG)’ / ‘Believe you (PL)’

are generally unacceptable, and can be used only in certain
situations for special effect. However, ná with second person object pronouns, i.e.:

(18) ná se / ná as
   'Here you (SG) are' / 'Here you (PL) are'

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

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

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

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