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Abstract
This study investigates the issue of word identification, focusing on the morphophonological description of cliticization phenomena, such as auxiliary verbs, weak object pronouns, genitive possessives, negative markers, etc., as observed in dialectal data bearing on the analysis. The research is entirely based on a huge corpus of fieldwork recordings of speakers from the Greek islands of the Ionian Sea, and in particular, from Lefkada. The primary data (Himmelmann 2006) collected, are spontaneous dialogues, or tales and songs, among native speakers of five distinct age groups. The paper is organized as follows: First, morpho-syntactic issues of clitics in English and Modern Greek are thoroughly discussed. Second, according to my findings, a phonological analysis of the dialectal data is attempted. Phenomena such as palatalization, syncope, elision, synaliphe, etc, regarding the dialect, are argued. Next, it is shown that the indications of affixal status clitics seem stronger in the dialects than in the standard language.
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1. Introduction
We shall refer to the word in the following senses: 1) as an abstract vocabulary item listed in the dictionary; i.e. in this general sense, it is called lexeme (Spencer 1991). The forms give, gives, giving, gave and given are different realizations of the lexeme GIVE. These physical occurrences of the lexeme GIVE are referred to as word-forms. Word-forms, such as, eat, eats, eating, ate, eaten and teeth, and better, are realizations of the lexemes EAT, TOOTH and GOOD, respectively. The notion of the term ‘word’ can also be associated with morpho-syntactic characteristics, such as, noun, adjective, adverb, verb, tense, person, number, gender, etc. In this sense, it is called grammatical word. E.g. the lexeme COST can represent three or more different grammatical words as a verb: cost[non-3rd sg Pres Simple], cost[Past Simple] and cost[past
Moreover, it can represent two different grammatical words as a noun: cos\textsubscript{[noun, singular]}, cos\textsubscript{[noun, pl.]}.

According to Di Sciullo & Williams (1987), words are listemes, i.e. all items are listed in the lexicon. The idiosyncratic properties of listemes typically include: (a) Morphological properties, e.g. derivational and inflectional affixes, (b) Semantic properties, e.g. ±human, ±male (often indicated by the suffix): bull-cow, stallion-mare, man-woman, widower-widow, waiter-waitress, hero-heroine, etc., (c) Phonological properties. The phonological word of the lexeme CUT is /κατ/. The same word form ‘cut’ may represent more than one grammatical word in the case of conversion: cut\textsubscript{V} and cut\textsubscript{N}, (d) Syntactic properties: ±noun, ±countable, ±feminine.

We can go on setting some tests of word identification (Mela-Athanasopoulou 2015). 1) The word as a minimal free form: the minimal unit of a sentence or an utterance which can stand alone with meaning. Of course, words such as articles, conjunctions, prepositions and the negator not are excluded as they cannot stand meaningfully on their own. 2) Potential pause, between words, orthographically marked by space. ‘A word is …. any segment of a sentence bounded by successive points at which pausing is possible’ (Hockett 1958: 167). Here, this criterion is refuted as in English, for instance, phrasal verbs (put out) are considered as single words without any pause between the two parts. It is also refuted with clitics in both English and Greek (esp. dialectal Greek) as we will see further. 3) The word as an indivisible unit (cf. the notion of uninterruptability of the word). This criterion is not sound either, regarding infixation. E.g. E. abso-blooming-lutely or MG maθemoute to ‘teach to me-inf. 2\textsuperscript{nd} plural-this’, where the indirect object pronoun mou\textsubscript{Gen sg} ‘to me’ may be infixed within the word maθete\textsubscript{Imp 2nd pl} ‘teach’. 4) Phonetic boundaries between words: The accent of a word may show where the word begins or ends. In languages such as French, for example, it occurs on the last syllable. There are languages where the accent may be ‘restricted’. In Greek it falls on one of the last three syllables. But this is not true of clitics in Greek, which are phonologically dependent on the host word they attach to.

2. Problems with word identification. Cliticization

Different notions of ‘word’ may be operative for different levels and/or components of grammar. For example, a ‘phonological word’ may be different from a ‘syntactic word’ and different from a ‘lexical word’. Different dialects or varieties of a language
may differ on the criteria for wordhood and on the status of individual elements. In this paper, accordingly, the issue of how to define ‘word’ for Modern Greek will be investigated, with the main emphasis being on how documented data from various Greek dialects contributes to a solid determination of the tests relevant for identifying which elements are best considered as ‘words’ (Booij 2007). Crucial to this task is the analysis of various little elements, the so-called ‘clitics’, that are part of the grammatical apparatus of noun phrases, verb phrases and sentences, i.e. the weak object pronouns, the genitive possessive and negative markers.

The question of cliticization is crucial for the notion of the independent word as it raises serious problems concerning the relationship between morphophonological and syntactic representations of this notion. Nonetheless, many generalizations have been proposed concerning the cross-linguistic behaviour of clitics and their treatment in Universal Grammar (Joseph 1988, 1994). Whether a given element is in fact a clitic or an affix or a word, that is, the identification of the clitic has long sparked the interest of linguists. In this section, we will propose that clitics are syntactic affixes, in the sense that they may have the syntactic properties of words on one hand, and the phonological properties of affixes on the other. And, in particular, we will further assume that the clitic in Modern Greek, and in particular the dialectal clitic will play the role of an incorporated element adjoined to the lexical verb (the host) while attracting the stress of the following clitic to itself, thus behaving very much like a Class I or non-neutral affix, i.e. it has a phonological effect on the base to which it is attached. E.g. author + {-ity}_{Class 1 af} ⇒ authority (vowel change and stress shift); public + {-ity}_{Class 1 af} ⇒ publicity (vowel change, velar softening and stress shift).

To begin with, clitics, like affixes, are elements which share some of the syntactic properties of words, and in particular function words, such as, in English, modals, auxiliary verbs, pronominals and conjunctions; but which have nothing to do with the characteristic independence of words. One can claim that a clitic is a reduced form of a word which is phonologically dependent on a host. Interestingly, the term clitic comes from the Greek verb ‘clino’, meaning "to lean'. Thus a genuine clitic will have to lean on the preceding word and will behave differently depending on the exact nature of this word (e.g., the word class). And what perhaps distinguishes them from affixes is some kind of freedom of movement concerning their attachment (Mela-Athanasopoulou 2007). Consider the data (1-4), especially 1b-4b in spoken English.
1. (a) Lary is working hard.  
   (b) Lary’s working hard
   
   /lærz  wɜːk 'hɑːd/

2. (a) Lary had worked hard.  
   (b) Lary’d worked hard.
   
   /lærɪd  'wɜːkt  'hɑːd/

3. (a) Lary would work hard.  
   (b) Lary’d work hard.
   
   /lærɪd  wɜːk 'hɑːd/

4. (a) The boy I was talking to is Lary.  
   (b) The boy I was talking to’s Lary.
   
   /də  bɒi  ai  wɔz  'tɔːkiŋz  'lærɪ/

The reduced forms of had, would, have and will combine directly with pronoun forms but not with full nouns. Such reduced auxiliaries have to develop a schwa /əd/, /əl/ standing for had or would, have and will respectively, even after vowel final words. However, the reductions are subject to highly lexical conditioning. Was, for example, is never reduced (Kaisse 1985).

Thus it would be misleading to say that ’s is a reduced form of is or has, whereas was fails to reduce. Also, the pronouns themselves cannot take the fully reduced forms if they are part of a conjoined NP. This means that the inflection is lexical and not phrasal.

The fact that the class category of the word to which a clitic attaches itself is usually irrelevant is shown in the evidence below (5a-e). The possessive formative {’s} does not correspond to a full form. Actually, it is not a reduced form of any independent word.

5. (a) the duke of York’s daughter (noun)  
   (b) the woman in black’s face (adjective)  
   (c) the man I saw yesterday’s hat (adverb)  
   (d) the person I was talking to’s going to be angry with me (preposition)  
   (e) the ball you hit’s just broken the window (verb)

The clitic then may be attached to a noun, an adjective, a verb and even an adverb. The contracted negator n’t (not) presents a particular picture (6a-d).

6. (a) You haven’t been here before.  
   (b) Haven’t you been here before?  
   (c) *Have not you been here before?  
   (d) Have you not been here before?

Whereas normal clitics can attach to material already containing clitics (as is the case of 7), the negator n’t is highly selective, attaching only to auxiliary verbs. As 8
shows, n’t behaves more like an inflectional affix rather than a simple clitic. Thus n’t cannot attach to material already containing simple clitics although the simple clitic ’ve can do so.

7. I’d ’ve done it if you’d asked me.
8. *I’d n’t be doing this unless I had to.
9. (a) I wouldn’t be doing this unless I had to.
    (b) I’d not be doing this unless I had to.

Moreover, we can say that the negator n’t is highly selective, attaching only to the finite forms of auxiliary verbs.

Granting now that n’t behaves more like an affix we could claim that clear cases of clitics typically behave like affixes as well. It would be instructive at this point to refer to Zwicky’s tests (Zwicky: 1985) showing similarities between clitics and inflectional affixes. Actually, we want to show that clitics have the phonological properties of affixes. The tests go as follows:

a. **Binding.** Two types of bound morphemes are found attached to words: clitics and affixes (esp. inflectional affixes), Zwicky supports. In other words if an element is bound and if it cannot stand alone, then it must be either an affix or a clitic\(^1\).

b. **Closure.** Inflectional affixes normally close off words to further affixation. Similarly, an element that closes off combinations to cliticization should be a clitic.

c. **Distribution.** With regard to their distribution, clitics behave very much like affixes in the sense that their distribution by single principles such as "combines with the head verb of a clause" or "combines with the first constituent of a clause" or "combines with an NP". Therefore, because of its simple distribution it is a clitic; whereas an element with a complex distribution is an independent word.

d. **Complexity.** A morphologically complex item is probably an independent word rather than an affix or a clitic.

Again Zwicky proposes a number of criteria which distinguish words, clitics and affixes. For example, there is a low degree of selectivity with regard to word-clitic

---
\(^1\) Aronoff has shown, in Aronoff and Sridhar (1983) that each word affix can be viewed as a stressless clitic, not a word. Thus, says Aronoff, a word such as relentless contains a clitic, -less, relentlessness contains two, and unrelentlessness contains three.
combinality, while affixes exhibit a high degree of selection with respect to their stems. Nevertheless as we have already stated, clitics can attach to words of virtually any category (5a-e).

Also, according to Zwicky, morphological and semantic idiosyncrasies are more characteristic of affixed words than of clitic groups. No morphological idiosyncrasies exist within clitic groups containing ‘s and ‘ve. Hosts are unaffected by these clitics, and the clitics themselves have allomorphs distributed by general rules which refer to phonological and morphological properties of the hosts. Moreover, there are no semantic idiosyncrasies for clitic groups containing ‘s and ‘ve, i.e., no cases where the contribution of these clitics to sentence meaning is not identical to the contribution of their associated full forms.

In general, affixes are characterized by a high degree of idiosyncrasy in their realization and behaviour while clitics and words by a high degree of regularity and predictability in realization and behaviour. In Zwicky’s model of Grammar, the occurrence of clitics and words in particular phrasal positions is licensed by the syntax and corresponds to regularly derived phonological material, while at the same time having a direct and transparent meaning.

3. The Greek clitics as affixes

With regard to their distribution and behaviour I will not go into the intricacies of Modern Greek Auxiliary verbs. I will simply use the Weak Object Pronoun (WOP) and the possessive as a model for my study. (See also, Condoravdi & Kiparski 2001, Tsimpli 1999, Sohneider-Zioga 1994, et al.). The illustration below shows the weak object pronouns of Modern Greek. Notice the plural possessive case mas, sas, etc which does not at all look like the typical ending of possessive case -on:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>μου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>σου</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>του</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>της</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 1. Possessive and Accusative case Pronouns |
Now what is interesting here is the fact that the WOPs when cliticized tend to congregate around the verb (Table 2), hence showing a high degree of selectivity (to occur only with verbs). And they are positioned before finite verbs (except the Imperative) and after non-finite verbs (e.g. participles). The same holds true, regarding the position of the dialectal clitics as we shall see further on (cf. MG (Modern Greek) tis/tus milisa → D (Dialect) t’s mil’sa, MG tis/tus ipa → D t’sipa; MG tus tin ipe → D t’s’t’n ipi, MG 0a mu tin kopsun → D 0a m’t’n kops’n/kops’ne; MG su tin ipa → D s’t’n ipa; MG pesto mu → D petum’; MG pesmuto → D pem’tu, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Weak object pronoun clitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>'pesto mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say it to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>`ðosto mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give it to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>`pestus to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say it to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>'pezmu to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say to me it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b</td>
<td>`ðosemu to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give to me it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>`pesto tus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say to them it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c</td>
<td>*pese’mu to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say to me it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c</td>
<td>`ðose’to mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give to me it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c</td>
<td>`pestus to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>say to them it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>`ðiava’sto mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read it to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>`maθe’teto mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teach it to me (pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>`filak,sto mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keep it for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>`ðiava’seto mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read it to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5b</td>
<td>`maθe to mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teach it to me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b</td>
<td>`fila’kseto mu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keep it for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c</td>
<td>`ðiavasemu to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>read to me it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5c</td>
<td>`maθemu to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>teach to me it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6c</td>
<td>`fila’ksemu to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keep for me it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Weak object pronoun clitics

What we should primarily notice here is that with regard to the criteria of selectivity (according to Zwicky), the WOPs tend to be more affix-like, i.e. they act as Class I affixes, viz. first, they attract the stress of the host verb (filak’se to mu, 6b) and second, they get incorporated into the host verb. With regard to their morphophonological idiosyncrasies they have the power to delete certain parts of the Verb.

2 Nonetheless, though marginally, the WOP may cliticize with words other than verbs, such as prepositions, adjectives, pronominals, e.g. anamesa mas ‘amongst us’, moni tis ‘on her own’, mazi tu ‘with him’, etc.
10. μυ το `ipes → μυ`topes
to me this told- you you told me this

11. θα συ το 'po → θα στο 'po
will to you this (I) tell I will tell you this

4. The documented data from Lefkada dialects

Now consider the morphosyntactic issues of clitics (i.e. the weak object pronoun and the definite article) drawn from documented data from the dialect spoken in the villages of Lefkada in the Ionian Sea (Kontomichis 2001, Kontopoulos 2006, Ralli 2009). Zwicky’s criteria distinguishing words, clitics and affixes are satisfied here, as we can see in the recorded data (12a-c and 13a-c).

The data recordings were done by my Morphology course students, in the framework of fieldwork research on the Greek dialects (Spring Semester 2011). However, most of the data were collected by me on a fieldwork research during the summers of 2009, 2010 and 2013, in Nidri and other towns and villages of Lefkada. They are all available in my personal data bank.

Consider the recorded data in context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12a</th>
<th>pes</th>
<th>ip'</th>
<th>barba,</th>
<th>θα</th>
<th>m'</th>
<th>t'n</th>
<th>kops'n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>PN_Gen</td>
<td>N_Gen_Sg</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>PN_Gen_Sg</td>
<td>PN_Acc</td>
<td>Fut 3rd pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>say</td>
<td>to him</td>
<td>uncle</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>of me</td>
<td>it</td>
<td>will cut</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>t'n</th>
<th>sintaks'.</th>
<th>δe</th>
<th>θα</th>
<th>δok'ne</th>
<th>tiputa.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ART_Acc_Sg</td>
<td>N_Acc_Sg</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>Fut 3rd pl</td>
<td>PN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it</td>
<td>pension</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>will</td>
<td>give</td>
<td>nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Say to my uncle: they will cut my pension. They will give (me) nothing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12b</th>
<th>m'</th>
<th>ekklips</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>andrazm</th>
<th>ki</th>
<th>m'k'niy'san</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PN_Acc_sg</td>
<td>PAST 3rd sg</td>
<td>Art_sg</td>
<td>N_Nom_sg-Poss</td>
<td>Con</td>
<td>PN_Acc_sg-PAST 3rd pl</td>
<td>Art_pl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>eloped</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>husband my</td>
<td>and</td>
<td>me chased</td>
<td>the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>θkit'.</th>
<th>δe</th>
<th>mθelan</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>pateras</th>
<th>t'andram.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PP-Poss_Gen_sg</td>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>PN_Acc-PAST 3rd pl</td>
<td>Art_sg</td>
<td>N_Nom_sg</td>
<td>Art_Gen_sg-N_Gen_sg-Poss_Gen_sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his own</td>
<td>not</td>
<td>me wanted</td>
<td>the</td>
<td>father</td>
<td>of husband my</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My husband eloped me and his own (relatives) chased me. They didn’t want me, my husband’s father.
And I went to the doctor and told him about my stubbing pain. He told me that it was from a cold.

She pinned her needle with one hand

The girls were embroidering and making their dowry.

And an uncle of hers took her there.

Not even Primary School that time.

---

3 The speaker (of 13a-13e) is a female, aged 88, from Karia village, Lefkada. The recording was done by my students Charalampidou M., Fitsiou M., Hourdaki P. and Vasilopoulou S., in the Spring Semester 2011.
13e. δεν t’s pa ‘γε
neg WOPN\textsubscript{Fem Acc pl} PST\textsubscript{1st sg} Pers PN
not them told I
I didn’t tell them.

From the documentation of 12(a-c) and 13(a–e) we have the following picture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SG. ACC</th>
<th>SG. GEN</th>
<th>PL. ACC</th>
<th>PL. GEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}</td>
<td>m’ (me)</td>
<td>m’ (mu)</td>
<td>mas (mas)</td>
<td>mas (mas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
<td>s’ (se)</td>
<td>s’ (su)</td>
<td>sas (sas)</td>
<td>sas (sas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} Msc</td>
<td>t’n (ton)</td>
<td>t’ (tu)</td>
<td>t’s (tus)</td>
<td>t’s (tus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} Fem</td>
<td>t’n (tin)</td>
<td>t’s (tis)</td>
<td>t’s (tis)</td>
<td>t’s (tus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} Ntr</td>
<td>t’ (to)</td>
<td>t’ (tu)</td>
<td>t’ (ta)</td>
<td>t’s (tus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 3. Object Pronouns positioned before finite verbs and after nonfinite verbs}

The items in parentheses are the object PNs in Standard Greek. ‘ACC’ stands for direct object markers, ‘GEN’ for indirect object markers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>MG</th>
<th>PL</th>
<th>MG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1\textsuperscript{st}</td>
<td>m’</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>mas</td>
<td>mas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2\textsuperscript{nd}</td>
<td>s’</td>
<td>su</td>
<td>sas</td>
<td>sas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} Msc</td>
<td>t’</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>t’s</td>
<td>tus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} Fem</td>
<td>t’s</td>
<td>tis</td>
<td>t’s</td>
<td>tus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3\textsuperscript{rd} Ntr</td>
<td>t’</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>t’s</td>
<td>tus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 4. Pronominal marking of possession within noun phrase}

The so-called genitive pronouns, occurring at the end of a noun phrase, after the noun, are identical in form with weak indirect object markers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>u (o)</td>
<td>i (i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>t’n (ton)</td>
<td>t’n (tin)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>t’ (tu)</td>
<td>t’s (tis)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{Table 5. Definiteness within noun phrase. The so-called definite article}
The items in parentheses are the definite article cases in Standard Greek.

Zwicky’s criteria (e.g. binding, distribution, etc.) are bolstered here showing that dialectal clitics raise serious problems concerning the relationship between the morpho-syntactic representations of the notion of the word. We have already mentioned that clitics are syntactic affixes, in the sense that they may have the syntactic properties of words on one hand, and the phonological properties of affixes on the other. We support then that the clitic in the dialect of Lefkada plays the role of an incorporated element adjoined to the lexical verb or noun (the host) while behaving very much like a Class I affix. In this sense a clitic is a reduced form of a word which is phonologically dependent on its host. And what distinguishes them from affixes is some kind of freedom of movement concerning their attachment. Pronominal marking of possession within noun phrase, the so-called genitive pronouns, occurring at the end of a noun phrase, after the noun, are identical in form with weak indirect object markers. So are the definite articles within a noun phrase regarding case. So, the clitic *t's*, for example, can be as is shown in Fig. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Noun</th>
<th>Clitic</th>
<th>Possession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gen Sg Fem DEF ART</td>
<td>t's</td>
<td>γις</td>
<td>tis</td>
<td>γις</td>
<td>of the land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tis lefkaðos</td>
<td>tis Lefkaðas</td>
<td>of Lefkada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc Pl Msc/Fem DEF ART</td>
<td>t's pateraðis</td>
<td>tis pateraðes</td>
<td>the fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t's trapezis</td>
<td>tis trapezes</td>
<td>the banks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Fem Sg WOPN</td>
<td>t'sipa</td>
<td>tis ipa</td>
<td>I told her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Msc/Fem/Ntr Pl WOPN</td>
<td>milat's</td>
<td>mila tis</td>
<td>talk to her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>milat's</td>
<td>mila tus/tis/ta</td>
<td>talk to them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>t'smil'sa</td>
<td>tus/tes/ta</td>
<td>I talked to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>milisa</td>
<td>them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Fem Sg Poss PN</td>
<td>u andrast's</td>
<td>o andras tis</td>
<td>her husband</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd Msc/Fem/Ntr Pl Poss PN</td>
<td>to</td>
<td>to psomaki tus</td>
<td>their bread</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>psomakít's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fig. 1. The clitic *t's* in the Lefkada dialect*

Here we have the issue of the phonological word (i.e. *t's*). We will start with the definite article (Table 6).
Table 6. The definite article in accusative and oblique

When combined with a preposition, the accusative τ’ or τ’n may be lost. For example, the locative preposition σ’ or se < is (archaic) εις ‘towards, in, on, at’, in the phrases σ’to/s’ton, σ’tin < archaic, is to, is ton, is tin (dialectal s’t’, s’t’n) plus Noun, deletes the definite article τ’, τ’n, e.g. s’hora ‘to, in, at the city’; whereas τ’s (Fem Gen Sg, Fem/Masc Acc Pl) remains, e.g. s’t’s kuzinas tu mat ‘at the cooker’s hot plate’, s’t’s trap’zis ‘at the banks’, etc.

Possessive and object pronouns present formal similarities with the definite articles (Tables 3 and 4). Also first and second person singular or plural are identical. Only the 1st and 2nd person plural are the same as in Modern Greek (mas, sas).

Table 7. Possessive pronouns within noun phrases
Moreover, the recorded data, exposing phonological phenomena (Baltazani & Topintzi 2010), such as palatalization, syncope, elision, deletion, synizesis, etc., per se, present irrefutable evidence bearing on word identification, in the Lefkada dialect, in the sense that they may affect the root itself, e.g. k’tao, kent’mα (syncope), the word form (shrinkage or loss of the inflectional suffix), e.g. vlep’, krion’n, her’, emporis’, etc. or the clitic, tu’ksera, t’sipa, θa t’n pum (WOP), t’andram’ (Art/Poss).

Palatalization: the sounds /l/ and /n/ change into /ƛ/ and /ɲ/ respectively, e.g. oli → oƛi, poli → poƛ’, moni → moɲ’, nifi → ɲif’, etc.

Syncope: unstressed e. i. u are lost in interconsonantal position, e.g. iθ’la (iθela), ex’te (exete), kent’mα (kentima), p’raz’ (pirazi), k’tao (kitao), im’na (imuna), ex’ne (exun), kaθis’ne (kaθisune), orest’s (Orestis), x’mona (himona), pin’ (pinun), krion’n (krionun), na par’ne, na val’ne, na δοκ’ne (na parun, na valun, na δοσun).

Elision: ap’otan (apo otan), t’onomat’s (to onoma tis/to onomat tus), θa t’n pum’ ets’ (θa tin pume etsi), o pateras t’andram’ (o pateras tu andra mu).

Synaliphe/apheresis: su’pa (su ipa), θa s’po (θa su po), t’uksera (to ’ksera < to iksera)

Deletion/apovoli: vowels /a/ and /i/ are lost word-finally or medially, e.g. vilon’ (velona), her’ (heri), emporis (emporises), vlep’ (vlepi), tetrayon’ (tetrayoni), δent’s’pa’yo (δen tus/tis ipa eyo).

Deletion of intervocalic /γ/ and /χ/: oi piðim (ohe peði mu), t’s paine (tis tus piγene), epia (epiγa/piγa)
5. Conclusion

As noted so far, it may be that separate notions of ‘word’ need to be recognized for different levels of grammatical analysis. So, there is the notion of grammatical word, which represents the ‘word’ as listed in the lexicon, thus taking in the major syntactic categories. What the lexical listing consists of is the stem and inflected forms. Now with regard to clitics, many of them have grammatical function (e.g. auxiliaries in English) and so they could be inflectional morphemes properly constituting part of a grammatical word. Alternatively, they could be separate grammatical words in their own right. Another level of analysis in which a separate notion of word might be useful concerns the phonology. This depends on how all the little elements, i.e. inflected articles are analyzed. If they are inflectional affixes (the cases of PNs) then much of what might be called ‘phonological word’ is simply created by regular word-formation and inflectional processes. Now, to conclude, working within a restrictive framework that allows only words and affixes as basic units and degrees of atypicality within those basic categories, one can account for all the properties shown by combinations of weak pronouns with their verbal hosts, inasmuch as the evidence points towards weak pronouns as being affixes and thus the host plus weak pronoun combinations as being simply words built up in the lexicon via word-formation processes and via inflectional processes. Moreover, the indications of affixal status for the weak pronouns seem stronger in the dialects than in the standard language (Modern Greek) – perhaps due to phonetic processes described above.
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