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The distribution of the Greek demonstratives, i.e. the available word order options, has remained constant throughout the history of the language, from Ancient to Modern Greek (henceforth AG and MG); however, the lexical items participating in it have not. Greek passes from a tripartite to a bipartite system, a cross-linguistically common development (Frei 1944:119, Lyons 1999:110). The facts and chronology of the evolution are known, but the causes behind it remain obscure. This paper attempts to explain them.

The pivot of this account is the re-interpretation of the AG demonstrative system as relying mainly not on person distinctions but on distinctions of distance and deixis vs. anaphora. By comparing synchronic systems of the language, facts acquire a new significance and a unified picture emerges. It is also demonstrated that Greek constitutes a clear counter-example to cross-linguistically well attested grammaticalisation patterns concerning the evolution of demonstrative pronouns, which thus cannot be argued to have universal value.

First, a short history of the process of lexical replacement is given, then an analysis of the AG demonstrative system is developed, and finally the new suggestions concerning the causality of the developments is elaborated.

Keywords: demonstrative pronouns, deixis, anaphora, diachrony

1. The evolution of lexical forms

This description of the historical development of the demonstrative system from AG to MG is based on previous works for the earlier stages of the language, but for the later ones, for which almost no information at all is available from previous scholarship, the data given are the results of extensive textual searches.
The AG demonstrative system is tripartite, consisting of the pronouns ὅσθε – ἡδε – τόδε / οὗτος – αὕτη – τοῦτο / ἕκεινος – ἐκεῖνο – ἐκεῖνο, traditionally held to correspond to deictic contrasts related to the three personal pronouns, with a further distinction between textually cataphoric ὅσθε vs. anaphoric οὗτος. The function of this system will be analysed in the next section. In the post-classical era, the pronoun ὅσθε gradually disappears, remaining only in legal expressions and other fixed expressions in the papyri, or mainly in cataphoric usage, e.g. in the fixed expression τάδε λέγει in the NT.

In the “literary” Koine, as represented for example by the historians Polybius and Diodorus Siculus, ὅσθε appears relatively rarely, usually in fixed expressions such as μέχρι τῶν καρπῶν (in D.S.4.19.2, 4.21.2, 4.56.5, 5.15.2, 19.36.4). The cataphoric usage has largely been taken over by οὗτος, e.g. D.S.11.1.2, 12.4.5. (Palm (1955:74–7), de Foucault (1972:86)).

The NT has only two demonstratives, οὗτος and ἕκεινος, usually in post-nominal position, possibly as a result of Semitic influence, and pre-nominally for reasons of emphasis (Turner (1963:193), Blass-Debrunner-Funk (1961:152), Heimerdinger (1996)). οὗτος is both deictic and anaphoric, having invaded all the territories where ὅσθε was employed before.

At about the same time, there begins to emerge a new demonstrative pronoun, αὐτός, arising from the AG anaphoric pronoun ἀὐτός (=“the same”). Its first uses are — obviously, due to its provenance — anaphoric (i.e. referring to something previously mentioned in the text), and are attested in the NT (rare and questionable, only in Luke, cf. Turner (1963:194, Ljungvik (1932:8)) and in papyri (1–2):

1. ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ Ev.Luc.13.1
   [ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ καιρῷ]
   in this the time (=at this time)

2. ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος BGU 1655.42 (169 AD)
   [ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος]
   on this the matter (=concerning this matter)

In these occurrences, αὐτός retains most of its original sense (= “the same”), and it is not until much later that it acquires the complete range of uses of a fully-fledged demonstrative pronoun (exophoric, cataphoric). In fact, for several centuries into the Byzantine era the main innovative function of this pronoun is in the legalistic ὁ αὐτός (=“the aforementioned”), alternating freely with οὗτος, in a discourse deictic function (3):
In Malalas, the use of αὐτός by far surpasses other demonstratives: 95 instances in the first 8 books, vs. 37 instances of οὗτος and ἐκεῖνος together. In fact, οὗτος is used adjectivally only 53 times in the whole of Malalas (Weierholt 1963:16). This usage of αὐτός appears also in other mediaeval texts (Sophocles 1870 s.v. αὐτός, Jannaris 1897: §1420, Horrocks 1997a:180, Psaltes 1913:194–5), e.g. in the Pratum Spirituale of Ioannes Moschos (6th c.), in the Chronicon Paschale (6th c.), in the chronicle of Theophanes the Confessor (9th c.) and in the De administrando imperio of Constantinus Porphyrogenitus (10th c.). Sometimes the position of αὐτός varies between the (original) internal one and the (new) pre-article one within the same text, e.g (4–5), but the use is always anaphoric.

(4) ὅτε ἤρχατο παρέχειν τὸ δημόσιον, εἰ τις ἔλευσε εἰς αὐτὸ τὸ δημόσιον Malalas 276.19

[ʼote ʼirksato pa'rechin to ὅ'mosion, i tis e'an el'ueto is a'fto when he-started offering the public, if anyone if he-bathed at this
to δι'μοσίαν]
the bath
«when the public bath came into use, anyone who went to bathe in this bath….»

(5) “Ὅτι καὶ τοῖς Βουλγάροις φοβερότερος δόξειν… ἐπειδὴ καὶ πρὸς αὐτοῖς τοῖς Βουλγάροις οἱ εἰρημένοι Πατζινάκηται πλησιάζουσιν.

DAI, 5.2–4

[ʼοτι cε tys vul'yarus fove'rot eros  δόξειν… That and to-the Bulgarians more-formidable he-would-seem…
epi'di ce pros a'ftus tus vul'yarus y irı'meny patsina'cite because and to these the Bulgarians the said Pachenegs
pli'sazusin] are-near

«That to the Bulgarians also he will appear more formidable… because the said Pachenegs are neighbours to these Bulgarians also.»

This fact, i.e. that the expressions ὁ αὐτός X and αὐτός ὁ X co-occur in mediaeval texts, should not be taken as an indication that the new demonstrative αὐτός had not yet been fully established; for the fixed expression ὁ αὐτός occurs in chronicles8 irrespective of place of origin (and sporadically in other non-literary texts as well) during the whole Byzantine and post-Byzantine era, well into the 17th century, interchanging with the modern equivalent and competing with alternative expressions such as ὁ ἄνωθεν, ὁ προερημένος, ὁ ίδιος, ὁ τοιοῦτος. It should therefore be considered more as something like a marker of genre (characteristic of chronicles and legal texts), especially in later sources.

(6–8) constitute a representative list of examples:

(6) καὶ ἔπεσαν ἀπὸ τὴν συντροφία τοῦς δύο κάτεργα… ἐξέβησαν ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀμόχουστον τά ἄνωθεν δύο κάτεργα… ἀπεσόσαν τὰ αὐτὰ κάτεργα εἰς τὴν Ἀλεξάνδραν L.Machairas,1450, Dawkins (1932:204–206).

[tje e'pepsan α'po ti sindro'fia tus ὁι katerya... e'ksevisan and they-sent from the company of-them two galleys… they-went a'po tin a'moxuston ta 'anothen dio 'katerya... ape'sosan ta off from-the Famagusta the above two galleys... they-reached the a'fta 'katerya is tin ale'ksandran] same galleys at the Alexandria
«And they sent off two of their galleys… the above two galleys left Famagusta… the said galleys reached Alexandria»

(7) “Ελαβαν καὶ δύο θημιατά τῆς Ἁγίας Σοφίας… Σῦν τούτοις ἐλαβαν καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς πόρτης αὐτῆς τῆς Ἁγίας Σοφίας… Οὐ μόνον ταύτα ἐπήραν ἀμή καὶ τὴν ἁγία τράπεζα τῆς αὐτῆς Ἁγίας Σοφίας.

(Ps.-Dorotheos, 1570, in Valetas 1947:43).

(8) Ξημερώνοντας Κυριακή… εἶδαμε καὶ ἔσχισεν ὡς κατό… Καὶ ἀπάνω εἰς τὴν κορυφὴν τοῦ αὐτοῦ κατοίκου… Μᾶς ἀνήγγειλαν πῶς ἡ θάλασσα ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τὴν τοσή ταραχή… Ἐπῆρε ἡ αὐτὴ θάλασσα χιλιάδων μουζουριών χεράφια

Anonymous, Santorini 1660, in Valetas (1947:130, 132).

The last example found, (9), comes from as late as 1806:

(9)  οὕτως καὶ εἰς τὴν τακτικήν, … ὅτι οἱ δέκα πολλάκις νικούσι τοις ἐκατόν, δυσκόλως θέλουν πιστεύσει οἱ ἁγιούντες τὴν αὐτήν τέχνην.
Ανωνύμος, Ελληνική Νομαρχία, Valetas (1982: Α69.33–6)

[’utos ce is tin daktic’in, ’oti i δεκα ποι’ασις ní’kusi tus
Thus and in the tactics, that the ten many-times defeat the
eka’ton, δί’skolos ἑλευν π’στεφσις ἀγνο’ουντες τις α’τιν ἰ’δεστιν]
hundred with-difficulty will believe the ignoring the same art

«The same thing happens with tactics: … that ten (soldiers) often defeat a
hundred, those who ignore this art will believe it with difficulty»

It is therefore not the disappearance of the order ὁ αὐτός that one should use as a
certain criterion for dating the establishment of αὐτός as a demonstrative
pronoun, but the use of this pronoun in non-anaphoric contexts. The first
examples of αὐτός with a cataphoric meaning come from the 10th century (10),
and this must date, at least approximately its establishment as a “real” demon-
strative pronoun:

(10) καὶ κατώκουν εἰς τὴν ἐπαρὰν εἰς αὐτὰ τὰ κάστρα: κάστρον Κόμκορδα,
κάστρον ᾿Ιουστινιάνα, κάστρον τοῦ Νοῦν καὶ ἑτερα πλῆστα κάστρα.
DAI 27.73
[ce kα’tokun is tiŋ ge’iran is a’fta ta ʾkastr:a: kastron kongord,a,
and they-lived at the land at these the castles: castle Concordia,
kastron justi’ñana, kastron tu ʾnuṇu ce ʾtera ʾplista ʾkastra.
castle Justiniana, castle of-the Nounou and other very-many castles.
«And [they] used to dwell on the mainland in these cities: the city of Con-
cordia, the city of Justiniana, the city of Nonu, and many other cities»

Clear examples of αὐτός as an exophoric-deictic demonstrative come only from
the vernacular poetry of the 12th century and beyond (11–12):

(11) Θωρεὶς αὐτὸν τὸν ἄγουρον πού στέκει εἰς τὸ λιβάριν…
[θο’rís a’ftοn don ʾagurοn pu ’stecë is i⁵ tô’βarin]
You-see this the unripe who he-stands at the rock
Do you see this youngster standing on the rock? Digenis E 1507

(12) Να ποίσο τήν κουδούσαν σου αὐτήν τὴν μαδιζμένην
[na ’psi o tiŋ gudunan su a’ftin di ma’dizmenin]
That I-destroy the pate of-you this the bald
I would break that bald pate of yours (Ptochoprodromos.1.154)

The late date of the clearly deictic examples does not necessarily signify that
αὐτός acquired this function only at that stage; due to the nature of the earlier
texts (impersonal narratives, reports etc) the opportunities to use an exophoric
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demonstrative were rather rare. The change might well have come sometime earlier, without this being reflected in textual evidence. However, another indication for this late dating of αὐτός in deictic usage is the appearance only after this date of the alternative forms αὐτός and αὐτέινος, αὐτόνος, αὐτοῦνος. The first is an analogical creation built on αὐτή, the feminine of οὗτος, providing a metrical variant (['αftos] vs. [αftos]) in mediaeval vernacular poetry, and surviving later as well (Jannaris 1897: §542, Horrocks 1997a:226). The others were built on the analogy of ἕκεινος (Kriaras 1968:- s.vv., Hatzidakis 1907:155–6, Jannaris 1897: §577). The fact that αὐτός is remodelled on the other demonstrative pronouns could mean that it was seen as equivalent to them, appearing in the same contexts. Alternatively, these forms could also have been created earlier, and have been avoided in earlier texts as too popular. In any case, on the basis only of the textual evidence, we can date the first appearance of an anaphoric demonstrative αὐτός to the first centuries AD, the extension to cataphoric usages to the 9th-10th c., and the final extension to deictic/exophoric uses to the 12th c.

A further development from AG to MG is the gradual limitation of the AG pronoun οὗτος to marginal/colloquial usage (under its new, analogically regularised form τοῦτος) in standard MG. This pronoun is in full use in the post-classical and Byzantine era but has almost died out in MG, leaving the language with only a two term opposition, αὐτός (proximal) vs. ἕκεινος (distal).

It is very hard, if not impossible, to date this progressive limitation of the use of οὗτος / τοῦτος, since, due to its history, it has both an archaic and a popular character, making it difficult to decide whether its use in a text is a marginal/colloquial survival or the result of an effort at a higher style.

In Byzantine times, τοῦτος is more frequent than αὐτός in texts of a higher register. Thus, in Digenis Akritis, E version, the ratios (both for pro-nominal and for adjectival usage) are the following: αὐτός 27 – αὐτός 53 – οὗτος / τοῦτος 37. This contrast with the poems of Ptochoprodromos, which give: αὐτός 1 – αὐτός 19 – οὗτος 24. Similarly, the earlier Byzantine Romance Callimachos and Chrysorroe, conservative morphologically in general, actually prefers οὗτος to αὐτός, (142: 84), with no examples of αὐτός but with one of the obsolete δὲ. In the text that is considered closest to the vernacular, the Chronicle of the Morea (13th c.), though, attributive αὐτός – αὐτέινος – αὐτοῦνος clearly outweighs attributive οὗτος by 76 to 36. It must be noted that in these texts αὐτός and οὗτος are used interchangeably, sometimes in the same verse, presumably for metrical reasons:
In post-Byzantine times, the picture in vernacular texts is similar: αὐτός is more frequent in chronicles and literary productions (novels, short stories) of the later centuries (original or translations), while τοῦτο prevails in rhetorical texts and essays (usually in the areas of theology or philosophy). Their meaning is again identical (15):

(15) ἀπὸ τὴν μόνην αὐτήν καὶ τὸ τοπίτσιν τοῦτο [a’po ti ‘monosin a’fin ce to topitsin ‘dutu]
from the isolation this and the little-place this
from this isolation and this little place

By the ogre this and the raging this

Of all these Scythians and these Kalmuks, the most warlike are…

The following table 1 shows the distribution of αὐτός vs ὁ αὐτός vs. οὗτος / τοῦτο in various prose vernacular texts ranging from the 15th to the 18th century, as well as the percentage of οὗτος in them. Only demonstratives in adjectival position i.e. modifying noun phrases and not used pronominally have been considered, since the consideration of the pronominal usages would create an imbalance: οὗτος used as a personal pronoun would have many tokens, but αὐτός as a personal pronoun would not, as it has by that time largely been replaced by the weak clitic forms του, τον etc.

Table 1. Distribution of demonstratives in 15th–18th c. prose
[Chr=Chronicle, Rel.=Religious, Lit.= Literature, T.=Translation (AG or French)]

| Text                        | Century | Type         | αὐτός | ὁ αὐτός | οὗτος / τοῦτο | % (τ)οὗτος |
|-----------------------------|---------|--------------|-------|----------|----------------|------------|
| Assizes of Cyprus – 100pp    | ca.1340 | Laws (T.)    | 14    | 19       | 25             | 43.1 %     |
| L. Machairas – 50pp         | ca.1450 | Chr.         | 0     | 11       | 11             | 50 %       |
| Text                          | Century | Type       | αὐτός | ὁ αὐτός | ύποτος / τοῦτος | % (τ)οὐτος |
|-------------------------------|---------|------------|-------|----------|-----------------|------------|
| Cardinal Bessarion            | 1465    | Letters    | 3     | 1        | 5               | 55.5 %     |
| N. Sofianos, Παιδαγωγός       | 1544    | Lit. (T.)  | 7     | 0        | 4               | 36.3 %     |
| Damaskinos Stouditis – Διάλεγος | ca.1577 | Rel.       | 1     | 0        | 11              | 91.6 %     |
| !Ps-Dorotheos Βιβλίον Ιστορικόν | 1578    | Chr.       | 6     | 1        | 2               | 21.1 %     |
| I. Miloitis – Όδοιπορικόν     | 1588    | Travel     | 3     | 0        | 1               | 25 %       |
| A. Soumakis – Ρεμπελίο Ποπολάρων | 1646    | Chr.       | 1     | 8        | 100             | 91.7 %     |
| I. Abbatios                   | 1648    | Chr.       | 0     | 2        | 6               | 75%        |
| Anon. – Διήγησις Σαντορίνης   | 1660    | Chr.       | 0     | 5        | 3               | 37.5 %     |
| Nektarios – Ιεροκοσμική Ιστορία | 1677    | Rel.hist.  | 0     | 0        | 11              | 100%       |
| Parthenios – Θρήνος           | 1690    | Lament     | 0     | 0        | 2               | 100%       |
| Chr. Notaras – Κεταία δουλεύουσα | 1694   | Chr.       | 46    | 2        | 13              | 21.3 %     |
| Euthymios – Ιστορία Γαλαξίδιον | 1705    | Chr.       | 11    | 0        | 1               | 8.3 %      |
| Patousas – Ἄνθη Ευλαβείας      | 1708    | Rel.       | 1     | 0        | 7               | 86.6 %     |
| K. Dapontes – Χρονογράφος     | 1769    | Chr.       | 26    | 3        | 11              | 27.5 %     |
| Kosmas Aitolos – Διδαχή Α      | 1773    | Rel.       | 18    | 0        | 23              | 56 b%      |
| Parthenios Pelop. – Προσκυνητάρων | 1775   | Rel.       | 6     | 5        | 11              | 50%        |
| Anonymous of 1789             | 1789    | Satire     | 8     | 0        | 1               | 11.1 %     |
The following observations can be made on the basis of it:

a. The type of a text is more important than its date: thus, chronicles and other popular texts (travel, letters, stories) contrast strongly with religious writings. Furthermore, the texts in which οὗτος appears often have the archaic, AG forms of οὗτος / αὕτη rather than the analogical MG τούτος.

b. the real turning point comes in the later 18th century: Until then, one may find texts with only οὗτος, or with αὕτος and οὗτος interchangeably, but there are no texts/authors using αὕτος exclusively, or in an overwhelming majority, similar to MG usage. In the 18th c. however, such texts/authors exist: literary texts, e.g. *Το σχολειών των ντελικάτων ἐραστών* of Rigas, a collection of romantic love stories translated from the French, or the prose of Daniel Philippides, a writer of educational texts, have very few or no examples at all of οὗτος / τούτος.

c. dialect is also a determining factor: thus, the dialectal texts from Zakynthos (Soumakis), Cephalonia (Abbatios) and Cyprus ("Ανθος Χαρίτων) show an unusually strong preference for τούτος.14

It is important to note in this connection that the overall evolutionary trend is valid only for what will ultimately become standard MG, while many local dialects tend to be more conservative. Thus, e.g., the verse literature of the Cretan Renaissance (16th- 17th c.) shows a rather different patterning: here τούτος is the standard demonstrative, with αὐτός appearing as a much rarer metrical alternative, without any possibility of characterising the language of these works as "high". The relevant numbers for some works of the period are as follows:

The texts chosen are representative of different genres, i.e. romances (*Erotokritos*, Philippides & Holton 1996), tragedy (*Sacrifice*, Philippides 1986,
and Erophi., Alexiou & Aposkiti 1988) and comedy (Katzourbos, Politis 1964), and of different authors, the two major representatives of the era, V. Kornaros and G. Chortatsis). No difference in meaning between the two demonstratives exists, as their use in identical contexts shows (16 vs. 17):

(16) Κι αὐτένος ὁ τραγουδιστής κι αὐτός ὁ λαγουτάρης / εἶναι μεγάλης δύναμις
   And this the singer and this the lute-player is of-great strength
   Erotocr.1.607.

(17) Ἐτούτος ὁ τραγουδιστής, νένα, πολλὰ κατέχει
   This the singer, nurse, much he-knows
   Erotocr.1.807

In the 19th century, with the development of katharevousa, the purist artificial language, approaching AG models in an effort to reconnect with the “glorious past” (Mackridge 1990) conclusions as to natural usage become impossible. However, it is important to note that the greatest writers (according to modern scholarship), such as Solomos and Makriyannis, prefer αὐτός, and that τούτος again appears preferentially in “higher style” texts, or, contrastively, in very low register or dialectal creations.

Nowadays, in standard MG, τούτος has a very strong deictic meaning, to the point where it is impolite to use it of persons, and gives an almost vulgar ring to an utterance (Mackridge (1985:226), Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki (1997: 317)). Crucially for the following discussion, in slightly earlier MG, as summarised by Τζαρτζάνος (2nd ed. 1989:140–41, 1st ed. 1928), where τούτος was in more general use, the distinction between αὐτός vs. τούτος was as follows:

“In cases of such notional deixis [=anaphora], αὐτός and ἐκεῖνος are usually employed, and very rarely ἐτούτος. … In general, the pronoun (ε)τούτος should
be used in notional deixis, that is in discourse, when it can have the meaning of ὅ ἔξης (ἡ ἔξης, τὸ ἔξης) [= the following]. And in general, when we see that the pronoun αὐτός also fits in a phrase, we should prefer αὐτός."  

In other words, before its limitation to the colloquial register, already started in Tzartzanos’ time, the uses of τοῦτος were mainly a) deictic and b) cataphoric. Standard MG texts, written in the last two decades, give a similar picture, with τοῦτος having virtually disappeared from the written language. The remaining two demonstratives of MG, αυτός and ἕκεινος, as established in Manolessou-Panagiotidis (1999), express the distinction deictic vs. anaphoric through alternative word orders: deixis involves the demonstrative in the pre-article position and anaphora placement in the post-nominal position.

2. The demonstrative system of AG

2.1 Previous accounts

The accounts in standard Grammars explain demonstrative usage in AG roughly as follows (Kühner-Gerth (1898:641ff), Humbert (1945:35ff), Schwyzzer-Debrunner (1966:207ff), Smyth (1956:307–9), Mendoza (1976:92–6)):

- ὅδε is “first person” (Ich-deixis) and refers to things close to the speaker, ὅτος is “second person” (Du-deixis) and refers to things close to the hearer, and ἕκεινος is “third person” (Jener-Deixis) and refers to things distant from both speaker and hearer — a distinction analogous to the Latin hic- iste- ille.

The relation of ὅδε with the first person is obvious from its use as an apposition to or a replacement of the first person, cf. (18–19):

18. ὅδε εἰμί ὁ Ὀρέστης E.Or.380
   [hóde em oréstes]
   This I-am, Orestes
   Here I am, I, Orestes

19. ὅδε τοι πάρεμι Hdt.1.115
   [hóde toi pâremi]
   This then 1-am-present
   Here I am

The connection of ὅτος and the 2nd person was strengthened by its usage in vocatives (very frequent in comedy, cf. Dickey 1996:154–8, Mussies (1998)), e.g. (20–21):
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(20) ὁ οὖντος Αἴας, δεύτερόν σε προσκαλῶ. S.Ai.89
[Oh this Ajax, second you I-call]
Ajax, for the second time I call you

(21) οὗτος, τί ποιεῖς; Ar.Ru.189
[This you, what you-do?]
Hey you, what are you doing?

The three-person distinction is a widespread view stemming from Brugmann (1904), who gave a unified account of the demonstrative systems of most Indo-European (IE) languages. In its main points it is still generally accepted today, cf. Lehmann (1982), Klein (1996).

Modern evaluations of the AG demonstrative system challenge this traditional interpretation of the Greek data, however. Biraud (1983) and Ledesma (1987), studying demonstratives in Lysias, suggest rather that the basic difference is one of distance and not of person. This is not, strictly speaking, incompatible with the traditional account, but rather sets things on a different basis: the fact that a demonstrative is proximal/distal brings about its connection to the first/third person, and not vice versa.19

According to Biraud, the morpheme -δε in a demonstrative ensures reference to a place and time considered as those of the utterance, while the morpheme κεῖ- denotes distance from them. Οὗτος on the other hand is neutral to the distinction, and therefore is more appropriate to anaphoric functions, where exact situation in place/time is not relevant. In the cases where a strongly localising demonstrative is used in anaphora, it situates the referent unambiguously, as far as distance in text or distance in space/time is concerned. For Ledesma, έκέινος on the one hand entails distance (in space, time, in the text, or affective);20 ὁδε and οὗτος on the other hand, entail nearness. Since these two are so similar in their basic meaning, the disappearance of one of them can be viewed as a natural evolution.

Martín-López (1994) gives a rather more enlightening description: έκέινος is indeed used in order to signify greater distance (in the above contexts) but the other two pronouns are not synonymous. They constitute the poles of another type of distinction operating in Greek, the one between deixis and anaphora. That native speakers were conscious of this distinction is obvious from the statement of Apollonius Dyscolus: πάσα ἀντωνυμία ἢ δεικτική ἔστιν ἢ ἀναφορική (AD.Pron.10B2). So the AG system could be viewed better under
the distinction δός = deictic vs. οὗτος = anaphoric, with this value of οὗτος stemming perhaps from its indifference to the notion of distance.\textsuperscript{21}

In support of Martín-López’s position one may use historical data pertaining to the genesis of the Greek demonstrative pronouns (Mendoza (1976:95–6), Klein (1996:35)). Both δός and οὗτος are new creations of Greek, not inherited demonstratives of IE. They are based on the older demonstrative ὁ – ἦ – τό, which later became the definite article (Wackernagel 1924:125–152, Meier-Brugger 1992:146). This can be proved from the fact that a) there is no οὗτος in Mycenaean and Arcado-Cypriot and b) δός inflects word-internally. So the idea of a Greek system which represents a direct inheritance from IE, analogous to the Latin one,\textsuperscript{22} cannot be maintained. One then may pose the question why the Greek language needed to invent these two demonstratives, if it did not have another type of distinction to express.

Parenti (1997:183) on the contrary, claims that AG does not have a specific form for the anaphoric function, since οὗτος is not used in exclusively anaphoric contexts. However, the position of Martín-López (1994) can be supported by textual evidence, as we shall see in the following section.

2.2 The data

A characteristic example of the deictic-anaphoric distinction, according to Martín-López, is the τειχοσκοπία in the Iliad. In this section (I.3.163ff), each hero is first mentioned with δός by Priam (22-23, 25), and then with οὗτος by Helen (24, 26):

\begin{itemize}
  \item (22) δός μοι καὶ τόνδ᾽ ἀνδρὰ πελάριον ἔξονομήνης
    [hós mòi kai tónd' ándra pelía'n éxonoménēs]
    that to-me and this man huge you-name
    \textit{that you tell me the name of this huge man}
  \item (23) δός τις ὁ δεῖ εἰστίν Ἀχαϊῶς ἀνήρ
    [hós tís hód estín akhaiós anír]
    whoever this is Achaean man
    \textit{who is this Achaean}
  \item (24) οὗτος δ᾽ Ἀτρείδης εὑρὸ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνον
    [hoútos d' atreides eu'rò kreión agamémnon]
    this and Atreides wide ruling Agamemnon
    \textit{This is the son of Atreus,wide ruling Agamemnon}
\end{itemize}
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(25) εἰπ’ ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε, φίλον τέκος, ὃς τις ὁδ’ ἔστι

tell come to-me and this, dear child, whoever this is

come, dear child, tell me also who this is,

(26) οὗτος δ’ αὖ Λαερτιάδης πολύμητις Ὅδυσσεύς

this and again Laertiades wily Odysseus

this again is the son of Laertes, wily Odysseus

Furthermore, the use of ὁδε in the second book of Thucydides has been systematically analysed by Díaz-Tejera (1972). According to this study, ὁδε is found 50 times in the text, 36 of which are in direct speech, and 15 in Thucydidean narration. Of the 36 instances in direct speech, 31 are deictic, so ὁδε can be argued to have a very strong deictic function, in Attic at least (27–28):

(27) οἷά καὶ νόν περὶ τὸν τάφον τόνδε… ὀράτε

Like-those and now around the grave this… you-see

Like those you see around this grave

(28) αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς οἶδε οἷ νόν ἐτί ὄντες

we ourselves who are now still alive

we ourselves who are now still alive

Another frequent usage of ὁδε in this text (and in AG in general, cf. Kühner-Gerth (1898:646), Humbert (1945:39), Smyth (1956:308)) is the cataphoric one, in contrast to οὗτος, which is anaphoric.23 For Martín-López (1994), this usage of ὁδε should not be considered anaphoric, since the referent is not yet present in the discourse, but should be classed as a kind of “anticipatory” deictic function. Of course this notion entails several theoretical difficulties; for example one would also have to consider deictic even personal pronouns when used cataphorically as in “when he walked into the room, X saw…” However, if we accept the definition of anaphora as given in Lyons (1977:673), namely that “anaphora presupposes that the referent should already have its place in the universe of discourse”, then cataphora is seen to have a greater affinity with deixis.24 Moreover, that the cataphoric usage of a demonstrative pronoun is connected to its function as a deictic is demonstrable from the history of the Greek language (development of the demonstrative αὐτός, restrictions in the uses of τότος) as we saw in the previous section.
In tragedy, ὁδὲ had a very strong deictic meaning as well. In fact, modern works on the stagecraft of tragedy, such as Taplin (1977: 150–1 and cf. references cited therein) base whole discussions about the presence or absence on stage of a certain person or object on the use of ὁδὲ, cf. Moorhouse (1982: 154) and Kühner -Gerth (1898: 641) (29–30):

(29) Ὑπὲρ Ὀρέστην τόνδε
[hora at oréstɛn tónde]
You-see Orestes this
you see Orestes there

(30) πάρεστι δεύρο Πολυνείκης ὁδὲ
[páresti deûro polynékès hóde]
he-is-present here Polynieces this
here is Polynieces

Notice also that in the Homeric poems, οὗτος is never used with expressions of time (e.g. “on this day”), which is one of the main deictic usages, while ὁδὲ is used thus 19 times, (Magnien 1922: 167, cf. graph 2 below).

In inscriptions, according to Lejeune (1943), one may distinguish four types of demonstrative usage:

a. anaphoric usage: in this case, Attic uses οὗτος, (31):

(31) ταῦτα ἐδοκέσαν τοὶ δέμοι ἐπὶ Φιλοκράτους
[tauta edoksæn taxi děmoi epi philokrátous]
This was-decided by-the people on of-Philocrates
This was decided by the people at the time of Philocrates

b. the demonstrative designates the decree itself which contains it. In this case, Attic uses ὁδὲ, (32):

(32) τὸ δὲ ψήφισμα τὸδε ἀναγραφάτω
[tò dè psèphisma tòde anagraphtò]
The and decree this let-be-written-up
Let this decree be written up

c. The demonstrative designates the monument on which the inscription is carved, and here ὁδὲ is used again, (33):

(33) Γνάθονος τὸδε σῶμα
[gnathònos tòde sôma]
Of-Gnathon this grave
This is the grave of Gnathon
d. Cataphoric usage, where ὁδε is used again, e.g. (34–5):

(34) ὁμηναί τάδε τεν βολέν… IG1².10.20
[to-swear this the parliament
that the parliament swears to the following]

(35) ἀναλόματα τάδε λίθον τομέ… IG 1.336.6
[expenses these of-stones cuttings
the following expenses: cutting of stone…]

Again the deictic function of ὁδε is obvious.

Moreover, one of the standard uses of οὗτος as described in grammars is in order to refer to someone famous (equivalent to Latin ille), but also to give a pejorative nuance. These usages can easily be attributed to its basically anaphoric meaning: it is referring back to something apparent and familiar in the general consciousness, and which may also, from being so well known, be considered notorious or deserving of contempt (Cooper 1998:522).

Finally, the anomalous paradigm of οὗτος lends credibility to an etymological provenance from a combination ὁ + αὐτός, where ὁ would play the part of the demonstrative. Such an origin points to an initially anaphoric usage. On the basis of this initial usage, a possible way of accounting for the extension to the 2nd person-related usages is to consider that (in dialogue contexts) what is previously mentioned, is usually the words of the interlocutor/addressee; therefore, anaphoric reference often requires reference to the utterances of the 2nd person, the addressee, and by extension to the addressee himself. Cf. the frequent Homeric formulas (36–38):

(36) Ἡ μάλα τὸῦτο ἔπος νημερτὲς ἔειπες Il.3.204
[ε: mala touto epos nemertes eieipes]
Indeed very this word true you-said
Indeed you have spoken very true words

(37) μάλα τὸῦτο ἔπος κατὰ μοίραν ἔειπες Il.15.206
[mala touto epos kata moiraan eieipes]
very this word according to share you-said
you have spoken very much as was due

(38) ταὐτά γε πάντα γέρον, κατὰ μοίραν ἔειπες Il.1.286, Il.8.146, Il.24.264
[tauta ge pantai geeron kata moiraan eieipes]
These ptc all old man according to share you-said
Indeed, old man, you have said all this as was due
The above argumentation on the deictic status of ὅδε and the anaphoric status of ὅτος does not entail that it is impossible in AG to find instances where ὅτος does not refer to elements within the text but to entities in the extralinguistic context. These cases do exist, as Biraud has shown in her researches (1981, 1991:173–192). However, in such cases the referent of ὅτος is an element “given”, “known” in the context, and not something that requires deixis, i.e. local specification; for example, ταύτην τήν γῆν at Lys.12.4 will refer to Αττικα and ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει at Lys.5.2 and 5.3 will refer to Αθῆναι. Thus, the present section is arguing for a more “extended” notion of deixis vs. anaphora, based on the notion of “presence/givenness in context”. Deixis entails “non-givenness” in the context, which therefore requires (gestural) ostension and precise local specification, and also includes cataphora. Anaphora, on the other hand, entails “givenness”, and presupposes presence either in the linguistic (more often) or in the extralinguistic context.

3. Diachronic development

If we combine Martín López’s theory on the deictic vs. anaphoric distinction in AG, with the historical facts of the developments in the demonstrative system, we may be justified in proposing the following: since the disappearance of ὅδε and the extension of ὅτος into deictic functions (whichever came first) destroyed the formal contrast between a deictic and an anaphoric pronoun, a new demonstrative pronoun was created in order to re-establish it. This was αὐτός, which was already in use, with ὄ ἦ τό, as an anaphoric pronoun, and which, as we have seen from the textual evidence, was initially used only in an anaphoric function. However, as αὐτός in its turn started to extend to true deictic functions as well, limiting ὅτος to strong deixis, and then to the point of complete extinction from MG, a new way to express the distinction deictic vs. anaphoric was created: not lexically, through a new pronoun, but syntactically, through pre-nominal vs. post — nominal position.

It is important to note that the proposed evolutionary pattern, presupposing as it does a pragmatic shift from anaphoric to deictic functions, is rather unusual, cf. Manoliu (2000:243): “Cross-linguistic synchronic evidence from languages in which the same forms serve as both indexical means and anaphors, as well as diachronic evidence provided by changes within the paradigms of demonstrative pronouns, suggest that the most likely direction of change affecting deictics is: from indexicals (exophoric use) to anaphors (endophoric
use)”. Diessel (1999: 7), based on an extensive language corpus, also claims that “the exophoric use represents the basic use from which all other uses derive”. However, the Greek data constitute a clear and unambiguous counterexample to this grammaticalisation channel. It is obvious (and accepted in standard grammars and histories of the language, as well as easily demonstrable from textual evidence) both that the initial uses of αὐτός are anaphoric, only later becoming exophoric-deictic, and that the MG τούτος has a very strong deictic meaning, which its ancestor οὗτος did not possess.

The MG system, based on word order variation, is more symmetric, since it works for ἐκεῖνος as well, which in AG did not participate in the distinction (i.e. there were no special/different forms for deictic vs. anaphoric usages). Note that ἐκεῖνος, both because of its regular paradigm, but also perhaps because the deictic- anaphoric distinction was not relevant to it, has not changed in function (i.e. it is still the only distal demonstrative, responsible for both deixis and anaphora) nor been lexically replaced, thus showing that this distinction is an important motivation for demonstrative evolution. As a further point, note also that before MG, as shown in Manolessou & Panagiotidis (1999), the positional difference between pre-and post-position of the demonstrative was governed by pragmatic factors such as emphasis and topic continuity (cf. also Palm (1960), Rijksbaron (1993)). So MG has the lexical distinction near vs. far (αὐτός vs. ἐκεῖνος) and the syntactic distinctions deictic vs. anaphoric.

Crucially, in a recent contribution, Bakker (1999), it was argued that the Homeric demonstrative system shows traces of an early distinction between deixis vs. anaphora. The anaphoric function is claimed to be represented by the demonstrative ὁ – ἦ – τό, not yet a definite article, and frequently used in narrative, while the deictic function is fulfilled by οὗτος, usually employed in direct speech or in personal comments of the poet addressing the audience directly. If this account is even partially tenable, one could claim that we have here yet another stage of the same patterning: the disappearance of one demonstrative (in this case ὁ, becoming an article) and the extension of the other to anaphoric usages (οὗτος) led to the creation of a new demonstrative in order to re-establish the distinction (ὁδε).

This analysis, although similar to the one proposed here for the subsequent phases of Greek, differs from it in one crucial respect: it presupposes that it is the anaphoric pronoun that disappears, and the deictic one that is extended to all contexts, a development which is the reverse of that observed for later phases.

These contradictions require a closer examination of the Homeric data, in order to ascertain the validity of Bakker’s analysis. To begin with, he totally
disregards the presence of ὄδε in Homer, which is in fact: a) more frequent than οὗτος (451 instances vs. 344) and b) also used almost exclusively in direct speech (there are only 2 examples in narrative, both in the Iliad, and both cataphoric, vs. 18 examples of οὗτος in both epics, all anaphoric). Furthermore, an examination of all instances of both pronouns in the Homeric epics (based on Gehring 1891) shows the following distribution:

Table 3. Graph representing demonstrative distribution in Homer (number of occurrences)

| Spat. D | Temp. D | Sit. D | P/Obj. D | Aud/Loc | 1st p.D. | 2nd p.D. | Cataph | Anaph ut. |
|---------|---------|--------|----------|---------|---------|---------|--------|-----------|
| ode     | 34      | 19     | 52       | 135     | 16      | 0       | 4      | 112       | 37        | 22       | 3        | 1        |
| outos   | 0       | 0      | 10       | 42      | 0       | 0       | 1      | 36        | 174       | 78       | 3        | 1        |

Spat. D: Spatial deixis — here, this place, e.g. σὺ μὲν’ αὐτόν τῶδ’ ἐνί χώρῳ Od.10.271

Temp. D: Temporal deixis — now, this time, e.g. νῦν δ’ ὅδε μάλα μακρή ἀθέσφατος Od.11.373

Sit. D: Reference to a present event, situation, e.g. ὑπὸ τῶδε ἔργα μετ’ ἀμφοτέρων ἔθηκε II.3.321

P/Obj. D: Deixis to a present person or thing e.g. εἰσῆλθε καὶ ἕξε τῶδ’ ἐπὶ δίφρω II.6.354

Aud/Loc: Reference to the present audience (those around), or to the inhabitants of the present place, the locals e.g. πείρησαι, ἵνα γνώσωσι καὶ οἶδε II.1.302

1st p.D.: 1st person deixis, e.g. δῶρα δ’ ἔγων ὅδε πάντα παρασχέμεν II.19.140

2nd p.D.: 2nd person deixis, e.g. τίς δ’ οὗτος κατὰ νήμα ἀνὰ στρατὸν ἔρχει τὸν οἶος; II.10.82

Cataph.: Cataphora, e.g. τῶδε οἶδα κατὰ φρένα καὶ κατὰ θυμόν / ἔσωσεν ἧμαρ ὃτ’ ἂν… II.4.163

Anaph. ut.: Anaphora to previous utterances, e.g. τίν’ ἦν ηὐς διελέξατο θυμός; II.11.407
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Anaph. P.: Anaphora to previously mentioned persons or things e.g. μηδ’ ἀξεοθοῦρον Ἄρη, τοῦτον μανόμενον, τυκτόν κακόν II.5.831

Und: Reference to understood, but unmentioned and absent entities, e.g. ἄλλος δ’ αὐτέ τις ὁτός ἀνέστη Od.20.380

The above graph clearly demonstrates that:

- certain deictic contexts, such as spatial and temporal deixis, are the exclusive domain of δδε.
- the most frequent usages for δδε are exophora/deixis (time-space-entities) and cataphora (47.7% and 29.4% respectively).
- the most frequent usages of οτός are anaphora to utterances and persons (50.6% and 22.7% respectively).
- plainly person-related reference is very rare,27 despite the fact that almost all demonstratives occur in direct speech.

On the basis of the above, it is impossible to classify οτός as a deictic pronoun in any way, as Bakker (1999) holds. The distribution of the two proximal pronouns follows very closely the classification proposed by Martín-López (1994), i.e. deictic δδε vs. anaphoric οτός. However, Bakker is correct in observing the restriction of these pronouns to direct speech and the existence of an alternative option, the “definite article” ὁ – η – τό, used for both deixis and anaphora. These two facts may point toward an earlier phase of the language, before the development of the two AG demonstrative pronouns, where ὁ was the only proximal demonstrative, contrasting with distal ἔκαστος.28 Unfortunately, the Mycenaean data do not shed any light on this question, since neither the “article” nor any demonstratives appear in the Linear B tablets.29 Nevertheless, it would be plausible to suggest, on the basis of the later developments, that this original demonstrative ὁ was further specified with additional elements in order to clearly express the distinction between deixis and anaphora.

Thus, ὁ + another element (even if not αὐτός, as Horrocks (1997b) suggests), would be used in anaphoric contexts, leading to the creation of an anaphoric demonstrative οτός, extending, through use in dialogue, to 2nd person usages as well, while ὁ + δδε,30 leading to the creation of a deictic demonstrative δδε, would be used in deictic contexts, extending, through reference to the immediate environment of the speaker (hic – nunc) to connection with the 1st person as well. These initial reinforcements/specifications of ὁ would contribute to its progressive weakening, on its way to becoming an article (something already apparent in Homer) or vice versa.
Schematically then, we propose the following pattern for the development of the demonstrative system in Greek, from pre-Homeric times until MG:

| Era                | Meaning | Motivation for word order |
|--------------------|---------|---------------------------|
|                    | Proximal| Distal | Semantic | Pragmatic |
|                    | Deictic Anaphoric | | |
| Pre-Homer.         | ὁ +ὅς ὁ +Χ | ἐκεῖνος | ? | ? |
| Homer- AG          | ὁ ὅδε (ὁ) οὐτος | ἐκεῖνος | − | + |
| PostAG-MedG        | ὅς (γ)οὔτος (οὔτος) οὗτος | ἐκεῖνος | − | + |
| MG                | τούτος αὐτός αὐτός | ἐκεῖνος | + | − |

4. Conclusions

In this paper we have examined the evolution of the demonstrative system in Greek. New data pertaining to the process of the change, especially in later times, have been adduced, and a new, unified analysis for all eras has been proposed. This analysis:

– presupposes the same semantic values (proximal vs. distal, deictic vs. anaphoric) operating throughout the history of Greek;
– applies the same principle of change to a variety of phenomena: gradual extension of the anaphoric demonstrative to deictic usages, which results in ambiguity, and thence to the disappearance of one of the members of the opposition and the introduction of a new one;
– explains the fluctuation in the use of the various demonstrative pronouns across the history of Greek in a principled way, and also explains the variations in word-order patterns across the history of Greek in a principled way;
– offers a unified explanation for the genesis of the demonstrative system in early Greek.
Notes

1. Details in Manolessou & Panagiotidis (1999), Panagiotidis (2000).

2. This paper deals only with the evolution of the demonstrative pronouns proper, i.e. those linguistic items termed "demonstrative pronouns" by standard grammars, which form a closed system, and not with all linguistic items that can have a similar function; thus, personal and relative pronouns are excluded from investigation.

3. The terms "deixis" and "anaphora" are used here according to usual practice (cf. the titles of Martín-López (1994), De Jong (1996), Bakker (1999)) with the meaning "reference to extra-linguistic entities, exophora" and "reference to previously mentioned linguistic entities" respectively. For an alternative terminology, according to which "deixis" is a semantic property of all demonstratives and "anaphora" a pragmatic sub-distinction of it, cf. Diessel (1999).

4. Data in Jannaris (1897: §§566–7); Mayser (1933:76), Dieterich (1898:197), Psaltis (1913:194), Moulton (1908:91), Gignac (1977:173–4), Horrocks (1997a:74–5, 180–1, 226).

5. “Cataphora” is, in all linguistic terminologies, the reference to following, yet unmentioned, linguistic entities.

6. 10 instances of ὅτε occur in the NT, and only one, Ep. Jac. 4.13, is adjectival (Robertson (1919:696–7)).

7. The pronoun αὐτός had two uses in AG (Smyth 296–7, Kühlner-Gerth 651–6, Sadoulet (1982), Taillardat (1987)): in pre-article position, e.g. αὐτός ὁ βασιλεύς, with an identificatory meaning, i.e. "the king himself", or in internal position, e.g. ὁ αὐτός βασιλεύς, with an anaphoric meaning, i.e. "the same king". The demonstrative meaning must stem from this second function, cf. Horrocks (1997a:74–5): "The shift of meaning from "the same" to "this" can readily be explained in terms of overlapping discourse functions, since "the same X" can be used to refer back anaphorically to some previously mentioned entity in much the same way as the true demonstrative "this X"... Once this true deictic use was established, αὐτός began to appear in the pre-articular position".

8. It also abounds, of course, in its original use and environment, i.e. in legal texts; a cursory glance through Miklosich-Müller (1865) will reveal dozens of examples.

9. According to an anonymous reviewer, the analogy is perhaps ἐκεῖ : αὐτόο – ἐκείνος : αὐτόόνος.

10. The first examples of these analogical formations come from dialectal inscriptions of ca.400 BC, according to Dieterich (1898:197).

11. Cf. Bella (1999).

12. The texts chosen were most of those proposed in the anthologies of Valetas (1947), and Motios (1990), and Kechagioğlu (1997), where the full references to them can be found. The entire texts were examined, except when they were too extensive (in which case a sample was taken) or when unaccessible (in which case the anthology sample was examined, noted with !).
13. Except in the nominative, of course, where the clitic form of οὗτος” (in the forms và 'τος and τοῦ 'τος — Joseph 1994) has a very specific and limited usage, so as to be statistically insignificant.

14. (ε)τοίτος is even nowadays the main demonstrative in the dialect of the Ionian islands (Chytiris 1992:228) and in Cyprus (Newton 1972:61), as well as in several other peripheral Greek dialects, e.g. Italian (Katsoyannou 1996:338)).

15. This does not entail that texts previous to the 19th c. are completely reliable sources, in sharp contrast to later ones; the crucial influence of genre evident in Table (1) shows quite the contrary. But from the “institutionalisation” of the katharevousa onwards, one rarely finds fluctuation which can be studied. For example in, "Ο Πατραβάς (1820) a well-known text by the main representative of katharevousa, Adamantios Koraes, οὗτος” is the only proximal demonstrative. On the contrary, in the memoirs of the war hero Kolokotronis (1847, ed. by Valetas (1958)), οὗτος” is used exclusively.

16. According to the concordance to Makriyannis’s works (Kyriazidis (1992)), αὐτός/ αὐτοῦνος/ αὐτεῖνος appears 3544 times, and τοῦνος/τοῦτος” only 102. The prose of Solomos (Η γυναίκα της Ζάκυνθος, Διάλογος) gives attributive αὐτός 20 vs. τοῦτος 8 (Alexiou 1994:481–504, 531–51).

17. Cf. also Jannaris (1897: §1429), commenting on οὗτος in MG: “Its N [=MG] representative τούτος…corresponds rather to ὅδε”.

18. Word-order variation of demonstrative pronouns in MG is an issue that has not been treated in detail in any MG Grammar, except for the remark in some (Mackridge (1985:193), Joseph-Philippaki (1987:52–3), Holton-Mackridge-Philippaki (1997:342)) that the pre-nominal order is the “most frequent” and the post-nominal one “emphatic”; Manolessou-Panagiotidis (1999) show that both assumptions are in fact inexact, as they fail to take into account the context in which the two alternative orders occur. Two different types of text form the corpus of research: scientific-theoretical-continuous discourse on the one hand, and everyday dialogue on the other. Detailed statistics show an overwhelming tendency for post-position in the first type of text, and an almost equally strong tendency for pre-position in the second. In the first type the demonstrative has usually, if not always, “anaphoric” function. It repeats a referent already mentioned above, for purposes of further elaboration or clarification. In the second type of text, the demonstrative is used as a rule in order to refer to the physical, immediate context, or in emotional utterances such as terms of abuse. A full analysis of the syntactic mechanism behind this distribution can be found in Panagiotidis (2000).

19. Cf. Lyons 1999:107: “On both accounts the speaker forms the deictic centre; [± Prox.] is understood in terms of proximity to the speaker, and the person analysis represents the contrast as association with first person or not… Cross-linguistically, this kind of demonstrative system, where the speaker is the primary reference point, is basic… But languages vary on whether person or distance from the speaker is the organising principle”.

20. Cf. Havers (1906).

21. Cf. Klein (1996:36): “The development of anaphoric *so/to- commonly reflected in IE texts… may be the result of the less specific localisation of a second person deictic relative to the proximal or distal deictic”.
22. In fact, it is even doubtful that the Latin tri-personal system reflects an inherited IE situation. Modern scholarship believes it rather to be a Classical Latin, strictly literary, evolution, cf. Keller (1946), Fontán (1965), De Jong (1996). This discussion on the Greek and Latin demonstrative systems does not entail, of course, that the whole notion of a IE tripartite system is to be rejected.

23. According to Lopez-Eire (1993:47–8), this distinction may be valid for Attic only, and not Ionic. For example, in the Hippocratic treatises the manuscript tradition varies between οδη and οότο in cataphoric usages, e.g. Hpc.Vict.248.1 των δε ιηθόων ξηρότατοι μεν ούτωι/οδη: σκορπίος δράκων...

24. The most recent work on demonstratives, Diessel (1999), does not include cataphora in its categorisation of the endophoric (i.e. referring to linguistic entities) functions of demonstratives, which could be taken as an additional indication of its special status.

25. The suggestion is from Horrocks (1997b), but contravenes standard phonological rules of contractions in AG. However, the etymology of οότο is far from settled. There is general acceptance that some form of the demonstrative/article *so is involved in the first part, and it is also suggested that a deictic element -υ-, is present (Klein (1996:35), Rix (1976:184), Chantraine (1968: s.v.), Frisk (1960–70: s.v.)). In any case, this doubtful etymology is not essential to the present argumentation.

26. The issue of demonstrative word-order diachronically (in Ancient, Hellenistic, Mediaeval Greek etc.) is examined in detail in Manolessou (2000), where, on the basis of extensive textual searches and comparisons between alternative versions of a text in various stages of the language, it is shown that the patterning observed in MG does not operate in previous phases of the language.

27. Dunkel (1990:106–7) explains the few Homeric examples of the syntagm δέ έγο as reanalysed survivals of the combination of an invariable δε plus the clause connective — δε, an equivalent of the Vedic so 'harm; he thus reduces even further the possibility of an inherent connection between demonstrative + person in Homer.

28. The suggestion already in Mendoza (1976:96).

29. The only exception being the phrase to-to-we-to in a Pylian tablet, “this year, the present year”, where to-to is usually explained as a reduplicated form of tov rather than the neutral of οότο, since the Linear B spelling rules would require to-u-tov for this word, ou being a true diphthong (Aurra-Jorro 1993 s.v. to-to).

30. This δέ element is usually explained as an enclitic emphatic particle analogous to δη (Rix 1976:184) or the “adversative” δέ (Chantraine 1968: s.v. δέ). However, on the basis of the originally deictic value of this demonstrative, as well as on the analogy of many modern languages exhibiting demonstrative reinforcement through locative expressions (e.g. MG αυτός εδώ, Fr. celui-ci, Sp. este aquí), one could also suggest a connection with the allative ending -δέ, as in οίκονδε. A similar suggestion in Bader (1992:36–7).
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Περίληψη

Το παρόν άρθρο εξετάζει αναλυτικά το πέρασμα από το τριμερές δεικτικό σύστημα της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής (δες — ο έτος — έκεινος) στο διμερές της Νέας (αυτός — εκείνος). Στηρίζεται στην επανερμηνεία του αρχαιοελληνικού δεικτικού συστήματος όχι με βάση τη διάκριση προσώπων (πρώτο — δεύτερο — τρίτο) αλλά την πραγματολογική λειτουργία της δείξεως και της αναφοράς. Η προτεινόμενη εξέλιξη είναι η εξής σταδιακή επέκταση του δεικτικού με αναφορική λειτουργία και σε δεικτικές χρήσεις, πράγμα που οδηγεί σε αμφισβήτηση και σε εξαφάνιση του ενός από τα δύο μέλη της αντιθέσεως και αντικατάστασή του από ένα νέο. Καταδεικνύεται ότι η ελληνική γλώσσα αποτελεί ένα ξεκάθαρο αντιτα-ράδιγμα για τους γενικά αποδεκτούς μηχανισμούς γραμματικοποίησης των δεικτικών.