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Abstract

In this paper we examine the semantics-pragmatics of the deictic motion verb erxome 'come' in central and extended uses. We argue that a detailed language-specific analysis of erxome and its systemic counterpart pijeno 'go' is necessary, since even at the level of basic appropriateness conditions, there are significant differences from other languages. Based on extensive corpus data, we further argue that in third-person discourse erxome is a conventional means of adopting perspective. In particular, we show that the factors which are relevant to the speaker's/narrator's choice to identify with a particular point of view are amenable to a principled description which relies both on discourse parameters and text-sensitive generalizations. Motivating the adoption-of-perspective uses is a subjectification shift whereby the speaker's presence at the goal of motion becomes increasingly more implicit. Our results, therefore, add to the study of deixis in natural languages, point to the existence of generalizations in the complex factors that underlie construal and highlight some of the cognitive mechanisms involved in meaning shifts.
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1. Introduction

The deictic motion verbs "come" and "go" have been a constant part of the description of deixis in natural languages. In this paper, we focus on the Greek verb erxome 'come' aiming to provide both an adequate description and an explanatory account of its deictic component of meaning. We further examine systematically certain uses that are directly related and derivable from the deictic meaning. Finally, we look at some extended uses that, although not deictic, may be still relatable to the person-deixis component of erxome.

Contrary to the assumption in some of the earlier literature (cf. Miller and Johnson Laird 1976) to the effect that the deictic verbs "come" and "go" are semantic universals, we show that even at the level of the basic appropriateness conditions for erxome (and its systemic counterpart pijeno 'go') there are significant differences from other languages. In agreement with the more recent literature (Fillmore 1983; Wilkins and Hill 1995; Goddard

---

1 We would like to thank Sophia Marmaridou, Maria Sifianou and an anonymous reviewer for their comments. We also thank Eleni Leondaridi for help with the Spanish data.

2 Throughout this paper we will be using the English words in quotes to refer to the concepts of coming and going, while the italicized forms refer to the actual verb forms in each language.
1997), we also suggest that detailed language-specific analyses of the deictic motion verbs in different languages are absolutely essential before we arrive at any meaningful generalizations, since differences in the basic semantics of these verbs have significant consequences for the range and type of further uses. Moreover, we argue that not only does erxome exhibit language-specific idiosyncrasies but its distribution is also affected by specific text types which sanction certain uses and prime the occurrence of erxome as opposed to pijeno.

Based on an analysis of extensive corpus data, we identify the core appropriateness conditions for erxome and we show how these are related to and motivate both the directly derivable and the non-deictic uses. We suggest that such uses are not random but lend themselves to generalizations and a principled description. In particular, we argue that erxome is a conventional means of adopting perspective and that an explanatory account of these uses amounts to a principled description of the factors that influence the speaker's/narrator's choice to identify with a particular individual or construe a particular place as significantly salient.

In looking at the deictic, perspectival and non-deictic uses of erxome, our aim is three-fold:

a) We show that the emergence of patterns in the distribution and use of erxome and the possibility of any significant generalizations rely indeed on a detailed analysis of its meaning, sensitive both to language-specific and text-specific characterizations.

b) We highlight the role of the notions of subjectivity and subjectification in motivating the adoption-of-perspective uses of erxome. In the cognitive literature we discuss and in particular in the work of Langacker, subjectivity represents these aspects of the semantics of a word which are firmly grounded into pragmatics; it can, therefore, naturally accommodate the uses of erxome which involve the speaker's/narrator's implicit presence at the scene or the event and her identification with a particular vantage point.

c) We argue that even elementary explanatory adequacy for such data can only be achieved if the governing conditions for the distribution of erxome are informed by semantic, pragmatic and discoursal/textual information and have access to the corresponding levels of analysis. At the same time, such data argue strongly for the necessity of corpus analysis. In cases that involve construal by the speaker/narrator of a particular situation in a particular way and the choice of erxome vs. pijeno does not result in ungrammaticality, the occurrence of erxome can nevertheless be predicted on the basis of certain factors that we identify and discuss. Such predictions are however meaningless in the absence of frequency counts and text-sensitive patterns, making corpus-based analysis not simply desirable but absolutely essential.

2. Appropriateness conditions for erxome and systemic relation to pijeno

It has been common practice to examine the meaning of "come" together with that of "go",
treating the two verbs in various languages as complementary. This practice is evident in dictionary definitions (e.g. OED, CoBuild) where one of these verbs is defined negatively with respect to the other, as well as in the linguistic analyses offered, most notably, for English come and go. Fillmore (1966, 1975, 1982, 1983) is typical of this trend while Goddard (1997) for English and Wilkins and Hill (1995) for Mparntwe Arrernte and Longgu also co-examine "come" and "go" without however defining one in terms of the other. These analyses differ as to whether they attribute deictic semantics to "go" (cf. Miller and Johnson-Laird 1976; Fillmore 1982, 1983) or not (Goddard 1997; Wilkins and Hill 1995). Indeed, we found this distinction useful for Greek as well (we return to this point later on in this section). Looking at the semantics-pragmatics of erxome, we also found it inevitable to examine its meaning together with that of pijeno, since their domains of application appear to be complementary and certain aspects of their respective meanings are best approached in the context of their systemic opposition (cf. also Wilkins and Hill 1995). Before discussing some of the factors which figure crucially in the uses of erxome, we need to review briefly some of the basic insights in the previous literature.

Fillmore (1966, 1975, 1982, 1983) is to our knowledge the first to discuss in considerable detail the meaning of come and go. The conditions accounting for the central meaning of come are basically that the speaker or the addressee is at the goal of motion at utterance or at arrival time, while for go it is simply assumed that the speaker is not located at the goal at the time of the utterance. Extended uses of come, as in (1) and (2)

(1) I came to the front door to let you in, but you had already left.
(2) She'll come home with me.

are handled by further conditions to the effect that for come it can be assumed that the speaker or the addressee is making the same journey (example (2)) or that the goal is the "expected" location of the speaker/addressee at the time of arrival (example (1)). Yet other conditions (transferring the effect of the previous ones in reported speech or third-person discourse) account for the presence of come in examples like (3) and (4):

(3) She asked Fred if I could come to his party.
(4) The men came into her bedroom.

In particular with respect to (4), which indicates that the point of view is the location of the person inside the bedroom, Fillmore notes that in the type of discourse where the identity and location of the speaker (or addressee) plays no role, the narrator is free to choose another character's point of view and this is what sanctions the use of come.

It is exactly this shift of perspective or deictic projection which is disputed in Goddard (1997). He suggests that both the cross-linguistic variation in the extent of deictically projected uses for "come" and the impossibility of deictically projecting "here" and "now" (we take up this point in section 3.1) argue against the existence of such an "inherent human capacity" (Goddard 1997: 158). Rather than restricting the central meaning of come to the purely deictic contexts and then extend the range of uses with further conditions, Goddard proposes a single definition for come and another one for go, which, he suggests, can cover all their respective uses. In both definitions he includes the element of intentionality (willful motion), but he acknowledges an "egocentricity"
difference between go and come, since the definition of come (but not that of go) includes a reference to the speaker: "Someone in this place could think: X is in the same place as me", where "someone" may be the speaker, the addressee, or a third person, whose actual identity is left open to be inferred from the context (Goddard 1997: 159). It is this part of the definition which accounts for the subjective point of view in the meaning of come and distinguishes it from go.

Shared by both analyses is the observation that come is a goal-oriented verb in the sense that the destination of motion is generally known from context. Expectedly, this is true of erxome as well. Nowhere however is there made an explicit connection between the "givenness" of the goal and the location of the speaker. It is, we suggest, crucial to note that if the speaker or the addressee is part of the goal, and in this sense part of the profile of the motion event coded by the verb, then predictably this goal is necessarily known as the location of the speaker. In this lies the initial motivation for the consistent, and apparently cross-linguistic, correlation (cf. Gathercole 1977; Wilkins and Hill 1995) between "come" and known destination. Also shared by all previous analyses is the observation that both purely deictic uses (towards speaker or addressee) and non (or less) deictic ones (towards a third person) are available to English come but also to "come" cross-linguistically, regardless of whether they are accounted for by separate conditions or by one inclusive definition. Indeed, it is exactly the extent of such uses of erxome which has originally motivated our interest in this work. Before taking up such uses in section 3, we need to address the central, purely deictic meaning of erxome.

Turning now to some of the core appropriateness conditions for erxome, it is clear that the domain of application of this verb is more extended than that of English come, and considerably more extended than in Spanish or Japanese where highly specific pragmatic restrictions govern the distribution of "come" (cf. Lyons 1977; Goddard 1997). Besides, it is more extended in a way consistent with the central place of the speaker and her cognitive salience in the semantics of erxome. Consider for example (5):

(5) θα πας σινεμα;  
FUT you-go-PERF cinema  
"Are you going to the movies?"

In contrast to the English translation which can be used in a context where the speaker is also going - in the case where the speaker wishes to distance herself from her interlocutor with a possibly rude effect (cf. Brown and Levinson 1987: 122) - the question in Greek can

---

3 In Langacker's Cognitive Grammar (see selectively Langacker 1987, 1991, 2001), the profile is the entity designated by a semantic structure. It is a substructure within the base (the background frame in more traditional terms) which is obligatorily accessed and functions as the focal point within the scene. For erxome, since the speaker or the addressee (at least in the central deictic uses) is at the goal of motion, they are necessarily profiled, and as such they receive a special degree of prominence.

4 Certain perfective forms of pijeno are taken on by the form pao (see also example (6)).

5 Modern Greek examples are written in a broad phonetic transcription. Examples from the New Testament and Alexander's Narration in 3.2 are written in the Greek alphabet. In the glosses, FUT stands for Future, PERF for Perfective aspect, IMP for Imperfective aspect and DIM for Diminutive.
only be used in a context in which the speaker is not going to the movies as well. In other words, this kind of distancing function which is available to English go, is not available to Greek pijeno. This amounts to saying that the speaker in Greek, if she is (or, in this example, will be) actually part of the motion event, she is obliged to declare her involvement by using erxome (and, conversely, restricting the use of pijeno to the effect that the speaker cannot be at the goal of motion either at utterance or at arrival time). In the same line, consider (6):

1. 

??boro na pao mazi su (ce na m afisis spiti)?
I-can to I-go-PERF with you (and to me you-drop home)
"Can I go with you (and be dropped off at home)?"

Whereas the English translation is appropriate in a context where the speaker merely wishes to leave a party (with the addressee) and be dropped off at her home, in the same context the Greek example is unacceptable as it would require the use of erxome. Since the addressee in this case is involved in the motion event, a Greek speaker would have to "acknowledge" this by saying something like (7):

2. 

boro na er9o mazi su (ce na m afisis spiti)?
I-can to I-come-PERF with you (and to me you-drop home)
"Can I come with you (and be dropped off at home)?"

Notice that example (7) expresses accompaniment which, according to Fillmore (1982, 1983), represents an extension from the central conditions for come since in such contexts come can alternate with go. In Greek, however, if the speaker or addressee is making the same journey then their presence must be explicitly marked by the use of erxome, thus extending obligatory conditions of this verb.

Erxome is therefore positively marked for speaker/addressee involvement and in this sense it is more deictic or deictically anchored than pijeno. Langacker's theory of subjectivity and subjectification (see selectively Langacker 1990, 1993, 1997) is one theory that allows for degrees in the deictic anchoring of words distinguishing, for example, between expressions like yesterday, tomorrow and last year on the one hand (where the ground (speech setting) remains offstage as an implicit/unprofiled reference point), and expressions like I, you, here and now on the other (in which some facet of the ground is put on stage and profiled). Subtle as this may be, we suggest that this is an apt description of the difference between erxome (where the speaker, as we have noted, is profiled as part of the goal) and pijeno (where the speaker's not being at the goal is understood to be part of the base/background). This is exactly the difference that may be obscured by defining pijeno negatively in deictic terms, as for instance in Fillmore's 1983 definition of English go ("the speaker is not located at the goal at the time of the utterance"), on a par with the deictic conditions for erxome. Instead, we wish to claim that an appropriate description for the deictic component of pijeno should specify that it is part of the background and not part of the profiled motion event (that is, the speaker is evidently not at the goal but she need not be at the source or the path of motion either). The deictic aspect of pijeno (speaker is not physically at the goal) is not however easily cancellable as a backgrounded component which suggests that it may be aptly characterized as a presuppositional component of
meaning. So (8), for example, is predictably odd:

(8) ??pijeno sinema ce ime c eyo eci
they-go IMP cinema and I am and I there
"They are going to the movies and I am also there"

The difference in the deictic character of pijeno (with respect to erxome) correlates with another difference between pijeno and its English counterpart. Contrary to what Fillmore (1983) suggests for go (with which Goddard seems to agree), pijeno is not really a source-oriented verb. In other words, it is not that the source of motion is known and retrievable from context (which is naturally related to the fact that the speaker for pijeno may but need not be at the source), but rather that the source is understood as being irrelevant to the specific speech event. So, for example, (9) is weird because, as Fillmore suggests, the source is taken to be a place known from context:

(9) ?? Where did he go from?

But example (10) is weird simply because the source is irrelevant. If it were relevant, Greek speakers would use an inceptive verb like fevno "leave", ksekinao "start" etc.

(10) ??apo pu pijen?
from where he-went PERF
"From where did he go?" 7

So far we have shown that the speaker's/addressee's involvement in the motion event must be declared with the use of erxome, thus extending the obligatory contexts for erxome at the expense of pijeno. We have also suggested that the difference in deictic anchoring between erxome and pijeno can be viewed in terms of a difference between profile and base (foregrounded vs. backgrounded information), the profile including the speaker/addressee for erxome (but not for pijeno). A final condition which is typically associated with erxome is that the initiative or "responsibility" for the motion event lies with the speaker who is/was/will be at the goal of motion; in this sense, erxome can be said to express "guided", "controlled" or even "coerced" motion by the subject-mover. So, for example, (11)

(11) theta erxome sinema?
FUT they-come PERF cinema

6 Although this analysis is only proposed for Greek, the suggested difference in "deicticness" between erxome and pijeno tallies both with Goddard's (1997) description of go as an essentially non-deictic verb and with Wilkins and Hill's (1995) claim that the deictic component of "go" in certain languages is at best a pragmatic implicature arising from its systemic contrast with "come" (even though in Greek it appears to be more of a presupposition than an implicature).

7Example (10) is acceptable only if it is interpreted as a question about the itinerary that was followed but not about the source of the journey.
"Are they coming to the movies?"

where erxome is sanctioned by the speaker making the same journey, imposes a construal in which the speaker, as opposed to the movers (coded by the subject of erxome), has the initiative of the proposed motion. This provides a natural motivation for the accompaniment use of erxome given the central conditions. That is, the central condition of the speaker being at the goal extends to the speaker having the initiative (literally or metaphorically) in the motion event, motivating the accompaniment use (the other person(s) follow(s)). So (11) clearly conveys that it is the speaker's decision to go to the movies and the question is whether "they" (i.e. the subject of erxome) are also going (even if the plan is for them to arrive first). Interestingly, Fillmore (1983) does not mention this at all in the conditions for come, while Goddard (1997: 155, 159) treats it as being equally relevant for come and go, since "X wanted to be somewhere else" appears in the definitions of both verbs. For Greek, however, willful/intentional motion appears to be associated with the subject of pijeno more than with the subject of erxome. Sidestepping the issue of whether such a condition is actually part of the lexical semantics of erxome (and correspondingly of pijeno) or whether it constitutes a pragmatic (and thus cancellable) implicature, we should note that this difference is actually reflected in the fixed and metaphorical expressions involving these two verbs. A perusal even of such expressions shows that inanimate subjects are predominant in fixed and figurative expressions with erxome. Consider, for example, (12a) and (12b) vs. (12c) and (12d):

(12a) mu erxete zalağa
    to-me it-comes-IMP diziness
    "I'm getting dizzy"

(12b) erxete vroxi
    it-comes-IMP rain
    "Rain is coming"

(12c) pijeno kondra
    I-go-IMP against (someone or something)
    "I go against (someone or something)"

(12d) pijeno peripato
    I-go-IMP walk
    "I am going for a walk"

If the deictic conditions already discussed were the only relevant ones for the distribution of pijeno and erxome, then we would expect figurative uses and fixed expressions with inanimate subjects to be equally divided between erxome and pijeno, which however is not the case.

---

8 This particular condition is reminiscent of the condition governing the use of Spanish venir 'come' which is highly restricted. In Spanish, the natural response to (i), for example, is (ii) with ir 'go':

(i) (the lady is calling her maid)
    Amanda, ven aquí. "Amanda, come here!"

(ii) Si, voy. "Yes, I am going."

If, however, the lady keeps calling insistently (thus frustrating Amanda), Amanda may respond with (iii):

(iii) Ya, vengo. "Yes, I'm coming".
Like *come*, *erxome* extends therefore to all contexts covered by Fillmore's (1983) conditions and by Goddard's (1997) definition. Like *come*, *erxome* can express movement towards the speaker/addressee at utterance or at arrival time, towards the speaker's or the addressee's expected or proper location at arrival time, and it can express the movement of someone accompanying the speaker or the addressee in the motion event. Unlike *come*, however, (for which the obligatory contexts are defined by the first two conditions only), all these represent obligatory contexts for *erxome* to the extent that they involve the speaker's or the addressee's physical presence in the motion event; in Greek, as we showed, the speaker's/addressee's physical presence cannot be left implicit but it has to be expressed by *erxome* restricting, by the same token, the contexts for *pijeno*. *Erxome* (like *come*) can also be used when any of the conditions above is transferred to the speaker or the addressee of a reported communication act, as in (13), although in these cases there is clearly a choice between *erxome* and *pijeno*:

(13) _rotise to betro an tha borusa na erdo sto parti tu_

she-asked the Peter if FUT I-could to I-come-PERF to-the party his

"She asked Peter if I could come to his party"

Finally, we suggested that *erxome* is also characterized by the "initiative" of the motion event being with the speaker (as opposed to the mover). While the speaker/addressee involvement being obligatorily declared is clearly part of the lexical semantics of *erxome*, it is possible that the initiative aspect may be a pragmatic implicature, albeit a typical, systematic one.

We have not yet said anything about the uses of *erxome* which are analogous to the uses of *come* covered by Fillmore's (1983) final condition to the effect that in pure third person discourse (i.e. in discourse in which the location of the speaker and the addressee plays no role), the narrator is free to choose a point of view, so that movement toward the place or person whose point of view is chosen can be expressed with *come* (Fillmore 1983: 226). In the next section, we intend to show that these kinds of uses of the verb *erxome* are amenable to generalizations. In other words, there are certain pragmatic, textual and discoursal factors, which independently motivate the narrator's choice to identify with a particular point of view (as opposed to another) and as such can be said to predict (or, more conservatively, to prime) the appearance of third person *erxome*.

As our Spanish-speaking informants tell us, (iii) implies that Amanda is being "dragged" and it is more likely than not that this answer is not meant for the lady to hear.

It is possible, as Goddard (1997) suggests, that even such extended subjective uses can be subsumed under a single lexical definition like the one he proposes for *come*, thus obviating the need for an "inherent human capacity for deictic projection". We intend to show however that such uses are sensitive to factors which are general and systematic enough to warrant description, but which are not easily incorporated into a lexical definition.
3. Adoption of perspective: Motivating factors

We investigated third-person uses of *erxome* in a corpus of Modern Greek literature, a collection of folk tales, student essays of fourth-graders, and the ILSP corpus\(^{10}\), which consists of different genres including literature, newspapers and scientific texts (these we discuss in 3.1). In order to be able to trace diachronic development, albeit partly, we also looked at the use of third person forms in the New Testament and an early Greek text of folk narrative, discussed in 3.2 (the corpus is listed in the appendix). As expected, *erxome* in its extended uses appears only in some types of texts and in certain genres more than in others, while being practically absent from newspapers and scientific discourse (we return to this point later).

The corpus has been examined focusing primarily on literal uses, that is contexts which involve physical change of location. Needless to say that any investigation aiming at completeness must eventually include the metaphorical uses and even the fixed collocational patterns with *erxome* which abound in all texts. Our goal has been two-fold: First, to identify some of the factors that favor the use of *erxome* (as opposed to *pijeno*) in all texts and, secondly, to keep track of the relative frequency of such uses in different types of texts and, where possible, determine the relative importance of these factors for different texts.

In all the examples we discuss in this section, substituting *pijeno* for *erxome* does not of course result in ungrammaticality. It is, however, significant that the factors which we identify as relevant to the speaker's/narrator's choice statistically prime the occurrence of *erxome*, and in cases where more than one factors converge, the appearance of *erxome* is practically exceptionless. In this sense, the free choice of the narrator in Fillmore's (1983) condition is not really free.

3.1. Empathetic deixis in Modern Greek texts

In the uses we discuss in this section neither speaker nor addressee are objectively part of the event. A typical example is (14):

(14) *tin epomeni irôe kapjios episkeptis sto otel de danmark*

The only one objectively present at the hotel is the Marquis de Sade whose perspective is being adopted by the narrator. Before discussing such cases systematically, we would like to suggest that one way of approaching such uses is to view them as instances of subjectification in Langacker's sense (1990, 1991, 1993, 1997). Langacker's analysis relies on the possibility of construing a particular entity or situation either subjectively or objectively. If something is construed with maximal objectivity, then it is salient by virtue of being put on stage as the focus of attention and profiled. As we suggested in section 2,

\(^{10}\) This is the corpus compiled by the Institute for Language and Speech Processing in Greece.
in the central, deictic meaning of \textit{erxome} the speaker or the addressee are part of the predicate's profile, as one of them coincides with the goal of the motion event coded by the verb; they are therefore construed with maximal objectivity. In uses such as those exemplified in (14) and in all the examples that follow, the speaker/narrator has gone, so to speak, off stage, since she is no longer the deictic anchor. However, simply by adopting someone else's perspective, the narrator is implicitly "present" at the scene functioning no longer as the objective landmark of motion but as the invisible observer performing a "mental scanning" (in Langacker's terms again) of the scene or the event. The objectively construed participant of the central meaning has been replaced by the conceptualizer/narrator who reports or narrates from another person's perspective, construing the event subjectively.\footnote{An analogous subjective shift is considered by Langacker (1990: 19) to occur in the meaning of the verb \textit{go} in examples (i) and (ii):}

(i) The hiker went up the hill.
(ii) The highway goes all the way from the valley to the hilltop.

In (ii), unlike (i), there is no objective motion; the highway obviously occupies all points on the path simultaneously without going anywhere. What is "going" is the eye of the implicit viewer/conceptualizer who traces a mental path in a particular direction, from a particular perspective.\footnote{This is in accordance with Bella's (2001) findings that in newspapers proximal place deixics and historic present, that is grammatical markers that have been consistently associated with adoption of perspective and empathy (see the discussion on the free indirect style below), occur almost exclusively in captions.}

If the extended uses of \textit{erxome} are analyzed as instances of subjectification, we have a possible explanation for the fact that such cases are practically absent from journalistic and scientific discourse where implicit adoption of perspective is a priori undesirable\footnote{This is in accordance with Bella's (2001) findings that in newspapers proximal place deixics and historic present, that is grammatical markers that have been consistently associated with adoption of perspective and empathy (see the discussion on the free indirect style below), occur almost exclusively in captions.}. Obviously this is not meant as implying that reporters or scholars are incapable of bias (anything but as a matter of fact), but that they will consciously avoid linguistic choices that will be conventionally recognized by readers as adoption of perspective.

Not surprisingly, one factor that is instrumental in the choice of perspective across different text types is the main figure of the story, the protagonist around whom the story revolves (and in this sense, example (14) is a very characteristic one). In the type of discourse called free indirect style, this is typically the third person subject who has become the "subject of consciousness" (Brinton 1995: 183; Adamson 1995: 208; Wright 1995: 156). Free indirect discourse is commonly understood in literary studies as the representation of events in consciousness, that is as involving narration of consciousness rather than speech or perception. It is standardly associated with a literary technique characterizing the 19th century (English) novel (although it is also traced back to earlier literature), and distinguished from empathetic deixis which is taken to be a "sporadic feature of ordinary language use" (Adamson 1995: 212). In literary studies, such as the ones mentioned above, empathetic deixis is associated with proximal time and place adverbials (i.e. now and here) appearing in free indirect discourse as modifiers of past tense verbs. Hence this representation of events in consciousness is realized through the "was - now" construction or the historic present. A typical example is provided by Brinton (1995: 185),
illustrating the most characteristic linguistic markers of free indirect discourse:

(15) Never had she imagined she could look like that. Is mother right? she thought. And now she hoped her mother was right. (Mansfield, The Garden Party)

Both in the case of a specific narrative style and in that of ordinary language use events are represented as experienced (rather than reported) or, in Lyons (1977) terms, the discourse referent is construed as the discourse agent (i.e. the speaker/narrator). It is this type of construal which allows in either case the use of deictic adverbials of proximity and, in our case, the use of erxome, which signals proximity to speaker (as it involves motion towards her location), even if objectively the goal of motion is not the speaker/narrator but the main figure/protagonist of the narrated event.

Expectedly, all the extensions that hold for the speaker's or the addressee's location in the central uses of erxome are also available to the main figure; just as erxome can be sanctioned by the speaker's or the addressee's present, habitual or expected location, the use of third person forms may be sanctioned by the protagonist's location at the time of the narrated event or his/her habitual or expected location. Consider, for example, (16) and (17):

(16) simera to proi i mama irthe sto dometio me tis paljatres
      today the morning the mum she-came-PERF to-the room with the old-stuff
      "This morning mum came to the room with the old stuff" (Nestlinger/Kasi 1984: 92)

(17) c apo pano na cis ce ti jaja ce ti thia alici
      and from top to you-have and the grandma and the aunt alike
      na rxonde c after stodera
      to they-come-IMP and they to-the Stoder
      "And on top of everything you have grandma and aunt Alice coming to Stoder as well" (Nestlinger/Kasi 1984: 118)

In Nestlinger's story, the protagonist is Sue, a thirteen-year old whose story is being told by the author. In (16), the room referred to in the sentence is Sue's room and she is in that room at the time of the event (her mother's arrival). In (17), Stoder is not yet the location of the main character, Sue, but it will be by the time of grandma's and aunt Alice's arrival, constituting therefore the protagonist's expected location. In example (18) the presence of erxome is sanctioned by the habitual location of the protagonist; the referent of "he" is the new colleague in the ministry where the protagonist works:

(18) apo ti mera pu irthe benovjmenun koritsopula
      from the day that he-came-PERF they-enter-exit girls-DIM
      "Since the day he came, young girls go in and out" (Kontoleon 2000: 13)
It is also clear that sometimes third-person exome can be used to express movement towards a location which is neither the present, nor the habitual or the expected location of the protagonist but is somehow associated with her and has local prominence (and as such represents yet another context). Consider for example (19),

(19) o sulis erçete ce vlepi to japi
the sulis he-comes-IMP and he-sees the construction
"Soulis comes (every now and then) and sees the construction site" (Kontoleon 2000: 87)

where the construction referred to is a house being built by the protagonist who is not there necessarily every time Soulis visits the site.

The global protagonist can be at times overridden by a locally salient character, that is a particular character around which the story revolves in the immediately preceding context. Consider, for instance, (20) and (21):

(20) o mayazatoras c o jos tu erxonte na voldisun to xasapi
the shop-owner and the son his they-come-IMP to they-help the butcher
"The shop owner and his son come to help the butcher" (Nestlinger/A(asi 1984: 173)

(21) irbe c i mama tis poles fores na ti ðì
she-came-PERF and the mother her many times to her she-sees
"Her mother too came to see her many times" (Zei 1987: 295)

In (20) the butcher is established locally as the topic of the paragraph. The protagonist, Sue, is watching the scene from a distance, so it is as if she is adopting the perspective of the local protagonist (the butcher as opposed to the shop owner). The same kind of "double adoption" (the narrator adopts the perspective adopted by the main character) is effected in (21), where "her mother" refers to the mother of the locally established main figure to whom the global protagonist (Achilleas' fiancée in Zei's novel) refers at that point. The location implicitly understood here is Switzerland, established as the goal of motion through being the locus of the locally main figure at the time of the motion event (neither the main protagonist nor, of course, the narrator are there at the time of the narration). In fact, there is no indication that Switzerland is in any way connected with the narrator or the protagonist at all.

So far we have suggested that subjectification, that is the speaker's/author's implicit choice to identify with a particular point of view can be seen as contributing to the coherence of a text, structuring discourse and distinguishing between global and local topics 14. In all the examples discussed (and quite systematically across text types), the

---

14 Subjectivity is already noted in Sweetser and Fauconnier (1996) as one of the things that can be seen as structuring discourse. Let us also note a related claim by Pander Maat and Sanders (2001) that subjectivity - that is the degree of speaker involvement - is relevant to the distribution of causal connectives, motivating again a different kind of discourse coherence. Finally the cognitive notion of subjectivity underlies Mushin's (2001) analysis of evidentiality and epistemological stance in narrative retelling.
The author’s use of third person *erxome* is motivated by the narrator’s identification with the point of view of the protagonist, except in cases where a locally main figure takes precedence, having been previously established as the immediate topic. The locally prominent figure’s perspective may be adopted by the global protagonist first and through him/her by the narrator, as in the examples discussed, or it may be directly adopted by the narrator, as in (22), where the wife is clearly the local topic:

(22) *i jineka aftunu san i̱de pos ̣en ercete o andras tis,*
the wife his when she-saw that not he-comes-IMP the husband her
*pai ston a̱elfo tu ce tu lei...*
she-goes-PEF to-the brother his and to-him she-says...
"His wife, when she saw that her husband was not coming, she goes to his brother and says..." (Folk tales 1979: 287)

Fillmore’s (1983) point that in a carefully constructed story one would not expect the perspective to change freely applies to the novels and the plays in our corpus. Expectedly, however, in the folk tales, the shift of perspective is much more frequent and the narrator(s) rely more heavily on the technique of adopting the perspective of a locally salient figure, who is different at different points of the story.

Cross-cutting the protagonist and the local protagonist factors (which are statistically the salient ones) is another parameter which, in very precisely defined contexts, can overwrite the salience of the main figure’s perspective. This is exemplified in (23), (24) and (25):

(23) *lei sti su na ṛi mesa jati siyura*
she-says to-the Sue to she-come-PEF in because certainly
*θ arpaksi kanena sinaçi*
FUT she-catches some cold
"She (=the grandmother) tells Sue to come inside because she will certainly catch a cold" (Nestlinger/Kasi 1984: 80)

(24) *mesa eγrafe oti i su tu lipi poli ce oti θa prepe*
he-wrote that the Sue to-him she-misses much and that FUT she-should
*na ṛi kamja fora na ton δi*
to she-come-PEF some time to him she-sees
"In it (=in the letter) he wrote that he missed Sue a lot and that she should come and see him some time" (Nestlinger/Kasi 1984: 62)

(25) *i eleni piże ce ton vrike. se stelni kanis?*
the Eleni she-went-PEF and him she-found. you s/he-sends someone?
ton apoyoitepse. irθe na tu zitisi lefta
him she-disappointed. she-came-PEF to him she-ask money
"Eleni went to find him. "Did anybody send you?" (he asked). She disappointed him. She came to ask him for money" (Zei 1987: 20)
In (23), third-person *erxome* codes the perspective of the grandmother who is not a main figure, locally or globally. We suggest that such uses are sanctioned as a reflex of the direct speech usage which is reported in indirect discourse; that is, the grandmother survives as the speaker of the message "come inside", hence the occurrence of *erxome*. In our view, this kind of motivation is another way of achieving prominent figure status, albeit very locally, through being the speaker/sender of the message. In the same line, (24) conveys the feeling that Sue (clearly the global protagonist as already mentioned) is reading her father's letter, converting first person to third but keeping the verb form intact, hence it is the father's perspective which is being coded. As Brown and Levinson (1987: 21) point out, in cases where *come* may alternate with *go*, the choice of *come* stresses the common ground between speaker and hearer and this implies minimal adjustment when reporting, that is when converting direct to indirect speech. It seems to us that this is also the case in the examples just discussed, with the main figure adopting the perspective of her interlocutor in the assumed direct speech. Example (25) can be analyzed in a similar way: Eleni (Achilleas' fiancée) is the protagonist whose perspective is adopted by the author throughout. The narrator renders the first part of the dialogue between Eleni and her interlocutor in direct speech (his words) and the second part in free indirect speech, keeping the verb of the original locution and changing, of course, first person to third.

We now turn to examples from the folk tales, where the mode in the classical terminology of Halliday (1964) can be identified as written but supposedly originating in a story narrated orally in an unplanned way. A typical characteristic of these Greek folk tales is that the whole story advances mainly through dialogues and reports of these dialogues. Expectedly, coherence through a consistent perspective (e.g. the main figure's perspective) is not dominant in this genre. Instead, the choice of *erxome* is determined by the adoption of a locally prominent figure's perspective (as already discussed) and by the predominance of direct discourse and the need to maintain the illusion of live dialogue, i.e. direct speech, even in stretches of indirect discourse. One such technique has been already discussed in relation to examples (23)-(25), where forms of the assumed direct speech survive in its indirect version. An example from the folk tales is (26) where third-person *erxome* is again sanctioned as a residue of the corresponding direct speech (why did you come?):

(26)  

stelni o turogles cirices na rotisune ton ofi ti theli

he-sends the Turogles messengers to they-ask the Ofis what he-wants

cce jati irthe na patti ti xora tu

and why he-came-PERF to he-attacks the country his

"Tourogles sends messengers to ask Ofis what he wants and why he came to attack his country" (Folk tales 1979: 158)

The use of third person *erxome* is also primed by another context, which is typical of the folk narrative genre and practically absent from all the others. As in the previous example, this use is also motivated by the general trend to maintain the direct speech mode, but it differs from it in that *erxome* functions now as an explicit cohesive device. Consider, for instance, (27) and (28):

(24)  

mja mera sikonete o jeros, lei: "kapetanjo, fonakse to pedi

mja mera sikonete o jeros, lei: "kapetanjo, fonakse to pedi
one day he-stands-up the old-man, he-says: "skipper, you-call the child na rði to peði, tu lei... to he-come-PERF here". he-comes-IMP the child, to-him he-says... "One day the old man stands up and says; "Skipper, call the child to come here". The child comes and he tells him..." (Folk tales 1979: 47)

(24) "ela xriso mu puli"... ce tote aﬁtos tha erçete peristeri "you-come-PERF golden my bird"...and then he FUT he-comes-IMP pigeon na nivete sto nero na jinete anthropos to-he-washes-himself in-the water to-he-becomes human "Come my golden bird."... And then he will come as a pigeon to wash himself in the water and become human" (Folk tales 1979: 108)

As in the preceding examples, third person erxome in (27) and (28) is motivated by its use in the preceding direct discourse, but in these cases it also advances the story (it is not a mere reflex of the assumed previous direct speech); so the motion event expressed by erçete in (27) occurs clearly at a different time from the motion event expressed by erði (also a form of erxome) in the preceding clause. In this sense, we can talk of explicit, linguistically coded cohesion, and this is an obligatory context for erxome (we have found no exceptions of the phenomenon in the folk tales).

The final context which correlates strongly with erxome in the folk tales is the one exemplified in (29):

(29) to taça bikane ta saranda koritsja sto xoro, the next-day they-joined the forty girls in-the dance, pije c o janis ekatse apenandi c evlepe. he-went-PERF and the Janis he-sat opposite and he-watched na c i melises irðane ce petaksane here and the bees they-came-PERF and they-flew ce kaman ena stefani pano ap to cefali tis vasilopulas and they-made a wreath over from the head of the princess "In the morning, the forty girls joined the dance, John went too and he sat across (from them) and watched. Here came the bees and they flew and formed a wreath over the princess's head" (Folk tales 1979: 206)

The deictic particle na (for a detailed description see Christidis 1991), by coding inherently the presence of a speaker/observer, forces, for all practical purposes, the appearance of erxome (in other examples it occurs as na su with the same effect), making explicit the implicit presence of the speaker/narrator. It is the presence of na which sanctions also the shift of perspective that occurs within the same paragraph with respect to the previous sentence (John, who is the protagonist, went and watched from a distance but the bees came there). As we have already noted, in this kind of narrative, the shift of perspective is much more frequent but hardly ever arbitrary; one or more of the factors we discussed motivate

15 As in the previous case, pijeno 'go' is of course acceptable in these contexts but we never actually found it.
the shift.

We have here identified some of the factors that prime the use of third-person erxome in Modern Greek texts, some of which appear to define exceptionless patterns in the choice of perspective. We have also shown that the particular type of text under analysis plays a decisive role in the hierarchical ranking of these factors, and we have offered suggestions in this direction in discussing the non-salience of the main (as opposed to the local) protagonist factor in the folk tales (in contrast to the novels and plays) as well as the predominance of direct discourse reflexes in indirect or free indirect speech in this genre of narrative which is written "like oral". We would also suggest that there is a higher probability of occurrence for erxome (as opposed to pijeno) in the case where more than one factor is actually present, which could lead to an obligatory (although not deictic) occurrence of erxome. Some evidence to that effect in the data we have examined can be found in examples like (30):

(30) pijene c eyo erxome. o drakos ti na kani?
   you-go-IMP and I I-come-IMP. the dragon what to he-does?
pijeni sto spiti tis. i ora omos purnuse c i yrja
   he-goes-IMP to-the house her the time however it-passed and the old-woman
den erxotan
   not she-comes-IMP
"Go and I will come" (said by the old woman to the dragon). What could the
dragon do? He goes to her house. But the time was passing and the old woman
was not coming" (Fourth graders' essays)

The first instance of erxome in (30) is in direct speech and corresponds to the prototypical conditions (for the first person) according to which the addressee is at the goal. The second occurrence, erxotan, is triggered by all three factors: a) the previous direct discourse with erxome (cf. examples (27)-(28)), b) the fact that one of the locally prominent figures (i.e. the dragon) is already established at the goal of motion, and c) the fact that the goal is the mover's habitual location. It is not, therefore, an accident that the use of erxotan is here obligatory (none of the speakers we consulted would use pijene in this context), in a type of text which does not a priori favor any of the factors more than the others.

3.2. Social and person - place deixis in earlier Greek texts

In the previous section, we discussed some patterned choices in the use of third-person erxome by authors of Greek texts. Comparison with early Modern Greek texts reveals that all these uses are also present in earlier periods of the language. However, the earlier texts exhibit two more uses which deserve special mention and which are at best marginal in the modern language. One of these is a clear case of social deixis marked by erxome, the other is a case where person and place deixis merge in pragmatically special contexts.

One of the texts we investigated systematically for third-person erxome is the "Narration of Alexander the Macedonian", a popular narrative by Gasparos Gerardos. We chose this text as part of the corpus first, because of its extensive use of third person erxome and secondly because it will ultimately enable us to address some of the diachronic
developments in the use of *erxome*. Written in 1750, the text is based on the oral tradition on Alexander the Great as it was developed in the four centuries of Ottoman rule. It is therefore supposedly a story orally narrated over the years that the author is responsible for putting down in writing. As a genre, consequently, we would expect this narrative to share characteristics with the folk tales. Indeed, we found that the use of third-person *erxome* in reported speech introduced by an explicit verb of communication (e.g. *έπε 'said', *ήκουσεν 'heard', *έμαθεν 'got to know' etc.) is practically exceptionless (compare the corresponding example (26) from the folk tales). Equally exceptionless is its use as a marker of explicit cohesion (analogous to examples (27) - (28) above), confirming our original hypothesis.

We will discuss here a particular characteristic of Alexander's Narration, which shows that the adoption of perspective is a fairly systematic deal even in texts which are written versions of an oral tradition. A striking feature of Alexander's story is the systematic use of third-person *erxome* to mark motion of a less powerful/lower status character towards a higher status/more powerful one. In the main body of the text narrating Alexander's deeds as a king and a conqueror, all other characters "come" towards him, quite expectedly, as he constitutes the global protagonist and the most powerful figure of the story. Interestingly, however, when Alexander is still young he "comes" towards his father, Philippos, who is at the time the center of power and decision making, e.g. (31):

(31) *Καὶ εὑρίσκειν ὁ Ἀλέξανδρος νὰ ἐλθεῖ πρὸς τὸν κύριον Φιλίππον καὶ ἐσερνεῖ ζωντανοὺς δέκα χιλιάδες*  
And Alexander turned back to come to (the) king Philip and he dragged ten thousand prisoners alive*  
(Gerardos 1750:par. 29)

Similarly, the Egyptian magician Ektenavos "came" to Alexander's mother Olimpias, although at that point the story revolves around both characters, thus making them equally prominent in terms of local salience but not in terms of status, e.g. (32):

(32) *Πώς ἠλθεὶν ὁ Εκτεναβὸς εἰς τὴν βασιλίσσα τὴν Ὀλυμπιάδα.*  
How he-came-PERF the Ektenavos to the queen Olimpias*  
(Gerardos 1750:par. 8)

Predictably, however, a simple soldier "came" to Ektenavos, e.g. (33):

(33) *Πώς ἠλθεὶν ὁ στρατιώτης Βερβέρης εἰς τὸν Εκτεναβόν.*  
How he-came-PERF the soldier Ververis to the Ektenavos*  
(Gerardos 1750:par. 4)

In our data, this is the clearest case of social deixis (cf. Verschueren 1999: 20 on social and person deixis). In the prologue of the text's critical edition, Veloudis (1977: μ) notes that the characters in Alexander's popular books "are determined by two necessary and sufficient conditions: Their name and their status in the social hierarchy". Ordinary people play a marginal role in these narratives, while kings, queens and their offspring, and the generals in Alexander's army are positioned along a strict hierarchy. In view of this, it is
hardly surprising that specific linguistic elements, like the use of *erxome* we identify here, are sensitive to the social structure which permeates the narrative constituting an independent, text-specific parameter.16

All uses of third person *erxome* discussed so far have been examples of what is normally referred to in the literature as person deixis (as distinct from place deixis), although we strongly feel that in *erxome* the distinction is less than self evident (in the sense that the goal is defined as the location of the speaker or the individual with whom the speaker/narrator identifies herself). However, there is yet another pattern of third person *erxome* in which the goal does not include in any obvious sense the speaker or the main/local protagonist or, in fact, any person at all, and in this sense it seems to distinguish prima facie between person and place deixis. This use appears to have been productive in earlier texts, at least as early as the New Testament. Consider, for instance, (34) where Jesus "comes" to a town (Sihar) although no character of the narrative (whether main or locally salient) is located there:

\[(34) \text{"And he had to go through Samaria. So he comes to a town in Samaria called Sihar..." (John Δ, 4-5)}\]

Such uses of *erxome* in the New Testament are, as we suggest, accompanied by the following conditions: a) the location (goal of motion) has been already mentioned and is therefore established in the consciousness of both narrator and reader, and b) events will take place at that location which the narrator describes in detail. In other words, the location triggering third-person *erxome* is identifiable as the place where phases of the protagonist's action are going to take place, which the narrator considers worth highlighting.

Interestingly, the same conditions are applicable to analogous uses of third-person *erxome* in Alexander's Narration. Once the location in question is mentioned as the goal of motion for the (globally or locally) main character, reference to this motion through *erxome* signals to the reader that important actions will take place there, of which the narrator will provide detailed accounts17, e.g. (35), where Macedonia has been established in the immediately preceding context as the locus of future action which is detailed in the text following the particular example:

16 These observations may be ultimately relatable to Levinson's (1983) and Marmaridou's (2000: 99) parameter of "relative rank" in social deixis, although this has only been used in relation to referring expressions. As Levinson (1983:64) notes, "to capture the social aspects of deixis, we would need to add at least one further dimension, say of relative rank, in which the speaker is socially higher, lower or equal to the addressee and other persons that might be referred to".

17 This particular function of *erxome* is in our view analogous to that of proximal deictics used for text referring cataphora (Fillmore 1982: 53-54), e.g. *Here's what I propose*, or *This is his message*. In both cases, a deictic expression defined with respect to the presence or proximity of the speaker is used to signal something in upcoming discourse.
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(35) O Kantarkousis ἠλθεν εἰς τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ ἠφέρε
the Kandarkousis he-came-PERF to the Macedonia and he-brought
τὴν χρυσοβουλιωμένην επιστολήν
the golden-sealed letter
"Kantarkousis came to Macedonia and brought the golden-sealed letter"
(Gerardos 1750:par. 41)

The juxtaposition of erxome and pijeno in Alexander's Narration is in fact further revealing as to place deixis. The text is divided into small chapters each consisting of one to three paragraphs and bearing a title which sums up the events to be narrated in the main body of the chapter. Interestingly, and we would like to claim predictably, pijeno may appear in the title and erxome in the main text, although they both refer to the same event, e.g. (36) vs. (37):

(36) Πῶς επήγεν ο Αλέξανδρος εἰς τὸ βασίλειον τῆς θαυμαστῆς Κανδάκης
how he-went-PERF the Alexander to the kingdom of the admirable Kandaki
"How Alexander went to the kingdom of admirable Kandaki" (Gerardos 1750: par. 224, title)

(37) Καὶ εσπεύθην πάλιν από εκεῖ ο Αλέξανδρος καὶ ἠλθεν
and he-started-off again from there the Alexander and he-came-PERF
εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν Ἀμαστρίδων
to the land of the Amastrides
"And Alexander started off again from there and came to the territory of Amastrides" (i.e. the Kandaki kingdom) (Gerardos 1750:par. 224, beginning of the main text)

The goal of motion in these examples is thus introduced with pijeno. Once the goal is established, erxome is used in the following text where the details of the mover's action will be described by the narrator.

Summing up, the extensive use of erxome in these earlier texts is illuminating as to the relation between person and place deixis. The goal of motion in both kinds of deixis coincides with a known location; it is established in the consciousness of the addressee/reader, either as the location of the speaker/narrator/main figure (for the clear case of person deixis), or, and here lies the motivation for the apparently weird early Greek uses, as an important, salient location to which the narrator attracts the reader's attention precisely because it is the focus of the main figure's future action.

4. Conclusions

Let us summarize our results briefly. We have investigated the uses of erxome in different types of texts and at different periods of the language, showing that both a language-specific detailed description of its semantics-pragmatics and a text-sensitive analysis are required in order to arrive at any generalizations about the distribution of this verb and its occurrence instead of pijeno. A central condition for erxome, determining the obligatory
contexts of its appearance, is that the speaker's or the addressee's physical presence at the goal of motion must be declared. As a consequence, the domain of application of pijkeno is more restricted than that of go, since "distancing" functions (in which the speaker wishes to "conceal" her presence placing a distance between herself and her interlocutor), or accompaniment uses in which either speaker or addressee is involved are not available to the Greek verb and are obligatorily expressed by erxome. We have also suggested that erxome is characterized by an "initiative with the speaker" (as opposed with the mover) aspect to its meaning, leaving open the possibility that this could be an implicature arising from the "speaker-as-goal" semantics of the verb.

Moving on to the adoption of perspective uses, we have argued that a natural way of describing these is to view them as instances of subjectification in Langacker's sense, that is as meaning shifts involving the speaker's/narrator's "moving" from the profiled to the non-profiled part of the predication. This accounts both for the intuition of an "invisible" observer/narrator and for the adoption of the perspective of a third person. Subsuming such uses under a single definition (as in Goddard's definition for come) may be possible; a similar approach for erxome, however, cannot account for the fact that these uses (unlike the central ones) involve construal and therefore a real choice of the speaker/narrator between erxome and pijkeno. At the same time, as we have shown, the "free choice" of the narrator (stated in Fillmore's relevant condition) and the context-inferred identity of the "someone" in Goddard's definition are not really so free in the case of erxome, since the factors we discussed constrain the speaker's/narrator's choice and determine completely general, and in this sense obligatory, patterns in the texts we analyzed.

Such factors are dependent on specific text types and in this sense the analysis relies on textual information. So in the novels and the plays the adoption of perspective is basically governed by factors that have been partly identified as characteristic of a particular style (the free indirect style), except that in Greek the appearance of third-person erxome is even more extensive (i.e. it is primed by more contexts). These contexts include the globally or locally main figure's perspective and what we have called "double adoption" of perspective going through the narrator and the main figure. These contexts can be also identified in the folk tales as triggering the presence of erxome but there they are commonly overridden by the contexts of reported speech mirroring the preceding direct discourse or indirect speech reflecting an assumed direct discourse. These two contexts together with that defined by the proximal deictic particle na correlate uniquely with erxome in the folk tales and appear to be characteristic of oral narratives conveyed in written mode. Finally, the investigation of the two texts of earlier Greek revealed that, while all these factors are at work in the earlier periods of the language as well, the additional parameters of social deixis and place (motivated through person) deixis also trigger uses of erxome which, though no longer current, are fairly systematic in the earlier texts. In these texts, it is clear that erxome marks conventionally purely discoursal factors like the social ranking of characters and, as a person-place deictic, highly specific information about the future part of the narration.

From our survey of the data, it is evident that the semantics of the deictic motion verb erxome (necessarily pragmatic by its very nature) interact with discoursal and textual factors in motivating the occurrence of third person forms and in stating generalizations about their distribution. Such factors are commonly treated separately in the literature, in terms of either lexical semantics or discourse analysis. However, following Langacker
(2001: 143), we can view lexical structures of whatever length as "instructions to modify a certain discourse state" (cf. also Rubba 1996), allowing for a unified treatment of these factors in terms of discourse expectations. At the very least, we believe that we have shown that any generalization about the use of third-person erxome must draw on information from semantic, pragmatic, discourse and text levels.

Appendix

Corpus

- Παραθέμα του λαού μας (Folk tales of our people), ed. by Γιώργος Ιωάννου (Giorgos Ioannou). 1979. Athens: Ermis.
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