



FACHLITERATUR
EDITION ROMIOSINI
ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΗ



ICGL12 | 12th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON GREEK LINGUISTICS
16 – 19 SEPTEMBER 2015
FREIE UNIVERSITÄT BERLIN, CEMOG

Proceedings of the ICGL12

vol. 1

The International Conference on Greek Linguistics is a biennial meeting on the study and analysis of Greek (Ancient, Medieval and Modern), placing particular emphasis on the later stages of the language.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE ICGL12
ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ ICGL12

**Thanasis Georgakopoulos, Theodossia-Soula Pavlidou, Miltos Pechlivanos,
Artemis Alexiadou, Jannis Androutsopoulos, Alexis Kalokairinos,
Stavros Skopeteas, Katerina Stathi (Eds.)**

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE 12TH INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON GREEK LINGUISTICS**

**ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ ΤΟΥ 12^{ΟΥ} ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ
ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ**

VOL. 1



© 2017 Edition Romiosini/CeMoG, Freie Universität Berlin. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.
Vertrieb und Gesamtherstellung: Epubli (www.epubli.de)
Satz und Layout: Rea Papamichail / Center für Digitale Systeme, Freie Universität Berlin
Gesetzt aus Minion Pro
Umschlaggestaltung: Thanasis Georgiou, Yorgos Konstantinou
Umschlagillustration: Yorgos Konstantinou

ISBN 978-3-946142-34-8
Printed in Germany

Online-Bibliothek der Edition Romiosini:
www.edition-romiosini.de

*Στη μνήμη του Gaberell Drachman (†10.9.2014)
και της Αγγελικής Μαλικούτη-Drachman (†4.5.2015)
για την τεράστια προσφορά τους στην ελληνική γλωσσολογία
και την αγάπη τους για την ελληνική γλώσσα*

ΣΗΜΕΙΩΜΑ ΕΚΔΟΤΩΝ

Το 12ο Διεθνές Συνέδριο Ελληνικής Γλωσσολογίας (International Conference on Greek Linguistics/ICGL12) πραγματοποιήθηκε στο Κέντρο Νέου Ελληνισμού του Ελεύθερου Πανεπιστημίου του Βερολίνου (Centrum Modernes Griechenland, Freie Universität Berlin) στις 16-19 Σεπτεμβρίου 2015 με τη συμμετοχή περίπου τετρακοσίων συνέδρων απ' όλον τον κόσμο.

Την Επιστημονική Επιτροπή του ICGL12 στελέχωσαν οι Θανάσης Γεωργακόπουλος, Θεοδοσία-Σούλα Παυλίδου, Μίλτος Πεχλιβάνος, Άρτεμις Αλεξιάδου, Δώρα Αλεξοπούλου, Γιάννης Ανδρουτσόπουλος, Αμαλία Αρβανίτη, Σταύρος Ασημακόπουλος, Αλεξάνδρα Γεωργακοπούλου, Κλεάνθης Γκρώμαν, Σαβίνα Ιατρίδου, Mark Janse, Brian Joseph, Αλέξης Καλοκαιρινός, Ναπολέον Κάτσος, Ευαγγελία Κορδώνη, Αμαλία Μόζερ, Ελένη Μπουτουλούση, Κική Νικηφορίδου, Αγγελική Ράλλη, Άννα Ρούσου, Αθηνά Σιούπη, Σταύρος Σκοπετέας, Κατερίνα Στάθη, Μελίτα Σταύρου, Αρχόντω Τερζή, Νίνα Τοπιντζή, Ιάνθη Τσιμπλή και Σταυρούλα Τσιπλάκου.

Την Οργανωτική Επιτροπή του ICGL12 στελέχωσαν οι Θανάσης Γεωργακόπουλος, Αλέξης Καλοκαιρινός, Κώστας Κοσμάς, Θεοδοσία-Σούλα Παυλίδου και Μίλτος Πεχλιβάνος.

Οι δύο τόμοι των πρακτικών του συνεδρίου είναι προϊόν της εργασίας της Εκδοτικής Επιτροπής στην οποία συμμετείχαν οι Θανάσης Γεωργακόπουλος, Θεοδοσία-Σούλα Παυλίδου, Μίλτος Πεχλιβάνος, Άρτεμις Αλεξιάδου, Γιάννης Ανδρουτσόπουλος, Αλέξης Καλοκαιρινός, Σταύρος Σκοπετέας και Κατερίνα Στάθη.

Παρότι στο συνέδριο οι ανακοινώσεις είχαν ταξινομηθεί σύμφωνα με θεματικούς άξονες, τα κείμενα των ανακοινώσεων παρατίθενται σε αλφαβητική σειρά, σύμφωνα με το λατινικό αλφάβητο· εξαίρεση αποτελούν οι εναρκτήριες ομιλίες, οι οποίες βρίσκονται στην αρχή του πρώτου τόμου.

Η Οργανωτική Επιτροπή του ICGL12

ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΑ

Σημείωμα εκδοτών	7
Περιεχόμενα	9
Peter Mackridge: <i>Some literary representations of spoken Greek before nationalism(1750-1801)</i>	17
Μαρία Σηφιανού: <i>Η έννοια της ευγένειας στα Ελληνικά</i>	45
Σπυριδούλα Βαρλοκώστα: <i>Syntactic comprehension in aphasia and its relationship to working memory deficits</i>	75
Ευαγγελία Αχλάδη, Αγγελική Δούρη, Ευγενία Μαλικούτη & Χρυσάνθη Παρασχάκη-Μπαράν: <i>Γλωσσικά λάθη τουρκόφωνων μαθητών της Ελληνικής ως ξένης/δεύτερης γλώσσας: Ανάλυση και διδακτική αξιοποίηση</i>	109
Κατερίνα Αλεξανδρή: <i>Η μορφή και η σημασία της διαβάθμισης στα επίθετα που δηλώνουν χρώμα</i>	125
Eva Anastasi, Ageliki Logotheti, Stavri Panayiotou, Marilena Serafim & Charalambos Themistocleous: <i>A Study of Standard Modern Greek and Cypriot Greek Stop Consonants: Preliminary Findings</i>	141
Anna Anastassiadis-Symeonidis, Elisavet Kiourti & Maria Mitsiaki: <i>Inflectional Morphology at the service of Lexicography: ΚΟΜΟΛεξ, A Cypriot Morphological Dictionary</i>	157

Γεωργία Ανδρέου & Ματίνα Τασιούδη: <i>Η ανάπτυξη του λεξιλογίου σε παιδιά με Σύνδρομο Απνοιών στον Ύπνο</i>	175
Ανθούλα- Ελευθερία Ανδρεσάκη: <i>Ιατρικές μεταφορές στον δημοσιογραφικό λόγο της κρίσης: Η οπτική γωνία των Γερμανών</i>	187
Μαρία Ανδριά: <i>Προσεγγίζοντας θέματα Διαγλωσσικής Επίδρασης μέσα από το πλαίσιο της Γνωσιακής Γλωσσολογίας: ένα παράδειγμα από την κατάκτηση της Ελληνικής ως L2</i>	199
Spyros Armostis & Kakia Petinou: <i>Mastering word-initial syllable onsets by Cypriot Greek toddlers with and without early language delay</i>	215
Julia Bacskai-Atkari: <i>Ambiguity and the Internal Structure of Comparative Complements in Greek</i>	231
Costas Canakis: <i>Talking about same-sex parenthood in contemporary Greece: Dynamic categorization and indexicality</i>	243
Michael Chiou: <i>The pragmatics of future tense in Greek</i>	257
Maria Chondrogianni: <i>The Pragmatics of the Modern Greek Segmental Markers</i>	269
Katerina Christopoulou, George J. Xydopoulos & Anastasios Tsangalidis: <i>Grammatical gender and offensiveness in Modern Greek slang vocabulary</i>	291
Aggeliki Fotopoulou, Vasiliki Foufi, Tita Kyriacopoulou & Claude Martineau: <i>Extraction of complex text segments in Modern Greek</i>	307
Αγγελική Φωτοπούλου & Βούλα Γιούλη: <i>Από την «Έκφραση» στο «Πολύτροπο»: σχεδιασμός και οργάνωση ενός εννοιολογικού λεξικού</i>	327
Marianthi Georgalidou, Sofia Lampropoulou, Maria Gasouka, Apostolos Kostas & Xanthippi Foulidi: <i>“Learn grammar”: Sexist language and ideology in a corpus of Greek Public Documents</i>	341
Maria Giagkou, Giorgos Fragkakis, Dimitris Pappas & Harris Papageorgiou: <i>Feature extraction and analysis in Greek L2 texts in view of automatic labeling for proficiency levels</i>	357

Dionysis Goutsos, Georgia Fragaki, Irene Florou, Vasiliki Kakousi & Paraskevi Savvidou: <i>The Diachronic Corpus of Greek of the 20th century: Design and compilation</i>	369
Kleanthes K. Grohmann & Maria Kambanaros: <i>Bilectalism, Comparative Bilingualism, and the Gradience of Multilingualism: A View from Cyprus</i>	383
Günther S. Henrich: „Γεωγραφία νεωτερική“ στο Λίβιστρος και Ροδάμνη: μετατόπιση ονομάτων βαλτικών χωρών προς την Ανατολή;.....	397
Noriyo Hoozawa-Arkenau & Christos Karvounis: <i>Vergleichende Diglossie - Aspekte im Japanischen und Neugriechischen: Veritäten - Interferenz</i>	405
Μαρία Ιακώβου, Ηριάννα Βασιλειάδη-Λιναρδάκη, Φλώρα Βλάχου, Όλγα Δήμα, Μαρία Καββαδία, Τατιάνα Κατσίνα, Μαρίνα Κουτσουμπού, Σοφία-Νεφέλη Κύτρου, Χριστίνα Κωστάκου, Φρόσω Παππά & Σταυριαλένα Περρέα: <i>ΣΕΠΙΜΕ2: Μια καινούρια πηγή αναφοράς για την Ελληνική ως Γ2</i>	419
Μαρία Ιακώβου & Θωμαΐς Ρουσουλιώτη: <i>Βασικές αρχές σχεδιασμού και ανάπτυξης του νέου μοντέλου αναλυτικών προγραμμάτων για τη διδασκαλία της Ελληνικής ως δεύτερης/ξένης γλώσσας</i>	433
Μαρία Καμηλάκη: «Μαζί μου ασχολείσαι, πόσο μαλάκας είσαι!»: Λέξεις-ταμπού και κοινωνιογλωσσικές ταυτότητες στο σύγχρονο ελληνόφωνο τραγούδι.....	449
Μαρία Καμηλάκη, Γεωργία Κατσούδα & Μαρία Βραχιονίδου: <i>Η εννοιολογική μεταφορά σε λέξεις-ταμπού της ΝΕΚ και των νεοελληνικών διαλέκτων</i>	465
Eleni Karantzola, Georgios Mikros & Anastassios Papaioannou: <i>Lexico-grammatical variation and stylometric profile of autograph texts in Early Modern Greek</i>	479
Sviatlana Karpava, Maria Kambanaros & Kleanthes K. Grohmann: <i>Narrative Abilities: MAINing Russian–Greek Bilingual Children in Cyprus</i>	493
Χρήστος Καρβούνης: <i>Γλωσσικός εξαρχαϊσμός και «ιδεολογική» νόρμα: Ζητήματα γλωσσικής διαχείρισης στη νέα ελληνική</i>	507

Demetra Katis & Kiki Nikiforidou: <i>Spatial prepositions in early child Greek: Implications for acquisition, polysemy and historical change</i>	525
Γεωργία Κατσούδα: <i>Το επίθημα -ούνα στη ΝΕΚ και στις νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα</i>	539
George Kotzoglou: <i>Sub-extraction from subjects in Greek: Its existence, its locus and an open issue</i>	555
Veranna Kyprioti: <i>Narrative, identity and age: the case of the bilingual in Greek and Turkish Muslim community of Rhodes, Greece</i>	571
Χριστίνα Λύκου: <i>Η Ελλάδα στην Ευρώπη της κρίσης: Αναπαραστάσεις στον ελληνικό δημοσιογραφικό λόγο</i>	583
Nikos Liosis: <i>Systems in disruption: Propontis Tsakonian</i>	599
Katerina Magdou, Sam Featherston: <i>Resumptive Pronouns can be more acceptable than gaps: Experimental evidence from Greek</i>	613
Maria Margarita Makri: <i>Opos identity comparatives in Greek: an experimental investigation</i>	629
2ος Τόμος	
Περιεχόμενα	651
Vasiliki Makri: <i>Gender assignment to Romance loans in Katoitaliótika: a case study of contact morphology</i>	659
Evgenia Malikouti: <i>Usage Labels of Turkish Loanwords in three Modern Greek Dictionaries</i>	675
Persephone Mamoukari & Penelope Kambakis-Vougiouklis: <i>Frequency and Effectiveness of Strategy Use in SILL questionnaire using an Innovative Electronic Application</i>	693

Georgia Maniati, Voula Gotsoulia & Stella Markantonatou: <i>Contrasting the Conceptual Lexicon of ILSP (CL-ILSP) with major lexicographic examples</i>	709
Γεώργιος Μαρκόπουλος & Αθανάσιος Καρασίμος: <i>Πολυεπίπεδη επισημείωση του Ελληνικού Σώματος Κειμένων Αφασικού Λόγου</i>	725
Πωλίνα Μεσηνιώτη, Κατερίνα Πούλιου & Χριστόφορος Σουγανίδης: <i>Μορφοσυντακτικά λάθη μαθητών Τάξεων Υποδοχής που διδάσκονται την Ελληνική ως Γ2</i>	741
Stamatia Michalopoulou: <i>Third Language Acquisition. The Pro-Drop-Parameter in the Interlanguage of Greek students of German</i>	759
Vicky Nanousi & Arhonto Terzi: <i>Non-canonical sentences in agrammatism: the case of Greek passives</i>	773
Καλομοίρα Νικολού, Μαρία Ξεφτέρη & Νίτσα Παραχεράκη: <i>Το φαινόμενο της σύνθεσης λέξεων στην κυκλαδοκρητική διαλεκτική ομάδα</i>	789
Ελένη Παπαδάμου & Δώρας Κ. Κυριαζής: <i>Μορφές διαβαθμιστικής αναδίπλωσης στην ελληνική και στις άλλες βαλκανικές γλώσσες</i>	807
Γεράσιμος Σοφοκλής Παπαδόπουλος: <i>Το δίπολο «Εμείς και οι Άλλοι» σε σχόλια αναγνωστών της Lifo σχετικά με τη Χρυσή Αυγή</i>	823
Ελένη Παπαδοπούλου: <i>Η συνδυαστικότητα υποκοριστικών επιθημάτων με β' συνθετικό το επίθημα -άκι στον διαλεκτικό λόγο</i>	839
Στέλιος Πιπερίδης, Πένυ Λαμπροπούλου & Μαρία Γαβριηλίδου: <i>clarin:el. Υποδομή τεκμηρίωσης, διαμοιρασμού και επεξεργασίας γλωσσικών δεδομένων</i>	851
Maria Pontiki: <i>Opinion Mining and Target Extraction in Greek Review Texts</i>	871
Anna Roussou: <i>The duality of mīpos</i>	885

Stathis Selimis & Demetra Katis: <i>Reference to static space in Greek: A cross-linguistic and developmental perspective of poster descriptions</i>	897
Evi Sifaki & George Tsoulas: <i>XP-V orders in Greek</i>	911
Konstantinos Sipitanos: <i>On desiderative constructions in Naousa dialect</i>	923
Eleni Staraki: <i>Future in Greek: A Degree Expression</i>	935
Χριστίνα Τακούδα & Ευανθία Παπαευθυμίου: <i>Συγκριτικές διδακτικές πρακτικές στη διδασκαλία της ελληνικής ως Γ2: από την κριτική παρατήρηση στην αναπλαισίωση</i>	945
Alexandros Tantos, Giorgos Chatzioannidis, Katerina Lykou, Meropi Papatheohari, Antonia Samara & Kostas Vlachos: <i>Corpus C58 and the interface between intra- and inter-sentential linguistic information</i>	961
Arhonto Terzi & Vina Tsakali: <i>The contribution of Greek SE in the development of locatives</i>	977
Paraskevi Thomou: <i>Conceptual and lexical aspects influencing metaphor realization in Modern Greek</i>	993
Nina Topintzi & Stuart Davis: <i>Features and Asymmetries of Edge Geminates</i>	1007
Liana Tronci: <i>At the lexicon-syntax interface Ancient Greek constructions with ἔχειν and psychological nouns</i>	1021
Βίλλυ Τσάκωνα: <i>«Δημοκρατία είναι 4 λύκοι και 1 πρόβατο να ψηφίζουν για φαγητό»:Αναλύοντας τα ανέκδοτα για τους/τις πολιτικούς στην οικονομική κρίση</i>	1035
Ειρήνη Τσαμαδοῦ- Jacobberger & Μαρία Ζέρβα: <i>Εκμάθηση ελληνικών στο Πανεπιστήμιο Στρασβούργου: κίνητρα και αναπαραστάσεις</i> ...	1051
Stavroula Tsiplakou & Spyros Armostis: <i>Do dialect variants (mis)behave? Evidence from the Cypriot Greek koine</i>	1065
Αγγελική Τσόκογλου & Σύλα Κλειδή: <i>Συζητώντας τις δομές σε -οντας</i>	1077

Αλεξιάννα Τσότσου:	
<i>Η μεθοδολογική προσέγγιση της εικόνας της Γερμανίας στις ελληνικές εφημερίδες</i>	1095
Anastasia Tzilinis:	
<i>Begründendes Handeln im neugriechischen Wissenschaftlichen Artikel: Die Situierung des eigenen Beitrags im Forschungszusammenhang.....</i>	1109
Κυριακούλα Τζωρτζάτου, Αργύρης Αρχάκης, Άννα Ιορδανίδου & Γιώργος Ι. Ευδόπουλος:	
<i>Στάσεις απέναντι στην ορθογραφία της Κοινής Νέας Ελληνικής: Ζητήματα ερευνητικού σχεδιασμού</i>	1123
Nicole Vassalou, Dimitris Papazachariou & Mark Janse:	
<i>The Vowel System of Mišótika Cappadocian</i>	1139
Marina Vassiliou, Angelos Georgharas, Prokopis Prokopidis & Haris Papageorgiou:	
<i>Co-referring or not co-referring? Answer the question!.....</i>	1155
Jeroen Vis:	
<i>The acquisition of Ancient Greek vocabulary.....</i>	1171
Christos Vlachos:	
<i>Mod(aliti)es of lifting wh-questions.....</i>	1187
Ευαγγελία Βλάχου & Κατερίνα Φραντζή:	
<i>Μελέτη της χρήσης των ποσοδεικτών λίγο-λιγάκι σε κείμενα πολιτικού λόγου</i>	1201
Madeleine Voga:	
<i>Τι μας διδάσκουν τα ρήματα της ΝΕ σχετικά με την επεξεργασία της μορφολογίας.....</i>	1213
Werner Voigt:	
<i>«Σεληνάκι μου λαμπρό, φέγγε μου να περπατώ ...» oder: warum es in dem bekannten Lied nicht so, sondern eben φεγγαράκι heißt und ngr. φεγγάρι</i>	1227
Μαρία Βραχιονίδου:	
<i>Υποκοριστικά επιρρήματα σε νεοελληνικές διαλέκτους και ιδιώματα</i>	1241
Jeroen van de Weijer & Marina Tzakosta:	
<i>The Status of *Complex in Greek.....</i>	1259
Theodoros Xioufis:	
<i>The pattern of the metaphor within metonymy in the figurative language of romantic love in modern Greek.....</i>	1275

SUB-EXTRACTION FROM SUBJECTS IN GREEK: ITS EXISTENCE, ITS LOCUS AND AN OPEN ISSUE

George Kotzoglou
University of the Aegean
gkatz@rhodes.aegean.gr

Περίληψη

Στο άρθρο αυτό εξετάζουμε ορισμένα χαρακτηριστικά της ερωτηματικής (*wh*-) εξαγωγής από υποκείμενα στα ελληνικά. Παρατηρούμε ότι δομές εξαγωγής από υποκείμενα είναι γραμματικές, σε αντίθεση με ό,τι συμβαίνει στα αγγλικά και εξετάζουμε τις αιτίες που κάνουν ορισμένους ομιλητές να θεωρούν τις δομές αυτές ελαφρώς αποκλίνουσες. Στη συνέχεια, υποστηρίζεται ότι οι εν λόγω δομές στα ελληνικά είναι αυθεντικές (κατά Uriagereka 2012) και ότι σε αυτές η εξαγωγή λαμβάνει χώρα από την επιφανειακή θέση του υποκειμένου και όχι από τη θεματική θέση (σε αντίθεση με τη πρόταση του Chomsky 2008). Τέλος, εξετάζεται το ζήτημα της διαφοράς μεταξύ εξαγωγών από προρηματικά υποκείμενα και εξαγωγών από προρηματικές φράσεις σε θέση αριστερής μετατόπισης με κλιτικό.

Keywords: sub-extraction from subjects; locality; bounding; *wh*-movement; Greek

1. Introduction

The ungrammaticality of *wh*-sub-extraction from subjects has recently become a hotly debated issue in the syntactic literature,¹ as the demise of CED-based and

¹ The properties of constructions such as (1) in have been recently discussed in Broekhuis (2005), Rizzi (2006), Gallego & Uriagereka (2007), Boeckx (2012), Chomsky (2008), Jurka (2010), Gallego (2010), Müller (2011), Uriagereka (2012), Bianchi & Chesi (2014), among many others.

government-based explanations of left branch extraction had left examples such as (1) unaccounted for.

- (1) *Who did [a picture of t] annoy Mary?
- (2) Who did Mary see [a picture of t]?

A number of minimalism-compliant proposals have been put forth to account for the ungrammaticality of (1) as opposed to the grammaticality of corresponding sub-extraction from objects (2) in most languages examined, but no consensus has been reached as to whether the phenomenon amounts to (a) an asymmetry on extractions from an internal vs external argument position (Chomsky 2008), (b) a side-effect of the special status of left branches (Uriagereka 1999), (c) a representational constraint on chain uniformity (Stepanov 2001), or (d) a product of the special ‘riterial’ nature of the EPP_T-position (Rizzi 2006).

However, the topic of the current paper is not the Subject Condition (1) itself. What makes the asymmetry (1-2) more interesting is the fact that a number of languages do *not* exhibit it:

- (3a) [Op [Mary-ga t yonda no]-ga akirakana yorimo
Op Mary-NOM t read that-NOM is.obvious thank
John-wa takusan-no hon-o yonda
John-TOP many-GEN books-ACC read
'John read more books than [that Mary read ____] is obvious.'
(Japanese, Stepanov 2001: 22)

- (3b) Amorratuak dirala bixtan dagon zakur oiekin
rabid-DET.PL are.that sight.at is.that dog those.with
ez det ibili nai
NEG AUX walk want
'I don't want to walk with those dogs that it is obvious are rabid.'
(Basque, Stepanov 2001:23)

The same state of affairs can be found in Greek. It has been observed in a number of works (Spyropoulos 1999, Spyropoulos & Philippaki-Warburton 2001, Kotzoglou

2005, 2010, Spyropoulos & Stamatogiannis 2011) that subjects in Greek are transparent to sub-extraction:

- (4) tinos eyrapsan i efimeriðes oti i omilia
 whose write.Past.3PL the newspapers.NOM that the talk.NOM
 epirease to akroatirio?
 influence.PAST the audience.ACC
 ‘Whose talk did the newspapers write influenced the audience?’

Kotzoglou (2005)

Three major accounts have been put forth for the above pattern:

I. Spyropoulos (1999), Spyropoulos & Philippaki-Warburton (2001) argue that the subject in Greek consists of a discontinuous element, a subject clitic in [Spec, TP] and an argumental DP or *pro* in the thematic position. Preverbal subjects may reconstruct in the thematic position and, thus, sanction extraction (By whatever reasoning allows extractions from phrases in governed positions, presumably the CED).

II. Kotzoglou (2005, 2010) claims that preverbal subjects are base generated in the periphery of the clause. Extraction from those elements is licit due to the fact that they are part of a nontrivial chain (i.e. they are unmoved). What is more, it is proposed that movement of an element to a non-phase edge renders opaque to sub-extraction due to a restriction on the phonological silencing of more than one copies of a single element per syntactic phase termed *Restriction on Copy Reduction* (RCR).

III. Spyropoulos & Stamatogiannis (2011) argue that Greek resists freezing. The Activity Condition (Chomsky 2000), the Edge Condition (Gallego & Uriagereka 2007) and Criterial Freezing (Rizzi 2006) may *derive from properties of the syntax-phonology interface, hence their unstable status and the crosslinguistic variation*.

This paper discusses loose ends pertaining to sub-extraction from subjects in Greek. We argue that Greek exhibits true sub-extraction from subjects, despite some superficial problems that might be observed in the acceptability of the data. We show that Greek does not manifest Chomsky’s (2008) internal vs. external argument split with respect to sub-extraction. Finally, we lay out the problem posed to Kotzoglou (2010) by the contrast in the grammaticality of sub-extraction from CLLDed preverbal subjects vs. the ungrammaticality of sub-extraction from CLLDed objects.

2. Does sub-extraction from subjects even exist in Greek?

The first question that needs to be dealt with is whether Greek does indeed exhibit sub-extraction from subjects, as a number of speakers find sentences like (4) awkward. A corresponding question, then, is whether such instances of movement are cases of what Uriagereka (2012) terms ‘genuine sub-extractions’. Let us tackle these questions in turn.

First of all, native speakers will agree that, especially in environments which involve more than one potential base position for the extracted phrase sentences in which the whole subject DP is pied-piped along with the extractee are more easily parsable than corresponding sentences in which the extracted phrase is severed from the containing DP and, hence, questions such as (5a) feel less awkward than the ones that involve separation of the genitive and the subject DP (5b).

(5a) *tinos i apofasi ipostirize i ðikiyoros oti*
 whose the decision.NOM argue.PAST.3SG the lawyer.NOM that
itan yemati sfalmata?
 be.PAST.3SG full.NOM errors.ACC
 ‘Whose decision did the lawyer argue was full of errors?’

(5b) *#tinos ipostirize i ðikiyoros oti i apofasi*
 whose argue.PAST.3SG the lawyer.NOM that the decision.NOM
itan yemati sfalmata?
 be.PAST.3SG full.NOM errors.ACC
 ‘Whose decision did the lawyer argue was full of errors?’

However, sentences like (5b) by no means deserve an ungrammaticality judgment, since they can be understood as grammatical by the hearer once produced, although they are rarely produced as such, since speakers tend to employ the pied-piping mechanism so as to avoid ambiguity. It seems, therefore, that the contrast between (5a) and (5b) is one of acceptability rather than grammaticality.

Moreover, if the context is manipulated in such a way that will facilitate the interpretation of the extracted phrase as part of the subject DP, then the sentence becomes totally acceptable:

(6a) i ðikiyoros afti sixna katiyoruse tus alus
 the lawyer.NOM this often accuse.PAST.3SG the other
 parayondes tis ðikis yia laθos apofasis
 participants.ACC the trial.GEN for wrong decisions
 ‘This lawyer often blamed the other participants in the trial for wrong decisions.’

(6b) tinos ipostirize i ðikiyoros oti i
 whose argue.PAST.3SG the lawyer.NOM that the
 apofasi itan yemati sfalmata?
 decision.NOM was full.NOM errors.ACC
 ‘Whose decision did the lawyer argue full of errors?’

With (6a) providing the required context information that facilitates the linking of the extracted DP *tinis* in (6b) to the subject-DP *i apofasi*, (6b) becomes totally acceptable. No such amelioration of judgments can be forced by context information in cases of purely syntactic ungrammaticality.

The conclusion that the awkwardness of overt separation of the possessor from the subject DP is not a CED effect, but a parsing (dis)preference is further supported by the fact that corresponding cases of object DP pied-piping are also preferred to instances of object DP stranding:

(7a) tinos ta epixirimata pisteve i
 whose the arguments.ACC believe.PAST.3SG the
 ðikiyoros oti o ðikastis θa antekrue?
 lawyer.NOM that the judge.NOM would contradict.PAST.3SG
 ‘Whose arguments did the lawyer believe that the judge would contradict?’

(7b) #tinos pisteve i ðikiyoros oti o
 whose believe.PAST.3SG the lawyer.NOM that the
 ðikastis θa antekrue ta epixirimata
 judge.NOM would contradict.PAST.3SG the arguments.ACC?
 ‘Whose arguments did the lawyer believe that the judge would contradict?’

So, the same effect can be observed even in the more ‘legitimate’ instances of extraction from objects. Therefore, it is not a usual case of a CED effect, as it does not single out subjects.

Even if some subject-object contrast does exist, it might be reduced to familiar cases of left branch parsability restrictions in ambiguity resolution of the kind explored by Phillips (1996), where a constituent which might in principle attach to more than one projection (and, hence, give rise to ambiguity) is preferably interpreted as belonging to the closer/lowermost projection. Given Phillips’s assumption that structure building and parsing work in a left-to-right fashion, attachment to the lowermost (and, by antisymmetry, rightmost) possible node obeys the Branch Right requirement, while attachment to a left branch violates it and is dispreferred (when an alternative interpretation locus that obeys Branch Right is available).

Let us further take out of the way some irrelevant instances of ungrammaticality:

- (8) *apo pu pistevis oti [o politikos t] ðe tha
 from where believe.2SG that the politician.Nom t NEG FUT
 ekleyi meθavrio?
 be.elected.3sg day.after.tomorrow
 ‘The politician from where do you believe won’t be elected the day after tomorrow?’

Examples such as the above do not constitute evidence against sub-extraction from subjects, once we consider that DP is a phase (Svenonius 2004) and, hence, extraction from within it must proceed through its edge, due to the PIC. Horrocks & Stavrou (1987) and Alexiadou (2004) have offered evidence for internal movement of DP_{GEN} to [Spec, DP] in Greek,² as exemplified in (9):

- (9) a. tu petru/tinos to vivlio
 b. [_{DP} tu Petru/tinos to [_{AgRP} vivlio [_{NumP} ... [_{NP} tu Petru/tinos]]]]

What is interesting for our purposes is the fact that not all elements can raise to the highermost [Spec, DP]. Possessive genitives can raise to the periphery of the DP but adjunct constituents cannot (either in focusing, or in interrogatives):

2 For a comprehensive discussion of subextraction possibilities from DPs see Ntelitheos (2002).

(10) *apo tis spetses o ðaskalos
 from the Spetses the teacher
 ‘the teacher from Spetses’

(11) *apo pu o ðaskalos
 from where the teacher
 ‘the teacher from where?’

This pattern is a well-known one, especially in Romance linguistics. Cinque (1980) observes that only *di*-prepositional phrases can be reordered from the postnominal position in Italian, while other prepositional phrases cannot. (*di*-phrases are the equivalent of genitive possessive phrases in other languages). It has been convincingly shown that possessive phrases are the most usual candidates for DP-internal movement and for extraction from DPs in a number of different languages.

The conclusion seems to be that certain phrases cannot escape their containing DP due to their own characteristics and not due to the position of this DP in the phrase marker. No matter whether these characteristics are thematic (Giorgi & Longobardi’s 1991 extraction hierarchy) or semantic (Kolliakou 1999) in nature, we expect that a large number of extraction from DP phenomena will be ruled out due to the impossibility of the first step of movement to [Spec, DP]. So, this will rule out cases in which an adjunct cannot leave a DP, such as the case of adjectival modifiers:

(12) *poso meyalo nomizis ena psema ða
 how big think.NONPAST.2SG. a lie.NOM FUT
 epireasi tin kini ynomi
 influence.3SG. the common opinion.ACC.
 ‘How big a lie do you think will influence the public opinion?’

(13) Hierarchical argument structure in DP
 Possessor > Subject > Object

Let us, finally, discuss whether Greek (4) is an instance of genuine sub-extraction or not, a matter discussed also in Spyropoulos & Stamatogiannis (2011). Uriagereka (2012: 93) makes a crucial distinction between ‘genuine’ sub-extractions and not ‘genuine’ ones. He claims that sub-extraction from subjects is spurious ‘(i) in contexts that could be recovered

as mere 'aboutness' inquiries of a proleptic sort; (ii) in languages that make liberal use of empty pronominals in argument positions that may be related, as 'gaps', to various antecedents; (iii) particularly if these elements could be inside 'extraposed' sentential subjects.'

However, the Greek case does seem not belong to any of the cases (i-iii).

First of all, the fronted possessor *tinos/pianu* cannot be a proleptic element since there is no aboutness meaning attached to it (an interrogative element). Possessor sub-extraction in Greek does not have the main characteristics of prolepsis (as summarized, for example, in Salzmann, to appear). The same conclusion is reached in Spyropoulos & Stamatogiannis (2011), who argue convincingly that *'In Greek, aboutness dependents are always PPs introduced by the preposition Ja 'for' or the complex preposition sxetika me 'about'; the wh-element in the relevant constructions are DPs marked in genitive case; the subextracted wh-phrase may not be reanalysed as a matrix predicate aboutness dependent, even with a predicate that allows for it.'*

As far as Uriagereka's (2012) point ii is concerned, we note that Greek indeed makes use of empty pronominals that relate to preverbal subjects. However, no empty pronominal within the DP has been claimed to be linked to a base-generated possessor. Note that Uriagereka's argument (ii) is mainly an argument against sub-extraction from sentential subjects, which is not what is happening in the examples we have presented so far. This final observation covers Uriagereka's point (iii) as well.

3. The locus of sub-extraction

Chomsky (2008) argues that the ungrammaticality of sub-extraction from subjects is not a property of the surface (TP-related) position of the containing DP but one of the base (ν P-internal position). He observes that English manifests an internal/external argument asymmetry with respect to sub-extraction, with agentive DPs banning it (14), while deep complements (i.e. subjects of ergatives and passives, 15), permit it:

(14a) *It was the CAR (not the TRUCK) of which [the (driver, picture) caused a scandal]

(14b) *Of which car did [the (driver, picture) cause a scandal]?

(15a) It was the CAR (not the TRUCK) of which [the (driver, picture) was found]

(15b) Of which car was [the (driver, picture) awarded a prize]?

(Chomsky 2008: 147)

It is not clear how the contrast (14-15) is to be interpreted. Chomsky argues that ‘the PP-complement of the subject cannot be extracted in the same way in the v^*P phase, because its base position is not in the search domain of the label/probe v^* ’. Broekhuis (2008) notes that this is a theoretically dubious claim and Bianchi & Chesi (2014) question the empirical validity of the distinction (14-15). But let us turn to the Greek data.

3.1 Greek: Sub-extraction out of unergatives is possible

Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1999) treat the (im)possibility of sub-extraction from subjects as an unaccusativity diagnostic. They argue that possessor sub-extraction from DP-subjects is permitted only with unaccusative predicates (16a) and not with unergatives (16b):

- (16a) *tinos irthe to aftokinito?*
 whose come.PAST.3SG the car.NOM
 ‘Whose car came?’
- (16b) **tinos etrekse to aftokinito?*
 whose run.PAST.3SG the car.NOM
 ‘Whose car ran?’

Therefore, sub-extraction from subjects of unaccusatives is interpreted by whatever mechanism explains extraction from objects of transitive verbs [e.g. as extraction from D-structure objects (cf. *ne*-cliticization in Italian)].

But, sub-extraction from subjects of unergatives improves if more context is added

- (17) *tinos etrekse [to aftokinito t] sto rali*
 whose run.PERF.PAST.3SG the car.NOM t at-the rally
akropolis to 1985?
 ‘Acropolis’ the 1985
 ‘Whose car ran at the Acropolis rally in 1985?’

and it improves even further if we modify the aspect on the verb:

- (18) *tinos etrexe [to aftokinito t] sto rali*
 Whose run.IMPERF.PAST.3SG the car at-the rally

‘Akropolis’ ti ðekaetia tu ’80?
 ‘Acropolis’ the decade the ’80s
 ‘Whose car ran at the ‘Akropolis’ rally in the 80s?’

In fact, (20) sounds odd even without extraction, as compared to (19):

- (19) irθe to aftokinito tu iðravliku
 come.PAST.3SG the car.NOM the plumber.GEN
 ‘The plumber’s car came.’
- (20) #etrekse to aftokinito tu iðravliku
 run.PAST.3SG the car.Nom the plumber.GEN
 ‘The plumber’s car ran.’

So, it seems that Greek does not show a clear ergative/unergative contrast.

3.2 Further arguments for the *vP*-external position of the subject

It is not only the case that Greek shows no ergative/unergative contrast. What is more, we can show that in cases of extraction from preverbal subjects, the subject itself and everything it contains cannot be reconstructed to the *vP*-internal position.

Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998) have shown that preverbal subjects take obligatorily wide scope over negation (21) (which means that they *c*-command the Neg particle at the relevant levels of representation):

- (21a) poli maθites ðen etroyan feta
 many pupils.NOM NEG eat.PAST.3PL feta.cheese.ACC
 many>NEG, *NEG>many
 ‘Many pupils did not eat feta cheese.’
- (21b) ðen etroyan poli maθites feta
 NEG eat.PAST.3PL many pupils.NOM feta.cheese.ACC
 many>NEG, NEG>many
 ‘Many pupils did not eat feta cheese.’ *and*
 ‘Not many pupils ate feta cheese.’

Even after extraction, though, the DP subject retains its wide scope:

- (22) *tin*_i *ipes* *oti* [*poli maθites t*_i] *ðen*
 whose say.PAST.2SG that many pupils.NOM NEG
etroyan feta?
 eat.PAST.3PL feta.cheese.ACC
 many>NEG, *NEG>many
 ‘Many pupils of whom did you say did not eat feta cheese?’

So, at LF the subject *c*-commands *neg* and, therefore, cannot have been reconstructed in the *vP*.

Spyropoulos (1999), Spyropoulos & Phillippaki-Warburton (2001), and Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou (2006) discuss the following asymmetry, whereby an R-expression within a postverbal subject DP gets bound by a coindexed TP-level special clitic, while no corresponding principle C violation ensues when the subject is in the preverbal position.

- (23a) *tin*_{*i/j} *ayapai* [*i mitera* [*tis marias*]_i]
 Her.CL love.NONPAST.3SG the mother.NOM the Mary.GEN
 ‘Mary’s mother loves her.’
 (23b) [*i mitera* [*tis marias*]_i] *tin*_{i/j} *ayapai*
 The mother.NOM the Mary.GEN her.CL love.NONPAST.3SG
 ‘Mary’s mother loves her.’

Kotzoglou (2013) argued that the contrast in (23) is a crucial argument in favour of the base-generated status of preverbal subjects in Greek. No Principle C violation arises in cases of sub-extractions from preverbal subjects:

- (24) *pianu*_i *nomizes* *oti* [*i mitera t*_i] *ðen ton*_i *iksere?*
 whose think.2SG that the mother t NEG CL.ACC. know.2sg
 ‘Whose mother did you think didn’t know him?’

Corresponding sub-extractions from a postverbal constituent are ruled out, due to the fact that the DP, whereby the raised *wh*-element is reconstructed at LF, is in the scope of the clitic.

- (25) *pianu_i nomizes oti ðen ton_i iksere [i mitera t_i]?
 whose think.2SG that NEG CL.ACC know.2SG the mother t
 ‘Whose mother did you think didn’t know him?’

Again, the conclusion is that preverbal subjects in Greek do not reconstruct to their thematic position, presumably due to the fact that they are base generated in the preverbal position.

4. Problem: Distinguishing between (CL)LD-ed elements and (CL)LD-ed subjects

Kotzoglou (2005, 2010)’s analysis of extraction from subjects makes crucial use of the fact that preverbal subjects in Greek are base-generated (CL)LDed phrases, coindexed with an argumental *pro*, in the sense of Philippaki-Warbuton (1987). The peripheral topic-position of preverbal subjects in null subject languages has been proposed for languages other than Greek as well.

Contra Gallego & Uriagereka’s (2007) *Edge Condition* (but in line with Chomsky’s 2011 Phase Impenetrability Condition), Kotzoglou (2005, 2010) argues that material on the edge of phases is visible in the next phase up. That includes material that is contained in phrases on the phase edge, as it is argued that the ungrammaticality of sub-extraction from subjects in English is due to a restriction on too local movement (in the spirit of Grohmann’s 2003 *Anti-Locality*):

- (26) **Restriction on Copy Reduction (RCR)** (phonological deletion of copies under identity) can apply to at most one pair of copies of an element in each phase.

This restriction permits extraction from base-generated CLLDed elements (such as the preverbal subjects in Greek), but bans sub-extraction from elements moved to a non-phase edge (such as subjects moved to [Spec, TP] in English). RCR is also able to account for a number of illicit cases of sub-extraction. Topicalized and scrambled constituents, moved to a non-edge phase internal position (cf. the discussion in Müller 1995), are opaque to extraction, as expected.

On the contrary, sub-extraction from ECM subjects is permitted in English since ECM DPs move to a phase edge, the matrix *vP* –probably without passing through the embedded defective [Spec, TP]:

(27a) ?Which topics do you expect [books about *t*] to sell well?

(27b) *Which topics do you expect that [books about *t*] will sell well?

Unproblematically, extraction from topicalized objects is banned in Greek (in those rare cases where object topicalization is permitted in the absence of a resumptive clitic):

(28) **tinos_i* epiveveose to ipuryio oti [ti whose
confirm.PAST.3SG the ministry.NOM that the
viografía *t_i*] tha siyrapsi o ipuryos
biography.ACC Fut write.3SG the minister.NOM
politismu?
culture.GEN
'Whose biography did the ministry confirm that the minister of culture will write?'

If topicalization is a product of movement to [Spec, Top], a non-edge position, then further sub-extraction is ruled out, as predicted by the RCR.

However, Kotzoglou's (2010) account cannot explain why extraction from base-generated CLLDed (doubled by a *pro*) preverbal subjects is licit, while extraction from CLLDed objects is ruled out:

(29) **tinos_i* nomizis oti [to aftokinito *t_i*] to thavmazume?
whose think.2SG that the car it admire.1PL
'Whose car do you think we admire?'

If (29) is ruled out due to its alleged adjunct nature (i.e. by the Adjunct Condition), then why is this not the case for (4)? On the other hand, if RCR does not pose problems to extraction in (4), why is (29) ungrammatical? I'll have to leave this question open for future research.

5. Summary

In the preceding sections we discussed some properties of sub-extraction from Greek subject DPs. We first discussed some potential parsing problems that lead some speakers to the preference of DP-pied piping to possessor sub-extraction, explaining that this preference does not affect the grammaticality judgement associated with sub-extraction. Then we noted that the relevant constructions manifest what Uriagereka (2012) calls ‘genuine sub-extraction’. We proceeded onto the examination of the surface and base position of the containing subject DP, arguing that no unergative/unaccusative distinction bears on the (im)possibility of sub-extraction, and we provided configurational evidence that extraction can also take place from the preverbal subject position. Finally, we discussed the differences in sub-extraction from subject vs. from object fronted CLLDed phrases.

List of glosses used: 1, 2, 3: 1st, 2nd, 3rd person; ACC=accusative case; AUX=auxiliary; CL=clitic; GEN=genitive case; FUT=future tense; IMPERF= imperfective aspect; NEG=negation; NOM=nominative case; PAST=past tense; PERF=perfective aspect; PL=plural; SG=singular; TOP=topic

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis. 2004. “On the Development of Possessive Determiners: Consequences for DP Structure.” In *Diachronic Clues to Synchronic Grammar*, edited by Eric Fuss and Carola Tips. 31–58. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1998. “Parametrizing AGR: Word Order, Verb Movement and EPP Checking.” *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16:491–539.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, and Elena Anagnostopoulou. 1999. “Tests for Unaccusativity in a Language Without Tests for Unaccusativity.” In *Greek Linguistics '97: Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, edited by Amalia Moser. 23–31. Athens: Ellinika Grammata.

- Bianchi, Valentina, and Cristiano Chesì. 2014. "Subject Islands, Reconstruction, and the Flow of Computation." *Linguistic Inquiry* 45:525–569.
- Boeckx, Cedric. 2012. *Syntactic Islands*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Broekhuis, Hans. 2005. "Extraction from Subjects: Some Remarks on Chomsky's *On Phases*." In *Organizing Grammar: Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk*, edited by Hans Broekhuis, Norbert Corver, Riny Huybregts, Ursula Kleinhenz, and Jan Koster. 59–68. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. "Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework." In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, edited by Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka. 89–155. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2008. "On Phases." In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, edited by Robert Freidin, Carlos P. Otero, and Maria Luisa Zubizarreta. 133–166. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1980. "On Extraction from NP in Italian." *Journal of Italian Linguistics* 5:47–99.
- Gallego, Ángel J. 2010. "Subextraction from Phase Edges." In *The Complementizer Phase: Subjects and Operators*, edited by E. Phoivos Panagiotidis. 51–75. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gallego, Ángel J., and Juan Uriagereka. 2007. "Conditions on Sub-extraction." In *Coreference, Modality, and Focus*, edited by Luis Eguren and Olga Fernández Soriano. 45–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Giorgi, Alessandra, and Giuseppe Longobardi. 1991. *The Syntax of Noun Phrases: Configuration, Parameters and Empty Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2003. *Prolific Domains: On the Anti-locality of Movement Dependencies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Horrocks, Geoffrey, and Melita Stavrou. 1987. "Bounding Theory and Greek Syntax: Evidence for *Wh*-movement in NP." *Journal of Linguistics* 23:79–108.
- Jurka, Johannes. 2010. "The Importance of Being a Complement: CED Effects Revisited." PhD diss., University of Maryland at College Park.
- Kolliakou, Dimitra. 1999. "De-phrase extractability and individual/property denotation." *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 17:713–781.
- Kotzoglou, George. 2005. "*Wh*-extraction and Locality in Greek." PhD diss., The University of Reading.
- Kotzoglou, George. 2010. "(Non-)extraction from Subjects as an Edge Phenomenon." In

- The Complementizer Phase: Subjects and Operators*, edited by E. Phoevos Panagiotidis. 33–50. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kotzoglou, George. 2013. “On the Unmarked Position for Greek Subjects: Problematic Issues and Implications for Constituent Order.” *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 13:203–238.
- Müller, Gereon. 1995. *A-bar Syntax: A Study in Movement Types*. Mouton de Gruyter: Berlin.
- Müller, Gereon. 2011. *Constraints on Displacement: A Phase-based Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Ntelitheos, Dimitris. 2002. “Possessor Extraction in Greek and the Left Periphery of the DP” ms. University of California at Los Angeles.
- Panagiotidis, Phoevos, and Stavroula Tsiplakou. 2006. An A-binding Asymmetry in Null Subject Languages and Its Significance for Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 37:167–177.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, Irene. 1987. “The Theory of Empty Categories and the *pro*-drop Parameter in Modern Greek.” *Journal of Linguistics* 23:289–318.
- Phillips, Colin. 1996. “Order and Structure.” PhD diss., Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 2006. On the Form of Chains: Criterial Positions and ECP Effects. In *Wh-Movement: Moving on*, edited by Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng, and Norbert Corver. 97–134. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Salzmann, Martin. to appear. “Prolepsis.” In *The Companion to Syntax*, 2nd edition, edited by Martin Everaert, and Henk van Riemsdijk. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Spyropoulos, Vassilios. 1999. “Agreement Relations in Greek.” PhD diss., The University of Reading.
- Spyropoulos, Vassilios, and Irene Philippaki-Warbuton. 2001. “‘Subject’ and EPP in Greek: The Discontinuous Subject Hypothesis.” *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2:149–186.
- Spyropoulos, Vassilios, and Nikolaos Stamatogiannis. 2011. “Subextraction from Subjects in Greek: Things you can Think and you can Say.” Talk given at ‘Islands in contemporary linguistic theory’ workshop, University of the Basque Country.
- Stepanov, Arthur. 2001. “Cyclic Domains in Syntactic Theory.” PhD diss., University of Connecticut.
- Svenonius, Peter. 2004. “On the Edge.” In *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and their Effects*, edited by David Adger, Cécile de Cat, and George Tsoulas. 259–287. Dordrecht: Kluwer Publishers.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 2012. *Spell-out and the Minimalist Program*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.