ICGL**12** | 12th INTERNATIONAL CONFERENC
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 12ΟΥ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΣ ΓΛΩΣΣΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ

VOL. 1

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, Ναπολέων Κάτσος, Ευαγγελία Κορδώνη, Αμαλία Μόζερ, Ελένη Μπουτουλούση, Κική Νικηφορίδου, Αγγελική Ράλλη, Άννα Ρούσσου, 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

2ος Τόμος

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

George Kotzoglou

University of the Aegean

gkotz@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 'criterial' 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   eɣrapsan   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   ðikiɣoros   oti
     whose the decision.NOM argue.PAST.3SG the   lawyer.NOM   that
     itan   ɣemati   sfalmata?
     be.PAST.3SG full.NOM errors.ACC
     'Whose decision did the lawyer argue was full of errors?'

(5b) #tinos   ipostirize   i   ðikiɣoros   oti   i   apofasi
     whose   argue.PAST.3SG the lawyer.NOM   that the decision.NOM
     itan   ɣemati   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 ðikiɣoros afti sixna katiɣoruse tus alus
the lawyer.NOM this often accuse.PAST.3SG the other
paraɣondes tis ðikis ɣia 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 ðikiɣoros oti i
whose argue.PAST.3SG the lawyer.NOM that the
apofasi itan ɣemati 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 *tinos* 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
ðikiɣoros 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 ðikiɣoros 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   θa
     from   where believe.2SG   that   the   politician.Nom t   NEG   FUT
     ekleɣi   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 $[_{NumP}$ … $[_{n}P$ 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   meɣalo   nomizis   ena   psema   θa
     how   big   think.NONPAST.2SG.   a   lie.NOM   FUT
     epireasi   tin   kini   ɣnomi
     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 (*v*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   irθe   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   etroɣan feta
       many   pupils.NOM   NEG   eat.PAST.3PL   feta.cheese.ACC
                                                                many>NEG, *NEG>many

       'Many pupils did not eat feta cheese.'

(21b) ðen   etroɣan   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) tinos$_i$ ipes   oti   [poli   maθites t$_i$]   ðen
      whose   say.PAST.2SG   that   many   pupils.NOM   NEG
      etroγan   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 *v*P.

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$_{*i/j}$ aγapai   [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$_{i/j}$ aγapai
       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-Warburton (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 *v*P –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$_j$ epiveveose to   ipuryio   oti   [ti   whose
       confirm.PAST.3SG   the   ministry.NOM that   the
       vioyrafia t$_j$]   θa   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. The 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 Chesi. 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. Phoevos 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-Warburton, 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-Warburton. 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.