

The “null” syntax of Greek null indefinite clitics

1. Introduction

Greek displays a well-known pattern wrt. cliticization, namely whereas (overt) definite and/or specific nouns can or must be cliticized (provided they are interpreted as topics), (post-verbal) indefinites, and bare nouns & quantifiers cannot. This is illustrated in (1-3) below:

- (1) a. $\delta\epsilon\eta$ (ton) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$ ton $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota$.
neg (him.cl) saw.1sg the John.acc
'I did not see (him), John.'
b. ton $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\nu\iota$ $\delta\epsilon\eta$ *(ton) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$.
the John.acc neg *(him.cl) saw.1sg
'John, I did not see him.'
- (2) a. $\delta\epsilon\eta$ (*ton) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\eta$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\eta\alpha$ me $\kappa\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron$.
neg (*him.cl) saw.1sg a man.acc with hat
'I did not see (*him) a man wearing a hat.'
b. $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\eta$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\delta\eta\alpha$ me $\kappa\alpha\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron$ $\delta\epsilon\eta$ *(ton) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$.
A man.acc with hat.acc neg *(him.cl) saw.1sg
'A (certain) man wearing a hat, I did not see him.'
- (3) a. $\delta\epsilon\eta$ (*to) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$ $\alpha\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron$.
neg (*him.cl) saw.1sg airplane.acc
'I did not see an airplane.'
b. $\alpha\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron$ $\delta\epsilon\eta$ (*to) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$.
Airplane.acc not (*him.cl) saw.1sg
'Airplane I did not see.'
c. $\delta\epsilon\eta$ (*to) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$ $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota$.
Neg (*it.cl) saw.1sg something.acc
'I did not see something.'
d. $\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\iota$ $\delta\epsilon\eta$ (*to) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$.
Something.acc neg (*it.cl) saw.1sg
'Something I did not see.'

The same distribution applies to definites, (non-specific) indefinites and bare nouns & quantifiers, when they are referenced by a (non-doubling) clitic pronoun [a phenomenon known as 'object drop']:

- (4) a. $\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ to $\alpha\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron$?
Saw.2sg the airplane.acc
'Did you see the airplane?'
- Ne, *(to) $\acute{\iota}\delta\alpha$.
Yes, *(it.cl) saw.1sg
'Yes, I did.'
b. $\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$) $\alpha\epsilon\rho\omicron\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\nu\omicron$?
Saw.2sg (a) airplane.acc
'Did you see an airplane?'
-Ne, *(to) $\acute{\iota}\delta\eta$ ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha$).
Yes (*it.cl) saw.1sg (one.acc)

‘Yes, I did//(|Yes, I saw one).’
 c. *ídes káti?*
 Saw.2sg something.acc
 ‘Did you see something?’
 -Ne, (*to) *ída (káti).*
 Yes, (*it.cl) saw.1sg (something.acc)
 ‘Yes, I saw something.’

However, when a post-verbal specific indefinite noun is resumed, a clitic pronoun must appear (and a gap is ungrammatical). On the other hand, repetition of the full specific indefinite is incompatible with cliticization:

- (5) *ídes éna aeropláno me ble urá pu épese prin misí óra?*
 Saw.2sg an airplane.acc with blue tail.acc that fell.3sg before half hour.acc
 ‘Did you see an airplane with a blue tail that fell half an hour ago?’
 -Ne, *(to) *ída.*
 Yes, *(it.cl) saw.1sg
 ‘Yes, I saw it.’
 -Oçi, neg (*to) *ída éna aeropláno me ble urá*
 no, not (*it.cl) saw.1sg an airplane.acc with blue tail
pu épese prin misi ora
 that fell.3sg before half hour.acc
 -No, I did not see an airplane with a blue tail half an hour ago.’

(4) & (5) suggest that object drop only applies to non-specific indefinites/bare nouns, whereas clitic doubling is ungrammatical with specific indefinites. A comparison between the patterns in (4-5) and (1-4) allows us to conclude that object drop and clitic dependencies (i.e. Clitic Doubling (CD) and Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD)) only partially overlap (namely, both apply to (referential) topics).

It has been pointed out that the distribution in (1-4) is parallel in various respects (modulo the definiteness/indefiniteness distinction), and that Greek (non-specific) indefinites/bare nouns in constructions like (3b & 4b) involve a null (indefinite) clitic, in the same way definite nouns involve an overt definite clitic in (1b, 2b & 4a) (see Dimitriadis 1994). In this squib, I will argue that indefinites and bare NP/QPs do *not* involve a null (indefinite) clitic. In particular, I will make the following two claims: (a) preverbal (non-specific) indefinite & bare NP/QP topics pattern like preverbal wh-phrases and foci in a number of properties, while at the same time all these structures differ from preverbal CLLDed topics in certain crucial respects. This suggests that CLLD topics and preverbal indefinites & bare NP/QP topics cannot be reduced to the same underlying structure; (b) preverbal definite locative topics, which cannot be doubled for independent reasons, pattern like indefinite & bare NP/QP topics. If locative topics are definite and non-cliticized, and if indefinite & bare NP/QP topics behave like locative topics, the null hypothesis is that the latter do not involve a clitic either. This suggests that cliticization or lack thereof plays a role in the properties of preverbal topics in Greek, rather than the presence of a definite vs. an indefinite clitic.

2. Empirical generalizations

This section starts with the discussion of the main properties of preverbal indefinites & bare NPs/QPs.

2.1 Preverbal indefinites and bare NPs/QPs

Indefinites and bare NPs/QPs can appear preverbally, where they can be interpreted as topics (if unstressed):

- (6) a. - Pjós éfaye míla?
Who.nom ate.3sg apples.acc
'Who ate apples?'
-Míla (o γÁnis) éfaye (o γÁnis).
apples.acc (the JOhn.nom) ate.sg (the JOhn.nom)
'Apples, John ate.'
- b. -Míla mu γia prásina míla...
talk.imp.2.sg me.dat.cl for green apples.acc
'Talk to me about green apples.'
- Prásina míla móno i MÁra trói.
Green apples.acc only the MAra.nom eat.3sg
'Green apples only Mara eats.'
-Prásina míla tróme siníthos to kalokéri.
Green apples.acc eat.1pl usually the summer.acc
'Green apples we usually eat during the summer.'
- c. - Pjós íde káti?
Who.nom saw.3sg something.acc
'Who saw someone?'
- Káti íde o Níkos.
Something.acc saw.3sg the Nick.nom
'Something, Nick saw.'
- d. - Pjós éfaye meriká/líya /káti /pénde míla?
Who.nom ate.3sg some /few /some/five apples.acc?
'Who ate some/five apples?'
-Meriká/líya/káti /pénde míla (o γÁnis) éfaye (o JÁnis).
some / few /some/five apples.acc (the JOhn.nom) ate.3sg (the JOhn.nom)
'John ate some/a few/five apples.'

In (6c-d), the preverbal quantifiers are topics and receive a weak, non-specific reading (cf. that they are not cliticized). That the meaning of preverbal cliticized quantifiers differs from that of non-cliticized ones has been shown by Iatridou (1990) (see also Alexopoulou & Kolliakou 2002). In particular, CLLDed quantifiers resist an opaque or de dicto reading, as opposed to non-cliticized ones:

- (7) a. Mia kókini fústa tin psáxno eðó ke méres
a red skirt.acc her.cl look for.1.sg here and days
'I've been looking for a red skirt for a few days...'
b. ≠ ke den mporo na vro kamia pu na mu aresi.
and neg can.1.sg subj find.1.sg none that subj me.dat like.3sg
'...and I cannot find any that I like.'

c. ke den mboró na θimiθó pu tin éxo váli.
 and not can.1sg subj remember.1sg where her.acc.cl have.1sg put
 ‘and I cannot remember where I have put it.’

(Alexopoulou, Folli & Tsoulas 2013: 303 (their 3))

a’. Mia kókini fústa psáxno eðó ke méres
 a red skirt.acc look.for.1sg here and days
 ‘I’ve been looking for a red skirt for a few days...’

b’. ke den mboró na vro kamiá pu na mu arési.
 and not can.1sg subj find.1sg anyone.acc that subj me.dat.cl like.3sg
 ‘and I cannot find one that I like.’

(adapted from Alexopoulou, Folli & Tsoulas 2013: 304 (their 5))

More generally, although preverbal indefinite & bare NP/QP topics share properties with CLLDed topics, they also differ from them in important respects. On the other hand, preverbal indefinite & bare NP/QP topics have the same distribution with topicalized constituents, i.e. preverbal wh-phrases and foci (modulo their topic properties) (see Rivero 1980 for Spanish). Their properties are illustrated below:¹

(i) Preverbal indefinite & bare NPs/QPs may undergo long-head movement, on par with wh-phrases, foci, and CLLDed topics (CLLDed topics must be cliticized):

- (8) a. [Míla_i /káti_i nomízo [óti ípe i María
 Apples.acc_i /something_i think.1sg that said.3sg the Mary.nom
 [óti ayórase o yánis t_i xtes]]].
 that bought.3sg the Janis.nom t_i yesterday
 ‘Apples I think Mary said that John bought yesterday.’
 b. [Ti_i nomízo [óti ípe i María
 What think.1sg that said.3sg the Mary.nom
 [óti aghórase o yánis t_i xtes]]]?
 that bought.3sg the Janis.nom t_i yesterday
 ‘What do I think that Mary said that Janis bought yesterday?’
 c. [Ta míla_i nomízo [óti ípe i María
 The apples.acc think.1sg that said.3sg the Mary.nom
 [óti *(ta_i) ayórase o yánis xtes]]].
 that *(them.cl) bought.3sg the Janis.nom yesterday
 ‘The apples, I think that Mary said that Janis bought them yesterday.’

(ii) Preverbal indefinite & bare NPs/QPs, wh-phrases, foci, and CLLDed phrases are all sensitive to strong islands

- (9) a. *[Míla_i /káti_i írthe i María [afú ayórase o yánis t_i]].
 apples.acc /something came.3sg the Mary.nom after bought.1sg the Janis.nom t_i
 ‘*Apples, Maria came after John bought.’
 b. *[Ti_i írthe i María [afú ayórase o yánis t_i]]?
 What came.3sg the Mary.nom after bought.3sg the Janis.nom t_i
 ‘*What did Mary come after Janis bought?’
 c. *[Ípe óti [ta míla írthe i María

¹ For expository reasons, here I will only use wh-phrases (unless they are not possible for independent reasons, in which case I will use foci). Preverbal wh-phrases and foci have the same distribution as far as the tests used here are concerned.

said.3sg that the apples.acc came.3sg the Mary.nom
 [afú ta ayórase o yánis]]]
 after them.cl bought.3sg the Janis.nom
 ‘*She said that apples, Mary came after Janis bought them.’

(iii) Preverbal indefinites & bare NPs/QPs, wh-phrases and foci are subject to minimality effects, unlike CLLDed topics which can be recursive:

- (10) a. *Míla /káti óreksi léne óti éçi na fáι.
 Apple.acc/something appetite.acc say.3pl that has.3sg subj eat.3sg
 ‘*Apples, appetite, they say that she has to eat.’²
 b. *Ti se rótisan pjos ayórase?
 What.acc you.cl asked.3pl who.nom bought.3sg
 ‘*What did they ask you who bought?’
 c. Ta míla, tu Kósta, mu ípan
 The apples.acc the Kosta.gen me.cl told.3pl
 óti tu ta éðoses xtes.
 that him.cl.gen them.cl.acc gave.2sg yesterday
 ‘The apples, the Kostas, they told me you gave them to him yesterday.’

(iv) Preverbal indefinites & bare NPs/QPs do not trigger obligatory subject-verb inversion, on par with CLLDed objects, and unlike preverbal wh-phrases and foci. This shows that topichood is independent of the gap vs. clitic distinction (and cf. 6c-d & 7 above):

- (11) a. Míla /káti o Pétros ayórase//
 apples.acc/something the Peter.nom bought.3sg
 Míla /káti o PÉtros ayórase.
 Apples.acc /something the PEter.nom bought.3sg
 ‘Apples Peter did buy//Apples PEter bought.’
 b. ??*Ti o Pétros ayórase?
 What the Peter.nom bought.3sg
 c. Ta míla o Pétros ta ayópase //
 The apples.acc the Peter.nom them.cl bought.3sg
 Ta míla o PÉtros ta ayórase.
 the apples.acc the Peter.nom them.cl bought.3sg
 ‘The apples, Peter did buy them//The apples, PEter bought them.’

² Cf. the grammatical counterpart (i):

- (i) Míla léne óti éçi óreksi na trói.
 Apples.acc say.3pl that has appetite.acc subj eat.3sg
 ‘Apples, they say that he wants to eat.’

Here, only one topic phrase has moved to the matrix clause. Note that movement of the lower topic to an intermediate position is also out (ii):

- (ii) ? Míla léne óreksi óti éçi na trói/*Míla léne óti óreksi éçi na trói.

Finally, topicalization of the higher NP only is fine:

- (iii) Óreksi léne óti éçi na fáι míla.

(v) Preverbal indefinites & bare NPs can be interpreted as parts of idioms (i.e. they reconstruct), on a par with foci and CLLDed topics:

- (12) a. Pípa dén éçi pári o yánis poté.
 pipe.acc not has eaten the John.nom ever
 ‘John has never bought a pipe/given a blowjob.’
 b. Mia íta éfaye i MaRía.
 a defeat.acc eat.3.sg the MaRía.nom
 ‘Maria faced a defeat.’
 c. PÍPA dén éçi pári o yánis poté.
 ‘A PIpe/BLOWjob has John never bought.’
 d. To mínima to píre i María.
 The message.acc it.cl took.3sg the Mary.nom
 ‘Mary took the message/understood.’

(vi) Preverbal indefinites & bare NPs/QPs reconstruct for binding purposes, on par with wh-phrases, foci, and CLLDed topics:

Binding Principle A:

- (13) a. [Fotografies tu eaftú tu_j]_i mu éðikse o yánis_j t_i xtes.
 Photos.acc the self.gen his.cl.gen me.cl.gen showed.3sg the Janis.nom t yesterday
 ‘Photos of himself John showed me yesterday.’
 b. [Pjes fotografies tu eaftú tu_j]_i mu éðikse o yánis_j t_i xtes?
 Which photos.acc the self his.cl.gen me.cl.gen showed.3sg the John.nom t yesterday
 ‘Which photos of himself did John show me?’
 c. [Tis fotografies tu eaftú tu_j]_i mu tis_i
 The photos.acc the self.gen his.cl.gen me.cl.gen them.cl.acc
 éðikse o yánis xtes.
 showed.3sg the John.nom yesterday
 ‘The photos of himself, John showed them to me yesterday.’

Binding Principle B:

- (14) a. [Fotografies /káti ðikó tu_{j/k}]_i mu éðikse o yánis_j t_i xtes.
 Photos.acc /something own his.cl.gen me.cl.gen showed.3sg the John.nom t_i yesterday
 ‘His photos John showed me yesterday.’
 b. [Pjes fotografies tu_{j/k}]_i mu éðikse o yánis_j t_i xtes?
 Which photos.acc his.cl.gen me.cl.gen showed.3sg the John.nom t_i yesterday
 ‘Which of his photos did Janis show me yesterday?’
 c. [Tis fotografies tu_{j/k}]_i mu tis_i éðikse o yánis_j xtes.
 The photos.acc his.cl.gen me.cl.gen them.cl showed.3sg the John.nom yesterday
 ‘His photos John showed them to me yesterday.’

Binding Principle C:

- (15) a. *[Fotografies/káti tu yáni_j]_i pro_j mu éðikse t_i xtes.
 Photos.acc /something the John.gen pro me.cl.gen showed.3sg t yesterday
 ‘*Photos of John_j he_j showed me yesterday.’
 b. *[Pjes fotografies tu yÁni_j]_i pro_j mu éðikse t_i xtes?

- which photos.acc the JOhn.gen]_i pro_j me.cl.gen showed.3sg t yesterday
 ‘*Which photos of JOhn_j did he_j show me yesterday.’
- c. *? [Tis fotoyrafies tu γáni]_i pro_j mu tis_i éðikse xtes.
 The photos.acc the John.gen pro me.cl.gen them.cl showed.3sg yesterday
 ‘*John_j’s photos, he_j showed them to me yesterday.’

(vii) Preverbal NP topics reconstruct for variable binding, on a par with preverbal wh-phrases and foci, and CLLDed topics:

- (16) a. [Eryasies/káti ton fititón tu]_i ðiorθóni [káθe kaθiyítis]_j t_i.
 Essays.acc/something the students.gen his.cl.gen marks.3sg every professor.nom
 ‘Essays of this students every professor marks.’
- b. [Pjes eryasies ton fititón tu]_i ðiorθóni [káθe kaθiyítis]_j t_i?
 which essays.acc the students.gen his.cl.gen marks.3sg every professor.nom t
 ‘Which essays of his students does every professor mark?’
- c. [Tis eryasies ton fititón tu]_i tis_i ðiorθóni [káθe kaθiyítis]_j.
 The essays.acc the students.gen his.cl.gen them.cl marks.3sg every professor.nom
 ‘His students’ essays, every professor marks them.’

(viii) As mentioned earlier, preverbal NP topics containing a quantifier obligatorily receive a weak reading, on a par with wh-phrases and foci, and contrary to CLLDed topics:

- (17) a. Énan ándra padréftike káθe kopéla sto γrafío.
 a man.acc married.3sg every woman.nom in.the office
 ‘For every woman in the office, there is a (different) man she got married to.’
- b. Énan ÁNdra padréftike káθe kopéla sto γrafío.
 a MAN.acc married.3sg every woman.nom in.the office
 ‘It was a (different) MAN that every woman in the office got married to.’
- c. Pósus ándres/pjón padréftike káθe kopéla sto γrafío?
 How.many men.acc/who.acc married.3sg every woman.nom in.the office
 ‘How many men/whom did every woman in the office get married to?’
- d. # Énan ándra ton padréftike káθe kopéla sto γrafío.
 A man.acc him.cl married.3sg every woman.nom in.the office
 ‘#There is a certain man such that every woman in the office married him.’

Note that (17c) receives a strong reading (and hence is out for independent pragmatic reasons, like (17d)), if cliticized (see Cinque 1990 for Italian):

- c’. Pósus ándres /pjón tus /ton padréftike káθe kopéla sto γrafío?
 How.many men.acc/who.acc 3.m.pl/3.m.sg married.3sg every woman.nom in.the office
 ‘#How many (particular) men/Which (particular man) did every woman in the office get married to?’

(ix) Bare quantifiers may be topicalized (weak reading only), wh-moved or focalized:

- (18) a. Kápjon /káti /énan (i MaRía) θa vríke (i María).
 Someone/something/one (the MArY.nom) fut found.3sg (the Mary.nom)
 ‘Mary must have found someone/something/one.’

- b. Pjón filise i María?
Whom kissed.3sg the Maria.nom
'Who did Maria kiss?'

In case they can be cliticized, they must be interpreted as specific:

- (19) a. *Kanénan i María den ton filise.
Noone.acc the Maria.nom not him.cl kissed.3sg
'*Anyone, Maria did not kiss him.'
b. Kápton /káti /énan i María ton /to íde.
Someone/something/one the Maria.nom him.cl/it.cl saw.3sg
'Someone/something/one, Mary saw him.'

(x) Fronted constituents containing a (bare) quantifier give rise to Weak Crossover Effects, unless they are CLLDed topics or based generated/D-linked wh-phrases:

- (20) a. ??* [Kápton (maθití)]_i adipaθí [i mitéra tu_i]_j t_i.
[Some (student)] dislikes.3sg the mother.nom his.cl.gen t
'Some student his mother dislikes.'
b. ??* [Pjon (maθití)]_i adipaθí [i mitéra tu_i]_j t_i ?
which (student) dislikes.3sg the mother.nom his.cl.gen t
'Which student does his mother like?'
c. [Kápton (maθití)]_i ton_i adipaθí [i mitéra tu_i]_j t_i.
[some (student)] him.cl dislikes.3sg the mother.nom his.cl.gen t
'Some student, his mother dislikes him.'
d. [Pjón (maθití)]_i ton_i adipaθí [i mitéra tu_i]_j t_i?
[which (student)] him.cl dislikes.3sg the mother.nom his.cl.gen t
'Which student does his mother dislike him?'

(xi) Preverbal indefinites and bare NPs/QPs, wh-phrases and foci license parasitic gaps³, as opposed to CLLDed topics, which do not (see Iatridou 1990):

- (21) a. [Káti]_i tha arxioθétise i María xorís na éçi diavási t_i.
[something] fut filed.3sg the Maria.nom without subj has read t
'Something Maria must have filed without having read.'
b. [Míla]_i i MaRía ayórase xorís na éçi (poté) ðokimási t_i.
apples.acc the MaRIa.nom bought.3sg without subj has (ever) tasted t
'Apples, Mary bought without having tasted.'
c. [Pjó árθro]_i arçioθétise i María xorís na éçi diavási t_i?
[which article] filed.3sg the Maria.nom without subj has.3g read t
'Which article did Maria file without having read?'
d. [Aftó to árθro]_i i María to_i arçioθétise xorís na *(to_i) éçi diavási.
[This the article] the Mary.nom it.cl filed.3sg without subj *(it) has.3sg read
'This article Mary filed it without having read it.'

³ Note that not all speakers accept parasitic gaps. The data reported here (as well as those in section 2.2) apply only to speakers who do accept such structures in the first place.

(xii) Topicalized bare NPs are not legitimate in non-root environments (or embedded clauses which lack root properties), such as central/non-peripheral adverbial clauses (22a) (as opposed to peripheral ones (22b)) (see Haegeman 2004). In this respect, they behave like English topicalization:⁴

- (22) a. *An míla den tros // *an káti fas, den tha aḍinatísis poté.
 If apple.acc not eat.2sg // if something eat.2sg not fut get.slim.2sg never
 ‘*If apples you do not eat, you will never lose weight//If something you eat, you
 will never lose weight.’
 b. O yánis den aḍinatízi yiatí míla den trói poté//ólo káti trói.
 The John.nom not gets.slim because apples.acc not eats ever//all something eats
 ‘John does not lose weight, because apples he never eats//because he eats something
 all the time.’

CLLDed topics, on the other hand, are fine in non-root environments:

- (23) An ta lazánja ta trós, tha mínis efxaristiménos.
 If the lasagna.acc them.cl eat.3sg, fut remain.2sg happy
 ‘If you eat lasagna, there won’t be a problem’.

(xiii) Although wh-phrases and main clause foci are incompatible with another wh-phrase (uniqueness/minimality), both CLLDed topics and preverbal indefinites/bare NP topics are fine with another wh-phrase:

- (24) a. *Pjanú tí éðoses?
 Who.gen what.acc gave.2g
 ‘*Who what did you give?’
 b. *To VIVLÍO pjanú éðoses?
 The BOOK who.gen gave.2sg
 ‘The BOOK who did you give?’
 c. To vivlíο pjanú to éðoses?
 The book.acc who.dat it.cl gave.2sg
 ‘The book who did you give it to?’
 d. Míla /káti /éna pjanú éðoses?
 Apples.acc/something/one who.dat gave.2sg
 ‘Apples/something/one (book), who did you give to?’

⁴ Preverbal foci are also not good in central adverbial clauses:

- (i) ??*An ta MÍLA den su arésun, den tha aḍinatísis.
 If the APPLES.acc not you.cl like.3pl, not fut get.slim.2sg
 ‘If you don’t like the APPLES, you will not get slimmer.’

The following table summarizes the above points:

	WH	Focus	CLLD	Indefinites & bare NPs/QPs
Long distance	√	√	√	√
Strong islands	√	√	√	√
Minimality effects/uniqueness	√	√	X	√
Obligatory S-V inversion	√	√	X	X
Idiomatic readings	N/A	√	√	√
Reconstruction for Binding	√	√	√	√
Reconstruction for variable binding	√	√	√	√
Scope reconstruction (weak reading)	√	√	X	√
Bare quantifiers	√	√	X	√
WCO	√	√	X	√
Parasitic Gaps	√	√	X	√
Embedded in central adverbial clauses	N/A	X	√	X
Co-occurrence with wh	X	X	√	√
Cliticization	X (unless D-linked)	X (unless D-linked)	√	X (unless D-linked)

On the basis of the above evidence, the following descriptive generalizations apply:

- (a) indefinites & bare NP topics behave like wh-phrases and foci in most of their properties (uniqueness, A'-properties, gap, scope reconstruction)
- (b) indefinites & bare NP topics behave like CLLDed topics in some respects only (topic structural position – highlighted in blue)
- (c) indefinites & bare NP topics, CLLDed topics, and wh-phrases/foci all behave alike in certain respects (connectivity effects- highlighted in green)

One way to account for the above distribution is to assume that indefinites & bare NPs/QPs are operator phrases which encode topics. On the other hand, preverbal wh-phrases and foci are operator phrases which encode new information. Finally, CLLDed topics are topic phrases which do not involve an operator (independently of whether they are generated via base generation or movement). Alternatively, preverbal wh-phrases and foci, and indefinites & bare NPs/QPs move to a non-recursive wh/focus and topic position respectively, as opposed to CLLDed topics, which merge in a recursive topic position (see Rizzi 1997 for Italian).

Dimitriadis (1994) reports that constructions with preverbal indefinites & bare NPs are sensitive to strong islands, on a par with CLLD constructions. On the basis of this similarity, he argues that CLLD involves an overt definite clitic, while indefinites & bare NPs/QPs involve a null indefinite clitic. The main problem this argument faces is that sensitivity to strong islands is also a property of *wh*-phrases and foci, which do not involve a clitic. This suggests that presence of a clitic cannot be tied to this property (and see Cinque 1990; Iatridou 1990). Dimitriadis further points out that Indefinite Object Drop (IOD) constructions, which only allow indefinites/bare NPs (cf. 4b-c above), also involve a null indefinite clitic. According to Dimitriadis, this fact supports a null indefinite clitic analysis of constructions with preverbal indefinites/bare NPs. Although it is true that both IOD constructions and postverbal indefinites/bare NPs involve non-specific NPs (as opposed to CLLD and CD, which involve a definite/specific phrase), this does not necessarily imply that they involve the same underlying structure and/or gap. Moreover, even if they do, this is not a strong enough reason to assume the presence of a null indefinite clitic for structures containing an indefinite or bare NP/QP⁵.

In what follows, I will show that preverbal locative topics behave exactly like preverbal indefinites and bare NP/QP topics despite the fact that they can be definite. I will argue that this is the case because they cannot be cliticized (for independent reasons). This supports the view that what is at stake here is the presence vs. absence of a clitic in the structure, rather than the definiteness/indefiniteness of the topic. Moreover, it shows that at least some of the differences between CLLD vs. preverbal indefinites & bare NP/QP topics & preverbal locative topics can be reduced to the presence vs. absence of a clitic respectively.

2.2 Preverbal locative topics

Daskalaki & Mavrogiorgos (2013, 2016) discuss a restricted set of locative predicates in Greek which take a locative genitive argument that cannot be cliticized:

- (25) O γάνis *?(tu) iperísxise tu γóryu stis ekloyés.
 The John.nom *?(him.gen.cl) prevailed.3sg the George.gen in.the elections.acc
 ‘Janis prevailed over George at the elections.’

They argue that this argument is a DP (and not a PP), and that the lack of cliticization is due to the fact that the applicative-like element (namely, the locative prefix that combines with the root) introducing and licensing the locative argument does not have phi-features (a necessary, though not sufficient, condition for cliticization to take place).

What is interesting about this structure in relation to the current discussion is that it may involve a definite DP argument that cannot be cliticized. The question that immediately arises is whether a preverbal definite locative argument is possible, and if yes what its properties are. In fact, preverbal definite locative arguments are possible, even though they cannot be cliticized, and they are interpreted as topics:

⁵ Dimitriadis partially supports this assumption on the fact that IOD in Greek is *not* subject to a number of restrictions found in Spanish IOD, which have been attributed to movement by Campos (1986). Although I am not convinced that the data reported by Dimitriadis (1994) are grammatical, or that they necessarily support his conclusion (cf. that CLLD construction have been analysed as involving movement by various researchers – see e.g. López 2009), it is far from clear that IOD and preverbal indefinite & bare NP/QP topics constitute the same phenomenon (as evidenced by 4-5).

- (26) a. - Pjós iperísxise tu γόρυ?
 Who prevailed the George.gen
 ‘Who prevailed over George?’
 - Tu γόρυ (o JÁnis) (*tu) iperísxise.
 The George.gen (the JOhn.nom) (*him.gen.cl) prevailed.3sg
 (o JAnis) stis ekloghes.
 (the JOhn.nom) in.the elections
 ‘George, John prevailed over him in the elections.’
 b. - Péss mu γia ton γόryo.
 Tell.2sg.imp me.gen.cl for the George.acc
 ‘Tell me about George!’
 -Tu γόρυ iperísxise o γánis.
 The George.gen prevail.pst.3.sg the John.nom
 -Tu γόρυ tu δósane éna vravío.
 The George.gen him.gen.cl gave.3pl a prize.acc
 ‘George, they gave him a prize.’

Additional evidence that preverbal locative arguments are topics is that they have to precede preverbal wh-phrases and foci, on a par with other (cliticized) preverbal topics:

- (27) a. Tu γόρυ pjós iperísxise stis ekloyés?
 The George.gen who.nom prevailed.3sg in.the elections
 ‘George, who prevailed over him in the elections?’
 b. *?Pjós tu γόρυ iperísxise stis ekloyés?
 c. Tu γόρυ pjós tu édose éna vravío?
 The George.gen who.nom him.gen.cl gave.3sg a prize.acc
 ‘George, who gave him a prize?’
 d. *?Pjós tu γιόρυ tu édose éna vravío?

If preverbal locative DPs are topics, and if they cannot be cliticized (despite the fact that they are definite), they are expected to pattern like indefinites & bare NP/QP topics (which are also not cliticized), rather than like CLLDed topics. If this turns out to be true, and if it is also true that preverbal locative topics do not involve a null clitic (highly unlikely, given that they block an overt clitic), the simplest hypothesis to make is that preverbal indefinites/bare NP topics do not involve a null clitic either. To assume the opposite would leave the similarities between the two structures (or with wh-phrases and foci), as well as their differences from CLLD unaccounted for. In other words, when syntactic conditions allow a clitic, it is definite and one can see it ; otherwise it is not present at all in the structure (i.e. indefiniteness is linked to the lack of a definite structure, an assumption that has been independently supported for Greek – see Alexopoulou, Folli & Tsoulas 2013).

In fact, and as far as the properties discussed in section 2.1 are concerned, preverbal locative arguments confirm this expectation:

- (i) Preverbal locative arguments/topics undergo long head movement

- (28) [Tu γáni nomízo [óti ípe i María
 The John.gen think.1sg that said.3sg the Mary.nom
 [óti epikrátise o Fánis e]].
 that prevailed.over.3sg the Fanis.gen e

‘John, I think Mary said that Fanis prevailed over.’

(ii) Preverbal locative arguments are sensitive to strong islands

- (29) *[Tu Kósta írthe i María [afú proiγíθike o γánis]].
 The Kosta.gen came.3sg the Mary.nom after preceded.3sg the Janis.nom
 *‘Kostas, Mary came after John preceded.’

(iii) Preverbal locative arguments are subject to minimality effects

- (30) *Tu eðáfus óreksi léne óti éci o γánis na iperíptate.
 The ground.gen appetite.acc say.3pl that has.3sg the John.nom subj over.fly.3sg
 *‘The ground, they say that John always wants to fly over.’

(iv) Preverbal locative arguments do not trigger obligatory subject-verb inversion

- (31) Tu γáni o Pétros iperísçise.
 The John.gen the Peter.nom prevailed.3sg

(v) Preverbal locative arguments reconstruct wrt. binding

- (32) a. [Tu eaftú tis_i]_j proístate i Revéka_i t_j.
 The self her.cl.gen presides.3sg the Reveka.nom
 ‘Reveka presides over herself.’
 [Binding Principle A]
- b. [Tu aðelfú tis_{i/k}]_j epikrátise i Revéka_i t_j.
 The brother.gen her.cl.gen prevailed.3sg the Reveka.nom
 ‘Reveka prevailed over her brother.’
 [Binding Principle B]
- c. *[Tu aðelfú tis Revéka_s]_k pro_j epikrátise t_{j/k} xorís prospáθia.
 The brother.gen the Reveka.gen pro prevailed.3sg without effort
 ‘S/he prevailed over Reveka’s brother without any effort.’
 [Binding Principle C]

(vi) Preverbal locative arguments reconstruct wrt. variable binding

- (33) [Ton fititón tu_j]_i proiγíθike [káθe kaθiyitís]_j t_i.
 The students.gen his.cl.gen preceded.3sg every professor.nom
 ‘His students, every professor preceded.’

(vii) Preverbal locative arguments are possible with bare quantifiers (weak reading)

- (34) Kápju/enós i MaRía θα proiγúndan.
 Someone.gen the MARY.nom would precede.3sg
 ‘MARIA would precede someone.’

(viii) Preverbal locative arguments give rise to WCO effects: the following sentence is possible with the reading given, only if the preverbal quantifier is interpreted as the possessum of ‘the boss’ (and not as an object of the verb):

- (35) [Kápu (ipalílu)]_i epikrátise [o proístámenós tu]_i t_i sti sinélefsi.
[some (clerk.gen)] prevailed.3sg [the boss.nom his.cl.gen] t_i in.the meeting
'Some (clerk), his boss prevailed over at the meeting.'

Similar effects arise with preverbal wh-phrases and foci, which suggests that this must be a construction specific effect:

- (36) a. [Pjanú ipalílu]_i epikrátise [o proístámenós tu]_i t_i sti sinélefsi?
[which clerk.gen]_i prevailed.3sg [the boss.nom his.gen.cl] t_i in.the meeting
'Whose clerk did his boss prevail at the meeting?'
b. [AfTÚ tu ipalílu]_i epikrátise [o proístámenós tu]_i t_i sti sinélefsi.
[THIS the clerk.gen prevailed.3sg [the boss.nom his.gen.cl] t_i in.the meeting
'The boss of THIS clerk prevailed at the meeting.'

That this is the case is further corroborated by the fact that indirect/genitive objects do give rise to WCO effects:⁶

- (37) a. ?*[Pjanú ipalílu]_i éstile [o proístámenós tu]_i t_i to vravío?
[which clerk.gen]_i sent.3sg [the boss.nom his.gen.cl] t_i the prize.acc?
'Whose clerk did his boss send the prize?'
b. [Pjanú ipalílu]_i tu_i éstile [o proístámenós tu]_i t_i to vravío?
[which clerk.gen] him.gen.cl sent.3sg [the boss.nom his.gen.cl] t_i the prize.acc
'Whose clerk did his boss send him the prize?'

- (ix) Preverbal locative topics give rise to parasitic gaps (38), preferably if they are bare NPs/QPs:

- (38) [Kápu /Ipalílon] i MaRíá proístáte
[someone.gen/clerk.gen] the MaRíA.nom presides.over
xorís na γnorízi prosopiká.
without subj knows personally
'Someone/Clerks, MARY presides over without knowing personally.'

Definite locative arguments may also give rise to parasitic gaps if the subject is focalized:⁷

⁶ The peculiar behaviour of locative arguments could be related to the fact that locative arguments and their subjects belong to the same minimal domain (see Daskalaki & Mavrogiorgos 2016).

⁷ Interestingly enough, when the verb is focused (instead of the subject), a preverbal locative argument allows for parasitic gaps, as opposed to post-verbal ones:

- (i) Tu Kósta proístáte i María xorís na γnorízi prosopiká.
The Kosta.gen preSides the Maria.nom without subj knows personally
'Over Kostas Mary DOES preside without knowing him personally.'
(ii) Proístáte i María tu Kósta xorís na ?*(ton) γnorízi prosopiká.
preSides the Maria.nom the Kosta.gen without subj ?*(him.acc.cl) knows personally
'Mary DOES preside over Kostas without knowing him personally.'

That the position of the locative argument before or after the verb plays a role in the licensing of parasitic gaps is confirmed by the fact that the same observation applies to bare QPs/NPs (note that the definite clitic does not need to refer to an actual person in iii):

- (iii) I MaRíá proístáte kápu /ipalílon
The MaRíA.nom presides someone.gen /clerk.gen

- (39) [Tu Kósta] (i MaRía) proístate (i MaRía)
 [the Kosta.gen] (the MaRia.nom) presides.over (the MaRia.nom)
 xoris na ghorizi prosopika.
 without subj knows personally
 ‘Kostas, Maria presides over him without knowing him personally.’

(x) Preverbal locative arguments are not allowed in non-root contexts (or embedded clauses which lack root properties), such as central/non-peripheral adverbial clauses (see Haegeman 2004):

- (40) *An tu γάνι proiyiθís, tha termatísis prótos.
 If the John.gen precede.2sg fut finish.2sg first
 ‘If you precede John, you will finish first.’

(xi) Preverbal locative arguments may co-occur with wh-pronouns or foci (which they precede). In this respect, they pattern like CLLDed topics:

- (41) a. Tu γάνι pjós iperísxise?
 The John.gen who.nom prevailed.3sg
 b.
 b. *?Pjós tu γάνι iperísxise?
 Who.nom the John.gen prevailed.3sg
 ‘John, who prevailed over him?’

These properties are summarized in the table below, where the properties of wh-phrases, foci, CLLD and indefinites/bare NPs are also presented (for comparison):

	WH	Focus	CLLD	Indefinites/bare NP topics	Locative topics
Long distance	√	√	√	√	√
Strong islands	√	√	√	√	√
Minimality effects/uniqueness	√	√	X	√	√
Obligatory S-V inversion	√	√	X	X	X
Idiomatic readings	N/A	√	√	√	N/A
Reconstruction for Binding	√	√	√	√	√
Reconstruction for variable binding	√	√	√	√	√

xoris na ?*(ton/tus) γnorizi prosopiká.
 without subj ?*(him.acc.cl/them.acc.cl) knows personally
 ‘Mary presides over someone/clerks without knowing him/them personally.’

Scope reconstruction (weak reading)	√	√	X	√	√
Bare quantifiers	√	√	X	√	√
WCO	√	√	X	√	X (N/A)
Parasitic Gaps	√	√	X	√	√
Embedded in central adverbial clauses	N/A	X	√	X	X
Co-occurrence with wh	X	X	√	√	√
Cliticization	X (unless D-linked)	X (unless D-linked)	√	X (unless D-linked)	X (for independent reasons)

From this table, it becomes obvious that locative topics behave like indefinites & bare NP/QP topics in all their properties (besides WCO effects, which are impossible to test for independent reasons). This fact is quite surprising, as one would expect definite locative arguments to behave like CLLDed topics (given that both are definite). It seems that what unifies indefinites & bare NP/QP topics with locative topics is not the (in)definiteness status of the topic but the (un)availability of an overt clitic. This conclusion renders the null indefinite clitic hypothesis very unlikely (especially so, given the fact that the properties shared by CLLDed topics and indefinites & bare NP/QP topics are also shared by wh-phrases and foci). Moreover, it is compatible with the hypothesis independently put forward by Alexopoulou, Folli & Tsoulas (2013) that bare NP arguments in Greek are NumbPs (and not DPs) and therefore ban cliticization (clitics being D). Finally, it makes the prediction that whereas CLLDed topics involve a definite clitic, indefinites & bare NP/QP topics as well as preverbal locative topics do not involve a clitic at all in their underlying structure. Whether this hypothesis is correct is an issue for further empirical research. However, from it follows that the presence of a clitic somehow blocks the application of ‘topicalization’ (independently of whether CLLD and topicalization are derivationally similar or not, an issue that is debated – see López 2009). One possibility that comes to mind is that whereas topicalization involves movement of the topic to the surface position, structures with a definite clitic involve topicalization from a higher position, namely a derived (A) position (see Daskalaki & Mavrogiorgos 2013 on Greek free relatives; Angelopoulos & Sportiche 2016 on Greek & French CLLD and CLRD). Presumably, the clitic needs to be discarded at the derived position before the rest of the DP is allowed to move to a left periphery/topic position (possibly, due to the fact that the clitic is a phase head, on a par with K and P heads – see Daskalaki & Mavrogiorgos 2013, 2016; Mavrogiorgos 2010). All these are open questions for further research.

3. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that structures containing preverbal indefinites & bare NP/QP topics in Greek do not involve a null indefinite clitic. First, I showed that these topics behave on a par with preverbal wh-phrases and topics, and only partially with CLLDed topics (namely, in terms of connectivity), rendering the indefinite null clitic hypothesis less likely. Second, I argued that preverbal locative topics, which may be definite and which cannot be cliticized for independent reasons, behave on a par with indefinites & bare NP/QP topics. This shows that their shared properties cannot be the result of their (in)definiteness status; rather it is linked to

the (un)availability of (overt) cliticization, a fact which suggests that locative arguments and preverbal non-cliticized topics actually do not involve a clitic. This conclusion is compatible with the well-known observation that Greek clitics are topic markers (and not definiteness markers, although they are restricted by definiteness – see Anagnostopoulou 1999).

Bibliography

Alexopoulou, Theodora, Folli, Raffaella, Tsoulas, George. 2013. Bare Number. *Syntax and its Limits*, ed. by Raffaella Folli, Christina Sevdali, Robert Truswell, 300-324. Oxford: OUP.

Alexopoulou, Theodora, Kolliakou, Dimitra. 2002. On Linkhood and Clitic Left Dislocation. *Journal of Linguistics* 38:2. 193–245.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1999. Conditions on Clitic Doubling in Greek. *Clitics in the Languages of Europe. Language Typology Volume III*, ed. by H. van Riemsdijk, 762-798. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Angelopoulos, Nikos, Sportiche, Dominique. 2016. “French dislocations are plain (scrambling) movements”. Talk presented at Going Romance 30, 8-10 December 2016, Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main.

Campos, Héctor. 1986. Indefinite Object Drop. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17:2. 354–359.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. Types of A'-dependencies. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Daskalaki, Evangelia, Mavrogiorgos, Marios. 2013. Obligatory Resumption in Greek Free and Restrictive Relatives. *Syntax and its limits*, ed. by Raffaella Folli, Christina Sevdali, Robert Truswell, 324-344. Oxford: OUP.

Daskalaki, Evangelia, Mavrogiorgos, Marios. 2016. Two ways of encoding location in Greek: Locative Applicative and Prepositions. *Glossa* 1(1):16. 1-33.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.74>

Dimitriadis, Alexis. 1994. Clitics and Object Drop in Modern Greek. *Proceedings of SCIL-6*, University of Rochester.

Haegeman, Liliane. 2006. Argument Fronting in English, Romance CLLD, and the Left Periphery. *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics: Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*, ed. by Raffaella Zanuttini, Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, Paul H. Portner, 27-52. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

Iatridou, Sabine. 1990. Clitics and Island Effects. Ms., MIT.

López, Luis. 2009. *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*. Oxford: OUP.

Mavrogiorgos, Marios. 2010. *Clitics in Greek: A Minimalist Account of Proclisis and Enclisis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Rivero, María-Luisa. 1980. On Left-Dislocation and Topicalization in Spanish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11. 363-393.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. *Elements of Grammar*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.