Discourse linking and subjects in Modern Greek

Elena Anagnostopoulou

0. Introduction

The purpose of this article is to discuss the facts of Obligatory Inversion (OI) in Modern Greek and to show how an analysis along the lines of Canac Marquis (1991) for Spanish may account for them: OI phenomena are treated in terms of clause-internal barrierhood which is due to the blocking character of preverbal subjects in certain languages.[1] Further support to this idea, which crucially presupposes the lack of overt I-to-C movement in main and embedded interrogatives, is provided by a class of systematic exceptions to OI attested in Modern Greek, namely questions introduced by Discourse linked wh-phrases.

   The paper is organized as follows. Section 1 summarizes the main properties of OI, as have been discussed in the literature. In section 2, the Modern Greek D-linking data are presented; it is claimed that they can be subsumed under 'specificity' in the sense of Enç (1991). Section 3 is a critical review of some recent treatments of the phenomenon under consideration. Finally, in section 4 an analysis of Obligatory Inversion is attempted: the specific proposal I make is that preverbal subjects in Greek are topics, and for this reason they interfere with wh-movement. Under this view, the wh-constructions that have been independently claimed in the literature not to involve movement are correctly predicted to be insensitive to Obligatory Inversion.

1. The phenomenon of Obligatory Inversion

The phenomenon of Obligatory Inversion (OI) as found in Modern Greek can be captured by the following generalization which is based on Torrego's (1984) original description of the relevant data from peninsular Spanish: *'An argument ('lexically selected') wh-word in the Comp position of a tensed clause triggers obligatory inversion (subject-verb) in both main and embedded clauses'*. Any analysis of OI should be able to express in a satisfactory way the correlation between three properties:

(a) The fact that OI systematically occurs in *null subject, 'free inversion'-languages* (e.g. Spanish, Catalan or Modern Greek).

(b) The fact that OI uniformly applies both in *direct* and in *indirect questions*, as shown by the oppositions below, where the subject is never allowed to intervene between the wh-word and the verb, and this irrespectively of the *root-embedded* character of the structures involved:

(1) a   *Pjon   o   Petros   idhe?
          Whom(Acc)   the Peter(Nom) saw-3sg?
     b   Pjon   idhe   o   Petros?
          Whom(Acc)   saw-3sg   the Peter(Nom)?
          'Who did Peter see?'
     c   *I   Maria   rotise   pjon   o   Petros   idhe.
          The Mary(Nom) asked-3sg whom(Acc) the Peter(Nom) saw-3sg
     d   I   Maria   rotise   pjon   idhe   o   Petros.
          The Mary(Nom) asked-3sg whom(Acc) saw-3sg the Peter(Nom)
          'Mary asked who Peter saw'

(c) Finally, the fact that this type of inversion is characterized by a number of significant *exceptions*: it is obligatory with *lexically selected* wh-words, but it does not have to occur with *adjunct fronting* (cf. Torrego 1984, Canac-Marquis 1991 for Spanish, Drachman & Klidi 1992 for the corresponding Modern Greek data and discussion).

2. Discourse Linking and Obligatory Inversion in Modern Greek

In Modern Greek, there is a second class of systematic exceptions to Obligatory Inversion, namely questions introduced by *d(iscourse)-linked wh-phrases* (i.e. wh-phrases referentially linked to '..sets established in the discourse..', according to Pesetsky's (1987:108) formulation). As the two groups of examples under (2) and (3) indicate, the *acceptability* of preverbal subjects depends on a number of characteristic properties of the fronted *argument* wh-phrases:

(a) In questions introduced by *overt partitive wh-phrases* (typically d-linked), inversion doesn't have to take place (2a).

(b) *'Which-phrases'* which are usually understood as d-linked do not require inversion, especially when they receive a partitive reading (2b).

(c) On the contrary, OI does occur with the bare element *'pjos'* (corresponding to the English 'who') and the 'aggressively' non d-linked element *'pjos sto diavolo'* (which is the Greek counterpart of the expression 'who-the-hell', cf. Pesetsky 1987 for the relevant tests), as illustrated by the corresponding illformed Modern Greek examples (2c), (2d).

(d) Finally, while inversion is not obligatory with *'how many phrases'* (especially as overt or covert partitives, cf. 3a & 3b), which are well known for having the option of receiving referential readings, it must take place with any type of *'what-phrase'* (i.e. bare, non bare), the latter being typically non d-linked (3c) & (3d).[2]

Here are the relevant examples:

(2)   a   Pjon   apo tus filus tu o   Petros agapai   perissotero?
          Which of   the friends-his the Peter love-3sg most?
          'Which one of his friends does Peter like most?'

      b   Pjon   mathiti i   dhaskala agapai   perissotero?
          Which pupil   the teacher   love-3sg most?
          'Which pupil does the teacher like most?'

      c   *Pjon   i   dhaskala malose   (xtes, perissotero)?
          *Whom the teacher   scolded-3sg (yesterday, most)?
          'Who did the teacher scold (yesterday) / scold (most)?'

      d   **Pjon   sto   diavolo i   dhaskala malose?
          **Whom to-the devil   the teacher   scolded?
          'Who the hell did the teacher scold?'

(3)   a   Posa   apo ta provlimata i Maria lini   efkola?
          How many of   the problems the Mary solve-3sg easily?
          'How many of the problems does Mary solve without difficulty?'

      b   Posa   provlimata i Maria lini   xoris   diskolia?
          How many problems   the Mary solve-3sg without difficulty?
          'How many problems does Mary solve without difficulty?'

---

[2] According to the intuitions of the native speakers, certain types of verbal predicates seem more appropriate to impose a clear partitive reading on the wh-phrase than others: tense, aspect and the type of verbal modifier chosen seem to play a role. Especially crucial seems to be the relevance of the adverbial element: all the wellformed cases given below are ungrammatical when the adverbs VP-finally are missing. The reason for this is completely unclear to me.

c   *Ti   tenies o   Gavras kani?
    *What films   the Gavras make-3sg?
    'What kind of films does Gavras make?'
d   **Ti   / ti   sto   diavolo o   Gavras ekane   (teleftea)?
    **What / what to-the devil   the Gavras made-3sg (lately)?
    'What / what the hell did Gavras make lately?'

By adopting the proposal in Enç (1991:5-9), according to which, the phenomenon
called by Pesetsky *D-linking* is actually a subcase of *Specificity*, which can be
semantically treated in terms of *Partitiveness* (in the sense that certain instances
of specific NPs are systematically interpreted as partitives, and various syntactic
phenomena crosslinguistically can be sensitive to this particular subtype of
specificity), the scale of acceptability illustrated above can be captured in a
straightforward manner.

3. Previous approaches to Obligatory Inversion. Criticism

With these facts in mind, let us now briefly review the main approaches towards
Obigatory Inversion which can be found in the literature:
    (a) *OI is an instance of I-to-C movement*: this line of analysis has been
proposed by Rizzi (1991: 15-19) for Italian interrogatives (for a variant of this
idea, cf. Tsimpli 1990 for Modern Greek). More specifically, Rizzi attempts to
attribute OI to the *Wh-Criterion*, thus extending the theoretical explanation he
uses for the obligatoriness of subject-Aux inversion in English to Obligatory
Inversion phenomena as well. In this way, he essentially handles OI as a residual
V-2 phenomenon. As far as I can see, there are two main objections to be raised
against such a view:
    First, the typological consideration with respect to the *non root character* of
the phenomenon discussed here can be taken as a strong indication against Rizzi's
proposal. Rizzi is aware of this problem, which he tries to solve by suggesting
that in OI-languages, the functional head bearing the WH feature is always the
tensed I, in embedded contexts too. He furthermore attempts to link this idea to
the 'richness' of tensed I in Null Subject Languages; however, it is not clear to
me why the richness of a head with respect to L-related features should be made
responsible for the attraction of non L-related features as well.
    The second objection is based on the fact that, as stated above, one striking
property of OI is that it has *exceptions*. Assuming that Rizzi is right in attributing
I-to-C movement in wh-questions to a principle like the Wh-criterion, any attempt
to extend this particular account to OI would be faced with the problem of
weakening the explanatory power of the Wh-criterion: one would be forced to
admit that, in OI languages, I-to-C movement has to take place with some wh-
phrases but not with others. Interestingly enough, Rizzi briefly mentions the D-

linking exceptions to OI by observing that '...*the obligatoriness of I-to-C in interrogatives is generally weakened, when a discourse linked wh is involved, for unclear reasons...*'. What I would like to show instead is that this class of exceptions to OI can be handled in a more principled way, provided that we abandon the overt I-to-C movement idea for the languages under consideration.

(b) *Wh and preverbal Subjects competing for the same structural position.* This account has been proposed independently by Bonet (1991) for Catalan and Drachman (1991) for Modern Greek.[3] It is based on the VP-subject internal hypothesis (cf. Koopman-Sportiche 1988 among others) and the consequences it may have for the analysis of free-inversion languages. First, post verbal subjects no longer have to be treated in terms of a subject-postposing rule, especially if Koopman and Sportiche are right that Nominative Case can be assigned VP-internally under government by INFL: it can be argued that they occupy their D-structure position. Furthermore, in order to ensure that, in interrogatives, the subject has to stay VP internally, it is suggested that the wh-words actually occupy the [SPEC, IP] position. The idea that [SPEC, IP] is the landing site for wh-movement again can be made to follow from the VP-subject internal hypothesis, which allows us to treat [SPEC, IP] as a neutral (A/A') position, at least for languages where Subjects can be Case-licensed VP-internally.[4] Figure (4) illustrates this proposal:

(4) $[_{IP}$ WH$_j$ V$_k$ $[_{VP}$ Subject e$_k$ e$_j$]]

The line of research which reduces OI to the ban on preverbal subjects in wh-constructions, by exploiting the free inversion character of the languages involved, appears to have one important advantage, namely that it manages to express the correlation between Free Inversion and Obligatory Inversion in a systematic way. I conclude that it is worth considering. However, the obvious implication of the analysis sketched above, as explicitly stated by Bonet (1991: 15), again would be that the feature Q associated with questions in these languages is in I and not in C, both in main and in embedded questions (cf. Pesetsky 1989): that would prevent [SPEC,CP] from being a landing site for wh-expressions. This result seems undesirable, given the fact that OI has *exceptions*, which are left

---

[3] For a similar view on Spanish, cf. Goodall (1991): his proposal results from a combination between Kuroda's (1988) formulation of the wh-criterion and Rizzi's (1990) ideas on the typology of C-agreement systems. Also, cf. Drijkoningen (1990) for a related (though essentially distinct) analysis.

[4] H.van Riemsdijk points out that this line of reasoning is insufficient to predict the contrast between Germanic languages on the one hand, and Obligatory Inversion languages on the other: for both we have to admit the option for VP-internal Case licensing of subjects (cf. den Besten 1985 for Dutch), but they clearly behave differently with respect to topicalization and question formation. Something more has to be said with respect to the feature manifestation of C and I in the languages under investigation.

unexplained in Bonet's analysis as well (cf. the criticism of Rizzi above). The alternative pursued by Drachman & Klidi (1992), according to which, [SPEC,IP] is the landing site for movement, while [SPEC, CP] is an intrinsic operator position where adjunct wh-phrases can be base generated (under the assumption that the latter don't need a variable in order to be interpreted), while being on the right track, does not provide a straightforward answer to the question of the exact location of the Q feature.

A second issue I would like to address here and that will lead us to the analysis proposed in the next section, has to do with the characterization of [SPEC, IP] as an A/A' position, which according to both Bonet and Drachman is determined by the surface position of the Subject (cf. Diesing 1990, for an interesting attempt to derive this result from Binding Theory). However, the status of structures like the following,

(5)   ?? [Wh$_i$........[that [Subject....V...e$_i$....]]]

seems to suggest that [SPEC,IP] does not obviously count as an A position when occupied by the subject, given that it interferes with wh-movement. Figure (5) is exemplified by the Modern Greek questions under (6):

(6) a ?? Pjon$_i$ ipes   oti   i   Katerina   idhe   t$_i$?
         ?? Whom$_i$(Acc)   said-2sg that the Katerina(Nom) saw-3sg   t$_i$?
     b Pjon$_i$ ipes   oti   idhe   i   Katerina   t$_i$?
        Whom$_i$(Acc) said-2sg that saw-3sg the Katerina(Nom) ti?
        'Who did you say that Katerina saw?'

I conclude that preverbal subjects in OI-languages create a weak locality effect, which it would be tempting to attribute to Subjacency.[5]

4. Deriving OI: Subjacency effect based on Preverbal Subjects as Topics

The analysis proposed here is heavily based on Canac-Marquis (1991), who attributes OI effects in Spanish to Subjacency.[6] Unlike Canac-Marquis though, who derives OI from an interaction of *Subjacency* and an extended application of

---

[5] As suggested to me by P.Coopmans (p.c.), the plausibility of such an account is enforced by the observation that Subjacency violations usually lead to weak ungrammaticality. Bonet, alternatively, suggests that the deviance of these long distance cases has to do with the fact that, in the languages under investigation, [SPEC,CP] is an unusual intermediate position for wh-movement to proceed through. It seems to me that though that within the proposal explored in the next section nothing extra needs to be stipulated.

[6] cf. also Uriagereka (1992b) for various Romance dialects and Basque.

the *Principle of Economy of Derivation*, I will explore the possibility of linking Subjacency to the *topic-status* of preverbal subjects in OI languages.[7] [8] From a functional point of view, the difference between SVO and VSO orders in pro-drop languages corresponds to the fact that the former can be divided into a topic-part and a comment part whereas in the latter all the information presented is new: it is plausible to formalise this intuition further along the lines suggested in this section.[9] The distributional similarity between subjects and XPs that are clearly topicalized provides empirical support in favor of this view: in all the enviroments of Obligatory Inversion, topics are not allowed to intervene between the wh-phrase and the verb; however, topicalized XPs are grammatical after adjunct and D-linked wh-phrases. The following examples (involving Clitic Left Dislocated Objects) illustrate this point:

(7)   a   *Pjos   ton Petro$_j$ ton$_j$-agapa?
         *Who(Nom) the Peter$_j$(Acc) him$_j$-love-3sg?
         Who, Peter(Topic) loves?
         'Who loves Peter?'

      b   Jiati ton Petro$_j$ ton$_j$-theoris   eksipno?
         Why the Peter$_j$(Acc) him$_j$-consider-2sg clever?
         Why Peter(Topic) you-consider clever?
         'Why do you consider Peter clever?'

      c   Pjo   apo ta pedhia   ton Petro$_j$ ton$_j$-agapai-3sg
         Which of   the children(Nom) the Peter$_j$(Acc) him$_j$-love-3sg
         perisotero?
         most?
         Which one of the children, Peter(Topic) loves most?
         'Which one of the children loves Peter most?'

---

[7] Canac-Marquis argues that, IP being a barrier, and *substitution* being a more economic escape hatch than *adjunction* (in the sense that the latter is not structure preserving, since it creates extra structure), the wh-phrase has to move through [SPEC, IP] whenever this option is being made available by the language: hence, in languages like Spanish, where [SPEC,IP] is an *open* position (A/A'), wh-movement has to proceed through it (for details, cf. R. Canac-Marquis 1991).

[8] This is an old intuition for M.Gk. (for example, cf. I.Philippaki-Warburton 1985 and previous work). The same idea (but with a different motivation, namely that in her system TP is higher than AgrP in M.Gk.) can be found in Tsimpli (1990). Drachman's (1991) proposal on the Modern Greek sentential system, on the other hand, has the advantage that, by considering MoodP as the highest projection in the M.Gk. sentential system, and [SPEC,MP] as the potential preverbal Subject position, there is no a priori reason to assume that [SPEC,MP] is an A position. For an alternative, according to which [SPEC,MP] necessarily is an A position, cf. Terzi 1992.

[9] As has been pointed out especially by I.Philippaki-Warburton for M.Gk., VSO orders can be thought as answers to the question "what happened"; this is what Kuroda (1972) calls a *"thetic statement"*: a new information structure is created (cf. also Comorovski 1991 for a detailed discussion on the relation between "free inversion" and "novelty" in pro-drop languages in general).

One way of executing the idea explored here would be by simply reformulating Bonet (for Drachman, cf. fn 12 below), so as to ensure that [SPEC,IP] never has the status of an A-position in Modern Greek, and for this reason wh-movement has to proceed through it. This can be done for instance if it is assumed that Nominative Case is only assigned VP-internally.[10] I will not maintain this solution, since I can see two internal theoretic problems with it: (i) Once we adopt the split INFL hypothesis, and in particular Belletti's reformulation of Pollock's original proposal, the highest [SPEC,IP] position is actually [SPEC,AgrSP]. It is hard to see how this position could ever be occupied by anything else but the subject, especially if we assume further the ideas expressed in Chomsky (1992). (ii) In addition, such an account would have no straightforward answer to the problem raised by *referential pro*. Take a wellformed, Null Subject, Modern Greek question like *'Pjon idhes?'* (Whom (Acc) saw-2sg, 'who did you see?'): if we analyse it by using standard theories of *pro* (cf. Rizzi 1986 in particular) and the *VP-subject internal hypothesis*, what we will have to say, is that pro is projected VP-internally, and then it is moved to [SPEC,AgrSP], in order to get locally identified (under spec-head agreement). This sentence then would have the structure (8),

(8) WH_i $[_{AgrSP}$ pro_j - V_k.........$[_{VP}$ t_j ...t_k...t_i ..]],

where *j* would be a *referential* index. Taking (8) to be the correct analysis, it is unclear why an overt referential element in [SPEC,IP] creates a blocking effect, while a covert one doesn't.[11] Complications of this sort can be avoided under the following representation of preverbal subjects as topics,

(9) $[_{CP}$ WH_i $[_{XP}$ TOPIC (Subject$_k$) $[_{AgrSP}$ pro_k.............t_i.....]]]

---

[10] For a detailed analysis along these lines, cf. Borer 1992: in her system, the A/A' distinction applies to chains and not to positions. Furthermore, she bases the island effects induced by XP-topics on licensing domains for Operator movement (cf. Borer 1992: 50-54 for details). The prediction her analysis leads to, is that locality effects created by topics are much stronger than simple Subjacency violations of the wh-island type for example. With respect to the M.Gk. data, what I have to observe at this point is that there is a significant difference between preverbal Subjects, Clitic Left Dislocated Objects and Adverbial elements on the one hand, and fronted focused XPs on the other: the former are comparable to wh-islands in creating a weak effect; the latter are responsible for a much stronger violation. As far as I can see, it is not obvious how to account for this difference in the first place: it is therefore not a priori clear which one of the two "locality" solutions actually makes the right predictions for Greek. I leave it open for further research.

[11] For an interesting attempt to derive this result in a principled way, cf. Uriagereka 1992b. His definition of barriers is based on an appropriately formulated notion of "strength".

where topicalized elements occupy the specifier position of a functional projection between CP and AgrSP. I take the head X of the XP represented in figure (9) to be a site of old information much in the sense of Uriagereka's (1992a) F.[12] I furthermore follow Uriagereka in assuming that parametric variation depends on whether F is syntactically licensed or not. The presence of elocutive clitics in Greek can be seen as one piece of independent evidence in favor of the postulation of this functional node, if the correlate between the strength of F and the existence of such clitics proposed in Uriagereka (1992a) is correct.[13] Under the assumption that the crossing of one barrier is sufficient even for strong Subjacency violations (cf. Cinque 1990 among others), the locality effect in (11) can be derived as follows: XP is a barrier by inheritance, AgrSP being a Blocking Category, as in Chomsky (1986); in addition, XP is an inherent barrier, when it is not L-marked.[14] In this way, both the ungrammaticality of (1a), (1c) and the deviance of (6) are formalized by appealing to Subjacency, as a theory on crossing clause internal projections (out of VP to Spec of CP). Now we have an account for the cases of Obligatory Inversion in terms of barrierhood. But how about the exceptions to OI that were discussed in the previous sections?

As was stated in the introduction of this paper, the main advantage of employing Subjacency to account for OI, is that it is certainly more promising for

---

[12]   The reason why I avoid labelling in this paper, is that there are many recent linguistic proposals (but cf. also Reinhart 1981 for a similar proposal motivated differently) that make use of an additional functional node between the traditional C and I. These proposals are not necessarily compatible with each other (e.g. Brody's (1990) FP has different properties from Uriagereka's FP, although both are "discourse sensitive"; on the other hand, Culicover's (1991) Polarity Phrase and Laka's (1990) Sigma are more semantic in nature). Notice that my account is compatible with an extension of Drachman, if his MoodP is partially identified with the XP used here. Due to space limitations, I can not elaborate more on this topic.

[13]   Uriagereka attributes this correlate to the fact that F serves as the interface with discourse representations, and elocutive clitics can only be bases generated there because they are pragmatically fixed to the addressee, outside the predicative and aspectual part of the clause. The existence of a range expressions like "su-exi mia xara o Petros !" (cl-dat, has one joy Peter !, "you know, Peter is full of joy"), which can be used only as main clauses, are taken as indication that elocutives exist in Greek.

[14]   In Anagnostopoulou (forthcoming) I argue that, in the short distance cases (1), XP is an inherent barrier, while it is only a barrier by inheritance in cases like (6), where long movement is involved. I follow Cinque (1990) in using the notion of selection instead of L-marking (the proper selection of the XP depends on the [+/- WH] features of C_o). I propose that this difference is responsible for a significant asymmetry: short distance wh-extraction across preverbal subjects is really bad (cf. the status of (1)), whereas the corresponding long distance questions have the status of weak violations. Under the proposed analysis, the former can be assimilated to strong Subjacency islands (i.e. the ones attributed to 2-Subjacency in Barriers) and the latter to weak Subjacency islands (prototypically wh-islands which are generally handled in terms of 1-Subjacency in Chomsky's (1986) system). Thanks go to Peter Coopmans, Riny Huybregts and Jan Koster for raising this issue and discussing it with me.

the treatment of both classes of exceptions presented above.[15] In particular, for the adjunct examples one possibility would be to adopt the analysis of Kolb & Thiersch (1990), who argue that, given the existence of an independent interpretive mechanism by virtue of which adjuncts are generally licensed within a local domain, adjunct wh-phrases can be base generated in [SPEC,CP], because they don't have to receive their interpretation by being bound to an independently licensed e.c.[16] The consequence of such a view would be that Subjacency (and therefore OI) is irrelevant for adjuncts (cf. also Hegarty 1991 for a detailed analysis of adjunct extraction without traces). As for the D-linking exceptions, I want to suggest further that these too can be dealt with, once we adopt the view advocated in Cinque (1990), that there exists an alternative to movement stategy involving base generated A' chains with a small pro instead of a variable: if (contra Cinque) Subjacency is a condition on movement, then OI is correctly predicted not to affect chains of this type. I therefore propose a 'last resort non movement' analysis for the grammatical Modern Greek examples presented in section 2.[17] The D-linking requirement has to do with *conditions on licensing pro*, given the well known fact that pronominal elements used as syntactic variables are excluded from intensional contexts (cf. Sells 1984, 1987 for resumptive pronouns) or, more generally, that pronouns cannot depend on non referential antecedents, unless they are licensed through a formal variable (cf. Higginbotham 1981, Barss 1987, Cinque 1990 among others). Independent evidence that a Cinque-type solution is on the right track is provided by the fact that, as the examples below indicate, in those enviroments where Inversion doesn't have to take place (namely, with specific wh-phrases), a Direct Object A' dependent clitic may be present. This clitic can be seen as *'lexical realization'* of *the A' bound object pro*:[18]

---

[15]   This point is already made in Canac Marquis for the adjunct-exceptions (cf. Canac Marquis 1991 for a different way of solving them than the one proposed here).

[16]   For the exact way they derive the grammatical cases of long distance wh-adjunct extraction, cf. Kolb & Thiersch 1990: 32-34 :"...The adjunct may (exceptionally) be interpreted within the lower CP by virtue of being bound to the *independently licensed* Specifier of COMP".

[17]   The idea that chains headed by D-linked wh-phrases are not subject to Subjacency is supported by the fact that Modern Greek shows similar distinctions with respect to D-linked vs. non D-linked wh-phrases in a number of environments: extractions out of wh-islands, factive islands introduced by the special complementizer "pu" (which arguably fall under Subjacency) and CNPs of the noun-complement type are acceptable with the former but unacceptable with the latter. For a detailed presentation of these facts and theoretical discussion on the related locality issues, cf. Anagnostopoulou (forthcoming).

[18]   This clitic is ungrammatical with non specific wh-phrases (due to space limitations I cannot give examples illustrating this), and there are good reasons for not analysing it as a "doubling one": contrary to Romanian and Porteño Spanish, it can be demonstrated that Modern Greek doubling is subject to "definiteness" and not to "specificity": this means that there is no plausible extraction site for the wh-phrases under (10); these are presumably specific but not definite. A convincing

(10) a   Pjo   provlima$_j$ o Petros   elise   e$_j$ monos tu?
         Which   problem$_j$(Acc) the Peter(Nom) solved-3sg e$_j$ on his own?
     b   Pjo   provlima$_j$ (o Petros)   to$_j$ elise   e$_j$ monos tu?
         Which   problem$_j$(Acc) the Peter(Nom) it$_j$-solved-3sg e$_j$ on his own?
         'Which problem did Peter solve on his own (without any help)?'

5. Conclusion

To conclude, in this paper I have argued in favor of treating Obligatory Inversion as a *locality effect*, thus extending Canac Marquis' (1991) analysis of Spanish to the Modern Greek data. The particular way I implemented *Subjacency* here, was to adopt the view that SVO orders in Modern Greek involve topicalization and to give it a structural correlate. Under this treatment, the head C can be maintained to be the host or the licenser of Operator Features (like Q), whereas the head X can be viewed as the 'interface with discourse representations' as in Uriagereka (1992a). All the possible consequences of this analysis have not been explored yet: for example, I did not spell out in details how I would deal with Nominative Case in Greek; nor did I describe the relation between *pro* and the *overt Subject* in a more precise way. These are complicated and theory dependent issues, which I hope to be able to address in future work.

References

Anagnostopoulou, E. (1992) 'A' Dependencies and Clitics in Modern Greek: the D-linking factor', to appear in *Studies in Greek Linguistics 13: proceedings of the 13th annual meeting of the Department of Linguistics* , University of Thessaloniki.

Anagnostopoulou, E. (forthcoming) *A' Constructions and clitics in Modern Greek*, PhD dissertation, Salzburg.

Barss, A. (1986) *Chains and Anaphoric Dependence: On Reconstruction and Its Implications*, PhD dissertation, MIT.

Belletti, A. (1990) *Generalized Verb Movement*, Rosenberg & Sellier, Turin.

Besten, H. den (1985) 'The Ergative Hypothesis and Free Word Order in Dutch and German' in Jindřich Toman, ed., *Studies in German Grammar*, Foris, Dordrecht.

Bonet, E. (1991) 'Subjects in Catalan,' in L.L.S. Cheng and H. Demirdash, eds., *Papers on Wh-movement*, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, Cambridge, MA.

Borer, H. (1992) 'The Ups and Downs of Hebrew Verb Movement', ms., UMass, Amherst.

Brody, M. (1990) 'Some remarks on the focus field in Hungarian' in *UCL working papers in linguistics 2*, University College London.

---

test for proving this point is to try to leave the wh-phrases under (10) in situ, under an echo reading: it can be shown that doubling is ungrammatical with them (the test has been suggested to me by H.Borer).

Canac Marquis, R. (1991) 'On the Obligatory Character of Inversion in Spanish' in *Proceedings of WCCFL 10*.

Chomsky, N. (1986) *Barriers*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, N. (1989), 'Some Notes on the Economy of Derivations and Representations' in *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 12*, Cambridge, MA.

Chomsky, N. (1992), 'A minimalist program for linguistic theory', ms. MIT.

Cinque, G. (1990), *Types of A' Dependencies*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Culicover, P. (1991), 'Topicalization, inversion, and complementizers in English' in D. Delfitto, M. Everaert, A. Evers and F. Stuurman, eds., *OTS Working Papers: the proceedings of Going Romance, and Beyond (fifth Symposium on Comparative Grammar*, University of Utrecht.

Comorovski, I. (1991) 'Partitives and the Definiteness Effect', in *Proceedings of WCCFL 10*

Diesing, M. (1990) 'Verb Movement and the Subject Position in Yiddish' in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8.

Drachman, G. (1991a), 'The Minimal Structure Hypothesis' in *Studies of Greek Linguistics 12: proceedings of the 12th annual meeting of the Department of Linguistics*, University of Thessaloniki.

Drachman, G. and. C. Klidi (1992), 'The proper treatment of adverbial questions in Greek: the extended minimal structure hypothesis', to appear in *Studies in Greek Linguistics 13: proceedings of the 13th annual meeting of the Department of Linguistics*, University of Thessaloniki.

Drijkoningen, F. (1990), 'Functional Heads and the Unification of French Word Order' in *Probus 2.3*

Enç, M. (1991), 'The Semantics of Specificity' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.

Goodall, G. (1991), 'On the Status of SPEC of IP' in *Proceedings of WCCFL 10*.

Hegarty, M. (1991), 'Adjunct Extraction without Traces', in *Proceedings of WCCFL 10*.

Higginbotham, J. (1980), 'Pronouns and Bound Variables' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 14.

Kolb, H.-P. and C. Thiersch (1990), 'Levels and Empty Categories in a Principles and Parameters Approach to Parsing', *ITK Research Report No. 19*, Institute for Language Technology and Artificial Intelligence, University of Tilburg.

Koopman, H. and D. Sportiche (1988), 'Subjects', ms. UCLA.

Pesetsky, D. (1987), 'Wh-in-situ: Movement and Unselective Binding' in E. J. Reuland and A. G. B. ter Meulen , eds., *The Representation of (In)definiteness*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Pesetsky, D. (1989), 'Language-Particular Processes and the Earliness Principle', ms., MIT.

Philippaki-Warburton, I. (1985), 'Word Order in Modern Greek' in *Transactions of the Philological Society 1985*

Rizzi, L. (1986), 'Null Objects in Italian and the Theory of pro' in *Linguistic Inquiry* 17.

Rizzi, L. (1991), 'Residual verb second and the Wh-criterion', *Technical Reports in formal and computational linguistics* 2, University of Geneva.

Sells, P. (1984), *Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns*, PhD dissertation, UMass Amherst.

Sells, P. (1987), 'Binding Resumptive Pronouns' in *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10.

Torrego, E. (1984), 'On Inversion in Spanish and Some of Its Effects', in Linguistic Inquiry 15.

Tsimpli, I.M. (1990), 'Clause structure and word order in Modern Greek', in *UCL working papers in linguistics 2*, University College London..

Uriagereka, J. (1992a), 'Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance', ms. UMD (to appear in LI).

Uriagereka, J. (1992b), 'Extraction Parameters', ms. UMD.