

Binding Illusions and resumption in Greek*

Theodora Alexopoulou
Marie Curie Fellow
Savoirs, Textes, Language
UMR 8163 CNRS Lille III
theodora.alexopoulou@univ-lille3.fr

Abstract

The paper focuses on some apparent exceptions to the generalization that quantifiers resist CLLD in Greek. The main body of exceptions involves generic statements. Following Fox and Sauerland (1996) I argue that the Generic Operator, by involving quantification over situations, allows a trivialization of quantifiers like *kathe*(=each). Thus, in sentences with a generic operator the pronominal resumes the single individual involved in each situation the generic tense quantifies over, rather than the quantified phrase. Pronouns in CLLD are thus-treated as E(D)-type pronouns.

1. Background

1.1. The problem

Examples (1) illustrate Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) in Greek.¹

- (1) a. To Yani *(ton) idha sto PARTY
the Yani-acc him saw-1sg at-the party
Yanis I met at the Party.
b. ta klidhia ta edhosa sti MARIA
the keys them gave-1sg to-the Maria
The keys I gave to Maria.

Greek CLLD resists quantifiers and wh-phrases² (Anagnostopoulou 1994; Iatridou 1995; Tsimpli 1995; Giannakidou 1997). So pronouns in CLLD are not bound ones, on a par with their Italian counterparts (Cinque 1990; Rizzi

*I am grateful to Richard Breheny, Ronnie Cann, Edit Doron, Paul Elbourne, Donka Farkas, Danny Fox, Liliane Haegeman, Caroline Heycock, Napoleon Katsos, Eleni Miltakaki, Mirabel Romero, Christina Sevdali, George Tsoulas and the audience of the 31st Penn Linguistics Colloquium 2007. Special thanks to Uli Sauerland for his insightful commentary and the editors of this volume Elena Anagnostopoulou, Sabine Iatridou and Jeremy Hartman. This work has been supported by a Marie-Curie Intra European Fellowship (MCA-IEF-GLIC-023943).

¹Throughout I translate CLLD with English Topicalization. But note that many Greek CLLD-ed objects would just appear in-situ in English, marked with B-accent or as passives. Small caps indicate accent placement throughout.

²For current purposes I assume that wh-phrases are indefinites with the quantificational force provided by a Focus operator.

1997).³ In all examples below, including the ones involving the preposed *kanena*, the problem is the pronominal. Without it the sentences are acceptable.

- (2) a. KANENA fititi dhen (*ton) idha sto parti
no-acc student-acc not him saw-1sg at-the party
No student did I see at the party.
b. PION (*ton) idhes sto parti
who-acc him saw-2sg at-the party
Who did you meet at the party?
c. KAMIA fititria dhen (*tin) apolisame
no student not her fired-1pl
No student did we fire.
d. PION ipalilo (*ton) apolisate
who-acc employee him fired-2pl
Which employee did you fire?

Further, at least referential CLLD-ed DPs cannot bear nuclear stress (3a) and function as the focus of a sentence (Anagnostopoulou 1994; Giannakidou 1997; Tsimpli 1995; Keller and Alexopoulou 2001; Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002). Thus, (4b) is ungrammatical; (4c) is grammatical but an infelicitous answer to (4a) since stress falls on the verb and not on the object; (4d) is a grammatical and felicitous answer to (4a) involving focus-movement (the object may also stay in situ).

- (3) *ta KLIDIA ta ferame
the keys them brought-1pl
The keys we brought.
- (4) a. pion idate sto parti
who-acc met-2pl at-the party
Who did you meet at the party?
b. *ton PETRO ton idame
the-acc Petros-acc him saw-1pl
c. ton Petro ton IDAME
the-acc Petros him saw-1pl
d. ton PETRO idame
the-acc Petros-acc saw-1pl

CLLD-ed DPs realize topics (Anagnostopoulou 1994; Philippaki-Warbuton 1985; Tsimpli 1995; Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002). In the (b) examples in (5)-(7), the CLLD-ed DPs establish a non-monotone anaphoric relation with a member of an established discourse set functioning as *links* in the sense of Hendriks and Dekker 1995—see Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002). (5b) and (6b) are *subsectional* topics while (7) is a relational one.

- (5) a. O kathiyitis tis glosologias edhose ti
the-nom professor the-gen linguistics-gen gave-3sg the-acc
vivliografia stus fitites
bibliography to-the students
The professor of linguistics gave the bibliography to the students.

³D-linking has been argued to improve acceptability of CLLD-ed quantifiers and wh-phrases. A recent magnitude estimation study has confirmed an effect of d-linking on the acceptability of a pronominal in wh-questions, in line with Anagnostopoulou's (1994) referentiality hierarchy. However, the effect is rather weak and the structures in question remain much worse than their gap counterparts (Alexopoulou and Keller).

- b. ton Chomsky ton vrikan DHISKOLO
 the-acc Chomsky him found-3pl difficult
 They found Chomsky difficult.

(Adapted from Anagnostopoulou (1994)[ex.13])

- (6) a. i fitites tu panepistimiu mas ehun poli
 the-nom students the-gen university-gen our have-3pl very
 kales epidhosis
 good ratings
 The students of our university are of a high caliber.
- b. mia dhidhaktoriki dhiatrivi tin protinan gia to
 a/one Ph.D. dissertation her recommended for the
 vradio kaliteris dhiatrivis stin astronomia
 prize best-gen disertation-gen in-the astronomy
 A Ph.D. thesis was recommended for the prize of best disserta-
 tion in astronomy.
- (7) a. Htes vjikame me tis palies simathitries
 Yesterday went-out-1PL with the old classmates
 Yesterday we went out with the old classmates.
- b. ta pedhia ta afisame stus adres
 the kids them left to-the men
 The children we left to the men.

So, to summarize, CLLD-ed DPs in Greek are necessarily topics, resist focalization and cannot be bound by quantifiers and *wh*-phrases. However, the restriction on binding is absent in generic statements (8). (Note that the negative polarity item *kanenas* and the *wh*-phrase *pios* necessarily bear nuclear stress in Greek.)

- (8) a. KANENA dhen ton apoliun etsi
 no one-acc not him fire-3pl like-this
 No one do you fire like this.
- b. KANENOS dhen tu aresi i ipokrisia
 no one-gen not him-gen like-3g the-nom hypocrisy
 No one likes hypocrisy (from Giannakidou 1997)
- c. KATHE dhiatrivi ti dhiavazume pada me MEGALI
 each dissertation it read-1pl always with big
 prosohi
 attention
 Each dissertation we always read (it) with great attention.
- d. PION ton apoliun etsi
 who-acc him fire-3pl like-this
 Who do you fire like this?

Consider also (9), where not only the pronominal is allowed, but Weak Crossover (WCO) is also absent.

- (9) a. KANENA₁ dhen ton₁ agapai i pethera tu₁
 no one-acc not him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his
 No one is loved by his mother-in-law.
- b. PION₁ ton₁ agapai i pethera tu₁
 who-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his
 Who is loved by his mother-in-law?

- c. KATHE₁ gineka ti₁ zilevi i pethera tis₁
 each woman her is-jealous-of the-nom mother-in-law her
 Every woman her mother-in-law is jealous of.

The focus of this paper is how binding apparently becomes possible in CLLD structures involving generic statements as in (8) and (9).

1.2. Quantifiers in CLLD

The first question is why binding is unavailable in (2) given that the quantifier *c*-commands the pronoun. One possibility is that a property of the pronoun blocks binding (see Elbourne 2005). However, this possibility has to be excluded. Greek pronouns can be bound (10a) and can be A-bar bound (10b-c) (see Alexopoulou 2006 on this).⁴

- (10) a. kathe fitiria₁ elpizi oti tha tin₁ kalesun
 each student hope-3sg that FUT her invite-3pl
 Each student hopes that they will invite her.
- b. kathe kopela pu tis lei ta mistika tu
 each girl that her-GEN say-3S the secrets his-GEN
 o Yanis kataliyi sto simperasma oti ine
 the-NOM Yanis-NOM reach-3S to-the conclusion that is
 trelos
 insane
 Every girl that Yanis tells his secrets to reaches the conclusion
 that he is mad.
- c. kamia kopela pu tis lei ta mistika tu
 no girl that her-GEN say-3S the secrets his-GEN
 o Yanis dhen ton perni sta sovara
 the-NOM Yanis-NOM not him-ACC take-3S at-the seriously
 No girl that Yanis tells his secrets to takes him seriously.

So the unavailability of binding in (2) relates to a property of the structure and not of the pronominal. The syntactic literature has stipulated a distinction between “anaphoric” and “quantificational” binding, first introduced by Sells (1984, 1987) to account for the contrast between *intrusive* (11) and *true* resumption (12). The intrusive pronominal appearing in the place of an island-violating trace in (11a) cannot be bound by *every*. By contrast, the true resumptive in Hebrew relative clauses can be bound by *kol*.

- (11) a. I'd like to meet the linguist that Mary couldn't remember if
 she had seen 0/him before.
- b. I'd like to meet every linguist that Mary couldn't remember if
 she had seen 0/*him before.
- (12) Kol gevev Se rina xoSevet alav
 every man that Rina thinks about-him
 every man Rina thinks about.

Lasnik and Stowell (1991) further developed the syntactic distinction between anaphoric and quantificational binding by dividing A-bar chains into

⁴Resumption is obligatory in non-argument relatives introduced by the complementizer *pou* but dispreferred in argument relatives.

quantificational and referential classes. Wh-questions (13) and Quantifier Raising Structures (QR) are typical examples of the former, while Null Operator Structures (NOS) (14a) and Topicalization (14b) exemplify the latter. Lasnik and Stowell (1991) assume that the operator in Wh-questions and QR constructions is a *true quantifier* ranging over a (possibly) non-singleton set. By contrast, the interpretation of the Null Operator in NOS depends on the interpretation of the matrix element that binds it. Thus, it may denote an individual, as in (14b), but could also be bound by a quantificational operator as in (14a).

This typology of A-bar chains is motivated by the distribution of WCO effects. Thus, the appearance of a WCO in (13) is viewed as a consequence of the quantificational nature of the operator involved in Wh-questions. By contrast, in (14), where the operator involved is non-quantificational, no WCO arises. In sum, pronouns may not function as variables bound by quantifiers in A-bar positions in English.⁵

- (13) Who_j does his_{*j/i} mother-in-law love?
- (14) a. Which boy_j will be easy Op to persuade his_j boss to vouch for?
 b. This book_i Op I expect its_i author to buy.

(From Lasnik and Stowell 1991, ex.31a&20c)

Rizzi (1997) and Tsimpli (1995,1999) argue that, as in English, quantificational operators in Greek and Italian bind a *null* variable. Thus, pronominal clitics are excluded from examples like (2) in both languages. However, the operator in anaphoric chains in Greek and Italian binds a pronominal clitic, resulting in well known examples of CLLD as in (1) (see Tsimpli 1999, 2005 for Greek adjectival and degree clauses).

So the exclusion of quantifiers from CLLD amounts to the stipulation that pronominals can only be freely licensed in anaphoric chains and cannot be A-bar bound variables in quantificational chains (at least not in structures created by movement, a necessary auxiliary assumption in order to account for (12)). As expected, CLLD licenses weakest crossover (15) (see Cinque 1990; Anagnostopoulou 1994; Rizzi 1997).

- (15) to Yanis_j ton_j AGAPAI i pethera tu_j
 the-acc Yanis-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his
 Yanis, his mother-in-law loves.

The incompatibility of CLLD with focus is also expected. A quantificational operator is assumed in focus-movement, identifying the reference of the focused item from a set of alternatives in the sense of Rooth (1996).⁶

⁵Of course, pronouns can be A-bar bound variables crosslinguistically, as indicated by the well known cases of resumption in Celtic and Semitic relative clauses—see (12). Whether a pronominal can be an A-bar bound variable in a quantificational chain depends on whether movement is involved or not—see Alexopoulou 2006; McCloskey 2002; Borer 1984.

⁶Though I assume a quantificational treatment of focus here, there is a question of whether Rooth's (1996) definition can distinguish between focus and the subsectional topics in (5) and (6).

I will not attempt a proper evaluation of Lasnik and Stowell's (1991) proposal and its adaptation for CLLD by Tsimpli (1995) and Rizzi (1997).^{7,8} I assume that some version of the distinction between anaphoric and quantificational operators/binding is indispensable in order to account for the contrasts between (2) and (10). In (1) the pronominal is anaphorically linked to its antecedent. Thus, quantifiers cannot bind pronouns on a par with cases of intrasentential anaphora (16). (Of course, such an assumption merely states a fact. Failure of binding in (16) is accounted for by the assumption that the scope of quantifiers does not extend beyond their clause. No such structural explanation is available for (2).)

- (16) a. dhen idha kanena mathiti. #Ton ihan stili gia
not saw-1sg no student-acc. Him had-3pl sent for
mathima
lesson
I did not see any student. They had sent him to attend a lesson.

I will also assume here that anaphoric binding is responsible for the specificity effects associated with CLLD-ed phrases. In particular, the fact that CLLD-ed indefinites necessarily take wide scope over the universal quantifier (17a) and intensional predicates like *psahno* in (17b-c) (Iatridou 1995; Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002).

- (17) a. ena arrho tu Chomsky to dhiavase KATHE
an article the-gen Chomsky it-CL read-3sg each
fittis
student-nom
An article by Chomsky each student read.
- b. *ena dhoro gia to Yani to psahno edho ki ena
a present for the Yani-acc it-CL look-for-1sg here and one
mina ke dhe mporo na vro tipota pu na
month and not can-1sg SUBJ find-1sg nothing that SUBJ
m'aresi
me-like-3sg
A present for Yanis I've been looking for for a month and I
cannot find anything that I like.
- c. ena pukamiso tu Yani to psahno edho ki
a/one shirt the-gen Yanis-gen it look-for-1sg here and
ena mina ke dhe mporo na thimitho pu
one month and not can-1sg subj remember-1sg where
to eho vali
have-1sg put
A shirt of Yanis, I've been looking for for a month and I cannot
remember where I have put it.

(Adapted from Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002, ex.47&51)

⁷The acceptability of (i) (which I owe to Caroline Heycock) indicates that *every* can bind a *null epithet* in English.

- (i) Every decent book I read; the girlie magazines I just chucked in the bin.

⁸See Ruys (2000) for an alternative to Lasnik and Stowell's (1991) analysis, which dispenses with the distinction between anaphoric and quantificational operators. It is not obvious, however, how Ruys's (2000) proposal can be extended to account for resumptive binding in Celtic and Semitic relative clauses.

I assume that in (17) the pronominal is related to its antecedent anaphorically, as in cases of intrasentential anaphora (18).

- (18) a. Kathe fititis dhiavase ena arrho tu Chomsky. #To
 each student read-3sg an article the-gen Chomsky. It
 xrisimopiise stn dhulia tu
 used-3sg for-his work
 Each student read an article by Chomsky. He used it for his work.
- b. Epsahna ena zevgari lefkes goves gia kero. #Telika to/tis vrika
 stis Kalogiru
 Was-looking-for a pair of shoes for time. Finally, it/them
 found-1sg at-the Kalogiru-gen
 I was looking for a pair of shoes for a while. In the end I found it/them at Kalogiru's.

Note that the involvement of an anaphoric operator cannot account for the specificity effects alone because of examples like (19), where a non-specific indefinite is topicalized (presumably binding a null epithet or *pro*).

- (19) a. logisti tha vrite EFKOLA, grammatea den
 accountant-acc will find-2pl easily secretary not
 KSERO
 know-1sg
 An accountant, you will find easily, as for a secretary I don't know.

So, the unavailability of binding in CLLD arises as the result of the interpretation of pronouns in a non-quantificational/anaphoric chain.

Before we turn to CLLD-ed quantifiers in generic statements, a note on the syntax of CLLD. For one thing, the data in (2) indicate that the clitic cannot be a spell-out trace. All structures in (2) are fine with traces. I assume that the CLLD-ed DP originates as a VP adjunct and then moves to Spec,CP. For a base-generation approach to CLLD see Iatridou (1995) and Anagnostopoulou (1994). Neither option will affect the argumentation in subsequent sections.

2. Fox and Sauerland's Scope Illusions

Assuming the distinction between anaphoric and quantificational binding and the absence of the latter in CLLD, let's return to our main question, i.e. the apparent availability of (quantificational) binding in CLLD structures involved in generic statements. I will begin with a related contrast discussed and analyzed by Fox and Sauerland (1996). Consider (20) and (21) from Fox and Sauerland. In (20a) tours cannot covary with guides and in (20b) conference delegates cannot covary with grad students. But in (21) they can.

- (20) a. Yesterday, [a guide]_∃ ensured [_{CP} that [every tour to the Louvre]_∀ was fun]. (∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃)
 b. When we entered the conference, [a grad student]_∃ was checking [_{CP} that [everybody]_∀ had a badge]. (∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃)
- (21) a. In general [a guide]_∃ ensures [_{CP} that [every tour to the Louvre]_∀ is fun]. (∃ > ∀, ∀ > ∃)

- b. At linguistic conferences, [a grad student]_∃ checks [_{CP} that [everybody]_∀ has a badge]. (∃ > ∀, ∀ > ∃)

Fox and Sauerland argue that *every* does not scope over the indefinites in (21) and that standard restrictions on its scope domain (e.g. clause-bound scope) apply. Rather, the co-varying interpretation arises due to the generic operator, which involves quantification over situations. Intuitively, a generic statement asserts that whenever we look at the relevant portion of the world it has a certain property. So, for (22a) it is standardly assumed that the relevant portion of the world is a situation containing a black cat (22b).

- (22) a. A cat is always black.
 b. Every (relevant) situation *s* is a situation in which there is a black cat.

A crucial part of Fox and Sauerland's (1996) analysis is the assumption that the focus of a sentence provides the restriction on the domain of the generic operator (in the absence of an explicit restrictor, e.g. adverbial). So, (23a) is a statement about situations where a plane disappears somewhere (23b) whereas (24a) is a statement about situations where something disappears in the Bermuda Triangle.

- (23) a. Planes disappear in the BERMUDA TRIANGLE
 b. Every situation *s*, such that [a plane disappears **somewhere** in *s*]_{Restrictor} is a situation in which [a plane disappears in the Bermuda Triangle]_{Nucleus}
- (24) a. PLANES disappear in the Bermuda Triangle.
 b. Every situation *s* such that [**something** disappears in the Bermuda Triangle in *s*]_{Restrictor} is a situation in which [a plane disappears in the Bermuda Triangle]_{Nucleus}

Consider now (25). According to Fox and Sauerland (1996) the restrictor of the generic operator in (25) is a situation in which I give **someone** every leaflet (25b). The restrictor (25b) cannot be satisfied by a situation involving more than one tourist with one leaflet each.⁹ Instead, Fox and Sauerland propose that the restrictor is satisfied by situations involving one tourist and one leaflet. For each such situation, it is true that a tourist gets every leaflet since there is only one leaflet in each situation. In this sense the universal *every* is trivialized, since there is only one leaflet involved in each relevant situation. Quantification over situations is then what gives rise to the co-varying reading or the illusory wide scope for *every*, since each situation may involve different guides.

- (25) a. In general, I give [A TOURIST]_∃ [every leaflet]_∀.
 b. Every situation *s*, such that [I give **someone** every leaflet in *s*]_{Restrictor} is a situation in which [I give **a tourist** every leaflet]_{Nucleus}

⁹This is due to standard assumptions about restrictions on the scope of *every* relating to the “frozen scope” of (i).

- (i) Yesterday, I gave [a tourist]_∃ [every leaflet]_∀. (∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃)

Fox and Sauerland (1996) extend this approach to structures involving WCO like (26). In descriptive terms, WCO arises when a pronoun appears to the left of a trace (assuming LF movement of the DP containing *every* in (26)), as is the case in (26).

- (26) a. ??Last year, her₁ thesis year was the hardest for every student₁.
 b. ???At the beginning of the dance last night, his₁ wife stood behind every man₁.

They observe that WCO disappears in the presence of generic tense.

- (27) a. Her₁ thesis year is the hardest for every student₁.
 b. Some people think that his₁ wife stands behind every great man₁.

They propose that the possessive pronoun in (27) is a situation bound variable, a definite description dependent on the situation the generic tense quantifies over (28). Crucially, the illusion of binding is possible only if each relevant situation contains a single student.

- (28) For every relevant situation *s*, (the student in *s*)_{her}'s thesis year is the hardest for every student in *s*.

Again, focus provides the restrictor of the Generic operator (29).

- (29) a. In general, HIS THESIS YEAR is the hardest for every student.
 b. Every situation *s*, such that [something is the hardest for every student in *s*,]_{Restrictor} is a situation where [the thesis year of (the student in *s*)_{his} is the hardest for every student.]_{Nucleus}

3. Analysis

3.1. Binding illusions with *kathe*

As indicated in the last section, a crucial element in Fox and Sauerland's (1996) analysis is that in situations restricting the domain of the Generic Operator the universal quantifier *every* is trivialized because each relevant situation involves a single individual. So, ultimately (30a) becomes equivalent to (30b).

- (30) a. Her₁ thesis year is the hardest for every student₁.
 b. Her₁ thesis year is the hardest for Mary₁.

I propose that the same analysis can explain the apparently bound pronouns in CLLD involving the generic operator. Consider (31) (for the moment I am abstracting away from focus). Let us assume that the generic operator ranges over the situation described in (31b). The crucial assumption here is that this situation involves a single man. (31a) then becomes equivalent to (31c), that is, a structure where a referential DP is CLLD-ed. In other words, the pronominal in (31b) is an E-type (or D-type) pronoun.

- (31) a. KATHE adra ton agapai mia yineka
 each man-acc him love-3sg a woman
 Each man a woman loves.

- b. For every relevant situation s , for every man in s a woman loves [the man in s]_{him}.
- c. to Yani ton AGAPAI mia yineka
the Yanis-acc him love-3sg a woman
Yanis a woman loves.

It is then no surprise that WCO does not surface in (31a). If the relevant situations for (32a) involve a single man, then (32a) is on a par with (32c).

- (32) a. KATHE adra₁ ton₁ agapai i mana tu₁
each man-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother his
Every man his mother loves.
- b. For every relevant situation s , for every man in s the mother of [the man in s]_{his} loves [the man in s]_{him}.
- c. to Yani₁ ton₁ AGAPAI i mana tu₁
the Yani-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother his
Yanis his mother loves.

3.2. Binding illusions with *kanena* and *pion*

Consider (33) and assume that the relevant situation is the one described in (33b). Now, the crucial assumption in the cases with *kathe* and *every* was that each relevant situation involved a single individual, which trivially satisfied the universal quantifier. If the same assumption can be made for (33b), then examples like (33a) are accounted for.

- (33) a. KANENA den ton apoliun etsi
no one-acc not him fire-3pl like-this
Nobody do you fire like this.
- b. For every relevant situation s , for no employee in s you fire the [the employee in s]_{him} like this.

Let us also turn to the Fox and Sauerland's (1996) original examples and replace *every* with *no*. As in the cases with *every*, the generic operator does indeed allow an interpretation where tours co-vary with guides, unlike (34a). Again, if the relevant situation is the one in (34c) and this situation can be assumed to involve a single tour, the contrast between (34a) and (34b) should be accounted for along the same lines the same contrast with *every* is explained.

- (34) a. Yesterday, a guide ensured that no tour to the Louvre was late.
- b. In general, a guide ensures that no tour to the Louvre is late.
- c. For every relevant situation s , a guide ensures that no tour to the Louvre is late.

The absence of WCO in (35a) follows. If each relevant situation involves a single man, then (35a) is on a par with the examples in (32).

- (35) a. KANENA₁ den ton₁ agapai i pethera tu₁
no one-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his
No man does his mother-in-law love.
- b. For every relevant situation s , for no man in s the mother-in-law of [the man in s]_{his} loves [the man in s]_{him}.

- c. to Yani₁ ton₁ AGAPAI i pethera tu₁
 the Yani-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother his
 Yanis his mother loves.

The same explanation must underlie (36) as well (though the semantics of the *wh*-item needs to be spelled-out).

- (36) PION₁ ton₁ agapai i pethera tu₁
 who-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his
 Who does his (own) mother-in-law love?

3.3. Focus movement

The generic operator may improve the acceptability of focused phrases as in (37a) and (37b) (but such examples are not as good as the ones with quantifiers, possibly because the focused phrase is not an inherently/lexically quantificational DP, but only becomes interpreted as such due to focus). When such binding is available, WCO is absent (37b). The assumption here has to be that every relevant situation involves a single *honest son-in-law* so that there are no alternatives for the value of focus. In the absence of a generic reading in (37d), the quantificational force of the focus cannot be trivialized.

- (37) a. ?tus TIMIUS adres tus agapane i yinekes
 the-acc honest men them love-3pl the-nom women-nom
 The honest men, women love.
 b. ?ton TIMIO gabro₁ ton₁ agapai i
 the-acc honest-acc groom-acc him love-3sg the-nom
 pethera tu₁
 mother-in-law his
 The honest son-in-law his mother-in-law loves.
 c. For every relevant situation *s*, the honest man in *s* the mother-in-law of [the honest man in *s*]_{his} loves [the honest man in *s*]_{him}.
 d. *to YANI ton agapai i pethera tu
 the-acc Yanis-acc him love-3sg the-nom mother-in-law his
 Yanis his mother-in-law loves.

3.4. CLLD-ed indefinites

CLLD-ed indefinites tend to be specific and take wide scope over an IP-internal universal quantifier or an intensional predicate like *psahno*, see (38) and (17).

- (38) a. ena arthro tu Chomsky to diavase KATHE fititis
 an article the-gen Chomsky it read-3sg each student-nom
 An article by Chomsky each student read ($\exists > \forall$).
 b. ena tragudi tu Dalara to zitise KATHE
 a song the-gen Dalaras-gen it asked-3sg each
 akroatis
 listener-nom
 A song of Dalaras each listener requested. ($\exists > \forall$)

However, when adverbials like *every Christmas* or *every year* are used, followed by present tense, illusionary scope of the universal quantifier sur-

faces (39) and *psahno* apparently scopes over *kalo arni* in (40). In (39a), the relevant situation involves a single Greek, thus, trivially satisfying *every Greek*. The example with *psahno* (40) ought to be explained by the same analysis. I don't think this is straightforwardly possible though. The problem is that in every relevant situation, which by hypothesis involves a single Greek looking for a good lamb for the Easter table, *psahno* has to take scope over the indefinite (17). That is, each single Greek has to look for a specific lamb which is not what (40) says. In other words, while we can get the co-variation between lambs and Greeks by trivializing *each* Greek, we cannot also explain the "wide scope" of *psahno*. I leave this question open.

- (39) a. Kathe Hristugena, ena cd tu Dalara to agorazi KATHE
 each Christmas, a CD the-gen Dalaras it buys each
 Elinas
 Greek-nom
 Each Christmas a CD by Dalaras every Greek buys. ($\forall > \exists$ preferred)
- b. Every year, for every relevant situation *s*, there is a CD in *s* such that every Greek buys [the CD in *s*]_{it}.
- c. Kathe hrono, ena arthro tu Chomsky to diavazi
 each year, an article the-gen Chomsky it read-3sg
 KATHE fititis
 each student
 Each year an article by Chomsky every student reads. ($? \forall > \exists$ possible)
- (40) Kathe hrono, mes ti sarakosti, ena kalo arni gia to Pasha to
 each year in the "Saracoste", a good lamb for the Easter it
 psahni KATHE Elinas
 look-for-3sg each Greek-nom
 Every year during the 40-day period of fast before Easter ("Saracosti") a good lamb (for Easter lunch) every Greek looks for.

3.5. Quantification over situations in episodic sentences

It turns out that the analysis of Fox and Sauerland (1996) can also be extended to episodic sentences containing an explicit adverbial triggering quantification over situations and—thus—giving rise to similar binding illusions as the generic operator. (Note that *paralamvane* is in "paratatikos", the imperfective past).

- (41) a. KATHE etisi tin adimetopisame os mia
 each application it treated-1pl as a
 horisti periptosi
 separate/individual case
 Each student we treated (her) as an individual case.
- b. KAMIA fititria den tin adimetopisame os idieteri periptosi
 no student not her treated-1pl as particular case
 No student did we treated as a special case.

- c. Kathe Pasha, ena dhema apo to spiti tu₁ to
 each Easter, a parcel from the house-his it received-3sg
 paralamvane KATHE stratiotis₁ sto metopo
 each soldier at-the front
 Each year, a parcel from his family every soldier at the front
 received.

3.6. Remaining issues: interaction with focus

Prima facie, the condition that focus provides the restrictor for the generic operator is not met in Greek. In most cases the main stress is associated with the very quantificational element that is supposed to take wide scope (*kathe, kanena, pion*). But this does not necessarily force a focus interpretation for these items. In fact, sentences with the same intonational realization can function as good answers to questions setting up a different ground-focus partition. Example (42a) sets up a focus construal for the quantifier. But in the answers some quantifiers bear stress and some do not (cf. (4)).

- (42) a. posa kefalea dhiavases
 how-many chapters read-2sg
 How many chapters did you read?
- b. ta perisotera (kefalea) ta DHIAVASA/*ta PERISSOTERA
 the most (chapters) tehm read-1sg/the most
 dhiavasa
 read-1sg
 Most I read.
- c. dhiavasa ta PERISOTERA
 read-1sg the most
 I read most.
- d. kapia/merika ta DHIAVASA/dhiavasa MERIKA
 some them read-1sg/read-1sg some
 Some I read/I read some.
- e. OLA ta dhiavasa/?KATHE vivlio to dhiavasa
 all them read-1sg/each book it read-1sg
 All I read/Each book I read.
- f. KANENA dhen dhiavasa
 no one not read-1sg
 No one did I read.

Sentences with exactly the same stress patterns can be used as subsectional topics (43).

- (43) a. o kathighitis tis glosologhias edhose ti vivliografia
 the professor the-gen linguistics gave-3sg the bibliography
 The professor of linguistics gave the bibliography.
- b. ta filosofika arthra ta vrika DHISKOLA
 the philosophy papers them found-1sg difficult
 The philosophical papers I found difficult.
- c. ta perisotera/merika/kapia filosofica arthra ta
 the most/some/some philosophical articles them
 vrika DHISKOLA
 found-1sg difficult
 Most/some philosophical articles I found difficult.

- d. OLA ta filosofika arthra ta vrika DHISKOLA
all the philosophical articles them found-1sg difficult
All the philosophical articles I found difficult.
- e. KATHE filosofiko arthro to dhiavasa DIO fores
each philosophical article it read-1sg two times
Each philosophical article I read twice.
- f. KANENA filosofiko arthro den (??to) vrika dhiskolo
no philosophical article not (it) found-1sg difficult
No philosophical article did I find difficult.

So, certain quantifiers in Greek appear to attract accents by default irrespective of their discourse function (see Ladd 1996). As a result, the discourse function of a Greek quantifier cannot be unambiguously derived from its intonational realization and thus, the current analysis still lacks a definition of a procedure for identifying the restrictor of the Generic Operator.

4. Conclusions

I have shown that the phenomenon of the availability of a wider range of binding and scope possibilities in generic statements noted for English extends to Greek and interacts with resumption and WCO. In this respect the phenomenon is general and systematic and deserves an explanation. Following Fox and Sauerland (1996) I suggested that the licensing of a pronominal in quantificational structures involving generic statements is only apparent. The trivialization of the quantifiers in the sense of Fox and Sauerland (1996) reduces such cases to ordinary cases of anaphoric, non-quantificational CLLD.

References

- Alexopoulou, T. (2006). Resumption in relative clauses. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 24(1), 57–111.
- Alexopoulou, T. and F. Keller. The complexity of a-bar dependencies: evidence from discourse linking in English and Greek.
- Alexopoulou, T. and D. Kolliakou (2002). On Linkhood and Clitic Left Dislocation. *Journal of Linguistics* 38(2), 193–245.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (1994). *Clitic Dependencies in Modern Greek*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Salzburg.
- Borer, H. (1984). Restrictive Relatives in Modern Hebrew. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 2, 219–260.
- Cinque, G. (1990). *Types of A-bar Dependencies*, Volume 17. MIT Press. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs.
- Elbourne, P. D. (2005). *Situations and Individuals*. Number 41 in Current Studies in Linguistics. MIT.
- Fox, D. and U. Sauerland (1996). Illusive wide scope of universal quantifiers. In J. Beckman (Ed.), *Proceedings of NELS 26*, pp. 71–85. University of Massachusetts, Amherst: GLSA.
- Giannakidou, A. (1997). *The Landscape of Polarity Items*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Groningen.
- Hendriks, H. and P. Dekker (1995). Links without locations. In P. Dekker and M. Stokhof (Eds.), *Proceedings of the Tenth Amsterdam Colloquium*, University of Amsterdam. ILLC.

- Iatridou, S. (1995). Clitics and Island Effects. *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 11–31.
- Keller, F. and T. Alexopoulou (2001). Phonology competes with syntax: Experimental evidence for the interaction of word order and accent placement in the realization of information structure. *Cognition* 79(3), 301–372.
- Ladd, R. D. (1996). *Intonational Phonology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lasnik, H. and T. Stowell (1991). Weakest Crossover. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22(4), 687–720.
- McCloskey, J. (2002). Resumption, Successive Cyclicity, and the Locality of Operations. In S. D. Epstein and D. T. Seely (Eds.), *Derivation and Explanation in the minimalist program*, pp. 184–226. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Parodi, T. and I.-M. Tsimpli (2005). "real" and apparent optionality in L2 grammars: finiteness and pronouns in Null Operator structures. *Second Language Research* 21(3), 250–285.
- Philippaki-Warbuton, I. (1985). Word order in Modern Greek. *Transactions of the Philological Society* (83), 113–143.
- Rizzi, L. (1997). The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, pp. 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Rooth, M. (1996). Focus. In L. Shalom (Ed.), *The Handbook of Contemporary Semantic Theory*, pp. 271–297. Blackwell.
- Ruys, E. G. (2000). Weak crossover as a scope phenomenon. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31(3), 513–539.
- Sells, P. (1984). *Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns*. Ph. D. thesis, university of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Sells, P. (1987). Binding resumptive pronouns. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 10, 261–298.
- Tsimpli, I.-M. (1999). Null operators, clitics and identification: a comparison between Greek and English. In A. Alexiadou, G. Horrocks, and M. Stavrou (Eds.), *Studies in Greek syntax*, Volume 43 of *Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, pp. 241–262. Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Tsimpli, M. I. (1995). Focusing in Modern Greek. In K. Kiss (Ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*, Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax, pp. 176–206. Oxford University Press.