

# CYPRIOT GREEK CLITICS AND THEIR POSITIONING RESTRICTIONS'

Arhonto Terzi  
*Technological Educational Institute (T.E.I.) of Patras*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a study of clitic placement in Cypriot Greek (CGr) finite clauses.<sup>2</sup> Its primary purpose is to provide a systematic description of the positions in which pronominal clitics surface in CGr, compare them with the counterpart structures of Standard Greek (SGr), and attempt to offer a formal account of the differences in clitic positioning between the two varieties. It will be shown that the ban on first position clitics that CGr demonstrates is unlike that manifested by the Slavic (the sometimes-called Wackernagel) languages. Rather, the environments from which CGr pronominal clitics are excluded are similar, although not identical, to those of Portuguese and Galician.<sup>3</sup> A central claim that will be advanced is that clitics adjoin to a functional head that occupies the same position in the clausal structure in both CGr and SGr; the fact that they often surface in a different position in each variety is seen as the result of the overt movement which the finite verb undergoes in CGr. I consider M<sup>0</sup> (the head of M(ood) P(hrase)) as the landing site of finite verb movement and conjecture that V-to-M movement is related to the licensing requirements of CGr clitics which, unlike those of their SGr counterparts, have to be satisfied before spell-out.

## 2. CYPRIOT GREEK IS NOT A WACKERNAGEL LANGUAGE

Contrary to SGr, where clitics always precede the finite verb and surface first in linear order when no other element precedes the verb, (1a), clitics may not appear sentence initially in CGr as the contrast between (1a) and (2a) illustrates (Terzi 1992):<sup>4</sup>

- (1) a. (I-go) to diavasa (SGr)  
(I) it read-1sg  
b. \*Diavasa to  
read-1sg it  
'I read it'

- (2) a. \*To edhkiavasa (CGr)  
it read-1sg  
b. Edhkiavasa to  
read-1sg it  
'I read it'

As a result of this prohibition, CGr clitics often surface second in the clausal structure (2b), reminding us of the clitic ordering manifested by languages with second position (2P) restrictions, such as Serbo/Croatian (S/C), (3) (or Ancient Greek, see Rivero and Terzi (1995)).

- (3) a. Vidam ga svaki dan (S/C)  
I-see him every day  
b. \*Ga vidam svaki dan  
him I-see every day  
'I see him every day'

It will be demonstrated that, despite the existence of examples such as (2b), CGr is not a language in which clitics occupy the second position in the clause. A closer look at the facts suggests that what seems to be the general requirement, is that clitics appear immediately after the finite verb regardless of their linear position with respect to the rest of the constituents. (4a) illustrates, for instance, that clitics follow the verb when an overt subject is present, thus they end up in third position, and (5a) that clitics are postverbal (and adjacent to the verb) even when more material than just the subject precedes the verb.<sup>6</sup>

- (4) a. I Maria edhkiavasen to  
Maria read-3sg it  
b. \*I Maria to edhkiavasen  
Maria it read-3sg  
'Maria read it'  
(5) a. Poli anthropi panda kammoun to sosta  
Many people always do-3pl it correctly  
b. \*Poli anthropi panda to kammoun sosta  
Many people always it do-3pl correctly  
'Many people always do it correctly'

Therefore, CGr differs significantly from Serbo/Croatian (and Ancient Greek), in which clitics must always follow the first constituent of the clause but do not have to be adjacent to the verb.

- (6) Maria ga je citala (S/C)  
Mary it has read-3sg  
'Mary was reading it'

- (7) Mnogi ljudi ga pazljivo citaju  
many people it carefully read-3pl  
'Many people read it carefully'

In Rivero and Terzi (1995) the second position of S/C clitics is accounted for in terms of movement of the element that surfaces first, to Spec(CP) or to C<sup>0</sup>, depending on its X-bar status. The clitic occupies the Specifier of W(ackermagel) Phrase, that is, of the Phrase that C<sup>0</sup> takes as its complement:

- (8) ...<sub>[CP</sub> [<sub>C</sub> [<sub>WP</sub> CL [<sub>w</sub> ([<sub>NEG</sub>P] [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>I</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>v</sub> .....]]]]]]]]]

This proposal is supported by the fact that clitics immediately follow the complementizer in embedded contexts:

- (9) Znam da ga mnogi ljudi pazljivo citaju  
know-1sg that it many people carefully read-3pl  
'I know that many people read it carefully'  
(10) Ivan kaze da nam Olga ništa ne daje  
Ivan says that us Olga nothing neg gives  
'Ivan says that Olga is not giving us anything'

The sentences in (3) and (4), but also the ones that follow immediately below, indicate that this line of reasoning does not extend to Cypriot Greek, where clitics, rather than being adjacent to C<sup>0</sup>, are adjacent to the verb, and, more precisely, they follow it.

- (11) Ksero oti i Maria edhkiavasen to  
know-1sg that Mary read-3sg it  
'I know that Mary read it'  
(12) Ksero oti poli anthropi kammoun to sosta  
know-1sg that many people do-3pl it correctly  
'I know that many people do it correctly'

The examples in (11) and (12) also argue that the postverbal position of clitics in Cypriot Greek finite clauses is unlikely to be the result of V-to-C movement since C<sup>0</sup> is occupied by a lexical complementizer (see Benincà 1984 where a V-to-C proposal is made to account, among other things, for partially similar clitic ordering in medieval Romance, and also Fontana 1993).<sup>8</sup> Therefore, adopting Kayne's (1994) antisymmetry proposals that disallow right adjunction (of clitics to the verb in this particular case) and, consequently, derive postverbal clitics from verb movement past the functional head to which clitics adjoin, we are led to conclude that the landing site of finite verb movement in Cypriot Greek is lower than C<sup>0</sup>.

To summarise, the discussion in this section intends to establish that despite the ban on first position clitics, to which it is subject, CGr should not be considered a Wackernagel language, that is, a language which is subject to 2P restrictions. While in a 2P language clitics must appear second, in CGr clitics simply cannot appear first but they may surface in various positions in the clause provided they are adjacent to the verb. This contrast supports the claim that a higher position serves as host for S/C clitics, namely, the WP projection following CP; thus clitics immediately follow C<sup>0</sup> in embedded contexts but they may be separated from the finite verb, (10). On the other hand, CGr clitics are to be found in a lower position in the clausal structure (Rivero 1994b).<sup>9</sup>

### 3. PREVERBAL CLITICS IN CYPRIOT GREEK

Clitics are not always postverbal in CGr, however. In fact, in a number of environments they can only surface preverbally, patterning in this respect with the order manifested by Standard Greek and Spanish/Italian.<sup>10</sup> The sentences below show that clitics must be preverbal when they are preceded by Neg<sup>0</sup> (14), by the subjunctive marker M<sup>0</sup> (15) or by a Focused XP, such as the DP in (16).

- (14) a. En ton iksero  
neg him know-1sg  
b. \*En iksero ton  
neg know-1sg him  
'I don't know him'
- (15) a. Thelo na ton dho  
want-1sg subj him see-1sg  
b. \*Ihelo na dho ton  
want-1sg subj see-1sg him  
'I want to see him'<sup>11</sup>
- (16) a. Tuto to vivlio su edhoken i Maria  
This the book you gave-3sg Mary  
b. \*Tuto to vivlio edhoken su i Maria  
This the book gave-3sg you Mary  
'This book Mary gave you'

In the light of facts such as the above, I would like to propose that, despite the different positions in which pronominal clitics surface in a number of contexts in CGr, they occupy the same position in the clausal structure as in SGr (but also as in Spanish or Italian). The plausibility of this claim is confirmed at first by the paradigm in (17), where clitics appear preverbally and adjacent to the verb in all the above languages.

- (17) a. I ipume pou i Maria en to djkjavazi (CGr)  
b. I ipame pou i Maria den to dhjavazi (SGr)

- c. Lamento que Maria no lo lea (Sp)  
regret-1sg compl Mary neg it read-3sg  
'I regret that Mary doesn't read it'

In order to account for the precise location of clitics in CGr, I will follow proposals in Terzi (1996a) based on SGr, and hold that CGr pronominal clitics – which I consider to be X<sup>0</sup> elements<sup>12</sup> – adjoin to a featureless functional head F<sup>0</sup> which takes IP as its complement.<sup>13</sup>

- (18) ...[<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>C</sub> COMP [<sub>NEG P</sub> [<sub>F P</sub> CL [<sub>F</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> ... ]]]]]]]

Subsequently, I would like to attribute the V-cl order of CGr finite contexts to verb movement past the functional head F<sup>0</sup>. As noted earlier, finite verb movement to C<sup>0</sup> is excluded since postverbal clitics and overt complementizers may cooccur (see (11), repeated below):<sup>14</sup>

- (11) Ksero oti i Maria edhkiavasen to  
know-1sg that Mary read-3sg it  
'I know that Mary read it'

Movement of the finite verb to F<sup>0</sup> is ruled out by Kayne's (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom, which we are adopting in the present work. Since F<sup>0</sup> is the functional head to which clitics adjoin, adjunction of the verb to it amounts to multiple adjunction, a configuration which is illicit because linear order cannot be derived by hierarchical structure. Furthermore, V-to-F movement via substitution is not an option to consider either, since it results to the order cl-V.

I would like to propose that the finite verb movement of CGr (which is responsible for the postverbal position of clitics) has M<sup>0</sup> as its landing site – the functional head that encodes modality and is lexically realised in both SGr and CGr.<sup>15</sup>

- (19) ...[<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>C</sub> COMP [<sub>IMP P</sub> [<sub>F P</sub> CL [<sub>F</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [v ... ]]]]]]]<sup>16</sup>

Evidence for this claim (or, to be precise, evidence that the finite verb does not move higher than M<sup>0</sup>) is provided by the identical order of adverbs and M<sup>0</sup> when the latter dominates the subjunctive marker, as in (20), or the verb that moves to it (21).

- (20) panda na to dhkiavazi  
always subj it reads  
'always to read it'
- (21) I Maria panda dhkiavazi to  
Mary always reads it  
'Mary always reads it'

Another position to be considered as a possible landing site for finite verb movement in CGr is some functional head between  $M^0$  and  $F^0$ , as is understood to be the case in Martins' (1994) analysis of Portuguese. Martins (1994) considers Laká's head of Sigma Phrase to be the landing site of finite verb movement in Portuguese. She bases her claims mainly on VP-deletion facts like in (22b).

- (22) a. Deste-lhe o livro?  
gave-2sg him the book  
'Did you give him the book?'  
b. (Sim,) dei  
yes, gave-1sg  
'Yes, I did'

Since no comparable evidence is present in Cypriot Greek, however, I regard it unlikely that option is viable. Although Sigma Phrase might be present in CGr, it is difficult to justify verb movement to  $\Sigma^0$  in this language. In Portuguese, the V-to- $\Sigma$  movement responsible for enclisis is triggered by strong S features evidenced by (22).

Notice that my proposal concerning the location of the functional head to which clitics adjoin in CGr is in many respects similar to that of Uriagereka's (1995). Discussing Portuguese and Galician, on the one hand, and Spanish and French, on the other, Uriagereka considers clitics to adjoin to the functional head  $F^0$  located in the same position in both language types, despite the different surface position of clitics in each one of them.<sup>17</sup> In this respect we do not differ from Martins (1994) either.

By contrast, I consider CGr to differ significantly from S/C, where clitics are in Spec(WP), (Rivero and Terzi 1995):

- (23) Zalim što ga Maria nije kupila (S/C)  
regret-1sg that it Maria not has-3sg bought  
'I regret that Mary hasn't bought it'

That the WP of 2P languages is not the same as the FP of CGr becomes more explicit when negation is inserted in the clausal structure. While NegP precedes FP, (18), it follows WP:

- (24) ...[<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>C</sub> COMP [<sub>WP</sub> CL [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>NP</sub> [VP] ]]]]]]

#### 4. FINITE V-TO-MOVEMENT AND LICENSING OF CLITICS

The reasons that trigger finite verb movement in CGr are less clear than its landing site. It is not immediately obvious at this point what type of features the verb has in CGr which require checking in the overt syntax, and motivate V-to-M movement. Notice that in Portuguese/Galician the strong F-features of the finite verb (suggested

in Uriagereka 1995) find a reasonable amount of empirical support in view of the inflected infinitives with which the language(s) are associated (see also Martins' S<sup>0</sup>). As a result of this, recasting the driving force of Portuguese finite verb movement in minimalist terms (Chomsky 1993, 1995) is not an unjustified direction.

It is not clear, however, that a similar approach is easily plausible for Cypriot Greek. Considering movement to be driven by the morphological requirements of the element that moves (Chomsky 1991, 1993) it is not easy to see, for instance, how the morphological requirements of the Cypriot Greek finite verb differ from those of Standard Greek in a way that triggers V-to-M movement in the former but not in the latter. Moreover, if V-to-M movement in CGr were triggered by strong features (supposedly  $M^0$ /modality features, since the landing site of verb movement is  $M^0$ ) that require checking in the overt syntax, why is no such movement required when a functional head is present in the clause, as in the paradigm (14)-(16) to which we will return shortly? Finally, it is not obvious whether the CGr Infl has features unique to it, which distinguish it from those of the SGr Infl and motivate the proposed V-to-M movement.<sup>18</sup>

A tentative solution I will consider here is that the finite verb movement that takes place in CGr (but not in SGr) is related to a difference in the level of representation at which clitics are formally licensed in each variety. That is, I will hold that CGr clitics have strong features that must be licensed in the internal domain of a functional head with operator-like properties before spell-out. This is a type of licensing that involves a head-complement rather than Spec-head relation and must be satisfied before spell-out (see Rivero 1994b).

In (14)-(16), repeated immediately below, the functional heads licensing the clitics in their internal domain are the negative marker, or Neg<sup>0</sup>, the subjunctive marker, or M<sup>0</sup>, and the head of Focus Phrase respectively.

- (14) a. En ton iksero  
neg him know-1sg  
b. \*En iksero ton  
neg know-1sg him  
'I don't know him'
- (15) a. Thelo na ton dho  
want-1sg subj him see-1sg  
b. \*Thelo na dho ton  
want-1sg subj see-1sg him  
'I want to see him'
- (16) a. Tuto to vivlio su edhoken i Maria  
'This the book you gave-3sg Mary  
b. \*Tuto to vivlio edhoken su i Maria  
'This the book gave-3sg you Mary  
'This book Mary gave you'

In the absence of such a functional head, verb movement to M<sup>0</sup> takes place and gives rise to V-cl as the only acceptable order, as is illustrated by (2a)-(4a) repeated below. Verb movement along these lines is a last resort operation, hence is excluded from (14b)-(16b), where clitics surface preverbally.

- (2) a. Edhkiavasa to  
read-1sg it  
b. \*To edhkiavasa  
it read-1sg  
'I read it'
- (3) a. I Maria edhkiavasen to  
Maria read-3sg it  
b. \*I Maria to edhkiavasen  
Maria it read-3sg  
'Maria read it'
- (4) a. Poli anthropi panda kammoun to sosta  
Many people always do-3pl it correctly  
b. \*Poli anthropi panda to kammoun sosta  
Many people always it do-3pl correctly  
'Many people always do it correctly'

Support for the claim that the presence of a functional head, rather than of any element preceding IP, is the crucial factor for the licensing of CGr clitics in preverbal position is offered by the contrast between Clitic Left Dislocated (CLLDed) and Focused constructions:

- (25) a. \*Tuto to vivlio to edhkiavasa  
this the book it read-1sg  
b. Tuto to vivlio edhkiavasa to  
this the book read-1sg it  
'As for this book, I read it'
- (26) a. Tuto to vivlio su edhoken  
this the book you gave-3sg  
b. \*Tuto to vivlio edhoken su  
this the book gave-3sg you  
'This book (s/he) gave you'

CLLDed XPs, such as *Tuto to vivlio* 'This book' in (25), are (P adjoined (Cinque 1990, Iatridou 1991), or IP-adjoined (Anagnostopoulou 1994). This amounts to saying that no functional head is present to license the clitic in its internal domain and V-to-M movement takes place satisfying the licensing requirements and resulting in the order V-cl of (25b). The focused *Tuto to vivlio* 'This book' of (26), on the other hand, is in the Specifier position of Focus Phrase, a phrase headed by the Focus operator (Tsimpli 1994, Agouraki 1993). The Focus head licenses the strong features of the clitic in its internal domain with the result that the latter

surfaces preverbally. As expected, verb movement is excluded in (26), hence the ungrammaticality of (26b). There is also evidence that not any functional head is capable of licensing clitics in its internal domain but only heads with operator-like properties. This was the case with Neg<sup>0</sup>, M<sup>0</sup>, Focus<sup>0</sup> in the examples (14)-(16) earlier. In addition to those, the following contrasts provide additional support for this idea:

- (27) a. Pjos ton idhe?  
who him saw  
b. \*Pjos idhe ton  
who saw him  
'Who saw him?'
- (28) a. \*I Maria to edhkiavasen  
Maria it read-3sg  
b. I Maria edhkiavasen to  
Maria read-3sg it  
'Maria read it'

While a C<sup>0</sup> with *wh*-features licenses CGr clitics in matrix environments with the result that they appear preverbally, (27a), an empty C<sup>0</sup> cannot perform the same role as the ungrammaticality of (28a) illustrates. V-to-M movement takes place giving rise to the order V-cl (28b).

Along the same lines, the (lexical or not) C<sup>0</sup> of embedded declaratives cannot license CGr clitics, hence they do not surface preverbally (29a) and (30a). Verb movement to M<sup>0</sup> results in the grammatical order V-cl, (29b) and (30b).

- (29) a. \*Ksero (oti) i Maria to edhkiavasen  
know-1sg that Mary it read-3sg  
b. Ksero (oti) i Maria edhkiavasen to  
know-1sg that Mary read-3sg it  
'I know that Mary read it'
- (30) a. \*Ksero (oti) poli anthropi to kammoun sosta  
know-1sg that many people it do-3pl correctly  
b. Ksero (oti) poli anthropi kammoun to sosta  
know-1sg that many people do-3pl it correctly  
'I know that many people do it correctly'

By contrast, the C<sup>0</sup> of embedded interrogatives licenses the strong features of CGr clitics in its internal domain, by virtue of hosting the *wh*-operator in its Specifier position. This is indicated by the preverbal position of clitics in (31a):

- (31) a. En ksero ti su edhoken  
Neg know-1s what you gave-3sg

- b. \*En ksero ti edhoken su  
Neg know-1sg what gave-3sg you  
'I don't know what s/he gave you'

The factive complementizer *pu* (31), behaves along similar lines supporting the view in Anagnostopoulou (1994) that *pu*-CPs (in SGr) are identical to *w/!*-CPs, in the sense of being complements of the matrix verb with their Specifier occupied by an empty operator.

- (32) a. Lipume pu to dhkiavazi  
regret-1sg comp it read-3sg (CGr)  
b. \*Lipume pu dhkiavazi to  
regret-1sg comp read-3sg it  
'I regret that (s/he) reads it'

If we consider the CGr factive complementizer to also host an empty operator in its Specifier position, thus being able to license pronominal clitics in its internal domain, we explain why clitics are preverbal in (32a).<sup>19</sup>

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper I focused on the clitic positioning restrictions of Cypriot Greek and compared them with other languages where various restrictions apply but also with Standard Greek which is not subject to similar constraints. I proposed that the different positions in which clitics surface in SGr and CGr do not reflect different adjunction sites for clitics in each variety but a parametric variation with respect to whether the finite verb undergoes overt movement to M<sup>0</sup>. I argued that V-to-M movement is responsible for the V-cl order of Cypriot Greek finite contexts and speculated that this movement is related to the fact that pronominal clitics have strong features in CGr which must be licensed in the internal domain of a functional head with operator-like properties before spell-out; it is only in the absence of a functional head of this type that verb movement to M<sup>0</sup> takes place. However, I leave open for future research the possibility that V-to-M movement is related to the features of M<sup>0</sup> in Cypriot Greek. This idea is primarily motivated by the fact that Cypriot Greek, contrary to Standard Greek, lacks the future particle, which, along with the subjunctive particle, is standardly considered to occupy the M<sup>0</sup> position (but see also the discussion in note 18).

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Research for this paper was conducted when I was a postdoctoral fellow at the University of Ottawa and was funded by grant SSHRC Grant 410-91-0178. I would like to thank Richard Kayne, Maria Luisa Rivero and two anonymous reviewers for comments and suggestions. My deepest thanks to

Kakia Petinou (CUNY/Speech and Hearing), Pavlos Pavlou (Georgetown/Linguistics) and Kiriakos Savvas (Ottawa) for patiently providing most of the Cypriot Greek data.

<sup>2</sup> For a detailed discussion of clitic positioning in the context of imperatives and gerunds of both Standard and Cypriot Greek see Rivero and Terzi (1995) and Terzi (1996).

<sup>3</sup> This amounts to saying that we do not group together languages with strict second position restrictions, such as Serbo/Croatian, with Portuguese and Galician as is implicitly done in Rouweret (1992) and Uriagereka (1995).

<sup>4</sup> See Drachman (1993) for a brief discussion of similar facts encountered in the dialects of Chios and Rhodos.

<sup>5</sup> Compound tenses are not available in Cypriot Greek, thus (i)=(2a) stands for the Standard Greek (ii) as well.

- (i) Edhkiavasa to  
read-1sg it  
'I read/have read/had read it'  
(ii) (To) cho/iha dhjavasi  
it have-1sg/had-1sg read  
'I have/had read it'

<sup>6</sup> Notice that quantified subjects do not result in a different position of clitics in CGr; thus, CGr differs in this respect from Portuguese and Galician, in which the status of the subject affects the position of clitics (cf. (i) vs. (iii) from Barbosa (1993) and Uriagereka (1995)).

- (i) Oli idhan ton  
all saw-3pl him  
'All of them saw him'  
(ii) O kathenas theli to  
the everyone want-3sg it  
'Everyone wants it'  
(iii) \*Todos viram-no  
everyone saw it  
(iv) Todos no viram  
everyone it saw  
'Everyone saw it'

The precise impact of subject quantifiers on clitic positioning in Portuguese and Galician is not clear (Uriagereka 1995), but see also Raposo (1995). The contrast with CGr, however, strengthens the idea (elaborated in section 4) that the presence of some lexically filled functional head is of crucial importance for the licensing of preverbal clitics in CGr.

As for negative quantifiers in subject position, they are subsumed under the paradigm in (14)-(16) of the following section, since they require the presence of Neg<sup>0</sup> (in both Cypriot and Standard Greek):

- (v) Kanenas \*(en) ton idhen  
(CGr)  
Nobody then him saw  
'Nobody saw him.'

<sup>7</sup> The same holds when the embedded clause is introduced by the complementizer *pos*.

- (i) Ksero pos i Maria edhkiavasen to  
know-1sg that Mary read-3sg it  
'I know that Mary read it'

However, proclisis is also possible.

<sup>8</sup> Agouraki (1994) claims that enclisis is due to V-to-C movement in Cypriot Greek. She does not consider examples such as (11)-(12), however, neither does she compare the second position restrictions of Cypriot Greek with those of SGr.

<sup>9</sup> Focusing on Slavic and Old Spanish, Rivero (1994b) argues for two different positions that clitic pronouns may surface in the clause: a Complementizer or C-oriented position and an Inflection or I-oriented position. A similar view is held by Martins (1993) for Portuguese clitics; the interpolated clitics of Portuguese (see note 10 below) belong, according to Martins, to the first type. As to why

Portuguese clitics (and for that matter CGr clitics as well) cannot possibly be in C<sup>0</sup>, see Rouvret's (1992) arguments against such a line proposed by Madeira (1992).

<sup>10</sup> More precisely, clitics must immediately precede the verb. That is, Cypriot Greek differs from Old Romance and some varieties of Northern Portuguese (Rouvret 1992, Barbosa 1993, Martins 1993) in that it lacks the interpolation facts of the latter. An example of interpolation is the one that follows, from Old Spanish, where the clitic is separated from the verb by Negation.

- (1) Que ellos te non digan en que puede finir ...  
that they you not tell in what can end

'Let them not tell you how it can end' (from Rivero 1994b)

<sup>11</sup> The position of clitics with respect to the future particle *tha* cannot be tested as *tha* is unavailable in CGr. Its counterpart structure utilizes an embedded 'na'-introduced sentential complement of what seems to be an impersonal verb.

- (1) Tha pao (SGr)

fut go-1sg

- (ii) F na pao (CGr)

is(C) subj go-1sg

'I will go'

<sup>12</sup> On the X<sup>0</sup> status of Standard Greek clitics, see Anagnostopoulou (1994)

<sup>13</sup> See Terzi (1996a) for a detailed discussion of the F<sup>0</sup> head to which clitics adjoin. In the spirit of Kayne's (1994) antisymmetry program, it is proposed that F<sup>0</sup> is a featureless functional head in finite clauses - unlike Kayne (1989, 1991) - but amounts to I<sup>0</sup> in gerunds and imperatives.

<sup>14</sup> A reviewer correctly points out that the incompatibility of enclitics and lexical complementizers does not necessarily exclude a V-to-C approach, as there is always the possibility of recursive CPs, discussed extensively in the context of Germanic languages (Vikner 1995 among others). It is not only the lack of independent evidence for recursive CPs in CGr, however, that makes the above suggestion rather implausible, but also the fact that there is no obvious reason why the finite verb would undergo movement to C<sup>0</sup>.

<sup>15</sup> See Rivero (1994a) and Terzi (1992) for a detailed discussion of M<sup>0</sup> with reference to SGr and the other Balkan languages.

<sup>16</sup> I will not discuss here whether or how the verb skips over the clitic on its way to M<sup>0</sup> (in apparent violation of the HMC/FCP) but see Benincà and Cinque (1993) and Terzi (1996a) where this and related issues are addressed in detail.

<sup>17</sup> There are a number of differences concerning the nature of I<sup>0</sup> between Utiagercka's (1995) approach and that in Terzi (1996a), which, nevertheless, are not immediately relevant for the present work.

<sup>18</sup> Some additional facts are to be considered in more detail, however, before disregarding the idea that CGr Infl is involved in the process of V-to-M movement which is responsible for the V-cl order that CGr manifests in a number of finite contexts. This approach, which is not necessarily compatible with Chomsky (1993), is in line with Lasnik's (1995) *Enlightened Self-Interest*, and is tackled in Terzi (1996b). As mentioned in note 11, CGr lacks the future particle *tha* which is available in SGr. According to standard views of the Balkan clausal structure (Terzi 1992, Rivero 1994a) the future particle, as well as the subjunctive marker, is in M<sup>0</sup>. The fact that *tha* is unavailable in CGr may suggest that CGr M<sup>0</sup> has different features than SGr, and this is related to V-to-M movement. The lack of compound Tenses in CGr (note 4) also supports such an idea.

Finally, this would also explain why finite verb movement in CGr has M<sup>0</sup> as its landing site rather than adjoining to the clitic that has itself adjoined to I<sup>0</sup>. As a reviewer notices, the latter option is not disallowed by Kayne's antisymmetry proposals that I am assuming here.

<sup>19</sup> It should be pointed out that not all speakers of CGr share the judgements in (32). For a number of them, clitics can be postverbal in the presence of the factive complementizer, in apparent conflict with our analysis. Interestingly, however, this disagreement in judgements correlates with a disagreement concerning the status of *pou* (in SGr). While for Anagnostopoulou (1994) *pou* has operator status, this is not the case for Varlokosta (1994).

## References

- Agouraki, Y. (1993) Spec-head Licensing. The Cases of Foci, Clitic Constructions and Polarity Items. A Study of Modern Greek, Ph.D. Dissertation, University College, London.
- Agouraki, Y. (1994) On the Enclisis/proclisis Alternation, paper given at the Second International Conference on Greek linguistics, University of Salzburg.
- Anagnostopoulou, E. (1994) Clitic Dependencies in Greek, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Salzburg.
- Barbosa, P. (1993) Clitic Placement in Old Romance and European Portuguese, unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Benincà, P. (1986) Un'ipotesi sulla Sintassi delle Lingue Romanze Medievali, *Quaderni Patavini di Linguistica* 4, 3-19.
- Benincà, P. & G. Cinque (1993) Su alcune Differenze fra Enclisi e Proclisi, in *Ommagio a Gianfranco Folena*, Edizionale Programma, Padova, pp. 2313-2336.
- Chomsky, N. (1991) Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation, in R. Freidin (ed.), *Principles and Parameters in Comparative Grammar*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, N. (1993) A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory, in K. Hale and S.-J. Keyser (eds.), *The view from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass, pp. 1-52.
- Chomsky, N. (1995) *The Minimalist Program*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Drachmou, G. (1993) The attachment of (Greek) Pronominal Clitics, paper given at the First International Conference in Greek Linguistics, University of Reading.
- Fontana, J. M. (1993) Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish, PhD Dissertation, University of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Iatridou, S. (1991) Clitics and Island Effects, unpublished manuscript, MIT.
- Kayne, R. (1989) Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing, in O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter*, Kluwer, Dordrecht, pp. 239-261.
- Kayne, R. (1991) Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO, *Linguistic Inquiry* 22, 647-686.
- Kayne, R. (1994) *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 25, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Lasnik, H. (1995) Case and Expletives Revisited: On Greed and Other Human Failings, *Linguistic Inquiry* 26, 615-633.
- Madeira, A. (1992) On Clitic Placement in European Portuguese, *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 3.
- Martins, A. M. (1993) Clitic Placement from Old to Modern European Portuguese, unpublished manuscript, University of Lisbon.
- Martins, A. M. (1994) Enclisis, VP-deletion and the Nature of Sigma, *Probus* 6, 173-205.
- Raposo, E. (1995) Proclise, Enclise, e a Posição do Verbo em Português Europeu, in J. Camilodos Santos and F. G. Williams (eds.), *O Amor das Letras e das Gramáticas*, Center for Portuguese Studies, University of California, Santa Barbara, pp. 455-481.
- Rivero, M. J. (1994a), Clause Structure and V-Movement in the Languages of the Balkans, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12, 63-120.
- Rivero, M. J. (1994b) On two Locations for Complement Clitic Pronouns: Serbo/Croatian, Bulgarian and Old Spanish, paper presented at the Third Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference, Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam.
- Rivero, M. J. & A. Terzi (1995) Imperatives, V-Movement and Logical Mood, *The Journal of Linguistics* 31, 301-332.
- Rouvret, A. (1992) Clitic Placement and the Wackemagel Position in European Portuguese, in L. Rizzi (ed.), *Clitics in Romance and Germanic*, *European Working Papers*, pp. 103-139.
- Terzi, A. (1992) PRO in Finite Clauses: A Study of the Functional Heads of the Balkan Languages, Ph.D. Dissertation, GUNY Graduate Center.
- Terzi, A. (1996a) The Linear Correspondence Axiom and the Adjunction Site of Clitics, in A. M. Di Sciullo (ed.), *Configurations*, Cascadia Press, pp. 185-199.

- Terzi, A. (1996b) Cypriot Greek and Serbo/Croatian: Clitic Positioning and Modal-Aspectual Features. *GLOW Newsletter* 36, 93-94.
- Tsimpli, I. M. (1994) Focusing in Modern Greek, in K. Kiss (ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*, Oxford University Press, pp. 176-206.
- Uriagereka, J. (1995) Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 26, 79-123.
- Vasilokosta, S. (1994) Issues on Modern Greek Sentential Complementation, Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Maryland at College Park.
- Vikner, S. (1995) *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.