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1. Indefinite Topics: the problem

The aim of the present paper is to understand a contrast in the interpretation of Clitic Left Dislocated (CLLD-ed) indefinites in Italian and Greek. In a nutshell, Greek CLLD- indefinites systematically take wide scope over clause internal intensional predicates or quantifiers while their Italian counterparts may be interpreted either within or outside the scope of clause internal operators. Consider (1)-(2): both examples involve a Clitic Left Dislocated (CLLD-ed) indefinite. A known fact about the Greek example in (1) (from Alexopoulou & Kolliakou, 2002) is that the indefinite resists the so-called opaque or de dicto interpretation (Iatridou, 1995; Alexopoulou & Kolliakou, 2002). Thus, only (1c) is a felicitous continuation of (1a); (1b) which involves a non-referential interpretation of the CLLD-ed antecedent is not felicitous (as indicated by ¥).

(1)  a. mia kokini fusta tin psahno edho ke meres
    a red skirt it look-for-1SG here and days
    I've been looking for a red skirt for a few days ...
  b. ¥ ke de boro na vro kamia pu na m'aresi
    and not can-1SG SUBJ find-1SG none that SUBJ me-please-3SG
    ... and I cannot find any that I like.
  c. ke de boro na thimitho pu tin eho vali
    and not can-1SG SUBJ remember-1SG where her.CL have-1SG put
    ... and cannot remember where I put it.

Unlike (1), the corresponding Italian example (2a) is ambiguous. Both (2b) and (2c) are felicitous continuations of (2a).

(2)  a. una gonna rossa la cerco da un po
    a red skirt her.CL look-for-1SG for a while
    A red skirt I've been looking for a while...
  b. ma non ne ho trovata nessuna che mi piaccia
    but not of-them.CL have-1SG found none-FEM that me please-3SG.SUBJ
    ... but have not found anyone that I like.
  c. ma non riesco a ricordarmi dove l'ho messa
    but not reach-1SG to remember where her.CL-have-1SG put
    ... but I cannot remember where I've put it.

CLLD in both Greek and Italian is standardly taken to encode discourse topics (Cinque, 1990; Rizzi, 1997; Anagnostopoulou, 1994; Tsimpli, 1995). Moreover, while Italian appears to encode topics exclusively by means of CLLD, Greek resorts to Topicalisation structures for indefinite topics, which characteristically involve a gap instead of a pronominal clitic as illustrated in (3) below (from Alexopoulou & Kolliakou, 2002:ex.51).
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1This is true for nominals. With PPs for instance the clitic is optional (Cinque, 1990).
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(3) a. Fetos i moda ine apesia; idika i bluzes ine aparadektes
    I hate this year’s fashion; the blouses are especially outrageous.

b. mia kokini bluza psahno edo ki ena mina ke de boro na vro puthena
    a red blouse her.CL look-for-1SG here and one month and not can SUBJ find-1SG
    kamia pu na m’aresi
    anywhere anyone that SUBJ me like-3SG
    A red blouse I’ve been looking for for a month now and I cannot find one that I like.

In the sections that follow we will see that the two languages diverge in the possibility to use CLLD to dislocate indefinite topics. The main question of this paper is to understand why Italian but not Greek expresses indefinite topics through CLLD and why Greek resorts to Topicalisation in such cases.

2. Previous analyses

2.1. Scope-based analyses

A standard approach to the readings discussed is to view them as scope ambiguities and link them to the underlying derivations of the relevant structures. Thus, in Greek, CLLD is taken to involve base-generation, while in Italian movement (Iatridou, 1995; Anagnostopoulou, 1994; Cecchetto, 2001).\(^2\) Reconstruction, and, therefore the possibility of a narrow-scope reading for the indefinite is unavailable in Greek but available in Italian. Indeed, Italian CLLD-ed indefinites are systematically ambiguous, as exemplified by (4) (from Cecchetto, 2001:ex.73) whereas their Greek counterparts systematically take wide scope (5).

(4) a. un articolo di Chomsky ogni studente l’ha letto
    An article of Chomsky, every student has read it.

b. Qualche compito di fonologia, Leo lo assegna a ogni studente
    A phonology problem, Leo assigns to every student.

(5) ena artho tu Chomsky to diavase KATHE fititis
    There’s an article of Chomsky that every student read (only wide scope for indefinite).

There are a number of problems with this analysis. First of all, the explanation is rather circular since there is no independent evidence indicating this derivational contrast between Italian and Greek CLLD. In fact, a number of characteristic properties of these constructions—including sensitivity to islands, unavailability of parasitic gaps, coercion of weak crossover effects and incompatibility with downward entailing quantifiers—are shared by the construction in both languages (Cinqué, 1990; Anagnostopoulou, 1994; Rizzi, 1997; Tsimpli, 1995; Alexopoulou et al., 2004).\(^3\)

Second, the facts in Greek are more complex. Greek CLLD allows the so-called 3rd reading as shown in (6) (Fodor, 1970; von Fintel & Heim, 2009).\(^4\) The CLLD-ed phrase in (6) can refer to a particular model of a skirt in Armani’s collection one might have seen in a catalogue.

(6) a. mia fusta tu Armani tin psahno edho ke meres
    An Armani skirt I’ve been looking for for a few days ....

b. ke de mporo na vro kamia pu na mu kani
    and not can-1SG SUBJ find-1SG none that SUBJ me fit-3SG
    ... and I cannot find anyone that fits me.

\(^2\)Cinqué (1990) proposes a base-generation analysis for Italian CLLD; partly, he bases his analysis on examples like (7) from Longobardi (1986) where the CLLD-ed element takes wide scope.

\(^3\)Haegeman (to appear) discusses some differences between Italian and Greek CLLD which she captures by assuming that Greek CLLD involves a lower projection than Italian.

\(^4\)We are grateful to Sabine Iatridou for bringing this point to our attention.
According to the 3rd reading, the indefinite does not refer rigidly (e.g. to a physical token of this model of Armani skirt) but is not de dicto either, since it picks a particular type or model and not any skirt from Armani’s collection. This so-called 3rd reading is often assumed to involve partial reconstruction, to an intermediate position outside the scope of the intensional predicate (von Fintel & Heim, 2009). If, for the sake of the argument, such an analysis is adopted, then Greek CLLD must involve movement (at least partially).

The picture becomes even more complex when we consider different types of preposed elements. As it turns out, the properties/features of the nominal per se affect the availability of "narrow scope"/opaque readings. Thus, in Italian, plural CLLD-ed indefinites behave like Greek ones in some cases, in that only "wide scope" readings are available as in (7), an example due to Longobardi (1986) cited by Cinque (1990).

(7) ?quanti pazienti ritiene che li debba visitare ogni medico?
   How many patients think-2pl that them should visit each doctor
   How many patients do you think each doctor should visit? (no wide scope for universal)

In addition, as discussed in detail by Cecchetto (2001), while CLLD-ed DPs reconstruct in Italian, CLLD-ed PPs don’t. In sum, the various interpretational possibilities interact with the properties of the preposed nominal (namely, number and definiteness) in unexpected ways under a scope/derivational analysis. Finally, such an analysis, appears stipulative since there is no independent evidence for a derivational contrast between Italian and Greek CLLD.

2.2. Topichood analyses

A second set of analyses attributes the unavailability of non-referential readings for CLLD-ed indefinites to their discourse function as topics. The basic intuition behind these approaches is that topics necessarily involve well established discourse antecedents and, as a result, they can only be referential (Reinhart, 1982; Alexopoulou & Kolliakou, 2002; Endriss, 2006).

There is broad consensus that CLLD-ed phrases in both Greek and Italian instantiate discourse topics (Philippaki-Warburton, 1985; Anagnostopoulou, 1994; Tsimpli, 1995; Rizzi, 1997). However, the availability of non-referential CLLD-ed examples like (2) and (4) challenges the generalisation that topics are exclusively referential, a generalisation that underlies topichood approaches to wide scope/specific readings of topics. Similarly, the Greek Topicalisation example in (3b) challenges the validity of such analyses for Greek, since the topicalised element can be shown to be a topic. For instance, mia kokini bluza has a (non-monotone) discourse antecedent, the set denoted by "this year's blouses", and, in this respect, it can be viewed as a topic (or link) in the sense of Hendriks & Dekker (1995). Alternatively, it can be taken to denote a location in a filecard, in the terms of Vallduví (1992). The definitions in question presuppose that such discourse anaphoric relations can only hold between discourse referents; but, the intuition these definitions capture about topichood is certainly true for these examples as well.

It is conceivable that the scope-based and topichood based analyses can be modified to account for the crosslinguistic contrasts in question. However, as we will demonstrate in the next section, both types of analyses fail to capture a systematic link between the CLLD facts and the structure of nominals and anaphoric relations in the two languages. We turn to these in the next section.

Similarly, in Greek, CLLD-ed indefinites resist "narrow-scope" but definites appear to allow a distributive reading for the universal as illustrated by (i). Such interpretational contrasts between indefinite and definite nominals stay beyond the scope of the current paper, but, it’s worth noting that they are found beyond CLLD—see Bianchi (1999); Alexopoulou & Heycock (2003); Aoun & hui Audrey Li (2003).

(i) to aftokinito tu to asfalise KATHE fititis
   the car his-GEN it insured-3SG each student-NOM
   Each student insured his car (distributive reading available).
3. Beyond topics: nominals and anaphoric relations in Italian and Greek

In section 2 we saw that Italian and Greek differ with respect to the availability of scope ambiguities with CLLD of indefinites. This is an unexpected difference given the otherwise very similar behaviour of Greek and Italian in CLLD. Interestingly, the consideration of CLLD-ed indefinites highlights a number of other differences between the two languages which we briefly discuss in this section. The facts we present in this data section reveal an interesting interaction between strategies of topicalisation of indefinites, the availability of argument drop and the syntactic inventory of D elements in the two languages. The ultimate goal of the paper is to give a unified account of these interactions.

In apparent contradiction with a general view of topics as specific/referential, Italian adopts the same syntactic device to dislocate an indefinite:

(8) a. Una *la-trovi facilmente/ prima o poi una segretaria *
    A secretary her.CL-find easily/ sooner or later a secretary her.find
    A secretary, you fill find her easily/ sooner or later you will find her
b. *Segretarie le-trovi facilmente.
    Secretaries them.CL-find easily
    Secretaries, you will find them easily.
c. (Delle)-segretarie ne trovi facilmente.
    Secretaries of-them.CL find.easily
    Secretaries, you will find them easily.
d. (Delle)-segretarie se *(ne) trovano facilmente
    Secretaries refl of-them.CL find easily
    Secretaries, can be found easily.

(9) Gianni l'ho visto
    Gianni him-CL.'have seen
    Gianni, I have seen him.

The examples show that the indefinite topic in (8a) is resumed in the same way definite topics are resumed in CLLD, namely a clitic has to be present as in (9). In the plural, the indefinite topic is resumed by the partitive clitic ne or a combination of the reflexive clitic se and the partitive clitic ne, but not by the plural clitic le. Also the plural indefinite can be bare, but it can also appear with the so-called bare partitive construction, introduced by delle (dt+le).

In contrast, all corresponding cases of indefinite topics in Greek involve a structure that looks like Topicalisation (adapted from Alexopoulou & Kolliakou, 2002):

(10) a. Gramatea tha vrite sigura
    Secretary will find-2PL certainly
    A secretary you will find certainly.
b. Logistes the vrite sigura
    Accountants will find-2PL certainly
    Accountants you will find certainly.
c. An ke hortofagos, psari troi
    if and vegetarian fish eat-3SG
    Even though vegetarian, she eats fish.
d. *Gramatea tha (*ti) vrite sigura
    Secretary will her.CL find-2PL certainly
    A secretary you will find her certainly.

The examples in (10) show that in Greek the topic involves a bare noun and is related to a gap in the comment. The clitic is, in fact, unacceptable in such examples, as shown in (10d). Such cases contrast with standard cases of CLLD-ed definite topics as in (11).\footnote{There is a strong preference for definite topics to be CLLD-ed rather than Topicalised. However, topicalised definites are tolerated in judgement studies (Keller & Alexopoulou, 2001) and have also been linked to a formal register (Roussou & Tsimpli, 2006).}
Maria I met her at the cinema.

One key fact here is that the very same elements that resist CLLD in Greek and are topicalised, may be null or dropped (for the moment we remain agnostic on the analysis of such cases) in cases of intransentential anaphora, an observation originally made by Dimitriadis (1994b) (for accounts of this phenomenon see also Giannakidou & Merchant, 1997; Tsimpi & Papadopoulou, 2005; Panagiotidis, 2002):

(12) a. Q: vrike dada I Maria? Has Maria found a nanny?
   Q: found-3SG nanny the-NOM Maria
   b. A: ne, (*ti) vrike
      A: yes, (*her) found-3SG
      Yes, she found.

(13) a. o Yanis psahni idravliko alla dhe (*ton) vriski puthena
     the-nom Yanis look-for-3sg plumber but not (him) find-3sg anywhere
     Yanis is looking for a plumber but cannot find one anywhere.
   b. i Maria epsahne dada ena hrono ke tefika (*ti) vrike
      the-nom Maria was-looking-for-3sg nanny one year and finally (*her) found-3sg
      meso mias gnostis through an acquaintance
      Maria was looking for a nanny for a year and in the end she found one through an acquaintance.

In fact, in Greek indefinite argument drop is also available with subjects7 (as also observed by Giannakidou & Merchant, 1997).

(14) a. Q: irthe kanis?
    came-3SG anyone?
    Did anyone come?
   b. A: ne, irthe
      yes, came-3SG

(15) a. Q: tilefonisan fitites?
    phoned-3PL students?
    Did students phone?
   b. A: ne tilefonisan
      yes, phoned-3PL

In Italian, on the contrary, indefinite argument drop is disallowed: the clitic lo is obligatory in (16) even under an indefinite, de dicto interpretation; in subject position an existential quantifier is required (17).

(16) Gianni sta cercando un idraulico ma non lo trova
    a. Gianni is looking-for a plumber but not him.CL find-3SG
    b. Gianni is looking for a plumber but cannot find one.

(17) a. Q: Ha telefonato qualcuno
    Has phoned someone
    Did someone phone?
   b. A: Si, qualcuno ha telefonato
      Yes, someone has phoned
      Yes, someone phoned.

7Some context is needed for the exchange in (15). For instance, if a new helpline is set up in a university, available to faculty, students and the general public, but what is of interest is if students specifically use it, then (15) can be a felicitous exchange.
A third important way in which Greek and Italian differ in the dislocation of indefinites is in the use of a bare noun: the examples in (10) above show that the dislocated topic is a bare NP in Greek, but a full DP in Italian. This relates to a more general property of Greek which, unlike Italian, allows bare NPs in argument positions in contexts where the indefinite has a weak reading. Such bare NPs may involve singular, plural or mass nouns (18)–(20).

(18) a. i Maria vrike dada gia ta pedhia
   the-NOM Maria found nanny for the children
   Maria found a nanny for the children.

b. i Maria psahni sigkatiko
   the-NOM Maria looks-for-3SG flatmate
   Maria is looking for a flatmate.

c. o Yanis ehi vyi me filus
   the-NOM Yanis-NOM has-3SG gone-out with friends
   Yanis has gone out with friends.

d. agorase spiti
   bought-3SG house
   She bought a house.

(19) a. mpikan kleftes ke sikosan ta pada
   broke-in-3PL burglars and lifted-3PL the all
   Burglars broke in and took everything.

b. diadilotes pirpolisan magazia ke aftokinita stus dromus yiro apo to
   demonstrators set-on-fire shops and cars in-the streets around from the
   Politehnio
   Politehnio
   Demonstrators set on fire shops and cars in the streets around the School of Engineering.

(20) a. hithike krasi (sto aspro trapezomadilo)
   got-spilled-3SG wine (on-the white tablecloth)
   Wine got spill on the white tablecloth.

b. trehi nero ap’to solina
   run-3SG water from the tube
   Water is dripping from the tube.

c. ipie gala
   drank-3SG milk
   S/he drank milk.

While bare nominals in Greek are much more widespread than in Italian, they are, nevertheless, more restricted than English. For instance, they can never denote established kinds selected by kind selecting predicates or universal kinds (Roussou & Tsimpli, 1994).

(21) a. i/*∅ dinosavri ehun eksafanisti
   the-NOM/*∅ dinosaurs-NOM have-3PL disappeared
   Dinosaurs are extinct. (bare nominal ungrammatical under the kind reading)

b. ta/*∅ skilia ine katikidhia zoa
   the/*∅ dogs are domestic animals
   Dogs are domestic animals.

c. ?dinosavri ehun eksafanisti
   dinosaurs-NOM have-3PL disappeared
   Dinosaurs have disappeared (bare nominal possible only under the existential reading).

In this respect then, Greek departs from English, where bare nominals can denote kinds and is on a par with languages like Hungarian (Farkas & de Swarts, 2003); it allows bare nominals with existential (weak) readings but the definite article is used for kinds. By contrast, in Italian, while bare nouns are not

8To give a sense of how productive bare nouns are in Greek it’s worth pointing out that, as reported by Marinis (2003), around 45% of target like child Greek involves bare nouns.
completely prohibited, their distribution is very restricted (Benincà, 1980; Longobardi, 1994; Chierchia, 1998b). What is particularly interesting is that systematically, in the cases above where Greek allows bare nouns, Italian employs either an indefinite (22) or a bare partitive construction (23) (Chierchia 1998b):

(22) Maria ha trovato una baby sitter/*baby sitter per i bambini
Maria found a nanny for the children

(23) a. Del vino si è rovesciato
of-the wine REFL PAST spill
Some wine got spill.
b. *Acqua sta gocciolando dal rubinetto
water is dripped from-the faucet
Water is dripping from the faucet. (From Chierchia 1998a, ex.2b&3c)

Finally, Greek and Italian differ in the availability of NP ellipsis as shown in (24) and (25). In the Italian example in (24), the continuation in (24b) involves a pronominal clitic and an elliptical form of the noun phrase uno grande which contains an extra vowel /o/ on the determiner uno. By contrast, the Greek example in (25b) contains neither a pronominal nor a determiner, but a simple bare adjective kitrini:

(24) a. Vorrei un tavolo grande
would-like-1sg a table big
I would like to buy a big table.
b. Mi spiace. Non lo abbiamo, uno grande
Me displeases-3SG. Not it have-1PL, a big
I'm sorry. We do not have a big one. (From Alexiadou and Gengel 2008, attributed to V. Samek-Lodovici)

(25) a. thelo afti ti fuseta se kitrino
want-1sg this the skirt in yellow
I would like this skirt in yellow.
b. Distihos dhen eho kitrini. (Mono mavres mu ehun mini)
unfortunately not have-1sg yellow-fem.sg (Only black-fem.pl me have-3pl left)
Unfortunately I don’t have a yellow one. (Only black ones are left).

A summary of the facts discussed above is presented in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Greek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Indefinite Topics</td>
<td>CLLD of an indefinite nominal (2)</td>
<td>Bare nominal linked to a gap (3,10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) CLLD-ed indefinites</td>
<td><em>De dicto</em> and <em>de re</em> available (2)</td>
<td>Only <em>de re</em> (1) &amp; 3rd reading (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) Bare nouns</td>
<td>Limited distribution; bare partitive construction instead (22,23)</td>
<td>Productive use of bare nouns (18-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(D) Indefinite Argument Drop</td>
<td>Unavailable (16,17)</td>
<td>Obligatory use with (some) weak indefinites and bare nouns (12-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E) Nominal Ellipsis</td>
<td>Always involves a D element (24)</td>
<td>May involve bare adjective (25)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Analysis

In our view, the main shortcoming of the scope-based and topichood-based analyses is that they fail to view CLLD as an instance of pronominal anaphora. While it is true that the CLLD-ed topic is linked to previous discourse and at the same time is, syntactically, the head of an A-bar dependency, it is also crucial to appreciate that this element is the antecedent of a pronoun. This holds the key to understanding the crosslinguistic contrast which bears directly on the properties of the two elements of the anaphoric chain, namely, the antecedent and the pronominal. In the cases in point, the relevant factors are:

1. The syntactic realisation of (non-referential/weak) indefinite nominals that may act as antecedents in a CLLD chain;
2. The availability of pronominal anaphora for indefinite non-referential antecedents (kinds, properties and/or weak indefinites).

In a nutshell, Greek allows bare nouns where in Italian a D element is involved. This contrast has implications for the ways in which such indefinite phrases can or cannot act as antecedents of pronouns in the two languages.

4.1. Bare nominals

Above we have seen that the examples of CLLD-ed indefinite topics in Italian involve bare nouns in Greek. The obvious question then is what the syntactic status of these bare nouns is. Our hypothesis is that bare nouns in Greek are instantiations of argumental NPs (in the sense of Chierchia, 1998b), namely NPs can be of type e, hence, arguments (Kolliakou, 2003; Tomioka, 2003; Tsimpli & Papadopoulou, 2005). By contrast, in Italian, arguments are always DPs. Following a substantial body of work, we assume that Italian nominals are structured around a D category; this is consistent with the wide range of determiner-like elements that are available in Italian (definite article, bare partitive construction, a larger inventory of clitic pronouns such as ne and ci), which are almost always obligatory and which, by and large, are assumed to be D heads selecting for NP complements (Longobardi, 1994; Alexiadou et al., 2007). This further explains the very restricted distribution of bare nominals in Italian, which are standardly taken to involve a null D (see Chierchia (1998b) and Longobardi (1994) for discussion). In other words, D is the main nominaliser in Italian and arguments are necessarily DPs.

The hypothesis that bare nouns in Greek instantiate argumental NPs is a controversial one. Authors like Kolliakou (2003) and Tsimpli & Papadopoulou (2005) assume argumental NPs but Sioupi (2001b,a) and Panagiotidou (2002, 2003) among others propose that a null D is implicated in the structure of bare Greek nominals (see also Alexiadou et al., 2007:for discussion). One argument offered in favour of the null D analysis is that bare nominals are excluded from subject positions as in (26) from Sioupi (2001b). Restrictions on the distribution of bare nouns can be explained by the special licensing conditions of null elements.

(26) *pedia efagan to psari
    Children ate the fish.(From Sioupi, 2001b:ex.4a)

However, the examples in (27) constitute counterexamples to this generalisation (see also (19)).

(27) a. itan enas hamos; yinekes epahnan ta pedia tus mes ta halasmata;
    was a disaster; women were-looking-for the children their in the ruins;
    pedia kitazan yiro tus sastismena
    children were-looking around them startled
    It was a mess; women were looking for their children in the ruins; children were looking around startled.

b. ton gratzunisan gates tu dromu
    Street cats scratched him.(From Kolliakou, 2003)

c. ta hronia ta palia, varia fortia fevgan ya tin America
    in old times heavy loads were-leaving for Americal (popular song by D.Papakonstantinou).

d. alepudes irthan ke perisi
    Foxes appeared last year as well.

Intuitively, the bare nouns in (27) denote kinds (in the various senses described by Chierchia (1998b)). Such an interpretation is somewhat odd for an example like (26), but quite natural in the examples in (27). Significantly, Greek not only allows bare plurals in argument positions, but also bare singulars as in (28).
(28)  a. karhariasis ehi na emfanistisi s’ahit tin periodo apo to 2002
    shark-NOM has SUBJ appear-3SG in this the region since the 2002
    A shark has not appeared in this area since 2002.

    b. ton exetase yatros
    him.CL examined-3SG doctor-NOM
    A doctor examined him. (From Kolliakou, 2003)

    c. kleftis de spai tetia klidaria me tipota
    thieve-NOM not break-3SG such lock with nothing
    There’s no way a thieve can break such a lock.

It is worth noting that the number of singular bare nouns is atomic, excluding an incorporation analysis of such cases (Farkas & de Swarts, 2003). Examples (29a) and (29b) below, where the object is a bare singular and a bare plural respectively, denote readings of a single and more than one newspapers accordingly. Crucially, the bare singular is ungrammatical in (29c), where the predicate is incompatible with a singular reading of the object.

(29)  a. dhiavase efimeridha
    read-3SG newspaper
    S/he read a newspaper. *(reading of one newspaper)*

    b. dhiavase efimeridhes
    read-3SG newspapers
    She read newspapers. *(reading of more than one newspapers)*

    c. mazevi *gramatosim-o/gramatosim-a
    gather-3SG stamp-SG/stamps-PL
    She collects stamps.

In other words, the distribution of bare nouns in Greek is systematic in a way that clearly sets Greek apart from Italian (and, in relation to bare singulars also from English). It is hard to see how a null D analysis can capture the contrasts between Italian and Greek with regard to the availability of bare nominals.

Moreover, it is hard to see how a null D analysis can provide an understanding for the three main contrasts we saw in the last section, repeated below:
(1) the absence of partitive constructions in Greek vis a vis the abundance of bare NPs in this language;
(2) the availability of argument drop in Greek and its absence from Italian together with the contrasts in the realisation of nominal subdeletion;
(3) the realisation of anaphoric relations in the two languages, in particular in structures involving dislocation.

As we will show in the next section, the hypothesis that Greek but not Italian allows argumental NPs can provide a unified analysis for the facts relating to 1-3 above, reducing all contrasts to one aspect of the syntax of nominals in the two languages.

Before we turn to the next section, let us briefly discuss our hypothesis about the syntax of bare nouns in the context of the syntax of definite phrases in the two languages. The analysis of the Greek definite article is a matter of debate. However, the main generalisation emerging from the literature is that the Greek definite article is not a D head (Karanassios, 1992; Androutsopoulos, 1994; Stavrou, 1996; Alexiadou et al., 2007)—at best, it is a derived D, moving from a lower Definiteness head. In other words, the Greek definite article, and D, in general, is not a necessary nominalisor in Greek (Kolliakou, 2003; Lekakou & Szendrői, 2010). In this context, it is not unexpected that bare nominals are just NPs. By contrast, the definite article in Italian is a D head in a syntactic nominalisor role. Its function as a functional category in syntax appears to supersede its semantic function (Giusti, 2010), since the Italian article allows for a wider range of semantic interpretations than its Greek counterpart. For example, the definite article in Italian can head a relative clause in subjunctive (30).

(30)  scommetto che non troverai mai la/tuna segretaria di un onorevole che sia
    bet-1SG that not will-find never the/a secretary of a depute who can-SUBJ
    disposta a testimoniare contro di lui
    submit-SUBJ a testimony against of him
I bet you’ll never find the secretary of a depute who can testify against him. (From Giusti, 2010)

Subjunctive relatives in Greek resist a definite head (31).

(31) *den prokite na vri ti yineka pu na tu kani ola ta hatiria not going-to-3SG SUBJ find-3SG the-ACC woman that SUBJ him.CL do-3SG all the favours
He’s not going to find the woman that will satisfy every whim of his.

As we will see in the next section, similar semantic contrasts arise between the pronominal elements in the two languages.

4.2. Indefinite Argument Drop and pronominal anaphora

In section 3 we saw that Greek allows indefinites to be dropped. If we are correct in assuming that Greek bare nouns do not project an empty D, the natural hypothesis is to analyse indefinite object drop (IAD here onward) as an instance of NP deletion/ellipsis, with Tomioka (2003). This in turn allows us to capture a crucial observation made Giannakidou & Merchant (1997), regarding IAD, namely that it involves recycling of the descriptive content of the antecedent, which appears equivalent to Tomioka’s property anaphora—see also Kolliakou (2003). Consider the contrast below:

(32) a. I Theodora mazepse fraules ki o Adreas pulise the-NOM Theodora picked-3SG strawberries and the-NOM Andreas sold-3SG Theodora picked strawberries and Andreas sold strawberries. (Disjoint reading)

b. I Theodora mazepse fraules_1 ke o Andreas tis_1 pulise the-NOM Theodora picked-3SG strawberries and the-NOM Andreas them-ACC sold Theodora picked strawberries and Andreas sold them.

(Adapted from Giannakidou and Merchant 1997, ex.3&6)

(33) a. o Napoleodas epline piata ke i Nafsika skupise the-NOM Napoleon washed-3SG dishes and the-NOM Nafsika dried-3SG Napoleon washed dishes and Nafsika dried dishes. (Disjoint reading)

b. o Napoleodas epline ta piata_1 ke i Nafsika ta_1 skupise the-NOM Napoleon washed-the dishes and the-NOM Nafsika them dried-3SG Napoleon washed the dishes and Nafsika dried them.

In (32a), which involves IAD, the default interpretation involves a “disjoint reading” according to which the strawberries Andreas sold are not the ones Theodora picked. (32a) contrasts with (32b), which involves a pronominal tis; as expected, tis refers to the strawberries Theodora picked. Notice that the disjoint reading is prevalent even in examples like (33a), where pragmatically it should be dispreferred. On the basis of this, Giannakidou & Merchant (1997) conclude that a pro drop analysis of IAD is wrong (contra Dimitriadis, 1994a,b; Panagiotidis, 2002).

Crucially, it is exactly the fact that IAD involves recycling of the descriptive content of its antecedent while clitics necessarily imply rigid reference that captures the obligatoriness of IAD in the examples below:

(34) a. o Yanis psahni idravliko alla dhe (*ton) vriski puthena the-NOM Yanis-NOM look-for-3SG plumber but not (him) find-3SG anywhere Yanis is looking for a plumber but cannot nd one anywhere.

b. i Maria epsahne dada ena hrono ke telika (*ti) vrike the-NOM Maria was-looking-for-3SG nanny one year and finally (*her) found-3SG meso mias gnostis through an acquaintance Maria was looking for a nanny for a year and in the end she found one through an acquaintance.

As pointed out to us by David Pesetsky, it is important to establish that the cases in point involve true argument drop and not some kind of VP ellipsis. Giannakidou & Merchant (1997) and Panagiotidis (2002) show convincingly that the relevant examples are true cases of argument drop.
This contrasts robustly with what we see in Italian where a clitic can pick up either a rigid referent or the descriptive content of the antecedent. Consider the following example:

(35) Gianni ha letto dei libri e poi li ha buttati via
Gianni has read of the books and then them.CL has thrown away
Gianni has read some books and then has thrown them away

Here the clitic pronoun li rigidly refers to the same books Gianni has read. On the other hand, in the following sentence with a kind referring DP as an antecedent, li picks up the descriptive content of the DP since the answer does not refer to a specific pair of glasses:

(36) a. Q: Porti gli occhiali?
   wear the glasses?
   Do you wear glasses?
   b. A: Si, liporto
   Yes, them.CL wear
   Yes I do.

Similarly in the examples below the clitics la and lo pick up the descriptive content of their antecedent and receive a weak, indefinite reading:

(37) a. Q: Maria ha trovato una baby sitter?
   Has Maria found a baby sitter?
   b. A: si, l’ha trovata
   Yes, her.CL has found found-3sg
   Yes, she found her.

(38) Gianni sta cercando un idraulico ma non lo trova
Gianni is looking for a plumber but cannot find one.

In order to capture the intuition that IAD picks up the descriptive content of its antecedent rather than its referent, Giannakidou & Merchant (1997) propose that IAD involves NP-deletion; the elided NP is part of a more articulated structure involving a null D, as illustrated in (39a). In particular, they assume that IAD involves a pro which has the structure in (39a), containing a D-layer with a null D. They further assume with many others in the literature that weak quantifiers are categorically adjectival and not determiners. This assumption allows a distinction between strong determiners, which are merged as D (39b), and weak ones which are not D heads. This contrast allows them to capture the fact that only weak determiners license IAD. In particular, they follow Lobeck (1995) in assuming that only XPs identified by strong functional heads can be elided. NPs but not DPs involve strong functional heads which, given the structures in (39), means that only NPs with weak determiners can be deleted and therefore give rise to IAD.

\[
\begin{align*}
(39) & \quad \text{a. } D & \text{NP} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \emptyset & \{\text{weak}\} & \ldots \\
& \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{b. } D & \text{NP} \\
& \quad \quad \quad \{\text{strong}\} & \ldots \\
\end{align*}
\]

We adopt the basic intuition of Giannakidou and Merchant (1997) that IAD involves NP-deletion. However, we do not assume the involvement of a pro element with the structure in (39a). We see no evidence for postulating a null D in Greek in contrast to Italian, following proposals like Longobardi (1994) and Chierchia (1998a,b) among others. One crucial challenge for a null D analysis for Greek is
how to capture the crosslinguistic contrasts we have discussed above. In other words, if both languages allow null Ds, why is Italian so restricted in the availability of bare nouns and why is IAD impossible in Italian? These contrasts follow naturally under the view that only Italian allows null Ds while Greek allows argumental NPs.

Further, consider the minimal pair in (40) which further demonstrates the problems faced by a null-D based analysis of IAD, and bare nouns in Greek. Unlike most examples considered so far, the indefinite nominal in (40) have an indefinite article. As can be seen, such indefinites provide potentially ambiguous antecedents. Crucially, the disambiguation relies on whether a pronominal is involved or not in the second sentence in (40). Thus, in (40a) the pronoun ton refers rigidly while in (40b) IAD forces an opaque reading for enan idravliko.

(40) a. o Yanis psahni enan idravliko, ala dhe ton vriski puthena
   the-NOM Yanis look-for-3SG one plumber but not him find-3SG anywhere
   Yanis is looking for a plumber but cannot find him anywhere. ∃ > look-for

b. o Yanis psahni enan idravliko, ala dhe vriski puthena
   the-NOM Yanis look-for-3SG one plumber but not find-3SG anywhere
   Yanis is looking for a plumber but cannot find one anywhere. look-for > ∃

The equivalent examples in Italian (41) and English (42) involve the clitic pronoun lo in either interpretation in Italian and either one or him respectively in English:

(41) Gianni sta cercando un idraulico ma non lo trova
   Gianni is looking-for a plumber but cannot it.CL find
   Gianni is looking for a plumber but cannot find one/him. look-for > ∃ or ∃ > look-for

(42) a. Gianni is looking for a plumber but cannot find one. look-for > ∃

b. Gianni is looking for a plumber but cannot find him. ∃ > look-for

These examples and their cross-linguistic comparison are important. First, they confirm that Greek stands out in that unlike the other two languages an opaque indefinite can be the antecedent of a dropped element. Second, they provide solid syntactic evidence that a null pronominal analysis of IAD is unjustifiable since the scopal differences between (40a) and (40b) cannot be accounted for if both examples were to have the same underlying syntax except for the PF properties of the pronominal element involved.

Finally, viewing IAD as NP ellipsis explains why subjects may also be dropped in Greek but not in Italian as shown in (17) vs. (14)-(15). If Greek allows argumental NPs and NP ellipsis, we would expect that subjects could also be dropped, as is the case. By contrast, Italian subject drop involves pro-drop associated with well known referentiality restrictions.

The examples from subnominal deletion (25) further confirm the hypothesis that Greek nominals are not determiner centered. Though subnominal deletion is distinct from IAD (Giannakidou & Merchant, 1997; Giannakidou & Stavrou, 1999), it is very clear that the Greek examples in question do not involve any D element, in fact they just involve the adjective. This contrasts with the Italian example in (24) where subnominal deletion not only involves a D but also it involves a specific morphology on D, which according to some analyses is explicitly implicated in the licensing of the subnominal deletion (Alexiadou & Gengel, 2008).

Let us now consider one final piece of evidence in favour of our analysis which also brings us to the starting point of this paper, namely the interpretational contrasts between Italian and Greek CLLD-ed indefinites. As mentioned earlier, in addition to CLLD, Topicalisation is also available in Greek, in particular in cases where the topic is an indefinite bare noun. The example below involves a topicalised indefinite with an article.10 As we have seen already, such indefinites can, in principle, be ambiguous (40). Indeed, the example below is ambiguous and, in fact, completely parallel to its counterpart involving focus-movement (44). But note that, crucially, it contrasts with (40b), where the dropped argument allows only an opaque interpretation of its antecedent, enan idravliko.

---

10 SMALL CAPITALS on Yanis indicate sentential stress which we indicate here to avoid a reading of the sentence as focus-movement, where stress would have to fall on the preposed element.
Dimitriadis (1994b) proposes that examples like (43) constitute cases of Exceptional CLLD (E-CLLD) involving an empty resumptive pro, the same element present in cases of IAD. This analysis captures formally Dimitriadis’s generalisation that languages that allow IAD also allow E-CLLD. But if both cases involve a null pro, then we expect the presumed null clitic in (43) to force the same interpretation as the presumed null clitic in IAD (40b). This is not the case, since (43) is ambiguous unlike (40b). Under our hypothesis, this contrast is expected if (40b) involves NP-ellipsis while (43) ordinary Topicalisation, i.e. A-bar movement of the topic (on a par with focus-movement in (44)). Further, under our hypothesis there is not intrinsic relation between these two phenomena per se; rather, they are only indirectly linked since they both arise as the consequence of the availability of argumental NPs, at least, in Greek. Finally, note that the parallel between topicalisation and focus-movement (43)-(44) reinforces our more general point that the discourse function of the preposed element is, ultimately, irrelevant for the scopal readings.

4.3. Open issues

We have provided structural evidence indicating that NPs in Greek can be arguments in the absence of a D element, a hypothesis that explains aspects of the realisation of weak indefinites and pronominal anaphora in Greek and captures a set of contrasts with Italian, a language where NPs cannot be arguments. The details of the semantics of these argumental NPs and the shifting operations that allow them to function as individuals rather than predicates await further investigation. If, in a Chierchia-style typology, Greek is typologically similar to English, with NPs ambiguous between a predicate and argument function, some thorny questions arise: why does Greek, unlike English, use the definite article for established kinds? Why does Greek allow bare singulars? The availability of argumental NPs has emerged as a crucial aspect of our crosslinguistic account. At the same time, a number of other interacting factors need to be understood in order to reach a comprehensive crosslinguistic account of the structure and distribution of bare nouns, argument drop, pronominal anaphora and the make up of indefinite topics. For instance, one immediate question is why English does not allow IAD if argumental NPs are available. The structure and distribution of bare nouns and argument drop in other Romance languages will certainly bring more factors and finer distinctions to light.

Finally, the source of the main difference between Greek and Italian, namely the availability of argumental NPs also needs to be understood. If D is not a necessary nominalisor in Greek, what can function as a nominalisor in its absence? Some obvious candidates suggest themselves. Unlike Italian, Greek nouns and adjectives have rich morphology including case that may play a role in licensing argumental NPs and potentially NP ellipsis (see Lekakou & Szendrői, 2010; Giannakidou & Stavrou, 1999). At the same time, Greek number has some idiosyncratic properties (Tsoulas, 2008; Alexiadou, 2010) which, again, may play a role in the licensing of argumental NPs.

5. Conclusion

This paper provides an analysis of a prima facie unexpected contrast in the way Greek and Italian dislocate indefinite topics: both languages adopt CLLD as a main strategy for the dislocation of topics, but in Greek indefinite topics behave differently. A fine grained analysis of these constructions highlights a number of important differences between the two languages, namely: (i) the absence of a

---

11Proposals in the spirit of Farkas & de Swarts (2009) can shed light to the issue as they specifically address this question. However, their analysis implicates number in a way that could not be straightforwardly extended to Greek because of some crucial idiosyncratic properties of Greek number—see for instance Tsoulas (2008).
partitive construction in Greek in conjunction with productive distribution of bare NPs vs the restricted distribution of bare nominals in Italian and employment of bare partitive construction for the expression of indefinites; (ii) the possibility of argument drop in Greek exactly for the range of nominals that can be bare vs the unavailability of argument drop in Italian (iii) the availability of "bare" subnominal deletion in Greek, but not in Italian and (iv) the cross-linguistic differences in the realisation of indefinite topics and their scopal properties: in Italian, indefinite topics are CLLD-ed on a par with referential/specific topics, while their Greek counterparts are topicalised and contrast with referential/specific topics which are CLLD-ed. The proposal advanced in the paper is that these differences can be straightforwardly accounted for if we assume the availability of determinerless NPs in Greek but not in Italian, where NPs always require a projection of a D. The existence of bare NPs in Greek naturally explains the possibility of NP ellipsis which in turn explains why argument drop is restricted to indefinites in Greek and is absent from Italian. Finally, bare NPs cannot be resumed by a DP pronoun in CLLD in Greek; instead they are just topicalised. By contrast, since indefinites are always DPs in Italian, they can be resumed by a D-pronominal clitic. This analysis forms part of a research programme which attempts to connect the availability of bare nouns in languages to other syntactic phenomena, for example Chierchia’s correlation between the unrestricted distribution of bare NPs and the absence of the bare partitive construction or Tomioka’s hypothesis regarding the relationship between bare nouns and NP ellipsis. Compared to previous proposals, the range of constructions which are discussed in this paper and shown to correlate with the availability of bare NP provides even stronger arguments for a true difference between languages in the availability of genuinely bare NPs.
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