selected papers

of

the **10**th
International
Conference of
Greek
Linguistics

Edited by

Zoe Gavriilidou
Angeliki Efthymiou
Evangelia Thomadaki
Penelope Kambakis-Vougiouklis

QUANTIFICATION AND SYNTAX

Anna-Maria Margariti

University of Patras, Greece

annamariamargariti@upatras.gr

margaritianna@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

In Modern Greek kathe, *the lexical paradigm for* every, *forms expressions with ambiguous interpretations. In this paper we present the different readings kathe phrases give rise to and a way of deriving these different readings through implementing the theory presented in Roussou & Tsimpli (2006) for indefinite phrases. More specifically, it is demonstrated that the different readings attributed to the phrase in question are crucially related to the sentence domain each time the* kathe *nominal phrase is merged in. When merged and interpreted in dC, the phrase receives a universal distributive "strong" interpretation. When merged in dv, the phrase is bound to receive a "weak", Free Choice-like interpretation. In dT the phrase may receive either of the above interpretations. Which interpretation the phrase will receive depends on the aspect of the verb and Focus. Focus seems to be related to dC and to the "strong" quantificational reading. I argue that in the case of the ambiguous quantificational expressions in hand the distributive property of* kathe *interacts with properties of the head of the domain it is merged in and that the relevant readings pertaining to quantification do not involve the Determiner Phrase (DP) as such alone.*

Keywords: universal quantification, distributivity, Free Choice, indefinites.

1. Introduction: (In)definites and universal quantification

Since Heim (1982) (in) definites are viewed as variables that should be bound by relevant operators. "Universal" distributive determiner phrases (such as *every, each)* have been spared from similar skepticism (unlike collective *all*, cf. Brisson 1998). However, the idea that distributive universal quantification, involving a sorting key and a distributive share (terms by Choe 1985) mainly results from the lexical semantics of the quantifier or determiner of the Quantifier Phrase (QP) or Determiner phrase (DP) which acts as the sorting key has been repeatedly challenged in recent literature.

With the lexical semantics of the "universal" determiners placed under scrutiny, a somewhat different approach rears its head. It has been argued by many that *every* NPs in one way or the other should be treated as similar to other (in)definites, e.g. as variables bound by external operators. The fact that distributivity may ensue with plain plural (in)definites, for example, has been considered as one indication that distribution is not related to a particular determiner forming a DP / QP (Szabolcsi 2010:113):

   (1) (The) six friends watched a movie together and had a glass of wine.

   In the above sentence "a glass of wine" is interpreted distributively; we infer that a total of (at least) six glasses of wine were consumed by the six friends, not just one. No overt distributive operator is visible, though.

   In this spirit it has been claimed that the lexical semantics of the determiners which form the quantifying DPs or Quantifier Phrases (QPs) are not responsible for the (universal) distributive reading (Szabolcsi 2010, Beghelli & Stowell 1997, Matthewson 2001, among others). The distributive reading is considered to be the result of a sentence-level operator not related to the determiner. All the DP that receives the distributive reading has to do is to merge in the designated syntactic position. In a nutshell, neither the determiner nor the DP are the major culprits; on the contrary, it is a sentence-level operator

that does all the work [1]. Evidence for relevant syntactic positioning and the resulting different interpretations comes from Hungarian (e.g. Szabolcsi 1997) and other languages (cf. references for KiLega and Palestinian Arabic in Beghelli and Stowell 1997).

Apart from that, distributivity itself is not viewed as a uniform notion. Different kinds or "degrees" of distributivity have been recognized in the literature. There are a number of differences between strong *every* and stronger *each - strong* in Milsark's (1974) sense, *stronger* as in Ioup's (1975) hierarchy.According to Heim & Kratzer (1998) *each* is presuppositional, while *every* is not. Tunstall (1998) similarly characterizes *each* as a total distributive; *every* is a partial distributive. According to Beghelli & Stowell (1997) *each* is obligatorily distributive whereas *every* is optionally distributive. Furthermore, as it has been claimed by Schein (1993) and adopted by many semantics researchers ever since (e.g. Kratzer 2003) plurality and any distributivity related to it seem to involve events (Davidson 1967). In this sense again, distributivity is not a matter of the DP alone.

Much of the above discussion and *each-every* distinction have been adopted for relevant Modern Greek paradigms -phrases *kathe* and *o kathe*. Lazaridou-Chatzigoga (2009) and Etxeberria and Giannakidou (2010) distinguish between *kathe* (*every*) vs. *o kathe* (*each)*. According to Giannakidou (1998) *kathe* is non-veridical, whereas *o kathe* is veridical. The latter phrase is also attributed an indiscriminative Free Choice (FC) reading (Giannakidou 2012). Considering that Free Choice Items (FCIs) have been regarded as indefinites, this use may be indicative of the indefinite, non-inherently universal nature of the paradigm *kathe* and that is precisely where the main focus of the present paper lies on. I present the different uses of the *(o) kathe* DPs and, building on the insights in recent literature discussed, I propose a syntactic analysis for the Greek *kathe* DPs. The phrase's different distributive readings are attributed to the position the phrase occupies within the sentence and its interaction with (im)perfective aspect and focus.

The discussion is organized as follows: In section 2 we see some facts and core data about the ambiguity of the *(o) kathe* DP. In section 3 we review Roussou and Tsimpli's (2006) proposal on the interpretation of indefinites which we will use as the basis for our analysis. In section 4 we present the data and analysis. In section 5 we conclude.

2. The ambiguity of *kathe* DPs

Modern Greek *kathe* is a distributive determiner (Holton et al. 2007) equivalent to the sorting key (Choe 1985) or distributive-key universal (Gil1995) *every* determiner.

(O) kathe DPs are (most commonly) interpreted as universal distributive DPs as in (2, 7). However, when combined with (a certain type) of nominals in particular contexts, they seem to render an FC-*any* interpretation as in (3, 4, 5, 6) below:

(2) O kathe ipopsifios pire apo ekato evro.
    the every candidate receive.past.3sg. from a hundred euro
    "Each candidate received a hundred euros."

(3) Anighi maghazi o kathe asxetos ke halai tin aghora.
    open.pres.3sg. shop every irrelevant and ruin.pres.3sg. the market
    "Just any amateur opens a store and ruins the market."

(4) Akoma ke o kathe tixeos perastikos tha iksere na su pi ghia tin akropoli.
    even and any random passer-by would know.3past.3sg subj. say about acropolis
    "Even just any random passer-by would know a few things to say about the Acropolis."

---

[1] Szabolcsi (2010) further argues that *every* NPs could be viewed on a par with indefinites on the basis that they both exhibit three common traits: they can be both referentially dependent as they can also be referentially independent. Their distributive scope is clause bounded in both cases. They differ in how the choice function involved in their interpretation is picked (ibid: 105).

Beghelli and Stowell (1997) argue that *every* NP supplies just the domain of quantification and not the universal distributive operator. The latter is not to be found in the determiner's lexical semantics. It is rather related to a specific position at LF.

Kratzer (2005) puts forth the idea that universal Ds are not inherently universal but agreement markers which participate in a quantificational concord phenomenon similar to negative concord as analyzed in Ladusaw (1994). This idea is also found in Butler (2004) who proposes a feature-based approach for universal quantification.

(5) Esi bori na min tin skotoses, dhen kseris omos ti bori na katathesi o kathe martiras.
you may subj. not her kill.past.2sg. not know.pres.2sg. what may subj. testify.3sg. any witness
"You may not be the killer, but you can't be sure what any witness might testify."

(6) Tora beni sto dhiadhiktio kathe aniliko ke kani ipoklopes sto Pentagono! # Ine kati poli sinithismeno.
now get.pres.3sg. in the internet any underage and make.pre.3sg hacking to the Pentagon. Be. pres.3sg very common.
"Any underage person may nowadays get on the internet and hack the Pentagon. # It is very common."

(7) Kathe aniliko beni sto dhiadhiktio ke kani ipoklopes sto Pentagono. Ine kati poli sinithismeno.
every underage get.pres.3sg. in the internet and make.pre.3sg hacking to the Pentagon. Be. pres.3sg very common.
"Every underage person gets on the internet and hacks the Pentagon. It is very common."

The different readings *o kathe* DPs receive are evident in (2, 3, 4, 5), where we encounter an *each* as well as a *just any* and *any* meaning. The different readings *kathe* DPs receive are found in (6, 7). In (4) the item in question is accompanied by words that may be viewed as indicative of the FC indiscriminative reading: *akoma ke (even though), tixeos (random).* The *every* and *each* interpretations anticipated based on the standard view appear only in (2, 7). We observe that in sentences (3-6) where the DP in question receives a Free Choice (FC *any)* interpretation we have a [–perfect(ive)] grammatical aspect on the verb[2].

Another common trait in sentences (3-6) is that the FCI *kathe*-DP subject is in a postverbal position. Note that the meaning differentiation between (6) and (7) seems to result from the positioning of the subject *kathe* DP in the sentence. The universal distributive reading arises in (7), where the *kathe* DP appears to be in the C domain. In (6), on the other hand, the phrase in question is in a postverbal position in the domain of v, yielding an FC *any* reading. This is not the only difference between the two phrases, however. In (7) the universal strong *kathe* DP seems to carry Focus, whereas in (6) the FCI version does not. Furthermore, if the phrase in question in (6) is pronounced as Focused, its reading becomes strong and universal. Focus seems to be a distinctive feature between the two readings.

The above data clearly indicate that *kathe* DPs receive a Free Choice interpretation[3] together with the anticipated universal distributive one (also cf. Margariti 2007). The sections that follow sketch an explanation of the above observations.

3. Background analysis: Roussou & Tsimpli (2006)

Roussou & Tsimpli (2006) in discussing the availability of VSO in Greek and its (relative) unavailability in Italian present a mechanism for deriving the interpretation of subjects (and more loosely all arguments) depending on the domain they occur in.

They divide the clause in three main domains: dC, DT and dv, defined by the heads C, T and V respectively (ibid: 322). The interpretation of a subject indefinite DP varies depending on the domain in which it is merged in. The properties of the head of the domain the DP is each time merged in affect the interpretation of the DP (ibid: 325). They further assume that clitic positions are available in all three domains, forming an iterative 'clitic-shell' that appears at the periphery of all domains, adopting a proposal in Manzini & Savoia (2004). In their notation, CL1 and CL2 stand for two clitic positions, roughly corresponding to subject and object clitics, respectively. They propose the following schema

---

[2] We have a [–past, –perfect] T specification in (3, 5, 6) and a modal context in (4). According to Roussou & Tsimpli (1996) all verb specifications in Greek but [+past, +perfect] may yield a modal interpretation. This is the case here for (3, 6); we have a modal interpretation, as evident from the English translation. Note that the relation between modality and the [–past, –perfect] specification is in line with Giannakidou's (2011) claim that [+past, +perfect] is the only true tense in Greek.

[3] A few words on what we take Free Choice items (e.g. *whichever*) to be are relevant at this point. Free Choice Items (FCIs) have been argued to be either universal or existential; we opt for the second view and consider FCIs to be existential indefinites in the sense of Heim (1982), following among others Kadmon & Landman (1993), Horn (2000, 2005) and Giannakidou (2001) and Vlachou (2007) for Greek FCIs in particular. If this line of research is on the right track, together with the proposal put forth in Szabolcsi (2010) about the uniformity of *every* expressions with indefinites, we could envisage a unified account for diverse items such as *every, any, whichever,* and *a.*

for the clause structure, where CL1 and CL2 may be realized by either a clitic or a full DP (their (16), pp. 325):

  (8) [a CL1 – CL2 C [b CL1 – CL2 T [c CL1 – CL2 V]]]

The interpretation of the subject DP is influenced by the properties of the head of the domain it appears in. In dV the event and aspectual properties of the predicate affect the DP. In dT it is the temporal properties of the clause that are relevant, while in dC discourse properties call the shots (ibid: 325).

The theory predicts a number of discrepancies between the three domains, which always pertain to the particular features of the head of each domain.

More specifically, CL1 ("Subject") and CL2 ("Object") in dC may alternate in order (SO, OS). Both positions may be lexically realized within this domain. The first in line is the Topic, the second the Focus (following Rizzi 1997).

In dT, CL1 ("Subject") and CL2 ("Object") cannot alternate in order. In the presence of a lexicalized CL1, CL2 can only be a clitic. Finally, CL1 and CL2 in Greek can be full argument DPs in dv and alternate in order. Greek allows for a morphological distinction between Nom (S) and Acc (O), primarily due to the full inflection of the definite article at D (while Italian does not have that). Quantification is viewed in connection with the C head and Focus, following previous literature that wants focus in the periphery to be quantificational, in opposition to topic (ibid: 335).

A few words about the general Greek syntax assumed by the two authors and also endorsed by our analysis: For starters, V-to-T movement always takes place. Also, Spec,TP is always projected while preverbal subjects are not always dislocated. The latter assumptions are in pace with Spyropoulos and Revithiadou (2007), contra Philippaki-Warburton (1987), Tsimpli (1990), Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1998), Spyropoulos & Philippaki-Warburton (2001), Kotzoglou (2005), among others. They also assume that T-to-C movement may also take place - contra Kotzoglou (2005) and Agouraki (2010) (for Standard Greek) for that matter.

An example of their analysis can be found below (ibid: 328, (their 17(a) and 17 (b)):

  (9)   (a) [T Estile [CL1 o Petros [CL2 to ghrama [V tv]]]]
            sent-3S the Peter the letter
         "Peter sent the letter."
  (10)   (b) [C Estile [CL1 o Petros [CL2 [T tv [CL1 [CL2 to ghrama [V tv]]]]]]]10
          sent-3S the Peter the letter
         "Peter did send the letter. / Did Peter send the letter ?"

4. Analysis of the subject *kathe* DP in relation to dC, dT and dv

Roussou and Tsimpli (2006) examine Greek DPs with the definite article *o, i, to* and Bare NPs. We will see how their proposal works with the distributive yet ambiguous *kathe* DP in subject position. Before continuing with the analysis, allow us a last observation. In (6, 7) we saw that the readings for the phrase in question alternated according to its pre /postverbal positioning (of the subject). Here allow us to observe that sentences that are perfectly grammatical with a *kathe* DP as a postverbal subject become ungrammatical when we change the tense specification on T from [–past, –perfect] or [+past, – perfect] to [+past, +perfect]. The data below provide us with a more lucid illustration of the [– perfect] vs. [+perfect] differentiation:

  (11) Me enoxli / me enoxlouse / (* me enoxlise) kathe pikramenos vradhiatika sto tilefono.
        me annoy.pres.imperf.3sg./ me annoy. past.imperf.3sg. /me annoy past.perf.3sg. any
        troubled individual on the phone.
        "Any troubled individual can / could annoy me on the phone at night."

  (12) Den thelo na mou tilefoni /(*na mou tilefonisi) kathe mathitis mes sto vradhi.
        Not want. pres.imperf.3sg. to me.gen call. pres.imperf.3sg. / to me.gen. call.perf.3sg. any
        student in the night.
        "I don't want any student to call me up in the middle of the night."

Based on the above data and adopting Roussou and Tsimpli (2006), we make the following predictions regarding the interpretation of the *kathe* DP in relation to the domain in which it is merged:

If the *kathe* DP is merged at dv, we expect its features to be related to the aspect and event properties of the predicate. I propose that this translates into our distributive DP being interpreted as distributive over events. This concept maybe viewed as similar to that of "domain-widening" for FCIs (Kadmon and Landman 1993). It is the FC interpretation for the *kathe* DP, the only possible when it is merged in the dv domain.

In our analysis we take *kathe* to be lexically specified for distributivity. It is the domain in which this distributive feature is expressed that determines whether this distribution will involve a distribution over events (with plural indefinite reading, and a "usual" reading, as we will see) or a choice over events (Free Choice reading) in dv or distribution over individuals, which, in combination with Focus, will render an exhaustive, universal reading in dC.

If the *kathe* DP is merged in dT, an FC interpretation of the DP in question is attainable only if it has a [–past, –perfect] T specification. A [+past, +perfect] Tense specification makes the [+distributive] feature of *kathe* DP over events impossible, as it only allows the predicate to have the interpretation of an accomplished single event. Thus, the [+distributive] feature in this case may only involve the subject. T is widely assumed to have a special relationship with the subject, in general. Except for this, the DP in question may be interpreted both as a universal and as an FC when in dT. We can assume a lower Focus position in this domain as in Belletti (2004), providing the DP with a [+Focus] feature.

If the *kathe* DP is merged in dC, it can receive both interpretations: A universal, if C is [+Foc] and a topicalized FC or plural indefinite one if C is [– Foc] (provided that T is [–past, – perfect].)

Let us now check how the proposed analysis works with our data: We will examine two sentences: one with a T [– past, – perfect] and another one with a T [+past, +perfect] specification. Each one of them facilitates one of the two readings better than the other for reasons other than syntactic. Let us see a T [– past, – perfect] VSO sentence first (transliterations provided only once for easiness of exposure):

(13) [T Anighi [CL1 kathe anerghos [CL2 maghazi [V tv]]]
    [T open.3sg. [CL1 any unemployed [CL2 shop [V tv]]]
    "Any unemployed person may open a shop."
    "Unemployed people tend to open shops."

(14) [C Anighi [CL1 kathe anerghos [CL2 [T tv [CL1 [CL2 maghazi [V tv]]]]]]]]
    "Do unemployed people tend to open shops?"
    "Can whichever unemployed person open a shop?"
    "Does every unemployed person open a shop?"
    "Every unemployed person does open a shop."

In (13) the CL1 subject *kathe* DP is in dv. Only the FC interpretation is available. In (14) V is in C either because it is focused or because C is [+Q], in which case we have a yes-no question. The *kathe* DP in CL1 in dT may be interpreted as an FC. Alternatively, if we assume a low Focus position in the IP domain (for subjects) as in Belletti (2004), then it can have a universal reading. Let us now check a VOS sentence:

(15)   [T Anighi [CL2 maghazi [CL1 kathe anerghos [V tv]]]
    "Any unemployed person may open a shop."
    "Unemployed people tend to open shops."

In Greek dv CL1 and CL2 may alternate in order due to the fact that Greek DPs, primarily due to the definite article, may check both case and agreement features. Again only the FC reading is available. SVO order is next:

(16)   [CL1 kathe anerghos [CL2 C [T anighi [CL1 [CL2 maghazi [V tv]]]]]]
    "Every unemployed person can open a shop."
    "Whoever is unemployed can open a shop!"

The subject is in dC, C is [+Foc] and the interpretation is universal. If C is [-Foc] then the interpretation of the CL1 DP here is FC, similar to a Free Relative clause in this case.

(17)   [CL1 kathe anerghos [CL2 [T anighi [CL1 [CL2 maghazi [V tv]]]]]
    "Every / any unemployed person can open a shop."

The subject is in dT, the object in dv. In this case, the subject may receive both a universal and an FC interpretation. If it is specified as [+Foc] by a low Focus, then it is universal. If not, it is situated in Spec, TP where it receives an FC (or even a generic-like) interpretation. OVS order is to be checked last:

(18)   [CL2 maghazi [CL1 [T anighi [CL1 [CL2 kathe anerghos [V tv]]]]]]
         "As for shops, any unemployed person can open one."

(19)   [CL2 maghazi anighi] [CL1 kathe anerghos C […T tv …[V tv]]]]
         "It is a shop that every unemployed person opens."

In (18) the DP is in dv, so it receives an FC interpretation. In (19) the DP is in CL1 at the second [+Focus] position in dC, receiving a Universal interpretation. In CL2 we have remnant movement of the IP. A bold proposal, this reading remains problematic, though (as OVS in general).

It is now time we turned to the T: [+past, +perfect] specification. VSO order is examined first:

(20) *[T pire [CL1 kathe paidi [CL2 mila [V tv]]]
        [T take.past.3sg [CL1 every child[CL2 apples[V tv]]]

The CL1 subject *kathe* DP cannot occur in the dv, where only the FC interpretation is available. In other words, no FC interpretation is available when T has a [+past, +perfect] specification because, according to our initial stipulations, we cannot have distribution over events.

(21) [C Pire [CL1 kathe paidi [CL2 [T tv [CL1 [CL2 mila[V tv]]]]]]]]
        "Did every child take apples?"
        "Every child did take apples."

V is in C either because it is focused or because C is [+Q], in which case we have a yes-no question. The *kathe* DP in CL1 in dT may not be interpreted as an FC for the reason we just saw. If we assume a low Focus position in the IP domain (for subjects) as in Belletti (2004), then it has a universal reading. VOS is examined next:

(22)   *[T Pire [CL2 mila [CL1 kathe paidi [V tv]]]
(23) [C Pire CL2 mila] [CL1 kathe paidi [T tv [CL1 [CL2 [V tv]]]]]]]]
        "Every child did take apples."

The FC reading is not available in the above structure. The universal reading could come up if we assume Remnant movement and CL1 is in dC or, alternatively, in dT in the presence of a low Focus. Let us check the SVO sentence now:

(24)   [CL1 kathe paidi [CL2 C [T pire [CL1 [CL2 mila [V tv]]]]]]
         "Every child took apples."
(25)   [CL1 kathe paidi [CL2 [T pire [CL1 [CL2 mila [V tv]]]]]]
         "Every child took apples."

In (24) the subject is in dC, C is [+Foc] and the interpretation is universal. FC is uniformly not permitted. In (23) the subject is in dT, the object in dv. In this case, the subject may receive a universal interpretation, if it is specified as [+Foc] by a low Focus. Finally, the OVS order:

(26)   *[CL2 mila[CL1 [T pire [CL1 [CL2 kathe paidi [V tv]]]]]]
(27)   [CL2 mila pire] [CL1 kathe pedi C […T tv …[V tv]]]]

The DP is in CL1 at the second [+ Focus] position in dC, receiving a Universal interpretation. In CL2 we have remnant movement of the IP (25).

Reviewing findings and discussion of our analysis, adopting Roussou and Tsimpli's (2006) theory, universal quantification rendered by *kathe* DP is connected to the [+ distributive] feature specification of the *kathe* D and the [+Focus] specification of C in the dC or dT (low focus) domain. The [+ distributive] feature of *kathe* in dV interacts with the event and aspectual features of the V in dv. The [+distributive feature] of *kathe* in dT may also interact with tense features of T. The [+distributive feature] of *kathe* in dC can interact with the [+Focus] feature of C giving an exhaustive reading (cf. the

feature specification of identificational Focus as [+exhaustive], [+contrastive] from E. Kiss 1998). This combination renders the universal reading for the DP[4].

Summarizing, the *kathe* D is always specified as [+distributive]. Distributivity does not equal universal quantification, however. *kathe* DPs may receive either a universal distributive or an FC (existential) or an indefinite reading. An FC *kathe* DP has the features [– Focus, –perfect] whereas a Universal *kathe* has [+Focus, +perfect] or just any of the two. *kathe* Agrees with [+ Focus] on C either in the C domain (dC) in SVO structures or in the T domain (dT) in VSO structures, assuming a low Focus position in the IP area as in Belletti (2004).

5. Conclusions

We have tried in the limited space allowed to sketch an account of the different readings *kathe DPs* exhibit in the framework of Roussou and Tsimpli's (2006) explanation of the Greek VSO. We have attributed the different readings *kathe* DPs receive to the positioning of these phrases in different syntactic domains and to the interplay between the features of the different heads and the [+distributive] feature on *kathe*. This is the only point of departure from the proposals in recent literature on *every* (such as Szabolcsi 2010 and the others cited in section 1), as we argue for a D indeed specified for distributivity, carrying a distributive operator in its lexical semantics. However, the *kathe* D does not contribute a universal operator. In line with these proposals, universal quantification remains mainly the area of responsibility of a sentence level operator in the C domain. More over, the existence of a non overt distributive operator heading (*or occupying the Spec of*) a DistP (e.g. for plain (in)definite distributive readings) is not refuted by the present analysis. In line with the basic tenets of the "deconstructing *every*" recent approaches, we have shown that syntactic positioning does play a crucial role in the emergence of the quantificational readings and that Greek *every* exhibits a behavior very close to indefinites. A number of technical and general issues still remain open for future research and clarifications.

References

Agouraki, Yiorjia. 2010. "It-clefts and stressed operators in the preverbal field of Cypriot Greek".
        Lingua 120: 527–554.
Alexiadou, Artemis & Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1998. "Parametrizing Agr: word order, V-movement
        and EPP-checking". *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16. 491–539.
Belletti, Anna. 2004. "Aspects of the low IP area". In Rizzi (ed.). *The cartography of syntactic
        structures, vol. II : The structure of CP and IP*. (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford: Oxford
        University Press, 16–51.
Beghelli, Fiodor & Timothy Stowell. 1997. "Distributivity and Negation: The syntax of each and every". In A.
        Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking*. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 71-107.
Brisson, Christine. (1998). *Distributivity, Maximality, and Floating Quantifiers*. PhD diss., Rutgers University.
Butler, John. 2004. "Phase structure, Phrase structure and quantification". PhD diss., University of York.
Choe, Jae-Woong 1987. Anti-Quantifiers and a Theory of Distributivity. PhD diss., UMass, Amherst.
Davidson, Donald 1967. "The logical form of action sequences". In: Nicholas Rescher (ed.), *The Logic of Decision
and Action*. Pittsburgh: U. of Pittsburgh Press. 81–120.
Diesing, Molly. 1992. *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
E ´. Kiss, Katalin. 1998. "Identificational focus versus information focus". *Language* 74. 245–273.
Etxeberria,Urtzi & Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2010. "Contextual domain restriction, familiarity, and definiteness:
        crosslinguistic perspective" in *Context-Dependence, Perspective and Relativity*, ed. by F. Recanati, I.
        Stojanovic, and N. Villanueva, Mouton de Gruyter, Mouton Series in Pragmatics 6.
Giannakidou, Anastasia. 1998. *Polarity sensitivity as (non)veridical dependency*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2001. "The Meaning of Free Choice". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 24: 659-735.
Giannakidou Anastasia. 2011. Modality, evidentiality, and the future of Greek: revisiting the subjunctive na and
'future' tha. Presentation at the 10th International Conference on Greek Linguistics, University of Thrace, Greece,

---

[4] Among the other issues that the analysis proposed here touches on is the strong prefererence in Greek for preverbal subjects in transitive constructions and post-verbal subjects in intransitive ones (Laskaratou 1984, 1989), while in subjunctive clauses subjects with neutral intonation can only be postverbal (Spyropoulos and Revithiadou 2007). This may explain why for instance VOS with *take* in (22) is not the most neutral order, while it is with *open* in (15). The fact that the FC *kathe* DP is closely related to a [–past, –perfect] tense specification on T could also be related to a T feature on D, like the *u*T feature on D, which Pesetzky & Torrego (2001) propose as instantiating the nominative case.

Sept. 2011. Available at: https://webshare.uchicago.edu/users/giannaki/Public/pubs/komotini2011.pdf

Giannakidou, Anastasia. 2012. "The Landscape of Greek Quantifiers". Edward Keenan & Denis Paperno (eds). Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy, Handbook of Quantifiers in Natural Language Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy. Volume 90: 285-346.

Gil, David. 1995. "Universal Quantifiers and distributivity" in E. Bach,E / Jelinek, A. Kratzer, B. H. Partee (eds.), Quantification in Natural Languages. Dordrecht, Kluwer, 321-362.

Heim, Irene. 1982. "The semantics of definite and indefinite noun phrases". PhD diss., UMass, Amherst.

Heim, Irene and Angelika Kratzer. 1998. Semantics in generative grammar. Malden, MA., Blackwell Publishers.

Holton, David, Mackridge, Peter, Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 1997. Greek: a comprehensive grammar of the Modern Language. Routledge, London - New York.

Horn, Lawrence. 2000. "Pick a Theory: Not Just Any Theory". *Negation and Polarity: Syntactic and Semantic Perspectives*, ed. by L. Horn and Y. Kato, 147-192. Oxford University press, Oxford.

Horn, Lawrence. 2005. "Airport 86 revisited: toward a unified indefinite any". In G. Carlson &F.J. Pelletier (eds), *The Partee effect*. Stanford: CSLI, 113-142.

Ioup, Georgette. 1975. The Treatment of Quantifier Scope in a Transformational Grammar. Doctoral Dissertation, The City University of New York, NY.

Kadmon, Nirit and Landman, Fred. 1993. "Any". *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4:353–422.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *Antisymmetric syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kratzer, Angelika 2003. A note on choice functions in context. Available online at: http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/zIyNTMxZ/Choice%20Functions%20in%20Context.pdf

Kratzer, Angelika. 2005. "Indefinites and the operators they depend on: From Japanese to Salish". Carlson, G.N. & F. J. Pelletier (eds.), *Reference and quantification: The Partee effect*. CSLI Press, Stanford.

Kotzoglou, George. 2005. Wh-Extraction and Locality in Greek. PhD diss., University of Reading.

Kuroda, Shigeyuki. 1972. "The categorical and the thetic judgement". *Foundations of Language* 9:153-185.

Ladusaw, William 1994. "Thetic and categorical, stage and individual, weak and strong". *Proceedings of Semantics and Linguistic Theory* IV. Ithaca: Cornell. 200–229.

Laskaratou, Chryssoula. 1984. "The Passive Voice in Modern Greek". PhD diss., University of Reading.

Laskaratou, Chryssoula. 1989. *A Functional Approach to Constituent Order with Particular Reference to Modern Greek. Implications for Language Learning and Language Teaching*. Athens: ParousiaMonograph S:5.

Lazaridou-Chatzigoga, Dimitra. 2009. "On definiteness and the co-occurrence of the definite article with other determiners in Modern Greek". PhD diss., Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona.

Manzini, M. Rita & Savoia, Leonardo. 2004. "Clitics : cooccurrence and mutual exclusion patterns". In *The structure of CP and IP*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. 211-250.

Margariti, Anna Maria. 2007. "Quantification and intonation in Modern Greek" in E. Agathopoulou, M. Dimitrakopoulou & D. Papadopoulou (eds.) *Selected Papers on theoretical and applied linguistics*, Department of Theoretical and Applied Linguistics, School of English, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, v.I.

Matthewson, Lisa. 2001. "Quantification and the nature of cross-linguistic variation". *Natural Language Semantics* 9: 145–189.

Milsark, Gary. 1974. "Existential sentences in English". PhD diss., MIT.

Pesetsky, David & Torrego, Esther. 2001. "T-to-C movement: causes and consequences". In Kenstowicz (ed.), M. (ed.) *Ken Hale: a life in language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 355–426.

Philippaki-Warburton, Irene. 1987. "The theory of empty categories and the pro-drop parameter in Modern Greek". *Journal of Linguistics* 23: 289-318.

Platzack, Christer. 2001. "Multiple interfaces". In Nikanne, U. & van der Zee, E. (eds.), *Cognitive interfaces: constraints on linking cognitive information*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 21–53.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. "The fine structure of the left periphery". In Haegeman (ed.). *The new comparative syntax*. London: Longman, 281–337.

Roussou, Anna & Tsimpli, Ianthi-Maria. 2006. "On VSO again!" in J. Linguistics 42. 317–354.

Schein, Barry. 1993. *Plurals and Events*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Sportiche, Dominique. 1995. "Clitic constructions". In Rooryck, J. & Zaring, L. (eds.), *Phrase structure and the lexicon*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 213–276.

Spyropoulos, Vasileios & Philippaki-Warburton, Irene 2001. "'Subject' and EPP in Greek: the discontinuous subject hypothesis". *Journal of Greek Linguistics* 2. 148–186.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1997. "Strategies for scope taking". In: Szabolcsi, Anna (ed.). *Ways of Scope Taking*. Dordrecht: Kluwer. 109–154.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 2010. *Quantification.* Reseach Surveys in Linguistics, Cambridge University Press.

Tsimpli, Ianthi-Maria. 1995. "Focusing in Modern Greek". In E´. Kiss, K. (ed.), *Discourse configurational languages*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. 176–206.

Tsimpli, Ianthi-Maria and Roussou, Anna.1996. "Negation and polarity items in Modern Greek". *The Linguistic Review* 13:49-81.

Tunstall, Susanne Lyn. 1998. "The Interpretation of Quantifiers: Semantics and Processing". PhD diss., Umass.

Vlachou, Evangelia. 2007. "Free Choice in and out of Context: Semantics and Distribution of French, Greek and English Free Choice Items". PhD diss., LOT, Netherlands.