

Argument CPs as frozen *in situ* DPs in Classical Greek
Richard Faure, Université Côte d’Azur, CNRS, BCL, France

The paper aims to provide fresh arguments in favor of the CP-as-nominal hypothesis (see Baunaz&Lander 2018, i.a.), arguing that the Classical Greek (CG) [but not Modern Greek] C *hóti* is a D (but not a probe as in Angelopoulos 2019). Although complement clauses (CCs) do not display the full range of properties of DPs, CG is typologically exceptional in that it does not need to resort to movement because it has overt proxies acting on the behalf of the CCs when needed.

Some argument CCs are distributed like DPs and it was proposed that they really are DPs. Yet, this picture is rare across languages. Worse, one and the same language often behaves contradictorily, e.g., Bangla, in which *bole*-clauses can appear *in situ*, but *je*-clauses cannot (Bayer 1995), or English, for which Takahashi (2010) argued that *that*-clauses are sometimes DPs, sometimes CPs. In contrast, Moulton (2015, 2019) argues that type-mismatch is solved *via* movement and trace conversion (English) or differences in semantic type (<e,t> or <v,t>, where v is the type of eventualities, Bangla).

CG finite CCs (headed by *hóti*, *hōs*, *hópōs*, *mé* Cs) prove to be of a different typological category as I will show by analyzing *hóti*-clauses. They appear with factive and report predicates, but are precluded with belief and modal verbs. Moreover, *hóti*-clauses contrast with Bangla *je/bole*-clauses in that they have properties supposedly mutually exclusive, thus offering a contradictory picture in two respects. First, they seem to both (A) be low within VP (binding within and A-movement out of them (1) are possible—CG is SVO) and (B) extrapose outside VP (they always are rightmost in their clause, contrary to argumental DPs); second, like argumental DPs, (C) they can be coordinated with DPs (2), but unlike DPs, (D) they cannot occupy focus (preverbal) and subject (Spec, TP) positions (3).

(1) *Délē hē oikodomía estin hóti hē oikodomía kata spoudēn egéneto*# (Thuc. 1.93.2)
manifest-F the-F structure is that down haste was.made

[hyperraising of *hē oikodomía*] lit. ‘The structure is manifest that the structure was made hastily.’

(2) *Alla pollà eípe álla pollà kai hóti paraspóndous hymás échoi*.
Many other things he.said and that truce.breakers you he.has (Lys. 12.74)

[DP-CP coordination] Lit. ‘He said many other things and that he held you guilty of breaking the truce.’

(3) *Ēngélthē autōi hóti Mégara aphéstēke*# (Thuc. 1.114.1)
report-PST.PASS.3SG to.him that Megara had.revolted

[postverbal/VP internal CCs subjects] ‘That Megara had revolted was reported to him.’

Along with (1), the coordination data in (2) suggests that the CP is *in situ* with the conjunct DP. The always final position (B) is just the result of CPs being low in the VP, not of extraposition. This is confirmed by two pieces of evidence. First, in (4), the *hóti*-clause is topicalized, stranding some of its material in the matrix final position (genitive pl. agreement signals the relation between the two pieces). This is only possible if the *hóti*-clause was generated *in situ*. I fail to see how topicalization could follow rightward-movement. Note moreover that topic clauses behave differently from subject clauses, which are postverbal (3 vs. 4), which rules out a uniform approach à la Koster (1978).

(4) *Hōs [=hóti] oudèn prosēkei And. tôn synthēkôn, perì toutou léxō, oúte tôn pròs Lak.*

[Topicalization] Lit. ‘That Andokides has no part in those agreements[gen], I will speak about that, no (part in) those[gen] (agreement) with the Lacedaemonians.’ (Lysias 6.38)

Second, a DP can be focalized in a devoted preverbal position (Dik 1995), stranding its conjunct *hóti*-clause (2). Neither rightward dislocation of the remnant conjunct, which would be counter-cyclic, nor leftward movement of the CC followed by remnant movement can explain this datum. Thus, *hóti*-clauses are *in situ* and do not extrapose (as in Haider 2010 i.a.), which solves the contradiction (A/B).

But now we face another difficulty, which runs as: how are *hóti*-clauses able to satisfy the selection of the verbs? When not with a CP, the CG matrix verbs select for DPs and type e arguments. The coordination data suggested that *hóti*-clauses are DPs. This is independently confirmed.

First, *hóti*-clauses cannot be nominalized with the neuter article *tó* (in contrast with Modern Greek, which I will address). This property is meaningful, since CG can nominalize anything with *tó* ‘the-N.SG’: adverbs (*tó nūn* ‘the now = the present time’), infinitival clauses, interrogative clauses etc. This limitation is due to, I claim, *hóti* and *tó* being in complementary distribution and *hóti* a D of some sort.

Second, like any (definite) DP, *hóti*-clauses can have a demonstrative (the structure of the DP with dem. is [DP [DemP *toûto*] [D' *tó* [NP *méros*]]] ‘lit. this the part’ = ‘this part’, Biraud 1991). Importantly, note that this dem. is sensitive to the sg.(5)/pl.(6) distinction, which shows that *hóti*-clauses bear φ -features, another DP property (with verbs of speaking, *hóti*-clauses denote pl. objects).

(5) *prosakoúsas kai toûto hóti triakosías autàs déoi genésthai.* (X.HG.3.4.1)
 having.heard also this-N that 300 them must be

[Singular demonstrative] ‘having also heard that they must be 300.’

(6) *taûta apologēsesthai autón hóti ekeinōi phílos ên.* (Lys. 12.62)
 these-N will.defend-INF him that to.that.man friend was

[Plural demonstrative] ‘(I am told) that he will plead in defense that he was that man's friend.’

The article-like nature of *hóti*, the possibility of a dem., their bearing φ -features, and the distribution of *hóti*-clauses show that they are DPs. However, restriction (D) is still to be clarified. Why can't *hóti*-clauses be subjects in TP and focalized objects? This points toward an inability to be Case-marked. Although they are DPs of type e and carry φ -features, which makes them suitable for θ -marking *in situ*, they are not licensed (as in Haider 2010 i.a.) to be A-moved to a position where they will be assigned Case (Spec, TP or Spec, vP, Chomsky 2001, the latter being both an A and \bar{A} position in CG): this is reminiscent of Stowell's (1981) Case Resistance Principle—CRP (tensed CPs assign Case and thus cannot be assigned Case), but without extraposition. Hence, subject clauses are always *in situ*, postverbal in CG, like the English *it* structure in *it is evident that she came*. Observe that a dem. or an extracted DP do not undergo such restrictions (*hē oikodomía* in 1, *taûta* in 6 are preverbal). Since they originate as parts of the CP, their bearing Case evidences that Case-assignment does take place and that our θ -marked *hóti*-clauses are part of a chain headed by a Case-marked DP, as required in Θ Theory. Put otherwise, they help the clause surmount Stowell's CRP and prevent extraposition. They are somehow repair devices. Note that languages like English that do not have hyperraising or demonstrative with their CCs must resort to other repair strategies like extraposition. When there is no overt case-bearer in CG, a silent expletive must be in relation with the *in-situ* clause to satisfy this requirement (see the passive in 4), an assumption that is also borne out by the fact that CG does have silent object *pros*. Last, note that \bar{A} -movement does not undergo such a constraint (see 4).

To sum up, *hóti*-clauses are DPs satisfying both the c- (DP) and the s- (type e) selection of factive and report verbs. As such, *hóti*-clauses do not have reasons to extrapose, they are located within VP, where they are assigned their θ -role. On the other hand, they can move to \bar{A} - but not to A-position, due to their inability to bear Case. Typologically, CG contrasts with languages that don't allow proxies to do it in their stead and must resort to other means like movement. That is Case provides a principled reason for the distribution of CCs across languages. Semantically, *hóti* is a nominalizer (in the spirit of Chierchia's 1984¹). Note that Classical Greek CCs display neither relative distribution nor Aktionsart restriction, which rules out Kayne's 2014 and Angelopoulos' (2019) approaches.

REF: ANGELOPOULOS N., 2019, *Complementizers and Prepositions as Probes: Insights from Greek*, PhD dis., UCLA. BAUNAZ L., E. LANDER, 2018, “Syncretisms with the nominal complementizer”, *SLing* 72, p. 537-570. BAYER J., 1995, “On the origin of sentential arguments in German and Bengali”, in HAIDER et al. (ed), *Studies in comparative Germanic syntax*, Kluwer, p. 47-76. BIRAUD M., 1991, *La détermination du nom en grec class.*, Belles Lettres. CHERCHIA G., 1984, *Topics in the Syntax and Semantics of Infinitives and Gerunds*, PhD dis., UMass. Amherst. CHOMSKY N., 2001, “Derivation by phase”, in M. KENSTOWICZ (ed.), *Ken Hale : A life in language*, MIT Press, p. 1-52. DIK H., 1995, *Word order in ancient Greek*, Gieben. HAIDER H., 2010, *The Syntax of German*, CUP. KAYNE R., 2014, “Why isn't This a complementizer?”, in P. SVENONIUS (ed.), *Functional structure from top to toe*, p. 188-231. KOSTER J., 1978, « Why subject sentences don't exist », in S.J. KEYSER (ed.), *Recent transformational studies in European languages*, MIT Press, p. 53-64. MOULTON K., 2015, “CPs: Copies and compositionality,” *LI*46, p. 305-342. —, 2019, “(Non)-Complement Clauses and In-situ Saturation: Consequences for cross-clausal A-dependencies”, Slides. GLOW in Asia XII. STOWELL T., 1981, *Origins of Phrase Structure*, PhD dis. MIT. TAKAHASHI S., 2010, “The hidden side of clausal complements”, *NAL*28, p. 343-380.