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Abstract
This article presents some new evidence for the control account (Kotzoglou 2002; Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007) of Greek quasi-ECM and replies to Pratt’s (2011) critique of this account. It is argued (in line with Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007) that quasi-ECM in Greek is a subcase of object control while the apparent counterexamples have alternative explanations. The paper concludes with a brief mention of the possible explanation of similar structures of other languages.
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1. Introduction
In this article I revisit and discuss some of the properties of the Greek structures in (1), which, at first sight, seem to be similar to Exceptional Case Marking/Raising-to-Object (henceforth ECM/R-to-O) constructions in English (2).

(1a) δέ θέλω toν ηνιάνα na me
to want. NonPast.1sg the Yannis. Acc SUBJ cl. Acc
kοροιδέων
‘I don’t want John to make fun of me’

(1b) ημε απειδετε περιμαναν toν καπητανίο
the passengers. Nom expected. Past.3pl the captain. Acc
ηα θεθόσι me aksioprepia
SUBJ behave. NonPast. 3sg with dignity

‘The passengers expected the captain to behave with dignity.’

(2) Απεξε με τον θηθ στον προβλεμα
I expected him to solve the problem.

The standard analysis of (2) (cf. Postal 1974) is as follows: The subject of the embedded nonfinite clause cannot get case within its clause and it ends up case-
marked by the matrix accusative-marking probe (v in Chomsky 2000 et seq.).
Whether the subject remains in situ ((3a) ECM; cf. Chomsky 1981) or raises to the outer Spec of the probe ((3b) ‘R-to-O’; see Bošković 1997; Koizumi 1993 a.o.) is a matter that hinges on the (un)availability of an EPP-feature on v.

(3a) \[ _{vP} v [... [TP subject T [...]]] \]
(3b) \[ _{vP} subject v [... [TP subject T [...]]] \]

A crucial observation of the standard analysis of standard ECM is that it is not possible in finite embedded clauses:

(4) *I expected (that) him would solve the problem.

Interestingly, Greek does allow ECM (or ‘quasi-ECM’) in finite clauses and does not exhibit a number of properties that are part and parcel of the phenomenon in English. Interesting aspects of constructions such as (1) in Greek have been discussed in the work of Joseph (1976); Philippaki-Warburton (1979); Kakouriotis (1980), Ingria (1981); Rivero (1987); Campos (1989); Schneider-Zioga (1992); Lee (1995); Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1997); Hadjivassiliou, Philippaki-Warburton and Spyropoulos (2000); Kotzoglou (2002); Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007); Pratt (2011), among others.

In this article I revisit the main characteristics of Greek quasi-ECM, as summarised in Kotzoglou (2002) as well as Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007) (section 2), I discuss Pratt’s (2011) counterarguments to Kotzoglou and Papangeli 2007, as well as the shortcomings of Pratt’s (2011) proposal (section 3). Section 4 contains a concluding crosslinguistic remark.

Kotzoglou (2002) as well as Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007) note that an important property of structures such as (1) is the fact that, unlike their English equivalents, the Greek constructions are perfectly grammatical even when the pivot DP (i.e. the one that gets ECMed in (5a) but not in (5b)) surfaces in nominative:

(5a) i epivates perimenan ton kapetanio
the passengers. Nom expected.Past.3pl the captain.Acc
na fer0i me aksioprepia
SUBJ behave.NonPast.3sg with dignity
‘The passengers expected the captain to behave with dignity.’

(5b) i epivates perimenan o kapetanios
the passengers. Nom expected.Past.3pl the captain.Nom
na fer0i me aksioprepia
SUBJ behave.NonPast.3sg with dignity

‘The passengers expected the captain to behave with dignity.’

[Under the non-temporal interpretation of perimenan]

(Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007: 111)

The optionality manifested in (5) is an undesired property for any syntactic account of the phenomenon, especially if the phenomenon is to be stated as stemming from the case-marking requirements of the embedded subject, as in standard accounts of ECM/R-to-O. In other words, if the embedded T was defective (in the sense of Chomsky 2000, 2001, et seq.), then (5b) would not be possible. If the embedded T was non-defective, then the DP subject would be nominative case-marked in the embedded clause and would be rendered frozen in place and inaccessible to probing from the matrix clause (hence (5a) would not be an option).

The main claim of Kotzoglou (2002) as well as Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007) is that constructions such as (5a) and (5b) derive from different numerations/lexical subarrays and that the accusative-marked pivot DP in (5a) is an argument of the matrix predicate all along the derivation. To this effect, they offer configurational evidence for the fact that (a) embedded subjunctives are finite in Greek and can license a nominative subject (cf. also, among many others, the similar conclusions of Philippaki-Warburton & Catsimali 1999; Spyropoulos 2007), and (b) that the pivot DP surfaces in the matrix clause when accusative-case marked but remains in the embedded when marked with nominative. Let us briefly present their findings plus some new evidence that backs the ‘quasi-ECM as control’ account.

2.1 Evidence for case marking in the embedded clause
Firstly, it is observed that secondary predicates and emphatic modifiers (italicised in (6-7)) in the embedded clause surface in nominative and not in accusative, indicating that a nominative case-marking head must exist in the embedded clause.

(6) perimena to jani na ine
expect.Past.1sg the John.Acc SUBJ be.NonPast.3sg
arostos/*arosto
sick.Nom/*Acc
‘I expected John to be sick.’

(7a) i epítheonites iðelan to jani
the inspectors.Nom want.Past.3sg the John.Acc
na lisi monos tu/*mono tu to provlima
SUBJ solve.NonPast.3sg alone.Nom/*Acc cl.Gen the problem
‘The inspectors wanted John to solve the problem on his own.’

(7b) i aliki theli to jani na
the Aliki.Nom wantNonPast.-3sg the John.Acc SUBJ
kopsi tin turta o iðjos/*ton iðjo
cut.NonPast.3sg the cake-Aacc the-same.Nom/*Acc
‘Aliki wants Janis to cut the cake himself.’

Kotzoglou & Papangeli (2007: 115-116)

Note that a strong argument in favour of the capacity of embedded T to nominative case-mark its subject is example (5b) itself in the first place.

2.2 Evidence for the matrix position of the DP_{Acc}
There is ample evidence that DP_{Acc} surfaces (or even is base-generated) in the matrix clause. First of all, clitic doubling of the DP_{Acc} is possible (9). Clitic doubling of the embedded clause (if it contains the DP_{Acc}) is banned (8), while clitic doubling of the corresponding embedded CP in which a DP_{Nom} is found is allowed.

(8) toni perimena [o jani/ *[ton jani na
ayapisi ti maria],
love.3sg the Maria.Acc
‘I expected John to love Maria.’

(9) toni iðela [ton petro]/ *[o petros], na
cl.Acc want.Past.1sg the Peter.Acc/ *the Pater.Nom SUBJ
ferði pio eksipna
behave.NonPast.3sg more smart
‘I wanted Pete to behave smarter.’ (Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007: 122)
Given that Greek does not manifest clitic climbing and that, at least for some researchers (e.g., Philippaki-Warburton et al. 2004) clitics are the real arguments of the verb in clitic-doubling constructions, (9) constitutes evidence for the existence of a matrix thematic position. What is more, (8) shows that $D_{P_{\text{Acc}}}$ does not occupy the same surface position as $D_{P_{\text{Nom}}}$.

A further configurational piece of evidence comes from the possibility of intervention of main clause material between the $D_{P_{\text{Acc}}}$ and the embedded clause. Indeed, matrix oriented PPs cannot appear between $D_{P_{\text{Nom}}}$ and the embedded clause, but are licit once the pivot DP surfaces in accusative case:

(10) o petros perimene *i sofia/ti sofia
    the Peter.Nom expect.NonPast.3dg the Sofia-Nom/-Acc
    me laxtara na δεξτι tin protasi
    with desire SUBJ accept.NonPast.3SG the proposal.Acc
    γαμου
    wedding.Gen

    ‘It is with desire that Peter expected Sofia to accept the wedding proposal.’

    [with a matrix reading of the PP]

    (Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007: 120)

A further argument for the matrix position of $D_{P_{\text{Acc}}}$ can be made once we take into account the distribution of negative polarity items. Such elements can be licensed once found in the scope of a negative/downward entailing operator at some point of the derivation (even prior to movement). The fact that only $D_{P_{\text{Nom}}}$, but not $D_{P_{\text{Acc}}}$, can be licensed by embedded negation constitutes evidence that $D_{P_{\text{Acc}}}$ was never an argument of the embedded clause in Greek quasi-ECM.

(11) o manos perimene KANIS/ *KANENA
    the Manos.Nom expect.Past.3sg nobody.Nom/*Acc
    na min tu milai
    SUBJ NEG prn.Gen speak.NonPast.3sg

    ‘Manos expected nobody to speak to him.’

The unavailability of idioms in $D_{P_{\text{Acc}}}$+clause constructions also backs Kotzoglou (2002) as well as Kotzoglou and Papangeli’s (2007) proposal. Idioms are considered to retain their reading even after some subconstituent of theirs has undergone A-
movement (as the moved can be interpreted in the first merge position at LF). No such reading is available in Greek quasi-ECM constructions:

(12) me afta pu eleye perimena
with these that say.Past.3sg expect.Past.1sg
o δjaolos/*ton δjaolo na ton pari
the devil-Nom/*Acc SUBJ him take.NonPast.3sg

‘With the things he said I expected the devil to take him (I expected him to be destroyed).’

Finally, Greek quasi-ECM exhibits the well-known contrast in interpretation under passivisation found in control (but not raising) environments. So, (13a) and (13b) have a subtle but existent difference in meaning.

(13a) θelo ton jatro na eksetasi ti
want.NonPast.1sg the doctor.Acc SUBJ examine.NonPast.3sg the
maria
Mary.Acc

'roughly: I want from the doctor to examine Mary.'

(13b) θelo ti maria na
want.NonPast.1sg the Mary.Acc SUBJ
eksetasti apo ton jatro
examine.Pass.Non.Past.3sg by the doctor

'roughly: I want from Mary to be examined by the doctor.'

Evidence such as the above lead Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007) “to the conclusion that ‘quasi-ECM’ constructions in Greek involve a weak thematic role meaning something like ‘as for . . . DP’ or ‘on behalf of . . . DP’. Given that there is no animacy restriction, [they] take this thematic role to be encoded as [-m], what Reinhart (2000, 2003) presents as the equivalent of Pesetsky's (1995) subject matter role in the case of experiencing derivations.”

2.3 Further evidence for a non-standard derivation of Greek Quasi-ECM
Let us add some new evidence that support Kotzoglou (2002) as well as Kotzoglou and Papangeli’s (2007) proposal that Greek quasi-ECM is an instance of object control.
In the light of Chomsky’s (2000, 2001, et seq.) phase-based approach to long-distance dependencies we would expect that accusative case-marking by the matrix vP would be possible even without subject raising to the matrix [Spec, vP] or –even– to the embedded [Spec, TP] (especially if the EPP\textsubscript{T} does not hold for Greek, as argued Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998; Kotzoglou 2013). Under such an interpretation, and given that (a) TP\textsubscript{def} is not a phase, (b) Greek subjects may remain in their thematic/postverbal position, (c) case-marking of a goal by a probe takes place long-distance, we would expect (14) to be licit in Greek, contrary to fact.: 

(14) *i epivates perimenan na
the passengers. Nom expected.Past.3pl SUBJ
fer0i ton kapetanio me aksioprepia
behave.NonPast.3sg the captain.Acc with dignity
‘The passengers expected the captain to behave with dignity.’

(compare to 1b)

An immediate answer could be that matrix v contains an EPP feature that needs to be checked by raising of the case-marked DP\textsubscript{Acc} to [Spec, vP], but such an answer would provoke further questions (such as how this feature gets discharged in the case of a sole clausal complement to V, or even why it is not that case that this feature gets satisfied by merger of a silent/overt expletive.)

Note that, as shown by Schneider-Zioga (1992) as well as Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007) DP\textsubscript{Acc} can surface on the right of the embedded verb once doubled by a matrix clitic and provided that no embedded material follows it. In such cases, it behaves as a right dislocated phrase of the matrix clause (with the clitic occupying the argumental position, as proposed in the analysis of Philippaki-Warburton et al. 2004):

(15) i astinomia *(ton) ithele na paraðoθi ton
the police.Nom cl.Acc want.Past.3sg SUBJ surrender.NonPast.3sg the
kakopio (*amesos)
bandit.Acc at once
‘The police wanted the bandit to surrender.’

(Modified example from Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007)

Let us turn to a further argument. For a number of speakers (but see Kotzoglou 2013) Greek sentences that contain quantificational subjects and objects are amenable
to an inverse scope interpretation (for discussion on the availability of inverse scope readings, see among others Roussou & Tsimpli 2006; Spyropoulos & Revithiadou 2009).

(16) enas ipuryos episkeftotan kaðe poli tis elaðas
    a minister.Nom visit.Past.3sg every city the Greece.Gen
    ‘A minister was visiting every city of Greece’

    ∃ > ∀ and ∀ > ∃

    (Spyropoulos & Revithiadou 2009: 296)

However, only the wide scope reading of the quantifier enan is available at quasi-ECM constructions (17). We don’t get an inverse scope interpretation even in cases where the context forces this interpretation (and the remaining one is pragmatically odd) (17b):

(17a) sto parti perimena enan filo mu
       at.the party expect.Past.1sg a.Acc friend.Acc cl.1sg.Gen
       na fai kaðe tiropitaki
       SUBJ eat.NonPast.3sg every cheese.pie.Acc
    ‘In the party, I expected a friend of mine to eat every cheese pie.’

(17b) δe 0elo na mini kanis nistikos
       NEG want.NonPast.1sg SUBJ stay.3sg nobody.Nom hungry
       0elo enan filo mu na
       troi kaðe tiropitaki
       eat.NonPast.3sg e very cheese.pie.Acc
    ‘I don’t’ want anyone to stay hungry. I want a friend of mine to eat every spinach pie.’

    ∃ > ∀, *∀ > ∃

Provided that inverse scope is probably a result of reconstruction to a lower copy position (Hornstein 1995; Johnson & Tomioka 1998 a.o.), the lack thereof in (17) constitutes an argument for the lack of such a copy/(trace) position inside the embedded clause.
A further argument for the matrix position of $\text{DP}_{\text{Acc}}$ emerges once we take into account binding theory, as $\text{DP}_{\text{Acc}}$-phrases have scope over adverbial clauses adjoined in the matrix clause:

(18) *perimena $\text{ekinon}_i$ [na $\text{ferzi}$ kalitera]

\begin{align*}
\text{expect.Past.1sg} & \quad \text{he.Acc} & \quad \text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{behave.NonPast.3sg} & \quad \text{better} \\
[\text{epi}zi & \quad \text{itan} & \quad \text{kalo} & \quad \text{pezi} & \quad [\text{o janis}_i]] & \\
\text{Because} & \quad \text{be.Past.3sg} & \quad \text{good} & \quad \text{boy} & \quad \text{the John.Nom} \\
\text{‘I expected John to behave better, because he was a good boy.’}
\end{align*}

In (18), the $\text{DP}_{\text{Acc}}$ $\text{ekinon}$ binds the DP-subject $\text{o janis}$ of the adjoined adverbial clause, thereby giving rise to a Principle C violation. No such violation arises in the non-quasi-ECM parallel (19):

(19) perimena $\ [\text{pro}_i \ na \ \text{ferzi} \ \text{kalitera}]$

\begin{align*}
\text{expect.Past.1sg} & \quad \text{pro} & \quad \text{SUBJ} & \quad \text{behave.NonPast.3sg} & \quad \text{better} \\
[\text{epi}zi & \quad \text{itan} & \quad \text{kalo} & \quad \text{pezi} & \quad [\text{o janis}_i]] & \\
\text{Because} & \quad \text{be.Past.3sg} & \quad \text{good} & \quad \text{boy} & \quad \text{the John.Nom} \\
\text{‘I expected John to behave better, because he was a good boy.’}
\end{align*}

3. Quasi-ECM as focusing

Pratt (2011) argues against Kotzoglou and Papangeli’s (2007) proposal and puts forth an analysis whereby the embedded subject may raise to [Spec, CP] and get case-marked by the matrix verb, as...

“Subjunctive complements seem to engage more locally with the matrix clause than indicative complements, as demonstrated by their frequent dependence on the matrix clause for temporal interpretation. Since it cannot be interpreted without reference to the matrix, we can say that a subjunctive clause licenses a shared temporal interpretation with the matrix clause, which prevents it from being fully independent [reference omitted]. This dependence licenses the matrix verb to assign accusative Case to the subject of an embedded $\text{na}$-clause, as long as that subject is sufficiently close to it, with no intervening material.” (Pratt 2011: 266)

Elements that get case in this way, according to Pratt (2011) get focalised, as ‘quasi-ECM […] encodes focus on the accusative NP’.
So, the following structure is proposed:

(20) \[ CP \, DP_{\text{ACC}} \, [COP_{\text{na}} \, [CM_{\text{tna}} \, [IP_{\ldots}]]] \]

The proposed analysis makes crucial use of a property of quasi-ECM constructions in Greek noted by Hadjivasiliou, Philippaki-Warburton and Spyropoulos (2000) and acknowledged as a problematic issue by Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007), namely the fact that quasi-ECM constructions in Greek disallow \(wh\)-subextraction (21), while prototypical object control constructions don’t (22).

(21) "pjon iôeles ton proðipuryo na
who.Acc want.Past.2sg the prime-minister.Acc SUBJ
entiposiasi?
impress.NonPast.3sg
‘Who did you want the prime minister to impress?’

(22) pjon epises ton proðipuryo na
Who.Acc persuade.Past.2sg the prime-minister.Acc SUBJ
entiposiasi?
impress.NonPast.3sg
‘Who did you persuade the prime minister to impress?’

(Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007: 129)

The asymmetry cannot be readily explained by the object control analysis, but it gets explained as a relativised minimal violation in Pratt’s (2011) account (and as an adjunct island violation in the reanalysis proposal of Hadjivassiliou, Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos 2000)².

3.1 Problems with quasi-ECM as focusing

However, Pratt’s proposal runs into a number of problems.

First, consider focusing. As shown by Tsimpli (1995), Greek does not allow more than one focused phrase per sentence:

² Note, though, that although the islandhood of quasi-ECM is a problem for Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007), it does not constitute a definitive argument in favour of Pratt’s (2011) focus-analysis. In fact, the islandhood of prototypical ECM structures was acknowledged by Chomsky (1973) and Postal (1974).
(23) O JANIS pire to VIVLIO apo ti Maria
the John.Foc.Nom take.Past.3sg the book.Foc.Acc from the Maria
‘John took the BOOK from Maria.’

(Tsimpli 2005: 191)

However, Quasi-ECMed constructions in Greek can accommodate a focused element different that the DP_{Acc}:

(24) o maestros iðele tin orxistra na
the conductor want.Past.3sg the orchestra.Acc SUBJ
peksi BETOVEN (oxi bax)
‘It is Beethoven (and not Bach) that the conductor wanted the orchestra to play.’

The licit co-occurrence of both the DP_{Acc} and the contrastively focused DP ‘BETOVEN’ must mean that DP_{Acc} is not focused.

A further problematic issue concerns clitic doubling. It is a well-known property of doubling clitics in Greek that they marked their associated DPs as topics/backgrounded information (Anagnostopoulou 1994; Warburton 1975, among many others). As such, clitics are incompatible with wh-constituents and focalised phrases, as shown in (25).

(25) [TON PETRO]i (*toni) ðavmazune
the Peter.Foc.Acc cl.masc.Acc admire.NonPast.3pl
‘It is Peter that they admire.’

However, as shown by Kotzoglou and Papangeli (2007) clitic doubling of DP_{Acc} is possible in Greek (in fact, this is one of the arguments for its matrix position of DP_{Acc}).

(26) toni episa ton jani na fiyi
him persuad.Past.1st cl.masc.Acc John-ACC SUBJ leave-3SG
‘I persuaded John to leave.’

(Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007: 123)

What is more, it is not just the case that Pratt’s (2011) analysis does not address the optionality issue (5), as it does not explain why the DP may stay in the subject position or raise to [Spec, CP] and get accusative case (note that the focus interpretation relies on case marking on her account and not vice versa). The proposed
analysis also opens up a further optionality issue, as alongside quasi-ECM constructions (involving a focalised $D_P^{Acc}$, according to Pratt 2011) Greek exhibits parallel constructions with a contrastively focused $D_P^{Nom}$:

(27) $i$ epivates perimenan O KAPETANIOS the passengers. Nom expected.Past.3pl the captain.Foc.Nom na ferɔi me aksiopreia SUBJ behave.NonPast.3sg with dignity

‘It is the captain that the passengers expected to behave with dignity.’

[Under the non-temporal interpretation of *perimenan*]

What is more, Greek may also exhibit quasi-ECM with the $D_P^{Acc}$ bearing heavy focus stress (which is clearly a different structure than the one without focus).

(28) $i$ epivates perimenan TON KAPETANIO the passengers. Nom expected.Past.3pl the captain.Foc.Acc na ferɔi me aksiopreia SUBJ behave.NonPast.3sg with dignity

‘It is the captain that the passengers expected to behave with dignity.’

[Under the non-temporal interpretation of *perimenan*]

Explaining the difference between clear-cut instances of quasi-ECM (such as (1b)) and (27) and (28) does not seem to be an easy task once quasi-ECM is explained as a structure involving focalisation of the $D_P^{Acc}$.

Let us turn to another argument. The environment that gives rise to quasi-ECM is formulated in Pratt (2011: 266) as a property of subjunctive embedded clauses (“The availability of accusative marking for the subject NP appears to be specifically linked to the presence of the subjunctive marker in the embedded clause.”) However, Joseph (1976); Philippaki-Warburton (1987) and Theophanopoulou-Kontou et al. (1998) have shown that accusative case-marking of subjects of embedded indicatives is also possible in Greek:

(29) perimename $i$ eleni/tin eleni oti tha eksoryisti expect.Past.3pl the Eleni.Nom/-Acc that will be-furious.Fut.3sg

‘We expected that Eleni will be furious.’

Constructions such as (29) do not constitute a problem for the object control account of quasi-ECM, once we accept that ‘semantic’ control of an embedded *pro* is...
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an option in Greek (as in the analyses of Philippaki-Warburton & Catsimali 1999 and Spyropoulos 2007, for example). Interestingly, Greek exhibits ECM constructions even with subjunctives that are not defective under any definition of (semantic, morphological, temporal) embedded C/T-defectiveness (cf. discussions of defectiveness in Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999; Iatridou 1993; Kapetangianni 2010; Roussou 2009; Spyropoulos 2007; Terzi 1992; Varlokosta 1994). Again, the mere interchangeability of Nom/Acc (cf. (5)) suggests that the embedded clause is not defective in a way that would not permit nominative case assignment in the first place.

Finally, a theoretical problem of Pratt’s (2011) account is that the motivation for the correlation between accusative case assignment and focus interpretation is not explained.

3.3 Against Pratt’s (2011) counterarguments to the object control analysis

Pratt (2011) puts forth a number of counterarguments to Kotzoglou and Papangeli’s 2007 analysis. Let us examine them.

Pratt (2011: 265) argues that “Object control constructions bear an assumption of animacy of the accusative element, something capable of consciously responding or reacting”. No such restriction applies to Greek quasi-ECM constructions, according to the author, as evidenced in (30).

(30) θελω τον κερονα να νελτιοθι
want.NonPast.1sg the weather-Acc SUBJ improve.Refl.NonPast.3sg
‘I want the weather to improve.’

(Pratt 2011: 265)

However, (30) is ill-formed and, hence, the argument cannot go through.

Secondly, Pratt (2011) claims that passivisation of quasi-ECM constructions (see (13)) may result in a different interpretation, but this is not an argument in favour of an object control analysis, since passivisation also alters the interpretation of equivalent sentences with the causative verb ekana (which the author assumes is a verb whose subject “is less disputably in the embedded clause”):

(31a) ekana ton jatrona eksetasi
make.Past.1sg the doctor-Acc SUBJ examine.NonPast.3sg

ton jani
the John.Acc
‘I made the doctor examine John.’

(31b) ekana ton jani na eksetasti
apo ton jatro
from the doctor

‘I made Yannis be examined by the doctor.’

I agree with Pratt’s judgement concerning the semantic difference in (31), but the conclusion that causative verbs are indisputably ECM structures needs further support.

The same applies for Pratt’s argument concerning idioms. The author claims that, although Kotzoglou and Papangeli’s (2007) argument presented in (12) is valid, the conclusion that this constitutes an argument for control cannot hold, since the idiomatic interpretation is also not retained in parallel structures with ekana.

(32) #ekana to ðiaolo na tus pari
make.Past.1sg the devil.Acc SUBJ cl.3pl.Acc take.NonPast.3sg

‘I made the devil take them.’ = *‘I made them be destroyed.’

Again, the question that arises is why the structures with ekana are relevant at all. (For example, Hadjivassiliou, Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos 2000: 76 treat causatives as quasi-ECM verbs noting that “[i]n these constructions the affinity of the accusative DP with the main verb is more obvious.”)

Pratt 2011 also argues that the grammaticality of the presence of the nominative subject KANIS in (33=11) below (from Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007) is due to its being not an emphatic but a non-emphatic

(33=11) o manos perimene KANIS/ *KANENA
the Manos.Nom expect.Past.3sg nobody.Nom/*Acc
na min tu milai
SUBJ NEG prn.Gen speak.NonPast.3sg

‘Manos expected nobody to speak to him.’

(Kotzoglou & Papangeli 2007: 122)

---

3 Giannakidou (1995) distinguishes between two classes of polarity items. Emphatics (e.g. KANIS, equivalent to ‘nobody’) and nonemphatics (e.g. kanis, equivalent to ‘anybody’) have different licensing properties.
However, (33) is grammatical even under the emphatic interpretation of KANIS. So, this argument cannot go through, either.

4. A concluding remark - ECM in finite clauses in other languages

Concluding our discussion, let us note that the existence of ECM out of finite clauses (hyper-ECM) is well-manifested in a number of languages other than Greek, including Romanian (Alboiu & Hill 2011; Rivero 1987, 1988), Korean (Hong 2005; Lee 1995), Tamazight Berber (Shlonsky 1986), Turkish (Moore 1998; Şener 2008; Zidani-Eroğlu 1997), Madurese (Davies 2001, 2005), Japanese (Bruening 2001; Kuno 1976; Saito 1983; Tanaka 1992, 2002), Passamaquoddy (Bruening 2001). See Ademola-Adeoye (2010) and Massam (1985) for comprehensive discussion. While it is not imperative (or even not possible) that a common explanation be given as regards the constructions of the above-mentioned languages, the existence of such a great number of imposters to the standard analysis of ECM/R-to-O calls for a principled explanation. Space limitations do not permit a lengthy crosslinguistic account of the dis-/similarities of quasi-ECM constructions in this paper. We hope to be able to tackle this issue in future work.
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