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Abstract
This article discusses the possible triggers of subject-verb inversion in Greek constituent questions (obligatory inversion). We lay out the main proposals put forth in the literature so far and we spot a couple of inconsistencies in Kotzoglou's (2005, 2006) proposal. We, then, note how Chomsky's (2013, 2015) model of projection might help explain both aspects of the phenomenon, i.e. the lack of T-to-C movement and the adjacency between the fronted wh-phrase and T.
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1 Introduction

This paper revisits the phenomenon of triggered inversion in Greek. Triggered (or obligatory) inversion is the term (Suñer 1994; Torrego 1984; Uriagereka 1999; Zubizarreta 2001, among others) attributed to structures where a subject may not intervene between a fronted wh-phrase and the inflected verb or auxiliary in a constituent question:

(1) a. *What John has seen?
   b. What has John seen?

The phenomenon is termed ‘obligatory inversion’ in contrast to ‘free inversion’, i.e. instances of VS orders in null subject language declaratives (Brandi & Cordin 1989;
Burzio 1986). Triggered inversion is evidenced even in languages that permit free subject verb inversion (i.e. declarative VS orders), such as Spanish (Canac Marquis 1991; Goodall 2004; Suñer 1994; Torrego 1984, among others), Italian (Barbosa 2001; Rizzi 1996), and Catalan (Ordóñez 2000). The same state of affairs has also been reported to hold for a number of languages including -but not limited to- Basque, European Portuguese, Galician, Romance (in general, see Barbosa 2001), and (not uncontroversially) Hebrew.

Greek also exhibits triggered inversion in interrogative contexts (2) alongside free inversion (3):

(2) a. pion rotise o kaθiγitis?
   who.ACC asked the professor.NOM
   ‘Whom did the professor ask?’

   b. *pion o kaθiγitis rotise?
   who.ACC the professor.NOM asked
   ‘Whom did the professor ask?’

(3) rotise o kaθiγitis ti matina
   asked the professor.NOM the Matina.ACC
   ‘The professor asked Matina.’

The standard analysis of triggered inversion in null subjects and non-null subject languages alike is by resort to T-to-C head movement (4) due to either the affixal nature of the interrogative complementizer (stray affix filter, cf. Lasnik 1981) or to some version of Rizzi’s (1996) wh-criterion (or both).
Many papers assume by default that T-to-C (or F(ocus)) takes places in Greek wh-questions on a par with English, without specifically arguing for its presence (for example, but not exclusively, Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou 2004; Roussou & Tsimpli 2006; Varlokonta 1994). On the other hand, a number of articles refute T-to-C as the source of triggered inversion, both in other languages (Barbosa 2001) and in Greek (Anagnostopoulou 1994; Kotzoglou 2005, 2006). No consensus as to the exact explanation of the phenomenon in Greek has been reached.

This paper discusses the ungrammaticality of non-inverted orders (2b) in triggered inversion contexts in Greek claiming that they are not produced by raising of T past the preverbal subject, i.e. claiming that they constitute a subcase of inversion. We discuss and try to amend some problems of Kotzoglou’s (2005, 2006) account of triggered inversion. Finally, we show how Chomsky’s (2013, 2015) novel view on the trigger for movement might provide an explanation to the true nature of triggered inversion and its crosslinguistic parameterization.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 outlines past account of triggered inversion. Section 3 provides further evidence against the presence of preverbal subjects in Greek triggered inversion contexts. Section 4 lays out some problem for Kotzoglou (2005, 2006). Section 5 discusses Chomsky’s (2013, 2015) novel proposal on the trigger of movement and its relevance to triggered inversion. Section 6 discusses some loose ends.
2 Past accounts of triggered inversion in Greek

A. T-to-C/Foc

The traditional account is that of T-to-C movement due to some version of the stray affix filter. Following Baker (1970) it is assumed that questions are introduced by an abstract Q morpheme on the C head, which has a performative reading. If this C\([+Q]\) is affixal in nature, it triggers head movement.

Alternatively, it might be the case that this kind of movement is be triggered by the wh-criterion:

\[(5)\quad \text{Wh-criterion}\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. A wh-operator must be in a Spec-head configuration with a [+wh] X}^0. \\
\text{b. A [+wh] X}^0 \text{ must be in a Spec-head configuration with a wh-operator.}
\end{align*}\]

Rizzi (1996: 64)

T-to-C (or to Foc) movement has been argued to exist in Greek by Agouraki (1990), Rivero (1994, 2001), Rivero & Terzi (1995) and Tsimpi (1990, 1995). It should be noted here that minimalist accounts of triggered inversion mostly replicate (with different specifics) the C-as-attractor account (e.g. Pesetsky & Torrego’s (2001) \(uT\) on C) or the symmetry/Spec-head account of Rizzi (1996) (e.g. Epstein et al. 1998)

B. Relativized minimality

Anagnostopoulou (1994) argues extensively against a T-to-C account of triggered inversion, based mainly on two observations:

First, contrary to English (6), Greek (7) does not exhibit a matrix-embedded asymmetry with respect to triggered inversion. In other words, the presence of an embedded complementizer does not preempt the surfacing of VS order (and its obligatoriness). Given that the matrix/embedded asymmetry has been the major landmark of V-raising phenomena (den Besten 1983), the natural conclusion is that triggered inversion in Greek is not a consequence of T-to-C.

\[(6)\quad \begin{align*}
\text{a. Who *(will) John (*will) meet?} \\
\text{b. Gerry asked who (*will) John *(will) meet.}
\end{align*}\]
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(7) a. pion (*o janis) θa sinandisi (o janis)?
    who the John will meet the John
    ‘Whom will John meet?’

    b. anarotiomaste pion (*o janis) θa sinandisi (o janis)?
    wonder.1PL. who the John will meet the John
    ‘We are wondering whom will John meet.’

What is more, Anagnostopoulou (1994) correctly identifies and brings forth a major aspect of the phenomenon, noting that D-linked (presuppositional, in the sense of Cinque 1990; Pesetsky 1987) \(wh\)-phrases do not trigger inversion:

(8) pio provlima i maθites δen borusan na lisun?
    which problem.ACC the pupils.NOM NEG can.PAST.3PL SUBJ solve.3PL
    ‘Which problem couldn’t the pupils solve?’

    Anagnostopoulou (1994: 177)

D-linked phrases have been claimed to merge on their surface position and merely bind a \(pro\) in the thematic position.

A further observation is that triggred inversion seems to apply in a successive cyclic fashion, in the sense that it imposes VS orders in all of the embedded clauses through which the \(wh\)-phrase proceeds:

(9) a. pion ipe o janis oti aγapuse i maria?
    who.ACC said.3SG the Yannis that loved.3SG the Maria
    ‘Who did Yannis say Maria loved?’

    b. ?pion ipe o janis oti i maria aγapuse?
    who.ACC said.3SG the Yannis that the Maria loved.3SG
    ‘Who did Yannis say Maria loved?’

    (my judgement)

(Let me note here that Anagnostopoulou (1994: 164-165) observes an argument-adjunct asymmetry in triggered inversion (first discussed in Drachman & Klidi 1992), and argues that only fronted \(wh\)-arguments give rise to the phenomenon. My judgements differ considerably from those of Anagnostopoulou 1994 on that issue.)
The relativized minimality account of triggered inversion relies heavily on the status or preverbal subjects in Greek. Greek preverbal subjects are CLLDed elements (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999; Philippaki-Warburton 1987) which act as blockers of further \( w_h \)-movement. (A relativized minimality violation, as in the model of Rizzi 1990). D-linked \( w_h \)-phrases are not fronted by movement and, hence, they may surface in the presence of CLLDed subjects without violation. Schematically:

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) \text{a.} & \quad [\text{CP pion } [\text{TopP i Maria .... [TP aγapai [vP pion]]}]]; \\
& \quad \ast \\
\text{b.} & \quad [\text{CP [pion apo tus filus], tis } [\text{TopP i Maria .... [TP aγapai [vP pro, ]]}}]; \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[C. \text{Relativized minimality plus PF adjacency}\]

Kotzoglou (2005, 2006) builds on Anagnostopoulou’s (1994) observations but also deviates in the ultimate explanation of the phenomenon.

First of all, Kotzoglou (2005, 2006) observes that a fronted \( w_h \)-phrase and the verb may not be in a Spec-Head relation (as would be expected after T-to-C) as a limited number of elements may in fact intervene between the two even when the subject is not D-linked. It is shown that parenthetical elements are licit in triggered inversion contexts:

\[
(11) \text{pion lipon pandreftike i katerina?} \\
\text{who.ACC well married.3SG the Catherine.NOM} \\
\text{‘Well, who did Catherine marry?’}
\]

Given Cardinaletti’s (1997) observation that parentheticals may not attach on an intermediate projection, (11) militates against T-to-C.
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(12) *mi fae!
    NEG eat.IMPER.2SG.
    ‘Don’t eat’

However, in triggered inversion preverbal particles do not appear to block (the alleged) T–to–C movement. When a negated verb is questioned, or when a verb in the subjunctive mood is questioned, the relevant particles appear on its left, as in non-inverted orders:

(13) a. pion [ðen θa apolisi] o petros?
    whom.ACC NEG will fire.3SG the Peter.NOM
    ‘Whom will Peter not fire?’

b. se pion [na ðosi] o taxiðromos to γrama?
    to whom.ACC SUBJ give.3SG the postman.NOM the letter.ACC
    ‘To whom should the postman give the letter?’

Since blocking particles do not preempt triggered inversion, as they should, given (12), we are led to the conclusion that no T-to-C takes place in (13).

Anagnostopoulou’s (1994) account, by focusing on the blocking effects of the preverbal topicalized subject has a difficulty in explaining aspects of triggered inversion that are particular to the interrogative content of the structure. So, triggered inversion is not required in instances of relativization, which also involve wh-movement.

(14) a. (ʔ) o petros θimate ekina
    the Peter.NOM remember.3SG those.ACC
    [ta opia i γonis tu ksexnun],
    the which.ACC the parents.NOM his forget.3PL
    ‘Peter remembers the things that his parents forget.’

b. o petros θimate ekina [ta opia i γonis tu ksexnun ta opia].
The contrast between (14a) and ungrammatical instances of triggered inversion reveal that something particular to interrogative clauses (clauses introduced by a C_{[+Q]}) partially triggers inversion.

Furthermore, Kotzoglou (2006) argues that although a relativized minimality account is on the right track, its cannot explain the sharp ungrammaticality of (15). If indeed relativized minimality was the only factor giving rise to the deviant reading in (15), we would expect mild ungrammaticality to arise (as relativized minimality islands are weak islands, and extraction of an argument across an intervener should give rise to a ?-judgement rather than a *-judgement, cf. Lasnik & Saito 1992).

\[(15=6b) \text{ } *\text{pion o k} \theta \text{i} \gamma \text{itis rotise?} \]
\[
\text{who.ACC the professor asked}
\]
\`
Whom did the professor ask?'
``

Kotzoglou (2005, 2006) observes that a relativized minimality account cannot fully capture the phenomenon, as movement of the WH-phrase across an embedded preverbal subject (on its way to the matrix [Spec, CP]) gives considerably milder ungrammaticality than instances of non-inversion in matrix clauses:

\[(16) \text{ a. } *\text{pion o k} \theta \text{i} \gamma \text{itis rotise?} \]
\[
\text{who.ACC the professor asked}
\]
\`
Whom did the professor ask?'
``

\[(16) \text{ b. } ?\text{pion ipe i maria oti o k} \theta \text{i} \gamma \text{itis rotise?} \]
\[
\text{who.ACC said.3SG the Maria.NOM that the professor.NOM asked.3SG}
\]
\`
Whom did Maria say the professor asked?'
``

The above observation leads to the following generalization:

“Obligatory inversion is not the effect of a single cause, but it is brought about by the interplay of two independent factors:

a. the relativized minimality effects that left-dislocated preverbal subjects induce with respect to A’-movement, and

b. an adjacency requirement between the clause-typing interrogative complementizer (henceforth, C_{[+Q]}) and the phonological phrase of the verb group.”

Kotzoglou (2006)
Hence, the different instances of extraction (whether from the matrix or from the embedded clause, across a A’-intervener or not, and with or without a D-linked wh-phrase) laid out in (17)

(17) a. [CP wh-phrase C_{+Q} [ø verb group]]
   b. pion iðe o petros?
      whom.ACC saw.3SG the Peter.NOM
      ‘Who did Peter see?’

(18) a. [CP D-linked-wh-phrase C_{+Q} [ø verb group]]
   b. pjon apo tus filus tu iðe o petros?
      which.ACC of the friends.ACC his saw.3SG the Peter.NOM
      ‘Which of his friends did Peter see?’

(19) a. *[CP wh-phrase C_{+Q} [XP_{subj} verb group]]
   b. *pion o petros iðe?
      whom.ACC the Peter.NOM saw.3SG
      ‘Who did Peter see?’

(20) a. *[CP D-linked-wh-phrase C_{+Q} [XP_{subj} verb group]]
   b. *pjon apo tus filus tu o petros iðe?
      which.ACC of the friends.ACC his the Peter.NOM saw.3SG
      ‘Which of his friends his did Peter see?’

(21) a. *[CP wh-phrase C_{+Q} [ø verb group [CP XP_{subj} verb group]]]
   b. *pion ipes oti o petros iðe?
      whom.ACC said.2SG that the Peter.NOM saw.3SG
      ‘Who did you say Peter saw?’

(22) a. [CP D-linked-wh-phrase C_{+Q} [ø verb group [CP XP_{subj} verb group]]]
   b. pjon apo tus filus tu ipes oti
      which.ACC of the friends.ACC his said.2SG that
      o petros iðe?
      the Peter.NOM saw.3SG
      ‘Which of his friends his did you say Peter saw?’
In other words, Kotzoglou (2006) accepts Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos’s (1999) distinction between affixes and particles. The former trigger head movement (due to some version of the stray affix filter), while the latter act as blockers. The above paper argues that languages parameterize with respect to the morphological nature of $C_{[+Q]}$, i.e. the clause-typing C, presumably also responsible for the interrogative intonation. In some languages $C_{[+Q]}$ is an affix, and thus triggers verb movement, while in others (such as Greek) it is merely a particle. It also argues that there is a requirement of PF adjacency between the $C_{[+Q]}$ and the verb group (the phonological word consisting of verb + particles).

### 3 Another argument against triggered inversion as head-movement across overt preverbal subjects

A further argument against triggered inversion as T-to-C movement can be derived from a well-known patter of Principle C violations in Greek.

Horrocks (1994), Panagiotidis & Tsiplakou (2006), Spyropoulos (1999), Spyropoulos & Philippaki-Warburton (2001) and Tsiplakou (1999) discuss the following asymmetry, whereby an R-expression within a postverbal subject DP gets bound by a coindexed TP-level special clitic, while no corresponding principle C violation ensues when the subject is in the preverbal position.

\[(23)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{tin}_{\text{sj}} \ \text{ayapai} \ [\text{i mitera} \ [\text{tis marias},i]] \\
& \text{her love.3SG the mother.NOM the Mary.GEN} \\
& \text{‘Mary’s mother loves her.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. } [\text{i mitera} \ [\text{tis marias},i]] \ \text{tin}_{\text{sj}} \ \text{ayapai} \\
& \text{The mother.NOM the Mary.GEN her love.3SG} \\
& \text{‘Mary’s mother loves her.’}
\end{align*}\]
Kotzoglou (2013) argues that the contrast in (23) is a crucial argument in favour of the base-generated status of preverbal subjects in Greek. As the landing site of the clitic is lower than the base-generated position of the preverbal subject, *i mitera* cannot be bound in (23b). On the other hand, vP-internal subjects get bound by the clitic (23a). Note now that clitics in triggered inversion context give rise to principle C violations with respect to inverted subjects:

(24) pote ton*_{ui} prosvale [i fili [tu andrea] _{i}]?

when him offended.3SG the friend.NOM the Andreas. GEN

‘When did Andreas’ friend offend him?’

The argument does not conclusively militate against T-to-C, as it could be the case that T-to-C happens indeed but for some independent reason the subject stays in its base/vP-position, but if this were the case one would have to explain why the alternative (wide reading) of the subject does not hold. In other words, we would expect (24) to be ambiguous with the subject having either preverbal or postverbal scope with respect to the clitic. However, this is not the case. On the other hand, it cannot be the case that the clitic binds from C (if T-to-C held), since it is too deep embedded (adjoined to the T-C complex head) to bind. The conclusion seems to be that no T-to-C takes place in triggered inversion contexts.


Let us now turn to a number of problems that Kotzoglou’s (2005, 2006) analysis faces.

First of all, positing a requirement for PF linear adjacency between the verb group (i.e. verb plus particles) and a phonetically null C is problematic on conceptual grounds. If C is phonetically null, then how can it impose PF requirements? Of course, it might be argued that although segmentally null C\_+[+Q] contributes to the interrogative intonation of the sentence, but still the reason why the proposed adjacency should hold is not entirely clear. For example, why should a complementizer require to be adjacent with verb+preverbal particles?
What is more, the adjacency between C_{+Q} and the verb group as a whole is equally problematic because there is no syntactic notion ‘verb group’ to begin with.

Let us now turn to the big picture. Given the properties of the phenomenon, discussed in section 3, and the problematic aspects of Kotzoglou’s (2005, 2006) proposal, the questions that arise with respect to triggered inversion in Greek are the following:

a. What does actually trigger T-to-C? If T-to-C exists in Greek, it can’t be a property of C, i.e. some uninterpretable feature on C that attracts T, as T does not get attracted when material intervenes.

b. What does the requirement for linear adjacency amount to? Why does an empty C impose a PF-requirement? How can the complex verb+particles be defined?

The answer(s) to the above questions:

i. Should take into account Anagnostopoulou’s (1994) suggestion concerning RM.
   ➢ This would explain ?-judgements on extraction from preverbal subjects of embedded clauses and the amelioration of ungrammaticality in sentences with D-linked wh-phrases.

ii. Should make crucial use of the interrogative nature of the sentences/clauses at hand.
   ➢ This would explain the lack of ungrammaticality (or the mild ungrammaticality) of non-inverted relative clauses and the requirement of linear PF-adjacency as a requirement of the accommodation of [+Q] contributing the interrogative intonation (and the same might extend to instances of inversion in focusing, see Tsimpli 1995)

iii. Should make reference to the adjacency between the verb group and the clause-typing C (and that would require a natural way to define the verb group…)
   ➢ This would explain the mild ungrammaticality of D-linked-wh-phrase + overt subject + verb group sequences.

iv. Should explain why parentheticals may intervene between the wh-phrase and the verb group.
   ➢ This would explain the grammaticality of (11).
5 ‘Principles of projection’ and the trigger for T-to-C

Chomsky’s (2013, 2015) recent work on the trigger of movement operations might provide some explanation as to some of the questions raised above. In this section we consider two proposals by Chomsky that help explain the two aspects of this phenomenon in Greek, i.e. the lack of T-to-C movement and the requirement for linear adjacency between the fronted wh-material and the rest of the ‘verb group’.

5.1 Lack of inversion

The question ‘What bans T-to-C in the presence of preverbal subjects and preverbal particles in Greek?’ might be explained if we couple the observation that preverbal subjects in Greek are base-generated CLLDed phrases in the left periphery with the following proposal by Chomsky:

‘[16] [C C [α NP TP]]
[…]
In [16], no relation is established between C and elements within α. However, there clearly is a C-T relation: that is shown directly by Aux-Inversion, but also by more complex theory-internal phenomena, such as inheritance of features of C by T. Since there is no notion of Specifier, minimal structural distance does not distinguish NP from TP. If we reduce Aux-inversion to the simpler principle that inversion depends on locality independent of category, then inversion could just as well yield “eagles [young are flying]” rather than “are [young eagles flying]” as the interrogative counterpart to “young eagles are flying.” Such considerations as these suggest that the C-T relation is established before the NP surface subject is introduced into [15]/[16], at which point TP = {T, XP} is labeled T, establishing the C-T relation and permitting Aux-raising, feature-inheritance, and any other C-T relations.’

Chomsky (2013: 42-43)

¹Numbering in square brackets within quoted material refer to examples in the original.
The importance of the above passage lies in the proposal that elements in [Spec, TP] and T are (to adopt an out-of-fashion term) ‘equidistant’ from C and the presence of a preverbal subject should preempt T-to-C. Subjects in English can be raised to [Spec, TP] only after C-T has been established. But, let us propose, CLLDed subjects in Greek are base generated in their peripheral position, and, hence, the possibility of a postcyclic raising (or any raising at all) does not arise (25). In other words, preverbal subjects in Greek block T-to-C, unlike their English counterparts, since the preverbal position in English is a derived one and, therefore, T-to-C occurs prior to subject raising (26).

(25) Greek:

```
C(P)
    /
   /  \
C    Top(P)
    /
   /  \
subject Top
      /
     /  \
Top   Mood(P)
      |   |
   ...  |
      |   |
   T(P)
```

(26) English:

```
C(P)
    /
   /  \
C    T(P)
    /
   /  \
T    v(P)
      /
     /  \
subject
```
The same applies with respect to preverbal particles, of course. Note that other topicalized objects also ban ‘inversion’ and give rise to the same judgements as the ones found with subjects:

(27) a. ti (*tu jani) tu estiles (tu jani)?
    what.ACC the John.GEN cl.GEN sent.2SG the John.GEN
    ‘What did you send John?’

b. ?ti ipan oti tu jani tu estiles?
    what.ACC said.3PL that the John.GEN cl.GEN sent.2SG
    ‘What did they say you sent John?’

c. ?pio apo ta vivlia su (?tu jani) tu
    which.ACC of the books your the John.GEN cl.GEN
    to estiles tu jani?
    cl.ACC sent.2SG the John.GEN
    ‘Which of your books did you send John?’

And the same applies to topicalized adjuncts (but not parentheticals):

(28) a. ti (*xtes) tu estiles xtes?
    what.ACC yesterday cl.GEN sent.2SG yesterday
    ‘What did you send him yesterday?’

b. ?ti ipan oti xtes tu estiles?
    what.ACC said.3PL that yesterday cl.GEN sent.2SG
    ‘What did they say you sent him yesterday?’

c. ?pio apo ta vivlia su (?xtes) tu
    which.ACC of the books your yesterday cl.GEN
    to estiles xtes?
    cl.ACC sent.2SG yesterday
    ‘Which of your books did you send him yesterday?’

This does not necessarily mean that T-to-C is banned in Greek. In the absence of topicalized preverbal material and particles (i.e. in the absence of maximal projections between T and C) T-to-C might be possible.
5.2 Feature inheritance

‘As shown by Marc Richards (2007), there is good reason to suppose that the φ-features of T are in fact inherited from C; and though his argument does not extend to this case, the tense feature as well. The system is simplified if features of an LI cannot move independently of the feature bundle to which they belong. That would entail that all the features of C should be inherited by T, including not only tense (as is overt) but also Q. If so, then in [12], spelled out more fully here, the Q feature of C should also appear in T:

[25] they asked [if-Q [ α [how many mechanics] [T-Q fix the cars]]]

Chomsky (2013: 47)

Chomsky’s proposal above marks a considerable departure from former accounts of T-to-C in that it opens up the possibility that the Q morpheme is inherited by C to T and this surfaces on the (verbal-)T-head rather than on the null C.

This is particularly interesting since it may help define the nature of the proposed adjacency relation. It is no longer an adjacency between C_{+Q} and the verb group. Q is a feature on T (which, unlike, C) has phonological content. So,

a. It can reasonably be said that Q, which contributes to clause typing must be linearly adjacent to the wh-word (so, the requirement is not one between C and T, but between T and the wh-phrase in [Spec, CP]).

b. The presence of the Q-feature on T and the fact that the requirement of adjacency is a PF-related one gives us a way to formally define the ‘verb group’ (i.e. verb plus particles (plus preverbal clitics)). It is well known that the verb and its paraphernalia form a phonological word (for extensive discussion see, for example, Philippaki-Warburton & Spyropoulos 1999). Given that the Q-morpheme/particle has been claimed to contribute the interrogative intonation (Cheng & Rooryck 2000), it is no wonder that the phonological phrase containing this morpheme should require to be adjacent to fronted wh-material.

In light of the above, we might reformulate Kotzoglou’s (2005, 2006) proposal as follows:
Apparent triggered inversion in Greek amounts to both:

a. The RM-effect created by preverbal topicalized/CLLDed material.

b. The requirement of PF-adjacency between the phonological word containing the [+Q]-feature and the fronted wh-phrase.

Among the issues left open in the current proposal, we would like to raise the following questions:

i. How does feature percolation proceed? (as it has been argued that preverbal material blocks T-to-C movement in Greek, but the implication is that it does not block C-to-T feature percolation…)

ii. What is the exact nature of Q? Is it a clause-typing particle/morpheme (Baker 1970; Cheng 1991), an intonation particle (Cheng & Rooryck 2000), or a mere syntactic feature triggering displacement (or a combination of more than one of the above)?

We hope to be able to tackle those issues in future research.
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