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**Abstract**
Commencing from Greek, in this paper, I provide further empirical support to a recent treatment of *wh*-slifting as an instance of *wh*-scope marking with evidential properties (reminiscent of parenthetical constructions). Within this context, Greek *wh*-slifting is comparable to its English counterpart, which in turn forms a minimal pair with German *wh*-Integrated Parenthetical configurations.
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1 Introduction

A *wh*-interrogative configuration that has attracted much recent attention is coined (by Haddican et al. 2014, who borrow the term from Ross 1973) “*wh*-slifting”, and can be exemplified in English as in (1):

(1) Who did Mary see, do you think?

As we may observe, a *wh*-interrogative clause, “*who did Mary see*” (hereafter, CP-2), linearly precedes a yes/no-interrogative clause, “*do you think*” (henceforth, CP-1). On the observation that both clauses feature Subject-Auxiliary Inversion, which is a typical property of main clauses, the question is if, and if so, how the two CPs are associated.
In the context of English, Haddican et al. (2014) propose that (1) be treated as an evidential construction, where the two CPs flank a modal evidential head. On the other hand, Stepanov & Stateva (2016) argue that wh-slifiting is a wh-scope marking strategy, comparable to German and Hindi. Vlachos (2017a) reasons that English wh-slifiting is an instance of wh-scope marking, which is based on true-subordination (unlike Stepanov & Stateva 2016 who pursue an adjunction-oriented treatment), and structurally implicates evidential properties (in a way fundamentally different from Haddican et al. 2014). Empirically, Vlachos (2017a) motivates his claim by comparing English wh-slifiting with German wh-Integrated Parentheticals (Reis 2000, 2002), arguing that both sets of constructions form a minimal pair, yielding two structural patterns of wh-scope making.

Taking the lead from Vlachos (2017a), as well as Vlachos (2017b) who shows that Greek wh-slifiting is comparable to its English counterpart, in the present paper, I extend this analysis to Greek. After I discuss some major properties of Greek wh-slifiting (section 2), I present the relevant analysis (section 3): first, I lay out the analysis of Vlachos (2017a) for English and German, within the frame of wh-scope marking (section 3.1), and then turn to Greek (section 3.2). Section 4 concludes the discussion.

2 Facts

In this section, I consider the properties of Greek wh-slifiting, emphasizing on the relation between CP-1 and CP-2, from the perspective of predication, linearization, and binding.

To begin with predication, first, notice that CP-2 is a typical wh-question, which may be introduced by any wh-phrase, as shown in (2):

\[
\text{(2) a. [CP-2 P} \text{jos efighe}, \text{ nomizis?} \\
\text{who-nom left-3sg think-2sg} \\
\text{“Who left, do you think?”} \\
\text{b. [CP-2 Ti tu ipan], pistevi} \\
\text{what him-cl say-3pl believe-2sg} \\
\text{“What did they tell him, do you believe?”}
\]
c. [CP-2 Pote ghirise o Petros], ipothesis?
    when returned-3sg the-nom Peter-nom suppose-2sg
    “When did Peter return, do you suppose?”

In (2a), \textit{pjos} (“who”) is the clausal subject, in (2b), \textit{ti} (“what”) is the object of the predicate \textit{ipan} (“say”), while in (2c), \textit{pote} (“when”) is an adjunct.

Now, while CP-2 is an ordinary wh-question, the predicate of CP-1 must be able to select propositions (i.e., declarative clause-types), and not questions (i.e., interrogative clause-types). This is illustrated by the ungrammaticality of (3), which contrasts sharply with the licit (2) above:

(3) a. *Pjos efighe, rotas?
    who-nom left-3sg ask-2sg
    “*Who left, do you ask?”
    b. *Ti tu ipan, anarotjese?
    what him-cl say-3pl wonder-2sg
    “*What did they tell him, do you wonder?”

According to typical patterns of clausal complementation (e.g. Grimshaw 1979; Ginzburg & Sag 2001), predicates like \textit{ask} and \textit{wonder} may only select questions. In (3), the Greek counterparts of both types of predicates are ungrammatical with wh-slifting (cf., \textit{ksero} in (3a) and \textit{anarotjeme} in (3b)). This means that wh-slifting is supported exclusively by predicates that may select propositions (a.k.a. propositional-attitude predicates, such as \textit{think}; e.g., (2a)).

It is not the case that any propositional-attitude predicate is appropriate for wh-slifting (cf., (4)):

(4) a. *Ti ipan, isxirizese?
    what say-3sg claim-2sg
    “*What did they say, do you claim?”
    b. *Ti ipan, anakalispes?
    what say-3sg discover-2sg
    “*What did they say, did you discover?”
As discussed extensively in Vlachos (2017b) the predicate of CP-1 is restricted to what Hooper (1975) coins “weak assertives” (e.g., think, believe, suppose, expect, etc.), and excludes her “strong assertives”, such as isxirizese (“claim”) in (4a), or factives, like anakalispes (“discover”) in (4b).

Descriptively speaking, the restricted distribution of the predicate in CP-1 suggests that CP-1 has a “parenthetical” status, so to speak. This may become more obvious if we compare the interpretation and prosody of wh-slifting with that of the closely related (but not identical) construction “sequential wh-scope marking” (Dayal 2000), which can be exemplified in Greek as in (5):

(5) \[\begin{array}{l}
[\text{CP-2 } \text{Pjos efighe}] \text{? } [\text{CP-1 Ti nomizis}]? \\
\text{who-nom left-3sg what think-2sg}
\end{array}\]

“Who left? What do you think?”

In (5), there is a clear prosodical boundary (not demonstrated here) between the two CPs, both of which carry a distinct question-request and melody. On the other hand, as evidenced by all the (grammatical) cases examined above, in wh-slifting there is no such prosodical boundary between the two CPs. What is more, CP-1 is interpretationally and prosodically reduced, while CP-2 carries the main question-request and melody.

Turning to word order, there are two possible surface linear arrangements between CP-1 and CP-2, as illustrated in (6a) and (6b) respectively:

(6) a. INITIAL:

\[\begin{array}{l}
[\text{CP-2 Pu pighe o Nikos}] \text{? } [\text{CP-1 nomizis}]?
\end{array}\]

where went-3sg the-nom Nick-nom think-2sg

“Where did Nick go, do you think?”

b. SPLIT:

\[\begin{array}{l}
[\text{CP-2 Pu [CP-1 nomizis] pighe o Nikos}]?
\end{array}\]

where think-2sg went-3sg the-nom Nick?

“Where, do you think, did Nick go?”
In what I term *INITIAL* order (cf. (6a)), the entire CP-2 precedes CP-1, while in the *SPLIT* alternative (cf., (6b)), what precedes CP-1 is the wh-phrase heading CP-2, and the rest of CP-2 follows CP-1.\(^1\)

Despite the apparently free ordering between CP-1 and CP-2, a structural regularity seems to be observed as binding across the two CPs is possible, as in (7):

\[
(7) \quad [\text{CP-2 } \text{Pja } \text{fotografti } \text{tu } \text{eafu } \text{tu}_j] \\
\quad \text{which-acc picture-acc the-gen self-gen his-gen} \\
\quad \text{kikloforise } \text{perisotero}] [\text{CP-1 } \text{pistevi } \text{o } \text{Janis}]? \\
\quad \text{was-circulated-3sg more believe-3sg the-nom John-nom} \\
\quad \text{“Which picture of himself\textsubscript{j} was circulated most, does John\textsubscript{j} think?”}
\]

In (7), the reflexive *tu eafu tu* (“of himself”), which is contained within the Picture Noun-Phrase (PNP) *pja fotografti* (“which picture”), figures in CP-2, and is successfully bound by the proper name *Janis* (“John”) in CP-1 (see the relevant coindexing).

Let us put the empirical evidence presented in this section together. With respect to predication, a distinctive property of wh-slifting is that the predicate in CP-1 must be able to select propositions, while CP-2 is a wh-question. As regards word order, wh-slifting assumes three linear arrangements: either CP-2 precedes CP-1 entirely (*INITIAL* configuration), or the wh-phrase heading CP-2 precedes CP-1, while the rest of CP-2 follows at the end (*SPLIT* alternative). Moreover, binding from CP-1 into CP-2 is grammatical as evidenced with Picture Noun-Phrases containing reflexives. Vis-à-vis interpretation and prosody, CP-2 acquires a more prominent status, so to speak, as it carries the main question-request and melody, while CP-1 is more impoverished in this respect, as shown by the restricted distribution of the proposition-selecting predicate.

---

\(^1\) I refer to (6a) and (6b) in the text as “alternatives” (or “counterparts”) because their difference in word order does not trigger any relevant difference in interpretation.
3 Analysis

In Vlachos (2017b), I argue that Greek wh-slifiting shares the same empirical profile with English wh-slifiting (Haddican et al. 2014). In Vlachos 2017a, I analyse English wh-slifiting as an instance of wh-scope marking with evidential properties. Here, I show that this analysis extends to Greek wh-slifiting. I summarize the main points of this analysis in section 3.1 below, where I also provide a necessary background on wh-scope marking, while in section 3.2, I consider the analysis in the context of Greek wh-slifiting.

3.1 Strategies of wh-scope marking

Traditionally, there have been two major approaches to wh-scope marking: The Direct Dependency Approach (DDA), originally developed for German by van Riemsdijk (1982), and the Indirect Dependency Approach (IDA), initially proposed for Hindi by Dayal (1994).

Proponents of DDA argue that the LF of a wh-scope marking construction in German parallels the LF of long-distance wh-movement. This is illustrated in the examples below:

(8) a. Mit wem glaubt Karl daß Maria gesprochen hat?
   with whom thinks Karl that Maria spoken has
   “Who does Karl think Maria has spoken to?”
   (Dayal 2000: 158, (1a))

In fact, as Reis (2000: 376, 17f) notes, DDA may originate even earlier with H.- T. Tappe.
c. Was glaubt Karl mit wem Maria gesprochen hat?
    “Who does Karl think Maria has spoken to?”
    (Dayal 2000: 158, (1b))

d. (modelled on Dayal’s 2000: 158, (1b))

(8a) is a typical, long-distance, wh-question, where mit wem (with whom) moves from its original, argument, position to the intermediate Spec,CP-2, and then to the matrix Spec,CP-1 (cf., (8b)). While in long-distance wh-movement, the relevant wh-
chain is formed via movement (in the syntax proper), in wh-scope marking, the
corresponding wh-chain is formed partly via movement and partly via coindexing.
This is shown in (8d) (which corresponds to (8c)): mit wem (with whom) lands at the
intermediate Spec,CP-2, while the scope marker was, in Spec,CP-1, is coindexed with
the “partially” moved wh-phrase “marking” (i.e., extending) the latter’s scope to the
matrix clause (CP-1); hence the alternative terms “wh-scope marking” or “partial wh-
movement”. Crucially, as regards syntax, was is base-generated at Spec,CP-1, while
in the semantics, the scope marker translates to an expletive element with no content
(in a way similar to the dummy it in expletive it-constructions). To account for the
fact that a structurally lower wh-phrase may acquire matrix scope if bound by a scope
marker, McDaniel (1989) proposes a Wh-chain formation algorithm, which extends
earlier work by Lasnik & Saito (1984). In a more recent version of DDA, Beck &
Berman (2000) capitalize on the expletive-like nature of was and propose that the
intermediate wh-phrase moves at LF all the way up to Spec,CP-1 to substitute for the
expletive; hence, bringing the LF of wh-scope marking even closer to the LF of long-
distance wh-movement.

For IDA, on the other hand, wh-scope marking in Hindi does not resemble long-
distance wh-movement, but boils down to a juxtaposition strategy, as in (9b), which
corresponds to (9a).3

(9) a. Jaun kyaa soctaa hai ki merii kis-se baat karegii?
John what think-PR that Mary who-INS talk do-F
“Who does John think Mary will talk to?”
(Dayal 2000: 160, (5a))

---

3 In the interest of clarity, we should note that, for Dayal (1994), wh-scope marking is akin to clausal
complementation structures in Hindi. In short, Hindi is an SOV language, but finite complements occur
at a right-adjointed position, altering the order of constituents to SVO, while a pronominal element
surfaces at the preverbal object (O) position.
Unlike DDA, IDA says that the relevant scope marker kyaa is the (semantically) contentful argument of the predicate in CP-1 (here, soctaa hai). As such, the scope marker moves from its object position inside VP to Spec,CP-1, as a typical wh-questions. In passing, notice that Hindi is a wh-in situ language, which means that movement of the marker takes place at LF, unlike the overt movement of the marker in German. Crucially, the trace of the scope marker is coindexed with the entire CP-2 (which right-adojins to CP-1), and not just with the wh-phrase in Spec,CP-2 (as in DDA). This renders the “dependency” of the wh-phrase on the scope marker “indirect”; hence, the name IDA. In the semantics, the scope marker, being itself contentful, translates to an existential quantifier that ranges over the set of (true) propositions discharged by the wh-question (CP-2), and returns the single proposition that is the argument of the predicate in CP-1.4

The substantial difference between DDA and IDA, which lies in the distinct treatments of the relevant scope markers, boils down to this: for DDA, the syntax of wh-scope marking involves the formation of a single wh-chain (on a par with long-distance wh-movement), while for IDA, the syntax of wh-scope marking assumes two independent wh-chains, which come together in the semantics. In a way that parallels the semantics (but not the syntax) of a determiner with a common noun, the semantics of IDA says that the scope marker, qua determiner, is an operator that scopes over a set of propositions, while CP-2, qua common noun, yields this set of propositions.

4 In fact, the semantics of IDA is somewhat more complicated, but the relevant phrasing in the main text is enough for the purposes of the present discussion (see Dayal 1994 for a more detailed treatment).
In an attempt to bring the syntax of IDA closer to that of DDA, and hence relieve the tension between the two approaches, Dayal (2000) proposes that CP-2 may not only be juxtaposed to CP-1, as in (9b), but may also either adjoin to IP or to VP (in which case, the marker is base-generated in Spec,CP-1), yielding indirect syntactic subordination or direct subordination configurations respectively. From this perspective, Dayal argues, IDA may subsume the subordination strategy of DDA.

While it is true that the direct subordination variant of IDA comes close to the subordination strategy of DDA, the former is, strictly speaking, a “pseudo-subordination” configuration as it assumes adjunction of CP-2 (at the VP-level). Herburger (1994) is the first to explore a “true-subordination” variant of IDA in the context of German wh-scope marking, arguing that the [[D CP-2]] denotation (in the semantics) maps transparently to a [D CP-2] syntax. (10) demonstrates:

(10) a. Was glaubst die Maria, wen sie gesehen hat?
   “Who does Mary think see saw?”

   b. [[CP-1 Was, + C ... DP t, CP-2 wen sie gesehen hat]]?
   (modelled on Lahiri’s 2002: 513, (44) – (45))

(10b) says that was, which is a head of category D, forms a DP-constituent with CP-2, which is the argument of glaubst (not shown here). Was moves from its original position to C-1, while CP-2 surfaces in situ; hence, the relevant word order. In its surface position, was translates to an existential quantifier that ranges over the set of propositions discharged by CP-2, and returns a proposition that is input to glaubst. In later developments of this approach, CP-2 moves either in the syntax proper or at LF, in order to provide the quantifier with a restrictor (e.g., Horvath 1997; Lahiri 2002; Mahajan 2000). In the former case, CP-2 extraposes at the right of CP-1 yielding the observed linear arrangement.

Extending the subordination strategy of Herburger (1994), in Vlachos (2017b) I propose that English wh-slifting (cf., (11)) constitutes a minimal pair with what Reis (2000, 2002) terms “wh-Integrated Parentheticals” (wh-IP) in German, which come in two forms: Was-Integrated Parenthetical (was-IP) and Verb-Initial Integrated Parenthetical (VIP), as in (12a) and (12b) respectively:
(11) Where does he leave now, do you think?

(12) a. WAS-INTEGRATED PARENTHEtical (was-IP):
    Wo wohnt er jetzt, was glaubst du?
    where lives he now what believe you
    “Where do you think he leaves now?”
    (Reis 2000: 359, (3))

    b. VERB-INITIAL INTEGRATED PARENTHEtical (VIP):
    Wo wohnt er jetzt, glaubst du?
    where leaves he now believe you
    “Where does he leave now do you believe?”
    (Reis 2000: 359, (2))

The two questions in (12) differ in that (12a) contains a was-clause that corresponds to the Verb-Initial construction in (12b). From this perspective, English wh-slifiting (cf., (11)) falls together with German VIPs, which along with was-IPs result into two variants: was vs. V1 (the latter stands for “Verb-Initial”).

The empirical and experimental evidence presented in Vlachos (2017b), which I do not review here due to space limitations (on the experimental facts, see also Vlachos et al. 2017), underpins an analysis of the two variants that implicates a modal evidential head (MoodEvid) in the structure of a wh-scope marking strategy that is proffered upon true-subordination. Within this context, the schema in (13) generates the was variant:
(13), which is the initial alternative of the was variant (the other two alternatives are not demonstrated here, but see Vlachos 2017b), says that was forms a DP-constituent with CP-2, and this constituent originates as the complement of the propositional-attitude predicate glaubst (“believe”). Was lacks a wh-feature (for reasons not to be discussed further), and as such does not l(exically)-select CP-2 (in the sense of Pesetsky 1982, 1991). Not being l-selected C-2, despite being embedded, may feature V2 (or T-to-C raising; see McCloskey (2006) for a similar approach to embedded V2 in Irish English, and Biberaurer (2016) for Afrikaans). Was s(emeantically)-selects (Grimshaw 1979, 1981) CP-2 in that the former translates to an existential ($\exists$) quantifier that scopes over the set of propositions provided by the latter. In order to translate to an $\exists$-quantifier, was needs to move to a left-peripheral head. The head that was moves to is Topic, because the former, lacking a wh-feature, becomes compatible with a head that does not encode either Force or Focus features; hence, Topic (on the cartographic treatment of the clausal left-periphery presently advocated, see Rizzi 1997). CP-2, being wh-interrogative, bears an interpretable wh-feature, and serves as a Goal that values the uninterpretable wh-feature of Force, which acts as a Probe, under Agree (Chomsky 2000). In passing, notice that was does not “intervene” (in the sense of Rizzi 1990) in the Agree relation between matrix Force and (the wh-phrase...
heading) CP-2 because lacking a wh-feature, *was* is not a suitable Goal for Force. The association of matrix Force with CP-2 results into wh-movement from Spec,CP-2 to Spec,ForceP, which is followed by clausal pied-piping (on the assumption that clausal pied-piping is parasitic on wh-movement; Arregi 2003); hence, the *INITIAL* order in (13). *MoodEvid* projects in CP-1, between C and T, and hosts the relevant predicate and clausal subject, yielding a restricted set of evidential readings that the predicate may draw from.

The V1 variant, exemplified below with English wh-slifting, is derived as in (14):

\[(14)\]

\[\text{Ceteris paribus, like the *was*-pattern, the V1-variant maps to the same wh-scope marking strategy, which justifies the constituency-formation of CP-2 with D. Now, the V1 pattern lacks a *was*-marker, so D satisfies the bear minimum requirement that the head merging with CP-2 be indefinite (hence, the \([-\text{DEF}]\) feature). Just like in the *was*-variant in (13), wh-movement in (14), accompanied by clausal pied-piping, takes place from CP-2 to the matrix ForceP, while the predicate of CP-1 and the clausal subject are associated with *MoodEvid* yielding the corresponding readings.} \]

Within this background in place, next, let us turn to Greek wh-slifting.
2.2 Greek wh-slifting qua wh-scope marking

According to Dayal (1994), one of the characteristic properties of wh-scope marking constructions (in Hindi, as well as in other languages), vis-à-vis distribution, is that the predicate of CP-1 must be able to select propositions, while CP-2 is a wh-question; or, as Dayal (1994: 141) puts it “[t]he distribution of scope marking is also interesting. Though the matrix verb must be able to take [-WH] complements, the actual complement must be [+WH].” As we saw in section 2, Greek wh-slifting abides by this requirement, as predicates that typically select questions (e.g., ask, wonder) are ungrammatical, while only propositional-attitude predicates are licit. Moreover, we saw that the set of possible reading available to the propositional-attitude predicate is quite limited, probably narrowed down to Hooper’s (1975) “weak assertive” predicates, and perhaps including only the verb say from the class of “strong assertives”. In this section, I show how the syntax of Greek wh-slifting predicts this fact, along with the rest of the empirical evidence discussed in section 2.

Greek wh-slifting is comparable to its English counterpart (as already mentioned), which falls under the V1 pattern discussed in the previous section. It is reasonable then to extend this analysis to the Greek equivalent of (14) which is (15):

\[
\text{(15)}
\]

Just like in its English counterpart in (14), (15) says that CP-2 forms a constituent with \(\text{D}_{[-\text{DEF}]}\), and this constituent is the complement of the predicate in CP-1. The wh-
phrase heading CP-2 agrees with matrix Force and the latter moves to Spec,ForceP, pied-piping the rest of CP-2.

As already mentioned, clausal pied-piping is optional, so along with the INITIAL order in (15) we have the SPLIT alternative in (16):

(16) shows that what moves to Spec,ForceP is the wh-phrase alone, leaving the rest of CP-2 “in situ”.

The interpretational and prosodic effects of Greek wh-slifiting that we observed in section 2 follow from the corresponding syntax in (15) (and (16)) straightforwardly: Mood\textsubscript{Evid} restricts the possible readings that the predicate in CP-1 may draw from to a certain set of evidential interpretations (discussed in Vlachos 2017a). Moreover, due to its association with matrix Force, CP-2, despite being syntactically embedded, acquires the “main” question-request (as Haddican et al. 2014 put it in the context of English wh-slifiting), and the corresponding melody.

Finally, the reconstruction facts provide further support to the present analysis. Witness (17), repeated from (7) for convenience:
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(17) [CP-2 Pja fotoghrafia tu eaftu tu_j
    which-acc picture-acc the-gen self-gen his-gen
    kikloforise perisotero] [CP-1 pistevi o Janis]?
    was-circulated-3sg more believe-3sg the-nom John-nom

    “Which picture of himself was circulated most, does John think?”

The grammaticality of (17) under the relevant coindexing says that Janis (“John”), in CP-1, binds the PNP pja fotoghrafia tu eaftu tu (“which picture of himself”) in CP-2. For binding to be established, it must be the case that the proper name c-commands the reflexive, which means in the turn that CP-1 is in the same hierarchical line of projections as CP-2 (for a formal definition of c-command, see Collins & Stabler 2016). Additionally, it follows that the “parenthetical” reading of CP-1 (mentioned in section 2) does not map to a corresponding parenthetical syntax, but is a function of the evidential modality structurally implicated in CP-1 (for a state-of-the-art discussion of parenthetical constructions, see Rooryck 2001).

To summarize the discussion of this section, Greek wh-slifitng (along with German wh-Integrated Parentheticals and English wh-slifitng) is a wh-scope marking strategy that relies on true-subordination, and assumes evidential properties. As in typical wh-scope marking constructions, in Greek wh-slifitng, a propositional attitude predicate is associated with a wh-question. This association is mediated by and indefinite D element: D forms a constituent with CP-2 which is the complement of the proposition-selecting predicate. Despite being embedded, CP-2 may feature T-to-C fronting (due to lack of l-selection by D), while due to its association with matrix Force (of CP-1), CP-2 acquires the interpretation and melody of a “main” wh-question. CP-1, on the other hand, undergoes a reduction in interpretation and prosody, which is due to the evidential modality that functionally implicated in CP-1, and not due to a parenthetical structure, as evidenced by reconstruction facts.

3 Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that Greek wh-slifitng is an instance of a wh-scope marking strategy that also generates German wh-Integrated Parentheticals and English wh-slifitng. This strategy assumes a hypotactic syntax: a wh-question (CP-2) forms a
constituent with an indefinite D element, which is, in turn, embedded under a propositional-attitude predicate (surfacing in CP-1). Evidential properties associated with CP-1, and the association of CP-2 with the Force of the matrix clause (CP-1) “reverses”, so to speak, the otherwise expected interpretational and prosodic effects: CP-1 acquires a more parenthetical status, despite being syntactically a main clause, while CP-2 has the main question-request and melody, despite being syntactically subordinate.
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