

## Aspects of phonological development in Modern Greek

Ioanna Kappa  
University of Crete  
[kappa@phl.uoc.gr](mailto:kappa@phl.uoc.gr)

In this talk will be discussed some aspects of phonological development in Modern Greek. We will focus in the intra-child variation in the acquisition of CC-clusters and Codas in Greek child language and specifically the developmental paths and the strategies followed by the children in the initial and intermediate stage of acquisition.

At the initial stage of phonological development the children's grammar cannot accommodate complex onsets, therefore the target CC-clusters are reduced to a single segment by means of different strategies, i.e. *reduction* to the stronger member (stop) of the cluster (cf. Drachman, 1973; Kappa, 1999, 2003; Tzakosta, 2001, 2003) or *coalescence* (Kappa, 2004). The data show that reduction (1) occurs in a prominent position such as the head of the prosodic word (stressed/word-initial syllable), whereas coalescence (2) occurs in a non-prominent position as the word-medial/unstressed syllable.

	Adult speech	Child speech	Gloss	Age
1)	'skala	'kala	'stair'	2;5,9/2;9,13
2)	'ekso	'eto	'outside'	2;5,9/2;6.

Our data show that the acquisition of a complex Onset preceeds that of a branching (medial) rhyme, (see Levelt & van de Vijver (2004) for an opposite view) [compare ages in: (3a,b) vs. (4a,b) and (7) vs. (8)] and that only the lateral [l] surfaces in Onset (3a,b) or Coda position (4a,b). The rhotics emerge faithfully relatively late; first as Onset singletons, in stressed/unstressed syllables (5) and later in clusters (6). Their realization implies the earlier acquisition of [Obstruent + l] clusters, [compare ages: (3a,b) vs. (6)]. The rhotic /r/ is not yet realized in coda position; instead a phonetic lengthening of the preceding vocalic nucleus emerges, as a 'trace' of the input rhotic coda consonant; consequently the branching shape of the input rhyme is realized faithfully (but not segmentally faithful).

	Adult speech		Child speech	Gloss	Child: Age
3a)	'ði . pla	→	'ði . pla	'beside'	(B : 1 ;11,10)
b)	mi . 'kra	→	mi . 'kla	'small' PL.	(M: 1 ;09)
4a)	'kar . ta	→	'kal. ta	'card'	(B : 2 ;09,25)
b)	'val . to	→	'val . to	'put (it) !'	(M: 1;11,07)
5)	'pa . re	→	'pa . re	'take (it) !'	(M: 1;11,22)
6)	mi . 'kro	→	'kro	'small' Sg..	(M: 2;01, 01)
7)	'tur . ta	→	'tu: . ta	'cake'	(M: 2;04, 04)

The final Codas [s] do not occur in the initial stage of acquisition, resulting in a CV-structure; the input final [s] carries morphological information (marker, for gender/case etc.), which is not evident in the initial stage. In the course of acquisition, -forced by the morphological development, as well as by input frequency effects- the realization of the coda-final segments preceeds that of medial ones [n, l, r].

# **Production and comprehension of wh-questions in Greek: Evidence from specifically language impaired children**

**Aikaterini Pantoula**  
UiL OTS, Utrecht University

*Background:* Cross-linguistic studies that have been conducted for Greek (Stavrakaki 2001) and English (van der Lely & Battell 2003) on the acquisition of syntactic processes involving wh-movement revealed difficulties in children with Specific Language Impairment (SLI) and Typical Development (TD). I investigated production and comprehension of root wh-questions in children with SLI and TD.

*Purpose:* The goal of this study is to add empirical data on the linguistic characteristics and nature of the deficit of SLI.

*Methodology:* Eleven Greek-speaking individuals with SLI (mean chronological age: 6;8 years; mean VIQ: 18.5) were individually chronologically aged-matched (CA) to eleven TD controls (mean: 6;9 years) and linguistically aged-matched (LA) to eleven TD controls (mean VIQ: 19.6). Participants were tested on verbal ability and tasks exploring the production and comprehension of root wh-questions, viz., *Who chased the elephant?*

*Results:* The results suggest an asymmetry in the performance of all participants between production and comprehension since all participants scored higher in comprehension. CA controls outperformed LA controls and SLI group both in comprehension and production. In comprehension, SLI children scored higher on *which-subject* and *wh-object* questions than on *wh-subject* and *which-object* questions. In production, SLI children scored higher on *wh-subject* than on *which-subject* questions, but lower on *wh-object* than on *which-object* questions. In production, the most frequent error and consistent to all three groups was the simplification of *which-subject* and *which-object* phrases to *wh-subject* and *wh-object* phrases.

*Discussion:* The findings of this study are not consistent with those of Stavrakaki (2001). In production, Stavrakaki's SLI group scored higher on referential subject and object questions, while the SLI group of this study scored higher on *which-subject* questions. I will discuss implications of these findings, regarding the linguistic nature of the deficit in SLI, namely, a difficulty in the acquisition of the D-link mechanism (Pesetsky 1987).

## **References**

- Pesetsky, D. (1987). Wh-in-situ: Movement and unselective binding. In E. J. Reuland & A. G. B. t. Meulen (Eds.), *The representation of (in)definiteness* (pp. 98-129). Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Stavrakaki, S. (2001). *Specific Language Impairment in Greek: Aspects of syntactic production and comprehension*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Thessaloniki: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki.
- van der Lely, H.K.J. & Battell, J. (2003). Wh-movement in children with grammatical SLI: A test of RDDR Hypothesis. *Language*, 79, 153-181.

## Deriving the ‘free’ order of enclitic clusters in (Standard) Modern Greek

A well-known peculiarity regarding clitic clusters in Standard Modern Greek (SMG) is the availability of both I(ndirect) O(bject)-D(irect) O and DO-IO orders in enclitic environments (imperatives and gerunds), while in proclisis only IO-DO is allowed. Previous analyses of the phenomenon (Terzi 1999, Boskovic 2004) failed to notice that this is actually a peculiarity of the standard variety not found in other varieties with the proclisis-enclisis alternation (*pace* Terzi 1999). It is suggested that this is due to the fact that Standard Modern Greek still has a residual DO>IO<sub>gen</sub> base-generated order, in parallel with the more productive IO<sub>gen</sub>>DO order (see Anagnostopoulou 2003 for the latter), which was apparently the prominent pattern in earlier stages of Greek and survived in SMG (but not e.g. in Cypriot Greek (CG)) due to the lasting Greek diglossia.

For a number of speakers of SMG, constructions involving underlying DO>IO<sub>gen</sub> (i.e. in A-positions) are almost equally acceptable as those with IO<sub>gen</sub>>DO (Catsimali 1990, Tsipplakou p.c.), whereas Cypriot speakers do not tolerate the former cases at all. This is reflected in the varying acceptability of direct passives without an IO-clitic (IO>DO forces cliticisation of IO as a means of cancellation of its defective intervention between T and DO), the (un)availability of quantifier binding suggesting DO>IO, the absence of WCO effects in wh-extraction of DO in the presence of a coindexed possessor inside an IO DP (even for speakers with a subject-object asymmetry regarding WCO, i.e. regardless of the dialectal split w.r.t. WCO that Horrocks (1994) observed).

The question then is why the availability of DO>IO<sub>gen</sub> is only reflected in enclitic clusters and not in proclitics. In any case, I assume cyclic clitic movement (Roberts 2010) yielding crossing dependencies and I adopt and adapt Mavrogiorgos’ (2007) proposal that ‘the absence of a realized person feature’ in imperatives and gerunds ‘makes available an additional slot within the subject agreement head’, which I construe as an optional/additional set of phi-features/EPP satisfier (with discourse-related effects, i.e. topicalisation) on T, realized by the (en)clitic when present. This additional clitic host is absent from finite (proclitic) environments. Therefore, in proclisis, only the structure underlying IO>DO can yield clitic clusters, on an analysis which involves two v-heads as possible targets of clitic-movement (1). Cl<sub>DO</sub> matches the phi-features of and cliticises to v<sub>2</sub>, and then Cl<sub>IO</sub> does the same with v\*, to which v<sub>2</sub> (with Cl<sub>IO</sub> as part of it) has already moved, yielding IO-DO clusters only. DO>IO<sub>gen</sub> (2), on the other hand, only contains v\* which can only attract and host one clitic, i.e. no proclitic DO-IO clusters are allowed. In enclitic environments, again (1) yields IO-DO clusters (the complex v\* moves to T with the same ingredients as in proclisis), but enclitic clusters are also predicted for (2): one clitic moves to T as part of v\*, but the other may match T’s optional uphi-set first, having moved to the edge of the v\*P phase. V-Cl<sub>1</sub> cliticise as a unit and Cl<sub>2</sub> takes up T’s agreement slot, thus yielding an apparent mirror effect. This does not quite explain why Cl<sub>1</sub> appears to the right of V too, but this is probably a PF requirement as enclitics are treated as phonological substitutes of agreement suffixes anyway on this analysis. An interesting prediction of this analysis is that the configuration underlying enclitic clusters can be different from IO>DO, i.e. the configuration giving rise to Person-Case effects (Bonet 1991); indeed SMG speakers, as well as L1 acquirers (see Tsakali & Wexler 2009), are often more tolerant to PCC violations in enclisis (3).

(1) [<sub>v\*P</sub> EA v\* [<sub>vAPPLP</sub> IO v<sub>APPL</sub> [<sub>v2P</sub> v<sub>2</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> V DO]]]]

(2) [<sub>v\*P</sub> EA v\* [<sub>VP</sub> DO V IO]]

(3) Dhikse (i) ??tu me / (ii) % me tu / (iii) mas tus.

Show.Imp.2S (i) Cl<sub>IO</sub>.3S.M Cl<sub>DO</sub>.1S / (ii) Cl<sub>DO</sub>.1S Cl<sub>IO</sub>.3S.M / (iii) Cl<sub>DO/IO</sub>.1S Cl<sub>IO/DO</sub>.3S.M  
‘Show (i-ii) me to him (iii) them to us / % us to them’

## The restrictive modifying nominals of Greek

by Maria Kyriakaki, University of Toronto

In this work, I discuss an interesting type of DPs known as *polydefinites* (Kolliakou, 2004). Such DPs contain multiple instances of the definite article each followed by an adjective. As argued by Kolliakou (2004) and Lekakou & Szendroi (2009), the article followed by the adjective in the polydefinite forms a restrictive DP. I examine the meaning of these constructions and show that a non-restrictive interpretation of such DPs is also possible. I determine the different environments in which the (non-/)restrictive readings arise and develop a mechanism parallel to those proposed for (non-/)restrictive relative clauses. I then extend the analysis to other modifying nominals and show how these can also be derived by the same mechanism.

I show that the restrictive and non-restrictive readings correlate with word order: (i) a postnominal Det+Adj is either restrictive or non-restrictive; (ii) a prenominal Det+Adj can only be restrictive. The mandatory restrictive interpretation is imposed by a contrastive or an informational Focus. Therefore, the restrictive Det+Adj has two syntactic positions, one postnominal where it is generated, and one prenominal where it can move to. The syntactic category of Det+Adj is a DP whose head is an empty nominal (*e*). Focusing on the restrictive DP, I argue that it adjoins to the *nP*. This assumption contrasts with analyses that take the restrictive DP to be a complement or the symmetric referential subpart of the polydefinite (Lekakou & Szendroi 2009, and references cited therein). The restrictive DP is syntactically optional – there can be more than one – and a thematic complement can also be present. Furthermore, the possibility that the restrictive DP is an adjunct is on par with analyses of restrictive relative clauses (Jackendoff 1977 and later). Returning to the structure, the restrictive DP adjoins to the *nP*, the head noun moves from *n* to Number to get inflection, and from this c-commanding position, it coindexes the null noun *e* in the restrictive DP. This gives the post-nominal position of restrictive polydefinites. In the case of prenominal restrictive DPs, a Focus Phrase dominates the main DP. The restrictive DP moves to the specifier of Focus giving the obligatory restrictive interpretation.

Other DPs that pattern similarly are proper or count DPs, and also demonstratives and pronominal possessors that are headed by their own determiner. The phrasal demonstrative pronoun in particular, is also shown to be a (non-/)restrictive modifying nominal, and the same facts hold for the pronominal possessor. I propose that these nominals can also be restrictive and can thus be derived by the mechanism developed above. Hence, the restrictive nominals of Greek are unified under the same account.

In conclusion, the proposed analysis captures not only the properties of polydefinites but also those of other types of restrictive nominals in Greek. Furthermore, it now follows that restrictive nominals are not unique to Greek. Most languages, if not all, have such modifiers. It will be interesting to examine if they pattern alike. If so, this analysis can form the basis for a unified treatment of restrictive nominals.

### *Selected Bibliography*

- JACKENDOFF, RAY. 1977. 'X-bar syntax'. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.  
KOLLIAKOU, DIMITRA. 2004. 'Monadic definites and polydefinites: their form meaning and use'. In *Journal of Linguistics*, 40: 263 – 333.  
LEKAKOU, M. & K. SZENDROI. 2009. 'The crosslinguistic distribution of polydefinites: case and expletive determiners'. *NELS* 40, MIT.