The diachronic evolution of the Greek article: parametric hypotheses

Cristina Guardiano
Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia

This paper proposes an interpretation of the diachronic evolution of the Greek article-system according to a theoretical framework essentially based on the recent parametric descriptions of the DP-structure. It particularly focuses on the relation between the rise of the so-called indefinite article and the necessity for the definite (expletive) one to occur along with proper names, in argument position. More specifically, the distribution of the definite article, the necessity of a phonetically visible expletive with proper names in Modern Greek, and its apparent optionality in Ancient Greek, are explained as the empirical consequences of the interaction among a number of parametric properties, namely the Null Article, the Strong Reference and the availability of the Noun-raising to high positions in the DP. Such an explanation also accounts for the diachronic development of the article-system throughout the history of Greek in terms of parameter resetting.

Keywords: Ancient and Modern Greek, diachronic evolution, DP-structure, parameters, expletive article, null article, reference, N-raising.

1   Theoretical background

1.1   The DP and its internal structure

The description of nominal phrases as DPs, as proposed first in Szabolcsi (1983, 1987) and Abney (1987), and more recently in Longobardi (2001) and Bernstein (2001), suggests a crosslinguistically common DP-structure that can be represented as follows (reduced version from Guardiano 2003:6):

(1) $[_{DP}$ Spec $[_{D'}$ D $[_{NumP}$ Num $[_{H1P}$ H1 $[_{AP}$ A$_{S\text{-oriented}}$ $[_{AP}$ A$_{Manner1}$ $[_{H2P}$ H2 $[_{AP}$ A$_{Manner2}$ $[_{H3P}$ H3 $[_{AP}$ A$_{Argument}$ $[_{H4P}$ H4 $[_{NP}$ Spec $[_{N'}$ N Compl $]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]$[1]

Our analysis essentially concerns a cluster of syntactic properties affecting the head of the DP (i.e. D), namely the identification[2] of the *definite* and the *count* readings of the noun, and the (overt or covert) association between D and two

other denotation properties of nominal expressions, *object-* and *kind-reference.* Such properties will be discussed along with the options of N-movement, as strictly related to a number of phenomena affecting the DP, which have been since long observed throughout the history of the Greek language. As assessed in Szabolcsi (1987) and Stowell (1989, 1991), nominal expressions in argument position are always DPs, namely they always contain a category D, and such a category may be even lexically empty (Crisma 1997; for empty categories, Rizzi 1986). Nominal expressions in non-argument positions may not contain a D head (namely, they may even be NPs): our analysis essentially concerning the realization in D of a number of properties, we focus our empirical observations only on arguments, excluding nominal expressions in predicative position, vocatives, prepositional phrases and idioms.

1.2   The head of the DP: definiteness and countability

According to Crisma (1999), if definiteness is grammaticalised in D, D must be identified with respect to such a property: if this is the case, the definite reading of nominal expressions in the DP is assigned only under specific conditions, namely if a definite determiner is visible in D, if a definiteness affix is visible on the noun, or through structural strategies, such as definiteness inheritance from a structural genitive or possessive.

(2)   a. *il* ragazzo legge *il* libro   Italian
         the boy reads the book
      b. bil-*en*   Swedish[3]
         car-*the*
      c. John's book (= the book of John; *a book of John)
      d. *ha*-isha   Hebrew[4]
         the woman

The indefinite interpretation is assigned by *default* whenever such conditions are unavailable. Given this, what is commonly described as the *indefinite* article is in fact "the morphological expression of the positive value of a feature ± *count*" (Crisma 1999: 122). The identification of such a feature is related to the satisfaction of at least one of the following conditions:

(3)   I: Strategies to assign a + value to [± count]: a. overt numeral or other designated determiner, including the so-called indefinite article. b. overt plural morphology. c. local identification by means of a genitive (inheritance of *count*)

100

II: Strategies to assign a – value to [+ count]: Default (plural or mass) (Crisma 1999:124)

(4) a. il ragazzo legge *un* libro   Italian
       the boy reads a book
   b. *il ragazzo legge libro
   c. il ragazzo legge lib*ri*
       the boy reads book*s*

(5) a. ho mangiato *un* maiale (*singular indefinite*)
       (I) eat a pig
   b. ho mangiato maiale (default mass)
       (I) eat pork

(6) isha
     Hebrew woman (indefinite count)

Such an analysis implies that, when the feature *count* is not grammaticalised, D can be left empty with all nominal expressions, namely the lexically empty D can freely select count singular nouns as arguments (6): languages which do not grammaticalise *count* in D allow the *null* determiner to encode both the marked and the unmarked values of such a feature.

(7) The *null article* is an empty D which selects the value *+count*

Four types of languages[5] can be in principle distinguished with respect to the identification of the two properties; Table 1 shows a tentative parametrization.

(8) Table 1

		(I)	(II)	(III)	(IV)[6]
1.	± gramm def in DP	+	-	+	-
2.	± gramm count (*null article*)	+	-	-	+

1.3   Structural positions in the DP: adjectives and N-movement

It has been observed since Sproat and Shih (1988, 1990), Bernstein (1993) and Crisma (1993, 1995) that adjectives are basically generated in a number of structural positions of the DP (i.e. A_{Arg}, A_{M2}, A_{M1}, A_{S-Or} in (1)); nouns are in turn generated in a lower position (N in (1)); thus, the superficial orders whit the noun preceding the adjectives are derived from the N-raising to one of the available intermediate landing sites (H4, H3, H2, H1 respectively, in (1)).

(9) a. nje **grua** tjetër e bukur (*S-or*) Albanian
     a woman other ART-nice
   b. un altro bel vestito blu tedesco Italian
     one other nice dress blue German
(10) another nice blue German **dress** English

The availability - in each single language - of a specific landing site for the N-movement has been parametrically described[7]; for the purposes of our investigation, the cluster of parametric choices can be reduced as follows:

(11) Table 3

		Albanian, Italian, Walloon…	English, German …
4.	± N over As	+	-

1.4   Denotation properties of nouns associated to D: reference

Longobardi (2004) defines the reference as a "denotation[8] relation" only based on the lexical content of the noun; in his framework *kind-referential*[9] expressions are defined as "proper names for species", while *object-referential* expressions are intended as "proper names for objects"[10]. Languages differ in associating *object-* and *kind-referential* nouns to D, and such a distinction happens to be parametric; namely, certain languages overtly associate both *proper* and *kind* names to D, either by visible N movement to D (N-to-D chain, available only for proper names), or by an expletive article[11] (N-to-D CHAIN, in Chomsky's 1986 sense), while others associate neither. In Guardiano and Longobardi (2005) such groups are defined *Strong D* and *Weak D* languages, respectively.

(12) a.   gli elefanti bianchi sono estinti
     b.   *the white coloured elephants are extinct
     c.   *elefanti bianchi sono estinti[12]
     d.   white coloured elephants are extinct

In English, *bare nouns* (nominal expressions without any visible D) are interpretable as *kind-referential*, while in Italian such an interpretation is never available ((12)d vs. (12)c) if the nominal expression is not introduced by a lexically visible D ((12)a); thus, in Italian *kind names* need overt association to D, while in English they do not.

102

(13) a. Lunedì scorso è stato un giorno difficile
     b. *Monday last was a hard day
     c. *scorso lunedì è stato un giorno difficile
     d. last Monday was a hard day
     e. lo scorso lunedì è stato un giorno difficile

Italian drops the (expletive) article with proper names only when the noun raises over the adjective (13)a vs. (13)e; the ungrammaticality of (13)c shows that the raising of the noun over the adjective is needed in order to fill D in the absence of the article; (13)d, and the ungrammaticality of (13)b, show that such a movement is not needed in English. Again, an overt association between the nominal expression and D is needed in Italian, but not in English. Such examples suggest that if a language does not need any chain/CHAIN between D and *kind names*, it never needs any chain/CHAIN between D and any *object-referential* noun, and vice versa.

(14) In order for a nominal expression to have a referential reading in the DP, a visible relation between N and D (N-to-D chain/CHAIN) is needed in Italian (*Strong D*), but not in English (*Weak D*)[13].

Empirical observations on a number of languages (Guardiano and Longobardi 2005) have shown that, in spite of idiolinguistic and lexical peculiarities, such languages behave either like Italian (Romance varieties, Bulgarian, Arabic...) or English (Germanic varieties, Welsh...); therefore, the distinction in (14) can be represented as a binary, parametric, choice between the ($\pm$) values of *Strong D*.

(15) Table 2

		Italian	English
3.	$\pm$ Strong D	+	-

2   The Greek DP

As far as the lexical realization of D through visible articles is concerned, three main phases are distinguished in the history of the Greek language: the Archaic period (essentially represented by Homeric poems), the Classical and Hellenistic (and perhaps Medieval) eras, and the Modern phase. The documents belonging to the Archaic period show a system without articles, where the values of both $\pm$ *def* and $\pm$ *count* are assigned without phonetically visible material in D (type II in table 1). In this phase an element ὁ, ἡ, τό[14] is already visible, and it always acts as a demonstrative without any deictic marking (17).

103

(16)H, 11-12

Ἕκτωρ δὲ Ἠιονῆα βαλε ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι
αὐχένα ὑπὸ τεφάνη εὐχάλκου, λύντο δὲ γυῖα

Hector threw struck Ioneus with *(the) pointed spear*
(wounded) *(the) neck* under the bronze rim of his helmet, lost *(the) strength*

(17) τ, 382

τὴν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς
and answering, Odysseus of many counsels spoke to her

In the so-called Classical and Hellenistic periods (Ancient Greek, AG) ὁ, ἡ, τό acts as a definiteness marker: nominal expressions, both singular and plural, introduced by such an article (or by some other definite determiner) have definite reading, while nominal expressions without any visible determiner in D are never interpreted as definite (+ *gramm def in DP*).

(18)a. Aristotle, Poetics 49 a 38 - b 1

ἡ δὲ κωμῳδία διὰ τὸ μὴ σπουδάζεθαι ἐξ ἀρχης ἔλαθεν
the comedy, as it was not regarded as important,
in its early stages has been beyond our control

b. Aristophanes, Clouds, 5

οἱ δὲ οἰκέται ῥέγκουσιν
while *the* slaves are snoring

(19)a. Xenophon, Anabasis I, 7

καὶ αὕτη αὖ ἄλλη πρόφασις ἦν αὐτω του ἀθροῖζειν στράτευμα
and this was another reason for him to collect (an) *army (indef)*

b. Apology of Socrates 20 a 4

ἔτυχον γὰρ προσελθὼν ἀνδρὶ
I happened in fact to run into (a) *man (indefinite)*

c. Symposium 215 b 3

ἔνδοθεν ἀγάλματα ἔχοντες θεῶν
and that have *images* of gods inside of them *(indefinite)*

In this stage *null* Ds license bare singulars, without producing the *default* (mass) reading of the noun ((19)a and b): thus, AG has *null article*. As far as the referential interpretation of nominal expressions is concerned, the behaviour of *kind names* appears crucial in order to define AG as *+Strong D*, as it behaves exactly like Italian: nominal expressions without any visible determiner in D are never interpreted as *kind-referential*[15].

(20)a. Cratylus 389 a 5-6

ἐπίϲκεψαι ποῖ βλέπων ὁ νομοθέτηϲ τὰ ὀνόματα τίθεται
see now what the lawgiver views in giving *the* names (*kind*)

b. Cratylus 393 e 2
ὀνόματα ποιοῦντεϲ
making (some) names (*indefinite*)

As it is well-known, the Modern Greek (MG) article-system is bipartite ̇ ο, η, το
(pl. οι, οι, τα) acts as a definiteness marker, and the so-called indefinite article
(ἕνα, μία, ἕνα) occurs with all singular common nouns having a count reading;
bare singulars are interpreted only as mass nouns. Therefore, MG belongs to
type (I) in table I (i.e. both *def* and *count* are grammaticalised in D).

(21)a. τό αγόρι ἔπαιζε με το μπαλόνι του
      the boy played with his ball
   b. *αγόρι ἔπαιζε με το μπαλόνι του
      boy played with his ball
   c. ἕνα αγόρι ἔπαιζε με το μπαλόνι του
      a boy played with his ball

(22)   πίνω νεϱό
      (I) drink water (*default mass*)

As far as reference is concerned, the following examples show that the drop of
the expletive is ungrammatical in MG both with *kind-* and *object-referential*
nominal expressions. With respect to the *kind-referential* interpretation, MG
behaves exactly like Italian: only nominal expressions with a visible determiner
can be interpreted, in the appropriate contexts, as *kind-referential*[16].

(23)a.   οι άϲπϱοι ελέφαντεϲ έχουν εξαφανιϲτεί
        the white elephants have become extinct   (*kind*)
    b.   *άϲπϱοι ελέφαντεϲ έχουν εξαφανιϲτεί
         white elephants have become extinct

Given the ungrammaticality of the referential reading of (23)b, we conclude that
even MG is *Strong D*, like Italian and AG. Yet, the behaviour of *object-referential*
expressions show a number of significant differences. In MG proper names in
argument position never occur without visible expletives and never precede any
adjective (Holton, Mackridge & Philippaki-Warburton 1997).

(24)a.   ἔϱχεται   ο   Δημήτϱηϲ
         is coming *the* Dimitris
    b.   *ἔϱχεται Δημήτϱηϲ

c. ἔρχεται ο καλὸc Δημήτρηc
   is coming *the* good Dimitris
d. *ἔρχεται καλὸc Δημήτρηc
e. *ἔρχεται Δημήτρηc καλόc

Given the Italian data in (13), our hypothesis is that the ungrammaticality of (24) b and e is due to the unavailability in MG of N-to-D raising. The basic order of constituents in DPs containing at least one adjective suggests that the noun in MG never precedes any adjective: the ungrammaticality of (25)b and (26)b, c and d suggest that the noun do not raise overtly over As.

(25)a. το *(ένα)* καλό βιβλίο
        the (a) good book
    b. * το (ένα) βιβλίο καλό   ((Ανδρουτσοπούλου (1994:1))
(26)a. το μεγάλο γερμανικό πιάνο
        the big German piano
    b. *το μεγάλο πιάνο γερμανικό
    c. *το πιάνο μεγάλο γερμανικό
    d. *το πιάνο γερμανικό μεγάλο

(27) το πανέμορφο μικρό, σκαλιστό, δρινό, μαύρο, ιαπωνεζικό τραπέζι
     the very-nice small curved oak black Japanese table[17]

Assuming such considerations to hold generally, i.e. even when no adjectives occur, we conclude that in MG the noun never raises to structural positions higher than As. Thus, the noun being constrained into a low position, even the overt movement of proper names to D happens to be unavailable (i.e. no chain), as the ungrammaticality of (24)e shows; then, the overt association of an *object-referential* expression to D can be obtained only through a CHAIN, namely the insertion in D of a phonetically visible expletive.

(28) Table 5

		Italian	Modern Greek
1.	± gramm def in DP	+	+
2.	± gramm count (*null article*)	+	+
3.	± Strong D	+	+
4.	+ N over As	+	-

As far as AG is concerned, the behaviour of proper names is ambiguous, in that they occur both with and without the visible expletive:

(29)a. Symposium 174 d 7 - e 1

106

ἐπὶ τῇ οἰκίᾳ τῇ ᾿Αγάθωνος
at the house of Agathon
b. Symposium 175 a 3
φάναι τὸν ᾿Αγάθωνα
(that) *the* Agathon said[18]

Given such data, the first hypothesis is that AG is like Italian: D is filled either by the proper name or by the expletive. Given this, we expect structures like (13)a. to be grammatical in AG, but in our data they are never attested: overt N-to D movement happens to be unavailable.

(30)a. Symposium 186 b 4
     τὸν διπλοῦν Ἔρωτα   Art A N
     the double-faced Eros
b. *Ἔρωτα διπλοῦν   *ø N A
c. * διπλοῦν Ἔρωτα   *ø A N

If the conclusions reached for MG are tenable, then we expect the unavailability of N-to-D overt movement in AG being due to the unavailability of the movement of any noun to high positions in the DP: the following data show that even in AG the noun never raises over any adjective:

(31)a. Apology of Socrates 31 d 7-8
     εἰ ἐγὼ πάλαι ἐπεχείρησα πράττειν τὰ πολιτικὰ πράγματα
     if I had long since begun to be involved in *the* political affairs
                                Art A N
b. *πράττειν τὰ πράγματα πολιτικά   *Art N A

(32) Table 4[19]:

	Art A N	Art N A	A Art N	N Art A	Art N Art A	Art A Art N	TOT
Plato	88%	0%	0%	0%	11,5%	0,5%	100%
The Gospels	21,5%	0%	0%	0%	78,5%	0%	100%

Thus, when a proper name occurs without any visible expletive in argument position, D is assumed to be empty: as such, in spite of AG being *Strong D,* the association of *object-referential* expressions with D appears to be possible either overtly (by means of the expletive) or covertly (leaving D empty).

107

2.1 Ancient Greek and the *null expletive*

The syntax of MG DPs empirically differs from AG in essentially two respects:

(33) MG needs to fill D through a visible article when a count singular nominal expression occurs in the DP, while AG allows empty determiners even with count singular nouns.

(34) MG needs to fill D through a visible expletive when an *object-referential* nominal expression occurs in the DP, while AG allows empty determiners even with *object-referential* expressions.

If our hypotheses are correct, the two languages parametrically differ in the setting of a single value, as Table 6 shows:

(35) Table 6

		Modern Greek	Ancient Greek
1.	± gramm def in DP	+	+
2.	**± gramm count (*null article*)**	+	-
3.	± Strong D	+	+
4.	± N over As	-	-

Our proposal is that such a parametric distinction is responsible for both (33) and (33), and, more precisely, that the licensing of *null* (i.e. phonetically empty) determiners with proper names (i.e. the association of *object-referential* expressions with D even in the absence of a phonetic content of D), depends on the licensing of the *null* determiner with (indefinite) singular common nouns with count reading (*null article*). In fact, if a *null* determiner is able to select a singular count reading, we expect it to do so not only when it is assigned an operator reading, i.e. the default indefinite interpretation, but even when it does not receive any such interpretation, namely when it functions as an expletive. On such grounds, we propose that, in AG, DPs containing a proper name and no visible determiner - in argument position -, such as Ἀγάθωνος in (29)a, exactly parallel MG DPs with lexical expletives and proper names such as (24)a, the only difference being that in the first case the expletive is *null*[20].

(36) If in a language the *null* determiner licenses indefinite singular common nouns without them taking the *default* mass reading (*null article*), and the language is *Strong D*, such a *null* determiner also licenses *object-referential* nominal expressions without them taking the quantificational *default* interpretation (*null expletive*).

Given the definition of the *null expletive* in (36), two empirical considerations arise from the analysis of the AG data. The examples under (30) show that *null*

expletives are not licensed when an adjective occurs along with the proper name: the identification of the *null expletive* seems to be prevented by the presence of an adjective between D and N, namely the licensing of *null expletives* happens to be possible only under adjacency conditions; such a restriction is presumably due to minimality requirements on local identification[21]. Besides, a significant asymmetry emerges between proper names and common nouns acting as *kind* names, i.e. the expletive is never *null* with *kind-referential* common nouns (20). Longobardi (2003) explains the parallel asymmetry concerning overt raising of N to D in languages like Italian, suggesting that a movement chain is functionally less economical than a derivation with a *default* (i.e. *–def*) interpreted empty D, and therefore the movement happens to be a *last resort*: as proper names are lexically unable to tolerate the quantificational interpretation imposed by *default* in the absence of a filled D^{22}, only the movement is available for the derivation to converge. Analogously, we suggest that an expletive-noun CHAIN is more costly than a *default* quantificational interpretation of an empty D: therefore, the *null article* with common nouns cannot escape the *default* indefinite (quantificational) reading, and only with proper names (which do not tolerate such a quantificational interpretation) it is interpretable as an expletive. Thus, common nouns must resort to an overt article in order to be interpreted as *kind* names even in languages which allow *null* ones.

2.2. Conclusion
Given the unavailability of the overt N-movement over APs in all the diachronic stages under examination, we assume that the value of the related parameter has not been reset throughout the history of the Greek language, the only parametric variation in this domain being the grammaticalization of the feature *count* in D. Then, if (36) is tenable, we expect the availability of the *null expletive* to be strictly related to that of the *null article*: when a visibly filled D becomes obligatory for the *+count* reading of the nominal expression, then a visibly filled D becomes obligatory for the *object-referential* interpretation of nominal arguments, that is, the two phenomena being structurally related, we predict them to be even chronologically related; in order to verify such a prediction, a systematic analysis of some Hellenistic and Medieval texts is up to now in progress (Guardiano, *in prep*) the first results apparently confirming such hypotheses.

3. Notes

[1] Legenda. **D**: head of the DP, position of the determiner; **Num**: base position for numerals and, in many languages, for other determiners different from the definite article (Longobardi 2001); **H1,2,3,4**: functional heads, landing sites for the noun when it moves out of NP (Longobardi 2001); A$_{S-Oriented}$: structural position for subject- or speaker-

oriented adjectives (Crisma 1993, 1995); $A_{Manner1}$, $A_{Manner2}$: structural positions for manner 1 and manner 2 adjectives, respectively (Crisma 1993, 1995); $A_{Argument}$: structural position for argument adjectives (Crisma 1993, 1995).

[2] More precisely, D *assigns* the definite/indefinite reading, and *selects* the count/mass reading (Longobardi 2001).

[3] For the description of Scandinavian nominal phrases see Delsing (1993).

[4] Longobardi (1995) has shown that in Semitic languages genitive modifiers can be realised by means of a prepositional phrase that follows the head noun (the so-called absolute state) or in the form of a structural case, which is "identified by the co-occurrence of a cluster of properties" (Longobardi 1995: 300); as far as our discussion is concerned, the most relevant are that the head noun occurs without any visible determiner and that the definiteness of the head noun depends on that of the following (genitive) complement: the construct state appears therefore to be a typical case of assignation of definite reading to a noun by means of structural strategies of definiteness inheritance.

a. beyt *ha*-iʃ
   house *the* man
   (the house of the man)

b. beyt iʃ
   house man
   (a house of a man)

[5] In the first type both features are grammaticalised: the marked values (*+def*, *+count*) are identified through a lexical D, and empty determiners have only the *default* values, unless structural strategies occur; Italian (and other Romance varieties) and English (and other Germanic varieties) among the others behave as such. In the second type (Latin, Russian and other Slavic varieties, ...) neither *def* nor *count* are grammaticalised. In the third type (Old English, Bulgarian, Irish, Hebrew, Arabic, ...) only *def* is grammaticalised: the null determiner licenses bare singulars as indefinites. In the fourth type only *count* is grammaticalised: *+count* needs an overt identification, while *+def* does not.

6 For a discussion on this type see Crisma (1997) and Guardiano (2003).

[7] In Albanian the noun raises over $A_{S\text{-}Or}$, in Italian it presumably raises over A_{M2} but not over A_{M1}, Bernstein (1993) has shown that in Walloon it raises over A_{Arg} but not over A_{M2}. The Albanian example is taken from Dimitrova-Vulchanova and Giusti (1998: 336).

[8] "Denotation is the relation between an argument phrase and an individual entity" (Longobardi 2004: 1).

[9] Referential expressions are constants, namely they denote one and only one fixed entity (*kind* or *object*), while quantificational expressions involve semantic variables (Longobardi 2003).

[10] i.e. they intrinsecally have singular count reading, definite specific interpretation, rigid designation (Longobardi 1994, 2003).

[11] The expletive is often lexically identical to the definite proper, the two differing in their semantic and syntactic functions: the latter is a quantificational operator, it assigns the noun a definite count interpretation; the expletive does not play any semantic function, acting as a "placeholder for the proper name in D in the absence of N-to-D raising" (Longobardi 2003: 20) and as an output of D with *kind-referential* nouns (Guardiano 2004).

[12] *Bare nouns* in Italian never refer to the kind named by the head noun; in all relevant semantic environments they behave as overt indefinites (Longobardi 2002).

[13] Adapted from Longobardi 2003.

[14] Its origins are Indo-European (*so, *sā, *tod); for its use in Homeric poems, Jannaris (1897: 317), Smyth (1920: 284-285), among the others.

[15] The data come from a systematic analysis on a corpus to the ancient (essentially Classic and Hellenistic) period, discussed in Guardiano (2003).

[16] For the interpretation of *bare nouns* crosslinguistically, Longobardi (2002), Schmitt & Munn (2002).

[17] Examples (26) from Androutsopoulou (1995: 4); from Stavrou (1999: 209). The other available strategy for adjectival modification is the so called "determiner spreading" construction (or "double definiteness", *Art N Art Adj*; *Art Adj Art N*); it is visible in both MG and AG (its properties being in some respect different), it seems unrelated to N-movement, and it won't be discussed here; for further references see Androutsopoulou (1994, 1995), Manolessou (2000), Campos & Stavrou (2001).

[18] Classical texts: 55% proper names without a visible expletive and 45% with a visible expletive; Hellenistic texts: 39% without the expletive and 61% with the expletive (data from Guardiano 2003).

[19] The noun precedes the adjective only when both occur in the "determiner spreading" construction. For a detailed description, Guardiano (2003, chapter 3).

[20] Given this, the alternation between *Null* and visible expletive with proper names in AG can be interpreted as related to syntax-independent (namely stylistic, contextual or pragmatic) strategies (see for example Jannaris 1897: 319, Eakin 1916, Smyth 1920: 289-291, Biraud 1992, Heimerdinger & Levinson 1992), like the Italian one between the proper name raised and the overt expletive (*Verdi // Il Verdi*).

[21] Bulgarian behaves like AG with this respect (Guardiano and Longobardi 2005).

[22] Proper names may lose their intrinsic *object* referentiality only in certain special and overtly marked environments, i.e. when they occur as plurals or when they are followed by a restrictive relative modification: in such cases they behave exactly as common nouns (Longobardi 1994, 2003).

4. References

Abney, Steven. 1987. The English noun phrase in its sentential aspect, Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.

Alexiadou, Artemis and Christopher Wilder (eds). 1998. *Possessors, predicates and movement in the determiner phrase*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins.

Alexiadou, Artemis, Geoffrey Horrocks and Melita Stavrou (eds). 1999. *Studies in Greek syntax*. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Androutsopoulou, Antonia. 1994. "The distribution of definite determiner and the syntax of Greek DPs", Proceedings of CLS 30.

Androutsopoulou, Antonia. 1995. "The licensing of adjectival modification", Proceedings of WCCFL 14.

Baltin, Mark and Chris Collins (eds). 2001. *The handbook of contemporary syntactic theory*, Oxford, Blackwell.

Bernstein, Judy. 1993. Topics in the syntax of nominal structure across Romance, Doctoral Dissertation, CUNY.

Bernstein, Judy. 2001. "The DP hypothesis: identifying clausal properties in the nominal domain", in Baltin & Collins (eds), 536-561.

Biraud, Michele. 1992. *La determination du nom en grec classique*, Nice, Faculté des Lettres.

Campos, Hector, & Melita Stavrou. 2001. "Polydefinite constructions in Modern Greek and Aromanian", paper presented at the XXVII Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, Trieste, March 2001.

Chomsky, Noam. 1986. *Knowledge of Language*, Praeger, New York.

Crisma, Paola. 1993. "On adjective placement in Romance and Germanic event nominals", *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 18, 61-100.

Crisma, Paola. 1995. "On the configurational nature of adjectival modification", Grammatical Theory and Romance Languages, ed. by K. Zagona, Amsterdam/ Philadelphia, John Benjamins, 58-72.

Crisma, Paola. 1997. L'articolo nella prosa inglese antica e la teoria degli articoli nulli, Doctoral Dissertation, Università di Padova.

Crisma, Paola. 1999. "Nominals without the article in the Germanic languages", *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa* 24 (Proceedings of the XXIV Incontro di Grammatica Generativa, edited by Alessandra Tomaselli, Padova, Unipress), 105-125.

Delsing, Lars-Olof. 1993. The internal structure of noun phrase in the Scandinavian languages. A comparative study, Doctoral dissertation, Lund University.

Dimitrova- Vulchanova, and Giuliana Giusti. 1998. "Fragments of Balkan nominal structure", in Alexiadiou & Wilder (eds.) 1998, 333-360.

Eakin, F. 1916. "The Greek article in the first century papyri", *American Journal of Philology* 37, 333-340.

Guardiano, Cristina. 2003. Struttura e storia del sintagma nominale nel greco antico: ipotesi parametriche, Doctoral Dissertation, Università di Pisa.

Guardiano, Cristina. 2004. "Parametric changes in the history of the Greek article", paper presented at DIGS VIII, Yale, June 2004.

Guardiano, Cristina. *In prep.* Indefinite and expletive articles in Greek: structural and historical remarks, ms. Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia.

Guardiano, Cristina and Giuseppe Longobardi 2005. "Reference and definiteness", paper presented at the 15° Coloquio de Gramàtica Generativa, Barcelona, 3-6 April, 2005.

Heimerdinger, J., S. Levinsohn. 1992. "The use of the definite article before names of people in the Greek texts of act with particular reference to Codex Bezae", *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 5, 15-44.

Holton, David, Peter Mackridge, and Irene Philippaki-Warburton. 1997. *Greek: a comprehensive grammar of the modern language*, London, Routledge.

Jannaris, A.N. 1897. *An historical Greek grammar, chiefly of the Attic dialect*, London, MacMillan & co.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1994. "Reference and proper names", *Linguistic Inquiry* 25/4, 609-665.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 1995. "A case of construct state in Romance", Scritti linguistici e filologici in onore di Tristano Bolelli, ed. by Roberto Ajello and Saverio Sani, Pisa, Pacini Editore, 293-329.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2001. "The Structure of DPs: principles, parameters and problems", in Baltin & Collins (eds), 562-603.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2002. "How comparative is semantics? A Unified Parametric Theory of Bare Nouns and Proper Names", *Natural Language Semantics*, 1-35.

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2003. "Toward a unified grammar of reference", ms. Università di Trieste [to appear in: Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft].

Longobardi, Giuseppe. 2004. "On the syntax of denoting". Paper presented at the Copenhagen Determination Symposium, August 2004.

Manolessou, Johanna. 2000. Greek noun phrase structure: a study in syntactic evolution, PhD dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1986. "Null objects in Italian and the theory of *pro*", *Linguistic Inquiry* 17.3, 501-557.

Schmitt, Cristina, and Alan Munn. 2002. "The syntax and semantics of bare arguments in Brazilian Portuguese", *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2, 185-216.

Smyth, Herbert Weir. 1920. *Greek grammar*, Cambridge Mass., Harvard University Press.

Sproat, Richard, and Chilin Shih. 1988. "Prenominal adjective ordering in English and Mandarin", *NELS 18*: 465-489.

Sproat, Richad, and Chilin Shih. 1990. "The cross-linguistic distribution of adjective ordering restrictions", Interdisciplinary approaches to language.

Essays in honor of S.Y.Kuroda, Kluwer, Dordrecht, ed. By C. Georgopoulos and R. Ishihara: 565-593.

Stavrou, Melita. 1999. "The position and serialization of APs in the DP: evidence from Greek", in Alexiadou, Horrocks & Stavrou (eds) 1999, 201-225.

Stowell, Timothy. 1989. "Subjects, specifiers and x-bar theory", Alternative conceptions of phrase structure, ed. by Baltin, Mark and Anthony Kroch, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 232-262.

Stowell, Timothy. 1991. "Determiners in NP and DP", Views on phrase structure, Kluver, ed. by K. Leffel and D. Bouchard, Dordrecht, 37-56.

Szabolcsi, Anna 1983. "The possessor that ran away from home", *The Linguistic Review* 3, 89-102.

Szabolcsi, Anna. 1987. "Functional categories in the noun phrase", Approaches to Hungarian, vol. 2, ed. by Istvàn Kenesei, Jate Szeged, 167-189.

5. Περίληψη

Η παρούσα ανακοίνωση προτείνει μια ερμηνεία της διαχρονικής εξέλιξης του ελληνικού συστήματος του άρθρου με βάση τις πρόσφατες παραμετρικές περιγραφές της δομής της φράσης άρθρου. Ειδικότερα, εστιάζει στη σχέση ανάμεσα στην ανύψωση του επονομαζόμενου αόριστου άρθρου και την ανάγκη για εμφάνιση ενός οριστικού (πλεοναστικού) άρθρου στα κύρια ονόματα, σε θέση ορίσματος. Πιο συγκεκριμένα, η κατανομή του οριστικού άρθρου, η ανάγκη ύπαρξης ενός φωνητικά ορατού πλεοναστικού στοιχείου με τα κύρια ονόματα στα Νέα Ελληνικά, και η προαιρετική εμφάνισή του στα Αρχαία Ελληνικά, θεωρούνται εμπειρικές συνέπειες της αλληλεπίδρασης ενός αριθμού παραμετρικών ιδιοτήτων, του κενού άρθρου, της ισχυρής αναφοράς και της δυνατότητας ανύψωσης του Ονόματος στη Φράση Άρθρου. Μια τέτοια ερμηνεία λαμβάνει υπόψη της τη διαχρονική εξέλιξη του συστήματος του άρθρου στα Ελληνικά ως διαδικασία επαναπροσδιορισμού των σχετικών παραμέτρων.

114