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The puzzle: In Greek, non-generic implicit agents of episodic passives cannot control the understood subject of temporal gerunds, the only non-finite context in Greek that can be shown to exhibit obligatory control in Greek (cf. Kotzoglou 2015 a.o.).

(1) *Opos dhiapistos, i porta tus dhen kliedhothike engatalipondas to ktirio
   As I-found-out the door their not was-locked leaving the building
   ‘As I found out, their door was not locked when leaving the building.’
By contrast, generic implicit agents (corresponding to Cinque’s 1988 quasi-universal ARB) controlling understood subjects of temporal gerunds are appreciably better.

(2) I porta prepi na kliedhothete IMP, PRO vjenondas apo to ktirio
   The door must SUBJ. lock.3SG.IMPERF getting-out from the building
   ‘The door must be locked when leaving the building.’

Exceptionally, episodic passives in Greek marginally allow a special type of implicit control whereby the implicit agent and the understood subject of the gerund both refer to an unspecified set of people that includes the speaker. In (1) the context disallows such an interpretation, but in (3) it is possible:

(3) Na, aphi i fotografia travixtiike IMP, PRO vjenondas apo tin poli
   Here, this the picture was-shot leaving from the town
   ‘Look/here, this picture was taken when leaving (=as we were leaving) the town.’

Non-generic implicit agents have the interpretive properties of what Cinque (1988) calls ‘quasi-existing point’ (potentially referring to a single individual, necessarily [+human], necessarily external argument etc.). On the other hand, generic implicit agents correspond to Cinque’s (ibid.) ‘quasi-universal ARB’ (4a). Cinque observes that elements with a necessarily quasi-universal ARB reading (e.g. σi with a non-external theta-role) may also appear in non-generic/episodic contexts (4b). Nevertheless, in such cases a paradoxical 1st plural interpretation arises, which parallels exactly the interpretation of (3).

(4) a. Oggi, a Beirut, si nasce senza assistenza medica.
   ‘Today, in Beirut, one/babies can be born with no medical assistance.

   b. #Oggi, a Beirut, si è nati senza assistenza medica.
   ‘Today, in Beirut, we were born with no medical assistance.’

Implications for the syntax of (short) passives: Passives are, among other things, A-dependencies between T and an internal argument. The precise mechanics of this dependency depends on the syntactic representation, if any, of the understood external argument. If we take implicit control to be a reliable diagnostic of when the external argument is really projected in syntax, then it is indeed present in (2) and (3). Consequently, quasi-universal ARB elements intervene structurally but do not prevent T and the internal argument from Agreeing/establishing an A-dependency (as in (2) and (3)). On the contrary, in (1) the non-generic/existentially-bound external argument cannot be projected, presumably because its intervention would block Agree between T and the internal argument.

We assume that the position of the understood external argument in passives, when projected, is invariably a position c-commanded by T and c-commanding the internal argument, just like in actives. Since it intervenes structurally, then the absence of a blocking effect in (2) and (3) (and the existence of such effects with existentially bound agents, presumably) must be due to some version of relativized minimalism, specifically relativized to features rather than positions:

(5) Featural Relativized Minimality (Starke 2001; Rizzi 2001, 2013): A local relation cannot hold between X and Y when Z intervenes, and Z is somehow a potential candidate for the local relation.

   The features of X should not be a subset of the features of Z.

Therefore, the features of the subject/whatever T Agrees with (i) are not a subset of a quasi-universal arbitrary covert pronoun, but presumably (ii) are a subset/not a superset of the features of a quasi-existent covert pronoun.

This hypothesis relies on the assumption that implicit control is indeed syntactic. Supporting evidence must be sought in constructions in which we keep the type of implicit argument constant and vary the features of the promoted argument. The purpose is to diagnose purely syntactic effects such as relativized minimalism effects in Agree/Move dependencies. In nominals with understood agents in Greek, the internal argument is realized either as a genitive DP or as a genitive clitic potentially appearing pre-nominally, attached to a (high) adjective. Implicit control by the understood external argument is possible in the presence of DP genitives (6a) but not with genitive clitics (6c).

(6) Speaking of the crusaders and the places they went through...
   a. I olokirotiki katastrofi ton poleon PRO vjenondas pros Ierusalim...
the total destruction the.GEN cities.GEN going to Jerusalem
‘The cities’ total destruction (by the crusaders), while heading to Jerusalem…’
…itan to meghaliroteu tus eglima
was the greatest their.CLITIC crime ‘…was their greatest crime’
b. I oloklirotiki tus katastrofi...
the total their.CLITIC destruction
‘Their total destruction’ [Their=the cities / the crusaders as patients/*agents]
c. I oloklirotiki tus katastrofi pijenondas pros Ierusalim...
the total their.CLITIC destruction going to Jerusalem
‘Their total destruction while heading to Jerusalem’ [Their=*the cities / OK=the crusaders only
as patients]

It must be noted that the agent interpretation of clitics is independently ruled out, as agents can be
realized as overt XPs in nominals with transitive predicates only if internal arguments are overt (see Alexiadou 2001, 2009). It must also be noted that non-generic covert pronouns in nominals are not
existentially bound but more like Principle B pronouns (see Alexiadou et al. 2015).

We assume that the internal argument must be licensed/probed by heads in the functional layer of the
dp across the understood external argument, if present. A syntactically represented agent may
occupy an intervening position when the internal argument is a DP but not when it is a clitic. In terms of
featural relativized minimality, then, the features of the non-generic covert pronoun must be a subset of
those of a DP but not of a clitic pronoun. Generic/quasi-universal covert pronouns can be shown to be
possible in nominals too, i.e., there are implicit arguments compatible with all sorts of theta-role (7)
but incompatible with specific time reference (8). In generic nominals, implicit control by the agent is
possible even in the presence of an internal argument realized as a clitic (9).

(7) O thanatos PRO dhiefinhondas tin orchestra me to kalitero telos ja ena maestro
The death conducting the orchestra is the best end for a conductor
(8) Pliroforithika ena thanato PRO diefthinondas orchestra
I-Heard-of a death conducting orchestra (PRO=I/*the deceased)
(9) To prosektiko tis klidhoma PRO vjenondas apo to ktiro ine aparetito
The careful its.CLITIC locking getting-out from the building is necessary
‘Its careful locking (i.e. of the door) when getting out of the building is necessary.’

Postulating a distinct probe for genitive DPs and a higher one for clitics, we get the following picture:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probe for clitics</th>
<th>Probe for gen DPs</th>
<th>External argument</th>
<th>Internal argument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+φ</td>
<td>non-generic</td>
<td>clitic_{cl}</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+φ</td>
<td>generic/qu-universal</td>
<td>clitic_{cl}</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+φ</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>clitic_{cl}</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+φ, +NP</td>
<td>non-generic</td>
<td>DP_{φ, +NP}</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+φ, +NP</td>
<td>generic/qu-universal</td>
<td>DP_{φ, +NP}</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+φ, +NP</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>DP_{φ, +NP}</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, non-generic covert pronouns comprise at least as many features as pronominal clitics, while
quasi-universal arbitrary covert pronouns comprise a subset of those features. The incompatibility of
non-generic covert pronouns with promoted subjects of clausal passives, at least preverbal ones, arguably suggests that the probe of T too does not comprise more features than those of a clitic. This
supports Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulo’s (1998) suggestion that preverbal subjects are base-generated
CLLDeD topics, while the actual thematic subject cannot be anything ‘heavier’ than pro.

Conclusions and wider implications: Episodic passives in Greek with existentially bound agents do
not have a syntactically active external argument and must therefore employ a Spec-less (Middle) Voice
head of the sort described in Spathas, Alexiadou & Schaefer (2013), Alexiadou & Doron (2012) and
Alexiadou et al. (2015), whose denotation predicts a not necessarily disjoint agent, thus being
compatible with both disjoint and reflexive interpretations. The unavailability of an English-like syntax
for existentially-bound agents is due to the feature specification of null subjects and of intervening
implicit arguments, as well as the absence of other mechanisms that can circumvent the intervention of
the external argument (e.g. participial passives may allow Collins’ (2005) smuggling). As opposed to
quasi-existential covert pronouns, quasi-universal ones can be projected causing no minimality effects,
therefore Greek also has an agentive passive Voice which may only host a (reduced) φ-bundle in its
Spec (Legate 2014). More importantly, it turns out that, manipulating the features of probes and implicit
arguments, a new argument arises in favor of the syntactic representation of the latter, namely the
existence of relativized minimality effects, which is purely syntactic, as opposed to many other
arguments that have often been recast as mainly semantic effects (cf. Bhatt & Pancheva 2006).