Wh-movement in Kashmiri has a rich and complicated paradigm and I shall not delve into it further here.
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**Clitics and Island Effects**

Sabine Iatridou

0 The problem

In this paper I will discuss the construction called Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD). Roughly put, CLLD contains a left dislocated element as well as a coindexed clitic on the verb, as in the Modern Greek (MG) (1):

(1) ton Kosta, i Maria ton idhe
    DET Kosta/ACC DET Mary/NOM him saw

CLLD, as instantiated in Romance languages, has been discussed by van Haften, Smits and Vat (1983) and Cinque (1977, 1983, 1990) among others. The debate about CLLD has mostly centered on whether the left dislocated element appears in its surface position by moving out of the postverbal position or whether it is base-generated sentence-initially. Cinque (1990), unlike the other cited references, argues in favor of base-generation. I will follow him on this, and in section 1 I will give an overview of some arguments for this position, with particular reference to MG.

Section 2, the main part of the paper, introduces and attempts to solve what I would like to call "Cinque's Paradox". This refers to the fact that although the relationship between the left-dislocated element and the clitic is not one of movement, it is constrained by islands:

(2) *ton Kosta, sinandisa tin kopela pu ton idhe
    DET Kosta, (I) met DET girl who him saw

This is paradoxical in current GB theory: if islands constrain movement and not base-generated relationships, why is the relationship between the clitic and the CLLDed constituent (which as argued by Cinque is not one of movement) constrained by islands? Cinque (1990) answers this by rejecting the widely held assumption that islands distinguish movement from base-generated representations, and making concomitant revisions in the theory. I will argue that the island effects exhibited in CLLD are, in fact, due to movement, and that therefore CLLD does not provide any evidence to abandon the basic assumption about the theoretical significance of island effects.

Finally, in section 3 I discuss some other advantages of the solution proposed in section 2.

1 The structure of CLLD

1.1

In this section I will give an overview of the arguments in favor of treating (1) as representing a base-generated order. In other words, the question that will be answered negatively is whether the OS cl-V order (CLLD) is derived from the S cl-V Q order by (Abar) movement of the object to a sentence-initial position.

The S cl-V Q order is a case of clitic doubling, a common construction in many languages, among which MG, in which a clitic agreeing in features with the object appears along with that object. The question therefore arises, whether clitic doubling is the source for CLLD by movement of the doubled element to the sentence-initial position. However,
as Cinque (1990) points out, there are languages that have CLLD but do not have elitic doubling. Such a language is Italian:

(3) a. *Io conosco Gianni
      him know Gianni

b. Gianni, io conosco
   Gianni, him know
   ‘Gianni, we know him’

Second, there are semantic classes of NPs that can appear in CLLD structures but cannot be clitic doubled:

(4) a. tre provimate mono o Kostas ta elusive
      three problems only Kostas them solved

b. mono o Kostas (*ta) elusive tre provimate
   only Kostas (*them) solved three problems

Third, there are languages that have an animateness requirement on clitic doubling, but not on CLLD:

(5) a. (lo) vimos a Juan
      him saw Juan
      ‘We saw Juan’

b. *lo vimos el libro
      it saw the book
      ‘the book, it bought yesterday’

Fourth, clitic doubling cannot be the source for CLLD, because extraction from a clitic doubled position is not possible. This is a highly theory-internal argument, however, and I will return to it in section 3.

Finally, we can find arguments in favor of the position that O.S.cl-V is base-generated as such by comparing it with O.S.V which is the result of movement.

A first, descriptive, point of comparison is that in O.S.cl-V (CLLD), the object is the object receives focal stress. Both (7a-b) can be answered with (8), the neutral SVO order, but the OSV order, (7a), can only be answered with (9a) and (7b) only with (9b):

(7) a. Who saw Mary?
   b. Who did Kostas see?

(8) o Kostas idhe tin Maria
    Kostas/NOM saw Mary/ACC

(9) a. tin Maria o Kostas
      (t̄in) idhe
      Mary/ACC Kostas/NOM her saw
      O.S.cl-V (CLLD)

b. tin Maria o Kostas
   (t̄in) idhe
   Mary/ACC Kostas/NOM her saw
   OSV

It is possible to argue that while (9b) is the result of movement, (9a) represents a base-generated construction. The relevant tests check the "variableness" of the ECs after the verb in (10) and (11):

(10) O.S.cl-V EC(prot)
    (base-generated order)

(11) O.S.V EC(prot)
    (movement)

First of all, while O.S.V shows Weak Cross Over effects, O.S.cl-V does not. WCO effects are found in a construction like the one in (12), where an operator binds both a pronoun and a variable, neither of which c-commands the other:

(12) *Operator [...pron...] EC(prot)

In the examples below, the pronoun in (12) is the possessive pronoun contained in the NP i mitera tu, and the variable is the empty category after the verb:

(13) O.S.V
   a. Op [...poss. pronoun...] verb EC(prot)
   b. *ton Kosta i mitera tu agapa
      Kosta/ACC the mother his loves
   c. *kath swedi h i mitera tu agapa
      each child/mother it loves
   d. ton Kosta i Maria agapa
      Kosta/ACC Mary/ACC loves

The unacceptable (13b-c), which have the status of a WCO violation compared to the fully acceptable (13d), seem to point towards the existence of a variable in the internal argument position of the verb.

This is not the case with CLLD, where no WCO violation occurs. Contrast (13b-c) above with (14b-c):

(14) O.S.cl-V
   a. Op [...poss. pron... [...clitic pron.] verb EC(prot)
   b. ton Kosta i mitera tu ton agapa
      Kosta/ACC the mother his loves
   c. kath swedi h i mitera tu agapa
      each child mother it loves

The fact that there are no WCO violations in (14b-c) indicates that the postverbal EC in these sentences is not a variable.

O.S.V licenses parasitic gaps. O.S.cl-V does not. A parasitic gap is licensed by an A-bar trace that does not c-command it.

(15) a. Which article did you file EC(vbl) without reading EC(pg)
   b. This article Mary filed EC(vbl) without reading EC(pg)

As in (15a-b), the acceptability of (16a) shows that there is an A-bar trace after arxiotethise:

(16) O.S.V
   a. Atto a artho i Maria arxiotethise xoris na dhaivasi
      this the article the Mary filled without reading
   b. Op V EC(prot) [...parasitic gap...]

Footnote:

1a (10) I represent the empty category in the argument position as prot (following Jaeggli (1986) and quite a few others) but only for concreteness. It's not crucial that this EC be prot; what is crucial is that it not be an extraction site. This point holds throughout the entire paper.
On the other hand, CLLD does not license a parasitic gap:

(17) O ș cl-V
a. *Ato to asthro i Maria to arxhoseis xoris na dhiafasi this the article Mary it filed without reading
b. Op V E(pro) *[-parasitic gap...]

The unacceptability of (17a) shows that the postverbal empty category in CLLD is not a variable. So, from the absence of WCO violations and the unacceptability of parasitic gaps, we can conclude that there is no A-bar trace after the verb in a CLLD construction. Summarizing this section so far, I have presented some arguments in favor of the position that while O ș cl-V is the result of movement of the object to a sentence-initial A-bar cl-V (CLLD) is a base-generated order. Some more arguments will come up in later sections as side effects of the discussion of long-distance CLLD in MG. For arguments from Italian that CLLD represents a base-generated order, see Cinque (1990, ch. 2).

1.2

In the previous section we established that there is no extraction site for the Clitic Left Dislocated object O ș cl-V. The natural step would be to assume that it is base-generated where it appears. In this section, I will address the question of where the CLLDed element stands.

We saw above that the CLLDed element appears before the subject. If it doesn’t, i.e., if it appears between the subject and the verb, the O ș cl-V order, both the subject and the object are understood as old information, the mark of CLLDed constituents. CLLD of the subject does not contain a coindexed clitic, as MG does not have subject clitics. I will assume that in such a case, there is a pro in subject position: 3, 4

(18) To Yanis [tir maria [pro tir agapsa]] John/NOM Mary/ACC her loves

So the CLLDed constituent stands to the left of the CP. It also must appear in front of the Wh-word in a matrix question:

---

2 A skeptic could argue that the postverbal EC in (14b-c) is, in fact, a variable, but it does not yield WCO violations, because its locality requirements are somehow satisfied by the clitic, the latter standing in some other position. The postverbal EC should still be able to behave as an A-bar trace and license a parasitic gap. But as is obvious from (17), this does not happen.

3 In fact, this shows that the term “Clitic Left Dislocation” is a misnomer, since it is possible to have this construction without an overt clitic. The name could also mislead one into believing that any language actually has a construction in question is the left dislocated, in combination with the respect for islands.

4 It should in principle be possible for the CLLDed element to be an adjunct. According to Cinque, this is not possible in Italian. However, the data, as well as his explanation, seem problematic. In MG it does seem possible, but I will not address this here.

---

The constituent *tir Maria* is base-generated under the node X (I'll return shortly to what this node can be). The coindexed clitic appears because the verb must project its argument somehow. In effect what licenses this construction is predication: the CLLDed element is the subject of predication and the rest of the clause is the predicate, the clitic being the predicate variable. 5 The clitic licensed pro in MG there is no pro in object position by

---

5 On the other hand, in an account like that of Pesetsky (1989), where Wh-words stand in [SPEC,IP], (19a) can at most indicate that *tir Maria* is to the left of the IP. In this account V-second is only V-to-S, in which case, (20b) would be the base-generated order, (20a) being the result of movement out of that position to the left of the CP. It’s possible that the present paper is translatable into a framework like the above. In any case, the only relevant point is that the CLLDed element is base-generated adjoined to the minimal clause containing the clitic. The exact category of our “clause” and the exact nature of the [SPEC,IP] position are issues outside the scope of the present paper.

6 The term “predicate variable” should be understood in the sense of Williams (1980). It refers to the open position that permits a constituent to behave as a predicate. This position does not have to be a variable in the syntactic sense, i.e. Case-assigned and locally A-bar bound. (In Williams (1980) PRO is treated as a
have to be transparent, since the presence of a CLLDed element does not block the access that a higher verb has to the element in COMP:

(25) anarotieme ton Kosta pios ton idhe wonder the Kostas who him saw 'I wonder who saw Kostas'

If X in (21) were a separate maximal projection, then anarotieme in (25) would not govern the maximal projection containing the Wh-word and its subcategorized integrants would not be satisfied. Since (25) is fully acceptable, I conclude that anarotieme governs the embedded CP, and that X is not an intervening maximal projection. I will assume therefore that the CLLDed element is (base-generated) adjoined to the CP and that X is a CP-segment created by the base-generated adunction of the CLLDed element:

(26)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CLLDed const.} \\
\text{CP} \\
\text{SPEC} \\
\text{C} \\
\text{IP} \\
\end{array}
\]

In section 2.2 I will return in more detail to the structure in (26).\(^8\)

2 Long distance CLLD

2.1

The CLLDed constituent can appear far away from the clause containing the clitic:

(27) ton Kosta nomiza oti th Maria ton idhe the K. (I) thought that the M. him saw

\(^8\) I have argued that while OSV is the result of movement, O.S.e.l-X (CLLD) is base-generated. When both occur in a sentence, the CLLDed constituent precedes the focused constituent. The underlined constituent is focus-moved, the constituent preceded by 'DL' is the CLLDed one:

(i) a. DL/in Maria o Yanis is agapa Mary/ACC John/NOM her loves
   b. DL/o Yanis DL/in Maria is agapa
   c. ??????o Yanis DL/in Maria is agapa
   d. ??????in Maria DL/o Yanis is agapa

Sentence (ic) is marginally acceptable as a corrective stress on a previously mentioned sentence in which o Yanis was understood as having been CLLDed. When both constituents are CLLDed, they can appear in any order:

(ii) a. DL/o Yanis DL/in Maria is agapa
   b. DL/in Maria DL/o Yanis is agapa

It is not possible to focus more than one constituent, however:

(iii) a. ??????o Yanis is agapa
   b. ??????in Maria o Yanis is agapa
appears in its surface position by movement, the source of (27) being (34):

(27) ton Kosta nómíza oti i Maria ton idhe the K. (I) thought that the M. him saw

(34) nómíza ton Kosta oti i Maria ton idhe (I) thought the K. that the M. him saw

If I am right, then the island effects on the relationship of the CLLDed element and the clitic are an illusion. Islands constrain the relationship between the position in which ton Kosta is generated (as in (34) and the position it appears in (27)). This is a movement relationship. This is movement out of an adjointed position and extraction out of such a position over an island is predicted to have the "heavy" feeling of an ECP violation, as in the case of adjunct extraction out of an island, and not a subadjacency violation as when an object is extracted out of an island. This prediction is borne out.10,11,12

2.2

I have argued that the CLLDed element is base-generated adjoined to the minimal CP containing the clitic. From now on I will call this position the "DL-position" for Pesetsky's (1986) notion of "D-Linking", since as mentioned, the elements that appear there must have been mentioned previously in the discourse. In fact, the DL-position might be the position of Pesetsky's "Baker-style operator". In such a case, the difference between English and languages with CLLD would be that the latter permit overt elements in the DL-position.

The locality constraint between the DL-position and the minimal clause containing the clitic follows from general structural constraints on predication: the subject of predication and the predicate must m-command each other (Rothstein, 1983), McNulty (1988), Rizzi (1990) and others). The subject is the DL-position and the predicate is the minimal maximal projection containing the predicate variable, which in the case of CLLD is the clitic

10Notice that this provides one more argument against the position argued against in section 1.1, namely, that the postverbal position in CLLD is an extraction site. If it were, there should be no ECP effects, since extraction would be out of an object position.

11Intermediate positions can be landing sites for the dislocated element on its way up. The following sentence is also acceptable in Italian:

(i) l Ana nòmíze ton Kosta oti o Yannis ope oti i Maria ton idhe DET Ana thought DET K. that DET Y. said that DET M. him saw

12Returning to sentences like (25) repeated here:

(ii) anaoríme ton Kosta pio oton idhe (I) wonder DET Kosta who him saw I wonder who saw Kostas'

and its long distance counterpart:

(ii) ton Kosta anaoríme pio oton idhe DET Kosta (I) wonder who him saw

These sentences are totally acceptable, i.e. they are not Wh-island violations. This confirms two points argued for in this paper. First of all, it supports the position of section 1.1 that the CLLDed element is not extracted from the postverbal position. If it had it would have crossed a Wh-island in both (i) and (ii).

Second, it supports the position of section 2.1 that the CLLDed element is base-generated to the left of the CP, so that again, it doesn't have to cross the Wh-island. This latter point explains why CLLD obeys what Cinque calls "strong" islands (the ones in (28)-(31)), but why it isn't at all sensitive to a "weak" island, like the Wh-island: it simply is base-generated outside the latter.

9According to Horrocks and Stavrou (1987) extraction from some NP-islands is acceptable for some speakers. This observation holds for English as well (Ross 1967). According to their account this is possible only with those NPs that are paraphrasable as complex verbs, i.e., "bear a rumor that" would be understood as a verb. This point is not really relevant, since all the other island effects hold without exception, as far as I know.
(35)

```
     CP₁
    └── DL ┆ CP₂
         └── IP
```

In effect, the mutual c-command relationship defines XP-government, as far as I can see, there is no structure where two maximal projections m-command each other, yet they don't govern as in Chomsky (1986) (crucially in combination with a notion like Rizzi's relativized minimal and not rigid minimal):

(36) X m-commands Y iff X does not dominate Y and every Z, Z a maximal projection, that dominates X, also dominates Y.

(37) X governs Y iff X m-commands Y and there is no Z, Z a barrier for Y, such that Z dominates Y and excludes X.

(Since we are not talking about head-government here, all of X, Y, Z are maximal projections.)

Moreover, domination is recursively defined as in (38a), and exclusion as in (38b):

(38) a. X is dominated by Y only if it is dominated by every segment of Y.

b. X excludes Y if no segment of X dominates Y.

Now let's look at what (36)-(38) can tell us about the structural relations in (35).

Immediately we can exclude CP₂ as a potential governor/predicate: first of all, we cannot speak of a segment of a maximal projection (CP₂) as being a governor; second, assuming projections can be predicates. This would leave CP₁ and IP as possible XP-governors of according to definitions (36) and (38a), the CP does not dominate the DL-position, since m-governors/govern the DL-position. However, I think that this reading of the containment is never a case of command. If I am right, then (36) should be read as (36):

(36) X m-commands Y iff no segment of X dominates Y and every Z, Z a maximal projection, that dominates X, also dominates Y.

(If Z is not restricted to maximal projections, (36) defines the c-command relation.)

Returning to (35), one segment of the CP (namely, CP₁) dominates the DL-position; this means that the CP does not m-command or XP-govern the DL-position and is therefore excluded as its predicate. This leaves only IP as potential predicate and indeed this node does stand in a mutual m-command/government relation with the DL-position. The DP-internal maximal projection that dominates IP but excludes the DL-position. The same relation holds in reverse. So, if the above revisions are on the right track, we are able to choose IP over CP as the predicate for the DL-position. But as already mentioned, either one of CP or IP would do for the purpose of this paper, since all that is needed is that the predicate be the minimal clause containing the clitic.

13There is a point here that needs emphasizing. All work done on the structural requirements on predication has focused on the locality between subject and predicate; nothing has been said on the locality relation between the predicate and the predicate variable, i.e. on how large the predicate can be with respect to the positioning of the predicate variable in it. Put differently, if putting a predicate variable in a maximal projection suffices to make a predicate, why should there be any constraints on where this should be? In the text, I suggested that the predicate is the minimal maximal projection containing the predicate variable. In addition to being consistent with the general structural relations within CLLD, this generalization seems to hold in all cases of predication containing a predicate variable (and if one is willing to accept an open position in an AP, or other secondary predicates, the generalization holds for those cases as well). Take for instance the predication in English relative clauses. The XX constituent (i) but not in (ii) can be the predicate on the man:

(i) the man [XX who [Mary said [Bill saw]]]  

(ii) the man [XX Mary said [YY who [Bill saw]]]

If we had to say about the structural requirements on predication were that subject and predicate must m-command each other, we would not be able to exclude (ii). If, however, we added the additional constraint that the predicate must be the maximal maximal projection containing the predicate variable then the predicate variable in the relative clause must be headed by who, then the predicate in (ii) could only be the constituent YY. However, this does not stand in a mutual m-command/government relationship with the man and (ii) cannot be a possible case of predication.

It seems, then, that this second constraint on predication is needed. It would be interesting to speculate on a possibility for combining both constraints. One possible direction, which I will not explore here, however, could be along the following lines: predication is some sort of chain formation between the subject of predication and the element with which it is coindexed, namely, the predicate variable. This would imply that each link in the chain would govern the next one. It would follow that the subject of predication must govern the predicate variable. The mutual m-command/government requirement would follow since only then could the subject govern the predicate variable. So would the locality constraint on how much higher than the predicate variable the "limasts" of the predicate could be; again if the predicate were larger than the minimal maximal projection containing the predicate variable, the subject could not govern the next element in the chain (the predicate variable).

One might additionally venture the speculation that a relative pronoun must move in order to be governed by the head noun: if it didn't, it stay in its position, it would be governed by the subject of predication (the head noun), and no relative clause/predicate could be formed. The same, of course, would hold for head-internal relative clauses, only there this movement would take place at IP. It seems encouraging for this possibility that the languages that have head-internal relative clauses are the languages with Wh-words in situ (Ken Hale p.c.), and where Wh-movement in general would happen at IP.

Something more would need to be said about cases where the Wh-word is embedded inside a maximal projection itself containing a maximal projection that XP-governs the Wh-word which would, by relativized minimal (Rizzi (1990)) block XP-government of the Wh-word by the head NP, as in (iii):

(iii) the country [Columbus's discovery of which] [Columbus]

In (iii), Columbus is a closer XP-governor of which, preventing government by the country, yet (ii) can form an acceptable relative clause. Whatever is at issue here is reminiscent of the phenomenon of pied piping. Notice that the complex NP Columbus's discovery of which country can satisfy the requirement of an interrogative (SPEC,CP) to carry a Wh-word:
2.3

I argued in section 2.1 that long distance CLLD should be analyzed as a case of movement
out of the DL-position of the minimal clause containing the clitic. It should be possible
to test for such movement. One test was suggested to me by David Pesetsky (p.c.). Since
this test crucially relies on parasitic gaps, it is applicable only to those speakers who accept
parasitic gaps in the first place. Suppose the alleged movement crosses an adjunct
containing a parasitic gap, then the acceptability of that sentence would confirm
the existence of such movement. Abstractly:

(39) NPj [...[-[-parasitic gap]] ... DL tı [...clitic...]]

If (39) is acceptable, Cinque’s analysis cannot account for it, since for him the NP is base-
generated where it appears in (39) and there is therefore no A-bar chain in the sentence
to license a parasitic gap. In the present account, however, the acceptability of (39)
is explained by the movement of the NP out of the DL-position and into the sentence-initial
position. This movement forms an A-bar/A-bar chain which licenses the parasitic gap.
(39) is, in fact, acceptable in MG; the ‘(7)’ indicates the status of parasitic gaps in
general.14

(40) (7) ton Yı. i M. ipe DL oti tha ton pandrefi
the J. the M. said [xoris na agapa] [xoris na agapa]
the IACC [without loves] [without loves]

Compare (40) with (41), which has the parasitic gap in a position not “crossed” by the

(iv) Columbus’s discovery of which country did John witness?

I assume that whatever mechanism is at play in (iv) (perhaps feature percolation) is also responsible for the
acceptability of (iii). In specific, if the whole NP can act as a single Wh-phrase for the purposes of
question formation in (iv), I assume the whole NP can also act as a single predicate variable in (iii). It
governs a relation between head-NP and predicate variable holds in (iii) as well.

14For some Italian speakers, it seems that (40) is unacceptable. As mentioned, unlike MG, does
tolerates material to the left of the complementizer as a headed clause. This means
that the adjunct “without loves” in (40) can only be interpreted as modifying the higher.
And it
parasitic gap that would be violated if the adjunct in (38) belonged to the higher clause. For many
English speakers (i) is considerably worse than the clastic parasitic gap sentences.

(i) “which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that [Mary said that] Bill would publish EC?”

Luigi Rizzi (p.c.) suggested a test that argues for the existence of a trace in the DL-position in
Italian as well. This test is based on having the DL-position provide a reconstruction site for a higher
anaphor. Sentence (ii) is not acceptable because the anaphor se stessa is not bound in its governing
category:

(ii) *Marla dice che Piero non parla abbastanza di se stessa
the children/NOM [M/Acc] [K/Nom] said that her love/3/PL

Marla said that Piero does not speak enough of himself.

The acceptability of (ii) however, shows, according to Rizzi, that there is a lower position in which
the anaphor reconstructs and in which it is bound by Maria inside its governing category. This position
would be a trace coindexed with the anaphor, specifically the DL-position in (iii):

(iii) di se stessa M. dice che DL P. non parla abbastanza
the children/NOM [M/Acc] [K/Nom] said that her love/3/PL

the clitic
of herself Maria said that P. not talks enough

I will not explore this further, since the significance of reconstruction as a diagnostic for the existence of
traces requires discussion beyond the scope of this paper (see Higgins (1973) and Barsi (1986)).

2.4

In sections 2.1 and 2.3, I argued that long distance CLLD obeys islands, because islands
constrain movement out of the DL-position. It is possible for many constituents to be
long CLLDed at the same time, indicating that CLLD does not create islands for further

movement

(43) ta pedehia tin Maria o Kostas ipe DL oti pro tin agapan
the children/NOM [M/Acc] [K/Nom] said that her love/3/PL

‘Kosta said that the children love Mary’

This is because the DL-position and all the traces that the CLlDed element might leave on its
way up are adjunction sites, and adjunction does not create islands, unlike A-bar
movement through [SPEC,CP],s which does create islands by blocking up “escape

15I am particularly grateful to Luigi Rizzi and Tim Stowell for discussions on this point.
hatches". This explains the superficially odd combination of properties that movement involved in long distance CLLD has: it obeys, but does not create, islands.

3 One more case of movement out of the DL-position

3.1

As already mentioned, clitic doubling is very productive in MG: 16

(44) o Kostas tin idhe tin Maria
    Kostas her saw Mary

A much discussed point in the literature on clitic doubling is that extraction from a position doubled by an accusative clitic does not seem possible (Jaeggli (1982, 1986 and references therein)); 17

(45) a. A quien (*lo) vimos EC?
    No CL saw
    "Who did we see?"

b. (*las) vi a todas las mujeres
    CL saw all the women
    "I saw all the women"

c. (*lo) vimos a JUAN
    him saw
    "We saw JUAN"

The unacceptability of (45a) shows that S-structure Wh-movement is not permitted out of the doubled position. The unacceptability of (45b-c) with a clitic is supposed to show the same point but for movement at LF. Quantifier Raising and Focus Raising are not possible

16Although not relevant to this paper, it is well-known that MG appears to violate what has come to be known as "Kayne's generalization" in the literature on clitic doubling, namely the generalization that a clitic can only move if the argument is in the same sentence as the clitic. This can be done with a "dummy" pronoun:

(i) a. L am vazut *(pe) Popescu
    CL have seen Popescu
    'I have seen Popescu'

b. Sif ta *(!) Xalid
    saw CL Xalid
    'I saw Xalid'

c. Marie l'aime *(a) Jean
    Marie CL loves Jean
    'Marie loves Jean'

17The discussion in this section will be referring only to extraction from a position doubled by an accusative clitic. Extraction from a position doubled by a dative clitic is possible:

(i) a quien le regalaron un auto
    to whom him/ her gave a car
    'To whom did they give a car?'

(ii) planu tu edoson ena astikoino
    who his gave a car
    'To whom did they give a car?'

MG does not have Dative Case, the Genitive having taken over previous occurrences of the Dative.

Clitics and Island Effects

Iatridou

out of the doubled position. The same facts hold in MG: 18

(46) a. Pion (*ton) idhes?
    who CL saw
    "Who did you see?"

b. (*ton) idha ton KOSTA
    CL saw Kosta
    'I saw Kosta'

c. dioho yatri tha (tus) eksetasum olus tus arostus
    two doctors PUT CL examine all the patients

Sentences (46a-b) are unacceptable with the clitic. (45c) is acceptable, but with the clitic, it lacks the reading corresponding to the object having raised over the subject. In other words, without the clitic, the sentence is ambiguous between (46a) and (47b), with the clitic it can only mean (47b):

(47) a. Each patient will be examined by some two doctors.

b. There are two doctors each of which will examine all the patients.

So as in the relevant dialect of Spanish, the presence of a clitic blocks A-bar movement in the syntax, as well as at LF. There have been several accounts of these facts in the literature; 19 which of these is correct is not directly relevant. All that is crucial for
present purposes is the descriptive generalization that A-bar movement out of the doubled position is not possible in sentences like (45)-(46).

However, this last generalization seems to have been made on too narrow a database. There is a set of data that to my knowledge nobody before Suner (1988) and Dobrovie-Sorin (1990) had discussed. It appears, in fact, that while extraction of the equivalent of who is impossible, extraction of the equivalent of a-which-NP is possible:

(48) a. pia pedhiá (ta) maloses which children them scolded (MG)
    Which children did you scold?
    b. A cual de los dos candidatos la entrevistaron? (SP)
    Which of the two candidates did they interview?

Clearly, an analysis that attempts to account for the lack of extraction in (45)-(46), should permit cases like (48a-b) and it isn’t clear how many existing proposals (e.g., the ones mentioned in fn. 18, except Suner’s) could be modified to cover (48). However, both Suner (1988) and Dobrovie-Sorin (1990) have proposals to account for the contrast between (45)(46) and (48). Although their proposals differ on basic points, they both believe that the existence of sentences like (48) shows that the “classic” accounts of clitic doubling were misled in that they excluded extraction from the doubled position altogether.

For Suner and Dobrovie-Sorin extraction is possible as long as some (but different for each author) requirements are met.

Unlike Dobrovie-Sorin and Suner, I would like to side with the old empirical generalization according to which extraction from a clitic doubled position is not possible and I will argue that the data in (48) are not instances of extraction of the which-clause from the clitic doubled position. I will propose that sentences like (48a-b) are the result of extraction from the DL-position and that the EC after the verb is of the same nature as it is in a sentence containing only a clitic. In other words, (48a) is argued to have two possible representations:

(49) a. CP
    pia pedhiá CP
    IP

b. CP
    pia pedhiá C
    CP
    IP

In (49a), the Wh-word stands in the DL-position in which it is generated. In (49b) it has moved into the [SPEC,CP] of a higher CP. The difference between (49a-b) seems to me to be narrowly theory internal at this point: the question revolves around whether a Wh-word can be interpreted in a base-generated adjunct position, or has to appear in a [SPEC,CP] at S-structure. For the present purposes, however, either of (49a-b) will do, since either one is compatible with the main argument, namely that the which-clause has not been extracted from the object position but from the DL-position. Sentences (48a) and (48a) are out because of independent constraints on the D-linking of Wh-words (Pesetsky (1986)): it is very hard to D-link who. Therefore (non-D-linked) who cannot appear in the DL-position.

The two expansions of (48a) (with and without a clitic) are not synonymous. Without the clitic, the sentence means something like “In the group of scolded people, which children fit?”, while with the clitic it means “Of the mentioned children, which ones did you scold?”. In other words, the expansion with the clitic has a different domain of discourse. This becomes clearer in a pair like (50a-b) (see Dobrovie-Sorin (1990)) for similar data in Romanian:

(50) a. posa pedhiá ta maloses how many children them scold of the children already mentioned, how many of them did you scold?
    b. posa pedhiá maloses how many children scold of all the people that you scolded, how many were children?

The contrast between (50a) and (50b) becomes especially crisp after a statement like (51), which can be followed only by (50b):

(51) I scolded many people.

In other words, and as already mentioned, the DL-position is a D-linked position and extraction from it is only possible when the DL-position can be felicitously used, i.e., when it contains something that has already been mentioned in the discourse. A statement like (51), which does not restrict the conversation to children, is not sufficient to license a constituent containing children in the DL-position of the next sentence.

If I am right in arguing that sentences like (48) have resulted from CLLD and not from clitic doubling, then we would expect a language that has CLLD but does not have clitic doubling to permit sentences like (48). Such a language is Italian and there this prediction is borne out. Sentences (52a-b) show the absence in Italian of clitic doubling and the existence of CLLD respectively:

(52) a. (*lo) conosciamo (a) Gianni him we know
    Gianni
b. Gianni, *lo conosciamo
    Gianni, him we know

Since Italian has CLLD, it is predicted to also permit highly specific Wh-NPs in the DL-position. The acceptability of (53a) confirms exactly that:

(53) a. quanti/quali bambini (hai detto che) (li) hai rimproverato how many/which children (have said that) (them) have scolded
    *Chi (hai detto che) (lo) hai rimproverato who (have said that) (him) have scolded
    *Who (did you say that) you have scolded?

A sentence like (53a) can obviously not result from extraction from a doubled position, since Italian lacks this construction. Moreover, the contrast between (53a) and (53b) reflects, as mentioned, restrictions on the D-linking of Wh-words.

When the which-clause is further removed from the clause that contains the clitic, it is contained in the [SPEC,CP] of the higher clause. So for example, the structure of (54) is as in (55):
(54) pia pedhia ikes oti ta maloses?
  which children said/2SG that them scolded
  'Which child did you say you scolded?'

(55) c
     CP
    /   \  
   C'   IP
  /   \   
 CP   V  proj
    / \   /
   ipes t1
    |   |
    C  IP
   /   \
 proj taj maloses proj

So far I have tried to argue that, independently of the reason for which extraction from a clitic doubled position is not possible, sentences like (48) are not sufficient to argue in favor of such extraction, but should be analyzed as extraction from the DL-position. There is another test that shows that sentences like (48) do not involve extraction out of the clitic doubled position. Note that, unlike real extraction (56a), a sentence like (56b) (which contains a clitic) does not license a parasitic gap:20

(56) a. pion andhra pandrefi ke xoris na agapa
  which man married without loves
  'Which man did she marry without loving?'
  b. pion andhra ton pandrefi (*xoris na agapa)
  which man him married without loves
  clitic

But as discussed in section 2, a parasitic gap is licensed with long distance extraction:

(57) pion andhra ipe xoris na agapa PG [DL oti tha ton pandrefi]
  which man say without loves that FUT him marry
  'Which man did she say that she would marry without loving?'

The contrast between (56a) and (56b) can easily be accounted for if there is no movement out of the doubled position in (56b). This is not so for an account in which the which-phrase is extracted from the doubled position.21

4 Summary

In this paper, I discussed Clitic Left Dislocation in Modern Greek and argued that the CLLDed constituent is not extracted from the postverbal position, but is base-generated adjoined to the minimal clause containing the cindexed clitic. I also argued that CLLD is restricted to D-linked constituents, which I further suggested that the relation between the CLLDed constituent and the clause it base-generated on is a relation of predication. More specifically, I suggested that the CLLDed constituent is the subject and the clitic (or, clitic-projected) the open position that makes the clause into a predicate.

Moreover, I suggested that Cinque’s paradox (the fact that although the relation between the CLLDed constituent and the clitic is not one of movement, it is still subject to island constraints) should be attributed to constraints on movement after all, specifically, movement out of the DL-position.

Finally, I suggested that there is at least one more instance of movement out of the DL-position, namely some cases that have been analyzed as extraction of a specific Wh-NP out of a clitic doubled position.
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20 There is also a clear contrast in WCO effects:
(58) a. ???pion pedhia [i mitera tu] malose
  which child the mother him scolded
  'Which child the mother him scolded'
  b. pio pedhia [i mitera tu] malose
  clitic
  'Which child the mother him scolded'

However, it appears that D-linked Wh-NPs do not show WCO violations (Pesetsky (p.c.)):
(59) a. ??Who does his mother love?
  b. ??Which boy does his mother love?

In other words, the contrast in (58) cannot uncontroversially be attributed to the lack of movement in (59).

21 Dobrovie-Sorin (1990) sets up a category of “non-syntactic quantifiers”, not unlike Cinque’s (1986) “non-bare quantifiers”. According to her, the differences between “syntactic” and “non-syntactic” quantifiers are structural as well as lexical, and crucially boil down to the former but not the latter needing to bind a variable. Both need a range of quantification. The Romanian “non-syntactic” quantifier is care, which she glosses as ‘which’ and its “non-syntactic” quantifier status is derived in D-S’s paper from the fact that care N- phrases always need to be clitic doubled:
(60) a. pe care balat (*t-) ai vazut
  which boy him-have seen
  'Which boy did you see?'

For D-S, (6) shows that care cannot bind a variable, and that therefore a pronominal clitic is inserted. However, on p. 362 they say: “…care structures can be used only if a certain set of [boys] has already been mentioned or is implicit in a given dialogue…”. This means that care is necessarily D-linked. In the present analysis this implies that care N must appear in the DL-position and if this is correct, the clitic is obligatory in (i) for the same reason that it is in the case of CLLD, of which it is an instantiation. This means that the existence of sentences like (i) does not provide evidence for a category of “non-syntactic quantifiers”.
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Adding to the Inventory:

Contemplating Anti-Perfect Marking in French Antilllean Creoles

Jon F. Pressman

1 Introduction

When considering the state of tense-mood-aspect (hereafter TMA) research and its dissemination within the field of creole linguistics, Bickerton’s (1975) typical system is the privileged foil to which all others, to a greater or lesser extent, are compared. It is also the case that in the years following the initial publication of Bickerton’s so-called ‘universalist’ claims, intensive studies of specific creole languages have shown the limits and oversights to such an all-encompassing theory. An example of this type of study, the one that the present paper takes as its impetus, was recently undertaken by Spears in two related articles (1990a, 1993) regarding the preverbal marking system in Haitian Creole (hereafter HC) and the expression of TMA through the absence or presence of such markers. As Sankoff (1990) has demonstrated, Bickerton has construed this opposition clearly as a privative one; much of Spears’ argument moves to redefine this orientation.

One of three prevalent markers comprising his bioprogrammatic system is what Bickerton has called an anterior, rather than a past marker; this differentiation is linked to a stative/nonstative verb distinction, and he asserts that a marker of anteriority “indicates past-before past for action [nonstative] verbs and simple past for state verbs” (1980:5). Spears has demonstrated certain inconsistencies in ascribing such compartmentalizations as this to the HC anterior marker td, particularly because “pasts and pluperfects are generally not marked, regardless of the stativity of the predicate” in HC (1993:263).

Further, following closely the conclusions reached by Givon (1982), Spears has proposed the ‘anti-perfect hypothesis’ which argues that marking with preverbal td serves to clarify or specify temporal relationships. By anti-perfect is meant that td functions not merely to mark a situation as past with respect to some reference time, but has the more important function of negating that situation’s connection to the present (or some posterior reference time)” (1993:264). Considering this, my aim in the present paper is to place Spears’ anti-perfect conceptualization in its historical-theoretical lineage, commencing with the work of Bickerton and subsequently followed up by Givon. It is...