Against Broad Subjects in Hebrew

Idan Landau

Ben Gurion University, October 2007

idanl@bgu.ac.il

Abstract

Hebrew has no multiple subject construction (MSC) of the Japanese type, contrary to the claims of three recent studies. The alleged "broad subject" in the Hebrew constructions is nothing but a left-dislocated DP. A series of arguments is presented to the effect that this DP patterns with Ā-bar phrases and displays none of the subject properties characteristic of either standard or broad subjects.

1. Introduction

Doron and Heycock (1999), Heycock and Doron (2003) (henceforth collectively, DH) and Alexopoulou, Doron and Heycock (2004) (henceforth, ADH) claim that the multiple subject construction (MSC), famously common in Japanese (and Korean), is also attested in Hebrew and Arabic. Crucially, it is distinct from left dislocation (LD) in that the outer nominative DP behaves like a broad subject (or a *major* subject) of the Japanese type and unlike a left dislocated DP of the English type.

In this paper I argue that for Hebrew, this is a misanalysis. Hebrew has no construction comparable to the Japanese MSC. What DH claim to be MSC in Hebrew is a run-of-the-mill LD construction of the English type. I will present two sets of arguments to this effect: (i) All of DH's tests claiming to show the alleged broad subject to be a true subject in Hebrew yield identical results with unambiguous left dislocated DPs; (ii) Under eleven additional, independent tests, the alleged broad subject displays Ā-properties of left-dislocated elements, unlike the Japanese broad subject, which displays the hallmarks of an A-position.

2. Distinguishing MSC from LD in Hebrew

DH do not explicitly state how MSC and LD are to be distinguished in Hebrew. They do, however, mention a constraint on the position of the bound pronoun (call it *the copy*) in MSCs.

(1)   *DH's locality constraint on broad subjects in Hebrew*
       "The position of abstraction is either that of the highest XP argument or a possessor of that argument. This suggests either A-movement or an anaphoric relation between the broad subject and the pronoun" (Heycock & Doron 2003: 8).

By implication, then, whenever the copy is further down, LD is the only analysis.[1] Given that DH rule out a movement analysis (broad subjects do not reconstruct), the remaining option is an anaphoric link. Why the relation of the broad subject to the copy should be anaphoric, rather than unbounded variable binding, is not discussed by DH. In any event, this locality constraint allows (2a,b) as a MSC in Hebrew, but not (2c), which must be LD, since the copy is not (inside) the highest XP argument below the initial DP.[2]

(2)   a.   Ruti yeš   la   savlanut.
            Ruti there.is to.her patience
            'Ruti, she has patience'.

      b.   af iton   erev   lo moxrim oto ba-boker.
            no newspaper evening not sell.3pl it   in.the-morning
            'No evening newspaper is sold in the morning'.

      c.   Ruti ani xošev še-yeš   la   savlanut.
            Ruti I   think that-there.is to.her patience
            'Ruti, I think she has patience'.

In fact, it seems that the analogy to anaphora is inadequate on DH's own terms, since ADH analyze the following examples as MSCs in Hebrew.

(3)   a.   af exad lo   maxnisim le-kan et   ha-anašim še-ovdim   ito.
            no one not let.in.3pl to-here ACC the-people that work.3pl with.him
            'No one is such that they allow in here the people who work with him'.

[1] DH assume that LD is always available, even in the local contexts of (1).
[2] (2b) is translated to passive in English, but it is an active sentence in Hebrew, with a null generic subject. DH assume that the null subject is in fact nothing more than the verbal morphology, so the position of the copy qualifies as the highest XP argument in the clause.

b. af talmid šelo lo keday   levakeš mi-af   more   lehamlic   alav.
    no student his   not advisable to.ask   from-no teacher to.recommend on.him
    'No student of his is such that it is advisable to ask any teacher
    to recommend him'.

Even if we ignore *le-kan* 'to-here' in (3a), which is closer to the initial QP than the copy, the distance between the latter two is clearly outside the domain of local anaphora. And (3b) seems to violate (1), *af more* 'no teacher' intervening between the initial QP and the copy.[3]

Nonetheless, since DH and ADH do not offer any alternative characterization of the distinction between MSC and LD, I will adopt (1) as the dividing line. The general point of the argumentation to follow will not be affected by this particular vagueness. The reason is this. DH explicitly assume that broad subjects are not left dislocated phrases; hence, some structural criterion must distinguish them, whether it is well or ill-defined. Yet as we will see below – no such structural distinction is warranted by the data: broad subjects are left dislocated DPs, under all the available tests. There is no point trying to sharpen (1), since the distinction it presupposes is spurious.

3. Alleged differences between "broad subjects" and dislocated DPs

DH present six pieces of evidence in support of the subjecthood of the initial DP in constructions of type (3a,b). I consider them in turn.

First, they claim that the initial DP can be shared by two conjuncts, where it functions as the broad subject in one conjunct and as the narrow (i.e., standard) subject in the other. Note that the second conjuncts in (4) must be predicates (and not full clauses) since Hebrew excludes pro drop in present tense.

(4) a. Ruti yeš   la   savlanut ve-maclixa   be-pitron tašbecim.
         Ruti there.is to.her patience and-is.successful at-solving crossword puzzles
         'Ruti has patience and is successful at solving crossword puzzles'.

     b. kafe   tov šotim   oto ba-boker   ve-mašpia kol ha-yom.
         coffee good drink.3pl it   in.the-morning and-effects all the-day
         'Good coffee, one drinks it in the morning and [it] has an effect all day'.

---

[3] (3b) does not allow a bound variable reading for *šelo* 'his', due to lack of reconstruction; this is orthogonal to the present point, which is simply the fact that the example is given as a grammatical MSC.

The status of these examples, however, is dubious; Hebrew speakers, including myself, reject them, and in fact can only save them by inserting an overt pronominal subject (*hi* 'she' in (4a), *hu* 'it' in (4b)) after the conjunction. This indicates that the initial DP is not shared by the two conjuncts; therefore, its position in the first conjunct cannot be inferred from the second one.

The same test, however, can be used to prove that the initial DP is not a broad subject. In (5), the initial QP can function as a broad subject in the first conjunct, on DH's account, but not in the second one, given the position of the bound pronoun. DH cannot analyze it as a dislocated phrase, given their assumption that bare quantifiers cannot participate in Hebrew LD. Note that the initial QP must be shared by the two conjuncts, as it binds a pronoun in each.

(5) af mitmoded$_i$ eyn   lo$_i$ sikuy mula
     no contestant there.isn't to.him chance against.her
     ve-lo   mešane mi   ya'azor lo$_i$.
     and-not matters who will.help to.him
     'No contestant stands a chance against her and it doesn't matter
     who will help him'.

On DH's assumptions, then, (5) should have no grammatical derivation. On my alternative account, (5) instantiates across-the-board LD, bare QPs being legitimate targets for LD in Hebrew (see (10) below).

DH's second claim is that broad subjects, unlike left dislocated phrases, can occur in embedded contexts.

(6) im be'emet Dani, ha-xavera   šelo mi-carfat,
     if really   Dani the-girlfriend his from-France,
     ex   ze še-hu af pa'am lo   haya šam?
     how it   that-he never   not was there
     'If indeed Dani's girlfried is from France, how come he was never there?'

(6) is rather awkward to begin with. What DH did not check is whether it contrasts with LD. Despite their claim that left dislocated phrases cannot be embedded, LD in the context of (6) yields a result of a comparable status (awkward, but passable). Notice that *Dani* in (7) does not qualify as a broad subject by DH's locality criterion.

(7) im be'emet Dani, kulam   be-carfat ma'aricim et   kol ma   še-hu   ose,
     if   really   Dani everyone in-France admire   ACC all what that-he does,
     ex   ze še-hu   af pa'am lo   haya šam?
     how it   that-he never   not was there
     'If indeed everyone in France admires whatever Dani does, how come
     he was never there?'

Third, DH claim that an adjunct may precede a broad subject but not a left dislocated phrase.

(8) be-anglit kol   mišpat yeš   lo   nose.
     in-English every sentence there.is to.it subject
     'In English, each sentence has a subject'.

DH use a different pair for LD examples, where the adjunct is supposedly grammatical after but not before the left dislocated phrase. I fail to perceive any contrast in that pair. More importantly, they do not compare (8) with a minimally different LD example. As it turns out, no contrast emerges.

(9) be-anglit kol   mišpat yeš   harbe draxim le'hagid oto.
     in-English every sentence there.are many ways   to.say   it
     'In English, for each sentence there are many ways to say it'.

Fourth, DH claim that broad subjects can, but left dislocated phrases cannot, be *wh*-phrases or bare quantifiers in Hebrew.

(10) a.   mi yeš   lo   zman la-dvarim   ha-ele?
           who there.is to.him time   to.the-things the-these
           'Who has the time for these things?'

     b.   af exad eyn   be-yado   la'azor le-Rina.
           no one there.isn't in-his.hand to.help to-Rina
           'No one has it in his power to help Rina'.

Again, DH fail to provide the LD data. These reveal no contrast.

(11) a. mi ata xošev še-yeš   lo   zman la-dvarim   ha-ele?
         who you think that-there.is to.him time   to.the-things the-these
         'Who do you think has the time for these things?'

    b. af exad eyn   be-yada   šel Rina la'azor lo.
        no one there.isn't in-her.hand of Rina to.help to.him
        'Rina doesn't have it in her power to help anyone'.

Example (10a) is cited by DH to support their next claim, which is stated as follows: "A left dislocated phrase... has a fixed pragmatic role of topic, whereas the broad subject, like any subject, may be (part of) the focus" (Doron and Heycock 1999:85). This view about the "fixed" pragmatic function of LD is indeed widespread, but unfortunately false. As Prince's 1997 careful study shows, LD serves three distinct functions in English: Simplifying discourse processing, by removing discourse-new entities from positions reserved for discourse-old entities (typically, subject and possessor positions); triggering a set-inference (the left dislocated entity stands in a salient partially-ordered set relation to some entity (or entities) already evoked in the discourse model); or amnestying island violations by resumption. Importantly, none of these functions is associated with "old information", and as Prince shows, typical LD examples fail standard topichood tests (i.e., *what about X*, *as for X*, etc.).

Hebrew LD seems to be quite parallel. In particular, examples like (10a) can be simply attributed to obligatory resumption (P-stranding being excluded), which is blind to information structure, applying in all island environments, whether the initial DP is a topic, focus, *wh*-phrase, relative pronoun and so on. I conclude that the construction under discussion displays no discourse properties that rule out an LD analysis.[4]

Finally, DH claim that the broad subject passes a subjecthood test in Hebrew – a particular cleft construction that only applies to subjects. (12a) is an example with a clefted standard subject, (12b) is one with a clefted broad subject.

(12) a. Dani hu še-azar   le-Dina.
         Dani he that-helped to-Dina
         'It is Dani who helped Dina'.

    b. Še-harey elen hi be-ecem še-haya   la   sade panuy.
        since   Ellen she in-reality that-there.was to.her field free
        'Since it is really Ellen who had a free field'.

---

[4] In contrast, a Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) analysis is ruled out, as ADH show. This is unproblematic, for LD and CLLD are known to be quite different along several dimensions (island sensitivity, tolerance to bare quantifiers, information structure etc.).

In fact, (12b) is taken from the Hebrew translation of Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!*. It is highly literary and would not be produced spontaneously by Hebrew speakers. To the extent that it is judgeable, however, it does not seem any better than (13), where the clefted DP is a left dislocated phrase, as implied by (1).

(13) Še-harey elen hi be-ecem še-Jim horiš   la   sade panuy.
     since   Ellen she in-reality that-Jim bequeathed to.her field free
     'Since it is really Ellen to whom Jim bequeathed a free field'.

To summarize, none of DH's six tests that are supposed to distinguish broad subjects from left dislocated phrases in Hebrew in fact does so. What are we to conclude from that? One option is that DH's locality criterion is superfluous, and *all* the initial DPs in examples (2)-(13) are broad subjects of the Japanese type. On this view, DH were not fundamentally mistaken in drawing the analogy between Japanese and Hebrew; they were simply over-restrictive in their claims for Hebrew, which features many more broad subjects that they suspected.[5]

An opposite conclusion, however, would be that all the initial DPs in the above examples are left dislocated phrases, and none is a broad subject of the Japanese type. On that view, DH were fundamentally wrong in drawing the analogy between the two languages. How can we decide between these two potential conclusions?

Since DH's data do not distinguish MSC from LD in Hebrew, we need to look elsewhere. In particular, we need to examine whether the initial DP in the Hebrew constructions displays any properties which are predictable from one analysis but not from the other. In the next section I turn to such properties.[6]

4. "Broad subjects" are not subjects

The extensive literature on Japanese MSC has established beyond reasonable doubt that not only the standard subject, but also the broad subject occupies an A-position. In that respect it sharply contrasts with dislocated DPs, which occupy Ā-positions. By subjecting the Hebrew construction to tests that are sensitive to the A/Ā distinction, we

---

[5] In fact, DH do assume that a LD parse is always available, even for the examples they analyze as MSCs. However, they are quite explicit about the fundamental differences between the two structures. Hence, they would probably already reject this potential conclusion. Note that the point of this section is that examples to which DH would *not* assign a MSC analysis are nonetheless empirically indistinguishable from examples to which they would. Thus, accepting that the MSC examples are ambiguously analyzable as LD would not help here.

[6] As is well-known, broad subjects in Japanese do not reconstruct, suggesting that they merge externally. DH observe that the alleged broad subjects in Hebrew similarly fail to reconstruct. This fact is neutral in the present context, since left dislocated phrases also merge externally and fail to reconstruct.

can obtain solid evidence as to its precise nature. As it turns out, all the tests yield the same result: The initial DP occupies an Ā-position, specifically a left dislocated one, contrary to DH's prediction. Eleven arguments are adduced to that effect.

Consider first anaphor binding. Broad subjects in Japanese, unlike left dislocated phrases, can bind local anaphors, an immediate consequence of the A/Ā distinction. The initial DP in the Hebrew construction cannot.

(14) a.   [axoto šel Gil$_i$]$_j$ sipra le-Rina$_k$ al   acma$_{j/k}$/*acmo$_i$.
            his.sister of Gil   told to-Rina about herself/himself
            'Gil's$_i$ sister$_j$ told Rina$_k$ about herself$_{j/k}$/*himself$_i$'.

      b.   Gil$_i$, axoto$_j$ sipra le-Rina$_k$ al   acma$_{j/k}$/*acmo$_i$.
            Gil   his.sister told to-Rina about herself/himself
            'Gil$_i$, his sister$_j$ told Rina$_k$ about herself$_{j/k}$/*himself$_i$'.

(14a), without a broad subject, shows that anaphors in Hebrew pick as antecedent any A-binder in their clause: the oblique anaphor can be bound either by the dative object or by the subject, but of course not by a subject-internal possessor. (14b) shows that this possessor cannot bind even when it is "promoted" to a broad subject status. The failure of binding by *Gil* in (14b) is unexpected on DH's analysis. *Gil* is a broad subject by their criterion, and it c-commands the anaphor from an A-position within the same minimal clause. If, however, *Gil* is a dislocated phrase, then its inability to bind in (14b) is no less surprising than it is in the English translation.

One might attribute the failure of binding by the broad subject in (14) to the intervention of the narrow subject. This is dubious, however, since A-binding in Hebrew tolerates clausemate intervention – the indirect object in (14) does not block binding by the narrow subject. In fact, Japanese provides straightforward evidence that A-binding across the narrow subject is possible. The contrast between (14b) and (15) (S. Takahashi. p.c.) confirms that Japanese broad subjects indeed occupy A-positions, whereas the initial DP in the Hebrew sentence (14b) does not.

(15) Taro$_i$-ga   usagi-ga   zibun-zisin$_i$-no heya de sinda.
      Taro-NOM rabbit-NOM self-GEN   room in died
      'Taro's$_i$ rabbit died in self's$_i$ room.'

Condition B effects also distinguish broad subjects from left dislocated phrases. As Kuroda (1986) observed, a broad subject cannot bind the matrix object position. Left dislocation, in contrast, can freely target that position. The contrast follows

straightforwardly from the A/Ā-distinction plus the assumption that binding condition apply to A-positions only.[7]

(16) a. *Japanese* (Heycock 1994:286)

* Nancy-ga   Tom-ga   ie-   ni maneita.
Nancy-NOM Tom-NOM house to invited
'Nancy is such that Tom invited her to his house.'

b. *Hebrew*

Nansi$_i$, Tom hizmin ota$_i$ ha-bayta.
Nancy Tom invited her the-house
'Nancy, Tom invited her to his house.'

Control into nonfinite adjuncts makes the same point. This type of control is purely configurational, depending on locality and c-command alone. Typically, adjuncts are subject oriented, hence one expects broad subjects to be able to control them. This is not the case, as (17) shows. Notice that the narrow subject must be the controller in (17) even though it is inanimate, whereas the broad subject is animate.

(17) Gil$_i$, [ha-bri'ut   šelo]$_j$ hidardera   bli   PRO$_{*i/j}$ laxzor le-acma$_j$/*le-acmo$_i$.
Gil   the-health.F his   deteriorated without PRO   to.return to-self.F/*M
'Gil, his health deteriorated without returning to itself/*himself'.

The LD analysis naturally predicts this fact: the initial DP is a dislocated phrase, which occupies an Ā-position, and control exclusively involves A-positions.

Nor can broad subjects be controlled, another subject diagnostic. In (18) PRO can only be controlled as a narrow subject, not as a broad one. (18a) shows this with complement control and (18b) with adjunct control. The facts are predicted if the alleged broad subjects are in fact left dislocated phrases – which are never controllable. On the broad subject analysis, however, auxiliary assumptions would have to be invoked.

(18) a. Gil$_i$ kiva   [PRO$_i$ (*ha-košer   šelo) le'hištaper].
Gil hoped PRO (*the-fitness his)   to.improve
'Gil hoped (*his physical shape) to improve'.

---

[7] The topic (*wa-*) construction corresponding to (16a) is grammatical. Notice that the pronominal copy in this example is null, as is common in Japanese.

b.   Gil$_i$ hitnacel   [bli   PRO$_i$ (*kvodo)   le'hipaga].
     Gil apologized without PRO (*his honor) to.be.offended
     'Gil apologized without (*his honor) being offended'.

Once again, genuine broad subjects in Japanese participate in control – both as controllers (19a) and as controllees (19b) (S. Takahashi, p.c.), indicating that control is a relevant test in this regard.

(19) a.   [PRO$_i$ Tegami-o yomi nagara] John$_i$-ga   kaoiro-ga   kawatta.
             letter-ACC read while   John-NOM countenance-NOM changed
           'John's countenance changed while he was reading the letter.'

      b.   [PRO$_i$ Meiyo-ga   kizutuke-rare-ru-koto-nashini] John$_i$-ga   zishoku sita.
             honor-NOM offend-PASS-PAST-NMZ-without John-NOM resign   did
           'John resigned without his honor being offended.'

Consider now Raising, another diagnostic of A-positions. As shown by Kuno (1978), Japanese broad subjects undergo raising to object, confirming their A-status (20a).[8] By contrast, left-dislocated DPs cannot undergo Raising-to-Object (20b).

(20) a.   Boku-ga John-o   imooto-ga kirei-da   to   omowu.
           I-NOM   John-ACC sister-NOM beautiful-be that think
           'I think that John's sister is beautiful'.

      b.   * We believe John, his sister to be a key witness.

The Hebrew construction patterns with (20b) and not with (20a) under Raising-to-Object, which is manifested in small clause complements. This follows from the LD analysis but not from DH's MSC analysis.[9]

(21) a.   ani maxšiv et   axoto   šel Gil axra'it   la-balagan ha-ze.
           I   consider ACC his.sister of Gil responsible to.the-mess the-this
           'I consider Gil's sister responsible for this mess'.

_____

[8] According to Yoon 2006, *only* broad subjects can undergo raising to object in Japanese and Korean.
[9] DH cite an Arabic example where a broad subject appears to raise to object, but no Hebrew analogue.

b. *ani maxšiv et Gil, axoto axra'it la-balagan ha-ze.
   I consider ACC Gil his.sister responsible to.the-mess the-this
   'I consider Gil, his sister responsible for this mess'.

Similarly, the alleged broad subject in Hebrew fails to undergo Raising-to-Subject, which is available with a variety of modal adjectives selecting infinitival complements.

(22) a. axoto šel Gil alula leramot otxa.
        his.sister of Gil might to.cheat you
        'Gil's sister might cheat you'.

b. *Gil alul(a) axoto leramot otxa.
        Gil might.M(F) his.sister to.cheat you
        'Gil might his sister cheat you'.

Consider next intervention effects. Left dislocated elements create barriers for Ā-movement, precisely because they occupy Ā-positions themselves. Subjects, on the other hand, do not interfere with Ā-movement. Again, the initial DP in the Hebrew construction patterns with left dislocated elements in blocking Ā-movement. (23a) shows that long *wh*-movement across a normal subject (of possession) is licit; (23b) is the declarative counterpart, with the embedded possessor *Gil* promoted to a "broad subject"; (23c) shows that movement across *Gil* is blocked – as expected on the LD analysis but not on the broad subject analysis.[10]

(23) a. le-ma ata xošev še-le-Gil eyn savlanut?
        to-what you think that-to-Gil there.isn't patience
        'What do you think Gil has no patience for?'

b. ani xošev še-Gil, eyn lo savlanut le-ne'umim arukim.
        I think that-Gil there.isn't to.him patience to-speeches long
        'I think that Gil, he has no patience for long speeches'.

c. ?* le-ma ata xošev še-Gil, eyn lo savlanut?
        to-what you think that-Gil there.isn't to.him patience
        'What do you think that Gil, he has no patience for?'

---

[10] (23c) also indicates that LD can be embedded in Hebrew, contra DH's claim (see also (6)-(7)).

In fact, ADH recognize that broad subjects create islands (see their example (59)), raising the question for them of why an A-position should have this effect. They concede that "at present we do not have an answer to this question" (p. 21), though they clearly do not consider this a lethal problem, as I think it is.

A seventh argument against the MSC analysis concerns the interaction of the initial DP with *wh*-phrases. Note that a broad subject and a left dislocated phrase occupy very different positions in the clausal hierarchy. While the former is in (a second) Spec,TP, the latter is located at the very edge of the left periphery (Rizzi 1997). Between these two positions, we find the canonical position of *wh*-phrases.

(24) [Dislocated DP [*wh*-phrase [Broad subject [Narrow subject]]]]

The MSC and the LD analyses, then, make contrasting predictions as to where the initial DP would be located with respect to a *wh*-phrase: On the former analysis, the initial DP should follow the *wh*-phrase, on the latter it should precede it. The facts confirm the LD analysis.[11]

(25) a.   ha-baxur ha-ze,   le'an amru   lo   lalexet?
            the-guy   the-this, where said.3pl to.him to.go?
            'This guy, where did they tell him to go?'
      b.   *Le'an ha-baxur ha-ze, amru lo lalexet?

Note that DH assume that the initial DP in (25a) could be analyzed either as a broad subject or as a left dislocated phrase. On the former analysis, then, (25b) is expected to be derivable, contrary to fact.

Eighth, as in many languages, LD is unavailable in infinitives in Hebrew. This is seen in the control complement (26a), which contrasts with (26b), where topicalization (more precisely, focus movement) takes place in the complement.[12]

(26) a.   * ani metaxnen RINA/Rina, lirkod   ita.   [stressed or not]
            I   plan   RINA/Rina to.dance with.her
            'I plan RINA/Rina, to dance with her'.

---

[11] (25a) triggers no intervention because the left dislocated phrase is base generated outside the *wh*-phrase; no crossing occurs, unlike in (23c).
[12] This contrast suggests that topics occupy a lower position than left-dislocated phrases. Consistent with this is the observation (U. Shlonsky, p.c.) that topics may follow *wh*-phrases, unlike left-dislocated phrases (cf. 25b).

b.   ani metaxnen IM   RINA lirkod.
     I   plan   WITH RINA to.dance
     'I plan to dance WITH RINA'.

Nothing in the MSC analysis precludes broad subjects from appearing in infinitival clauses. On the contrary, since these subjects are hosted in Spec,TP, and infinitives project at least up to the TP level, one expects the combination to be possible. Given that, the ungrammaticality of (27b), with a causative infinitival complement, is unexpected on the MSC analysis, but fully predicted on the LD analysis.[13]

(27) a.   lo natati la-avar   šel Gil le'hafria li.
           not let.1sg to.the-past of Gil to.disturb to.me
           'I didn't let Gil's past disturb me'.

     b.   *lo natati le-Gil, ha-avar šelo le'hafria   li.
           not let.1sg to-Gil the-past his   to.disturb to.me
           'I didn't let Gil, his past disturb me'.

     Ninth, Hebrew has an optional V2-like process of subject-verb inversion, triggered by preverbal XP constituents (Shlonsky and Doron 1992). A variety of elements can trigger this inversion, including adverbs (28b) and *wh*-phrases (28c).

(28) a.   ha-bayt   šel Rina hafax le-xorva.
           the-house of   Rina turned to-wreck
           'Rina's house has turned into a wreck'.

     b.   ba-zman   ha-axaron hafax ha-bayt   šel Rina le-xorva.
           in.the-time the last   turned the-house of Rina to-wreck
           'Recently, Rina's house has turned into a wreck'.

     c.   le-ma   hafax ha-bayt šel Rina?
           to-what turned the-house of Rina
           'What has Rina's house turned into?'

---

[13] If raising to (dative) object applies to the subject of these causative complements, then (27b) is also redundantly blocked by the impossibility of raising a left dislocated phrase (cf. (21b)).

Triggered inversion, however, cannot place the verb in front of a left dislocated phrase. Notice that (29b,c) are sharply ungrammatical, whether the verb agrees with the subject or with the left dislocated phrase.

(29) a.　　Rina, Gil šipec　　et　ha-bayt　šela.
　　　　　　Rina　Gil renovated ACC the-house her
　　　　　　'Rina, Gil renovated her house'.

　　　b.　* ba-zman　　ha-axaron šipec/šipca　　　Rina, Gil et　ha-bayt　šela.
　　　　　　in.the-time the last　renovated.3sgM/sgF Rina　Gil ACC the-house her
　　　　　　'Recently Rina, Gil renovated her house'.

　　　c.　* matay šipec/šipca　　　Rina, Gil et　ha-bayt　šela?
　　　　　　when renovated.3sgM/sgF Rina　Gil ACC the-house her
　　　　　　'When did Rina, Gil renovate her house?'

These facts are entirely unsurprising: Triggered inversion inverts the verb with the subject and not with any other element of the left periphery (possibly because V raises to the lowest C head, Fin^0). Notice that (29c) also violates the hierarchy in (24), similarly to (25b).

　　　Observe now that triggered inversion also fails to place the verb to the left of a broad subject: (30b,c) are no better than (29b,c).[14]

(30) a.　　Rina, ha-bayt　šela hafax　le-xorva.
　　　　　　Rina　the-house her　turned to-wreck
　　　　　　'Rina, her house has turned into a wreck'.

　　　b.　* ba-zman　　ha-axaron hafax/hafxa　　　Rina, ha-bayt　šela le-xorva.
　　　　　　in.the-time the last　turned.3sfM/3sgF Rina　the-house her　to-wreck
　　　　　　'Recently Rina, her house has turned into a wreck'.

　　　c.　* le-ma　hafax/hafxa　　　Rina, ha-bayt　šela?
　　　　　　to-what turned.3sfM/3sgF Rina　the-house her
　　　　　　'What did Rina, her house turn into?'

---

[14] DH might rule out (30b) by appealing to the fact that an adverb precedes the left dislocated phrase. This configuration, however, is not generally problematic, witness (9).

These facts naturally follow from the LD analysis: the postverbal DP both in (29b,c) and in (30b,c) is a left dislocated phrase, which never inverts with the verb in Hebrew. On DH's account, however, these two pairs are unrelated. While (29b,c) are explained by the same ban on inversion with left dislocated phrases, (30b,c) must be explained differently. This is because the latter examples, on DH's analysis, also allow a MSC parse, in which the postverbal DP is a broad subject. The problem for DH, then, is to explain why narrow subjects invert with V (28b,c) but broad subjects do not (30b,c) (recall that both types of subjects reside in specifiers of T).

DH, in fact, do not address this issue. They do discuss a different word order restriction, namely, the fact that the verb cannot intervene between the broad and the narrow subject. This is not possible, they claim, since the trigger of inversion (of V and the narrow subject) must check some feature against V, but the broad subject checks no features, being base generated in its surface position.

This account is dubious, given the fact that *any* preverbal XP (except for dislocated DPs) can trigger inversion, including adverbs, which neither move nor check features. The account is also redundant: On the assumption that the two subjects are both specifiers of T, there should be no head position between them to host the verb. At any rate, it cannot explain the ungrammaticality of (30b,c), where the status of the broad subject as a *subject* is at stake, and not its status as an inversion trigger. That nothing is the matter with the inversion triggers in (30b,c) is evidenced in (28b,c), where the same triggers do license inversion of a narrow subject.

Tenth, consider the distribution of constituent negation, specifically DP negation. This type of negation, typically contrastive and stressed, is generally available in A-positions.

(31) a. LO le-Rina yeš kesef, ela le-aba šela.
         NOT to-Rina there.is money, but to-father her
         'It isn't Rina that has money, it is her father'.

     b. oxlim LO et ha-yarok, ela et ha-adom.
         eat.3pl NOT ACC the-green, but ACC the-red
         'One doesn't eat the green stuff, only the red stuff'.

DP negation, however, cannot be attached to left dislocated phrases.

(32) a. *LO Rina, amru li še-yeš la kesef, ela (le-)aba šela.
         NOT Rina, told.3pl to.me that-there.is to.her money, but (to-)father her
         'It's not Rina that they told me has money, it's her father'.

b. *LO   ha-yarok, amarti lexa   še-oxlim   oto, ela (et)   ha-adom.
NOT the-green told.1sg to.you that-eat.3pl it   but (ACC) the-red
'It's not the green stuff I told you one eats, it's the red stuff'.

Exactly the same restriction applies to initial DPs that are analyzable by DH as broad subjects.

(33) a. *LO   Rina, yeš   la   kesef, ela (le-)aba   šela.
NOT Rina, there.is to.her money, but (to-)father her
'It's not Rina that has money, it's her father'.

b. *LO   ha-yarok, oxlim   oto, ela (et)   ha-adom.
NOT the-green eat.3pl it   but (ACC) the-red
'It's not the green stuff one eats, it's the red stuff'.

That the initial DPs in (33) resist constituent negation, like those in (32) and unlike the narrow subjects in (31), is a serious challenge to the MSC analysis. Note that the challenge is independent of the ultimate nature of the constraint. On DH's analysis, broad subjects are distinct from left dislocated phrases both in their syntactic position and in their pragmatics. Whether it is the syntax or the discourse function of DP negation that is incompatible with LD, a broad subject is expected to be governed by this constraint no more than a narrow subject is. [15]

---

[15] The following two facts jointly suggest that the relevant constraint is syntactic. First, topicalization, in contrast to LD, permits DP negation (i). Second, as discussed above in connection to Prince 1997, one function of LD is to amnesty island violations. In other words, some instances of LD simply replace topicalization (out of islands), and as such, are discourse functionally equivalent. Crucially, even these LDs resist DP negation (ii).

i.   (LO)   et   ax   šel Rina pagašti.
(NOT) ACC brother of   Rina met.1sg
'It's not Rina's brother that I've met'.

ii.   (*LO)   Rina, pagašti et ax   šela.
(*NOT) Rina   met.1sg ACC brother of.her
'It's not Rina whose brother I've met'.

The topicalized DP in (i) binds an object trace while the left dislocated DP in (ii) binds a pronoun inside the object DP (DPs are islands in Hebrew). Any discourse situation in which (i) would be felicitous has a parallel discourse situation in which (ii) would; the fact that LD and not topicalization is used in the latter is purely syntactic (avoidance of an island violation). That DP negation nonetheless distinguishes the two sentences, therefore, implies that a syntactic distinction is responsible for the contrast.

Lastly, the eleventh argument. As is well-known, Japanese broad subjects need not bind any identifiable syntactic position in the clause following them, so long as it is construed as being about the broad subject (Kuroda 1986).

(34) a. Buturigaku-ga syuusyoku-ga taihen da.
    physics-NOM finding.jobs-NOM difficult COP
    'Physics is such that finding jobs is difficult'.

   b. Oranda-no sakana-ga huyu-ga nisin-ga   yoi.
    Holland-GEN fish-NOM winter-NOM herring-NOM good-is
    'Fish from Holland [are such that] [in] winter herring is the best'.

Nothing comparable is possible in Hebrew; the initial DP must bind a pronominal copy.

(35) a. ＊Fizika, limco avoda ze kaše.
    physics finding job it difficult

   b. ＊Dagim me-Holland, xoref, ha-hering hu tov.
    fish from-Holland winter the-herring is good

This difference cannot be attributed to a difference in the availability of null pronouns in the two languages, for examples like (34a,b) cannot be analyzed as containing null pronouns: A null pronoun normally cannot replace a PP, as it would be required to in (34a), nor can it express the subset relation between *herring* and *fish from Holland* in (34b).

 More plausibly, we should think of the contrast between (34) and (35) in analogy to the contrast between (36a) and (36b).

(36) a. As for John, something terrible happened.
   b. John, something terrible happened *(to him).

A hanging topic construction (36a) does not require a bound pronoun, whereas a LD construction (36b) does. A natural way to account for this contrast is to view the "aboutness" relation in the former as a pragmatic relation between a topic and a proposition; in contrast, LD involves grammatical predication. The clause following the left dislocated DP is a sentential predicate, formed by a null operator. This operator that must bind a variable (or else the Ban on Vacuous Quantification would be violated), hence the necessary presence of the copy. This analysis straightforwardly extends to

parallel contrasts between copy raising and proleptic object constructions and gapless vs. gapped clauses (see Landau 2007 for much discussion).

That the Hebrew examples (35) fall together with (36b) in requiring a bound pronoun is entirely expected if indeed they instantiate LD. On the MSC analysis, however, there is no obvious reason why Hebrew should be any different from Japanese in this regard. DH propose that in gapless MSCs a λ-abstract is nevertheless formed over the event/situation variable. This would seem to imply that *physics* and *fish from Holland* in (34) are construed as events/situations (being attributed properties of events/situations), contrary to intuition. Furthermore, DH admit that their proposal does not cover all types of broad subjects (leaving out indefinite and PP ones). Finally, on DH's account, the Japanese/Hebrew contrast remains a stipulated statement on "abstractable variables", with no obvious locus in parametric theory. On the present analysis, it is just one instance of the broad dichotomy between propositional and predicative clauses – MSCs and LD constructions simply falling on opposite sides of the split.

5. Conclusion

In this squib I have argued against the extension of the MSC analysis to Hebrew, as proposed in Doron and Heycock 1999, Heycock and Doron 2003, and Alexopoulou, Doron, and Heycock 2004. Although Hebrew exhibits constructions with two initial nominative DPs, the outer DP behaves like a left dislocated phrase in every respect. Unlike the Japanese broad subject, the outer DP in Hebrew fails all subjecthood tests and passes all tests for an Ā-position.

This is not surprising from a typological perspective. As argued in Kuroda 1988 and Fukui 1995, the MSC is not an isolated property of Japanese; rather, it clusters together with scrambling, determiner stacking and lack of overt *wh*-movement. By contrast, English displays none of these properties. Both Kuroda and Fukui trace this parametric clustering to a single factor: The fact that English is an agreement language and Japanese is not. Indeed, Hebrew is just like English in being an agreement language. Hebrew also patterns with English in having overt *wh*-movement and no scrambling or determiner stacking. Given this array, it would have been extremely puzzling for Hebrew to pattern with Japanese on just one construction – the MSC – and with English on all the other constructions that are governed by the agreement parameter. Our finding that MSCs do not exist in Hebrew thus restores the homogeneity of this typological picture.

References

Alexopoulou, Theodora, Edit Doron, and Caroline Heycock. 2004. Broad Subjects and Clitic Left Dislocation. In *Peripheries: Syntactic Edges and Their Effects*, ed. by David Adger, Cecile de Cat and George Tsoulas, 329-358. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Doron, Edit, and Caroline Heycock. 1999. Filling and Licensing Multiple Specifiers. In *Specifiers: Minimalist Approaches*, ed. by David Adger, Susan Pintzuk, Bernadette Plunkett and George Tsoulas, 69-89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fukui, Naoki. 1995. *Theory of Projection in Syntax*. Tokyo/Stanford: Kurosi/CSLI Publications.

Heycock, Caroline, and Edit Doron. 2003. Categorial Subjects. *Gengo Kenkyu* 123, 95-135.

Kuno, Susumo. 1978. Theoretical Perspectives on Japanese Linguistics. In *Problems in Japanese Syntax and Semantics*, ed. by John Hinds and Irwin Howard, 213-285. Tokyo: Taikatusha.

Kuroda, Shige-Yike. 1986. Movement of Noun Phrases in Japanese. In *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, ed. by Takashi Imai and Mamuro Saito, 229-272. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kuroda, Shige-Yike. 1988. Whether We Agree or Not: A Comparative Analysis of English and Japanese. *Linguisticae Investigationes* 12, 1-47.

Landau, Idan. 2007. Predication vs. Aboutness in Copy Raising. Ms., Ben Gurion University.

Prince, Ellen F. 1997. On the Functions of Left-Dislocation in English Discourse. In *Directions in Functional Linguistics*, ed. by Akaio Kamio, 117-143. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, ed. by Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Shlonsky, Ur, and Edit Doron. 1992. Verb Second in Hebrew. In *Proceedings of WCCFL 10*, ed. by Dawn Bates, 431-445. Stanford: CSLI Publications.

Yoon, James Hye-Suk. 2006. Raising of Major Arguments in Korean (and Japanese). To appear in *New Horizons in the Grammar of Raising and Control*, ed. by Stanley Dubinsky and William Davies, Springer.