

Clitic Left Dislocation as an A-dependency

Clitic left dislocation (CLLD) is a subtype of clitic doubling attested in various typologically unrelated languages; it is particularly well-documented for Romance and Greek (Cinque 1990, Agouraki 1992, Iatridou 1995, Alexopoulou *et al.* 2004 and others). In CLLD, as opposed to canonical clitic doubling, the DP-associate of the clitic occurs preverbally, followed by the (generally obligatory) clitic (1a-b). The relevance of CLLD transcends the boundaries of clitic syntax because of the potential interaction of CLLD with other, seemingly unrelated, syntactic phenomena (see e.g. Bhatt 2010 for recent discussion on a possible connection between CLLD and correlatives in Hindi).

A review of the existing literature suggests two significant trends concerning previous research on CLLD: (i) accusative CLLDed items, as in (1), dominate the discussion disproportionately and (ii) CLLD has been traditionally regarded as distinct from traditional clitic doubling (Cinque 1990, Anagnostopoulou 1994, 1997). However, assuming the correctness of (ii) might conceal a significant generalization and an attractive unified analysis. Based on Modern Greek data, I propose in this talk that a unified analysis for clitic doubling and CLLD is indeed possible and that it can be established by examining CLLDed *dative* arguments (see also Agouraki 1992). Such a unified approach also has more general repercussions regarding the identity of Goals and Experiencers.

A central question annexed to the syntactic analysis of CLLD is whether the CLLDed argument is base-generated in the preverbal position or relates to that position transformationally via movement chain. While the base-generation analysis has been popular for *accusative* CLLDs (Cinque 1990, Iatridou 1995, Anagnostopoulou 1997), I illustrate that this approach is suboptimal for CLLDed dative DPs. It turns out that CLLDed dative DPs behave on par with preverbal dative Experiencers (*contra* Anagnostopoulou 1999). The examples in (3-4) illustrate that CLLDed datives and preverbal dative Experiencers display similar quirky Subject properties, such as PRO-control and A-binding. Dative Experiencers, on the other hand, have a strong profile as derived (unaccusative) Subjects cross-linguistically (Belletti & Rizzi 1988, Pesetsky 1995 and related work). The syntactic parallelisms between preverbal dative Goals and Experiencers (in addition to their frequent semantic similarities) motivate the treatment of CLLDed dative Goals as derived Subjects as well.

I defend an analysis where CLLDed datives (both Goals and Experiencers) come about via A-movement, a hitherto relatively unexplored strategy in the domain of CLLD. The movement approach has initial plausibility, because (accusative) CLLD is known to be sensitive for islands. As the example in (2) makes clear, this is also the case for CLLDed dative DPs. An A-bar movement approach (as in Agouraki 1992), on the other hand, is less plausible because CLLD is not associated either with Weak Crossover effects, (5a), or parasitic gaps, (5b) (Iatridou 1995).

The A-movement analysis provides a simple unified approach to clitic doubling and CLLD in the realm of double object constructions. The serialization of the clitic with its DP-associate does not signal a fundamental difference between clitic doubling and CLLD, but merely depends on which argument is moved to the preverbal position. A clitic doubling configuration emerges when a Theme undergoes movement and a CLLD when the dative DP is moved. The dative clitic itself constitutes a spellout of the applicative head which introduces the dative DP in a low applicative configuration (cf. Pytkänen 2002, Cuervo 2003, Diaconescu & Rivero 2007 among others). Locality issues are resolved with Den Dikken's (2006, 2007) phase extension instead of minimal domains. Possible extensions to accusative CLLD are also discussed.

- (1) a. ton Kósta, i María *(ton) agapá (Greek, Iatridou 1995)
the Kostas the Maria CL.ACC loves
‘Kostas, Maria loves him’
b. Gianni, *(lo) conosciamo (Italian, Cinque 1990)
‘Gianni, we know him’
- (2) *tis Marías sinántisa [ton φίλο pou tis édose éna vivlíο]
the Maria I-met the friend who CL.DAT gave a book
‘*Maria, I met a friend who gave a book’
- (3) a. tis Marías_i tis arési o eaftós tis_i
the Mary.DAT CL.DAT please the herself her
b. tis Marías_i tis mílise o eaftós tis_i
the Mary.DAT CL.DAT spoke the herself her
(* in English, but OK – pragmatic considerations aside – in Greek)
- (4) a. [akúgontas PRO_i óla aftá] mu_i dimiurjítikan erotimatiká politikís físeos
hearing PRO all this me.DAT was-created questions political character.GEN
‘having heard all this, I came to think of questions of political character’
b. [akúgontas PRO_i tin istoría], tis Marías_i árhisē na min tis arési o Pétros
hearing the story the Mary.DAT began not CL.DAT please the Peter.NOM
‘having heard the story, Peter started not to appeal to Mary’
- (5) a. ton Kosta i mitéra tu ton agapá (no WCO-effects; Iatridou 1995)
the Kostas the mother his CL.DAT loves
‘Kostas, his mother loves him’
b. *aftó to arthro i María to arxióthétise xorís na diavási (no parasitic gaps; Iatridou 1995)
this the article the María CL.ACC filed without reading
‘this article María filed without reading’

Selected bibliography

- Agouraki, Yoryia. 1992. Clitic Left Dislocation and Clitic Doubling: A Unification. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 4.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena, 1994. Clitic dependencies in Modern Greek. PhD dissertation, University of Salzburg.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 1997. Clitic left dislocation and contrastive left dislocation. In: E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk and F. Zwarts (eds.), *Materials on Left Dislocation*. 151-193. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena 2003. *Syntax of Ditransitives*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Belletti, Adriana and Luigi Rizzi. 1988. Psych verbs and theta theory. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6:291-352.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A'-dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cuervo, Cristina. 2003. *Datives at large*. PhD dissertation, MIT.
- Den Dikken, Marcel. 2006. *Relators and Linkers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Diaconescu, Constanta R. and Maria L. Rivero. 2007. An applicative analysis of double object constructions in Romanian. *Probus* 19.2: 209-233.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1995. Clitics and Island Effects. *UPenn Working Papers in Linguistics* (Vol 2).
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen 2002. *Introducing Arguments*. PhD dissertation, MIT.