

Against a PF account of IO resumption in Greek Free and Restrictive Relatives

Evangelia Daskalaki-lila.daskalaki@gmail.com
Marios Mavrogiorgos-mmavrog@yahoo.gr

Athens Reading Group
May 28, 2010

It is a well-established fact in the literature on Greek Relative clauses (both Restrictive and Free) that obligatory resumption (i.e. resumption of Indirect Objects) is sensitive to island constraints and that, consequently, it is the result of A' movement (see Alexopoulou 2006). Two analytical possibilities are consistent with the A' movement analysis of IO resumption. The first one belongs in the tradition popularised by Pesetsky (1998) and maintains that it realises the phi and case substructure of the copy left by the moved IO. The second one maintains that IO resumption can be reduced to a clitic doubling input (Boeckx 2001. For Greek, see Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2000; Alexiadou & Varlokosta 1997, 2007). Their main difference lies in the component of the grammar in which they locate its occurrence. The first account treats IO resumption as a purely morphological phenomenon: all there is in the narrow syntax is a copy of the moved IO. The resumptive clitic is the result of partial pronunciation of this copy that takes place in a post syntactic component. The second account, on the other hand, gives resumption a narrow syntactic existence.

In this paper, we demonstrate that the narrow syntactic existence of IO resumption in Greek is both empirically and theoretically motivated. The argumentation builds on the similarities of IO resumption with IO *cliticization* and *clitic doubling*, which are, arguably, morpho-syntactic phenomena. We show that in addition to drawing from the same morphological paradigm of pronouns, they share a number of syntactic and semantic properties, which would resist a principled explanation under a PF account. Syntactically, they show the same word order patterns (1) (they are pro-clitic, they disallow interpolation, and they allow clitic climbing). Furthermore, they show the same basic distribution: wherever clitic doubling/cliticization is impossible (cf. the impossibility to cliticize/ double the arguments of a restricted set of verbal predicates, such as *iperisχío* 'to prevail' Anagnostopoulou (2003)), resumption is also impossible (2). Semantically, they cancel Weak Cross Over Effects (WCOs) (3) and Intervention Effects (4), they interfere with Reconstruction, and, unlike their DO counterparts, they are not sensitive to the D-Linking of their coindexed DP (5).

In view of the above evidence, we develop a morpho-syntactic analysis which takes IO clitics to be the spell-out of the phi-features and case of the v-applicative head, which agrees with the doubled/resumed DP (as opposed to DO clitics which we take to be external topicalizer D-heads, merged in the left periphery of the doubled/resumed DP which contain phi-, case and D- features). More particularly, we argue that the v-applicative head in T (merged there by movement) agrees with the IO DP, triggering movement of the agreeing DP to an A specifier (presumably by means of an EPP feature –see Chomsky 2001). Further (A') movement to a higher position starts off from this derived A position. As a result, the presence of an IO clitic signals agree/move to the spec of v-applicative in T, whereas its absence signals lack of agree/move. In this way, we can account for the fact that doubling/resumption of an IO DP cancels WCOs as well as Intervention effects: on the one hand, A'-movement of the DP starts from a position that is higher than any other argument position within the vP (which ensures that no pronominal will be able to c-command the variable left behind by the moved DP). On the other hand, A-movement to T takes the genitive DP out of the c-command domain of T, and hence cancels out its intervention

potential. Moreover, as far as reconstruction is concerned, this analysis explains why the doubled/resumed DP may be interpreted at T, given that an A-position containing a copy of the doubled/resumed DP is projected at this level. Non-sensitivity to the D-linking of their coindexed DP is due to the fact that the applicative head (and therefore the IO clitic) does not contain a D-feature; rather, it only contains phi-features and case (as opposed to the DO clitic which contains a D-feature). As for the distribution of IO clitics in resumption and clitic doubling, we argue that they are impossible with certain verbs such as *iperisχío* ‘to prevail’ because these verbs do not contain a v-applicative head; rather their genitive DP contains a purely inherent genitive case that is licensed by V. Finally, the common syntactic word order patterns of IO clitic doubling and resumption trivially follow from the fact that the v-applicative head merges with the higher v*, moving along with it to T (in Greek, as in other Null Subject Languages, the verb (parts) move(s) to T obligatorily – see Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998). All these syntactic and semantic properties would be hard to capture if a purely PF account was followed.

- (1) a. *Γnórisa ópjon tu (*χtes) éðosan (χtes) ipotrofía.*
 met-1stSg who-Acc cl-3rdSgGen (*yesterday) gave-3rdPl (yesterday) scholarship
 ‘I met whoever they gave a scholarship to yesterday.’
 b. *tu (*χtes) éðosan (χtes) tu Kosta tin ipotrofía.*
 cl-3rdSgGen (*yesterday) gave-3rdPl (yesterday) the Kostas-Gen the scholarship
 ‘They gave yesterday Kostas the scholarship.’
- (2) a. **Lipíthika ópjon tu iperisçises.*
 felt-sorry-1stSg who-Acc cl-3rdSg Gen prevailed-2ndSg
 ‘Int. meaning: I fell sorry for the person you prevailed over.’
 b. **Tu iperisçíi tu simaθití tu.*
 cl-3rdSg Gen prevails-2ndSg the classmate-Gen his
 ‘He prevails over his classmate.’
- (3) a. *[...] ópju_i tu_i éðose fajitó i aðerfí tu_{i/j}.*
 who-Gen cl-3rdSg Gen gave-3rdSg food-Acc the sister-Nom his
 ‘[...] whoever his sister gave food to.’
 b. *[I mitéra tu_i] tu_i éðose tu káthe pedjú_i fajitó.*
 the mother-Nom his cl-3rdSg Gen gave-3rdSg the every child-Gen food-Acc
 (Anagnostopoulou 2003a: 208 [294b,d])
- (4) a. *ópju *(tu) ðóθike i ipotrofía.*
 who-Gen *(cl-3rdSg Gen) was-given-3rdSg the scholarship-Nom
 b. *tu Kósta *(tu) ðóθike i ipotrofía.*
 the Kostas-Gen *(cl-3rdSg Gen) was-given-3rdSg the scholarship-Nom
 ‘Kostas was given the scholarship.’
- (5) a. *Γnórisa ópjon tu éðosan tin ipotrofía.*
 met-1stSg who-Sg Acc cl-3rdSg Gen gave-3rdPl the scholarship-Acc
 ‘I met whoever they gave a scholarship to.’
 b. *Ðen tu éðosa kanenós leftá.*
 Neg cl-3rdSg Gen gave-1stSg anyone-Gen money-Acc
 ‘I didn’t give anyone money.’