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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, DET Kosta/ACC
     ton idhe DET Mary/NOM
     tin Maria DET girl who
     idhe saw

CLLD, as instantiated in Romance languages, has been discussed by van Haaften, 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 O S cl-V order (CLLD) is derived from the S cl-V O order by (A-bar) movement of the object to a sentence-initial position.

The S cl-V O 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 clitic doubling. Such a language is Italian:

(3) a. *lo conosciamo (a) Gianni
     him know Gianni
   b. Gianni, lo conosciamo
      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. tria provilimata mono o Kostas ta clisc
     three problems only Kosta them solved
   b. mono o Kostas (*ta) elise tria provilimata
      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 (Rio Platese Spanish)
     him saw Juan
     'We saw Juan'
   b. *lo vimos o/al libro
      it saw the book

(6) el libro lo compramos ayer
    the book it bought yesterday
    'the book, we bought it 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 V the object is old information and cannot be stressed. 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 *(tin) idhe
     Mary/ACC Kostas/NOM her saw
   b. tin Maria o Kostas (*in) idhe
     Mary/ACC Kostas/NOM her saw

It is possible to argue that while (9b) is the result of movement, (9a) represents a base-generated construction. The relevant tests check the "variablehood" of the ECs after the verb in (10) and (11):
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. The fact that there are no WCO violations in (14b-c) indicates that the postverbal EC in position of the verb does not c-command the other:

(12) *Operator [...pron... EC(variable)

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) OSV
a. Op [...poss. pronoun...] verb EC(variable)
b. *ton Kosta i mitera tu agapa
Kosta/ACC the mother his loves
  Kosta/ACC the mother his loves
c. *kathe pedhi i mitera tu agapa
each child/ACC the mother its loves
d. ton Kosta i Maria agapa
Kosta/ACC Mary/NOM loves

The unacceptability (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. pronoun...] [clitic pron.] verb EC(var)
b. ton Kosta i mitera tu ton agapa
Kosta/ACC the mother his him loves
c. *kathe pedhi i mitera tu to agapa
  each child/ACC the mother its it loves
d. ton Kosta i Maria agapa
Kosta/ACC Mary/NOM loves

The fact that there are no WCO violations in (14b-c) indicates that the postverbal EC in these sentences is not a variable. The OS cl-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(wh) without reading EC(pg)
b. This article Mary filed EC(pro) without reading
As in (15a-b), the acceptability of (16a) shows that there is an A-bar trace after arxiothetise:

(16) OSV
a. Afto to arthro i Maria arxiothetise xoris na dhiavasi
this the article Mary it filed without reading
b. Op V EC(var) [...parasitic gap...]

On the other hand, CLLD does not license a parasitic gap:

(17) O S cl-V
a. *Afto to arthro i Maria arxiothetise xoris na dhiavasi the article Mary it filed without reading
b. Op V EC(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 OS V is the result of movement of the object to a sentence-initial A-bar position (this would be some sort of focusing associated only with new information, O S 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 in O S 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. In fact, it must appear before the subject. If it doesn’t, i.e., if it appears between the subject and the verb, the only possible reading is one in which the subject is dislocated as well. In other words, in the OS 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.

(18) [o Yanis [tin maria [pro tin agapa]]]
John/NOM Mary/ACC her loves

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

1A 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 fashion as proxy for the operator, and therefore no Crossover configuration is created. If this were the case, however, 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.
2In effect, 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 that has clitics as well as dislocation, should be expected to have CLLD. This is obviously not so. The actual characteristics of the construction in question is the left dislocation, in combination with the "feeling" of old information or discourse linking of the left dislocated element, and, as we will see later, respect for islands.
3It 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.

1In (10) I represent the empty category in the argument position as pro (following Jaeggli (1986) and quite a few others) but only for concreteness. It’s not crucial that this EC be pro; what is crucial is that it not be an extraction site. This point holds throughout the entire paper.
The constituent tin 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 CLLD-ed element is subject of predication and the rest of the clause is the predicate, the clitic being the predicate variable.\(^6\) The clitic licenses pios; in MG there is no pio in object position by itself:

(22) *o Kostas Kostas cut

But even with those verbs that permit a pio(arb) in the object position in the sense of Rizzi (1986). The "$^5\) in (23) is intended to indicate that the CLLD reading (i.e., the dislocated element being old information) is not possible without a clitic:

(23) *to Yani o Kostas epirazi Yani/ACC Kostas/NOM influences

Presumably this is because pio(arb), being referential, cannot function as a predicate variable. Similarly, if a full NP were to replace clitic-pro, there would be no predicate variable, therefore no predicate, and no predication relation to license CLLD.\(^7\)

Returning now to the question of what the node X is in (21), we can exclude it being the CP segment dominating the [SPEC,CP] since the CLLD-ed element appears before the Wh-phrase, and in MG it is not possible to have more than one (Wh-) phrase in [SPEC,CP]. Moreover, CLLD does not create islands (Cinque 1990), for the relevant Italian data):

(24) pios nomizis tin Maria oti tha tin psifize who (you) think Mary/ACC that FUT her vote

'Who do you think would vote for Mary'

The acceptability of (24) shows that tin Maria does not occupy the [SPEC,CP] position: if it did, extraction of pios should be blocked.

The node X could possibly be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projection, but this one would be a separate maximal projectio

\(^5\)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) anarotie me 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 anarotie me in (25) would not govern the maximal projection containing the Wh-word and its subcategorization requirements would not be satisfied. Since (25) is fully acceptable, I conclude that anarotie me 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 adjunction of the CLLDed element:

(26)

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

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 i 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 as V (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 DLS is the CLLDed one:

(i) a. DL/in Maria a Yannis tin agapa
Mary/ACC John/NOM she loves
b. DL/o Yannis tin Maria agapa
c. ???/o Yannis DL/in Maria tin agapa
d. ???/in Maria DL/o Yannis agapa

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

(ii) a. DL/o Yannis DL/in Maria tin agapa
b. DL/in Maria DL/o Yannis tin Maria

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

(iii) a. ???/o Yannis tin Maria agapa
b. ???/in Maria o Yannis agapa

However, no island can intervene between the CLLDed element and the clitic:

Relative Clause:

(28) *ton Kosta sinandisini tin kopela pu ton idhe
the K. (I) met the girl who him saw

Adjunct:

(29) *tin esimerida apokimitheke dhiavazondas tin
the newspaper (he) fell asleep reading it

Sentential subject:

(30) *ton Kosta ipes oti oti i Maria ton agapa tromazi ton Yani
the K. (you) said that the that the M. him loves scars the Y.

NP island:\(^9\)

(31) *ton Kosta dhiavasa tin idhisi oti ton apelisian
Kosta/ACC read the news that him (they) fixed

Compare (28)-(31) with the construction, translatable as "as for X,...", which does not obey islands (33a-c). It is the only construction in which a vague "aboutness" relationship can be expressed (32a); this is not possible with CLLD (32b):

(32) a. oson afora ta psaria, protimo tis rengers
as concerns fish, (I) prefer herring
b. *psaria, protimo tis rengers

(33) a. oson afora ton Kosta, akusa tin fini oti oti apelisian
as concerns Kosta, (I) heard the rumor that him fired
b. oson afora ton Kosta, sinandisini tin kopela pu ton idhe
as concerns Kosta (I) met the girl who him knows

c. oson afora tin esimerida, apokimitheke dhiavazondas tin
as concerns the newspaper, (he) fell asleep reading it

We thus have "Cinque's paradox": If islands constrain movement and not base-generated relationships, why is the relationship between the clitic and the CLLDed constituent (which, as argued above has not been extracted from the clitic doubled position) constrained by islands? As a solution, Cinque (1990) proposes that islands do not distinguish movement from base-generated representations and discusses a number of ensuing consequences of this position. As mentioned, Cinque himself argues, using data from Italian, that there is no extraction site after the most embedded verb in a sentence like (27). But he then makes a logical jump and concludes that in a sentence like (27) ton Kosta is base-generated where it appears, without considering any intermediate position. I would like to suggest that the source of (27) is (34) below, which is a fully acceptable sentence in both MG and Italian. I will argue that the island effects exhibited in CLLD arc, in fact, reducible to islands, and that therefore CLLD does not provide any reason to abandon the widely held assumption that islands constrain only movement relationships.

In other words, I will argue that in long distance CLLD, the CLLDed element

\(^9\) According to Horrocks and Stavrou (1987) extraction from some NP-islands is acceptable for some speakers. This observation holds for English as well (Ross 1987). According to their account this is possible only with those NPs that are paraphrasable as complex verbs, i.e., "hear 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.
appears in its surface position by movement, the source of (27) being (34):

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

(34) nomiza 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 adjoined 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 subjacency violation as when an object is extracted out of an island. This prediction is borne out.101112

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) I ana nomize ton Kosta oti o Yanis ipe 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:

(i) anarotiem son Kosta pion ton idhe
(I) wonder DET Kosta who him saw
'I wonder who saw Kostas'

and its long distance counterpart:

(ii) ton Kosta anarotiem pion ton 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 (28a)(i)), but why it isn't at all sensitive to a "weak" island, like the Wh-island: it simply is base-generated outside the latter.

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 that CP2 is the predicate would go against the widely argued position that only maximal projections can be predicates. This would leave CP1 and IP as possible XP-governors of the DL-position, i.e., as possible predicates, but, in fact, we can also exclude CP1. According to definitions (36) and (38a), the CP does not dominate the DL-position, since it's not the case that both its segments (CP1 and CP2) dominate it. This means that the CP m-commands/governs the DL-position. However, I think that this reading of the definitions goes against the spirit of the (m-or c-) command relations, according to which 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.

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 each other as well. This follows from the definitions of m-command and government as in Chomsky (1986) (crucially in combination with a notion like Rizzi's (1990) relativized minimality and not rigid minimalism).

(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.

Although I think that our present knowledge leaves the answer to this question underdetermined, in the next part of this section, I will suggest that there might be some reasons that favor the option of IP as the predicate.

As mentioned above, the predicate must m-command the subject. To see which of the two potential predicates m-commands the subject of predication (the DL-position), let's look at the structure proposed for a simple CLLD construction in section 1:

![Structure Diagram]

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 each other as well. This follows from the definitions of m-command and government as in Chomsky (1986) (crucially in combination with a notion like Rizzi's (1990) relativized minimality and not rigid minimalism):

(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.
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 DL-position governs the IP in (35) since there is no maximal projection that includes 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.\footnote{There 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 in (i) but not in (ii) can be the predicate on the man:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] the man [XX who [Mary said [Bill saw]]]
  \item[(ii)] the man [XX Mary said [YY who [Bill saw]]]
\end{itemize}

If all 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 in the minimal maximal projection containing the predicate variable, this being the chain 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 (i) 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 relation would follow since only there would need to be the subject govern the predicate variable. So would the locality constraint on how much higher the predicate variable the "limits" 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, but stayed in situ, it wouldn't 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 LF. 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 when Wh-movement in general would happen at LF.

Something only then could 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 minimality (Rizzi (1990)) block XP-government of the Wh-word by the head NP, as in (iii):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(iii)] the country [Columbus's discovery of which] ... In (iii), \textit{Columbus} is a closer XP-governor of which, preventing government by the country, yet (ii) can form an acceptable relative clause. Whatever is ii: 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:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] the man [XX who [Mary said [Bill saw]]]
  \item[(ii)] the man [XX Mary said [YY who [Bill saw]]]
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] "which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that (Mary said that) Bill would publish EC?"
  \item[(ii)] "which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that Mary said that Bill would publish EC?"
\end{itemize}

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 '??' indicates the status of parasitic gaps in general:\footnote{For some Italian speakers, it seems that (40) is unacceptable. As mentioned, Italian, unlike MG, does not tolerate material to the left of the complementizer as belonging to the embedded clause. This means that the adjunct "without loves" in (40) can only be interpreted as modifying the higher clause. And it seems that there must be some locality constraint on the relationship between the licensing A-bar chain and the 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 classic parasitic gap sentences:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] "which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that (Mary said that) Bill would publish EC?"
  \item[(ii)] "which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that Mary said that Bill would publish EC?"
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] "which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that (Mary said that) Bill would publish EC?"
  \item[(ii)] "which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that Mary said that Bill would publish EC?"
\end{itemize}

If (40) 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 '??' indicates the status of parasitic gaps in general:\footnote{For some Italian speakers, it seems that (40) is unacceptable. As mentioned, Italian, unlike MG, does not tolerate material to the left of the complementizer as belonging to the embedded clause. This means that the adjunct "without loves" in (40) can only be interpreted as modifying the higher clause. And it seems that there must be some locality constraint on the relationship between the licensing A-bar chain and the 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 classic parasitic gap sentences:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(i)] "which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that (Mary said that) Bill would publish EC?"
  \item[(ii)] "which paper did [John say [without reading PG]] that Mary said that Bill would publish EC?"
\end{itemize}

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:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(39) NP]: [...[parasitic gap]... [DL ti [...clitic...]]]
\end{itemize}

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 '??' indicates the status of parasitic gaps in general:\footnote{For some Italian speakers, it seems that (40) is unacceptable. As mentioned, Italian, unlike MG, does not tolerate material to the left of the complementizer as belonging to the embedded clause. This means that the adjunct "without loves" in (40) can only be interpreted as modifying the higher clause. And it seems that there must be some locality constraint on the relationship between the licensing A-bar chain and the 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 classic parasitic gap sentences:}

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(40) (??) ton Y. i M. ipe [scris na agapa] DL otì tha ton pandrefi [without loves] that (she) will him marry]
\end{itemize}

Compare (40) with (41), which has the parasitic gap in a position not "crossed" by the
movement out of the DL-position. The sentence is ungrammatical:

(41) a. *ton Y. i M. ipe DL oti tha ton pandreti [xoris na agapa] the J. the M. said that (she) will him marry [without loves]

Usually, the existence of A-bar chains is tested with the licensing of parasitic gaps and WCO violations, and usually, both tests come out on the same side (as e.g. in section 1.1). We just saw that long distance CLLD licenses parasitic gaps. But the prediction that it causes WCO is not borne out. There is no contrast between (42a-b):

(42) a. ton Yani i Maria ipe DL oti i Katerina ton idhe JACC M. said that K. him saw b. ton Yani [mitera to] ipe DL oti i Katerina ton idhe JACC [the mother his] said that K. him saw

However, should one really expect a trace in the DL-position to cause WCO violations?15 A trace in the DL-position has the status of an intermediate trace in an A-bar chain (it is neither an operator, nor a variable), and it is dubious whether intermediate traces cause WCO violations. Unlike parasitic gaps, which only seem to need a local A-bar chain, WCO is defined with respect to true semantic variables (Lasnik and Stowell 1989; for additional evidence for a position like that of Lasnik and Stowell (1989) according to which only true semantic variables can cause WCO violations).

In the most often discussed cases of potential WCO configurations it is not possible to determine whether it is the deepest or an intermediate trace that causes the violation, and the decision would have to be made on theory internal grounds. However, long distance CLLD, by providing an environment where the two can be teased apart (the intermediate trace is connected by movement to the operator, but the semantic variable isn't), it provides additional evidence for a position like that of Lasnik and Stowell (1989) according to which only true semantic variables can cause WCO violations.

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 pedhia 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], which does create islands by blocking up "escape

15I am particularly grateful to Luigi Rizzi and T. 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) a. 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? who CL saw 'Who did we see?' b. (*las) vi a todas las mujeres CL saw all the women c. (*lo) vimos a JUAN him saw Juan 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 absorbs Case and that for the object NP to appear overtly, there must exist an additional source of Case. This can be done with a "dummy" preposition:

(6) i. a. L am vazut»(pe) Popescu CL have seen Popescu 'I have seen Popescu' b. Sif-t-a »(1) Xaltd saw CL Xalid 'I saw Xalid' c. Marie l'aiine*(a) Jean Marie CL loves Jean 'Marie loves Jean'

Pied Noir French, Robergc 1990

(7) The 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 regalan un auto to whom him/her gave a car 'To whom did they give a car?' b. quien le dio una niñita to whom he 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.
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. pi a pedhia (ta) maloses (MG)
   which children them scolded
   'Which children did you scold?'

b. A cual de los dos candidatos lo 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 will argue that the data in (48) are not instances of extraction of the which-phrase 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 pedhia (ta) maloses
   proj taj maloses proj
   CP

b. CP
   pia pedhia (ta) maloses
   proj taj maloses proj
   CP

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-phrase has not been extracted from the object position but from the DL-position. Sentences (45a) and (46a) are 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. dhio yasti (this) eksetasun olus tus arostus
   two doctors FUT CL examine all the patients

Sentences (46a-b) are unacceptable with the clitic. (46c) 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 (47a) and (47b), with the clitic it can only mean (47b):

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

18Depending on one's theory of echo-questions one can construct one more argument that extraction from a doubled position is not possible. This revolves around data like (i) and (ii):

(i) Pios idhe pion
   who saw whom?
   (Mary Bill, Jane Fred)

(ii) Pios ton idhe pion?
   who saw whom?
   (c. ho on object)

(iii) can only be answered by responding to the contained echo-question first, as indicated below the gloss. This contrast between (i) and (ii) is not expected if the Wh-word in object position can extract in both (i) and (ii) at LF.

19Some of these include the following. Jareggi (1982, 1986) argues that the expansion of sentences (45a-c) with the clitic are ungrammatical because the clitic absorbs the Case the verb has to assign (see fn. 15). As a result, the EC left behind by A-bar movement does not receive Case and therefore it cannot function as a variable.

According to Borer (1984), Case agreement is a condition on proper government. In (45) the clitic is Accusative, yet the EC left by movement is Dativic due to the preposition a. Therefore the extraction site violates the ECP.

According to Aoun (1981) accusative clitics absorb theta-roles, turning the doubled object to a non-argument, which can therefore not be extracted. In this account, Daivic clitics do not absorb theta-roles. According to Hurtado (1984) (for dialects of Spanish) and Philippaki-Warburton (1987) (for MG), the doubled NP stands in an A-bar position and gets Case in whichever way NP-adjuncts receive Case. In these proposals extraction from the doubled position is not possible because of what they consider to be a general ban on extraction from adjuncts. According to Suner (1988) clitics are (object) agreement markers, and therefore do not absorb Case or Theta-roles. But as agreement markers they must match in features the object they agree with. Daivic clitics are specified for [animate], [gender], [number] and [person]. Accusative clitics are specified for all those, plus [+specific]. So extraction from an accusative doubled position is out because there is a mismatch: the Wh-word is [+specific], while the clitic is [+specific].

All of the above accounts have their insights and weaknesses, but a detailed discussion of them would take us beyond the scope of the present paper.
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 pedhia ta maloses
   how many children them scold
   'Of the children already mentioned, how many of them did you scold?'
b. posa pedhia 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 possible only 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/qualsi bambini (hai detto che) (li) hai rimproverati
   how many/which children (have said that) (them) have scolded
   'How many/which children did you say that you have scolded?'
b. *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-phrase 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):

(55)

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 andra pandrefike xoris na agapa
   which man married without loves
   'Which man did she marry without loving?'
b. pion andra ton pandrefike (*xoris na agapa) clitic
   which man him married without loves

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

20There is also a clear contrast in WCO effects:

(i) a. ??7pio pedhia [i mitera tu] malose
   which child [the mother its] scold
   'Which child did you say you scolded?'b. pio pedhia i mitera tu to malose
   clitic
   which child the mother its him scolded

However, it appears that D-linked which-NPs do not show WCO violations (Pesetsky (p.c.)):

(ii) a. ??Who does his mother love?
   b. (i)Which boy does his mother love?

In other words, the contrast in (i) cannot uncontroversially be attributed to the lack of movement in (ib).
4 Summary

In this paper, I discussed Clitic Left Dislocation in Modern Greek and argued that the CLLD-ed constituent is not extracted from the postverbal position, but is base-generated adjoined to the minimal clause containing the coindexed clitic. I also argued that CLLD is restricted to D-linked constituents. I further suggested that the relation between the CLLD-ed constituent and the clause it is base-generated on is a relation of predication. More specifically, I suggested that the CLLD-ed constituent is the subject and the clitic (or, cliticized) 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 CLLD-ed constituent and the clitic is not one of movement, it is still subject to islands) should be attributed to constraint 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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(57) pion an didra ipe xorís na aga π PG [i. oit a ton pandrefti]]

which man say without loves that PUT 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-phase is extracted from the doubled position.21

21Dobrovie-Sorin (1990) sets up a category of "nonsyntactic quantifiers"; not unlike Cinque’s (1986) "non-bare quantifiers". According to her the difference between "syntactic" and "nonsyntactic" 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 "nonsyntactic" quantifier is care, which she glosses as which and its "nonsyntactic" quantifier status is derived in D-S’s paper from the fact that care non- phrases always need to be clitic doubled:

(i) pe care baist [0] ai vaxit
which boy him-have seen

"Which boy did you see?" For D-S, (i) shows that care cannot bind a variable, and that therefore a pronominal clitic is inserted. However, on p. 362 she says: ... 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 reasons 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 "nonsyntactic quantifiers."