Broad Subjects and Clitic Left Dislocation*

Theodora Alexopoulou, Edit Doron and Caroline Heycock

1 Introduction: Clitic-related peripheral positions

Our understanding of the syntax and semantics of left-peripheral positions has relied heavily on the study of a range of languages. On the basis of English alone, it would appear that there is clear evidence for two possible sources for (non-adverbial) phrases appearing to the left of the surface subject position. They may have moved to that position through A′ movement, in which case they will be part of a chain whose foot is a "gap"; cases like this may be categorised as topicalisation, focus-movement, negative inversion.[1] Alternatively, it is possible for phrases to be merged directly (base generated) in the left-peripheral position, and associated representationally with some pronominal element in the clause: this is the case of left-dislocation. There are number of well-known differences between left-dislocation and the other constructions involving phrases on the left-periphery in English, as will be set out in somewhat more detail below; crucially, though, left-dislocation shows no island effects, and is restricted to root clauses or, marginally, to clauses which are independently known to exhibit root behaviour (Ross 1967).

It is now clear, however, that this simple dichotomy does not hold crosslinguistically. In particular, the work of Cinque 1990 on Italian, and Iatridou 1995 and Anagnostopoulou 1994 on Greek, has demonstrated the possibility of a left-peripheral XP, apparently in an A′-position, and associated with a clitic, but which is not a case of left-dislocation of the English kind. This is the construction known as *Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD)*.

Further, in Doron and Heycock 1999, we argued for the existence in some languages of a left-peripheral XP in an A-position that can also be in a chain with a clitic. This was analysed as the result of merge at TP, available in languages where Nominative Case could be checked by more than one DP. We called such XPs *Broad Subjects (BS)*; they correspond to the "Major Subjects" of Japanese as discussed by Kuno 1973, Kuroda 1978, Kuroda 1986a; Kuroda 1986b, and many subsequent authors (for an analysis and further references, see Heycock 1993).

In this earlier work, we were primarily concerned to show that Broad Subjects were neither instances of a specialised Topic or Focus position, nor were they left-dislocated phrases of the kind described for English. One might ask, however, whether the Broad Subject construction

---

[1] There is of course an alternative view of "topicalisation," according to which it is a null operator, and not the topic itself, that moves; at the moment this distinction is not important to us.

and Clitic Left Dislocation should in fact be reduced to a single phenomenon. This paper will explore this question in Hebrew and Levantine Arabic. The conclusion will be that the two constructions do have to be distinguished, and in fact that we find all combinations: Italian and Greek have CLLD without BS; Modern Hebrew has BS without CLLD, and Levantine Arabic has both CLLD and BS.

2   Brief outline of background and terminology

Because the left periphery has been getting more crowded, the terminology can no longer be taken for granted. We will therefore sketch out very briefly what we are taking as the denotation of some key terms. First, we will adopt **PXP** as a neutral term for any phrase that appears at the left periphery (this is supposed to be mnemonic for "peripheral XP"). Second, we will use **RP** to refer to any element occurring within a sentence, whether clitic or not, that is bound by the PXP, leaving open whether or not such an element is a "true" resumptive pronoun.

2.1   Left dislocation

We will use **L[eft] D[islocation]** to refer to the construction exemplified by the English example in (1). Note that here, as in all following examples, bold face does not represent stress; we simply use it to facilitate quick identification of the PXP and RP.

(1)   **A man like that**, I'd run a mile before I trusted **him** with a secret.

A partial characterization of this construction includes the following points (see also Cinque 1977, Cinque 1990: 57–60).

- A nominal PXP (see e.g. Cinque 1990: 58, Cinque 1977).
  That is, the PXP may not be a PP or an AP or a VP, for example, but must be some extended projection of a nominal:

  (2)   *__From a man like that__, I'd run a mile before I accepted a gift **from him**.

- An RP that *can* be a strong (or tonic) pronoun.

- Restriction to root clauses.
  The construction may not appear in embedded clauses, except possibly in those which are known independently to license "root phenomenona" (see Heycock (in press) for discussion and references).

This construction is referred to in Cinque 1977 as the *hanging topic* construction, but in Cinque 1990 he too adopts the term L[eft] D[islocation].

2.2   Topicalisation

Topicalisation is illustrated for English and Greek (Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002) below:

(3)   **Shoes like those** I would never wear.

(4) a. **tin**   **parastasi** skinothetise o   karolos kun
       the-ACC show   directed-3s   the-NOM Karolos Kun
       Karolos Kun directed the show.

     b. **tetia paputsia** de tha   foruse pote i   maria
       such shoes   not would wear-3s never the-NOM Maria
       Maria would never wear such shoes.

Some characteristics:

- PXP not necessarily nominal.

- No pronominal RP.

- Not strictly limited to root clauses, although impossible in non-finite clauses.

- Focal stress not on PXP; standardly associated with the discourse function of topic.

The extent to which topicalisation can occur in embedded clauses is a matter of some controversy. It is often assumed to be a "root" phenomenon, but nevertheless appears to occur more freely in embedded contexts than Left Dislocation does (Heycock in press); see for example (Rizzi 1997) for an influential account according to which topicalised phrases occupy a position below that of the complementiser. To give just one example, embedded topicalisation appears acceptable in Greek:

(5) a. skeftika   oti **tetia paputsia** de tha   foruse pote i   Maria
       thought-1s that such shoes   not would wear-3s never the-NOM Maria
       I thought that Maria would never wear such shoes (and so I did not buy her any).

     b. ine mia kopela stin   opia **lefta**   de tha   daniza se kamia periptosn
       is a   girl   to-the who money not would lend-1s in no   case
       She is a girl to who I would lend money under no circumstances.

With respect to the question of focal stress: in this paper we will have little to say about a further left-peripheral construction: **focus movement**. Typically this appears very similar to topicalisation except for the focal stress on the PXP, although it has been argued to involve movement to a distinct position (see e.g. Rizzi 1997). For those familiar with Cinque 1990, note that he uses "topicalisation" to refer to what we would call focus movement (see particularly p. 63, fn. 11).

2.3 CLLD

Cl[itic] L[eft] D[islocation] has been exemplified in the literature in various languages, including Italian, French, Greek, and (Lebanese) Arabic, illustrated here in turn:

(6) **In quella città**, non **ci**   sono mai stato.
     in that town   not there am   ever been
     I have never been in that town.

(7) **Au pape**, personne n'oserait   **lui**   parler ainsi.
     to-the pope no one   neg-would-dare to-him speak thus
     No one would dare to speak to the pope like that.

(8)   **ta klidia ta**   stilame sti   maria
        the keys   them sent   to-the Maria
        We sent the keys to Maria.

(9)   fakart   ʔinno **naadya** šeef-**a**   Kariim mbeeriħ
        thought that   Nadia   saw-her Kerim   yesterday
        I thought that Kerim saw Nadia yesterday.

Some characteristics:

- PXP not necessarily nominal (at least in French and Italian—see Section 4.3).

- RP is a *clitic* pronoun.[2]

- Not restricted to root clauses.

- Focal stress not on PXP; standardly associated with the discourse function of topic.

As pointed out in Cinque 1990, and much subsequent work, CLLD in Italian at least shares many properties with topicalisation as found in English. The pragmatics of the construction appear to be similar, and like topicalisation in English (and unlike Left Dislocation), the construction is not limited to DPs. Rather confusingly, at least in his initial description of CLLD in Italian, Cinque states that when the RP is a direct object clitic, it is obligatory, but in all other cases it is optional:

(10)   a.   **Gianni**, *(**lo**)   vedrò   domani.
            Gianni   *(him) will-see tomorrow
            I'll see Gianni tomorrow.
       b.   **A casa**, non (**ci**)   sono stato ancora.
            to home not (there) am   been yet
            I haven't been home yet.

Rizzi (1997) claims that the same is true in French: thus for example alongside (7) above, the version without any clitic is also acceptable:

(11)   **Au pape**,   personne n'oserait   parler ainsi.
        to-the pope no one   neg-would-dare speak thus
        No one would dare to speak to the pope like that.

However, as both of these authors go on to demonstrate, there are in fact subtle differences between examples of CLLD with and without "optional" clitics. In this paper, therefore, we will reserve the term **CLLD** for examples where there is an pronominal RP; cases which Cinque would refer to as "CLLD without a clitic" we will refer to as **topicalisation**, using this term then in a more superficial descriptive sense than Cinque himself. This terminology

---

[2]Cinque (1977) argues that German also allows the construction that he later refers to as CLLD; German does not however have true clitic pronouns. It does have a series of "weak" pronouns, and these are what appear in the construction discussed by Cinque. It may be then that CLLD should rather be thought of as involving the "weakest" type of pronominal available in the language at issue (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999 for a proposal concerning a pronominal hierarchy). Note that we assume that the *pro* that occurs as the subject in *pro*-drop languages can consistute the pronominal RP in CLLD. As a result, sentences where the PXP corresponds to a subject in such languages may in some cases be ambiguous between CLLD or topicalisation.

is not meant to exclude the possibility that CLLD and topicalisation should—perhaps only in some cases—be unified.

CLLD has a number of intriguing characteristics which have not been mentioned here, these will be discussed as they become relevant.

2.4   Broad Subjects

Doron and Heycock 1999 argued for the existence in Modern Hebrew, Modern Standard Arabic, and also in Japanese, of a further type of PXP, there termed the **Broad Subject**. (12) is an example from Hebrew, (13) from Japanese, (14) from Modern Standard Arabic and (15) from Levantine Arabic (LA):[3]

(12)   **ruti** yeš   l-**a**   savlanut
       Ruti there-is to-her patience
       Ruti has patience.

(13)   **mary**-**ga**   kami-ga   nagai (koto)
       Mary-NOM hair-NOM long   (fact)
       Mary has long hair.

(14)   **ʔal**-**bayt**-**u**   ʔalwaan-u-**hu**   zaahiyat-un
       the-house-NOM colours-NOM-its bright-NOM
       The house has bright colours.
       Literally: The house, its colours are bright.

(15)   **ʔil**-**beet**   ʔalwaan-**o** faatħa
       the-house colours-its bright
       The house has bright colours.
       Literally: The house, its colours are bright.

Some characteristics:

- PXP nominal, and in the nominative case (where this can be determined).

- Not restricted to root clauses.

- May bear focal stress; consistent with either discourse function, topic or focus.

3   Broad Subjects are distinct from LD and CLLD

3.1   Subject properties of Broad Subjects

As noted in the introduction, in our earlier work on Broad Subjects we focussed primarily on establishing the properties that indicated that they had the status of elements in Spec,T[ense]P, and were neither topicalised nor left-dislocated. We argued in Doron and Heycock 1999 and Heycock and Doron 2003 that Broad Subjects in Arabic and in Hebrew have the properties normally associated with subjects in A-position rather than properties of

---

[3]The varieties of Arabic spoken in Lebanon, Syria, Israel and Palestine are classified together as Levantine Arabic. Though there is variation between these differenct areas, it is not wider than the variation which is often found between dialects within each area. The data reported in this paper are drawn from work on LA by Aoun and Benmamoun 1998 and consultants from Lebanon and Israel.

dislocated elements in A′-position. Here we briefly summarize some of the arguments, replacing the Standard Arabic examples with Levantine Arabic, since the facts are parallel. First, Broad Subjects occur freely in embedded contexts. In Arabic, Broad Subjects can be embedded under ECM verbs, as illustrated in (16a), just like ordinary subjects. Such embedding is impossible with topicalised sentences in Arabic, and also with left-dislocation sentences in e.g. the English (16b).

(16)   a.   fakart   **il-beet**   ʔalwaan-**o** faatħa
                thought-1s the-house colours-its bright
                I believed the house to be of bright colours.
    b.   *I believed the house its colours (were/to be) bright

Moreover, a Broad Subject can be embedded under an auxiliary in Arabic (17a), which is impossible for English left-dislocated elements (17b):

(17)   a.   kaan   **il-beet**   ʔalwaan-**o** faatħa
                was-3M the-house-3M colours-its bright
                The house was of bright colors.
    b.   *Was the house its colours (were) bright?

In Hebrew, we find Broad Subjects embedded in the antecedent of conditionals (18a), unlike dislocated elements:

(18)   a.   im be'emet **ruti** yeš   l-**a**   savlanut, eyx ze še   hi sonet tašbecim
                if   indeed Ruti there-is to-her patience, how it that she hates puzzles
                If indeed Ruti has patience, how come she hates crossword puzzles?
    b.   *If indeed Ruti she has patience, how come she hates crossword puzzles?

Further, the example in (19a) shows that in Hebrew a Broad Subject may occur to the right of an adjunct, which a left-dislocated phrase in English may not (19b):

(19)   a.   be anglit   **kol mišpat** yeš   **lo**   nose
                in English each   sentence there-is to-it subject
                In English each sentence has a subject.
    b.   *In the classroom, Ruti she has patience.

Broad Subjects also behave like ordinary subjects is that in a coordination a single noun phrase may be shared between two conjuncts, in one of which it functions as the Broad Subject, and in the other as an ordinary subject. Examples from Arabic and Hebrew are given in (20a) and (20b) respectively:

(20)   a.   **sayyart-i** loon-**a**   faateħ   uu- maftuuħa min foʔ
                car(F)-my colour(M)-its bright(M) and open(F)   from above
                My car has a bright colour and is a convertible.
    b.   **yerušalayim** toldotey-**ha** svuxot   ve- qdoša le šaloš datot
                Jerusalem   history-its   complex and holy to three religions
                Jerusalem has a complex history and is holy to three religions.

The first conjunct in each of these examples is a sentential predicate, which is conjoined with an ordinary predicate. Note that the second conjunct, being a predicate AP, is undoubtedly

only a predicate and not a sentence with a null subject, since predicate APs do not license *pro*-drop in these languages.

In Hebrew, the subject status of Broad Subjects can also be demonstrated by a particular cleft-construction which applies to subjects only:

(21)   a.   dani hu še   ʕazar   le dina
                  Dani he that helped to Dina
                  It is Dani who helped Dina.
        b.   *dina hi   še   dani ʕazar   l-a
                  Dina she that Dani helped to-her
                  It is Dina that Dani helped.

Broad Subjects too are clefted in this construction, as in the following example from Amatzia Porat's translation of Faulkner's *Absalom, Absalom!* published in 1983 by Am Oved Publishers, Tel Aviv:

(22)   še-harey **elen** hi   be-ecem še   haya   l-**a**   sade panuy
        since   Ellen she really   that there-was to-her field free
        Since it was really Ellen who had the free field.

Levantine Arabic is of particular interest here because, as we will argue in the following sections, it has both BSs and CLLD. This position differs from recent literature on LA. In particular, Aoun and Benmamoun 1998 argue that Lebanese Arabic has CLLD, which, however, divides into two cases, with very different properties. One type of CLLD they argue to be the result of movement of the PXP from within the clause, leaving a trace, and the other to be the result of base-generation of the PXP at the left periphery. As they note, CLLD derived by movement respects islands and allows binding of pronouns by quantifiers under "reconstruction"; base-generated CLLD-ed PXPs neither respect islands nor do they allow reconstruction. While their hypothesis can capture the differences they observe for the two cases, it does not accommodate some further differences between them. Unlike their movement driven CLLD, and in contrast to the cases of CLLD documented in Italian and Greek, their island violating variant appears orthogonal to information structure: it can be the basis of *wh*-movement and can accept downward entailing quantifiers like *no one*. To the extent that both types of the CLLD they assume involve A′-binding, this contrast is completely unexpected under their assumptions. In the following sections we will present evidence indicating that the two variants of CLLD they propose in fact involve two distinct phenomena. While their movement island respecting variant appears to be an instance of the type of CLLD found also in Italian and Greek, their island violating one corresponds to a BS construction. In discussing Aoun and Benmamoun's (1998) data we will systematially compare them with cases of BSs from Hebrew and Arabic.

3.2   Information Structure: Broad Subjects and CLLD

As discussed in Cinque 1990, Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002, and Aoun and Benmamoun 1998, in Italian, Greek, and Levantine Arabic (but see comments below), CLLD has a fairly specific discourse function (see also Tsimpli 1995, Anagnostopoulou 1994 for Greek, and Vallduví 1993 for Catalan). One aspect of this is that CLLD is incompatible with focus (Cinque 1990: 63, Rizzi 1997: 289, Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002: 2–3). In Cinque's

example (23) from Italian, where *Gianni* bears the nuclear accent of the sentence (as indicated by the small capitals) and is thus interepreted as focus, the clitic *l* renders the example ungrammatical.

(23)　*Gianni,　l'ho　　cercato, non Piero.
　　　　Gianni(focus) him-have sought　not　Piero
　　　　I looked for Gianni, not Piero.

Similarly in (24) from Greek, the focus interpretation of *to Yani*, forced by the context in (a) and the placement of the nuclear accent, is incompatible with the clitic in (b).

(24)　a.　pion　　apelise i　maria?
　　　　　who-ACC fired-3s the Maria-NOM
　　　　　'Who did Maria fire?'
　　　b.　**to** Yani　　　　(***ton**) apelise i　　maria
　　　　　the Yanis(focus) (*him) fired　　the Maria-NOM
　　　　　Maria fired Yanis.

In contrast, in Hebrew and LA (as in Japanese) the BS may function as a focus or a topic (Doron and Heycock 1999: 74). Thus the following exchange in Hebrew is perfectly felicitous: despite the presence of the clitic -*a*, *Rina* is the focus.

(25)　a.　**mi** yeš　　l-**o**　　zman la-dvarim　　ha'ele
　　　　　who there-is to-him time　for-the-things the-these
　　　　　Who has time for these things?
　　　b.　**rina** yeš　　l-**a**　　zman
　　　　　Rina there-is to-her time
　　　　　Rina has time.

The same is true in LA:

(26)　a.　**miin** šaʕar-**ha** ṭawiil
　　　　　who　hair-her　(is) long
　　　　　Who has long hair?
　　　b.　**rana** šaʕar-**ha** ṭawiil
　　　　　Rana hair-her　(is) long
　　　　　Rana has long hair.

　　　In other words, the BS construction, in contrast to CLLD, is orthogonal to information structure. Given our analysis of the BS construction, according to which the PXP is in an A-position as a specifier of TP, this contrast is expected under current assumptions about the properties of the domain of C and T. While XPs appearing in the C domain are often associated with distinct information structural segments (topic/link, focus—see for example contributions in Kiss 1995), the BS, appearing in Spec,TP, is not expected to have a specific import for the information structure of the sentence.
　　　Consider now the following examples also from Levantine Arabic, in which *Hamlet* and *hadak likteeb* in (27) and (28) are felicitous foci, and are thus on a par with the BSs in (25) and (26) rather than the CLLD examples in (23) and (24). Under the analysis in Aoun and Benmamoun 1998, (27) and (28) would be instances of base-generated CLLD (since they violate islands). Thus the only difference between the examples below and the corresponding

Italian and Greek CLLD would be that the latter would involve movement. Both cases though would be instances of A′ binding from presumably the same position. It is not clear, then, how this contrast could be captured.

(27) A: **ʔayya masraħiyye** ruħt   min duun ma   šuuft-**a**?
          which play   left-2s without   COMP see-her
          Which play did you leave without seeing (it)?

      B: **"Hamlet"** ruħt   min duun ma   šuuft-**a**
          Hamlet   left-1s without   COMP see-her
          I left without seeing HAMLET.

(28) A: **ʔayya kteeb** ħkiit   maʕ zzalame yalli katab-**o**
          which book   you-talked with the-man that wrote-it
          Which book did you talk with the man who wrote (it)?

      B: **hadak likteeb** ħkiit   maʕ zzalame yalli katab-**o**
          that   book   I-talked with the-man that wrote-it
          I talked with the man that wrote THAT BOOK.

3.3   QPs in the PXP position

Bare quantifiers (those that do not contain a lexical restriction) do not allow CLLD in Italian (Cinque 1990, Rizzi 1997) and Greek (Iatridou 1995, Anagnostopoulou 1994, Giannakidou 1997).[4]

(29) a. ***Nessuno**, **lo** ho   visto.
          no one   him I-have seen
          No one, I saw him.

      b. ***Tutto**,   **lo** ho   fatto
          everything it I-have done
          Everything, I did it.

(30) ***kanena**   den **ton** ida
      nobody-ACC not him saw-1s
      Nobody I saw him.

In contrast, the following examples of the BS construction are acceptable. The examples in (31a)–(31d) are from Hebrew, and the examples in (32a)–(32d) from Levantine Arabic.

(31) a. **af exad** eyn   l-**o**   savlanut la-dvarim ha'ele
          no one   (there) is not to-him patience to these things
          No one has patience for these things.

      b. **af exad** lo mecapim   še yegale   savlanut la-dvarim ha'ele
          no one   not (they) expect that (he) will show patience to these things
          No one is such that people expect that he would show patience for these things.

      c. **kol   exad** sof-**o**   lehašlim im   hameci'ut
          every one   end-his to-accept with reality
          Everyone ends up accepting reality.

---

[4]Bare indefinite quantifiers, however, may occur in CLLD in Italian in certain contexts: see Cinque 1990: 73–77.

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

      e.   **kol davar** yeš   l-**o**   sikuy
          everything (there) is to-it chance
          Everything has a chance.

(32)   a.   **wala waḥade** šaʕar-**ha** ṭawiil
          no   one(F)   hair-her long
          No one has long hair.

      b.   **wala waḥad** bifawtu   l-muwazzafiin illi   bištirlu maʕa-**h**
          no   one(M) (they) allow in the-employees that work   with-him
          No one is such that they let in the employees that work with him.

      c.   **kull waḥade** šaʕar-**ha** ṭawiil
          everyone(F) hair-her long
          'Everyone has long hair.'

      d.   **kull waḥad** bifawtu   l-muwazzafiin illi   bištirlu maʕa-**h**
          everyone(M) (they) allow in the-employees that work   with-him
          'Everyone [is such that] they let in the employees that work with him.'

    As can be seen from the examples above, the comparison between Semitic and Italian is not completely minimal, in that the Italian quantifiers are single lexical items—*nessuno, tutto*—while Hebrew and LA have no forms expressing both the quantifier and the restrictive term. Indeed, both Cinque and Rizzi take this morphosyntactic fact about the Italian examples to be essential, and Rizzi provides an entirely syntactic account for the ungrammaticality of (29a) and (29b) above which depends on the impossibility of Quantifier Raising the entire phrase from the PXP position (in contrast to QR of a quantifier from the specifier of the PXP). This, in his account, provides an explanation for the contrast between the ungrammaticality of (29a) and (29b) and the acceptablity of examples like (33a,b) (Rizzi 1997: 295).[5]

(33)   a.   **Tutti i   tuoi libri**, **li**   ho   rimessi a posto.
          all   the your books them have put-back in place
          I have replaced all your books.

      b.   **Molti libri**, **li**   ho   buttati via.
          many books them have thrown away
          I have thrown away many books.

If Rizzi's account of this contrast is correct, then the acceptability of the Hebrew and Arabic examples in (31) and (32) cited above would not preclude them from being examples of CLLD. However, at least in the case of downward-entailing quantifiers it seems that the purely syntactic account is not sufficiently restrictive. Neither Cinque nor Rizzi give any example of the behaviour of syntactically complex downward entailing QPs. According to Rizzi's account, one would expect a difference in acceptability between (29a) above, repeated here as (34a), and (34b). This prediction is not however confirmed; our informants reported no improvement in such examples.

---

[5]The examples quoted here from Rizzi 1997 are all plural, but (Cinque 1990) gives grammatical examples of singular quantified nominals in the CLLD construction (see e.g. pp. 74–76).

(34) a. ***Nessuno**, **lo** ho   visto.
          no one   him I-have seen
          I saw no one.
      b. ***Nessun uomo**, **lo** ho   visto.
          no   man   him I-have seen
          I saw no man.

The same is true of Greek, as shown in (35a,b).

(35) a. ***kanena**   den **ton** ida
          nobody-ACC not him saw-1s
          Nobody I saw him.
      b. ?***kanena**   anthropo den **ton** ida
          nobody-ACC man   not him saw-1s
          No man I saw him.

We conclude from these data that downward entailing quantifiers are excluded from functioning as the PXP in the CLLD construction, presumably because such quantifiers cannot function as topics. Thus, given that *nessun uomo* (no man) is not possible as the PXP in Italian CLLD, the grammaticality of the equivalent quantified PXPs in Hebrew and Arabic argues that we are dealing with a different construction in the latter two languages.

It is not surprising that quantified BSs can bind pronouns, given that they appear in a subject position (Spec,TP) and subjects are of course able to bind pronouns, as in the simple case in (36).

(36)   Nobody$_i$/who$_i$ loves his$_i$ mother.

On the other hand we assume that QPs in A$'$ positions cannot bind pronouns; purely quantificational QPs (in the sense of Beghelli 1994; Beghelli 1995) are thus excluded from CLLD. This assumption is in accordance with the fact that *wh*-phrases (which occupy an A$'$ position) typically resist coindexing with resumptive pronouns, as for example shown in (37) from Italian and (38) from Greek.[6]

(37) ***Chi** l'hai   visto?
        who him-saw-2s saw
        'Who did you see (him)?'

(38) ***pion**   **ton** ides?
        who(M)-ACC him saw-2s
        'Who did you see (him)?'

Unlike CLLD and on a par with ordinary subjects, BSs may be questioned, as shown in Doron and Heycock 1999 and illustrated already by the questions in (25) from Hebrew and (26)-(28) from LA (see also section 3.4).

Before leaving the question of quantifiers, consider the following examples from Levantine Arabic, and in particular the contrast between them and the ungrammatical (29a) and (30) above from Italian and Greek respectively. Under Aoun and Benmamoun's (1998) assumptions the examples in (39) are ambiguous between base-generation and movement. In either

---

[6]We should however note that the relevant literature reports that d-linking can improve the acceptability of clitics in wh-questions at least in Greek (Iatridou 1995, Anagnostopoulou 1994, Dobrovie-Sorin 1990).

case though they should involve A′ binding from presumably the same position as their Italian and Greek counterparts. The contrast therefore between Italian and Greek CLLD on one hand and Levantine Arabic is unexpected. We take this contrast as further indication that the examples in (39), rather than involving CLLD, are in fact instances of BSs, on a par with the Hebrew and Arabic examples presented earlier.

(39)   a.   **wala** waħade xabbaruw-**a**
            no   one(F) told-3P-her
            No one$_i$, they told her$_i$.

        b.   **wala** waħade ħekuu   l-**a**
            no   one(F) talked-3P to-her
            No one$_i$, they talked to her$_i$.

        c.   **wala** waħade ħekuu   maʕ-**a**
            no   one(F) talked-3P with-her
            No one$_i$, they talked with her$_i$.

3.4 Island violations

CLLD constructions respect islands (see Cinque 1990: 59 for Italian and Iatridou 1995 for Greek). This is in fact one of the central facts about CLLD, and one that crucially distinguishes it from "ordinary" **LD**. The following two examples are from the longer list in Cinque 1990.[7]

(40)   a.   *__A Carlo__, ti   parlerò   solo delle persone che **gli**   piacciono.
            to Carlo you (I) will talk only of the people who to him appeal
            To Carlo, I will talk to you only about the people who appeal to him.

        b.   *__A casa__, lo   abbiamo incontrato prima che **ci**   andasse.
            home   him (we) have met   before that there he went
            Home, we met him before he went there.

The **BS** construction, on the other hand, clearly does not respect islands. Compare (40) with (41a)-(41c) from LA. In (41a) the PXP *ʔayya masraħiyye* is associated with a resumptive pronoun in an adjunct island; in (41b) the dependency is across a CNP while in (41c), *ʔayya walad* corresponds to a clitic in a wh-island.

(41)   a.   badkun taʕrfo   **ʔayya masraħiyye** ruħt   min duun ma   šuuft-**a**
            want-2P know-2P which play   left-1S without   COMP see-1s-her
            You want to know which play I left without seeing (it).

---

[7]Both Italian and Greek allow CLLD over a wh-phrase, as shown in (i) from Rizzi 1997, 14a and (ii) from Greek; but wh-phrases do not create islands in either of these languages.

(i)   Mi domando, **il premio Nobel**, a chi   **lo** potrebbero dare.
       refl ask   the prize   Nobel to whom it they-could give
       I wonder, the Nobel prize, to whom they could give it.

(ii)   anarotieme **to proto vravio** se pion   tha **to**   dosun
       wonder-1s the first   prize   to who-ACC will it-CL give-3P
       I wonder, the first prize, to whom they will give it.

b. badkun taʕrfo **ʔayya kteeb** ħkiit maʕ zzalame yalli katab-**o**
want-2P know-2P which book talked-1s with the-man who wrote-3SM-him
You want to know which book I talked with the man who wrote (it).

c. tseeʔalto **ʔayya walad** byaʕrfo ʔiza Kariim ḍarab-**o**
wondered-2P which boy know-3P whether Kerim hit-3SM-him
You wondered which boy they know whether Kerim hit (him).

That the construction illustrated is the Broad Subject construction, rather than Left Dislocation (which is known not to respect islands) is shown by the fact that, unlike LD, which is a root phenomenon, the PXPs in the above examples are all embedded. Further, the above examples involve *wh*-questions based on the BS; something that as far as we are aware is never possible for clear cases of LD. In the answer to such a question, for example (42a) from Hebrew, the PXP is in focus, which again is not typical of the information structure associated with left dislocation (see also (27) and (28) from LA).

(42) a. **eyze bamay** makrinim et ha-sratim šel-**o** bli targum
which director (they) show ACC the-films his without translation
Which director's films do they show without translation?

b. lemašal **Hitchcock** makrinim et ha-sratim šel-**o** bli targum
for example Hitchcock (they) show ACC the-films his without translation
For example they show HITCHCOCK's films without translation.

Finally, the island violating examples of LA and Hebrew BSs allow a downward entailing quantifier like *no*, which again is typically impossible with LD. Examples (43a–d) illustrate this point for LA; the Hebrew facts are shown in (44).

(43) a. **wala masraħiyye** ruħt min duun ma šuuft-**a**
no play left-1s without COMP see-1s-her
No play did I leave without seeing (it).

b. **wala kteeb** ħkiit maʕ zzalame yalli katab-**o**
no book talked-1s with the-man that wrote-it
No book did I talk with the man who wrote (it).

c. **wala waħad** bifawtu l-muwazzafiin illi bištirlu maʕa-**h**
no one(M) (they) allow in the-employees that work with-him
No one (is such that) they let in the employees that work with (him).

d. **wala walad** byaʕrfo ʔiza Kariim ḍarab-**o**
no boy know-3P whether Kerim hit-him
No boy do they know whether Kerim hit (him).

(44) **af exad** lo maxnisim le-kan et ha'anašim še ʕovdim it-**o**
no one not (they) let in to-here ACC the-people who work with-him
No one (is such that) they allow in here the people who work with (him).

In addition to clausal islands, a possessor BS can be extracted both from subject and object DPs, as illustrated in (45a,b) from Hebrew and (32a)—repeated below as (46)—from LA. The fact that all PXPs in the examples below involve quantified phrases excludes the possibility of an LD analysis.

(45) a. **kol exad** sof-**o** lehašlim im hameci'ut
every one end-his to-accept with reality

Everyone ends up accepting reality.

    b. **af bamay** zar   lo   makrinim et   srat-**av** le-lo   targum
       no director foreign not (they) show ACC films-his without translation
       No foreign director has his films shown without subtitles.

(46)   **wala waħade** šaʕar-**ha** ṭawiil
       no   one(F)   hair-her long
       No one has long hair.

Note that adjunct clauses, *wh*-questions and relative clauses are islands for *wh*-movement and topicalisation/focus movement in Levantine Arabic. Consider first the ungrammaticality of topicalisation/focus-movement and *wh*-movement from an adjunct clause (for further examples see Aoun and Benmamoun 1998).

(47)   *smeʕt   ʔinno naadya ruħte   min duun ma   šuufte.
       heard-1S that   Nadia   left-2SF without   COMP see-2SF
       I heard that Nadia you left without seeing.

(48)   *baddkun taʕrfo   miin ruħt   min duun ma   šuuft
       want-2P know-2P who left-1S without   COMP see-1S
       You want to know who(m) I left without seeing.

Further, extraction of the possessor from a DP is impossible in LA as shown by the ungrammaticality of (49a–c).

(49)   a. *miin šaʕar ṭawiil?
         who hair (is)-long?
         Who has long hair?
    b. *ʔayya mara   šaʕar ṭawiil?
         which woman hair (is)-long?
         Which woman has long hair?
    c. *ayya   beet   ʔalwaan faatħa?
         which house colours (are)-bright
         Which house has bright colours?

The same is true of *wh*-movement in Hebrew; it cannot violate islands that are happily crossed by BSs (Borer 1984). Thus for example a possessor phrase cannot be questioned out of a DP:

(50)   *šel eyze anašim sof-am   lehašlim   im   hameci'ut
       of which people end-their to-accept with reality
       Intended: Which people end up accepting reality?

Rather, pied piping of the entire NP is obligatory:

(51)   sof-am   šel eyze anašim lehašlim im   hameci'ut
       end-their of which people to-accept with reality
       Which people end up accepting reality?

Now compare the ungrammaticality of extracting a possessor from the containing DP, as in (50) above, to the grammaticality of *wh*-moving a BS:

(52)   **eyze anašim** sof-**am**   lehašlim   im   hameci'ut
       which people   end-their to-accept with reality
       Which people end up accepting reality?

Neither can *wh*-movement take place out of relative clauses:

(53)   *im   eyze   bamay   lo   maxnisim   le-kan   et   ha'anašim   še   ovdim
       with which director not (they) let in to-here ACC the-people who work
       With which director$_i$ do they not allow in here the people who work t_i

Again, pied piping of the entire DP is obligatory:

(54)   et   ha'anašim   še   ovdim im   eyze   bamay   lo   maxnisim   le-kan
       ACC the-people who work   with which director not (they) let in to-here
       The people who work with which director do they not allow in here?

Just as in (52) above, however, also here it is possible to question the BS:

(55)   **eyze bamay** lo   maxnisim   le-kan   et   ha'anašim   še   ovdim it-**o**
       which director not (they) let in to-here ACC the-people who work   with-him
       Which director is such that they do not allow in here the people who work with him?

Again many of the examples discussed in this section are presented by Aoun and Benmamoun 1998 as cases of base-generated CLLD (since they all involve islands). As mentioned earlier the very fact that most of these examples involve either a *wh*-question or a downward-entailing quantifier like *wala waħad* (no one) already casts doubts on the correctness of the CLLD analysis. But even if our previous objections were overcome and all these cases were indeed instances of CLLD, a BS construction would still have to be postulated in addition to their two variants of CLLD. The reason CLLD could not subsume all the relevant cases relates to examples involving possessor PXPs as in (56).

(56)   a.   **wala waħade** šaʕar-**ha** ṭawiil
            no   one(F)   hair-her   long
            No one has long hair.
       b.   **miin** šaʕar-**ha** ṭawiil?
            who   hair-her   (is) long
            Who has long hair?
       c.   **rana** šaʕar-**ha** ṭawiil
            Rana hair-her   (is) long
            Rana has long hair.

At first sight it looks as though such examples could be analysed as cases of base-generated CLLD, since all the examples above involve island violations. However a complication arises when some crosslinguistic facts are considered. As shown in (57a-c) extraction of a possessor is grammatical in Greek.

(57)   a.   pianu   tha danistis   to aftokinito (?*tu)?
            who-GEN will borrow-2s the car   his
            Whose car will you borrow?
       b.   pianis   vapsane ta   malia (?*tis) mavra?
            who-GEN dyed-3P the hair   (her)   black

Whose hair did they die black?

c. pianu   tha erthi   i   mana   (?*tu)?
    who-GEN will come-3S the-NOM mother his
    Whose mother will come?

It would thus be expected that CLLD of a possessor NP should be grammatical in Greek. As already indicated in (57), however, the resumptive pronoun is not acceptable. In the case of (57) this could be due to the fact that clitics are typically bad in *wh*-questions. However, in (58a-c), where the PXPs are not accented (therefore precluding a focus interpretation) the sentences are still unacceptable.

(58)   a. ?***tu**   **yani**   tha danisto   to   AFTOKINITO **tu**
          the-GEN Yanis-GEN will borrow-1S the car   his
          As for of-Yanis, I will borrow THE CAR.

      b. ?***mas ipane   oti **tis**   **elenis**   tha erthi   i   MANA **tis**
          us   told-3P that the-GEN Eleni-GEN will come-3S the-NOM mother her
          They told us that Helen her MOTHER will come.

So the mere fact that CLLD respects islands in Greek but does not necessarily respect islands in Levantine Arabic would not be enough to explain the difference. A BS construction would have to be assumed for Levantine Arabic, a justified hypothesis in view of the fact that all such examples are identical to Hebrew BSs, a language which does not have CLLD. Since it appears that a BS construction should be assumed for Levantine Arabic, and since the properties of Aoun and Benmamoun's (1998) island violating CLLD can be better explained under a BS analysis, we conclude that there is no reason to assume both BSs and two variants of CLLD.

3.5   Creation of islands for movement

Another factor distinguishing CLLD from BSs is that unlike the former, the latter create islands for extraction.

In both Hebrew and LA BSs create islands for extraction.[8] Thus consider the ungrammaticality of *wh*-movement over the BS in (59a,b) from Hebrew, and the corresponding examples from LA in (60).

---

[8]There seems to be an asymmetry here between adjuncts and arguments. Thus, (59a), where the wh-phrase is an argument, contrasts with (i), where the wh-phrase is an adjunct.

(i)   le-eyze   dvarim **af exad** eyn l-**o**   savlanut
          to-which things   no one   not to-him patience
          For which things does no one have patience?

This contrast can be explained under the assumption that, unlike arguments, adjuncts are merged anywhere in the clause where they are interpreted. Crucially, when a long-distance dependency is involved, as in (ii), where adjuncts may only appear at the Spec of the higher CP through movement, long-distance movement of a *wh*-adjunct phrase over a BS is illicit.

(ii)   *heyxan **dani** yeš be-kox-**o**   li-fgoš   et   rina
       where$_i$ Dani it-is in-power-his to-meet ACC Rina t$_i$
       Where is it in Dani's power to meet Rina?

Note that long-distance movement of adjuncts is possible in Hebrew, as shown in (iii). Thus it is only the presence of the BS in (ii) that blocks the extraction of *heyxan*.

(59) a. *kama   savlanut **ruti** yeš   l-**a**?
          how-much patience Ruti there-is to-her
          How much patience does Ruti have?

      b. *et-mi   **dani** yeš be-kox-**o**   li-fgoš   bi-yrušalayim?
          ACC-who Dani it-is in-power-his to-meet in-Jerusalem
          Who is it in Dani's power to meet in Jerusalem?

(60) a. *adeeš faatħa **l-beet**   ʔalwaan-**o**?
          how   bright the-house colours-its?
          How bright are this house's colours?

      b. *adeeš   ṭawiil **rana**   šaʕar-**a**?
          how-long Rana hair-her
          How long is Rana's hair?

The same point is illustrated by Aoun and Benmamoun's (1998, ex. 27–28) shown below. Not only *wh*-movement (61a) but also topicalisation is illicit over a BS as shown in (61b) for LA and (62) for Hebrew.

(61) a. *šu   **naadya** xabbaro   ššabe   yalli šeef-**a**?
          what Nadia   told-3PL-HER the-boy that saw-3MS-her
          What Nadia, did they tell the boy who saw her?

      b. *nukte **naadya** xabbaro   ššabe   yalli byaʕrif-**a**
          joke   Nadia   told-3PL-HER the-boy that know-3MS-her
          A joke, Nadia, they told the boy that knows her.

(62) a. *et   ruti **dani** yeš be-kox-**o**   li-fgoš   bi-yrušalayim
          ACC Ruti Dani it-is in-his-power to-meet in-Jerusalem
          Ruti, Dani, it is in his power to meet in Jerusalem.

      b. *savlanut **ruti** yeš   l-**a**
          patience Ruti there-is to her
          Ruti has patience.

Unlike BSs, CLLD does not create islands in Italian and Greek. Compare (62) with (63) from Greek (Iatridou 1995) and (64) from Italian showing the grammaticality of *wh*-movement over a CLLD-ed phrase.

(iii) heyxan yeš be-kox-o   šel dani li-fgoš et   rina
       where$_i$ it-is in-power-his of Dani to-meet ACC Rina t$_i$
       Where is it in Dani's power to meet Rina?

The same point is illustrated by the contrast in the interpretation of the adverbial in (iva,b). In (iva), *matay* (when) may only be associated with the matrix verb.

(iv) a. matay **dani** yitxašek   l-**o**   le-daber
          when   Dani (it-)will-feel to-him to-speak
          When will Dani feel like speaking? (questions only the time of having the feeling, not that of speaking)

      b. matay yitxašek   le-dani le-daber
          when (it-)will-feel to-Dani to-speak
          When will Dani feel like speaking? (ambiguously questions the time of having the feeling or that of speaking)

(63) pios   nomizis **ti maria**   oti tha   **tin**   psifize
      who-NOM think-2s the Maria-ACC that would her-CL vote-3s
      Who do you think would vote for Maria?

(64) ?Chi credi   che **Maria la** voterebbe?
      who think-2s that Maria her would vote
      Who do you think would vote for Maria?

3.6   Scope and reconstruction

Finally, BSs and CLLD differ in that only the latter allows binding of pronouns by quantifiers under "reconstruction". In (65) from Italian, *suo* in the CLLD-ed PXP is bound by *ogni*, thus allowing a reading in which there is one student per teacher.[9]

(65) **Il suo$_i$ studente migliore**, ogni professore$_i$ cerca sempre di incoraggiarl**o**   a
      the his$_i$ student   best   every teacher$_i$ tries always to encourage-him to
      proseguire i   studi.
      pursue   the studies
      His$_i$ best student, every teacher$_i$ always tries to encourage to pursue his studies.

Binding of pronouns by quantifiers under "reconstruction" is possible with **focus movement** in Hebrew, but not with BSs. Thus, as indicated by the indices, *šelo* can be bound by *more* in (66a) but not in (66b).

(66) a. al af talmid šelo$_i$ lo   keday   levakeš mi   af more$_i$
          on no student his$_i$ (it is) not advisable to-ask from no teacher$_i$
          lehamlic
          to-recommend
          Any student of his$_i$, it is not advisable to ask any teacher$_i$ to recommend.
      b. **af talmid šelo**$_{*i/j}$ lo   keday   levakeš mi   af more$_i$
          no student his$_i$ (it is) not advisable to-ask from no teacher$_i$
          lehamlic   al-**av**
          to-recommend on-him
          No student of his$_i$ is such that it advisable to ask any teacher$_i$ to recommend
          him.

The impossibility of reconstruction in the case of a BS holds also in Levantine Arabic. Thus, in (67) from Aoun and Benmamoun 1998, 47b, binding of *-a* (her) in the BS by *mʕallme*

---

[9]As in Italian (65) in the Greek example (i) the possessive *tu* is bound by *kathe fititis* (each student).

(i)   ti   diatrivi   tu tin   prosehi   kathe fititis
      the-ACC dissertation his cl-ACC take-care-of-3s each   student-NOM
      His dissertation, every student takes care of.

Such "reconstruction" facts appear to support a movement analysis of CLLD, as indeed proposed by Aoun and Benmamoun 1998. However, the possibility of reconstruction of the type exemplified in (65) is restricted in Greek to definites; CLLD-ed indefinites take wide scope over the universal quantifier and intensional predicates (see Alexopoulou and Kolliakou 2002). This interaction of scope and definiteness is found also in relative clauses in Greek, as in Italian and English (see Alexopoulou and Heycock 2002). We consider that at present the data from reconstruction effects do not provide definitive evidence for or against a movement analysis of CLLD.

is illicit.

(67)   **tilmiiz-a**$_{*i/j}$ **ššitaan**   fallayto ?ablma kull   mʕallme$_i$?aaṣaṣat-**o**
            student-her   the-naughty left-2P   before   every teacher-F punished-him
            Her naughty student you left before every teacher punished him.

4   Broad Subjects and CLLD can coexist

In Section 3 it was established that both Hebrew and Arabic allow the Broad Subject construction. As the relation between the PXP and the clitic in the Broad Subject construction is one of A-binding of a non-anaphor, it does not show the locality effects that are characteristic of movement or of A′-binding chains in the sense of Cinque 1990. We were thus led to assume that a number of sentences of Levantine Arabic that under the analysis of Aoun and Benmamoun 1998 were described as CLLD are in fact cases of Broad Subjects. It does not follow, however, that Levantine Arabic lacks CLLD altogether; as we will see, some notable differences between Modern Hebrew and Levantine Arabic follow from this one difference: while Hebrew has the Broad Subject construction but lacks CLLD, Levantine Arabic has both.[10]

4.1   Extraction past the PXP

As we have seen, in Hebrew it is never possible to extract a wh-phrase or topic/focus past a PXP in a chain with a clitic. The generalisation, therefore, was that Broad Subjects defined islands for movement. Examples from Hebrew and Arabic are repeated in (68) and (69).

(68)   a.   *kama   savlanut **ruti** yeš   l-**a**
               how-much patience Ruti there-it to-her
               How much patience does Ruti have?
      b.   *et-mi   **dani** yeš be-kox-**o**   li-fgoš   bi-yrušalayim
               ACC-who Dani it-is in-power-his to-meet in-Jerusalem
               Who is Dani able to meet in Jerusalem?

(69)   a.   *adeeš faatħa **l-beet**   ?alwaan-**o**
               how   bright   the-house colours-its?
               How bright are this house's colours?
      b.   *adeeš   ṭawiil **rana**   šaʕar-**a**
               how-long Rana hair-her
               How long is Rana's hair?

---

[10]Older stages of Hebrew seem to have allowed CLLD, as illustrated by the following example from Mishnaic Hebrew, where the preposed PXP is a PP, and therefore cannot be a Broad Subject.

(i)   al   kol cara   še   tavo   al ha-cibur   matriʕin   ʕaleyha
           about any calamity that will-come on the-community (they)-warn about-it
           One should warn against any calamity that may befall the community.

(Taʕanit 3:8 from Azar 1995, p.104)

(70) a. *šu **naadya** xabbaro ššabe yalli šeef-**a**?
what Nadia told-3PL the-boy that saw-3MS-her
What Nadia, did they tell the boy who saw her?

b. *nukte **naadya** xabbaro ššabe yalli byaʕraf-**a**
joke Nadia told-3PL the-boy that know-3MS-her
A joke, Nadia, they told the boy that knows her.

As noted in Aoun and Benmamoun 1998, however, in Lebanese Arabic a PXP in a chain with a clitic does not necessarily define an island. Specifically, they observe that if the clitic is separated from the PXP by an island, it in turn creates an island, but not otherwise—judgements that are replicated by our Palestinian consultants. Thus for example we find the contrast between (70a) above and (71)(Aoun and Benmamoun's (27a), (25a)):

(71) šu **naadya** (smeʕte ʔinno) xabbaruw-**a**
what Nadia heard-2SF that told-3P-her
What Nadia, did (you hear that) they tell/(told) her?

If every PXP related to a clitic was a Broad Subject in Levantine Arabic, the ungrammaticality of (70a) would be predicted, but not the contrast with (71). If Levantine Arabic allows CLLD of the type found in Romance and Greek, however, the contrast is as expected. CLLD is known to respect islands (hence it is a possible analysis for the chain *naadya . . . -a* in (71), but not for that in (70a), which must therefore be an instance of BS); it is also known not to create islands for movement (hence the acceptability of the extraction in (71)). These data then lead us to conclude that Levantine Arabic allows CLLD.

One consequence is that in Levantine Arabic many sentences with a PXP-clitic chain will have two possible structures. Thus the following example could be either an instance of CLLD or of BS:

(72) **naadya** ħakuu l-**a**
Nadia talked-3P to-her
Nadia, they talked to her.

Recall, however, that downward entailing quantifiers are acceptable as Broad Subjects, but not as the PXP in a CLLD construction. Thus the following, which is acceptable, should only be interpretable as an instance of BS:

(73) **wala waħade** ħakuu l-**a**
no-one(F) talked-3P to-her
No-one, they talked to her.

It follows, then, that *wh*-movement **over** *wala waħade* should be blocked in examples like (73), in contrast to (72). This prediction appears to be born out. While (71) was accepted by our consultants, the minimally different (74), where the PXP is a downward-entailing quantifier, was not:

(74) *šu **wala waħade** (smeʕte ʔinno) xabbaruw-**a**
what no-one(F) heard-2SF that told-3P-her
What no one, did (you hear that) they tell/(told) her?

The generalization that Broad Subjects define islands, therefore, makes correct predictions for Modern Hebrew, and for Arabic. What is less clear, however, is why this construction, which we have argued involves recursive merge as Spec,TP, should have this effect. At present we do not have an answer to this question, which we must therefore leave to further research.

4.2   Reconstruction

A second contrast between Hebrew and Levantine Arabic that can be explained by the existence in the latter only of the CLLD construction is the possibility of "reconstructed" readings. As discussed above, PXPs coindexed with clitics in Hebrew cannot contain a pronoun that has to be bound by a quantifier within the clause (see (66b)). As Aoun and Benmamoun 1998 point out, however, in Levantine Arabic a PXP coindexed with a clitic can reconstruct—just as long as the clitic is not contained within an island. Thus they give the contrast in (75), their (47).

(75)   a.   **tilmiiz-a ššitaan**   btaʕrfo ʔinno kull mʕallme ʔaaṣaṣat-**o**
           student-her the-naughty know-2s that   every teacher(F) punished-3FS-him
           Her$_i$ naughty student, you know that every teacher$_i$ punished him.

       b.   **tilmiiz-a ššitaan**   fallayto ʔablma kull mʕallme tʔaaṣaṣ-o
           student-her the-naughty left-2P before every teacher(F) punished-3FS-him
           Her$_i$ naughty student, you left before every teacher$_i$ punished him.

If (75a) is a case of the kind of CLLD found also in Italian and Greek, the possibility of reconstruction is as expected; since CLLD is blocked by islands (such as the adjunct island in (75b)), only a BS structure is possible—but BS does not allow for reconstruction.[11]

4.3   Non-nominal PXPs

We have seen evidence that Arabic has a PXP-clitic construction in addition to true Left Dislocation and to the BS construction; so far this additional construction has displayed all the behaviour observed for CLLD in Italian and in Greek. There is however one respect in which CLLD in Levantine Arabic appears to behave differently. In Italian the PXP may be a PP, as long as there is an appropriate clitic. Thus we find examples such as the following:

(76)   a.   Penso   che **a Gianni** Luigi non **gli**   abbia   mai   fatto un favore.
           think-1s that to Gianni Luigi NEG him-DAT has-SUBJ never done a   favour
           I think that to Gianni, Luigi has never done him a favour.

       b.   Penso   che **a Roma** Luigi non **ci**   abbia   mai   visto nessuno.
           think-1s that in Rome   Luigi NEG there has-SUBJ never seen noone
           I think that in Rome, Luigi has never seen anyone there.

Note that in both of these cases, the PXP is a prepositional phrase headed by *a* (to/in). If this preposition is omitted, the result is not interpretable as a case of CLLD. Thus both of (76a,b) contrast sharply with (77a,b), where the PXPs are DPs:[12]

---

[11]Our own consultants gave mixed results as far as reconstruction is concerned. One—a speaker from Israel—gave the same judgements as those reported by Aoun & Benmamoun. The other, a speaker from Lebanon, never allowed reconstructed readings. We do not have an explanation for the latter judgements.

[12](ia) is possible, but as this is a matrix clause we can attribute this to the possibility of reading it as a case of true Left Dislocation; a similar matrix clause corresponding to (77b)—(ib)—is only marginal:

(77)   a.   *Penso   che **Gianni** Luigi non **gli**   abbia   mai   fatto un favore.
            think-1s that Gianni   Luigi NEG him-DAT has-SUBJ never done a   favour
            I think that Gianni, Luigi has never done him a favour.
       b.   *Penso   che **Roma** Luigi non **ci**   abbia   mai   visto nessuno.
            think-1s that Rome   Luigi NEG there has-SUBJ never seen   noone
            I think that Rome, Luigi has never seen anyone there.

CLLD in Levantine Arabic appears to show the opposite pattern. Our consultants judge PXPs with the preposition *la* to be marginal (in contrast to the Italian examples in (76)); but they accept minimally different examples with DPs:[13]

(78)   a. ?***la naadya** ħakuu   l-**a**.
            to Nadia   talked-3P to-her
            To Nadia, they talked to her.
       b.   **naadya** ħakuu   l-**a**.
            Nadia   talked-3P to-her
            Nadia, they talked to her.

At first glance it might appear that examples like (78b) are only acceptable because they have a derivation as BS, or as true Left Dislocation, but it turns out that this conclusion is not tenable, since cases like this behave like CLLD, and unlike BS and LD, in allowing *wh*-extraction and topicalisation/focus-movement, as illustrated by these examples from Aoun and Benmamoun 1998: 575.[14]

(79)   a.   ʕan   miin **naadya** (smeʕte   ʔinno) ħakuu   l-**a**?
            about who Nadia   (heard-2SF that)   talked-2P to-her
            About who Nadia did (you hear that) they talked to her?
       b.   ʕan   il-mudiir **naadya** (smeʕte   ʔinno) ħakuu   l-**a**?
            about who   Nadia   (heard-2SF that)   talked-2P to-her
            About the principal Nadia did (you hear that) they talked to her?

Thus, while (78b) does have a possible derivation as a BS, it must also have a possible derivation as CLLD.

(i)   a.   **Gianni** Luigi non **gli**   a   mai   fatto un favore.
            Gianni   Luigi NEG him-DAT has-SUBJ never done a   favour
            Gianni, Luigi has never done him a favour.
       b. ?***Roma** Luigi non **ci**   vede   mai   nessuno.
            Rome   Luigi NEG there sees-SUBJ never noone
            Rome, Luigi never sees anyone there.

[13]One of our consultants accepted PXPs with the preposition *la* when the sentences were more complex (for example, when the corresponding clitic was in a subordinate clause). Her judgements on such examples was consistent with a CLLD analysis (the clitic could not be contained within an island, and reconstructed readings were possible). But we are not sure at present how to reconcile these judgements with her rejection of simple cases like (78a).

[14]Aoun and Benmamoun treat what we have glossed as *to her* as a dative clitic (thus apparently entirely parallel to Italian *gli*); we have altered the transliteration and gloss of their examples to reflect our analysis.

Furthermore, PPs are also excluded from Greek CLLD. Indirect objects in Greek may be marked either by the preposition *s(e)* followed by a DP (80a), or by genitive[15] marking of the DP (80b). Only DPs can be CLLD-ed (80c); PPs may only be topicalised (80d). Thus, the ungrammaticality of the clitic in (80d) is parallel to the ungrammaticality of (78a).

(80)   a.   milisa   sti   maria/se ena filo   mu
              talked-1s to-the Maria/to a   friend my
              I talked to Maria/a friend of mine.

         b.   milisa   tis   marias
              talked-1s the-GEN Maria-GEN
              I talked to Maria.

         c.   **tis**   **marias**   **tis**   milisa
              the-GEN Maria-GEN her-GEN talked-1s

         d.   **sti**   **maria** (*__tis__)   milisa
              to-the Maria (*her-GEN) talked-1s

The contrast between (80c) and (80d) indicates that the Greek clitics are strictly specified as nominal and are thus incompatible with a PP antecedent. The availability of PPs in Italian CLLD can be captured by assuming that clitics like *gli* are of category P; this then can explain not only the grammaticality of (76a) but also the ungrammaticality of (77a). Like *gli*, *ci* is also of category P as indicated by the contrast between (76b) and (77b) and examples like (6) repeated below as (81). Lacking pronominals of category P, Greek allows no examples like (76b) or (81).

(81)   **In quella città**, non **ci**   sono mai stato.
       in that town   not there am   ever been
       I have never been in that town.

As in Greek, it appears that pronominals in LA are strictly nominal and consistent only with DP antecedents. In particular, we assume that in examples like (78), the element *la* is composed of a prepositional part (*l-*) and a pronominal element (*-a*). The pronominal element, being fully nominal, may only resume a DP, a requirement that is not satisfied in (78a). This requirement is met in (78b) where the presence of the prepositional part is obligatory for marking the indirect object.[16]

---

[15]Greek has one oblique case, referred to in traditional grammar books as *genitive*; it primarily marks indirect objects and possessors.

[16]Note that unlike LA, the following example from Greek, in which a preposition with a clitic appears in-situ, is ungrammatical.

(i)   *tis   marias   milisa   sti
       the-GEN Maria-GEN talked-1s to-her
       Maria I talked to her.

The ungrammaticality of (i) is due to the independent fact that clitic pronouns cannot be complements of prepositions, as indicated by (ii), where *afton* in (ii) is a non-clitic pronoun.

(ii)   a.   *milisa   sti
           talked-1s to-her
      b.   milisa   s'afti
           talked-1s to her

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have further defended the claim, set out in Doron and Heycock 1999, that a language in which nominative case can be checked by more than one element can allow merging of "Broad Subjects" in [Spec,TP]. In this earlier work, we argued that such languages included Modern Hebrew and Modern Standard Arabic. Here we have further argued that Broad Subjects are found also in Levantine Arabic. The recognition of this possibility then allows an analysis of a residue of left-peripheral XPs associated with a clitic as instances of Clitic Left Dislocation, with properties near-identical to this construction as identified in Italian and Greek. While a number of questions about the nature of the configurations involved remain to be answered, we consider that some progress at least has been made in reducing the apparent proliferation of language-specific properties of elements occupying the left periphery.

References

Alexopoulou, T. and C. Heycock (2002). Quantifier scope in relative clauses and definiteness effects. In C. Beyssade et al. (Eds.), *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics*, Volume 3. Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne.

Alexopoulou, T. and D. Kolliakou (2002). On Linkhood, Topicalization and Clitic Left Dislocation. *Journal of Linguistics 38*(2), 193–245.

Anagnostopoulou, E. (1994). *Clitic Dependencies in Modern Greek*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Salzburg.

Aoun, J. and E. Benmamoun (1998). Minimality, reconstruction, and PF movement. *Linguistic Inquiry 29*, 569–597.

Azar, M. (1995). *taxbir lešon hamišna (The Syntax of Mishnaic Hebrew)*. The Academy of the Hebrew Language, Jerusalem.

Beghelli, F. (1994). A minimalist approach to quantifier scope. In A. Schafer (Ed.), *Proceedings of NELS 23*, pp. 65–80. GLSA.

Beghelli, F. (1995). *The Phrase Structure of Quantifier Scope*. Ph. D. thesis, UCLA.

Borer, H. (1984). Restrictive relatives in Modern Hebrew. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 2*, 219–260.

Cardinaletti, A. and M. Starke (1999). The typology of structural deficiency: A case study of the three classes of pronouns. In H. van Riemsdijk (Ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, pp. 145–233. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Cinque, G. (1977). The movement nature of Left Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry 8*(2), 397–411.

Cinque, G. (1990). *Types of A′-Dependencies*, Volume 17 of *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. Cambridge, Mass.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1990). Clitic Doubling, Wh-Movement, and Quantification in Romanian. *Linguistic Inquiry 21*(3), 351–397.

Doron, E. and C. Heycock (1999). Filling and licensing multiple specifiers. In D. Adger, S. Pintzuk, B. Plunkett, and G. Tsoulas (Eds.), *Specifiers: Minimalist Approaches*, pp. 69–89. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Giannakidou, A. (1997). *The Landscape of Polarity Items*. Ph. D. thesis, University of Groningen.

Heycock, C. (1993). Syntactic predication in Japanese. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics 2*, 167–211.

Heycock, C. (In press). Embedded root phenomena. In M. Everaert and H. van Riemsdijk (Eds.), *The Syntax Companion*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Heycock, C. and E. Doron (2003). Categorical subjects. *Gengo Kenkyu 123*, 95–135.

Iatridou, S. (1995). Clitics and island effects. In *Penn Working Papers in Linguistics*, pp. 11–31. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.

Kiss, K. É. (1995). *Discourse Configurational Languages*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuno, S. (1973). *The Structure of the Japanese Language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1978). Case-marking, canonical sentence patterns, and counter equi in Japanese. In J. Hinds and I. Howard (Eds.), *Problems in Japanese Syntax and Semantics*, pp. 30–51. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1986a). Movement of Noun Phrases in Japanese. In T. Imai and M. Saito (Eds.), *Issues in Japanese Linguistics*, pp. 229–272. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kuroda, S.-Y. (1986b). What happened after the movement of Noun Phrases in La Jolla. In S.-Y. Kuroda (Ed.), *Working Papers from the First SDF Workshop in Japanese Syntax*. UCSD: Department of Linguistics.

Longobardi, G. (1986). L'estrazione dalle 'isole' e lo scope dei sintagmi quantificati. In *Parallela 2: Aspetti della sintassi dell'italiano contemporeano*. Gunter Narr, Tübingen.

Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (Ed.), *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, pp. 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Ross, J. R. (1967). *Constraints on Variables in Syntax*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.

Tsimpli, I. (1995). Focusing in Modern Greek. In K. É. Kiss (Ed.), *Discourse Configurational Languages*, pp. 176–206. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Vallduví, E. (1993). Information packaging: A survey. Technical Report HCRC/RP-44, Human Communication Research Center, University of Edinburgh.