

First conjunct clitic doubling in Modern Greek – Implications for the theory of clitic doubling, the PCC, and the syntax of first conjunct agreement

1. Summary. We will document for the first time the possibility of first conjunct clitic doubling, based on new data from Modern Greek. We will show that this has far-reaching implications for (i) the theory of clitic doubling and (ii) the syntax of first conjunct agreement (FCA). W.r.t. the former, it provides evidence for Agree-based approaches and against Big-DP-based approaches as well as derivational approaches (involving head-movement or A-movement). W.r.t. the latter, first conjunct doubling argues against equidistance-based accounts of FCA, instead favoring accounts based on rule ordering where only the features of the first conjunct are present on &P.

2. Data part 1. The following data show that in Modern Greek, agreement on T and (object) clitic doubling can target either the first conjunct or the entire coordination phrase but not the second conjunct (the clause-final adverb(s) ensures that there is no conjunct extraposition):

- (1) Xtes eftases/ftasate/*eftase [esi ke i Maria] para
 yesterday arrive.2SG/arrive.2PL/arrive.3SG you.NOM and the.NOM Mary together
 ‘Yesterday, you and Mary arrived together.’
- (2) se/sas/*tin iða [esena ke ti Maria] para sto parko
 2SG/2PL/3SG.F saw.1PL you.ACC and the.ACC Mary together in.the park
 ‘I saw you and Mary together in the park.’

3. Implications for the theory of clitic doubling. There are three major theories of clitic-doubling: (i) Big-DP-approaches, where the doubled DP and the clitic form a constituent (e.g., Uriagereka 1995, Nevins 2011), (ii) derivational approaches where the clitic arises (a) via long head-movement of the D heading the doubled DP (e.g., Rezac 2008, Preminger 2019) or (b) via A-movement/object shift of the doubled DP + Merger/rebracketing between its D-head and the verb (Kramer 2014, Harizanov 2014), and (iii) agreement-based approaches (Sportiche 1996, Angelopoulos 2019).

The data in (2) crucially argue against Big-DP- and derivational approaches, since first conjunct clitic doubling would lead to a Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) violation under these approaches (we will show that the CSC holds in Modern Greek): Under the Big-DP-approach, the clitic would arguably be associated only with the first conjunct; movement of the clitic to the verb would be asymmetric and thus violate the CSC. Under derivational approaches, only the head of the first conjunct would move to the verb (long head-movement approaches) or only the first conjunct would undergo A-movement/object shift to Spec,vP, in both cases violating the CSC.

Our data thus provide evidence against movement being involved in clitic doubling, thereby paralleling the argument in Kalin & Weisser (2019) for differential object marking. Rather, the data favor an account that is purely based on agreement. Further arguments from Greek against derivational approaches come from (i) the doubling of D-elements with features not obviously compatible with the VIs for clitic pronouns (Angelopoulos 2019; how can a clitic-VI be inserted into a copy containing the features of a quantifier or an indefinite article?) and (ii) doubling of &P, where it is not clear how head-movement/rebracketing of the &-head could result in a clitic pronoun. No such problems arise under a pure Agree approach since only phi-features are copied.

We will provide more evidence against (A-)movement in Greek clitic doubling by showing that (i) doubling is possible with DPs known not to undergo object shift/scrambling, viz., idiomatic DPs, and (ii) clitic doubling fails to affect Condition C effects in the following configuration:

- (3) $cl_i V [_{DP1} R-Exp_j] [_{DP2} X \text{ of } R-Exp_j]_i$

In (3), a Condition C effect is expected to arise if DP1 (e.g., ‘John’) c-commands DP2 (e.g., ‘picture of John’). Given that the lower DP is clitic-doubled, an A-movement approach predicts the Condition C effect to be voided as DP2 would be interpreted above DP1. We show that this prediction is *not* borne out in the relevant contexts: DP1 = SU, DP2 = IO; DP1 = IO, DP2 = DO. Both configurations are ungrammatical, suggesting the absence of A-movement. Nothing changes if the clitic is omitted, showing that the DO occupies the same structural position in both configurations.

A consequence of our pure Agree-approach is that the movement effects that have been documented for clitic doubling (alleviation of WCO and dative intervention, see, e.g., Anagnostopoulou

2017) have to be reanalyzed. We will show that at least the WCO alleviation can be accounted for given the observation in Eilam (2011:150) that WCO alleviation is also possible if the intended binder is interpreted as a topic (and the pronoun as focused). Given that clitic-doubled DPs are often topical/given, A-movement is no longer necessary to account for the effect.

4. Data part 2: FC doubling and the PCC. First conjunct clitic doubling interacts with the PCC in Greek, which is strong and thus bars $3 > 1/2$ in IO > DO configurations. We adopt the popular assumption that the PCC-effect is related to relativized probing for the feature [participant]. The question is what happens if the DO involves a coordination of a 2nd person pronoun with a 3rd person pronoun or DP. If the 2nd person is the first CJ, both first CJ clitic doubling and doubling of &P are predicted to violate the PCC as it instantiates a $3 > 2$ configuration. This is borne out:

- (4) *Tis **se/sas** sistisa (tis Marias) [esena ke ton Petro].
 3SG.F.DAT 2SG.ACC/2PL.ACC introduced the.DAT Mary.DAT you.ACC and the.ACC Peter.ACC
 ‘I introduced you and Peter to Mary.’

Crucially, if we switch the order of conjuncts, 1st CJ doubling and doubling of &P have different consequences: While doubling &P still causes a PCC-violation, first CJ doubling does not:

- (5) Tis **ton/*sas** sistisa (tis Marias) [ton Petro ke esena].
 3SG.F.DAT 3SG.ACC/2PL.ACC introduced the.DAT Mary.DAT the.ACC Peter.ACC and you.ACC
 ‘I introduced Peter and you to Mary.’

If the dative clitic is omitted, doubling of &P or the first conjunct is possible (6). (The (syncretic) 2PL clitic should not be parsed as dative, which would cause a garden path).

- (6) **ton/sas** sistisa (tis Marias) [ton Petro ke esena].
 3SG.ACC/2PL.ACC introduced the.DAT Mary.DAT the.ACC Peter.ACC and you.ACC
 ‘I introduced Peter and you to Mary.’

5. Implications for the theory of FCA. (6) shows that the probe that generates the clitic can either target the features of &P or those of the first CJ. Given that relativized probing for [participant] is involved, this has implications for the syntax of FCA: Under an approach where the first CJ and &P are equidistant (e.g., van Koppen 2005), one would expect the probe to always target &P in (5), as it is the only goal that could satisfy the probe; it shouldn’t be possible to generate the grammatical version of (5). The optionality suggests instead that the features are distributed differently in the &P in the two configurations. This follows most directly in an approach like Murphy & Puškar (2018), where the features on &P depend on the ordering of Agree (with & probing) and Merge of the conjuncts. Resolved agreement obtains if Agree precedes Merge and & thus agrees with both conjuncts. FCA arises if & fails to agree with the 2nd CJ because Agree precedes Merge. Only Agree with the 1st conjunct is successful (because Merge of the specifier precedes Agree). By assumption, only the features on &P are accessible in this approach. Relativized probing thus can access the participant feature only if it is on &P (resolved agreement) but not if it is only on the second CJ, while &P only bears the features of the 1st CJ. In that case, only the features of the 1st CJ are copied, leading to the illusion of FCA. The optionality in (6) is thus due to different features on &P. Viewing the PCC as a syntactic phenomenon, the data also argue against 2-step Agree approaches to FCA where it arises via copying from the linearly closest DP (Marušič et al. 2015).

6. Repairs and optionality. It has been observed (Anagnostopoulou 2003) that PCC-violations can be repaired by using a strong local pronoun as DO, in which case doubling can be omitted. This is usually explained by positing an FP-shell around the pronoun that blocks Agree (e.g., Keine & Coon, to appear). However, our data clearly show that strong pronouns *are* accessible in that they can be doubled and participate in resolved agreement/doubling. Our data also cast doubts on approaches to optionality that relate it to different structural positions of the goal: Given the CSC and the possibility of first CJ doubling in both (5) and (6), the &P most likely occupies the same structural position. This suggests that the possibility of the 2nd person to participate in resolved doubling can’t be due to its being in different structural positions in (5) and (6). Taken together, our data call for a reassessment of current views on PPC-repair and optionality of clitic doubling.