Clitics and Object Drop in Modern Greek

Alexis Dimitriadis
University of Pennsylvania

1   Introduction

In this paper, I argue that Greek shows evidence of having phonetically null indefinite "special" object pronominals (meaning null, clitic-like indefinite pronominals). This claim is motivated by the similarity of a number of constructions involving indefinites to constructions involving cliticized definites. As I will show, it provides a maximally simple account of Greek indefinite object drop (which under this account is not object drop at all, but rather cliticization by a null "clitic"), and of certain constructions involving left-adjoined indefinite objects that I will refer to as "exceptional" *clitic-left-dislocation.*

Since Huang's (1984) analysis of null objects in Chinese, null object constructions in many languages have been analyzed as operator-variable constructions, in which a null topic operator raises to verb-complement position, leaving behind a trace that serves as the variable it binds. Raposo (1986) adopts Huang's analysis for European Portuguese, also an object-drop language, and Campos (1986) proposes the same analysis for Spanish, in which only indefinite objects may be dropped. A major source of support for such analyses is the sensitivity of object drop to island effects.

However, it is known that a number of languages exhibit object drop that is insensitive to island constraints. (cf. Farrell (1990), Kato (1993) for Brazilian Portuguese, Suñer and Yépez (1988) for Quiteño Spanish). I will show below that indefinite object drop (IOD) in modern Greek is likewise insensitive to islands. In such cases a topic operator analysis is unmotivated (and is indeed rejected by the aforementioned authors). In section 3, I will show that Greek IOD behaves as the indefinite counterpart of cliticization, rather than as a form of topicalization, and that the null argument has all the referential restrictions expected of an indefinite counterpart to clitic pronouns, as opposed to the referential restrictions expected of object *pro*. Thus an analysis of Greek IOD in terms of null special pronominals is superior to a null topic analysis in the style of Huang (1984), or to an analysis stipulating that *pro* (or an equivalent empty category) can be licensed as an indefinite object.

Exceptional clitic-left-dislocation (ECLLD), a construction that to my knowledge has not been studied in the syntax literature, involves the left adjunction of an object NP under conditions that identify it as ordinary clitic-left-dislocation (CLLD), but does not involve a clitic in object position. Iatridou (forthcoming) argues that CLLD is an operator-variable construction, with the clitic functioning as the variable; it is not logically necessary for the CLLD variable to be a clitic, and indeed it is claimed that *pro* and null syntactic variables can function as CLLD variables. But in section 2, I will show that neither of these alternatives can account for the distribution of ECLLD, while an analysis in terms of null special pronominals can do so straightforwardly.

Moreover, the details of ECLLD and IOD are sufficiently similar that they must involve the same null element. Thus, granted the existence of null indefinite special pronominals, the IOD and ECLLD facts are automatically explained, and in a better motivated way than can be provided by alternative approaches in the literature.

1.1   Special clitics and special pronominals

Given the inherently phonological nature of clitics, the notion of a null counterpart to a clitic pronoun appears to be not only unprincipled, but a contradiction in terms. In this section I will attempt to address these objections and clarify the relation of null clitics to licensing mechanisms and to the empty category paradigm.

Part of the problem, I believe, is the use of the term "clitic" to describe a phonological as well as a syntactic notion. Within the class of clitics it is traditional to distinguish the class of "special clitics," which are characterized, for example, by appearing in syntactically restricted positions, as opposed to "simple" clitics such as the cliticized pronouns in English. (cf. Wanner (1978)). I assume that (some) such clitics comprise a distinct grammatical category, for which I have coined the name "special pronominals."

Traditional Greek grammar recognizes clitic pronouns as a distinct subclass of pronouns; elsewhere they are described as "non-tonic object pronouns." I chose the term "special pronominals" as a typological generalization of the notion of special clitics, and I use it explicitly to refer to the syntactic properties of the class in question *without* reference to its phonological properties. Suppose one were studying Greek (or any Romance language) in its written form only, without any knowledge of its phonology: there would still be a clearly recognizable *syntactic* class of pronominals that must always immediately precede or follow a verb, can (in some languages) enter in doubling constructions, etc. It is this class, so construed, that I intend the term "special pronominals" to describe.[1] This is not a deep claim: I am merely providing a name for what I consider to be an obvious, and long recognized, natural syntactic class, whatever its formal status.

It is true that all known members of this class, however defined, are overt, and that they are obligatorily cliticized. But it does not follow that these are *necessary* properties of the class of special pronominals. Certainly they would be if the *overt* identification of a grammatical relation is taken to be an essential property of this class;[2] but this is a theory-internal matter, not a pretheoretical given, certainly not a matter that should be settled by definition.

The thesis of this paper can be described as the claim that the class of special pronominals in Greek contains null elements, corresponding to the indefinite clitics of some Romance languages.

For reasons of consistency with established usage, I will continue to refer to "clitic pronouns", and sometimes even to "null clitics;" but it should be borne in mind that the null entities I propose belong to the paradigm of the syntactic class that contains pronominal clitics, and need not have all the properties associated with the term "clitic."

I should clarify that I am not proposing that null clitics are an empty category, but rather that they fill apparent holes in the paradigm of special pronominals (i.e., clitic pronouns); I do not propose that a language may have a clitic system consisting entirely of null special pronominals. Most verb-subject agreement in English is phonetically null, but analyses of sentence structure involving an "agreement phrase" AgrP do not claim any additional licensing requirements for first and second person Agr. I propose to treat null special pronominals as instances of the overt category "special pronominal." It follows that their licensing properties and requirements may be identical to those of overt special clitics, whatever the latter may really be.[3]

---

[1] Special pronominals are thus distinct from "weak pronouns," another phonologically defined class.

[2] If for example we consider clitics to be "the overt spelling out of a *wh*-trace," then the null counterpart to clitics would be the *wh*-trace. This is obviously incompatible with my proposal; cf. Cinque (1990, p. 61) for a discussion of the problems that CLLD raises for this conception of clitics.

[3] It is also possible that subclasses of special pronominals have different properties.

It can be seen now that the notion of null clitics is not as unprincipled as may have appeared at first. And the notion of null clitics actually simplifies the grammar. Once we have said that Greek has null indefinite clitics there is nothing more to say about the relevant instances of object drop and left adjunction: their behavior is fully predicted by the presence of a clitic.

If some clitic movement is phonologically driven, it is conceivable that null clitics will fail to undergo such movement. In particular, in a theory that claims that clitics are generated in verb-complement position and subsequently undergo *phonologically* driven movement, the prediction might be made that null clitics remain in their base position. It is not clear at this point that this issue has empirical consequences; I include it here to illustrate the nature of my proposal.

Finally, note that although the descriptive generalization that special pronominals obligatorily cliticize is obviously incompatible with my proposal, it can be replaced by the following weaker statement:

1   Special pronominals cannot be independently realized as phonological phrases (in effect, they must cliticize or be null).

2   Left-adjoined Indefinites and CLLD

Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD), recently studied by Cinque (1990) and Iatridou (forthcoming), typically involves a left-dislocated element coindexed with a clitic, as in the following example from Greek.

2   To vivlio   i   Maria   to efere.
       the book/Acc the Maria/Nom CL brought
       'Maria brought the book.'

Although CLLD superficially resembles the left dislocation of a clitic-doubled element, it has been established that it is a distinct phenomenon, present in languages that prohibit clitic doubling (such as Italian), and appropriate in contexts incompatible with left dislocation.

Cinque (1990) identified as CLLD a number of constructions involving (in addition to NP objects), PPs, APs, or VPs. Of these, only CLLD'ed NPs require an overt marker at the position they are construed with (locative markers etc. can optionally appear with the others). Cinque offers as explanation the claim that CLLD'ed PPs and the like are "outside" the [±anaphor], [±pronominal] paradigm, hence empty categories in such positions are not subject to binding theory. Thus the presence of a clitic is not conceptually necessary to a CLLD construction, but is expected with most classes of nominal antecedents (the known exceptions are CLLD'ed subjects and bare quantifiers, vide infra).

Iatridou (forthcoming) argues that the preposed object in (3b) is base-generated in that position, and presents several diagnostics that differentiate it from ordinary left dislocation (LD) of an object. The first diagnostic is that a CLLD object is old information, and need not be stressed, while an ordinary left-dislocated object *must* be stressed.Thus (3b), but not (3c), is an appropriate (unstressed) answer to (3a).

3   a.   Pios agorase to palto?
           who bought the coat

    b.   To palto o   Costas to   agorase.   (CLLD)
           the coat the Costas CL bought
           'Costas bought the coat.'

    c. # **To palto** o   Costas agorase.   (LD)
           the coat   the Costas bought
           'Costas bought **the coat.**'

By this diagnostic, (4b) must be a CLLD construction, since it is an appropriate answer to (4a): Left-adjoined indefinites in Greek can be interpreted like CLLD definite NPs.

4   a.   Pios agorase palto?
           who bought coat
           'Who bought a coat?'

    b.   Palto o   Costas agorase.   (CLLD-like)
           coat   the Costas bought
           'Costas bought a coat.'

5   a.   Pios grafi   vivlia?
           who writes books

    b.   Vivlia o   Costas grafi.
           books the Costas writes
           'Costas writes books.'

We have here a left dislocation construction, in the absence of an overt clitic, in which the adjoined *nominal* element is old information. (Note that this is unexpected under Cinque's typology of CLLD). Let's call such "clitic-less nominal CLLD" constructions "exceptional CLLD," or ECLLD; when necessary I will refer to CLLD with a visible clitic as "overt CLLD." The null special pronoun analysis, of course, claims that there is nothing "exceptional" about ECLLD, aside from involving a non-overt special pronominal instead of an overt one (i.e., instead of a pronominal clitic). As (3c) indicates, Greek only allows indefinites to appear in ECLLD constructions.[4]

[4]The precise class of NPs that can undergo ECLLD in Greek is difficult to determine, but as I will argue below appears to be coextensive with the class of NPs that (under a given interpretation) cannot be cliticized. The characterization of the latter class in various lan-

I have used the capacity of the left-adjoined object to be old information as the defining test of CLLD. ECLLD indefinites have a range of other properties of CLLD mentioned in Iatridou (forthcoming); I am aware of no properties inconsistent with their analysis as CLLD. Consider extraction from islands: According to Iatridou (forthcoming), CLLD objects are base-generated above the CP containing the position they are construed with; if they raise from there to a higher position ("long distance CLLD"), their movement is sensitive to strong islands. Since extraction from such islands is bad for both LD and CLLD, it would not be expected to distinguish between the two. In fact I find Iatridou's examples of CLLD with Adjunct and NP islands (her sentences (29) and (31), given as (6b) and (6d) below) marginally acceptable; and similarly I find their ECLLD equivalents in (6d) somewhat degraded, but acceptable. Other speakers find both sets of sentences unacceptable.[5] Again, ECLLD behaves exactly as might be hoped of a subclass of CLLD, down to idiolectal differences!

6   a.   * Ton Kosta sinandisa tin kopela pou ton   ide.   (Rel Clause)
           the Kostas I-met   the woman that CL/him saw
           'Kostas, I met the woman that saw him.'
      b.   % tin efimerida i   Maria apokimithike diavazondas tin.
           the newspaper the Maria fell asleep   reading   CL
                                            (Adjunct)
      c.   * Ton Kosta ipes   oti to oti i Maria ton agapa tromazi ton Yani.
           the Kostas you-said that the that the Maria CL loves scares   the Yani
           (Sent Subject)
           'Kostas$_i$, you said that (the fact) that Maria loves him$_i$ scares Yanis.'
      d.   % Ton Kosta diavasa tin idisi oti ton apelisan.   (NP island)
           the Kostas I-read   the news that CL they-fired

7   a.   * Galika sinantisa tin kopela pou milai.   (Rel Clause)
           French I-met   the woman that speaks
      b.   % Efimerida i   Maria apokimithike diavazondas.   (Adjunct)
           newspaper the Maria fell asleep   reading

---

guages has been the subject of much work (see, for example, Uriagereka (forthcoming)). Although the issue forms a recurring subtext to this work, resolving it is certainly beyond the aims of this paper.

   At any rate, it is closer to the truth to say that in Greek, neither specific nor syntactically definite objects can be dropped or enter in ECLLD constructions. The following minimal pair of non-specific (E)CLLD constructions demonstrates the importance of syntactic definiteness in Greek:

i   Apiles na kanis se allous.
        threats to make at others
ii   Tis apiles na *(tis) kanis se allous.
        the threats to CL   make at others
        'Save your threats for others (not me).'

[5]The LD equivalents of the sentences in (6) are universally found unacceptable.

c. * Krasi ipes   to oti i   Maria pini   tromazi ton Yani.
    wine you-said the that the Maria drinks scares   the Yani

(Sent Subj)

   'Wine, you said that (the fact) that Maria drinks (it) scares Yanis.'
d. % Kipouro diavasa tin idisi oti   vrikan.   (NP island)
    gardener I-read   the news that they-found

2.1   In search of a null variable

Granted then that ECLLD of indefinites should be subsumed into CLLD, it ought
to be analyzed as an operator-variable construction. The question is, what plays
the role of the variable in ECLLD? As mentioned above, the variable in a CLLD
construction cannot in general be null when it occupies a nominal position; but
two classes of exceptions have been previously identified.

2.1.1   *Pro* as a CLLD variable

Iatridou (forthcoming) claims that CLLD'ed objects must appear to the left of the
matrix subject position, and that any subject appearing to the *left* of a CLLD ob-
ject is itself clitic-left-dislocated. In such cases of *subject CLLD,* the role of the
variable is assumed to be played by *pro.* Could *pro* be the variable involved in
indefinite object ECLLD? The distribution of *pro* and ECLLD give no support to
this idea. As a pronoun and as a subject CLLD variable, *pro* can be construed with
definites and indefinites alike.

8   a.   *pro* Grafi.
         'He/she writes.'
    b.   Den erchonte   (touristes).
         not   they-come tourists
         'Tourists are not coming.'
9   a.   I   Maria tin Katerina den ti   fovizi.
         the Maria the Katerina not CL scare.
         'Maria does not scare Katerina.'
    b.   Apiles   tin Katerina den ti   fovizoun.
         Threats the Katerina not CL scare.
         'Threats do not scare Katerina.'

If *pro* is the variable in ECLLD, the restriction of the latter to indefinites must be
explained independently.

In addition, Iatridou and Embick (1993) have shown that *pro* is not construable with C/IP antecedents;[6, 7] but those sentential complements that are treated as indefinite by the grammar (for object drop and cliticization purposes) freely undergo ECLLD. Note that clitic pronouns may be construed with sentential antecedents.[8]

10 a. * An [ftasoume arga]$_i$ *pro$_i$* tha tromaxi ti Maria.   (*pro)
      if   we-arrive late   will scare   the Maria
      'If we arrive late, it will scare Maria.'

    b. An [ftasoume arga]$_i$ tha to$_i$ martirisi i   Maria.   (CL)
      if   we-arrive late   will CL reveal   the Maria
      'If we arrive late, Maria will tell (it).'

    c. Q: 'Who saw how the door opens?'
      A: Pos anigi i   porta i   Maria ide.   (ECLLD)
      how opens the door the Maria saw
      'Mary saw how the door opens.'

Thus positing *pro* as the variable in ECLLD does not account for the distribution of ECLLD; while as I will show in section 4, ECLLD is allowed in exactly those cases in which an overt clitic is inappropriate, i.e., in exactly the cases that would be construable with a (null) indefinite special pronominal.

2.1.2 Binding by an operator

The second systematic exception to the requirement that a CLLD'ed noun phrase be construed with a clitic is described by Cinque (1990). Italian allows bare quantifiers to be CLLD'ed without a clitic, while quantified full NPs require a clitic when CLLD'ed. Cinque allows a "proper operator (a bare quantifier in an Ā position external to IP)" to Ā bind an empty category, licensing it as a variable and obviating the need for a clitic.

11 a. Qualcuno,   troverò   di sicuro per questo compito.
      someone (or other) I will find surely   for this task

    b. * Molte lettere mi   hanno spedito in ufficio.
      many letters to-me have   sent   to (my) office

    c. Molte lettere me *le* hanno spedito in ufficio.

---

[6] Iatridou and Embick (1993) do not reach a conclusion about the nature of the restriction, which is at any rate not important to this discussion; it may be that what *pro* cannot refer to is *states of affairs.*

[7] Since Greek does not have true (non-nominalized) sentential subjects, the behavior of *pro* as a subject CLLD variable in this respect cannot be tested.

[8] It is implicit here that clitic pronouns may be construed with sentential antecedents; one might well wonder how this is reconciled with accounts in which clitics license an object *pro.* Iatridou and Embick (1993, fn. 20) address this issue, attributing it to the distinction between verbal and nominal phi-features.

An analysis of indefinite ECLLD along the same lines would seem particularly tempting, in light of treatments of indefinites as quantificational (cf. Heim (1982) for a review). But such an analysis does not turn out to be tenable. Greek, unlike Italian, allows certain full quantifier phrases to be ECLLD'ed:

12 a.   Polles patates   o   Giorgos efage.
         many potatoes the George ate
    b.   Kapia psichi tha vro   na me voithisi
         some soul   will I-find to me help
         'I will find some kind soul to help me.'

Any account of ECLLD in Greek along such lines must as a minimum cover the behavior of full-NP quantifier phrases as well. In this section I examine the CLLD of explicitly quantified phrases, and show that the Greek data is inconsistent with any plausible way of extending Cinque's analysis. A coherent analysis is possible in terms of null special pronominals, which reduces the acceptability of ECLLD with quantified phrases to a question of specificity or definiteness. Thus the pattern of CLLD of QPs can be explained with reference to definiteness, not the other way around as an extension of Cinque's analysis would have done.

In order to extend Cinque's analysis to ECLLD of indefinites in Greek, some or all indefinite objects must be treated like "proper operators" for purposes of licensing a variable in object position. The question then is how much "like" a proper operator an NP must be in order to license a variable in this way: ECLLD should be possible for NPs that (under a given interpretation) are "more" quantifier-like, in some appropriate sense, than some cutoff point; while overt CLLD should be required for less quantifier-like NPs. This leads to the following concrete prediction:

13   If the less "quantificational" of two NPs, or of two interpretations of the same NP, allows ECLLD, so should the more "quantificational" one.

There may be no obviously right or wrong answer to the question of how "quantifier-like" an ordinary indefinite NP is; but prediction (13) can be shown to be false, or rather, irrelevant to the acceptability of ECLLD with full-NP quantifier phrases in Greek.

First of all, D-linked quantifiers systematically fail to allow ECLLD. For example, the syntactically indefinite (14b) cannot be used non-specifically to say "I read many books."

14 Q: What did you think of the books?
    a.   Ta perissotera *(ta) echo   diavasi.
         the most   CL I-have read
         'I have read most of them.'

   b. Polla ta diavasa.
       Many CL I-read
       'I read many of them.'

It turns out that as pointed out by Cinque (1990) himself, D-linked quantifiers in Italian also require overt CLLD. Cinque shows that this pattern is the result of a lexical ambiguity between D-linked full-NP quantifiers (with a null complement), which require a clitic, and nonspecific bare quantifiers, which bind a null variable. This cannot be the explanation for the Greek data, since in Greek full-NP quantifiers do undergo ECLLD. But even if we agree to simply exclude D-linked quantifiers from licensing ECLLD, problems for this analysis remain.

Consider at this point the English sentence (15), which has (at least) the two readings shown in (16).

15   My pack fits many books.

16 a.   There are many books that can fit in my pack.
    b.   My pack has enough room for many books.

I will refer to (16a) as the "bound variable" reading. It states that in many cases, it is true of an individual book that it can fit in my pack (but says nothing about whether such books fit in my pack one at a time or all together). It is likely that not all books that fit in my pack could do so at the same time. This interpretation may be given the following tripartite structure (cf. Heim (1982), Diesing (1992)).

17   Many_x [book(x)] fits-in-my-pack(x)

At this level of representation, the argument of the predicate expressed by the matrix clause is a variable bound by the quantifier *many* and restricted by the predicate *book*. The QP *many books* may, but need not be, interpreted as D-linked: I may be referring to the books that I tested and found to fit in my pack, or I may be just stating a general fact about the typical size of books compared to the size of my pack.

Interpretation (16b) is what I will call the "group" reading: it says that my pack has room enough for many books, any set of many books (but possibly a nonspecific subset of a contextually salient set of books). Under this reading, the QP *many books* cannot be said to bind a variable in the predicate "my pack fits *x*." This predicate is true of the entire set denoted by the quantifier, not of its members; we might as well have said "this pile of books fits in my pack." This interpretation might be given the following representation:

18       $\exists y$ [y a set of many books] fits-in-my-pack(y)

If quantificational force were responsible for the licensing of the null variable in ECLLD, we would expect that for the Greek version of (15), the bound-variable

reading (16a) would be a better candidate for allowing ECLLD than the group reading (16b). But the opposite is in fact true:

19 a. Polla vivlia o sakos mou *(ta) chorai.   (bound var)
       many books the pack mine CL fits
       There are many books that can fit in my pack.
   b. Polla vivlia o sakos mou (*ta) chorai.   (group)
       many books the pack mine CL fits
       My pack has enough room for many books.

The bound-variable interpretation of the null variable is incompatible with ECLLD, while the group reading requires ECLLD. This state of affairs is, at the least, counterintuitive if we want to attribute the licensing of the null variable to the presence of quantification.

Thus Cinque's analysis of bare quantifiers in Italian cannot be extended to ECLLD of indefinites in Greek, and we must look elsewhere for the identity of the variable of ECLLD. An account in terms of null special pronominals does make the right predictions for explicitly quantified phrases, namely:

20 a. When a CLLD'ed QP has the group interpretation, the CLLD variable must be appropriate to the QP as a whole: strong quantifiers require a definite special pronominal (overt clitic), weak quantifiers require an indefinite special pronominal (null "clitic").
   b. When a CLLD'ed QP has the bound variable interpretation, the CLLD variable must be appropriate to the elements of the set over which the quantifier ranges.

In (19a), a definite clitic is bound by the quantifier "many books," and is in effect construed with each book in the set; this is true whether the quantifier itself is D-linked or nonspecific. In (19b), the indefinite clitic cannot be construed with individual books, and so cannot be bound by the QP; but, it can bind the entire QP (provided it is not D-linked) as it could bind any other nonspecific indefinite antecedent, giving the group reading. This analysis predicts that for a strong QP, the group reading should be available to CLLD with an overt variable. This is indeed the case: (21a) is ambiguous, having either of the readings in (22); sentence (21b) is ill-formed, since neither reading provides an indefinite antecedent for the null clitic.

21 a. Ola ta vivlia o sakos mou ta chorai.   (CLLD)
         all the books the pack mine CL fits
   b. * Ola ta vivlia o sakos mou chorai.   (ECLLD)
         all the books the pack mine fits
22 a. My pack is big enough to fit any book.   (bound var)
   b. My pack has enough room for all the books. (group)

Finally, we might wonder what would happen if a QP quantifying over a non-countable set is ECLLLDed. In this case only the group reading is available, and the type of variable (overt or null) appropriate to the entire QP is required.[9]

23　a.　Olo to　kreas o　Yanis *(to) magirepse.
　　　　　all　the meat　the Yanis　CL　cooked
　　　　　'Yanis cooked all the meat.'
　　　b.　Deka kila　kreas o　Yanis (*to) magirepse.
　　　　　ten　　kilos meat　the Yanis　CL　cooked
　　　　　'Yanis cooked ten kilos of meat.'

It is not obvious why these sentences do not have a bound-variable reading. It may be that such constructions must involve countable sets, or it may be that the null pronominals are not fully parallel to overt clitics, being incapable of functioning as the bound variable of a quantifier. At any rate, we see that the distribution of ECLLD, like that of cliticization, is more closely related to definiteness and specificity than to quantificational force *per se,* even in quantificational constructions. Accordingly, an account in terms of null indefinite special pronominals ("null clitics") straightforwardly accounts for ECLLD.

3　Object Drop and Cliticization

In this section I examine Indefinite Object Drop (IOD) in Greek, which as noted is insensitive to islands. For this reason an analysis in the style of Huang (1984) must be rejected, while an analysis in terms of null special pronominals accounts for IOD by assimilating it to cliticization.

Again, I will not attempt to pin down the exact class of objects that can be dropped; but in section 4 I will demonstrate that the objects that can be dropped (under a given interpretation) are exactly the objects that cannot be replaced by a clitic. Thus for a given construal of an object, there is never a choice between cliticization and IOD; only one of the two is ever appropriate. This situation is reminiscent of the split between overt CLLD and ECLLD, and is consistent with the notion that IOD is truly cliticization; the choice between overt and null clitic is never free, being determined by the specificity (or other relevant property) of the object.

3.1　IOD in Greek

Greek does not in general allow direct objects to be dropped, although of course they may be omitted if a clitic is present. (Sentence (24a) shows optional clitic

---

[9]Sentence (23b) would be acceptable with a *plural* definite clitic, understood to range over kilograms of meat.

doubling).

24 Q: Foras   to palto sou?
      you-wear the coat your
      'Are you wearing your coat?'
   a. (To) forao to palto mou.
        CL I-wear the coat my
   b. *(To) forao.
        CL I-wear

However, an indefinite NP may be omitted without a (visible) clitic being present. (In fact a clitic may not in general appear in place of an indefinite, as discussed in section 4).

25 Q: Foras   palto?
      you-wear coat
      'Are you wearing a coat?'
   a. Forao palto.
   b. (*To) forao.
26 Q: Echis   ena taliro?
      you-have one nickel
      'Do you have a nickel?'
   a. Echo   ena taliro.
      I-have one nickel
      'I have a nickel.'
   b. (*To) echo.

If the indefinite sentences may contain an invisible counterpart to the clitic pronoun, then IOD is simply assimilated to cliticization, requiring no additional devices.

3.2 Island effects

Campos (1986) presents five diagnostics demonstrating that indefinite object drop in Spanish obeys the constraints associated with movement. It is indicative of the differences in the superficially similar object drop paradigms of the two languages that Greek behaves differently from Spanish with respect to all five diagnostics.[10]

---

[10]Campos (1986) notes that "In all the constructions discussed in this squib, a subjunctive or an emphatic sí makes the ungrammatical sentences more acceptable." The emphatic sí is also required in some cases of matrix object drop.

Focus or prosodic considerations seem to be relevant to Greek as well: certain somewhat marginal sentences with a null indefinite object are improved when negated, or when an overt subject is substituted for a *pro* subject; it is likely that the added element serves as the receiver of focus.

The sentences in (27) show that in Greek, but not in Spanish, object drop is insensitive to the Sentential Subject Constraint; in (29), to the Doubly-filled Comp Filter;[11] and in (28), to the Adjunct Island Constraint. All are otherwise present in both languages. (Spanish examples are from Campos (1986)).

27 a. Q: Pepe necesita gafas?   (Sentential Subject)
          'Does Pepe need glasses?'
          A: * Que necesita es obvio.
            'That he needs (them) is obvious.'
    b. Q: O   Costas chriazete gialia?
          the Costas needs   glasses
          A: To oti   chriazete ine profanes.
          the that he-needs is   obvious
          'That he needs (them) is obvious.'

28 a. Q: Encontraron entradas para la película?   (Adjunct)
          'Did you find tickets for the movie?'
          A: * Sí, pudimos entrar al cine porque encontramos.
            'Yes, we were able to go into the cinema because we found (some).'
    b. Q: Vrikate   isitiria gia tin tenia?
          you-find tickets for the film?
          A: Ne, boresame ke   bikame giati   vrikame.
          yes, we-could and entered because we-found
          'Yes, we were able to enter because we found (some).'

29 a. Q: María traerá ponchos de Perú?   (Comp-Trace)
          'Will Maria bring ponchos from Peru?'
          A: * A quién le traerá?
            'To whom will she bring (some)?'
    b. Q: I   Maria tha feri   pulover apo to Peru?
          the Maria will bring sweaters from the Peru
          A: Se pion   tha feri?
          to whom will bring?

On the basis of the sensitivity to islands of Spanish IOD, Campos (1986) argues for an analysis involving movement from verb-complement position of a null topic operator (cf. Huang (1984)). The insensitivity of Greek IOD to islands establishes that a similar analysis of Greek IOD would be inappropriate. The null-clitic analysis, on the other hand, naturally predicts that IOD would be insensitive to syntactic islands.

---

[11]Like other null subject languages, Greek appears not to show Comp-trace effects:

i   Pios nomizis   oti *t* tha erthi?
        who you-think that *t* will come
ii   * Who do you think that will come?

I follow Rizzi (1982), who argues that null subject languages do have Comp-trace effects, but generate sentences like (i) by extracting the subject from post-verbal position.

There is another benefit to this approach: It is not clear, under Campos's system, why Spanish only allows indefinite objects to be dropped; the restriction of the null topic operator to such objects must be stated independently. Since indefinite "clitics" are by their nature restricted to non-specific objects, an analysis along the lines I propose is automatically inapplicable to definite objects. Moreover, we would expect that the objects that can be dropped are exactly those that cannot be cliticized by an overt clitic. As the following section establishes, this indeed appears to be the case in Greek.

4   The Distribution of ECLLD and IOD

A prediction of the claim that null special pronominals are involved in IOD and ECLLD is that the distribution of the two constructions will be consistent, i.e., that all and only the objects that can object-drop should appear in ECLLD constructions. This is not logically necessary: CLLD has special properties that distinguish it from ordinary cliticization or clitic doubling. For example, Italian does not allow ordinary clitic doubling, but allows CLLD; cf. Cinque (1990).

30 a.   * Lo conosciamo (a) Gianni.
            CL we-know   Gianni
     b.   Gianni, lo conosciamo.

In Greek, nevertheless, the choice between the definite (overt) and indefinite (null) variant appears to be made on the basis of the same criteria for CLLD and ordinary cliticization. In every case we find a four-way correspondence: those objects that can be dropped can also undergo ECLLD, and cannot be cliticized or (ordinarily) undergo overt CLLD; and vice versa.

The sentences in (31) allow object drop and ECLLD, and resist cliticization and overt CLLD; those in (32) have the opposite properties, allowing cliticization and overt CLLD but resisting object drop and ECLLD. These sentences are chosen to include borderline entities whose status with respect to definiteness and specificity, and their ability to undergo object-drop or replacement by clitics, may vary cross-linguistically. In all cases, the objects that can be dropped and ECLLD'ed are exactly the objects that cannot be cliticized.

31 a.   Q: (O   Costas) vrike kerasia?
              (the Costas) found cherries
              'Did he (Costas) find cherries?'
           A1: (*Ta) vrike.   (IOD; *CL)
               CL   found
              'He found some.'

       A1: Kerasia (*ta) vrike.   (ECLLD; *overt CLLD)
          cherries CL   found
          'Cherries, he found some.'

  b. Q: Ides   tileorasi?
         you-saw television
         'Did you watch TV?'
       A1: (*Tin) ida.
          CL   I-saw
       A2: Tileorasi (*tin) ida.
          television CL   I-saw

  c. Q: Kanis istioploia?
         you-do sailing/N
         'Do you go sailing?'
       A1: (*Tin) kano.
          CL   I-do
       A2: Istioploia (*tin) kano.
          sailing   CL   I-do

32 a. Q: Eferes   to vivlio?
         you-brought the book
       A1: *(To) efera.   (*IOD; CL)
          CL   I-brought
       A2: To vivlio *(to) efera.   (*ECLLD; overt CLLD)
          the book CL   I-brought

  b. Q: Ekanes to kefi sou?
         you-did the wish your
         'Did you enjoy yourself?'
       A1: *(To) ekana.
          CL   I-did
       A2: To kefi mou *(to) ekana.
          the wish mine CL   I-did
         'I enjoyed myself.'

  c. Q: Ipes   tin prosefchi sou?
         you-said the prayer   your
         'Did you say your prayers?'
       A1: *(Tin) ipa.
          CL   I-said
       A2: Tin prosefchi mou *(tin) ipa.
          the prayer   mine CL   I-said.

Non-nominal complements are similarly consistent: those that can be the antecedents of a clitic cannot be dropped or appear in ECLLD constructions, and vice versa. Factive CP objects headed by the complementizer *oti* 'that' or *pos* 'that' behave as "definite" in both respects, while infinitivals (with *na* 'to'), quoted phrases

and CPs containing a wh-word behave as "indefinite," again in both respects.[12]

33 Q: (To) kseris   oti/pos ta   skilia trone tiri?
       CL you-know that   the dogs eat   cheese
       'Do you know that dogs eat cheese?'
   a. *(To) ksero.   (*IOD; CL)
        CL I-know
   b. Oti ta   skilia trone tiri   *(to) ksero.   (*ECLLD; overt CLLD)
       that the dogs eat   cheese   CL I-know
       'I know that dogs eat cheese.'

34 Q: (*To) Ipes   efcharisto?
        CL   you-said thanks
       'Did you say thanks?'
   a. (*To) ipa.   (IOD; *CL)
        CL I-said
       'I said it.'
   b. Efcharisto (*to) ipa.   (ECLLD; *overt CLLD)
       thanks   CL I-said

Thus the objects that can undergo object drop and ECLLD in Greek appear to be exactly those that should not be cliticized.

5   Conclusion

The preceding sections have established that indefinite object drop, cliticization and the "exceptional" CLLD of indefinites of Greek are distributionally related,

---

[12] Some infinitivals and wh-words can, somewhat marginally, be clitic-doubled in questions, in which case the response must also be construed with a clitic. Although this shows that infinitivals and wh-words can in some cases be construed as definite, the conclusion remains that objects construed as definite may not be dropped.

i   Q: Thelis   na me voithisis?
        you-want to me help
        'Do you want to help me?'
    A: (*To) thelo
         CL   I-want
        'I want to.'
ii Q: To thelis   na me voithisis?
        CL you-want to me help
        'Do you want to help me?'
    A: *(To) thelo
         CL   I-want
        'I want this.'

motivating the conclusion that the same mechanism is involved. The presence of null "clitics" would explain the cluster of observed phenomena in a maximally simple way, requiring no additional stipulations.

The plausibility of this analysis is bolstered by the possibility of extending it to languages with island-insensitive *definite* object drop, in particular to Brazilian Portuguese and Quiteño Spanish. (This topic is addressed in Dimitriadis (forthcoming), and is merely summarized here).

The null "clitic" analysis assumes that ideally, a language has a single special pronominal paradigm. If a certain form is null in some language, that language is expected to lack an overt variant of the same form. This expectation is confirmed in the cases of BP ans QS, both of which have gaps in their definite clitic paradigms that correspond to the types of objects that can be dropped: BP, which can only drop third person objects, has recently lost theird-person definite clitics; and QS has lost accusative clitics. Moreover, both languages allow *definite* objects to enter in ECLLD constructions, just as would be expected of languages with null definite "clitics." Example (35a), from Kato (1993), involves a left-adjoined antecedent that is old information. Example (35b), from Farrell (1990), shows ECLLD in an embedded clause. (Neither author identifies these examples as analogues of CLLD).

35 a. Q: E   quanto ao bolo?
          and as for the cake
          'What about the cake?'
        A: (O bolo,) o   rapaz que ϕ trouxe saiu agora.
          the cake   the boy   who   bought just left
          'The cake$_i$, the boy who bought ϕ_i just left.'
    b. Ouvi   falar que o   bolo todo o mundo ϕ adorou.
        I-heard say   that the cake everybody   adored
        'I heard that everybody loved the cake.'

As Farrell notes, (35b) is not readily analyzed as topicalization, particularly since the left-adjoined NP here follows the complementizer; but it is perfectly regular as an instance of CLLD. Compare the following Greek examples:[13]

36 a. O   Yanis nomize oti tin Maria   o   Kostas tin ide.   (CLLD)
        the Yanis thought that the Mary/Acc the Kostas CL saw
        'Yanis thought that Kostas saw Maria.'
    b. O   Yanis nomize oti kerasia   o   Kostas efage.   (ECLLD)
        the Yanis thought that cherries/Acc the Kostas ate
        'Yanis thought that Kostas ate cherries.'

Thus languages that have IOD in islands lack (overt) indefinite clitics and have

---

[13]In Greek, the left-adjoined NP and the complementizer can appear in either order, as noted by Iatridou (forthcoming), whence example (36a).

ECLLD of indefinites, while the languages that have island-indefinite full object drop have lost the relevant definite object clitics and allow ECLLD of definite objects. The persistence of this pattern irrespective of the definiteness of the allowable null objects supports the contention that the phenomena in question are related.

The data discussed establishes that the same null element serves as the variable in ECLLD and island-insensitive object drop. The claim that this null element is indeed similar to a pronominal clitic is somewhat more open to question, but in my opinion sufficiently well-motivated by the presence of appropriate paradigmatic gaps in the overt clitic paradigm of each language and the correspondence in the construal characteristics of the constructions in question.

I based the notion of null "clitics," more properly *null special pronominals,* on a typological generalization of the syntactic category of which pronominal "special clitics" are members. Although the syntactic status and properties of clitics remain mysterious, the empirical coverage achieved in this paper can be taken as evidence against accounts that make overtness an essential property of pronominal clitics.

References

Campos, Héctor. 1986. Indefinite Object Drop. Linguistic Inquiry 17:2, 354–359.

Chomsky, Noam. 1982. Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. Types of A′-Dependencies. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Diesing, Molly. 1992. Indefinites. Cambridge: M.I.T. Press.

Dimitriadis, Alexis. 1994. Clitics and Island-Insensitive Object Drop. In Proceedings of FLSM 5, Urbana-Champaign, IL.

Farrell, Patrick. 1990. Null Objects in Brazilian Portuguese. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 8, 325–346.

Heim, Irene. 1982. The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases. Doctoral dissertation. Amherst: University of Massachussets.

Huang, C. T. James. 1984. On the Distribution and Reference of Empty Pronouns. Linguistic Inquiry 15:4, 531–574.

Iatridou, Sabine. Forthcoming. Clitics and Island Effects. Linguistic Inquiry.

Iatridou, Sabine, and David Embick. 1993. pro-hibitions on Reference. WCCFL 12.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo, and Carmen Silva-Corvalán, eds. 1986. Studies in Romance Linguistics. Dordrecht: Foris.

Kato, Mary Aizawa. 1993. The Distribution of Pronouns and Null Elements in Object Position in Brazilian Portuguese. In William J. Ashby, Marianne Mithun, Giorgio Perissinotto, and Eduardo Raposo, eds., Linguistic Perspectives on the Romance Languages, Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 225–235.

Raposo, Eduardo. 1986. On the Null Object in European Portuguese. In Jaeggli and Silva-Corvalán (1986). 373–390.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. Negation, Wh-movement and the Null Subject Parameter. Chapter 4 in Luigi Rizzi, ed., Issues in Italian Syntax, Dordrecht: Foris. 117–188.

Suñer, Margarita, and Maria Yépez. 1988. Null Definite Objects in Quiteño. Linguistic Inquiry 19:3, 511–519.

Tarallo, Fernando. 1985. The Filling of the Gap: Pro-drop Rules in Brazilian Portuguese. In Larry D. King and Catherine A. Maley, eds. Selected papers from the 13th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 355–375.

Tarallo, Fernando Luiz. 1983. Relativization Strategies in Brazilian Portuguese. Doctoral dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.

Uriagereka, Juan. Forthcoming. Some Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance. Linguistic Inquiry.

Wanner, Dieter. 1978. Modern Greek Clitics: Placement, Order, and Function. In Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, volume 4. Berkeley, CA. 268–282.

Department of Linguistics
619 Williams Hall
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305

Email: *alexis@babel.ling.upenn.edu*