Are Clitic Doubling and Clitic Right Dislocation really distinct?

Aya Zarka
McMaster University and Ben-Gurion University of the Negev

PUZZLE: It has been argued that Clitic Doubling (CD) and Clitic Right Dislocation (CLRD) exhibit distinct structural analyses[1;2;3;4]. Thus, they are treated as two separate phenomena. However, data from North Galilee Arabic (NGA), a dialect of Levantine Arabic, reveal that there is no straightforward dichotomy between the two phenomena.

CLAIM: Building on Anagnostopoulou's (2007) diagnostics separating CD and CLRD, I argue that Differential Object Marking (DOM) in NGA shares properties with both CD and CLRD, suggesting that CD and CLRD co-occur and accordingly cannot be separated.

DATA DESCRIPTION: DOM in NGA is classified as CD[5;6]. The DOM construction contains a clitic which agrees with the φ-features of the DOM-DP i.e., the associate (1). The associate is marked with dative which is realized as a prepositional phrase. Note that (2) is a non-DOM baseline example wherein the object is not morphologically marked (absence of accusative).

(1) DOM: šoft-a$_i$ *(**la**)-s-sabeyy-e$_i$ (2) NON-DOM: šoft   s-sabeyy-e
        saw.1SG-3F.SG.OBJ   DAT-the-lady-F.SG   saw.1SG the-lady-F.SG
        'I saw the lady.'   'I saw the lady.'

DOM can also be an instantiation of CLRD[7] based on linear order. The associate is not linearly adjacent to the verb. The associate is dislocated as evidenced by the adverb intervening between the verb and the associate (3). Compare (3) with (4) where the non-DOM object is not dislocated.

(3) DOM: bʕerf-a$_i$ (ktir) la-sara$_i$ (*ktir) (4) NON-DOM: bʕref   (*ktir) sara (ktir)
        know.1SG-3F.SG.OBJ well DOM-Sara well   know.1SG well Sara well
        'I know Sara well.'   'I know Sara well.'

We expect DOM as an instance of CD not CLRD if (i) there is no prosodic boundary before the associate, (ii) CD is subject to Kayne's Generalization[8] i.e., CD requires the presence of the preposition preceding the doubled object; and (iii) the associate resides in an argument position[2;3;9]. We find that in NGA, DOM manifests properties (i) and (ii) but not (iii). We expect DOM as an instance of CLRD if the associate is an adjunct derived by movement, which we find in NGA.

DOM is analyzed as CD: CD, but not CLRD, is subject to Kayne's Generalization. In (1), the preposition *la-* 'to', a dative marker, must co-occur with the associate. Another argument for DOM as CD is that in CD, but not in CLRD, there is no intonational break before the associate.

DOM is analyzed as CLRD: An argument supporting DOM as an instance of CLRD is that the associate occupies an adjunct position on the surface: it cannot occur in positions where only complements are tolerated i.e., as objects in object control constructions.

(4) */?? aḥmad   xalla-ha   **la-sara**   tsafer
        Ahmad   allowed-3F.SG.OBJ DOM-Sara travel.PRS
        Intended: 'Ahmad allowed Sara to travel.'

Scholars argue for a movement analysis of the doubled object in CLRD[10;11]. Sensitivity to islands offers evidence that the associate undergoes movement (e.g., Coordinate Structure Constraint).

(5) *sara [$_{vP}$ ḥddart-a$_i$ t_i o   zayyant   l-ʔoda]   mbirḥ   [la-l-kaʕk-e]$_i$
        Sara   prepared-3F.SG.OBJ and decorated the-room   yesterday DOM-the-cake-F.SG
        Intended: 'Sara prepared the cake and decorated the room yesterday.'

Having shown that DOM shares properties with CLRD, I examine two existing analyses of the landing position of the CLRDed: vP[12;13] vs. CP-layer[11;14]. Based on binding and adverbial placement data to be presented, I propose that the dislocated associate adjoins to vP.

The paper shows that DOM in NGA overlaps with properties of both CD and CLRD. This is a novel fact when viewed cross-linguistically: unlike in Romance languages[15;16;17], Arabic DOM combines both CD and CLRD; therefore, the dichotomy CD/CLRD cannot be supported.

References

[1]   Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 1998. *Prosody, focus, and word order.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[2]   Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2007. Clitic doubling. In *The Blackwell companion to syntax*, eds. Martin Ever-aert and Henk van Riemsdijk, 519–581. Malden: Blackwell Publishing.

[3]   Harizanov, Boris. 2014. Clitic doubling at the syntax-morphophonology interface. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, *32*(4), 1033-1088.

[4]   Runic, Jelena. 2014. A new look at clitics, clitic doubling, and argument ellipsis: Evidence from Slavic.Runic 2014

[5]   Aoun, Joseph. 1999. Clitic-doubled arguments. In *Beyond principles and parameters*. Springer, Dordrecht. 13-42.

[6]   Hallman, Peter & Rashid Al-Balushi. 2022. Pronominalization and clitic doubling in Syrian and Omani Arabic. *Linguistics*, *60*(5), 1295-1336.

[7]   Brustad, Kristine. 2000. *Spoken Arabic*. Georgetown University Press.

[8]   Jaeggli, Osvaldo. 1982. *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht Holland: Foris Publications.

[9]   Borer, Hagit. 1984. *Parametric Syntax.* Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

[10]   Cecchetto, Carlo. 1999. "A comparative analysis of left and right dislocation in Romance". In: *Studia Linguistica* 53, pp. 40–67.

[11]   Samek-Lodovici, Vieri. 2006. When right dislocation meets the left-periphery.: A unified analysis of Italian non-final focus. *Lingua*, *116*(6), 836-873.

[12]   Villalba, Xavier. 2000. *The syntax of the sentence periphery*. PhD thesis. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

[13]   López, Luis. 2009. *A Derivational Syntax for Information Structure*. Oxford: OUP

[14]   Samek-Lodovici, Vieri. 2015. *The interaction of focus, givenness, and prosody: A study of Italian clause structure*. Oxford University Press.

[15]   López, Luis. 2012. *Indefinite objects: scrambling, choice functions and differential marking*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[16]   Irimia, Monica Alexandrina. 2020. Types of structural objects. Some remarks on differential object marking in Romanian. In *Case, agreement and their interactions. New perspectives on differential argument marking*, ed. Andras Barany and Laura Kalin. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 78–126.

[17]   Hill, Virginia and Alexandru Mardale. 2021. *The diachrony of differential object marking in Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.