Complementizer Agreement = Clitic Doubling?

LSA 96 — January 6-9, 2022

Faruk Akkuş, UMass Amherst • fakkus@umass.edu

University of Massachusetts Amherst

Introduction

Various approaches to complementizer agreement (CA), mostly on the basis of Germanic, argue that CA is the result of clitic doubling (CD), (e.g., Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2008, van Alem 2020), as one view to CD involves a purely Agree-based approach, in which clitic results from Agree with a functional head (e.g., Sportiche 1996, Angelopoulos 2019).

- One of the motivations for the view is that the morpheme on the complementizer is morphophonologically a weak clitic in CA, similar to the doubling clitic in CD (van Alem 2020).
  - Another argument used for an Agree-only approach to CD is *First Conjunct Doubling* (FCD, Van Craenenbroeck & Van Koppen 2008, Paparounas & Salzmann 2020).
- Arabic on the surface follows from this view: (i) the indexer on the C head, (1), and the one in CD, (2), are identical, and both differ from the canonical subject-verbal agreement, realized as an affix. (ii) FCD is attested.

(1) fakkar ʔinn-a hiyye raaħ-*it*.
thought.3SG.M that-3F.SG she went-3F.SG
'He thought that she left.' (Lebanese Arabic, CA)

(2) kariim sheef-a la-zeena / la-ʔila.
K saw.3M-3F.SG to-Z / to-her
'Karim saw Zeena/her.' (Lebanese Arabic, CD of direct object)

Today's Goal. To provide an initial evaluation of the view (without committing to an analysis) that equates CA and CD on the basis of Arabic varieties, which have both phenomena.

Claim(s)

- CA exhibits various distinct behaviors from CD (and Clitic Left Dislocation, CLLD) although the morpheme on the complementizer is morphophonologically a weak clitic in CA. Various challenges need to be addressed to reduce CA to CD (or vice versa), at least in Arabic.

Distribution of Clitic Doubling

- What constituents can be doubled depends on the variety (see Table), with IO doubling appearing to be the most common:

	Possessor	*Indirect object (IO)*	*Direct object (DO)*	*Objects of Preposition*
Levantine (Aoun 1999)	✓	✓	✓	✓
Maghreb (Souag 2017)	✓	✓	*	*
Sason	✓	✓	*	*
Dhofar (Souag 2017)	?	✓	✓	✓
Cypriot (Borg 2004)	✓	?	✓	?
Maltese (Camilleri 2011)	*	✓	✓	*
Berber	✓	✓	*	*

- A DO, (2), a possessor, (3), IO, (4), or a P-argument, (4), can be optionally doubled with lexical item/full pronoun preceded by the particle *la* 'to' in Lebanese Arabic (LA).

(3) kariim sheef kteeb-*a* *la-zeena* / *la-ʔala*.
K saw.3M book-her to-Z / to-her
'Karim saw Zeena's / her book.' (Possessor)

(4) kariim ʔal-*la* *la-zeena* ʔəsaa. (5) fikiit maʕ-*o* *la-kariim*.
spoke.2SG.M said-her to-Z story spoke.2SG.M with-him to-K
'Karim told Zeena a story.' (IO) 'You spoke with him.' (P-argument)

- The doubled possessor can also be used as the IO.

(6) kariim ʕata bint-*o* *la-Hassan* kteeb.
K gave girl-his to-H book
'Karim gave Hassan's daughter a book.' (LA, IO possessor)

(7) kariim qal bint-*en* *le ricel* hikaye-ma
K said girl-their of men story-a
'Karim told the men's daughter a story.' (Sason, IO possessor)

- Subjects cannot be clitic doubled in any dialect.

(8) neem (*la)-kariim.
slept.3M to-Karim
'Karim slept.' (Lebanese)

(9) nam-o (*ş*a)-zyar.
slept-3PL to-children
'Children slept.' (Sason)

Commonalities between CA and CD

Commonality 1. Morphophonologically, the morpheme on C head, as well as the indexer in the doubling has the clitic form, unlike the subject-verb agreement, realized as an affix (cf. (1) and (2)).

Commonality 2. Both First Conjunct Agreement (FCA, (10)) and First Conjunct Doubling (FCD) are possible, (11)), including for collective predicates.[a]

(10) fakkar {ʔinn-un / ʔʔinn-a / ʔinno} [hiyye w huwwe] raaħ-o.
thought.3SG.M {that-PL / that-3SG.F / that} [she.F and he]PL went-3PL
'He thought that she and he left.'

(11) a. l-mudiira dʒamaʕ-it{-*on*/-*a*} [*hiyye w iyyah*] mbeerih.
the-principal.F gathered-3SG.F-3PL/-3SG.F [her and him] yesterday
'The principal gathered her and him yesterday.'

b. samir zar{-*na*/-*ni*} [*la-ʔili w (la-)zeena*] mbeerih.
S visited.3M-1PL/-1SG [to-me and to-Z] yesterday
'Samir visited me and Zeena yesterday.'

In this regard, they both behave like subject-verb agreement, (12)), which also has FCA.

(12) a. ltaʔay{-*na*/-*t*} [ana w marwan].
met-1PL/-1SG [I and M]1PL
'I and Marwan met.'

b. kən{-*to*/-*ət*} [ənta w kariim] fell-īn.
be.PFV-2PL/-2SG.M [you.M and K]2PL leave-2PL
'You and Kariim were leaving.'

The Coordinate Structure Constraint (CSC) holds in Arabic (both for head- and phrasal-movt) in non-doubling, (14), as well as doubling configurations, (15).

(13) shrəb-ət [s-shay w l-halib].
drank-1SG the-tea and the-milk
'I drank the tea and the milk.'

(14) *shu$_1$ shrəb-ət [_$_1$ w l-halib]?
what drank-1SG and the-milk
'What did I drink and the milk?'

(15) *min$_1$ dʒamaʕ-it{-*on*/-*a*} l-mudiira [_$_1$ *w iyyah*] mbeerih?
who gathered-3SG.F-3PL/-3SG.F the-principal.F [and him] yesterday
'Who did the principal gather _ and him yesterday?' (cf. (11a))

On the basis of these two properties, CD has received a pure Agree-based account, and CA sometimes is reduced to CD.

[a] Aoun et al. 1994 reports that CA is available only with pronominal subjects in LA, but this restriction holds only for some speakers. Similarly, FCA is indeed possible with right setup of examples.

Differences between CA and CD

CD differs from CA and subject-verb agreement (SVA) in several respects.

Difference 1. Definiteness contrast
While (negative) quantified NPs can be subjects which show SVA and CA, (16), they cannot be CD-ed, (17).

(16) qal {le / le-na} habbe mara ma-cat-te.
said {that.∅ / that-3SG.F} any woman NEG-came-3SG.F
'He said that no woman arrived.' (SA)

(17) *ma-qul-tu-*lla* *şa-habbe mara* xabar.
NEG-said-1SG-her to-any woman news
'I didn't tell any woman the news.' (SA)

Though in Maghreb, such a restriction doesn't hold in CD (Souag 2017:21) (it doesn't have CA, so a comparison can't be drawn).

Difference 2. Possessors
Although CD with possessors is possible (cf. (3), (7)), the possessor cannot trigger subject-verb agreement (SVA) or CA.

(18) ʔəmm-o raħ-*(it)
mother-his went-3SG.F
'His mother left.' (LA)

(19) fakkar {ʔinn-a / *ʔinn-e / ʔinno} ʔəmm-i raaħ-*it*.
thought.3SG.M {that-3F.SG / that-1SG / that} mother.3F-my went-3F.SG
'He thought that my mother left.' (LA, speakers with non-pronominals triggering CA)

Difference 3. Clitic and the doubled DP form a unit

- The clitic and doubled DP (or D) are part of the same unit, i.e., form a constituent, unlike the indexer and its associated phrase involved in CA and SVA.

(20) a. ʔrit kteeb-*a* *la-zeena*
read.1SG book-his to-Z
'I read Zeena's book.'

b. kteeb-a la-zeena, ʔrit-o
book-her to-Z read.1SG-it.M
'Zeena's book, I read it.' [CLLD]

c. kteeb-*a* *la-zeena* n-(k)ara.
book-her to-Z PASS-read.3M
'Zeena's book was read.' [passive]

d. shu ʔrit?
what read.1SG
'What did I read?' [*wh*-question]

- It is not possible to separate the clitic and the doubled element, or target a subpart of the complex.

(21) *kteeb-a, ʔrit-o _ la-zeena
book-her read.1SG-it.M to-Z
Int: 'Zeena's book, I read it.'

(22) *la-zeena, ʔrit-o kteeb-a _.
to-Z read.1SG-it.M book-her

(23) *shu ʔrit _ la-zeena?
what read.1SG to-Z

No such constituency exists between the indexer and the DP in CA, (24), or SVA, (25). A similar property holds in long-distance operations, e.g., focusing.

(24) fakkar ʔinn-a raaħ-*it* mara.
thought.3SG.M that-3F.SG went-3F.SG woman
'He thought that Maya left.' (LA)

(25) qal-e balki Leyla hikaye-ma.
said-3SG.F probably Leyla story-ma
'Leyla told probably a story.' (Sason)

Property 4. CA exhibits Anaphor Agreement Effect, as in (26), in which an anaphoric object is focus-fronted, and agreement with it is disallowed (unlike non-anaphoric objects, cf. (27)) (Akkuş 2021).

(26) qul-tu {le / *le-na / *le-ni} ROA varri-tu bınt _.
said-1SG {that.∅ / *that-3SG.F / *that-1SG} herself showed-1SG girl
'I said that I showed the girl herself (not something else).' (Sason)

(27) qul-tu {le / le-na / *le-ni} BINT varri-tu _ roa.
said-1SG {that.∅ / that-3SG.F / *that-1SG} girl showed-1SG herself
'I said that I showed the girl (not someone else) herself.' (Sason)

Future directions:

- investigation of quantified phrases allowed in CD, particularly their scope properties in comparison with their non-doubled counterparts.
- examination of Arabic CD in the context of theories of CD.

Tentative Conclusions

- Complementizer Agreement and Clitic Doubling share some properties in Arabic.
  - The indexer is realized morphophonologically as a clitic.
  - Both CA and CD exhibit first conjunct 'agreement' and 'doubling', respectively.
- Yet, there are some differences that need addressing in order to fully assimilate one phenomenon into the other.

Selected References:
Akkuş, F. (2021). C and T are distinct probes. NELS 52. **van Alem, A.** (In Prep). *Life of Phi*. PhD thesis, Leiden University. **Aoun, J.** (1999). Clitic-doubled arguments. In *Beyond Principles and Parameters: Essays in memory of Osvaldo Jaeggli*. 15–42. **Paparounas, L. & Salzmann M.** (2021). First Conjunct Clitic Doubling: Evidence for Agree-based Approaches. WCCFL 39.

Acknowledgments. Many thanks to my Lebanese Arabic consultants.