

Pronouns and their associates (I): Doubling, resumption, and ‘copy raising’

---

- pronouns usually *represent* either an argument or a predicate
- but occasionally, they *co-occur* with another element, engaging in some kind of dependency with that other element:
  - (i) doubling (1)
  - (ii) resumption (2)
  - (iii) ‘copy raising’ (3)

- (1) *lo* vimos a *él*<sup>%</sup> *Juan* (Spanish)  
CL.3SG.M we.saw to him/Juan  
‘we saw him/Juan’
- (2) a. (as for) *John*, I don’t like *’m*  
b. these are the kinds of things *which* I can never remember where I put *them*
- (3) a. *John* seems like *he*’s sick  
b. *John* seems like *his* mind is somewhere else  
c. *John* seems like she terrifies *him*

**Q** how are the dependencies between the two elements established in each of these constructions?

**(i) clitic doubling**

- when clitics represent arguments, it is reasonable to treat the clitic as the recipient of a  $\theta$ -role
- if it is the clitic that gets the  $\theta$ -role, the ‘double’ cannot receive it (as well)
- the ‘double’ must then be a non-argument serving to specify the content of the clitic
- specificational asyndetic coordination would be one way to represent such a dependency: (4)

(4) [<sub>NP</sub> PRONOUN [: [‘DOUBLE’]]]

- (4) is a perfectly sensible approach to appositions and ‘afterthoughts’
- (5) a. he, (viz.) John, is running for mayor      her brother, (viz.) John, is running for mayor  
b. I don’t like him, John      I don’t like that man, John
- but clitic doubling constructions do not have the prosodic profile of appositions of ‘afterthoughts’
  - moreover, while appositions and ‘afterthoughts’ can associate not just to pronouns but also to full DPs (see the right-hand examples in (5)), clitic doubling is strictly confined to pronouns
  - any approach to clitic doubling that locates the ‘double’ *outside* the projection of the clitic will have a hard time accounting for the restriction to pronouns

- we can capture the fact that ‘clitic doubling’ is restricted to pronouns by assuming that the clitic and its double together form a complex DP — roughly, in one of the two ways in (6) (we will end up developing this more below)

- (6) a.  $[_{DP} \acute{e}l/Juan [_D, D=CL]]$   
 b.  $[_{DP} [_D, D=CL] [\acute{e}l/Juan]]]$

- the syntax in (6b) assimilates clitic doubling to (7a), for which it is widely assumed (following Postal’s seminal work; see also Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002) that the pronoun takes the projection of the common noun phrase as its complement

- (7) a. we/us linguists  
 b.  $[_{DP} [_D, D=we/us] [linguists]]]$

- an assimilation of clitic doubling to (7a) would be undesirable: the two have very different distributions (e.g., (7a) systematically fails with third person singular pronouns, not just in English but also in Spanish: \**he linguist*, \**lo linguïsta*)
- so this pleads against a representation of clitic doubling as in (6b)

- the syntax in (6a) places the ‘double’ in the specifier of the ‘big DP’, in the same structural position which is widely assumed to be the locus of prenominal possessors
- this may seem problematic in light of the fact that *Juan/él* in (1) is not interpreted as the possessor of *lo*
- but (a) Spanish prenominal possessors are adjectival (not in SpecDP, so SpecDP is not ‘earmarked’ for possessors in Spanish) and (b) as SpecDP is not a position to which any lexical head can assign a  $\theta$ -role, the semantic relationship between the occupant of SpecDP and any other constituent in the DP is not inherently confined to any particular (thematic) dependency
- it will be attractive to develop (6a) a bit more and to have D establish a semantic relationship between the occupant of SpecDP and a silent complement of D (*pro*), with D as the RELATOR of this relationship (cf. Uriagereka 1995)

- (8)  $[_{DP} \acute{e}l/Juan [_D, D=CL] [pro]]]$

- *pro* in (8) stands for a property (contextually recoverable: in (1), ‘the person we saw’) that is attributed to the occupant of SpecDP
- the occupant of SpecDP is not in a  $\theta$ -relationship with the verb that takes the DP as its internal argument (*vimos* ‘saw’ in (1)); but because the verb does take this ‘big DP’ as its thematic dependent and the *pro* in the complement of D is interpreted as representing the property of being seen by us, the referent of the occupant of SpecDP will be understood to be the object of the verb
- Den Dikken (2006) uses a *pro*-headed structure functionally similar to (8) in the analysis of equative copular sentences (such as *Clark Kent is Superman*)

- in equatives, the *pro*-predicate is not licensed within the DP, hence the DP must undergo predicate inversion
- in clitic doubling constructions, by contrast, *pro* is licensed DP-internally by the overt occupant of D, the clitic (*lo*), hence the DP can in principle remain *in situ* (although displacement of the ‘big DP’ to the specifier of a Sportiche-style CliticVoiceP would not be impossible)
- the clitic in D must itself be spelled out outside the ‘big DP’: it differs in this respect from ‘ordinary’ definite articles, which are exponed in DP

**NB1** Paparounas & Salzmänn (2023) present data and analysis from Greek first-conjunct clitic doubling and binding to argue (a) that the clitic itself is not moving and (b) that the ‘double’ is *in situ*, i.e., has not undergone movement either

- (a) runs counter to a ‘big DP’ approach according to which exponence of D outside DP is the result of movement; but it is compatible with an interpretation of the ‘big DP’ approach that base-generates the physical clitic outside DP and associates it, via Agree, with the D-head position inside the ‘big DP’
- (b) is compatible with the ‘big DP’ approach as long as both the ‘big DP’ as a whole and the ‘double’ remain *in situ*

[the Paparounas & Salzmänn paper also provides a critical overview of approaches to clitic doubling, useful for those interested in developing a research proposal on this topic]

**NB2** nothing in the analysis in (8) hinges on the labelling of the structure containing the clitic, *pro* and the ‘double’: if it should turn out to be better to treat the clitic as the exponent/associate of the head of  $\phi$ P (*à la* Déchaine & Wiltschko 2002), the relationship between the clitic, *pro* and the ‘double’ can be established within the confines of  $\phi$ P instead of DP

- no matter whether the phrase containing the three key elements is DP or  $\phi$ P, the major difference between clitics and definite articles remains the fact that the former are not at liberty to be exponed inside their containers: they have to be spelled out on an external head
- an interesting question to examine will be whether clitic doubling constructions treated in terms of a structure of the type in (8) (in Romance, and more generally) are restricted to proforms whose paradigms are non-identical with the paradigm of the definite article  
[the French pronominal clitics *le/la/les* are form-identical with definite articles, while the Spanish object clitic *lo* is not form-identical with the definite article *el*; perhaps concomitantly, French lacks object clitic doubling with *le/la/les*]

**(ii) resumption**

- the ‘big DP’ structure in (8) is probably helpful in the analysis of a subset of resumption constructions — ‘**movement resumptives**’ (found in Swedish, Vata, Gbadi, *i.a.*)

- (9)      àlÓ   Ó lē   saká la?  
           who he eat rice Q  
           ‘who is eating rice?’

(Vata; Koopman 1982:128)

- the resumptive pronoun in (9) appears in the position where we would expect the trace of *wh*-movement to reside
- its non-complementarity with the *wh*-constituent falls out if the resumptive and the *wh*-constituent underlyingly form a complex constituent from which the *wh*-constituent subextracts, leaving the pronoun (either the head of the DP in (8) or the complement) behind
- the fact that ‘movement resumption’ does not lift island effects, give rise to weak crossover and connectivity effects, and allow the operator to license a parasitic gap suggests that *bona fide* movement of the operator is involved
- it is as though the resumptive here is a kind of ‘spell-out’ of the trace of movement (as McCloskey 2006 puts it) — if taken literally, this is hard to reconcile with ‘copy theory’; but ‘movement resumption’ is straightforward if, as in the ‘big DP’ approach, the resumptive and the operator are two parts of a single nominal constituent (McCloskey 2006:110: ‘derivations in which the NP-part of a moved phrase would be deleted stranding a D — that is, a ‘resumptive pronoun’”)
- McCloskey (2006:109): ‘In Swedish, Vata, and Gbadi, those  $\bar{A}$ -binding relations which terminate in a pronoun show the complete constellation of properties associated with  $\bar{A}$ -movement. In Irish and similar languages, resumptive pronoun constructions show none of those properties’
- in Irish, resumptive pronouns do not give rise to island violations, and show no WCO and connectivity effects

(10)        an ghirseach    a-r                    ghoid    na síogaí    *i*                    (Irish; McCloskey 2002:189)  
               the girl            COMP-PAST    stole    the fairies    her  
               ‘the girl that the fairies stole away’

- for this kind of resumption, we want a **base-generation** analysis: the operator is base-generated in its  $\bar{A}$ -position; the resumptive pronoun occupies the  $\theta$ -position; a variable-binding relationship is established between the operator and the resumptive
- English (2b), repeated below as (11), is usually considered to instantiate a third type of resumption, featuring what Sells (1984) calls an ‘**intrusive pronoun**’ (also found in Swedish — this language has two types of resumption)

(11)        these are the kinds of things *which* I can never remember where I put *them*

- ‘classic’ intrusive pronouns found in environments such as (11) are similar to Irish-style resumptives in giving rise to no island, WCO or connectivity effects
- but Asudeh (2004) argues that a distinction should be made, in English, between two types of resumptives — (i) those occurring in island contexts (Sells’s ‘intrusive pronouns’) and (ii) those occurring in cases of multiple clausal embedding (‘complexity resumptives’); according to Asudeh, (ii) does give rise to WCO and connectivity effects

(12) this is the girl that Peter said that John thinks that yesterday his mother had given some cakes to *her*

- Sells (1984) presents a number of ways in which (singular) ‘intrusive pronouns’ are restricted
  - ‘intrusive pronouns’ do not allow a quantificational antecedent
  - ‘intrusive pronouns’ do not support list answers
  - ‘intrusive pronouns’ do not support so-called functional answers

(13) \*I’d like to review every book that Mary couldn’t remember if she had read *it* before

(14) which of the linguists do you think that if Mary hires *him* then everybody will be happy?

- a. Tom
- b. \*Tom, Dick and Harry

(15) which exam question does no professor even wonder whether *it* will be tough enough?

- a. question 2
- b. \*the one that every student answered correctly last term

→ these properties of ‘intrusive pronouns’ suggest that these are not true bound variables; they behave more like **referential** pronouns

→ this can be (begun to be) understood if the dependency between the operator and the resumptive, in the case of ‘intrusive pronouns’, is similar to the one seen in instances of **prolepsis**

(16) they say of John that *he* is smart

(17) of which of the linguists do they say that *he* is smart?

- a. Tom
- b. \*Tom, Dick and Harry

(18) of which exam question does no professor say that *it* is tough enough?

- a. question 2
- b. \*the one that every student answered correctly last term

→ ‘intrusive pronouns’ and prolepsis provide us a natural segue to ‘copy raising’ constructions

**(iii) ‘copy raising’**

- (3) a. *John* seems like *he*’s sick
- b. *John* seems like *his* mind is somewhere else
- c. *John* seems like she terrifies *him*

- on its face, the ‘copy raising’ example in (3a) resembles ‘hyper-raising’ (found, e.g., in Brazilian Portuguese; see Ferreira 2000, 2004; Martins & Nunes 2006; Nunes 2008)

(19) o João parece que ’ta doente  
 the João seems.3SG that be.3SG sick  
 ‘(lit.) João seems that is sick, i.e., João seems to be sick’

- the only difference between (3a) and (19) appears to be the overtness of the subordinate subject in the former
- but while ‘hyper-raising’ may involve actual raising (although a non-movement analysis is also on the table), there can be no doubt that ‘copy raising’ does not: (3b,c) cannot, on any reasonable assumptions, be treated as movement dependencies
- *John* in (3b,c) is coindexed with the pronouns *his* and *him* not as a result of movement but as a result of either binding or coreference — *John* is a **proleptic** element in the subject position of the matrix clause, linked to a pronoun that receives the appropriate  $\theta$ -role

**Q** can we distinguish between binding and coreference in the context of (3)?

- theoretically, treating the pronoun as a **bound variable** is desirable because it ensures, as desired, that the subordinate clause serves as a **predicate** for *John*
- empirically, the binding approach appears to be vindicated by the fact that in ‘copy raising’ constructions, the matrix subject can be a quantificational expression (*contra* (13))

(20) *every boy* seems like *he* is sick

- NB** prolepsis with *of*-PPs also allows quantificational expressions (*they say of every boy that he is smart*); but for prolepsis we had taken (17) and (18) to indicate that coreference is involved
- we would ideally procure judgements on *wh*-question versions of ‘copy raising’ constructions featuring potential list or functional readings (*%which exam question seems to no professor like it’s tough enough*); but this task is complicated by a register clash and possibly by other complications as well
  - it may also be that Sells’s (1984) restrictions on ‘intrusive pronouns’ are not (necessarily) indicative of coreference *vs* variable binding
  - for the question of whether ‘copy raising’ constructions such as those in (3) involve binding or coreference, I will here follow the theory’s lead and assume that bound-variable anaphora is involved