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Abstract

Unlike object agreement markers, direct object clitics in Albanian and Greek are restricted in their distribution and display operator-like properties. This paper shows that direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek produces information structure in a systematic way, in that doubled DPs are unambiguously interpreted as topics. Hence, topicality is syntactically encoded in these languages. Specificity cannot be bestowed on an argument by a doubling clitic or by scrambling but is fundamentally related to the D-head.

1. Introduction

A pervasive phenomenon in the languages of the Balkans is clitic doubling. This study investigates clitic doubling of direct objects in two of these languages: Albanian and Greek. This undertaking is motivated by the need to gain deeper

* This paper deals with topics that are further elaborated in the second and third chapters of my doctoral dissertation (Kallulli 1999). Versions of it were presented at the GLOW-workshop "The Syntax of Balkan Languages" (Athens, April 1996) and at the workshop on Clitic Phenomena in English and other European Languages, ESSSI4 (Debrecen, September 1997). I am grateful to these audiences for their comments. In particular, I wish to thank Fris Beukema and Marcel den Dikken for making possible its presentation at the Debrecen workshop in my absence. I am indebted to Antonis Androutopoulos for her invaluable help with the Greek data. I also thank Lars Hellan, Joe Emonds, Georg Nikiforid and an anonymous reviewer for detailed comments.

* Parts of the material contained in this article appear in the Proceedings of ConSOLE V and the Proceedings of WCCFL 17.
insight into the nature of clitic doubling constructions, and in turn contributes to the general question of why clitic doubling appears at all. Doubling constructions are by their nature strongly reminiscent of object agreement constructions. Yet, there are essential differences between the two that beg for explanation. The Albanian and Greek patterns confirm the idea that in spite of certain similarities between clitic doubling and object agreement phenomena, the two cannot be equated. For instance, unlike object agreement markers, direct object clitics in Albanian and Greek have a restricted distribution and operator-like properties. It will be shown that the factors determining clitic doubling of direct object DPs in both languages are by and large identical and can be captured by a uniform syntactic analysis. Crucially, I argue that direct object clitics in both languages unequivocally mark the DPs they double as [+Focus], which in analogy with the [+Focus] feature on phrases (cf. Jackendoff 1972; Horvath 1986; Rochemont 1986; Brody 1990, i.a.), will be defined as a syntactic feature interpretable at both the LF and PF interfaces. Consequently, clitic doubling of direct object DPs does not induce specificity on these DPs, as has been claimed for Romance (cf. Sportiche 1996; Uriagereka 1995, i.a.). It will be argued instead that the locus of specificity is the D-position (cf. Abney 1987), which for noun phrases underlies argumenthood (cf. Longobardi 1994). The view that direct object clitics in Albanian and Greek mark the DPs they double as unambiguously [+Focus] may be implemented successfully within the minimalist framework (cf. Chomsky 1995) by preserving Sportiche’s (1996.) basic assumption that clitics head their own maximal projections and that direct object clitics in particular are heads with operator-like properties. Importantly, it will be argued that argument clitics carry a D-feature, which is why they may double only DPs, not NPs, and that specificity, presuppositionality and/or strength effects often attributed to clitic constructions (cf. Sportiche 1996; Uriagereka 1995; Anagnostopoulou 1994 i.a.) are only epiphenomenal, straightforwardly derived because of the feature-matching need.

This paper is organised as follows. I start out in Section 2 by outlining and scrutinising the general properties of Albanian and Greek clitic doubling. This is motivated by the need to comprehend the factors that are important for the so-called Clitic Doubling Parameter. In Section 3 the interaction of focus and doubling is discussed. Finally, Section 4 deals with matters of representation. In this section I also investigate the parallels between doubling constructions in Albanian and Greek and scrambling constructions in Germanic and discuss in some detail the internal structure of noun phrases. In addition, I provide an account of the phenomenon of specificity which rests on the individual vs. property-denotation distinction.

2. Preliminaries

Albanian and Greek are so-called free word order, null subject languages with rich morphology. Both languages have object pronominal clitics with distinct morphological inflections for accusative and dative/genitive cases; both lack subject clitics. In Greek, clitics follow only gerunds and imperatives. In Albanian they may precede, follow or be infixed in imperatives. As in French, clitics in both languages immediately precede all other verb forms both in matrix and embedded clauses. The relative order of clitics is rigidly fixed for all combinations of Person(s): dative/genitive followed by accusative. Clitic climbing is absent, as are infinitives, which have historically been supplanted by the subjunctive form. Perhaps the most striking property of Albanian and Greek clitic doubling is the fact that it violates Kayne’s generalisation which, informally stated, says that clitic doubling is possible whenever a noun phrase can get case by means of some non-verbal device which has case-assigning properties, namely, prepositions. The Albanian and Greek examples below show that doubled DPs are not

1. Here I depart from the view that an NP is exclusively a complement of D (cf. Abney 1987) and more generally from the implication that once a functional projection is available at least within a given language, it is always phonologically active in that language even though at times it may be inert/morphologically empty (cf. Chomsky 1995). Note, however, that I am not claiming that the D-position cannot be morphologically empty. For discussion, see sections 4.2 and 4.3. I imagine that the countable bare singulars and existential bare plurals are not DPs with a morphologically null D, but NPs lacking a D-projection altogether. Consequently, they are not arguments, but predicates at LF. By contrast, generic bare plurals are DPs with morphologically null Ds. The advantage of this distinction between DPs and NPs is that it allows for a more principled mapping between syntax and semantics.

2. Albanian and Greek have identical case systems except for the fact that the Greek counterpart of the Albanian dative is the genitive.


4. For an analysis as to why clitic climbing is absent across all Baltic languages, see Terzi (1992).

5. Suárez (1988: 399-400) provides the following examples from Porteño Spanish as empirical evidence against viewing the prepositional element a in Spanish, a language where Kayne’s generalisation seems to be generally operative, as a case assigning device; she argues instead that a is an animacy marker, which is why it is missing in the examples below in spite of the fact that the object DPs are doubled here.

(i) Yo lo voy a comprar el diario justo antes de subir
I am going to buy the newspaper just before coming up
preceded by prepositions. In fact, prepositional objects may not be clitic doubled in these languages.  

In Albanian, dative DPs are invariably clitic doubled. In (1a) this applies to a definite expression, in (1b, c) to an indefinite expression, in (1d) to a wh-dative, in (1e) to a quantified dative. The opposition (1b) vs. (1c) shows that dative clitic doubling is insensitive to so-called ‘VP-internal scrambling of objects’ (cf. Massey 1991).

(1)  
a. Ev-a *(i) dërgoi An-ës lule  
   Ev-the her.CL sent An-the.DAT flowers  
   ‘Ev sent Ann flowers’
b. Ben-i *(i) dërgoi një vajze lule  
   Ben-the her.CL sent a girl.DAT flowers  
   ‘Ben sent a girl flowers’
c. Ben-i *(i) dërgoi lule një vajze  
   Ben-the her.CL sent a girl.DAT flowers  
   ‘Ben sent a girl flowers’
d. Kujt *(i) foli mësues-i?  
   who.DAT him/her.CL talked teacher-the  
   ‘Who did the teacher talk to?’
e. Ben-i *(u) bleu gjithë vajza-ve(i) lule  
   Ben-the them.CL buys all girls-DAT(he) flowers  
   ‘Ben buys all (the) girls flowers’

Both in Albanian and Greek, quirky subjects are invariably clitic doubled both when marked for dative/genitive or accusative case. Examples are given in (2) and (3).

(2)  
a. Al: Jan-it *(i) mungojnë dhjetë libra?  
   Jan-the.DAT him.CL.DAT miss-they ten books.NOM  
   ‘Jan is missing ten books’
b. Gr: Tu Yanni *(tu) lipun dhëka viflia  
   the Yannis GEN him.CL.GEN miss-they ten books.NOM  
   ‘John is missing ten books’

8. Albanian and Greek are pro-drop, null-subject languages and nothing stops clitics from appearing sentence initially.

9. In Albanian the definite article is suffixed to the noun stem (indicated by the use of hyphens in the Albanian examples); in Greek, like in English, it is a separate phonological entity and precedes the noun stem.

It has been claimed for Greek that clitic doubling of direct object DPs is subject to definiteness, in the sense that only definite DPs may be clitic doubled (cf. Anagnostopoulou 1994). The example in (5b) (from Kazazis and Pentheroudakis 1976) is then a counterexample to this claim since the doubled DP here is clearly indefinite. This counterexample is in fact acknowledged by Anagnostopoulou, who writes:

'At first sight, sentences like (5b) seem to contradict the view that Modern Greek doubling is subject to definiteness... Utterances like (5b) have a clear modal reading, the verbal form used is subject to acceptability restrictions (imperfective aspect is systematically chosen: this type of aspect is typical of conditionals) and the clitics in them seem to have a kind of "sentential" function... These constructions are extremely interesting because the function of the clitics in them is not clear. However, they are, in many respects, different from the doubling constructions of the type examined here and, from this point of view, beyond the scope of the present discussion... The fact that the adverbial elements ... must be heavily stressed and that they typically precede the doubled DPs seems to indicate that structures like (5b) are right dislocations. Furthermore, note that examples of this type are only possible in "ordering-contexts" where ... it is quite common to use attributive definitions instead of indefinites.' (Anagnostopoulou 1994:4, footnote 5)

Let me point out several inaccurate claims in the quote. First, doubled indefinite DPs need not occur in constructions where the verb has imperfective aspect; the Greek example in (6) contains a perfective aspect form. Secondly, adverbial elements do not necessarily precede the indefinite DPs, as (6) also shows. Thirdly, (6) shows that doubling of indefinite DPs is possible outside of 'ordering-contexts'. Even if examples as in (5b) were only possible in 'ordering-contexts', where it is claimed to be common to use attributive definitions instead of indefinites, doubling should still be expected [for Anagnostopoulou, who claims that attributive definites, as a subclass of novel definites, may not be clitic doubled in Greek].

---

11. Note, however, that the implication is only one way: definite direct object DPs may be doubled but need not be. As not all definites can be clitic doubled in Greek (cf. e.g. (9b), (10b)), Anagnostopoulou tries to relate direct object clitic doubling in this language to Heim’s (1982) Familiarity Condition. However, this analysis is untenable in the face of doubling of indefinites unless Heim’s crucial claim that all indefinites represent novel information is rejected.

12. Cf. also Agouraki (1993) who provides several other parallel examples of doubling of indefinites.

13. Anagnostopoulou’s claim that attributive definites may not be clitic doubled in Greek is not uncontroversial, though. In this context, according to Anagnostopoulou (1994), while clitics necessarily license familiarity on the direct object DPs they double, these DPs may be either novel or familiar if not doubled. This is clearly imperfect, as clitic doubling emerges in her treatment not only as a totally optional but also as an entirely redundant phenomenon if clitics may double definite DPs which are non-novel/familiar even when not doubled.

14. An additional argument against the right dislocation hypothesis is presented in Section 3.3.

(6) Akorna ke i Anna kafere na to ekdosio ena vivlio prin still and the Anna managed SUBJ it.CL publish a book before na pethani SUBJ die
‘Even Anna managed to publish a book before she died’

Finally, I reject the idea that indefinite DPs may be clitic doubled only when they are right dislocated, as has been claimed by Anagnostopoulou for Modern Greek. The main argument against the view that clitic doubled indefinites are exclusively right dislocated phrases comes from the fact that, just like clitic doubled definite DPs, they may occur in both languages in positions that are typically associated with theta marking and case marking, i.e., in A-positions such as ECM complements and subjects of small clauses, as in (7) and (8).

(7) a. Al: Jan-i e pret një gjë tê tillë tê ndodhë Jan-the it.CL expects a thing such SUBJ happen
b. Gr: O Yannis to perimeni kati tetio na simv the John it.CL expects something such SUBJ happen
‘John expects something like this to happen’

(8) a. Al: Jan-i nuk e konsideron një vajzë tê tille/ Jan-the not her.CL consider a girl such/ Mer-in inteligente Mary-the.ACC intelligent
b. Gr: O Yannis qen tin teori kamja tetia kopela/ the John not her.CL consider no such girl tin Maria eksipini [the Mary].ACC intelligent
‘John does not consider any such girl/Mary intelligent’
It is thus my contention that clitic doubling constructions of the type in (5b) do not differ from the doubling constructions involving doubling of definite direct object DPs other than with respect to the definiteness feature, which is irrelevant. The factors that determine clitic doubling of direct object DPs are the same, irrespective of the [±definite] status of these DPs. In this way clitic doubling of direct object DPs emerges as a uniform phenomenon and should be treated as such.

The fact that both definite and indefinite direct object DPs may be doubled does not mean that they always can be. The data in (9) show that even definite DPs cannot be doubled invariably.

(9) A: Do you walk to school or do you take the bus?
   B: a. Al: Nuk shkoj në këmbë, (*e) marr autobus-in
   b. Gr: Dhen pigjeno me t’as podhja, (*to) perno to loforio

   'I don’t walk, I take the bus (to school)'

The fact that the definite DPs in these examples cannot be doubled is problematic for the specificity/presuppositional/familiarity/d-linking/strength approaches to doubling (cf. Sportiche 1996; Anagnostopoulou 1994; Uriagereka 1995), if we assume with Ito (1991) and Daring (1992) that all definite are specific/presuppositional/strong. While the claim that all definitions are specific will be challenged (cf. Section 4.3.4), there are indisputably specific/presuppositional/strong definites (and indefinites) that need not and/or cannot be doubled. (10) is a case in point.

(10) A: What happened?
   B: a. Al: Jan-î (#f) hëngri fasule-t/ (*e) plu
   b. Gr: O Yánis-îs (#ns) éfaye ta fasólia/ (#fns) ipje

   'Yannis ate the beans/her.CL drank
   një birrë
   mëa birra
   a beer.FEM
   'Yannis ate the beans/drank a beer'

Finally, referentiality of the doubled DP is also irrelevant for direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek. This is indicated by the fact that quantified expressions may also be doubled, as in (11). Note that doubling in Albanian and Greek does not suppress the attributive reading of definite DPs; the doubled DP in (12) may receive both a referential and a non-referential/attribution interpretation.

(11) a. Al: An-a i urrente tè gjithë djem-t
   b. Gr: I Anna ta misouse ola ta-aghoria

   'Anna HATED all the boys'

(12) a. Al: I dua mace-t e vogla

   'I LOVE cats-the small'

   b. Gr: Tsí aghapos tis mikres (tis) ghates

   'I LOVE the small the cats'

Now that we have seen that clitic doubling of direct object DPs in Albanian and Greek cannot be adequately described in terms of any of the features highlighted so far by various theorists as significant for the Clitic Doubling Parameter, let me turn to the identification of the factors determining direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek.

3. The Non-optionality of direct object clitic doubling

A variety of facts converge in showing that clitic doubling of direct object DPs systematically yields ungrammaticality when these DPs are in focus or part of the focus domain, that is, when they are marked [+Focus]. In this section, I show that clitic doubling of direct object DPs in Albanian and Greek unambiguously marks these DPs [-Focus].

15. However, clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek is incompatible with focus DPs, as will become clear in Section 3. According to the view that any constituent that can be raised by QR can serve as focus (cf. Chomsky 1976), quantifiers in general are default foci. In (11) I have tried to control this factor by focusing the verb. This is indicated in the English translation by the use of small capital letters. The interaction of clitic doubling and focusing will be discussed at length in Section 3.

16. Anagnostopoulou (1994) claims that doubled DPs in Greek may only receive a referential interpretation. A. Androustospolou (personal communication), however, points out to me that the doubled DP in (12b) can receive an attributive interpretation (e.g. when the verb is focused).

17. Except where indicated otherwise, I will only be concerned with doubling of direct objects, not of accusative quirky subjects.
3.1 Justifying [−Focus]

In defining the feature [−Focus], I will proceed indirectly by defining the notion focus first.

Informally speaking, focus is viewed as the most informative part of an utterance. Hence, any definition of focus is sensitive to the speech act and varies according to it. For instance, the notion information or information structure for a question does not make sense unless one defines information structure as the type of answer one expects (cf. Sperber and Wilson 1988). So, for wh-questions, focus is the variable represented by the wh-element; this also holds for echo-questions. For a yes-no question focus is either the assertion (i.e. the given polarity), or the negation (i.e. the opposite polarity). Focus can also be an element which is contrasted. Finally, focus can be the item that fills a slot in an information structure where other slots have already been filled. In this latter function, focus is close to the notion 'new information'. The definitions above are quasi-collectively reflected in the following quote from Vaidavu (1999: 575): '... focus, an informative, news-bearing, dominant, or contrary-to-expectation part...'. The complement of focus is topic. Following a long-established tradition in generative grammar, I assume that focus is a syntactic feature on phrases interpretable at both the LP and the PF interfaces as [+Focus] (cf. Jackendoff 1972; Rochemont 1986; Horvath 1986; Brody 1990).

In view of the fact that a sentence may lack a topic (e.g. out-of-the-blue sentences) but will always have a focus, I assume that the [+Focus] feature is in fact the unmarked value in a markedness theory for natural language and that the [−Focus] feature is the marked value. Derivational syntax then renders this feature significant. I argue that clitic doubling is one of the means by which this feature gets licensed.

Consider the examples in (13).

(13) a. Al: An-a lekoi libi-in
b. Gr: I Ana diavase to vivlio
   the Ana read book
   'Ann read the book'

The undoubled Albanian example (13a) is a felicitous answer to either (14a) or to (14b), but not to (14c) or (14d).

The Greek example (13b) may be a felicitous answer to either of the questions in (14). However, (15b), the doubled version of (13b), is preferred as an answer to (14c) and (14d) even in Greek. Crucially, (15a, b), the doubled version of (13a, b), may in both languages only be a felicitous reply to (14c, d) but not to (14a, b). This latter fact suggests that direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek is incompatible with direct object DPs that are marked [+Focus] (or alternatively, are contained in focus domains).

(15) a. Al: An-a lekoi libi-in
b. Gr: I Ana diavase to vivlio
   the Ana read book
   'Ann did read the book'... 'Ann read the book'

I devote the next two sub sections to a brief review of some recent ideas on the syntactic encoding of focus and to how focus interacts with clitic doubling of direct object DPs in Albanian and Greek.

3.2 Focus, wh-elements and clitic doubling

Following Horvath (1988), Brody (1990) assumes that just like there is a feature [+wh], which marks phrases as wh-elements, there is a feature [+f] that indicates focushood. 19 wh-phrases are argued to be necessarily [+f] and the conditions on [+wh] and (+WH) CPs are generalised to the [+f] and F(ocus) P(hrase) so that they will entail (16), which may be regarded as a Focus Criterion. The unavoidable implication is that Rizzi's (1991) Wh-criterion is a subcase of the Focus Criterion and that Spec of (a root) CP is one of the canonical positions for focus.

---

19. Brody claims that the S-structure presence of the [+f] feature shows up as heavy stress at PF. According to him, the stressed [+f]-marked category is not necessarily the same as the [+f]-phrase, but the [+f]-phrase will always contain a [+f]-marked element. While he does not define the notion of 'heavy stress', I take it to be phonetic prominence, probably indicated by a pitch accent. Unlike Brody, I wish to leave open the possibility that focus may have other PF correlates even if phonetic prominence/pitch accent is absent.

18. For details on the formalisation of focus (i.e. its formal representation in lambda-reduced intensional logic), see Jacobs (1986), Rooth (1996), Krifka (1996).
(16) (Brody 1990: 208)
   a. At S-structure and LF the Spec of an FP must contain a [+f]-phrase
   b. At LF all [+f]-phrases must be in an FP

Just as the corresponding notion on +WH CPs is parametrised, it is assumed that (16a) may or may not hold in a given language. (16b), on the other hand, like the condition on wh-elements, should be universal. Further, a distinction is drawn between + and −WH FPs.

If my claim is correct that direct object clitics license non-focusing of the DPs they double and if we assume with Brody (1990) that wh-elements are necessarily foci, then clitic doubling of wM direct object DPs in Albanian and Greek is bound to yield ungrammaticality. The examples in (17) show that this is indeed the case.

(17) a. Al: Këçfarë (*e) pe?
   [who/what].ACC it/him/her.CL saw-you
   "Who/what did you see?"
   b. Gr: Pjoni (*tou/to) idhes
   [who/what].ACC him/her.CL saw-you
   "Who/what did you see?"

Direct object DPs in Albanian are obligatorily clitic doubled in constructions with wh-subjects, as well as in yes/no questions, as shown in (18) and (19), respectively. Similar facts are reported for Greek by Agouraki (1993), who notes that in questions, either yes/no or wh-questions, a doubling clitic is strongly preferred. These facts are also predicted under the hypothesis that clitic doubling exempts direct object DPs from focus domains (that is, from phrases that are marked [+Focus]).

(18) a. Al: Kush (*e) pa ëmijë-n?
   b. Gr: Pios (to) ëdhë to pedhë? (Agouraki 1993; 154)
   who it.CL saw the child
   "Who has seen the child?"

(19) a. Al: (A) *e) pe Jan-in?
   [+Q] him.CL saw Jan-the
   b. Gr: (Ton) idhes ton Yënni? (Agouraki 1993; 170)
   him.CL saw the John
   "Have you seen John?"

In (20a) and (20b) the whole VP is contrastively focused. Since the direct object here is part of the focus domain (i.e. is marked [+Focus]), it cannot be doubled.22

(20) a. Al: An-a nuk (*i) zjeu fasule-t, por
   b. Gr: I Anna dhen (*ta) mëripeza ta fasëli, ala
   the Ann not them.CL cooked the beans but
   (*i) hëngri fiq-të
   (*ta) ëfaye ta sika
   them.CL ate the figs
   "Anna didn’t [cook the beans]; she [ate the figs]."

Likewise, direct object DPs in out-of-the-blue sentences may not be doubled, as the examples in (21) show.23

(21) A: What happened here?

   B: a. Ben-i (*e) ka thyer termëmetër-in/tujë pija të (Al)
      Ben-the it.CL has broken thermometer-the/a plate
      "[Ben has broken the thermometer/a plate]."
   b. O Yënnis (*ta) ëfaye ta fasëli/*llë ipe
      the Yannis them.CL ate the beans/ her.CL drank
      mia bira
      (Gr)
      "[Yannis ate the beans/drank a beer]."

Focus (i.e. a [+Focus] phrase) is most clearly brought out in association with so-called focus particles, such as even and only, otherwise referred to as scalar particles by Jacobs (1984), or as focusing adverbs by Rooth (1996). In the next

20. At this point, it should be clear that direct object clitic doubling is somehow less strict in Greek than in Albanian since only in the latter does it obligatorily occur whenever the direct object DP is outside the focus domain. The fundamental point to note, however, is that in both languages direct object clitic doubling indisputably marks the direct object DP as [+Focus]. In other words, while doubling of direct object DPs in Albanian and Greek necessarily marks these DPs as [+Focus], it is not the case that for the direct object DP to be interpreted as [+Focus], it has to be clitic doubled (e.g. Greek).

21. Albanian has an optional question particle for yes/no questions.

22. The sentences in (20) are grammatical also when the direct object (in the first conjunct) is clitic doubled under an interpretation which can be roughly rendered in English as: ‘As for Anna and the beans, she didn’t cook them, rather she ate the figs’. But notice that under this interpretation, ‘the beans’ is indisputably outside the focus domain. Hence, doubling exempts the direct object from the focus domain.

23. (21) is analogous to (10).
section, I use this diagnostic to identify [+Focus] phrases and investigate the effects of their interaction with direct object clitic doubling.

3.3 More [+Focus] phrases and their interaction with doubling

In the examples in (22a, b) the direct object DP Tirane is a [+Focus] phrase, as the English translation indicates.24 As such, it cannot be clitic doubled either in Albanian or in Greek.

(22) a. Al: Pap-a (*e) vizitoi majde Tirane (jo vetem Shkodra)
Pope-the it.cl visited even Tirana-the (not only Shkodra)
b. Gr: O Papas (*ta) episkefike akoma ke ta Tirana...
the Pope them.cl visited still and the Tirana
The Pope visited even [Tirana], (not only Shkodra)

Likewise, the direct object DP in (23a, b) cannot be clitic doubled, since it is marked [+Focus]. The fact that the direct object DP 'a beer' in (23) may not be clitic doubled is not related to its being [-definite]; the examples in (24) show that in both languages constructions involving double indefinites are fully grammatical if (and only if) the direct object is construed as outside the focus domain, a point which was already made earlier in the discussion.25

(23) a. Al: Jan-i (*e) piu majde një birrë para se të Jan-the it.cl drank even a beer before that SUBJ
shkonte
went
b. Gr: O Yannis (*tin) ipje akoma ke mjë bira prin
the Yannis her.cl drank still and the beer.FEM before
na fighti
SUBJ went
'John drank even [a beer], before he left'

24. In Albanian, focusing adverbs can attach to different sites without necessarily affecting the interpretation of phrases in terms of the [+Focus] feature. That is, unlike in English, it is not necessarily the constituent which the focus particle immediately precedes that constitutes the focus domain. Because of this complexity, I provide the intended interpretation in the English translations of the Albanian and Greek examples by employing square brackets followed by the subscript 'F' (to indicate focus domains).

25. Again, in Albanian, clitic doubling of direct object DPs is obligatory when the object is outside the focus domain. A. Andriotopoulos (personal communication) points out that clitic doubling of the object when the direct object is inside the focus domain is optional in Greek; however, she notes that (24b) and (25b) are strongly preferred with the doubling clitics.

(24) a. Al: Jan-i (*e) piu majde një birrë para se të Jan-the it.cl drank even a beer before that SUBJ
shkonte (jo vetem e porosit)
went not only it.cl ordered
'John even [drank], a beer before he left (not only did he order it)'

b. Gr: O Yannis (*tin) IPJE mjë bira prin na the Yannis her.cl drank a beer.FEM before SUBJ
fighti...
went...
'John [DID drink] a beer before he left (he didn't just order it)'

Similarly, the clitic doubled versions of the sentences in (22) are grammatical under an interpretation in which the direct objects are construed outside the focus domain; in these cases, doubling is indeed obligatory in Albanian. This is shown in (25).

Pope-the it.cl visited even Tirana-the
b. Gr: O Papas os ke (?ta) episkefike ta Tirana
the Pope till and them.cl visited the Tirana
'The Pope even [visited] Tirana' i.e. 'As for Tirana, the Pope even visited it'

The clitic doubled versions of the objects in (22) also become grammatical if the subject DP is marked [+Focus], a fact which is indicated in the examples in (26) by the focus particles in front of the subject DP.26

(26) a. Al: Madje Pap-a (*e) vizitoi Tirane-n
even Pope-the it.cl visited Tirana-the
b. Gr: Akoma ke o Papas (ta) episkefike ta Tirana
still and the Pope them.cl visited the Tirana
'Even [the Pope] visited Tirana'

The data thus systematically reveal that clitic doubling of direct object DPs that are marked [+Focus] or are contained in [+Focus] phrases is disallowed in Albanian and Greek. The question then arises as to whether the function of direct

26. In fact, as the notation in (26) indicates, clitic doubling of the direct object DP is obligatory in Albanian when the subject is focus; in Greek, however, clitic doubling of the direct object DP is only optional when the subject is focus.
object doubling clitics is to license verb/subject-focusing or object non-focusing. The fact that verb/subject focusing may still be achieved in intransitive constructions decides the issue in favour of the latter alternative. 

In sum, we may state that clitic doubling of direct object DPs in Albanian and Greek is not optional: [+Focus] DPs cannot be clitic doubled. Thus, direct object clitics in Albanian and Greek have interpretive import; they mark the DPs they double as unambiguously [-Focus], which is interpreted as an operator feature.27 In this respect, direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek is different from clitic doubling in Spanish, which does not necessitate a [-Focus] reading (cf. e.g. (27) from Porteño Spanish), but is strongly reminiscent of so-called clitic right dislocation structures in French, Spanish and Italian, which are incompatible with [+Focus] phrases.28

(27) La nombraon a Maria. (Sufer 1988: 419) 
her they-nominated a Maria
'They nominated MARIA'

However, the fact that clitic doubled DPs in Albanian and Greek may occur in positions where adjuncts are simply not tolerated, as was shown in Section 2 (cf. e.g. (7) and (8)), ultimately rules out a right dislocation approach to these constructions. Further evidence can be adduced to this effect. For instance, if the doubled direct object DPs in Albanian were indeed right-dislocated, a [+Focus] phrase to the right of a right dislocated direct object would be precluded. This prediction is not borne out, however, as the example in (28) demonstrates.

him.CL =-IL.CL gave book-the.ACC BEN-the.DAT
'I gave the book to BEN' i.e. 'It was BEN that I gave the book to'

The question then remains whether the Albanian and Greek doubling constructions constitute yet a third type of clitic constructions with properties distinct from those of the two others—that is, clitic doubling constructions in Spanish/Romanian on the one hand and clitic right dislocation constructions in Romance on the other—or whether it can subsume, or be subsumed, under either of the two. To address this question one has to look at all the properties of the other two constructions in detail, as well. Such a task is well beyond the province of the study at hand.

Direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek is also strongly reminiscent of scrambling of direct objects in Germanic (cf. Webelhuth 1989), as will be more closely discussed in Section 4.2.

3.4 Summary

In concluding this section, it may be stated that direct object doubling clitics in Albanian and Greek are characterized by the fact that they have (i) a restricted distribution, and (ii) operator-like properties. These two properties suggest that direct object doubling clitics in these languages cannot be treated as mere object agreement markers, that is, as spell-outs of e.g. AgrO heads. Yet, there is little doubt that clitic doubling is a form of agreement between an X0 and an XP, namely the clitic head and the DP it doubles and with which it agrees in phi-features. The next section is devoted to how this cluster of properties can best be represented.

4. Issues of representation

4.1 Spec-Head licensing, feature checking and doubling

The view that accusative clitics mark the DPs they double as [-Focus] may be implemented formally in terms of the theory of spec-head licensing (cf. Chomsky 1995), if we assume with Sportiche (1996) that a clitic heads its own maximal projection in whose specifier position it licenses a particular property/feature...
For the derivation to converge, this feature has to be saturated or checked off (cf. Chomsky 1995). Since features may only be checked off in spec-head configurations, the (doubled argument) XP* in (29) must by LF move to the XP^a position so as to establish the relevant spec-head configuration.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{XP}^a \\
\text{CIP} \\
\text{Cl^0} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V^0} \\
\text{XP^a}
\end{array}
\]

In Sportiche's terms, movement of XP* to the XP^a position is motivated by the Clitic Criterion, an analogue of Rizzi's (1991) wh-Criterion, and yet another instantiation of the so-called Generalized Licensing Criterion, according to which feature-licensing may only obtain in spec-head configurations.

Further, Sportiche (1996) sets the following parameters of clitic constructions:

\( (30) \text{ Clitic construction parameters (Sportiche 1996:36) }\)

(i) Movement of XP* to XP^a occurs overtly or covertly
(ii) H is overt or covert
(iii) XP* is overt or covert

By these parameters, the cases in (31), among others, are predicted.

\( (31) \text{ a. Clitic doubling constructions (as in Spanish, Romanian, Greek, Albanian) arise when an overt XP^a moves covertly with an overt Cl.} \)

\( (31) \text{ b. Scrambling in Dutch/German arises when an overt XP^a moves overtly with a covert Cl.} \)

As for direct object clitic constructions, Sportiche claims that the property which the clitic head licenses in the specifier of the phrase it heads is invariably specificity, irrespective of whether the direct object clitic is overt (as in doubling constructions) or covert (as in scrambling constructions). As discussed above, this cannot possibly be the case for Albanian and Greek direct object clitics. The feature that Albanian and Greek direct object clitics license in the specifier of the phrase they head is what was defined in Section 3 as [-Focus]. By the theory of spec-head licensing, for the derivation to converge, the feature values on the clitic head and those of the DP in its specifier must match. Since the attracting feature is [-Focus], a clitic doubled [+Focus] direct object DP would invariably cause the derivation to crash. In this way, doubling of [+Focus] direct object DPs is of necessity ungrammatical.

While the idea that the same syntactic configuration underlies both doubling and scrambling constructions is desirable conceptually and attractive theoretically (cf. Chomsky 1995), I argue that the property F, whose need to be licensed motivates the postulated maximal projections (that is, Sportiche's CIP's or Voice Phrases), is identified incorrectly by Sportiche. In Section 3, I demonstrated that the feature that Albanian and Greek direct object clitics license on the DP they double is not specificity but topicality. In the next section I show that this is also the case for Germanic scrambling.

4.2 Parallels with scrambling

Like doubling of direct objects in Albanian and Greek, scrambling of direct objects in Germanic applies both to definite DPs as well as to a-expressions.\(^{30}\)

That is, the [definite] feature of the DP is not relevant for scrambling. This is illustrated in (32b), (33b) and (34b).

\( (32) \text{ a. Ge: Anna hat gestern das Buch gelesen} \)
\( \text{Anna has yesterday the book read} \)

29. With respect to the property they license, according to Sportiche, clitics subdivide into two types. The first type (typically accusative clitics) assimilates to such functional heads as [+wh] complements or [+negative] heads, which license some operator-like properties (e.g. wh or negative quantifiers). Sportiche argues that the operator-like property these clitics license is specificity in DPs. The second type of clitics (typically nominative and dative Romance clitics) is claimed not to be linked to specificity. Concerning this second type of clitics, Sportiche suggests that they should be analysed as pure agreement markers, that is, as elements devoid of interpretive import, presumably responsible for dative case assignment (i.e. AgrO-heads in the sense of Chomsky 1995).

30. The idea that focus is involved in scrambling phenomena is extensively discussed in Reinhart (1995). While Reinhart argues that a scrambled constituent cannot be focus, she favours a PF approach to focus (cf. Cirque 1993), which crucially involves the notion of stress prominence. However, as stated in note 19, I wish to leave open the possibility that the syntactic feature focus may have PF correlates that are different from (and perhaps exclude) stress prominence. Therefore, I will not undertake to present Reinhart's account.

31. Throughout, I use the term a-expression (cf. Chastain 1975) to refer to non-quantified singular indefinite noun phrases with articles.
b. Ge: Anna hat das Buch gestern gelesen.
   Anna has the book yesterday read
   'Ann read the book yesterday'
(33) a. Ge: Ich habe gestern eine Zeitung gelesen.
   I have yesterday a newspaper read
   I have a newspaper yesterday read
   'I read a newspaper yesterday'

(34) a. Du: dat de politie gisteren een kraker opgepakt heeft
    that the police yesterday a squatter arrested has
    (de Hoop 1992: 50)
b. Du: dat de politie een kraker gisteren opgepakt heeft
    that the police a squatter yesterday arrested has
    (de Hoop 1992: 50)

It was shown in Section 2 that definite direct object DPs cannot always be
doubled. The data in (35) and (36) show that they cannot always scramble either.
This fact is problematic for the specificity/presuppositional/strength related
approaches to scrambling (cf. Sportiche (1996), Diesing (1992), de Hoop (1992)
i.e., if we assume with Enc (1991) and Diesing (1997) that all definites are
specific/presuppositional/strong. While the claim that all definites are specific
will be challenged (cf. Section 4.3.4), there are unequivocally specific/presuppositional/strong
definites (and indefinites) that cannot scramble (cf. e.g. (37)).
Hence, scrambling emerges even in these analyses as an optional phenomenon.

(35) Ge: Er sagte, daß er nicht zu Fuß in die Schule geht, sondern
    he said that he not on feet in the school walks but
    a. daß er immer den Bus nimmt
       that he always the bus takes
       'He said that he doesn’t walk to school but always takes
the bus'
b. *daß er den Bus immer nimmt
   that he the bus always takes

(36) Du: a. dat ik altijd de bus neem (Reinhart 1996: 4)
    that I always the bus take
b. *dat ik de bus altijd neem
    that I the bus always take

(37) A: What happened?
B: a. Ge: Hans hat heute das Thermometer/einen Teller
    Hans has today the thermometer/a plate
    zerbrochen
    broken
    b. Ge: Hans hat das Thermometer/einen Teller heute
    Hans has the thermometer/a plate today
    zerbrochen
    broken
    'Hans broke the thermometer/a plate today'

It is easy to notice in the (grammatical) examples above that the direct object
DPs are marked [+Focus]. I propose that this is why these DPs cannot undergo
scrambling. Further evidence that can be adduced to this effect is the fact that
+wh direct object DPs cannot scramble, as (38) shows.

(38) (Sternefeld 1990)
    a. Ge: Wem hat der Student welche Frage beantwortet?
       whom has the student which question answered?
       'To whom did the student answer which question?'
b. Ge: *Wem hat welche Frage der Student beantwortet?
       whom has which question the student answered

Now consider the German examples in (39).

(39) A: Hat der Papst Tirana endlich besucht?
    has the Pope Tirana finally visited
    'Did the Pope finally visit Tirana?'

32. The anonymous reviewer points out that scrambled noun phrases may have contrastive focus, as
in the Dutch example below:
   (i) Ik heb slechts BFN van de boeken nog niet gelezen
       I have only BFN of the books yet not read
Here the DP 'the books' is marked [+Focus], but 'one' is [+Focus]. However, in Albanian and Greek
contrastively focused direct object DPs are incompatible with doubling. The reason as to why the
parallel between scrambling and doubling breaks down when contrastive focus is involved is not
totally clear to me. It might be stipulated, though, that contrastive focus is fundamentally correlated
with stress prominence at PF. However, since clitics are incompatible with PF stress (i.e. marked
[-stress]), the derivation crashes because of value divergence with respect to PF stress. The non-overt
clitic head in the case of scrambling might, however, be totally underspecified for the PF stress value;
as such, a [+stress] element moved to its specifier position in the syntax will not render the derivation
illicit at PF.
The examples in (39) show that scrambling of direct objects is obligatory in answers to yes/no questions. This fact can be accounted for in a straightforward manner under the hypothesis that scrambling of direct object DPs licenses a [−Focus] feature on these phrases. As was pointed out in Section 3.1, for yes/no questions (and answers to yes/no questions) focus is either the assertion or the negation of the event expressed by the verb, whereas direct object arguments are outside the focus domain. i.e., they are not marked [Focus]. Consequently, there is no feature clash between the (covert) clitic head and the scrambled DP in the specifier of the CIP in the diagram in (29) with respect to the feature [−Focus]. Therefore the derivation will converge (provided that the covert clitic head and the XP do not show a mismatch with respect to other features). Note that the specificity/presuppositionality/strength approaches to scrambling cannot account for the fact that scrambling of direct objects in answers to yes/no questions is obligatory, since 'Tirana' as a proper noun is referentially specific also in the unscrambled version.

While definite and indefinite DPs with overt determiners may be doubled and scrambled, bare indefinites cannot. For bare plurals this is shown in (40); doubled and scrambled bare plurals are ungrammatical in any context.33 The sentences in (41a–c) show that this also holds for countable bare singular direct objects.34

(40) a. Al: An-a nuk (*i) zëju fasule, por
    'The Pope has not visited Tirana yet'
    The Pope has not visited Tirana yet

b. Gr: I Anna dhen (*tu) mayirepse fasolin, aja
    the Ann not them.cl boiled beans, but
    Al: (*i) hëngri fiq
    Gr: (*tu) efaye sika
    them.cl ate figs

c. Ge: Anna hat nicht Bohnen gekocht, sondern sie hat Feigen
    Anna has not beans boiled but she has figs
gessessen eaten

d. Ge:*Anna hat Bohnen nicht gekocht, sondern sie hat Feigen
    Anna has beans not cooked but she has figs
gessessen eaten
    'Anna didn’t [cook beans], but [eat figs]'p

(41) a. Al: An-a donte t-(a) blente fustan
    'An-a donte t-(a) blente fustan

b. Gr: I Anna ihile na (*to) aghorasi forema
    the Ann wanted subj-it.cl buy dress
    'Anna wanted to buy a dress'

c. Ge: Ich habe (*Zeitung) nicht/im Garten (Zeitung)
    I have newspaper not/in the garden newspaper
    gelesen read
    'I have not read a newspaper’/’I have read a paper in the garden

ps.
a'. Al: An-a donte t-(a) blente një fustan
b'. Gr: I Anna ihile na (to) aghorasi ena forema
    the Ann wanted subj-it.cl buy a dress
    'Anna wanted to buy a dress'

c'. Ge: Ich habe (eine Zeitung) nicht/im Garten (eine
    Zeitung) gelesen newspaper read
    'I have not read a paper’/’I have read a paper in the garden'

33. In fact, claim only holds for those bare plurals that receive an existential interpretation. This is explained in Section 4.3.2.

34. As it happens, even closely-related languages differ with respect to the possibility of instantiating their direct objects by countable bare singulars. Thus, while countable bare singulars are virtually non-existent as direct objects in English, across Balkan and Mainland Scandinavian languages they may occur as direct objects of all predicates whose bare plural direct objects cannot get a generic (either referential/kind-denoting or quantification) interpretation but get an existential interpretation instead. In German, on the other hand, countable bare singulars do occur as direct objects, but are much more restricted than in Balkan and Mainland Scandinavian. Note in this context that of all the languages mentioned above, only English disallows countable bare singulars in predicate nominal position. Finally, note that countable bare singulars are found also in English as objects of certain prepositions; e.g. go to school/church/market; travel by train/plane etc.
are not marked for morphological case in Albanian and Greek).

The question arises as to why bare indefinites cannot be doubled/scrambled. I will approach this question by considering first why bare singulars cannot be doubled/scrambled. To the extent that this question has been addressed at all, bare singulars have been treated as forming a complex predicate with the clausal predicate (cf. Haiden 1996), that is, as incorporating semantically. While this seems intuitively correct, the fact that countable bare singulars need not be adjacent to the clausal predicate but may be moved to Spec of CP, as in (42), shows that this semantic incorporation does not result from syntactic incorporation of the bare singular into V.35

(42) a. Al: Fustan doja tê bleja
   dress wanted sum buy
   'It was a dress that I wanted to buy'

   b. Ge: Zeitung habe ich gestern gelesen
   newspaper have I yesterday read
   'It was a newspaper that I read yesterday'

I propose that the impossibility of doubling and scrambling bare singulars is due to feature mismatch between the clitic head and the direct object bare singular with respect to the D-feature: while clitics carry a D-feature (cf. Emonds 1992), Uhrigereka (1995), bare singulars are NPs that altogether lack a D-projection. Clitics are listed in the lexicon as separate morphophonological units. That clitics carry a D-feature (alternatively: are specified in the lexicon as elements of category D or are underlying determiners (cf. Postal 1969; Raposo 1997) is not surprising, in view of the fact that they originate from personal and demonstrative pronouns which are prototypical D-heads (cf. Abney 1987 and subsequent literature). This means among other things that only DPs but not NPs may be doubled and scrambled, since the [–D] feature of the latter will clash with the [+D] feature on the clitic head, thus causing the derivation not to converge. This reasoning, however, rests on the assumption that bare singulars are NPs lacking a D-projection. This is problematical, as it seems to run counter to Longobardi’s

(1994) claim that only DPs but not NPs may function as arguments, his idea being that bare noun objects have a morphologically null D-head. Therefore, the assumption that bare singulars are NPs and not DPs with a morphologically null D is in need of some justification. Is there any evidence that legitimises the claim that bare singulars lack a D-projection? In what follows, I will argue that there is.

First, note that bare singulars occur only as predicate nominals and as direct objects. Crucially, they cannot occur as subjects.37 Further, bare singulars do not occur as direct objects of just any predicate; they may occur as direct objects of only those predicates whose bare plural direct objects cannot get a generic interpretation (either referential/kind-referring or quantificalional), but they get only an existential interpretation.38

This fact alone raises an important question: what are the factors that govern the distribution of bare singulars? The importance of addressing this question is twofold. On the one hand, it has a bearing on the study of bare singulars. On the other hand, it also relates to the study of bare plurals, given the distributional parallels in languages between the bare singulars and the existential bare plurals. With regard to the factors governing the distribution of bare singulars, I claim that these are semantic in nature. However, on the assumption that a given syntactic construction cannot be systematically ambiguous, my basic working hypothesis is that semantic interpretations for noun phrases are fundamentally dependent on their internal structure. On this view, I crucially claim that whereas DPs may be either arguments or predicates, NPs translate as predicates at LF irrespective of whether they occur as predicate nominals or as direct objects. Consequently, they do not translate as variables or restricted modifiers. For bare singulars (and existential bare plurals), this amounts to the claim that they are predicates, not arguments. In other words, while subjects are always DPs (since they are arguments, not predicates), direct objects (and predicate nominals) may be either DPs or NPs, i.e., direct objects are not always arguments, they can also be predicates. Thus, I argue that countable bare singulars cannot be doubled/

35. The relation between bare singulars and bare plurals is discussed in detail in Section 4.3.2.
36. Here I am not implying that if a constituent occurs clause-initially it necessarily occupies the Spec of CP. I am only assuming with Brody (1990) that Spec of CP is one (of the) canonical position(s) for [+Focus] phrases and since the fronted constituents in (42) are indisputably [+Focus], it makes sense to assume that they occupy precisely this slot. However, I remain open to the idea that above there is the CP-arc a projection headed by some operator which licenses D-linking in its specifier position (cf. Pesetsky 1987).

37. In some (though not all) Balkan languages (e.g. Greek, Bulgarian), bare singulars may occur as subjects of unergative predicates. However, it is essential to note that unlike non-subject bare singulars, bare singular subjects are referentially specific and therefore interchangeable with singular definite descriptions and/or a-expressions on the referential reading of the latter (cf. also Marinis 1997). (These crucial meaning differences are detailed in Section 4.3, where, among other issues, I investigate in detail the meaning of bare singulars.) Since I am advocating a systematic mapping between syntax and semantics, I contend that bare singulars occurring as subjects are DPs (not NPs) with a morphologically null D (cf. Section 4.3.3).
38. Throughout this paper the term ‘existential’ is used in opposition to ‘presuppositional’. (Thus ‘existential bare plurals’ should be understood as ‘non-generic bare plurals’ only.)
scrambled because they are not arguments but predicates; they denote properties, not individuals, and translate therefore as predicates, not as variables or restricted quantifiers at LF. Drawing on work by Zimmerman (1993), I argue that most natural language predicates can take both individuals and properties as their internal arguments.

In the next section, I show that it is precisely in terms of the distinction individual vs. property denotation that the distinction specific vs. non-specific for noun phrases should be understood. Countable bare singulars provide an excellent tool for this. A discussion of the phenomenon of specificity is essential for this study, as I intend to show that specificity cannot be bestowed on an argument by a clitic. I will also demonstrate eventually that specificity-related effects in clitic doubling and scrambling constructions arise only as epiphenomena since argumenthood for noun phrases is defined by specificity.

4.3 Specificity, individuation, argumenthood

4.3.1 The meaning of bare singulars
The α-expressions nje fuss an in (41a') and ena forema in (41b') might denote:

(43)

a. some particular dress that Ann has seen on some display
b. some particular kind of dress (e.g. some Dior vs. some Versace dress)
c. some/any object which classifies as a dress; that is, any dress at all

With respect to specificity, the (43a) and (43b) readings are both specific readings and can be continued by (44).

(44) She may find it in House of Fraser

Only the (43c) reading is non-specific, and (44) is not an appropriate continuation for it. One could continue the (43c) reading as in (45):

(45) She may find one in House of Fraser

Importantly, the bare singulars fuss an in (41a) and forema in (41b) cannot refer to some particular dress or to some particular kind of dress. So, the bare singulars in (41a,b) lack the readings given under (43a,b) that obtain for the α-expressions in (41a') and (41b'). This means that the bare singulars in (41a) and (41b) may not receive specific interpretations. Thus, α-expressions and bare singulars are not fully synonymous; they are so only on the non-specific readings of the former.

As loup (1977) points out, certain inferences follow on a specific reading which are invalid on a non-specific reading. In the specific readings (43a,b), the existence of the items referred to by the α-expressions is presupposed. Given (43a) and (43b), the given sentence in (46) will be true.

(46) There is a certain dress that Ann wants to buy

No existence claims follow from the non-specific reading in (43c), i.e. (46) is not a valid inference from (43c). Instead, we can paraphrase (43c) as in (47):

(47) Ann wants there to be some dress or other that she can (find and) buy

Thus, what Ann is interested in (in (41a) and (41b)) is some individual or other which embodies a certain property, namely that of being [+dress] and not, say, [+book]. The identity of the item that Ann wants, beyond its being [+dress], is irrelevant here. Assuming that properties do not exist outside individuals (that is, that properties are not ontological primitives), Ann is interested in some individual or other that has the property [+dress]. But, each individual that has the property [+dress] in addition has other properties, at least one, that make it distinct from other individuals that have the same property [+dress]. The very existence of distinct individuals possessing the same basic property (here: [+dress]), which causes them to be regarded as members of the same class (here: the class of dresses), is due to the existence of at least one distinct property. Being a distinct individual itself is a property. These extra properties of individuals, beyond the property [+dress], are not only irrelevant to Ann in (41a, b), but indeed unable to be expressed by the bare singulars here. The bare singulars in (39a,b) do not denote individuals but properties, which is why (41a) and (41b) get an event-related reading which may be paraphrased as in (48):
Ann wants to engage/is interested in dress-buying

It is my contention that while direct object α-expressions may denote individuals, direct object bare singulars may not; the latter invariably denote properties. The distinction between properties and individuals may be represented as in (49):

\[(49)\] \[P \sqcap p\]

(where \(P\) is the fundamental property that identifies individuals as members of the same class and \(p\) is a property that does not contradict \(P\))

It is by now a well-established view in the semantic literature that specific readings are presuppositional and non-specific readings are not (cf. Eng 1991; Diesing 1992). The hypothesis that bare singulars are property-denoting expressions, i.e. predicates, can account for the fact that they are not presuppositional if we assume that presupposition is about saturated structures, that is, about individuals (and propositions), not about properties. It then follows that specificity involves individuation; individual-denoting expressions are always specific, irrespective of the fact that they may be used referentially or attributively. On the other hand, property-denoting expressions are non-specific. Since arguments are saturated structures, noun phrase arguments denote individuals, that is, are specific.

To summarise: On their specific reading, noun phrases always denote individuals, not properties. Individuals translate as arguments (they are saturated structures), never as predicates at LF. Therefore, noun phrase arguments are always specific (irrespective of the fact that as such they may be used referentially or attributively). On their non-specific reading, noun phrases invariably denote properties, not individuals. Properties translate as predicates at LF; they are unsaturated structures. Bare singulars are non-specific (i.e. property-denoting); they translate as predicates.

Given that direct objects may be instantiated by bare singulars, which invariably denote properties, it follows that direct objects are not always arguments; they may also be predicates. I claim that when direct objects denote properties, not individuals (i.e. when they are predicates, not arguments), doubling and scrambling cannot apply to them.

Consider the examples in (50) and (51).41 In (50), the bare singular piano is a predicate, not an argument. Therefore it cannot scramble past the high adverb probably. In (51) piano occurs to the left of the adverb. Yet, the meaning of (51) suggests that piano is a predicate here as well, as indicated by its English translation. Observe, however, that here the predicate (namely: play or take) which selects piano as its internal argument is deleted at PF; that is, no adverbial intervenes between the bare singular piano and the predicate whose internal argument it is. Note also that piano playing or taking piano lessons is a gerundive argument of the clausal predicate find. As such, it may scramble.

\[(50)\] Du: dat Jan (*piano) waarschijnlijk (piano) speelt
dat Jan piano probably piano plays

\[(51)\] Du: dat Jan (piano) waarschijnlijk (piano) leenker zal vinden dan
that Jan piano probably piano nicer will find than
viiool
violin
‘that Jan will find playing the piano/taking piano lessons nicer than playing the violin/taking violin lessons’

Adapting the formalisation of Dobrovie-Sorin and Laca (1995) for existential bare plurals, it may be stated that direct object bare singulars are predicates restricting an existentially bound argument variable that is independently introduced in the LF representation as the placeholder of the theta-slot (that is, the internal argument) of the clausal predicate. It is important to note that the argument variable that the bare singular restricts does not arise via the translation of the bare singular itself. The clausal predicate may then be translated as an open formula whose open positions are bound by existential quantification, as given in (53) for the (German) sentence in (52):

\[(52)\] Ich lese Zeitung
I read newspaper

\[(53)\] \(\lambda x_1 \exists (x_1 \text{ read } x_1 \text{ at } e \wedge \text{zeitung } (x_2))\) (ICH.)

Let me now explain where the existential quantification in (53) comes from.

A striking property of bare singulars is that they invariably take (existential) narrow scope in the presence of other scopal items in the sentence. Thus, the Albanian sentence in (54a) only has the reading in (54b) but lacks the reading in (54c) where the bare singular has scope over negation.

\[(54a)\] a. Nuk dua biçikletë
not want bicycle
‘I don’t want a bicycle’

b. It is not the case that I want a bicycle

c. "There is a bicycle that I don’t want"

41. Many thanks to Marcel den Dikken (personal communication) for pointing out these data to me.
Likewise, the Albanian sentence in (55), unlike its English translation, can only mean that there is a one-to-one correspondence between children and bicycles. That is, (55) cannot mean that a bicycle was such that it was bought by many children.

(55) Shumë fëmiqë blënë bikletë dje
many children bought bicycle yesterday
‘Many children bought a bicycle yesterday’

The data in this section unequivocally show that bare singulars cannot take wide scope. In this respect, they differ both from definite descriptions and *a*-expressions, which may, but need not, take wide scope. This fact immediately reminds one of Carlson’s (1977) observation that the English bare plural always takes narrow scope with respect to negation. He accounts for this by suggesting that the existential force of the bare plural in non-generic contexts comes from a source external to the bare plural itself, namely from the verb. I adopt this proposal for bare singulars as well.\(^{42}\)

What then is the relation between count bare singulars and bare plurals? I address this question in the next section.

4.3.2. On the relation of count bare singulars to bare plurals

Recall from Section 2 that bare plural direct objects cannot be clitic doubled in Albanian and Greek. Nor can they scramble in German or Dutch. For the explanation that I will propose for this phenomenon, it is essential to point out the distinction between generic and existential bare plurals (cf. Carlson 1977). This distinction, which holds across the Germanic languages, does not, however, hold for the Balkan languages. In the Balkan languages, generic readings (either referential/kind-denoting or quantificational) are incompatible with bare plurals. Bare plurals in these languages can only have an existential interpretation. The same holds for Romance bare plurals (cf. Laca 1990; Longobardi 1994). Thus, individual-level predicates, which, as is well known, force generic readings on their direct objects, are incompatible with bare plurals in these languages. Some examples are *love, respect, admire, adore*, etc. Generic readings in Balkan (and Romance) languages require an overt determiner; the definite determiner for plural noun phrases and either the definite or the indefinite determiner for singular noun phrases.

---

42. As van Geenhoven (1996) shows, the arguments that have been brought against Carlson’s lexicalised existential quantifier vanish if this quantifier is granted dynamic instead of static force.

43. This is independently proposed by Kiss (to appear). However, Kiss relies on Eng’s (1991) account of specificity which is rather problematic. Space considerations prevent me from dealing with this point in detail, though some problems with it will be identified in Section 4.3.4. For further discussion see Albott (1995).

44. M. Krifka (personal communication) points out to me that in the same vein, number words can have wide scope, as in his example: ‘Four thousand ships passed through the lock’, which means: ‘There were four thousand ship-passings’.
b. Eva will morgen Zeitungen lesen
   Eva will tomorrow newspapers read

c. Tomorrow Eva will engage in (at least) one newspaper-reading event

d. Tomorrow Eva wants to engage in several events of newspaper reading

Thus, I am claiming that existential bare plurals are the plural counterparts of bare singulars. On the one hand, the fact that bare singulars occur as direct objects of only those predicates whose bare plural direct objects cannot get a generic interpretation supports this claim. On the other hand, however, the reverse does not hold across all the languages that have bare singulars in object position. German is a case in point. How are we to account for the lack of (total) distributional compatibility between bare singulars and existential bare plurals then? For one thing, we saw in (56a) to (56d) above that the meaning of bare singulars is a subset of the meaning of existential bare plurals. We saw (in Section 4.3.1) that the meaning of bare singulars is also a subset of (i.e. contained in) the meaning of a-expressions. It is only reasonable then to try to relate the lack of (one-to-one) distributional parallelism between bare singulars and existential bare plurals within and across languages to economy considerations.

If existential bare plurals are the plural counterparts of bare singulars, they should not occur as subjects of unergative predicates. At first sight, this prediction is easily falsified by data like the one in (57).

(57) Studenten lärmen auf der Strasse

'students make noise in the street'

I propose that the NP Bil(ler) ‘car(s)’ is not the subject of the sentence, but instead occupies the Spec of CP. This view is corroborated by the fact that the NP in constructions like (58) is necessarily interpreted as a [+Focus] phrase; the meaning of the sentence in (58) can be rendered as in (59).

(58) Bil(ler) er dyrt. (Hellan 1986: 95)

Car.masc.s(s) is expensive-neut

I propose that the NP Bil(ler) ‘car(s)’ is not the subject of the sentence, but instead occupies the Spec of CP. This view is corroborated by the fact that the NP in constructions like (58) is necessarily interpreted as a [+Focus] phrase; the meaning of the sentence in (58) can be rendered as in (59).

(59) It is expensive to have/keep/run/manage/buy a car/cars

In this section I have argued that just like bare singulars, existential bare plurals are not DPs with a morphologically empty D, but NPs that lack a D-projection. As such, they cannot be doubled (in Albanian/Greek) or scrambled (in German/Dutch). On the other hand, generic bare plurals are DPs with a morphologically empty D. They are always specific (i.e. individual-denoting). As such, they can scramble unless they are marked [+Focus].

The syntactic distinction NP vs. DP (with morphologically null D) that I have drawn between existential and generic bare plurals, respectively, in addition to representing a principled mapping between syntax and semantics, is also motivated by the (morphological) fact mentioned above, that generic plural nominals in Albanian and Romance languages necessarily require the presence of the definite determiner.

4.3.3 Bare singular subjects

As already pointed out, in Albanian bare singulars are confined to predicative and direct object positions. In Greek, bare singulars may also occur as subjects, in which case they are necessarily focused, as the English translation of the Greek example in (58) indicates.

(60) FIDH ton ike dhagosi ton Costas (Agouraki 1993: 170)

'SNAKE him_CL had bitten the Costas'

It was a snake that had bitten Costas'

not: the predicative adjective is marked for neuter gender and singular number, while the noun is masculine, and can be either singular or plural. If the bare singular in (58) were really the subject of the sentence, this construction would be a counterexample to the theory of agreement.46

46. Note also that Norwegian is not a pro-drop language.

47. Since bare plurals are incompatible with generic readings in the Balkan languages, the question of doubling them does not even arise.
In this context, it is fundamental to note that while all transitive verbs may take a-expressions as their direct objects, not all may take bare singulars. Besides, while a-expressions in direct object position may be ambiguous between a specific and a non-specific interpretation, bare singular objects may only receive a non-specific interpretation. In other words, direct object bare singulars are not always interchangeable with direct object a-expressions. However, when bare singulars occur as subjects (as in (60)), they are fully interchangeable with either a definite DP or an a-expression. This is natural, in view of the fact that subjects are necessarily specific. These facts suggest that subject bare singulars are structurally different from direct object bare singulars. I claim that, while subjects are always DPs, direct objects may be either DPs or NPs.

### 4.3.4 Definite expressions

Consider the example in (61):

(61) I shall kiss the first woman to enter this room

In line with what was stated in Section 4.3.1, the definite expression in (61) is also specific, though it may have both a referential and an attributive reading, depending on whether or not the speaker knows beforehand who the first woman to enter the room will be. In other words, the definite expression in (61) may denote either a particular individual in relation to the speaker, namely, the type of ‘first woman to enter the room’ (as opposed to, say, the type of ‘second woman to enter the room’), or the type of ‘no woman to enter the room’. The type of ‘first woman to enter the room’ is an individual with respect to the concept/property ‘woman’. So, independently of whether the definite expression is intended to refer or not, it is specific, which also accords with Eng (1991).

The question arises, however, as to whether definite noun phrases in direct object position can ever be predicates, that is, denote properties (like bare singulars and a-expressions on a non-specific reading). I will argue that they can. Examples are definite noun phrases in object position in set expressions like: take the bus in (62a), play the violin in (62b).

(62) a. I like to take the bus  
   b. Ben has played the violin beautifully at times

It is true that the definite expression the bus in (62a) may have both a referential-

---

48. J. Emoos (personal communication) points out to me that definite expressions in some locative phrases (e.g. I am going to the airport to see the doctor at the shore to the hospital) have a predicative reading as well. Note that these are not generic: The only time in my life I went to Texas I took the plane.
denoting) interpretation and why. The second is why the ambiguity in terms of the distinction specific vs. non-specific for a-expressions arises only when they occur as direct objects of certain predicates (e.g. want, buy, draw, hunt, smoke, find, get, etc.) but not of others (e.g. love, hate, admire, adore, etc.). These facts can be accounted for if we assume that many (and perhaps most, though not all) natural language predicates of the type (e, (e, t)) (e.g. buy) can be raised to type ((e, t), (e, t)) meaning:

\[ \lambda P \lambda x \exists y [P(y) \land BUY(x, y)] \]

This means that certain predicates that take individuals as their internal arguments may also take properties as their internal arguments. In addition, we need to assume that the dual nature of a-expressions is due to their lexical underspecification with respect to specificity (i.e. individual vs. property-denotation). Hence, they can oscillate between type (e) and (e, t). Given the fact that many definite noun phrases may also be interpreted non-specifically/predicatively when objects of verbs and prepositions, we need to assume that the-expressions are also underspecified with respect to individual vs. property-denotation and can therefore oscillate between type (e) and (e, t). To generalise, we may then state that while NPs (e.g. bare singulars and existential bare plurals) are unambiguously type (e), DPs may be of type (e) or (e, t). 50

Consider the examples in (66).

(66) Ge: a. weil ich morgen den Bus nehme
               because I tomorrow the bus take
    b. weil ich den Bus morgen nehme
              because I the bus tomorrow take
         'because I will take the bus tomorrow'

In line with what was stated above, den Bus 'the bus' in (66a) can denote either an individual (that is, some bus-vehicle or other or some bus-line or other) or a property. In other words, both (67a) and (67b) are valid paraphrases for (66a). (67a) is an event-related reading; that is, den Bus here denotes a property and translates therefore as a predicate at LF.

(67) a. because, as for me, I will engage in bus-taking tomorrow
    b. because, as for (me and) the bus, I will take it tomorrow

In (66b), on the other hand, the scrambled DP den Bus denotes an individual only; that is, it denotes some bus or other or some bus-line or other. In other words, the scrambled DP den Bus in (66b) is specific/presuppositional. Since specificity/presuppositionality is a property of arguments not of predicates, den Bus in (66b) is an argument variable, not a predicate, as it can (though need not) be in (66a). Crucially, (66b) lacks the event-related reading that obtains for (66a). This suggests that scrambling applies to arguments only, not to predicates. Hence the unavailability of the reading in (67a) for the sentence (66b). The same pattern obtains with clitic doubling of definite in Albanian and Greek.

In sum, it may be stated that definite noun phrases and a-expressions are semantically (and perhaps syntactically) non-homogeneous; they are not always syntactic arguments when objects of verbs (and prepositions) but may translate both as arguments or as predicates at LF depending on whether the clausal predicate selects an individual (type (e)) or a property (type (e, t)) as its internal argument (cf. also van Geenhoven (1996) for a similar treatment of indefinites). The type shifting mechanism (cf. Partee 1987) allows for this duality. This creates the illusion that scrambling/doubling of definites and a-expressions is optional. In fact, scrambled/doubled objects are always syntactic arguments. Since argument noun phrases are always specific (i.e. individual-denoting), specificity effects will be observed in scrambling constructions. Non-scrambled/non-doubled objects may but need not be arguments.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have shown that direct object clitic doubling in Albanian and Greek produces information structure in a systematic way: doubled DPs are unambiguously interpreted as topics. This suggests that topicalhood, at least in part, encoded in the syntax for these languages. Whether this is the case universally and whether the representation of topics involves the same syntactic configuration cross-linguistically, remains an issue for further study. I have also shown that specificity cannot be bestowed on an argument by a doubling clitic/scrambling; instead specificity is fundamentally related to the D-slot. Specificity effects in doubling and scrambling constructions are only by-products of deeper triggering properties.

---

50. Alternatively, it might be that both the indefinite and the definite article are not exclusively generated under D but may also be generated NP-externally. It is beyond the scope of this study to decide between these alternatives.
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Where do Clitics Cluster?

Lilijana Progovac
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Abstract

Critically examining Bošković’s treatment in this volume of second position clitic placement in Serbo-Croatian, this paper argues for a conceptually desirable tight fit between syntactic position and intonation boundaries, on the basis of the strong correlation between these two. The approach proposed accounts for the interaction between wh-formation, comma intonation and clitic placement, and sheds light on the nature of the syntax/phonology interface.

1. Introduction

This paper is a brief response to the conclusion reached in Bošković, this volume, that second position cliticisation in Serbo-Croatian (SC) is phonological in nature. For the relevant background on Clitic Second in SC, the reader is referred to Bošković’s paper.

There are two basic sets of data on which Bošković’s conclusion relies: (i) the availability of partial clitic clusters, and (ii) apparent sensitivity of clitic placement to intonation boundaries. The first set of data has been addressed in Progovac (1998a), the basic argument of which will be reviewed in Section 2. This paper addresses the latter set of data, and argues that the influence of intonation boundaries on clitic placement is only apparent (see also Progovac 1998b for additional arguments against phonological placement of clitics, based on the interaction between the distribution of the (eventive) pronoun to and clitics).

If A and B consistently coincide, there are two possible reasons: (i) A causes/determines B, or vice versa; or, alternatively, (ii) there is a third factor, factor C, that causes/determines both A and B, giving the appearance that A and