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1. Introduction

Aims of the Analysis

✓ all arguments (strong pronouns & lexical DPs) are clitic doubled in the syntax
✓ optional or obligatory clitic doubling is regulated by particular functional heads that agree with clitics
✓ apply the derivational mechanisms behind doubling to the PCC & PCC repair
✓ highlight the place of Judeo-Spanish (JS) in contemporary syntactic theory

Road Map for Today

• overview of JS (section 1) • analysis of doubling (section 4)
• doubling background (sections 2-3) • the PCC & PCC repair (section 5)

Judeo-Spanish (Ladino)

• Romance language of Jewish people of Sephardic descent
• spoken in Spain until the Expulsion in 1492
• spread throughout Ottoman Empire: Balkans, Turkey, North Africa, Middle East
• estimated 400,000 speakers today (Vidal Sephiha 1977)
• modern JS: restructuring, simplification of paradigms, & borrowing from languages like Moroccan Arabic, Turkish, Italian, Greek, Slavic, Hebrew
• threats to the language (Vidal Sephiha 1977)
  – WWII & the Holocaust
  – isn’t being transmitted to younger generations

2. Clitic Doubling in Judeo-Spanish

▷ Clitic Doubling: clitic co-occurs with a corresponding nominal in argument position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Argument Type</th>
<th>overt DAT DP</th>
<th>overt ACC DP</th>
<th>overt 1st/2nd pronoun</th>
<th>ACC 3rd pronoun</th>
<th>covert DAT/ACC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clitic Doubled</td>
<td>optional (1)</td>
<td>optional (2)</td>
<td>optional (3)</td>
<td><strong>obligatory</strong> (4)</td>
<td><strong>obligatory</strong> (5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Optional doubling of dative DPs

1) (le_i) mandó el libro a Rachel_i
   3SG_DAT sent3SG the book to Rachel
   “He sent the book to Rachel.”

Optional doubling of accusative DPs

2) (la_i) vido a Rachel_i
   3SG_ACCF saw3SG a Rachel
   “He saw Rachel.”

Obligatory doubling only for 3rd ACC strong pronouns & covert arguments

3) (te/me) vido a ti/mí
   2/1SG_ACC saw3SG a you3SG/you
   “She saw you/me.”

4) *(lo) vido a él
   3SG_ACCM saw3SG a him
   “She saw him.”

5) *vido
   saw3SG
   “She saw him/you/me.”

▷ Strong pronoun doubling is obligatory in Spanish; DP (DAT/ACC) doubling is optional

CLAIM 1: Doubling vs. Un-Doubling

• optional doubling derived via agree alternations with a clitic and v or X head
• obligatory doubling derived via clitic’s inability to agree with X
3. Background on Clitic Doubling

The “Big DP Hypothesis”

- Base-generated doubled structure wherein clitic & argument form a constituent, from which the clitic extracts
  - Different formulations of the “Big DP”

- one formulation of the big DP ...

“Big DP” Structure (Papangeli 2000)

- (6) ton idha to Jani
  - cl-3SGACCM saw1SG the JaniACC
  - “I saw Jani.”

- (7) CIP
  - clitic doubling in Modern Greek
  - clitic takes a DP as its complement
  - clitic incorporates with the verb
  - one lexical head

4. Optional vs. Obligatory Doubling: [pers] is Key

CLITICS & ARGUMENTS

- nothing critical in this analysis depends on a particular big DP structure
- structure similar to Papangeli (2000)
- clitics & arguments match in phi-features

- DP₂ = 3rd ACC strong pronoun: argument that is obligatorily doubled
- 3rd ACC strong pronouns have no person features, which is shared with the clitic, D
- clitics doubling 3rd ACC pronouns lack [pers] also

- DP₂ = all other arguments: optionally doubled
- DP₂ has a person feature, which is shared with the clitic, D

DE Riv I nG O P T I O N AL D O U BL I NG

- except for 3rd ACC pronouns, all arguments are optionally doubled
- 2 probes regulate realization of a clitic: v & a functional head/person probe, X

(11) un-doubling: vido a mí

- X is strictly a person probe: X only probes for person
- unlike v which probes for [pers] & [num]
- Agree with X & D causes clitic to be null: X deletes clitic’s phi-features

- Agree with X & D also blocks Agree between v & D
Deriving Obligatory Doubling

▶ only 3rd ACC pronouns require a corresponding clitic

(12) **doubling: me vido a mí**

- if X is absent: v probes & agrees with D
- Agree with v yields overt cliticization:
  because v doesn’t delete clitic’s phi-features

(13) **obligatory doubling: *lo vido a él***

Step 1

- X never agrees with D because X is a person probe
- ACC 3rd pronouns always lack [pers]

Step 2

- v invariably agrees with D
- agree with v yields overt cliticization

**Realization of the Argument**

- Judeo-Spanish does not have pro-drop of objects
- one element must overtly express the object; if cliticic is null, then argument is overt

(14) *vido

(15) me vido

(16) vido a mí

“He saw me.”

▶ Saab (2009a, 2009b, 2016): pro-drop is head/morphological ellipsis, i.e., ellipsis at PF
- head ellipsis is licensed if there is a formally identical antecedent
- pro-drop of subjects in Spanish is licensed by an identical AGR morpheme on the verb
- ellipsis = insertion of a [+I] feature on head; [+I] blocks lexical insertion

**pro-drop: me vido**

(17)

- X agrees with the clitic
- phi-features of the clitic are therefore deleted
- insertion of [+I] on argument is blocked as clitic isn’t identical to argument
- clitic cannot be the antecedent and license ellipsis
- lexical insertion applies to argument, which is overt

(18)

- v agrees with the clitic, but v does not delete clitic’s features (17)
- clitic, formally identical to the argument, can be an antecedent and license ellipsis
- argument is marked with [+I]; lexical insertion blocked on this node (18)

**NO pro-drop: vido *(a mí)**

(19)

- X agrees with the clitic
- phi-features of the clitic are therefore deleted
- insertion of [+I] on argument is blocked as clitic isn’t identical to argument
- clitic cannot be the antecedent and license ellipsis
- lexical insertion applies to argument, which is overt

**Three Deletion Alternatives**

1. Impoverishment, akin to Baier on anti-agreement (2016, 2018)
   - clitic acquires a feature [x] from X via Agree
   - at PF, [x] triggers an impoverishment rule of all clitic’s phi-features

2. Deletion through Agree: “Un-Agree”
   - Agree operation values [pers] on X
   - Agree also deletes all phi-features on clitic

3. Feature Movement (cf. Himmelreich 2019)
   - clitic’s features move to X; lower occurrence of the moved features is deleted
   - a general Obliteration rule (Arregi & Nevins 2012) applies to X at PF (since no exponent seems to realize X’s features)
   - Obliteration rule also deletes higher occurrence of clitic’s features in the process
5. Another Clitic-Argument Phenomenon: The Person-Case Constraint

▶ The Person-Case Constraint (PCC)
- restriction on combinations of clitic internal arguments (Perlmutter 1971; Bonet 1991)
- STRONG PCC: in a combination of clitic direct object (DO) & clitic indirect object (IO), the DO must be third person (Bonet 1991).

### PCC Violation

(20) *me le recomendó

“He recommended me to him.”

### PCC Repair: Dative = Strong Pronoun

(21) me a él recomendó

“He recommended me to him.”

### CLAIM 2: THE PCC & PCC REPAIR

- extend the same analytic machinery of doubling to the PCC & PCC repair
- adopt a previous account of the PCC plus the addition of the X head

### DERIVING THE PCC

- Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005), Béjar and Rezac (2003), Ormazabal and Romero (2002), Stegovec (2017), and others

▶ “one-probe/two-goals” style account (in terminology of Stegovec (2017))

- higher indirect object intervenes between v and the lower direct object
- The Person Licensing Condition (PLC): interpretable 1st/2nd person features must enter into an Agree relation with a functional category (Béjar & Rezac 2003, 2009; Preminger 2019)

(22) Step 1: agree between v & cliticDAT

- v probes cliticDAT first because it is the closest goal
- cliticDAT agrees for [pers] with v but not for [num]
- by hypothesis, [num] is inaccessible to v (Taraldsen 1995)

### DERIVING THE PCC REPAIR: JUST ADD X

- presence of X in the structure derives the repair

(24) X eliminates intervention effects

- X agrees with cliticDAT (which always has [pers])
- X deletes clitic’s phi-features
- cliticDAT is therefore null and argumentDAT is pronounced, parallel to un-doubling
- v has both [pers] & [num]; probes to agree for both
- v agrees with both features on the cliticACC, which can be any person, doubling a strong pronoun or lexical DP
Conclusion

• propose an account of doubling & the PCC repair

• theoretical claims:
  – a new functional head X
  – all arguments (strong pronouns & DPs) are clitic doubled in the syntax
  – realization of a clitic is regulated by which functional head it enters into an agree
    relation with

• from an empirical perspective
  – highlight the place of JS in contemporary syntactic theory

• potential avenues of further inquiry
  – dialectical variation within Judeo-Spanish (Haketía vs. Judezmo)
  – other variation across Judeo-Spanish and Old & Modern Spanish
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