

### A note on Clitics and P-stranding

Clitics cannot be complements of prepositions (P) in most languages (1-4). The following filter captures this generalization: \*[P clitic]. The cross-linguistic stability of this filter suggests that it is tied to a deep property of language. This talk focuses on Serbo Croatian (SC). I argue that the filter follows from two assumptions: (a) Clitics never occur in their base position; (b) The languages in question do not allow P-stranding. Taking into account more data from SC, we derive further consequences for the theory of P-stranding.

Before basing further claims on (1), we must make sure that the second position effect is controlled for. *Prema*, unlike most Ps in Serbo Croatian, is itself not a clitic and carries stress. It should therefore prosodically be able to host clitics. If the second position effect is prosodic at heart (Bošković, 2001), then *prema* should be able to host clitics. If the second position effect additionally requires the clitic to appear syntactically in the highest functional head of its clause (e.g. Franks, 1998), then example (1) is out on the structure given in (5a). Nothing said so far would rule out the parse in (5b) however, where the clitic has moved to the highest functional head of the clause and cliticizes to the PP. The second position effect is thus controlled for, yet (1) is out.

Uncontroversially, clitics always surface in derived positions. This property of clitics furnishes the link to P-stranding: the clitics would have to leave PP. P-stranding is disallowed in SC (6) – just as in Spanish, Greek, and Bulgarian. Notice that the ban against stranded Ps is neither what Merchant (1999) has called a PF-island as Merchant's (7) shows, nor is it a filter of the form \*[P silence] as (8) indicates. The ban against P-stranding must then be genuinely syntactic. However, it is not the case that nothing can escape from a PP as (9) shows, which is a case of remnant PP fronting (Franks and Progovac, 1994). This leaves us with the almost paradoxical situation depicted in (10a/b): the complement of  $P^\circ$  must stay put, but sub-extraction out of the complement of  $P^\circ$  is possible.

Paradoxical as it may be, the situation is a familiar one. Extraction out of CP is in principle possible, but the complement of  $C^\circ$ , IP, can never move stranding the complementizer. Similarly, extraction out of vP is possible, but it follows from Huang's (1998) analysis of reconstruction effects with VP-fronting that the immediate complement of  $v^\circ$ , VP, cannot move. Assuming that  $v^\circ$ ,  $C^\circ$  and  $P^\circ$  (for the latter cf. Riemsdijk, 1978) are cyclic nodes (phase heads in minimalist terms), the generalization in (11) emerges.

(11) follows on two assumptions: (i) Movement only happens to bring an attracting head and a moved phrase into a more local relation (last resort); (ii) A phrase can leave the c-command domain of a phase head  $\alpha$  only by passing through Spec- $\alpha$ .

The head-complement relation is the most local relation. By assumption (i) it follows that no movement can ever take place from the complement of  $H^\circ$  to the specifier of  $H^\circ$ . This movement from complement to specifier is exactly what would be needed by assumption (ii) to derive the banned pattern of (11a).

For languages that do allow P-stranding it must now be assumed that in these languages  $P^\circ$  does not head a phase. This will allow extraction of the complement of P and it will also allow clitics to appear as the complement of  $P^\circ$  in these languages. The prediction is borne out as (12) (from Koopman, 1984:54) and (13) show. Both Gbadi and Swedish allow P-stranding. The clitic nature of *na* in the relevant dialect is demonstrated in (14): *na* obligatorily undergoes object shift in the dialect in question.

In this talk the descriptive filter \*[P clitic] is derived from the ban against P-stranding. This ban follows from successive cyclicity and the last resort nature of movement.

### Examples:

- (1) Prema {*\*joj*; ✓*njoj*} Jovan ide.  
Toward her<sub>cl</sub> her Jovan walks  
*Jovan walks toward her.* (SC)
- (2) sred {*\*gi*; *\*im*; ✓*tjax*}  
among them<sub>cl.Acc</sub> them<sub>cl.Dat</sub> them  
*among them* (Bulgarian)
- (3) Sobre {*\*la*; ✓*ella*} habló Pedro.  
about her<sub>cl</sub> her talked Pedro  
*Pedro talked about her.* (Spanish)
- (4) Gia {*\*ton*; ✓*afton*} milise o Petros.  
about him<sub>cl</sub> him talked the-Petros  
*Petros talked about him.* (Greek)
- (5a) [[<sub>PP</sub> prema *joj*] F° [Jovan ide t<sub>PP</sub>]]  
(5b) [[<sub>PP</sub> prema t<sub>joj</sub>] *joj*+F° [Jovan ide t<sub>PP</sub>]]
- (6) \*Kim je govorila Ana sa?  
who is spoken Ana with  
*Who did Ana speak with?*
- (7) Ana je govorila sa nekim, ali ne znam \*(sa) kim.  
Ana is spoken with someone but not I.know (with) who  
*Ana talked to someone, but I don't know who (she spoke with).*
- (8) ✓ Jovan je ostavio čekić ispod, a Petar ispred, Mrijinih kola  
Jovan is put hammer below and Petar in-front-of Mary's car  
*Jovan put the hammer below, and Petar in front of, Mary's car.*
- (9) ✓ Prema velikoj je Jovan trčao kući.  
toward big is Jovan run house  
*Jovan ran towards the big house.*
- (10a) \*[P trace]  
(10b) ✓[P [<sub>XP</sub> ... trace ...]]
- (11a) \*[α trace] (where α is a phase-head)  
(11b) ✓[α [<sub>XP</sub> ... trace ...]]
- (12) wa yÉ – bÓ t<sub>CL</sub> kiÚ j<sub>III</sub>EĒ  
they PERF-A-CL-Q on put-Q  
*Have they put food on it?* (Gbadi)
- (13) ✓Han trodde på na.  
He believed on her  
*He believed in her.* (Swedish)
- (14) Han möter \*(na) alltid \*(na) snabbt \*(na) på lördagar fore lunch.  
He meets (her) always \*(her) quickly \*(her) on Saturdays before lunch  
*He always meets her on Saturday before lunch.* (Swedish)

### References:

- Bošković. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-Phonology Interface: Cliticization in South Slavic*. London: Elsevier North-Holland.
- Franks, and Progovac. 1994. On the placement of Serbo-Croatian clitics. In: *Proceedings of the 9th Biennial Conference on Balkan and South Slavic Linguistics, Literature, and Folklore (=Indiana Linguistic Studies 7)*, Bloomington.
- Franks. 1998. Clitics in Slavic. Paper presented at *Comparative Slavic Morphosyntax Workshop*, Bloomington, ID.
- Huang. 1993. Reconstruction and the structure of VP: Some theoretical consequences. *LI* 24:103-138.
- Koopman. 1984. *The syntax of verbs: From verb movement rules in the Kru languages to Universal Grammar: Studies in Generative Grammar*; 15. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Merchant. 1999. The Syntax of Silence - Sluicing, Islands, and Indentity of Ellipsis. Ph.D. dissertation. UCSC, Santa Cruz, CA.
- Riemsdijk. 1978. *A case study in syntactic markedness*. Dordrecht: Foris.