Towards a Theoretical Treatment of Left-dislocated Subordinate Clauses

Georges Rebuschi

HAL Id: artxibo-00000074

https://artxiker.ccsd.cnrs.fr/artxibo-00000074

Submitted on 7 Feb 2006

TOWARDS A THEORETICAL TREATMENT OF
LEFT-DISLOCATED SUBORDINATE CLAUSES

Georges Rebuschi

1. INTRODUCTION[1]

Among the many proposals put forth in the last decade in order to radically simplify and/or constrain grammars, the theory of Antisymmetry advocated in Kayne (1994) is both fascinating and frustrating. It is fascinating because of its reduction of all constituent structure to a basic phrase schema [$_{XP}$ X° YP], which can be enriched by means of one and only one instance of "adjunction", that of a single ZP to the left – what is traditionally known as a specifier –, yielding a variant of the canonical X-bar structure in which the intermediate level is also symbolized as XP, rather than X': [$_{XP}$ ZP [$_{XP}$ X° YP]] — in other words, both adjunction to the right, and multiple adjunction to the left, are forbidden, thereby drastically constraining syntactic representations. Kayne's theory is also frustrating, as said above, insofar as the derivation of structures which are otherwise – or were formerly – analysed as instanciating axiomatically ruled-out adjunction implies the (apparent or real) stipulation of abstract or phonetically empty heads — and correlatively, in a good many cases, of (otherwise unmotivated) movement of various phrases to the Spec. position of those heads.[2]

This paper has two aims. First, it will show that the hitherto unexplained presence of coordinating or "copulative" conjunctions (typically *eta* 'and' in Basque and its counterparts in many other natural languages) in certain constructions is precisely the lexical realisation of the underlying heads postulated by the Kaynean framework. Second, it will also argue that the base-generation (or [direct] Merging, in Minimalist parlance) of ZPs in the specifier position of these heads is in many cases superior to a (multiple-) movement analysis.

---

[1] This paper is a deeply revised version of the first half of the talk I gave at the Bayonne Conference organised by the CNRS (UMR 5478 "IKER") and the Basque Academy in Memory of Pierre Lafitte. The second half of it, which investigates in detail the morphology, syntax, and semantics of Basque correlative complex sentences, is addressed in Rebuschi (2001c).

The following abbreviations will be used: CL, [noun] class; COM, comitative; E, ergative case; IMP, imperative; LOC, locative; NEG, negation; PROSP, prospective aspect; SUBJ, subjunctive.

[2] I will not address here the other consequence of Kayne's Axiom of Linear Correspondence or LCA, which basically reduces to the idea that linear precedence always means asymmetric c-command, and therefore implies that the basic order [Spec [Head-Complement]] is universal (although, as pointed out to me by Janne B. Johannessen, p.c., [[C-H]S] should also be allowed). For a vindication of this very strong claim as far as languages which are (apparently) partially, or totally "head final", see for instance Zwart (1993, 1994) on Dutch, and Whitman (2000) on Japanese.

2. SOME NON-CANONICAL USES OF *ETA* 'AND' IN BASQUE AND RELATED PHENOMENA IN OTHER NATURAL LANGUAGES

2.1. *Lafitte's data*

In Lafitte's *Grammaire basque [...]* (1962: 105), although the reference is not given in the index, at least two "unexpected" uses of the (otherwise?) coordinating conjunction *eta* are given, in relation with "left-hanging" free relatives like (1) below (Lafitte's own example). [Since the expression "left-dislocation" is traditionally associated with base-generation, adopting it would be begging the question of whether the left-peripheric free relatives are base-generated there, or transformationally raised, whence my more neutral choice here].

(1)   Nork ere erran baitautazu[3],   gezurti bat da.
        who *ere* said *bait*-he-has-it-to-you liar   one he-is
        'Whoever said so is a liar' lit. 'Whoever said so, he's a liar.'

The author comments: "Basque speakers like to represent the element expressed in a relative form in the subordinate clause by a demonstrative pronoun from the *hura* series, and *the interrogative word may be followed by eta*" (emphasis mine, GR),[4] and illustrates:

(2)   Non **eta** ere aukituko baituzu,   han hil zazu.
        where and *ere* find-PROSP *bait*-you-have-him there kill AUX[IMP]
        'Wherever you find him, kill him there.'

Next, he adds: "Often, this demonstrative element is preceded by *eta*, which strenghtens it", and provides the following example:

(3)   Otoitz egin dezagun,   nor ere penetan baita, **eta** harentzat.
        prayer make AUX[IMP.1PL] who *ere* in-pain *bait*-is and for-him
        'Let's pray for whoever is in sorrow.'

It is to be noted that if, on the one hand, these two instances of *eta* are indeed somewhat "special" (for reasons that will be discussed in 4.3 and 5.3), on the other hand, the occurrence of *eta* in between the free relative clause and the main clause, which, although optional [see

---

[3] *Ere* is best left untranslated, in spite of its resemblance to English *ever* is such contexts, and *bait-* is a suffixal C° that introduces both causal clauses (in all dialects) and certain relative clauses in the Northern dialects studied here (it also appears as a suffix in certain indefinite pronouns): see Rebuschi (2001c) for some discussion of those two items.

[4] "*En basque, on aime bien représenter dans la proposition principale par un pronom dé-monstratif de la série hura l'élément exprimé sous forme relative dans la proposition subor-donnée. L'INTERROGATIF PEUT ETRE SUIVI DE ETA*". The "demonstrative series" to which *hura* belongs is the paradigm of distal pronouns; in the dialects spoken in the province of Navarre, on the other hand, [-proximate,-distal] pronouns of the *hori* "series" are preferred.

the "Ø" in (6a)], is quite natural – and has been attested for centuries – is not even mentioned. Here are, then, a few examples:

(4)   Mt, 6.21 *For where your treasure is, there will your heart be also.*

      a   Ezen non   ere baida   zure tresora,
            for   where ere bait--is your treasure
            eta han   diteke zure bihotza.   Haraneder (1740)
            and there will-be your heart

      b   Zure ontasun non,   *eta* zure bihotza han.[5]   Léon (1947)
            your treasure where and your heart   there

(5)   Mt, 7.12 — *Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.*

      a   Zer ere, beraz,   nahi baiduzue   egin
            what *ere* therefore want *bait*-you-have-it do
            diezazue[te]n   zuei gizonek, *eta* hek   guziak
            they-to-you[SUBJ] to-you men-E   and those all
            egin diotzatzue   zuek *ere* hei…   Haraneder (1740)
            do you-them-to-them[IMP] you too to-them

      b   Zer ere nahi baituzue   beraz bertzeek   zuentzat
            what *ere* want *bait*-you-it thus   others-E-PL for-you-PL
            egitea *eta* hura bera egizue zuek *ere* bertzeentzat.   Léon (1947)
            do(ing) and that same do[IMP] you too for-the-others

(6)   Mt 18,4 — *Whosoever therefore shall humble himself as this little child, the same is greatest in the kingdom of heaven.*

      a   Nor ere, beraz, humiliatuko   baida
            who *ere* thus   humble-PROSP *bait*-AUX[INACC]
            eta eginen   haur xume hau bezala, *Ø* hura
            and do-PROSP child little this like   that-one
            diteke handiena   zeruetako Erresuman.   Haraneder (1740)
            will-be the-greatest skies-*of*   realm-LOC

      b   Nor ere eginen   baita   haurño   hau bezain
            who *ere* do-PROSP *bait*-AUX[INACC] small-child this as-much
            xume, *eta* hura   da zeruetako erresuman handiena.
            humble and he/that-on   is skies-of realm-LOC the-greatest
                                               Léon (1947)

---

[5] Note here that the (generally parallel) movement of the *Wh-* phrase or pronoun and of the correlative element towards the left periphery of their own minimal clause has not take place (on this parallelism, see Izvorski 1996).

A spontaneous reaction to such examples consists in saying that the conjunction merely provides a (speaker-oriented) kind of adverbial modification translatable by *also, too*. Such a (purely) pragmatic analysis can certainly be maintained for (4) above, but as (5) shows, *eta* is compatible with *ere* 'too' – thus, more specifically, although *eta* cannot be considered to signal that the same "referent" is introduced in the main clause, it cannot either do the job of signalling that a second predicate is, contrary to expectations, introduced and predicated of the same (set of) entities,[6] since it is *ere* in the apodosis that plays that rôle. What is more, such a "description" does not say anything concerning the syntactic status of *eta*.

2.2. *Cross-linguistic evidence*

I would now like to underline the fact that what functions otherwise as a coordinating conjunction is widely attested cross-linguistically as also introducing the main clause whenever a relative is left-hanging (i.e. in complex sentences with a correlative protasis). Rebuschi (1999, 2001c) provides many examples from ancient or modern Indo-European languages (Hittite, Gotic, Russian, etc.). Here are some more examples, first from a language isolate, Burushaski (Tiffou & Patry 1995: 352-3 (29-30) & (35)):

(7) amenmoiNga bariN écam (*ka*) mo gusmoiNa ɣare sail ayét
     which-Com words I-will-do and the woman-com with walk don't
     'Dont give a walk with the woman with whom I'll speak.'

(8) ane bim *ka* toya pat éten
     where he-was and there him they-left
     'They left him at the very place where he was.'

Next, from Swahili:

(9) Awaye yote, *na* aje.   Ashton (1947, p. 281)
     he-who-is whoever, and let-him-come[SUBJ]
     'Whoever he is, let him come.'

(10) Asiopo, *na* lake halipo.   Perrott (1957: p. 79)
     he-who-is-NEG-LOC and his-CL:5 NEG-be-LOC
     [lit.] 'He who is not here, and his (business) is not here'
     'Out of sight, out of mind.'

Consider now the following Old French examples.[7]

---

[6] On this aspect of the use of *too*, see Fiengo & May (1991).

[7] *Si* was not the hypothetical or conditional particle it is to day (*se* was used instead, cf. (19-20) below), but a coordinating conjunction that triggered either subject inversion (with a full DP) or the presence of *pro*

(11) ***Qui*** vuelt aveir guaagnier et conquerre, / ***SI*** viegne   tost…
       who wants wealth earn   and conquer   and come-SUBJ early
       'If anybody wants to earn and conquer wealth, let him come quick.'

<div align="right">(*Couronnement Louis*, 1621-22)</div>

(12) Dex est charitez, et ***qui*** vit / en charité, Selonc   l'escrit Sainz
       God is charity and who lives in charity according-to the-writ St
       Polz ou   je le vi ***ET*** lui, / il meint   an Deu et Deux en lui.
       Paul where I it saw and he he remains in God and God in him
       'God is love and he that dwelleth in love (according to St Paul's writ where I saw it)
       dwelleth in God, and God in him.'

<div align="right">Chrétien de Troyes (±1175, *Graal*, 45-48)[8]</div>

(13) ***Qui*** ne l'a   leus   qu'il prie, / ***SI*** mesdit   d'Amour.
       who NEG it-has as-soon as-he prays and calumniates of-love
       'Who(ever) does not obtain love as soon as he prays defames it.'

<div align="right">Adam de la Halle (end of 13th C., *Chansons* #11, 8-9)</div>

2.3. *Preliminary conclusions*

The semantic or pragmatic rewording of *eta* as 'also, too' in (5a) or of the conjunctions in (11)
- (13) makes no sense, and there is no natural way to account for their presence in ordinary
Kaynean terms: if they are "adjoined" in other frameworks,[9] they should then be reanalysed
here as specifying a covert or silent functional head above AgrSP; in other words, in order to
avoid granting *eta* and its likes (*et* or *si* and *ka* or *na*) the status of a functional head, one
would have to place it in the specifier of another, unidentified, functional head — and this, in
spite of their solid mono-morphemic status across languages.

---

[8] The verse is in fact 1-Jn 4,16, wherefrom I borrowed the standard (King James') translation.
Unfortunately, the Navarro-Labourdin translations I have consulted (Liçarrague 1577, Hara-
neder 1740 and Duvoisin 1855-65) only provide *semi-free* relative clauses, in *-(e)n-a*, which,
owing to their DP status, are never explicitly linked to the main clause by a conjunction when
they are left dislocated — for more on these SFR Clauses, see Rebuschi (2001b), written in a
non-Kaynean framework.

Note in passing that in Old French, on the contrary, such examples as the following, although
rare, are to be found :

(i)   *Li un des   barons qui vint   a mon seignor Gauvain parler*
         the one of-the earls   who came to my lord   G.   to-talk
         SI fu   li rois Yvons de Yrlande…
         si was the king Y.   of Ireland
         (*Lancelot du lac* III, *La fausse Guenièvre*, p. 220)

[9] Which would probably be hard put to explain why they are adjoined below the correlative
CP, rather than above it, for instance…

On the other hand, considering that the conjunction in the Basque, Burushaski, Old French and Swahili examples above is a *functional head* that takes an IP (or AgrSP, or TP) as its complement and a (free) [+relative] clause or CP as its specifier greatly simplifies the description, and simultaneously renders it compatible with the most constrained version of X-bar theory, namely, Kayne's – without having recourse to (too much) Movement.

What is more, as shown in Rebuschi (2001c), there are strong arguments in favour of a formal semantic translation of whatever lexicalized or non-lexicalized material such a head contains into a (standard or non-standard) connective; therefore, the "headness" of the conjunction will directly correspond to the rôle played by such a connective from a truth-conditional point of view.[10]

3. AGAINST MOVEMENT (I)

Several arguments can be provided which show that a base-generated account of complex sentences with left-hanging (subordinate) correlative clauses is superior to one based on movement. One is to show that the pronoun *hura* of examples (5) and (6) or *pro* of (1) and (2) is a *real* correlative pronoun, i.e. that it is not a resumptive pronoun in one of the two usual senses of the word. This is the question addressed in section 3.1; in 3.2, I will briefly discuss the case of correlative pronouns when two (or more) *Wh*-Ps appear in the correlative protasis, and will review the relevant part of Bianchi's (2000) diachronic study in 3.3.

3.1. *On resumptive and correlative pronouns*

There are three series of facts which indicate that *hura* etc. are neither "intrusive pronouns" nor "true" resumptive ones.

First, as shown in Rebuschi (1998) and summarized in Rebuschi (2001c), 18th and 19th century Labourdin Basque possessed a special pronoun, *haina*, which contributed universal quantification to the root clause, and typically appeared after left-hanging free relatives (as well as Semi-free relatives, but this is irrelevant here). Now clearly, if the correlative clause is extracted from somewhere within the "main" AgrSP, a resumptive pronoun will only be the spelling-out of a trace, and it is not expected that a trace should have any semantic import (apart from being translated into a variable). Likewise, the explicit universal quantification provided in the apodosis of examples like (5a) above (*hek guziak* lit. 'they all') seems hardly compatible with a translation of the pronominal correlate into a simple variable.[11]

---

[10] This argument, however, is only telling for those who hold that as much compositionality as possible should be allowed at the syntax/semantics interface.

[11] See Rebuschi (2001c) against a systematic "maximalizing" reading of the protasis – at least as far as Basque is concerned.

Second, the sort of resumptive pronoun alluded to above (and relabelled "intrusive pronouns" by Demirdache (1997), following a distinction established in Sells (1984)) is typical of a well-identified (but, as far as *I* am concerned, not too well-understood), situation in which the spelling-out of a trace would somehow "salvage" a structure in which that trace is not properly bound. Note, however, that would-be resumptives like pro, *hura* and *haina* are perfect when they correspond to a subject position in the apodosis — obviously the one position out of which all the material it contains can be extracted, if any...

Third, there is another type of resumptive pronouns that has been well studied and identified so far; it is the one illustrated by Hebrew, where the demonstrative element (a "pure" resumptive pronoun) is in fact itself a relative pronoun[12] that need not raise before "Spell-Out", but simply *may* do so: see Demirdache (1997) for exemplification and detailed discussion. Now, here again, such "pure" resumptive pronouns just tend *not* to appear in subject position cross-linguistically, a fact clearly contradicted by the data discussed here.

3.2. *Structures with Multiple Wh-Ps*

Now, consider an example like (14), which has counterparts in a good many languages that exhibit correlative constructions (Hindi, Hungarian: see Rebuschi (2001c) for references and details).

(14) ***Nork ʒertan*** baitu bere burua bilhatzen alabainan,
who-E what-LOC *bait*-he-has-it himself looking indeed
hartan ere du hark bere amodioa galtzen.
that-LOC also he-has-it he-E his love losing

lit. 'Thus, in whatever whoever seeks himself, in this very thing he loses his love too.'
≈ 'In whatever (thing) anybody seeks himself, he loses his love in that very thing.' Léon (1929, p. 148: 3.5.6)

Such sentences just cannot be transformationally derived,[13] since extracting the correlative protasis from, say, the position later filled by the would-be "resumptive" locative pronominal *hartan* 'there, in it', means that the other pronoun (in this case *hark*, the ergative form of *hura*) will have to be interpreted in some other manner (and *vice versa*, of course).

3.3. *V. Bianchi on ancient Indo-European languages*

---

[12] Other languages in which a relative pronoun may (seem to) be borrowed from a demonstrative paradigm are Dutch, German, Old English, and, outside the I.-E. domain, Tswana, for instance.

[13] At least as far as the relationship between the left-hanging subordinate clause and the main clause to its right is concerned, of course: I do not not intend to discuss here whether Basque exhibits *Wh*-movement (as is generally assumed) or whether *Wh*-Ps are base-generated too, as advocated by Oyharçabal (1989) and Etchegoyen (1997).

Bianchi (2000) reinterprets Haudry's (1973) findings under the Antisymmetry hypothesis, and shows that the historically well-established fact that ancient I.-E. languages first had left-hanging relative clauses, and only displayed DP-internal restrictive relatives later, can be reduced to the following.

(a) The correlative was indeed AgrSP-external (curiously, Bianchi does not discuss the specific position it must have occupied, but the answer is straightforward, at least from the point of view adopted in this paper), and did bind a *correlative* pronoun.

(b) At some time, the relative CP to the left of the main clause happened to be dominated by a DP node —in strict Kaynean terms, the CP became the complement of a (possibly phonetically unrealised) D°.

(c) One must also assume that left-dislocation as such was independently available for DPs, with resumptive pronouns in the corresponding A-position (although this is hardly a far-fetched stipulation, it is not explicitly made by Bianchi).

(d) Given (b) *and* (c), the DP-dominated left-hanging relatives were reanalysed as just another instance of (usual) DP left-dislocation, being thereby allowed to sit in the A position otherwise occupied by the correlative pronoun, now reanalysed as a resumptive one.

We shall see below that such an analysis is not only diachronically sound, but is also synchronically so, in the sense that deriving various other types of left-hanging subordinate clauses by extractions leads to a proliferation of heads and (sometimes remnant-) movements that are totally unnecessary on a base-generation analysis.

But in order to do so convincingly, I must first examine more closely the syntactic association of left-hanging adverbial clauses with the following "main clause".

4. ON NON-EMBEDDED ADVERBIAL CLAUSES

4.1. *Basque indirect evidence for the presence of eta*

Let us consider again Lafitte's example (2) above, repeated here for easier reference:

> (2)   Non   *eta* ere aukituko   baituzu,   han hil zazu
>   where and *ere* find-PROSP *bait*-you-have-him there kill AUX[IMP]
>   'Wherever you find him, kill him there'

Two questions come to the mind. First, how is it possible for the conjunction *eta* to appear to the right of the *Wh*-P *within* the correlative protasis? And second, is that always possible?

Let us start with the second question, whose answer is easy: in fact, *eta* only surfaces where it does in (2) when the left-hanging subordinate clause is interpreted, or interpretable, as an adverbial clause – this is most perspicuous with *noiz eta ere...*, lit. 'when and *ere*' which basically refers to *one* moment or instant, vs. *noiz ere ..., eta...* which is normally interpreted generically. Moreover, when the whole complex sentence is a comparative one, as in (15), *eta* may surface in both positions:

(15) Zenbait   *eta* gehiago edaten   bait du,
how-many and   more   drinking *bait* he-has-it,
hanbat   *eta* zozokeria   gehiago erraiten du.[14]
so-much and stupid-thing more   saying   he-he-has-it
'The more he drinks, the more stupid things he says.'

It is difficult to suggest that *eta* undergoes Raising (or copying plus optional deletion, if we are to take the two examples above into account) from the functional head position it occupies in the other examples (e.g. in (4-6)) to the head of its specifier (the protasis), as this movement would be to a non-c-commanding position: an indirect sort of checking such as the generalised Pied-Piping mechanism propozed by Koster (2000) would certainly fare better, but that is not the issue at stake: what is important here is that *eta* somehow *also* materializes in complex sentences where the left-hanging clause is basically adverbial. Fortunately, some other natural languages provide much more direct evidence that protactic adverbial clauses may be "associated" to the apodosis or main clause by means of a coordinating or copulative conjunction.

4.2. *Direct evidence: Old French*

Old French very clearly indicates that left-hanging adverbial clauses can be "connected" to the main clause by the same conjunctions as were shown to be used in correlative sentences – see (11-13) above. In the following examples, the two conjunctions *e(t)* and *si* thus follow time adverbial clauses.

(16) a   Einsi est de ce   monde: *quant* l'ung   descent,
such is of this world   when   the-one goes-down
ET l'autre   monte.   (*Proverbes* #184, after Ménard 1989)
and the-other goes-up

   b   Or dit li   conte QUE *quant* Lancelot fut   venuz a l'eve
then said the tale   that when   L.   was arrived at the-water
de Marcoise, *ET* il   se   vit [...]
of M.   and he himself saw
(*Lancelot en prose*, early 13th C., in Torterat 2000)

   c   *Quant*   furent assanlé, *et* li   pape souspire [...]
when   (they) were gathered and the pope sighs
(Adam de la Halle, second half of 13th C., *Roi de Sicile*, 260)

---

[14]I must confess I do not know why the second conjunction is much better *after* the correlative quantifier than to its left (the same is true of the southern dialects, in which an adverbial item like *gero* lit. 'later' also typically precedes the second occurrence of *eta* in such cases). A possible solution might be found in the multiplicity of functional heads proposed by Beghelli & Stowell (1995), but this issue must be left for future research.

(17) a   Et ***quant*** el l'ot   assés   escouté, ***SI*** comença a dire […]
     and when she him-had enough listened *si* began   to say
                        (Anon., *Aucassin et Nicolette*, ±1200, ch. 12)

    b   ***Quant*** ceo ot   dit, ***SI*** se repent.
      When that had said *si* repents   (Marie de France, ±1175, *Eliduc*, 322)

     c   Et ***quant*** il les   vit en apert / que do   bois   furent
       and when he them saw clearly   that from-the woods were
       descovert / ***SI*** li   fu   molt tres bel   et gent
       uncovered *si* to-him were very much beautiful and noble
                     (Chrétien de Troyes, ±1175, *Graal*, 123-6)

Note also the following rare example, in which the conjunction *si* is directly associated with the *wh*-word, *just as in the Basque example* (2):

(18) ***Quant si*** l'aüstic   orent pris /
     when *si* the nightingale (they) had   seized
     Ø al   seignur fu   renduz   tus vis
     to-the lord   was (it) given-back all alive
       (Marie de France, ±1175, *Lais de l'aüstic / Le rossignol*, 101-102)

Interestingly, Old French used the *same* conjunctions to introduce the apodosis of complex conditional sentences, as shown in (19) and (20):[15]

(19) a   ***S'***en volt ostages,   ***E***   vos l'en   enveiez / U dis u vint
      if he   wants hostages, and you him send[IMP] or ten or twenty
                             (*Roland*, ±1080, 40)

    b   *Se* Bel Acuel   est frans   et dous, /
      if Noble Welcome is generous and gentle,
      et ye   be[SUBJ] cruel and arrogant
      ET vous soiés   fel   et   estous
                 (G. de Lorris, ±1230, *Roman de la Rose*, 3697-98)

(20) a   *Se* ele puet, ***SIL***   retendra
      if she can, *si*+him will-hold
            (Marie de France, ±1175, *Eliduc*, 330 [*sil*= si+l(e)])

    b   *Se* j'estoie fix a   roi / ***S'***afferriés   vos bien a moi
      if I-were son to king, *si* would-match you well to me
                (*Aucassin et Nicolette*, ±1200, ch. 25, 13-14)

---

[15] *If* was translated by *se*, not *si* , but both forms optionally contracted to *s'* when followed by a word beginning in a vowel.

To say that *e(t)* and *si* play the role of the (not temporally interpreted) "adverb" *then* in a conditional sentence actually begs the question, which is basically the same one: where does this word come from, or, more technically, what is its position in an X-bar-theoretic representation?[16]

5. AGAINST MOVEMENT (II)

5.1. *Protactic adverbial clauses*

The question of a possible transformational account of left-hanging adverbial (and hypothetical) clauses is at least as acute as that of transformationally deriving correlative protases. This is so because in order to derive the superficial word order by extracting the subordinate clause out of an apparently right-adjoined position, one has to describe how such a superficial position might be built or derived in the first place.

To begin with, then, it would be necessary to postulate that, within AgrSP, there is a first functional head H1 (probably identifiable to one of Cinque's (1999) many functional heads) that asymmetrically c-commands the VP (or vP, etc.): time adverbials, for instance, would sit in H1's specifier. But since the adverbial clause surfaces to the right of VP, and given that extraposition (a special instance of right adjunction) is banned, it would next be necessary to raise the adverbial clause from that position to the Specifier of a higher (and not so easily independently justified) covert head H2, which would sit higher than AgrSP. Third, AgrSP itself (i.e. containing the trace of the raised Adverbial clause) would have to raise further to the Spec of a still higher empty head H3. That three such heads and the associated movements are necessary seems unavoidable: although the complement of H1 has phrasal status in this framework (recall the introduction), it cannot undergo direct movement to the Spec position of a higher head H2', because this would result in stranding the subject DP, a devastating effect if any. When the adverbial clause is topicalized, then, one would finally have to posit the existence of a fourth head H4 (possibly materialized by *e(t), si* etc. in Old French, and *eta* in Basque), to the specifier of which the subordinate clause would ultimately raise.

Needless to say, this a very complicated way of deriving what can be generated much more simply: it suffices to posit that there is *one* head above AgrSP – H2 in the scenario sketched above – to ensure that the main clause will follow the subordinate one, which means that the easiest thing to do consists in taking the complex sentences with a left-hanging adverbial clause as basic, with either a phonetically unrealized, or *eta, et/si,*(and possibly *na* in Swahili and *ka* in Burushaski) as the head of the whole complex construction: "left-hanging" will then mean "left-dislocated" in the technical sense of the word.

This, of course, does not exclude that a *correlative* position be occupied by some material (again, either phonetically realized or not), somewhere lower under AgrSP, in the specifier of the Cinquean head H1 — but in any case, a base-generation analysis is to be preferred to a

---

[16] See Rebuschi (2001c) for a defense of my answer: *then* ***is*** a Conjunctive head, just as *eta* is in Basque correlative sentences.

raising approach even now, since there is no reason to consider that a hypothetical movement of the adverbial clause from the Cinquean adverbial position to the specifier of the conjunction might violate any known constraint, and because in certain correlative protases containing two *Wh*-Phrases, the second one *must* be interpreted as corresponding to such a position in the apodosis, but just *cannot* have originated there — as in (14), repeated here as (14') with the relevant material in boldface:

(14') Nork **zertan**   baitu   bere burua bilhatzen alabainan,
      who-E what-LOC *bait*-he-has-it his self   looking indeed
      hartan   ere du   hark bere amodioa galtzen.
      that-LOC also he-has-it he-E his love   losing
      lit. 'Thus, in whatever whoever seeks himself, in this very thing he loses his love too.' ≈
      'In whatever (thing) anybody seeks himself, he loses his love in that very thing.' Léon
      (1929, p. 148: 3.5.6)

5.2. *Sentence-final adverbial clauses*

Given the analysis sketched above, one might be tempted to introduce just *one* more (covert) functional head above the Conjunction Phrase headed by *eta* (or *et/si*) when the adverbial clause is sentence final.[17] However such a move (a) would be against the spirit of this paper, and (b), more importantly, would be difficult to reconcile with empirical data: (i) I know of no natural language in which this second head is explicitly (or lexically) realized — as against the examples studied here;[18] (ii) moreover, if it can be agreed upon that there is at least some connection between syntax and prosody, it must also be noted that there is a pause separating the conjunction from the left-dislocated adverbial (or correlative) clause, but that there is precisely *no* pause when the adverbial "adjunct" follows the main clause; now, if the lower Conj. head triggers a pause, it is difficult to imagine that another head (whose effect would simply consist in reversing the direction of the connective that will translate the lower one) might have less prosodic effect than what is the first one,

Fortunately, another solution is available, which consists in extending Koster's (2000) treatment of would-be "extraposed" relative clauses to the case under discussion. Although Koster's work was apparently made independently of Johannessen's (1998) on asymmetric coordination, there are strong similarities between the two approaches, so that I will use the latter's framework to expose the idea.

First, Kayne's (1994) approach to coordination is adopted, according to which conjoined elements are, respectively, the specifier and the complement of a Conj. head. Next, there is some mechanism whereby, in case both conjuncts do not share exactly the properties, it is (normally) the specifier that transmits its features to the Conj.P — Johannessen explicitly

---

[17] It is a general effect of Kayne's framework that some special mechanism has to be postulated whenever an adverbial clause is final (i.e. linearly follows the main clause) rather than initial.

[18] Or yet again as against the presence of a phonetically realized head in the case of the "co-pulative" association of relative clauses (and other nominal modifiers) and NPs in the scope of a D° (see Rebuschi (2001a) on this issue).

proposes that the first conjunct transmits the relevant features through Spec-Head Agreement, an operation followed by the percolation of those features to the Conj.P itself.[19]

In the clausal domain, a typical example is provided by Höhle's (1990: 222) well-kown pair of examples in (21).[20]

(21) a   [[Wenn jemand   nach   Hause kommt] und
           when someone towards home comes   and
           [*da*   der Gerichtsvollzieher vor der Tür   ***steht***]]   [VF & VF]
           there the bailiff   at the door stands

     b   [[Wenn jemand nach Hause kommt] und
           [*da*   ***steht*** der Gerichtsvollzieher vor der Tür]]   [VF & V2]
           there stands the bailiff   at the door

The feature [+subordinate] or whatever else is contained in the first C° and determines the word-order in the first clause may thus render the complex, coordinated, adverbial clause grammatical, although the second clause does not possess that characteristic.

Koster's specific proposal, then, consists in using this strategy to deal with "extraposed" relative clauses in the following fashion: the would-be extraposed [+rel] CP is in fact the second conjunct of a Conjunctive Phrase whose first member is whatever XP contains the first conjunct as its specifier; this can be illustrated by the parallelism between the examples (22) - (24), where I use "&" for any underspecified conjunctive head, whether realized or not; thus, just as a Conj.P [*en* [DP *Marie*]] can take either an AgrOP as its specifier (and thus compositionally yield a Conj.AgrO.P) or a CP, a Conj.P [& CP[+rel]] can have an AgrO.P (etc.) as its specifier and yield a Conj.C.P:

(22) Hij heeft [&.AGROP [AGROP [DP Jan] AgrO° [VP gezien] [&P [& en] [DP Marie]]]
     he has*i*   Jan   *ti*   seen   and   Marie
     'He has seen Jan and Marie.'

(23) [&.CP [CP [DP Jan] heb ik gezien] [&P en [DP Marie]]]
              Jan have I seen   and   Marie

(24) Hij heeft [&.AGROP [AGROP [DP de vrouw] AgrO° [VP gezien]
     he has*i*   the woman   *ti*   seen
     [&P & [CP die het boek schreef]]]
         –   that the book wrote
     'He has seen the woman that wrote the book.'

---

[19] Note that this approach entails that some heads are *underspecified.* Numerous other technical details are involved which I will not discuss here.

[20] A variant in which a first clause exhibiting a V2 word-order would be followed by a V-final clause would of course be ungrammatical.

Finally, Koster proposes to check the second conjunct against the first one in the pre-minimalist way the [+Wh] feature in C° was, for instance, checked against a *Wh*-P contained in a DP or a PP in case of Piedpiping (*whose book, against which...*). Furthermore, he proposes some specific "content", Colon (:), to account for the type of modification contributed by the relative clause.[21]

Likewise, then, a sentence final adverbial clause can be considered to be the complement (or second conjunct) of the Conj.P whose specifier (or first conjunct) is the projection of the adverbial, Cinquean, head H(1), as in:

(25) [&HP [HP *pro* [HP H° VP]] [&P & CP]]

The checking would be as in Koster's examples, and the semantics would clearly consist in localising the event in the segment of time denoted by the adverbial clause.[22]

5.3. *On example (3) and free relatives in (would-be) argumental position*

Let us finally return to example (3), repeated here with some (hypothetical) bracketing as (26):

(26) Otoitz egin dezagun, [XP [CP nor   ere penetan baita], [eta [DPharentzat]]].
      prayer make AUX[IMP.1PL] who *ere* in-pain *bait*-is and   for-him
      'Let's pray for whoever is in sorrow.'

Apparently, the whole expression is in A-position, since it is to the right of the Verb complex (the lexical verb and its auxiliary), which has presumably raised towards the left periphery. This could be taken as evidence that ordinary (left-hanging) correlative protases might, after all and against everything I said above, be analysed as having raised from that A-position, the whole XP raising to the specifier of some covert conjunction, as in (27):

(27) [XP [CP nor ere penetan baita], [eta [DP harentzat]]]*i* otoitz egin dezagun *ti*
           who *ere* in-pain *bait*-is and   for-him   prayer make AUX
      lit. 'Whoever is in sorrow, let's pray for *t*.'

However, this would not account for the pause between *baita* and *eta*, which is clearly audible in (3'), and could not carry over to the analysis of correlatives with several *wh*-Phrases. Moreover, the fact that *harentzat* (like any other resumptive/correlative pronoun) is felt to be focused is also left without account. Finally, the translation of *eta* here would be particularly

---

[21] See Rebuschi (2001a) for a semantic approach to nominal modification that does not require any such new concept.

[22] This of course means that the "content" of the conjunction is in fact functionally determined by the semantic content of its arguments, a fact I have independently established in the paper cited in the preceding note wrt. restrictive and appositive clauses: in the first case, we have set intersection, and in the second, after the shifting of the entity denoted by the DP into a generalised quantifier, we have set membership (the property denoted by the appositive relative being a member of the set of properties denoted by the DP).

difficult, since the property expressed by the relative clause must be interpreted as a member of the set of properties denoted by the pronoun, but, at the same time, there is no pragmatic reason to justify this abstract "extraction" of one property among many – this, on the contrary, being the mechanism that I think explains why appositive clauses are conjoined with their DP (see the last footnote) – all the more as *hura* (the absolute form of *harentzat*) has no other known property!

On the other hand, suppose that the basic word order is, as argued for at length here, that of the correlative followed by the head conjunction *eta*, followed in its turn by the "main" clause (thereby rejecting the bracketing of (27)). If, as suggested above and advocated by Izvorski (1996), the correlative pronoun raises to the specifier of a focus head, the complement of that head will be the IP (or whatever "Finite" head has attracted the imperative verbal complex in the specific example discussed). It follows that a sentence like (3) will in fact be derived by Remnant movement of that IP, which contains the trace of the correlative pronoun, as in (28), where the covert higher Conjunction at least corresponds to a prosodic mark (see the comma after *dezagun* in (3/3'):

(28) $[_{\text{Conj.P}}$ [otoitz egin dezagun $t_i]_j$ $[_{\text{Conj}°}$ Ø] $[_{\text{Conj.P}}$ $[_{\text{CP}}$ nor ere peneta baita], [eta [harentzat$_i$]]]]

6. CONCLUSIONS

The leading ideas of this paper can be summed up as follows.

(i) Functional heads *are* important, not necessarily because they host invisible and uninterpretable features that trigger movement so as to be eliminated in the course of the derivation, but because they go a long way towards helping to solve the problem of adjunction, which can be depicted as allowing far too many options in the description of many phenomena, and more generally as leaving grammars formally far too unconstrained.

(ii) However, those functional heads are just as little explanatory if they are allowed to proliferate whenever they're needed: what is necessary is to find both empirical evidence across natural languages for their presence here or there, and what possible semantic import they can contribute to the structure they enrich by being present, projecting and taking arguments.

(iii) Finally, movement is also unsatisfactory if viewed as costless: whenever a representational account can be provided, other things being equal, it is certainly consonant with any normal interpreatation of Ockam's razor that a rival transformational description should be relinquished.

I have tried to implement these ideas here by showing there is strong evidence, in certain natural languages such as (Northern) Basque and Old French, that correlative protases, as well as left-hanging adverbial clauses, are in fact base-generated in the specifier position of a conjunctive head which is directly, or indirectly, observable at PF — the head of something that modern linguistic thought it could do without, namely, complex sentences.

In Rebuschi (2001c), I show that the translation of this conjunction is exactly that of a (conditional) connective in the case of Basque correlative sentences, and I have here reached the result that, as far as adverbial clauses are concerned, it is most probably a localising operator of sorts.[23]

One more point deserves to be made. In cases of asymmetric conjunction, I have followed Johannessen's (1998) theory that it is the structural specifier, rather than the complement, that transmists its features to the (underspecified) head, whence they percolate to the conjunctions's maximal projection. This, however, might seem to be contradicted by most of the examples discussed here, since a complex sentence will typically inherit its pragmatic force (assertive, injunctive, interrogative, etc.) from the apodosis or main clause. Or will it? In fact, it is quite possible that that "force" is in fact contributed by the contents of an *external* C°. Thus recall example (16b), repeated below as (29), where, as the bracketing shows, the completive status of the complex sentence is given by *que* 'that' — and the fact that the completive morpheme in Basque, *-(e)la*, is suffixal, and therefore appears at the end of the clause final finite verb form, should not lead anyone into believing that it belongs under the Focus Phrase: neither it nor the preceding correlative protasis have any "force" whatsoever.

(29) Or   dit li conte [QUE [[***quant*** Lancelot fut venuz   a l'eve
          then said the tale that   when   L.   was arrived at the-water
          de Marcoise,] [[***ET*** [il se   vit …]]]]
          of M.   and he himself saw

                                    (*Lancelot en prose*, early 13th C, in Torterat 2000)

REFERENCES

1. LINGUISTICS AND GRAMMAR

Ashton, E.O. 1947. *Swahili Grammar* [2nd ed.]. London: Longman.

Beghelli, Filippo, & Stowell, Tim. 1997. 'Distributivity and Negation'. In A. Szabolcsi (ed.), *Ways of Scope Taking* (Dordrecht: Kluwer), 71-107.

Bianchi, Valentina. 2000. 'Some Issues in the Syntax of Relative Determiners'. In A. Alexiadou et al. (eds.), *The Syntax of Relative Clauses* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 53-81.

Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and Functional Heads*. Oxford: OUP.

Demirdache, Hamida. 1997. 'Dislocation, Resumption and Weakest Crossover'. In E. Anagnostopoulou, H. van Riemsdijk & F. Zwarts (eds.), *Materials on Left Dislocation* (Amsterdam: Benjamins), 193-231.

Etchegoyen, Thierry. 1997. 'Against Wh-Movement in Relative Clauses'. Colloquium "Langues et grammaire III", Univ.

---

[23] Which, in the long run, could even help us do away with the Cinquean adverbial head and the silent adverbial correlative mentioned in section 5.2.

Paris 8, Saint-Denis, June.

Fiengo, Robert, & Robert May. 1991. *Indices and Identity*. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Haudry, J. 1973. 'Parataxe, hypotaxe et corrélation dans la phrase latine'. *BSL* 68.1, 147-186.

Höhle, T. 1990. 'Assumptions about Asymmetric Coordination in German'. In J. Mascaró & M. Nespor (eds.), *Grammar in Progress. GLOW Essays for Henk van Riemsdijk* (Dordrecht: Foris), 221-235.

Izvorski, R. 1996. 'The Syntax and Semantics of Correlative Proforms'. *NELS 26* (ed. by K. Kusamoto), 133-147.

Johannessen, J. B. 1998. *Coordination*. Oxford: OUP.

Kayne, Richard. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Koster, Jan. 2000. 'Extraposition as Parallel Construal'. Ms., Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Lafitte, Pierre. 1962. *Grammaire basque (navarro-labourdin littéraire)*. Bayonne: Amis du Musée basque & Ikas.

Ménard, Philippe. 1989. *Syntaxe de l'ancien français* [2nd ed.]. Bordeaux: Bière.

Oyharçabal, Bernard. 1987. *Etude descriptive de constructions complexes en basque* [...]. Doctoral diss. (thèse d'Etat), Univ. Paris VII.

Oyharçabal, Bernard. 1989. 'Pro-drop and the Resumptive Pronoun Strategy in Basque'. In L. Marácz & P. Muysken (eds.), *Configurationality: The Typology of Asymmetries* (Dordrecht: Foris), 63-83.

Perrott, D.V. 1957. *Swahili*. London: English Universities Press.

Rebuschi, Georges. 1998. 'Nouvelles remarques sur *haina*'. *Lapurdum* 3, 53-75.

Rebuschi, Georges. 1999. 'Types de langues de types de constructions: le cas des corrélatives'. In A. Sörés & C. Marchello-Nizia (eds.), *Typologie des langues, universaux linguistiques: LINX* [special issue on typology], 55-72.

Rebuschi, Georges. 2001a. 'Generalizing the antisymmetric analysis of coordination to relativisation'. Paper presented at the International Conference on Coordination, Manchester/Salford, Nov. 2001.

Rebuschi, Georges. 2001b. 'Semi-Free Relative Clauses and the DP-Hypothesis: Basque Evidence and Theoretical Consequences'. *IATL* 8, 55-64.

Rebuschi, Georges. (2001c). 'Note sur les phrases complexes à protase corrélative du basque'. *Lapurdum* 6, 261-289.

Sells, Peter. 1984. *Syntax and Semantics of Resumptive Pronouns*. Doctoral dissertation, Univ. of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Tiffou, Etienne, & Richard Patry. 1995. 'La relative en bourouchaski du Yasin'. *BSL* 90.1, 335-390.

Torterat, Frédéric. 2000. '*Et en emploi "syndético-hypotactique": hypothèses sur une jonction implicite en ancien et en moyen français*'. BSL 95.1, 183-202.

Whitman, John. 2001. 'Overt heads of Right-Branching Functrional Projections in Japanese'. Talk given at the Seminar on Minimalism, CNRS/U. P.8, Paris, January. Ms., Cornell Univ. & CRLAO (Paris).

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1993. *Dutch Syntax; A Minimalist Approach*. PhD dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen.

Zwart, Jan-Wouter. 1994. 'Dutch is Head Initial'. *The Linguistic Review* 11, 377-406.

2. CORPUS

2.1. BASQUE

Duvoisin, J. 1855-65. *Bible edo Testament Zahar eta Berria [...]*. London. Facsim., Bilbao: Gran Enciclopedia Vasca, 1972.

Haraneder, Joannes. 1740. *Jesu Christoren Evangelio Saindua*. Ms. ed. by P.

Altuna, Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia, 1990.

Léon, L. 1929. *Jesu-Kristoren Imitazionea*. Turnhout (Belgium): Brepols.

Léon, L. 1947. *Jesu-Kristo gure Jaunaren Ebanjelio Saindua*. Ustaritz.

Liçarrague, J. 1571. *Iesus Christ Gure Iaunaren Testamentu Berria – Kalendera – ABC edo Christinoen Instructionea*. La Rochelle. Facsim., Bilbao: Euskaltzaindia, 1990.

2.2. OLD FRENCH

Adam de la Halle, end of 13th C., *Chansons*. In *Œuvres complètes*, Paris: LP-LG, 1995, 38-125.

Adam de la Halle, *Roi de Sicile, ibid.*, 376-393.

Aucassin et Nicolette, ±1200, anon. Paris: G-F, 1984.

Chanson de Roland, end of 11th C, anon. Paris: GF, 1993.

Couronnement Louis, ±1150, anon. Extracts in *Cycle de Guillaume d'Orange*. Paris: LP-LG 1996, 71-145.

Chrétien de Troyes, ±1175, *Conte du Graal*, Paris: GF, 1997.

Lancelot du Lac III: *La fausse Guenièvre*. ± 1220, anon. Paris: LP-LG 1998.

Lorris, Guillaume de. ±1230. *Roman de la rose*. Paris: GF, 1999.

Marie de France, ±1175. 'Eliduc'. In *Lais*, Paris: LP-LG, 271-327.

Marie de France, ±1175. 'Lai de l'aüstic ≈ Le rossignol'. In *Lais*, Paris: LP-LG, 211-220.

* * * * *