The Multiple Spell-Out Hypothesis and the Phonological Component: Evidence from Greek

In this paper, we investigate the consequences of the Multiple-Spell-Out Hypothesis (MSO) (Uriagereka 1999) for prosodic constituency based on evidence from Greek phrasing. Prosodic size constraints play a prominent role in Greek phrasing, often at the expense of the isomorphism between syntactic and prosodic edges. Thus, input strings, such as the ones given in (1), are grouped into (minimally) binary phonological phrases (p-phrase, φ) despite the dictates of the End-based algorithm (Selkirk 1978, 1981, et seq.; Truckenbrodt 1995, 1999) for alignment between the right edges of maximal projections (XPs) and p-phrases. This suggests that prosodic binarity constraints are deemed more important than alignment constraints in the Greek grammar.

Strikingly, binarity of p-phrases is violated in the prosodification of preverbal clitic doubled DP-objects in OclV(S) constructions, as shown by the blocking of s-voicing, for instance, in (2). Here, the p-phrasing of the DP-object [tis próves]φ is unexpected given its subminimal size (the φ consists of just one prosodic word). In this paper, we provide robust evidence that preverbal clitic doubled DP-objects are phonological islands, since they constitute opaque domains for the application of phonological rules that operate within the p-phrase domain. Furthermore, the prosodic islandhood of such DP-objects is claimed to be the reflection of their derivational status, as predicted by the MSO Hypothesis. More specifically, we argue that they are syntactic islands, because, among other things, they exhibit CED effects (3). There is also substantial evidence in the literature of Greek syntax that preverbal clitic doubled DP-objects are based generated in their surface position either as adjuncts or as Spec of TopicP (Philippaki–Warburton 1987, Tsimpli 1990, Alexiadou 1997). This syntactic status together with the CED effects clearly suggest that such elements constitute derivational islands and hence are forced to be Spelled-Out separately from the main derivation. This is crucial for their p-phrasing since it means that they are mapped onto separate prosodic constituents independently of the prosodification of the main derivation. We conclude, therefore, that the MSO Hypothesis makes clear predictions about the isomorphism between syntactic and prosodic islands. To be precise, it predicts that non-complements constitute derivational cascades forced to be independently Spelled-Out and hence to be phrased separately from the rest derivation.

The predictive power of the MSO program is tested against two constructions: (a) clVOS orders and (b) preverbal subjects. We provide evidence that the clitic-doubled DP-object in clVOS orders displays both syntactic and phonological islandhood. Thus, it exhibits CED effects (4) and it forms a p-phrase on its own as suggested by intonational and segmental evidence, as well as the distribution of fill-words and parentheticals. To illustrate the latter, in Greek, fill-words, e.g. re, re sí, and parentheticals, e.g. lej ‘(s/he) says’, are placed at the end of the initial p-phrase of the utterance (see their distribution in VOS orders (5a)). In (5b), however, lej is placed after the cl-verb, suggesting that the clitic doubled DP-object forms a p-phrase on its own.

With respect to Greek preverbal subjects, it has been extensively argued that they are base generated adjuncts (Philippaki 1987, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1998). Therefore, according to the mechanics of the MSO program, they should constitute derivational islands and exhibit syntactic and phonological islandhood. Nevertheless, we show that this prediction is not born out, since preverbal Greek subjects permit extraction from within (6). What is more striking is that they do not qualify as islands at the phonological level either. Subjects comply with the binarity requirements imposed by p-phrasing since, when subminimal, they are grouped into one p-phrase with the verb, (7).

Such findings have two consequences for the empirical justification of the MSO Hypothesis. First, the non-islandhood status of Greek preverbal subjects indicates that MSO is not necessarily triggered by the induction clause of Kayne’s (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom, as this would wrongly predict the islandhood of preverbal subjects. Second, the fact that a syntactic non-island conforms to binarity requirements of p-phrasing verifies from the opposite direction the basic prediction of the MSO architecture regarding the syntax-phonology interface, namely that the derivational history of the relevant element is reflected on its prosodic constituency. This means that the overall architecture of MSO program is in its essence correct, but an alternative implementation than the one chosen in Uriagereka (1999) is required. In this paper we undertake this task from the perspective of the revised MSO model by Uriagereka (2003), according to which, under certain circumstances, specific types of subjects may not be forced to be independently Spelled-Out.
Examples

(1) a. /i éksi apantísíaς mjas péktriaς sta erotímatα/
the six answer.NOM.PL a.GEN.SG player.FEM.GEN.SG to-the question.ACC.PL
‘The six answers of a player to the questions.’

b. binarity-based mapping
[ĵeksapandisis]φ [mjas péktriaΩ sta erotímatα]φ2 φ1=2PrWs, φ2= 2PrWs
blocking of s-voicing application of s-degemination within φ

c. end-based mapping
??[ĵeksapandisiz mjas péktrias sta erotímatα]φ φ=4PrWs

(2) a. tis próves, mas tis klini o pános
the try-out.ACC.PL us.GEN-them.ACC-arrange.PRES.3PL the panos.NOM
‘As for the try-outs, Panos arranges them for us/you.’

b. [tis próves]φ1 [mas tis klini o pános]φ2 φ1=2PrWs, φ2= 2PrWs
blocking of s-voicing

(3) a. pjanúi ipes óti éfaye [DP to axlādī ti] o kóstas?
who.GEN say.PAST.2SG that eat.PAST.3SG the pear.ACC the Kostas.NOM
‘Of whom did you tell me that Kostas has eaten the pear?’

b. *pjanúi ipes óti [DP to axlādī ti] to éfaye o kóstas?
who.GEN say.PAST.2SG that the pear.ACC it-eat.PAST.3SG the kostas.NOM

(4) a. pjanúi éfaye [DP to axlādī ti] o kóstas?
who.GEN eat.PAST.3SG the pear.ACC the Kostas.NOM
‘Of whom Kostas has eaten the pear?’

b. *pjanúi to éfaye [DP to axlādī ti] o kóstas?
who.GEN it-eat.PAST.3SG the pear.ACC the kostas.NOM

(5) a. [éfaye ro axlādī]φ léj
eat.PAST.3SG the pear.ACC say.3SG

b. [to éfaye]φ léj [to axlādī]φ
it-eat.PAST.3SG say.3SG the pear.ACC

(6) pjanú peðjú mu ipes óti i mitéra parapóntike
who.GEN child.GEN me.GEN say.PAST.2SG that the mother.ACC complain.PAST.3SG
sto diefθidí?
to the director-ACC
‘The mother of which child did you say complained to the director?’

(7) /o pános stėlni efxēs me kártes/
the panos send.3SG greeting.ACC.PL with card.ACC.PL
[o pánosΩstėlnj]φ [efxēz me kártes]φ (see also Prieto 2003 for similar p-phrasings in Catalan)
‘Paul sends greetings with cards’