"Double" Floating Quantifiers in Standard Greek and Pontic
Vina Tsakali

In the literature on clitic doubling there are several cases of obligatory clitic doubling discussed. For example, in all dialects of Spanish an indirect pronominal object has to be doubled by a clitic (e.g. Jaeggli 1981) and in Romanian specific indefinites must be doubled by a clitic (e.g. Dobrovie-Sorin 1990). In this paper I discuss what appears to be one more instance of obligatory clitic doubling, namely the fact that the quantifier "all" (*olus*) in Modern Greek (MG) and in Pontic dialect needs to be accompanied by a clitic (1).

Despite its appearance, I will argue that (1) should not be analysed as genuine clitic doubling (see also Sportiche 1996 and Kayne 2000). Instead, I will show that (1) is an instance of a single clitic construction, which has the underlying structure of I and not II. In other words, example (1) is syntactically akin to (2) and not to (3), which is representative of structure II.

I.   **[cl[$_{VP}$V [[all]pro]]]**

II.   [cl [V [all]]]

       Two are the main arguments that rule structure (II) out. The first argument comes from the observation that the quantifier *olus* needs to be accompanied by a clitic not only in clitic doubling languages like Greek but also in Pontic dialect that lacks clitic doubling (like French and Italian). The second argument against structure II is that the quantifier *olus* can carry informational focus as in (4), a property that is systematically incompatible with doubled objects as shown in (5). However, defending structure I raises a number of questions.

DOES THE OBSERVATION THAT "ALL" NEEDS TO BE ACCOMPANIED BY A CLITIC HOLD FOR ALL CLITIC LANGUAGES?

The answer to this question is negative. In what follows I will discuss the cases of Brazilian Portuguese (BP), European Portuguese (EP) and a dialect of South American Spanish (Quiteno Spanish) (QS) that do not pattern along with MG, Pontic, Italian, French and Catalan.

WHY IS THE CLITIC NECESSARY IN SENTENCES (1)?

I show that the presence of the clitic follows from the object-drop properties of the language. More precisely, I will show that *olus* needs to be obligatorily accompanied by a clitic when the language does not permit definite object drop. As illustrated by (6) in MG and Pontic, the definite DP-object cannot be omitted, unlike the indefinite NP-object, which can be dropped (7) (e.g. Dimitriadis 1994). The clitic that obligatorily appears in (6) replaces the definite object and is bound to *pro* as discussed above regarding (2). Given that *olus* can only modify definite DPs (8), it is then expected that the clitic will appear obligatorily with the quantifier in the languages that lack definite object omission (MG, Pontic, AG, French, Italian, Catalan). On the other hand, the prediction is that in languages that can omit definite objects (BP, EP and QS) (9) (see Raposo 1986, Suner and Yepez 1988) the presence of the clitic will no longer be compulsory in *todos/olus* constructions. This prediction is borne out in BP, EP and QS, where the presence of the clitic in *todos* constructions is optional (10).

WHICH OTHER ELEMENTS BEHAVE LIKE *TODOS/OLUS*?

I show that the class of elements that behave like *todos/olus* modify the entire DP, as opposed to the NP, as shown in (11). I will further argue that this class coincides with quantifiers that can float (FQ). Additional evidence for the proposed relationship between the clitic and the FQ comes from French data that exhibits the same "clitic doubling" pattern (12) with respect to the FQ "each" (*chacun*).

WHY CAN'T *TODUS/OLUS* BE A DP BY ITSELF, THE WAY THAT NOMINALISED ADJECTIVES CAN AS IN (13)?

I will show that certain quantifiers in the languages that show the *clitic-todos* dependency (MG, Pontic, AS, French, Italian, Catalan) cannot behave like DPs. Moreover, I argue that despite the agreement we observe between the FQ and the DP it modifies, the relationship between the FQ and the DP is one of adjunction, as in $[_{DP} FQ [DP_1]]_2$.

I show that this correctly predicts certain elliptical phenomena, i.e. a clitic can replace either the whole QP (*"all the students"*) or just the DP ("the students"), stranding the adjoined FQ (14), an option that I argue to be similar to the VP ellipsis constructions in (15), where VP adjuncts can be optionally stranded.

In summary I argue against an analysis that groups the clitic-DP dependency together with the clitic-FQ dependency. I have shown that the presence of the clitic in constructions with FQ is only indirectly linked to the properties of the quantifier, but directly linked to the properties of object drop in the language. The prediction is that *the apparent "clitic doubling" of quantifiers will happen only with floating quantifiers*. This holds true for both clitic doubling languages and non clitic doubling languages, which was shown across languages and across two dialects of Greek that differ significantly in this respect.

EXAMPLES

(1) a. ***(tus) idha olus** (MG) (2) **tus$_i$ idha [*pro*]$_i$** (MG)
     b. **idhats oluts** (Pontic) them-cl-acc saw-1st
         them-cl-acc saw-1st all-acc "I saw them"
         "I saw them all"

(3) **Ta$_i$ idha [ta pedhia]$_i$** (MG)
     Them-cl-acc saw-1st the kids-acc
     "I saw them"

(4) **tus idha OLUS** (MG) (5) ***to dhiavasa TO VIVLIO** (MG)
     it-cl acc read-1st sing the book-acc them-cl-acc saw-1st all-acc
     "I saw them ALL" "*I read it, THE BOOK"

(6) **agorases [ta vivlia]$_i$?-- *(ta) agorasa [*pro*]$_i$** (MG)
     Did you buy the books?"--"I bought them"

(7) **Agorases vivlia?-- B: agorasa [*pro*]** (MG)
     "Did you buy books"—"I bought"

(8) **ola ta vivlia/ *ola vivlia** (MG)
     all the books/ all books

(9) a. **Quem e que viu a filme? O Manel viu** (EP/BP)
        Who was-3rd sing that saw-3rd sing the film- the Manel saw-3rd sing
        "Who saw the film? Manel saw it" (Raposo 1986)
    b. **Cuando quieres que te mande las tarjetas?Puedes mandarme manana?**(QS)
        When want-2nd sg that you send-1st sg the cards?can-2nd sg send me tomorrow?
        "When do yuou want me to send you the cards? Can you send them to me tomorrow?" (Suner and Yepez 1988)

(10) a. **(les) vi a todos** (QS)
      b. **(os) vi todos** (EB/BP)
          them-cl-acc saw-1st sing all-acc
          "I saw them all"

(11) **[$_{QP}$ola [$_{DP}$ta pedhia]]/ olts ti fotitas** (MG/Pontic)
      all the kids/all the students

(12) **Je *(les) vus chacun (un par un)** (French)
      I-nom them-cl-acc have-1st seen every-acc
      "I have seen each of them (one by one)"

(13)   **theli ta kokina / Il veut les rouges** (MG/French)
       them-cl acc saw-1st the red-acc
       "He wants the red ones"

(14)   **A: Idhes [$_{QP}$ olus [$_{DP}$ tus fitites]$_k$]$_i$?** (Did you see all the students?) (MG)
       B: Tus idha [$_{QP}$ *pro*]$_i$ /   tus idha olus [$_{DP}$ *pro*]$_k$
       "I saw them all"

(15)   **Bill [bought the books]$_i$ on Tuesday and Mary [did so]$_i$ on Wednesday**.