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Abstract

Hebrew has no multiple nominative construction (MNC) of the Japanese type, contrary to the claims of three recent studies. The alleged “broad subject” in the Hebrew constructions is nothing but a left-dislocated DP. A series of arguments is presented to the effect that this DP patterns with A-bar phrases and displays none of the subject properties characteristic of either standard or broad subjects.
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1. Introduction

Doron and Heycock (1999), Heycock and Doron (2003) (henceforth collectively, DH) and Alexopoulou et al. (2004) (henceforth, ADH) claim that the multiple nominative construction (MNC), famously common in Japanese (and Korean), is also attested in Hebrew and Arabic. Crucially, it is distinct from left dislocation (LD) in that the outer nominative DP behaves like a broad subject (or a major subject) of the Japanese type and unlike a left-dislocated DP of the English type.

In this paper I argue that for Hebrew, this is a misanalysis. Hebrew has no construction comparable to the Japanese MNC. What DH claim to be MNC in Hebrew is a run-of-the-mill LD construction of the English type. I will present two sets of arguments to this effect: (i) All of DH’s tests claiming to show the alleged broad subject to be a true subject in Hebrew yield identical results with unambiguous left-dislocated DPs; (ii) Under eleven additional, independent tests, the alleged broad subject displays A-properties of left-dislocated elements, unlike the Japanese broad subject, which displays the hallmarks of an A-position.

2. Distinguishing MNC from LD in Hebrew

A typical MNC in Hebrew, according to DH, is (1).

(1) Ruti sof-a lenaceax.
    Ruti end-hers to win
    ‘Ruti will end up winning.’
The narrow subject sof-a is generated in the standard VP-internal thematic position, and assumes its surface position, Spec, TP, by movement. The broad subject Ruti is externally merged as a second specifier to T, above the narrow subject. Crucially, DH holds that both specifiers are A-positions; in particular, the broad subject is said to pass a battery of subjecthood tests.

On the interpretative side, a MNC is understood as a categorial judgment (Kuroda, 1972; Ladusaw, 1994), as opposed to a thetic judgment. In a categorial judgment, an object is presented (by asserting its existence) and then a property is either ascribed or denied to it. In a thetic judgment, all that is asserted is a description of an eventuality; the existence of objects associated with the eventuality is only indirectly entailed. Typically, individual-level predicates figure in MNCs, but this is not necessary; stage-level predicates can also produce categorial judgments through a process of abstraction.

Notice that abstraction similarly characterizes the relation between a left-dislocated DP and the pronoun it binds. The question arises, then, what is the difference between MNC and LD. In fact, DH does not explicitly state how MNC and LD are to be distinguished in Hebrew. In terms of discourse function, ADH assimilates LD to CLLD (clitic left dislocation)—the initial DP in both constructions is taken to be a topic. By contrast, the broad subject in MNC can either be focus or topic. One consequence of this distinction is that a broad subject can but a left-dislocated DP cannot be a downward-entailing quantifier (these claims will be challenged below).

More importantly, DH mention one constraint on the position of the bound pronoun (call it the copy) in MNCs.

(2) **DH’s locality constraint on broad subjects in Hebrew**

“The position of abstraction is either that of the highest XP argument or a possessor of that argument.

This suggests either A-movement or an anaphoric relation between the broad subject and the pronoun”

(Heycock and Doron, 2003:8).

By implication, then, whenever the copy is further down, LD is the only analysis. Given that DH rule out a movement analysis (broad subjects do not reconstruct), the remaining option is an anaphoric link. Why the relation of the broad subject to the copy should be anaphoric, rather than unbounded variable binding, is not discussed by DH. In any event, this locality constraint allows (3a,b) as MNCs in Hebrew, but not (3c), which must be LD, since the copy is not (inside) the highest XP argument below the initial DP.

(3)

a. Ruti yeš la savlanut.
Ruti there is to her patience
‘Ruti, she has patience.’

b. af iton erev lo moxrim oto ba-boker.
no newspaper evening not sell.3pl it in-the-morning
‘No evening newspaper is sold in the morning.’

c. Ruti ani xošev še-yeš la savlanut.
Ruti I think that-there is to her patience
‘Ruti, I think she has patience.’

In fact, it seems that the analogy to anaphora is inadequate on DH’s own terms, since ADH analyze the following examples as MNCs in Hebrew.

(4)

a. af e’xad lo maxnisim le-kan et ha-anašim še-ovdim ito.
no one not let in.3pl to-here ACC the-people that work.3pl with him
‘No one is such that they allow in here the people who work with him.’

b. af talmid šelo lo keday levakeš mi-af more lehamtic alav.
no student his not advisable to ask from-no teacher to recommend on him
‘No student of his is such that it is advisable to ask any teacher to recommend him.’

---

1 DH assume that LD is always available, even in the local contexts of (2). In fact, long-distance MNCs, crossing clause boundaries, are marginally possible in Japanese (as an anonymous reviewer points out), raising the question for DH of why Hebrew MNCs are clause-bound.

2 (3b) is translated to passive in English, but it is an active sentence in Hebrew, with a null generic subject. DH assume that the null subject is in fact nothing more than the verbal morphology, so the position of the copy qualifies as the highest XP argument in the clause.
Even if we ignore le-kan ‘to-here’ in (4a), which is closer to the initial QP than the copy, the distance between the latter two is clearly outside the domain of local anaphora. And (4b) seems to violate (2), af more ‘no teacher’ intervening between the initial QP and the copy.³

Nonetheless, since DH and ADH do not offer any alternative characterization of the distinction between MNC and LD, I will adopt (2) as the dividing line. The general point of the argumentation to follow will not be affected by this particular vagueness. The reason is this. DH explicitly assume that broad subjects are not left-dislocated phrases; hence, some structural criterion must distinguish them, whether it is well or ill-defined. Yet as we will see below—no such structural distinction is warranted by the data: broad subjects are left-dislocated DPs, under all the available tests. There is no point trying to sharpen (2), since the distinction it presupposes is spurious.

3. Alleged differences between “broad subjects” and dislocated DPs

DH presents six pieces of evidence in support of the subjecehood of the initial DP in constructions of type (3a,b). I consider them in turn.

First, they claim that the initial DP can be shared by two conjuncts, where it functions as the broad subject in one conjunct and as the narrow (i.e., standard) subject in the other. Note that the second conjuncts in (5) must be predicates (and not full clauses) since Hebrew excludes pro drop in present tense.

(5) a. Ruti yeš la savlanut ve-maclixa be-pitron tašbecim.
   Ruti there is to her patience and is successful at-solving crossword puzzles
   ‘Ruti has patience and is successful at solving crossword puzzles.’

   b. kafe tov šotim oto ba-boker ve-mašpia kol ha-yom.
      coffee good drink.3pl it in.the-morning and-effects all the-day
      ‘Good coffee, one drinks it in the morning and [it] has an effect all day.’

The status of these examples, however, is dubious; Hebrew speakers, including myself, reject them, and in fact can only save them by inserting an overt pronominal subject (hi ‘she’ in (5a), hu ‘it’ in (5b)) after the conjunction. This indicates that the initial DP is not shared by the two conjuncts; therefore, its position in the first conjunct cannot be inferred from the second one.⁴

The same test, however, can be used to prove that the initial DP is not a broad subject. In (6), the initial QP can function as a broad subject in the first conjunct, on DH’s account, but not in the second one, given the position of the bound pronoun. DH cannot analyze it as a dislocated phrase, given their assumption that downward-entailing quantifiers cannot participate in Hebrew LD. Note that the initial QP must be shared by the two conjuncts, as it binds a pronoun in each.

(6) af mitmoded, eyn lo, sikuy mula
   no contestant there isn’t to him chance against her
   ve-lo mešane mi ya’azor lo,
   and-not matters who will help to him
   ‘No contestant stands a chance against her and it doesn’t matter
   who will help him.’

On DH’s assumptions, then, (6) should have no grammatical derivation. On my alternative account, (6) instantiates across-the-board LD, downward-entailing QPs being legitimate targets for LD in Hebrew (see (11) below).

³ (4b) does not allow a bound variable reading for šelo ‘his’, due to lack of reconstruction; this is orthogonal to the present point, which is simply the fact that the example is given as a grammatical MNC. I myself find (4a) marginal and (4b) next to impossible (an anonymous reviewer rejects both). Whether or not one counts in such examples is of minor importance, as we will see below that (2) fails to distinguish MNC from LD.

⁴ A reviewer suggests that the MNC analysis can be saved if (5a–b) are subject to a parallelism condition, so that the initial DP must be a broad subject in both conjuncts. Since broad subjects require a pronominal copy in Hebrew, the obligatory subject pronoun in the second conjunct would be explained. Notice, however, that the same facts – obligatory presence of a copy pronoun in each conjunct – equally follow on the LD analysis of the initial DP, hence cannot be taken as an argument for the MNC analysis.
DH’s second claim is that broad subjects, unlike left-dislocated phrases, can occur in embedded contexts.

(7) im be’emet Dani, ha-xavera šelo mi-carfat,
    if’ really Dani the-girlfriend his from-France,
ex ze še-hu af pa’am lo haya šam?
    how it that-he never not was there
    ‘If indeed Dani’s girlfriend is from France, how come he was never there?’

(7) is rather awkward to begin with. What DH did not check is whether it contrasts with LD. Despite their claim that left-dislocated phrases cannot be embedded, LD in the context of (7) yields a result of a comparable status (awkward, but passable). Notice that Dani in (8) does not qualify as a broad subject by DH’s locality criterion.

(8) im be’emet Dani, kulam be-carfat ma’aricim et kol ma še-hu ose,
    if really Dani everyone in-France admire ACC all what that-he does,
ex ze še-hu af pa’am lo haya šam?
    how it that-he never not was there
    ‘If indeed everyone in France admires whatever Dani does, how come he was never there?’

Third, DH claim that an adjunct may precede a broad subject but not a left-dislocated phrase.

(9) be-anglit kol mišpat yeš lo nose.
    in-English every sentence there.is to.it subject
    ‘In English, each sentence has a subject.’

DH do not compare (9) with a minimally different LD example. As it turns out, no contrast emerges.

(10) be-anglit kol mišpat yeš harbe draxim le’hagid oto.
    in-English every sentence there.are many ways to.say it
    ‘In English, for each sentence there are many ways to say it.’

Fourth, DH claim that broad subjects can, but left-dislocated phrases cannot, be wh-phrases or bare quantifiers in Hebrew.

(11) a. mi yeš lo zman la-dvarim ha-ele?
    who there.is to.him time to.the-things the-these
    ‘Who has the time for these things?’

b. af exad eyn be-yado la’azor le-Rina.
    no one there.isn’t in-his.hand to.help to-Rina
    ‘No one has it in his power to help Rina.’

Again, DH fail to provide the LD data. These reveal no contrast.

(12) a. mi ata xošev še-yeš lo zman la-dvarim ha-ele?
    who you think that-there.is to.him time to.the-things the-these
    ‘Who do you think has the time for these things?’

b. af exad eyn bi-ydey ha-hanhalot lešaxna oto lehišaer.
    no one there.isn’t in.or.hands the-management to.convince him to.stay
    ‘It is not in the power of the management to convince anyone to stay.’

Example (11a) is cited by DH to support their next claim, which is stated as follows: “A left-dislocated phrase...has a fixed pragmatic role of topic, whereas the broad subject, like any subject, may be (part of) the focus” (Doron and Heycock, 1999:85). This view about the “fixed” pragmatic function of LD is indeed widespread, but unfortunately false. As Prince’s 1997 careful study shows, LD serves three distinct functions in English: simplifying discourse processing, by removing discourse-new entities from positions reserved for discourse-old entities (typically, subject
and possessor positions); triggering a set-inference (the left-dislocated entity stands in a salient partially ordered set relation to some entity (or entities) already evoked in the discourse model); or amnestying island violations by resumption. Importantly, none of these functions is associated with “old information”, and as Prince shows, typical LD examples fail standard topichood tests (i.e., *what about X, as for X*, etc.).

Hebrew LD seems to be quite parallel. In particular, examples like (11a) can be simply attributed to obligatory resumption (P-stranding being excluded), which is blind to information structure, applying in all island environments, whether the initial DP is a topic, focus, *wh*-phrase, relative pronoun and so on. I conclude that the construction under discussion displays no discourse properties that rule out an LD analysis.\(^5\)

Finally, DH claim that the broad subject passes a subjecthood test in Hebrew—a particular cleft construction that only applies to subjects. (13a) is an example with a clefted standard subject, (13b) is one with a clefted broad subject.

(13) a. Dani hu še-azar le-Dina.
   Dani he that-helped to-Dina
   ‘It is Dani who helped Dina.’

   b. Še-harey elen hi be-eem še-haya la sade panuy.
   since Ellen she in-reality that-there.was to.her field free
   ‘Since it is really Ellen who had a free field.’

In fact, (13b) is taken from the Hebrew translation of Faulkner’s *Absalom, Absalom!*. It is highly literary and would not be produced spontaneously by Hebrew speakers. To the extent that it is judgeable, however, it does not seem any better than (14), where the clefted DP is a left-dislocated phrase, as implied by (2).

(14) Še-harey elen hi be-eem še-Jim horiš la sade panuy.
    since Ellen she in-reality that-Jim bequeathed to.her field free
    ‘Since it is really Ellen to whom Jim bequeathed a free field.’

To summarize, none of DH’s six tests that are supposed to distinguish broad subjects from left-dislocated phrases in Hebrew in fact does so. What are we to conclude from that? One option is that DH’s locality criterion is superfluous, and all the initial DPs in examples (3)–(14) are broad subjects of the Japanese type. On this view, DH were not fundamentally mistaken in drawing the analogy between Japanese and Hebrew; they were simply over-restrictive in their claims for Hebrew, which features many more broad subjects that they suspected.\(^6\)

An opposite conclusion, however, would be that all the initial DPs in the above examples are left-dislocated phrases, and none is a broad subject of the Japanese type. On that view, DH were fundamentally wrong in drawing the analogy between the two languages. How can we decide between these two potential conclusions?

Since DH’s data do not distinguish MNC from LD in Hebrew, we need to look elsewhere. In particular, we need to examine whether the initial DP in the Hebrew constructions displays any properties which are predictable from one analysis but not from the other. In the next section I turn to such properties.\(^7\)

4. **“Broad subjects” are not subjects**

The extensive literature on Japanese MNC has established beyond reasonable doubt that not only the standard subject, but also the broad subject occupies an A-position. In that respect it sharply contrasts with dislocated DPs, which occupy A¯-positions. By subjecting the Hebrew construction to tests that are sensitive to the A/A¯ distinction, we

---

\(^5\) In contrast, a clitic left dislocation (CLLD) analysis is ruled out, as ADH show. This is unproblematic, for LD and CLLD are known to be quite different along several dimensions (island sensitivity, tolerance to bare quantifiers, information structure, etc.).

\(^6\) In fact, DH do assume that a LD parse is always available, even for the examples they analyze as MNCs. However, they are quite explicit about the fundamental differences between the two structures. Hence, they would probably already reject this potential conclusion. Note that the point of this section is that examples to which DH would *not* assign a MNC analysis are nonetheless empirically indistinguishable from examples to which they would. Thus, accepting that the MNC examples are ambiguously analyzable as LD would not help here.

\(^7\) Broad subjects in Japanese do not reconstruct, suggesting that they merge externally ([Ura, 1996; Doron and Heycock, 1999; Yoon, 2007]). DH observe that the alleged broad subjects in Hebrew similarly fail to reconstruct. This fact is neutral in the present context, since left-dislocated phrases also merge externally and fail to reconstruct.
can obtain solid evidence as to its precise nature. As it turns out, all the tests yield the same result: the initial DP occupies an A-position, specifically a left-dislocated one, contrary to DH’s prediction. Eleven arguments are adduced to that effect.

Consider first anaphor binding. Broad subjects in Japanese, unlike left-dislocated phrases, can bind local anaphors, an immediate consequence of the A/A¯ distinction. The initial DP in the Hebrew construction cannot.

(15a), without a broad subject, shows that anaphors in Hebrew pick as antecedent any A-binder in their clause: the oblique anaphor can be bound either by the dative object or by the subject, but of course not by a subject-internal possessor. (15b) shows that this possessor cannot bind even when it is “promoted” to a broad subject status. The failure of binding by Gil in (15b) is unexpected on DH’s analysis. Gil is a broad subject by their criterion, and it c-commands the anaphor from an A-position within the same minimal clause. If, however, Gil is a dislocated phrase, then its inability to bind in (15b) is no less surprising than it is in the English translation.

One might attribute the failure of binding by the broad subject in (15) to the intervention of the narrow subject. This is dubious, however, since A-binding in Hebrew tolerates clausemate intervention—the indirect object in (15) does not block binding by the narrow subject. In fact, Japanese provides straightforward evidence that A-binding across the narrow subject is possible. The contrast between (15b) and (16) (S. Takahashi. p.c.) confirms that Japanese broad subjects indeed occupy A-positions, whereas the initial DP in the Hebrew sentence (15b) does not.

(16) Taro-i ga usagi ga zibun zisini no heya de sinda.
Taro-NOM rabbit-NOM self GEN room in died
‘Taro’s rabbit died in self’s room.’

Condition B effects also distinguish broad subjects from left-dislocated phrases. As Kuroda (1986) observed, a broad subject cannot bind the matrix object position. Left dislocation, in contrast, can freely target that position. The contrast follows straightforwardly from the A/A¯-distinction plus the assumption that binding conditions apply to A-positions only.8

(17) a. *Nancy-ga Tom-ga i- ni maneita.
Nancy-NOM Tom-NOM house to invited
‘Nancy is such that Tom invited her to his house.’

b. Hebrew
mi dofkim oti kol ha-zman?
who screwup 3pl him all the-time
‘Who is screwed up all the time?’

Control into nonfinite adjuncts makes the same point. This type of control is purely configurational, depending on locality and c-command alone. Typically, adjuncts are subject oriented, hence one expects broad subjects to be able to control them. This is not the case, as (18) shows. Notice that the narrow subject must be the controller in (18) even though it is inanimate, whereas the broad subject is animate.

---

8 The topic (wa-) construction corresponding to (17a) is grammatical. Notice that the pronominal copy in this example is null, as is common in Japanese. (17b) is slightly awkward since a resumptive pronoun is dispreferred wherever a trace is possible, but is far better than standard Condition B violations. Notice that DH must analyze this example as a MNC given their assumption that LD is not available with bare wh-words.
The LD analysis naturally predicts this fact: the initial DP is a dislocated phrase, which occupies an A-\(^\ast\) position, and control exclusively involves A-positions (adjunct control specifically being limited to subjects).

Nor can broad subjects be controlled, another subject diagnostic. (19a–b) are analyzable by DH as MNCs with Gil as a broad subject outside an impersonal null (narrow) subject. This broad subject can neither be controlled in a complement clause (20a) nor in an adjunct clause (20b) (the embedded impersonal narrow subject is marked as Pro\(_{imp}\), to be neutral between PRO and pro).

---

**Example (19)**

a. \(\text{Gil}, \text{o}z\text{r}\)im lo\(_i\) le’hi\text{š}taper.
\(\text{Gil} \text{ help.3pl to.him to.improve} \)
‘Gil, people help him improve.’

b. \(\text{Gil}, \text{bikšu} \text{ mimen}\_0 \text{ le’hitnacel}.\)
\(\text{Gil} \text{ asked.3pl from.him to.apologize} \)
‘Gil, they asked him to apologize.’

---

**Example (20)**

a. \(* \text{Gil, kiva [PRO}_i \text{ (Pro}_{imp}) \text{ la’azor lo}_i \text{ le’hištaper].} \)
\(\text{Gil} \text{ hoped to.help to.him to.improve} \)
‘Gil hoped for people to help him improve.’

b. \(* \text{Gil, hitnacel [bli PRO}_i \text{ (Pro}_{imp}) \text{ levakeš mimeno}_0]. \)
\(\text{Gil} \text{ apologized without to.ask from.him} \)
‘Gil apologized without anyone asking him to.’

Notice that an impersonal reading is in general available to narrow subjects of infinitives (i.e., varieties of PRO\(_{arb}\)), hence it is unlikely that the ungrammaticality of (20a–b) is to be blamed on the Pro\(_{imp}\) ingredient (whether ultimately realized as PRO, pro, or neither). Nor do the translations reveal any pragmatic implausibility. The facts are predicted if the alleged broad subjects are in fact left-dislocated phrases—which are never controllable. On the broad subject analysis, however, auxiliary assumptions would have to be invoked.

Once again, genuine broad subjects in Japanese participate in control—both as controllers (21a) and as controllees (21b) (S. Takahashi, p.c.), indicating that control is a relevant test in this regard. Notice that nashini-adjuncts, exemplified in (21b), normally do not display obligatory control (they allow a lexical subject distinct from the matrix subject). When containing a null subject coindexed with the matrix subject, however, this null subject must be interpreted sloppily, as indicated in (21b).\(^9\) This implies that at least under subject coindexation, the nashini-adjunct does feature obligatory control of PRO, since a pro subject would have been free to pick the strict reading. Significantly, this PRO can be the broad subject.

---

**Example (21)**

a. \([\text{PRO}_i \text{ Tegami-o yomi nagara}] \text{John,ga kaioiro-ga kawatta,} \text{ letter-ACC read while John-NOM countenance-NOM changed} \)
‘John’s countenance changed while he was reading the letter.’

b. \([\text{PRO}_i \text{ Meiy-o ga kizutuke-rare-ru-koto-nashini}] \text{John, dake-ga zishoku sita,} \text{ honor-NOM offend-PASS-PAST-NMZ-without John-only-NOM resign did} \)
‘Only John resigned without his honor being offended.’
_Strict reading OK: The only x who resigned without x’s honor being offended is John._

_No strict reading: The only x who resigned without John’s honor being offended is John._

---

\(^9\) Out of five Japanese speakers, only one accepted a strict reading in (21b). If this reflects a dialect split, then the argument holds only for the majority dialect.
Consider now Raising, another diagnostic of A-positions. As shown by Kuno (1978), Japanese broad subjects undergo raising to object, confirming their A-status (22a).\(^\text{10}\) By contrast, left-dislocated DPs cannot undergo Raising-to-Object (22b).

\[(22) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Boku-ga John-o imooto-ga kirei-da to omowu.} \\
& \quad \text{I-NOM John-ACC sister-NOM beautiful-be that think} \\
& \quad \text{‘I think that John’s sister is beautiful.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{* We believe John, his sister to be a key witness.}
\end{align*}\]

The Hebrew construction patterns with (22b) and not with (22a) under Raising-to-Object, which is manifested in small clause complements. This follows from the LD analysis but not from DH’s MNC analysis.\(^\text{11}\)

\[(23) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{ani maxšiv et axot-o šel Gil axra’it la-balagan ha-ze.} \\
& \quad \text{I consider ACC sister-his of Gil responsible to.the-mess the-this} \\
& \quad \text{‘I consider Gil’s sister responsible for this mess.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{* ani maxšiv et Gil, axot-o axra’it la-balagan ha-ze.} \\
& \quad \text{I consider ACC Gil sister-his responsible to.the-mess the-this} \\
& \quad \text{‘I consider Gil, his sister responsible for this mess.’}
\end{align*}\]

Similarly, the alleged broad subject in Hebrew fails to undergo Raising-to-Subject, which is available with a variety of modal adjectives selecting infinitival complements. Notice that (24b) cannot be easily explained by the lack of case for axoto ‘his sister’ in the infinitive. As (24c) shows, overt raising in such contexts is optional, and nominative case can be assigned long-distance to an unraised DP.

\[(24) \quad \begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{axot-o šel Gil alula lehikanes le-kan kol rega.} \\
& \quad \text{sister-his of Gil might.to.enter to-here every moment} \\
& \quad \text{‘Gil’s sister might come in every moment.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{* Gil alul(a) lehikanes le-kan axot-o kol rega.} \\
& \quad \text{Gil might.M(F) to.enter to-here sister-his every moment} \\
& \quad \text{‘Gil might his sister come in every moment.’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{c.} & \quad \text{alula lehikanes le-kan axot-o šel Gil kol rega.} \\
& \quad \text{Gil might.F to.enter to-here sister-his of Gil every moment} \\
& \quad \text{‘Gil’s sister might come in every moment.’}
\end{align*}\]

Consider next intervention effects. Left-dislocated elements create barriers for Â-movement, precisely because they occupy Â-positions themselves. Subjects, on the other hand, do not interfere with Â-movement. Again, the initial DP in the Hebrew construction patterns with left-dislocated elements in blocking Â-movement. (25a) shows that long wh-movement across a normal subject (of possession) is licit; (25b) is the declarative counterpart, with the embedded possessor Gil promoted to a “broad subject”; (25c) shows that movement across Gil is blocked—as expected on the LD analysis but not on the broad subject analysis.

\(^{10}\) According to Yoon (2007), even when the single subject of a complement clause raises to a matrix object position, it raises from the broad subject position, explaining why Raising-to-Object and MNCs in Japanese and Korean share a characteristic interpretation (the so-called “categorial judgment”).

\(^{11}\) DH cite an Arabic example where a broad subject appears to raise to object, but no Hebrew analogue. In fact, the Arabic example could involve a proleptic object construction, which is subtly different from Raising-to-Object (Davies, 2005).
In fact, ADH recognize that broad subjects create islands (see their example (59)), raising the question for them of why an A-position should have this effect. They concede that “at present we do not have an answer to this question” (p. 21), though they clearly do not consider this a lethal problem, as I think it is.

A seventh argument against the MNC analysis concerns the interaction of the initial DP with \textit{wh}\textit{-phrases}. Note that a broad subject and a left-dislocated phrase occupy very different positions in the clausal hierarchy. While the former is in (a second) Spec,TP, the latter is located at the very edge of the left periphery (Rizzi, 1997). Between these two positions, we find the canonical position of \textit{wh}\textit{-phrases}.

\begin{equation}
\text{(26) } \text{[Dislocated DP [\textit{wh}\textit{-phrase [Broad subject [Narrow subject]]]]]}
\end{equation}

The MNC and the LD analyses, then, make contrasting predictions as to where the initial DP would be located with respect to a \textit{wh}\textit{-phrase}: On the former analysis, the initial DP should follow the \textit{wh}\textit{-phrase, on the latter it should precede it. The facts confirm the LD analysis.\textsuperscript{12}

\begin{equation}
\text{(27) a. } \text{ha-baxur ha-ze, le’an amru lo lalexet?}
\text{the-guy the-this, where said.3pl to.him to.go?}
\text{‘This guy, where did they tell him to go?’}
\text{b. } \text{* Le’an ha-baxur ha-ze, amru lo lalexet?}
\text{where the-guy the-this, said.3pl to.him to.go}
\end{equation}

Note that DH assume that \textit{ha-baxur ha-ze} ‘this guy’ in (27b) could be analyzed either as a broad subject or as a left-dislocated phrase. On the former analysis, then, the sentence is expected to be derivable, contrary to fact.

Eighth, as in many languages, LD is unavailable in infinitives in Hebrew. This is seen in the control complement (28a), which contrasts with (28b), where topicalization (more precisely, focus movement) takes place in the complement.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{equation}
\text{(28) a. } \text{* ani metaxnen RINA/Rina, lirkod ita.}
\text{I plan RINA/Rina to.dance with.her}
\text{‘I plan RINA/Rina, to dance with her.’}
\text{b. } \text{ani metaxnen IM RINA lirkod.}
\text{I plan WITH RINA to.dance}
\text{‘I plan to dance WITH RINA.’}
\end{equation}

Nothing in the MNC analysis precludes broad subjects from appearing in infinitival clauses. On the contrary, since these subjects are hosted in Spec,TP, and infinitives project at least up to the TP level, one expects the combination to

\textsuperscript{12} (27a) triggers no intervention because the left-dislocated phrase is base generated outside the \textit{wh}\textit{-phrase; no crossing occurs, unlike in (25c).

\textsuperscript{13} This contrast suggests that topics occupy a lower position than left-dislocated phrases. Consistent with this is the observation (U. Shlonsky, p.c.) that topics may follow \textit{wh}\textit{-phrases, unlike left-dislocated phrases (cf. 27b).}
be possible. Given that, the ungrammaticality of (29b), with a causative infinitival complement, is unexpected on the MNC analysis, but fully predicted on the LD analysis.

(29) a. lo natati [la-avar šel Gil le’hafria li].
not let.1sg to.the-past of Gil to.disturb to.me
‘I didn’t let Gil’s past disturb me.’

   b. * lo natati le-Gil, ha-avar šelo le’hafria li.
not let.1sg to-Gil the-past his to.disturb to.me
‘I didn’t let Gil, his past disturb me.’

Ninth, Hebrew has an optional V2-like process of subject-verb inversion, triggered by preverbal XP constituents (Shlonsky and Doron, 1992). A variety of elements can trigger this inversion, including adverbs (30b) and wh-phrases (30c).

(30) a. ha-bayt šel Rina hafax le-xorva.
the-house of Rina turned to-wreck
‘Rina’s house has turned into a wreck.’

   b. ba-zman ha-axaron hafax ha-bayt šel Rina le-xorva.
in.the-time the last turned the-house of Rina to-wreck
‘Recently, Rina’s house has turned into a wreck.’

   c. le-ma hafax ha-bayt šel Rina?
to-what turned the-house of Rina
‘What has Rina’s house turned into?’

Triggered inversion, however, cannot place the verb in front of a left-dislocated phrase. Notice that (31b,c) are sharply ungrammatical, whether the verb agrees with the subject or with the left-dislocated DP.

(31) a. Rina, Gil šipec et ha-bayt šela.
Rina Gil renovated ACC the-house her
‘Rina, Gil renovated her house.’

   b. * ba-zman ha-axaron šipec/šipec Rina, Gil et ha-bayt šela.
in.the-time the last renovated.3sgM/sgF Rina Gil ACC the-house her
‘Recently Rina, Gil renovated her house.’

   c. * matay šipec/šipec Rina, Gil et ha-bayt šela?
when renovated.3sgM/sgF Rina Gil ACC the-house her
‘When did Rina, Gil renovate her house?’

These facts are entirely unsurprising: triggered inversion inverts the verb with the subject and not with any other element of the left periphery (possibly because V raises to the lowest C head, Fin\(^9\)). Notice that (31c) also violates the hierarchy in (26), similarly to (27b).

Observe now that triggered inversion also fails to place the verb to the left of an alleged broad subject: (32b,c), which respect the locality condition (2), are no better than (31b,c).

---

14 Note that causative complements host a lexical subject (the causee in (29a)), hence the overtness of the embedded subject(s), by itself, cannot explain (29b). If raising to (dative) object applies to the subject of these causative complements, then (29b) is also redundantly blocked by the impossibility of raising a left-dislocated phrase (cf. (23b)).

15 DH might rule out (32b) by appealing to the fact that an adverb precedes the left-dislocated phrase. This configuration, however, is not generally problematic, witness (10).
These facts naturally follow from the LD analysis: the postverbal DP both in (31b,c) and in (32b,c) is a left-dislocated phrase, which never inverts with the verb in Hebrew. On DH’s account, however, these two pairs are unrelated. While (31b,c) are explained by the same ban on inversion with left-dislocated phrases, (32b,c) must be explained differently. This is because the latter examples, on DH’s analysis, also allow a MNC parse, in which the postverbal DP is a broad subject. The problem for DH, then, is to explain why narrow subjects invert with V (30b,c) but broad subjects do not (32b,c) (recall that both types of subjects reside in specifiers of T).

DH, in fact, do not address this issue. They do discuss a different word order restriction, namely, the fact that the verb cannot intervene between the broad and the narrow subject. This is not possible, they claim, since the trigger of inversion (of V and the narrow subject) must check some feature against V, but the broad subject checks no features, being base-generated in its surface position.

This account is dubious, given the fact that any preverbal XP (except for dislocated DPs) can trigger inversion, including adverbs, which neither move nor check features. The account is also redundant: on the assumption that the two subjects are both specifiers of T, there should be no head position between them to host the verb. At any rate, it cannot explain the ungrammaticality of (32b,c), where the status of the broad subject as a subject is at stake, and not its status as an inversion trigger. That nothing is the matter with the inversion triggers in (32b,c) is evidenced in (30b,c), where the same triggers do license inversion of a narrow subject.

Tenth, consider the distribution of constituent negation, specifically DP negation. This type of negation, typically contrastive and stressed, is generally available in A-positions.

DP negation, however, cannot be attached to left-dislocated phrases.

Exactly the same restriction applies to initial DPs that are analyzable by DH as broad subjects.
That the initial DPs in (35) resist constituent negation, like those in (34) and unlike the narrow subjects in (33), is a serious challenge to the MNC analysis. Note that the challenge is independent of the ultimate nature of the constraint. On DH’s analysis, broad subjects are distinct from left-dislocated phrases both in their syntactic position and in their pragmatics. Whether it is the syntax or the discourse function of DP negation that is incompatible with LD, a broad subject is expected to be governed by this constraint no more than a narrow subject is.\textsuperscript{16}

Lastly, the eleventh argument. As is well-known, Japanese broad subjects need not bind any identifiable syntactic position in the clause following them, so long as it is construed as being about the broad subject (Kuroda, 1986).

\begin{align*}
\text{(36) a.} & \quad \text{Buturigaku-ga syuusyoku-ga taihen da.} \\
& \quad \text{physics-NOM finding-jobs-NOM difficult COP} \\
& \quad \text{‘Physics is such that finding jobs is difficult.’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Oranda-no sakana-ga huyu-ga nisin-ga yoi.} \\
& \quad \text{Holland-GEN fish-NOM winter-NOM herring-NOM good-is} \\
& \quad \text{‘Fish from Holland [are such that] [in] winter herring is the best.’}
\end{align*}

Nothing comparable is possible in Hebrew; the initial DP must bind a pronominal copy.

\begin{align*}
\text{(37) a.} & \quad * \text{Fizika, limeo avoda ze kaše.} \\
& \quad \text{physics finding job it difficult} \\
\text{b.} & \quad * \text{Dagim me-Holland, xoref, ha-hering hu tov.} \\
& \quad \text{fish from-Holland winter the-herring is good}
\end{align*}

This difference cannot be attributed to a difference in the availability of null pronouns in the two languages, for examples like (36a,b) cannot be analyzed as containing null pronouns: a null pronoun normally cannot replace a PP, as it would be required to in (36a), nor can it express the subset relation between herring and fish from Holland in (36b).

More plausibly, we should think of the contrast between (36) and (37) in analogy to the contrast between (38a) and (38b).

\begin{align*}
\text{(38) a.} & \quad \text{As for John, something terrible happened.} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{John, something terrible happened *(to him).}
\end{align*}

A hanging topic construction (38a) does not require a bound pronoun, whereas a LD construction (38b) does. A natural way to account for this contrast is to view the “aboutness” relation in the former as a pragmatic relation between a topic and a proposition; in contrast, LD involves grammatical predication. The clause following the left-dislocated DP is a sentential predicate, formed by a null operator. This operator must bind a variable (or else the Ban on Vacuous Quantification would be violated), hence the necessary presence of the copy. This analysis straightforwardly extends to parallel contrasts between copy raising and proleptic object constructions and gapless vs. gapped clauses (see Landau, 2007 for much discussion).

\textsuperscript{16} The following two facts jointly suggest that the relevant constraint is syntactic. First, topicalization, in contrast to LD, permits DP negation (ii). Second, as discussed above in connection to Prince (1997), one function of LD is to amnesty island violations. In other words, some instances of LD simply replace topicalization (out of islands), and as such, are discourse functionally equivalent. Crucially, even these LDs resist DP negation (iii).

\begin{align*}
\text{(LO) et ax šel Rina pagašti.} \\
& \quad \text{(NOT) ACC brother of Rina met.1sg} \\
& \quad \text{‘It’s not Rina’s brother that I’ve met.’} \\
\text{(ii) (LO) et ax šel Rina pagašti.} \\
& \quad \text{(NOT) ACC brother of her} \\
& \quad \text{‘It’s not Rina whose brother I’ve met.’}
\end{align*}

The topicalized DP in (ii) binds an object trace while the left-dislocated DP in (iii) binds a pronoun inside the object DP (DPs are islands in Hebrew). Any discourse situation in which (ii) would be felicitous has a parallel discourse situation in which (iii) would; the fact that LD and not topicalization is used in the latter is purely syntactic (avoidance of an island violation). That DP negation nonetheless distinguishes the two sentences, therefore, implies that a syntactic distinction is responsible for the contrast.
That the Hebrew examples (37) fall together with (38b) in requiring a bound pronoun is entirely expected if indeed they instantiate LD. On the MNC analysis, however, there is no obvious reason why Hebrew should be any different from Japanese in this regard. DH propose that in gapless MNCs a λ-abstract is nevertheless formed over the event/situation variable. This would seem to imply that physics and fish from Holland in (36) are construed as events/situations (being attributed properties of events/situations), contrary to intuition. Furthermore, DH admit that their proposal does not cover all types of broad subjects (leaving out indefinite and PP ones). Finally, on DH’s account, the Japanese/Hebrew contrast remains a stipulated statement on “abstractable variables”, with no obvious locus in parametric theory. On the present analysis, it is just one instance of the broad dichotomy between propositional and predicative clauses—MNCs and LD constructions simply falling on opposite sides of the split.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued against the extension of the MNC analysis to Hebrew, as proposed in Doron and Heycock (1999); Heycock and Doron (2003) and Alexopoulou et al. (2004). Although Hebrew exhibits constructions with two initial nominative DPs, the outer DP behaves like a left-dislocated phrase in every respect. Unlike the Japanese broad subject, the outer DP in Hebrew fails all subjecthood tests and passes all tests for an A¯-position.

This is not surprising from a typological perspective. As argued in Kuroda (1988) and Fukui (1995), the MNC is not an isolated property of Japanese; rather, it clusters together with scrambling, possessor stacking and lack of overt wh-movement. By contrast, English displays none of these properties. Both Kuroda and Fukui trace this parametric clustering to a single factor: the fact that English is an agreement language and Japanese is not. Indeed, Hebrew is just like English in being an agreement language. Hebrew also patterns with English in having overt wh-movement and no scrambling or possessor stacking. Given this array, it would have been extremely puzzling for Hebrew to pattern with Japanese on just one construction – the MNC – and with English on all the other constructions that are governed by the agreement parameter. Our finding that MNCs do not exist in Hebrew thus restores the homogeneity of this typological picture.
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