1. Introduction

The goal of this paper is to challenge the industry-standard conception that Comp-trace (C-t) effects are narrow syntactic phenomena and counter by motivating a purely prosodic (i.e. PF-centric) characterization of the effect. We’ll approach this task by investigating C-t effects in two unrelated languages, namely, English and Nupe, the latter a Niger-Congo language spoken in central Nigeria. Although this goal is simple enough, the outcome is far-reaching if correct, for it calls into question over thirty years of generative research on the phenomenon.

By way of introduction, the C-t effect is one of the quintessential subject–non-subject asymmetries. It is standardly taken to describe the outcome of certain movement operations in which subjects are displaced across overtly headed clause boundaries. As shown below, subjects, unlike objects and adjuncts, cannot be long extracted across overt complementizers in English.

(1) a. Who do you think [(*that) __ wrote the book]?
   b. What do you think [(that) Bill wrote __ ]?
   c. Why do you think [(that) Bill wrote the book __ ]?
   d. The author [(that) the publisher predicts [(*that) __ will be adored]]
   e. The book [(that the publisher predicts [(that) the public will adore __ ]]

Crucially, however, subject extraction across some C₀s is allowed, as in matrix subject relatives and clefts. In fact, for many speakers, extraction is only possible in these cases if C₀ is overt.

(2) a. The boy [*(that) __ bottles fireflies]
   b. It’s my cousin [*(that) __ bottles fireflies].

Nupe shows a similar effect, as do many other languages.

(3) a. √ EXTRACTION OF AN EMBEDDED OBJECT WH-
    Ke u: bè [ke Musa du __ ] na o?
    what 3stag COMPl Musa cook na o
    ‘What does it seem that Musa cooked?’

b. √ RELATIVIZATION OF AN EMBEDDED OBJECT
    Nakàn [na Musa kpe [gànnà bagi-zi ba __ ]] na
    meat COMP Musa know COMP man-PL cut na
    ‘The meat that Musa knew that the men cut’
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c. * EXTRACTION OF AN EMBEDDED SUBJECT WH-
*Zéé u: bê [ke __ du nakàn] na o?
 who 3SG seem COMP cook meat na o
*‘Who does it seem cooked the meat?’

d. * RELATIVIZATION OF AN EMBEDDED SUBJECT
*Bagi-zí [na Musa kpe [gânán __ ba nakàn]] na
 man-PL COMP Musa know COMP cut meat na
*‘The men that Musa knew cut the meat’

e. √ RELATIVIZATION OF A NON-EMBEDDED SUBJECT
Bagi [na __ ba nakàn] na
 man COMP cut meat na
‘The man that cut the meat.’

The C-t effect has spawned a vast literature in the generative tradition. The earliest approaches (Perlmutter 1971, Chomsky and Lasnik 1977) accounted for the effect in representational terms, culminating in the ECP-driven analyses of the GB program. In response to the recent Minimalist paradigm shift, the ECP analyses of the GB era have been largely jettisoned and replaced with derivational characterizations (cf. Deprez 1994, Szczegielniak 1999, Pesetsky and Torrego 2001, Hoge 2001, Roussou 2002, Ishii 2004, Rizzi 2004, among others). Although the character of these accounts varies somewhat, the central theme unifying them all is the view that complementizer-trace outputs are somehow syntactically ill-formed. Now, a widely held view in generative linguistics is that the computational system (i.e. the syntactic component) manifests considerably less variation comparatively speaking than other modules, for instance, phonology and morphology (i.e. the modules of the PF wing of grammar). Viewed from this perspective, the plausibility of a syntactic characterization of C-t effects is called into question by the existence of considerable inter-linguistic and intra-linguistic variation. Inter-linguistically, for example, C-t effects do not obtain in Arabic, Basque, Hausa, Serbo Croatian, and Warlpiri (Perlmutter 1971), nor do they surface in Modern Hebrew (Borer 1984, Shlonsky 1988), West Flemish (Haegeman 1992), Icelandic (Maling and Zaenen 1978), Japanese (Ishii 2004), or Hindi (Rajesh Bhatt, personal communication), among other languages. We often find considerable variation within a given language as well. For instance, although many dialects of English manifest the effect, Midwestern dialects (Sobin 1987), varieties of African American English (Pesetsky 1982), certain populations of L1 (Thornton 1990, McDaniel et. al 1995) and L2 (Gethercole and Montes 1997) learners, and some dialects of British English (Guest 2001) lack the effect. Similarly, certain dialects of Dutch (Maling and Zaenen 1978, Reuland 1983), German (Bayer 1984), and French (Pesetsky 1982), among others, show variable C-t behavior as well. At the very least, these facts encourage exploration of alternative (i.e. non-narrow syntactic) characterizations of C-t effects. Although a minority, a small body of PF-based research in this regard has persisted in the face of a syntactically dominated literature (cf. Aoun et. al 1987, Culicover 1993b, Richards 1999, Merchant 2001, to appear, and de Chene 1995, 2000, 2001).

This paper follows in this PF-oriented tradition. In the spirit of de Chene 1995, 2000, 2001, we argue that the C-t effect reduces to a purely prosodic phenomenon. Moreover, we claim that the effect does not represent a homogeneous linguistic phenomenon, nor is a grand unified analysis available. Toward this goal, we first discuss C-t effects in English and then move on to the case of Nupe.

2. English Comp-trace Effects
2.1 Empirical Observations

Supporting evidence for the claim that the C-t effect is a prosodic/PF-oriented phenomenon in English\(^1\) comes from the fact that the effect is mitigated/ameliorated in special prosodic circumstances.

\(^1\) The judgments reported in this section reflect the intuitions of 25 native speakers, 15 of whom were non-linguists.
In addition to the well-known fact that C-t effects disappear when C^0 is omitted, C-t violations are lessened/voided if a monosyllabic complementizer is reduced or unstressed, as shown in (4).

(4) a. Who do you hope *for/√fer __ to win?
   b. The author that the editor predicts *that/√th’t __ will be adored

As pointed out by Merchant (2001, to appear), C-t effects are cancelled under ellipsis.

(5) John said that someone would write a new textbook, but I can’t remember who John said that __ would write a new textbook.

Moreover, as discovered by de Chene (1995, 2000, 2001), the intonational phrase break induced by Right Node Raising has a mitigating effect on the outcome of long embedded subject extraction.

(6) a. √Who does John doubt whether and Bill suspect that __ cheated on the exam?
   b. √That’s the president I’ve been hoping for and you’ve been petitioning for __ to be impeached.

Perhaps the most famous case of mitigation is the so-called Adverb Effect, discovered by Bresnan (1977:194), first discussed by Barss and Deprez (1986), and popularized by Culicover (1993a).

(7) a. √Who do you think that after years and years of cheating death __ finally died?
   b. √The author that the editor predicts that for all intents and purposes __ will be adored?

Nuclear pitch accentation also has a mitigating effect in English (Drury 1999:208, Kandybowicz 2006). As shown in (8), intonation focus of an embedded verb salvages what would otherwise be a C-t violation.

(8) a. A: I didn’t think that John would survive.
   B: √Well then, who do you think that __ WOULD?
   b. √?Who do you think that __ WROTE Barriers (as opposed to say, edited it)?
   c. *Who do you THINK that __ wrote Barriers (as opposed to say, know)?

Lastly, for many speakers, C^0-auxiliary contraction across a subject trace voids a C-t violation.

(9) a. √?Who do you suppose that’ll leave early?
   b. √?The author that the editor predicted that’d be adored

2.2 Analysis

What are the prosodic consequences of the phenomena previously outlined? In the case of C^0 omission, the answer is transparent. For most speakers, the most natural way to pronounce a C-less clause is without a prosodic break. Thus, the whole utterance is parsed as a single prosodic unit (i.e. an Intonation Phrase (iP)). Moreover, C^0 and trace are no longer adjacent at PF if C^0 is omitted.

(10) [iP Who did you claim __ discovered Antarctica]?

Consider next the case of complementizer reduction (4). When C^0 is pronounced in full (i.e. when unreduced), an Intermediate Phrase (intP) boundary divides the embedded clause from the matrix clause (11a). However, when C^0 is reduced, no such Intermediate Phrase break exists (11b). In this way, sentences with reduced embedded complementizers are prosodically similar to sentences lacking embedded complementizers (cf. (10)).

(11) a. [iP Who do you think [intP that __ wrote Barriers]]?
   b. [iP Who do you think th’t __ wrote Barriers]?
The case of ellipsis (5) is relatively straightforward as well. When elided, complementizer-trace sequences are removed from considerations of PF/prosodic well formedness. The mitigation of Comp-trace effects under Right Node Raising (6) and sentential adverbial modification (7) pattern together. RNR’ed constituents and sentential adverbials are obligatorily parsed as Intonation Phrases at PF. In these cases, the complementizer and trace do not occupy the same prosodic phrase, as shown below. 2

(12)  a. [intP Who does John doubt whether] [intP and Bill suspect that] __ [ip cheated on the exam]?
     b. [intP Who do you think that] [intP for all intents and purposes] __ [intP wrote Barriers]?

In the case of intonation focus (8), the embedded verb bears a nuclear pitch accent, marking the boundary of an independent IntP. As a result, C^0 and trace cease to occupy the same prosodic phrase.

(13)  a. [Who did you say [intP that ___ wrote Barriers]]? vs.
     b. [Who did you say that] __ [intP WROTE Barriers]?

Abstracting away from these observations, a generalization appears to emerge. In English, the sequence <C^0,tr> is illicit when C^0 and trace are adjacent within the same prosodic phrase and C^0 is aligned with a prosodic phrase boundary. (The latter condition is minimally necessary to rule in sentences of the sort in (4) and (2), as we will discuss momentarily.) (In what follows, we understand traces to be copies marked for PF deletion, in line with the Copy theory of movement.)

(14)  *<C^0, t> iff:
     i. C^0 & t are adjacent within a prosodic phrase AND
     ii. C^0 is aligned with a prosodic phrase boundary

Our proposal, essentially a PF anti-adjacency constraint on complementizers and traces, harkens back to Chomsky and Lasnik’s (1977) filter-based approach. (14) systematically accounts for the data in (4)-(8), as the reader may easily verify. (Space limitations preclude a detailed explication of this.) More importantly, (14) makes a correct prediction about amelioration of C-t effects via intonation focus, namely, that focusing anything other than an embedded predicate/auxiliary will fail to mitigate a C-t effect. The reason for this is that focusing material non-adjacent to the trace will not result in the prosodic separation of the complementizer and the trace, as shown below.

(15)  a. [Who did you say [intP that ___ wrote Barriers yesterday]]?
     b. [Who did you say that] __ [intP WROTE Barriers yesterday]?
     c. [Who did you say [intP that ___ wrote] [intP BARRIERS yesterday]]?
     d. [Who did you say [intP that ___ wrote Barriers] [intP YESTERDAY]]?

As mentioned, this prediction is borne out. Native speaker intuitions on this point are fairly robust.

(16)  a. ??/*Who did you say that ___ wrote BARRIERS yesterday?
     b. *Who did you say that ___ wrote Barriers YESTERDAY?

The proposal in (14) also explains why C-t effects fail to obtain in cases of unembedded subject relativization and clefts (2). In these cases, no Intermediate Phrase boundary separates C^0 from the embedded clause. Thus, the complementizer is not aligned with a prosodic phrase boundary.

(17)  a. [ip The butler that ___ murdered the maid] (No intP boundary before C^0)
     b. *[ip The butler [intP that ___ murdered the maid]] (Non-restrictive RC only possible with who)
     c. [ip It’s the butler that ___ murdered the maid] (No intP boundary before C^0)

---

2 Because prosodic phrasing must occur at the juncture between two prosodic words (Nespor and Vogel 1986, Schütze 1994), the traces in (12) cannot be grouped into any prosodic phrase (i.e. ip/intP).
Additionally, (14) provides a way of understanding the contraction facts previously laid out in (9). On the assumption that contraction in this case reflects the fact that the auxiliary has encliticized onto C⁰, one way to account for the acceptability of C-t configurations in the presence of C⁰-Aux contraction would be to assume that for speakers that find the resulting sentences acceptable, contraction renders the trace word-internal, that is, internal to C⁰. In this case, C⁰ and the trace, although still in the same prosodic phrase, would no longer count as prosodically adjacent, given that the two are word-internal.

\[ \text{(18)} \quad \ldots \text{[INSP that who will leave early]} \]
\[\text{[Pwd]} \Rightarrow [\delta \varepsilon r l] \]

By contrast, suppose that for speakers who do not report contraction-based improvements in C-t violations, contraction is analyzed differently. That is, suppose that for these speakers the auxiliary has encliticized onto C⁰ to the exclusion of the trace, as in (19) below. Then, as predicted by (14), the resulting output will be prosodically ill-formed because C⁰ and trace will be adjacent, phrase-internal, and aligned with a prosodic boundary.

\[ \text{(19)} \quad \ldots \text{[INSP that who will leave early]} \]
\[\text{[Pwd]} \quad (\text{Pwd}) \Rightarrow [\delta \varepsilon r l] \]

In conclusion, the English C-t effect is a PF anti-adjacency phenomenon. In other words, C-t effects in English are violations of a prosodic requirement that C⁰ and trace fail to be adjacent whenever they occupy the same prosodic phrase and are situated at the phrase’s left edge. At this stage of the research, we should think of (14) as a descriptive generalization, rather than as a deep explanation of the facts. Moreover, we can view (14) either as a PF interface condition that is evaluated following Prosodic Mapping or as an OT constraint. Cross-linguistic and intra-linguistic variation with respect to the C-t effect could then be accounted for by either parameterization of (14) or by appealing to differences in constraint ranking.

3. Nupe Comp-trace Effects

3.1 Empirical Observations

As shown in (3), extraction out of embedded clauses in Nupe exhibits an English-like asymmetry, however, some of the details vary. For instance, omitting C⁰ does not salvage a C-t violation in Nupe.

\[ \text{(20)} \quad \text{a. *Zéé u: bè [ ___ du nakàn] na o?} \]
\[ \text{who 3SG seem cook meat na o} \]
\[ \text{‘Who does it seem cooked the meat?’} \]

\[ \text{b. *Bagi [na Musa kpe [ ___ ba nakàn]] na} \]
\[ \text{COMP Musa know cut meat na} \]
\[ \text{‘The man Musa knew that cut the meat’} \]

Nonetheless, a range of options exists in the language for salvaging derivations involving long subject extraction across embedded complementizers. For one, extraction of an embedded subject across the complementizer gànán is possible when gànán surfaces in its reduced form ‘án’.

\[ \text{3 Gànán is historically related to the verb gàn ‘say’, as in many West African languages. The form gànán, then, can be analyzed as a composite morpheme comprised of the verb ‘say’ together with a C⁰ element (e.g. gàn_v + án_c). When reduced, then, only the C⁰ element surfaces. This repair strategy does not improve C-t violations involving complementizers other than gànán in the language because all other complementizers in Nupe are monosyllabic and phonologically irreducible.} \]
REDUCTION OF A MULTISYLLABIC $C^0$ MITIGATES C-T EFFECTS

a. Zéè Musa gànn [‘àn __ ni enyà] o?
who Musa say COMP beat drum o
‘Who did Musa say beat the drum?’

b. Bagi [na Musa kpe [‘àn __ ba nakàn]] na man COMP Musa know COMP cut meat na
‘The man that Musa knew cut the meat’

A second way C-t effects can be mitigated in Nupe is by insertion of TP-adjoined adverbials. Similar to the English Adverb Effect, embedded subject extraction becomes possible when an adverbial expression intervenes between the complementizer and the trace (i.e. when it attaches to TP). This is illustrated below for the adverbial pányi lèè, which Kandybowicz (2006) argues is a TP adjunct.

INSERTION OF TP-ADJOINED ADVERBIALS MITIGATES C-T EFFECTS

a. Zéè Musa gànn [gànnán pányi lèè __ ni enyà] o?
who Musa say COMP before PST beat drum o
‘Who did Musa say that a long time ago beat the drum?’

b. Bagi [na Musa kpe [gànnán pányi lèè __ ba nakàn]] na man COMP Musa know COMP before PST cut meat na
‘The man that Musa knew cut the meat a long time ago’

Subject extraction across $C^0$ can also proceed if the moved element (i.e. the lower copy of the subject) is spelled-out as a resumptive pronoun, provided that it agrees in number with the head of the chain.

LOWER COPY RESUMPTION OF THE SUBJECT MITIGATES C-T EFFECTS

a. Zéè, u: bè [ke u;/*a;/*zèè, du nakàn] na o?
who 3$^{rd}$.SG seem COMP 3$^{rd}$.SG/3$^{rd}$.PL/who cook meat na o
‘Who does it seem cooked the meat?’

b. Bagi-zì, [na Musa kpe [gànnán a;/*u;/*bagi-zì, ba nakàn]] na man-PL COMP Musa know COMP 3$^{rd}$.PL/3$^{rd}$.SG/man-PL cut meat na
‘The men Musa knows that cut the meat’

Lastly, C-t effects in Nupe fail to arise whenever embedded $T^0$ is phonetically realized. In all the Nupe examples thus far, embedded $T^0$ was phonetically null (the exponent of the past tense morpheme in the language). As illustrated below, long extraction of an embedded subject across overt $C^0$ becomes acceptable when $T^0$ is spelled-out (even without lower subject resumption or TP-adverbial adjunction).

SPELLING OUT EMBEDDED CLAUSE $T^0$ MITIGATES C-T EFFECTS

a. Zéè Musa gànn [gànnán __ *Ω/ŋè∥à ni enyà] o?
who Musa say COMP PST/PRS/FUT beat drum o
‘Who did Musa say is beating/will beat the drum?’

b. Bagi [na Musa kpe [gànnán a;/*Ω/ŋè∥à ni enyà]] na man COMP Musa know COMP PST/PRS/FUT beat drum na
‘The man Musa knows that is beating/will beat the drum’

3.2 Analysis

Looking back over the data in the previous subsection, a generalization emerges. Long extraction of embedded subjects is possible whenever the output of the derivation is one in which the “edge” of
the embedded TP projection (i.e. either a daughter of TP or T0) is realized at PF. Mitigating adverbial expressions like pànyì lèé occupy a TP edge (adjoined) position, as do resumptive lower copies in Spec, T and tense markers in T0. Whenever the embedded TP edge is phonetically empty (i.e. whenever the tail of a non-trivial chain is deleted at PF and neither a TP adverbial nor tense marker is pronounced), the output of long subject extraction is illicit. What underlies this generalization? In the discussion that follows, we provide an answer to this question.

The key fact around which everything will turn is a prosodic one. In Nupe, embedded unreduced/non-relative complementizers (e.g. gànàn, ke) mark the right boundaries of Intermediate Phrases. As such, the complement of embedded C0 in the language is itself an independent prosodic domain. That is, fully propositional embedded TPs are obligatorily parsed as separate Intermediate Phrases in Nupe. In contrast, embedded TPs following reduced complementizers (e.g. ’àn) are not parsed as separate intPs in the language. The evidence that full non-relative embedded complementizers mark the juncture of two prosodic domains in Nupe comes from a number of observations. For one thing, a small pause separates C0 from material in the embedded TP. Second, pre-pausal lengthening can be detected. That is, the complementizer is slightly lengthened when it occurs in an embedded position. A third line of evidence concerns the fact that following the phonetic realization of C0, pitch is reset. The fourth and most compelling piece of evidence comes from the fact that otherwise regular phonological processes are blocked when C0 introduces a complement clause. This is illustrated below for regressive assimilation and hiatus resolution.

(25) a. INTRA-PHRASAL REGRESSIVE ASSIMILATION:
   /[gànàn + u]/ → [gùnnùn u:]

   b. ASSIMILATION BLOCKED WHEN C0 INTRODUCES A COMPLEMENT CLAUSE:
      [INTP Zéé Musa gàn gànàn/*gùnnùn] [INTP u: du nakån na o]?
      who Musa say COMP 3rd.SG cook meat na o
      ‘Who did Musa say cooked the meat?’

(26) a. INTRA-PHRASAL HIATUS RESOLUTION VIA GLIDE FORMATION:
   /[ke + u]/ → [kjù:]

   b. GLIDE FORMATION BLOCKED WHEN C0 INTRODUCES A COMPLEMENT CLAUSE:
      [INTP Zéé u: bè ke/*kj] [INTP u: du nakån na o]?
      who 3rd.SG seem COMP 3ed.SG cook meat na o
      ‘Who does it seem cooked the meat?’

Therefore, unreduced/non-relative complementizers and traces will never appear adjacent within the same prosodic phrase in Nupe. Contrary to both (14) and what we observe in English, C-t effects still obtain. The problem with C-t sequences in Nupe must thus lie elsewhere.

Let us build on this observation. According to Nespor and Vogel (1986:190), Intonation Phrases are isomorphic with syntactic phrases that are obligatorily parsed as iPs. Suppose the same were true for obligatory Intermediate Phrases. Then, the left edge of a fully propositional embedded TP (an obligatorily parsed intP in the language) must be aligned with the left edge of intP in Nupe. This is illustrated graphically below.

(27) Syntactic structure: … V [CP C [TP …
Prosodic structure: ………………] [INTP …

Given that iP/intP phrasing must occur at the juncture between two prosodic words (Nespor and Vogel 1986, Schütze 1994), intP will fail to align with TP if the edge of TP is phonetically unrealized because in that case the edge would lack a prosodic word and thus fail to be a potential boundary site. We understand “edge” in the Minimalist sense of the word (Chomsky 2001): given a projection ZP, the edge positions of ZP include ZP’s daughters (adjunct(s) and specifier(s)) and Z0 (the projecting
head). Given this, we can understand C-t effects in Nupe as cases where an intP and embedded T projection fail to align as a consequence of the fact that the TP edge is phonetically unrealized when the subject occurrence is displaced and its copy is deleted at PF. When the TP edge is phonetically unrealized, the first prosodic word encountered in the parse of the embedded TP will be a verbal element residing in v0. In this case, intP will align with the v projection, a syntactic phrase that is not obligatorily parsed as an intP in the language. This is schematized in (28) below.

(28) a. PROSODICALLY WELL-FORMED  (Mitigation by TP modification)
   Syntactic structure: … gân [cp gânàn] [TP pányi lêé] [TP zëë] [T …
   √ Prosodic structure: ……………………………] [INTP …

b. PROSODICALLY WELL-FORMED  (Mitigation by subject resumption)
   Syntactic structure: … gân [cp gânàn] [TP u:] [T …
   √ Prosodic structure: ……………………………] [INTP …

c. PROSODICALLY WELL-FORMED  (Mitigation by spelling-out T0)
   Syntactic structure: … gân [cp gânàn] [TP zëë] [T ê …
   √ Prosodic structure: ……………………………] [INTP …

d. PROSODICALLY ILL-FORMED  (Ø TP modifier, Ø PF subject, Ø T0)
   Syntactic structure: … gân [cp gânàn] [TP zëë] [Ø Ø] [vP zëë] [v ni …
   * Prosodic structure: ……………………………] [INTP …

Stepping back, a broader generalization can be surmised. Namely, the edge of an obligatorily parsed prosodic phrase must be phonetically realized. This observation was first made by An (2006).

(29) INTONATIONAL PHRASE EDGE GENERALIZATION  (IPEG - An 2006)
The edge of an intonational phrase cannot be phonetically empty.

Nupe C-t effects thus reduce to a violation of the IPEG. Because embedded reduced complementizers do not mark the right boundaries of Intermediate Phrases in Nupe (as mentioned at the outset of this section), extraction of embedded subjects across such complementizers will never trigger an IPEG violation. Hence, we derive the amelioration of Comp-trace effects by C0 reduction (cf. (21)). Furthermore, relative clause complementizers in the language (e.g. na) mark the left edge of intP in Nupe, unlike the other complementizers in the language. For this reason, subject extraction across a relative C0 will never incur a violation of the IPEG: regardless of the PF realization of the relative TP following the complementizer, the edge of the relative clause will always be phonetically realized by the relative C0 (whose omission is always illicit). For this reason, relativization of non-embedded subjects (cf. (3e)) does not engender a Comp-trace effect in the language.

4. Closing Remarks

We have seen fairly substantial evidence that C-t effects are sensitive to prosodic well formedness conditions. As such, they fall under the domain of the syntax-phonology interface, rather than the narrow syntactic umbrella. Given that C-t effects in unrelated languages can be blamed on unrelated prosodic factors, as we have seen, we have reason to believe that there is no universal C-t effect, only language-specific differences in prosodic mapping/structure. Consequently, there can be no grand unified analysis of the effect, as has been the dream for over thirty years.
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