GOALS:  (a) Provide a phase-based analysis of cliticization  
(b) Consider its consequences for clitic climbing

1. Background

(1) Clitics as determiners (Torrego 1985, Uriagereka 1988)

\[
\text{DP} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{double } D' \\
\text{pro} \\
\text{clitic}
\]

(2) Citics appear in non-thematic positions

a. Where?
- I / X (Kayne 1991; 1994)
- Cl (Sportiche 1998, Zubizarreta 1999)
- v* (Torrego 1998)

b. Why?
- they move there for checking reasons  
  (Suñer 2000, Rizzi 1993, Torrego 1998)
- they move for interface (PF-oriented) reasons  
  (Raposo & Uriagereka 2005, Uriagereka 2008b)
- they are the spell-out of a Probe-Goal dependency  
  (Roberts 2006)

(3) Previous devices, not obviously recastable in the 
context of Bare Phrase Structure and Phase Theory, 
have been invoked to analyze cliticization.
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- X-bar levels (Chomsky 1970)
- Incorporation (Baker 1988, Hale & Keyser 2002)
- Excorporation (Roberts 1991)
- Head Movement Constraint (Travis 1984)

(4) The hardest issue is perhaps Head Movement (HM), cornered to PF by some authors (Chomsky 2001 and Boeckx & Stjepanović 2001).

Problems posed by HM (Roberts 2006, Vicente 2007)
- BPS cannot capture ‘segments of X’ (Harley 2004)
- weak semantic effects (Chomsky 2001)
- violates the Extension Condition (Chomsky 2001)
- violates anti-locality (Abels 2003)
- violates the A-over-A Condition (Roberts 2006)

(5) Syntactic HM –if accepted at all– is typically regarded as movement to a SPEC position, followed by a morphological operation of m(orphological)-merger (Matushansky 2006).

(6) Alternatives: p-signature copying (Hale & Keyser 2002) and VP-remnant movement (Koopman & Szabolcsi 2000).

2. Cliticization via Agree

(7) Problems with HM emerge if it is viewed as internal Merge. Could HM reduce to Agree?

(8) Roberts (2006) develops an analysis of cliticization that builds precisely on this idea. Roberts (2006) claims that (internal-)Merge and Agree cannot be differentiated under certain circumstances. Cliticization is one of them.

Agree typically involves copying the values of the Goal’s features into the Probe’s. Crucially, this process exhausts the Goal’s content in cliticization (unlike in regular Agree scenarios).

\[\text{a. Agree (v*, DP)}\]
\[\text{step 1: } v^* [u\phi] \rightarrow \text{DP [i\phi] [uCase]}\]
\[\text{step 2: } v^* [i\phi] \rightarrow \text{DP [i\phi] [iCase]}\]
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(9) Potential problems for Roberts’ account:

(i) Cliticization involves distinct feature tokens, not feature occurrences of the same feature token.

(ii) Goals must contain uFF (Case) to be ‘active.’ If they are not ‘active,’ how can they ‘freeze’?

(iii) If clitics are just $\phi P$, how can the connection between clitics and determiners (Bello 1847, Postal 1966). If they are $D$ elements, the fact that are proclitics (putting aside non-finite forms and conservative Romance varieties), follows.

(iv) An additional puzzle comes from oblique clitics, like Catalan hi (there) and en (of-it).

(v) The hypothesis that clitics have a D nature (and hence Case) is reinforced by the fact that clitics affect the aspectual properties of verbs (Uriagereka 2008b), assuming Aspect is related to Case (Pesetsky & Torrego 2004). This does not mean caseless clitics don’t exist (Raposo & Uriagereka’s 1996 se).

(vi) If clitics are Ds, then Probe ($v^*$) and Goal (clitic) are distinct.

(vii) If cliticization is akin to ‘chain reduction,’ the logic of Nunes’ (2004) implies that the higher copy should get rid of uFF (Case).

(viii) Also problematic is Chomsky’s conception of FF deletion as a morpho-syntactic operation, not a purely PF one (i.e. deletion of lower copies).

(10) Alternative scenario:

(i) Clitics involve Agree (as Roberts 2006 argues).

(ii) Clitics may move (= Merge is free). If they don’t, a PF crash obtains (Raposo & Uriagereka 2005).

(iii) Key issue: the clitic (qua head) should project (Chomsky 2008, Donati 2006).

Chomsky’s (2008) labelling algorithm

a. In $\{H, \alpha\}$, H an LI, H is the label
b. If $\alpha$ is internally merged to $\beta$, forming $\{\alpha, \beta\}$, then the label of $\beta$ is the label of $\{\alpha, \beta\}$

We avoid this by sticking to the idea that cliticization is XP movement (Torrego 2002). Things may depend on how complex the structure of cliticP or DP is (Boeckx 2008, Picallo 1991, and Ritter 1993).

3. Cliticization under Phase Theory

(11) We want to relate cliticization to Chomsky’s (2008) $\phi$-feature inheritance.
Let us focus on the v*P case:

a. \[ v^* [ V \ Cl ] \]
b. \[ v^* [ Cl-V \ t_{cl} ] \]

Option (b) must be ruled out, or else the Cl will not be able to escape given the strong PIC (Chomsky 2000). We assume this is due to the fact that V moves to v*.

In the CP case, the possibility that (subject) clitics move because of \( \phi \)-inheritance is welcome: that would involve movement to Uriagereka’s F, or T itself.

(12) Cliticization should therefore affect all phase heads.

P: Clitic movement onto P (Abels 2003 and van Riemsdijk 1978) has been argued for by Esther Torrego in unpublished work (Torrego 1993). Potentially related evidence is reported by Tortora (2002).

C: Agreeing complementizers are good candidates to instantiate cliticization onto C (see Haegeman 1992, Carstens 2003, van Koppen 2006, Zwart 1993). Data from Old Romance dialects, reported by Rivero (1986:784) and Uriagereka (1996:261), also points to C as a clitic host.

游戏操作，我们以传统的方式（运动到相关载体），但视图从一种探测-目标框架。

- 与Roberts (2006)我们取Agree作为至关重要参与的过程。

- 我们声称cliticization与\( \phi \)-feature inheritance (Chomsky 2008)，并且只能目标阶段头部：C，v*，和P。

- 这预测cliticization有关于冻结效果（Chomsky’s Activity Condition）。所以，clitics不能从变形的条件（Hyper-raising）。

- 注意到对象clitics不被冻结在v*P阶段。我们假设他们可以逃脱如果他们作为‘free riders’运动v*（Collins’ 2005 smuggling）。

- 我们的设计似乎被威胁由所谓的clitic climbing (CC)，一个问题我们转到。
4. Clitic Climbing: Defective Phases and the PIC

4.1. Climbing, Defectivity, and the PIC (I)

(13) Like Agree, cliticization cannot cross finite clauses.

   In Phase Theory, the standard way to account for these facts is to invoke some version of the PIC.

(14) Clitics can nonetheless ‘climb’ when the embedding verb is not lexical: functional (modals, auxiliaries) or quasifunctional (perception, motion, causative), to use Cardinaletti & Shlonsky’s (2004) terminology.


(15) Cardinaletti & Shlonsky’s (2004) analysis is appealing in that it does not invoke a dedicated rule to account for clitic distribution. However, it is puzzling that one and the same verb can occupy different positions in the clausal backbone without additional verbal heads being introduced.

(16) With Solà (2002) and Wurmbrand (2001), we take restructuring domains to be defective domains. This is the only option under phase-based guidelines.

4.2. Optional CC

(17) From our perspective, CC in (a) is not different from DP movement in (b), mutatis mutandis.

   a. (Lo) puedo entender(lo).
      CL can-1SG understand-CL
      ‘I can understand it’

   b. (Juan) puede llegar (Juan).
      Juan can-3SG arrive Juan
      ‘Juan can arrive’

   For the DP Juan to move (climb, if you want) or remain in situ, one does not have to argue that poder (Eng. can) is placed in different positions, or that the entire structure is different: full DPs, like clitics, can sometimes appear in different positions.

   Cardinaletti & Shlonsky (2004) argue that clitic placement is very restricted: they can only appear in two specific positions.

   Full DPs can also show a very restricted distribution. Consider the following paradigm, taken from Martin & Uriagereka (2000), which simply shows how restricted placement of the indefinite alguien (Eng. someone) is.

   a. [parece [haber [sido [arrestado alguien]]]]
      seem-3SG have-INF been arrested someone
‘Some seems to have been arrested’

b. *[parece [haber [sido [algüen i [arrestado t i ]]]]]

c. *[parece [haber [algüen i [sido [arrestado t i ]]]]]

d. *[parece [algüen i [haber [sido [arrestado t i ]]]]]

e. [algüen i [parece [haber [sido [arrestado t i ]]]]]

(18) Full DPs can sometimes appear in more than two positions (Ordóñez 2005):

a. (Pedro) llamó (Pedro) a María (Pedro).   (Spanish)
   Pedro called-3SG Pedro to María Pedro
   ‘Pedro called María’

Clitics behave in a similar fashion (Luján 1992):

b. Este libro, lo debo haber querido leer.
   this book, CL must-1SG have wanted read
   . . . debo haberlo querido leer.
   . . . debo haber querido leerlo.

As expected, if structure is expanded, there are more positions for clitics to attach to.

c. Este libro, lo estoy debiendo haber querido leer.
   this book, CL be-1SG must have wanted read
   ‘This book, I must have been wanting to read it’
   . . . estoy debiendo haberlo querido leer.
   . . . estoy debiendo haberlo querido leer.
   . . . estoy debiendo haber querido leerlo.

In sum, clitics attach to different verbal forms in restructuring contexts --except for participles (Kayne 1991, Raposo & Uriagereka 2005). Italian, though, allows for cliticization onto participles (Belletti 2001), an issue we will not go into.

(19) If both cliticization and CC involve internal-Merge, there should be an interpretive effect (Chomsky 2004). With Uriagereka (2008a; 2008b), we assume so.

(20) Further evidence in favor of a movement account comes from Nunes’ (2004:38-50) discussion of the phonetic realization of multiple copies (akin to doubling; Belletti 2005), and Boeckx & Stjepanović’s (2005) analysis of multiple wh-fronting and clitic clusters.

4.3. Climbing, Defectivity, and the PIC (and II)

(21) We follow Solà’s (2002) proposal that restructuring involves selection of a defective CP (or bare/raising TP), which cannot assing nominative Case to the EA.
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a. \[ \text{[} v^* \text{ [ V} \text{ [ C_{def} [ T [ EA v^* [ V IA]]]]]]] \]

(22) A crucial point about the raising structure in (21a) is that it is not enough for CC to be legitimate.

Consider the following derivational stage, with the clitic attached to the low phase head, $v^*$:

a. \[ \text{[} v^* \text{ [ V} \text{ [ C_{def} [ T [ EA Cl v^* [ V t_{Cl} ]]]]]] } \]

For CC to occur, Cl in (a) must be ‘active,’ in Chomsky’s (2000) sense. Therefore, $v^*$ cannot check its Case: otherwise it would not be able to reach the matrix domain (and one cannot say that Cl moves as a free rider here, since $v^*$ remains in situ).

Solà (2002:244–245) argues that $v^*$ in restructuring contexts must not be assimilated to AGR, but to participial agreement (Kayne 1989): since that kind of agreement lacks person, Cl is still active.

In defense of this analysis, Solà (2002) provides the following data, where it is shown that certain clitics cannot climb (and cluster) if the restructuring verb has ‘clitics of their own.’

b. Se n’hi va a viure. (Catalan)
   ‘He is going to live there’

c. ‘Se n’ho va a veure. (Catalan)
   ‘He is going to see it’

d. ‘No se n’atreveixen a venir (d’admiradors). (Cat)
   ‘No admirer dares to come’

Solà (2002) accounts for this by following Rigau (1994), who argued that reflexive clitics absorb accusative and partitive Case.

Guasti (2005:160) makes a similar claim for causatives, taking them to lack AgrP. She capitalizes on the contrast in (e) to support her analysis.

e. Maria (la) fa riparar(e)(*la) a Gianni. (Italian)
   ‘Maria made Gianni repair it’

4.4. Intervention Effects

(23) CC has been reported to be barred in some environments (Cinque 2006 and references therein): (i) negation and (ii) islands. Such facts have been explained in different terms, either by assuming intervention effects (Kayne 1989 and Rizzi 1990), or else ordering restrictiones between modals, raising verbs, and negation (Cinque 2004; 2006).
The fact that CC is not possible out of islands is expected under a movement analysis.

As for negation, we assume it involves a richer structure, where ‘richer’ means articulated enough to license accusative Case. Accordingly, CC is blocked due to freezing.

5. Conclusions

- Under Phase Theory, cliticization must be related to $\phi$-feature inheritance (Chomsky 2008).

- Clitics can thus move to the relevant host (a phase head). Movement is free/optional, but if it fails, there will be a crash at the PF interface.

Although Agree is involved (pace Roberts 2006), cliticization also involves internal-Merge. This approach is supported by: distribution of DPs and clitics (CC), freezing effects (anti-CC), and semantic effects.

- CC involves escaping from a defective domain, where Cl fails to be de-activated.
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