

Clitic Climbing and Null Subject Languages*

Jaume Solà

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Departament de Filologia Catalana
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona). Spain
jaume.sola@uab.es

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to derive Clitic Climbing from restructuring together with the Null Subject property. Data are drawn mainly from Catalan. I propose a biclausal analysis for restructuring constructions in which clitic climbing (like any clitic-Argument dependencies) is analysed as an A-dependency, assuming that clitics are AGR-heads which check features in the Agreement-Case system. Clitic climbing would be then a «long distance» A-dependency, which is made possible by assuming that restructuring is always raising, and that raising in NSLs is a transparent structure for A-dependencies, due to the nature of Nominative Case checking in these languages. To this end, a reformulation of locality conditions for checking (Agree, Chomsky 1998) is needed, which has some independent plausibility.

Key words: verbal agreement, object clitics, Case, subject raising, clitic climbing.

0. Introduction

Clitic climbing is a intricate phenomenon in the syntax of Romance Languages: it is clearly linked to «restructuring» (whose exact nature has always been a matter of debate¹) but it also appears to be linked to the Null Subject status of the language. It is furthermore subject to a number of wellformedness conditions in interaction with other side effects of restructuring (auxiliary assignment, participle agreement, SE-passive). This paper is an attempt at reassessing the overall picture of clitic climbing and restructuring in the light of both empirical and theoretical consider-

*. The present work has been supported by grant BFF2000-0403-C02-01 from the Spanish Government and by grant 2001/SGR/00150 from the Generalitat de Catalunya. I have also benefited from comments at the Grup de Gramàtica Teòrica's seminar. I want to specially thank the invaluable comments by the volume editor Gemma Rigau and two anonymous reviewers, who had to face many obscure and imprecise points throughout the first draft.

1. For different views on restructuring and clitic climbing, see Rizzi (1982), Zubizarreta (1982), Aissen & Perlmutter (1983); Manzini (1983), Hernanz & Rigau (1984), Burzio (1986), Guéron & Hoekstra (1988), Kayne (1989), Martineau (1989), Llinàs Grau (1990-91), Luján (1993), Treviño (1993); Bok-Bennema & Kampers-Mahne (1994), Roberts (1997), Gonçalves (1997a, b), Cinque (2000). For GPHG or HPHG accounts, see Monachesi (1998, 1999).

ations. On the empirical side, most of the data are drawn from Catalan, which is close enough to Spanish and Italian in most respects.

The connection between null subjects and clitic climbing has been challenged. Cinque (2000) adduces 17th century French and Kru languages as cases of clitic climbing without null subjects. The present proposal relies on certain assumptions on the nature of I(nflection) in NSLs, together with a bare IP analysis for the restructured infinitival clause. If indeed clitic climbing is possible in non null-subject languages, the present analysis may still be valid provided these languages feature a more reduced type of infinitival with restructuring. For the moment, let us proceed by assuming that clitic climbing is a property tied to null subject in modern Romance, postponing the discussion of possible counterevidence to section 4.1.

In order to provide an account for Romance clitic climbing, one has to address the following issues:

- 1) Which verbs are restructuring? In section 1 we will adduce some clitic climbing verbs from Catalan that are not standardly considered in restructuring accounts.
- 2) What does restructuring consist in? In section 2 we will argue for the view that restructuring involves a biclausal structure, and more specifically one of raising.
- 3) What does clitic climbing consist in? In section 3 we argue that clitic climbing is 'long' DP-movement out of the embedded clause, which crucially can only take place in a Null subject language.

1. Restructuring verbs

As a first approximation, the class of restructuring verbs in Catalan can be described as consisting of the following classes (which I exemplify with clitic climbing and without):²

a) *Auxiliary verb: va* 'past perfect':

- | | | |
|----------------------------|---|------------------------|
| (1) Ho van trençar. | / | Van trençar-ho. |
| it-PAST-3pl to-break | | PAST-3pl to-break-it |
| 'They broke it.' | | |

b) *Epistemic modals: poder* 'may', *haver de* 'must', *deure* 'must':

- | | | |
|--------------------------|---|---------------------|
| (2) Ho deuen tenir. | / | Deuen tenir-ho. |
| it-must-3pl to-have | | must-3pl to-have-it |
| 'They probably have it.' | | |

2. In this paper I put aside Romance causative verbs (Catalan *fer* 'make' and *deixar* 'let'), which involve a different construction, in which clitic climbing is not sensitive to la Null Subject status of the language (thus French does not allow clitic climbing with restructuring, but it does with causative constructions).

- c) *Root modals: haver de* 'have to', *poder* 'can', *voler* 'want to', *gosar* 'dare to', *tractar de* 'try to' *mirar de* 'try to', *provar de* 'try to', *intentar* 'try to', *saber* 'know how', *aconseguir* 'manage to', *arribar a* 'manage to'.
- (3) El vull veure. / Vull veure'l.
 him-want-sg to-see want-sg to-see-him
 'I want to see him.'
- d) *Aspectuals: soler* 'usually', *començar a* 'start V-ing', *continuar* +GER 'keep V-ing', *anar* +GER 'go on V-ing', *deixar de* 'stop V-ing', *tornar a* 'be back V-ing'; *estar* +GER 'be V-ing', *acabar de* 'have just V-ed' *acabar de* 'finish V-ing'; *anar a* 'be about to':
- (4) El torno a llegir. / Torno a llegir-lo.
 it-return-1sg to to-read return-1sg to to-read-it
 'I am reading it again.'
- e) Some *verbs of motion: anar* 'go'; *venir* 'come':
- (5) L'aniré a visitar. / Aniré a visitar-lo.
 him-go-FUT-1sg to to-visit go-FUT-1sg to to-visit-him
 'I will go and visit him.'

The claim has been made that some or all of these verbs are functional verbs that do not have a full clausal complement: they are rather functional morphemes belonging somewhere in the functional hierarchy of the clause. Picallo (1990) makes this proposal for epistemic modals, and assigns root modals a non full-verb status. Cinque (1999a, 1999b, 2000) proposes that modal and aspectual verbs are functional morphemes corresponding to a variety of functional categories which are arranged in a universal hierarchy present in each clause.

Within Cinque's a proposal, restructuring (hence clitic climbing) with modal and aspectual verbs can be derived almost trivially: these verbs involve no biclausal structure and therefore clitic climbing turns out to be a clause-bound operation (just like clitic placement in any simple clause). Cinque (2000) in fact makes the stronger claim that the class of restructuring verbs is coextensive with the class of functional verbs. Restructuring is therefore 'obligatory' (a functional verb can not be lexical).³ If independently motivated, this account appears to provide the simplest solution to restructuring.

Not all restructuring verbs, though, are equally likely to be «only functional». Auxiliaries are uncontroversially functional. Epistemic modals are good candidates to be functional verbs: they do not impose selectional restrictions on their

3. Of course, there might be a limited number of cases of lexical ambiguity between functional and lexical status, but not a systematic alternation.

subject; they must precede auxiliaries (see Picallo 1990) and they seem to be paraphrasable with some modal adverb. Next, aspectual verbs do not impose selections on their subject either; and at least some of them have an adverbial paraphrase too:

- (6) a. Torna a ploure. - Plou una altra vegada.
 returns to to-rain rains an other time
 'It's raining again.'
- b. Acaba d' arribar. - Ha arribat ara mateix.
 finishes of to-arrive has arrived now self
 'S/he's just arrived.'

Root modals do not satisfy the transparency criterion for subjects. It is not clear that they assign a standard theta role to their subject, but at least they seem to attribute to it some relational property (capability, obligation or volition). They do not lend themselves to adverbial paraphrase.

Finally, we have verbs of motion such as the ones in (7) from Catalan, whose meaning does not easily lend itself to an aspectual or modal interpretation.

- (7) a. Ho ha anat a arreglar.
 it-has gone to to-fix
 'S/he has gone to fix it.'
- b. T'he vingut a veure.
 you-have-1sg come to to-see
 'I have come to see you.'

It is true that motion verbs meaning 'go' or 'come' often become grammaticalized as modal or aspectual verbs (with some aspectual or modal interpretation, typically 'future'). But the more basic meaning of these verbs (which allows restructuring) is clearly one of motion to a (not mentioned) space location in order to do something.

Verbs meaning 'go' with a more specific path interpretation ('go up', 'go down', etc.) are also restructuring:⁴

- (8) a. L'he pujat a veure.
 him-have-1sg gone-up to to-see
 'I have gone up to see him.'

4. In Catalan, *venir* 'come' is restructuring not only in its allative construal, but also, more marginally, in its ablative construal:

(i) [?]Ara m'hi vinc d'inscriure.
 now me-tere-come-1sg from-to-register
 'I'm just back from getting registered for it.'

- b. *L'he* baixat a buscar.
 him-have-1sg gone-down to to-fetch
 'I have gone down to fetch him.'
- c. *Hi* entraré a parlar.
 there-go-in-1sg to to-talk
 'I'll go in to talk to him.'
- d. *El* va sortir a veure.
 him-PAST-3sg go-out to to-see
 'S/he went out to see him.'
- e. *El* passaré a saludar.
 him go-by-1sg to to-greet
 'I'll go by to greet him.'

Beyond verbs of motion, there are some other apparently lexical verbs that allow clitic climbing. One of them is *aprendre* 'learn'.

- (9) *Ho* he après a fer.
 it-have-1sg earned to to-do
 'I have learned to do it.'

Most strikingly, Catalan allows for clitic climbing with a number of inherently reflexive verbs. These verbs are compatible only with a restricted (basically locative) set of climbing clitics (in the following examples, climbed clitics are in italics, while inherent clitics are in normal case):

- (10) a. *Se n'hi* va a viure. / **Se n'ho* va a veure.
 SE-EN-*there*-go-3sg to to-live SE-EN-*it*-go-3sg to to-see
 'S/he's going there to live there.' 'S/he's going there to see it.'
- b. No *s'hi* atreveix a anar. / *No *se n'*atreveix a parlar.
 not SE-*there*-dares to to-go not SE-*of-it*-dares to to-speak
 'S/he doesn't dare to go there.' 'S/he doesn't dare to do talk about it.'
- c. *S'hi* ha proposat anar. / **Se l'ha* proposat llegir.
 SE-*there*-has determined to-go SE-*it*-has determined to-read
 'S/he has determined to go there.' 'S/he has determined to read it.'
- d. ⁽³⁾*S'hi* disposava a anar. / **Se'n* disposen a venir
 SE-*there*-get-ready-PAST-3sg to to-go SE-EN-get-ready to to-come
 molts.
 many.
 'S/he was getting ready to go there.' 'Many are getting ready to come.'
- e. ⁽³⁾*S'hi* ha descuidat d'anar. / ^{??}*Se l'ha* descuidat de comprar.
 SE-*there*-has forgotten of-to-go SE-*it*-has forgotten of to-buy
 'S/he forgot to go there.' 'S/he forgot to buy it.'

Clitic climbing is also possible with some psych-verbs, which show similar restrictions:

- (11) a. ^(?)M'hi agradaria anar. / *Me l'agradaria llegir.
 me-there-would-like to-go me-it-would-like to-read
 'I'd like to go there.' 'I'd like to read it.'
- b. [?]M'hi interessaria ser present. / *Me l'interessaria llegir.
 me-there-would-interest to-be present me-it-would-interest to-read
 'I'd be interested in going there.' 'I'd be interested in reading it.'

Even if a modal-aspectual flavor could be argued for in most cases, it should be assessed whether functional verbs are to be expanded to such a generous extent, including apparently lexical meanings like 'learn', and allowing for the possibility of inherent clitics. In the following section we will provide tests to decide between alternative structural options for the analysis of restructuring. Probably the optimal solution is a unitary account for all restructuring cases, extending from the most functional-like cases to the most lexical-like ones.⁵

2. Restructuring

Ideally, an account of restructuring should satisfy the following desiderata:

- (12) a. Restructured constructions should minimally differ from their non-restructured counterparts, to the extent that (at least some) restructuring constructions have a systematic relation to a non-restructured counterpart.
5. A further issue to consider is whether (apparent) object or dative control verbs can be restructuring. One candidate is *ensenyar* 'teach' (and its counterpart in other Romance languages), a dative control verb:

- (i) M'hi ha ensenyat a anar sol. / M'ho ha ensenyat a fer.
 me-there-has taught to to-go alone me-it-has taught to to-do
 'S/he taught me how to go by myself.' 'S/he taught me how to do it.'

Cinque (2000) argues that this is a case of hidden causative. Indeed, there are several verbs that display causative behaviour when clitic climbing occurs. Verbs like *forçar/obligar* 'force' or *ajudar* 'help', which basically are object control verbs, show the typical object/dative alternation of causative verbs (depending on the transitivity of the infinitive) with clitic climbing:

- (ii) a. [?]L'en han obligat a sortir. / [?]Li ho han obligat a pagar.
 ACC-EN-have-3pl forced to come-out DAT-it-have-3pl forced to pay
 'They forced him to come out of there.' 'They forced him to pay it.'
- b. [?]L'en han ajudat a sortir. / [?]Li ho han ajudat a pagar.
 ACC-EN-have-3pl helped to come-out DAT-it-have-3pl helped to pay
 'They helped him to come out of there.' 'They helped him to pay it.'

The verb *ensenyar*, instead, always displays dative in clitic climbing, as shown in (iii):

- (iii) Li n'ha ensenyat a parlar bé. / Li ho ha ensenyat a fer.
 DAT-EN-has taught to speak well DAT-it-has taught to do
 'S/he taught him to praise it.' 'S/he taught him to do it.'

- b. Restructuring should make transparency effects possible (perhaps not obligatory).

Consider first (13). It has been traditionally assumed that while (13.a) is an instance of restructuring (and clitic climbing), (13.b,c,d,e) (where clitic climbing is impossible due to several opacity factors) are not:

- (13) a. El vull veure. (Vull veure'l.)
 him-wantg-1sg to-see want-1sg to-see-him
 'I want to see him.'

INFINITIVAL NEGATION:

- b. *El vull no veure més. / Vull no veure'l més.
 him-want-1sg not to-see more want-1sg not to-see-him more
 'I want not to see him anymore.'

FOCUS FRONTING OF THE INFINITIVE:

- c. *VEURE, el vull! / VEURE'L, vull!
 see him-want-1sg see-him want-1sg
 'It's seeing him that I want.'

DISLOCATION OF THE INFINITIVE:

- d. *Veure, ara no el vull. / Veure'l, ara no vull.
 see now not him-want-1sg see-him now not want-1sg
 'As for seeing him, I don't want right now.'

CLEFTING OF THE INFINITIVE:

- e. *És veure, que el volia. / És veure'l, que volia.
 is to-see that him-wanted-1sg is to-see-him that wanted-1sg
 'It's to see him that I wanted.'

It is plausible that all instances of *voler* 'want' in (13) are to be ascribed to the same lexical entry. Therefore, differences between the restructured and the non-restructured options should be minimal.

Cinque (2000) makes the most radical claim in this connection: there is only one structure with restructuring verbs, the «restructured» one, which in fact simply involves a monoclausal structure with the «restructuring» verb in its functional position. A verb like *voler* (and, *mutatis mutandis*, any other restructuring verb) is inserted as the head of some Modal (or Aspectual) phrase, whose complement is the next functional category in sentence structure.

In Cinque's view, the fact that clitic climbing (and other transparency effects) are blocked in cases (13.b,c,d,e) is not due to absence of restructuring, but to some locality problem which occurs even with restructuring. Specifically, focus fronting, dislocation and clefting would involve Null Complement Anaphora (and not a trace) as the resumptive element, which would break the chain con-

Obviously, the facts in (14) are incompatible with control, as can be seen from the behavior of control non-restructuring verbs:⁶

- (16) *Lamenten (no) anar-n'hi alguns.
 regret-3pl (not) to-go-en-there some
 'There are some that regret not to go.'

The facts in (14) are compatible with both the Only Functional Hypothesis and a version of the Partial Structure Hypothesis that postulates IP structure (hence raising) for the restructured infinitive.

There is another test that shows essentially the same result. In restructuring constructions (unlike in non-restructuring ones), subject inversion (both free and indefinite) can be shown to place the inverted subject inside the infinitive:

- (17) a. Volen venir els cosins a dinar.
 want-3pl to-come the cousins to to-lunch
 'Our cousins want to come and have lunch.'
- b. *Es proposen venir els cosins a dinar.
 SE-determine-3pl to-come the cousins to to-lunch
 'Our cousins are determined to come and have lunch.'
- c. Venen els cosins a dinar.
 come-3pl the cousins to to-lunch
 'Our cousins are coming to have lunch.'
- (18) a. Han provat d'entrar lladres a la casa.
 have-3pl tried of-to-enter thieves to the house
 'Thieves have tried to get into the house.'
- b. *S'han decidit a entrar lladres a la casa.
 SE-have-3pl decided to to-enter thieves to the house
 'Some thieves have made their mind to get into the house.'
- c. Han entrat lladres a la casa.
 have-3pl entered thieves to the house
 'Thieves got into the house.'
- (19) a. No ho ha gosat tocar ningú amb les mans.
 not it-has dared to-touch nobody with the hands
 'Nobody dared to touch it with their hands.'

6. These facts (and the subject inversion facts below) constitute strong counterevidence against any proposal that postulates control in restructured infinitives: Kayne (1989b), Bok-Benema & Kampers-Mahne (1994), Roberts (1997).

- b. *No s'ha desdit de tocar-ho ningú amb les mans.
not SE-has declined of to-touch-it nobody with the hands
'Nobody declined touching it with their hands.'
- c. No ho ha tocat ningú amb les mans.
not it-has touched nobody with the hands
'Nobody touched it with their hands.'
- (20) a. L'ha anat a escriure en Joan amb l'ordinador.
it-has gone to to-write the John with the-computer
'John has gone to write it with the computer.'
- b. *S'ha ofert per escriure-la en Joan amb l'ordinador.
SE-has offered for to-write-it the John with the-computer
'John offered himself to write it with the computer.'
- c. L'ha escrit en Joan amb l'ordinador.
it-has written the John with the-computer
'John wrote it with the computer.'

The a-examples show that the restructuring verbs (which could be otherwise argued to be control verbs) allow the inverted subject to appear inside the infinitive. The b-examples feature non-restructuring control infinitives, where an inverted subject cannot appear inside the infinitive, as expected (Cf. **There hoped to be a man in the room*). The c-examples are just to check that the kind of subject inversion exemplified in the a-examples is independently attested in simple sentences, with the same word order and the same topic-comment interpretation.⁷

Again, the opacity inducing factors block subject inversion in-the-infinitive:

- (21) a. Voldrien venir els nens a dinar.
would-want-3pl to-come the children to to-lunch
'Our children would like to come and have lunch.'
- b. Voldrien no haver de venir (*els nens) a dinar.
would-want-3pl not to-have of to-come the children to to-lunch
(negation)
'Our children would like not to have to come and have lunch.'

7. To guarantee the empirical relevance of these examples, the constituent after the inverted subject must be pronounced as non right dislocated, i.e., forming an intonational unit with the rest of the sentence. It is under such conditions that the contrast between examples (20a/c) and (20b) holds.

As for topic-focus interpretation, the generalization seems to be that whenever the inverted subject is not in final (non dislocated) position, the whole VP is interpreted as focus. Thus, both (20a) and (20c) could be a reply to 'What about the letter we had to send?'

- c. VENIR (*ELS NENS) A DINAR, voldrien! (focus fronting)
 to-come the children to to-lunch would-want-3pl
 'What our children would like is to come and have lunch.'
- (22) a. Han provat d'entrar lladres a la casa.
 have-3pl tried of-to-enter thieves to the house
 'Thieves have tried to get into the house.'
- a. Ha provat de no caure (*lladres) a la trampa. (negation)
 have-3pl tried of not to-fall thieves to the trap
 'Thieves have tried not to fall into the trap.'
- b. D'ENTRAR (*LLADRES) A LA CASA, han provat!
 (focus fronting)
 of-to-enter thieves to the house have-3pl tried
 'It is to get into the house that thieves have tried.'

Again, these facts are only compatible with either the Only-Functional Hypothesis or the Partial-Structure (raising) Hypothesis. Let us try to decide between the two. One argument against the Only-Functional Hypothesis would consist in showing that restructuring is optional: the same lexical entry can behave as a restructuring and as a non restructuring verb. Such an argument could be invalidated if what we actually show is that transparency effects triggered by restructuring are optional, since it can be argued, as Cinque (2000) does, that transparency effects may be optional side-effects and still restructuring remains obligatory.

Now, the facts about subjects (*en*-cliticization and inversion) cannot be taken to be optional side-effects of restructuring. They should be core properties of the sentence structure of restructuring. Therefore in cases where the inverted subject cannot appear within the infinitive, we cannot claim that there is restructuring. The argument is specially valid in cases the infinitive is not displaced (dislocated, fronted or clefted): in these cases, there should be no problem for the licensing of inverted subjects in a monoclausal structure. In the following examples, subject inversion in the infinitive with restructuring verbs is blocked by negation, *only* focusing and adverbial intervention:

NEGATION

- (23) a. No ho gosa dir ningú al director.
 not it-dares to-say nobody to-the director
 'Nobody dares to tell the director.'
- b. No gosa no dir-ho (*ningú) al director.
 not dares not to-say-it nobody to-the director
 'Nobody dares not to tell the director.'
- (24) a. Hi ha aconseguit parlar en Joan per telèfon.
 with-him-has managed to-talk the John by phone
 'John managed to talk to him by phone.'

- b. Ha aconseguit no enfrontar-s'hi (*en Joan) verbalment.
has managed not to-quarrel-SE-with-him the John verbally
'John managed not to get quarrel with him verbally.'

ONLY-FOCUSING

- (25) a. Demà anirà a comprar en Joan al supermercat.
Tomorrow will-go-3sg to to-buy the John to-the supermarket
'Tomorrow John will go shopping to the supermarket.'
- b. Demà anirà només a comprar (*en Joan) al supermercat.
Tomorrow will-go-3sg only to to-buy the John to-the supermarket
'Tomorrow John will only go shopping to the supermarket.'
- (26) a. Han après a engegar-lo els nens amb la maneta.
have-3pl learned to to-turn-on-it the children with the handle
'The children have learned to turn it on with the handle.'
- b. Han après només a engegar-lo (*els nens) amb la maneta.
have-3pl learned only to to-turn-on-it the children with the handle
'The children have learned only to turn it on with the handle.'

ADVERBIAL INTERVENTION

- (27) a. L'han sortit a saludar els nens amb la mà.
him-have-3pl gone-out to to-greet the children with the hand
'The children have gone out to greet him with their hands.'
- b. Han sortit ara mateix a saludar-lo (*els nens) amb la
have-3pl gone-out now self to to-greet-him the children with the
mà.
hand
'The children have gone out right now to greet him with their hands.'
- (28) a. Les papallones, les han après a caçar els nens amb
the butterflies them have-3pl learned to to-catch the children with
una xarxa.
a net
'The children have learned to catch butterflies with a net.'
- b. Han après de seguida a caçar-les (*els nens) amb una
have-3pl learned right away to to-catch-them the children with a
xarxa.
net
'The children have learned right away to catch them with a net.'

The conclusion seems to be that negation and other opacity factors do block restructuring and that, when restructuring is blocked, a control structure is avail-

able.⁸ If the restructuring and the control counterparts are close enough in meaning and structure, desideratum (12.a) becomes relevant: restructuring should minimally differ from non-restructuring.

In this connection, the Partial Structure Hypothesis is better fitted than the Only Functional Hypothesis: it is unlikely that functional verbs systematically alternate with lexical verbs with a full clause complement. Restructuring verbs are, therefore, lexical verbs with a restructuring option.⁹

Suppose restructuring consists in eliminating CP layer. In other words, restructuring verbs select a proposition, which can optionally be a CP (control) or an IP (raising), with the condition that the controller-PRO link in the control option becomes a raising chain in the raising option. In other words, the controller theta role of the non-restructuring counterpart should somehow be made invisible to Argument projection in order to allow raising: either by becoming an adjunct theta role, or by being demoted into an implicit argument.¹⁰

This is not an appealing conclusion: there is no known general mechanism for turning control structures into raising ones. The alternation between control and raising would require ad hoc devices far beyond merely eliminating CP. But there seems to be no way out of the problem: control and raising seem to alternate in minimally differing structures.¹¹

8. An apparent counterexample to this blocking effect would be provided by some epistemic verbs, such as raising *semblar* 'to seem' and some epistemic modals (*poder* 'may' and *haver de* 'must'), which allow subject inversion in the presence of negation:

- (i) a. *Sembla no haver vingut ningú a la reunió.*
seems not to-have come nobody to the meeting
- b. *Podria no venir ningú a dinar.*
might not to-come nobody to to-have-lunch
- c. *Hauria de no venir ningú a la reunió.*
Ought of not to-come nobody to the meeting

But the facts are not straightforward. The examples are degraded with plural subjects:

- (ii) a. ??*Semblen no haver vingut nens / els nens a dinar*
seem not to-have come children the children to to-have-lunch
- b. ??*Podrien no venir nens / els nens a dinar*
Might not to-come children the children to to-have-lunch
- c. **Haurien de no entrar tants nens / els nens a la biblioteca*
ought of not to-go-in so-may children the children in the library

I have no account for this contrast.

- 9. This is also the conclusion in Amadas Simon (1999) for aspectual verbs: their general argument structure is that of a lexical verb, restructuring being a «further» option, not the only one.
- 10. Besides the standard case of external argument absorption in passives, there is another candidate to argument absorption: reflexive constructions in Romance, where a reflexivized (di)transitive verb acquires some unaccusative properties. See Alsina (1996:3,4) for a revision of the facts and account within Lexical-Functional grammar.
- 11. Schroten (1986) claims that raising verbs can be classified as being unaccusative or unergative, this meaning that they involve raising to their internal or external NP position (i. e., to Argument position). This heterodox view could shed some light into the control/raising alternation, since control verbs can also be unaccusative or unergative.

A further piece of evidence for the biclausal status of restructuring clauses is the fact that they display two positions for either clitics and Past Participle agreement:

- (29) a. Al pati, *hi* volen anar els nens a jugar.
to-the courtyard there-want-3pl to-go the children to to-play
- b. Al pati, volen anar-*hi* els nens a jugar.
to-the courtyard want-3pl to-go-there the children to to-play
'The children want to go to the courtyard to play.'
- (30) a. Les ha volgudes veure.
them-has wanted-3pl-fem to-see
'S/he's wanted to see them.'
- b. Les pot haver vistes.
them-can-3sg to-have seen-3pl-fem
'S/he may have seen them.'

(29) shows that clitic climbing is optional within restructuring (the inverted subject guarantees we are dealing with a restructuring -raising- construction). (30) shows that agreeing participles can appear both with the restructuring and the infinitival verb. We will make sense of these facts in the next section.

Finally, the prepositions that appear between the restructuring verb and the infinitival verb are also easier to deal with in a biclausal structure: they seem to indicate that the restructuring verb is not just a functional head selecting the next functional head down in the hierarchy, as expected within the Only-Functional Hypothesis. Rather, the restructuring verb seems to be lexically subcategorized for idiosyncratic prepositions heading its complement.¹²

There is a more theoretical point that can be made: clitic climbing (as well as other transparency effects) should be derivable from restructuring plus some other crucial factor. Restructuring should in principle be available in all languages, and specifically in all Romance languages. It has been argued (Kayne 1989b, Bok-Bennema & Kampers-Mahne 1994, Roberts, 1997) that restructuring takes place in French, even if transparency effects are quite limited. This means that restructuring is a necessary but not sufficient condition for clitic climbing. It has been argued that the other necessary condition is pro-drop. Now, if pro-drop is to play any role in restructuring, it is likely that restructuring involves IP, since pro-drop has to do with properties of the IP head(s). This favors the hypothesis that IP intervenes between the restructuring verb and the infinitive. Cinque's hypothesis that restructuring verbs are functional have little room for making INFL play a role in restructuring, at least in terms of locality conditions.

In next section, we will introduce a possible account on how pro-drop makes restructured domains transparent.

12. Since we will assume that infinitival complements in restructuring constructions are bare IPs (TPs), we cannot take the preposition too be the head of CP. The form of the preposition (or its absence) is lexically determined by the verb. We will simply assume the preposition is transparent for V-selection of the infinitive.

3. Clitic climbing

Both clitic placement and clitic climbing have been analyzed in two alternative ways: as head movement that brings clitics from their base position successively into their final position (Kayne 1975, 1989b, 1991, 1992, Rizzi 1986, Torrego 1994, Uriagereka 1995) or as base generated morphemes that are somehow associated to an argument position. (Strozer 1976, Rivas 1977, Aoun 1979, Jaeggli 1982, 1986, Borer 1984, Suñer 1988, Sportiche 1992, Franco 1993, 2000). A particularly interesting view within the latter option is that the clitic-argument relation is established by A-movement (L-related movement in minimalist terms): the clitic associate (a DP in theta-position) undergoes (covert) movement to the specifier of the functional category headed by the clitic.

In fact, Kayne's version of the head-movement hypothesis also involves A-movement: according to Kayne (1989a, 1993), Past Participle agreement with the clitic is obtained by having the object DP pass through the participial Spec before its clitic head undergoes head movement. So A-movement seems to be involved in both the head-movement and the base-generation hypothesis.

Taking Kayne's criterion on Past Participle agreement to be correct, we can draw an important conclusion on clitic climbing: clitic climbing is A-movement. Consider (31):

- (31) a. Les pot haver vistes.
 them-f-pl he-can have seen-f-pl
 'S/he may have seen them.'
- b. Les ha pogudes veure.
 them-f-pl has can-Ptc-f-pl see
 'S/he has been able to see them.'
- c. Les ha pogudes anar a veure.
 them-f-pl has can-Ptc-f-pl go to see
 'S/he's been able to go and see them.'

Any participle in the way between a climbing clitic and its base position can (must) agree with the clitic, indicating that the moving element in clitic climbing never leaves the infinitive as a head.

Let us suppose that the clitic-argument relation is an A dependency. More specifically, let us assume that clitics are the morphological manifestation of AGR-heads, that check the features of their associates.¹³ Specifically, object clitics spell the

13. I cannot properly address the issue why doubling is not the general option for clitic AGR, as would seem to be for AGR_S (i.e., AGR_S can generally be «doubled» by its associate -subject- NP). I just point out that clitic AGR, like AGR_S, abides by Greenberg's Universal 33: 'When number agreement between the noun and the verb is suspended and the rule is based on order, the case is always one in which the verb precedes and the verb is in the singular' (if we just replace 'verb' by 'AGR morphology' and 'singular' by 'unmarked/zero form'). Non doubling means absence of morphological agreement, whether this amounts to '3 person singular' morphology or to a 'zero' form.

AGR_O head, while other clitics (dative and oblique) stand for other AGR-heads. We will assume that checking for clitic AGRs is generally pure agree, without move:

(32) [_{AGRP} [_{AGR°} cl] ... DP ...]

Let us call them clitic AGR-heads.¹⁴ Within such a view, consider clitic climbing. If we want to analyze clitic climbing as a direct AGR-argument dependency, two problems arise:

- a) Why should the clitic AGR be generated in (or moved to) the upper clause (instead of in the infinitive), considering that it is associated with the infinitival argument positions?
- b) Are «climbed» clitic AGRs local enough to their associated arguments?

We address these questions in turn.

3.1. Clitic climbing as attraction

Clitic climbing should satisfy a requirement which has been largely accepted within the Minimalist Program, namely that movement should be driven by (functional) features that need to be checked against matching features in a lower constituent.

In this connection, it is to be remarked that the «landing site» for clitic climbing is always exactly the clitic position corresponding to the restructuring verb: either a proclitic of the finite restructuring verb or an enclitic of the infinitival or imperative restructuring verb. This is highly suggestive of movement to a specific target. Let us examine some facts that convincingly show that clitic climbing is sensitive to the «attracting» clitic position.

If clitic climbing was head movement with no attracting or preexisting target, the expectation is that any clitic or clitic cluster originating in the restructured infinitive should be able to climb to the main clause (just as, say, any phrase is able to scramble in the right configuration). This is indeed the case with many restructuring verbs.

However, we have seen that in Catalan there is a significant number of restructuring verbs which have «clitics of their own», namely inherent clitics (*anar-se'n* 'go-SE-EN' 'leave', *disposar-se* 'get ready to', *atrevir-se* 'dare' *descuidar-se* 'forget'). In these cases, clitic climbing is possible, but in a limited way: only certain clitics can climb (in the following examples, I indicate climbed clitics in italics):

Further, the patterns of variation for clitic doubling (either with any NP or only with pronouns) parallel those of AGR_S-doubling: while Italian has AGR_S doubling with any NP, some well-known Northern Italian dialects have AGR_S-doubling only with pronouns.

14. An assumption also compatible with our account would be that clitics are voices in Sportiche's (1992) sense (Roberts 1997 adopts this option). Then clitic associates undergo A-movement to their Spec,AGR (this being either clause-bound or climbing movement), subsequently moving to their Voice Phrase in a clause-bound fashion. The essential point is that clitic climbing is A-movement out of the infinitive. In other words, clitic climbing is cyclic, whereas clitic placement is not (Luján 1993:259).

- (33) a. Se *n'hi* va a viure. / *Se *n'ho* va a veure.
 SE-EN-*there*-go-3sg to to-live SE-EN-*it*-go-3sg to to-see
 'S/he's going there to live there.' 'S/he's going there to see it.'
- b. S'*hi* disposava a anar. / *S'*ho* disposava
 SE-*there*-get-ready-PAST-3sg to to-go SE-*it*-get-ready- PAST-3sg
 a fer.
 to to-do
 'S/he was getting ready to go there.' 'S/he was getting ready
 to do it.'
- c. No s'*hi* atreueix a anar. / *No s'*ho* atreueix a fer.
 not SE-*there*-dares to to-go not SE-*it*-dares to to-do
 'S/he doesn't dare to go there.' 'S/he doesn't dare to do it.'
- d. S'*hi* ha descuidat d'anar. / **Se s'*ha* descuidat d'afaitar.
 SE-*there*-has forgotten of-to-go SE-*SE*-has forgotten of to-shave
 'S/he forgot to go there.' 'S/he forgot to shave himself.'

Morphological incompatibilities are expected to arise in such cases, stemming from the clitic cluster pattern of possible forms. This would be the case with the ungrammatical sentence in (33d), where the climbed reflexive clitic is incompatible with the inherent reflexive clitic of the restructuring verb (*descuidar-se*): Catalan clitic clusters do not allow two reflexive clitics. But the incompatibilities observable in such cases are far from obvious within a merely morphological account. One consistent type of incompatibility is that between the inherent reflexive clitic from the restructuring verb and the climbed accusative clitic. This incompatibility is not morphological in any obvious sense, since reflexives are generally compatible with 3rd person Accusative clitics.

Suppose we try to relate these incompatibilities to Case Theory. In (33a,b,c) we can see that Accusative clitic climbing is not compatible with the inherent reflexive of a restructuring verb. This can be taken to derive from the fact that (a subset of) inherent reflexives absorb Accusative Case. Take the case of *disposar-se* 'get ready'. This verb coexists with a transitive counterpart (*disposar* 'to arrange'), which suggests that its inherent reflexive somehow has absorbed Accusative. In the other cases (*anar-se'n* 'go', *atrevir-se* 'dare'), there is transitive alternation, but we can still assume that the clitic is an indication of lack of Accusative.

This Case account does not cover all the incompatibilities that arise with these verbs: in fact, only the clitic *hi* 'there' can generally climb with reflexive restructuring verbs.¹⁵ Let us tentatively assume, nevertheless, that clitic climbing is restricted by the Case (and possibly other) properties of the upper clause clitic configuration.

15. Consider:

- (i) No s'*hi* atreueix a anar.
 not SE-*there*-dares to to-go
 'S/he does not dare to go.'

We then propose that clitic climbing involves Case checking at the upper clause: it would not consist in mere displacement of constituents that have already been checked for case in the lower clause. Rather, we assume that in clitic climbing constructions, there is no object Case checking in the lower clause.

Let us reconsider our suggestion that clitics are AGR-heads (clitic AGR-heads). In the cases above, a clitic AGR position in the main restructuring clause contains clitics associated to both main and infinitival arguments or Cases. This suggests that clitic AGRs are not necessarily tied to every clause structure, but rather are projected when possible and necessary. Now the question is: what makes clitic AGR-projections not necessary in the infinitive and possible in main clause.

3.2. *Null subjects and clitic climbing*

The connection between clitic climbing and NSLs has been claimed for Romance languages. Kayne (1989) proposes that what crucially characterizes Null-Subject languages is I(nflection)'s ability to I-mark VP. An I-marked VP loses barrierhood and the clitic can escape the VP as a necessary first step for clitic climbing.

This proposal captures the Null-Subject status of clitic climbing in a simple way, but we cannot adopt it as it stands because we have discarded a head-movement account of the clitic «displacement».

Assuming that restructuring occurs in non-NSLs such as French (perhaps in all languages), and assuming further that raising is also present in restructuring in the other languages, we must conclude that raising *per se* can not amount to

-
- (ii) No *s'hi* atreveix a parlar.
not SE-there-dares to talk
'S/he does not dare to talk to him.'
 - (iii) *No *s'ho* atreveix a fer.
not SE-there-dares to to-do
'S/he does not dare to do it.'
 - (iv) *No *se n'*atreveix a sortir.
not SE-EN-dares to to-go-out
'S/he does not dare to get out.'
 - (v) *No *se li* atreveix a dir res.
not SE-DAT-dares to to-say nothing
'S/he does not dare to tell her/him anything.'

Rigau (1994) argues that inherent reflexives generally absorb Partitive Case. Indeed, Partitive Case is not possible with reflexive restructuring verbs, whether in unaccusative or in transitive constructions:

- (vi) *No *se n'*atreveixen a venir (d'admiradors).
not SE-EN-dare to to-come (of fans)
'No fan dares come'
- (vii) *No *se n'*atreveix a comprar (de condons).
not SE-EN-dares to buy (of condoms)
'S/he does not dare to buy condoms.'

clitic climbing. Optimally, the simple interaction between the Null Subject «prop-erty» and raising should give Clitic Climbing as a result. Let us try.

There has been, during decades, a minority line of research that has contended that the Null Subject property of the Romance kind is to be defined by a single core property which simultaneously derives null subjects and free subject inversion (see Rosselló, 1986, Solà 1992, Picallo 1998, and Rosselló 2000, that makes a critical review of other recent proposals). According to this view, free subject inversion is a misnomer for the parametric option of licensing Nominative Case in its basic (theta) position, without resorting to NP movement to (or expletive insertion in) Spec,IP. In a recent proposal, Rosselló (2000) convincingly argues that I (T) checks its associate DP inside the ν P or VP directly (by *mere agree*, in Chomsky's 1998 terms),¹⁶ with no EPP feature requiring raising of the DP or merge of expletive.¹⁷

Assuming this line of reasoning, we should now ask what the implications of such a theory should be for raising. Raising (and ECM) infinitives have been generally characterized as involving a defective I (Chomsky 1988 ties this property to the absence of CP). Defective I (I_{def}) contains an EPP feature but it cannot check (erase) a Case feature.¹⁸

Now, it becomes apparent that the hypothesis sketched above for NSLs must inescapably address the issue of defective I: if NSLs generally lack an EPP feature in I, and this extends to I_{def} , I_{def} will not project a subject specifier. In fact, I_{def} will neither be able to check Case features (due to its deficiency in phi-features) nor trigger DP movement. Assuming that I_{def} has some features to check, its role will solely be to ensure that some DP is still active for checking when the derivation reaches I'. In other words, I_{def} needs an associate, and makes sure that this associate will not be Case marked when the derivation reaches I'.

Let us put all the pieces together. Restructuring involves a raising configuration, headed by I_{def} . This defective I lacks an EPP feature in NSLs. This means that no subject position will be projected in the specifier of I_{def} . This in turn implies that NSLs will lack a potential minimality barrier for A-movement, which will be present in non-NSLs. Is all this amenable to an account of clitic climbing?¹⁹

16. Rosselló shows that a standard account in not only unnecessary, but even impossible for Catalan, in view of the never-raising behavior of subjects of certain existential verbs (*quedar* 'be left', *faltar* 'be lacking').

17. This kind of approach challenges the EPP principle, perhaps redefining it as a parameter: roughly, some nominal features must be strongly present in IP, either as «rich» AGR in the I head or, if AGR is poor, as a DP in Spec,I.

Under the view that subjects are checked in their base position, preverbal subjects must be analysed as dislocated or base generated DPs that bind a resumptive *pro* in theta position.

18. The EPP feature has emerged into the theory due to the inescapable need to justify DP movement to, or expletive merge in, Spec,I, in the infinitive of an ECM construction, in the face of no possible Case account.

19. If restructuring (as raising) triggers clitic climbing, typical raising verbs (counterparts of *seem* or *turn out*) should also allow clitic climbing. This is so for Italian. For Spanish and Catalan, these verbs do not allow clitic climbing. There should be some structural property that distinguishes Catalan and Spanish raising verbs from restructuring verbs: perhaps they involve a more complex infinitival structure.

Indeed, we have claimed that clitic climbing configurations involve a «long distance» dependency between an upper clitic position and its associated argument positions in the infinitive. Consider the following abstract configuration for a simple clause (where AGR_S and AGR_O are descriptive labels for any categories responsible for Nominative and Accusative, respectively, while EA and IA are the external and the internal argument DPs, respectively):

(34) AGR_S AGR_O [_{VP} EA IA]

AGR_S should check EA and AGR_O should check IA, giving a crossing paths pattern. This configuration raises a problem for minimality, which has been solved by ensuring equidistance between the two DPs competing for AGR_O (see Chomsky 1985:187,356).

Chomsky's (1995:Ch4, 1998) solution is to assimilate AGR_O to v , which both projects the EA and checks the IA, thus becoming a hinge point for locality. With AGR_S assimilated to T, we have:

(35) T [IA [EA v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]]

In (35), EA is accessible to T, given appropriate definitions on equidistance.

Now, consider what a clitic climbing configuration would be for a sentence like *El vull veure* it-want-1sg to-se 'I want to see it', according to our previous assumptions:

(36) AGR_S AGR_O [_{IP} I_{def} [_{VP} EA IA]]

If I_{def} is inactive, the local relations between the two AGRs and the two DPs are essentially the same as in (34): crossing paths. But for this case locality cannot be accommodated as in (35), because AGR_O is in a different clause. In order to pursue an account of clitic climbing in terms of 'long distance AGR_O ', AGR_O must be conceived as independent from v .

Suppose then that we want to essentially preserve the patterns in (34) and in (36) for simple clauses and clitic climbing configurations, respectively. We need some substantial elaboration to ensure that locality is respected.

I want to pursue one of the essential insights in Chomsky (1995:ch.4): v is the key-stone for enabling Accusative Case checking and projecting the external argument (so deriving Burzio's Generalization). This connection provides a local configuration that minimizes the «crossing» pattern for Nominative-Accusative checking. But instead of assimilating v to AGR_O , I propose to assimilate it to another kind of AGR.

Consider the participial agreement visible in Italian compound tenses (see Kayne 1989a), which is always agreement with the internal argument: it agrees with unaccusative subjects and with transitive (clitic) objects. It is an adjectival-like agreement (only Number and Gender features). Therefore it is not likely to

check Accusative Case, if Nominative and Accusative checking is a property of categories with a full set of phi-features (Person, Number and Gender).²⁰

Suppose we assimilate v to participial agreement, in an abstract sense generalizable to all sentences (even if in Italian only compound tenses show its overt manifestation). This means that v can perform a task similar to that in Chomsky (1995,1998): checking the internal Argument and, possibly, «attracting» it to its specifier. But now we propose that no Accusative Case is involved in this checking, for the above-mentioned reason that this kind of agreement is [Number, Gender] only, no [Person] being involved. We assume, with Chomsky, that only a full set of phi-features can check (structural) Case.

Let us assume that transitive v (i.e., v projecting an external argument EA) has an EPP feature that brings the internal argument to its specifier. The result will be the configuration in (37), where the IA has raised and the EA is projected (for transitive verbs).

(37) [_{VP} IA [_{VP} EA v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]]

Now, even if, with Chomsky, we assimilate AGR_S to T, AGR_O (as well as other clitic AGRs) is to be kept an independent category. It is essential that AGR_O is projected (or activated) only when and where necessary: in clitic climbing contexts it need not be projected in the embedded clause (although it can, if clitic climbing is indeed optional).

Now the configurations for a simple clause and for clitic climbing, after IA raising to Spec, v has taken place, will be (38) and (39) respectively:

(38) T AGR_O [_{VP} IA [_{VP} EA v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]]

(39) T AGR_O [_{VP} V [T_{def} [_{VP} IA [_{VP} EA v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]]]]

If T_{def} in (39) does not project a specifier, the locality conditions are now the same in both constructions: both T and AGR_O can access both IA and EA, assuming that specifiers of the same projection (v P) are equidistant. For simplicity, we have omitted main clause v , which does not project a specifier either, assuming that restructuring verbs, as raising verbs, do not have an EA, hence v does not have an EPP feature.

One problem remains to be solved: as it stands, our proposal predicts that either T or AGR_O can access either IA and EA. We must ensure that AGR_O checks IA while T checks EA. To this effect, we narrow the definition of equidistance from (40) to (41):

20. One plausible job for this agreement is checking of Partitive Case, assuming that [Gender, Number] is a sufficient phi-set for Partitive checking. It appears that Partitive is not a «self-standing» Case: its needs to be supplemented by a structural (Nominative/Accusative) Case, as assumed in the text that follows (see Belletti 1988). See, however, Rosselló (2000:123,124) for an interesting piece of evidence against this view.

(40) Terms of the same minimal domain are equidistant (Chomsky 1985, 1988).

(41) Two terms of the same minimal domain are equidistant if one of them is inactive.

In configurations (38) and (39), (40) makes IA and EA equidistant to both T and AGR_O . (41), instead, predicts that IA is closer to AGR_O at the moment AGR_O is merged. It is the only option for AGR_O , which will check it under agree (crucially, not under move), rendering it inactive. At the moment T is merged, however, EA is equidistant from IA, which will not intervene in the T-EA checking operation by agree (with no move either, we assume for NSLs).

The optionality of clitic climbing within restructuring is accounted for by assuming that the structure in (42.a) is a legitimate free alternative to (42.b) (= (39)):

- (42) a. T [T_{def} AGR_O [_{VP} IA ([_{VP} EA) v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]]]
 b. T AGR_O [T_{def} [_{VP} IA ([_{VP} EA) v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]]]

Since AGR_O projects when possible and necessary, it can be perfectly projected in the embedded infinitive, giving a non-climbing configuration.

Now, for non pro-drop languages like French (or English), T_{def} projects a specifier due to its EPP feature, so that only (43.a) (non-climbing), but not (43.b) (climbing), is possible:

- (43) a. T [EA T_{def} AGR_O [_{VP} IA [_{VP} t_{EA} v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]]]
 b. T AGR_O [Spec T_{def} [_{VP} IA [_{VP} EA v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]]]

In (43.a) AGR_O agrees with IP and inactivates it; T_{def} subsequently agrees with EA, which moves its specifier (where it will be accessed by the higher T). In (43.b), T_{def} cannot access EA. If then T_{def} (incorrectly) accesses IA, EA will be left inaccessible to both AGR_O and T, due to the intervention of Spec, T_{def}, leading the derivation to crash.

4. Further extensions and discussion

4.1. On the relevance of null subject parameter

The present analysis relies on the idea that in (Romance) null-subject languages T (hence T_{def}) does not have an EPP feature; therefore T_{def} does not create a minimality barrier for long distance checking between main clause AGR_O and its associate internal argument (IA) in the infinitive. This predicts that languages being like Catalan except for the null-subject property will lack clitic climbing in restructuring constructions. This does not predict, however, that clitic climbing is confined to null-subject languages: clitic climbing should also be possible with a more impoverished infinitival structure lacking the TP projection, since this too would provide the relevant transparency effects by eliminating the T_{def} specifier. The Romance

causative construction (which allows clitic climbing in both French and null-subject Romance languages) is likely to instantiate this possibility.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to assess whether 17th century French or Kru languages (which have been claimed to allow clitic climbing in the absence of null subjects, as we mentioned in the introduction) can be accommodated in this way.

4.2. *On the status of blocking factors*

A further issue that has not been addressed thus far is why negation and other factors block restructuring (hence clitic climbing). Let us pursue the idea that blocking factors somehow force a richer structure than a bare TP. Negation in Romance has been claimed to be a functional category above TP (Zanuttini 1991). As for the other factors (focusing, extraposition over an adverb, dislocation), let us assume that a bare TP is not suited for such operations (while CP is).

Now, we can assume with Chomsky (1998) that T_{def} can be selected only by V. Therefore, any clause structure larger than a bare TP will not contain a T_{def} ; and restructuring and clitic climbing will be impossible.

For the blocking status of negation, a head movement account has often been adduced (Kayne 1989, Bok-Bennema & Kampers-Mahne 1994, Roberts 1997). Such an account seems unavailable here. It should be remarked, in addition, that a preposition often intervenes between the restructuring verb and the infinitive. This preposition is likely to be lexical (see Amadas Simon 1999:5.3) and may be a problem for head incorporation analyses.

4.3. *On the status of v*

Let us shift attention to a central idea in our proposal, namely that v is responsible for checking and attracting an internal argument, but without checking its Case (due to its incomplete set of phi-features). We have suggested that v -agreement is visible in past-participial agreement in languages like Italian.

Past participial agreement in Italian is triggered by both (clitic) objects and unaccusative subjects. If this is to be captured by the present proposal, v should be present not only in transitive (including unergative) structures but also in unaccusative structures, much like Chomsky's (1998) generalized v (vs. transitive v^*).

There are several pieces of evidence in favor of the structure [IA [EA v VP]] postulated here. If this structure generalizes to all kinds of verbs, we have the following three representations:

- (44) a. [IA [EA v [_{VP} ... t_{IA}]]] (transitive structures)
 b. [[EA v [_{VP} ... (IA)]]] (unergative structures)
 c. [[v [_{VP} ... IA]]] (unaccusative structures)

For the unergative configuration (44.b), the postulated internal argument would probably incorporate to V (ultimately to v).

One piece of evidence in favor of (44) is that it mirrors the shape and behavior of past participles: «passive» past participles (when EA is absorbed: hence unergatives do not have a «passive» past participle) and «active» past participles in compound tenses, where EA, if present, remains accessible.

(45) also corresponds to the infinitive complement of causative verbs in Romance, an ECM construction where Accusative Case is assigned exactly to the DP which is most accessible in each of the structures in (45): IA with transitives and unaccusatives, and EA with unergatives:

- (45) a. El faig arreglar (a en Joan/per en Joan).
it-make-1sg to-repair (to the John/by the John)
'I have it repaired (by John).'
- b. El faig caure.
it-make-1sg to-fall
'I make it fall.'
- c. El faig treballar.
him-make-1sg to-work
'I make him work.'

A further piece of evidence concerns word order. In transitive structures IA moves to the left of EA. It must be actual move, not just agree, for the locality theory advanced here to work. Now, is there any evidence for this movement? The answer is clearly yes. Assuming that the verb ($[_v V v]$) moves past both arguments, we predict the order V IA EA for sentences with subject inversion (where the EA stays in its base position). That is what we standardly find in Catalan and Italian (even if cooccurrence of both overt object and overt subject is somehow marginal in some cases):

- (46) a. Només menja patates en Joan. / *Només menja en Joan patates.
only eats potatoes the John / only eats the John potatoes
- b. Pagarà la factura la companyia. / *Pagarà la companyia la factura.
will-pay the bill the company / will-pay the company the bill

It is not accurate to claim that these facts point to a VP final position for the subject: inverted subjects unmarkedly precede VP adjuncts and also datives and governed locatives:²¹

- (47) a. Ho ha escrit en Joan amb l'ordinador /a casa seva /aquesta tarda.
it-has written the John with the-computer at home his this afternoon
'This was written by John with the computer/at his home/this afternoon.'

21. In (47) the inverted subject is not interpreted as (restricted) focus: rather the whole VP is interpreted as the comment. (47.b), for example is an adequate reply to «What's this letter you found?». We cannot then support the view that subject inversion is focalization (Belletti 1999).

possibility, deep rethinking of the nature of control and raising should be undertaken.²²

4.5. *On the clitic cluster*

A further issue in the present proposal is the precise nature of clitic AGRs other than AGR_O. Assuming that they (or some of them, e.g. AGR_{DAT}) establish A-dependencies with their associates, complex locality interactions are expected to arise. If, instead, they (or some of them) induce a different (A') kind of dependency, locality interactions are not expected, therefore the above locality arguments become irrelevant.

The fact is that, for many languages, the clitic clusters seem to behave as a unit, not as an accidental cluster of independently derived clitics. This probably derives from morphological properties (the clitic cluster would be a morphophonologically uniform domain, see Bonet 1991). But it might as well be that complex argument structures (such as object-dative: *give the book to John*; or object-locative *put the book on the table*) behave as a unit not only in their base position (as Small Clauses) but also for checking by a complex AGR (the «clitic cluster»).

Whatever the account, it must be able to predict the general impossibility of split clitic climbing, which is strongly ungrammatical:

- (49) **Em volia donar-lo.
 me wanted-3sg to-give-it
 'He wanted to give it to me.'

4.6. *On other transparency effects*

A further issue to be addressed is how other transparency effects (beyond clitic climbing) are accounted for in the present proposal. The general expectation is that restructuring in NSLs opens a door for «long distance» A-dependencies. If so, the other transparency effects described in Rizzi (1982) could be accommodated: SE-passivization and auxiliary selection seem to belong to the Case-Agreement system. Now French (and also Italian, as demonstrated in Bok-Bennema & Kampers-Mahne (1984) shows a transparency effect which seems to be of A'-kind: quantifier and adverb climbing:

- (50) Jean a *tout* voulu faire.
 Jean has everything wanted to-do
 Cf.: Jean a voulu *tout* faire. (without climbing)

22. See Hornstein (1996) and references therein for various attempts to unify control and raising under raising. Even under such accounts, though, the fact remains that 'true' raising chains have a single theta-role, while control raising chains have two theta-roles, so that it is not in principle possible to turn one into the other.

Although it seems hard to predict why and how exactly these elements climb, the facts are compatible with the idea that French has restructuring but, as a non-NSL, it does not have A-transparency effects, while A'-transparency effects are independently available.

4.7. A hard problem

The present proposal is ill-equipped to account for a well known fact in Romance, which is well attested in Catalan: double clitics (See Bonet 2002:10.3.6). For some Catalan speakers it is possible to spell a clitic (or clitic cluster) both on the infinitive and on the restructuring verb, as in (51a,b). Even more intriguing is the possibility (available to a more restricted set of speakers) that one of the clitic clusters is only a subset of the other, as in (51c,d):

- (51) a. Ho vull fer-ho.
 it-vant-1sg to-do-it
 'I want to do it.'
- b. M'ho podries haver-m'ho dit.
 me-it-could-2sg to-have-me-it told
 'You could have told this to me.'
- c. L'hi he volgut deixar-lo.
 it-there-have-1sg wanted to-leave-it
 'I have wanted to leave it there.'
- d. L'he volgut deixar-l'hi.
 it-have-1sg wanted to-leave-it-there
 'I have wanted to leave it there.'

For (51a,b), one could assume that the AGR instantiated by the lower clitic is somehow inert for Case checking (and, since clitic AGR generally lacks an EPP feature, it is also innocuous for minimality): hence Case checking would take place at the upper clause, as in standard clitic climbing. The facts in (51c,d) are more intricate. Consider (51d): the lower object clitic should be inert (since there is an upper instantiation of the same clitic) but its cluster-mate, the locative clitic, should be active, since there is no such clitic in the main clause.

I have no interesting proposal for these facts. In fact, postulating that AGR_O is (sometimes) inert for Case checking is problematic considering that it has a full set of phi-features. I leave the issue here.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have argued that there is a biclausal structure in restructured clauses, although a simpler one involving IP (raising). One reason for postulating a biclausal structure is that restructured clauses seem to alternate with non-restructured clauses and to be closely related to them. A more theoretical reason is that a

biclausal structure seems to provide more room to account for the correlation between pro-drop and clitic climbing (and other transparency effects).

Clitics are characterized as AGRs, which are optionally projected when necessary. Clitic climbing consists in projecting clitic AGRs one clause up from their associate XPs, provided the I_{def} in the lower clause is inactive and does not block the AGR-associate checking dependency. To this effect, we provide a redefinition of the functional structure associated to A-movement, and of locality for checking, which allows for the relevant 'long distance' movement.

The redefinition of the functional domain for Case and Agreement advanced here is not, I think, an *ad hoc* adjustment: the agreement feature I ascribe to v is independently motivated, if we take Italian participle agreement to be its overt manifestation, and must be sooner or later incorporated into the Case-Agreement system. Furthermore, DPs/NPs triggering this agreement seem to be coextensive with the ones that can receive Partitive Case. We are dealing with a Case-Agreement subsystem which appears to be orthogonal to the Nominative-Accusative system: both participial agreement and Partitive are compatible with both Nominative and Accusative. If participial agreement is not phi-complete and Partitive checking does not freeze the DP/NP for further checking, it seems reasonable to put the participial agreement system before (lower than) the rest of the Case-Agreement system.

References

- Aissen, J.L.; Perlmutter, D.M. (1983). «Clause reduction in Spanish». In: Perlmutter, D. M. (ed.). *Studies in Relational Grammar I*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. [Also published in: *Proceedings of the Second Annual Meeting of the BLS*. Berkeley, CA, 1983.]
- Alsina Àlex (1996). *The Role of Argument Structure in Grammar. Evidence from Romance*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Amadas Simon, Laia (1999). «L'estructura argumental dels verbs aspectuals del català». Treball de recerca, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Aoun, Joseph (1979). «On government, case marking and clitic placement». Ms., MIT.
- Belletti, Adriana (1988). «The Case of Inaccusatives». *Linguistic Inquiry* 19-1: 1-34.
- (1999). «Inversion as focalization and related questions». *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 7: 9-45.
- Benincà, Paola (ed.) (1989). *Dialect Variation in the Theory of Grammar*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- Bok-Bennema, Reineke; Kampers-Mahne, Brigitte (1994). «Transparency Effects in Romance Languages». In: Mazzola, M. L. (ed.). *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics*. Washington DC: The Georgetown University Press.
- Bonet, Eulàlia (1991). «Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance». PhD Dissertation, MIT, distributed by MITWPL.
- (2002). «Cliticització». To appear in: Solà, Joan (dir.). *Gramàtica del Català Contemporani*, cap. M10. Barcelona: Empúries.
- Borer, Hagit (1984). *Parametric Syntax. Case Studies in Semitic and Romance Languages*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.

- (ed.) (1986). *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*. Orlando: Academic Press, Syntax & Semantics vol. 19.
- Burzio, Luigi (1986). *Italian Syntax. A Government-Binding Approach*. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- Chomsky, Noam (1995) *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- (1998) «Minimalist inquiries: the Framework». *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 15, to appear in: Martin, R.; Michaels, D.; Uriagereka, J. (eds.). *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honour of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1999a). *Adverbs and Functional Heads: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- (1999b). «“Restructuring” and the Universal Hierarchy of Functional Heads». Presented at the *1999 GLOW Colloquium: Universals*. April 29-31, ZAS BERLIN.
- (2000). «“Restructuring” and Functional Structure». Ms., University of Venice.
- Fernández Soriano, Olga (ed.) (1993). *Los pronombres átonos*. Madrid: Taurus.
- Franco, Jon (1993). «On Object Agreement in Spanish». Doctoral Dissertation, University of Southern California.
- (2000). «Agreement as a continuum: The case of Spanish pronominal clitics». In: Beukema, F.; Dikken, M. van (eds.). *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp.147-189.
- Guéron, Jacqueline; Hoekstra, Teun (1988). «T-Chains and Constituent Structure of Auxiliaries». In: Cardinaletti, A.; Cinque, G.; Giusti, G. (eds.). *Constituent Structure. Papers from the 1987 GLOW Conference*. Dordrecht: Foris, pp. 35-99.
- Gonçalves, A. (1997a). «Sobre as propriedades das categorias funcionais nas construções de Reestruturação do português europeu». Ms., Universidade de Lisboa.
- (1997b). «On restructuring constructions in European Portuguese». Ms., Universidade de Lisboa.
- Hernanz, Maria Lluïsa; Rigau, Gemma (1984). «Auxiliaritat i reestructuració». *Els Marges* 31: 29-51.
- Hornstein, Norbert (1996). «Control in GB and Minimalism». *GLOT International* 2-8: 3-6.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo (1982). *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- (1986). «Three Issues in the Theory of Clitics: Case, Doubled NPs, and Extraction». In: Borer, H. (ed.): 15-42.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo; Safir, Kenneth J. (eds.) (1989). *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kayne, Richard S. (1975). *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- (1989a). «Facets of Romance Past Participle Agreement». In: Benincà, P. (ed.): 85-103.
- (1989b). «Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing». In: Jaeggli, O.; Safir, K. J. (eds.): 239-261.
- (1991). «Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO». *Linguistic Inquiry* 22-4: 647-686.
- (1992). «Italian negative infinitival imperatives and clitic climbing». In: Tsmovskiy, L.; Zribi-Hertz, A. (eds.): *Homage à Nicolas Ruwet*. Gand: Communication and Cognition, 300-312.

- (1993). «Toward a Modular Theory of Auxiliary Selection». *Studia Linguistica* 47: 3-31.
- Llinàs Grau, Mireia (1990-1991). «Verbs de “reestructuració” i verbs de “no-reestructuració”». *Llengua & Literatura* 4: 265-276.
- Luján, Marta (1993). «La subida de clíticos y el modo de los complementos verbales del español». In: Fernández Soriano, O. (ed.): 235-283.
- Martineau, France (1989). «La montée du clitique en ancien français; une étude de la syntaxe des constructions infinitives». Doctoral Dissertation, University of Ottawa.
- Monachesi, Paola (1998). «Italian restructuring verbs: a lexical analysis». In: Hinrichs, E.; Kathol, A.; Nakazawa, T. (eds.). *Complex Predicates in Non-derivational Syntax. Syntax and Semantics* 30. San Diego: Academic Press, pp. 313-368.
- (1999). «Syntactic and prosodic properties of Italian restructuring verbs». *Proceedings of NELS 1998*. Amherst: GLSA.
- Manzini, M. Rita (1983). *Restructuring and Reanalysis*. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Picallo, Carme (1990). «Modal Verbs in Catalan», *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8-2: 285-312.
- (1998). «On the extended Projection Principle and null expletive subjects». *Probus* 10: 219-241.
- Rigau, Gemma (1994). «Les propietats dels verbs pronominals». *Els Marges* 50: 29-40. Fot.-11
- Rivas, A. (1977). «A theory of clitics». PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982). «A restructuring rule». In: Rizzi, L. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- (1986). «On chain formation». In: Borer, H. (ed.): 65-95.
- Roberts, Ian G. (1997). «Restructuring, Head Movement, and Locality». *Linguistic Inquiry* 28-3: 423-460.
- Roselló, Joana (1986). «Gramàtica, configuracions i referència». Tesi doctoral, Universitat de Barcelona.
- (2000). «A Minimalist Approach to the Null Subject Parameter». *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 8: 97-128.
- Schroten, J. (1986). «Ergativity, Raising and Restructuring in the Syntax of Spanish Aspectual Verbs». *Linguisticae Investigaciones* X-2: 436-465.
- Solà, Jaume (1992). «Agreement and Subjects». Doctoral Dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Sportiche, Dominique (1992) «Clitic constructions». Ms., University of California, Los Angeles.
- Strozer, J. (1976). «Clitics in Spanish». Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Suñer, Margarita (1988). «The role of AGR(eement) in clitic doubled constructions». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 391-434.
- Torrego, Esther (1994). «On the nature of clitic doubling». *International Journal of Basque Linguistics and Philology* 28: 199-214.
- Treviño, Estela (1993). «El caso como rasgo de Minimidad en el comportamiento de los clíticos». In: Fernández Soriano, O. (ed.): 284-308.
- Uriagereka, Juan (1995). «Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance». *Linguistic Inquiry* 26-1: 79-123.

- Zanuttini, Raffaella (1991). «Syntactic Properties of Sentential Negation: a Comparative Study of Romance Languages». PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Zubizarreta, María Luisa (1982). «On the Relation of the Lexicon to Syntax». PhD Dissertation, MIT.