

Why does not clitic climbing feed the Logical Form?

Jon Franco

University of Deusto (Bilbao)
Aptdo. 1, BILBAO 48080

Alazne Landa

University of Deusto (Donostia)/
University of the Basque Country

Moore (1994) proposes an account of licit cases of clitic climbing based on an additional relativization of Rizzi's (1990) Relativized Minimality. Thus, under Moore's analysis, the clitic must govern its argument position. Intervening T' heads in Li's (1990) terms, such as Infl and clitics, will prevent a matrix clause clitic from establishing this government relation, as (1) illustrates:

- (1) a. *cl_i + V ... Infl ... ec_i b. *cl_i + V ... cl_i ... ec_i

The Minimality violations exemplified in (1) may account for a wide range of data on clitics, namely, the ban against split cliticization and the impossibility of climbing over negation and out of an IP complement. Notwithstanding, we will show that there is a need for a more sophisticated explanation when the time comes to analyze other clitic climbing contexts such as those of causative constructions. Thus, assuming in the spirit of Zubizarreta (1985) that the Romance causative counterparts of the English verb make function like a bound morpheme, which requires incorporation to a lexical verb, the data in (2) and (3) turn out to be problematic for Moore's proposal in (1):

- (2) Juan le_i hizo leerlo_i e_i e_i.
Juan Dat.CL made read-Acc.CL
'Juan made him read it.'

- (3) Juan le_i hizo leer_ise_i -lo_i e_i t_i e_i e_i.
Juan Dat.CL made read Dat.CL-Acc.CL
'Juan made him read it to her/him.'

Crucially, Moore's constraint in (1b) would wrongly yield (2) and (3) as ungrammatical since, in these examples, there is, at least in the flavor of Moore (1994), an intervening clitic between the Causee clitic and its trace or the coreferential argument position, depending on whether one adopts the movement or the in-situ analysis of clitics.

In this paper, we attempt to account for a number of cases of clitic placement in causative constructions in Spanish for which Moore's analysis as it is would run afoul. Moreover, we propose a revision of such an analysis geared on the structural mapping of Spanish clitics as heads of functional AGRO categories. Specifically, we claim that the role of Relativized Minimality in clitic placement should be tested on a well-determined hierarchical articulation of the functional AGR heads within the INFL node. Also, we are going to adopt a Minimalist ECM structure (see Chomsky 1993) for causative constructions similar to that proposed in Chung (1993) for Korean causatives in which the Causee gets its Case licensed in the AGRO projection of the matrix clause, whereas the natural objects of the lexical verb do it in the functional AGR projections of the subordinate clause.

Additionally, we will present some challenging data that strongly suggest that ultimately, it may well be the case that some of the ill-formed clitic combinations in Spanish are banned by some purely morphological constraints (see Perlmutter 1971). That is to say, an account of these data in exclusive syntactic terms actually fails to achieve descriptive adequacy. Thus, in view of the suspicious evidence from Colloquial Spanish given in (5) below, the well-known

contrast shown in (4) (cf. Kayne 1975) is in need of an alternative uniform morphosyntactic explanation:

- (4) a. *Se_i la_t dejamos al bedel_i e_t traer en el ascensor.
 Dat.CL Acc.CL let.1Pl to-the janitor bring in the elevator
 We let the janitor bring it on the elevator.
- b. Se_i la dejamos traer al bedel_i en el ascensor.
 Dat.CL Acc.CL let.1Pl bring to-the janitor in the elevator
 We let the janitor bring it on the elevator.
- (5) Se la_i dejamos al bedel traerla_i en el ascensor.
 Dat.CL Acc.CL let.1Pl to-the janitor bring-Acc.CL in the elevator
 We let the janitor bring it on the elevator.

In this regard, we make a proposal parallel to Laka's (1993) analysis of Ergative Displacement in the Basque inflectional system that contemplates clitic placement as an instance of subatomic head movement within a complex articulated X' head. In this way, we claim that the final output of the sentences in (4b) (or (6b) below, for that matter) is the result of subsequent movement of the agreement clitic heads within the syntactic atom composed by the causative and subordinate verbs, and the corresponding inflectional morphemes.

Furthermore, in the flavor of Laka (1993), this subatomic movement (i) does not feed Logical Form operations and (ii) takes place in the mapping from overt syntax to Phonological Form. This dual claim is supported by a number of facts. First, along the lines of Aoun, Horsntein, Lightfoot and Weinberg (1987), head movement is subject to head government by an overt phonological head. This government requirement mainly explains the ungrammatical sentence in (4a) in which the DO clitic launching site (AGR₀₂) is left ungoverned since, under the non-incorporation version, the subordinate empty head Tense cannot satisfy this government condition. In contrast, the restructured counterpart sentence in (4b) is precisely saved by the incorporated lower verb which is able to govern the trace left by the object clitic. Second, the offending ungoverned empty category trace in (4a) is rescued in (5) by the occurrence of a phonological replica of the moved clitic head. Third, since subatomic movement is head internal, syntactic operations are blind to this type of processes inside the atom (see Chomsky 1991) and therefore, cannot interact with clitic placement. This correctly predicts that clitic climbing does not have any bearing on the semantic interpretation of the sentence and viceversa. This prediction is borne out. To the best of our knowledge, there is no difference in interpretation between an utterance with subatomic movement, that is, clitic climbing, as in (6a), and one without, as in (6b):

- | | |
|--|---|
| (6) a. Juan se lo hizo leer.
Juan Dat.CL Acc.CL made read
Juan made him/her read it. | b. Juan le hizo leer-lo.
Juan Dat.CL made read.Acc.CL
Juan made him/her read it. |
|--|---|

Finally, a further advantage of our proposal is that the head government requirement on traces resulting from subatomic movement can also account for the impossibility of having downstairs cliticization of the Causee, as shown in (7):

- (7) *Juan e_i hizo trabajarnos_i (a nosotros_i).
 Juan made to work CL-1.Pl to us
 Juan made us work.