

BARE CLITICS.
Xavier Villalba
Universitat de Barcelona

In this communication I will extend Chomsky's (1993) Checking Theory to Romance clitics, and I will argue that the DP hypothesis of cliticization (see Torrego 1988, Uriagereka 1989, Cardinaletti & Starke 1993, Corver & Delfitto 1993) should be properly understood as a device to check the Case features of an argument: clitics are bare DPs incorporating to a verbal head to check their Case features. Under Chomsky's (1994) assumptions on phrase structure, clitics will ambiguously move as either heads or maximal projections. Moreover, it will be argued that there exists a crucial difference between accusative and dative clitics: whereas the former are inherently [+specific] Dets, the latter are unspecified for this features. This analysis will suffice to explain not only the clear difference between accusative and dative clitics in causative constructions, but also their puzzling behavior when acting as reassumptive clitics elsewhere. Furthermore, this paper tries to contribute to the current theoretical discussion regarding the relationship between Case and Agreement.

Consider the following contrast in Catalan:

- (1) a. *El Joan LA va fer venir.*/**El Joan va fer venir-LA.*
'John made her come.'
b. *El Joan EN va fer venir dos.*/*El Joan va fer venir-NE dos.*
'John made two of them come.'

Even though both the accusative (*la* 'her') and the partitive (*en* 'of.it/them') clitics are generated in the internal argument position of the unaccusative verb *venir* 'to come', only the later can incorporate to the embedded verb. This is not surprising if we assume that cliticization (properly, Det Incorporation) is a device to check the Case features of an argument: the unaccusative verb cannot check the [+ACC] feature of *la*.

The distribution of dative clitics in Catalan causatives strongly supports this analysis as well (this contrast also holds in Spanish):

- (2) a. *El Joan va fer comprar-LI el cotxe als nens.*
'John made the children buy him a car.'
b. *El Joan LI va fer comprar el cotxe als nens.*
*'*John made the children buy him a car.*'/'John made him buy a car.'
(3) *El Joan LI va fer arribar la carta.*
'John had the letter send to him.'

The dative clitic related to the indirect object cannot incorporate to the causative verb, as long as the dative causee is present. This behavior sharply contrasts with the optionality of [+ACC] clitic climbing (*Me la va fer comprar/Em va fer comprar-la* 'He made me buy it.'). The analysis here proposed gives us an answer: we have a Case conflict. The causative verb can only check one [+DAT], that of the causee. However, if a dative causee is not present (e.g., with unaccusative verbs or in the *faire-par* construction) no problem arises: the indirect object clitic can check its [+DAT] with the causative verb (i.e., it can 'climb').

I further show, following ideas by Uriagereka 1989 and Roca 1992) that there is a crucial difference in the internal structure of ACC and DAT clitics: only the former is

inherently marked as [+specific]. Consider the crucial contrast in Catalan (again, the contrast is extensible to Spanish):

- (4) a. *EL/*un rellotge, EL vaig comprar ahir.*
 'The/a watch, I bought yesterday.'
 b. *A la/una mare no LI pots dir això.*
 'To the/a mother you cannot say this.'

ACC clitics cannot reassume unspecific dislocated elements. Moreover, in Spanish dialects allowing ACC clitic doubling, only specific doubled DPs are allowed. I will assume that ACC clitics are inherently marked as [+specific]. Hence, under current views on the mapping from syntax to semantics (see Diesing 1990 or Enç 1991, among others), the ACC clitic must be projected out of the VP. According to my proposal, the ACC clitic will incorporate to the verb to check its case (head-movement) and afterward it will raise to the [Spec, AgrOP] (hence the existence of past participle agreement with ACC clitics) to check the [+specific] feature (maximal projection movement), satisfying the mapping principles (some final head-movement might place the clitic in the initial position hosting clitics that has been argued for by Uriagereka 1989 and other scholars). This derivation is OK for clitics because their ambiguous status between D° and DP allows them to always satisfy the categorial uniformity condition on chains. DAT clitics, however, are unspecified for [specific], hence after incorporating to the verb to check their Case, they don't move through any [Spec, AgrP] at all (> lack of past participial agreement). That gives us an explanation for the following contrast in Catalan (and in Spanish also):

- (5) a. **LA va fer comprar-LOS.*
 3P.FEM(ACC) PAST.(s)he make buy-3P.MASC.PL(ACC)
 '(S)he made her buy them.'
 b. *LI va fer enviar-LI els papers.*
 3P.DAT PAST.(s)he make send-3P.DAT the papers
 '(S)he had the papers sent to him/her.'

Even though the causative and the embedded verb have an [+ACC] each, the licensing of both ACC clitics is impossible. This nicely follows from our analysis: in spite of the fact that both DPs can check their case, we have two clitics competing for a single [Spec, AgrOP]. As a result, the derivation crashes. This is not a problem for two DAT clitics, as far as they select no pro: they check their Case features on a verb each.

The resulting organization of the grammar is certainly appealing, since we clearly trace a difference between Case and Agreement, as it has been recently suggested by many scholars (see Jonas & Bobaljik 1993, Chomsky 1994). Moreover, the Case checking approach to cliticization when combined with current views on the mapping from syntax to semantics gives us a plausible answer to why and where clitics move.

Universitat de Barcelona
 Laboratori de Fonètica
 Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585
 08007 Barcelona, SPAIN

e-mail: villalba@lingua.fil.ub.es