1. Introduction

This is an updated version of my 2006 contribution to the Blackwell Companion to Syntax (Anagnostopoulou 2006). I investigate the syntax of clitic doubling constructions focusing on the question of variation within and across languages. In the course of the discussion, two different patterns of clitic doubling will emerge, with different factors causing variation across languages in each case: a) In the case of direct object clitic doubling, languages vary with respect to whether they permit it (i) only with pronouns or also with DPs, (ii) with humans, animates or also with inanimates and (iii) with specific indefinites, partitives or only definites. Direct object clitic doubling of DPs is generally optional (doubling of pronouns is in many cases obligatory). b) In the case of indirect object doubling, languages vary w.r.t. whether (i) doubling is obligatory in the double object construction or (ii) doubling is optional in the double object construction. The research on clitic doubling will be presented from a historical perspective focusing on the nature of the Clitic Doubling Parameter and its potential implications for the syntax of cliticization. I will identify four periods in the study of doubling which coincided with different stages of the Principles and Parameters framework and Minimalism:

(i) Early (GB) studies (e.g. Jaeggli 1982; 1986, Borer 1984) take clitic doubling as an argument for a base-generation analysis of clitics and the movement-properties of cliticization as properties of Chains rather than Movement (contra Kayne 1975 who argued for a movement analysis of French clitics, a language lacking clitic doubling). In their attempt to isolate the factor underlying the property that permits formation of clitic-argument pairs in some languages (Spanish, Romanian) but not in others (French, Italian), these accounts capitalize on Romance and Semitic clitic doubling which is limited to DPs that are preceded by special prepositions (a in Spanish, pe in Romanian, šel in Hebrew).

(ii) Late GB studies maintain the base-generation syntax of clitics and concentrate on certain interpretive effects associated with direct object clitic doubling, which will be referred to by the term “specificity” (see Enç 1991 and Diesing 1992 for discussion and references). This change of perspective is initiated by Suñer (1988), who argues on the basis of data from Argentinean Spanish that direct object clitic doubling does not rely on the presence of special prepositions, contrary to what has been previously thought.

---
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(iii) In the beginning of the nineties, new analytic options arise for cliticization and clitic doubling due to a number of major developments in the syntactic formalism. It therefore becomes possible to maintain that there is both a movement and a base-generation component into the syntax of cliticization and clitic doubling. Two influential proposals which combine movement with base-generation in very different ways, were developed in an unpublished paper by Sportiche (1993) (versions of this paper were later published as Sportiche 1996, 1998; he adopts a base generation approach for clitics and a movement approach for doubled DPs, as will be seen later on) and in Uriagereka (1988; 1995), who based himself on unpublished work by Torrego (1988; they propose that the clitic and the DP are base-generated in a big DP and the clitic moves to its clitic position).

(iv) The research summarized so far is placed within an influential tradition that treats clitic constructions as being uniform. In such a conception, variation in the types of clitic chains encountered cross-linguistically is traceable to a single difference between e.g. Spanish and French, what has been referred to as the "Clitic Doubling Parameter". Against this tradition, there is a current trend for fragmentation: clitics are argued to have a different syntax across constructions and languages.

In the last part of the chapter, I will present two representative recent studies on clitic doubling which explore the phenomenon from the point of view of Chomsky’s (2000, 2001) theory of Agree. These explorations, and other work related to them, lead us to rethink the similarities and differences between object clitics and object agreement markers and hence also the nature of the parameter underlying clitic doubling.

2. The phenomenon

Clitic doubling is a construction in which a clitic co-occurs with a full DP in argument position forming a discontinuous constituent with it, as in (1) (from Jaeggli 1986: 32):

(1) Lo vimos a Juan  
   Him we-saw a Juan  
   'We saw Juan'


Clitic doubling displays intriguing cross-linguistic variation which has been widely discussed in the literature. In particular, while some languages (e.g. Spanish and Romanian) have clitic doubling of objects, others (e.g. French and Italian) lack this type of construction (data from Jaeggli 1982: 12-13). This difference is illustrated in (2) with an indirect object clitic doubling example from Spanish and (3) with its ungrammatical counterpart from French:
The study of clitic doubling has always enjoyed a privileged position among investigations of cliticization which center around the question of whether clitics move to their surface position from an argument position or whether they are base-generated in their surface position functioning as agreement markers of sorts. The movement view of cliticization is pursued in a number of analyses which belong to a tradition initiated by Kayne's (1975) seminal work on French, which lacks clitic doubling of NP objects. A major argument for the base-generation alternative analysis is the existence of clitic doubling phenomena, which were first observed and discussed in Strozer (1976) and Rivas (1977) for Spanish. Thus, the availability of doubling has been viewed as an argument for a base-generation analysis (e.g. Jaeggli 1982, 1986; Borer 1984). This basic dilemma has been and still is under debate and a recurrent issue in the research on clitics.

3. Clitic doubling and related constructions

At a descriptive level, clitic doubling must be distinguished from two related constructions:

3.1. Clitic Doubling vs. Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD)

CLLD is a construction in which a clitic co-occurs with an XP to its left (Italian data from Cinque 1990: 71):

(4) Gianni, lo vedrò domani (Italian)  
    Gianni him will-see-I tomorrow  
    ‘I will see Gianni tomorrow’

CLLD is an unbounded dependency that is selectively sensitive to islands and shows connectedness effects (see Cinque 1990, Iatridou 1991, Anagnostopoulou 1994 and the various contributions to Anagnostopoulou et al. 1997).

Cinque (1990), Iatridou (1991) and Anagnostopoulou (1994) point out that the two constructions show a number of systematic differences, which are summarized below (see Anagnostopoulou 1994: 151-158 for an overview):

(i) There are languages that have CLLD but not clitic doubling. For example, CLLD is grammatical in Italian (see (4)) but doubling is not:

2 As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the view that clitic doubling is different from clitic left dislocation is not the only point of view available in the literature (see, e.g., Delfitto 2002).
(5) *Lo vedrò domani Gianni (Italian)
   Him will-see-I tomorrow Gianni

(ii) There are languages in which doubling is subject to Kayne's Generalization while CLLD is not. Rioplatense Spanish presents such a case:

(6) a.  Lo vimos a Juan (Rioplatense Spanish)
       Him saw-we a Juan
       'We saw Juan'

   b.  *Lo compramos el/al libro
       It bought-we the book
       'We bought the book'

(7) a.  A Juan, lo vimos Ayer
       A Juan him saw-we yesterday
       'We saw Juan yesterday'

   b.  El libro, lo compramos ayer
       The book it bought-we yesterday
       'We bought the book yesterday'

(iii) While the cases of doubling reported in the literature are limited to (doubling of) DPs, the dislocated constituent in CLLD can be any maximal phrase. The Italian data in (9) (Cinque 1990: 58) exemplify CLLD of PPs and APs:

(8) a.  A casa, non ci sono stato ancora (Italian)
       To home, not there am been yet
       'I haven’t been home yet'

   b.  Di questa faccenda, non ne voglio più parlare
       Of this matter, not of-it want anymore talk
       'I don't want to talk about this matter anymore'

   c.  Bella, pare che non lo sia mai stata
       Beautiful, seems that not it is ever been
       'It doesn't seem that she has ever been beautiful'

(iv) There are semantic classes of noun phrases that can undergo CLLD but resist clitic doubling, as illustrated in (9) with examples from Greek:

(9) a.  Tria provlimata mono o Kostas ta elise (Greek)
       Three problems only the Kostas them solved
       'Only Kostas solved three problems'

   b.  *Mono o Kostas ta elise tria provlimata
       Only the Kostas them solved three problems
Cinque (1990), Iatridou (1991) and Anagnostopoulou (1994) argued that these differences are unexpected if CLLD is the movement counterpart of doubling. In turn, this led them to analyze CLLD in terms of base-generation of the dislocated phrase in a left-peripheral position which is associated with a resumptive clitic IP-internally via predication (see specifically Iatridou 1991 on the issue of predication). In later literature, this conclusion has been questioned on the basis of the well-known fact that CLLD shows Connectivity effects (e.g. Case matching, sensitivity to strong islands, Principle A reconstruction etc; see the various contributions to Anagnostopoulou, van Riemsdijk and Zwart 1997). Agouraki (1993), Kayne (1994), Sportiche (1996) and Cecchetto (2000), among others, argued that the most straightforward account for the movement properties of CLLD would be in terms of fronting of the CLLDed phrase to the left periphery from a clitic doubled position. Under a movement account, the differences between CLLD and clitic doubling mentioned above would derive from the fact that CLLD is an A’dependency, unlike clitic doubling. What would also have to be explained is why some languages permit clitic doubling only if it subsequently feeds A’ movement, while in other languages there is no such restriction. See Harizanov (to appear, sections 2 and 5.4.) for a recent discussion of these issues.

3.2. Clitic Doubling vs. Right Dislocation

In Right Dislocation a clitic co-occurs with a phrase to its right (data from Jaeggli 1986: 33):

(10) J'ai vu, l'assassin (French)
    I have seen, the murderer
    'I saw him, the murderer'

Right Dislocation of subjects and objects has been discussed by, among others, Antinucci & Cinque (1977), Calabrese (1990), Jaeggli (1986), Vallduví (1990, 1992), and Zubizarreta (1994, 1998). Given the similarity between Right Dislocation of objects and clitic doubling, the question once again arises whether the two constructions have the same or a different structural analysis. In the literature, both positions have been entertained. According to one view (Hurtado 1984; Aoun 1981; Philippaki-Warburton 1987, and much later literature, see e.g. Philippaki-Warburton et al. (2004) for an updated version of this), there is no formal difference between clitic doubling and right dislocation. In both constructions, the phrase associated with the clitic is an adjunct. According to another view (Strozer 1976; Rivas 1977; Jaeggli 1982, 1986; Borer 1984), the object is generated as a complement of the verb in clitic doubling constructions, while it is an adjunct (to VP or IP) in right dislocations. In the present discussion, the latter approach will be adopted because, as will be demonstrated in the next subsections, a) there are strong arguments against unifying the two constructions structurally (3.2.1) and b) there is evidence that in clitic doubling the doubled DP resides in an argument position (3.2.2).
3.2.1. Differences between Clitic Doubling and Right Dislocation

Jaeggli (1986: 32-35) argued against the adjunct analysis of clitic doubling on the basis of the following systematic differences between right dislocation and clitic doubling:

(i) In right dislocation, the dislocated phrase is set off from the rest of the sentence with a sharp intonational break, while no such break is required before the object in clitic doubling:

(11) Parece que tuvieron que llevarla de urgencia a los Estados Unidos la hija de Coronel Martínez (Rioplatense Spanish)
It seems that they had to take her urgently to the United States the daughter of Coronel Martinez

(12) Parece que tuvieron que llevarla a La hija de Coronel Martínez de urgencia a los Estados Unidos
It seems that they had to take her the daughter of Coronel Martinez urgently to the United States

The difference in intonation between (11) and (12) correlates with a difference in word order. In (11) the direct object occurs at the very end of the sentence, following all other phrases. On the other hand, in (12) the direct object is followed by the string de urgencia a los Estados Unidos.

(ii) Right dislocation is not subject to Kayne's Generalization, as illustrated in (11), while clitic doubling requires the presence of the preposition a preceding the doubled phrase, as illustrated in (12).

(iii) There are languages that have right dislocation but disallow clitic doubling. French presents such a case. This language freely allows right dislocation, as was illustrated in (10), while lacking clitic doubling, as was shown in (3).

In later literature, the properties of right dislocation have been investigated in more detail. Vallduví (1990, 1992) and Zubizarreta (1994, 1998) focused on an intonational property of right dislocation not discussed in Jaeggli (1986). While for Jaeggli (1986) the salient property of right dislocation is a pause separating it from the rest of the clause, for Vallduví (1990, 1992) and Zubizarreta (1994, 1998) the crucial property is that the intonation peak of the sentence falls on some element preceding the right dislocated phrase. According to Vallduví, the main informational task of right dislocation is to focus V\(^0\) or a projection of V\(^0\). The intonation peak of the sentence falls on V\(^0\) to which the clitic (and the negation, if present) attaches. Zubizarreta (1998: 151-158) draws a distinction between right dislocated objects and de-accented in situ objects. The former co-occur with a clitic and follow a subject bearing Nuclear Stress, as shown in (13). The latter do not co-occur with a clitic and follow a subject bearing Contrastive Stress, as illustrated in (14):

(13) La lavó mamá, la mamadera (Standard Spanish)
Cl-acc washed mother the milk bottle
“Mother washed the milk-bottle”

(14) Lavó MAMÁ, la mamadera (Standard Spanish)
washed mother the milk bottle
“Mother washed the milk-bottle”
There is no prosodic boundary between in situ de-accented objects and the nuclear pitch accented words preceding them in examples like (14). On the other hand, the prosodic status of right dislocated objects in (13) is comparable to some extent to that of English tags. Like tags, right dislocated objects constitute a distinct prosodic phrase from the preceding material and they bear their own nuclear pitch accent. Similarly to tags, right dislocated objects are perceived as less prominent than the preceding nuclear pitch accented word. Unlike tags, right dislocated phrases may be preceded by a salient pause. Thus, a pause may be present in right dislocation, as was observed by Jaeggli (1986), but doesn't have to be present, contrary to what Jaeggli (1986) thought.

There are also phrase structure asymmetries between right dislocated constituents and in-situ de-accented constituents. First, as seen in (13) and (14), in-situ de-accented objects do not co-exist with clitics, while with right dislocated objects the presence of a clitic is obligatory. Second, in locative structures the order among dislocated constituents is free, as illustrated in (15) (the pound sign indicates the prosodic boundary preceding a right dislocated phrase), while the order among in situ de-accented objects is fixed, as shown in (16):

(15) a. Escondió el libro #el niño #debajo de la cama (Standard Hid the book #the boy #under the bed Spanish)
b. Escondió el libro #debajo de la cama #el niño
'The boy hid the book under the bed'

(16) a. Escondió el NIÑO el libro debajo de la cama
Hid The boy the book under the bed
b. *Escondió el NIÑO debajo de la cama el libro
'The boy hid the book under the bed'

Third, objects undergoing clitic doubling can be accented and precede elements with nuclear stress, unlike right dislocated objects. Thus, in Standard Spanish, where indirect objects and direct object pronouns undergo clitic doubling, a doubled indirect object may carry nuclear stress, as shown in (17a) (from Zubizarreta 1998: 198, ex. (iv)), and a doubled direct object pronoun may precede a non-right dislocated focused subject receiving nuclear stress, as shown in (17b) (from Zubizarreta 1998: 186: ex. (vi)):

(17) a. Se lo envoi a mamá #María#el regalo
Cl-dat Cl-acc sent to mother #Mary #the book
‘Mary sent the book to mother’
b. Esta mañana lo castigó a él [la madre de Juan]
This morning Cl-acc punished him the mother of Juan
‘This morning, Juan’s mother punished him’

Thus, doubled objects have the intonation and distribution of arguments, while right dislocated objects have the intonation and distribution of peripheral elements. These differences can be straightforwardly expressed in an analysis according to which, the former occupy argument slots and the latter are right-adjoined elements, as proposed by Jaeggli (1986) and Vallduví (1990, 1992). Even
though a clitic co-occurs with an object to its right in both clitic doubling and right dislocation, the two constructions can be easily distinguished in Spanish and Catalan. Clitic doubling is subject to Kayne's Generalization (i.e. it takes place with pronouns or DPs preceded by the preposition a associated with animacy), while right dislocation takes place with DP objects of any kind, as illustrated in (13) and (14), where a clitic co-occurs with an inanimate object not being preceded by a.

3.2.2. Evidence that in clitic doubling, doubled DPs reside in argument position

Harizanov (to appear) offers a number arguments from Bulgarian based on extraction and islandhood, Case assignment and word-order that in true clitic doubling languages doubled DPs reside in argument position. The same arguments have been offered (see e.g. Schneider-Zioga 1994, Anagnostopoulou 1994, Sportiche 1996 on the last argument) or can be reproduced for Greek. Here I will briefly summarize the extraction argument with data from both Bulgarian and Greek.

In both Greek and Bulgarian extraction out of adjuncts is prohibited due to the CED (Huang 1982, Chomsky 1986). In both languages, non clitic possessors originate in a post-nominal position but they can also occur pronominally and clause initially, as shown in (18) for Bulgarian and (19) for Greek (see Horrocks and Stavrou 1987 on Greek):

(18) a. Popravih dvigatelja na bežovija Moskvič
   I-repaired the engine of the beige Moskvitch
   ‘I repaired the engine of the beige Moskvitch’
   
   b. Popravih na bežovija Moskvič dvigatelja
      I-repaired of the beige Moskvitch the engine
   
   c. Na bežovija Moskvič popravih dvigatelja
      Of the beige Moskvitch I-repaired the engine
   
   d. Na koj avtomobil propravi dvigatelja?
      Of which automobile you-repaired the engine?
   ‘Of which automobile did you repair the engine?’

(19) a. Foresa to forema tis Marias
    I-wore the dress-ACC the Maria-GEN
    ‘I wore Maria’s dress’
    
   b. Foresa tis Marias to forema
      I-wore the Maria-GEN the dress-ACC
   
   c. Tis Marias foresa to forema
      The Maria-GEN I-wore the dress
   
   d. Tinos foreses to forema?
      Whose GEN you-wore the dress?
   ‘Whose dress did you wear?’

Horrocks & Stavrou (1987) argued that this type of possessor fronting in (19c) and (19d) involves A’ movement of the postnominal possessor via the specifier of the DP which in Greek has the status of an A’ position (akin to spec,CP). In (19b) the possessor occupies the spec, DP position which has the
properties of a Focus-like position (in 19b the possessor has the intonational and interpretational properties of a focused phrase). Harizanov (to appear) argues for the same type of analysis for Bulgarian and offers independent evidence for the movement analysis of possessors (see Harizanov, to appear, section 3.1. for details). Possessor movement of the kind illustrated in (18) and (19) is sensitive to adjunct-islands, as shown in (20) for Bulgarian and (21) for Greek:

(20) a. *Na bežovijaMoskvič si trăgnah sled kato popravih dvigatelja
   Of the beige Moskvitch REFL I-left after when I-repaired the engine
   ‘I left after I repaired the engine of the beige Moskvitch’

   b. *Na koj avtomobil si trăgnah predi da popraviš dvigatelja?
   Of which automobile REFL you-left before to you repaired the engine
   ‘Of which automobile did you leave before you repaired the engine’?

Crucially, possessor extraction out of clitic doubled object DPs is well-formed in both Bulgarian and Greek, as shown in (22) and (23), respectively:

(22) a. Na Sonja  Maria go vidja prijatelja
   Of Sonia Maria Cl-DO saw the friend
   ‘Maria saw Sonia’s friend’

   b. Na Ivan  gi polzvah instrumentite
   Of Ivan Cl-DO I-used the instruments
   ‘I used Ivan’s instruments’

   c. Na koi tvoi učenici gi poznavaš roditelite?
   Of which your students Cl-DO you-know the parents
   ‘The parents of which of your students do you know?’

(23) a. Tis Elenis  i Maria ton gnorise ton filo
   The Eleni-GEN the Mary-NOM Cl-ACC met the friend-ACC
   ‘Mary met the friend of Eleni’

   b. Tu Jani  ta xrisimopiisa ta organa
   The Jani-GEN Cl-ACC I-used the instruments-ACC
   ‘I used Janis’s instruments’

   c. Tinos  to foreses to forema?
   Whose-GEN Cl-ACC you-wore the dress-ACC
   ‘Whose dress did you wear’?

This provides evidence that clitic doubled DPs in the two languages occupy an argument and not an adjunct position.
4. Four stages in the history of the analysis of doubling and how variation was discovered and dealt with

The history of the study of clitic doubling can be divided into four periods, which coincide with different stages of the Principles and Parameters theory and the Minimalist framework. In what follows, I will present the main issues discussed in each period, focusing on the question of variation in clitic doubling phenomena within and across languages and how they have been dealt with.

4.1. Early GB approaches: A Parameter relating to Kayne's Generalization

4.1.1. Movement vs. Base Generation

Consider the French examples in (24):

(24) a. Je le vois (French)
   I him see
   ‘I see him’

   b. *Je le vois Jean
      I him see Jean
      ‘I see Jean’

In (24a), le appears as a morpheme bound to the verb on the basis of a number of tests. For example, it cannot appear in isolation, it cannot be stressed or coordinated, nothing can interrupt the cl-V sequence etc. (see, among others, Kayne 1975: 82-87). This leads to a representation as in (25), where the clitic and the inflected verb form a morphological unit:

(25) V
     le V
     vois

A central issue in the study of clitics is whether the complex [le-vois] in (24a) is directly inserted as such (the base-generation approach) or the clitic moves to its host from the post-verbal complement position of the verb (the movement approach). For a long time this was seen as a dilemma concerning the component of the grammar in which cl-verb combinations are formed: base generated approaches assumed that this process takes place in the Lexicon (lexicalist approaches), while movement (transformational) analyses treated cliticization as a phenomenon taking place in Syntax.

Kayne (1975) argued that the movement analysis correctly accounts for the fact that clitics and full DP objects are in complementary distribution. Corroborating evidence for a syntactic approach to clitic placement was drawn by Specified Subject Condition effects. In causative constructions, a dative clitic cannot appear in the main clause in the presence of a subject in the embedded clause:
John has let Peter speak to Mary

'John has let Peter speak to Mary'

John him has let speak to Mary

'John has let him speak to Mary'

Jean to her has let Peter speak

'Jean has let Peter to speak to her'

(27) \[X_{lui} \ldots s[\ldots Z_{Pierre} \ldots \ldots W_{source of lui} \ldots ]\]

(27) is the representation of (26c), where \( X \) is the surface position of \( lui \), \( Z \) is the position of the embedded subject Pierre, and \( Y \) is the source position of \( lui \). This configuration violates the SSC, as stated in (28), which Chomsky (1971) viewed as a condition on transformations.

(28) No rule can involve \( X,Y \) in the structure \( \ldots X \ldots s[\ldots Z \ldots -W_{YV} \ldots ] \)

where \( Z \) is the subject of \( W_{YV} \)

Kayne argued that the postulation of a Clitic-Placement transformation (as opposed to inserting clitics in the clitic position via Phrase Structure Rules) correctly predicts the fact that it is subject to the SSC. The movement view was adopted by Quicoli (1980) and others.

Kayne's major argument for a movement approach to cliticization, namely the complementarity between clitics and full NPs, has been challenged on the basis of clitic doubling in a number of languages with pronominal clitics such as Spanish, Romanian and Hebrew, which are exemplified in (29) (see Jaeggli 1982: 15-19 for critical discussion; in Aoun 1981, and Hurtado 1984 the movement view is maintained by analyzing doubled DPs as adjuncts):

(29) a. Lo vimos a Juan (Rioplatense Spanish)

Him saw-we a Juan

'We saw Juan'

b. l-am vâzut pe Popescu (Romanian)

him-have-I seen pe Popescu

'I have seen Popescu'

c. beit-o šel ha-more 'omed 'al ha-giv'a (ModernHebrew)

house-his šel the-teacher stands on the-hill

'the teacher's house stands on the hill'

For these cases a representation along the lines of (30) was needed (see Borer 1984 and Jaeggli 1986 that clitics are parts of the head, as opposed to the earlier proposal in Rivas 1977 and Jaeggli 1982: 98 fn. 10 that they are sisters of \(V\) immediately dominated by \(V\)'):
Since the complement position of the verb is occupied by \textit{a Juan}, it was hard to maintain a movement analysis for clitic doubling, as there is no source position available for the clitic. This led to the view that \textit{lo} in (30) is directly inserted under $V$.

Ethical datives were seen as a further argument for base-generation. In Spanish, \textit{ethical datives} are obligatorily realized as clitics, a fact suggesting that the thematic role assigned to the dative clitic is never assigned to an NP in argument position (data first discussed in Perlmutter 1971):

(31)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Me \textit{le} arruinaron \textit{la} vida a \textit{mi} hijo (All Dialects of Spanish)
\item b. *\textit{Le} arruinaron \textit{la} vida a \textit{mi} hijo a \textit{Me}
\end{enumerate}

'\textit{They ruined my son's life}'

In Jaeggli (1982: 18-19) it was argued that ethical dative clitics are base-generated in the clitic position since they do not alternate with phrases in the canonical argument position.

The view that a) clitics are inserted from the lexicon in clitic doubling and ethical dative constructions and b) all clitics share the same syntax led to a base-generation analysis of non-doubling clitic constructions, such as the Spanish example (32) and its French counterpart \textit{je le vois}.

(32)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Lo} & \quad \text{veo} \quad (\text{Standard Spanish}) \\
& \quad \text{Cl-ACC} \quad \text{see-I} \\
& \quad \text{I see him/it'}
\end{align*}

Under the "uniformity" view of clitic constructions according to which, cliticization is a uniform phenomenon in invariably all clitic languages, clitics must be assumed to be base-generated in their surface position, even in languages like French where clitic doubling is disallowed.

Base-generation analyses of clitics were developed in Jaeggli (1982, 1986), Borer (1984), Bouchard (1982), Burzio (1986), among many others. According to these proposals, in non-doubling constructions the clitic is associated with an empty category in complement position:
Note that in a base generation analysis, SSC effects of the type illustrated in (34) do not constrain movement *per se* but rather the relationship between the clitic and the base generated empty category in the complement position of V:

(34)  

This was compatible with Chomsky's (1981) position that the SSC is part of the Binding Theory, which applies equally to movement and base-generation dependencies (see van Riemsdijk 1999 and Sportiche 1993; 1996; 1998; for an overview). See Borer (1984) for extensive argumentation that the clitic in (33) governs and c-commands the coindexed NP position (see also Jaeggli 1986). As stressed by Borer (1984: 35), an analysis along these lines treats clitic constructions without doubling as being formally similar to the output of movement rules. Since the base-generated clitic is coindexed with the empty category it c-commands, base-generated constructions of this type are identical in representational terms to movement dependencies.

4.1.2. Kayne's Generalization and the Clitic Doubling Parameter

In Jaeggli's (1982) theory of cliticization clitic doubling was seen as a marked phenomenon (see Jaeggli 1982: 20 for theoretical discussion): within Romance, clitic doubling is found to varying extents in Spanish and Romanian, while it is totally absent in French and Italian.\(^3\) Within Romance, the property that appears to regulate the cross-linguistic distribution of doubling is *Kayne's Generalization*:

(35)  

\(^3\) Later research has shown that clitic doubling is not totally absent from French and Italian; see e.g. Kayne 2000 on French.
According to Jaeggli (1982, 1986), the theory of cliticization must be flexible enough to allow for the clitic doubling option but restrictive enough to treat doubling as a specific option limited to Kayne's Generalization environments. The core proposal in that time was that clitics absorb Case (expressed in different ways in Jaeggli 1982, Borer 1984, Jaeggli 1986). As a result, when an overt NP occurs in object position, it cannot receive Case, which was taken to be assigned under government. Therefore, clitic doubling was expected to be ruled out as a Case Filter violation (Chomsky 1981), unless a special preposition is present, which can assign Case to the NP.

In Jaeggli's (1982) theory, the cross-linguistic differences in the distribution of clitic doubling in Romance were accounted for as follows (see Jaeggli 1982 for details and Jaeggli 1986 for some revisions).

a) Direct Object Doubling: presence vs. absence of a; a is not always a Case-assigner

Direct Object Doubling is allowed in Rioplatense Spanish with animate, specific objects, which are introduced by the special preposition a (36a). It is disallowed in Rioplatense Spanish when the object is inanimate and a preposition in front of it is impossible (36b). Doubling is ruled out in French and Italian, where the option of inserting a is unavailable, as illustrated in (37) for French. Finally, in Standard Spanish direct object doubling is ruled out, even though animate, specific objects are introduced by a (38):

(36) a. Lo vimos a Guille
   Cl-acc saw-we a Guille
   'We saw Guille'

   b. *La vimos la casa de Mafalda
      Cl-acc saw-we the house of Mafalda
      'We saw the house of Mafalda'

(37) a. *Je le vois Jean (French)
     I him see Jean
     'I am seeing Jean'

   b. Je vois Jean
      I see Jean

   c. *Je vois a Jean

(38) a. *Lo vimos a Guille (Standard Spanish)
     Cl-acc saw-we a Guille
     'We saw Guille'

   b. Vimos a Guille
      Saw-we a Guille

The contrasts between (36a) and (36b) in Rioplatense Spanish, on the one hand, and (36a) in Rioplatense Spanish vs. (37a) in French (and Italian), on the other, were linked to the presence vs. absence of a. Jaeggli proposed that when a is present, as in (36a), Case can be assigned to the NP complement of V. In the absence of a, the NP cannot be assigned Case, violating the Case Filter. In order to account for the contrast between Rioplatense Spanish (36a) and Standard Spanish (38a), he had to stipulate that a cannot assign Case to direct objects in Standard Spanish.
b) Indirect Object Doubling: \( a \) is a preposition or a Case marker

Indirect object doubling is permitted in all dialects of Spanish and disallowed in French and Italian:

\[(39)\] \hspace{1cm} Miguelito (le) regaló un caramel a Mafalda (All dialects of Spanish)

\text{Miguelito \hspace{1cm} Cl-DAT \hspace{1cm} gave \hspace{1cm} a \hspace{1cm} candy \hspace{1cm} a \hspace{1cm} Mafalda 'Miguelito gave Mafalda a piece of candy'}

\[(40)\] \hspace{1cm} Jean (*lui) A donné des bonbons à Marie (French)

\text{Jean \hspace{1cm} Cl-DAT \hspace{1cm} Has \hspace{1cm} given \hspace{1cm} the \hspace{1cm} candies \hspace{1cm} a \hspace{1cm} Marie 'Jean gave chocolates to Marie'}

The problem posed by this contrast is that in both Spanish and French/Italian, indirect objects must be preceded by \( a \), and yet doubling is ruled out in the latter group of languages, as illustrated in (3). To account for this, Jaeggli suggested that \( à \) is a Case marker in French, i.e. it realizes dative Case rather than assigning it. He presented two pieces of evidence that \( à \) is not a preposition in French, which were based on a co-ordination paradigm discussed by Vergnaud (1974). See Jaeggli (1982) and Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005b, 2006) for more details on this. Not being a preposition, French \( à \) cannot assign Case, and doubling violates the Case Filter. By contrast, Spanish \( a \) was argued to qualify as a preposition on the basis of Vergnaud's tests (Jaeggli 1982: 32). Being a true preposition, Spanish \( a \) was taken to be capable of Case licensing the doubled DP.

Finally, Jaeggli pointed out that whenever clitic doubling is obligatory in Spanish, cliticization is obligatory in French, an observation providing evidence for the deep similarity between clitic doubling and simple cliticization configurations (up to the parametric availability of the language-specific devices that may Case-license an overt doubled NP in one language but not the other). The environments under discussion are two, namely inalienable possession constructions and pronouns (though see footnote 3 above that clitic doubling of pronouns in French is possible after all):

a) Inalienable Possession Constructions

\[(41)\] \hspace{1cm} a. \hspace{1cm} Le lavaron las manos a Luis (All Dialects of Spanish)

\text{They washed Luis's hands}'

\hspace{1cm} b. \hspace{1cm} Le lavaron las manos

\hspace{1cm} c. \hspace{1cm} *Lavaron las manos a Luis

\[(42)\] \hspace{1cm} a. \hspace{1cm} *Elle lui cassera Jean le gueule French

\text{She will break his face}'

\hspace{1cm} b. \hspace{1cm} Elle lui cassera la gueule

\hspace{1cm} b. \hspace{1cm} *Elle cassera Jean le gueule
b) Pronouns

(43) a. *Vimos a él (All Dialects
Saw-we a him of Spanish)
‘We saw him’
b. Lo vimos
Cl-Acc saw-we
c. Lo vimos a él
Cl-Acc saw-we a him
‘We saw him’

(44) a. *Jean voit moi/toi/lui/elle/nous… (French)
b. Jean me/te/le/la/nous….voit

Borer (1984) widened the empirical coverage of the Case-theoretic interpretation of Kayne's Generalization by extending it to the domain of nouns and prepositions. Similarly to Jaeggli (1982) who explained cross-linguistic differences in terms of variation in the properties of a (see above), Borer (1984) accounted for parametric differences between Hebrew and Romanian in terms of the specific properties of šel and pe illustrated in (29b) and (29c) above. Concerning the nature of clitics, Borer proposed that they are parts of the heads to which they attach, in particular they are inflectional elements spelling out (and absorbing) the Case features of the heads. In this sense, Borer was the first to suggest that clitics are (special kinds of) agreement markers.

(45) Clitic Spell-Out (Borer 1984: 37)
\[
\begin{align*}
[x, \alpha \text{ Case}] & \rightarrow [x, X [\alpha \text{ Case}, \beta \text{ gender}, \gamma \text{ number}, \delta \text{ person}]] \\
X &= [+V] \text{ in Romance} \\
X &= V, P, N \text{ in Semitic}
\end{align*}
\]

Borer pointed out that that šel is obligatory in clitic doubling (Borer 1984: 49) in nominals, leading to the conclusion that doubling is another configuration in which the Case-assigning capacity of nouns is suppressed:

(46) a. beit-a šel ha-mora (Modern Hebrew)
house-her of the-teacher
'the teacher's house'
b. *beit-a ha-mora
house-her the-teacher

Doubling in Hebrew nominals is permitted only in the presence of a special preposition assigning Case to the complement of the noun, in accordance with Jaeggli's (1982) interpretation of Kayne's Generalization.
Finally, a distinction was introduced between šel, which is a content-less, dummy element, and pe and a in Romanian and Spanish, which are contentful prepositions. More specifically, Borer (1984) pointed out that the range of environments where šel is found in Hebrew coincide exactly with those in which structural Case cannot be assigned, doubling being one of them. By contrast, pe in Romanian is found quite independently of the unavailability of Case assignment. Pe is found in the presence of the lexico-semantic features [+human], [+pronominal], while doubling is found only when the object is, in addition, [+specific], i.e. it is limited to a subset of the environments in which pe is available:

a) **Pe obligatory-Doubling Obligatory**

(47)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[+specific,+definite,+human,+pronominal]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Am văzut-o pe ea (Romanian)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have-I seen-Cl pe her</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'I have seen her'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*am văzut-o ea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>*am văzut pe ea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(48)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[+specific,+definite,+human,-pronominal]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>l-am văzut pe Popescu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl-have-I seen pe Popescu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'I have seen Popescu'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*l-am văzut Popescu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>*am văzut pe Popescu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(49)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[+specific,-definite,+human,-pronominal]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>O caut pe o fată de la noi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cl-I-am pe a girl from the our village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>looking for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>din sat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>*o caut o fată de la noi din sat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>*caut pe o fată de la noi din sat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(50)  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[-specific,-definite,+human,+pronominal]</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Am văzut pe altcineva</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>have-I seen pe somebody else</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>'I have seen somebody else'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

4Borer 1984: 128 based herself on Steriade 1980; see also Dobrovie-Sorin 1990, 1994 for discussion of the semantic properties of direct object doubling in Romanian. Similar considerations apply to a in Spanish, according to Jaeggli's 1982 description; see also Borer 1984.
b. *am văzut altcineva
   have-I seen somebody else

   *l-am văzut pe altcineva

   c) *Pe impossible-Doubling Impossible

(51) [-specific,-definite,+human,-pronominal]

   a. Am văzut un bucătar
      have-I seen a cook
      'I have seen a cook'

   b. *am văzut pe un bucătar

   c. *l-am văzut pe un bucătar

(52) [+specific,+definite,-human,-pronominal]

   a. Am văzut cîinele lui Popescu
      have-I seen dog-the of Popescu
      'I have seen the dog of Popescu'

   b. *am văzut pe cîinele lui Popescu

   c. *l-am văzut pe cîinele lui Popescu

(53) [-specific,-definite,-human,+pronominal]

   a. Am văzut altceva
      have-I seen something else
      'I have seen something else'

   b. *am văzut pe altceva

   c. *l-am văzut pe altceva

Borer argued that the presence of pe is required by lexico-semantic factors, and therefore, it must be present at D-structure. Its presence facilitates doubling, but the purpose of inserting pe is not simply to rescue the structure. On the other hand, the sole purpose of inserting šel is to assign genitive Case.

Let us summarize how inter- and intra-linguistic variation is accounted for in the two works presented so far which capitalize on Kayne's Generalization to account for the Clitic Doubling Parameter:

a) Kayne's Generalization: a preposition-like element must be present... Case-interpretation:... to assign the Case absorbed by the Clitic. This explains Spanish, Romanian direct object clitic doubling as opposed to French and Italian. It also explains Hebrew doubling in nominals.

b) Auxiliary assumption 1: When a preposition-like element is a preposition, doubling is possible. Otherwise not. This explains why indirect object doubling is well-formed in Spanish but not in French and Italian.

c) Auxiliary assumption 2: When a preposition-like element is a preposition that can assign Case, doubling is possible. Otherwise not. This explains why direct object doubling is well-formed in Rioplatense Spanish but not in Standard Spanish.
4.2. Late GB approaches: Specificity, animacy and rejection of Case-theoretic approaches

An important step in the study of clitic doubling was the discovery that Kayne’s Generalization is insufficient to account for the distribution and properties of clitic doubling across different languages and different constructions. It turned out that clitic doubling is possible in environments where the doubled DP is not preceded by the preposition. Moreover, it was observed that direct object and indirect object clitic doubling are subject to distinct conditions within and across languages. What seems to unite direct object doubling across languages is the fact that it has interpretational effects, encoding specificity and topicality in different ways. On the other hand, indirect object doubling does not generally show these effects.

4.2.1. Specificity determines doubling of DOs. IOs work differently.

Suñer (1988) built on Borer’s (1984) insight that clitics are similar to agreement markers and focused on the fact that direct object doubling in Spanish is limited to specific NPs. In addition, she argued against the view that clitics absorb Case. By doing so, she initiated an altogether different way of thinking about clitic doubling constructions and the Clitic Doubling Parameter. Finally, she pointed out that direct object doubling and indirect object doubling differ with respect to specificity effects. In what follows, these three points are presented in more detail.

(a) Suñer drew attention to the fact that clitic doubling is sensitive to the semantic nature of direct object DPs. While specific animate DPs can be doubled by accusative clitics (54a, 54b), non-specific animate DPs cannot undergo clitic doubling (54c, 54d) in Rioplatense Spanish (Suñer 1988: 396):

(54) a. [+anim,+spec,+def] (Rioplatense Spanish)
   La oían a Paca a la niña a la gata
   Her listened-3PL to Paca to the girl to the cat
   'They listened to Paca/the girl/the cat'

   b. [+anim,+spec,-def]
   Diariamente, la escuchaba A Una mujer que
   daily, her listened-3sg to A woman who
   cantaba tangos
   sang tangos
   'He listened daily to a woman who sang tangos'

   c. [+anim,-spec,+def]
   *Lo alabarán al niño Que termine primero
Him will praise-3PL the boy Who finishes first
'They will praise the boy who finishes first'
d. [+anim,-spec,-def]
*No lo oyeron a ningún ladrón
Not him heard-3PL to Any thief
'They didn't hear any thieves'

(b) She furthermore provided data from Porteño/Rioplatense Spanish where direct object clitic doubling is possible in the absence of a (Suñer 1988: 399-400):

(55) a. Yo la tenía prevista esta muerte (Rioplatense Spanish)
I had forseen (it) this death
b. ¿Así que el tarambana de Octavio
La liquidó su fortuna?
Isn’t it true that the empty-headed Octavio squandered (it) his fortune?
c. Lo último que escuché, claro que
La encontré pesada la audición, fue el reportaje
The last thing I listened to, of course I found (it) boring the radio-program, was the interview (Barrenechea y Orecchia 1979)
d. Ahora tiene que seguir usándolo
El apellido (idem)
Now s/he has to go on using (it) the surname
e. Yo lo voy a comprar el diario justo antes
I it am going to buy the newspaper just before
de subir (spont.)
coming up

Suñer argued that these examples are not right-dislocations because they are uttered with the same unbroken intonation curve they would have without the clitic, they occur in embedded or parenthetical clauses as in (55c), as well as in non-peripheral positions as in (55e). On the basis of these data, she concluded that a is not a Case marker but rather a marker of animacy or "distinctiveness" (Ramsey 1956) and that the presence of a is not a necessary condition for clitic doubling in Argentinean Spanish, contrary to what is widely assumed in the literature. The existence of examples like (55) show that although direct object clitic doubling of inanimates in Spanish is less general than doubling of animates, neither animacy nor the presence of a are required for clitic doubling.

(c) Finally, she pointed out that indirect object/dative clitic doubling differs from direct object/accusative clitic doubling in not being subject to specificity (Suñer 1988: 394-395):

(56) a. [+human,+spec., def] (All Spanish)
Le ofrecí ayuda a la niña/ a una estudiante
her offered-1SG to help to the girl/ to A student
'I offered help to the girl/ to a student'
b. [+human,-spec.,-def]  
Les ofrecieron queso y leche a familias De pocos medios  
'they offered cheese and milk to low-income families'

c. [+human,-spec,+def]  
Les dejarían todo mi dinero a los pobres  
'I will leave all my money to the poor'

To account for the above facts, Suñer (1988) proposed that clitics are inflections, generated as part of the V. They are listed in the lexicon, which permits their features to be specified there. Indirect object clitics and direct object clitics are defined by assigning values to the features [specific], [animate], [gender], [number], and [person], the crucial difference between the two being that direct object clitics are inherently [+specific]. Being agreement affixes, clitics must agree in features with the constituent they form a chain with (Matching Principle). This, according to Suñer, explains the specificity requirement on direct object clitic doubling. A chain is well-formed only when there is no clash of features, and a non-specific NP cannot form a chain with a [+specific] clitic, because this would lead to such a clash.

As already mentioned, Dobrovie-Sorin (1990, 1994) reported similar findings for Romanian. Unlike Suñer, Dobrovie-Sorin did not challenge the view that the presence of a special preposition (pe for direct objects, the dative morphology for indirect objects in Romanian) is a prerequisite for object clitic doubling. She argued, though, that a) in Romanian there are many restrictions on direct object clitic doubling which have to do with the interpretation of NPs and b) indirect object clitic doubling differs from direct object clitic doubling with respect to sensitivity to the semantics of NPs.

4.2.2. Balkan languages do not fall under Kayne's Generalization. The case of Greek.

Having discussed Spanish as a potential counterexample to Kayne's Generalization, let us now turn to languages that present straightforward counterexamples to Kayne's Generalization. All Balkan languages that have been claimed to have clitic doubling (e.g. Bulgarian, Albanian and Greek) fall in this group. See Franks & King (2000) for an overview of clitic doubling in Slavic. See Harizanov (to appear) and references cited there for discussion of Bulgarian clitic doubling. Greek will be discussed here in some detail.

In Greek, indirect objects bearing genitive case and direct objects bearing accusative can be doubled:

(57) (Tu) (to) edhosa tu Jani to vivlio (Greek)  
Cl-gen Cl-acc gave-1sg the Janis-gen the book-Acc  
'I gave John the book'

5 Guentchéva (2008), Alexandrova (1997), Dimitrova and Hellan (1999), Pancheva (2005), Krapova & Cinque (2008) are some of the works cited there specifically on Bulgarian doubling.
Greek instantiates a third pattern apart from Spanish/ Romanian, which possess clitic doubling and (by and large) observe Kayne’s generalization, and Italian/French, which lack clitic doubling. As shown in (57), clitic doubling does not take place in the presence of a preposition. In fact, clitic doubling in Greek is blocked when the indirect object is a PP (see Dimitriadis 1999, Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005b for discussion):

(58) a. *Tu edhosa to vivlio s-ton Jani (Greek)  
   Cl-gen gave-1sg the book-acc to-the Janis  
   'I gave the book to John'  
   b. *Tu pira to vivlio apo ton Jani  
   Cl-gen took-1sg the book-acc from the Janis  
   'I took the book from John'

As shown by the contrast between (57) and (58), Greek looks like the reverse of Spanish and Romanian: doubling is actually not allowed in the presence of a preposition. This cross-linguistic difference between Romance and Greek raises the question whether Greek indeed possesses genuine clitic doubling of DPs. Alternatively, one might argue that what superficially resembles clitic doubling in fact manifests a case of right dislocation, which is found in all clitic languages, regardless of whether they have doubling or not, and which is not subject to Kayne's Generalization (see section 2.2, above). But we saw in section 3.3. that Greek possesses genuine doubling where the doubled DO resides in argument position. Evidence for this was provided from the observation that doubled DPs are not islands for extraction. Moreover, objects can be doubled in environments in which the object precedes the subject:

(59) a. Pjos tin efage tin turta? (Greek)  
   Who Cl-acc ate-3sg the cake-acc?  
   'Who ate the cake?'  
   b. Tin efage tin turta o Janis  
   Cl-acc ate-3sg the cake-acc the Janis-nom  
   'John ate the cake'

(60) a. O Petros agorase ena vivlio.  
   The Petros-nom bought-3sg a book-acc.  
   'Peter bought a book'  
   b. Ke tin ali mera,  
   to kastrepse to vivlio enas mathitis tu  
   Cl-acc destroyed the book-acc a student-nom his  
   'And the next day, a student of his destroyed this book'

In both cases, the object is de-accented and the subject bears main sentence stress. The context ensures that the subjects are not presupposed. In these constructions, the subject has been argued to

Crosslinguistic evidence that the facts in (59) and (60) indeed constitute an argument that Greek has clitic doubling comes from languages that have limited clitic doubling of direct objects such as Standard Spanish and Catalan. In Standard Spanish and Catalan, doubling of objects preceding post-verbal subjects carrying main sentence stress is permitted with indirect objects (Ordoñez 1997), and with pronominal direct objects (Zubizarreta 1998: 185 fn 16, see example 17b above), as illustrated in (61) (see also the discussion in section 3.2):

(61) a. Se lo dio a Juan Maria, el libro (Standard Cl-dat Cl-acc gave to Juan Maria-nom, the book Spanish)
   'Maria gave to Juan the book'
b. Lo castigó a el la madre de Juan
   Cl-acc punished a him the mother of Juan
   'Juan's mother punished him'

In these languages, clitic doubling of direct object DPs is ruled out. Accordingly, doubling of a la profesora in a position preceding the subject is ruled out in (62) (Josep Quer, personal communication):

(62) *La saludó a la profesora Juan (Standard Spanish)
   Cl-acc greeted a the professor Juan-nom
   'Juan greeted the professor'

Note that in (61) the direct object el libro is "doubled" by a clitic but, crucially, it occurs in a position after the subject, i.e. in a right dislocated position.

To sum up, VOS configurations in which the subject bears main stress provide diagnostic environments for clitic doubling as opposed to right dislocation. On the basis of this test, it can be concluded that Greek has clitic doubling.

Similarly to Romanian and Spanish, clitic doubling in Greek has interpretive effects (see Anagnostopoulou 1994). In Greek, clitic doubling is mainly found with definites, which cannot be understood as novel in the presence of doubling. Consider the following examples (constructed on the basis of Heim's 1982 discussion of pronouns):

6 Note that in VOS strings of this type, objects may bind subjects to their right:

(i) a. [OBJ ...[[SUB pron, ] [t, ...]]] (Greek)
   b. Pjos Sinodhepse to kathe pedhi?
       Who-nom accompanied the every child?
       'Who accompanied every child?'
   c. Sinodhepse to kathe pedhi, i mitera tu, i
      Accompanied the every child the mother his
      'His mother accompanied every child'

Thus, the object in (i) must have reached its surface location by overt leftward A movement to a position above the subject.
(63) O Jannis diavase [ena vivlio jia ton Arthur Miller,] enthusiastic, ke thelise na gnorisi ton sigrafeia apo konta.
John read [a book about Arthur Miller,] he got very enthusiastic, and he wanted to get to know the author.
the author: (i) Arthur Miller himself (k=i) or (ii) the author of the book (k related to j by "accommodation")

(64) O Jannis diavase [ena vivlio jia ton Arthur Miller,] enthusiastic, ke thelise na ton gnorisi ton sigrafeia apo konta.
John read [a book about Arthur Miller,] he got enthusiastic, and he wanted to get to know the author.
the author: necessarily the already established member of discourse (i.e. the doubled DP cannot be "novel").

In (63), the undoubled definite ton sigrafeia (the author) is ambiguous: under a familiar reading, its referent is already present in the context of discourse (k=i); under an "associative anaphoric use" (Heim 1982), it introduces a novel referent, namely the author of the book about Arthur Miller that John read (k is linked by cross-references to the already present discourse referent j). The presence of the doubling clitic in (64) suppresses the second option: the doubled DP is necessarily linked to the previously mentioned proper name, thus being strictly construed as anaphoric to previous discourse.

As discussed in Anagnostopoulou (1994, 1999), Greek doubling is obligatory with definite DPs functioning quasi-pronominally (‘epithets’; see Lasnik & Stowell 1991 for discussion and references):

(65) Prospathisa na episkefto ton Jani tin perasmeni
Tried-I to visit the Janis the last
edvomada ala den boresa na ?*(ton) piso
week but not could-I to Cl-Acc persuade

‘I tried to visit John last week, but I wasn’t able to persuade the jerk to see me’

Moreover, clitic doubling is impossible with novel, non-opaque, weak definites:

(66) a. Kathe pedhi psahni tin kaliteri fotografia tu eafu tu gia na
every child is looking for the best picture the self his to

*tin kremasi s-ton tiho
it-cl hang on the wall

‘Every child is looking for the best picture of himself to put it on the wall’

b. *?Kathe pedhi tin psahni tin kaliteri fotografia tu eafu tu gia na
every child Cl-ACC is looking for the best picture the self his to

tin kremasi s-ton tiho
it-cl hang on the wall

‘Every child is looking for the best picture of himself to put it on the wall’
(67) a. Ehi dulia
    Has-he job
    “He has a job”

b. *Ehi ti dulia
    has-he the job
    #“He has the job”

c. Ehi ti dulia pu tu aksizi
    has-he the job that him-cl deserves
    “He has the job he deserves”

d. ?*Tin ehi ti dulia pu tu aksizi o Janis
    Cl-ACC has the job that him-cl deserves the John
    “John has the job he deserves”

4.2.3. Direct object (DO) doubling: Patterns of variation

On the basis of the sample of languages we have discussed so far, we can identify three different patterns of DO doubling. These show variation along two dimensions, namely animacy and specificity.

(a) The Romanian pattern

Dimension A: animacy hierarchy

Romanian represents the most restrictive pattern with respect to animacy. Clitic doubling is possible only with humans. Recall from (52), repeated here, that non-human animates do not permit pe, and hence doubling is impossible with them.

(52) [+specific,+definite,-human,-pronominal]
    a. Am văzut cîinele lui Popescu
       have-I seen dog-the of Popescu
       'I have seen the dog of Popescu'
    b. *am văzut pe cîinele lui Popescu

7 See Anagnostopoulou (1994, 1999) for discussion.
8 An anonymous reviewer points out that even though Spanish and Romanian have been analysed together in the literature, with focus on the similarities of the prepositions “a” and “pe”, it is worth taking into account that there is a crucial difference between “a” and “pe”, namely that “a” is associated with dative case while “pe” specifically with accusative case. Clitic doubling might not be indifferent to this difference.
9 The anonymous reviewer points out that in Romanian, clitic doubling is also allowed with [-human] DPs as well as with [-animate] definite pronouns, e.g. demonstratives. An example illustrating the latter case is provided by the reviewer, who also points out that in this case the presence of the clitic actually ‘extends’ the domain of “pe”, allowing it in a context in which it would otherwise be banned:
   (i) l-am desenat *(pe) aila de acolo [+-animate]
      Cl-Acc.3rd.masc.sg have drawn pe that one of there
      ‘I have drawn the one over there’

The reviewer furthermore points out that in view of cases like (i) it is difficult to believe that in Romanian clitic doubling is a subset of the environments in which “pe” is available, unlike in Spanish. Concerning the cases of clitic doubling of inanimate DPs mentioned by the reviewer, I am unaware of such cases reported in the literature.
c. *I-am văzut pe căinele lui Popescu

*Dimension B: referentiality hierarchy*

At the same time, Romanian displays the freest pattern with respect to referentiality restrictions. Doubling is possible with specific indefinites, as shown in (68), and everything more referential than that (see also the data in (47)-(53) above).

(68) a. O caut pe o secretereā
   Cl-ACC look-1sg for a secretary
   ‘I look for a certain secretary’

   b. L-am păcălit pe mulți copii dar
   Cl-ACC have fooled pe many children but
   pe tine n-am reușit
   pe you not-have I succeeded
   ‘I have fooled many children but I have not succeeded to fool you’

(b) The Spanish pattern

*Dimension A: animacy hierarchy*

With respect to animacy, Spanish doubling is less restrictive than Romanian. Doubling is possible with animates (allowing for a) and, according to Suñer (1988), sometimes with inanimates. Recall the data in (54a) and (55b) illustrating this:

(54) a. [+anim,+spec,+def] (Rioplatense Spanish)
   La oían a Paca/ a la niña/ a la gata
   Her listened-3PL to Paca to the girl/ to the cat
   ‘They listened to Paca/the girl/the cat’

(55) e. yo lo voy a comprar el diario Justo antes
   i it am going to buy the newspaper Just before
   de subir (spont.)
   coming up

*Dimension B: referentiality hierarchy*

With respect to referentiality, however, Spanish is more restrictive than Romanian. Doubling is mainly restricted to partitives, resulting in contrasts as in (69) (from Suñer 1988):

(69) a. *Los entrevistaron a muchos/ varios candidates
   Cl-ACC interviewed-3pl a many / several candidates
   por media hora
   for half hour
   ‘They interviewed many/several candidates for half an hour’
b. El médico examinó a muchos/ varios de los pacientes
The doctor examined a many/ several of the patients
‘The doctor examined several of the patients’

(c) The Greek pattern

Finally, Greek clitic doubling represents the least restrictive pattern with respect to animacy and the most restrictive one with respect to referentiality. Specifically:

**Dimension A: animacy hierarchy**

Greek doubling is possible with humans, animates and inanimates. We have already seen many examples of doubling of inanimates, for example, the extraction data in (23), repeated here, show that clitic doubling is equally well-formed with animates and inanimates:

(23) a. Τις Ελένης και Μαρία νόσησε τον φίλο
The Eleni-GEN the Mary-NOM Cl-ACC met the friend-ACC
‘Mary met the friend of Eleni’
b. Το Ιανί και τα Χρήσιμοπήσα τα οργάνα
The Jani-GEN Cl-ACC I-used the instruments-ACC
‘I used Janis’s instruments’
c. Τινος το φορέσες το φορέμα?
Whose-GEN Cl-ACC you-wore the dress-ACC
‘Whose dress did you wear’?

**Dimension B: referentiality hierarchy**

On the other hand, Greek doubling represents the most restrictive pattern with respect to referentiality. Clitic doubling is for many speakers limited to definites and is disallowed with specific indefinites or partitives:10

(70) a. *Τις ψάξνο μια γραματεα
Cl-ACC look-I a secretary
‘I look for a (certain) secretary’
b. *Ο Ιατρός τούς έκστασε διό από το στήθος
The doctor Cl-ACC examined two of the patients
today the morning
‘The doctor examined two of the patients this morning’

---

10 There are also some well-formed examples with apparent doubling of non-specific indefinites in modal contexts; see Anagnostopoulou (1994) for discussion and references.
As far as animacy is concerned, the restrictions observed in Romanian and Spanish are expected by "markedness theories" of the type postulated in the typological literature (see Silverstein 1976; Dixon 1994 among others; see Anagnostopoulou 1994 for an informal proposal to link phenomena of the Spanish, Romanian type to theories of this kind and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2006 for more discussion). Assume, in the spirit of such theories, that $a$ and $pe$ are ways to (differentially) mark by special morphology objects that are less likely to be in the O/P (object of transitive clause) function according to the Nominal hierarchy in (71):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st person pronouns</th>
<th>2nd person pronouns</th>
<th>3rd person pronouns, demonstratives</th>
<th>Proper Names</th>
<th>Human</th>
<th>Animate</th>
<th>Inanimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>←---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

more likely to be in A than O function

On such a view, languages with a special preposition for direct objects, sometimes treat as unmarked non-human animates along with inanimates (Romanian) and sometimes treat non-human animates as being more marked than inanimates (Spanish). In languages where doubling can only take place with objects marked by special prepositions, the effect is that doubling is limited to animates or humans. By contrast, languages lacking a special preposition for direct objects, like Greek and Bulgarian, do not have this restriction.

Turning to the effects of the referentiality hierarchy in (72) (see Anagnostopoulou & Giannakidou 1995), one can assume, following Diesing & Jelinek (1995) that doubling is a mechanism of “re-distributing arguments” within the clause, mapping them VP-externally, in the position occupied by the clitic, for purposes of interpretation, in a manner similar to object shift in Scandinavian and scrambling in German and Dutch. As will be seen in later sections, movement analyses of clitic doubling (Sportiche 1996, Uriagereka 1995, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1997), Anagnostopoulou (2003) and later literature) straightforwardly express this. In all languages under investigation, the DPs placed on the left of the hierarchy in (72) are allowed to undergo clitic doubling, while languages differ in how they treat the DPs that are placed further to the center and towards the right in (72).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>personal pronouns, demonstratives</th>
<th>Proper Names</th>
<th>Definites</th>
<th>Novel, Weak Definites</th>
<th>Partitives</th>
<th>Referential Indefinites</th>
<th>Weak Indefinites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4.2.4. What happens to the Clitic Doubling Parameter?

The discussion in the preceding sections has led to the conclusion that Kayne’s Generalization can no
longer be seen as a necessary condition for the emergence of clitic doubling. In turn, this entails that one cannot resort to the (un-)availability of special prepositions, in order to account for the cross-linguistic (un-)availability of clitic doubling. This raises the question of how to account for the Clitic Doubling Parameter. In Anagnostopoulou (2003: 163-4), I pointed out that the crosslinguistic variation in clitic doubling is strongly reminiscent of the crosslinguistic variation in object shift (OS, see also Anagnostopoulou 2012) and should be accounted for along similar lines. If Kayne (2000) is correct about French (see footnote 3), then French is like Danish; Peninsular Spanish and Catalan are like Swedish and Norwegian, and Greek, Bulgarian, Romanian and Rioplatense Spanish behave like Icelandic in how productively they allow for clitic doubling with different classes of arguments:

**French / Danish**

French has clitic doubling only of pronouns and not of DPs (Kayne 2000: 164-5):

(73)  
   a. Jean me connaît moi  
        Jean Cl,1sg knows me-ACC  
        ‘Jean knows me’  
   b. Jean la connaît elle  
        Jean Cl-ACC knows her-ACC  
        ‘Jean knows her’  
   c. Jean me parle à moi  
        Jean Cl,1sg speaks to me  
        ‘Jean speaks to me’  
   d. Jean lui parle à elle  
        Jean Cl-DAT speaks to her  
        ‘Jean speaks to her’

(74)  
   a. *Jean lui parle à Marie  
   b. *Jean la connaît Marie

Like French, Danish has object shift of pronouns but not of DPs:

(75)  
   a. Peter viste hende jo den  
        Peter showed her indeed it  
        ‘Peter indeed showed it to her’  
   b. *Jeg gav Peter ikke bogen  
        I gave Peter not the book  
        ‘I didn’t give Peter the book’

**Peninsular Spanish, Catalan / Swedish, Norwegian**

Peninsular Spanish and Catalan have clitic doubling of pronouns and indirect object (IO) DPs but not of direct object (DO) DPs:
(76) a. Lo vimos a él
Cl-ACC saw-we a him
‘We saw him’
b. Andrea le envió un dictionario a Gabi
Andrea Cl.DAT sent a dictionary to Gabi
‘Andrea sent Gabi a dictionary’
c. *Lo vimos a Guille
Cl-acc saw-we a Guille
‘We saw Guille’

Similarly, Swedish, Norwegian have object shift of pronouns and IO DPs but not of DO DPs:

(77) a. Jag kysste henne inte
I kissed her not
b. Jag gav Elsa inte den
I gave Elsa not it
c. *Jag kysste Elsa inte
I kissed her not

*Rioplatense Spanish, Romanian, Greek /Icelandic*

Finally, Rioplatense Spanish, Romanian, Greek and Bulgarian show the most permissive pattern: they have doubling of pronouns, IO DPs and DO DPs:

(78) a. Lo vimos a él
Cl-ACC saw-we a him
‘We saw him’
b. Andrea le envió un dictionario a Gabi
Andrea Cl.DAT sent a dictionary to Gabi
‘Andrea sent Gabi a dictionary’
c. Lo vimos a Guille
Cl-acc saw-we a Guille
‘We saw Guille’

In this respect, they resemble Icelandic which has object shift of pronouns, IO DPs, DO DPs:

(79) a. að ég sá hana ekki
that I saw her not
‘that I didn’t see her’ (Holmberg & Platzack 1995:166)
b. Ég lóna Mariú ekki bækurnar
I lend Mary-DAT not the books-ACC
‘I do not lend Mary the books’ (Collins and Thráinsson 1996)
c. að þeir lásu bókina ekki allir
that they read the-book not all
‘that they didn’t all read the book’ (Holmberg & Platzack 1995: 161)

Note that German and Dutch also have scrambling of all three categories, pronouns IO DPs and DO DPs; see Anagnostopoulou (1994), Sportiche (1996), Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1997), Nevins (2011) for attempts to unify clitic doubling and Germanic object shift/scrambling.

These observations lead to the proposal that the Clitic Doubling Parameter reduces to the conditions regulating the variation in the elements undergoing OS and short-distance scrambling (except for the animacy dimension). Apparently, different languages differ in how freely they redistribute arguments within the clause, in the spirit of Diesing and Jelinek (1995).

4.3. Two different ways of reconciling movement with base-generation: Inflections vs. Determiners

In the preceding subsection, two significant developments in the research on clitic doubling have been noted: (i) emphasis on the sensitivity of direct object doubling to the semantico-pragmatic properties of DPs (specificity, prominence etc.) along with the fact that (ii) the validity of Kayne's Generalization has been questioned. A third significant development will be presented in this subsection and concerns the movement vs. base-generation debate. Due to the expansion of the analytic tools of the theory it became possible to put forth analyses which combine movement with base-generation.

4.3.1. Some further evidence for movement and some further evidence for base generation

Before proceeding, let us briefly review some further arguments supporting both the movement and the base generation approach towards clitic chains provided by Cardinaletti (1999: 41-2) and Sportiche (1996), respectively.

First, except for SSC effects discussed above, there are other locality effects motivating a movement analysis. As seen in (80a,b) and (80c,d), clitics cannot be extracted out of an adverbial prepositional phrase or a noun phrase whose higher specifier is filled with a demonstrative, similarly to wh-phrases:

(80) a. *L’ ho parlato dopo
    him have-I spoken after
    ‘I have spoken after him’

    b. *Chi hai parlato dopo ?
    Whom have-you spoken after

    c. *Ne ho vista questa foto
    Of him have-I seen this picture
    ‘I have seen this picture of him’

    d. *Di chi hai visto questa foto
    Of whom have-you seen this picture

Second, participle agreement supports the view that the clitic has moved through the specifier of the participle, triggering object agreement on the participle (see Tsakali 2006 for discussion of
participle agreement in connection to clitic doubling:\footnote{Tsakali (2006) points out that there is an intriguing negative correlation between participle agreement and clitic doubling that needs to be accounted for and provides a key towards the clitic doubling parameter (see Tsakali 2006 for details). The prototypical clitic doubling languages (Greek, Spanish) lack participle agreement with clitics. The prototypical non-clitic doubling languages (Italian, French) have participle agreement with clitics. I am not exploring this correlation further here due to the fact I adopted a different approach towards the clitic doubling parameter in the preceding section, also assuming that French has the option of limited clitic doubling, with pronouns, following Kayne (2000).}

(81)  
n a. H{o} letto spesso queste riviste
Have-I read often these magazines\textsubscript{FEM-PL}  

b. L{e} ho lette spesso
Them\textsubscript{FEM-PL} have-I read\textsubscript{FEM-PL} often

Note that clitic movement qualifies as A-movement on the basis of two considerations: (i) Clitics cannot move out of finite clauses:

(82)  
n a. *Lo penso [che vedrò ]
him think-I [that will see-I]
‘I think that I will see him’  

b. Penso che lo vedrò

(ii) They do not license parasitic gaps:

(83)  
n *Gianni l’ha dato t a Maria [senza leggere e]
Gianni it has given to Mary without read

At the same time, Sportiche (1996) provides some further evidence for base-generation based on floated quantifiers. He discusses cases where stranded quantifiers are higher than the clitics they modify, as in (84 b - d):

(84)  
n a. Marie les a tous pris
Mary them has all taken
‘Marie took them all’  

b. Marie a toutes voulu [les manger]
Marie has all wanted them eat
‘Marie wanted to eat them all’  

c. Il a tous fallu [qu’ils parlent]
It has all necessary that they speak
‘It was necessary that they all speak’  

d. Il a tous fallu [que Louis les lise]
It has all necessary that Louis them reads
‘It was necessary that Louis reads them all’
Sportiche considers two potential analyses of Q-stranding. Either the strandable Q takes a DP complement and stranding is the result of movement of the DP through the specifier position of QP. Alternatively Q takes a VP-complement and quantifies over some DP moving through its specifier position. He argues that a movement analysis of clitics is problematic in cases (84 b-d) above, under either analysis of Q-stranding, because for these constructions we must arrive at the following configuration:

(85)  [QP [tous [CP …..[D les]….][DP ti]]]

If Q gets stranded by movement of the DP or the head D out of the QP, then movement of Q to the higher clause will contain the unbound trace of DP or D (and reconstruction of the Q is excluded given that it has matrix scope). If, alternatively, Q is generated in the higher clause, then the DP must raise to Q at LF, even though it contains a trace of an incorporated clitic. None of these problems arises if clitics do not move.

4.3.2. Clitics as Inflections

To reconcile movement with base-generation, Sportiche (1993/1996/1998) argued that clitics are best analyzed as functional heads heading their own projections (Clitic Voices) in the domain of IP.

(86)  
```
       CIP_{acc}
      /     \         
     XP^   Cl_{acc}'  
   /   \       /       
 Cl_{acc}^0 VP   XP*
```

According to this analysis, the syntax of clitics is fully assimilated to that of other functional heads. The (overt or covert) XP* related to the clitic moves to the XP^ position at some point in the derivation (overt syntax or LF). The agreement relation between the clitic and the XP* is derived as a spec/head relation. The (XP-)locality between the clitic and the XP* follows from the movement relationship between the XP* and the XP^.

Clitic doubling minimally differs from non-doubling in that the XP* is overt in the former and covert in the latter:

(87)  Clitic Constructions Parameters
Movement of XP* to XP^ occurs overtly or covertly
Head is overt or covert

12 In this account, the formal relation between clitics and argument DPs is comparable, to some extent, to the relation between expletives and associates in expletive-associate chains in the framework of Chomsky (1995). Similarly to associates that move to the expletive position at LF, doubled DPs move to the clitic position overtly (in CLLD and scrambling) or covertly (in clitic doubling; see Sportiche 1993).
XP* is overt or covert

(i) Undoubled clitic constructions as in French and Italian arise when a covert XP* moves overtly or covertly to XP^ with H overt.
(ii) Clitic doubling constructions as in Spanish and Romanian arise when an overt XP* moves covertly with H overt.
(iii) Object agreement constructions in Lebanese Arabic and Clitic Left Dislocation may be instances of an overt XP* moving overtly with an overt H.
(iv) Scrambling constructions as in Dutch and German arise when an overt XP* moves overtly with H covert.

Sportiche (1996) argues that in non-reflexive se constructions, XP* is pro, when XP* is silent. It is properly identified after movement to XP^ by the coindexed clitic. Accusative Voice, Dative Voice, Genitive Voice, Locative Voice are pro-drop constructions. Subject pro-drop is treated along similar lines, as a clitic construction (pro drop is not licensed by nominative agreement but by nominative clitics, i.e. it implicates the presence of Nominative Voice). XP*-to-XP^ movement is attributed to the Clitic Criterion which, in turn, is subsumed under the Generalized Licensing Criterion (see Rizzi 1991 for the Wh-criterion):

(88)

Clitic Criterion
At LF
a. A clitic must be in a spec/head relationship with a [+F] XP
b. A [+F] XP must be in a spec/head relationship with a clitic

(89)

Generalized Licensing Criterion
At LF
a. A [+F] head must be in a spec/head relationship with a [+F] XP
b. A [+F] XP must be in a spec/head relationship with a [+F] head

In (89) [±F] stands for a set of properties such as Wh, Neg, Focus, etc. which trigger movement. For direct object clitic constructions, he proposes that the clitic licenses Specificity on its associate. As already mentioned, Sportiche proposed to unify the syntax of cliticization/clitic doubling with the syntax of scrambling which has also been claimed to display interpretational effects. On the other hand, indirect object clitic heads are treated as indirect object agreement markers since they do not yield specificity effects (cf. the discussion of Suñer 1988 above), i.e Cl-Voice is AgrIO, a Case assigning head.

This account reconciles base generation and movement properties of clitic constructions in the following way:

Movement properties: The analysis can handle SSC, CED/ECP effects since it postulates XP movement of XP*. Moreover, participle agreement is triggered when XP* moves to XP^ through spec,AgrO in (90). Lack of agreement is the result of either (i) moving of XP* to XP^ skipping
spec,AgrO or (ii) covert movement of XP* to to XP^.

(90)  [CIP XP^ [ [le]…[Agr0P XP*] [AgrO’ participle……..XP*] ……

Base generation property 1, Cl-doubling. The account straightforwardly predicts that a clitic may co-occur with a doubled DP, an overt XP* in (86). Sportiche suggests that the Clitic Doubling Parameter might be attributed to a filter similar to the doubly filled COMP filter (see Cheng 1991 for crosslinguistic discussion):

(91) Doubly Filled Voice Filter
    *{HP XP [H...]} where H is a functional head licensing some property P
    and both XP and H overtly encode P

where property P is Case. Taking as a starting point Kayne’s Generalization, he points out that “...Because Romance clitics are nominal and encode Case morphology, they cannot co-occur at the same time as a full Case marked XP* (unless an extra option exists to Case mark this XP*-Kayne’s generalization)”. To escape the Doubly Filled Voice Filter, seen as a restriction against two Case-marked nominals, either morphologically poor clitics co-occur with DPs, as in Lebansese Arabic, or the insertion of a preposition makes the DP dissimilar to the clitic. Note that Greek clitic doubling does not fit the above picture, since both the clitic and the doubled DP overtly encode case morphology in Greek.

4.3.3. Clitics as Determiners

Following Torrego (1988), Uriagereka (1995; see also Uriagereka 1988) argued, alternatively, that third person clitics are transitive determiners:

13 See Sportiche (1996) for a detailed account of base generation property 2, namely Q-stranding, as well as a detailed discussion of how French clitic placement, i.e. the actual position of different clitics, is accounted for in his system.
14 A further option Sportiche (1996) explored and dismissed was that clitic doubling arises in a language when XP* movement may be delayed until LF, since this is a way of preventing a violation of the filter with an overt XP* in the presence of an overt clitic. A positive aspect of his proposal is that it predicts the incompatibility of doubling with participle agreement which seems to be correct; see Tsakali 2006 for discussion (see footnote 11 above for discussion). Note though that such an analysis is compatible only with a non-movement analysis of CLLD (as in Cinque 1990, Iatridou 1991, Anagnostopoulou 1994).
This proposal rests on three claims: (i) \(D^0\)'s may select for null NP-complements, (ii) doubled DPs are specifiers in complex DPs consisting of \(D\) and a null complement, and (iii) clitics are determiners (with null NP-complements). In what follows, I will present the motivation/evidence Uriagereka presents for these claims.

Claim (i): Uriagereka (1988:402; 1995: 81 fn. 6) points out that determiners take null pro complements in strings corresponding to the English sequences *the one he came*, *the one from France*. In a subset of Romance languages, the determiner licenses a pro-NP modified by the relative clause or the PP instead of the pro-form "one":

(93) a. El/la que vino (Spanish)  
   The who came  
   'The one who came'

b. El/la de Francia  
   The from France  
   'The one from France'

Uriagereka proposes that the only difference between (93) and constructions with cliticization is that the determiner remains *in situ* in the former while it undergoes movement to the functional domain in the latter.

Claim (ii): Uriagereka (1995: 81, fn. 6) suggests that doubling is systematically attested in languages allowing for determiners *in situ* to select zero complements. He points out that in Romance, clitic doubling correlates with a) the availability of the sentences in (93) and b) the unavailability of ne-/en-cliticization. Those of the Romance languages that have (93) possess clitic doubling and lack ne-/en-cliticization. Those that do not have (93) lack doubling and show ne-/en-cliticization.\(^{15}\) Uriagereka proposed that the Clitic Doubling Parameter in Romance depends on the strength of determiners. The Romance languages permitting the sentences in (93) have "strong" determiners while the ones that resist them have "weak" determiners. In languages with strong determiners, a double can be licensed inside the complex DP leading to clitic doubling. In languages with weak determiners, a double cannot be licensed and clitic doubling is ruled out. Note, though, that the correlation between strength and doubling cannot be extended to Greek. Greek determiners do not license a pro-NP and yet doubling is attested:

---

\(^{15}\) Uriagereka does not explain why ne-/en-cliticization is relevant for the strength vs. weakness of determiners.
a. *

b. *

Claim (iii): Uriagereka (1988; 1995: 80-82) provides a number of arguments in support of the claim that clitics are determiners. First, third person clitics and determiners in Romance diachronically derive from the same source, namely Latin demonstratives, i.e. *illum, illam* etc. (Wanner 1987). Second, from a synchronic point of view, clitics have a similar or identical form to determiners. In Galician, for example, the forms are identical:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Clitic</th>
<th>(Galician)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>(l)o</td>
<td>(l)os</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>(l)a</td>
<td>(l)as</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The morphological identity can be accounted for if clitics and determiners instantiate one and the same lexical item projecting onto two different syntactic structures. Third, in Galician, determiners undergo optional syntactic cliticization onto the verb:

a. Comemos o caldo (Galician)
   Ate-we the soup
   'We ate the soup'

b. Comemo-lo caldo
   Ate-we-the soup

Thus, determiners may undergo movement out of the DP onto the verb, similarly to clitics.

In an analysis that treats clitics as determiners the *movement* properties of clitic constructions are derived from the assumption that clitics uniformly vacate their VP-internal position and undergo movement to the functional domain. Uriagereka (1995) argues that cliticization is a complex phenomenon which does not obey a single principle and must be parametrized in order to derive placement possibilities arising in various languages. Accusative clitics in all languages undergo movement to the functional domain and are necessarily specific. These properties are derived from the assumption that clitics are referential elements which must move to a VP-external site in order to identify pro. Being VP-external at LF, clitics fall under the Mapping Hypothesis according to which all specific elements must be assigned VP-external scope at LF. Clitic placement possibilities depend on the site to which clitics move and the mode of movement and attachment to a functional head. It is proposed that in languages like Galician, clitics move to F, a site where is encoded, to license their associated pro. Languages like French, on the other hand, do not have an active F and pro is licensed through affixation of the clitic to AgrO. Uriagereka (1995), who is mainly concerned with clitic
placement, capitalizes on head-movement to account for crosslinguistic variation. At the same time, he incorporates an XP-movement step into the movement analysis of clitics in order to derive properties of phrasal-movement. Thus, head-movement is local in his account, following a phrasal movement step of the DP containing the clitic, which moves overtly at least as high as the site hosting agreeing participles. Finally, he proposes that 1\textsuperscript{st} and 2\textsuperscript{nd} person clitics are what he called ‘strong clitics’. They are [-projected, + maximal] and their ‘double’ has the status of an adjunct (1995: 111-118): 16

\[(97) \quad \text{DP} \]
\[\quad \quad \text{(double) \quad \text{DP=D clitic}}\]

See Anagnostopoulou (2003), Roberts (2010), Nevins (2011) and others for different variants of the big DP analysis in later literature (see below for some discussion). 17

4.4. Fragmentation views: IO vs. DO doubling in Spanish and Spanish IO doubling vs. Greek IO doubling

As has been seen, IO- and DO-clitic doubling are subject to different restrictions across and within languages. Two differences have been seen so far: a) There are dialects/languages (e.g. Standard Spanish, Catalan) in which direct object doubling of DPs is ruled out while indirect object doubling is permitted. b) While direct object doubling is limited to specific DPs, doubling of non-specific indirect objects is licit. The differences between the two types of doubling have led to a relaxation of the view that clitic constructions are uniform. For example, Sportiche (1996) analyzes direct object clitics as markers for specificity while he treats indirect object clitics as agreement markers. In what follows, I will briefly review an explicit proposal according to which IO and DO doubling receive different structural analyses in Spanish, and then compare Greek to Spanish from this perspective.

4.4.1. Dative clitics as inflections and accusative clitics as determiners

Bleam (1999) investigates micro-variation among dialects of Spanish and argues that dative clitics are agreement markers, as proposed by Sportiche (1996), while accusative clitics are determiners, as proposed by Torrego (1988) and Uriagereka (1988, 1995). Bleam focuses on Léista Spanish, a dialect spoken in the North of Spain which she compared to varieties of Argentinean Spanish such as Rioplatense Spanish and Cordoba Spanish and to Standard Spanish. These dialects show variation along three factors: (a) the form of direct object clitics, (b) the availability of direct object doubling and (c) animacy restrictions on direct object doubling:

16 As far as I can see, he does not explain why they move as clitics. One could link this movement to their person feature.

17 As Dominique Sportiche (personal communication) points out, these analyses cannot deal with his Q-float argument for base generation of the actual clitic, which was presented above.
a) The form of direct object clitics. In Leísta Spanish the dative clitic form le is used as a DO clitic, when the referent is animate (and in many subdialects, masculine, Bleam 1999: 1):

(98) le vi
   Cl-dat saw-I
   ‘I saw him/her’

This contrasts with Standard and Argentinean Spanish where the accusative forms lo and la are employed for DOs and le is limited to DOs.

b) Availability of direct object doubling. Clitic doubling of DO pronouns is obligatory in all dialects of Spanish. Clitic doubling of DO DPs is more limited. In Standard Spanish, it is ungrammatical. In Rioplatense Spanish it is grammatical in Kayne's Generalization environments mainly. DO doubling is found in two more varieties of Spanish. Some sub-dialects of Leísta, (Bleam 1999: 2), and Cordoba Spanish (Bleam 1999: 135) spoken in central Argentina (see Schmitt 1996): DO doubling clitics in Leísta Spanish have a dative form. This property is due to the fact that in these dialects doubling is limited to animate DPs: recall that animate direct object clitics are dative in Leísta.

(99) Le vi a Juan
    Cl-DAT I-saw a Juan
    ‘I saw Juan’

(100) La toqué a la sonata
      Cl-ACC I-played a the sonata
      ‘I played the sonata’

c) Doubling of inanimate direct objects. While DO doubling is limited to animate DPs in most varieties of Spanish, in Cordoba Spanish it is also found with inanimates, as seen in (100) above.

For accusative clitics Bleam adopts Uriagereka's (1988; 1995) syntax presented in section 3. They are determiners heading a complex DP. Morphological evidence for this analysis comes from the observation that they resemble determiners. Semantic evidence comes from their specificity-marking function. Bleam (1999: 35), furthermore, points out that dative clitics in Spanish, unlike accusative clitics, do not resemble determiners morphologically. She views the lack of resemblance as evidence that dative clitics do not have the same syntax as accusative clitics. Bleam furthermore argues that the lack of specificity effects of dative clitics in ditransitives is due to the fact that they are not determiners but rather agreement markers of the kind suggested in Sportiche (1996). Following Demonte (1995) and Ormazabal and Romero (1999, 2007) Bleam (1999) points out that dative doubling in Spanish signifies the double object construction.

In the literature on Spanish there is a consensu that the double object construction is signaled by the obligatory presence of dative clitics. Demonte (1995), Torrego (1998), Bleam (1999), Ormazabal & Romero (2007), Cuervo (2003) and others point out that the presence vs. absence of dative clitics in goal ditransitives correlates with a number of syntactic and semantic phenomena characterizing the dative alternation in English (cf. Uriagereka 1988 on similar asymmetries in Galician). In particular,
Spanish ditransitives with clitic doubled \textit{a}-goals pattern with English double object constructions, while their counterparts without clitic doubling show properties of prepositional ditransitives. For one, animate goals can be doubled while locative goals cannot (see Bleam 1999, Ormazabal & Romero 2007, Cuervo 2003):

(101) Andrea le envió un dicionario a Gabi / *a Barcelona  
\hspace{1cm} Andrea Cl-DAT sent a dictionary to Gabi/ to Barcelona  
\hspace{2cm} ‘Andrea sent Gabi/ *Barcelona a dictionary’

Animate and locative datives may equally occur undoubled, as in prepositional ditransitives which do not discriminate between animate and inanimate goals:

(102) Andrea envió un dicionario a Gabi / a Barcelona  
\hspace{2cm} Andrea sent a dictionary to Gabi/ to Barcelona  
\hspace{4cm} ‘Andrea sent Gabi/ *Barcelona a dictionary’

Clitics are allowed to double inanimate dative goals only when the goal and the theme stand in a part-whole relationship. In (103a) below \textit{el mantel} can be construed as a part of \textit{a la mesa}, and doubling is licit. In (103b) \textit{los platos} cannot be construed as a part of \textit{a la mesa}, and doubling is ruled out. This restriction is similar to the one attested in English, where the double object construction is licensed only when the indirect object can be understood as a possessor of the direct object (see Demonte 1995):

(103) a. Le puse el mantel a la mesa  
\hspace{2cm} Cl-DAT put-I the tablecloth to the table  
\hspace{4cm} ‘I put the tablecloth on the table’

b. *Le puse los platos a la mesa  
\hspace{2cm} Cl-DAT put-I the dishes to the table  
\hspace{4cm} ‘I put the dishes on the table’

Furthermore, datives are permitted exclusively under clitic doubling in Oehrle’s (1976) environments (Demonte 1995; Bleam 1999; Cuervo 2003; data from Cuervo 2003):

(104) a. *El viaje a Troncoso ofreció a Maria la oportunidad de practicar portugués  
\hspace{2cm} The trip to Troncoso offered to Maria the opportunity to practice Portuguese  
\hspace{4cm} ‘*The trip to Troncoso offered an opportunity to practice Portuguese to Maria’

b. El viaje a Troncoso le ofreció a Maria la oportunidad  
\hspace{2cm} The trip to Troncoso Cl-DAT offered to Maria the opportunity  
\hspace{4cm} de practicar portugués  
\hspace{4cm} to practice Portuguese  
\hspace{4cm} ‘The trip to Troncoso offered Mary the opportunity to practice Portuguese’
In English, only the double object construction is licit in these contexts.

Binding provides syntactic evidence that the clitic doubling construction is a double object construction. In the absence of a dative clitic, a direct object can bind a reflexive indirect object while the reverse is not possible, as shown in (105). When a dative clitic is present, the indirect object can bind into the direct object while the reverse is impossible, as shown in (106):

(105) a. El tratamiento psicoanalítico reintegró
    the therapy psychoanalytic gave-back
    a María a sí misma
    to Mary-DO to herself-IO
    ‘The psychoanalytic therapy gave back Mary to herself’

     b. *El tratamiento psicoanalítico devolvió
       The therapy psychoanalytic gave-back
       (a) sí misma a María
       (to) herself-DO to Mary-IO
       ‘*The psychoanalytic therapy gave back herself to Mary’

(106) a. *El tratamiento psicoanalítico le devolvió
    The therapy psychoanalytic Cl-DAT gave-back
    a María a la estima de sí misma
    to Mary-DO to the esteem of herself-IO
    ‘The psychoanalytic therapy gave back her self-esteem to Mary’

     b. El tratamiento psicoanalítico le devolvió
       The therapy psychoanalytic Cl-DAT gave-back
       a la estima de sí misma a María
       to the esteem of herself-DO to Mary-IO
       ‘The psychoanalytic therapy gave back Mary her self-esteem’

Bleam analyses dative clitics as heading an applicative/aspectual/dative Voice head present in the double object construction. There are several versions of this analysis in the literature on Spanish. The first to propose it was Demonte (1995) who argued that dative clitics in Spanish are obligatory in the double object construction and analyzed them as heading a dative Clitic-Phrase corresponding to Marantz’s (1993) applicative v head (see Demonte 1995: 7 fn 6). See also Cuervo (2003) for a later analysis along these lines.

4.4.2. Greek IO doubling compared to Spanish

Unlike Spanish, where the presence of a dative doubling clitic is obligatory in the double object construction, indirect object doubling is optional in active double object constructions in Greek and obligatory in direct passives. These facts are discussed at length in Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005b) and will be briefly summarized here.
Greek possesses a variety of ditransitive goal constructions, in which indirect object goals are realized as PPs, as DPs with morphological genitive case or as DPs with morphological accusative case (see Tzartzanos 1945/1989, Mackridge 1985/1987, Philippaki-Warburton 1977, Holton, Mackridge and Philippaki-Warburton 1997 among others). The first construction consists of an accusative DP denoting a theme and a goal PP introduced by the preposition s(e) ‘to’. The DP is assigned morphological accusative case by the preposition, as shown in (107a). Similarly to English to, Greek s(e) is also used as a locative preposition, as in (107b):

(107) \[ \text{ACC}_{\text{Theme}} - \text{PP}_{\text{Goal}} \]

- a. O Jianis estile to grama stin Maria
  The Janis-NOM sent the letter-ACC to-the Maria-ACC
  ‘John sent the letter to Mary’
- b. O Jianis píge stin Olandia
  The Janis-NOM went to-the Holland-ACC
  ‘John went to Holland’

The second construction combines two non-prepositional DPs, a goal and a theme. The goal bears morphological genitive case, while the theme surfaces with morphological accusative:

(108) \[ \text{GEN}_{\text{Goal}} - \text{ACC}_{\text{Theme}} \]

- O Jianis estile tis Marias to grama
  The Janis-NOM sent the Maria GEN the letter-ACC
  ‘John sent Mary the letter’

Greek has lost the morphological distinction between genitive and dative case and has generalized the use of genitive. Finally, with a limited set of verbs, the goal can either be introduced by a PP headed by s(e) or it can be projected into a structure in which both the indirect object and the direct object surface with morphological accusative case. This construction will not be discussed here (see Anagnostopoulou 2001, 2003 for details).

The Greek alternation between a PP and an undoubled genitive DP shares many characteristics typical of the dative shift alternation in English. For one, the genitive construction in Greek is mainly tolerated with animate goals, similarly to the double object construction in English (it is also possible with inanimate possessors, like English):

(109) \[ *I \text{ Ilektra estile tis Galias} \]

- The Ilektra-NOM sent the France GEN ena dema
- a parcel-ACC
  ‘*Ilektra sent France a parcel’

Se-phrases can be inanimate, similarly to to-PPs in English:
Moreover, in English, there are verb classes that allow the genitive construction and others which don't (Oehrle 1976; Pesetsky 1995: 141; Pinker 1989; Gropen et al. 1989: 243ff). The same observation holds for Greek (see Anagnostopoulou, 2003 for details). Third, in the genitive construction the genitive goal asymmetrically c-commands the theme, similarly to the double object construction in English. This is illustrated here with the *each…the other* test (see Barss & Lasnik 1986; Larson 1988; see Anagnostopoulou 1999; 2003 for extensive discussion of word order and c-command in Greek ditransitives):

(111) a. Estila tis mias miteras to pedi
    Sent-I the one mother-GEN the child-ACC
    tis alis
    the other-GEN
    ‘I sent each mother the other’s child’
    b. *Estila tis miteras tu alu
    sent-I the mother-GEN the other-GEN
    to ena pedi
    the one child -ACC
    ‘*I sent the other’s mother each child’

Unlike Spanish, where a-phrases appear to be ambiguous between PPs and dative-shifted DPs, Greek genitives are unambiguously dative shifted/applicative DPs and se-DPs may qualify as PPs (at least in goal-constructions; for benefactive se-phrases, see Anagnostopoulou 2005b for extensive discussion of se-PPs in goal and benefactive applicatives).

As has been seen in (57), (58) above, here repeated, indirect objects bearing genitive case may optionally undergo doubling in active ditransitives, similarly to direct objects bearing accusative and clitic doubling is blocked when the indirect object is a PP:

(57) (Tu) (to) edhosa tu Jani to vivlio (Greek)
    Cl-GEN Cl-ACC gave-1sg the Janis-GEN the book-ACC
    ‘I gave John the book’
(58) a. *Tu edhosa to vivlio s-ton Jani (Greek)
    Cl-GEN gave-1sg the book-ACC to-the Janis
    ‘I gave the book to John’
    b. *Tu pira to vivlio apo ton Jani
    Cl-GEN took-1sg the book-ACC from the Janis
    ‘I took the book from John’

While a clitic is obligatory in the double object construction in Spanish, in Greek it is optional, as is illustrated in (57). This suggests that genitive clitics in Greek do not qualify as dative
agreement/applicative-like heads of the type found in Spanish. In turn, this entails that Spanish and Greek indirect object doubling constructions have a different syntax. While clitic doubling of genitives in Greek is optional in active sentences, genitives must undergo doubling obligatorily in constructions where the theme undergoes NP-movement. Doubling of a goal or experiencer is obligatory in passives, unaccusatives and raising constructions, as illustrated in (112) with passive examples:

(112) a. To vivlio?*(tis) xaristiketis Marias
    The book-NOM Cl-GEN award-NACT the Maria-GEN
    apo ton Petro
    from the Petros
    ‘The book was awarded Mary by Peter’

b. To gramata?*(tou) taxidromithike tu Petru
    The letter-NOM Cl-GEN mailed-NACT the Petros-GEN
    apo tin Ilektra
    from the Ilektra
    ‘?*The letter was mailed Peter by Ilektra’

In Anagnostopoulou (2003), I argued that these structures are ungrammatical without clitics because the theme cannot undergo NP-movement to T across an intervening genitive IO DP. Indirect objects are introduced by a high applicative v (Marantz 1993; Pylkkänen 2008) blocking NP movement of the lower direct object to T, as shown in (113):

(113) T
    T Voice
    Voice<trans>vAPPL
    GEN vAPPL
    vAPPL VP
    NOM V

I further argued that in clitic constructions, the intervening features of the genitive move to T before the nominative and are spelled out as a clitic, as illustrated in (114). In this derivation, locality is respected (Chomsky 1995; Richards 1997) and, therefore, (112b) is grammatical.
According to this analysis, IO doubling clitics in Greek undergo overt movement to the functional domain leaving the genitive phrase behind. The offending intervening features of the genitive are removed by this cliticization process, no longer blocking NP-movement to T of the lower argument across them.

Morphological evidence that indirect object clitics are not agreement elements but rather D-elements comes from the observation that their forms are identical to determiners, as illustrated in (115) and (116). In this respect, they pattern with exactly with accusative clitics:

(115)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>tis</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>ton</td>
<td>tin</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominative</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>ton</td>
<td>ton</td>
<td>ton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>tus</td>
<td>tis</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(116)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Masculine</th>
<th>Feminine</th>
<th>Neuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>tis</td>
<td>tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>ton</td>
<td>tin</td>
<td>to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plural
Genitive tus tus tus
Accusative tus tis ta

Recall that in Spanish, dative clitics do not have the same form as determiners, unlike accusative clitics (see above). Note that even though the semantic effects of IO doubling in Greek have not been investigated in detail, it seems to be licensed under conditions similar to those licensing DO doubling; for example, IO doubling of indefinites is deviant, unlike IO doubling of proper names and definites.\textsuperscript{18}

(117) a. Tu edosa tu Petru to vivlio
Cl-GEN gave-I the Peter-GEN the book-ACC
‘I gave Peter the book’
b. ??Tu edosa enos pedhiu to vivlio
Cl-GEN gave-I a child-GEN the book-ACC
‘I gave a child the book’

Summarizing, in this section I have reviewed a proposal according to which, indirect object clitics in Spanish are inflections; they head the projection hosting the indirect object in the double object construction, unlike accusative clitics, which have the semantics and morphology of determiners. I have then proceeded to examine Greek, where the double object construction is formed quite independently of the presence of a genitive clitic. On the basis of the optionality of genitive doubling in active sentences, I suggested that the (applicative/aspectual) head forming the double object construction is zero in Greek, like English and unlike Spanish. I furthermore pointed out that genitive clitics in Greek are obligatory in NP-movement constructions and I attributed their obligatoriness to the hypothesis that the process of clitic movement obviates locality effects. As a final note, I would like to point out that a straightforward way of linking the morphological form of Greek genitive clitics as determiners to the obviation of intervention effects is the way I suggested in Anagnostopoulou (2003). Following Chomsky (1995), I assumed that intervention effects caused by genitive IOs are due to their EPP features, understood as D features. Genitive doubling is movement of the intervening D features of the doubled DP to T, and are spelled out on T as determiners/clitics. Doubling permits movement of the lower Nominative to T across the higher genitive, because the genitive no longer counts as an intervener due to the combination of two independent assumptions: a) The landing site of doubling clitics is T, the same landing site targeted by NP-movement. In their moved positions clitics do not cause intervention effects for NP-movement because both clitics and the NP-moved objects target T (Equidistance). b) Clitics form an A-chain with doubled genitive DPs which no longer count as interveners since only heads of A-chains cause intervention effects.

\textsuperscript{18} There seem to be additional restrictions on IO doubling in Greek that are not well understood. For example, it is dispreferred with plurals (possibly for morphological reasons, i.e. because the clitic and the determiner do not have an identical form) and it signifies a high degree of familiarity between the speaker and the discourse referent of the doubled IO which has as a consequence that doubling tends to be preferred with proper names than with definite descriptions.
5. Recent developments: Clitics, agreement, Agree and Merge

Recall Sportiche’s analysis according to which clitics are best analyzed as functional heads heading their own projections (Clitic Voices) in the domain of IP, as in (86), repeated here:

(86)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{CIP_{acc}} \\
\text{XP^\text{acc}'} \\
\text{C_{acc}^0} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{XP^*}
\end{array}
\]

It is easy to see that in the framework of Chomsky (2000, 2001) the relationship of the XP* to the clitic position can be restated as an Agree relation between the position hosting the clitic, namely T, and the doubled phrase. The clitic can thus be viewed as an overt signal of Agree between T and the object. Such an analysis would dispense with actual movement but maintain the locality characteristics of movement. However, see Anagnostopoulou (2003) for arguments that Agree and doubling are two different configurations.

In recent literature, a number of works further explore the relationship between clitics and agreement markers from the point of view of the properties of the formal operations Agree (Chomsky 2000, 2001) and Merge, in an attempt to characterize the similarities and differences between the two types of phenomena. The main question asked is whether object agreement and clitic doubling are the same or different processes, and what are possible diagnostics to distinguish between the two. This question has not been resolved in the literature (see Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2000 for relevant discussion). One might expect that a principled way to state the distinction between agreement markers and clitics is to treat agreement markers as reflexes of Agree and doubling clitics as resulting from Merge (either external Merge of a functional head, as in Sportiche 1996, or internal Merge, as in Kayne 1975, 1989a, 1989b, 1991 and later, and Uriagereka 1995, among many others). I will briefly present here two representative papers addressing these question, namely Preminger (2009) and Nevins (2011). The surprising conclusion of both of these works is that a lot of what looks like object agreement should be reanalyzed as clitic doubling and crucially not the other way round, contra much of the previous literature on the topic (see especially the papers by Suñer 1988 and Sportiche 1996, 1998 presented above).

To begin with, object agreement and clitic doubling both involve a configuration in which a pronominal-type element, a clitic or agreement marker, appears on a verbal host, a verb or an auxiliary, “doubling” the phi-features of a DP, the clitic doubled or agreeing DP, which is also present in the clause (Preminger 2009: 619 (1)):

(118) host + [agreement morpheme]_{\phi_1}...........(other material)......[full noun phrase]_{\phi_1}
As already mentioned, there are, in principle, two analytic options for such a configuration. One possibility is to analyse the agreement morpheme on the host in (118) as a reflex of the Agree relationship between the host and the full noun-phrase, an instance of agreement. Under this analysis, the agreement morpheme represents the uninterpretable phi-features of the host after their valuation. An alternative possibility is clitic doubling, an operation by which a pronominal morpheme matching the phi-features of the full noun phrase is affixed on the host. The question is whether there are formal diagnostics that can be employed to distinguish between the two.

Preminger (2009: 621, (2) and (3)) argues on the basis of a family of constructions in “substandard” Basque (Etxepare 2006) that this is indeed possible because the characteristics of agreement/Agree and doubling are crucially different. Agree/agreement shows the following properties (Chomsky 2000, 2001):

(119) a. It is subject to defective intervention.
   A host cannot enter into an Agree relation with a given noun phrase if there is
   Another noun phrase structurally closer to the host (e.g. Chomsky 2001, McGinnis
   1998).
   b. It is subject to a locality condition that prevents it from operating across the boundaries
   of a tensed clause (e.g. Chomsky’s 2000, 2001 Phase Impenetrability Condition)

On the other hand, clitic doubling has the following characteristics (Anagnostopoulou 2003):

(120) a. It voids the status of its target as an intervener (see the discussion in the previous section)
   -The chain formed by clitic doubling behaves as an A-chain whose head is the clitic.
   -Only the heads of A-chains can intervene
   b. It conforms to a locality condition that can be called “the clausemate relation” (see
   Iatridou 1991 for relevant discussion).

Preminger (2009) proposes a novel diagnostic for distinguishing between Agree/agreement vs. clitic doubling based on configurations where the relationship between the host and the noun phrase in (118) fails to obtain. Given the differences between Agree/agreement and doubling we expect two different effects in each case. When clitic doubling fails to obtain, the result will be the absence of a doubling morpheme on the host. On the other hand, when Agree/agreement between the verbal host and the noun-phrase cannot be established, then either the structure will be ungrammatical (as in Italian raising constructions, see McGinnis (1998), Anagnostopoulou (2003) based on Rizzi 1986) or the host will surface with default agreement, and the resulting structure is grammatical (Holmberg and Hróarsdóttir 2003). Preminger argues that the two situations exist in the substandard dialect of Basque that permits Long Distance Agreement across nominalized clauses. Absolutive agreement is a reflex of Agree: it is subject to defective intervention and can take place across clauses as long as no phase-boundary intervenes. On the other hand, dative agreement is clitic doubling. It is subject to a strict clause-mate condition (hence cannot take place long-distance) and obviates intervention effects that are otherwise caused by its associate dative DP. An interesting consequence of this proposal is that it leads to the conclusion that ergative agreement in Basque is really clitic doubling. This leads to a picture of Basque as having a single agreement, despite appearances to the contrary.
Agree targets noun phrases with unmarked absolutive in Basque, just as in Icelandic, where it targets noun phrases with unmarked nominative. This converges with the claim that there can only be one instance of true agreement per clause, as proposed by Woolford (2010).

Nevins (2011) addresses the same question of how to distinguish agreement from doubling by looking at the morpho-syntactic differences between clitics and agreement markers. He proposes three morphosyntactic criteria for pronominal clitics, as opposed to agreement markers. The most important one is tense-invariance. Since clitics are pronominal elements they are not expected to show allomorphy across different tenses, unlike agreement. As pointed out by Nevins (2011: 960-961), “...Taking this hypothesis to its logical conclusion would bring a vast number of elements previously analyzed as agreement affixes into the fold as clitics, with the following criteria then potentially applicable for further investigation”. These further criteria are two: 1) What he calls “Person Complementarity effects”, i.e. Person Co-occurrence Restrictions like the Person Case Constraint (PCC; see Bonet 1991, Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005a and many others). Nevins claims that effects of this type only characterize clitics and are never found with Tense-Sensitive person markers. The elements showing PCC effects in Romance, Greek, Kashmiri, Georgian, Albanian, Mohawk, Nahuatl, Southern Tiwa, Kambera, Walpiri are always tense-invariant. 2) The phenomenon of omnivorous number agreement, i.e. the fact that a single plural marker can be employed to agree with more than one plural argument. This effect is found with clitics and not when the trigerring element (e.g. subject, object) is a tense-varying person marker.

See Kramer (to appear) who applies the above mentioned and other diagnostics to an object agreement marker in Amharic and concludes that it qualifies as a doubling clitic, contra Baker (2012) and others.

As a final note, let us briefly look at how clitic doubling and the agreement phenomena that qualify as doubling have been analysed in recent literature. Nevins (2011) argues for a version of the big-DP hypothesis (see also Roberts 2010), according to which the doubling clitic is adjoined to the argumental DP (he takes it to be a KP, with Case), similarly to a floated quantifier (see Nevins 2011: 952, (28)):

(121) Clitics as adjoined to KP

\[ \text{KP} \]
\[ \text{D}_{\text{DO}} \quad \text{KP}_{\text{DO}} \]
\[ \text{D} \quad \text{DP} \]

Like floating quantifiers, clitics can be separated from the DPs they adjoin to. Following Roberts (2010) and others, he proposes that they first undergo Object Shift to \( v \) and then they undergo syntactic rebracketing (Matushansky 2006), i.e. the process by which two heads that are in a spec-head relation are rebracketed as a complex head (see Nevins 2011: 957, (39)):
(122) Input to Rebracketing Merger:

Further head movement brings along the rebracketed clitic which undergoes head movement (parasitic on the movement of the host) after the object shift step. This analysis is further adopted by Harizanov (to appear) and Kramer (to appear), except that they argue that clitic doubling involves the simultaneous realization of both the head and the foot of a movement chain, i.e. it is canonical A-movement with the head of the chain spelled out as a pronominal element (similarly to resumptive pronouns; see Anagnostopoulou 2003). Under this view, the rebracketing process in (122) does not apply to the clitic itself (which is taken to be a branching XP in this analysis) but to its label.

To conclude, in this final section I provided a summary of the recent literature on clitic doubling which focuses on the question of how to characterize the similarities and differences between clitics and agreement markers. If Preminger (2009), Nevins (2011), Kramer (to appear) and others are right (and see also Řezáč 2008), then clitic doubling is much more extensive than previously thought and does not just involve clitics but also elements that have been standardly treated as agreement markers. For the most part of this paper, I have ignored this kind of doubling, the existence of which will complicate the picture of variation and of the nature of the clitic doubling Parameter even more.
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