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1 Introduction

1.1 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 is illustrated in (1) with an example from Spanish (Jaeggli 1986b: 32):

(1) Lo vimos a Juan.
Him we-saw a Juan
‘We saw Juan.’

Within the Indo-European languages, clitic doubling has been claimed to exist in Romance, Semitic, Slavic, Albanian, and Greek (see, among others, Strozer 1976; Rivas 1977; Aoun 1981, 1996; Jaeggli 1982, 1986b; Drachman 1983; Borer 1984a; Suñer 1988; Philippaki-Warburton 1987; Fykias 1988; Dobrovie-Sorin 1990; Sportiche 1996b, 1998; Massey 1992; Anagnostopoulou 1994, 2003; Uriagereka 1988, 1995a; Torrego 1998; Bleam 1999; Petkova Schick 2000; Kallulli 1999). Doubling has also been claimed to exist in Pirahã, a member of the Mura language family spoken in the Maici river in Amazonas, Brazil (Everett 1987).

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; see later sections for discussion of further cross-linguistic differences). This difference is illustrated in (2) with an indirect object clitic doubling example from Spanish and in (3) with its ungrammatical counterpart from French:

(2) Miguelito (le) regaló un caramelo a Mafalda.
Miguelito Cl-dat gave a candy a Mafalda
‘Miguelito gave Mafalda a piece of candy.’

(3) Jean (*lui) a donné des bonbons à Marie.
Jean Cl-dat has given the candies to Marie
‘Jean gave candies to Marie.’

The study of clitic doubling has always enjoyed a privileged position among investigations of cliticization, which center on 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 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.

1.2 Overview of the history

The history of the study of clitic doubling can be divided into the following periods, which coincide with different stages of the Principles and Parameters theory:

(i) Early Government and Binding (GB) studies (e.g., Jaeggli 1982, 1986b; 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 actual Movement. In their attempt to isolate the factor underlying the Clitic Doubling Parameter, i.e., 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). Example (4) attests to the availability of clitic doubling with direct objects preceded by a in Rioplatense Spanish.

(4) La oían a la niña.
ACC listened-3pl a the girl-ACC
‘They listened to the girl.’

The fact that doubling clitics co-occur with arguments preceded by special prepositions is known in the literature as Kayne’s Generalization (attributed to Kayne in Jaeggli 1982: 20). Within the literature of this period, Kayne’s Generalization is assumed by most researchers to provide the key to the Clitic Doubling Parameter. The parameter regulating the cross-linguistic distribution of clitic doubling is claimed to be Case-theoretic. Specifically it is proposed that clitics absorb Case and, accordingly, clitic doubling is only possible in languages with special prepositions which can license Case on the doubled object.

(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 1992b 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 had been previously thought. Suñer argues that special prepositions are markers for animacy, while clitic doubling is related to partitiveness
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and specificity, in the sense of being licensed only when the doubled argument is partitive or discourse-specific. A similar point is made by Dobrovie-Sorin (1990, 1992) on the basis of Romanian direct object doubling. The shift of focus from the phrase structure of doubling clitics to their interpretational effects sheds new light on potential factors underlying the Clitic Doubling Parameter. Clitic doubling is linked to a number of constructions where different semantico-pragmatic properties of direct objects are systematically encoded through morphosyntactic differences, such as scrambling in Dutch and German (de Hoop 1992; Diesing 1992b), participle agreement in French (Obenauer 1995; Adger 1993) and Hindi (Mahajan 1990) and morphological accusative case in Turkish (Enc 1991). The view that doubling and scrambling have the same underlying syntax is first suggested in Sportiche (1996b, original manuscript 1993; see below) and is further defended in Anagnostopoulou (1994), on the basis of interpretational similarities between the two constructions, and in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1997b), on the basis of evidence from binding (Weak Crossover and Principle C).

(iii) In the early 1990s, new analytic options arise for cliticization and clitic doubling due to a number of major developments in the syntactic formalism. Among them, I note the following: (a) the proliferation of functional projections (Ouhalla 1988; Pollock 1989); (b) the investigation of the conditions on Head Movement (see, e.g., Koopman 1982; Travis 1984; Baker 1988a); (c) the typology of A- and A′-positions, which became particularly important to the understanding of the various types of scrambling (short-distance, medium-distance, and long-distance; see, among others, Deprez 1989; Webelhuth 1989, 1992; Mahajan 1990; Saito 1992) and the locality conditions on Chains (Rizzi 1990b; Cinque 1990c); (d) the extensive postulation of covert movement operations to the functional domain (see, e.g., Chomsky 1989 for head movement and Chomsky 1993 for argument movement); (e) the view that movement is triggered by morphosyntactic features filtering out improper representations where a functional head and an XP do not enter spec–head agreement (Rizzi 1991b for wh-movement and all Minimalism, up to Chomsky 2000). These developments lead to a reconciliation of the base-generation and movement approaches to cliticization. It becomes possible to maintain that there is both a movement and a base-generation component in the syntax of cliticization and clitic doubling. Two influential proposals which combine movement with base generation in different ways are developed in an unpublished 1993 paper by Sportiche (versions of this paper were later published as Sportiche 1996b, 1998) and in Uriagereka (1988, 1995a), who bases himself on unpublished work by Torrego (1988). Sportiche (1996b) argues that clitics are heads in the extended projection of V, i.e., they are parts of the V-inflectional system. On the other hand, Uriagereka (1988, 1995a) treats clitics as determiners, i.e., as heads in the extended projection of N. Sportiche proposes that the doubled DP is generated in an argument VP-internal position and undergoes movement to or through the clitic position at some stage in the derivation (overtly or covertly). The availability of clitic doubling depends on whether a clitic can co-occur with an overt DP. A filter similar to the Doubly Filled Comp filter determines whether doubling is possible in a designated language.
Uriagereka suggests that the doubled DP is in the Spec, DP position of a complex DP headed by the doubling clitic which undergoes movement to its surface site. Drawing on evidence from Romance, Uriagereka argues that in some languages, determiners are strong enough to head such complex DPs and in others not: this determines availability of clitic doubling.

(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 languages and constructions. One such proposal is developed by Bleam (1999), who argues that accusative clitics are determiners and dative clitics are inflections. Another proposal that takes the uniformity of clitics to be epiphenomenal is put forth in Anagnostopoulou (2003). Dative clitics relating to the double object construction are argued to have a different syntax in Greek and, e.g., the Bantu language Sesotho. Note, finally, that there is a change at the data level. The GB view that clitic doubling is absolutely impossible in certain clitic languages like Italian and French is no longer valid. Kayne (2000) argues that clitic doubling of strong pronouns is possible – in fact, obligatory – in French.

1.3 Organization of the discussion

Having outlined the main theoretical issues arising in connection with clitic doubling, I now turn to a more detailed presentation of the issues surrounding this phenomenon. The discussion is organized as follows. In section 2, I discuss two related clitic constructions, namely Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) and right dislocation, addressing the question of how these relate to clitic doubling. In section 3, I present the history of the research on clitic doubling within the tradition that treats clitic constructions as being uniform. A central question within this line of approach has to do with the nature of the Clitic Doubling Parameter. In section 4, a number of proposals are presented that take the syntax of clitics as differing across languages and constructions.

2 Clitic doubling and related constructions

Clitic doubling should be, at least descriptively, distinguished from two constructions that look very similar to it, namely Clitic Left Dislocation (CLLD) and right dislocation.

2.1 Clitic doubling vs. CLLD

CLLD is a construction in which a clitic co-occurs with an XP to its left. An example of CLLD is provided in (5) from Italian (Cinque 1990c: 71):
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Anagnostopoulou et al. 1997).

Given the similarity between CLLD of objects in (5) and clitic doubling, a
natural question that arises is whether CLLD results from fronting of a clitic
doubled DP to a position in the left periphery of the clause. Agouraki (1993),
Kayne (1994), Sportiche (1996b), and Grohmann (2003), among others, argue in
favor of analyses along these lines, which straightforwardly explain the connected-
ness properties of CLLD. On the other hand, Cinque (1990c), 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. Italian pre-
sents such a case. While CLLD is grammatical in Italian, as shown in (5), doubling
is not, as shown in (6):

(5) Gianni, lo vedrò domani. 
Gianni him will-see-I tomorrow
‘I will see Gianni tomorrow.’

(6) *Lo vedrò domani Gianni. 
Him will-see-I tomorrow Gianni

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

(7) a. Lo vimos a Juan. 
Him saw-we a Juan
‘We saw Juan.’

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

(8) 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 1990c: 58) exemplify CLLD of PPs and
APs:
(iv) There are semantic classes of noun phrases that can undergo CLLD but resist clitic doubling, as illustrated in (10) with examples from Greek:

(10) 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 problem

These differences are unexpected if CLLD is the movement counterpart of doubling, arguing against the reduction of CLLD to an underlying clitic doubling source. For this reason, Cinque (1990c), Iatridou (1991), and Anagnostopoulou (1994) propose that in CLLD the left-dislocated phrase is base-generated in a left-peripheral adjunct position. The main problem for base-generation analyses of CLLD is that they have to appeal to special mechanisms in order to derive the connectivity property of CLLD (on selective island sensitivity, see Iatridou 1991 and Demirdache 1991).

2.2 Clitic doubling vs. right dislocation

Right dislocation is a construction in which a clitic co-occurs with a phrase to its right as illustrated in (11) with an example from French (from Jaeggli 1986b: 33):

(11) Je l’ ai vu, l’ assassiin. French
    I him have seen, the murderer
    ‘I saw him, the murderer.’

Right dislocation of subjects and objects has been discussed by, among others, Antinucci and Cinque (1977), Jaeggli (1986b), Calabrese (1992), Vallduvi (1992), Bonet (1991), 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 (Aoun 1981; Hurtado 1984; Philippaki-Warburton 1987; and much later literature), 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 1997; Jaeggli 1982, 1986b; 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 this section, there are strong arguments against unifying them structurally.

Jaeggli (1986b: 32–35) argues 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, as illustrated in (12), while no such break is required before the object in clitic doubling, as illustrated in (13):

(12) Parece que tuvieron que llevarla de urgencia a los Estados Unidos la hija de Coronel Martinez.

'It seems that they had to take her urgently to the United States the daughter of Coronel Martinez.'

(13) Parece que tuvieron que llevarla a la hija de Coronel Martinez 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 (12) and (13) correlates with a difference in word order. In (12) the direct object occurs at the very end of the sentence, following all other phrases. On the other hand, in (13) the direct object is followed by the string de urgencia a los Estados Unidos. According to Jaeggli, these two differences would be mysterious if clitic doubling and right dislocation have the same structural analysis, while they naturally follow from the proposal that doubling is a chain consisting of a clitic and an argument while, in right dislocation, the right-dislocated phrase occurs in a peripheral right-adjoined position.

(ii) Right dislocation is not subject to Kayne’s Generalization, as illustrated in (12), while clitic doubling requires the presence of the preposition a preceding the doubled phrase, as illustrated in (13).

(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 (11), while lacking clitic doubling, as was shown in (3).1

In later literature, the properties of right dislocation have been investigated in more detail. More specifically, Vallduví (1992) and Zubizarreta (1994, 1998) focus on an intonational property of right dislocation not discussed in Jaeggli (1986b). While for Jaeggli (1986b) the salient property of right dislocation is a pause separating it from the rest of the clause, for Vallduví (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. Right dislocation is found in all clitic languages and can be easily mistaken for doubling because it is productive and the presence of a pause is not its most prominent feature. In fact, as will be pointed out below, a pause doesn’t have to be present at all. It is therefore necessary to present here a more complete picture of right dislocation, as opposed to clitic doubling.

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. The example in (14) is an instance of this construction in Catalan (from Vallduví 1992: 102):

(14) La vaig VEURE la baralla.

It 1-sg-past-see the fight
‘I SAW the fight (I did see the fight).’

Evidence from word order supports the view that in right dislocation the DP “doubled” by the clitic is an adjunct. In Catalan locative constructions, the order of the verbal complements is fixed. The direct object must precede the locative phrase carrying the main stress of the sentence, as illustrated in (15a). A stressed object is not allowed to follow the locative phrase, as illustrated in (15b) (from Vallduví 1992: 96, 98):

(15) a. Fiquem el ganivet al calaix.

Put-we the knife in-the drawer
‘We put the knife in the drawer.’

b. *Fiquem al calaix el ganivet.

Put-we in-the drawer the knife
‘We put the knife in the drawer.’

When a clitic is present, signaling right dislocation, word order and intonation must be as in (16b), i.e., the direct object must follow the locative phrase, which carries the main sentence stress. As (16a) shows, the right-dislocated object is not allowed to precede the locative phrase:


it put-we the knife in-the drawer
‘We put the knife in the drawer.’

b. El fiquem AL CALAIX el ganivet.

it put-we in-the drawer the knife
‘We put the knife in the drawer.’

Vallduví’s discussion of right-dislocated objects in Catalan creates the impression that their crucial property is that they be de-accented while the intonation peak of the sentence falls on some preceding material, the V-cluster in (14) and the locative phrase in (16b). However, even this picture is not refined enough.
In her discussion of right dislocation of objects in Standard Spanish, Zubizarreta (1998: 151–158) draws a further 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 illustrated in (17). The latter do not co-occur with a clitic and follow a subject bearing Contrastive Stress, as illustrated in (18):

(17) La lavó mamá, la mamadera. Standard Spanish
   Cl-Acc washed Mother the milk bottle
   ‘Mother washed the milk-bottle.’

(18) Lavó mamá, la mamadera.
   washed mother the milk bottle
   ‘Mother washed the milk bottle.’

Zubizarreta points out that there is no prosodic boundary between in situ de-accented objects and the nuclear pitch-accented words preceding them in examples like (18). On the other hand, the prosodic status of right-dislocated objects in (17) 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, however, right-dislocated phrases may be preceded by a salient pause. Thus, a pause may be present in right dislocation, as observed by Jaeggli (1986b), but doesn’t have to be present, contrary to what Jaeggli (1986b) thought. Concerning the phrase structure asymmetries between right-dislocated constituents and in situ de-accented constituents, Zubizarreta points out that there are two systematic differences between them. First, as seen in (17) and (18), 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 (19) (the hash mark indicates the prosodic boundary preceding a right dislocated phrase), while the order among in situ de-accented objects is fixed, as shown in (20):

(19) a. Escondió el libro #el niño #debajo de la cama. Standard Spanish
    Hid the book #the boy #under the bed
    ‘The boy hid the book under the bed.’

b. Escondió el libro #debajo de la cama #el niño.
   ‘The boy hid the book under the bed.’

(20) 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.’
The structural properties Zubizarreta (1998) isolates as being typical of right dislocation coincide with those identified by Vallduví (1992): (i) obligatory presence of a clitic and (ii) freedom of word order in locative constructions where order is otherwise rigid.

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, e.g., (14), (16b), and (17), where a clitic co-occurs with an inanimate object not preceded by *a*. This difference in form correlates with the intonational and positional differences discussed above. 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 are allowed to (or must; see section 3.1 below) undergo clitic doubling, a doubled indirect object may carry nuclear stress, as shown in (21a) (from Zubizarreta 1998: 198, (iv)), and a doubled direct object pronoun may precede a non-right-dislocated focused subject receiving nuclear stress, as shown in (21b) (from Zubizarreta 1998: 186, (vi)):

(21) a. Se lo envió a *mamá* #María #el regalo. Standard Spanish
   Cl-Dat Cl-Acc sent to mother #Mary #the present
   ‘Mary sent the present 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-adjointed elements, as proposed by Jaeggli (1986b) and Vallduví (1992).

The analysis of right dislocation in terms of right-adjunction must be reformulated in antisymmetry proposals, which reject right-adjunction. To this end, both Kayne (1994) and Zubizarreta (1998) relate right dislocation to CLLD. Kayne (1994: 82–83) proposes that in both clitic doubling and right dislocation, the DP doubled by the clitic is base generated in an argument position, thus unifying structurally clitic doubling with right dislocation. To express the intonational and interpretational differences between right dislocation and doubling, Kayne suggests that the former construction is an instance of CLLD at LF, i.e., the right-dislocated phrase undergoes LF-movement of the CLLD type. Covert CLLD is triggered by a feature having the effect of a particular intonation contour at PF. No such feature is present in clitic doubling. Alternatively, Zubizarreta (1998: 198, fn. 57) suggests that right dislocation involves clitic left dislocation followed by leftward movement of the TP across the left-dislocated constituent. Given the
distributional differences between right dislocation and clitic doubling mentioned above, the latter approach is descriptively more adequate, as it captures the fact that right-dislocated elements occupy a peripheral position in the sentence, unlike doubled elements. In Kayne’s proposal, this difference is not explained.

3 Unification views: a historical perspective

Having clarified the relations between CLLD, right dislocation, and clitic doubling, I am now in a position to turn to the core issues arising in connection with clitic doubling, defined as a construction in which a clitic forms a chain with a phrase in argument position. This definition puts me in agreement with certain theoretical proposals and not with others. In particular, I will not discuss here the theories developed in Aoun (1981), Hurtado (1984), Philippaki-Warburton (1987), and others, which take the doubled DP to be an adjunct.

3.1 Early GB approaches: a parameter relating to Kayne’s Generalization

3.1.1 Movement vs. base generation

Consider the French examples in (22):

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

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

In (22a), 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 (23), where the clitic and the inflected verb form a morphological unit:

(23) V
    le
    V
    vois

A central issue in the study of clitics is whether the complex [le–vois] in (22a) is directly inserted from the lexicon (the base-generation/lexicalist approach) or the clitic moves to its host from the postverbal complement position of the verb (the movement/syntactic approach).
In Kayne (1975) it is argued that the movement analysis correctly accounts for
the fact that clitics and full DP objects are in complementary distribution, as is
evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (22b) in French. It is furthermore pointed
out that in causative constructions, a dative clitic cannot appear in the main
clause in the presence of a subject in the embedded clause, a Specified Subject
Condition (SSC) effect providing corroborating evidence for a syntactic approach
to clitic placement:

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

(25) is the representation of (24c), 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 (26), which Chomsky (1973) views as
a condition on transformations:

(26) No rule can involve X, Y in the structure \[ \ldots Z_{WYV} \ldots \]

where Z is the subject of WYV.

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 (27) (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):

(27) a. Lo vimos a Juan.

him saw-we a Juan

‘We saw Juan.’

b. L-am văzut pe Popescu.

him-have-I seen pe Popescu

‘I have seen Popescu.’
These examples show that there are languages in which clitics and argument NPs are not in complementary distribution. For, e.g., (27a) a representation along the lines of (28) is needed (Borer 1984 and Jaeggli 1986b argue 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 a Juan, it is hard to maintain a movement analysis for clitic doubling, as there is no source position available for the clitic. This leads to the view that lo in (28) is directly inserted under V. Ethical datives constitute a further argument for base generation. In Spanish, 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):

In Jaeggli (1982: 18–19) it is 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 (i) clitics are inserted from the lexicon in clitic doubling and ethical dative constructions and (ii) all clitics share the same syntax leads to a base-generation analysis of non-doubling clitic constructions, such as the Spanish example (30) and its French counterpart je le vois (see (22a)):
Under the “uniformity” view, clitics are base generated in their surface position even in languages like French where clitic doubling is disallowed.

Base-generation analyses of clitics are developed in Bouchard (1982), Jaeggli (1982, 1986b), Borer (1984), and Burzio (1986), among many others. According to these proposals, the only difference between (30) and (27) is that in (30) the clitic is associated with an empty category in complement position, as illustrated in (31):

This is compatible with Chomsky’s (1981) position that the SSC is part of the Binding Theory, which applies equally to Movement Chains and Base-Generated Chains (see Sportiche 1996b, 1998 and van Riemsdijk 1999 for an overview). See Borer (1984) for extensive argumentation that the clitic in (28) and (31) governs and c-commands the coindexed NP position (see also Jaeggli 1986b). 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.

Base-generated chains consisting of a clitic and an (overt or covert) NP pose a number of questions, widely discussed in the early GB literature (see Jaeggli 1986b for an overview).

(i) What is the role (argument–non-argument) and position (A, A′) of the clitic?
(ii) What is the relation between the verb and the clitic, on the one hand, and the verb and the NP, on the other, in terms of thematic roles and Case?
(iii) What is the relation between the clitic and the NP (what type of Chain do they form)?
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(iv) How does the base-generated empty category in (31) fit Chomsky’s (1981, 1982) typology of empty categories (is it PRO, pro, or a different type of category)?

(v) What explains the difference between languages like French, where the complement position of the verb is obligatorily empty in the presence of the clitic, and languages like Spanish, where the two are allowed to co-occur?

Due to space limitations, it is impossible to present an exhaustive list of all answers to these questions suggested in the early GB literature. I focus here on the fifth question, namely the Clitic Doubling Parameter, which, as will become evident, presupposes a particular view on clitic chains, highlighting some of the positions taken by individual researchers with respect to the other questions. In the next subsection, I present two representative proposals on the Clitic Doubling Parameter developed in the framework of Chomsky (1981), namely Jaeggli (1982) and Borer (1984). The facts they discuss compose an intriguing picture of variation within and across languages. Before proceeding, I would like to point out that these researchers (as well as Steriade 1980; Dobrovie-Sorin 1990; Suñer 1991) extensively discuss the behavior of clitic doubling in wh-constructions. This issue is disregarded here.

3.1.2 Kayne’s Generalization and the Clitic Doubling Parameter

The main insight expressed in Jaeggli’s (1982) theory of cliticization is that clitic doubling is 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 (as already mentioned, later research has shown that clitic doubling is not totally absent from French and Italian; see, e.g., Kayne 2000 on French). It is pointed out that within Romance, the property that appears to regulate the cross-linguistic distribution of doubling is Kayne’s Generalization: an object NP may be doubled only if it is preceded by a special preposition. It is therefore concluded that 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. To this end, it is proposed that clitics are generated in the clitic position and they absorb government of the verb (a special kind of government called “subcategorying government”), due to a uniqueness condition on government. (Recall that Jaeggli did not assume that the clitic is part of V but rather analyzed it as a sister of V dominated by V’.) As a result of government-absorption, the empty NP in complement position in (31) is PRO, which is ungoverned. (The view that clitics absorb government and that the complement position of the verb is ungoverned was argued against in Borer 1984 and was also dropped in Jaeggli 1986b. According to Borer 1984, the empty position is undefined in terms of Chomsky’s system; according to Jaeggli 1986b, it is pro.) When an overt NP occurs in object position, it cannot receive Case, which must be assigned under government. Therefore, clitic doubling is ruled out as a Case Filter violation (Chomsky 1981; Vergnaud 1981), unless a special preposition is present, which can assign Case to the NP. Kayne’s Generalization is thus linked to Case theory.
In Jaeggli’s (1982) theory, the cross-linguistic differences in the distribution of clitic doubling in Romance are accounted for as follows (see Jaeggli 1982 for details and Jaeggli 1986b for some revisions):

(i) **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 (33a). It is disallowed in Rioplatense Spanish when the object is inanimate and a preposition in front of it is impossible (33b). Doubling is ruled out in French and Italian, where the option of inserting a is unavailable, as illustrated in (34) for French. Finally, in Standard Spanish direct object doubling is ruled out, even though animate, specific objects are introduced by a (35):

(33) a. Lo vimos a Guille. Rioplatense Spanish  
   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.’

(34) a. *Je le vois Jean. French  
   I him see Jean  
   ‘I am seeing Jean.’

b. Je vois Jean.  
   I see Jean

c. *Je vois à Jean

   Cl-acc saw-we a Guille  
   ‘We saw Guille.’

b. Vimos a Guille.  
   Saw-we a Guille

The contrasts between (33a) and (33b) in Rioplatense Spanish, on the one hand, and (33a) in Rioplatense Spanish and (34a) in French (and Italian), on the other, are linked to the presence vs. absence of a. When a is present, as in (33a), 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 (33a) and Standard Spanish (35a), it is stipulated that a cannot assign Case to direct objects in Standard Spanish.

(ii) **Indirect Object Doubling: a is a preposition or a Case marker.**

Indirect object doubling is permitted in all dialects of Spanish and is disallowed in French and Italian. The relevant examples are repeated from above, for Spanish and French respectively:
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Miguelito gave Mafalda a piece of candy.

Jean gave candies 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 presents two pieces of evidence that à is not a preposition in French, which are based on coordination (Vergnaud 1974). First, contrary to coordinated PPs in (36a), coordinated indirect objects introduced by à in French can serve as antecedents of a relative clause (37a), behaving like NPs. Moreover, while the complement of a preposition can be a conjunction of noun phrases as in (36b), this is not allowed with the complement of à, as shown in (37b). Instead, two à-phrases must be coordinated, as shown in (37c):

(36) a. *Il a compté sur l’homme et sur la femme qui se sont rencontrés hier. He has counted on the man and on the woman who met yesterday.
b. Ils se sont assis sur la table et les chaises. They sat on the table and the chairs.

(37) a. Il a parlé à l’homme et à la femme qui se sont rencontrés hier. He has spoke to the man and to the woman who met yesterday.
b. *Ils ont parlé à Marie et le directeur. ‘They talked to Mary and the director.’
c. Ils ont parlé à Marie et au directeur. ‘They talked to Mary and to the director.’

The differences in (36) and (37) present evidence that à is not a preposition. It is proposed that, not being a preposition, à cannot assign Case, and doubling violates the Case Filter. By contrast, Spanish a qualifies as a preposition on the basis of Vergnaud’s second test (Jaeggli 1982: 32):

(2) Miguelito (le) regaló un caramelo a Mafalda. All dialects of Spanish
Miguelito Cl-DAT gave a candy a Mafalda
‘Miguelito gave Mafalda a piece of candy.’

(3) Jean (*lui) a donné des bonbons à Marie. French
Jean Cl-DAT has given the candies to Marie.
‘Jean gave candies to Marie.’
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(38) a. Les compraron una casa a María y el director.
   They bought a house for María and the director.
   ‘They bought a house for María and the director.’

b. Les mandaron cartas a los padres y los abuelos del interesado.
   ‘They sent letters to the parents and the grandparents of the interested party.’

Being a preposition, a assigns Case to the object when a clitic is present, and, therefore, clitic doubling is permitted in Spanish.

(iii) Whenever clitics are obligatory in Spanish, cliticization is obligatory in French.

In Jaeggli (1982) a number of environments are discussed where clitic doubling or simple cliticization is obligatory in Spanish. It is furthermore pointed out that in all cases where the presence of a clitic is obligatory in Spanish, cliticization is obligatory in French as well. The environments in question are inalienable possession constructions and constructions with strong object pronouns:

(a) Inalienable possession constructions:

(39) a. Le lavaron los manos a Luis.
   Cl-dat washed the hands a Luis
   ‘They washed Luis’s hands.’

b. Le lavaron los manos.

c. *Lavaron los manos a Luis.

(40) a. *Elle lui cassera Jean le gueule.
   She Cl-dat will break Jean the face
   ‘She will break Jean’s face.’

b. Elle lui cassera la gueule.
   She Cl-dat will break the face
   ‘She will break his face.’

c. *Elle cassera Jean le gueule.

(b) Pronouns:

(41) a. *Vimos a él.
   Saw-we a him
   ‘We saw him.’

b. Lo vimos.
   Cl-acc saw-we

c. Lo vimos a él.
   Cl-acc saw-we a him
   ‘We saw him.’
The obligatoriness of clitics in inalienable possession is accounted for in terms of theta-theory. It is hypothesized that certain theta-roles, such as inalienable possessor, are obligatorily assigned to clitics and are transmitted to argument NP positions. The obligatoriness of clitic doubling with strong pronouns is accounted for in terms of a version of the Avoid Pronoun Principle. The difference between Spanish and French illustrated in (39)–(42), namely that clitic doubling is ruled out in French but not in Spanish, falls out from the fact that French lacks clitic doubling altogether and, therefore, only the simple cliticization option is available. In Spanish, doubling and simple cliticization are equally possible (though see Kayne 2000 for an argument that strong pronouns can be doubled in French).

Having summarized Jaeggli’s (1982) theory and the main facts derived by it, I now turn to Borer (1984), who builds on the view that clitic doubling is tightly linked to Kayne’s Generalization and widens 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) accounts for parametric differences between Hebrew and Romanian in terms of the specific properties of sel and pe. At a theoretical level, Borer (1984) clarifies a number of issues pertaining to the nature of clitics and the formal relations displayed in clitic doubling chains. The latter topic has already been mentioned in section 3.1.1. Concerning the nature of clitics, Borer proposes 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 is the first to suggest that clitics are (special kinds of) agreement markers. Her treatment of clitics is embedded within a theory of inflection according to which inflectional rules can apply at any level and are allowed to change relational configurations, provided that the lexical specifications remain unchanged. According to Borer, clitics are affixes which are

the output of an inflectional rule which inserts number, gender and person features and associates them with an already existing Case feature on a lexical head. Clitics are a spell-out of Case features in the sense that once the Case feature is associated with the inserted number, gender and person features, it is given an independent phonological representation and can no longer be transferred to a complement of the head. (Borer 1984: 41)

Borer’s inflectional rule of clitic spell-out is given in (43):

(43) **Clitic Spell-Out (Borer 1984: 37):**

\[
[\lambda X, \alpha \text{Case}] \rightarrow [\lambda X [\alpha \text{Case}, \beta \text{gender}, \gamma \text{number}, \delta \text{person}]
\]

\[
X = [+V] \text{ in Romance}
\]

\[
X = V, P, N \text{ in Semitic}
\]

(42) a. *Jean voit moi/toi/lui/elle/nous . . . French

b. Jean me/te/le/la/nous . . . voit.
Borer’s (1984) analysis is embedded within a discussion of the structure and the Case properties of Hebrew nominals and, in particular, the Construct State construction. On the basis of the Construct State, she argues that noun heads assign structural Case in Hebrew under certain conditions, and establishes that ֶל is present whenever the noun is not in the right configuration to assign structural Case. She furthermore points out that ֶל 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. Consider the contrast in (44):

(44) a. beit-a ֶל ha-mora
   house-her of the teacher
   ‘the teacher’s house’

b. *beit-a ha-mora
   house-her the-teacher

Thus, doubling in Hebrew nominals takes place under exactly the same conditions as doubling in Rioplatense Spanish. It 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.

Nevertheless, a property of ֶל is noted that appears to differentiate it from Spanish a. The NP ֶל introduces can serve as an antecedent for a lexical anaphor, as illustrated in (45a), contrary to real prepositions, which block binding, as shown in (45b) (Borer 1984: 56):

(45) a. re’iyat ‘acma ֶל ha mora
   view herself of the teacher
   ‘the teacher’s view of herself’

b. *xaşıvat ‘acma ‘al ha mora
   thinking herself about the teacher

On the basis of (45), Borer concludes that ֶל-phrases are not PPs but rather NPs. In view of Jaeggli’s discussion of Spanish a as opposed to French à discussed above, this appears to create an analytic problem. Recall that in order to account for the difference between Spanish, which allows clitic doubling of indirect objects, and French and Italian, which do not, it was crucial for Jaeggli (1982) to argue that French (and Italian) à is not a preposition, contrary to Spanish a. Now we see that clitic doubling in Hebrew relies on ֶל and falls under Kayne’s Generalization. Everything else being equal, ֶל is expected to qualify as a preposition. And yet, there is evidence that it is not.

Even though Borer (1984) does not explicitly address this problem, she makes a proposal that resolves it, which is motivated by independent considerations. In particular, she draws a distinction between ֶל, which is a contentless, dummy element, and pe and a in Romanian and Spanish respectively, which are contentful prepositions. Borer (1984) points out that the range of environments where ֶל
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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. In particular, *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 (similar considerations apply to *a* in Spanish, according to Jaeggli’s 1982 description; see also Borer 1984). The complex distribution of *pe* and clitic doubling in Romanian is illustrated below (Borer 1984: 128 drawing on Steriade 1980; see also Dobrovie-Sorin 1990, 1992, for discussion of the semantic properties of direct object doubling in Romanian):

(i) **Pe obligatory, doubling obligatory**

(46) [+specific, +definite, +human, +pronominal]
   a. Am văzut-o pe ea. [Romanian]  
      have-I seen-Cl pe her  
      ‘I have seen her.’
   b. *am văzut-o ea
   c. *am văzut pe ea

(47) [+specific, +definite, +human, −pronominal]
   a. L-am văzut pe Popescu.  
      Cl-have-I seen pe Popescu  
      ‘I have seen Popescu.’
   b. *L-am văzut Popescu.
   c. *Am văzut pe Popescu.

(48) [+specific, −definite, +human, −pronominal]
   a. o caut pe o fată de la noi din sat.    
      Cl- I-am looking for pe a girl from the our village
   b. *o caut o fată de la noi din sat
   c. *caut pe o fată de la noi din sat
      (on the specific interpretation)

(ii) **Pe obligatory, doubling impossible**

(49) [−specific, −definite, +human, +pronominal]
   a. Am văzut pe altcineva.  
      have-I seen pe somebody else  
      ‘I have seen somebody else.’
   b. *am văzut altcineva
   c. *l-am văzut pe altcineva
(iii) *Pe impossible, doubling impossible*

(50) [–specific, –definite, +human, –pronominal]
   a. Am văzut un bucătar.
      'I have seen a cook.'
   b. *am văzut pe un bucătar
   c. *l-am văzut pe un bucătar

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

(52) [–specific, –definite, –human, +pronominal]
   a. Am văzut alteceva.
      'I have seen something else.'
   b. *am văzut pe alteceva
   c. *l-am văzut pe alteceva

On the basis of the fact that there are environments in Romanian where *pe* is obligatory and doubling is ruled out, Borer argues that the presence of *pe* is required by lexico-semantic factors, and therefore, it must be present at D-structure. Its presence facilitates doubling in the sense that *pe* assigns Case to the direct object. But the purpose of inserting *pe* is not simply to rescue the structure. On the other hand, the sole purpose of inserting *sel* is to assign genitive Case in contexts where the noun cannot do so. Borer proposes that the rule of *sel* insertion is an inflectional rule operating in the phonological component (she argues that the environment of insertion is dependent upon string adjacency). In this analysis, *sel* is not present at S-structure where Binding Conditions apply, explaining the status of examples like (45a) where the presence of *sel* does not affect binding.

I conclude this part of the discussion by summarizing how inter- and intralinguistic variation is accounted for in the two works presented so far which capitalize on Kayne’s Generalization to account for the Clitic Doubling Parameter:

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

(iii) **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.

(iv) **Auxiliary assumption 3:** When a preposition-like element rescues a clitic doubling construction without providing evidence that it is a preposition, then it is inserted at PF. This explains differences in extraction from doubling in Hebrew and Romanian. The claimed difference between D-structure insertion and PF insertion correlates with the fact that prepositions belonging to the first group are contentful and prepositions belonging to the second group are dummy elements.

### 3.2 Late GB: specificity, animacy, and rejection of Case-theoretic approaches

Suñer (1988) builds on Borer’s (1984) insight that clitics are similar to agreement markers and focuses on the fact that direct object doubling in Spanish is limited to specific NPs. In addition, she argues against an important assumption made in early approaches toward clitic doubling, namely that clitics absorb Case. By doing so, she initiates an altogether different way of thinking about clitic doubling constructions and the Clitic Doubling Parameter. Finally, she points out that direct object doubling and indirect object doubling differ with respect to specificity.

More specifically: first, she points out that while specific animate DPs can be doubled by accusative clitics (53a, b), non-specific animate DPs cannot undergo clitic doubling (53c, d) (Suñer 1988: 396):

\[
\begin{align*}
53 \text{a.} & \quad [+\text{anim}, +\text{spec}, +\text{def}] \text{ (Rioplatense Spanish)} \\
& \quad \text{La oían a Paca/ à la niña/ à la gata.} \\
& \quad \text{her listened-3pl to Paca/ to the girl/ to the cat} \\
& \quad \text{‘They listened to Paca/the girl/the cat.’} \\
53 \text{b.} & \quad [+\text{anim}, +\text{spec}, −\text{def}] \\
& \quad \text{Diariamente, la escuchaba a una mujer que cantaba tangos.} \\
& \quad \text{daily, her listened-3sg to a woman who sang tangos} \\
& \quad \text{‘He listened daily to a woman who sang tangos.’} \\
53 \text{c.} & \quad [+\text{anim}, −\text{spec}, +\text{def}] \\
& \quad *\text{Lo alabarán al niño que termine primero.} \\
& \quad \text{him will praise-3pl the boy who finishes first} \\
& \quad \text{‘They will praise the boy who finishes first.} \\
53 \text{d.} & \quad [+\text{anim}, −\text{spec}, −\text{def}] \\
& \quad *\text{No lo oyeron a ningún ladrón.} \\
& \quad \text{not him heard-3pl to any thief} \\
& \quad \text{‘They didn’t hear any thieves.’}
\end{align*}
\]
This is similar to the point Borer (1984) made for Romanian (see above; see also Dobrovie-Sorin 1990 for Romanian), i.e., that doubling takes place only with a subset of direct objects introduced by a special preposition.

Second, Suñer argues against the view that in Spanish, the preposition *a* is a Case marker licensing clitic doubling. She provides data from Porteño/Rioplatense Spanish, where direct object clitic doubling is possible in the absence of *a* (Suñer 1988: 399–400):

(54) a. Yo la tenía prevista esta muerte. 
   Rioplatense Spanish
   I had foreseen (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?
   (Kany 1969: 149)

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 and Orecchia 1979)

d. Ahora tiene que seguir usando el apellido. (Barrenechea and Orecchia 1979)
   ‘Now s/he has to go on using (it) the surname.’

e. Yo lo voy a comprar el diario justo antes de subir
   I it am going to buy the newspaper just before coming up

Suñer argues that these examples are not right dislocations because they are uttered with the same unbroken intonation curve they would have without the clitic, and they occur in embedded or parenthetical clauses as in (54c), as well as in non-peripheral positions as in (54e). She concludes 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. According to Suñer, the existence of examples like (54) 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* is required for clitic doubling.

Note, as an aside, that there is minimal variation in the “distinctiveness” features associated with *pe* and *a* in Romanian and Spanish respectively. The presence of *pe* in Romanian is sensitive to the feature [+human], as was evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (51) presented in the preceding subsection, while *a* in Spanish is sensitive to the feature [+animate], as shown in (53a) where *la gata* is preceded by *a*. Minimal variation of this kind is expected by “markedness theories” of the type postulated in the typological literature (see Silverstein 1976 and Dixon 1994 among others; see Anagnostopoulou 1994 for an informal proposal to link phenomena of the Spanish and Romanian type to “markedness” theories of this kind, and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2000 for a proposal). Assume, in the spirit of such theories, that *a* and *pe* are ways to 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 (55). In such a view, object marking with a and pe is the counterpart of subject marking of NPs that are less likely to occur in the A (subject of transitive clause) function with ergative case morphology (as opposed to unmarked nominative) in languages with ergative splits conditioned by the semantic properties of NPs (see Dixon 1994 for details):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(55)</th>
<th>Common nouns</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st person pronouns</td>
<td>2nd person pronouns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Animate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more likely to be in A than O function</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Like ergative languages that sometimes group together 1st and 2nd person, treating both as unmarked, and sometimes treat 1st person as being less marked than 2nd, 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).

Returning now to Suñer’s (1988) third point: she notes that indirect object/dative clitic doubling differs from direct object/accusative clitic doubling in not being subject to specificity (Suñer 1998: 394–395). The data in (56) show that any indirect object can undergo doubling in Spanish, unlike direct objects, which must be specific, as was demonstrated in (53):

(56)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(56)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>[human, spec, def]</td>
<td>Le ofrecí ayuda à la niña/a una estudiante.</td>
<td>Rioplatense her offered-1sg to help to the girl/to a student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>[human, −spec, −def]</td>
<td>Les ofrecieron queso y leche a familias de pocos medios.</td>
<td>them offered-3pl cheese and milk to families of little means</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>[human, −spec, +def]</td>
<td>Les dejan todo mi dinero a los pobres.</td>
<td>them will leave-1sg all my money to the poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To account for the facts presented above, Suñer (1988) proposes 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 explains the specificity requirement on direct object clitic doubling. A chain
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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.

Suñer’s (1988) contribution to the study of clitic doubling can be summarized as follows:

(i) She is the first one to systematically discuss the interpretive effects of direct object clitics. After the relevance of these effects was discovered, most accounts of direct object clitic doubling focused on them.

(ii) It has always been known that the conditions under which indirect object clitic doubling takes place are different from the conditions of direct object doubling (see, e.g., Jaeggli’s 1982 discussion presented above, as well as Jaeggli 1986b, which proposed that indirect object clitics are optional Case absorbers, unlike direct object clitics, which absorb Case obligatorily). Suñer (1988) points out an additional major difference between the two instances of doubling, namely specificity.

(iii) The fact that Kayne’s Generalization has counter-examples was known in the 1980s. Greek was mentioned as being one such language. Spanish, however, was considered to be “well-behaved” in this respect. Suñer (1988) argues that this is not the case. If doubling clitics do not absorb Case, then they behave similarly to agreement markers, which are usually not assumed to absorb Case (though see Baker 1996 for a generalized view of agreement markers as “Case absorbers” leading to non-configurationality in polysynthetic languages; his proposal is inspired by clitic doubling and the Case-theoretic interpretation of Kayne’s Generalization in the early GB literature).

As already mentioned, Dobrovie-Sorin (1990) reports similar findings for Romanian. Unlike Suñer, Dobrovie-Sorin does 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 argues, though, that (i) in Romanian there are many restrictions on direct object clitic doubling which have to do with the interpretation of NPs, and (ii) indirect object clitic doubling differs from direct object clitic doubling with respect to sensitivity to the semantics of NPs.

Having discussed Spanish as being a potential counter-example to Kayne’s Generalization, it is time to turn to languages that present straightforward counter-examples to Kayne’s Generalization. All Balkan languages that have been claimed to have clitic doubling (e.g., Bulgarian, Albanian, and Greek) fall into this group. 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.’
Greek instantiates a third pattern, apart from that of Spanish and Romanian, which possess clitic doubling and (by and large) observe Kayne's Generalization, and that of Italian and 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 for discussion):

(57) 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 of 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, and which is not subject to Kayne’s Generalization (see section 2.2 above). Greek definitely has right dislocation, i.e., a natural way of uttering (57) is with the intonation peak falling on the verb cluster, resulting in an emphatic interpretation of the verb, as illustrated in (57′):

(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 (I did give John the book).’

If (56′) is compared to the Catalan example of right dislocation (14) in section 2.2, discussed in Vallduví (1992), it becomes evident that the two constructions have exactly the same intonation and interpretation.

In previous work (Anagnostopoulou 1994, 1999a, 2003), I have extensively argued that Greek productively employs clitic doubling. Here I limit myself to presenting one set of data in support of this claim, which relates to the evidence from intonation and word order presented in section 2.2 (see Anagnostopoulou 2003). In Greek, objects can be doubled in environments in which the object precedes the subject, as in (59b) and (60b):

(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.’
In both cases, the object is de-accented and the subject bears main sentence stress. The context furthermore ensures that the subjects are not presupposed. Moreover, it can be shown that subjects in strings with the order Cl–VOS reside in situ. From this it follows that the object associated with the clitic cannot be right dislocated. Hence, it can be concluded that Greek possesses genuine clitic doubling.

Evidence for the assumption that the subjects in (59b) and (60b) remain in situ comes from the observation, made by Zubizarreta (1994) for Romance and by Alexiadou (1999a) for Greek, that in VOS strings, the subject necessarily bears main sentence accent. Following Cinque (1993), Zubizarreta and Alexiadou take this to indicate that the subject is the most deeply embedded argument, which remains in its VP-interal base position. Furthermore, they point out that objects may bind subjects to their right, as schematized in (61a) and illustrated in (61c):

(61) a. \[\text{OBJ} \ldots [[\text{SUB} \text{pron}] \ [t, \ldots]] \]

b. \[
\text{P jos} \ \text{sinodhepse} \ \text{to} \ \text{kathe pedhi}?
\text{Who-nom accompanied the every child?}
\text{‘Who accompanied every child?’}
\]
c. \[
\text{Sinodhepse} \ \text{to} \ \text{kathe pedhi} \ i \ \text{mitera tu.}
\text{Accompanied the every child the mother his}
\text{‘His mother accompanied every child.’}
\]

Thus, the object in (61) must have reached its surface location by overt leftward A-movement to a position above the subject. Versions of this analysis for VOS orders are widely adopted in the literature (see Zubizarreta 1994, 1998, for Spanish; Ordoñez 1994, 1997, for Spanish and Catalan; Cardinaletti 1997 for Italian; Alexiadou 1999a for Greek). Crucially for present purposes, the subject also bears main stress when the object is doubled as in (59b), (60b). This entails that objects in Cl–VOS configurations are not right dislocated. But from this it also follows that Greek qualifies as a genuine clitic doubling language.

Cross-linguistic 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 postverbal subjects carrying main sentence stress is permitted with indirect objects (Ordoñez 1997), and with pronominal direct objects (Zubizarreta 1998: 185, fn. 16: see (21b) above), as illustrated in (62) (see also the discussion in section 2.2):

(62) a. O Petros agorase ena vivlio.
The Petros-nom bought-3sg a book-acc.
‘Peter bought a book.’

b. Ke tin ali mera, to katestrepse 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 furthermore ensures that the subjects are not presupposed. Moreover, it can be shown that subjects in strings with the order Cl–VOS reside in situ. From this it follows that the object associated with the clitic cannot be right dislocated. Hence, it can be concluded that Greek possesses genuine clitic doubling.

Evidence for the assumption that the subjects in (59b) and (60b) remain in situ comes from the observation, made by Zubizarreta (1994) for Romance and by Alexiadou (1999a) for Greek, that in VOS strings, the subject necessarily bears main sentence accent. Following Cinque (1993), Zubizarreta and Alexiadou take this to indicate that the subject is the most deeply embedded argument, which remains in its VP-interal base position. Furthermore, they point out that objects may bind subjects to their right, as schematized in (61a) and illustrated in (61c):

(61) a. \[\text{OBJ} \ldots [[\text{SUB} \text{pron}] \ [t, \ldots]] \]

b. \[
\text{P jos} \ \text{sinodhepse} \ \text{to} \ \text{kathe pedhi}?
\text{Who-nom accompanied the every child?}
\text{‘Who accompanied every child?’}
\]
c. \[
\text{Sinodhepse} \ \text{to} \ \text{kathe pedhi} \ i \ \text{mitera tu.}
\text{Accompanied the every child the mother his}
\text{‘His mother accompanied every child.’}
\]
In these languages, clitic doubling of direct object DPs is ruled out. Accordingly, doubling of a la professora in a position preceding the subject is ruled out in (63) (Josep Quer, p.c.):

(63) *La saludó a la profesora Juan.
   Cl-acc greeted a the professor Juan-nom
   ‘Juan greeted the professor.’

Note that in (62) 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 as well (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):

(64) O Jannis diavase [ena vivlio jia ton Arthur Miller,] entusiastike, ke thelise na gnorisi ton sigrafeas apo konta.
   John read [a book about Arthur Miller,] 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”).

(65) O Jannis diavase [ena vivlio jia ton Arthur Miller,] entusiastike, ke thelise na ton gnorisi ton sigrafeas apo konta.
   John read [a book about Arthur Miller,] 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 (64), the undoubled definite ton sigrafeas (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 building on Hawkins 1978), 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 (65) suppresses the second option: the doubled DP is necessarily linked to the previously mentioned proper name, thus being strictly construed as anaphoric.

3.3 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 that will be presented in this subsection concerns the movement vs. base generation debate. Due to the expansion of the analytic tools of the theory, it becomes possible to combine movement with base generation.

3.3.1 Clitics as inflections

An influential theory reconciling movement with base generation is advanced in Sportiche (1996b, 1998). According to Sportiche, clitics are functional heads heading their own projections in the domain of Infl. These are referred to by the term “Clitic Voices” and it is suggested that they license a particular property on an agreeing argument: the doubled DP in clitic doubling, an object pro in simple cliticization.

Sportiche argues that clitic constructions show properties of XP-movement (see section 3.3.2) and claims that it would be the null hypothesis to postulate that clitic constructions are identical to all other types of movement configurations, which, in Checking theory (Chomsky 1993, 1995c), involve movement demanded by specifier–head licensing. The structure Sportiche proposes for accusative clitics is illustrated in (66):

\[
\text{(66)}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ClP}_{\text{acc}} \\
\text{XP}^\wedge \\
\text{Cl}_{\text{acc}} \\
\text{ClP}_{\text{acc}} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{XP}^* \\
\end{array}
\]

In (66), the (overt or covert) XP* related to the clitic moves to the XP^ position at some point in the derivation (overt syntax or LF). In this way, agreement between Cl and XP* is sanctioned. The agreement relation between the clitic and the XP* is derived as a spec–head relation, and the locality between the clitic and the corresponding XP* follows from the movement relationship between the XP* and the XP^*. Clitic doubling minimally differs from non-doubling in that the
$\text{XP}^*$ is overt in the former and covert in the latter. This way, the syntax of clitics is fully assimilated to that of other functional heads.

The obvious question to ask is the trigger of movement of the double. Sportiche answers this question by pushing the parallelism between the syntax of clitics and that of other kinds of movement. Under the assumption that $\text{wh}$-movement is motivated by the $\text{Wh}$-Criterion (Rizzi 1991b), he attributes the $\text{XP}^*$-to-$\text{XP}^\uparrow$ movement to the Clitic Criterion in (67), which, in turn, is subsumed under the Generalized Licensing Criterion in (68):

(67) **Clitic Criterion:**
At LF:
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. A clitic must be in a spec–head relationship with a [+F] XP.
  \item b. A [+F] XP must be in a spec–head relationship with a clitic.
\end{itemize}

(68) **Generalized Licensing Criterion** (Sportiche 1996b: 68):
At LF:
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. A [+F] head must be in a spec–head relationship with a [+F] XP.
\end{itemize}

In (68), [+F] stands for a set of properties such as Wh, Neg, Focus, etc. which trigger movement. For direct object clitic constructions, it is proposed that the clitic licenses Specificity on its associate. Indirect object clitic heads are treated as indirect object agreement markers since they do not yield specificity effects (cf. Suñer’s 1988 discussion presented above). The general schema in (66) makes a number of further options available:

(69) **Clitic Constructions Parameters** (Sportiche 1996b: 32):
Movement of $\text{XP}^*$ to $\text{XP}^\uparrow$ occurs overtly or covertly.
Head is overt or covert.
$\text{XP}^*$ is overt or covert.

By (69) the following cases are predicted:

(i) Undoubled clitic constructions as in French and Italian arise when a covert $\text{XP}^*$ moves overtly or covertly to $\text{XP}^\uparrow$ with $H$ overt.
(ii) Clitic doubling constructions as in Spanish and Romanian arise when an overt $\text{XP}^*$ moves covertly with $H$ overt.
(iii) Scrambling constructions as in Dutch and German arise when an overt $\text{XP}^*$ moves overtly with $H$ covert.

Note that Sportiche unifies the syntax of cliticization/clitic doubling with the syntax of scrambling, which has also been claimed to display interpretational effects (see the references to Diesing 1992b and de Hoop 1992 above). This idea is further explored in Anagnostopoulou (1994) and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1997b).
Finally, Sportiche proposes that the Clitic Doubling Parameter should be attributed to a filter similar to the doubly filled COMP filter (see Cheng 1997 for cross-linguistic discussion):

(70) **Doubly Filled Voice Filter (Sportiche 1996b: 28):**

\[ \{ H \_P \} \_XP [H \ldots ] \]

where H is a functional head licensing some property P and both XP and H overtly encode P.

Assuming (70) to hold universally, Sportiche speculates that clitic doubling arises in a language precisely when XP* movement may be delayed until LF, since this is the only way of preventing a violation of (70) with an overt XP* in the presence of an overt clitic.

Sportiche's intuition concerning the nature of clitics is similar to the one expressed in Suñer (1988). Both researchers view clitics as agreements and assume that the syntax of indirect object and direct object clitics minimally differ in that the former are pure agreement markers while the latter encode specificity. While for Suñer, direct object clitics are lexically specified as \[+\text{specific}] and, therefore, can only form a chain with a DP that has compatible feature specification, Sportiche assimilates accusative clitics to heads encoding features like \[+\text{Wh}], \[+\text{Neg}],[\text{etc}].

### 3.3.2 Clitic constructions in a movement typology: XP-movement vs. head-movement

Sportiche’s theory predicts that clitic constructions will show properties of XP-movement because the element undergoing movement is the overt or covert DP-associate of the clitic. On the other hand, for theories of cliticization like the one put forth in Kayne (1989b, 1991) and related work, clitic constructions should display X\(^0\)-movement properties, since clitics are analyzed as heads undergoing X\(^0\) movement. As a matter of fact, clitic constructions support both claims, i.e., they present evidence for both XP-movement and head-movement. In what follows, I will briefly summarize some of the evidence presented in the literature.

#### 3.3.2.1 Arguments that clitic dependencies display XP-movement properties

SSC effects of the type illustrated in (24c), repeated here, constitute an argument that clitic constructions involve phrasal movement if the SSC is assumed to fall under Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990). The ungrammaticality of (24c) shows that cliticization is sensitive to the presence of an intervening DP, namely the embedded subject Pierre:

\[(24)\text{ a. Jean a laissé Pierre parler à Marie. French}\]

\n
‘John has let Peter to speak to Mary.’
b. Jean lui a laissé parler à Marie.
   John him has let to speak to Mary
   ‘Jean has let him speak to Mary.’
c. *Jean lui a laissé Pierre parler.
   Jean to her has let Peter to speak
   ‘Jean has let Peter to speak to her.’

If clitic constructions displayed head-movement, then X^0 elements would count as interveners (Head Movement Constraint) and XP elements would not.

Participle agreement (Kayne 1989a) in French and Italian presents further evidence that clitics move as XPs. As shown in (71c), participles may agree with clitics, similarly to elements undergoing wh-movement (71b) and unlike in situ objects (71a):

(71) a. Jean a peint(e) la porte
    John has painted(*fem) the door
    ‘John painted the door.’
b. la porte, que Jean a peint(e) t
    The door that John has painted(*fem)
    ‘the door that John painted.’
c. Jean lui a peint(e).
    John Cl has painted(*fem)
    ‘John painted it.’

If, as suggested in Kayne (1989a), agreement on the participle is a reflex of a spec–head relation between the participle-head and the object XP undergoing overt movement through its specifier, then the clitic in (71c) – or its covert associate – undergoes phrasal movement.

3.3.2.2 An argument for X^0 movement that has been reanalyzed as an argument for XP-movement

In Kayne (1989b), it is argued that clitic climbing in restructuring contexts provides evidence that clitic placement is X^0 movement, because it is not sensitive to the presence of an intervening wh-phrase while it is sensitive to the presence of an intervening wh-complementizer, as illustrated in (72):

(72) a. *Mario, non lo, saprei [a chi affidare t].
    Mario, not Cl-acc I-would-know to whom entrust
    ‘Mario, I wouldn’t know to whom to entrust him.’
b. *Su questo problema, non lo, saprei [se consigliare t].
    On this problem, not him I-would-know whether advise
    ‘On this problem I wouldn’t know whether to advise them.’

The wh-phrase a chi does not interfere with clitic climbing while the wh-complementizer se does. Kayne argues that this contrast is expected if clitic climbing
is head-movement, which is sensitive to intervening heads like the C0 element *se and insensitive to intervening phrases like the wh-phrase *a chi in Spec, CP.

Sportiche (1996b), however, points out that Long Object Preposing, which also takes place in restructuring contexts (Brezio 1986), patterns with clitic climbing in being permitted in the presence of a wh-phrase but not in the presence of a complementizer (Rizzi 1982):

(73) a. *Certe riposte non si sanno mai come dare. Italian
   Certain answers not si know never how give
   ‘One never knows how to give certain answers.’
   
   b. *Certe riposte non si sanno mai *se dare. Italian
   Certain answers not si know never whether give
   ‘One never knows whether to give certain answers.’

Since long object preposing is phrasal movement, the contrast in (73) cannot be explained as a locality effect. In a locality account, the presence of an intervening complementizer is not expected to block phrasal movement and the presence of an intervening phrase is expected to do so, contrary to facts. To account for (73), Sportiche (1996b) suggests, alternatively, that the presence of an intervening complementizer in (73b) blocks incorporation of a head from the lower clause (V or Infl) into a head of the higher clause (V or Infl) leading to restructuring. Thus, long object preposing, which is contingent on restructuring, fails to apply in (73b). Since there is no intervening head blocking restructuring in (73a), long object preposing may apply. This explanation is further extended to (72). The complementizer in (72b) does not directly affect movement of the clitic to the higher clause but rather blocks incorporation/restructuring, which determines the availability of clitic climbing. Sportiche points out that clitics trigger participle agreement on the higher clause in environments like (72a), providing evidence that they undergo phrasal movement at least as high as the specifier position of the participle in the higher clause, as illustrated in (74):

(74) Non li avrei [ei]XP* saputi /*saputo a chi dare [ei]XP* Italian
   Not them I-would-have known-pl /*known-sg to whom give
   ‘I would not have known to whom to give them.’

3.3.2.3 Arguments that clitic dependencies display X0 properties

The most interesting arguments for X0 movement come from accounts of clitic placement in proposals according to which clitics left-adjoin to T or one or more inflectional heads in the domain of INFL. The left-adjunction to a functional head line of analysis, which presupposes that clitics move as heads since their landing site is a head position, syntactically accounts for the position and order of clitics, the environments in which proclisis and enclisis occur, as well as the complex interaction between the syntax of clitics, the syntax of heads in the I and C domains, such as negation, mood, complementizers, and the placement of finite verb forms as opposed to infinitives, gerunds, and imperatives (see Kayne 1991,

To briefly illustrate, consider clitic placement in Greek. In Standard Greek, clitics precede the finite verb forms but are enclitics on (non-finite) gerunds and imperatives (similarly to Spanish, Italian, French and Catalan):

(75) a. To vlepo.
   it see-1sg
   ‘I see it.’

b. Dhjavase to.
   read-2sg it
   ‘Read it!’

c. dhjavazondas to
   reading cl-acc

The relative order of the preverbal clitics is strictly indirect object > direct object, while there is no strict order among enclitics:

(76) a. Mu to edhose.
   Cl-gen Cl-acc gave-3sg
   ‘He/she gave it to me.’

b. dhose mu to
   give-2sg Cl-gen Cl-acc

c. dhose to mu
   give-2sg Cl-acc Cl-gen

Terzi (1992) and Rivero (1994) argue that in finite clauses clitics left-adjoin to the inflectional head to which the verb raises, in finite environments T or AgrS (Kayne 1989b, 1991). Rivero (1994) develops an interesting analysis for the distribution of clitics in Imperatives, which is based on the view that the verb undergoes head movement to C of the A′ type which is triggered by illocutionary features in C (see also Rivero and Terzi 1995). It is proposed that this movement is blocked by Negation, which is assumed to be an operator head under a version of Relativized Minimality (Rizzi 1990b) on head movement which is relativized to the A- vs. A′-status of intervening heads. This analysis captures the correlation between enclisis and absence of negation in imperatives. For gerunds, Rivero (1994) argues that they move to Mood, which is higher than T, in order to pick up the gerundive affix resulting in enclisis, but they can co-occur with negation, which is higher than Mood.

Terzi (1996b) investigates the properties of the functional head to which clitics adjoin from the point of view of Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetry framework: she argues that clitics adjoin to T and/or a functional head F, which is a featureless functional head in finite clauses while it is T in gerunds and imperatives. Terzi (1999) explores an LCA line of analysis to account for the puzzle concerning the rigid vs. free ordering of clitics in proclisis and enclisis respectively. She points out that the LCA makes two options available for the manner in which more than
one clitic adjoins in the clausal structure: either (i) each clitic adjoins to a different functional head (77), or (ii) one clitic adjoins to the other (78):

(77)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FP1} \\
\text{F1} \quad \text{FP2} \\
\text{cl} \quad \text{F1} \quad \text{F2} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{cl2} \quad \text{F2}
\end{array}
\]

(78)  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FP2} \\
\text{F2} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{Cl1} \quad \text{F2} \\
\text{Cl2} \quad \text{Cl1}
\end{array}
\]

In (77) FP1 is an empty functional head, a place holder for clitics, while FP2 is T. In (78), on the other hand, FP2 is T. Terzi proposes that Greek double object clitics instantiate both the first and the second options, while in Romance only the second option is possible, i.e., clitics cluster under the same head T. In contexts of enclisis, the accusative > dative order results from a derivation in which the verb incorporates the accusative clitic in (77), and the two move as a complex higher up, while the dative > accusative order results from a configuration in which Cl1 adjoins to F2 in (74) and the whole complex moves higher up. Assuming that in Romance only option (78) is available for clitic clusters, the order of clitics is not altered in contexts of enclisis.

Note, as an aside, that the proposal that clitics adjoin to one another in Romance could, perhaps, be linked to the fact that in the morphological component, Romance clitics are arranged in a template according to person features overriding syntactic ordering (Bonet 1991). One could suggest, for example, that when clitic clusters have the representation (78) forming a syntactic unit, they are spelled out according to their feature specifications and not in a way that reflects hierarchical relations among the corresponding argument positions.

3.3.3 Clitics as determiners

Uriagereka (1988, 1995a) develops an analysis that reconciles the view that clitics move with the view that doubled DPs are in argument position. Following Postal
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(1969) and Torrego (1988), Uriagereka argues that third person clitics are determiners, and analyzes them as in (79):

(79)

This proposal makes three claims: (i) D’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.

Concerning claim (i), Uriagereka (1988: 402, 1995a: 37) points out that determiners take null pro complements in strings corresponding to the English sequences the one he came, the one from France. More specifically, in a subset of Romance languages, these have the form illustrated by the Spanish examples in (80). The determiner licenses a pro-NP modified by the relative clause or the PP instead of the pro-form “one”:

(80) a. el/la que vino
    the who came
    ‘the one who came’

    b. el/la de Francia
    the from France
    ‘the one from France’

Languages permitting the strings in (80) provide straightforward evidence for the structure in (79). Uriagereka proposes that the only difference between (80) 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.

Concerning claim (ii), Uriagereka argues 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 both the availability of the structures in (80) and the unavailability of ne-/en-cliticization. Those of the Romance languages that have (80) possess clitic doubling and lack ne-/en-cliticization. Those that do not have (80) lack doubling and show ne-/en-cliticization. On the basis of this correlation, Uriagereka suggests that the Clitic Doubling Parameter in Romance depends on the strength of determiners. He proposes that the Romance languages permitting the structures in (80) 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 of the form (79), leading to clitic doubling. In languages with weak determiners, a double cannot be licensed in (79), and clitic doubling is ruled out.

Concerning claim (iii), namely that third person clitics are determiners, Uriagereka (1988, 1995a) provides a number of arguments in support of it. First, he points out that 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, as illustrated in (81).³

(81) Galician

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clitic</th>
<th>Galician</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masculine</td>
<td>(lo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine</td>
<td>(la)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The morphological identity of the forms in (81) can be straightforwardly accounted for if clitics and determiners instantiate one and the same lexical item projecting onto two different syntactic structures. Bleam (1999: 18–20) extends this argument to Spanish, where masculine clitic forms (82a) are not identical to masculine determiner forms (82b). She points out that masculine clitic forms are used as determiners in the absence of an NP-complement (82c):

(82) a. *Lo/*el vi. Spanish
    Cl-masc I-saw
    ‘I saw him.’

b. Vi el/*lo libro.
    Saw-I the-masc book
    ‘I saw the book.’

c. Vi lo que hiciste.
    Saw-I the that you-did
    ‘I saw what you did.’

The third argument comes from the phenomenon of determiner cliticization in Galician. Uriagereka (1988) argues that in Galician, determiners introducing an overt NP undergo optional syntactic cliticization onto the verb, as illustrated in (83):

(83) a. Comemos o caldo. Galician
    Ate-we the soup
    ‘We ate the soup.’

b. Comemo-lo caldo.
    Ate-we-the soup
    ‘We ate the soup.’
(83b) provides evidence that 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 (1995a) 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 point of view 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. In the preceding subsection we saw that clitic placement can be given a description without resorting to language-specific rules in systems that assume that cliticization involves head-movement and head-adjunction. It is therefore not surprising that Uriagereka (1995a), who is mainly concerned with clitic placement, capitalizes on head-movement to account for cross-linguistic variation. We also saw, though, that cliticization provides strong evidence for phrasal movement. As Uriagereka himself points out, it is necessary to incorporate an XP-movement-step into a movement analysis of clitics in order to derive properties of phrasal movement. Thus, in an analysis where clitics are determiners, head-movement must be local, following a phrasal-movement step of the DP containing the clitic, which must be assumed to move overtly at least as high as the site hosting agreeing participles.

4 Fragmentation views

In the course of the discussion, it has become evident that indirect object and direct object clitic doubling are subject to different restrictions across and within languages. So far, the two types of doubling have been shown to differ in two respects. First, 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 (see the discussion in section 3.1). Second, while direct object doubling is limited to specific DPs, doubling of non-specific indirect objects is licit (see the discussion in section 3.2). We have seen that the differences between the two types of doubling have led to a relaxation of the view that clitic constructions are uniform. For example, Sportiche (1996b) proposes to analyze direct object clitics as markers for specificity, while he treats indirect object clitics as agreement
 markers. In this section, I will concentrate on indirect object doubling and its relation to the double object construction. The link between indirect object doubling and the double object construction will lead to a new typology of clitic doubling.

4.1 Indirect object doubling is a double object construction in Spanish

Demonte (1995) investigates Spanish ditransitives and argues that the alternation between the construction exhibiting dative doubling and its counterpart without doubling shows systematic syntactic and semantic properties very similar to those exhibited by the members of the English dative alternation (see also Stowell 1981). The two construction types are illustrated in (84) and (85) (see also Strozer 1976: 557, examples 7a, b):

(84) a. Le entregué las llaves al conserje. Standard Spanish
    Cl-dat gave-I the keys to-the janitor
    ‘I gave the keys to the janitor.’
    b. Le cociné el pollo a Mario.
    Cl-dat cooked-I the chicken to Mario
    ‘I cooked the chicken for Mario.’

(85) a. Entregué las llaves al conserje. Standard Spanish
    Gave-I the keys to-the janitor
    ‘I gave the keys to the janitor.’
    b. Cociné el pollo para Mario.
    Cooked-I the chicken to Mario
    ‘I cooked the chicken for Mario.’

Demonte (1995) argues that the ditransitives in (84) where the goal and benefactive arguments undergo clitic doubling share relevant syntactic and semantic properties with the double object construction in English. The sentences in (85) without clitic doubling show properties of prepositional ditransitives. Some of the evidence for these points is summarized below (Demonte 1995: 9–13).

4.1.1 C-command

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 (86). As indicated by the translations, the same contrast is found in the prepositional dative construction in English:

(86) a. El tratamiento psicoanalítico reintegró a María a sí misma.
    the therapy psychoanalytic gave-back to Mary-DO to herself-IO
    ‘The psychoanalytic therapy gave back Mary to herself.’
When a dative clitic is present, the indirect object can bind into the direct object, while the reverse is impossible, as shown in (87). This is reminiscent of c-command asymmetries found in the double object construction in English (Barss and Lasnik 1986; Larson 1988b):

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

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

In Spanish, the doubled indirect object counts as being higher even though it linearly follows the direct object. In this respect, Spanish differs from English, where, as is well known, precedence and c-command match (see Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1997b, 1999, for discussion of related binding facts with clitic doubled direct objects which can bind into the subject even though they follow the subject).

4.1.2 Passivization
Passivization of the theme in the presence of a clitic doubled benefactor is ill-formed in Spanish, as shown by (88), similarly to English (89), where theme-passivization in the presence of a dative shifted benefactor is ruled out:

(88) *La casa le fue pintada a Juan ayer.
   The house Cl-dat was painted to Juan yesterday
   ‘The house was painted for Juan yesterday.’

(89) *The sandwich was fixed Mary
   English

4.1.3 Possession/theme part of goal
The clitic can double a dative only when the dative is construed as a “possessor” of the theme. In (90a) el mantel can be construed as a part of a la mesa, and doubling is licit, while in (90b) los platos cannot be construed as a part of a la mesa, and doubling is ruled out:

b. *El tratamiento psicoanalíltico reintegró/devolvió (a) sí misma
   The therapy psychoanalytic gave-back (to) herself-DO
   a María.
   to Mary-IO
   ‘The psychoanalytic therapy gave back herself to Mary.’
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Demonte (1995) argues that this restriction is similar to the one found in English where the double object construction is licensed only when the indirect object can be understood as a possessor of the direct object (Oehrle 1976; den Dikken 1995c; Pesetsky 1995; and others):

(91) a. *Mary sent France a parcel.
   b. The revolution gave France democracy.

To account for the differences between the constructions with dative doubling and the ones without, Demonte (1995: 17) proposes that the former are double object constructions, represented as in (92):

(92)  

\[ \text{V'} \]  
\[ \text{V2} \]  
\[ \text{DP<subject>} \]  
\[ \text{DCIP} \]  
\[ \text{a-DP_i} \]  
\[ \text{DCI'} \]  
\[ \text{Cl} \]  
\[ \text{VP1} \]  
\[ \text{V1} \]  
\[ \text{DP<direct object>} \]

The clitic is the head of a dative Clitic Phrase (corresponding to Marantz’s 1993 VP headed by an applicative V head; see Demonte 1995: 7, fn. 6), to the specifier of which the indirect object raises from a base position higher than the theme in the lowest VP-shell (or in a DP containing the indirect object and the theme; see Demonte 1995: 25–28; in the latter alternative the indirect object undergoes possessor-raising). On the other hand, the construction without doubling has the Larsonian representation in (93), i.e., the a-phrase is a PP, the counterpart of to-PPs in English (Larson 1988b):
Demonte’s (1995) analysis of dative clitics in Spanish as heads of a Dative Clitic Phrase is similar to Sportiche’s (1996b) treatment of the dative Clitic Voice as a dative-agreement head (as opposed to the accusative Clitic Voice, which is a specificity head). In addition, Demonte reduces the presence of a dative clitic to the syntax of the double object construction and assimilates the clitic to the overt or covert applicative head present in applicative and double object constructions (Baker 1988a; Marantz 1993). By doing so, Demonte draws an even sharper distinction between the syntax of dative doubling and the syntax of accusative doubling. Since direct objects do not undergo alternations comparable to the dative-shift alternation, the syntax of dative doubling proposed by Demonte is difficult to extend to the syntax of accusative doubling.

4.2 Dative clitics as inflections and accusative clitics as determiners

An explicit proposal according to which dative and accusative clitics have different analyses is developed in Bleam (1999; she builds on Uriagereka 1988), who investigates micro-variation among dialects of Spanish. Bleam argues that dative clitics are agreement markers a la Sportiche (1996b) and Demonte (1995), while accusative clitics are determiners, as proposed by Torrego (1988) and Uriagereka (1988, 1995a).

Bleam focuses on Leísta Spanish, a dialect spoken in the north of Spain, which she compares to varieties of Argentinean Spanish, such as Rioplatense Spanish, and Cordoba Spanish, and to Standard Spanish. These dialects show variation with respect to three factors: (i) the form of direct object clitics; (ii) the availability of direct object doubling, and (iii) animacy restrictions on direct object doubling. In what follows, I summarize some of the facts Bleam discusses.

4.2.1 The form of direct object clitics

In Leísta Spanish the dative clitic form le is used as a direct object clitic, when the referent is animate (and in many subdialects, masculine), as illustrated in (94) (Bleam 1999: 1):
This contrasts with Standard and Argentinean Spanish, where the accusative forms \textit{lo} and \textit{la} are employed for direct objects, as illustrated by (95), and \textit{le} is limited to indirect objects, as exemplified by (96) (similarly to Standard and Argentinean Spanish, \textit{le} is used for indirect objects in Leísta Spanish):

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(94)] \textit{Le vi.} \textit{Cl-dat saw-I}  \\
      \textit{I saw him/her.}'
  \\
  \textit{Le vi a Juan.} \textit{Doubling dialects of Leísta}  \\
      \textit{Cl-dat saw-I a Juan}  \\
      \textit{I saw Juan.'}
  \\
  \textit{La toqué a la sonata.} \textit{Cordoba Spanish}  \\
      \textit{Cl-acc played-I a the sonata}  \\
      \textit{I played the sonata.'}
\end{itemize}

As shown in (97), direct object 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.

\subsubsection{Doubling of inanimate direct objects}
While direct object clitic doubling in most varieties of Spanish is limited to animate DPs, in Cordoba Spanish it is also found with inanimates, as illustrated in (98).
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For accusative clitics Bleam adopts Uriagereka’s (1988, 1995a) syntax, presented in section 3. They are determiners heading a complex DP as illustrated in (78), repeated here:

(78) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{(double)} \quad \text{D'} \\
\text{D} \\
\text{clitic} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{pro}
\end{array}
\]

Bleam (1999: 35) 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. Building on Uriagereka (1988, 1995a), who attributes the specificity effects of accusative clitics to their status as determiners, Bleam furthermore argues that the lack of specificity effects of dative clitics in ditransitives (cf. Suñer’s discussion in section 3.2 above) is due to the fact that they are not determiners but rather agreement markers of the kind suggested in Sportiche (1996b). Following Demonte (1995) and Ormazabal and Romero (1999), Bleam (1999) maintains that dative doubling in Spanish is an instance of dative shift. Following Baker (1996), she assumes that in the double object construction, the goal moves past the theme to the specifier of an internal aspect projection (Travis 1991) which dominates the inner VP shell (Larson 1988b). She furthermore proposes that in Spanish the clitic \(le\) is generated in this Asp head and the indirect object moves to its specifier, as illustrated in (99) (Bleam 2000: 40):

(99) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{Juan} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{Asp/ClP} \\
\text{a María} \\
\text{Asp/Cl'} \\
\text{Asp/Cl} \\
\text{le} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{el libro} \\
\text{V'} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{dió} \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{t}_k
\end{array}
\]
This syntax is very similar to the one proposed in Demonte (1995; see above). For possessor raising constructions of the type illustrated in (100) Bleam (1999: chapter 3) argues for the structure in (101):

(100) Le vi la mano a Carmen.
    Cl-dat saw-I the hand to Carmen
    I saw Carmen’s hand.’

(101)  

The possessor originates as the DP-internal subject of an integral (IntP) relation (Hornstein 1994). It moves to the spec,DP, where it is associated with dative marking. From there, it moves to the specifier of the dative clitic, where it checks dative Case and the feature [+A] associated with animacy and affectedness, a feature that all indirect objects in the double object construction have.

Finally, Bleam (1999) extends the possessor-raising analysis of the type illustrated in (101) to direct object clitic doubling in Leísta Spanish. She argues that clitic doubling in this dialect is an instance of an integral relation. The double is a subconstituent of the direct object which escapes the DP and becomes a dative argument of the verb, thus accounting for the use of the dative clitic form with the direct object. This derivation is illustrated in (102) (Bleam 2000: 129):
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In this representation, the overt double is the “possessor” and pro is the possessed element. The possessor moves through spec,DP to the specifier of the le-phrase acquiring properties of an indirect object.

4.3 The Greek type of indirect object clitic doubling

Unlike Spanish, where the presence of a dative doubling clitic signifies a double object construction, in Greek indirect object doubling is just a variant of the double object construction. In active sentences, doubling optionally takes place with genitive indirect object DPs, which alternate with PPs in a manner reminiscent of the dative shift alternation in English. These facts are discussed at length in Anagnostopoulou (1999a, 2003) and will be briefly summarized here.

Greek possesses a variety of ditransitive constructions, in which indirect objects are realized as PPs, as DPs with morphological genitive case, or as DPs with morphological accusative case (see Philippaki-Warburton 1977; Mackridge 1985; Tzartzanos 1989; Holton, et al. 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 (103). Similarly to English to, Greek s(e) is also used as a locative preposition, as in (104):

(103) O Janis estile to grama s-tin Maria.
    The Janis-nom sent the letter-acc to-the Maria-acc
    ‘John sent the letter to Mary.’
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:

(105) O Janis estile tis Marias to grama. Greek
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 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, like the double object construction in English (it is also possible with inanimate possessors, as in English):

(106) a. I Ilektra estile ena dhema s-tin Galia. Greek
The Ilektra-nom sent a parcel-acc to-the France
‘Ilektra sent a parcel to France.’

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

(107) a. Estila tis mias miteras to pedhi tis alis.
Sent-1sg the one mother-gen the child-acc the other-gen
‘I sent each mother the other’s child.’

b. *Estila tis miteras tu alu to ena pedhi.
Sent-1sg the mother-gen the other-gen 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 DPs and se-DPs qualify as PPs (at least in goal constructions; for benefactive se-phrases, see Anagnostopoulou 2005).

As has been seen in (57) and (58) in section 3, 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. These examples are repeated here:

(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 illustrated in, e.g., the structure (92) proposed by Demonte (1995) and the structure (99) proposed by Bleam (1999). 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 (108) with a passive example (see Anagnostopoulou 1999a, 2003, for details):

(108) a. ?*To vivlio charistike tis Marias apo ton Petro.
   The book-nom award-Nact the Maria-gen from the Petros
   'The book was awarded Mary by Peter.'
   b. To vivlio tis charistike (tis Marias) apo ton Petro.
   The book-nom Cl-gen award-Nact the Maria-gen from the Petros
   '*'The book was awarded Mary by Peter.'

In Anagnostopoulou (1999a, 2003), I argue that (108a) is ungrammatical because the theme cannot undergo NP-movement to T. In the genitive construction, indirect objects are introduced by a higher zero applicative v (Marantz 1993) blocking NP movement of the lower direct object to T, as shown in (109):
I further argue that in clitic constructions, the intervening formal D-features of the genitive move to T before the nominative and are spelled out as a clitic, as illustrated in (110). In this derivation, locality is respected (Chomsky 1995c; Richards 1997) and, therefore, (108b) is grammatical:

According to the analysis in (110), genitive doubling clitics in Greek spell out formal nominal features that undergo overt EPP-triggered movement to the functional domain, leaving the genitive phrase behind. Morphological evidence that indirect object clitics are D-elements in Greek comes from the observation that
their forms are identical to determiners, as illustrated in (111) and (112). In this respect, they pattern with accusative clitics:

(111) **Determiners**

<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>

(112) **Clitics**

<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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>tus</td>
<td>tus</td>
<td>tus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>tus</td>
<td>tis</td>
<td>ta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recall that in Spanish, dative clitics do not have the same form as determiners, unlike accusative clitics (see section 4.2 above).

Summarizing, in the preceding sections I have reviewed some proposals 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 have suggested that the (applicative/aspectual) head forming the double object construction is zero in Greek, as in English and not as in Spanish. I have furthermore pointed out that genitive clitics in Greek are obligatory in NP-movement constructions and I have attributed their obligatoriness to their status as D-features of DPs, which undergo movement to the functional domain and, therefore, provide an escape hatch to locality violations. The comparison of the properties of the double object construction in the two languages leads to a novel typology of indirect object clitics. In Spanish, they are inflections; in Greek, they are D-features of DPs.

### 4.4 Aspectual factors and accusative clitics in Spanish

I will close my review of the literature on clitic doubling by presenting an analysis of accusative clitics in Spanish advanced by Torrego (1998). Torrego links
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the presence of accusative clitics in Spanish to transitive v (Kratzer 1994; Chomsky 1995c) and proposes that they signal/host/provide the "active" D-feature of that v (Torrego 1998: 14, 51, 58–72).

More specifically, Torrego (1998) investigates the conditions under which objects of transitive accusative verbs occur with the dative preposition a in Spanish, and formulates six generalizations characterizing Spanish accusative/direct objects marked by the dative preposition. These are summarized here (see Torrego 1998: 14–34 for details):

(i) The first generalization is Kayne's Generalization. In the dialects of Spanish permitting clitic doubling of direct objects, doubling is limited to direct objects preceded by a (see section 3 above).

(ii) The second generalization is that accusatives marked with a are specific in Spanish (compare this claim, however, to sections 3 and 4.2 above—where it is claimed that a-phrases are not always specific; those undergoing doubling are).

(iii) The third generalization is that telicity governs the distribution of a in Spanish (see, in particular, Schmitt’s 1996 discussion of aspectual effects in Spanish; see also Bleam 1999). Torrego points out that (indefinite) objects of verbs that are inherently specified as accomplishments must be preceded by a when they are animate, as illustrated in (113):

(113) La policía encarceló *(a) varios ladrones.
   The police jailed *a several thieves
   'The police jailed several thieves.'

With other aspectual classes, a is optional, as illustrated in (114):

(114) Escondieron (a) varios prisoneros.
   Hide-they *a several prisoners
   'They hide several prisoners.'

Torrego argues that when a is present the predicate is telic and when it is absent the predicate is atelic.

(iv) The fourth generalization has to do with agentivity/causation/eventiveness. With predicates that are inherently agentive or causative, a (on indefinite animate objects) is required, regardless of whether the subject is animate or inanimate, as illustrated in (115):

(115) a. El soldado emborrachó *(a) varios colegas.
   The soldier made-drunk *a several friends
   'The soldier got several friends drunk.'

b. El vino emborrachó *(a) varios invitados.
   The wine made-drunk *a several guests
   'The wine made several guests drunk.'
With eventive transitive predicates that permit non-animate subjects, a on the object is possible only when the subject is animate, as illustrated in (116):

(116) a. El herido exigía (a) un médico.
    the injured required a doctor
    ‘The injured required for a doctor.’

    b. La situación exigía (*a) un médico
    the situation required a doctor
    ‘The situation required for a doctor.’

Stative predicates require a (on indefinite animate objects) when they express “active emotions” (Pesetsky 1995):

(117) Caín odiaba *(a) un hermano.
    Cain hated a brother
    ‘Cain hated a brother.’

With other stative verbs, when the subject is animate, a is permitted (on indefinite animate objects), and when the subject is inanimate, a is disallowed:

(118) a. Inés conoce (a) un médico.
    Inés knows a doctor
    ‘Inés knows a doctor.’

    b. La ópera conoce (*a) muchos aficionados.
    Opera knows many fans
    ‘Opera knows many fans.’

In examples like (118a), the presence vs. absence of a correlates with eventiveness vs. stativity. When a is present, the predicate qualifies as eventive by, e.g., the progressive test (Dowty 1979). When a is absent, the predicate is stative and the progressive is disallowed:

(119) a. Estoy conociendo a un vecino.
    Am-I knowing a neighbor
    ‘I am getting to know a neighbor.’

    b. *Estoy conociendo un vecino.
    Am-I knowing a neighbor
    ‘*I am knowing a neighbor.’

(v) The fifth generalization has to do with animacy. As already mentioned, the preposition a occurs mainly with animates (Torrego 1998: 55 points out that a can also occur on metals or proper names referring to anything, from a boat to a magazine).

(vi) The sixth generalization has to do with affectedness. Affected (indefinite animate) objects require a, unlike unaffected ones, where a is optional:
Note that generalizations (iii), (iv), and (vi) hold of indefinite animate objects. Definites must always be marked by *a* (see Torrego 1998: 66).

To provide a very brief and oversimplified overview of what Torrego (1998) proposes: she argues that non-affected morphologically marked accusatives have structural Case while affected marked accusatives have quirky Case. She furthermore hypothesizes that the mechanism responsible for the properties of marked accusatives listed above is overt raising of the object to spec,vP triggered by a D-feature of v, i.e., a kind of object shift. Among other things, she links object shift to the proposal that (i) affectedness is associated with a specifier position within the layered VP-domain (spec,vP for direct objects, the specifier of a lower functional head for dative shifted indirect objects), and (ii) quirky Case (assigned to the object when the subject is agentive/causative/eventive) is licensed by V in conjunction with v (Torrego 1998: 36). Specificity of marked accusatives is linked to overt raising to spec,vP; she points out that the D-feature of v has been linked to specificity in the case of, e.g., Icelandic object shift (see, in particular, Chomsky 1995c, 2000, 2001b, who proposes that the assignment of an EPP feature to the vP phase has interpretive effects). As for the fact that doubling is limited to marked accusatives in Spanish, Torrego (1998: 56) argues that accusative clitics are Ds overtly encoding the categorial feature D of v (and agreement features), which triggers raising of accusatives marked by *a*. (Torrego furthermore argues that the dative preposition introducing the indirect object in ditransitives is a functional head p, the counterpart of v, which is merged below v and that the dative clitic *le* is to p what the accusative *lo* is to v; she argues that doubled indirect objects do not raise outside VP, unlike direct objects.)

### 4.5 Putting (some) pieces together

In this section, I have presented the most recent literature on clitic doubling, concentrating on the differences within and across languages, which have led to non-uniform analyses (Spanish indirect objects vs. direct objects; Spanish vs. Greek indirect objects; Leísta vs. Argentinean vs. Standard Spanish direct objects). I will close the discussion with some thoughts on how to partially unify Greek indirect object doubling and Spanish direct object doubling.

It has been demonstrated that Greek doubling differs from its Spanish counterpart with respect to two properties. First, indirect object doubling in Greek is just a variant of the double object construction; in Spanish, it signifies the double object construction. Put differently, in the Greek double object construction, doubling of the indirect object is optional; in the Spanish double object construction,
doubling is obligatory. Second, direct object doubling in Greek optionally takes place with any accusative object of the appropriate semantic type (definites; for some speakers also specific indefinites); in Spanish it is limited to what Torrego calls “marked accusatives,” i.e., direct objects marked by the dative preposition a.

Interestingly, if Greek indirect object doubling is compared to Spanish direct object doubling as described by Torrego, it turns out that the two are descriptively rather similar. In both, clitics optionally co-occur with objects that have been characterized in the literature as “affected,” are usually animate, and alternate morphologically and syntactically with non-affected, non-animate objects. More specifically, in section 4.3, I have presented evidence that the Greek genitive construction is a double object construction. Genitive objects are usually animate (or inanimates in a possessor/part–whole relation with the theme); they are construed as affected (Marantz 1993); and they alternate with goal PPs, similarly to “dative-shifted” objects in English. Torrego’s (1998) description of a marked accusatives in Spanish, presented in section 4.4, reveals a number of related properties: they are usually animate; they are affected (as Torrego stresses, it is not a coincidence that they surface with the dative marking a); and they alternate with unmarked accusatives. One difference between genitive goals and marked accusatives is that, to the extent that I have been able to determine, realization of goals as genitive does not depend on properties of the external argument but rather on properties of the internal argument (the goal is affected by the event affecting the theme; the goal must be a possessor of the theme). On the other hand, according to Torrego, realization of direct objects as DPs preceded by a depends on whether the subject can be construed as an agent/causer.

It is rather standard to assume that the special semantic properties of indirect objects in the double object construction are located on a functional (applicative) head introducing the indirect object (or checking features of the indirect object in transformational analyses of dative shift) which is merged above the V introducing the theme (Marantz 1993). It is also widely assumed in the literature that “dative-shifted” objects enter Agree/Move relations with (causative) v or T, unlike prepositional indirect objects (this intuition is expressed in various forms in Larson 1988b; Baker 1988a, 1996; Pesetsky 1995; McGinnis 1998; Anagnostopoulou 1999a, 2003, to mention some analyses). Genitive doubling can be viewed as the overt realization of the Move/Agree relation between v or T and the indirect object (see the discussion in section 4.3). Suppose we extend this line of analysis to Spanish marked accusatives. One possible implementation would be to suggest that the special semantic properties of marked accusatives in Spanish are also hosted on a functional head, presumably the agentive/causative/telic v introducing the subject (see Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 2000). It could be suggested that Spanish has two types of a transitive v: one with agentive/causative features for subjects and marked accusative case for animate objects, and one with non-agentive features for subjects and unmarked accusative case for animate objects. Doubling of marked accusatives in Spanish would accordingly be the overt realization of a Move/Agree relation between (agentive) v and the direct object it licenses, similarly to doubling of genitives in Greek.
NOTES

1 Jaeggli (1986b) actually proposed four arguments in favor of his position, but only three of them are mentioned here. Jaeggli’s fourth argument relies on a difference between right dislocation and left dislocation in Spanish with respect to Subjacency, namely that right dislocation is subject to Subjacency while left dislocation is not. On the basis of this, Jaeggli proposed that right dislocation is a construction involving movement of the dislocated phrase from a clitic doubling position, and left dislocation is a base-generated dependency not showing island sensitivity. However, later research has shown that in Italian and Greek, there are actually two instances of left dislocation, one showing properties of base generation in not being subject to Subjacency (Hanging Topic Left Dislocation) and one showing properties of movement (CLLD) in being selectively sensitive to islands. Given this complication as well as the fact that right-peripheral constructions are not subject to the same type of locality conditions as left-peripheral ones, this argument is either not valid or requires further refinement.

2 Borer’s proposal is the result of an attempt to explain certain properties of extraction from clitic doubling configurations in Hebrew free relatives and questions, as opposed to Romanian (Steriade 1980).

3 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 (1995c). 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 1996b). It is easy to see that in the framework of Chomsky (2000, 2001b), movement of the associate to the clitic can be restated as an Agree relation between the clitic and the doubled phrase (or T and the doubled phrase; in the latter case, the clitic can be viewed as an overt signal of Agree between T and the object). Such an analysis dispenses with actual movement but maintains the locality characteristic of movement (for discussion, see Anagnostopoulou 2003).

4 The summary of clitic placement facts in Greek and of the analyses proposed for them is taken from Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (2000: 179–181).

5 In (81), the $l$ indicates the form used when the clitic or the determiner is enclitic.
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