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A well-known phenomenon

Standard Spanish shows variation in object clitic placement, a phenomenon known as *Clitic Climbing*:

(1)  
   a. Quiero **ver -la**.
       want.1SG see.INF -CL3P.F.ACC
   ‘I want to see her/it_{fem}.’
   b. La **quiero ver**.
       CL3P.F.ACC want.1SG see.INF
   ‘I want to see her/it_{fem}.’

Chilean and Argentinian Spanish also allow double occurrence of the object clitics, known as *Clitic Reduplication* (??):

(2)  
   a. La **quiero ver -la**.
       CL3P.F.ACC want.1SG see.INF -CL3P.F.ACC
   ‘I want to see her/it_{fem}.’
Double object clitics

The phenomenon raises the following questions:

- Do varieties of Spanish that allow Clitic Duplication have two clitic pronouns in their lexical numeration?
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Double object clitics

The phenomenon raises the following questions:

• Do varieties of Spanish that allow Clitic Duplication have two clitic pronouns in their lexical numeration?

• Is Clitic Reduplication a case of Clitic Climbing with overt presence of both copies?

• Why do some varieties of Spanish not allow the phenomenon?
Properties of object clitics

- Clitics mark case, gender, number and person

(3) Quiero ver -la(s)/ -lo(s)/ -te/ -me/ -nos.
   want.1SG see.INF -CLF.(PL)/ CLM.(PL)/ CL2P.SG/ CL1P.SG/ CL1P.PL
   ‘I want to see (her/it\textsubscript{fem})(pl)/(him/it\textsubscript{masc})(pl)/you/me/us.’

Clitic placement in Spanish:

(a) Proclitic to finite verbs
(b) Enclitic to non-finite verbs (infinitives, gerunds, imperatives)
Standard enclitic patterns in Argentinian Spanish

(4) a. No está bien admirarla tanto.
   not is good to.admire.CL so.much
   ‘It is not good to admire her so much.’ [Infinitive]

b. *No esta bien la admirar tanto.
   not is well CL to.admire so.much

(5) a. Comélo
   eat.CL
   ‘Eat it.’ [Imperative]

b. *Lo comé.
   CL eat

(6) a. Estoy admirándolo.
   am.1sg admiring CL
   ‘I am admiring him/it’ [Gerund]

b. *Estoy lo admirando.
   am.1sg CL admirando
• Verbs that allow Clitic Climbing also allow Clitic Duplication (?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>acabar</th>
<th>poder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>venir a</td>
<td>soler</td>
<td>querer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>terminar de</td>
<td>comenzar a</td>
<td>tener que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprender a</td>
<td>volver a</td>
<td>deber (de)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tratar de</td>
<td>dejar de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Other particles also allow Clitic Duplication (con, que, a)
Clitic Duplication is the phenomenon where two copies of the same clitic appear simultaneously:

(7) a. *La quiero ver -lo.
   CL3P.F.ACC want.1SG see.INF -CL3P.M.ACC
   Int. ‘I want to see her/it\textsubscript{fem}.’

   b. *Lo quiero ver -la.
   CL3P.M.ACC want.1SG see.INF -CL3P.F.ACC
   Int. ‘I want to see her/it\textsubscript{fem}.’
Double object clitics

- In Clitic Duplication, the infinitive and the clitic show a V+Cli order
- Double occurrence of object clitics gives support of double occurrence of functional projections hosting object clitics (?)

(8)

```
AgrSP
  /\   \              
Agr  ClP_{high}     
   /\          \          
  Cl  TP       AgrOP
    /\      /\             
   T  AgrO ClP_{low}     
     /\       \            
    Cl  vP   vP           
       /\      /\         
      v  VP  VP          
        /\     /\         
       V  DP/pro V       
```
Double Clitic Projections

• Assumption of two functional projections gives different underlying structures for (non-)Clitic Climbing cases

• Clitic climbing assumes a high CliP
• Non-Clitic Climbing assumes a low CliP
• Assumption of lower CliP adjoined to vP always results in a visible amalgam of V+Cli order

\[
\text{(9) a. } \text{La quiero ver-la.} \\
\text{CL}_{3p.f.\text{ACC}} \text{ want.}1\text{SG see.} \text{INF-CL}_{3p.f.\text{ACC}} \\
\text{‘I want to see her/it}_fem.\text{’}
\]

• This analysis does not give the correct word order of V+Cli in Clitic Duplication

- Low CliP results in a complex head
- High CliP results in a clitic in the matrix clause

• It also implies that clitic climbing in Clitic Duplication can only be a case of excorporation (?) since a complex head is created before movement of the clitic to the higher clause
Proposal: Clitic Duplication results from the simultaneous occurrence of two CliP selecting both a matrix or embedded TP

Consequences:

- Modification of previous assumptions on merging position of CliP
- Clitic Climbing and Clitic Reduplication cannot be unified as the same phenomenon
- Separation of syntactic and post-syntactic operations better capture the variation
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This view of Clitic Duplication implies that grammatical features represent a continuum rather than a strict division:

Content $\rightarrow$ Function $\rightarrow$ Phrasal $\rightarrow$ Spanish $\rightarrow$ Bound

words $\rightarrow$ words $\rightarrow$ Affixes/Clitics $\rightarrow$ Clitics $\rightarrow$ morphemes
Previous accounts of Clitic Duplication: Mann 2012

“[T]he data fit best within another framework, one that characterizes Spanish clitics as object-agreement morphemes (Franco, 1993, a.o.).”

This view of Clitic Duplication implies that grammatical features represent a continuum rather than a strict division:

Content → Function → Phrasal → Spanish → Bound words → words → Affixes/Clitics → Clitics → morphemes

Main arguments:

- duplication of function words is more common than of content words (McDaniel 1986, Volgelaer & Devos 2008, Barbiers 2008)
- data from aphasic patients showed that there are strong similarities between inflectional affixes and clitics (Bedore and Leonard 2001)
- not as many restrictions on repetition in morphology as there is in syntax
Nevins (2011) shows that clitics cannot be agreement morphemes:
Nevins (2011) shows that clitics cannot be agreement morphemes:

- Tense invariant?
  - No
  - Yes
    - Agreement
    - Person-Complementarity?
      - Yes
      - No
        - Clitic
        - Omnivorous-Number?
          - Yes
          - No
            - Clitic
            - Ambiguous
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Clitic Doubling is obligatory with all indirect objects, and with pronominal direct objects (Suñer 1988). There are no agreement systems that do this. There are no agreement system in which agreement is obligatory only with pronouns.

Diagnostic of agreement: defective intervention yields default agreement, whereas failure in clitic doubling (e.g. failure to move or find a host) yields the wholesale absence of the clitic element (Preminger 2009).
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- Clitics are generated in their argument position (Kayne 1975) as part of full DPs, and move to a functional head higher up.

\[(10) \quad L_{a_i} \text{ vi} \quad [\text{DP } l_{a} \text{ a } \text{María}_i ] \quad \text{CL saw.1SG} \quad \text{CL DOM Mary} \quad \text{‘I saw Mary.’} \]
Proposal: clitics are part of a ‘big DP’

- Clitics are generated in their argument position (Kayne 1975) as part of full DPs, and move to a functional head higher up.

(10) \[ \text{La}_i \text{ vi} \quad [\text{DP la a María}_i] \]
    CL saw.1SG CL DOM Mary
    ‘I saw Mary.’

(11) Structure of the doubled, ‘big’ DP (Nevins 2011):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{DP/D} \\
\text{clitic} \\
\text{María} \\
\end{array}
\]
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- Clitics always move to the specifier of a Clitic Projection (ClP)

- ClP is attached to a TP

(12) La_i vi (a María_i)

ClP

\[ \text{CL} \quad \text{saw.1SG} \quad \text{DOM Mary} \]

\[ \text{CL}_i \quad \text{la} \]

\[ \text{V+v+T} \quad \text{vP} \]

\[ \text{V+v} \quad \text{VP} \]

\[ \text{V} \quad \text{DP} \]

\[ \text{CL}_i \quad \text{la} \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{María} \]
Proposal: two positions for ClP

In (13) the embedded structure is a TP and ClP attaches lower.

(13) Quiero ver -la.
want.1SG see.INF -CL3.F.ACC

TP

V+v+T

quiero

V

ClP

CL_i

la

V+v+T

ver

V

DP

CL_i DP

la

Stigliano & Pavlou
Proposal: two positions for ClP

In (13) the embedded structure is a TP and ClP attaches lower. In (14) the embedded structure is smaller, and ClP attaches to the matrix TP.

(13) Quiero ver -la.
    want.1SG see.INF -CL3.F.ACC

(14) La quiero ver.
    CL3.F.ACC want.1SG see.INF
To obtain the order V-Cl (ver-la) in cases of enclisis, the lower verb complex undergoes further head movement to attach to the clitic:
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To obtain the order V-Cl (ver-la) in cases of enclisis, the lower verb complex undergoes further head movement to attach to the clitic:

(15)  

Postsyntactic Raising (Harizanov & Gribanova 2017):

\[ \ldots \]

\[ \text{ClP} \]

\[ \text{V+v+T+CL}_i \]

\[ \text{TP} \]

\[ \text{V+v+T} \]

\[ \ldots \]
Proposal: Postsyntactic Raising

- To obtain the order V-Cl (ver-la) in cases of enclisis, the lower verb complex undergoes further head movement to attach to the clitic:

(15) *Postsyntactic Raising* (Harizanov & Gribanova 2017):

- This is a post-syntactic operation triggered by the defectiveness of $T_{\text{inf}}$. 
Dialects that allow Clitic Duplication allow two ClPs in a given numeration. In these cases, the embedded clause is a TP:

(16) La quiero ver -la.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CL}_3.f.\text{ACC} & \quad \text{want.1SG} \quad \text{see.INF} \quad \text{CL}_3.f.\text{ACC} \\
\text{ClP} & \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{CL}_i & \quad \text{la} \\
\text{V+V+T} & \quad \text{quiero} \\
\text{V} & \quad \text{ClP} \\
\text{CL}_i & \quad \text{la} \\
\text{V+V+T} & \quad \text{ver} \\
\text{V} & \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{CL}_i & \quad \text{la} \\
\text{DP} & \quad \triangledown
\end{align*}
\]
Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky 1993)
movement = copy + deletion
Multiple pronunciation of copies & Chain Reduction

Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky 1993)
movement = copy + deletion

The two copies of John count as “the same”, so no linear order can be established in accordance with Kayne’s (1994) LCA:

(17) *John$_i$ was kissed John$_i$?

```
TP
  
DP
    seen
     |
    John$_i$

was
```

After Chain Reduction (Nunes 1995), all the links of the chain are deleted, except for one (usually the head of the chain):

(18) John$_i$ was kissed John$_i$?
After *Chain Reduction* (Nunes 1995), all the links of the chain are deleted, except for one (usually the head of the chain):

(17) $\text{John}_i$ was kissed $\text{John}_i$?
Why are two copies of the same clitic pronounced in cases of Clitic Duplication?
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The verb complex \((V+v+T)\) and the clitic forms a head. These morphemes undergo Morphological Reanalysis (i.e. the heads fuse into a single terminal node) \((Halle \& Marantz 1993)\).

The clitic and the verbal complex are part of a single terminal element, becoming invisible to the LCA \((Nunes 2004)\).

The intermediate copy escapes deletion.
The verb complex (V+v+T) and the clitic forms a head. These morphemes undergo Morphological Reanalysis (i.e. the heads fuse into a single terminal node) (Halle & Marantz 1993)

The clitic and the verbal complex are part of a single terminal element, becoming invisible to the LCA (Nunes 2004)

The intermediate copy escapes deletion

The result is the pronunciation of both copies
Certain varieties of Spanish allow the multiple occurrence of the same clitic → there are two ClPs in the same sentence

Clitic Duplication can obtain when there is a ClP in the complement clause (embedded TP)

Morphosyntactic reanalysis forces the pronunciation of both copies
Conclusions

- The current analysis captures all the patterns of object clitic placement in a uniform way.
Conclusions

- The current analysis captures all the patterns of object clitic placement in a uniform way.

- Theoretical implications that support the existence of post-syntactic operations.
The current analysis captures all the patterns of object clitic placement in a uniform way.

Theoretical implications that support the existence of post-syntactic operations.

Dialectal variation can be accounted for in a formal way.
Thanks!
¡Gracias!
(18) **Linear Correspondence Axiom** (Kayne 1994)
Let X, Y be nonterminals and a, b terminals such that X dominates a and Y dominates b. Then if X asymmetrically c-commands Y, a precedes b.

(19) **Chain Reduction** (Nunes 1995)
Delete the minimal number of constituents of a nontrivial chain CH that suffices for CH to be mapped into linear order in accordance with the LCA.
Appendix 1: Further evidence for clitic movement to Spec,ClP

Clitics always move.

(20) Quiero ver -la.
want.1SG see.INF -CL3,F.ACC
Appendix 1: Further evidence for clitic movement to Spec,ClP

Clitics always move.

(20) Quise haber-la visto.

\[\text{wanted.1SG have-INF-CL_{3P,F.ACC.SG} seen}\]

‘I would have seen it_{fem}.’
Appendix 2: Postsyntactic Raising (Harizanov & Gribanova 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Postsyntactic Amalgamation</th>
<th>Syntactic Head Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produces head-adjunction structures</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven by morphological properties of heads</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obey the Head Movement Constraint</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for interpretive effects</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Properties of syntactic head movement and postsyntactic amalgamation
Appendix 2: Postsyntactic Raising (Harizanov & Gribanova 2017)

Amalgamation:

- involves the formation of words out of independent morphosyntactic terminals (i.e. verla vs. ver la)
- as a postsyntactic operation, amalgamation is predicted not to have any interpretive effects
- Head Movement Constraint (HMC): An X⁰ may only move into the Y⁰ which properly governs it.
Clitic Reduplication is only allowed in contexts that allow Cl. Climbing:

(21) a. Quiero que la compres.
    want.1.SG that CL buy.SUBJ.2.SG
    ‘I want you to buy it.’

b. *La quiero que compres.
    CL want.1.SG that buy.SUBJ.2.SG
    Int. ‘I want you to buy it.’
Appendix 3: Finite clauses and Clitic Duplication

Clitic Reduplication is only allowed in contexts that allow Cl. Climbing:

(21) a. Quiero que la compres.
    want.1.SG that CL buy.SUBJ.2.SG
    ‘I want you to buy it.’

b. *La quiero que compres.
    CL want.1.SG that buy.SUBJ.2.SG
    Int. ‘I want you to buy it.’

c. ?*La quiero que la compres.
    CL want.1.SG that CL buy.SUBJ.2.SG
    Int. ‘I want you to buy it.’
Distribution

Clitic Duplication is also possible with clitic clusters:

(22)  a. ?Se lo quiero decir -se -lo.
       CL3P.DAT CLM.ACC want.1SG tell.INF CL3P.DAT -CLM.ACC
       ‘I want to tell it to her/him.’

       b. ?Se la quiero mostrár -se -la.
       CL3P.DAT CLF.ACC want.1SG show.INF CL3P.DAT -CLF.ACC
       ‘I want to show her/it to him/her.’

Clitic clusters cannot be separated:

(23)  a. *Se lo quiero decir -lo.
       CL3P.DAT CLM.ACC want.1SG tell.INF -CLM.ACC
       Int. ‘I want to tell it to her/him.’

       b. *Lo quiero decir -se -lo.
       CLM.ACC want.1SG tell.INF CL3P.DAT -CLM.ACC
       ‘I want to tell him/it to her/him.’
Clitic climbing in other contexts

Certain prepositions and particles allow CC

(24)  

a. Tengo que hacerlo.  
   have.1sg to do.CL  
   ‘I have to do it.’

b. Lo tengo que hacer.  
   CL have.1sg to do  
   ‘I have to do it.’

c. Voy a leerlo.  
   go.1sg to read.CL

d. Lo voy a leer.  
   CL go.1sg to read  
   ‘I am going to read it.’

e. Cuento con leerlo.  
   count.1sg with read.CL

f. Lo cuento con leer.  
   CL count.1sg with read
Appendix 4: Evidence from Coordination

Apparent Coordinate Structure Constraint violations:

(25) a. Juan quiere ver-la$_i$ y besa-la$_i$
    John wants.3 see.INF-CL$_3$.F.ACC and kiss.INF-CL$_3$.F.ACC
    ‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’
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     ‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’

   b. Juan la$_i$ quiere ver-t$_i$ y besar-t$_i$.
      John CL$_{3,F,ACC}$ wants.3 see.INF and kiss.INF
      ‘John wants to see and kiss her$_i$.’
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Apparent Coordinate Structure Constraint violations:

(25)  
   a. Juan quiere ver-la$_i$ y besar-la$_i$
       John wants.3 see.INF-CL$_{3,F,ACC}$ and kiss.INF-CL$_{3,F,ACC}$
       ‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’
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   c. Juan la$_i$ quiere ver-t$_i$ y besar-la$_i$
       John CL$_{3,F,ACC}$ wants.3 see.INF and kiss.INF-CL$_{3,F,ACC}$
       ‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’
Appendix 4: Evidence from Coordination

Apparent Coordinate Structure Constraint violations:

(25) a. Juan quiere ver-la$_i$ y besar-la$_i$

John wants.3 see.INF-CL$_3$.F.ACC and kiss.INF-CL$_3$.F.ACC

‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’

b. Juan la$_i$ quiere ver-t$_i$ y besar-t$_i$.

John CL$_3$.F.ACC wants.3 see.INF and kiss.INF

‘John wants to see and kiss her$_i$.’

c. Juan la$_i$ quiere ver-t$_i$ y besar-la$_i$

John CL$_3$.F.ACC wants.3 see.INF and kiss.INF-CL$_3$.F.ACC

‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’

d. *Juan la$_i$ quiere ver-la$_i$ y besar-t$_i$

John CL$_3$.F.ACC wants.3 see.INF-CL$_3$.F.ACC and kiss.INF

Int. ‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss.’
Appendix 4: Evidence from Coordination

Clitic Climbing only occurs in the first conjunct. We claim that these are cases of coordination of two bigger structures (possibly CPs):

(26)  a. [Juan quiere ver-la] y [Juan quiere besar-la]
     John wants see.INF-CL and John wants kiss.INF-CL
     ‘John wants to see her_{i} and kiss her_{i}.’
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Clitic Climbing only occurs in the first conjunct. We claim that these are cases of coordination of two bigger structures (possibly CPs):

(26)  a. [Juan quiere ver-la] y [Juan quiere besar-la]
      John wants see.INF-CL and John wants kiss.INF-CL
      ‘John wants to see her_i and kiss her_i.’

b. [Juan la_i quiere ver-t_i] y [Juan quiere besar-la]
   John CL wants see.INF and John wants kiss.INF-CL
   ‘John wants to see her_i and kiss her_i.’
Appendix 4: Evidence from Coordination

Clitic Climbing only occurs in the first conjunct. We claim that these are cases of coordination of two bigger structures (possibly CPs):

(26)   a. \[Juan\ quiere\ ver-la\] \hspace{1em} y \hspace{1em} \[Juan\ quiere\ besar-la\]
John wants see-INF-CL and John wants kiss-INF-CL
‘John wants to see her and kiss her.’

b. \[Juan\ la_i\ quiere\ ver-t_i\] \hspace{1em} y \hspace{1em} \[Juan\ quiere\ besar-la\]
John CL wants see-INF and John wants kiss-INF-CL
‘John wants to see her and kiss her.’

c. *\[Juan\ la_i\ quiere\ ver-la\] \hspace{1em} y \hspace{1em} \[Juan\ quiere\ besar-t_i\]
John CL wants see-INF and John wants kiss-INF-CL
‘John wants to see her and kiss her.’
Further evidence: Gapping

(27)  [Juan quiere comprar-la] y [María quiere alquilar-la_i]
John wants buy.INF & Mary wants rent.INF-CL
‘John wants to buy it_i and Mary rent it_i.’

(28)  *María alquilarla.
Mary rent-it
Lit. ‘Mary renti it.’