The Syntax of Clitic Climbing in Czech

Abstract: Second position clitics in Czech may originate in the infinitival complement of the matrix verb, giving rise to clitic climbing. Climbing provides a probe into the implementation of argument cliticization. Cliticization is argued to be driven by the Case/φ-agreement system, and not by an Ā or clitic-specific system. This explains four properties. First, climbing is restricted to infinitives without an internal Case licenser. Second, it may cross a matrix argument, but not an accusative one, which absorbs matrix Case by Relativized Minimality. Third, the dative > accusative order of clitics is given by multiple A-movements as in Object Shift. Fourth, the clitic cluster shows the Person-Case Constraint, which is a consequence of the A-system implementation in the Minimalist Program.

1 Introduction

Czech has ten disjoint sets of second or 'Wackernagel' position clitics, each set mapping to a single position in a partially ordered cluster (Franks and King 2000: 90f. and references therein). The sets are listed in Table 1. For argumental clitics, bracketed forms have homophonous non-clitic forms.1 The cluster is located approximately after the first constituent of the clause, but it is not tied to any overt syntactic element such as the finite verb. It has certain prosodic characteristics such as resistance to being broken up by or parsed into separate intonational phrases; see Fried (1994), Toman (1996), and Franks and King (2000: 112f.) for detailed discussion of both properties.

---

1 I would like to thank Elizabeth Cowper and Diane Massam for comments on earlier versions of this paper, and to the audiences of CLA 1999 and FASL 9 where they were presented. For the present version, I am indebted to Lorie Heggie for detailed comments and for encouragement, and to anonymous reviewers who helped improve the presentation. This work was partly funded by SSHRC grant #752-2000-1545.

1 What counts as a clitic can be determined by combinations of standard diagnostics (see Cardinaletti and Starke 1999 for a recent synthesis): for example, clitics cannot be modified, conjoined, focused, and independently positioned, while non-clitics cannot appear inside a clitic cluster. These tests reveal that elements like tebe are necessarily clitics (with non-clitic counterparts like tebe), while others like nám are only optionally so (cf. Toman 1999: 224-5). Although the cluster is largely transparent, there are certain morphophonological variants: for example, by-ji-se-se consisting of the conditional auxiliary, the 2.sg. perfect auxiliary, and the se clitic, can also take the form by-se-s. The description here is close to common spoken Czech of the central (Prague) variety.
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Table 1: The second position clitic cluster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Forms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative particle</td>
<td>li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modal auxiliary</td>
<td>1.sg bych, 2.sg bys, 1.pl bychom, 2.pl byste, 3.sg/pl and uninflected by</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect auxiliary</td>
<td>1.sg jsem, 2.sg jsí, 1.pl jsme, 2.pl jste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Se-type clitic</td>
<td>accusative se, dative si</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dative of address</td>
<td>2.sg ti, 2.pl (vám)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumental dative</td>
<td>1.sg mi, 2.sg ti, 3.sg masc/neut mu, 3.sg fem (ji), 1.pl (nám), 2.pl (vám), 3.pl (jim)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative</td>
<td>1.sg. (mě), 2.sg. tě, 3.sg masc/neut ho, 3.sg fem (ji), 1.pl. (nás), 2.pl (váš), 3.pl (je)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive</td>
<td>1.sg (mě), 2.sg. tě, 3.sg masc/neut ho, 3.sg fem (ji), 1.pl. (nás), 2.pl (váš), 3.pl (jich)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adversative particle</td>
<td>však</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quotative particle</td>
<td>prej</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clitic cluster has certain internal properties: only one element of each cluster set may be realized, and the sets are partially ordered with respect to each other. The following order seems nearly universal among speakers (Franks and King 2000: 104f.):

(1) \( li > \) conditional > auxiliary > se/si > dative > accusative

Variation is found in the order of the dative of address and the reflexive se/si, the placement of the adverbial clitics prej and však, and in the murky ordering between the accusative and genitive clitics. In the dialect described here, the argumental dative and accusative sequence is absolutely fixed and the two are not separable (cf. Toman 1999: 205 note 2).

At a first approximation, the linear order of the cluster reflects the expected hierarchical positions of the clitics based on their meaning and form (Toman 1999, Rezac 2000). Within the C-system, expanded for concreteness following Rizzi (1997: 297) as Force\( ^0 > \) Foc\( ^0 > \) Fin\( ^0 \), we find the question particle naturally fits into Force\( ^0 \) and the conditional clitic into Fin\( ^0 \), to which T\( ^0 \) moves with its \( \phi \)-inflection if it is not independently lexicalized by a raised verb or the perfect auxiliary. The \( \phi \)-inflected perfect auxiliary is in T. Se plausibly originates in [Spec, vP] when interpreted as an arbitrary pro and in the voice locus v when inchoative, inherent, and perhaps reflexive. Finally, the dative and accusative arguments are base-generated with the dative c-

\(^2\) Other variation, discussed in Franks and King (2000: 110-117), is along two parameters: (a) the nature of the second position; (b) the integrity of the cluster with respect to parentheticals. The following examples from Jaroslav Hašek's Osudy dobrého vojáka Švejka (c. 1920; citation from the edition by Československý spisovatel, Praha, 1966; vol. III-IV, p. 33) illustrate both; the examples are Hašek's rendering of colloquial Prague speech of his time. They are marked in the dialect described here.

(i) ...že musejí taky ty vostatní páni se tak na to divat
...that must-3.PL also those other sirs-N SE so at it look-INF
...'that the other sirs must also look at it in this way.'

(ii) Vždy já jsem, pane obrlajntant, se váš taky hned ptal po telefonu...
indeed I-N am sir lieutenant.commander SE you-PL.A also immediately asked-SG.M by telephone
'And indeed I did immediately ask you by telephone, sir lieutenant commander...'
commanding the accusative in the double object construction. Under these rather default assumptions, the order within the cluster emerges from the c-command relations of the base positions of the clitics:

\[ \text{[FocP Foc}^0 : li \text{[FinP Fin}^0 : \text{cond. [TP T}^0 : \text{perf. [v se v}^0 : \text{se [VP dat. [V}^0 \text{ acc.]]]]]} \]

The adverbial clitics in the less strictly ordered part of the cluster evidently correspond to speaker-oriented adverbs; analyzing the dative of address in a similar way as Toman (1999: 217-9) does, the relative positional freedom of these elements is not surprising.

The properties of many of these categories also explain the co-occurrence restrictions on the cluster, that is, the existence of sets only one member of which can be realized. Thus only one interrogative, conditional, and auxiliary clitic will surface, because only one corresponding syntactic category is licensed per clause. In section 3.2 and 3.4 we will see further that the approach to cliticization that will be developed there predicts that no relevant double accusative structures.

This principal empirical domain of this paper is clitic climbing in Czech, whereby clitics associated with an infinitival complement appear in the second position of an upstairs clause. Example (3) illustrates. In the clitic cluster in bold, the conditional particle by and the inflected perfect auxiliary jsem belong to the functional architecture of the matrix finite verb, the dative of address ti and the adversative particle však represent functional categories also found only in finite clauses (see below), and the inherent se-type clitic sí is lexically selected by the matrix verb přát si 'wish'. On the other hand, the arguments mu and je belong thematically to the infinitive vysvětlit and would be equally grammatical if realized in a second cluster following vysvětlit. In the example, they have climbed to the matrix clause.3

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(3) } & \text{Já by jsem si ti mu je však přála vysvětlit} \\
& \text{I-N COND am SE-D you-D him-D them-A however wished-SG.F explain-INF} \\
& \text{‘You know though, I would wish to explain them to him.’}
\end{align*}
\]

The argument of this paper is that the dislocation of the dative and accusative clitics under climbing, and in general, is an instance of A-movement, and that this hypothesis explains the intricate patterns of cliticization that will reveal themselves as we proceed. In section 2, it will first be shown that the domain of clitic climbing is the same as the domain of A-movement, and climbing thus requires that the matrix verb and the infinitive be in the same domain for φ-agreement, Case assignment, and A-movement. In turn, such a structure requires climbing. Thus, argumental clitics must A-move into the matrix clause for Case reasons. Properties of climbing and argument cliticization in general, like the restriction to a single accusative per cluster and the dative > accusative order, follow from this formulation, since identical properties restrict the A-movement and Case system in general. This is supported in the aftermath of section 3.1, which presents a constraint on climbing that refers to the Case of the DPs across which a clitic climbs, and which turns out to follow from Relativized Minimality in the Case

3 The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: N for nominative, A for accusative, D for dative, G for genitive, SG/PL number, 1/2/3 person, M/F/NEUT for masculine, feminine and neuter gender, INF infinitive, COND conditional, SE a clitic with a reflexive, impersonal (passive or middle), ergative, and inherent functions. Czech is a pro-drop language; pro is indicated by agreement on the verb, which is always glossed, while agreement with an overt nominative is only for clarity. Clitics in examples are in bold type throughout.
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system. Finally, section 3.4 investigates the Person-Case Constraint that applies to dative-
accusative sequences in Czech whether formed by climbing or not, which also emerges as a
consequence of the A-movement and φ/Case-system formulation in the Minimalist Program of
Chomsky (2000). Tying clitic climbing and argument cliticization in general to this system
provides an explanatory account of all these patterns.

The investigation is limited to dative and accusative argumental clitics. Of the others, the
auxiliaries, the quotative, adversative, and interrogative particles, and the dative of address, can
only appear in finite clauses, from which they cannot be dislocated:

(4) \textit{Požádala (ti) (prej) Jana pomoc (*ti) ji (*prej)}
    requested-3.SG.F you-D apparently John-A help-INF you-D her-D apparently
    'She asked John to help her.'

The genitive clitic in Czech usually represents extraction of the genitive portion of a quantified
NP, a subset of the \textit{en/ne}-cliticization of the Romance languages, and falls outside the scope of
this paper; see Toman (1986) and the remarks in section 4 here. More rarely the genitive is an
argumental genitive with the few verbs that allow it. In the latter case, judgments regarding
position, ordering, and climbing are unclear to native speakers (see Franks and King 2000:
107f.), and I will exclude it as well. Lastly, the \textit{se}-type clitics can climb and would indeed shed
additional light on the topic. However, the variety of interpretations available for \textit{se/si} is similar
to that of Spanish \textit{se} and Italian \textit{si} (Burzio 1986: 36f., Cinque 1988): reflexive, inchoative,
inherent, middle, impersonal both with and without object agreement; and since their syntactic
properties in Czech have not yet been investigated, I must leave them for future discussion.

2 Clitic climbing and restructuring

2.1 Introduction

This section presents the basic facts of clitic climbing in Czech. The infinitival transparency
which allows clitic climbing is known as restructuring in the literature on Romance, and has been
the subject of rich investigation: among others Strotzer (1976), Rivas (1977), Rizzi (1978),
Aissen and Perlmutter (1983), Burzio (1986), Kayne (1989, 1991), Roberts (1997); for other
languages, particularly Germanic and Japanese, see Wurmbrand (2001) and the literature cited
therein. Strotzer (1976) and Aissen and Perlmutter (1983) argue that the distinction to be drawn
between restructuring infinitives (RIs) that undergo clitic climbing, and non-restructuring
infinitives that do not (NRIs), is that RIs are bare VPs, lacking for example a subject of their
own, while NRIs are (closer to) full clauses. Strotzer (1976) implements the hypothesis by
simply base-generating RIs and NRIs as VPs and clauses respectively, while Aissen and
Perlmutter (1983) derive the reduced structure of RIs by the application of Clause Union in the
Relational Grammar framework. However, the shared intuition of the two approaches is the
same: clitic climbing is both permitted and necessitated by the impoverished RI structure. In
current terms, RIs are missing the functional architecture which licenses clitics (Cardinaletti and
Starke 1999), which come to depend on that of the upstairs verb; at the same time, this
relationship is not impeded by barriers to syntactic dependencies precisely because it is the
missing functional structure that would be responsible for barrierhood.\footnote{See Aissen and Perlmutter (1983: 401 note 31) for the history of the proposals by Aissen and Perlmutter, Rizzi, and Rivas in 1974-6. The other principal approach to restructuring phenomena basically takes the structure of RIs and NRIs to be the same in terms of base-generation, and then exploits V or VP-movement of the infinitive to eliminate various barriers to movement: see Rizzi (1978), Rivas (1977: 132), Burzio (1986: 322f.), Kayne (1989, 1991), Roberts (1997).}

A recent implementation of this tradition is Wurmbrand (2001), who delimits more precisely the amount of functional architecture that must be missing in RIs.\footnote{This article was originally written referring to Wurmbrand's dissertation, Wurmbrand (1998), from which the published Wurmbrand (2001) significantly differs in certain respects: particularly in observing that alongside bare VP infinitives, there are others with a fuller clause structure which are nevertheless transparent to a subset of restructuring diagnostics such as focus fronting. In the latter work therefore, the point is made more strongly made that the various restructuring diagnostics should be directly correlated to their explanatory causes such as the absence of a particular functional projection, and that they pattern together to the extent they share a single cause: the absence of v for example is responsible for both the absence of a base-generated subject and transparency to accusative Case assignment. Since this had been the approach pursued in this paper, the relevant results of Wurmbrand (1998) do not change. The class of RIs at hand in Czech are the \textit{lexical restructuring infinitives} of Wurmbrand (2001: chapter 2, 4), which are bare VPs in the sense of lacking CP, TP, and most crucially vP. Page references have been updated to Wurmbrand (2001). I am greatly indebted to Susana Béjar for providing me with a copy against considerable odds at the last minute.} Not only CP and TP, but also the vP category responsible for the base-generation of the subject and the Case licensing of objects must be missing, so that RIs end up as bare VPs. These translate semantically into properties rather than propositions, and are predicated of one of the arguments in the matrix clause by a meaning postulate that is part of the semantics of the matrix verb (Chierchia 1984). The structure of RIs is thus as schematized in Figures 1 and 2 (cf. Wurmbrand 2001: 17, 27, 227), where the subject of the RI is interpreted as identical to an argument of the matrix verb, either the subject in Figure 1 or the object in Figure 2.\footnote{This is not intended as a proposal for the English verbs \textit{try} and \textit{advise}; English probably lacks this kind of restructuring entirely (cf. Landau 2000). Head movement is not indicated, and the details of DP movement will vary across languages. See also note 10.}

Figure 1: John tried to visit his sister

\begin{figure}
\centering
\begin{tikzpicture}[level 1/.style={sibling distance=2cm, level distance=1.5cm, align=left}, level 2/.style={sibling distance=1cm, level distance=1.5cm, align=left}, level 3/.style={sibling distance=0.5cm, level distance=1.5cm, align=left}, level 4/.style={sibling distance=0.2cm, level distance=1.5cm, align=left}]
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\caption{John tried to visit his sister}
\end{figure}
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Figure 2: John advised Mary to visit his sister

The absence of the C/T/v functional categories under restructuring, which is necessary for clitic climbing, predicts a substantial number of diagnostic correlates for it. The aspect of this hypothesis that is crucial for the rest of this paper is that RIs are transparent to Case assignment and φ-feature agreement, forming with the upstairs predicate a single domain for this system; NRIs are not. This transparency correlate of RIs will be extensively tested below, after introducing clausal complementation and clitic climbing in Czech.

2.2 Clausal complements in Czech

Czech has both finite and non-finite clausal complements:

(5) a. Jana řekla Petrovi že utekl
   'Jana told Peter that he had run away.'

b. Jana přikázala Petrovi aby utekl
   'Jana ordered Peter to run away.'

c. Jana přikázala Petrovi utíct
   'Jana ordered Peter to run away.'

Verbs taking non-finite complements can be demonstrated to be of both the raising and control type, the latter distinguishing subject and object control, and the latter further dative and accusative controllers. There do not seem to be genuine accusative-assigning ECM verbs with infinitival complements, although there are both perception verbs with apparently similar infinitival complements and ECM verbs with small clause complements, as in German, French, and Italian (cf. Burzio 1986: 234ff., 287f.).

A standard diagnostic differentiating raising and control is the theta criterion. Raising predicates impose no selectional restrictions on their subjects, while control predicates do. Consequently, raising but not control allows non-subcategorized subjects in the matrix clause. Since Czech has a rather free word order, eye should be kept on matrix agreement and
nominative assignment. Consider the following contrast between chtít 'want' and začnout 'begin':

(6) Mýdla začly/*chtěly stát dvě koruny už před inflací
    soap-N began-PL/*wanted-PL cost-INF two crowns-A already before inflation
    'Soap bars began/*wanted to cost two crowns already before the inflation.'

The subjects of both chtít and začnout when used with a DP object must denote something capable of wanting or beginning something. As in English, this changes when these verbs take infinitival complements. Chtít 'want' behaves as a control verb and still requires its subject to be capable of wanting something; začnout 'begin' imposes no requirements on its subject, which must only satisfy the selectional requirements of the infinitival clause.

These and other tests (see Vaněk 1977: 225-7 for factivity) consistently distinguish raising and subject control verbs in Czech. Among raising verbs are some modals, muset 'have to', moci 'be able', but not směř 'be allowed', chtít 'want', přít 'wish'; the modal uses of být lit. 'be', dát se lit. 'give oneself', jít lit. 'go', nechat se lit. 'let oneself', all approximately meaning 'be possible'; perhaps all phasal verbs, such as začít 'start', přestat 'stop', skončit 'finish', pokračovat 'keep on, continue'; and the classical raising examples zdát se 'seem' (Vaněk 1977: 227), strašit, hrozit 'promise, threaten' (as in "the price of soap threatens to go up"). Subject-control verbs are the non-raising modals listed above; motion verbs, přijít 'come', jít 'go', vrátit se 'return', bežet 'run', pospíchát, leštít 'hurry'; and propositional attitude verbs, skusit, pokusit 'try', rozhodnout se 'decide', odhodlat se 'resolve', dokázat 'manage, succeed', mínit, hodlat 'intend, plan', umínit si 'intend, decide', odmítnout 'reject', zapomenout 'forget'. A special class of monadic control verbs have a single argument in the dative or accusative: examples are líbit se 'appeal to' and vadit 'inconvenience' with the dative, and štvát 'annoy, bother' with the accusative.7

Object control verbs do not pass ECM tests; for example, they do not preserve idiomatic meaning of sentential idiom chunk complements, except for perception verbs. Some verbs that correspond semantically to ECM verbs in English, e.g. očekávat 'expect' and počítat 'reckon, expect', take finite complements in Czech, while others like seznat 'acknowledge' take either finite or small clause complements. Object control verbs in Czech fall into two classes depending on the case of the controlling object: dative or accusative. Among dative-control verbs are příkázat, poručit 'order', doporučit 'recommend', (po)radit 'advise'. Among accusative-control verbs are (při)mutit 'force' and požádat 'request'.

2.3 Clitic climbing

Clitic climbing refers to a phenomenon whereby the clitic argument of an infinitive shows up within the clause of a c-commanding verb. To clarify the thematic relation of the clitic, I will throughout use a subscript I in the glosses for clitics that thematically belong to the infinitive:

7 Since this is independently of some interest and not treated elsewhere for Czech (to my knowledge), (i) gives some examples. The sole argument here is not a subject, as in the analogous Icelandic construction (Sigurðsson 1991): it cannot be controlled PRO or bind subject-oriented anaphora. Direct objects of infinitival complements of these verbs get accusative, not the agreeing nominative of Icelandic. This is thus best viewed as a species of object control and the matrix verbs have null expletive subjects, as in the English translations.

(i) Líbí se mu / vadi mu / štve ho, [PRO, vstávat brzo]
    'It pleases him / inconveniences him / bothers him to get up early.'
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(7) Jan ji¹  chtěl  ukázat  svou  televizi
Jan-N her-D wanted  show-INF own  televizion-A
'Jan wanted to show her his television.'

In this section I will discuss the scope and basic properties of climbing.

Climbing is never possible from finite complements, which in Czech are headed by complementizers or wh-words. In such clauses, the clitic has to be realized internally. The {} brace convention indicates from now on that one and only one element is to be realized:

(8) a. Dana  {*tě¹} zapoměla  že/jestli/kde  {tě¹} potkala
Dana-N you-A forgot  that/whether/where  you-A met-3.SG.F
'Dana forgot that/whether/where she met you.'

b. Dana  {*tě¹} chce  aby  {tě¹} potkala
Dana-N you-A wants that-COND you-A met-3.SG.F
'Dana wants to meet you.'

Clitic climbing is allowed out of infinitival complements of raising, object-control, and subject-control verbs:

(9) a. Dana  {ho¹}  chtěla  pohladit  {ho¹}  jemně
Dana-N him-A wanted caress-INF him-A gently
'Dana wanted to caress him gently.'

b. Dana  {mi}  {ho¹}  přikázala  hlídat  {ho¹}  opatrně
Dana-N me-D him-A ordered  guard-INF him-A carefully
'Dana ordered me to guard him carefully.'

c. Honza  {se¹}  chce  jít  {se¹}  schovat  {se¹}  do  seníku
Honzæ-N SE wants go-INF SE hide-INF SE into  hayloft
'Honza wants to go hide into the hayloft.'

In these examples, the clitic ho belonging to the lower verb can be realized in either the matrix or the embedded clause. There is no clitic 'lowering': the clitic mi in (9)b, an object of the matrix verb, can only be placed as in the example. Climbing is theoretically unbounded in the number of infinitival boundaries crossed, as in (9)c, which also shows that it can target other infinitival clauses rather than only finite ones. Finally, climbing is limited to complement infinitives, and barred from adjuncts:

(10) Dana  {*tě¹}  radši  uteče  než  {tě¹}  políbit
Dana-N you-A rather runs.away than  you-A kiss-INF
'Dana will run away rather than kiss you.'

When climbing occurs, it is an all-or-nothing phenomenon: either all the clitics of an embedded verb climb, or none does. In the following example the lower verb is ditransitive and

---

In general, the second position requirement for clitics within infinitival clauses may be satisfied in two ways: the clitic may be placed after the first constituent of the embedded clause, or alternatively before the first constituent, in which case the matrix clause apparently counts as the first element towards satisfying the requirement.
both of its arguments are realized as clitics:

(11) a. Jana chce ukázat tiʰ hoʰ zejtra
    'Jana wants to show him to you tomorrow.'

b. Jana tiʰ hoʰ chce ukázat zejtra

c. *Jana tiʰ chce ukázat hoʰ zejtra

d. *Jana hoʰ chce ukázat tiʰ zejtra

The all-or-nothing nature of climbing was one of the original arguments that it is a consequence of a different structure rather than of a special clitic movement rule, which could presumably affect clitics selectively (Aissen and Perlmutter 1983: 364). Clitic climbing is thus obligatory when the restructuring structure is present, and impossible when it is not.

This argument can be extended, as much work beginning with Aissen and Perlmutter (1983) and Rizzi (1978) has done, to find other correlates of restructuring and show that they necessarily co-occur. Recently, Wurmbrand (2001: chapters 2, 4) gathers an impressive array of such co-occurring diagnostics, and uses them to argue for the correctness of Strotzer's (1976) hypothesis that RIs are VPs and NRIs contain at least v and their own subject (trace or PRO). An initial indicator that there is something about the size of the infinitival complement that allows restructuring is that the presence of a CP layer blocks it. Wh-infinitives cannot be climbed out of Czech:

(12) Nevím {hoʰ} jak/komu {hoʰ} představit
    'I don't know how / to whom to introduce him.'

The other indicators of reduced structure for RIs we will consider below are the following: transparency of RIs to Case assignment and φ-agreement, indicating a lack of internal v and T categories; absence of a subject of any kind, including PRO, for the purposes of Binding Theory, implying lack of T and/or v; and lack of PF-independence, showing RIs are not phases (CP/vP). The necessary co-occurrence of all of these with clitic climbing and with each other, where testable, leads to the conclusion that RIs are bare VPs on the C-T-\(v\)-V distinction, where we take T to be the locus of tense, nominative Case assignment and nominative φ-agreement, and v of accusative Case assignment (and φ-agreement). It is the absence of T and v, so defined, will be crucial to the argument in this paper, which starts by identifying the domain of clitic climbing with the domain of A-movement, Case assignment, and φ-agreement.  

---

9 As in other languages, there are exceptions like (i), of the same type as those for which Wurmbrand (2001: 105f.) suggests an idiomatic structure with the wh-word not in the CP layer.

(i) Nemám ti co dáš
    'I don't have anything to give you.'

10 A reviewer questions whether RIs are truly bare VPs, lacking even aspectual markers. The issue is addressed inconclusively in Wurmbrand (2001: 105f.) for infinitival markers like English to, German zu, and Spanish a, which can or must precede the relevant infinitives. Interesting in this respect is Rivas (1977: 163-4, 175-6) who observes that Spanish infinitives are preceded by the preposition and Case marker a if the other object of the verb is an accusative, and not so preceded if it is a dative; it is not clear to what extent this generalizes. The absence of structure in RIs in this paper is crucial only in so far as it is the absence of Case/φ-categories, or even more
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2.4 Structure of restructuring infinitives

2.4.1 Domains of Case licensing and ϕ-agreement

One of the most impressive correlations between two different processes sensitive to restructuring is the correlation of clitic climbing with promotion of the internal argument of the infinitive to the derived agreeing nominative subject of the finite verb. This is demonstrated by Aissen and Perlmutter (1983: 375f.) for the Spanish impersonal se construction with object agreement, which we will follow closely.11

In Czech there is a productive impersonal formation using the clitic se, which suppresses the external argument. It has the option of retaining an internal argument in the accusative, or promoting it through nominative assignment and ϕ-agreement (cf. Aissen and Perlmutter 1983: 369f. for Spanish, Burzio 1986: 42-53 for Italian): 12

(13) a. Musí se jedlib dobře prozkoumat
   must-3.SG SE them-A well examine-INF

   b. M usej se dobře prozkoumat
   must-3.PL SE well examine-INF

   'One must examine(d) them well.' (both)

Verbs that take infinitival complements enter into this alternation, and its results can be used to show that climbing is only possible when the infinitive does not have a Case licenser for its object clitic(s). Three exemplar verbs are given in (14)a: skusit 'try', chtít 'want', and plánovat 'plan'. All allow clitic climbing, as can be seen by the possible positions of the dative clitic mu.

In (14)b, we see that these verbs can appear with impersonal se, in which construction they are interpreted with an impersonal external argument. One option then is for the object of the infinitive to remain accusative and the matrix verb to take default 3rd.sg.neut. agreement, with optional clitic climbing as shown in (14)b:

(14) a. Honza {mu} tyhle vlašky skúsí/chce/plánuje prodat {mu}
   Honza-N him-D these bottles-A try-SG/want-SG/plan-SG sell-INF him-D
   až za rok
   even after year
   'Honza will try/wants/plans to sell him these bottles only after a year.'

   b. Tyhle vlašky se {mu} skúsí/chce/plánuje prodat {mu}
   these bottles-A SE him-D try-SG/want-SG/plan-SG sell-INF him-D
   až za rok
   even after year
   'One will try/wants/plans to sell him these bottles only after a year.'

cautiously, their ability to assign Case and agree for ϕ-features with the infinitive's arguments. The same point is made in Wurmbrand (2001: 99f.).


By the hypothesis we will proceed to verify directly, (14)b exemplifies a structure where the matrix verb assigns accusative to the infinitival object when that is a bare VP, licensing climbing, and a structure where the infinitive's complement is a full control CP and the object receives accusative internally to it, with no clitic climbing.

The other possibility is for the matrix verb to assign nominative to the infinitival object and agree with it. This is shown in (15)a (slightly odd, cf. note 12). Here, the infinitive must lack the accusative Case assigner ν to permit the relation between matrix T and its object. The infinitive is thus reduced with respect to infinitives that have their own Case assigner, an RI. If RIs correlate one-to-one with clitic climbing, then climbing should be required in this case. This is splendidly confirmed in (15)b, where the assignment of agreeing nominative to the direct object of the infinitive requires climbing of the indirect object clitic:

(15) a. ?Tyhle vlašky se skusej/chtěj/plánujou prodat až za rok
   these bottles-N SE try-PL/want-PL/plan-PL sell-INF even after year
   'One will try/wants/plans to sell these bottles only after a year.'
   b. ?Tyhle vlašky se {mu1} skusej/chtěj/plánujou prodat {*mu1}
   these bottles-N SE him-D try-PL/want-PL/plan-PL sell-INF him-D
   až za rok
   even after year
   'One will try/wants/plans to sell him these bottles only after a year.'

This correlation between climbing and cross-infinitive Case assignment is quite a strong demonstration that a VP that does not contain a Case assigner necessarily forms the same cliticization domain with its matrix verb.

2.4.2 Binding domains

The difference between RIs and NRIs has binding-theoretic implications. An RI should have no subject in any technical sense of the word -- agreeing subject, tensed clause subject, PRO, subject of predication -- and therefore does not constitute a minimal domain for Conditions A and B. We predict consequences for Condition B, which rules out coreference between a pronoun and a c-commanding NP within the same minimal domain. The principle permits NRIs to contain a pronoun coreferential with an argument α (say the subject) the matrix clause provided that the PRO subject of the infinitive is controlled by a distinct argument β (say the object). Since RIs do not contain PRO or another subject, they will not constitute a binding domain of their own, and coreference between a pronominal argument of the infinitive and any argument of the upstairs verb should be blocked (cf. Miyagawa 1987 for Japanese). This prediction is correct for Czech as the following example illustrates:

(16) Anna, mu {ji1,vi} dovolila políbit {ji1,vi} nashledanou
   Anna-N him-D her-A permitted kiss-INF her-A goodbye
   'Ana permitted him to kiss her good-bye.'

A clitic that has climbed cannot be coreferential with the matrix subject, while one that has not can. This difference follows immediately from the RI/NRI structures in Figures 1 and 2, if climbing diagnoses RIs, without a subject.
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Languages with subject-oriented anaphora should also display another binding-theoretic difference between RIs and NRIs when the interpretive subject of the infinitive is the object of the upstairs verb. Only in NRIs should such a matrix object be able to bind a subject-oriented anaphor, via the PRO subject it controls; in RIs where there is no PRO, the anaphor should not be able to be bound by the matrix object. Wurmbrand (2001: 233-6) shows this is the case for German.

In Czech clitic climbing should block a subject-oriented anaphor within the infinitive from being bound by a matrix object, even though it is interpreted as the subject of the infinitival predicate. There is a series of subject-oriented anaphors such as the possessive adjective svůj 'his/her own' (inflected for gender, number, and Case), whose properties are discussed in Toman (1992). Object-control complements are an apparent exception to this rule, and svůj in an embedded clause is obligatorily bound by the matrix object if climbing does not take place. This yields strong evidence for the presence of PRO in them.

(17) Paveli přikázal Janovi je [PRO j dáť je svým svůj přátelům]
Pavel-N ordered John-D give-INF them-A own-D friends-D
Pavel ordered John to give them to his friends.'

However if climbing does take place here, svůj cannot be coreferential with a matrix object:

(18) *Paveli je Janovi přikázal [dát svým svůj přátelům]
Pavel-N them-A John-D ordered give-INF own-D friends-D

The inability of Janovi to bind svým follows from the RI structure, where neither Janovi or any coin dexed category is a subject. This in turn is evidence for the hypothesis that a crucial distinction between RIs, which require climbing, and NRIs which do not allow it, is the presence of a subject only in the latter. NRIs therefore must have a source for PRO, that is v implicated in external argument selection, and a PRO licenser, that is T whether construed as the assigner of Chomsky and Lasnik's (1995: 119-120) null Case or implicated in Borer's (1989) anaphoric agreement (see Martin 2001 and Landau 2000 respectively for development of these options); RIs must lack these.

2.4.3 Phasehood

Chomsky (2000, 2001) develops a theory of cyclicity where certain categories called phases are granted special status because they define the domain of cyclic spell-out. As spell-out units, phases are independent at LF and PF. A consequence of the latter fact is that only they have sufficient PF-cohesion to undergo operations like fronting and (pseudo-)clef ting. Independent

---

13 The anaphor is strictly subject-oriented, and cannot be bound even by the indirect object of a ditransitive, as is sometimes possible elsewhere (cf. Maling 1990: 285-6 note 6 for Icelandic). Toman (1992) shows that apparent exceptions to this generalization in Czech happen only when the anaphor is bound by a small clause subject.

14 I owe this observation to Diane Massam, p.c., who commented on the original version of this work (12/1998). A complementary test for PRO, the possibility of split/partial control (Wurmbrand 2001: 236f.), confirms these results: Rezac (2000: 243) shows that it is possible only if there is no climbing.

15 Interestingly, the matrix subject cannot bind the anaphor either. A possibility is that (beside agreement / [Spec, TP]) any specifier β creates a minimal binding domain for α except if α and β are co-arguments. A dative in [Spec, ApplP] would then define a binding domain for any argument of an RI since it is not a co-argument of it, but presumably still not count as a subject for the quite different requirement of binding subject-oriented anaphora.
considerations identify the CP and vP as phases, but not the TP (Chomsky 2000: 108-9, 144 note 48, 2001: 14-5). Chomsky (2000: 106, 2001: 8, 43 note 13) uses the PF-cohesion of phases to explain contrasts observed in Rizzi (1982), cited in Chomsky (1981: 62), between control and raising infinitives in fronting and (pseudo-)clefting constructions: only control complements may appear in them, diagnosing them as CP phases and raising complements as TP non-phases. The constructions may also involve complements that look like simple VPs, but Huang (1993) demonstrates for them the presence of a subject trace and therefore a vP phase. The following paradigms illustrate the effect:

(19) a. \([vP \text{ Kiss Mary}], \text{I never expected that Kate would}\]
    b. \[*[T \text{ Would kiss Mary}], \text{I never expected that Kate}\]
    c. \[*[TP \text{ Kate would kiss Mary}], \text{I never expected that}\]
    d. \([CP \text{ That Kate would kiss Mary}], \text{I never expected}\]

(20) a. \(\text{What Kate wanted is } [CP \text{ to kiss Mary}]\)
    b. \(\ast[\text{What Kate seemed is } [TP \text{ to kiss Mary}]\]

This PF-independence diagnostic of phasehood may be applied to clitic climbing. Rizzi (1978) observes that while complements of potential restructuring verbs in Italian may indeed appear in such constructions without clitic climbing, they may not if clitic climbing takes place (cf. Burzio 1986: 326, Wurmbrand 2001: 132f.). In terms of the present distinction, NRIs are therefore phases (CPs or vPs), while RIs are not (VPs, assuming they are not TPs).

Turning to Czech, while pseudoclefting is not a productive strategy, fronting is. As the following example shows, an infinitival complement with potential clitic climbing (21)a may undergo fronting, but only if clitic climbing does not take place(21)b:

(21) a. \(\text{Katka } \{\text{mu'}\} \text{ ch}^\text{t}\text{ěla } [\text{být } \{\text{mu'}\} \text{ představena}] \text{ okamžitě}\)
    \text{Kate-N him-D wanted be-INF him-D introduced immediately}
    'Kate immediately wanted to be introduced to him.'
    b. \([\text{být } \{\text{mu'}\} \text{ představena }] \{\ast\text{mu'}\} \text{ ch}^\text{t}\text{ěla Katka okamžitě}\)
    \text{be-INF him-D introduced him-D wanted Kate-N immediately}
    'Kate immediately wanted to be introduced to him.'

We thus conclude that NRIs are phases but RIs are not, converging with their analysis as VPs in Strotzer (1976) and Wurmbrand (2001).

2.4.4 Conclusion

The preceding discussion has shown that infinitival complements subject to clitic climbing have no Case licensing and φ-agreement architecture for their internal arguments and no subject for binding-theoretic purposes; while complements that do not undergo climbing have these. One kind of infinitival complement, the NRI, is thus a CP and blocks clitic climbing; another kind, the RI, is a bare VP and requires climbing. Since the RI VP is the complement of a V, it shares the relevant Case licensing and φ-agreement functional architecture with the upstairs V. If cliticization involves relation to clausal functional architecture, for example because a clitic is deficient in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), then we have an explanatory account for why clitics must climb out of RIs. However, this leaves underspecified the actual mechanism by
which clitics climb; much as saying that wh-phrases move for scope leaves underspecified the implementation of Ā-movement, which then may be through Agree between [Q-] on C and [Q], [wh-] on the wh-word as in Chomsky (2000: 128). The rest of this paper argues that argumental clitic movement is implemented by the same system as φ-agreement, Case assignment, and A-movement.

Because it is limited to RIs which lack T and v, argumental clitic climbing, and by implication all argumental clitic movement, is limited to the domain of structural Case assignment, φ-feature agreement, and A-movement: the A-domain. Empirically, A-domains are always CP-bounded, while there is no limit on the number of predicates they main contain since they may encompass complex predicate constructions such as RIs and causatives (cf. Burzio 1986: 232, 258 for independent evidence from passivization in the latter). Chomsky (2000: 108) argues that the size and distribution of A-domains is derivable from the mechanism that underlies the φ/Case/A-movement system, the A-system. Each A-domain consists of a single functional category with uninterpretable φ-features and the ability to assign structural Case, e.g. T for nominative and v for accusative, and all material in its c-command domain as far as locality constraints on the Probe-Goal system (Relativized Minimality) permit. Considering a simple transitive construction, then, we have the A-domain of v c-commanded by the A-domain of T:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{Limitation to A-domains thus begins the argument that clitic movement is driven by the A-system. In the next section we will see that in cases where more than one DP falls into an A-domain, there are certain limitations on the A-system mechanism which show up as limitations on the licensing of multiple DPs in monoclausal constructions. They will also turn out to predict patterns of clitic climbing. The results show that argumental clitics are displaced within A-domain by the A-system, which treats them as other DPs, with which they therefore interact. Clitics, or more neutrally the clitic-base position relation, do not have the option of skipping the A-system nor of using the long-distance Ā-system (contrast Sportiche 1996: 244, 251-260 respectively for French clitics). Rather, the picture that will emerge is one where the displacement of a clitic is driven by the A-system, modulo possibly a very short and largely inert final step of cliticization itself.}
\end{array}
\]

3 Clitic climbing, Case, and agreement

3.1 Interaction between Case and climbing

The results of the previous section indicate that in order for clitic climbing to occur, the target position and the base position must be within a single A-domain, which suggests that argumental clitic climbing is implemented by the A-system. The functional layers that block climbing are a barrier to the A-system as well. In this section, we will turn to a constraint on climbing that is initially of quite a different nature. This constraint allows clitics to climb only when the overall configuration of Case patterns between the target of climbing and the origin of the clitic matches certain criteria; otherwise climbing is blocked, and a non-restructuring
structure is forced on the infinitive. The claim about the constraint will be that it shows up independently for DPs in constructions with only a single predicate, and that it follows from the basic derivational mechanics of the A-system.

The constraint can be stated as follows, where we make the usual assumption that the position of a clitic is necessarily outside of the basic thematic domain, the VP; on Cardinaletti and Starke's (1999) proposal for example that follows because clitics require licensing by clausal functional categories whose counterparts they themselves lack, unlike full DPs.

(23) Where Θ is the theta-related position of a clitic and K its final position, and co-indexing indicates the theta-selection relation between a verb and an argument, α cannot be accusative or the copy/trace of an accusative in the following configuration (linear order irrelevant):

\[ K \ldots [\ldots V_j \ldots \alpha_j \ldots] \ldots [\ldots V_i \ldots \Theta_i \ldots] \]

In the possible combinations of Case-marked arguments in Czech in a potentially climbing construction, where we restrict ourselves to the dative and accusative, (23) rules out clitic movement past a non-co-argument accusative:

(24) Climbing allowed:
- \( V_1 [V_2 D_2/A_2] \)
- \( V_1 D_1 [V_2 D_2/A_2] \)

Climbing blocked:
- \( V_1 A_1 [V_2 D_2/A_2] \)

If \( V_1 \) has no arguments, climbing is free for all argumental clitics that instantiate arguments of \( V_2 \):

(25) \[ Dana \ mu' ho' ch'ela uk'azat \]
\[ Dana-N him-D him-A wanted show-INF \]
'Dana wanted to show him to him.'

If \( V_1 \) has a dative argument, whether that is itself a clitic or a dative DP, climbing of an accusative clitic is fine:

(26) \[ Dana \ (ti) ho' [Iren'ě] doporu'cila poslat domů \]
\[ Dana-N you-D him-A Irena-D recommended send-INF home \]
'Dana recommended to you/Irene to send him home.'

If \( V_1 \) has an accusative argument, no climbing is allowed. This is true regardless of whether the argument of \( V_1 \) is a clitic or a full DP, showing we are not dealing with a clitic-specific or morpho(phono)logical constraint. Furthermore, the position of the accusative DP intervener is not really relevant; left and right-peripheral positioning improves the sentence only slightly.

(27) a. \*\[ Dana \ mu' ho/Irenu p'rinutila pomoc \]
\[ Dana-N him-D him-A/Irene-A forced help-INF \]

16 Climbing of a dative past a dative is also blocked, but for different reasons, which do not block such sequences in clitic systems universally; I return to it in section 3.5.
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'Dana forced him/Irene to help him.'

b. ?(Irenu) mu’ Dana přinutila pomoc {Irenu} 
   Irena-A him-D Dana-N forced help-INF Irena-A
   'Dana forced Irene to help him.'

(27) is fine without climbing – if the clitic does not climb, or if the downstairs argument is realized as a full DP. In that case, the infinitive is an NRI; for example, it counts as a separate binding domain, allowing the subject-oriented possessive svůj to be bound by the matrix object via PRO:

(28) Dana, ho/Pavla, přinutila pomoc svým j nepřátelům 
   Dana-N him-A/Pavel-A forced help-INF own enemies-D
   'Dana forced him/Paul to help his/а her (own) enemies.'

The restriction (23) is not limited to Czech. It has been extensively investigated in Rivas (1977: chapter 5) for climbing and causative constructions in Spanish (as well as French and Italian), and the pattern is the same as described here for Czech. Rivas's proposal is that (23) follows from a filter on possible clitic sequences (CL stands for clitic):

(29) CL Filter: The only possible order among CLs is refl dat acc.  (Rivas 1977: 171)

The filter blocks both permutations of this order and the realization of one slot by more than one clitic, the latter deriving (23). However, it only applies to clitic sequences, whereas an important aspect of (23) is that the illegitimate accusative intervener α can be a full DP. Rivas accordingly assumes that there is universal clitic doubling of dative and accusative DPs regardless of whether it can show up, as variously in Spanish dialects, or not, as in standard French or in Czech; his CL Filter then applies correctly to the covert clitic double of α in (23) even if α is a full DP.

As a start on an explanatory theory of (23), we may observe that an abstractly similar restriction constrains Case patterns in faire-type causatives in Romance and elsewhere (Aissen and Perlmutter 1983: 379). The generalization for such causatives is that if the embedded verb is unaccusative or the passive of a transitive, its sole DP argument shows up with accusative assigned by the matrix causative verb; if it is transitive, its external argument must become dative:

(30) a. Los hice caminar toda la noce 
   them-A made-1.SG walk-INF all the night
   'I made them walk all night.'  (Spanish; Aissen and Perlmutter 1983: 380)

b. Les hice poner sus nombres en la lista 
   them-D made-1.SG put-INF their names in the list
   'I made them put their names on the list.'  (Spanish; Aissen and Perlmutter 1983: 380)

As Aissen and Perlmutter (1983: 385) and others observe, clitic climbing in such causatives is obligatory, showing we are dealing with obligatory RIs (se is the form le(s) takes before another clitic):

17 Rivas (1977) came to my attention after this paper was in substantially its present form; the cross-linguistic corroboration lends strong support to deriving the constraint at hand from universal mechanics of the A-system.
There is thus a single A-domain for both verbs (cf. Burzio 1986: 232, 258 for matrix passivization of embedded causee and theme in Italian), and arguments of the infinitive are necessarily dependent on the A-system of the matrix verb.

The Case of the causee in these causatives is independent of clitic climbing. However, both it and the constraint in (23) are restrictions on possible Case patterns, and both refer to the effect of an accusative as distinct from a dative intervening between a Case licenser and another accusative. We see that in both causatives and RIs, the infinitive and the matrix predicate fall into a single A-domain. Thus, we can unify the two patterns as a constraint on possible A-domains, if we assume that the constraint on climbing in (23) is really a constraint on the A-system, and that therefore there is no argumental clitic climbing except through the A-system. The unification can then be stated as follows, with an eye on full generality and assuming the approach to the A-system in Chomsky (2000):

(32) The Case Licensing Generalization: In the following configuration, where F is a φ/Case head and DP_β is assigned structural Case by /φ-agrees with / is A-moved by F, DP_α must not have structural Case:

\[
[F \ldots \text{DP}_\alpha \ldots \text{DP}_\beta]
\]

where (a) v assigns accusative and T assigns nominative, while (b) the dative is not a structural Case nor does it allow φ-agreement.

For (23), DP_α is a matrix object that intervenes in climbing of the clitic DP_β through the A-system; for causatives, DP_α is the causee and DP_β the theme. In both cases, DP_β cannot be in a bare VP when DP_α is accusative, which forces an NRI structure for infinitives and blocks a causative construction altogether.

The Case Licensing Generalization is a universal generalization about A-domains, and should show up whenever we find combinations of multiple DPs in the domain of a single φ/Case head. In the next section, we will verify this prediction by seeing that it holds of the arguments of a single predicate as well. This will lead in section 3.3 to deriving the generalization from the locality constraints on A-system mechanics.

3.2 The Case Licensing Generalization

The Case Licensing Generalization is in part inherent the syntactic approaches to Case since Chomsky (1981), which require the closest eligible DP to a Case licenser to receive Case and ignore DPs that bear inherent Case. A problem for this approach historically arose from the 'quirky' Case phenomenon: instances of DPs with inherent Case that are eligible for A-movement, unlike DPs/PPs with inherent Case that are inert, but that are assigned theta-related morphological Case and do enter into the φ-agreement and structural Case assignment system, which can instead target a farther DP.
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Quirky Case DPs are found along the path of both T-nominative and v-accusative A-systems. In the former, we find quirky subjects in languages like Icelandic, where a dative subject qualifies for A-movement to [Spec, TP] but does not interfere between T and its nominative assignment to and number agreement with a lower DP (Zaenen et al. 1985); examples come from psych-verbs and passives of double object ditransitives (see Chomsky 2000: 126-8, Rezac 2001, Anagnostopoulou 2003: 104f. for this analysis T-dative-nominative Case checking and agreement in these constructions):

(33) \( \text{Jóni}_1 \)  \( \text{voru} \) \( [\text{VP} \text{t}_1 \text{gefnir þessir sokkar}] \)
John-D were-3.PL given these socks-PL.N
'John was given these socks.' (Icelandic; Jónsson 1996: 148)

In the v-accusative system, we find interfering along the path between v and the accusative datives with theta-related morphological Case that are nevertheless eligible for A-movement like Object Shift, and that become quirky subjects in passive constructions. Examples are dative goals of ditransitives in the double object construction, which undergo Object Shift in the following example; see Richards (1997: 92-3), Rezac (2001, 2002) for this analysis of v-dative-accusative pattern here:

(34) \( \text{Ég}_1 \text{gef} \) \( \text{Jóni}_2 \) \( \text{ekki} \) \( [\text{VP} \text{t}_1 [\text{VP} \text{t}_2 \text{þessa sokka}]] \)
I-N give John-D not these socks-A
'I will not give John these socks.' (Icelandic; Jónsson 1996: 147)

The reason why quirky Case DPs may enter into the A-system is not crucial in this section: it has been proposed that they are displaced by the EPP/D property of their target (Schütze 1993), that they bear a defective or partial Case feature (Belletti and Rizzi 1988, Chomsky 2000: 127-8), or that they are displaced because they enter the \( \varphi \)-system partially (Chomsky 2000: 128, 130-1, Rezac 2001, Anagnostopoulou 2003: chapter 5, this volume, Béjar and Rezac 2003; cf. the next section). What is crucial is that in all instances where multiple DPs enter into the A-system in a single A-domain, we find that the Case Licensing Generalization holds. A DP between the \( \varphi \)/Case head of an A-domain (T, v) and the corresponding DP that gets structural Case (nominative, accusative) must not itself have full structural Case and/or value \( \varphi \)-agreement.

Much work bears this out. To be sure, apparent counterexamples exist in the form of transitives whose two internal arguments are accusative, even if we eliminate predicative structures (the only kind to allow double nominatives as well), cognate objects, and adverbial accusative objects: setting aside the first group completely, in the latter two cases a cognate or adverbial accusative is not structural if there is another accusative (see Zaenen et al. 1985: 472f.). This leaves a group of verbs like teach, pay, and serve which take two accusative arguments in various languages. However, Anagnostopoulou (2001) shows that even here, the second accusative is not structural. In Czech, this is reflected by the fact that such verbs allow only the first accusative argument to be cliticized or to become nominative under passivization; examples of such verbs are naučit 'to teach' and krmit 'feed':

(35) a. Naučil jsem ho zeměpis
   taught am him-A geography-A
   'I taught him geography.'
b. *Naučil jsem ho Honzu
   taught am him-A Honza-A
   'I taught it to Honza.'

(36) a. ?Honza ho byl naučen
    Honza-N him-A was taught
    'Honza was taught geography.'
b. *Zeměpis ho byl naučen
    geography-N him-A was taught
    'Geography was taught to him.'

It remains a point of investigation exactly how the second accusative is assigned. Holmberg and Platzack (1995: 205f.) treat the other apparent exception to the Case Licensing Generalization, where an accusative c-commands a dative in a class of ditransitive verbs in Icelandic, and show that as expected the dative is in fact beyond the reach of the A-system; it cannot undergo Object Shift or become a quirky subject.

The Case Licensing Generalization thus holds empirically in A-domains containing a single predicate, as well as in the restructuring and causative constructions we saw in the previous section. In the Chomskyan (2000) approach to the A-system, the Case Licensing Generalization follows from the fact that a DP without inherent Case fully matches and values the uninterpretable features of the φ/Case head of an A-domain (its Probe): specifically, it values uninterpretable φ-features through the Agree operation, gets assigned Case as a reflex of this, and can move to satisfy the EPP. In other words, the relation between a φ/Case head and a DP with structural Case is necessarily symmetric and unique: the φ and Case requirements of both categories are satisfied by the relationship, and locality allows only the closest such pair to relate. By contrast, DPs with inherent Case, or DPs with ‘quirky’ Case however it is implemented, can evidently never value φ-features since they never trigger agreement, even if they undergo A-movement. This allows a relationship between a φ/Case head and a more remote DP. The Case Licensing Generalization follows in A-domains generally.

We thus reach the conclusion that our original constraint (23) on clitic climbing constructions is a specific instance of a more general observation, the Case Licensing Generalization, which itself results from the mechanics of the A-system. This is significant independent evidence added to the limitation of climbing to A-domains that climbing is implemented by the A-system. In the next two sections, we will look in more detail at A-system mechanics, and see that both the dative > accusative ordering of argumental clitics and a special constraint on person combinations in clitic clusters follows from a more articulated statement thereof.

3.3 The A-system

The Case Licensing Generalization allows a DP\(_a\) without full structural Case (quirky) to enter into the A-system with a φ/Case head F if situated between F and the closest DP\(_F\) with full

---

18 Chomsky (2000) argues that φ-agreement and Case assignment cannot be separated, and both are implemented by checking (valuing) of φ-features; A-movement piggy-backs on this system if the φ/Case head also has an EPP feature. In the Chomsky (1995) system, EPP (as [D-] and/or [N-]), Case, and φ-features can enter into checking separately (cf. Schütze 1993); but a DP without inherent Case will always check all these features through the free rider principle (Chomsky 1995: 265), deriving Case Licensing Generalization as well.
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structural Case:

(37)  F … DP\(_\alpha\) … DP\(_F\)

Examples of such quirky Case DPs were given in the previous section: Icelandic dative subjects that undergo movement for EPP, and dative primary objects in the double object construction that undergo Object Shift.

The investigation of these constructions has yielded an important result: DP\(_\alpha\) and DP\(_F\) may both undergo A-movement triggered by a relation to F via the A-system, and they may undergo such movement alone or jointly; but the c-command relation between DP\(_\alpha\) and DP\(_F\) must be preserved. The patterns of A-movement are accordingly the following:

(38)  

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
F & \ldots & DP\(_\alpha\) & \ldots & DP\(_F\) > \text{by A-movement} \\
\text{DP}\(_\alpha\) & F & \ldots & t\(_\alpha\) & \ldots & DP\(_F\) \\
* \text{DP}\(_F\) & F & \ldots & t\(_\alpha\) & \ldots & t\(_F\) \\
\text{DP}\(_\alpha\) & \text{DP}\(_F\) & F & \ldots & t\(_F\) & \ldots & t\(_\alpha\) \\
* \text{DP}\(_F\) & \text{DP}\(_\alpha\) & F & \ldots & t\(_F\) & \ldots & t\(_\alpha\)
\end{array}
\]

This result is argued for A-movement in Icelandic by Richards (1997: 92-3) and Rezac (2001, 2002). To exemplify, the possible A-positions of the dative goal and accusative theme in a double object construction active ditransitive in Icelandic are exhaustively given in the following example, where the negation éki demarcates the left edge of the vP:

(39)  

\[\text{Ég } \text{låna } \{\text{éki}\} \text{Mariú } \{\text{éki}\} \text{bækurnar } \{\text{éki}\} \]

I-N lend not Maria-D not books-A not

'I do not lend Maria the books.' (Collins and Thráinsson 1996: 406)

A-movement of either argument is allowed, but their in-situ order must be preserved. Richards (1997) shows that order preservation under movement is a general characteristic of multiple specifier constructions, here of the head F. Chomsky (2000: 131), Anagnostopoulou (2003), and Rezac (2001, 2002) argue that F necessarily enters into relations with the DPs in its A-domain in this same order: the F-DP\(_\alpha\) relation must be established first, yielding A-movement, and only then can the F-DP\(_F\) relation be established, optionally also yielding A-movement which 'tucks in' under the first movement.\(^{19}\)

The pattern in (38) is exactly the pattern we find with multiple clitic climbing. As discussed in section 1, argumental clitics in Czech necessarily display the dative > accusative order. This holds true whether the clitics are co-arguments of a single predicate or distributed across several predicates in a climbing construction. The Case Licensing Generalization dictates that in all

---

\(^{19}\) These works actually argue for a stronger conclusion: displacement of DP\(_\alpha\) must take place in order for the F-DP\(_F\) relation to occur at all. It might seem that this conclusion runs afool of examples like (26); however, I suspect that in Czech short Ā-movement of the dative obviates this requirement, as argued for apparent Icelandic nominatives below shifted objects in Rezac (2002). Note that the analogue of (26) in Spanish, which has more limited word order options, does require overt dislocation of the intervening DP (Rivas 1977: 186-8; the clitic le doubles a José):

(i)  

\[\text{María le} \_hizó \_\{a José\} \_tocrar \_la \_flauta \_\{a José\} \]

María him-D made to José play-INF the flute to José

'María made José play the flute.'
cases, the only possible combination in the cliticization domain will be dative > accusative; the
tucking-in constraint requires that this order be preserved. Construing argumental clitic
movement as movement due to the A-system, then, independently predicts the correct ordering
of argumental clitics. The next section will show that this yields one further result: it predicts an
important limitation on the distribution of person features in argumental clitic clusters, the
Person-Case Constraint.

3.4 The Person-Case Constraint

The Person-Case Constraint (PCC) is a universal condition on the distribution of marked
person features. Bonet (1991: 177) characterizes it at a first approximation as the requirement
that an accusative clitic or agreement morpheme be 3rd person if there is also a dative:

(40) a. Je le/*vous lui ai présenté
   I-N him-A/you-A her-D have introduced
   'I have introduced him/*you to her.' (French)

b. Je vous ai présenté à lui
   I-N you-A have introduced to her
   'I have introduced you to her.' (French)

(41) Je le/*vous lui/*lui ai fait aider
   I-N her-A/you-A him-D have made help-INF
   'I have made him help her/*you.' (French)

In (40)a the accusative clitic is limited to the third person if there is also a dative clitic. In (40)b
this is obviated because the dative is a PP in the prepositional construction, not a clitic
originating as the high dative of the double object construction (cf. Kayne 1975: 134-169).
Example (41) shows that the constraint applies to complex predicate constructions like
causatives.

Anagnostopoulou (2003: chapter 5) and Béjar and Rezac (2003) argue that the PCC is a
product of A-system mechanics: in the configuration T/v-dative-nominative/accusative, the
person φ-feature [π] on T/v cannot agree with the [π] feature of the nominative/accusative DP
because of the intervention of the dative. On the implementation in Béjar and Rezac (2003), [π]
on a φ/Case head (say v in ditransitives) enters into a relation with the closer dative DP, and the
number φ-feature [#] then enters into a relation with the more distant DP, yielding number
agreement and Case assignment. Both relations may result displacement (cliticization, A-
movement), but only the second leads to feature valuation since Agree requires of the valuing DP
to have structural Case (Chomsky 2000: 122-4):

(42) v DAT ACC
   __________ [π] feature finds and displaces the dative
   ___________________ [#] feature finds, Agrees with, and displaces the accusative

In such configurations then, the [π]-accusative/nominative relation is blocked. Béjar and
Rezac (2003) claim that this leads to a crash if the latter is a clitic, because a marked 1st/2nd [π]
feature on a deficient element must be licensed at LF by entering into an Agree relation with a
functional category: the Person Licensing Condition (Béjar and Rezac 2003: 53). Thus there can be no 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person clitics in such configurations, deriving the PCC. PPs, as in (40)b, and full DPs, contain their own internal φ-head (P, D) which licenses their [π] feature (Béjar and Rezac 2003: 54-5, cf. the DP-internal γ complementizer of Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: 179-192).

The PCC arises from locality conditions on the mechanics of the A-system, which is implemented through φ-agreement following Chomsky (2000). In Czech, the PCC holds in monoclusal constructions of dative-accusative clitics when the dative is a goal, experiencer, benefactive or possessive dative, but not with the dative of address (cf. Franks and King 2000: 106 on the PCC in Czech, and Toman 1999: 217-220 on distinctions among dative clitics).

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Ukážu \ mu \ ho/\?tě \ zítra} (goal/experiencer)
  \begin{itemize}
    \item show-1.SG \ him-D \ him-A/you-A \ tomorrow
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
'I will show him/*you to him tomorrow.'

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Pozvu \ mu \ ho/\?tě \ zítra} (benefactive)
  \begin{itemize}
    \item invite-1.SG \ him-D \ him-A/you-A \ tomorrow
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
'I will invite him/*you for his sake tomorrow.'

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Viděl \ jsem \ mu \ ho/\?tě \ v rukou} (possessive)
  \begin{itemize}
    \item saw \ am \ him-D \ him-A/you-A \ in \ hands
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
'I saw him/*you in his hands.'

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Vona \ ti \ ho/tě \ ale nenávidí} (address)
  \begin{itemize}
    \item she-N \ you-D \ him-A/you-A \ but \ hates
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
'You know, she really hates him/you.'

This distribution is one of the arguments given by Anagnostopoulou (2003: 302) and Béjar and Rezac (2003: 50) that the PCC applies in A-domains; datives of address are adverbial datives, not present in the A-system.

Now just as in the French case (41), PCC in Czech applies in restructuring (climbing) constructions; this holds regardless of which predicate the two arguments originate with, so long as they share a clitic cluster:

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Honza \ mu \ ho/ \ je/ \ ?tě \ poradil \ pozvat \ na večerí}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Honza-N \ him-D \ him-A \ / \ them-A \ / \ you-A \ advised \ invite-INF \ for \ supper
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
'Honza advised him to invite him/them/*you for supper.'

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textit{Honza \ mu \ ho/ \ je/ \ ?tě \ chce \ ukázat}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item Honza-N \ him-D \ him-A \ / \ them-A \ / \ you-A \ wants \ show-INF
    \end{itemize}
  \end{itemize}
'Honza wants to show him/them/*you to him.'

\footnote{The examples are construed only with tě, since the other accusative 1\textsuperscript{st}/2\textsuperscript{nd} person clitics are homophonous with the independent pronouns. The strength of the PCC varies cross-linguistically in various ways (see Anagnostopoulou, this volume, on one). The degradation it causes in Czech seems milder than for example in French and Basque, where the ungrammaticality is quite severe (thanks respectively to Mélanie Jouitteau and Aritz Irurtzun for discussion); the same contrast obtains between these languages and the milder deviance many English speakers find in \textit{John showed me 'm vs. John showed 'm *me/ME} (Bonet 1991: 185). I would conjecture that this has to do with the position of the accusative on the clitic-weak-full pronoun scale of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), which reflects the richness of the functional layer and thus its ability to license [π] internally. The prevailing homophony of Czech clitics and full pronouns commented on in Toman (1999: 224-5) supports this picture.}
Non-restructuring constructions, where there is no climbing, do not show the PCC:

(45) *Honza mu poradil pozvat ti / ho na večeři
Honza-N him-D advised-3.SG invite-INF you-A / him-A for supper
'Honza advised him to invite you/him for supper.'

The application of the PCC to climbing constructions in exactly the same form as to clitic combinations belonging to a single predicate shows that the two should receive a unified analysis. The works cited above argue that the PCC is a consequence of the mechanics of the A-system, providing one further argument that argumental clitic climbing, as an instance of argumental clitic movement generally, is driven by the A-system.21

3.5 Appendix: The double dative ban

I end this section with a discussion of a constraint on clitic climbing that has not been subsumed under the Case Licensing Generalization.22 Clitic climbing is additionally blocked in Czech for a dative clitic if the matrix verb contains a dative argument, where we have seen that accusative climbing is fine:

(46) a. Dana (*mu doporučila Ireně pomoc mu s mytí
Dana-N him-D advised Irena-D help-INF him-D with washing up
* with climbing, o.k. without: 'Dana advised Irene to help him with washing up.'
o.k. with climbing: 'Dana advised him to help Irene with washing up.'
b. Dana (*mu doporučila Ireně dát mu knihu.
Dana-N him-D advised Irena-D give him-D book-A
* with climbing, o.k. without: 'Dana advised Irene to give him a book.'
o.k. with climbing: 'Dana advised him to give Irene a book.'

This prohibition is found in Czech against all constructions with two argumental datives, clitic or not. First, Czech has no double dative ditransitives such as are found for example in Icelandic (Holmberg and Platzack 1995: 185f.). Second, considering the addition of possessive dative arguments to simple transitive constructions (see Landau 1999 on a recent treatment), the following contrast shows that such a dative is fine if added to a clause with the verb pohlídat 'watch' which takes an accusative object, but bad if added to pomoc 'help' which takes dative object:23

---

21 The PCC might explain Rivas' (1977: 172) observation that in Spanish, accusative clitic climbing from a potential RI into a matrix clause that already contains a dative clitic argument is the unmarked option if the accusative is inanimate, and the marked one if it is animate; cf. Ormazabal and Romero (forthcoming) on PCC with animate 3rd person arguments in Spanish.
22 The sketchy attempt to proceed along those lines in Rezac (2000: 241-2) did not take into account the range of variation here.
23 Toman (1999: 218) has (i) as illustration of the possibilities of multiple datives, with the corresponding translation. I find it strained; but there is a definite contrast between (i) and the examples in the text. I suspect that mi here is not really an argumental dative, and would compare the whole ti mi with the use of the sequence te me in colloquial French (ii), to indicate that the matter under discussion concerns the speaker and the addressee (pointed out to me by Mélanie Jouitteau and Nicolas Berthomeau, 08/2002).

(i) Už ti mi ji nikdo nepomáhal
already you-D me-D her-D no-one-N NEG-helped
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(47) a. Dana mu / Pavlovi pohlídá děti
   Dana-N him-D Pavel-D watch kids-A
   'Dana will watch his/Paul's kids.'

b. Dana mu / Pavlovi pomůže dětem
   Dana-N him-D Pavel-D help kids-D
   'Dana will help his/Paul's kids.'

Whatever is at work here, it is not morphological, since a full DP triggers it in (46), and it limits combinations of dative arguments, since a dative of address is not affected by it. Thus mu could be replaced by the dative of address ti in the above example to yield a grammatical example "Dana will watch/help the kids, you know."

This constraint does not have the same cross-linguistic scope as the other consequences of the A-system described above: the constraint (23), the PCC, or the ban on ditransitives with two structural accusative objects that arises from the Case Licensing Generalization. Limiting ourselves to clitic or agreement sequences, we find that like Czech in banning double datives is Spanish (Rivas 1977: 89f., 169f., 205f.) and French (Kayne 1975: 174-5), but not Italian (Rivas 1977: 212f.) or Choctaw (Davies 1986: 45, 53-5, 116). Casting the net a little wider, generalizations are not simple in this domain. Landau (1999: 20) observes that in constructions like (47) above, Hebrew dative objects resist the addition of a possessor dative DP but not of a possessor dative clitic. In French, both a possessor dative DP and clitic are fine with another argumental dative, unless both cliticize. Czech, Hebrew, French, and Italian thus make for pair-wise contrasts in this matter; and throughout, it is not clear how much can be attributed to what differences, such as the availability of analyzing the relevant datives as high and low (cf. note 24 for French).

The problem seems closely connected or identical to the treatment of dative objects of transitives (unergatives) and of ditransitives, when embedded under the faire-type causatives which requires that the external argument causee become dative (see section 3.1). The options for cliticization or agreement of the dative object vary significantly within languages and among speakers; and failure to do so results varyingly in ungrammaticality or not. For many speakers of French, for example, there is no way to replace à Pierre in (48)a with a pronoun, since a pronominal goal must cliticize, there is no cliticization site in the infinitive, and two argumental dative clitics are ruled out in the matrix clause. For many speakers of Italian, the analogous (48)b is fine (gli gli being realized as gli ci):

(ii) Je vais te me les (lui) maiter, par Jupiter
   I-N go you-D me-D them-A him-D kill by Jupiter
   'I'm going to kill them (for him), by Jupiter.' (Le domaine des dieux, une aventure d'Astérix le Gaulois, 1971, A. Uderzo and R. Goscinny, Dargaud Editeur: Paris, p. 21; Mélanie Jouitteau, p.c.)

24 In the case of arguments originating with distinct heads in French, some speakers but not others do allow such sequences; cf. Kayne (1975: 175 note 128), Nicol (this volume). This adds further to the problem. The behavior of à-DP sequences in French shows they correspond to both a double object (high) datives and a prepositional (low) datives, with various restrictions on which can be used when (see for example Kayne 1975: 170f.). When cliticization of the latter is attested cross-linguistically, the PCC disappears (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003: 295-300). Some variation in the double dative ban could perhaps be reduced to this.

25 Thanks to Mélanie Jouitteau for sitting through my examples.
(48)  
a. À Jean, Marie les lui fera porter à Pierre
   to Jean Marie-N them-A him-D will.make bring-INF to Pierre
   'Jean, Marie will make him take them to Pierre.' (cf. Kayne 1975: 290)
b. Gli ci ho fatto scrivere
   him-D him-D have-1.SG made write-INF
   'I made him write to her.' (Rivas 1977: 214)

For Romance these issues are discussed among others by Kayne (1975: 281f, 309f.), Rivas (1977: 205-219), Burzio (1986: 240-247, 257-8, 273), and arise in various forms elsewhere such as Basque, which prefers to simply omit agreement with the dative object, and Georgian, which does so as well but by putting the dative object into a distinct PP. Of the various directions to explore, for example that some datives but not others require structural Case checking which Landau (1999: 20) suggests for Hebrew, none seem to me to make much inroad into the range of variation at this point.26 I leave the matter in this unsatisfactory state.

4 Conclusion: Clitic movement in the syntax

Within the Principles and Parameters framework, the richest analyses of clitics exist for the Romance languages (see the papers collected in Borer 1986, for example). Much of the discussion has concerned the question of whether argumental clitics are to be analyzed as relating to their thematic position by the same mechanism that underlies movement (e.g. Kayne 1975, 1989, Sportiche 1996: 244), or by the mechanism that underlies pronominal binding and/or PRO control phenomena (Rivas 1977, Jaeggli 1982, Borer 1983, Burzio 1986). As Sportiche (1996: 223f.) points out, the arguments for a movement relation remain persuasive. Since argumental clitic movement is sensitive to islandhood constraints typical of movement and not that of binding or control chains, it or a concomitant of it should be analyzed as involving a movement chain.27

The present paper is an exploration of the evidence that Czech clitic climbing brings on the movement approach. In these constructions, the long distance relationship between the clitic and its gap lets us abstract from both very local processes like X\(^0\)-incorporation and prosodic

26 For a range of data that seems related, particularly the cross-linguistic variation in the combinability of various applicative constructions, see McGinnis (2000).
27 Although the account here shares the movement-type dependency approach of Kayne (1989) and Sportiche (1996), it is not particularly close to them. For Kayne (1989, 1991), Romance clitic movement, including climbing, is always head movement. For Czech at any rate, this would require massive exorporation, or the positing of abstract heads dissociated from the overt verbal material; I have not considered how the results gained here could be restated in it. See further Sportiche (1996: 247-8).

In Sportiche's (1996) system, the movement relation is between pro (in non-doubling languages such as Czech) in the theta-related position, and the specifier of a clitic voice head, which is a part of the extended functional projection of the clause. The movement is driven by the Spec-Head criterion; dative clitics in particular assign dative Case to their A-specifier, while accusative clitics license specificity in their Ā-specifier. The approach in this paper relies at many points on the treatment of datives as Chomsky's (2000: 123) defective interveners that undergo cyclic displacement in the relation between a φ-Probe and a corresponding nominative or accusative DP, as argued in Chomsky (2000: 130-1), Anagnostopoulou (2003), Rezac (2001, 2002), Béjar and Rezac (2003). This is an instance where the change from Spec-Head agreement to the Agree relation under c-command is not a trivial one, nor is the general perspective on the distribution of functional categories and the role of licensing; I have not attempted to restate the results here in the Spec-Head system.
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inversion, and also somewhat from the relative freedom of ordering available to Czech. The latter is a non-trivial problem. The language has available to it familiar \( \tilde{A} \) and \( A \)-movement to the left periphery (Rezac 2003), both interpretively neutral and interpretively marked scrambling into the middle field, remnant movement, left branch subextraction from subjects (Toman 1986), Long Head Movement (Rivero 1991), and a perhaps variable position for verb-raising within the TP aside from feature-driven verb-raising (cf. Vaněk 1977: 182f., Veselovská 1995: chapter 3, Rezac, forthcoming). These all interact to map the right periphery to new information focus, the middle to the background, and the optional left periphery to discourse topic or various \( \tilde{A} \)-readings (cf. Veselovská 1995: chapter 10). The following example is a good illustration, with the varying positions of the finite verb all available:

(49) Honza \{musel\} to okno \{musel\} tady \{musel\} někde \{musel\} vidět \{musel\}.

Honza-N must.have that window-A here somewhere see-INF

‘Honza must have seen the window somewhere here.’

The fact that the direct object \textit{to okno} can be separated from the infinitive \textit{vidět} by the matrix adverb \textit{tady} requires scrambling; the finite verb can precede or follow its infinitival complement, one of which requires remnant movement since it contains the trace of \textit{to okno}; and the finite verb may intervene between the infinitive and its locative adverb, calling for a more complicated analysis. Nevertheless, the language is thoroughly configurational, as the preceding references and others cited above make clear. Limiting ourselves to monoclausal constructions, the displacement possibilities make tempting an in-situ analysis of clitics, with other movements deriving the surface order (cf. Toman 1999 for such an approach). The distance between the left-peripheral target of clitic climbing and the right-peripheral position of the infinitive it climbs out of provides some control for this. For the rest, it is up to the coherence of the movement account of clitics to speak for itself.

An investigation of the pattern of this movement has revealed that argumental clitic climbing is restricted to \( A \)-domains, shows intricate interactions with DPs along the path of movement, results in the same ordering pattern as multiple \( A \)-movement, and is subject to the Person-Case Constraint. These conclusions follow if the clitics obligatorily enter into the \( A \)-system, as implemented in Chomsky (2000) and related work, in order to cross the gap between their base-generated position and the functional categories that drive this system. The conclusions would be largely nullified if clitic climbing had available to it also \( \tilde{A} \)-movement, capable of extracting a clitic from the \( A \)-domain in which it starts, of skipping parts of the \( A \)-system (cf. Sportiche 1996: 244), or of re-ordering the dative > accusative order. We thus conclude that clitic climbing is implemented solely by the \( A \)-system, modulo a possible cliticization step that does not have the unwanted side effects of \( \tilde{A} \)-movement. Since the properties of monoclausal clitic movement are the same as that of clitic climbing in so far as can be seen -- for example, there is less opportunity to explore clitic/DP interaction relative to Case -- we may generalize to all argumental clitic movement. The conclusion dovetails nicely with Chomsky’s (1982: 64f., 87f.) demonstration that accusative clitics in Italian do not license parasitic gaps (a result difficult to test for Czech), for which the most straightforward explanation is that they are not in an \( \tilde{A} \)-position. Given the systematic parallelism in the behavior of Czech and Romance argumental clitic movement which we have seen above in such matters as the domain of climbing, the Case Licensing Generalization, and the Person-Case Constraint, this is predicted. Their argumental
clitic movement is the same, other differences between the languages aside (see note 19).28

Beside dative and accusative argument clitics, the Czech second position clitic cluster also has adverbial clitics like the dative of address and the quotative particle prej; the clitics se/si; and genitive clitics. Adverbial clitics do not climb, presumably because they are generated in the CP/TP layer, and are not relevant here. The clitics se/si present issues familiar from the Romance group (Kayne 1975: 385ff., Burzio 1986: 36-53), as well as some special problems of their own (Vaněk 1977: 223-4, 233 note 34). Finally, the omission of the genitive is significant. Genitive clitics in Czech come in two varieties. One are genitive arguments with a few verbs, such as bát se 'to fear' or litovat 'regret (with genitive), feel pity for (with accusative)'. The other are genitive DP complements of numeral quantifiers, similar to the partitive use of the en/ne clitics of Romance (Toman 1986). Both can climb:

(50) a. Tak jsem se1 jich1 pomalu přестал bát
    so am SE them-G slowly stopped fear-INF
    'So I slowly stopped fearing them.'

b. Včera jsem jich1 šel koupit pět
    yesterday am them-G gone buy-INF five-A
    'Yesterday I went to buy five of them.'

The distribution of the latter would correctly fit into this system if they target a functional projection between T and v, a QP category available for short Ā-movement after which the clitic freezes in its scope position. There is considerable evidence for such a category in that position: for example movement of quantifiers like tout and rien in French (Sportiche 1988, Starke 2001: 68f.), negative and quantified object movement in Icelandic (Svenonius 2000 and references therein), wh-movement in Malayalam (Jayaseelan 2001). However, I have no suggestions to offer on how genitive arguments fit into the A-system, and thus on how they climb.

In order for the patterns of dative and accusative cliticization to follow from the A-system, any other step involved in clitic movement must have severely limited powers. In particular, it must not be allowed to move a clitic out of an A-domain, to violate the Case Licensing Generalization by attracting a dative clitic past an accusative clitic, and to reorder the tucking-in dative > accusative cluster. It is possible that there is no such step in Czech, and the second position requirement of the clitic is satisfied by a combination of other movements; Toman (1999) explores such an approach. Alternatively, there is a step of presumably X0-incorporation into some functional category. This would be fed by the A-system along the lines of Sportiche's proposal reviewed in Sportiche (1996: 244), where clitics undergo XP-movement to a landing site from which clitic-to-head incorporation takes place. The amount of cross-linguistic variation in this domain is large: second position clitics differ strikingly from Romance-style head-adjoined clitics, and within Romance clitic ordering shows both dative > accusative and accusative > dative orders as well as ordering principles based on such features as person (see Bonet 1991, Desouvrey, this volume, Nicol, this volume).

---

28 Sportiche (1996) claims that en-cliticization in French displays the Ā-properties of not binding anaphora (p. 253) and licensing parasitic gaps (p. 255), although it counts for Condition C (p. 252-4). If correct, this sets it apart from Czech argumental clitics, and from French accusative and dative clitics as well, since they do not have the same properties (ibid. p. 256 for the failure of accusatives to license parasitic gaps). This is not unexpected given that it seems to extract the PP complement of a DP via [Spec, DP] (ibid. p. 225-6). See below on genitive clitics in Czech, supporting the idea that an Ā-position is involved.
In this respect, weak object pronouns in Icelandic (Jónsson 1996: 54-5, 67-9) make for a particularly good comparison with Czech. Like Object Shifted arguments, they must keep the dative > accusative order (cf. ex. (39) above); but unlike them, they cannot be separated from T by adverbs (51)a. Thus cliticization is involved. Nevertheless, T-to-C movement in (51)b separates the verb in T from the clitic by moving it over the subject, showing that there is no incorporation of the Romance kind:

(51) a. *Jón las {ðað/bókina} líklega {*ðað/?bókina} aldrei
   'John probably never read it.' (Jónsson 1996: 68)

b. *Samt las {{*ðað} Jón {ðað} ekki
   yet read it-A John-N it-A not
   'Yet John has not read it.' (Jónsson 1996: 55)

We thus have here XP A-movement feeding a cliticization step that brings the clitic into adjacency to T, but that does not actually incorporate it into T and lets T-to-C movement separate it from the verb in T. Again, the step of cliticization need not be an actual movement of the clitic, but rather a requirement on the part of the clitic that filters derivations where an adverb ends up intervening between it and T. The fact that the phonological content of the functional category targeted by cliticization can displace without the clitic is promising. It offers a parallel the fact that the Czech second position cluster is not tied to any overt head or designated specifier. It is simply after the first XP, whatever may fill it regardless of interpretation and movement, and wherever the verb may be.

Importantly, the cliticization step is limited: essentially, it can pull clitics out of the last step of A-movement, keep the ordering given by the A-system, and move them a short distance to a designated functional category within the same clause. The syntax otherwise manipulates clitics not as clitics, but on a clitic-independent basis as full XPs, by the same A-system that produces XP A-movement. The extensions to se clitics and genitive clitics suggested above offer the possibility that all properties of the cluster except for clustering reflect clitic-independent syntactic properties.
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