

## Abstract

*Considering clitic climbing an instance of  $X^0$  movement, we propose in this work that it follows the process of  $T$ (ense) raising (to the matrix Tense).  $T^0$  raising has the effect of coindexing subject positions, thus it only occurs in subject control and raising contexts correlating exclusively with infinitives in Romance. The idea that clitic climbing involves  $I^0$  raising with coindexing effects is present in Kayne (1989). In this work we argue that it is  $T^0$  in particular that undergoes raising and support this claim with evidence from Salentino and Serbo-Croatian, both of which are languages that lack infinitives but manifest clitic climbing out of finite restructuring contexts inflected for Tense. A number of issues concerning the adjunction site of clitics are also addressed.*

## 1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the phenomenon of clitic climbing, discussed primarily in the context of Romance languages and illustrated below with a typical example from Spanish. It is shown in (1) that while the pronominal clitic *lo*, which is an argument of the lower predicate, appears in the same clause with it in (1a), it can also be found in the matrix clause in (1b).

---

1. While writing this paper I was supported by SSHRCC Grant #410-91-0178 awarded to M. L. Rivero. Different parts of it have been presented at LSA 1993 in Los Angeles, Georgetown University, the University of Venice and the First Conference on Formal Approaches to South Slavic Syntax in Plovdiv, Bulgaria, and I would like to thank the audiences of those events for their questions and comments. I am especially indebted to G. Cinque, R. Kayne, M. L. Rivero, R. Zanuttini for extensive discussion, and L. Progovac for data and comments. Finally, deepest thanks to A. Calabrese for discussion and continuous supply of data, without which this paper would have not been written.

- (1) a. *Juan quiere leerlo.*  
 Juan want-3SG read-INFN.it  
 b. *Juan lo quiere leer.*  
 Juan it want-3SG read-INFN  
 'Juan wants to read it.'

A main issue this work addresses is why clitic climbing takes place in the context of infinitival subordinate clauses in the standard Romance languages, (1b), but is excluded from finite clauses selected by the same predicates, (2b).

- (2) a. *Juan quiere que lo lea.*  
 Juan want-3SG COMP it read-3SG-SUB  
 b. \**Juan lo quiere que lea.*  
 Juan it want-3SG COMP read-3SG-SUB

Alternatively put, why do the standard Romance languages contrast with languages of the Balkan clausal type, such as Salentino or Serbo-Croatian, in which clitic climbing out of finite clauses is possible, as demonstrated by (3b) and (4b). Furthermore, how does this contrast contribute to a better understanding of clitic climbing in general?

- (3) a. *Karlu voli lu kkatta.* (Salentino)  
 Karlu want-3SG it buy-3SG  
 b. *Karlu lu voli kkatta.*  
 Karlu it want-3SG buy-3SG  
 'Karlu wants to buy it.'
- (4) a. *Milan želi da ga vidi.* (Serbo-Croatian)  
 Milan want-3SG COMP him see-3SG  
 b. \**Milan ga želi da vidi.*  
 Milan him want-3SG COMP see-3SG  
 'Milan wants to see him.'

To anticipate some of the conclusions reached in the paper, I argue that clitic climbing is a consequence of (the embedded) T<sup>0</sup> raising. This amounts to saying that while I consider clitic climbing an instance of head movement, blocked by interfering X<sup>0</sup> elements, along the lines of Kayne (1989, 1991), Zanuttini (1991), Roberts (1994), I take it to be movement of T<sup>0</sup> rather than of the clitic. In the standard Romance languages T<sup>0</sup> raising has the additional effect of carrying along the clitic(s) by virtue of them adjoining to the infinitival T<sup>0</sup> (Terzi 1995). In Salentino, restructuring verbs select for finite clauses introduced by the subjunctive marker, or M<sup>0</sup>; M<sup>0</sup> is omitted in the context of T<sup>0</sup> raising and only then is clitic climbing possible. Serbo-Croatian, which also manifests clitic climbing out of finite clauses offers further support to the idea of T<sup>0</sup> raising, as clitic climbing is attested only when matrix and embedded Tenses are identical (a requirement that also holds for Salentino M<sup>0</sup> omission).

I claim that T<sup>0</sup> raising has the effect of co-indexing subject positions, and, as a result, it is constrained by the requirement to proceed via clauses whose subjects are coreferent (thus, may not be contra-indexed [Terzi 1994]). Since such contexts are subject control and raising contexts, and are restricted to infinitivals in the standard Romance, clitic climbing is also restricted to infinitivals. By contrast, since subject control and raising is manifested in finite clauses in Salentino and Serbo-Croatian, clitic climbing from finite complement clauses is possible in these languages. Clitic climbing occurs in the presence of a lexical complementizer in Serbo-Croatian. I claim that this is so because Serbo-Croatian clitics are XPs and relate their XP status to the second position restrictions they are subject.

## 2. Clitic climbing and the clausal structure of infinitives

This section offers an overview of previous accounts of clitic climbing by focusing on predictions they make as to why clitic climbing is excluded from finite complement clauses in the standard Romance languages, or, alternatively, why it is restricted to infinitivals. I demonstrate that, although the approach that considers restructuring contexts monoclausal explains the correlation of clitic climbing and infinitives, it must be abandoned on the basis of theoretical inadequacies. I also show that while attributing finite and infinitival clauses a similar Infl composition is a desirable direction, merely considering clitic climbing an instance of head movement blocked by intervening X<sup>0</sup> elements does not provide a full understanding of the issues under consideration.

### 2.1. Restructuring configurations as monoclausal

Although the co-occurrence of clitic climbing and infinitives has not been addressed directly in the Romance literature, the various approaches to clitic climbing (Luján 1980; Rizzi 1982; Burzio 1986; Kayne 1989, 1991; Rivero 1991; Roberts 1994 among others) provide a number of insights to the issue.

Picallo (1990) argues that restructuring complexes must be monosentential, otherwise movement of the clitic from its lower position in (5a) is blocked because VP constitutes a barrier (Chomsky 1986).<sup>2</sup>

2. We will not be concerned here with clitic placement, that is, with the process associating the cliticized position in (i) with the argument position of the clitic in (ii).

(i) *Lo lei /leerlo.*  
 it read-1SG read-INFN.it  
 'I read it/to read it.'

- (5) a. *La Joana* [<sub>Inf</sub> *pot* [<sub>VP</sub> *enviar-li* *cartes*]].  
 Joana may send-INFN-him/her letters  
 b. *La Joana* [<sub>Inf</sub> *li* *pot* [<sub>VP</sub> *enviar-e<sub>i</sub>* *cartes*]].  
 Joana him/her may send-INFN letters  
 'Joana may send letters to him/her.'

In a similar vein, Moore (1994) holds that Infl prevents the clitic from head-governing its lower position in examples such as (6b). Therefore, the infinitive in (6b) must involve no more structure than a bare VP.

- (6) a. *Curro* *quiere* *conocer-te*.  
 Curro want-3SG know-INFN.you  
 b. *Curro* *te<sub>i</sub>* *quiere* [<sub>VP</sub> *conocer* *e<sub>i</sub>*].  
 Curro you want-3SG know-INFN  
 'Curro wants to know you.'

Presumably, clitic climbing out of finite clauses is ruled out by the above approaches because finiteness implies the presence of functional heads which check features of the verb while at the same time act as minimality blockers for clitic climbing.

A number of views to the clausal structure of infinitives suggest that this line of reasoning is not on the right track however. Raposo (1987) and Kayne (1991) provide evidence for the functional head Inf dominating the Romance infinitival suffix and Kayne (1991) argues for an empty functional head immediately above Inf to which clitics adjoin.<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, according to Chomsky and Lasnik (1991), Chomsky (1993, 1995) and subsequent work (Martin 1993), infinitival T<sup>0</sup> is indispensable for null Case checking of PRO in its specifier position. Thus, adopting Pollock's (1989) order of inflectional heads, (7) is a more accurate representation of the clausal structure of infinitives.

- (7)  $V_{\text{matrix}} \dots [T \dots [AgrS [AgrO \dots [VP V_{\text{Inf}} ] ] ] ] - CI$

Therefore, if clitic climbing began from the position the clitic occupies in (7), as is assumed for (5) and (6) by the monoclausal type of approaches, it should be also blocked by (the functional heads that compose) infinitival Infl, but this is not the case.

- (ii) *Le<sub>i</sub>* *el* *libro/leer* *el* *libro*.  
 read-1SG the book read-INFN the book  
 'I read the book/to read the book.'

For the purposes of this work, we will follow Sportiche (1992) in that clitic placement involves both X<sup>0</sup> and XP movement from the argument position. What is relevant for us is that movement at the initial step of cliticization is not related with the finiteness of the associated predicate.

3. Uriagereka (1995) proposes the functional head F<sup>0</sup> which serves as host of clitics in both finite and infinitival clauses.

Another argument as to why the co-occurrence of clitic climbing and infinitivals is unlikely to be due to the Infl (or rather, the lack of Infl) of infinitives is offered by recent accounts (Kayne 1991, 1994; Terzi 1995) which sustain that in examples like (5) and (6) clitics adjoin to some functional head to the left of the verb, rather than to its right, roughly as in (8).<sup>4</sup>

- (8)  $V_{\text{matrix}} \dots Cl \dots [T \dots [Agr \dots [VP V_{\text{Inf}}(F_{\text{Inf}})]]]$

Considering clitics that are associated with infinitives to adjoin to the left of some IP-head amounts to saying that the embedded IP is not crossed by clitic climbing. Therefore, the issue of whether the complements of restructuring verbs are IPs or bare VPs becomes immaterial, as only functional heads to the left of the clitic have the effect of blocking clitic climbing.

Along these lines, it is then incorrect to conclude that clitic climbing is absent from a *pro*-drop Romance language like Rumanian on the general grounds that it lacks infinitives in potential restructuring contexts (9). Such a reasoning is perhaps incited by contrasts such as between (9) — where the subordinate clause is a Balkan-type subjunctive and clitic climbing is impossible — and (10) — where clitic climbing is attested in one of the few instances in which Rumanian utilizes true infinitives.

- (9) a. *Maria* *încearcă* *să* *o* *scrie*.  
 Mary tried-3SG M it write-3SG  
 b. \**Maria* *o* *încearcă* *să* *scrie*.  
 Mary it tried-3SG M write-3SG  
 'Mary tried to write it.'

- (10) *El* *pot* *minca*.  
 him can-1SG eat-INFN  
 'I can eat it.'

Since, however, clitics precede the embedded verb in (9a), it is unlikely that the finiteness of the embedded clause is in any way related to the ill-formedness of (9b).

To conclude, although clitic climbing correlates exclusively with infinitival subordinate clauses in the standard Romance languages, it is not obvious how the Infl composition of infinitives accounts for this correlation. Attributing

4. For a detailed discussion of the postverbal surface position of clitics in the context of infinitives, gerunds and imperatives in Greek and the Romance languages see Terzi (1995). In line with Kayne (1991, 1994) clitics are considered to always left-adjoin to a functional head to the left of the verb, as in (8), and their postverbal position is attributed to verb movement. Verb movement past the clitics results in incorporation of the verb into the clitic(s) (slightly altering an idea by Benincà and Cinque 1993) and subsequent movements involve the complex V+cl rather than the verb or clitic alone. This approach has to consider clitic climbing to take place before the clitic surfaces postverbally, and is consistent with the discussion around (8).

infinitives an impoverished clausal structure falls short of explaining the lack of clitic climbing from finite clauses by means of an ECP violation induced by finite Infl because, first, it is not clear that such a difference between infinitival and finite Infl indeed exists and second, because even if it existed it would not interact with clitic climbing, since clitic climbing does not cross the embedded Infl but rather begins from a position to its left.

## 2.2. Clitic climbing as $X^0$ movement out of CP complements

Considering clitic climbing to be an instance of  $X^0$  movement blocked by functional heads to the left of the highest IP-head (such as the  $X^0$  of [11]) is a way to account for the absence of clitic climbing from finite subordinate clauses without resorting to a different Infl make up for finite clauses than for infinitives.

- (11)  $V_{matrix} \dots X^0 \dots Cl \dots [_{T \dots} [_{Agr \dots} [_{VP} V_{Infn} ] ] ]$

That is, one can derive the ungrammaticality of sentences like (12b) from the blocking effect of the embedded  $C^0$ , along the same lines that Neg<sup>0</sup> blocks clitic climbing in run-of-the-mill restructuring configurations such as (13b) (Kayne 1989, 1991; Roberts 1994; Zanuttini 1991).

- (12) a. *Maria quiere que lo coma.*  
Mary want-3SG COMP it eat-3SG-SUB  
b. \**Maria lo quiere que coma.*  
Mary it want-3SG COMP eat-3SG-SUB  
'Mary want that he/she eats it.'
- (13) a. *Maria lo quiere comer.*  
Mary it want-3SG eat-INFN  
'Mary wants to eat it.'  
b. \**Maria lo quiere no comer.*  
Mary it want-3SG NEG eat-INFN  
'Mary does not want to eat it.'

According to this reasoning, the ungrammaticality of (9b) from Rumanian is attributed to the blocking effect of  $M^0$  (as in Terzi 1992).

- (9) a. *Maria încearca să o scrie.*  
Mary tried-3SG M it write-3SG  
b. \**Maria o încearca să scrie.*  
Mary it tried-3SG M write-3SG  
'Mary tried to write it.'

Despite the fact that this approach to clitic climbing holds a more realistic view of the clausal structure of infinitives, however, it does not provide an exhaustive account of the issues under consideration. First, it is not clear why the complementizer *que* does not block clitic climbing in a sentence such as (14b) from Spanish, as it arguably does in (12b).

- (14) a. *Tengo que hacerlo.*  
have-1SG COMP do-INFN it  
b. *Lo tengo que hacer.*  
it have-1SG COMP do-INFN  
'I have to do it.'

If we consider *que* to occupy Spec of CP in (14), as suggested in Kayne (1989), the ungrammaticality of (12b) is left unexplained.<sup>5</sup>

Second, one wonders why clitic climbing is not possible in the absence of a lexical complementizer, in examples such as (15), for instance, where the matrix verb, *esperar* 'hope', is a restructuring verb, as demonstrated by (16b).

- (15) a. *Espero lo comas rápido.*  
hope-1SG it eat-2SG-SUB quickly  
b. \**Lo espero comas rápido.*  
it hope-1SG eat-2SG quickly  
'I hope you eat it quickly.'
- (16) a. *Espero comerlo rápido.*  
hope-1SG eat-INFN quickly  
b. *Lo espero comer rápido.*  
it hope-1SG eat-INFN quickly  
'I hope to eat it quickly.'

To conclude, although the approach that considers clitic climbing to be an instance of head movement, blocked by functional heads to the left of IP, has the advantage of postulating a similar Infl make up for infinitival and finite clauses, it does not explain why clitic climbing from finite clauses is not licit in

5. Notice, however, that clitic climbing is blocked in a number of cases by a *wh*-phrase, which presumably occupies Spec of CP as well.

- (i) \**No lo sé dónde hacer.*  
NEG it know-1SG where do-INFN  
'I don't know where to do it.'
- (ii) \**No te sé qué decir.*  
NEG you know-1SG what tell-INFN  
'I don't know what to tell you.'

The contrast between (14) and the above examples can be explained if we postulate an empty *wh*-operator in  $C^0$  in the latter case (see Terzi 1992). No such operator is in any obvious way present in (14).

a number of instances where no  $X^0$  elements block it. An answer to this question is even more imperative under recent views that consider clitic climbing to begin from a position to the left of the embedded IP in both finite and infinitival sentences (Kayne 1991, 1994; Terzi 1995).

### 3. Clitic climbing and co-indexed subjects

In this section I propose that clitic climbing is not only constrained by the blocking effect of intervening functional heads which induce the familiar ECP violations, but also by the requirement that the subject positions of the clauses through which clitics move be co-indexed (Terzi 1994). Since in the standard Romance languages it is only infinitival subjects that can be co-indexed with the subjects of their superordinate clause (by virtue of being coreferent with them in subject control or raising configurations), clitic climbing is restricted to infinitives. Since subject control and raising involve finite clauses in Salentino, clitic climbing is manifested in the context of finite complement clauses. I propose that the constraint on co-indexed subjects, which holds across both finite and infinitival restructuring contexts, is a consequence of (embedded)  $T^0$  raising. In the standard Romance languages clitics adjoin to the  $T^0$  of infinitives and  $T^0$  raising carries them along to the matrix clause. In Salentino, where both verbs are finite,  $T^0$  raising may only occur under identity of matrix and embedded Tenses.

#### 3.1. Clitic climbing and finite subordinates in standard Romance

In line with Kayne (1989, 1991) and Roberts (1994) I hold that clitic climbing is an instance of  $X^0$  movement before spell-out in the Romance languages, thus, is blocked by intervening  $X^0$  elements.<sup>6</sup> However, I would like to propose that

6. To be more precise, Roberts (1994), as well as Treviño (1993), hold that clitic climbing involves both  $X^0$  and XP movement. As a reviewer points out, clitic climbing over negation is attested in Spanish restructuring contexts with a modal matrix verb.

(i) *Lo puedo no comer.*  
it can-1SG NEG eat-INFN  
'I cannot eat it.'

Treviño (1993) considers examples like the above similar to monoclausal structures with the modal verb resembling an auxiliary. Treviño's idea is that clitic movement over negation may be possible if Neg and clitics are of different X-bar status, and is along the lines of her proposal that clitics move as both  $X^0$ 's and XPs. That leads us to conclude that *no* in (i) is an XP. Another context in which clitic climbing takes place over what appears to be an  $X^0$  element are prepositional complements:

clitic climbing is also constrained by the requirement that movement of clitics take place via clauses whose subject positions can be co-indexed (Terzi 1994). The first part of the approach I am suggesting explains why clitic climbing cannot take place out of finite clauses headed by a lexical complementizer: a  $C^0$  or, for that matter, any  $X^0$  element induces an ECP violation. Clitic climbing out of infinitival subordinates such as (17) below is excluded for similar reasons.

- (17) \**No lo se si hacer.*  
NEG it know-1SG if do-INFN  
'I don't know whether to do it.'

That is, we account for the illformedness of (17) and, in general, for the absence of clitic climbing from clauses headed by a lexical complementizer by considering clitic climbing to involve substitution into an empty  $C^0$ , while excluding the possibility of clitic movement via adjunction to  $C^0$  by virtue of C being a non-L-related head (as in Roberts 1994).

The second part of my approach explains why clitic climbing is not possible when no functional heads such as  $C^0$  (or  $Neg^0$ ) intervene and is illustrated by the examples that follow. In a standard example where clitic climbing is licit, that is, (18), matrix and embedded subjects are coreferent, thus, they can be co-indexed. Furthermore, no  $X^0$  element blocks the movement of the clitic *lo* from the lower clause:

- (18) *Juan<sub>j</sub> lo quiere pro<sub>j</sub> leer.*  
Juan it want-3SG read-INFN  
'Juan wants to read it.'

Clitic climbing is excluded, however, from an object control configuration such as (19), although no functional heads block it. I attribute the ungrammaticality of (19) to the fact that no co-indexing of the two subjects can be established, since the PRO subject of the infinitive is coreferent with the matrix object.

- (19) \**María<sub>i</sub> lo convenció a Juan<sub>j</sub> de PRO<sub>j</sub> comer.*  
Mary it convinced-1SG a Juan de eat-INFN  
'I convinced Juan to eat it.'

The same reasoning explains the impossibility of clitic climbing from finite clauses: the ungrammaticality of sentences such as (20) below is not simply a result of the blocking effect of the complementizer (and it might not actually be,

(ii) *Lo considero difícil de hacer.*  
it consider-1SG difficult de do-INFN  
'I consider it difficult to do it.'

Kayne (1989) considers the *di* of the Italian counterparts of (ii) to be the Specifier of an empty  $C^0$ , an idea we can extend to the Spanish examples above. See also Zaring (1993) for a detailed discussion of the *à* and *de* of French.

if we consider *que* to occupy Spec of CP, as in we did in [14b]) but of the fact that matrix and embedded subjects are disjoint in reference, and therefore cannot be co-indexed.

- (20) \**María, lo quiere que pro<sub>y,1</sub> coma.*  
 Mary it want-3SG that eat-3SG-SUB.  
 'Mary wants him/her to eat it.'

This is why clitic climbing from a subjunctive subordinate without a lexical complementizer is also excluded:

- (21) \**Lo espero coma rápido.*  
 it hope-1SG eat-2SG/1SG-SUB quickly  
 'I hope you/I eat it quickly.'

*Esperar*, which is a restructuring verb, selects for a subjunctive sentential complement in (21). The embedded subject is disjoint in reference from the matrix subject, manifesting the well-known obviation effects of Romance subjunctives (Picallo 1985, Rizzi 1990). As a consequence, co-indexing of the two subject positions cannot be established and clitic climbing cannot take place. Thus, my proposal accounts for (19) through (21) on similar grounds, namely, by attributing the ungrammaticality of all three sentences to the fact that matrix and embedded subjects cannot be co-indexed. This is not a surprising direction, because by considering clitic climbing an instance of X<sup>0</sup> movement alone, we would be unable to explain why it is excluded from the above paradigm where no X<sup>0</sup> elements intervene.<sup>7</sup>

It is desirable to relate the requirement on co-indexed subjects, to which I attribute the impossibility of clitic climbing from finite clauses in the standard Romance, to some other property of restructuring contexts. I would like to propose that clitic climbing follows from a process of T<sup>0</sup> raising via which the infinitival T<sup>0</sup> moves to the embedded C<sup>0</sup> and then to the matrix T<sup>0</sup>. This movement has the effect of co-indexing matrix and embedded Tenses, and consequently matrix and embedded subjects as well. Since in the paradigm (19)–(21) the subject positions are disjoint in reference, they cannot be co-

indexed in the process of T<sup>0</sup> raising; therefore, T<sup>0</sup> raising cannot take place and clitic climbing is not manifested either.

In the spirit of Kayne's (1994) Linear Correspondence Axiom, it is argued in Terzi (1995) that clitics left-adjoin to the non-lexical T<sup>0</sup> of infinitives in the Romance languages:<sup>8</sup>

- (22) [C ... [Neg I<sub>T</sub> Cl I<sub>T</sub> 0 [Agr ... [V ... ]]]]]<sup>9</sup>

If this line of reasoning is on the right track, clitic climbing in the standard Romance can be viewed as direct manifestation of T<sup>0</sup> raising, in the sense that clitics move along with T<sup>0</sup>. That is, movement of the embedded T<sup>0</sup> to the matrix one, apart from co-indexing subject positions, also carries along the clitic(s) — which are finally found to the left of the matrix verb as in (23).

- (23) 
$$\begin{array}{c} V \\ \uparrow \\ \text{max} \dots [C] J [I_T] Cl [I_T] \emptyset [Agr \dots [V \dots ]]]] \end{array}$$

That clitic climbing is associated with T<sup>0</sup> raising, rather than the I/Agr raising proposed in Kayne (1989), is suggested, first, by recent claims according to which clitics left-adjoin to T<sup>0</sup> rather than to Agr<sup>0</sup> (Kayne 1991; Terzi 1995) and, second, by the fact that T<sup>0</sup> raising — which is less transparent in the standard Romance where complements of restructuring verbs do not show Tense alternations — is easier to observe in counterpart structures with finite clauses, as we will see in the following sections. As to why clitic climbing is not the result of V-raising, see footnote 4.

To summarize, considering clitic climbing an instance of X<sup>0</sup> movement which proceeds successive cyclically via the embedded C<sup>0</sup> position, and is blocked by intervening X<sup>0</sup> elements, I propose that it is movement of the embedded Tense (T<sup>0</sup>) (with the clitics adjoined to it in Standard Romance). The process of T<sup>0</sup> raising has the effect of co-indexing subject positions, thus, does not take place when subjects can be contra-indexed, explaining why clitic climbing is restricted to infinitivals in the standard Romance languages.<sup>10</sup>

8. But also, to the T<sup>0</sup> of imperatives and gerunds. By contrast, clitics adjoin to an abstract functional head, F<sup>0</sup>, devoid of features in finite clauses (Terzi 1995):

- (i) [C ... [Neg I<sub>F</sub> Cl I<sub>F</sub> 0 I<sub>T</sub> ... [Agr ... [V ... ]]]]]

Adjunction of clitics to Agr is excluded from both finite and infinitival contexts as it results in multiple adjunction once the verb moves to Agr for feature checking.

9. Notice that the view which considers clitics to adjoin to a functional head to the left of the verb in infinitival structures (that is, [22]) renders the surface order of restructuring contexts comparable to that of SOV languages (where object movement is subject to similar constraints in instances of Long Distance Scrambling [Müller and Sternefeld 1993; Grewendorf and Sabel 1994]).

10. An apparent counterexample to the idea of subject co-indexing (pointed out to me by R. Kayne) is the following instance of clitic climbing from earlier French, where the impersonal matrix subject and PRO are not coreferent, yet clitic climbing is possible.

7. Issues related to (21) are discussed in Uriagereka (1988). He argues that the ungrammaticality of (i) and (ii) is due to different reasons.

- (i) \*\**Lo dije que puedas resolver.*  
 it said-1SG that can-2SG resolve-1FN  
 'I said you can resolve it.'  
 (ii) \**Lo espero puedas resolver.*  
 it hope-1SG can-2SG resolve-1FN  
 'I hope you can resolve it.'

Where he attributes the status of (i) to an ECP violation, he considers (ii) to violate a different sort of requirement, whose nature is ultimately interpretive.

## 3.2. Clitic climbing in Salentino

A central prediction of the previous section is that clitic climbing should be possible in configurations whose matrix and embedded subjects can be co-indexed, regardless of whether the subordinate clause is infinitival or not.

Evidence supporting this prediction, and, consequently the approach to clitic climbing advocated here, comes from Salentino of Brindisi. Salentino is a Southern Italian dialect with the clausal structure of the Balkan languages in the sense that volitional (among other) predicates select exclusively for M(ood) P(hrase). MP is headed by the subjunctive particle *M<sup>0</sup>*, which is followed by the embedded verb inflected for subject agreement and tense.<sup>11</sup>

- (24) *Karlu voli ku vveni kraï.*  
 Karlu want-3SG M come-3SG tomorrow  
 'Karlu wants (him/her) to come tomorrow.'

Just like in the Balkan languages (cf. Rumanian in [9b]), clitic climbing is impossible in Salentino in the presence of the subjunctive marker (25b).<sup>12</sup>

- (i) *Il le faut faire.*

(it) it is.necessary do-INFN

In view of structures such as (i) it may be suggested that dative subject has moved to the position of the impersonal after spell-out in (it) and rendered subject co-indexing possible.

- (ii) *Il me faut ces livres.*

(it) me is.necessary these books

Notice that the same process is not able to save the Spanish example in (iii). This can be attributed to the fact that *hacer falta* (contrary to *falloir*) agrees with a postverbal subject (iv), and thus the matrix subject has to be co-indexed with it instead.

- (iii) \**Me lo hace falta leer.*

me it is necessary read-INFN

- (iv) *Me hacen falta dos libros.*

me are necessary two books

A number of object control configurations which manifest clitic climbing will be considered instances of hidden causative constructions as in Kayne (1989).

11. Rivero (1994), and Terzi (1992) attribute the status of *M<sup>0</sup>* to the Balkan subjunctive particle, a functional head that is lower in the clause than *C<sup>0</sup>*. (i)=(24).

- (i) *Karlu voli* [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> *ku vveni kraï*]].

Karlu want-3SG *ku* come-3SG tomorrow

By contrast, Calabrese (1993) holds that Salentino *ku* is a complementizer that cliticizes onto the verb. Since both accounts agree as to the *X<sup>0</sup>* status of the subjunctive particle, we will not dwell here on whether *ku* is dominated by *M<sup>0</sup>* or *C<sup>0</sup>* since either alternative derives its blocking effect for clitic climbing (but see also footnote 15). For the sake of clarity, we will be referring to *ku* as *M<sup>0</sup>* throughout this paper.

12. On the other hand, just like in Rumanian, clitic climbing is obligatory in Salentino in the context of true infinitives.

- (i) *Maryu la poti kkattari.*  
 Maryu it can buy-INFN  
 'Maryu can buy it.'  
 (Salentino)

Considering clitic climbing an instance of head movement in Salentino as well, the ungrammaticality of (25b) follows directly from the blocking effect of *ku*.

- (25) a. *Voggyu ku lu kkattu.*<sup>13</sup>  
 want-1SG M it I.buy  
 b. \**Lu voggyu ku kkattu.*  
 it want-1SG PRT buy-1SG  
 'I want to buy it.'

But notice that, unlike any of the Balkan languages, the subjunctive marker can be omitted in Salentino (26b).<sup>14</sup>

- (ii) *Il poti minca.*  
 him can-1SG eat-INFN  
 'I can eat it.'  
 (Rumanian)

Salentino does not manifest the auxiliary switch of Italian; rather, only *aviri* is available. Long NP movement, typical of Italian restructuring contexts, is also unavailable in Salentino (Calabrese, personal communication).

13. Contrary to the standard Romance languages where the subjects of subjunctive complements of volitional verbs are disjoint in reference from the matrix subjects (i), the corresponding subjects in Salentino (and all Balkan languages) do not display obviation effects (ii) (see Terzi 1992 for discussion of these issues).

- (i) *Juanì, quere que pro<sub>ji</sub>, lo compie.*  
 Juan want-3SG COMP it buy-3SG  
 'John wants him/her to buy it.'  
 (ii) a. *Maryu, voli ku pro<sub>ji</sub>, lu kkattu.*  
 Maryu want-3SG M it buy-3SG  
 'Maryu wants (him/her) to buy it.'  
 b. *O Yiamis, theli na pro<sub>ji</sub>, lo agorasì.*  
 John want-3SG M it buy-3SG  
 'John wants (him/her) to buy it.'  
 (Spanish)  
 (Salentino)  
 (Greek)

14. It is not entirely clear why only in Salentino of all Balkan-type languages can *M<sup>0</sup>* be omitted. One possibility is that *ku*, unlike the subjunctive particle of the "mainland" Balkan languages, is a *C<sup>0</sup>* (as Calabrese (1993) has suggested) which, following the well-attested property of complementizers crosslinguistically, is omitted.

Diachronic evidence from Greek indicates that the omission of the subjunctive particle may indeed be related to its *C<sup>0</sup>* versus *M<sup>0</sup>* status. While the Modern Greek subjunctive particle *na*, which is undoubtedly an *M<sup>0</sup>*, is obligatory (cf. [i]), its antecedent in earlier stages of Greek, the *ina* of (ii), which was unambiguously a complementizer, could be omitted (See Longobardi 1989 for a discussion of the Ancient Greek *ina*).

- (i) *Thelete \*(na) kanoum oi anthrōpoi.*  
 want-3PL M do-3PL the people  
 'You want that the people do.'  
 (ii) *...thetele (ina) poiōsi umin oi anthrōpoi.*  
 want-3PL that do-3PL to you the people  
 'You want that the people do to you.'

- (26) a. *Voggyu ku lu kkattu.*  
want-1SG M it buy-1SG  
b. *Voggyu lu kkattu.*  
want-1SG it buy-1SG  
'I want to buy it.'

M<sup>0</sup> omission may only occur, however, when matrix and embedded subjects are coreferent, as the following contrast illustrates:

- (27) a. *Voggyu ku vvyeni krai.*  
want-1SG M come-2SG tomorrow  
b. \**Voggyu vvyeni krai.*  
want-1SG come-2SG tomorrow  
'I want you to come tomorrow.'

When M<sup>0</sup> is not omitted, and in a way untypical for both Romance and Balkan languages, clitic climbing may take place in Salentino (28b).

- (28) a. *Karlu<sub>i</sub> voli lu pro<sub>i</sub> kkat<sub>ta</sub>.*  
Karlu want-3SG it buy-3SG  
b. *Karlu<sub>i</sub> lu voli pro<sub>i</sub> kkat<sub>ta</sub>.*  
Karlu it want-3SG buy-3SG  
'Karlu wants to buy it.'

Thus, Salentino of Brindisi demonstrates that clitic climbing from finite clauses is not impossible, as should indeed be expected given that no analysis has so far been able to rule it out in a principled manner. Furthermore, Salentino of Brindisi provides evidence that clitic climbing is confined to contexts whose subject positions can be co-indexed, suggesting that this is a requirement that holds across all restructuring configurations.

Further supportive evidence for the claim that clitic climbing may only take place in contexts whose subjects can be co-indexed comes from Salentino of Lecce. While the subjunctive marker may be omitted in Salentino of Lecce, its omission does not require coreferent subjects, as (29b) below illustrates.

- (29) a. *Ole<sub>i</sub> ku llu pro<sub>ij</sub> kkat<sub>ta</sub>.*  
want-3SG M it buy-3SG  
b. *Ole<sub>i</sub> llu pro<sub>ij</sub> kkat<sub>ta</sub>.*  
want-3SG it buy-3SG  
'S/he wants (him/her) to buy it.'

As Calabrese (1993) notes, contrary to Salentino of Brindisi, Salentino of Lecce does not manifest clitic climbing.

Returning to Salentino of Brindisi, something more has to be said about the conditions under which M<sup>0</sup> omission takes place. As (30) demonstrates, *ku* cannot be omitted in all environments with coreferent subjects, but appears to be sensitive to the Tense of the matrix clause (Calabrese, personal communication).

- (30) a. *Maria e vultu ku mandza.*  
Maria wanted-3SG M eat-3SG  
b. \**Maria e vultu mandza.*  
Maria wanted-3SG eat-3SG

That is, while M<sup>0</sup> may be omitted when both verbs are in the present tense (31b), this option is not available when the matrix verb is [-present], or else when each one of the verbs bears different tense features (30b).<sup>15</sup>

- (31) a. *Maria voli ku mandza.*  
Maria want-3SG M eat-3SG  
b. *Maria voli mandza.*  
Mary want-3SG eat-3SG

In light of the above facts and the proposals in the previous section, it appears that M<sup>0</sup> omission occurs in the context of T<sup>0</sup> raising in Salentino, but T<sup>0</sup> raising may only take place when matrix and embedded Tenses are identical. Since matrix and embedded Tenses are different in (30), T<sup>0</sup> raising cannot take place, and M<sup>0</sup> is not omitted. Thus, clitic climbing cannot take place either. Recall that we have associated T<sup>0</sup> raising with the further effect of co-indexing subject positions; this is why T<sup>0</sup> raising cannot take place in sentences such as (27), repeated below, where subjects are disjoint in reference. Consequently, M<sup>0</sup> cannot be omitted (27b), and clitic climbing cannot take place, despite the fact that both predicates are in the same Tense.

- (27) a. *Voggyu ku vvyeni krai.*  
want-1SG M come-2SG tomorrow  
b. \**Voggyu vvyeni krai.*  
want-1SG come-2SG tomorrow  
'I want you to come tomorrow.'

We see therefore, that the proposals made on the basis of the standard Romance languages carry over and find direct support in Salentino, where matrix and embedded verbs are overtly inflected for Tense and illustrate in a direct way the role that Tense plays in the process of clitic climbing. Contrary to the standard Romance, however, it is unlikely that T<sup>0</sup> raising carries the clitics along in Salentino. Since T<sup>0</sup> raising is associated with M<sup>0</sup> omission, we would expect clitic climbing to take place each time M<sup>0</sup> is omitted, but this is not true as (28), repeated below, demonstrates.

15. The verb of the embedded clause may only occur in the present Tense, thus we cannot test the option in which the Tense specifications of matrix and embedded verb differ in the opposite direction, that is, the matrix verb is [+present] and the embedded [-present].

- (28) a. *Karlu<sub>i</sub> voli lu pro<sub>i/rj</sub> kkatta.*  
 Karlu want-3SG it buy-3SG  
 b. *Karlu<sub>i</sub> lu voli pro<sub>i/rj</sub> kkatta.*  
 Karlu it want-3SG buy-3SG  
 'Karlu wants to buy it.'

Thus, if my analysis is on the right track, the contrast in (28a) versus (28b) indicates that T<sup>0</sup> raising, which we essentially consider to reflect the notion of restructuring or clause union (Rizzi 1982), although necessary for clitic climbing, can be independent of it in the sense that clitic climbing does not have to take place each time T<sup>0</sup> raising does.

The above reasoning also suggests that clitics adjoin to a functional head other than T<sup>0</sup> in Salentino and they are not carried along to the matrix clause in the process of T<sup>0</sup> raising. This is consistent with the idea in Terzi (1995) that in finite clauses, contrary to infinitives, clitics do not adjoin to T<sup>0</sup> but to a (featureless) functional head F<sup>0</sup> (see footnote 9). T<sup>0</sup> raising then presumably takes place after spell-out, this is why it is not blocked by M<sup>0</sup> (while clitic climbing is). Since clitics adjoin to the infinitival T<sup>0</sup> in the standard Romance, it is difficult to tell T<sup>0</sup> raising apart from clitic climbing, and both processes are most likely to occur in the overt syntax.

To conclude, this section provided an account of clitic climbing according to which the movement of clitics (and in the case of Romance infinitives, the movement of T<sup>0</sup> with the adjoined clitics) is not only blocked by intervening functional heads such as C<sup>0</sup>, Neg<sup>0</sup> or M<sup>0</sup>, but is also constrained by the requirement that the subject positions crossed on the way be coreferent, as only then can they be co-indexed. By focusing on Salentino, this section shed light on the issue of clitic climbing from perspectives not available from the study of the phenomenon in the context of standard Romance languages alone. Since Salentino demonstrates clitic climbing out of fully inflected subordinate clauses, it shows that clitic climbing cannot be related to the structural composition of infinitivals — despite the fact that it is restricted to infinitival complements in the standard Romance. Instead, since Salentino manifests clitic climbing in contexts with coreferent matrix and embedded subjects only, it argues that clitic climbing is associated with infinitivals in the standard Romance by virtue of them being the only contexts with coreferent subjects. Finally, the Salentino facts support the idea of clitic climbing as related to the Tense properties of restructuring contexts, more precisely to the idea of T<sup>0</sup> raising, a process which has been shown to take place only under identity of matrix and embedded Tenses in finite contexts.<sup>16,17</sup>

16. This amounts to saying that I consider the restructuring "character" of a verb to reflect its ability to allow for T<sup>0</sup> raising. A verb like *decir* 'say', for instance, does not allow for T<sup>0</sup>

#### 4. Clitic climbing in Serbo-Croatian

Serbo-Croatian is another language which, just like Salentino, manifests clitic climbing out of finite clauses.<sup>18</sup>

- (32) a. *Milan želi da ga vidi.*  
 Milan wish-3SG COMP him see-3SG  
 b. *?Milan ga želi da vidi.*  
 Milan him wish-3SG COMP see-3SG  
 'Milan wishes to see him.'  
 (from Progovac 1993)

As in the Romance languages, clitic climbing in Serbo-Croatian may take place only when matrix and embedded subjects are coreferent, thus examples like the following are ungrammatical:

- (33) *\*Milan ga želi da vidiš.*  
 Milan him wish-3SG COMP see-2SG  
 'Milan wishes you to see him.'

However, coreferent subjects are not a sufficient condition for clitic climbing. Although subjects are coreferent in both (34) and (35), only in (34) is clitic climbing an option.

- (34) *?Milan ga želi da vidi.*  
 Milan him wish-3SG COMP see-3SG  
 'Milan wishes to see him.'

raising, thus clitic climbing is not possible either, despite the fact that matrix and embedded subjects can be coindexed:

- (i) a. *Dijo verla.*  
 said-3SG see-INFN.it  
 b. *\*Lo dijo ver.*  
 it said-3SG see-INFN  
 '(He) said (him) to see it.'

17. The idea that clitic climbing is related to Tense is expressed in Luján (1980) and Quicoli (1976) but in a significantly different manner. Luján notes that the verbs that allow for clitic climbing are those which take infinitival complements with an independent Tense, relating this property with the possibility of these verbs to take a subjunctive complement as well (roughly as Quicoli 1976). Notice, however, that both accounts neither address nor are they in a position to account for the absence of clitic climbing from subjunctive subordinates of restructuring verbs. Furthermore, it is not obvious that they can provide an explanation for the Balkan facts we are considering.

18. It should be pointed out that clitic climbing is not a widespread phenomenon in Serbo-Croatian, and, when present, is not widely acceptable, hence the question mark in the relevant examples. It is more common in the Southern than in the Northern varieties.

- (35) \**Ne bih ga želeo da vidim.*  
 NEG COND wished-1SG COMP see-1SG  
 'I didn't wish to see him.'

Notice that (34) differs from (35) in that matrix and embedded verbs are in the same Tense, a contrast reminiscent of the environment in which M<sup>0</sup> omission takes place in Salentino (see [30] versus [31]).

That is, restructuring in Serbo-Croatian follows the pattern of Salentino supporting the view that T<sup>0</sup> raising, which is a necessary condition for clitic climbing, may only take place when matrix and embedded Tenses are identical. However, since T<sup>0</sup> raising has the further effect of co-indexing subject positions, it may take place only when such co-indexing can be established, thus the impossibility of T<sup>0</sup> raising (as manifested by the impossibility of clitic climbing) in (36), despite the identity of matrix and embedded Tenses.

- (36) \**Milan ga želi da vidiš.*  
 Milan him wish-3SG COMP see-2SG  
 'Milan wishes you to see him.'

Having argued consistently that clitic climbing involves head movement, blocked by X<sup>0</sup> elements in the Romance languages, one wonders why it is not blocked by the complementizer *da* in Serbo-Croatian, (32b), which unambiguously occupies the C<sup>0</sup> position.<sup>19</sup> I would like to propose that this is so because the movement the clitic undergoes in (32) is an instance of XP movement and, as a result, intervening X<sup>0</sup> elements do not block it. Moreover, the XP status of Serbo-Croatian clitics is closely related to the second position restrictions to which they are subject.

Several reasons support the idea that Serbo-Croatian pronominal clitics, unlike the Romance ones, are XPs rather than X<sup>0</sup>s. According to Rivero and Terzi (1995), in languages with second position restrictions (like Serbo-Croatian and Ancient Greek) clitics occupy the specifier position of the W(ackernagel) P(hrase), a phrase that complements CP and takes IP as its complement.

- (37) ...[<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>WP</sub> Cl [<sub>W</sub> [<sub>NEG P</sub> [<sub>IP</sub> ...]]]]]

19. Unlike the rest of the Balkan languages, where subjunctive complements are headed by M<sup>0</sup>, the element that introduces the Serbo-Croatian counterpart structures is a C<sup>0</sup>, as suggested by the position of the subject.

- (i) *Ion vrea (ca) Maria să (\*Maria) plece.*  
 John want-3SG COMP Maria M Mary leave-3SG  
 (Rumanian)
- (ii) *O Yiannis theli o i Maria na (\*Maria) figi.*  
 John want-3SG COMP Mary M leave-3SG  
 (Greek)
- (iii) *Jovan hoće da Maria ode.*  
 John want-3SG COMP Mary leave-3SG  
 'John wants Mary to leave.'  
 (Serbo-Croatian)

The position attributed to Serbo-Croatian clitics in (37), combined with Kayne's (1994) proposals concerning the adjunction possibilities of clitics, derives the fact that only one element in the clause can precede Serbo-Croatian clitics, and this element occupies either C<sup>0</sup> or Spec of CP. The following minimal pair from Serbo-Croatian and Romance, with clitics adjacent to C<sup>0</sup> (thus in Spec of WP) in the former, but adjacent to the verb (thus adjoined to I<sup>0</sup>) in the latter, illustrates the proximity of clitics and C<sup>0</sup> in Serbo-Croatian but not in the Romance (see Rivero and Terzi 1995 for more discussion).

- (38) *Žalim što ga Maria nije kupila.*  
 regret-1SG COMP it Mary not.has bought  
 (Serbo-Croatian)
- (39) *Lamento que Maria no lo haya comprado.*  
 regret-1SG COMP Mary not it has bought  
 'I regret that Mary has not bought it.'  
 (Spanish)

A direct consequence of the proposal that Serbo-Croatian clitics occupy Spec of WP is that they are X<sup>max</sup>.<sup>20</sup>

The idea of relating the second position restrictions of Serbo-Croatian clitics to their XP status further coincides with Barbosa's (1993) prosodic explanation of the ban on first position of Portuguese clitics. Focusing on those Portuguese clitics which, in a manner similar to the Serbo-Croatian ones, do not appear adjacent to the verb, (40) versus (41), Barbosa derives the impossibility of clitics appearing sentence initially from the fact that they cannot construct a prosodic word unless some X<sup>0</sup> element precedes them. Subsequently, they are considered to be XPs and are taken to adjoin to IP (see Barbosa 1993 for a detailed discussion).

- (40) *Žalim što ga Maria nije kupila.*  
 regret-1SG COMP it Mary not.has bought  
 (Serbo-Croatian)
- (41) *Ela prometeu que lhe nao diria nada.*  
 she promised COMP him not would.tell anything  
 'She promised that she wouldn't tell him anything.'  
 (Portuguese)

Transposing Barbosa's account of Portuguese interpolated clitics to Serbo-Croatian, I will consider the latter to be XPs as well, thus take them to occupy a Specifier position, in line with the conclusions reached on independent grounds by Rivero and Terzi (1995).

20. Shlonsky (1994) considers subject clitics to occupy a similar position in the clause in West Flemish, in particular Spec of AgrCP. A difference between West Flemish and Serbo-Croatian clitics is that the former are not subject to second position constraints, or else, they do not have

If Serbo-Croatian clitics are XPs rather than X<sup>0</sup>s, they move via XP movement utilizing the available Specifier positions, roughly as in (42).<sup>21</sup>

- (42)  $[_{CP} [_{WP} [_{W} [_{Neg} [_{T/I} \dots] ] ] ] ] ] ]$   $[_{CP} [_{C} [_{WP} Cl [_{W} [_{T/I} \dots] ] ] ] ] ]$

Therefore, intervening elements of X<sup>0</sup> status do not interfere and, as a result, clitic climbing over a lexical complementizer is licit (43) = (29):

- (43) a. *Milan želi da ga vidi.*  
Milan want-3SG COMP him see-3SG  
b. *?Milan ga želi da vidi.*  
Milan him want-3SG COMP see-3SG  
'Milan wants to see him.'

Thus, it is less of a surprise that clitic climbing may also take place in the presence of negation in Serbo-Croatian:

- (44) *Milan ga ne želi da vidi.*  
Milan it NEG want-3SG COMP see-3SG  
'Milan doesn't want to see it.'

By contrast, an XP such as *Petar* in the following clause acts a minimality blocker rendering clitic climbing impossible.

- (45) *\*Milan ga želi da Petar vidi.*  
Milan him want-3SG that Peter see-3SG  
'Milan wants Peter to see him.'

To summarize, Serbo-Croatian is another language which manifests clitic climbing out of finite clauses, demonstrating that there is nothing in the structural make up of a finite clause that excludes clitic climbing. Just like in Salentino, but also like in the standard Romance, clitic climbing in Serbo-Croatian may only take place via clauses with coreferent subjects demonstrating that, regardless of whether a finite or infinitival subordinate clause is involved in restructuring contexts, clitic climbing is an option only when subject positions can be co-indexed.<sup>22</sup> Just like Salentino, Serbo-Croatian also demonstrates that

21. Serbo-Croatian offers additional evidence to the idea that although T<sup>0</sup> raising is necessary for clitic climbing, the latter does not have to take place each time the former does. Since Serbo-Croatian clitics are XPs, they cannot be taken to adjoin to T<sup>0</sup>; therefore clitic climbing and T<sup>0</sup> raising must involve different movements. Thus, clitic climbing is dependent on identity of Tenses in Serbo-Croatian not because clitics adjoin to T<sup>0</sup> but because clitic climbing is dependent on restructuring (which amounts to T<sup>0</sup> raising — and this requires identity of Tenses).

22. But (45) is also ruled out because subject positions cannot be co-indexed.

23. In this sense we see clitic climbing as different from Long Distance Scrambling. Although both are phenomena subject to a somehow similar parametric variation, that is, in some languages they occur in the context of finite complement clauses and in others in infinitival only, clitic

the requirement on coreferent subjects is the result of T<sup>0</sup> raising which co-indexes subject positions and takes place only under identity of matrix and embedded Tenses. Finally, Serbo-Croatian provides us with a case where clitic climbing is a clear instance of XP rather than X<sup>0</sup> movement, thus, is subject to different constraints than the more familiar instances of clitic climbing.<sup>24</sup>

## 5. Conclusions

This paper investigated the factors underlying the co-occurrence of clitic climbing and infinitives or else the striking absence of clitic climbing from finite clauses in the majority of languages where the phenomenon is manifested. I argued that clitic climbing is excluded from finite subordinate clauses in the standard Romance because no co-indexing of their subject position can be established with the subjects of the matrix clause. Since only coreferent subjects can be co-indexed, but they amount to subject control and/or raising contexts which employ infinitives, clitic climbing is restricted to infinitives. My account predicts the possibility of clitic climbing from finite clauses provided subject control and/or raising involves finite complement clauses, and demonstrates how this prediction is borne out by Salentino and Serbo-Croatian.

I claim that co-indexed subject positions are the result of Tense raising, considering T<sup>0</sup> raising to reflect the notion of restructuring or clause union, concepts standardly associated with clitic climbing. I also claim that in the standard Romance languages T<sup>0</sup> raising carries the clitics along to the matrix clause but that in Salentino it doesn't since clitics adjoin to a functional head other than Tense providing evidence that T<sup>0</sup> raising does not always involve clitic climbing. In Salentino, where T<sup>0</sup> raising correlates with M<sup>0</sup> omission (and subsequent clitic climbing) it takes place only under identity of matrix and embedded Tenses and the same holds for Serbo-Croatian. Thus, since both Salentino and Serbo-Croatian are overtly inflected for Tense, they offer insights as to the role of Tense in restructuring that would have been missed had we only focused on the study of comparable structures with infinitival subordinate clauses.

Received 12 February 1995

Revised 15 January 1996

Technological Educational Institute  
Patras, Greece

climbing is always confined to configurations with coreferent subjects. By contrast, this requirement does not always hold for Long Distance Scrambling: while Long Distance Scrambling is exclusively associated with restructuring contexts in German (Grewendorf and Sabel 1994), the same is not true for Russian (Müller and Sternefeld 1993).

24. Therefore, it is not surprising that clitic climbing in Serbo-Croatian is subject to similar constraints as other instances of XP movement such as Topicalization (Progovac 1993) and Long Distance Scrambling (Kudra 1994).

## References

- Barbosa, Pilar (1993). Clitic placement in Old Romance and European Portuguese. Manuscript, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge.
- Benincà, Paola and Guglielmo Cinque (1993). Su alcune differenze fra enclisi e proclisi. In *Omiaggio a Gianfranco Foglia*, 2313–2336. Padova: Editoriale Programma.
- Burzio, Luigi (1986). *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Calabrese, Andrea (1993). Sentential complementation in a language without infinitival clauses: The case of Salentino. In *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, Adriana Belletti (ed.), 28–98. Turin: Rosenberg and Sellier.
- Chomsky, Noam and Howard Lasnik (1991). Principles and parameters theory. In *Syntax: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research*, Joachim Jacobs, Armin von Stechow, Wolfgang Sternefeld and Theo Vennemann (eds.), Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Chomsky, Noam (1986). *Barriers*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (1993). A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In *The View from Building 20*, Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Grewendorf, Günther and Joachim Sabel (1994). Long scrambling and incorporation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 263–309.
- Kayne, Richard (1989). Null subjects and clitic climbing. In *The Null Subject Parameter*, Osvaldo Jaeggli and Kenneth Safir (eds.), 239–262. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- (1991). Romance clitics, verb movement, and PRO. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647–686.
- (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Kudra, Danijela (1994). Scrambling in Serbo-Croatian as A-bar movement. Unpublished manuscript, University of Ottawa.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe (1989). Parametric syntax and the supposed coordinating function of the Gothic complementizer *ei*. In *Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon, Studies in honor of Wim de Geest*, Dany Jaspers, Wim Klooster, Yvan Putseys and Pieter Seuren (eds.), 295–304. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Luján, Martha (1980). Clitic promotion and mood in Spanish verbal complements. *Linguistics* 18: 381–484.
- Martin, Roger (1993). On the distribution and Case features of PRO. Paper presented at the LSA Winter Meeting.
- Moore, John (1994). Romance cliticization and relativized minimality. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 335–344.
- Müller, Gereon and Wolfgang Sternefeld (1993). Improper movement and unambiguous binding. *Linguistic Inquiry* 24: 461–507.
- Picallo, M. Carme (1985). Opaque domains. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, CUNY Graduate Center.
- (1990). Modal verbs in Catalan. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 8: 285–312.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. (1993). Locality and subjunctive-like complements in Serbo-Croatian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1: 116–144.
- Quicoli, Carlos (1976). Conditions on clitic-movement in Portuguese. *Linguistic Analysis* 2: 199–223.
- Raposo, Eduardo (1987). Romance infinitival clauses and Case theory. In *Studies in Romance Languages*, Carol Neidle and Rafael Nuñez-Cedeño (eds.), 237–249. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rivero, María Luisa (1991). Clitic and NP climbing in Old Spanish. In *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, Hector Campos and F. Martínez-Gil (eds.), 241–282. Georgetown University Press.
- (1994). Clause structure and V-movement in the languages of the Balkans. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 63–120.
- Rivero, María Luisa and Arhonto Terzi (1995). Imperatives, V-movement and logical mood. *The Journal of Linguistics* 31: 301–332.
- Rizzi, Luigi (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- (1990). On the anaphor-agreement effect. *Rivista di Linguistica* 2: 27–42.
- Roberts, Ian (1994). Two types of head-movement in Romance. In *Verb Movement*, Norbert Hornstein and David Lightfoot (eds.), 207–242. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Slonsky, Ur (1994). Agreement in Comp. *The Linguistic Review* 11: 351–376.
- Sportiche, Dominique (1992). Clitic constructions. Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Los Angeles.
- Terzi, Arhonto (1992). PRO in finite clauses: A study of the inflectional heads of the Balkan languages. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, CUNY Graduate Center.
- (1994). Clitic climbing from finite clauses and long head movement. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 3: 97–122.
- (1995). The linear correspondence axiom and the adjunction site of clitics. In *Configurations*, Anna Maria di Sciullo (ed.), (to appear). Cornell Cascadilla Press.
- Treviño, Esthela (1993). El caso como rasgo de minimidad en el comportamiento de los clíticos. In *Los Pronombres Clíticos*, O. Fernández-Soriano (ed.), 284–308. Madrid: Taurus Universitaria.
- Uriagereka, Juan (1988). On government. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Connecticut.
- (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79–123.
- Zanuttini, Raffaella (1991). Syntactic properties of sentential negation: A comparative study of Romance languages. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
- Zaring, Laurie (1993). On a type of argument-island in French. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 11: 121–174.