Minimal Link Constraint violations: Move vs. Agree

1. Introduction: This paper investigates the properties of Move vs. Agree in the case of ‘defective intervention’ in clitic doubling (CD) and Long Distance Agree (LDA) in Greek, Romanian & Spanish. So far, the relation between clitic doubling and agreement has been regarded from two divergent perspectives: i. clitics are subject-verb agreement (Rivas 1977, Jaeggli 1982, 1986, Borer 1984, Sünden 1988); ii. clitics undergo movement to their surface position (e.g. Kayne 1975, Torrego 1988, Uriagereka 1995, Sportiche 1992, 1998, Anagnostopoulou 2003). Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005) and Preminger (2008) show that cliticization repairs violations of the Minimal Link Constraint (MLC): the clitic in CD removes the intervening features of the c-commanding indirect object enabling the movement of the direct object or LDA between the subject in situ and the Raising verb.

2. The aim of the paper: Contrary to Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005) and Preminger (2008) this paper shows that clitic doubling in Romanian and Spanish (unlike in Greek) does not behave as predicted by the MLC in the case of defective intervention in multiple cliticization (with Move) and in raising construction with (Long Distance) Agree: i. First, we argue that the crosslinguistic variation in the properties of clitics to obviate defective intervention can be explained by a defragmented analysis of clitics: phi markers (phi-clitics) and determiners (D-clitics) (cf. Bleam 1999 Dechaine & Wiltshchko 2002, Anagnostopoulou 2005); ii. Second, the crosslinguistic variation of CD in raising and LDA is related to other syntactic properties: the distinction between double object constructions and prepositional constructions with ditransitives, clitic climbing and the status of the embedded clause as a phase. iii. Third, the theoretical aim is to show that CD and LDA are the outcome of two different operations Move vs. Agree but both are sensitive to MLC and both are regulated by a phase-based locality condition (the Phase Impenetrability Condition). (see Boeckx & Gallego 2008).

3. CD vs. LDA: Romanian, Spanish and Greek which systematically allow CD show LDA in raising constructions (cf. Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, Iordachioaia & Marchis 2009):

- **CD**

  (1) a. Ion îi trimite Mariet o scrisoare. Romanian
     Jon cl-dat. sends Mary-dat. a letter.

  (2) LDA

     a. [TP Au încetat [TP så citească [DP copiii]]]
     stopped.3pl subj. read.3pl children.the.pl
     Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005) analyzes cliticization as an overt feature movement construction with a PF reflex. Under this assumption, CD in (1) and LDA in (2) are the outcome of two different operations Move vs. Agree. Chomsky (2000) proposes a diagnostic to distinguish them: violations of Minimal Link Constraint (MLC) lead to ungrammaticality with Move and to default agreement with Agree (see Holmberg & Hróarsdóttir 2003 for Icelandic and Preminger 2009 for Basque):

- **Icelandic**

  (3) Manninum virðast [hestarnir vera seinir].
  The.man-sg-dat seem-pl the horses-pl-nom be slow
  ‘The man finds the horses slow.’

- **Holmberg & Hróarsdóttir (2003:12)**

  (4) Pað virðist/*virðast einhverjum mannir [hestarnir vera seinir]
  Expl seem-pl/*seem-pl some man-sg-dat the horses-pl-nom be slow
  ‘A man finds the horses slow.’

Moreover, clitic doubling is another strategy of obviating intervention effects in agree constructions as cliticization of IOs systematically licenses A-movement of themes, an operation blocked in the absence of clitics due to MLC (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003):

- **Greek**

  (5) [To vivlio], *(tis) charistike tis Marias tis apo ton Petro.
  The book cl-gen awarded the Mary-gen from the Peter
  We show that although Greek, Spanish and Romanian sentences with indirect object clitic doubling are double object construction (DOC) where the doubled DP/PP is introduced by an applicative head, v_{appl}, and c-commands the theme (cf. Demonte 1995, Diaconescu & Rivero 2005), Greek, Spanish & Romanian CD behaves differently with respect to intervention effects in the case of Move and Agree:

1. Move: Romanian & Spanish permit the DO cliticization in the absence of the dative clitic. This leads to MLC violation in Greek (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003:119):

   a. *(Se) la presente. b. (I)-am prezentat-o mamei.
   cl-dat cl-acc presented. cl-dat-have presented.cl-acc mother.

We show that although Greek, Spanish and Romanian sentences with indirect object clitic doubling are double object construction (DOC) where the doubled DP/PP is introduced by an applicative head, v_{appl}, and c-commands the theme (cf. Demonte 1995, Diaconescu & Rivero 2005), Greek, Spanish & Romanian CD behaves differently with respect to intervention effects in the case of Move and Agree:

1. Move: Romanian & Spanish permit the DO cliticization in the absence of the dative clitic. This leads to MLC violation in Greek (cf. Anagnostopoulou 2003:119):
‘I introduced her to him/her.’  ‘I have introduced her to my mother.’

In this paper, the dichotomy between Greek and Romanian & Spanish is accounted for on the basis of a defragmented analysis of clitics: clitics in Greek are determiners while dative clitics in Romanian and Spanish are agreement markers. Anagnostopoulou (2003) argues that Greek clitics have a +D feature, being [+Animate] and [+Gender]. This is shown by the fact that when the accusative clitic is unspecified for gender, it freely moves across the IO:

(7)  O Gianis to/ *tin edhose tis Marias.
    Gianis cl-acc-neut/*fem gave-3sg Mary-gen  (Anagnostopoulou 2003: 199)

In line with Anagnostopoulou (2003), we argue that the MLC effect in Greek is caused by a categorical animacy/gender D-feature of clitics in Greek while in Romanian & Spanish, dative clitics in (6) are devoid of D-features, being mere agreement markers on a par with neuter clitic to in (7).

2. Agree: In Greek, in both cliticization and raising constructions (RC), CD alleviates MLC violations (Anagnostopoulou 2003). Unlike Greek, Romanian & Spanish allow subject Raising and LDA (without default agreement) in Raising construction in the absence of the dative clitic. Moreover, Spanish even allows the clitic climbing in the matrix clause (10):

(8)  Polla dora fenete na *(tus) edose sara ton pedion
    ‘Many presents it seems subj cl gave Sara the children-gen
    many presents it seems to offer Sara to the children.’  (pc. Artemis Alexiadou)

(9)  (*le)-a început să (le) ofere (Moşul) copiilor multe cadouri.
    (Santa) cl-dat started-sg subj (cl-dat) offer (Santa) children.dat many presents.

(10)  (Santa) (les) empezó a ofrecre(les) (Santa) a los niños muchos regalos.
     Santa Claus cl-dat started-sg to offer-cl.dat (Santa)to the children many presents.

The data in (8), (9) & (10) present a two way distinction among these languages: i. Unlike Romanian and Spanish, Greek obligatory makes use of the indirect object clitics in the embedded clause in order to obviate locality effects; ii. In contrast to Romanian and Greek, Spanish allows the optional clitic climbing (CC) in the matrix clause in RCs. First, we account for the first variation by arguing in line with Anagnostopoulou (2003) that in Greek a sentence is a double object construction (with a v-applicative head) only if the indirect object is realized as a genitive and irrespectively whether the indirect object is clitic doubled. Hence, the genitive indirect object intervenes and its features must be removed by the clitic. In Romanian and Spanish, the sentences are DOC only when the clitic is presented (Demonte 1995, Bleam 1999, and Diaconescu & Rivero 2005). Second, we explain the variation between Greek & Romanian and Spanish with respect to clitic climbing, by arguing that in the former the subjunctive clauses have a different status: v phases. Crucially, Raising constructions in Spanish (10) do not involve monoclausal restructuring configuration as shown by the adverbial modification and the scope tests. In addition, in Salentino, clitic climbing can take place also when the embedded clause is a subjunctive clause with a missing subjunctive marker (cf. Terzi 1992):

(11)  Lu     we  *ku     kkatti.  (Salentino)
      cl  want subj buy-2sg

(12)  *Maria  o  încearcă *(să) scrie.  (Romanian)
      Maria cl-acc try subj write.

As cliticization is related to phi-feature movement and can only target phase heads: C and v* (Boeckx & Gallego 2008), clitics should not be able to move out of inflected clauses (cf. Chomsky’s Activity Condition). Thus, we explain the distinction between Greek & Romanian and Salentino & Spanish as follows: in the former subjunctive clauses are phases vP, deactivating the clitic for Case while in the latter the clitic remains active as the v is defective and cannot check its Case. An argument for the lack of v phase with CC is the absence of the subjunctive marker in Salentino.

3. Agree vs. Move: McGinnis (1998) and Chomsky (2000, 2001) provide evidence that Move and Agree behave differently with defective intervention and locality conditions. This paper shows that Agree and Move operations are both sensitive to defective intervention: the same minimality effects arise both in the cliticization (7) and in LDA (8). However, the defective intervention in LDA can be repaired either by default agreement in Icelandic languages (Holmberg & Hróarsdóttir 2003) or by clitic doubling (Greek and Basque). With respect to the locality constraints shown by Long Distance Agree and clitic climbing, we argue that both are restricted by the Phase Impenetrability Condition so that they cannot operate above the boundaries of C and v phase. Alboiu ((2006) and Alexiadou et. al (2009) assume that in Greek and Romanian, LDA subjunctives cannot be C phases in the absence of morphological & semantic Tense.