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1 Introduction

“Restructuring” in Romance refers to constructions which appear to violate standard locality constraints, thereby presenting a challenge for syntactic theory. One of the most well-studied cases of restructuring is that of clitic climbing. This is illustrated in the Italian example (1a), in which the clitic lo, the apparent object of leggere, appears on the higher verb vuole. As shown in (1b), it can even move past more than one verb.

(1) a. Maria lo vuole leggere
   'Maria wants to read it'

b. Maria lo vuole poter leggere
   'Maria wants to be able to read it'

Such clitic climbing is possible only with certain verbs, such as voler and poter in (1), which I will refer to as the “trigger” verbs, following Aissen and Perlmutter (1983). Bleam (1994) argued in detail that clitic climbing causes problems for TAG, and that set-local multi-component TAG is required. In previous work (Kulick 1997), I have proposed that due to the limited nature of the trigger verbs (aspectuals, motion verbs, modals) they can be treated as “adjunct predicates” that adjoin into a TAG tree, as if they were raising verbs, taking advantage of their semantic “weakness”. An advantage of this approach is that the apparent unboundedness of clitic climbing, as in (1b), can be handled in TAG by repeated adjoinings of these trigger verbs. There are also several aspects of “restructuring” other than clitic-climbing (e.g., long reflexive passive, long tough-movement, Italian auxiliary change, etc.) which I cannot comment on here. The case of the long reflexive passive is discussed in Kulick (1997).

However, this “adjunct” predicate approach to clitic climbing in TAG is clearly insufficient for two other major cases of clitic climbing: the Romance causatives, and object-control verbs in Spanish such as permitir (Strozer 1977, Moore 1991). In this work I extend the analysis to handle these two cases. The relation of these cases to the “restructuring” trigger verbs has long been a matter of debate, and I argue that it is desirable that TAG enforces a sharp distinction between them. Still, an analysis must be given in TAG for these cases, and I propose a tree-local multi-component TAG analysis for both cases. This raises again the issue of the unboundedness of clitic climbing with these verbs.

2 Causatives

The Romance causative, as illustrated by the French example (2), of course has a number of unusual features which have been the focus of much research. As illustrated in (2), the word order and Case marking of the causee in the lower clause is strikingly different than the usual. Of particular interest here is that when the lower object is cliticized, as in (3),

(2) a. Marie a fait lire à la petite fille.
   'Mary made the girl read it'

b. Marie a fait la petite fille lire.
   'Mary made the girl read it'

(3) a. Marie a fait lire à la petite fille.
   'Mary made the girl read it'

b. Marie a fait la petite fille lire.
   'Mary made the girl read it'

2 Cinque has proposed that clitic climbing and other transparency effects can be handled by treating the trigger verbs as being “directly inserted in the extended projection of a lexical verb”, according to the abstract for a talk. This depends on the trigger verbs being limited to modal, aspectual, and motion verbs, which for Cinque correspond to functional heads, and so can be so inserted into the extended projection. Clearly, this proposal seems to have much in common with that in Kulick (1997). However, I have not seen Cinque’s full analysis, and so I cannot currently comment further on the connection.

3 I am putting aside here the faire-par causative.
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3 I am putting aside here the faire-par causative.
it appears on a fait rather than with the verb that it is semantically associated with, manger.

(2) Jean a fait manger ce gateau à Pierre
Jean has made eat the cake to Pierre
‘Jean made Pierre eat the cake

(3) Jean l’a fait manger à Pierre
Jean it has made eat to Pierre
‘Jean made Pierre it’

Clearly, the approach taken for the “adjunct predicates” is insufficient here. Adjoining fait or a fait into a tree which has both Jean and Pierre is absurd, since the latter tree would be a radical violation of the most basic principles of what constitutes an elementary tree.

There have been two basic approaches taken in TAG to handling the problem of non-local movement in the French causative. (Abellé 1991, Abellé 1993) treated faire as a co-anchor of an elementary tree headed by the infinitival verb. Then the clitic movement is local to an elementary tree, and there is no problem. Santorini and Heycock (1988) argue, however, that the French causative must be considered bi-clausal, and therefore two separate TAG trees, since the complement object is not able to passivize (unlike the case with the Italian causative). However, they did not discuss how to handle the clitic movement.

There are arguments for both approaches, but in this work I follow Santorini and Heycock (1988), and adopt a bi-clausal analysis. I extend Santorini and Heycock (1988)’s analysis to handle the clitic movement by using a tree-local multi-component TAG, which allows a tree set for Jean and a fait to wrap around le in le manger à Pierre. This depends on the clitic moving to the top of the manger tree.

One way to work this out is to use the tree set in (4ab) for the matrix clause, and the tree in (5) for the embedded clause. The derivation proceeds by (4b) adjoining at the TP node, while (4a) adjoins at the root of (5) to produce the tree (6) (this requires that the AgrSP node be treated as a TP node for purposes of adjoining). There are obviously some issues here concerning the Case marking and word-order which require further discussion. For now, I am assuming that the dative Case on Pierre is assigned by the causative verb, and that if the lower verb was intransitive, it would get accusative Case.

However, just as with the restructuring Case, it becomes a crucial question as to how unbounded such clitic movement is. For the causatives, this relates to the issue of how recursive causative formations are determined. As a reviewer notes, Abeille et al. (1996) argue that the causee is a true indirect object or direct object, depending on the transitivity of the lower verb. They note that when the lower verb takes a dative argument, then it is possible for the accusative causee to appear between the lower verb and its dative argument:

(1) Maire fera parler Jean à Paul
Marie will make Jean speak to Paul

Thus, the arguments of the causative and embedded verbs follow the unmarked ordering of clausal arguments in French. This is not expected given the type of analysis as in (6). However, these facts are not new, and were discussed in Santorini and Heycock (1988), in which they suggested, following Burzio (1986) that there are “late reordering rules” to fix up the order. I follow Santorini and Heycock (1988) in this regard, although such rules of course are somewhat undesirable.

Most of the arguments in Abellé et al. (1996) point out that the causative construction acts differently from a control construction, in terms of how the arguments of the two verbs can be reordered. While this is correct, I don’t see how it’s an argument against a structure as in (6) (again, assuming the existence of reordering rules), which is clearly not a control structure.

They also note that since quantitative en can be extracted out of an accusative causee, as in (2), this shows that it must be a structural object. However, since such extraction can also take place out what might be analyzed as a small-clause subject (3), it’s not clear to me how strong this argument is.

(2) Il en fera courir trois
He will make three of them run

(3) a. Paul entend 3 femmes chanter
b. Paul en entend 3 chanter

Their strongest argument, I think, concerns the ability of “tough movement” to take place across the causative in French. Clearly, for the approach taken here, this deserves further study.

4In work-in-progress, I propose using this same approach to handle long-distance-scrambling in German (Rambow 1994), thus hopefully unifying the machinery needed for these two cases of non-local movement.
There has been very little discussion of this issue in the literature, and the data is somewhat murky, but it seems to be the case that sentences with lower unaccusative verbs are acceptable. For example, (7b) has an additional causative verb on top of the causative construction in (7a). In such a case, it is possible to place a clitic for the causee (lui for à son fils) and for the object (le, for le pont), on a fait, as shown in (7c).

(7) a. Son fils a fait sauter le pont
   His son made blow up the bridge
   His son made the bridge blow up

   b. Elle a fait faire sauter le pont
   She made make blow up the bridge
   She made her son make the bridge blow up

   c. Elle le lui a fait faire sauter
   'She made him make it blow up' or
   'She had it blown up by him'

   d. Elle me l'a fait faire sauter
   'She made me make it blow up' or
   'She had it blown up by me'

I discuss the consequences for TAG of the possibility of sentences such as (7c), which appear to require the use of set-local MCTAG. However, there is a "trick" that can be done to allow a tree-local derivation for (7c), although space prohibits here any explanation of what I'm talking about. This approach, however, will not work for the case in which the clitics are in a different order, as in (7d), and I discuss the consequences of that.

3 Spanish object-control verbs

An example of clitic climbing with permitir is shown in (8ab), in which (b) shows that la can optionally move from arreglar to permitir.

(8) a. Juan le permitió arreglarla a Pedro
   Juan permitted Pedro to repair it

   b. Juan se la permitió arreglar a Pedro
   Juan permitted Pedro to repair it

Similar issues arise here as with the causatives. Again, the "adjunct predicate" analysis is inadequate, and a tree-local TAG analysis seems appropriate. Following the approach of Bleam (1994) and

---

6Kayne (1975) is an exception.
7For sentences with lower intransitive verbs, I have gotten mixed reactions from native speakers.
8le in (8a) is a clitic double of a Pedro, and a morphological rule changes le la to se la in (8b).
others (e.g., Moore 1991), I adopt a "reduced complement" analysis.

The question of unboundedness is quite interesting, since it seems to be the case that clitic climbing over these verbs is much more constrained than with the "adjunct predicate" trigger verbs, and speakers are very reluctant to accept even a highly simplified sentence such as (9b). This is true even for speakers who can accept clitic climbing over two or even three "adjunct predicates" without any hesitation.

(9) a. Juan ordenó permitir comprar
Juan ordered someone to permit to buy it
b. *Juan la ordenó permitir comprar

Since tree-local TAG can clearly handle such cases as (8b), it might be appropriate to say that the increased difficulty of clitic climbing in cases such as (9) is a reflection of the need to move to set-local TAG. However, the force of this argument is weakened if the same approach for clitic climbing out of two embedded clauses with the causatives (as in (7c)) can be applied in this case.

More interesting is the question of why the object-control verbs that allow clitic climbing in Spanish are limited to those that take dative, not accusative, controllers. I offer the tentative suggestion that the complements of accusative controllers such as forzar are not "defective" enough, since they take a preposition which takes a sentential complement, as in (10): (example from Bordelois (1988))

(10) *Se lo forzó a hablar
her-DAT him-ACC he forced to speak
. 'He forced him to speak to her

For this argument to go through, of course, the a in (10) must be fundamentally from the a that follows some of the "adjunct predicate" trigger verbs which do allow clitic climbing. It also depends on a correlation between the accusative controller taking prepositional complements, while the dative controllers do not. I am currently unsure whether this correlation holds fully, and of course it leaves open the question of why such a correlation might exist.

However, it is very interesting to note that the same facts concerning which object-control verbs allow long movement appear to hold for long-distance scrambling in German. Bayer and Kornfilt (1989) suggest that this is because all German verbs with accusative controllers can take "prepositional adverbs", while those with dative controllers do not. Thus, if the Romance data cooperates, it appears promising that there can be a unified explanation for the similar behavior of the object-control verbs in Spanish and German.
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