

Why Clitics Cannot Climb out of CP: A Discourse Approach*

Jakub Dotlačil
Utrecht University

1 Introduction

As is well-known, clitics do not need to stay in the same clause in which they originate. Under some circumstances they can move into a higher clause. This phenomenon is referred to in literature as *clitic climbing*. It is exemplified in (1). (All the data come from Czech, unless stated otherwise.)

- (1) Honza **ho_i** chce sníst *t_i*
Honza him_{ACC} wants eat_{INF}
'Honza wants to eat it.'

In this example the clitic *ho* 'him' is the argument of the embedded infinitival clause (the internal argument of the verb 'to eat') but it surfaces in the clitic position (=the Wackernagel position) of the matrix clause.¹

Two more examples of clitic climbing are given in (2a) and (2b):

- (2) a. Mára mi **ho_i** zakazovala jíst *t_i*
Mother me_{DAT} him_{ACC} forbid eat_{INF}
'Mother forbade me to eat it.' [Czech National Corpus]
b. ale stále nás **ho_i** nutila jíst *t_i*
but always us_{ACC} him_{ACC} forced eat_{INF}

* Thanks to Janneke ter Beek for many suggestions, most of which found their way into the paper in one way or another; thanks to Anne Sturgeon and Kriszta Szendrői for discussions on discourse characteristics of Czech, and to Rick Nouwen. Thanks also to two anonymous reviewers and the audience at FASL 15.

¹ For readability purposes I **boldface** every relevant clitic (every clitic that undergoes clitic climbing) and coindex it with *t* in the clause in which the clitic originates.

‘...but she always forced us to eat it.’ [Lenertová 2004]

As should be clear from examples (1)-(2b), clitic climbing can cross the boundary of an infinitival clause. Thus, one might be tempted to say that clitic climbing is an instance of \bar{A} -movement. However, clitic climbing is not as free as \bar{A} -movement in every case. Junghanns (2002), Lenertová (2004) observe that in Czech it cannot cross the CP boundary. (3a) shows that clitics cannot move out of a clause that is headed by the inflected *aby*-complementizer. (3b) shows that a *wh*-infinitival clause is an island for clitic climbing, as well.

- (3) a. *Podle mě **ho_i** chtěla abychom navštívili *t_i*
According me him_{ACC} wanted compl_{IPL} visit
‘According to me she wanted us to visit him.’
b. *Ale nevím **ho_i** opravdu jak zapisovat *t_i*
But not-know him_{ACC} really how record_{INF}
‘But I really do not know how to record it.’ [Lenertová 2004]

Crucially, CP is not an island for \bar{A} -movement in Czech (exemplified here on *wh*-movement):

- (4) a. Koho chceš abychom navštívili?
Who want compl_{IPL} visit
‘Who do you want us to visit?’
b. Co nevíš jak zapisovat?
What not-know how record_{INF}
‘What don’t you know how to record?’

This is the puzzle: why is clitic climbing more restricted than instances of \bar{A} -movement? In particular, why does CP block it? The rest of the paper provides an answer to this question.

The paper is organized as follows: the next section summarizes previous accounts of the puzzle and discusses their shortcomings. After that another explanation is developed which is based on two facts. First, it is demonstrated that movement out of CP is possible only under special discourse conditions (section 3). Second, it is shown that clitics cannot express the discourse functions that are required for movement out of CP. If both of these claims are right, the explanation for the puzzle

follows (section 5). However, this explanation also leads to some interesting consequences. As shown in section 5, the presented explanation is only applicable if movement is not triggered by discourse interpretation but rather, discourse interpretation is a mere consequence of independently-triggered movement (in line with Chomsky, 2001, but *contra* Sturgeon's (2006) work on Czech).

2 Previous accounts

There have been at least three accounts in Slavic literature that try to explain why clitic climbing is more restricted than \bar{A} -movement.

Progovac (1993)² makes two assumptions. First, clitics right-adjoin into C. Her second assumption is that clitics cannot undergo successive-cyclic movement. Thus, CP creates the first landing site for clitics but also a position from which clitics cannot move any further.

Of course, this story is successful only if one can find an independent support for each of the two hypotheses. Unfortunately, that is far from clear. First, Bošković (2001) presents handful of arguments against the assumption that clitics in Serbian are located in C. Some of these arguments are applicable to Czech, as well.³ Second, it is not clear why clitics should not be able to undergo successive-cyclic movement. This property is not derived, it is just stipulated in order to get empirical facts right. Of course, an analysis that avoids such a stipulation is preferable.

The second approach is presented in Veselovská (1995). Veselovská (1995) follows Rizzi's (1982) account of clitic climbing in Italian and suggests that clitics in Czech are heads. As such, they are subject to the Head Movement Constraint. Therefore, when moving out of the CP they cannot skip the intervening C-head. This has originally been assumed for Italian to account for the difference between (5a) and (5b):

² Her account has been developed to deal with Serbian data which I will say nothing about. My main concern is to see whether this approach could be applicable to the puzzle that I am focusing on.

³ Surprisingly enough, not all are. VP ellipsis cannot split the clitic cluster and adverbs retain subject-oriented reading even when preceded by pronominal clitics. Golden (2003) discusses differences between Serbian and Slovenian with respect to some other tests. Czech behaves like Slovenian and unlike Serbian.

- (5) a. Non **ti**_i saprei che dire *t*_i
 Not you know what tell
 'I would not know what to tell you.'
 b. *Non **lo**_i saprei se consigliare *t*_i
 Not him know whether to advise
 'I would not know whether to advise him.'

In (5b) *se* sits in the C. Therefore, the clitic *lo* cannot pass it on its way up to the higher clause. *Che* 'what' in (5a) is a phrase that sits in Spec, CP and therefore, the clitic can move across it into the matrix clause.

Unfortunately, this nice correlation breaks down once one discusses more data. As Cinque (2003) points out, clitic climbing out of CP is severely restricted. Other verbs than *sapere* do not allow it, as shown on *dire* 'tell' in (6):

- (6) *Me **lo**_i ha ditto a chi dare *t*_i
 Me it have told to whom give
 'He told me to whom to give it.' [Cinque, 2003, ex. 35c]

Notice that *a chi* 'to whom' is a phrase and thus is located in Spec, CP. Thus, under Rizzi's (1982) account this sentence is expected to be grammatical, contrary to the facts. Furthermore, Cinque notes that the difference between (5a) and (5b) has probably another source. The right generalization is, according to him, that clitic climbing out of a wh-clause is possible only if the sentence allows for a rhetorical reading without the wh-phrase. Whereas (5a) is equivalent to *Non ti saprei dire niente* 'I would not be able to tell you anything' there is no equivalent paraphrase of this type for (5b). This descriptive generalization cannot be captured by employing the Head Movement Constraint.

But no matter what the right explanation for the Italian facts are, it is important for the present discussion that in Czech there is no contrast between counterparts of (5a) and (5b):

- (7) a. *Já mu neví_m jakou historku říct
 I him not-know what story tell_{INF}
 'But I really do not know what to tell him.'
 b. *Já mu neví_m zda říct pravdu
 I him not-know whether say_{INF} truth

‘I do not know whether to tell him truth.’

Since *jakou historku* ‘what story’ is a phrase, the ungrammaticality of (7a) is unexpected if constraints on clitic climbing should follow from the Head Movement Constraint. Besides, clitics *can* climb across verbs or negation, which are heads *bona fide*. To conclude, as far as I know, there is no evidence that clitic climbing in Czech is subject to the Head Movement Constraint.

The third approach to clitic climbing is advocated in Rezac (2005). He assumes that clitic climbing is A-movement driven by the clitic’s need to get its Case licensed.⁴ This explains the fact that clitics cannot escape CP – since every A-movement is confined to a local TP (whatever the explanation is for such a fact; see, for example, Chomsky, 2000). However, in order to make this account fully work one would have to show that infinitival clauses from which clitics can move are smaller than TPs (in fact, they must be smaller than vPs – otherwise object clitics would not be able to move out). Rezac (2005) follows Wurmbrand (2001) and assumes that some verbs (so-called restructuring verbs) can subcategorize for a VP infinitival complement (restructuring infinitives). He argues that clitics can climb out of restructuring infinitives only.

However, this explanation is quite problematic. First, Wurmbrand (2001) shows for couple of unrelated languages that restructuring verbs constitute a small set. This set includes verbs like *try*, *manage*, *allow*, but not many more. On the other hand, clitic climbing in Czech is unrestricted. Clitics can climb out of any infinitival clause provided it is not a CP. In a corpus study (Dotlačil, 2005), I went through around 30 verbs that embed infinitives. None of them is incompatible with clitic climbing. If these were all restructuring verbs, Czech would present quite an anomalous case cross-linguistically (compare this to clitic climbing in Italian or Spanish, which does occur only with handful of verbs).

Second and more importantly, I believe that there are empirical problems with Rezac’s approach.

Rezac’s argumentation that clitic climbing is possible out of VPs only is based on arguments like the following. If they were just VPs, they

⁴ Rezac’s approach aims not only to explain restrictions on clitic climbing but also other issues, like clitic co-occurrence restrictions. Since this is irrelevant to the topic of this paper, I do not discuss these issues here.

should lack the subject (PRO): this is a testable prediction. Since Czech has subject-oriented possessive anaphors like *svůj* (I gloss it as ‘self’s’), it is expected that in case of clitic climbing the anaphor could not be bound by the infinitival subject (since the infinitival subject must be missing). Rezac claims that this is right, as witnessed by the following example (Rezac’s judgments):

- (8) *Pavel_i **je**_k Janovi_j přikázal dát *t_k* svými_{i/j} přátelům
Pavel them_{ACC} Jan_{DAT} ordered give_{INF} self’s friends
‘Pavel ordered Jan to give them to his friends.’

Here, *svým* cannot be bound by the infinitival subject (co-referential with ‘Jan’) because climbing occurred and therefore, according to Rezac, the subject is missing. Furthermore, *svým* cannot be bound by the higher subject (independent lexical property of the possessive anaphor in Czech). Data of this type would quite strongly support Rezac’s account. However, I personally find this data very weak. For myself, the sentence in (8) is ok (both interpretations of *svým* are possible).⁵

Another problem for Rezac’s approach has been noticed by Lenertová (2004). If clitic climbing was driven by the need of Case licensing we would expect it not to occur if the higher clause cannot license the clitic’s Case. But that is wrong. For example, accusative clitics can climb into clauses that are deprived of the ability to license accusative (passives, unaccusatives).

I conclude that neither of these approaches is satisfactory. In the rest of the paper, I am going to develop my own account. Before doing so, I would like to stress the general idea that lies behind it. Notice that all the previous analyses have something in common. They assume that clitics have special syntactic property (they are located in C (=Progovac, 1993), they are heads and must obey the Head Movement Constraint (=Veselovská, 1995), they can only undergo A-movement (=Rezac, 2005)). I want to go a different way: throughout the rest of the paper I assume nothing special about the syntactic properties of clitics. For my story to work, they do not need to differ from phrases in this respect.

⁵ See also a review in *Linguistlist* (16.3131). The Czech reviewer points out that she finds this example grammatical.

However, it is their interface properties that sets them apart from phrases. Clitics cannot be interpreted contrastively. As the next section is going to show, contrastive interpretation is necessary for every non-wh-phrase that moves out of CP.

3 Restrictions on \bar{A} -movement

3.1 *How movement out of CP cannot be interpreted*

If we understand every sentence as an answer to some (usually unpronounced) question then we can always divide the sentence into two parts: a part that answers the question (focus) and a part that does not (appearing under many different names in the literature; for example, topic, background, etc.).

As is well-known, discourse notions as topic and focus do play a role in the language. In particular, movement can force one discourse interpretation over the other. It is interesting to note that the movement out of an infinitival clause and movement out of CP differ in this respect. The former is felicitous if the moved phrase is interpreted as a topic. This is not true for the latter.

This is shown in the following example. (9) introduces the context and the question which (10) is an answer to. In this context the phrase *s ním* ‘with him’ in (10) becomes the topic part of the sentence.

(9) Context:

Marie had a friend Jirka but they had an argument a short time ago.
According to you, how does she approach him since then?

- (10) a. Podle mě s ním od té doby nechce mluvit.
According me with him from this time not-want talk
‘According to me she does not want to talk to him anymore.’
- b. Podle mě (#s ním) od té doby nechce abychom
According me (with him) from this time not-want compl_{1SG}
(s ním) mluvili
(with him) talked
‘According to me she does not want us to talk to him anymore.’

Notice that *s ním* ‘with him’ as a part of topic can move out of the infinitival clause in (10a). However, its movement out of the CP is infelicitous (marked by # in (10b)).

As I am going to show in next sections, one needs to interpret a phrase as a contrastive topic (section 3.2 and 3.3) or focus (section 3.4) in order to make movement out of CP felicitous.

3.2 Contrastive topic⁶

Interpreting a syntactic constituent as a contrastive topic has consequences on both the phonological and the semantic/pragmatic side. On the phonological side, the contrastive topic is pronounced with a rising pitch in Czech (Veselá et al., 2003). On the semantic/pragmatic side, Büring (1997), which I am going to follow, distinguishes two basic functions of contrastive topic.⁷

First, contrastive topic can be used to shift the topic of the previous question. For example, in (11) Marie is the topic brought up by the question. This topic is shifted in B’s answer; however, this shift is only possible if the new topic is marked as contrastive on the phonological side – i.e., it must be pronounced with rising pitch.

- (11) A: Koho políbila Marie?
B: No, Natálka políbila Honzu.
A: Who did Mary kiss?
B: Well, Nathalie kissed Honza.

To explain the second use of contrastive topic, I need to introduce the alternative semantics theory of focus. Following Rooth (1985), let us assume that every syntactic node when assigned its meaning comes with two values: an ordinary value and a focus value. We get the focus value of a syntactic node if we substitute its focus part with its alternatives. For example, the sentence *John likes Mary* in which *Mary* is the focus has

⁶ As with topic and focus, also this is by no means the only name that appears in literature. Apart from being called contrastive topic (Gyuris, 2002, Büring, 2003), it has also been called contrastive focus (Gundel, 1994), topic (Büring, 1997), or TOPIC-focus (Kadmon, 2001).

⁷ To be more precise, he discusses three functions of contrastive topic but later on shows that one represents only a subtype.

the proposition [[John likes Mary]] as its ordinary value. The focus value is the set of propositions {[[John likes x]]: x is Mary or any of the possible alternatives to her} = {[[John likes Mary]], [[John likes Nathalie]], [[John likes Susan]], ...}.

Now, Büring (1997) notes that contrastive topic can be used to bring about the following implication:⁸ there is at least one alternative to the contrastive topic, such that if this alternative replaces the actual contrastive topic, the focus value (i.e., the set) is still open to discussion in the discourse.

Let us go through one example. A brief conversation:

- (12) A: Líbala se tvoje žena s jinými muži?
B: Moje žena se s jinými muži nelíbala.
A: Did your wife kiss other men?
B: My wife didn't kiss other men.

In B's sentence, negation is focus. Let us assume that the focus value of the sentence is the set {[[My wife kissed other men]], [[my wife didn't kiss other men]]}.

Let us say that B wants *moje* 'my' to be contrastive topic. He marks it by pronouncing this word with rising pitch. This intonation goes hand in hand with the implication on the semantic side that there are alternatives to B's wife for which the focus value is open to discussion. For instance, even though B just says that 'my wife didn't kiss other men', by making 'my' contrastive topic, he is implicating that the following set is still open to the discussion (and A should probably inquire about it): {[[your wife kissed other men]], [[your wife didn't kiss other men]]}.

In the next section I am going to show that a constituent outside its CP does not cause ungrammaticality when interpreted as a contrastive topic. I will say nothing about the intonation. Instead I will only concentrate on the interpretation that the constituent moved out of CP triggers.

⁸ The word implication is used here as a cover term for both implication and entailment. See Büring (2003), Gyuris (2002), Sturgeon (2006) for discussion on which of these notions is more appropriate.

3.3 *Movement out of CP and contrastive topic*

Let us go back to example (10b) and its context (9), repeated here:

- (13) Context:
Marie had a friend Jirka but they had an argument a short time ago. According to you, how does she approach him since then?
- (14) Podle mě (#s ním) od té doby nechce abychom
According me (#with him) from this time not-want compl_{1PL}
(s ním) mluvili.
(with him) talked
'According to me she does not want us to talk to him anymore.'

What goes wrong with example (13) is that the context for this sentence does not support contrastive topic reading of the phrase that moved out of the CP (i.e., *s ním* 'with him') (I consulted this example with three speakers and indeed, they all did reject (13)).

What we need is the context that enables the implication which contrastive topic brings about; namely, the implication that the focus value of the sentence is still open to the discussion if the contrastive topic phrase is substituted with its alternative.

This implication is satisfied quite naturally in the following scenario: imagine that A is desperate to know whether Mary minds if he and B talk with some people. He then asks for each person in particular, what B thinks that Mary's attitude towards such a person is (15). In this conversation B can answer one of the questions by (16).

- (15) Context:
A: Vadí Marii, když budeme mluvit s Natálií? / B: Ne.
A: Vadí Marii, když budeme mluvit s Honzou?
A: Does Mary mind if we talk with Nathalie? / B: No.
A: Does she mind if we talk with Honza?
- (16) Podle mě (s ním) nechce abychom (s ním) mluvili.
According me (with him) not-want compl_{1PL} (with him) talked
'According to me he does not want us to talk to him.'

The sentence is fine since ‘with him’ can be quite naturally understood as a contrastive topic. In other words, the context in (15) supports the implication that the contrastive topic puts forward: there are alternatives to *s ním* ‘with him’ for which the focus value is open to the discussion (namely, the other people that A is going to ask about).

A contrastive topic reading may not only be supported by the context, it may also be forced directly; for example, by using the lexical item *zato* (close in its meaning to ‘but’, or ‘on the other hand’). *Zato* is grammatical in a sentence in which there is a shift from one discourse entity to another (intuitively, this is reminiscent of topic shift with contrastive topic – see section 3.2). The phrase that introduces such an entity can move out of CP:

- (17) Context:
Honza měl dva sourozence: Marii a Jirku. Jirku měl rád...
‘Honza had two siblings: Marie and Jirka. He liked Jirka...’
- (18) ...zato o Marii nechtěl abychom mluvili.
...but about Marie not-wanted compl_{1PL} talked
‘On the other hand, about Marie he did not want us to talk.’

I should mention that acceptability judgments presented in this section are on a scale. As said above, all three speakers rejected (13) and (14). One speaker found (16) in the context (15) ok, two found it marginal (but still, better than (14)). I believe that the reason that (16) was not ok for all the speakers lies in the fact that even though the context in (15) makes the contrastive topic reading quite viable, it does not force it as the only possible one. It might be that two speakers still understood the phrase non-contrastively. Example (18) (which forces contrastive topic reading of the phrase as the only possible one) was ok for all three speakers.

It could also be shown that contrastive topic reading is necessary for movement out of wh-infinitival clauses but for reasons of space I refrain from doing so here.

3.4 A note on wh-movement

In the preceding section I argued that movement out of CP is impossible if the phrase is interpreted as a topic but it is grammatical if the phrase is interpreted as a contrastive topic. However, this cannot be the end of the

story. Notice that wh-movement out of CP is possible, as already shown in (4) and repeated here for convenience:

- (19) Koho chceš abychom navštívili?
Who want compl_{1PL} visit
'Who do you want us to visit?'

I believe that the reason why (11) is fine is that wh-phrases are foci.

Surprisingly, movement of phrases which are not wh-words out of CP is degraded (even though not ungrammatical) even when this phrase is interpreted as a focus, as shown in (12) which represents an answer to (11) (and therefore, *Jirka* is the narrow focus of the sentence):

- (20) ?#Jirku chci abyste navštívili.
Jirka want compl_{1PL} visit
'I want you to visit Jirka.'

However, the marked status of (20) has probably nothing to do with the fact that the phrase crossed the CP boundary; the marginal status of the sentence is probably caused by a general preference of leaving focus in situ. Even cases in which a focused phrase moves to the left edge of the clause without crossing the CP boundary are marginal.

- (21) Context:
Co chceš číst?
What do you want to read?

- (22) a. ?#Murakamiho chci číst.
Murakami want read
b. Chci číst Murakamiho
want read Murakami
'I want to read Murakami.'

I conclude that there is a difference between topic and focus/contrastive topic. A topic interpretation of a phrase is incompatible with movement out of CP. On the other hand, if a phrase receives a focus or contrastive topic interpretation it can move out of CP. For independent reasons, a focus interpretation is viable only for wh-phrases; the other

phrases must be interpreted contrastively when surfacing outside of the original CP.

4 Clitics cannot be contrastive topics or foci

We have one piece of the story: movement out of CP requires contrastive topic or focus interpretation. It remains to be shown that clitics cannot be interpreted this way.

First, notice that they cannot be the contrastive element in a sentence with *zato*:

- (23) Zato **ho** kritizoval.
But him criticized
'On the other hand, he CRITICIZED it.'

This sentence is fine but only under reading in which 'read' is interpreted contrastively, not 'him' (i.e., it could only be a follow-up of sentences like: *John didn't read the latest novel of Haruki Murakami*).

Second, notice that clitics cannot trigger the implication that is typical for contrastive topic. There is no way for B to make the answer (25) to the question (24) to implicate that there are other men which A's wife might have kissed.

- (24) Context:
A: Políbila moje žena Jirku?
A: Did my wife kiss Jirka?

- (25) Nepolíbila **ho**.
Not-kissed him.
'She didn't kiss him.'

Finally, (26) and (27) show that clitics cannot be narrow foci in the sentence:

- (26) Context:
Honza měl dva sourozence: Marii a Jirku. Koho měl rád?
Honza had two siblings: Mary and Jirka. Which one did he like?

- (27) #Nejradši **ho** měl.
best him had.
'He liked him the best.'

In sum, (27), (25) and (23) suggest that interpreting clitics as focus or contrastive topic is impossible.

5 Analysis

Now, we are in the position to explain why clitics cannot climb out of CP: clitics do not allow focus/contrastive topic interpretation; however, this interpretation is necessary for every movement out of CP.

For the analysis, I take a recent development of Minimalism (Chomsky, 2001). I need to assume very little about the syntactic status of clitics. Probably, they undergo \bar{A} -movement like DPs.⁹ The nature of the movement trigger is unknown to me; for simplicity, let me say that clitics come with an uninterpretable feature [+clitic] which is deleted in the Agree relation with a head that carries the EPP feature (i.e., after establishing an Agree relation, the particular clitic moves to the specifier of the head). Furthermore, let us suppose that every clause might have a head which can get into an Agree relationship with a clitic. Of course, there are many other issues like clitic ordering (why are clitics only ordered the way they are?) or clitic placement (why are clitics in the Wackernagel position of the clause and not somewhere else?) which are not captured by what I said so far. But I consider that a good thing since the restriction on clitic climbing should follow from the (im-)possible interpretation of clitics and nothing else, and therefore the syntactic part of clitic climbing should remain as general as possible.

⁹ I argued against the A-movement analysis in section 2. It would be interesting to find out whether an \bar{A} -movement analysis of clitic climbing can get other than negative support. For example, is it the case that clitic climbing licenses parasitic gaps or induces weak-crossover effect? Unfortunately, so far I leave these issues open, the main reason being that the status of these tests in Czech is not so clear. For example, it has been shown that weak-crossover effect does not arise with wh-movement in Czech (Sturgeon, 2006).

So far, there is nothing in the analysis that explains why clitics cannot climb out of CP. For that we have to turn to the other part of the analysis: discourse interpretation.

There are at least two ways we can think about the requirement of interpreting a constituent outside of its original CP as a focus/contrastive topic. The first one: (as assumed in Sturgeon, 2006) a phrase that is to be interpreted as a contrastive topic¹⁰ has two features: [contrastive topic] (which is interpretable) and [quantifier] (uninterpretable); the head that attracts contrastive topic also comes with two features: [contrastive topic] (uninterpretable), [quantifier] (interpretable). Moreover, the head has the EPP, hence movement of the contrastive topic. Now, both the goal and the probe are active so an Agree relation (and therefore, movement) might be established. It suffices to assume that the head appears in a higher clause: thus, the contrastive topic phrase must move out of CP otherwise uninterpretable features cannot be deleted (and the derivation crashes).

Even though this approach is quite straightforward, I deem it wrong. Notice that in this story, a phrase can move out of CP if it carries a feature that is deleted by a head in a higher clause. The feature might be contrastive topic. However, there is nothing in this analysis that forces every phrase outside of its CP to be interpreted as a focus/contrastive topic. In other words, a constituent can move out of its original CP as long as there is some head in a higher clause which has the EPP and the constituent and the head can enter Agree relation. Now, suppose we say that a higher clause hosts a head that has the EPP and enters Agree relation with a clitic in a lower clause (there is nothing so far that would prohibit such a scenario). In such case it would be possible for a clitic to climb out of its original CP. And this is *not* what we want.

The moral is, we need to make sure that *every constituent that moves out of CP* is interpreted as a focus/contrastive topic, otherwise we have no explanation of why clitic climbing out of CP is impossible. In other words, movement out of CP may be triggered by whatever feature; but it must always lead to the focus/contrastive topic interpretation. This is in line with Chomsky's suggestion (Chomsky, 2001) that movement is not driven by such considerations as discourse interpretation. A "dumb"

¹⁰ Sturgeon (2006) talks only about a contrastive topic interpretation. The same reasoning could extend to a focus interpretation.

computational system should be blind to such issues; it is just an independent property of interfaces that a phrase ends up being interpreted in a particular way.

Let us follow Chomsky's phase theory and assume that every constituent that moves to a higher phase must move through the phase edge. Furthermore, let us say that vPs and CPs are phases. Thus, every constituent that moves out of the CP must go through the CP edge. I suggest that there are two interpretative principles of the following type in Czech:

- (28) a. C-I: interpret every constituent that goes through the edge of CP as contrastive topic
S-M: assign rising pitch to every constituent that goes through the edge of CP
- b. C-I: interpret every constituent that goes through the edge of CP as focus
S-M: assign falling pitch¹¹ to every constituent that goes through the edge of CP

Assume this scenario: the constituent YP moves out of a non-CP clause:

[_{XP} YP₁ ... [_{VP} [_{TP} ... t_i]]]

In this case, the interpretative principles in (28) are not triggered; YP does not have to be interpreted as a contrastive topic. Consequently, YP can be a clitic and the scenario might represent a case of clitic climbing.¹²

A second scenario: the constituent YP moves out of a CP clause:

[_{XP} YP₁ ... [_{VP} [_{CP} ... t_i]]]

¹¹ Falling pitch is typical for focus (see Veselá et al.2003), apart from the parts that are given (Schwarzschild, 1999).

¹² Of course, provided other conditions on movement are not violated (island constraints etc.)

In this case, the interpretative principles in (28) kick in. Thus, YP must be interpreted either as a contrastive topic (28a) or a focus (28b). If YP is a clitic, the sentence becomes illicit.

Thus, I claim success. The original puzzle (why clitics cannot climb out of CP) has been derived from independent properties of clitics and movement out of CP. I take this result to be support of an approach in which discourse interpretation is not a movement trigger; rather a particular discourse interpretation is a consequence of independently triggered movement.

6 Conclusion

This paper offered an explanation of why clitics cannot climb out of CP and differ in this respect from ordinary DPs. It was proposed that the solution to the problem lies in the discourse properties: movement out of CP leads to the focus/contrastive topic interpretation which is not available for clitics. It has been shown that pursuing this explanation leads one to the conclusion that contrastive topic cannot be a movement triggering feature.

There are many issues that I did not touch upon. One of them is why clitics cannot be contrastive topics. Another one is the exact account of focus and contrastive topic, the one that would not only concentrate on the interpretation of constituents that left the CP but would also have something to say about constituents interpreted in-situ. Still another question is whether the analysis presented here is challenged by other Slavic languages, or other languages that exhibit clitic climbing.

Hopefully, there will be opportunities for future research in which these issues can be taken up.

References

- Bošković, Željko. 2001. *On the Nature of the Syntax-phonology Interface: Cliticization and Related Phenomena*. Oxford: Elsevier Science.
- Büring, Daniel. 1997. *The Meaning of Topic and Focus. The 59th Street Bridge Accent*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Büring, Daniel. 2003. On D-trees, B-beans and B-accent. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 26:511-545.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2003. "Restructuring" and functional structure. Ms., Venice.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquires: The framework. In *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, eds. R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 89-155.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, ed. M. Kenstowicz. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. 1-52.
- Dotlačil, Jakub. 2004. Jedno syntaktické omezení u neprojektivních konstrukcí s klitikami [One syntactic restriction on non-projective clitic constructions]. In *Korpus jako zdroj dat o češtině*, ed. P. Karlík. Brno:
- Golden, Marija. 2003. Clitic placement and clitics climbing in Slovenian. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 56:208-233.
- Gundel, Janet K. 1994. On different kinds of focus. In *Focus and Natural Language Processing*, ed. Peter Bosch and Rob van der Sandt. Heidelberg: IBM.
- Gyuris, Beáta. 2002. The semantics of contrastive topics in Hungarian. Doctoral Dissertation, L. Eötvös University, Budapest.
- Junghanns, Uwe. 2002. *Untersuchungen zur Syntax und Informationsstruktur slavischer Deklarativsätze*. Leipzig: Linguistische Arbeitsberichte.
- Kadmon, Nirit. 2001. *Formal Pragmatics*. Oxford, Massachusetts: Blackwell.
- Lenertová, Denisa. 2004. Czech pronominal clitics. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 12.
- Progovac, Ljiljana. 1993. Locality and subjunctive-like complements in Serbo-Croatian. *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 1:116-144.
- Rezac, Milan. 2005. The syntax of clitic climbing in Czech. In *Clitic and Affix Combinations*, ed. Lorie Heggie and Francisco Ordoñez. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1982. *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. Association with focus. Doctoral Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Sturgeon, Anne. 2006. The syntax and pragmatics of contrastive topic in Czech. Doctoral Dissertation, University of California, Santa Cruz.
- Veselá, Kateřina, Nino Peterek and Eva Hajičová. 2003. Topic-Focus articulation in PDT: Prosodic characteristics of contrastive topic. *The Prague Bulletin of Mathematical Linguistics* 79-80:5-22.
- Veselovská, Ludmila. 1995. Phrasal movement and X-morphology: Word order parallels in Czech and English nominal and verbal projections. Doctoral Dissertation, Palacký University, Olomouc.
- Wurmbrand, Susi. 2001. *Infinitives: Restructuring and Clause Structure*. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jakub Dotlačil
jakub.dotlacil@let.uu.nl