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On Clitic Climbing in the Balkan Languages from a Synchronic Perspective

ILIANA KRAPOVA, GIUSEPPINA TURANO

1. Introduction

In this paper, we intend to describe the pattern of variation (i.e., presence or absence) of clitic climbing, as it is currently attested in several Balkan Slavic dialects, among which Eastern Serbian and South Bulgarian, in Northern and Southern Albanian (Geg vs Tosk dialects), as well as the Greek varieties spoken in Southern Italy Grecia Salentina (Griko). Apart from providing, through novel data, empirical generalizations about the distribution of the phenomenon and its cross–Balkan isoglosses, we intend to test the hypothesis of a correlation between restructuring (w.r.t. clitic climbing as a transparency effect) and the pan–Balkan phenomenon of infinitive loss. In so doing, we will also make reference to older stages of the Balkan languages/dialects where clitic climbing is attested (cf. e.g. 14th c. Medieval Greek).

2. Clitic Climbing as a Linguistic Phenomenon

Clitic climbing is an optional phenomenon first identified in Romance languages, and consists in the raising of an embedded clitic pronoun to the domain of the matrix verb. An example of clitic climbing is shown in the Italian structure in (rb), where the clitic io, object of incontrare, is moved out of the domain of the embedded verb and cliticized on the matrix verb voglio.

\begin{itemize}
  \item[(a)] voglio incontrarlo
    \begin{itemize}
    \item want–srg meet–him
    \item “I want to meet him”
  \end{itemize}

  \item[(b)] io voglio incontrarlo
    \begin{itemize}
    \item io want–srg me–him
    \item “I want to meet me”
  \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Clitic climbing is known to possess several distinguishing properties, which underlie the language characterization of this phenomenon and have been argued to have theoretical significance. First, it is possible only with a subset of verbs such as modals, aspectuals, and motion verbs (Rizzi 1976). This is shown by the contrast in (2) containing a mental predicate which precludes the possibility of clitic climbing, as evident from the ungrammaticality of (2b) (as opposed to (1b).

\begin{itemize}
\item[(a)] \textit{rispetto di incontrarlo}
\textit{refuse–3sg of meet–him}
\textit{"I refuse to meet him"}
\item[(b)] \textit{*lo rispetto di incontrare}
\end{itemize}

The second property of clitic climbing is the restriction on the type of the embedded structure: raising of the clitic is only possible from infinitives while finite clauses do not allow this option:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(a)] \textit{voglio che lo incontri}
\textit{want–3sg that him meet–3sg}
\textit{"I want that you meet him"}
\item[(b)] \textit{*lo voglio che incontri}
\end{itemize}

The possibility of extracting and raising a clitic from a lower domain to a higher one appears to be related to restructuring (Rizzi 1976), a syntactic operation of verbal complex formation, which reduces a bi-clausal structure into a monoclausal one such as that of (1b). Clitic climbing is one of the so-called transparency effects of the restructuring operation which some authors label "clause union" but certainly not the only one. Romance languages have been shown to respond to all relevant diagnostics for restructuring, as evident from tests such as cleft sentence formation, Right Node Raising, Heavy NP shift, Aux–to–Comp, Long object Preposing (for details see Cinque 2004 and references therein) and are consequently languages with "restructuring" verbs (e.g. volere, solere, tendere, cominciare, terminare, etc).

3. Complex predicates in the Balkan languages

In the Balkan languages, which lack the infinitive apart from some marginal cases to be discussed below, the equivalent of a restructuring context is typically associated with an embedded inflected verb, which according to the language can either be morphologically subjunctive or indicative. There is a considerable overlap between the semantic class of matrix predicates (modals, aspectuals and motion verbs) in the Balkan languages and the respective predicates in Romance undergoing (optionally) the restructuring operation. Examples of Balkan subjunctives and subjunctive–like constructions headed by a modal particle (tē in Albanian, ū in Bulgarian, na in Greek, să in Romanian) and selected by a modal predicate are given in (4):

\begin{itemize}
\item[(a)] \textit{dua tē takoj Xhonin}
\textit{want–3sg Tē meet.Subj–3sg John}
\textit{"I want to meet John"}
\item[(b)] \textit{iskam ū vidja Ivan}
\textit{want–3sg ū see.Ind–3sg John}
\textit{"I want to see John"}
\item[(c)] \textit{O Yannis theli na fai}
\textit{John wants NA eats–Ind}
\textit{"John wants to eat"}
\item[(d)] \textit{Ion vrea să mâncine}
\textit{John wants SA eats–Ind}
\textit{"John wants to eat"}
\end{itemize}

Object clitics belonging to the domain of the embedded verb, as in (5) containing the same volition predicate, must appear inside this domain and cannot be raised above the modal particle. (5) thus shows that clitic climbing is unavailable in the Balkan languages, a fact that has already been noted by Terzi (1994)\textsuperscript{1}:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(a)] \textit{(*) tē tua taki tē them–CL want–3sg Tē + them meet.Subj–3sg}
\textit{"I want to meet them"}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{1} The other transparency effects cannot be tested in the Balkan languages since they do not dispose of the corresponding structures.
These examples pose the question of whether there are or not at all restructuring configurations in the Balkan languages irrespective of the absence of transparency effects. Secondly, given that the selecting predicates belong to the same semantic class as those in Romance, the question arises of what blocks clitic climbing in the apparently similar structural contexts. Later, we will see that clitic climbing is still possible at least in some Balkan varieties under certain conditions.

Terzi (1994) attributes the impossibility of clitic climbing to the presence of the modal particle. More specifically, working in the generative grammar paradigm, the modal particle, as well as the head C, occupied by the complementizer, are argued to be barriers for the raising of the clitic to the domain of the matrix verb because they cannot participate in the L-related chain formed by the embedded and matrix verbal complexes: Agr(eement) T(ense) V Agr(eement) T(ense) V. In order for co-indexation of these heads to obtain, a crucial condition must be fulfilled: identity of subject reference. This identity is guaranteed with embedded infinitives though not with finite structures. In fact, in the examples to follow, it will become obvious that wherever clitic climbing is available, obligatory co-referentiality is observed (see ex. (8)).

At first sight, this seems like a reasonable explanation not just for Greek, which is the main source of Terzi’s evidence, but also for the other Balkan languages. Balkan languages differ in the morphological means used in replacing the Infinitive of the older stages, which, as is well-known, is one of the analytic tendencies occurred in the Balkan Sprachbund. Albanian has retained a subset of the older subjunctive forms, after having reduced them to 2nd and 3rd person present tense. In Bulgarian, infinitives have been lost almost completely, and are still maintained (the so-called reduced form of the infinitive) in several set expressions of the type *nedje płaka “don’t cry”, ne moga kaza “I cannot say”. Modern Greek too has a present tense indicative form following the modal particle na. Romanian has some limited cases of bare Infinitives and de-supines (see examples in (10) below), while the subjunctive is in effect, exactly as in Bulgarian and Greek, a present tense indicative verb form.

Given that in Albanian subjunctive morphology is retained but the subjunctive verb must be introduced by a modal particle, we can conclude that it is the latter that blocks the raising of the clitic in potential clitic climbing contexts. This seems like a general constraint even in cases of apparent omission of the modal particle as in the Arbëresh dialect of Italy where clitic climbing of the Italian type is disallowed even with the modal verb mund “can”, which selects a subjunctive without the modal particle. See (6):

```
(6)

a) mund e shohç
   can it-CL see.Subj-2sg
   "You can see it"

b) *e mund shohç
```

The ungrammaticality of clitic clitic climbing in (6b) should in principle be a counterexample for Terzi’s proposal since the absence of the particle should allow the formation of an L-related chain via the co-indexation of the two inflected verbal heads. One way to reconcile this datum with Terzi’s analysis is to suppose that even though the modal particle is not lexically realized, it is still present structurally. Such an idea receives support from the fact that in the negative version of (6), given in (7), Negation does trigger the overt realization of the modal particle të.

```
(7)

a) mund mos të shohç
   can not see.Subj-2sg
   "You can’t see"

b) mund mos të shohç
   can not TB-4-it-CL see.Subj-2sg
   "You can’t see it"
```

2. Our observations are based on the Arbëresh dialect spoken in San Nicola dell’Alto, Calabria.
We can generalize that even in case the modal particle is a zero element in a particular syntactic position separating the two verbal domains it still blocks the availability of clitic climbing, cf. (7c).

c) *e mund [tv/tx]+e shohč
   It–CL can TB CL see–subj–2sg

Terzi's proposal seems to receive an additional confirmation from Slavic dialectal data involving clitic climbing. See (8). In the East Serbian dialects, as well as in the Bulgarian Rhodope dialect of Gela, reported in Sobolev (2004), it appears possible to find the clitic argument of the embedded verb to the left of the matrix verb in a configuration corresponding to clitic climbing.

a) d' a li ga m'o'gu n'ai dem?
   Q him–CL can–3sg find–3sg
   "Can I find him?"
   (Gela, Southern Bulgaria, MDBjAtlas: 68)

b) i gu nā možaxmā fanām
   and him–CL not could–ppl catch–ppl
   Sobolev 2004, ex. 20b
   "And we couldn't catch him"
   (Kamenitsa, East Serbia, Sobolev 2004, ex. 20b)

As mentioned above, neither Bulgarian, nor Serbian would admit a particle drop so these examples are ungrammatical in the standard languages. The phenomenon of particle drop or omission, which Sobolev (2004: 75) describes as a "synthetic innovation" located in the Central Balkan zone, represents a clear case of clitic climbing available with the verb can in its ability reading.

Particle drop has also been attested for Istro–Romanian (Zegrean 2012), and under the exact same conditions as in Slavic: identity of subject reference and use of the modal verb can in its ability reading:

Io voi vo pute (vo) vede
   I will–3sg (her) can–3sg (her) see–3sg
   "I'll be able to see her"
   (Istro–Romanian, Zegrean 2012)

Conscious that more data are needed for the description of this phenomenon and abstracting away from the possible origin of structures (plausibly due to language contact with Croatian or as a continuation

of an older structure), the examples in (8)–(9) show that clitic climbing is available in Slavic and Istro–Romanian with verbs, which like ability can, appear to select an inflected present tense verb not introduced by a (null) M particle as in Arbëresh (7c) above. Thus, it is not the type of embedded morphology per se which allows for clitic climbing: subjunctive vs. indicative. Rather, the absence of clitic climbing in the standard languages and in Arbëresh is to be attributed to the blocking effect of the modal particle acting as a barrier for the movement of the clitic argument.

The question that arises at this point also with respect to the Balkan data is what triggers a configuration allowing for the union of two otherwise independent clauses. We will come back to this question but for the time being we point out that more generally speaking, clitic climbing in the context of two indicative verbs is observed also in the Italian dialect of Brindisi (Salentino), as discussed by Terzi (1994) and Calabrese (1993). See (10a). The contrast with (10b) shows that in case want selects a CP headed by the overt complementizer (ku) in (10b), it is this complementizer that blocks the raising of the clitic in spite of the preserved subject coreference. Calabrese also notes (fn.2, fn.9) that the embedded verb following the complementizer can optionally appear in the subjunctive mood. However irrespective of the embedded morphology, whenever ku is absent, clitic climbing is possible.

a) lu voggyu katru
   it want–3sg buy–3sg
   "I want to buy it"

b) *lu voggyu ku katru
   it want–3sg that buy–3sg

4. Clitic climbing out of infinitival complements

Apart from the V1 V2 sequences seen above, another case of clitic climbing in the Balkan area is the one attested in the few instances of infinitive (or supine) retention in the contemporary languages/dialects. Romanian for example has preserved the bare infinitive after the verb putea "can" and — until the first half of the 20th century — in the first half of the 20th century.
infinitival complements as the few Balkan/Balkan-like varieties seen above. For example, in Serbo-Croatian (Progovac 1994; Todorović, Wurmbrand 2015, a.o.), a “language” with infinitives alongside synonymous indicative complements introduced by the modal particle da, clitic climbing is possible, even preferred out of tenseless infinitives, as in (13a), but is dispreferred out of da-complements selected by the same verb. See the difference in judgements between (13a) and (13b).

\[
\begin{align*}
(13a) & \quad \text{Marxo (v)ih je probao napisati (v)ih} \quad \text{(Todorović, Wurmbrand 2015)} \\
\text{Mark (v)them} \text{ is tried write-INF (v)them} \\
\text{“Mark tried to write them”} \\
(13b) & \quad \text{Mark (v)ih je probao da (v)ih rapiše} \\
\text{Mark (v)them} \text{ is tried DA (v)them} \text{ writes} \\
\text{“Mark tried to write them”}
\end{align*}
\]

Wurmbrand (2015) has shown that languages fall into three basic types in view of the distribution of clitic climbing: those that allow clitic climbing out of tenseless [-TNS] infinitives only, those that allow clitic climbing out of tenseless as well as out of future ([FUT]) infinitives, and those that disallow clitic climbing. Since no Balkan-(like) variety represents clitic climbing out of a FUT infinitive, we can categorize the Balkan zone as belonging to type 3 in Wurmbrand’s classification albeit being far more limited than Italian and Spanish which also belong to this type.

5. Clitic climbing from a diachronic perspective

Clitic climbing out of tenseless complements can be observed also diachronically, at the older stages of the languages under comparison. The following example from the 14th c. historical text The Chronicle of Morea is cited in Joseph (1983, 64):

3. This is not the whole story however. The modal particle does not always exert a blocking effect, so deontic contexts, as well as finite volitional complements, are accepted as possible clitic climbing contexts, at least by some speakers: (i) Petar je mora/želi da vidi [Todorović, Wurmbrand 2015, ex. (32a)] Petar-NOM her-ACC has-to/wants DA see “Peter has to want to see her”.

\[
\begin{align*}
(11) & \quad \text{O pot vede} \\
\text{her-CL can-1sg see-INF} \\
\text{“I can see her”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(12) & \quad \text{O are de terminat} \\
\text{CL-fem has DB finished-sup} \\
\text{“He has to finish it”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad \text{Mark (v)ih je probao napisati (v)ih} \\
\text{Mark (v)them} \text{ is tried write-INF (v)them} \\
\text{“Mark tried to write them”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(10) & \quad \text{To spitse tse (”to) torisi (”to) avri} \\
\text{it-CL finish-1sg COMP see-INF tomorrow} \\
\text{“I will finish seeing it tomorrow”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(9) & \quad \text{sa sótsze insultesi (*sa)} \\
\text{you-CL can-3pl.Past insult-INF} \\
\text{“They could insult you”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(8) & \quad \text{To sótsi vorasi? Ne, sótsi} \\
\text{it-CL can-3sg buy-INF yes can-3sg} \\
\text{“Can he buy it? Yes, he can”}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
(7) & \quad \text{To spitse tse (”to) torisi (”to) avri} \\
\text{it-CL finish-1sg COMP see-INF tomorrow} \\
\text{“I will finish seeing it tomorrow”}
\end{align*}
\]

Note that the verbs used in these contexts form a superset with respect to the verbs allowing for a particle drop: apart from ability denoting predicates, we find the aspecual finish and the permission/possibility can. If so, then the bigger generalization based on current available positive evidence is that the temporal interpretation of the embedded verb is a distinguishing factor in languages with
(14) is a periphrastic future formation involving an infinitive and is the prototype of the MG future, in use since the 10th c. Pappas (2001, 2004) gives other examples of clitic climbing from Later Medieval Greek before the 14th c. such as that of (15):

\[
\text{ōp
\etaς )&&(\text{th}
\eta\text{λεις} \text{mathe}ι
\) (Pappas 2004, 92)
\]

which me want–3sg take–INF

"which will take me"

According to the analysis of Joseph, the periphrastic future construction, which made productive use of the infinitive in the medieval period, was reanalyzed, due to a sound change (the loss of the final -n of the infinitive), as a Vx Vx finite sequence (thelo grapho "want write") so that the infinitive came to be homonymous with 3sg present indicative (in 15–16 c. colloquial language) which would subsequently give rise to the MG analytic future (the(tvoc) grapho > tha grapho "I will write"). As noted by Pappas (2004), other verb types in Later Medieval Greek (like begin, dare, hope), which also combine with an infinitive did not allow clitic climbing. We therefore conclude with Pappas, that the periphrastic future was the only type of structure which could yield a restructuring configuration.

6. Two approaches to Balkan–type restructuring: reanalysis and clausal size reduction

The above data from the history of Greek, as well as those in (10)–(13) seem to corroborate the idea of Roberts and Roussou (2003) that modal verbs may undergo a reanalysis when combined with certain infinitival heads: the higher verbs in (11)–(12), as well as (14)–(15), once full verbal elements, underwent a category change and became auxiliaries. For the Medieval Greek periphrastic future, the reanalysis can be illustrated with the two structures in (16) for (14): (16a) is the structure before reanalysis while (16b) is the one after:

\[
\text{a) [TP theleis [VP theleis [TP T [VP mathe]])] (16)
\]

\[
\text{b) [TP theleis [VP mathe]]]
\]

An important consequence of this functional change is that an initial biclausal structure like (16a) has become monoclausal when the modal got reanalyzed as a functional T element (16b). Briefly, reanalysis involves elimination of verb movement from V to T and the grammatization of the modal verb to a T category merged in the structure under this node. With the loss of infinitival morphology, as mentioned above, there was no evidence anymore for a lower T projection, so the earlier structure containing two VP and two TP nodes got simplified in a structure with just a single VP and a single TP.

At first sight, this analysis looks really attractive, since it can be said to capture not just the Greek diachronic development but also all the other contexts examined above (Romanian (11), Grik in (12), as well as the Slavic data in (7)–(8), Istro–Romanian (9) and Salentino (10)), in which the embedded finite indicative verb shows present tense morphology and can thus be argued to have a tenseless VP rather than a TP. However, this analysis is not sufficient to explain the data from the few dialects of Southern Albania (Tosk dialects) featuring clitic climbing out of embedded infinitival clauses despite the presence of two potential barriers: a preposition and a modal particle.

Tosk dialects have an analytic future form of the type kam për të dhënë (= I have to give) "I will give", built up by means of the auxiliary kam "have", followed by an infinitive. In these contexts, clitic climbing is possible, as is shown in (17), where the dative clitic u precedes the auxiliary:

\[
\text{Turqya u ka për të dhënë gjë}
\]

"Turkey them has Për Të given something"

"Turkey will give them something"

Even if the infinitive për të dhënë shows no tense or agreement features, positing just a VP projection as a result of reanalysis cannot

4. This analytic future form is characteristic of some Tosk dialects only; standard Albanian has only the de-forms with the auxiliary.
work since it cannot accommodate the preposition për nor the modal particle të.

An analysis à la Wurmbrand (2015) which treats tenseless complements allowing for clitic climbing, whether infinitival or finite, as Vp/VP projections expressing just thematic relations (the Θ domain) and not being able to project neither the ‘TP functional domain nor the A’ domain of the CP, seems to be insufficient as well. Why are modal particles exempt from their blocking properties when size reduction of the clause takes place? Such an approach would attribute the grammaticality of (17) to the fact that the Infinitive has [–TNS] feature, i.e. is tenseless. However, in order to account for (18) from standard Albanian, where we find the same infinitival complement as in (17) but without the possibility of clitic climbing, cf. (19), Wurmbrand’s analysis would have to rely on the feature [FUT] of the Infinitive since according to this analysis, some languages which instantiate both [–TNS] (tenseless in sensu stricto) as well as [FUT] Infinitives, allow for clitic climbing with the former though not with the latter. From this point of view, Tosk will be a dialect of type 1, allowing clitic climbing with tenseless infinitives only (corresponding cases like (18) are ungrammatical in this dialect too). Albanian, on the other hand, will be a language of type 0, i.e. disallowing clitic climbing altogether (recall that with other modal, aspectual and motion verbs illustrated in (4a) above, and containing a subjunctive verb introduced by the të particle, clitic climbing is also excluded).

5. All dative NPs or pronouns must be obligatorily doubled by the corresponding clitic.
6. In fact, this sentence is grammatical in the interpretation of “I make someone read the book to the student”.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{erdhi për të më takuar} \\
\text{came–3sg PBR TË me meet} \\
\text{“He came to meet me”} \\
\text{(18)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
a) \text{*erdhi më për të takuar} \\
b) \text{*më erdhi për të takuar}
\end{align*}
\]

The approach proposed by Wurmbrand faces the following problems.

First, it is not clear how to treat prepositional infinitives of the type widespread in the Geg area (Northern Albania) built up by means of the preposition me (“with”) + participle (marr, “taken”) which also disallow clitic climbing.

Second, subjunctive particles act as blockers for clitic climbing in the majority of Balkan modal and aspectual constructions, though not in the Arbëresh causative constructions featuring the verb boj “make” and a complement introduced by the same modal particle të as in standard Albanian (and displaying the VOS word order). The Arbëresh causative construction is illustrated in (21). In (21a), the embedded thematic subject bears dative case; in (21b), it has accusative case since the subjunctive verb is intransitive. In all cases, the subject shows agreement with the subjunctive verb:

\[
\begin{align*}
a) & \ \text{boj të ghojirmi gëbarën studentit} \\
& \ \text{him–1sg TË read–3sg book student–DAT} \\
& \ \text{“I make the student read the book”} \\
& \ \text{(21)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b) & \ \text{boj të niset studentin} \\
& \ \text{make–1sg TË leave–3sg student–ACC} \\
& \ \text{“I make the student leave”}
\end{align*}
\]

The contrast between (21a) and (21b) shows that the clitic which doubles the dative subject studentit cannot remain in the lower position and must be obligatorily raised to the left of the causative verb:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{*boj t’i ghojirmi gëbarën studentit} \\
\text{(22)}
\end{align*}
\]

The same happens if the accusative subject in (21b) is cliticized: the clitic appears to the left of the matrix verb, as is shown in (23):

\[
\begin{align*}
a) & \ \text{e boj të fjas} \\
& \ \text{him–CL make–1sg TË speak–3sg} \\
& \ \text{“I make him speak”} \\
& \ \text{(23)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
b) & \ \text{*boj t’fjas}
\end{align*}
\]
If clitic climbing is only possible in a monoclusal/clause union structure, reanalysis a–lā Roberts & Roussou, involving just one single position VP, is not sufficient since the embedded subjunctive verb has arguments of its own which require at least a vP projection expressing the thematic structure. Even in clear cases of monoclusal structure, as is the case of the Tosk analytic future, we still need an extra position for V movement in view of the position of adverbs such as špesh/shpisu “often”. This refers also to the Arbëresh examples in (21), where we can see that an adverb may appear in between the embedded verb and the direct object, as illustrated in (25):

\[
\text{Turqya u ka për të dhënë \textit{špesh gjë}} \\
\text{Turkey them has PERS TÉ given often something} \\
\text{"Turkey will give often them something"} \\
\]

a) boj të qhojirnj \textit{shpisu} ghibrin studenti
make–ng TÉ read–3sg often book student–NOM
“I make the student often read the book”

b) I boj të qhojirnj \textit{shpisu} ghibrin studentit
him make–ng TÉ read–3sg often book student–DAT
“I make the student often read the book”

c) boj të fias \textit{shpisu} studentin
make–ng TÉ talk–3sg often student–ACC
“I make the student often talk”

Thus, on one hand, the reanalysis explanation leaves open the question where the Tosk infinitive particle and the Arbëresh subjunctive particle are generated, and on the other hand, a clause reduction analysis a–lā Wurmbrand leaves the blocking effect of the modal particles unaccounted for (even though one can argue that modal particles introducing the embedded verb are not elements of the C domain). This precludes a unitary explanation of what makes clitic climbing unavailable in the majority of Balkan embedded contexts. Moreover, it is hard for each single language to motivate absence of V movement with respect to the clitic position.

We therefore propose a cartographic account of clitic climbing such as the one advocated for in Cinque (2006). Note that for the above examples from Romanian, Greek, Salentino, Serbian dialects, Istro–Romanian, Tosk and Arbëresh dialects, the “restructuring” con-

figuration typically includes a portion of Cinque’s (1999) articulated functional hierarchy involving several Mood projections:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Mod(al)
epistemic} & > \text{Mod(al)
irrealis} > \text{Mod(al)
volitional} > \text{Mod(al)
possibility} > \text{Mod(al)
ability} \\
\text{Voice} & > \text{Perception} > \text{Causative}
\end{align*}
\]

(Cinke 2006, 93) (26)

Following Cinque, we argue that so-called “restructuring” verbs are functional verbs directly inserted in any of these head positions. Thus, for the East Serbian examples in (8), Istro–Romanian in (9), Romanian in (11), Greek varieties in (12), the relevant head involved in restructuring is inserted in Mod\textsubscript{possibility}, Mod\textsubscript{ability} or Mod\textsubscript{permission}, whereas the embedded tenseless indicative or infinitive verb is inside the lexical projection VP.

The restructuring head involved in the Later Medieval Greek examples (14)–(15) is instead inserted in Mod\textsubscript{volitional}.

We propose that the modal particles of the Balkan languages can be inserted in different functional portions of the clause according to the functional head with which they are associated. In the Tosk dialectal example in (17) for example, the modal particle të can be argued to occupy the position of Mod\textsubscript{irrealis} which in Cinque’s hierarchy is very close, in terms of hierarchy, to Future Tense, thereby explaining the frequent cross-linguistic use of have auxiliaries with future meaning, see (27):

\[
\text{[Turqya [VP u ka [VP për [Mood\textsubscript{irrealis} [VP dhënë [VP \textit{špesh dhënë gjë]]]]}] (27)}
\]

In the case of the Arbëresh causative in (21), the modal particle të preceding the subjunctive verb is inserted in a different functional position associated with the causative verb.

\[
\text{[PP\textsubscript{causative} i boj [VP të [VP qhojirni [VP \textit{shpisu} qhojirni] ghibrin studentiti]]] (28)}
\]

To summarize, when a verb is inserted in a functional position, what we obtain is the activation of a higher position accessible for the clitic. This gives the effect that the clitic has climbed to the left of the
"restructuring" verb. The idea that there are two different positions for clitics is not new: it has been argued for by Cardinaletti & Shlonsky (2004) who distinguish between a clausal clitic position situated in the high portion of IP and a lexical clitic position located in the VP domain.

There are however contexts where clitic climbing is unavailable or blocked, as we saw: in Albanian and Gheg infinitive contexts, cf. (18) and (20) respectively. For these contexts it seems probable (at least at this stage of the analysis) to posit a full CP structure given that they involve a preposition. Besides that, the unavailability of clitic climbing can also depend on the position of për të, which probably are generated in a higher position, inside the C domain:

\[
\begin{align*}
a) & \quad [\text{T}_P \text{ erdh}i [\text{VP } \text{ ardh}i [\text{CP } \text{ për } \text{ të } [\text{T}_P [\text{VP } \text{ më } \text{ takuar}]]]]] & \text{Albanian} \\
& \quad \text{came for to me meet-inf} \\
& \quad \text{(29)} \\
b) & \quad [\text{T}_P \text{ du } [\text{VP } \text{ që } [\text{CP } \text{ me } [\text{VP } \text{ e } \text{ marr}]]]]] & \text{Gheg} \\
& \quad \text{want with it take-inf} \\
& \quad \text{(30)}
\end{align*}
\]

The subjunctive-like particles of the Balkan languages can also be thought of a C heads realizing the lower C (= Fin) position of the C domain (Manzini & Savoia 2007, Roussou 2000). One piece of evidence for this position comes from the fact that in Albanian and Romanian the modal particles may co-occur with the complementizer që in Albanian and ca in Romanian. See the examples in (31) and the structure in (32) based on Rizzi’s (1997) articulated structure of the left periphery:

\[
\begin{align*}
a) & \quad \text{dua që Beni të niset nesër} & \text{Albanian} \\
& \quad \text{want–3sg that Ben TB leave–3sg tomorrow} \\
& \quad \text{“I want Ben to leave tomorrow”} \\
& \quad \text{(31)} \\
b) & \quad \text{vreau ca mâine să văi Ion} & \text{Romanian}^9 \\
& \quad \text{want–3s that tomorrow SÂ come. Subj–3sg Ion} \\
& \quad \text{“I want John to come tomorrow”} \\
& \quad \text{(32)}
\end{align*}
\]

8. Note that in this example, “want” is a lexical verb, not an auxiliary, as opposed to future tense kam.

9. The example is taken from Dobrovie-Sorin (2001), her (22a) and (25a) resp.

Given this structure, it can be argued that the blocking effect of the modal particle on clitic climbing derives from Fin⁰, as a X⁰–head, preventing the clitic from head governing its lower position. Kayne (1989) for example considers clitic climbing to be an instance of head movement, subject to antecedent government and attributes the ungrammaticality of Italian sentences like (3b) to the blocking effect of the lexical complementizer. Kayne attributes the status of (3b) to an ECP violation induced by che (“that”). But it is also possible that, in absence of the complementizer (Force marker), the subjunctive particle raises from Fin to Force (Roussou 2000). In fact, when the complementizer që is lexicalized, the entire C domain is activated as is shown by the distribution of topic and focus elements in (33a) and (33b):

\[
\begin{align*}
a) & \quad \text{Beni dëshiron që librin studentit të kthejë në bibliotekën} & \text{Ben wants that the book the student TB+it–CL return. Subj–3sg in library} \\
& \quad \text{(33)} \\
b) & \quad \text{Beni dëshiron që LIBRIN studentit të kthejë në bibliotekën} & \text{Ben wants that THE BOOK the student TB return. Subj–3sg in library} \\
\end{align*}
\]

When the complementizer që is absent, no topic or focus elements can appear in the left periphery of the clause:

\[
\begin{align*}
a) & \quad *\text{Beni dëshiron librin ta lexojnë studentet} \\
& \quad \text{Ben wants the book TB+it–CL read–3pl the students} \\
& \quad \text{(34)} \\
b) & \quad *\text{Beni dëshiron LIBRIN të lexojnë studentet} \\
& \quad \text{Ben wants THE BOOK TB read–3pl the students} \\
\end{align*}
\]

We can conclude therefore that in constructions without që, the particle të raises from Fin to Force, precluding therefore the realization of a Topic or a Focus element between the matrix verb and Force?

Thus, the subjunctive particles in standard Balkan languages, like the infinitival particles in standard Albanian and in Gheg dialects, act as blockers for clitic climbing. When no clitic climbing takes place, clitics realize in the lowest position, on the left of the embedded verb.
7. Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that certain embedded subjunctive, infinitive and indicative structures in the Balkan dialects should be analyzed as monoclusal structures in view of the obligatoriness of clitic climbing out of these complements.

The respective complements in the standard Balkan languages, on the other hand, do not allow clitic climbing because of the blocking effect of the modal particles which introduce them. We have argued that these structures receive a more plausible analysis in terms of a CP structure. It is the CP projection then that blocks clitic climbing.
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