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Abstract

This chapter discusses the syntax of clitic pronouns and compares them to strong and weak pronouns and full DPs. The peculiar properties of clitic pronouns will be presented, which concern all modules of grammar. To account for these peculiar properties, it will
be argued that clitic pronouns are merged as reduced maximal projections which are further reduced to heads during the derivation. Clitic placement is a local movement operation, which places the pronoun in one of the two clitic areas available in the clause and most visible in restructuring contexts allowing clitic climbing. The hosts of clitic pronouns and their mode of attachment (proclisis, enclisis, mesoclisis) are also discussed. Finally, some motivations for the obligatory movement of clitic pronouns will be presented.

1. Introduction

Cliticization is one of the topics (alongside with locality and clause structure) on which most works of the past 40 years have concentrated. For this reason, what follows cannot be an exhaustive overview. For a rich bibliography which collects the studies on clitic pronouns until 1991, the reader is referred to Nevis, Joseph, Wanner and Zwicky (1994).

This chapter restricts its attention to the cliticization of personal pronouns, because this is the area where the most stable knowledge has been attained; mention of other clitic grammatical elements will be made, but unfortunately there are still too few studies of clitic elements other than personal pronouns (with the notable exception of Slavic clitic auxiliaries, see Franks and Kings 2000). Furthermore, this chapter focalizes on Romance languages and in particular on Italian, although many studies exist on clitic pronouns of other language families.

We will analyze special clitics, in the sense of Zwicky (1977). Cliticization of special clitics is not a purely phonological phenomenon. As far as their internal syntax is concerned, clitic pronouns are deficient from all points of view, not only phonologically. As for their external syntax, clitic placement is sensitive to syntactic notions such as finite vs. infinitive, indicative vs. imperative mood, declarative vs. interrogative sentences, noun vs. verb, and so on. Phonological phenomena do not display this kind of properties.

Kayne (1975), the most influential work on personal pronouns in the framework of Generative Grammar, recognized in French two morphologically and syntactically different series of pronouns, clitic and strong pronouns, and elaborated a number of tests to distinguish one series from the other. Since then, comparative research has extended the empirical domain from French to other Romance languages and from Romance languages to other language families, e.g. Germanic, Slavic, Greek, Semitic and Berber, which has brought to light a number of properties of clitic pronouns not instantiated in French (e.g., clitic climbing, clitic doubling, mesoclisis, etc.) and a wide cross-linguistic variation in clitic placement. Furthermore, comparative research has led to the conclusion that clitic pronouns differ not only from strong elements, but also from clitic-like (called weak) pronouns, which led to the proposal that natural languages may possess not two, but three classes of personal pronouns (cf. Cardinaletti and Starke 1996, 1999).

2. An overview of the cliticization of verbal arguments

Every complement of the verb can be realized by a clitic pronoun, if such an element is present in the lexicon of the language: a direct object (either accusative or partitive) (1a,
b), an indirect object (1c), or a prepositional object (locative [1d–f], manner [1g]). Examples are provided for Italian (note that if not otherwise indicated, all examples in the text are Italian):

(1)  
a. *Mangio un panino.*  

`eat.I a sandwich`  
‘I eat a sandwich.’

a’. *Lo mangio (*un panino).*  

`it eat.I a sandwich`  
‘I eat it.’

b.  

*Mangio un panino.*  

`eat.I a sandwich`  
‘I eat a sandwich.’

b’. *Ne mangio uno (*panino).*  

`of.them eat.I one sandwich`  
‘I eat one of them.’

c.  

*Parlo a Gianni.*  

`speak.I with Gianni`  
‘I speak with Gianni.’

c’. *Gli parlo (*a Gianni).*  

`to.him speak.I with Gianni`  
‘I speak with him.’

d.  

*Sono uscita da quella situazione.*  

`am.I gone.out of that situation`  
‘I am out of that situation.’

d’. *Ne sono uscita (*da quella situazione).*  

`from.there am.I gone.out of that situation`  
‘I am out of it.’

e.  

*Abito a Roma.*  

`live.I in Rome`  
‘I live in Rome.’

e’. *Ci abito (*a Roma).*  

`there live.I in Rome`  
‘I live there.’

f.  

*Passo sempre per quella strada.*  

`pass.I always along that street`  
‘I always go along that street.’

f’. *Ci passo sempre (*per quella strada).*  

`there pass.I always along that street`  
‘I always go through there.’
g. *Mi comporto sempre in malo modo.*
   \text{REFL} behave.I always in bad way
   ‘I always behave badly.’

g'. *Mi ci comporto sempre (*in malo modo).*
   \text{REFL} so behave.I always in bad way
   ‘I always behave so.’

In some languages, notably northern Italian dialects, subjects can also be realized by clitic pronouns. An example is provided from Trentino (Brandi and Cordin 1989: 113):

(2) a. *El Mario el parla.*
   the Mario he speaks
   [Trentino]
   a'. *El parla.*
   he speaks

As the examples in (1)–(2) show, clitic pronouns realize an argument of the verb, bear the same thematic role and the same case assigned to that argument and are usually in complementary distribution with it (but see [2a] and section 5.4 below for cases in which pronouns and DPs co-occur, a phenomenon known as \textit{clitic doubling}).

The same observations hold when clitic pronouns realize secondary complements of the verb, such as the benefactive/malefactive dative complement in (3a) and locative (3b), comitative (3c, d), and instrumental (3e) complements:

(3) a. *A Gianni è nato un bambino.*
   to Gianni is born a baby
   ‘Gianni has had a baby.’
   a'. *Gli è nato un bambino (*a Gianni).*
   to.him is born a baby to Gianni
   ‘He has had a baby.’

b. *Mangio sempre in quel posto.*
   eat.I always in that place
   ‘I always eat in that place.’

b'. *Ci mangio sempre (*in quel posto).*
   there eat.I always in that place
   ‘I always eat there.’

c. *Ho parlato con Gianni.*
   have.I spoken with Gianni
   ‘I have spoken with Gianni.’

c'. *Ci ho parlato (*con Gianni).*
   with.him have.I spoken with Gianni
   ‘I have spoken with him.’

d. *Esco sempre con Gianni.*
   go.out.I always with Gianni
   ‘I always go out with Gianni.’
d’. *Ci esco sempre (*con Gianni).
   ‘I always go out with him.’

e. *Ho aperto la scatola con le forbici.
   ‘I have opened the box with the scissors.’
e’. C’ ho aperto la scatola (*con le forbici).
   ‘I have the box with them.’

Non-arguments, such as temporal (4a) (from Cinque 1990: 119, to be compared with [19c]), and causal adjuncts (4b), and frame locatives (4c) (from Rizzi 1988/2001: 541, 1990: 127, n. 9), are never realized by clitic pronouns:

   ‘I will stay three weeks.’
a’. *Spero di rimaner=le in allegria.
   ‘I hope to stay being jolly.’

b. *Telefono per questo motivo.
   ‘I call for this reason.’
b’. *Ci telefono.
   ‘There call.I’

c. *Gianni è felice a casa dei genitori.
   ‘Gianni is happy at their parents’ house.’
c’. *Gianni ci è felice.
   ‘Gianni there is happy’
   ‘Gianni is happy there.’

The generalization seems to be that only VP-internal complements can be realized by clitic pronouns, while VP-external complements cannot.

3. On the peculiar properties of clitic pronouns

Clitic pronouns display a peculiar behaviour as far as properties of all grammatical modules are concerned (see Kayne 1975; Zwicky 1977, 1985). In particular, they are deficient from all points of view. Clitic pronouns have a restricted syntactic distribution in that they only appear in specialized non-thematic positions; they are monosyllabic elements which do not bear word stress; their reference is restricted to salient anteced-
ents, and they cannot introduce new referents into the discourse. Clitic pronouns systematically differ from strong pronouns, which behave like regular DPs.

What follows is a survey of their properties, mainly exemplified on the basis of Italian. Most of these properties characterize clitic pronouns in all languages studied so far. They can be taken to reflect a fundamental property of natural languages. These properties also characterize clitic (and clitic-like, i.e., weak) elements of other categories, such as possessive pronouns and adjectives (Cardinaletti 1998), demonstratives (Cardinaletti 1999: 70), adverbs (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999; Cardinaletti 2007, 2011), and wh-elements (Bouchard and Hirschbuhler 1987; Friedemann 1990, 1997; Munaro 1999; Polletto and Pollock 2004, 2009; Sportiche 2011).

3.1. Syntactic properties

A1: *obligatory displacement*: clitic pronouns cannot remain in their merge position, but are obligatorily displaced to a higher position (adjacent to the verb in Italian), a position not available to strong pronouns and full DPs:

(5) a. Maria conosce *lo / lui / Gianni.  
   Maria knows him / him / Gianni

b. Maria lo / *lui / *Gianni conosce.  
   Maria him / him / Gianni knows
   ‘Maria knows him / Gianni.’

A2: *limited distribution*: clitic pronouns cannot appear in peripheral positions (6a) or in isolation (6b):

(6) a. Lui / *Lo, Maria lo conosce.  
   him / him Maria him knows
   ‘Him, Maria knows him.’

b. Chi conosce, Maria? Lui / *Lo.  
   whom knows Mary him / him
   ‘Who does Mary know? Him.’

A3: *limited distribution*: differently from strong pronouns, clitic pronouns cannot be modified (7)–(8), conjoined (9), contrastively stressed (10):

(7) a. Maria conosce solo lui.  
   Maria knows only him
   ‘Maria knows only him.’

b. *Maria conosce solo lo.  
   Maria knows only him
b’. *Maria lo conosce solo.  
b”. *Maria solo lo conosce.  
   Maria knows only him
   ‘Maria knows only him.’

   ‘Maria knows only him.’
(8) a. **Accuseranno loro stessi.**
   will.accuse.they them themselves
   ‘They will accuse themselves.’

   b. *Accuseranno li stessi.
   will.accuse.they them themselves

b’. *Li accuseranno stessi.

b″. *Li stessi accuseranno.

(9) a. **Maria conosce [lui e voi].**
   Maria knows him and you.PL
   ‘Maria knows him and you.’

   b. *Maria conosce [lo e vi].
   Maria knows him and you.PL


(10) a. **Maria conosce LUI, non voi.**
   Maria knows him, not you.PL
   ‘Maria knows him, not you.’

   b. *Maria conosce LO, non voi.
   Maria knows him, not you.PL

b’. *Maria LO conosce, non voi.

3.2. Phonological properties

B1: **lack of word stress:** clitic pronouns lack word stress, while strong pronouns bear one.

The following Italian monosyllabic words form minimal pairs, where one word bears stress, while the other, i.e., the clitic pronoun, lacks word stress: là [ˈla] ‘there’ vs. la [la] ‘her’, né [ˈne] ‘neither’ vs. ne [ne] ‘of them’, sì [ˈsi] ‘yes’ vs. si [si] ‘himself/herself/ themselves’, etc.

Minimal pairs are also formed by clitic and strong pronouns which have the same segmental content, such as French *nous* ‘us’ and *vous* ‘you.PL’:

(11) a. **Il nous voit.** [nu]
   he us sees
   ‘He sees us.’

   b. **Il ne voit que nous.** [ˈnu]
   he not sees than us
   ‘He only sees us.’

B2: **prosodic status:** Clitic pronouns do not form single phonological words with the host verbs. In Italian, for instance, the process of s-sonorization which is found word-internally in intervocalic contexts (after a prefix, as in *re[z]istere* ‘resist’, *de[z]istere* ‘desist’, and before a suffix, as in *ca[z]a* ‘house’), does not take place between a proclitic pronoun and the verb (*Lo [z]o / *[z]o* ‘I know it.’), and between the verb and an enclitic
pronoun (mettendo[s]i / *mettendo[z]i ‘placing himself’). The verb and the clitic(s) are different phonological words. In Selkirk’s (1995) terminology, clitic pronouns are neither internal clitics nor affixal clitics, but free clitics, which are incorporated into prosodic structure at the level of the Phonological Phrase. The same conclusions hold for subject clitics found in northern Italian dialects (see Cardinaletti and Repetti 2009 for discussion).

3.3. Morphological properties

C1: reduced morphological form: clitic pronouns are morphologically reduced with respect to their strong counterparts. They are always monosyllabic words, while strong pronouns can be bisyllabic. Since clitic pronouns can also be homophonous to strong pronouns (cf. e.g. French [11]), the generalization on morphological reduction can be formulated as in (12): clitic pronouns equal or smaller than their strong counterparts (see other examples in Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: 174):

(12) Morphological reduction: clitic ≤ strong

C2: free morphemes: although they bear no word stress (see B1 above), clitic pronouns must be considered independent words (free morphemes) and cannot be treated as affixes (bound morphemes) – for discussion, see Klavans (1979), (1982), (1985); Zwicky (1977); Zwicky and Pullum (1983). In Romance languages, this is very clear when clitic pronouns appear in proclisis; this is a position where inflectional morphemes are never found. However, the same is true when they occur in enclitic position. See the phonological evidence in B2 above. Note that in grammaticalization theories (Givón 1979; Hopper and Traugott 1993, 2003, among many others), clitic elements are situated between grammatical words and affixes: content word > grammatical word > clitic > affix > zero.

C3: case distinctions: although in Italian and French (and other Romance languages), DPs do not display morphological case, clitic pronouns can manifest case distinctions: accusative (e.g. It. lo, Fr. le ‘it/him’), dative (e.g. It. gli, Fr. lui ‘to him’), partitive/genitive (It. ne, Fr. en ‘of it/them’), locative (It. ci, Fr. y ‘there’).

C4: phi-features: depending on the features they realize, two series of clitic pronouns should be distinguished: person and non-person pronouns (Kayne 2000b). Cardinaletti (2008), (2010a) further elaborated this distinction for Italian clitic pronouns, which can be categorized as in (13) (note that the morphological make up of clitic pronouns may have consequences, among other things, on the type of clitic clusters that the pronoun can enter, as shown in the quoted works):

(13) a. morphologically simple clitic pronouns which only consist of consonantal morphemes expressing person (the final vowel is epenthetic):
   - 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd} and 0 person clitics: mi ‘me’, ti ‘you.sg.; si ‘himself/herself/them-selves’; ci ‘us, there’, vi ‘you.pl., there’
   - 3\textsuperscript{rd} person (masculine) dative clitic gli ‘to him’
b. morphologically complex clitic pronouns which consist of the pronominal morpheme /l/ and portmanteau vocalic morphemes encoding number/gender (also found in the unmarked Italian nominal declension, see [40]):
     (note that in Spanish (pro)nominal system, phi-features are expressed by more than one morpheme: l-o-s ‘them.M.PL’, l-a-s ‘them.F.PL’)

c. morphologically complex clitic pronouns which consist of the pronominal morpheme /l/ and the vocalic morpheme /e/ (also found in the marked Italian nominal declension, e.g. fiore ‘flower’, felice ‘happy’):
   - 3rd person feminine dative clitic le ‘to her’
   - partitive/genitive/locative ne ‘of them’, ‘from there’.

3.4. Semantic Properties

D1: non-arguments (expletives) and quasi-arguments: clitic pronouns can realize non-argumental and quasi-argumental subjects, which cannot be realized by strong pronouns. Data come from the northern Italian dialect of Trepalle, province of Sondrio (Manzini and Savoia 2005 I: 174). (14a) contains non-argument al ‘it’ co-occurring with the postverbal subject i marcin ‘the children’ (see the similar Florentine example in [14a′] from Brandi and Cordin 1989: 115); (14b) contains the quasi-argumental al subject of the weather verb plof ‘rain’; (14c) contains quasi-argument al co-occurring with the postverbal subject clause klamel ‘call him’:

(14) a. Dopo al vegn i marcin. [Trepalle]
   later it comes the children
   ‘The children are coming later.’

   a’. Gl’ è venuto la Maria. [Florentine]
   it is come the Maria
   ‘Maria came.’

b. Al plof. [Trepalle]
   it rains
   ‘It is raining.’

c. Al sarò megl klame=l. [Trepalle]
   it will.be better call.INF=him
   ‘It would be better to call him.’

D2: benefactive and ethical datives: clitic pronouns can realize non-argumental datives, i.e., benefactive (15a, b) (see [3a′]) and ethical (15c) datives; the latter cannot be realized by strong pronouns:

(15) a. Mi parte il treno. to.me leaves the train
   ‘My train is leaving.’
b. *Mi è nato un bambino.
   to.me is born a baby
   ‘I have had a baby.’

c. Mi è saltato dalla finestra.
   to.me is jumped from.the window
   ‘He jumped out of the window.’

D3: *[±human] reference: (3rd person) clitic pronouns can refer to both human and non-human entities, a possibility excluded to strong personal pronouns which may only refer to human entities (see Kayne 1975: 91; Jaeggli 1982: 41; Rizzi 1982; Berendsen 1986: 38–39; Schroten 1992; Corver and Delfitto 1999; Cardinaletti and Starke 1996, 1999 among others). A verb that implies a non-human object, such as *comprare ‘buy’, gives ungrammatical results with a strong pronoun, and is only compatible with a clitic pronoun:

(16) a. Non conosco / *compro che lui.
   not know.I / buy.I than him
   ‘I only know him.’

   b. Lo conosco / Lo compio.
      him/it know.I / it buy.I
      ‘I know him / I buy it.’

Demonstrative pronouns behave differently in that they can have non-human referents. We show it with the following French example: Je ne connais / achète que celui-là ‘I only know / buy that one’.

D4: referentiality/specificity/familiarity: it is often claimed that clitic pronouns only have referential/specific usages (e.g. Uriagereka 1995a; Sportiche 1996/98). But this claim is not entirely correct. First, clitic pronouns can realize non-referential arguments, such as clitic objects in idiomatic expressions (17a, b), measure objects of verbs like *pesare ‘weigh’ (17c), and the object of phrasal verbs (17d) (examples [17c, d] are taken from Cinque 1990: 163, n. 8):

(17) a. Ce la farò.
   there it will.make.I
   ‘I will manage.’

   b. Ci vuole altro pane.
      there wants more bread
      ‘More bread is needed.’

   c. 70 chili, non li pesa.
      70 kilos, not them weighs.he
      ‘70 kilos, he does not weigh them.’

   d. Giustizia, non la farà mai.
      justice, not it will.do.he ever
      ‘Justice, he will never do it.’
Referentiality only matters for discourse grammar, i.e., when the antecedent of the clitic pronoun must be recovered from the discourse. In this case, non-referential clitics are not possible. Consider the contrast between (17c, d) and (18c, d) (examples from Cinque 1990: 162, n. 8):

(18) a. Speaker A:  \textit{Io conosco Mario.}  
I know Mario  
‘I know Mario.’  
Speaker B:  \textit{Anch’io lo conosco.}  
also I him know  
‘I know him, too.’

b. Speaker A:  \textit{Io so l’inglese.}  
I know English  
‘I speak English.’  
Speaker B:  \textit{Anch’io lo so.}  
also I it know  
‘I speak it, too.’

c. Speaker A:  \textit{Io peso 70 chili.}  
I weigh 70 kilos  
‘I weigh 70 kilos.’  
Speaker B:  \textit{*Anch’io li peso.}  
also I them weigh  
‘Me too.’

d. Speaker A:  \textit{Farà giustizia.}  
will.do.he justice  
‘He will do justice.’  
Speaker B:  \textit{*Anch’io la farò.}  
also I it will.do  
‘Me too.’

Second, clitic pronouns can also have non-specific readings (sentence [19c] from Cinque 1990: 119):

(19) a. \textit{Cerco una segretaria che sappia l’inglese, ma non la voglio troppo giovane.}  
look.for.I a secretary who knows English but not her want.I too young  
‘I am looking for a secretary who speaks English, but I wouldn’t like a too young one.’

b. \textit{Il bambino che arriverà per primo lo premieremo con un gelato.}  
the child who will.arrive for first him will.give.a.prize.we with an ice-cream  
‘The child who will arrive first will get an ice-cream as a prize.’
c. *Ci rimarrò tre settimane. Spero di passar=le in allegria.*
   there will.stay.I three weeks hope.I to spend=them being jolly
   ‘I will stay three weeks. I hope to spend them being jolly.’

Third, a subject clitic pronoun as in (20) can have an impersonal, existential reading. The example comes from an Emilian dialect spoken in Gazzoli (province of Piacenza) (Cardinaletti and Repetti 2010: 130, n. 24):

(20) [in kula butiga la, i m an vendiːd əl pay vɛtʃɛ] [Emilian, Gazzoli]
   in that shop there to.me have sold the bread old
   ‘In that shop they sold me stale bread.’

In all the examples seen above except idiomatic (17a, b) and existential (20), clitic pronouns have an anaphoric usage and refer to familiar antecedents. They cannot be used to introduce a new referent into the discourse, for example accompanied by a pointing gesture; in this case, only strong pronouns are possible:

(21) Conosci ⌇ lui / * ⌇ lo?
    know.you him / him
    ‘Do you know him?’

3.5. Choice between classes of pronouns

E: In contexts like (22), a clitic pronoun must be used instead of a strong pronoun. In (23), the opposite situation is found: when e.g. modification or coordination occurs, a strong pronoun is the only possibility since these are contexts in which clitic pronouns are independently barred; see (7)–(9) above. This suggests that a clitic pronoun is always chosen over a strong pronoun if possible. The choice preference can be expressed as in (24):

(22) Question: Conosci Gianni?
    know.you Gianni
    ‘Do you know Gianni?’
    Answer: *Sì, conosco lui / Sì, lo conosco.
    yes know.I him / yes him know.I
    ‘Yes, I know him.’

(23) Question: Conosci Gianni?
    know.you Gianni
    ‘Do you know Gianni?’
    Answer: Sì, conosco solo lui / conosco lui e la moglie.
    yes know.I only him / know.I him and the wife
    ‘Yes, I know only him / I know him and his wife.’

(24) choice: clitic > strong
4. A syntactic attempt to derive the peculiar properties of clitic pronouns

In order to capture the co-variation of syntactic, semantic and phonological properties, a syntactic trigger is needed. Given the current model of grammar, where semantics and phonology are independent of each other, a syntactic trigger will necessarily have both semantic and phonological consequences. The first attempts to derive the properties of clitic pronouns capitalize on their syntactic head status. Since they are heads, their behaviour is expectedly different from that of full phrases, i.e., DPs and strong pronouns (see section 4.1). The discovery of weak pronouns makes this view insufficient. Weak pronouns display the same properties as clitic pronouns, but they are not heads: they do not occupy head positions, but specifier positions, typical of phrases. A more elaborated analysis is needed which captures the parallel behaviour of clitic and weak pronouns. One such proposal is that clitic pronouns (as well as weak pronouns) are reduced maximal projections (see section 4.2 for two different implementations of this idea).

4.1. The head approach

Since Kayne (1975: 81–83) and Baltin (1981), clitic pronouns are taken to be heads. This view is supported by the observation that a clitic pronoun and its host can undergo movement as a unit. Consider French interrogatives (25a, b) (Kayne 1975) and Italian hypotheticals (26a, b) and gerunds (27a) (Rizzi 2000b: 108), in which the verb moves to C, i.e., the position preceding the subject which is occupied by the complementiser in subordinate clauses. In the presence of a clitic pronoun, both the clitic and the verb precede the subject, (25d), (26d), (27b). These data can be interpreted by saying that object pronouns are carried along by auxiliary movement to C; also see (62c–e) below. In (25)–(27) and throughout the paper, the barred character indicates the traces of moved constituents (we assume that clitic pronouns move from the position typical of the XPs they replace; see section 5 below for arguments to support this thesis):

(25) a. \([CP [TP tu \ as \ [VP vu \ Jean]]].\)
   ‘You saw Jean.’

     b. \([CP [C \ as] \ [TP tu \ as \ [VP vu \ Jean]]].\)
    ‘Did you see Jean?’

     c. \([CP [TP tu \ l’ \ as \ [VP vu \ le]].\)
    ‘You saw him.’

     d. \([CP [C \ l’ \ as] \ [TP tu \ [l’\ as] \ [VP vu \ le]].\)
    ‘Did you see him?’
Other arguments for the head status of clitic pronouns come from their complex interaction with verb movement (giving rise to proclisis and enclisis, see sections 6.2–3).

The peculiar properties of clitic pronouns might be attributed to their head status. Their behaviour is similar to that of elements realizing functional heads, which cannot be focalized, modified, conjoined, and do not bear word stress.

Although clitic pronouns are taken to be heads, the peculiar properties discussed in section 3 cannot be attributed to their head status. Most of these properties also characterize the class of weak pronouns, which, like clitics, differ from strong pronouns, but are not heads: they occur in specifier positions (Cardinaletti and Starke 1996, 1999). One example is provided by the Italian dative pronoun loro ‘to.them’ which, like clitic pronouns, must evacuate its merge position (28), cannot be modified and coordinated (29)–(30), is morphologically reduced with respect to the strong dative form a loro ‘to.them’, and is always anaphoric (Cardinaletti 1991). Loro however differs from clitic pronouns in that it is a bisyllabic word which bears word stress, as shown by the fact that the tonic vowel is lengthened by a productive phonological rule of Italian (cf. [‘lo:ro]); on the syntactic side, loro does not share the distribution of clitic elements since it follows the lexical verb (28b) vs. (28c) and is not necessarily adjacent to it (31):
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(28) a. *Maria ha dato un libro loro.
   Maria has given a book to them
b. Maria ha dato loro un libro loro.
   ‘Maria gave them a book.’
c. *Maria loro ha dato loro un libro loro.
   ‘Maria gave them a book.’

(29) a. Maria parla solo a loro.
   Maria talks only to them
   ‘Maria only talks to them.’
b. *Maria parla solo loro.
   Maria talks only to them

(30) a. Maria parla [a loro e a voi].
   Maria talks to them and to you
   ‘Maria talks to them and to you.’
b. *Maria parla [loro e a voi].
   Maria talks to them and to you

(31) Non ho dato mai loro un libro loro.
   ‘I have never given them a book.’

A common analysis is needed to account for the syntactic and semantic properties which are shared by clitic and weak pronouns and differentiate them from strong pronouns. Taking weak pronouns into account, the morphological and the choice generalizations in (12) and (24) should be reformulated as in (32a) and (32b), respectively:

(32) a. morphological reduction: clitic ≤ weak ≤ strong
   b. choice: clitic > weak > strong

Although clitic pronouns behave as heads, they cannot be merged as such. Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetric framework excludes the base-generation of a pure head in complement position, as in (33a) (see Kayne 1994: 61). A more elaborated hypothesis is therefore needed in which clitic pronouns are inserted as maximal projections, as in (33b), and become heads in the course of the derivation. Since its category hasn’t been established yet, the clitic pronoun is represented here as X and XP, respectively:

(33) a. * V’
      V   X
b. V’
   V   XP

Before turning to the discussion of (33b), the proposal by Moro (2000) is worth mentioning, who assumed Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetric approach, but looked at clitic placement in a slightly different way. Moro suggested that clitic pronouns (i) indeed merge as heads and (ii) must move to break down a symmetric configuration, namely a phrase which
contains two heads (the verb and the clitic pronoun itself), as in (33a). We have just seen in (28a, b) that obligatory syntactic movement also characterizes weak pronouns, which are not merged as heads. Moro’s proposal thus cannot be extended to account for the obligatory movement of weak pronouns. Since it is more desirable to have a common motivation for the obligatory movement of clitic and weak pronouns (see section 6.1), this hypothesis will not be further considered here.

4.2. The maximal projection approach

As we concluded above, a clitic pronoun should be regarded as the realization of the head of an otherwise empty phrase generated in argument position, out of which it is extracted at some point of the derivation (see Torrego 1988 and section 5.6). Two approaches have been explored in the literature: compared to full DP phrases (34a) (see Abney 1987), pronominal projections are reduced from either below (i.e., they lack the NP projection, as roughly in [34b]) or above (i.e., they lack the DP projection, as in [34c]):

(34)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{a. } & \text{DP} & \text{b. } & \text{DP} & \text{c. } & \text{NP} \\
D & \text{NP} & | & D & | & N \\
\end{array}
\]

The two proposals in (34b, c) are discussed in sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, respectively – note that within a Bare Phrase Structure Theory, Chomsky (1995) suggested that clitic pronouns are both maximal (X_{\text{max}}), because they do not project, and minimal (X_{\text{min}}), because they do not dominate anything. This proposal does not allow us to distinguish clitic from weak pronouns, hence it will not be assumed here.

4.2.1. The D-hypothesis

Since pronouns lack descriptive content, clitic pronouns can be taken to realize a nominal projection which lacks the lexical portion of the nominal structure, namely NP. In other words, clitic pronouns only realize the head D of the nominal expression, as in (34b).

The fact that in some Romance languages, 3rd person accusative clitic pronouns have the same morphological form as determiners, as shown in (35) for French, seems to support the view that clitic pronouns are determiners (Ds). This proposal builds on Postal’s (1969) analysis of English pronouns, according to which phrases like the linguists and we linguists have the same structure (for Germanic languages, see Cardinaletti 1994: 198–199; for a historical perspective on the D-hypothesis, see Harris 1980a, b and Vincent 1997). Clitic pronouns differ from regular DPs (36a) (see [34a]) in that their complement NP is empty (36b); something like a null pronoun – Torrego (1988); Uriagereka (1988), (1995a), (1996); Corver and Delfitto (1999); Panagiotidis (2002), or absent (36 b’) (i.e., they are intransitive Ds, cf. Cardinaletti 1994; Rizzi 2000b):
(35) a. *Je connais la fille.*
   I know the girl
   ‘I know the girl.’

   b. *Je la connais.*
   I her know
   ‘I know her.’

(36) a. 
   \[
   \text{DP} \\
   \text{D} \\
   \text{NP} \\
   \text{la} \\
   \text{N} \\
   \text{fille}
   \]

   b. 
   \[
   \text{DP} \\
   \text{D} \\
   \text{NP} \\
   \text{la} \\
   \text{pro} \\
   \text{la}
   \]

In spite of its *prima facie* attractiveness, this proposal raises many questions, both on the morphological/phonological side and the semantic side of grammar.

First, while in some Romance languages such as French, the paradigms of determiners and (accusative) clitic pronouns are indeed identical, in other languages (e.g. Italian), the two paradigms are similar but not identical, something which is unexpected if determiners and clitic pronouns are listed in the lexicon as one and the same lexical item:

(37)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Italian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>determiners</td>
<td>accusative clitic pron.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASC</td>
<td>le</td>
<td>le</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEM</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>les</td>
<td>les</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that the differences between the two paradigms in Italian cannot be traced back to productive phonological rules. Furthermore, the final vowels of clitic pronouns have a different distribution from those of definite articles in front of vowel-initial words. Note the minimal pairs in (38) and (39):

(38) a. *Lo àmo / ??l’àmo*
   him love.I
   ‘I love him.’

   a’. *Lo inizio / l’inizio*
   it,M begin.I
   ‘I am beginning it.’

b. *La àmo / ??l’àmo*
   her love.I
   ‘I love her.’
b'. La inizio / l’inizio
it.F begin.I
‘I am beginning it.’

\(39\)

a. *lo àmo / l’àmo
the.M fish-hook.M
‘the fish-hook’
a’. *lo inizio / l’inizio
the.M beginning.M
‘the beginning’
b. ?la àmaca / l’àmaca
the.F hammock.F
‘the hammock’
b’. ??la amica / l’amica
the.F friend.F
‘the friend’

Final vowels occur on clitic pronouns depending on the phonological properties of the verb: they are preferably kept when the initial vowel of the verb is stressed (38a, b), and optionally omitted otherwise (38a’, b’); note that the gender of the pronoun is not relevant. Determiners display the opposite behaviour in that they are preferably omitted, and gender is a crucial factor. Vowels are obligatorily missing on the article if it is masculine (39a, a’) and preferably missing when it is feminine (39b, b’). The phonological differences between (38) and (39) argue against a common treatment of determiners and clitic pronouns (cf. Cardinaletti 2010a). In phonological theories, clitic pronouns and determiners are analysed as independent lexical entries. For Italian, Repetti (2004) and Cardinaletti and Repetti (2007) take /l/ to be the underlying form of the masculine singular definite article, which explains why final [o] does not occur in (39a, a’), and /lo/ to be the underlying form of the masculine singular (accusative) clitic pronoun.

Second, since determiners do not bear case distinctions in Romance languages, it is surprising that determiners are identical/similar to accusative clitic pronouns. This criticism can be suspended by observing that in some Romance languages, notably northern Italian dialects, nominative clitic pronouns are (often) identical to accusative clitic pronouns. Thus, the lack of case distinctions seems to characterize not only determiners but also clitic pronouns. However, the same observation as above holds: Although nominative clitics are often similar to accusative clitics and determiners, their paradigms are not always identical. This is again unexpected if these three items were the same lexical elements of category D. In the D-approach to clitic pronouns, it is also difficult to understand why one of the Italian allomorphs of the 3rd person plural masculine determiner, namely the one used in front of consonantal clusters (e.g. gli studenti ‘the students’), should be identical to the 3rd person dative singular masculine clitic gli (e.g. Maria gli parlerà ‘Maria will speak to him’). These homophonous forms can only be explained diachronically. See Vanelli (1996) for the parallel, but not identical historical development of determiners and clitic pronouns from Old Italian to Modern Italian.

Third, the D-hypothesis is also undermined by the observation that some languages manifest one paradigm but not the other: Slavic languages have clitic pronouns but not determiners, Brazilian Portuguese has determiners but no corresponding clitics.
Fourth, the D-hypothesis is hardly extendable to those clitic pronouns whose morphological form is different from determiners, but which share the same syntactic and phonological properties as 3rd person (accusative) clitic pronouns: 3rd person dative clitics (Italian gli, le), 1st and 2nd clitic pronouns (Italian mi, ti), locatives (Italian ci, vi) and partitives/genitives (Italian ne) (see [1]). To overcome this difficulty, Uriagereka (1995a) suggests that non-3rd person pronouns are indeed not Ds. The non-uniformity hypothesis concerning clitic pronouns is also defended in Bleam (1999), who suggests that only accusative 3rd person pronouns are determiners, while dative clitics are inflections.

Finally, an observation concerning the semantic side of the grammar: if D is the locus of referential properties (Longobardi 1994), the proposal that clitic pronouns are Ds is problematic in view of the fact that they do not have any autonomous referential capability. Contrary to strong pronouns, they are always anaphoric on a DP present in the linguistic context and cannot be used to introduce new referents into the discourse (see property D4 in section 3 and [21]).

These observations make the proposal that clitic pronouns are Ds highly controversial. The morphological identity or similarity between determiners and 3rd person (accusative) clitic pronouns observed in Romance languages must be attributed to historical reasons, both classes of elements having Latin demonstratives as their predecessors (Harris 1980a, b; Wanner 1987; Vincent 1997), and cannot be used to argue for a common syntactic status of determiners and clitic pronouns. Historical reasons, but not the D-hypothesis can also explain why in Sardinian, 3rd person clitic pronouns and determiners display different roots: l- and s-, respectively (Jones 1993). While clitic pronouns derive from Latin ille, determiners derive from Latin ipse. Also see Jones (1999).

In conclusion, determiners and clitic pronouns are different lexical items: while definite articles occur in D and can be seen as the spell out of copies of the features of the noun (Giusti 2008), clitic pronouns have more structure: they realize (reduced) nominal projections. As we will see in the following section, they may be taken to realize a nominal projection lacking the DP layer, as in (34c).

4.2.2. The structural deficiency hypothesis

The critical observations against the D-hypothesis suggest that the peculiarities of clitic pronouns must be captured in a different way. Here, we explore the alternative hypothesis depicted in (34c) above, according to which clitic pronouns are reduced projections crucially lacking the highest portion of nominal expressions (i.e., the DP layer). Clitic pronouns only realize the nominal functional heads encoding phi-features (person, number, gender) and case features. Note that 3rd person clitics indeed display the same morphemes realizing gender/number features (40a) as in the unmarked nominal declension of nouns (40b) and adjectives (40c) (the same morphemes also appear on quantifiers, demonstratives, and past participles):

(40) a. *lo*  *la*  *li*  *le*
   him.M.SG  her.F.SG  them.M.PL  them.F.PL

   b. *bambino*  *bambina*  *bambini*  *bambine*
c. *alto* *alta* *alti* *alte*

In languages with case morphology, such as Slavic, clitic pronouns realize another DP-
internal feature (case) and end up being homophonous to case endings; see for instance
the Czech clitic *ho* in (41a), which is identical to the case ending found on the adjective
in (41b) (this observation is also true of Germanic language, see Cardinaletti 1994: 198−
199; Cardinaletti and Starke 1996):

(41) a. *Videl ho.*
   saw.he him.ACC
   ‘He saw him.’

   b. *velkého muze*
   big.ACC man.ACC
   ‘the big man’

The projection realized by a clitic pronoun can thus be seen as the nominal counterpart
of the clausal IP layer (see Roberts 2010 for the similar proposal that clitics encode phi-
features and not the D feature). Like clitic pronouns, weak pronouns also lack the highest
functional projection D, but retain some further projection that clitics lack. This can
account for the differences between them, in particular their different phonological prop-
erties. The representation of full phrases (including strong pronouns), weak pronouns
and clitic pronouns is provided in (42) (see Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: 195):

(42) a. Strong Pronouns
    b. Weak Pronouns
    c. Clitic Pronouns

As we have seen in section 3 above, clitic pronouns are deficient on all linguistic levels.
Their peculiar behaviour can be reduced to the syntactic properties of the phrase they
project. The lack of the highest DP projection can explain their semantic properties and
the fact that they cannot be modified, conjoined and contrasted, under the hypothesis
that only full extended projections can undergo these operations. The lack of the projec-
tion, to which phonological properties are correlated, explains the fact that clitic pro-
nouns bear no word stress. As we will see below, the deficiency hypothesis can also
motivate the peculiar syntax displayed by clitic (and weak) pronouns, in particular the
fact that they never appear in their merge position and always occur in derived posi-
tions — see (5) and (28a, b). For a more detailed discussion of the deficiency hypothesis,
see Cardinaletti and Starke (1999).
5. Clitic placement: Derivation or base-generation?

Since Kayne (1975) and Quicoli (1976, 1980), a movement analysis has been assumed for object clitic pronouns: they are merged as arguments of the verb and moved to higher clitic-dedicated positions. In the following sections 5.1–3, I discuss the arguments for taking clitic placement as a syntactic movement rule. In section 5.4, I discuss the evidence, mainly represented by clitic doubling, to analyze clitic pronouns as merged in their spell-out positions. In sections 5.5–6, some recent attempts at reconciling the apparently contradictory pieces of evidence are presented.

5.1. Locality restrictions

Clitic placement displays locality restrictions typical of other movement operations, such as wh-movement and NP-movement.

As originally pointed out by Kayne (1975), pronouns cannot be cliticized across the subject of causative constructions (a Specified Subject Condition effect, currently analyzed as a Minimality effect, Rizzi 1990), which can be taken as a piece of evidence for a movement analysis of clitics:

(43) a. *Jean lui a laissé [Pierre parler à Marie].
Jean to.her has let Pierre speak to Marie
‘Jean let Pierre speak to her.’

b. Jean l’a laissé [le parler à Marie].
Jean him has let speak to Marie
‘Jean let him speak to Marie.’

c. *Jean lui a laissé [Pierre parler lui].
Jean to.her has let Pierre speak
‘Jean let Pierre speak to her.’

Now compare (44a) with (44b): while the nominal expression la foto ‘the picture’ in (44a) contains a determiner in D, questa foto ‘this picture’ in (44b) contains a demonstrative in SpecDP, which blocks movement out of the DP (see Giusti 1997: 111; Sportiche 1989/98: 126, 143, 1996/98: 256):

(44) a. Ne ho visto [DP ne la [NP foto ne]].
of.him have.I seen the picture
‘I saw the picture of him.’

cf. Di chi hai visto [DP di chi la [NP foto di chi]]?
of whom have.you seen the picture
‘The picture of whom did you see?’

b. *Ne ho visto [DP questa [NP foto ne]].
of.him have.I seen this picture
‘I saw this picture of him.’
19. Syntactic Effects of Cliticization

Clitic pronouns cannot be extracted out of an adjunct temporal PP (45), a CED effect (Huang 1982). Argumental and adjunct locative PPs give rise to contrasts like those in (46): extraction of a clitic pronoun is possible out of an argumental locative as in (46a–c) and ungrammatical out of an adjunct locative as in (46d) – see also (92); cf. Rizzi (1988/2001: 540–542); Siloni (1997: 64, n. 27); Belletti (1999: 557–558). A similar effect is found with partitive ne-extraction out of quantified nominal expressions: in (47a) tre ‘three’ is the argument of passare ‘spend’, and extraction is possible – see also (93), in (47b) tre ‘three’ is a temporal adjunct of rimanere ‘stay’, and extraction is ungrammatical (Belletti and Rizzi (1981):

(45) *L’ ho parlato [dopo le].
him have.I spoken after
‘I spoke after him.’

cf. *Chi hai parlato [dopo chi]?
whom have.you spoken after
‘After whom did you speak?’

(46) a. Gianni le si è messo [accanto le].
Gianni to.her REFL is placed next
‘Gianni placed himself next to her.’

cf. A chi si è messo [accanto a chi]?
to whom REFL is placed next
‘Next to whom did he place himself?’

La ragazza a cui Gianni si è messo [accanto a chi]
the girl to whom Gianni REFL is placed next
‘the girl next to whom Gianni placed himself.’

b. Gianni le è seduto [accanto le].
Gianni to.her is seated next
‘Gianni is seated next to her.’

cf. A chi è seduto [accanto a chi]?
to whom is seated next
‘Next to whom is he seated?’

La ragazza a cui Gianni è seduto [accanto a chi]
the girl to whom Gianni is seated next
‘the girl next to whom he is seated.’

c. ?Gianni le ha mangiato [accanto le].
Gianni to.her has eaten next
‘Gianni was eating next to her.’
cf. *A chi ha mangiato [accanto a chi]? to whom has eaten next ‘Next to whom was he eating?’

*La ragazza a cui Gianni ha mangiato [accanto a chi] the girl to whom Gianni has eaten next ‘the girl next to whom Gianni was eating.’

d. *Gianni le è felice [accanto le] Gianni to her is happy next ‘Gianni is happy next to her.’

cf. *A chi è felice [accanto a chi]? to whom is happy next ‘Next to whom is he happy?’

*La ragazza a cui Gianni è felice [accanto a cui] the girl to whom Gianni is happy next ‘the girl next to whom Gianni is happy.’

(47) a. Ne ho passate [tre ne] a Londra. of. them have. I spent three in London ‘I spent three of them in London.’

b. *Ne sono rimasto [tre ne] a Londra. of. them am stayed three in London ‘I stayed three of them in London.’

Clitic movement cannot take place out of complex NPs (48) and PPs (49):

(48) a. Ho cominciato [la lettura [di [due giornali]]]. have. I started the reading of two newspapers ‘I have started reading two newspapers.’

b. *ho cominciato [la lettura [di [due ne]]]. them have. I started the reading of two ‘I have started reading two of them.’

cf. *Cosa hai cominciato [la lettura [di [due cosa]]]? what have. you started the reading of two

(49) a. Ho parlato [con [la madre [di Enrico]]]. have. I spoken with the mother of Enrico ‘I spoke with Enrico’s mother.’

b. *Ne ho parlato [con [la madre [ne]]]. of. him have. I spoken with the mother ‘I spoke with his mother.’

cf. *Di chi hai parlato [con [la madre [di chi]]]? of whom have. you spoken with the mother ‘With whose mother did you speak?’
Other locality constraints are discussed in Torrego (2002).

It can be concluded that clitic pronouns undergo syntactic movement from the first merge (complement) positions to the positions in which they are pronounced (spell-out positions).

5.2. Locality and Clitic climbing

Differently from *wh*-movement, clitic movement cannot take place long-distance, whether the clause is finite (50) or infinitive (51):

(50) a. *Penso [che lo vedrò le].
   think.I that him will.see.I
   ‘I think that I will see him.’

b. *Lo penso [che vedrò le].
   him think.I that will.see.I

cf. Chi pensi [che vedrai chi]?
   whom think.you that will.see.you
   ‘Who do you think that you will see?’

(51) a. Penso [di veder=lo].
   think.I to see=him
   ‘I think to see him.’

b. *Lo penso [di veder=lo].
   him think.I to see

cf. Chi pensi [di vedere chi]?
   whom think.you to see
   ‘Who do you think to see?’

In this respect, clitic movement is similar to NP-movement, which also takes place locally:

(52) a. John seems [John to win].

b. *John seems [that it is likely [John to win]].

Apparent counterexamples to the locality of clitic movement are so-called clitic-climbing structures found with modal, aspectual, and motion verbs (*Restructuring verbs*), in which the pronoun can appear cliticized onto the superordinate verb of which it is not a complement (53a′, b′, c′), in addition to being enclitic on the infinitival verb (53a, b, c) – see Rizzi (1982) for the first extensive discussion of the phenomenon, Cinque (2004) for the most recent and comprehensive account, and Bok-Bennema (2006) for an introductory overview of the literature and examples from Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish; also see Strozer (1976) for Spanish; Picallo (1985), (1990) and Fischer (2002) for Catalan; Jones (1988) for Sardinian; Martins (2000) for Portuguese:
The sentences in (53) are monoclausal structures in which modal, aspectual, and motion verbs are functional verbs (like auxiliaries), merged in the extended projection of the lexical verb (in the sense of Grimshaw 1991) (see Cinque 2004). (54) is a schematic clausal representation where FP stays for the functional projections associated with the lexical verb V, subject to rigid order restrictions (Cinque 1999). Restructuring verbs may realize the heads of such functional projections:

\[
(54) \quad [CP \ldots [FP \ldots [FP V_{restr} \ldots [VP V_{lex} ]]]]
\]

The phenomenon known as clitic climbing boils down to the appearance of the clitic pronoun in the high clitic position which precedes the finite restructuring verb, as in (53a', b', c').

To account for the position of the clitic pronoun on the infinitival verb in (53a, b, c), another clitic position must be assumed, located in the (lexical) domain of the infinitival verb. The structure is schematized in (55) (see Cardinaletti and Shlonsky 2004, who also distinguish different classes of restructuring verbs with respect to clitic placement). The high and the low clitic positions encode different features, person/number features and case features, respectively (see section 6.5):

\[
(55) \quad [CP \ldots [FP \text{ clitic} [FP (V_{restr}) \ldots [FP \ldots [FP \text{ clitic} [VP V_{lex} ]]]]]]
\]

Another argument for the existence of the two clitic positions and the movement nature of clitic placement comes from the observation that in restructuring contexts, more than one instance of the same clitic pronoun is sometimes possible, as in (56) (see Kayne 1989b: 257, n. 37 and the references cited there). Similar sentences are produced by
children acquiring Italian, both with restructuring verbs, (57a), and imperative infinitival forms, (57b):

(56) Gianni li vuole veder=li li.
    ‘Gianni wants to see them.’

    ‘I want to try to do it.’
    (Adriano, 4;3.15)

b. Non ci andar=ci ci!
    ‘Don’t go there!’
    (Adriano, 4;6.10)

In these sentences, more than one link of the clitic chain is spelled out, both the intermediate link on the infinitival lexical verb and the highest link in the functional domain. Although two clitic positions are available in the clause, they cannot be occupied by different clitic pronouns. As the Italian contrasts in (58) indicate, two clitic pronouns inside one and the same sentence necessarily have to cluster (see Rizzi 1982). The data show that the cluster is formed in the lower clitic position (58a) and optionally moved to the high clitic position (58b):

(58) a. Voleva presentar=mel to.me.him ieri me lo.
    ‘He wanted to introduce him to me yesterday.’

b. Me lo voleva presentare ieri me lo.
    ‘He wanted to introduce him to me yesterday.’

c. *Mi voleva presentar=lo ieri.
    ‘He wanted to introduce him to me yesterday.’

d. *Lo voleva presentar=mi ieri.

For the analysis of the syntactic and phonological properties of clitic clusters in Romance languages, see Perlmutter (1971); Bonet (1995); Laenzlinger (1993); Dobrovie-Sorin (1995); Gerlach (1998a, b); Popescu (2000); Cardinaletti (2008); Săvescu Ciucivara (2009), among many others.

5.3. On the nature of clitic movement: XP movement followed by head movement

In previous sections, we have shown that clitic placement displays locality properties shared by syntactic movement and in particular A-movement. Is clitic movement indeed
A-movement, namely the movement of a maximal projection? The answer is positive. Consider the fact that e.g. in Italian, accusative and partitive clitic pronouns trigger past-participle agreement; this is true of both lexical verbs (59) and restructuring verbs (60):

(59) a. *Gianni ha letto queste riviste.*
   Gianni has read these.F.PL magazines.F.PL
   ‘Gianni read these magazines.’

   b. *Gianni le / ne ha lette.*
   Gianni them.F.PL of.them has read.F.PL
   ‘Gianni read them / some of them.’

(60) a. *Gianni ha dovuto leggere queste riviste.*
   Gianni has must read these.F.PL magazines.F.PL
   ‘Gianni was obliged to read these magazines.’

   b. *Gianni le / ne ha dovute leggere.*
   Gianni them.F.PL of.them has must.F.PL read
   ‘Gianni was obliged to read them / some of them.’

If (morphological) agreement is the reflex of a local relation like specifier-head agreement (Kayne 1989a), the data in (59)−(60) show that there must be a step in the derivation in which the pronoun occupies the specifier position of the projection headed by the past participle and is therefore an XP. Past participle agreement is found in other instances of XP-movement, i.e., with passive and unaccusative verbs: *queste riviste sono state lette* ‘these.F.PL magazines.F.PL have been.F.PL read.F.PL’, *queste riviste sono arrivate ieri* ‘these.F.PL magazines.F.PL have arrived.F.PL yesterday’.

In order to reconcile these data with the fact that clitic pronouns are heads at the end of the derivation (cf. section 4.1 above, where it was shown that the verb takes the pronoun along), clitic placement must be seen as a two-step operation: The first step is A-movement of a maximal projection to the specifier of the head realized by the past participle, the second step is proper head movement to the next higher head (cf. Sportiche 1989/98; Belletti 1999; Cardinaletti and Starke 1999; Rizzi 2000b, among others):

(61) a. \[CP \{TP Gianni [\_ le ha \{[PARTP le lette \{VP Gianni lette le\}]\}\}\].

   b. \[CP \{TP Gianni [\_ le ha \{[PARTP le dovute \{VP Gianni leggere le\}]\}\}\].

As pointed out in Sportiche (1996/98) and Roberts (1997), the piece of data in (60b) argues against an analysis like Kayne’s (1989b) according to which clitic movement proceeds through the C head of the CP complement to restructuring verbs (when this head is empty). (60b) shows that clitic pronouns move as maximal projections at least as high as the participle phrase headed by the restructuring verb.

That XP movement is followed by head movement is also clearly shown by the following French data. In infinitival clauses (62a, b), the pronoun and the verb or the auxiliary follow adverbs such as *pas* ‘not’; infinitival auxiliaries can also optionally precede *pas*, as in (62c), similarly to what happens with finite verbs and auxiliaries (62d, e) (cf. Pollock 1989; Belletti 1990; Rizzi 2000b: 117). In (62c−e), the clitic pronoun attaches to the verb in the lower position (seen in [62a, b]) and is taken along by the verb or the auxiliary on their way to the higher position preceding *pas*:
(62) a. ... ne pas les manger les.
    ... not not them eat.INF
    ‘... not to eat them.’

b. ... ne pas les avoir [les mangés les].
    ... not not them have.INF eaten
    ‘... not to have eaten them.’

c. ... ne les avoir pas les avoir [les mangés les].
    ... not them have.INF not eaten

d. Jean ne les mange pas les mangés les.
    Jean not them eats not
    ‘Jean does not eat them.’

e. Jean ne les a pas les a [les mangés les].
    Jean not them has not eaten
    ‘Jean did not eat them.’

If past participle agreement is however due to another mechanism, it is no longer strong
evidence to support an XP-movement step of clitic movement. D’Alessandro and Roberts
(2008) for instance suggest that morphological agreement obtains between elements that
are contained in the complement of the minimal phase head, that is, the substructure that
is transferred to PF as a single unit (Chomsky 2008). The clitic pronoun moved to the
auxiliary and the past participle are contained in the complement of same phase head,
namely C.

The view that clitic movement is indeed XP movement at least until a certain point
of the derivation is given independent support by the comparison with the derivation of
weak pronouns. The first part of the clitic derivation shown in (61) also characterizes
weak pronouns. The head movement step is instead peculiar to clitic pronouns (cf. Ca-

5.4. Clitic doubling and the base-generation approach

Some reduplication constructions known as *clitic doubling* seem to challenge the deriva-
tional approach discussed so far.

Clitic doubling is the possibility attested in some languages to realize both a clitic
pronoun and the associated phrase in one and the same clause. See the examples in (63)
from River Plate Spanish and Rumanian (cf. Jaeggli 1982 and Dobrovie-Sorin 1990,
1994, respectively), where the direct object is doubled, those in (64) from Spanish (De-
monte 1995) and Italian, where the indirect object is doubled, and those in (65) from
Trentino, where the subject is doubled (see [2]):

(63) a. Lo vimos a Juan. [River Plate Spanish]
    him saw.we to Juan
    ‘We saw Juan.’
Clitic doubling must be differentiated from Left and Right Dislocation, where the phrases associated to clitic pronouns occur in clause-peripheral positions (see Anagnostopulou 2006: sect. 2 for an overview of the differences):

(66) a. Gianni, io lo conosco.
    Gianni I him know
    ‘Gianni, I know him.’

b. Io lo conosco, Gianni.
    I him know Gianni
    ‘I know him, Gianni.’

The observation, known as Kayne’s generalization, that in clitic-doubling constructions, a case-marker is in general present on the doubled object DP (such as a and pe in [63]), has led to the view that clitic pronouns are government / case absorbers (cf. Jaeggli 1982; Borer 1984). See Anagnostopulou (2006) for an overview on the cross-linguistic robustness of this generalization and the actual role of these preposition-like elements. Rizzi (2000a: section 2) addresses the question as to why Kayne’s generalization does not extend to subject clitic doubling, as in (65).

Doubling of DPs – as in (63)–(65) – contrasts with doubling of pronouns. This is obligatory in all dialects of Spanish (67a) (Jaeggli 1982). In other Romance languages, doubling is allowed only with pronouns. See the French data in (67b) (cf. Kayne 2000a) and the Catalan data in (67c, d) (cf. Rigau 1988; Fischer 2002):

(67) a. Lo vimos a él.
    him saw.we to Juan
    ‘We saw him.’

b. Il m’a vu moi.
    he me has seen me
    ‘He saw me.’
19. Syntactic Effects of Cliticization

When both the clitic pronoun and the associated phrase are present in the clause, it seems trivial that the pronoun cannot originate in the VP-internal position, which is occupied by the associated phrase, as in (63) and (64), or by a trace of the associated phrase, as in (65) (assuming that the subject DP el Mario is merged VP-internally and moved to the canonical, preverbal subject position, SpecTP).

The existence of clitic doubling led many researchers to suggest an alternative analysis of clitic placement: clitic pronouns are generated in their surface position, i.e., attached to their host, and are linked to an empty category in the canonical position of the phrase with the same grammatical function. If a full phrase is merged instead of the empty category, clitic doubling arises. Various implementations of this idea are found in the literature which cannot be discussed here at length (among many others, see Strozer 1976; Rivas 1977; Jaeggli 1982, 1986; Bouchard 1984; Suñer 1988; Roberge 1987, 1990; Rini 1991; Gutiérrez-Rexach 1999, 1999/2000 for Romance, and Borer 1984; Siloni 1997; Shlonsky 1994 for Semitic).

In what follows, we discuss the attempts at reconciling the contradictory evidence coming from locality restrictions and clitic doubling.

5.5. An attempt to reconcile the evidence for movement and the base-generation approach

Sportiche (1996/98) is the most recent base-generation approach to clitic placement in Romance. He suggests that clitic pronouns are merged as functional heads in the clausal skeleton and project CliticVoicePs, as in (68). An empty category (akin to pro) is merged with the verb and moved to the specifier of the Clitic-Voice Phrase, in order to satisfy a requirement of spec-head agreement with the clitic (the so-called Clitic Criterion) and to check features such as specificity. Note that if what is displaced is not the clitic pronoun itself, but an empty category associated with the clitic, the locality effects observed in clitic constructions in section 5.1 still follow.

In Sportiche’s reasoning, this analysis of clitic placement has the advantage of explaining the phenomenon of clitic doubling in a straightforward way. Clitic doubling can be said to obtain when a noun phrase is generated instead of the null category pro. The following would be the relevant portion of the structure of the two River Plate Spanish sentences lo vimos and lo vimos a Juan (cf. [63a]).

This analysis of object clitics somehow recalls the proposal by Brandi and Cordin (1981), (1989); Burzio (1986); Rizzi (1986) that subject clitics are realizations of the Inflectional head, while the argument of the verb is realized by either a null subject pro or a subject DP (for recent proposals along the same lines, see Poletto 2000, 2005; Goria
2004, among others). (69) is a simplified structure of *el parla* ‘he speaks’ and *el Mario el parla* ‘Mario speaks’ (see [65])

Sportiche’s proposal also accounts for two facts concerning doubling and weak pronouns. First, doubling is possible with clitic pronouns and ungrammatical with weak pronouns, which are not heads and therefore cannot be merged as functional heads of the clausal skeleton – compare (64b) with (70a, b), which contain weak *loro*. Second, it predicts doubling of a clitic and a weak pronoun, a correct prediction as shown by (70c) (although a register clash arises: doubling is typical of spoken language, weak *loro* is restricted to the high register of Italian, cf. Cardinaletti 1991):

(70) a. *Ho dato loro le caramelle ai bambini.*

    have.I given.to.them the sweets to.the children

b. *Le ho date loro ai bambini.*

    them have.I given.to.them to.the children

c. *Gliele ho date loro.*

    to.him.them have.I given.to.them
    ‘I gave them to them.’

In spite of its *prima facie* attractiveness, the proposal in (68) however raises a number of questions, for both subject and object clitics – for the criticism of (69) and the pro-
posals that subject clitics like el in (65) / (69) must be analyzed as moved verbal arguments along the same lines as object clitics, also see Cardinaletti and Repetti (2008), (2010).

First, it cannot capture the parallel behaviour of clitic and weak pronouns as far as the syntactic and semantic properties are concerned (see section 4.1 above). If clitic pronouns are heads of the clausal skeleton, as in (68), clitic and weak pronouns are now seen as two fundamentally distinct elements. The fact that they share most syntactic and semantic properties should be seen as accidental, and their common properties should be attributed to different reasons, a move which clearly implies a loss in descriptive generalization. Furthermore, the relationships between the two classes of pronouns in terms of morphological reduction and choice would be much more difficult to capture than under the hypothesis that they instantiate two different classes of deficient nominal projections – see section 4.2.2, (12), (24), and (32).

Second, although this type of proposal seems to capture clitic doubling quite easily, it predicts that this phenomenon should be much more common among languages, whereas it is pretty restricted.

Third, there is evidence that clitic doubling structures obey locality conditions on a par with simple cliticization. Compare (71a, b), taken from Belletti (1999: 558), with (46a, d) above:

(71) a. Maria se le colocó cerca a Juan.
   Maria herself to.him placed next to Juan
   ‘Maria placed herself next to Juan.’

b. *Maria le es feliz cerca a Juan.
   Maria to.him is happy next to Juan
   ‘Maria is happy next to Juan.’

Since in (68) the associated phrase, contrary to pro, does not move, the CED locality effect seen in (71) is unexpected. It can only be explained by assuming that clitic movement takes place in clitic doubling as well (Belletti 1999: 558). In conclusion, a purely derivational analysis seems to be the only coherent analysis of clitic placement. The existence of clitic doubling however remains puzzling.

5.6. An attempt to reconcile the evidence for movement and the existence of clitic doubling

In recent years, the attempt has been made to make the movement account of clitic placement compatible with the existence of the clitic doubling phenomenon. Under the enriched nominal structure made available by the DP-hypothesis, it has been proposed that both the clitic pronoun and the associated DP are contained in a big DP merged in argument position – cf. Torrego (1995); Uriagereka (1995a), (2005); Belletti (1999), (2005); Cecchetto (2000). Different implementations of this idea exist in the literature. The doubling phrase is taken to either occur in SpecDP (72a) (Uriagereka 1995a) or in the complement to D (72b) (Belletti 1999, 2005; Cecchetto 2000):
The big-DP hypothesis makes Sportiche’s (1996/98) analysis of clitic placement and clitic doubling unnecessary, a welcome result given the problems pointed out in section 5.5 above. Note however that both proposals in (72) have the disadvantage of considering the clitic pronoun as the D head of the big DP. As we have seen in section 4.2, clitic pronouns cannot be considered as determiners. A reformulation of the hypothesis in (72) which is worth exploring is (73a), which takes the clitic pronoun to be merged as a reduced maximal projection in the specifier position of the big DP. Clitic doubling would involve merge of the big DP in (73b):

(i) the type of arguments that allow clitic doubling (e.g. any argument in Rumanian and River Plate Spanish (63), the goal argument in Italian and Spanish (64); Sportiche (1996/98: 302, n. 24) observes that the existence of accusative clitic doubling in a language presupposes dative clitic doubling),
(ii) the semantic conditions under which doubling is possible (e.g. specificity in direct object doubling, Suñer 1988),
(iii) the implicational hierarchy concerning the type of nominal expressions that allow doubling – pronouns > definite DPs > quantified DPs; see (63)–(65) vs. (67) above.


6. On the derivation of clitic placement

In the previous sections, we have established that clitic pronouns realize reduced maximal projections which are moved out of the merge position by XP movement followed by head movement. In the following sections, we will try to establish why clitic pronouns have to move obligatorily, and where they move to in the structure. A general answer

\[\text{(72)}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{double} \quad D' \\
& \quad \text{D clitic}\text{ NP pro} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{D double} \\
& \quad \text{D clitic}
\end{align*}

\[\text{(73)}\]

\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{clitic} \quad D' \\
& \quad \text{D NP pro} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{DP} \\
& \quad \text{clitic} \quad D' \\
& \quad \text{D double}
\end{align*}
to the first question is required since that property characterizes clitic pronouns in all languages which displays this category of pronouns. The second question is instead more difficult to answer given that a wide cross-linguistic variation is observed.

6.1. On the motivation for clitic movement

One of the defining properties of clitic pronouns is that they have to appear in displaced position. The question addressed in this section is: why is clitic movement obligatory?

In recent grammatical theories, syntactic movement is motivated by feature checking: elements move to verify their grammatical features against functional heads with the corresponding features. If clitic pronouns move to check their phi-features and case, the obligatoriness issue however remains: while in e.g. Romance languages, DPs may check their features without syntactic movement (via Agree), clitic pronouns can do so only via movement.

One answer to this question takes the obligatory nature of clitic movement to ensue from the fact that they have to check more features than regular phrases. On the one hand, a semantic motivation has been adduced: clitic pronouns move to check the familiarity feature (Corver and Delfitto 1999), or the specificity feature (Sportiche 1996/98) (see property D4 in section 3). On the other hand, a morphological motivation has been used: clitic pronouns display case distinctions and therefore move to check case features (Belletti 1999) (see property C3 in section 3).

Although these proposals can account for many instances of clitic pronouns, there are other cases in which they cannot be used because clitic pronouns do not encode any such features. Consider for instance those clitic pronouns that have non-referential usages in idiomatic expressions (17a, b) and impersonal sentences (20). No familiarity or specificity feature is ever involved in these cases. Since these pronouns share the same syntax as “familiar” and “specific” clitics in above proposals, we cannot appeal to such semantic notions to account for their obligatory movement. Similarly, many clitic pronouns, such as 1st and 2nd person clitics, do not encode case distinctions, still they are obligatorily displaced (cf. Italian *mi* in *mi conosce* ‘he knows me’, *mi parla* ‘he speaks to me’, and French *me* in the same contexts: *il me connait* ‘he knows me’, *il me parle* ‘he speaks to me’).

Suppose that clitic pronouns check features like ordinary DPs and may move. As in other cases, it is desirable to assume that Movement (Internal Merge) is free, and that some interface condition regulates whether it should apply or not. It follows that clitic pronouns move in order to avoid a crash in the derivation.

One proposal is that lack of clitic movement causes a crash at the syntax-phonology interface. Raposo and Uriagereka (2005: 650) assume that “Romance determiners (special clitics or regular articles) are phonological clitics that must find themselves within a well-formed prosodic word at PF”. In addition, they assume that the phonological host must be to the right of the clitic pronoun, in other words, proclisis is required. While articles always fulfil this requirement (74a), clitic pronouns staying in their merge position do not (74b); to find an appropriate host, they must evacuate their base position (74c) (in [74] the host is bold; the category of the host in [74c] does not matter here and is marked as X):
This proposal raises the following questions. First, Toman (1993) has convincingly argued for Czech (a language with second position clitic pronouns which seem to be always enclitic) that “clitics cannot be mechanically described as enclitics” (Toman 1993: 113). The direction of (phonological) cliticization depends on the phonological environment: it “is established locally at the level at which prosodic structure is determined” (Toman 1993: 114). In Czech, pronouns are indeed enclitic most of the times, but if the first position is filled with a heavy phrase such as a clause or a DP containing a relative clause, pronouns become proclitic on the element which follows them. Note also that in Galician, determiners can be enclitic to the verb (Uriagereka 1995a); it is thus surprising that this cannot happen when the N is unpronounced, as in (74b). Second, obligatory syntactic movement is shared by weak pronouns, which do not display the same phonological properties as clitic pronouns: crucially, they are not phonological clitics. As shown for instance by the Italian dative pronoun loro, weak pronouns can bear word stress (see section 4.1) and are not necessarily adjacent to the verb (31). In conclusion, the fact that clitic pronouns must move cannot entirely be motivated by their phonological properties (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: § 6.3 suggest that only the head movement step is motivated by phonological requirements).

The alternative proposal is that lack of clitic movement causes a crash at the other interface. Under the hypothesis that clitic pronouns are merged as (defective) maximal projections (section 4.2.2), obligatory clitic movement is due to their reduced structure. The deficient phrases they head cannot be interpreted at the syntax-semantics interface; only full phrases can. In order to get interpreted, clitic pronouns must occur at spell-out in dedicated derived positions. (An advantage of this proposal is that the same account can be used to explain the obligatory XP movement step of weak pronouns).

Note finally that there is indeed no tension between a deficiency approach and a feature-checking approach to clitic movement. Deficiency tells us that the pronoun must move obligatorily, feature-checking tells us where the pronoun moves to. This is the topic of next sections.

6.2. The host of clitic pronouns

Kayne (1991: 649) assumes “that Romance clitics have the (perhaps defining) property that they must adjoin to some X^0 element” and takes this X element to be a functional head. As noted by Kayne (1994: 18–21), antisymmetry forces the pronoun to be a head in order for it to adjoin to X. Antisymmetry also requires left-adjunction. Cliticization can thus be represented as in (75): The clitic pronoun left-joins to a functional head F, and the verb can occur in the same head (75a), or in a structurally lower functional head (75b):
The structure in (75a) accounts for the fact, pointed out in section 4.1 and 5.3 above, that the clitic pronoun and the verb may move as a syntactic unit to functional heads higher than F. The structure in (75b) accounts for cases in which the clitic pronoun and the verb are not adjacent, but separated by various material in the clause. This is the rule in languages with 2nd position clitics such as many Slavic and Germanic languages (cf. Wackernagel 1892). In (76), Croatian examples taken from Čavar and Wilder (1999) are provided. As can be seen in (76a−c), any constituent can precede the pronoun; furthermore, (76d) shows that the pronoun can be separated from the verb by the subject DP Ivan:

(76)  

a. Ivan ga je često čitao.  
Ivan it has often read  

b. Često ga je Ivan čitao.  
often it has Ivan read  

c. Čitao ga je Ivan često.  
read it has Ivan often  
‘Ivan often read it.’  

d. ... da ga Ivan čita.  
that it Ivan reads  
‘... that Ivan reads it.’  

The structure in (75b) is also encountered in languages which usually display adverbal clitics, i.e., clitics adjacent to a verbal form. The phenomenon is known as interpolation – see Chereny (1905); Ramsden (1963); Wanner (1992); Rivero (1992, 1997); Fontana (1993) among others. Examples are found in many Old Romance languages – see Rivero (1986) for Old Spanish; Martins (1994, 2002, 2003, 2005) for Old Portuguese; Fischer (2003: 260) for Old Catalan; Ledgeway and Lombardi (2005) and Cardinaletti (2010b: 435) for Old Italian. The phenomenon is still attested in some modern Romance varieties, such as certain northern dialects of Portuguese (Barbosa 1996), Romanian (Dobrovie-Sorin 1994; Rizzi 2000b: 101), Galician (Uriagereka 1995a), Occitan (Kayne 1991: 653–654), and some Italian dialects (see Renzi 1989: 369, n. 12). An example from literary French is provided in (77a), in which the clitic pronoun and the infinitival verb are separated by the adverb bien ‘well’. The pronoun raises to a higher position with respect to the verb, presumably the same position as in finite clauses (77b) (cf. Kayne 1975: sect.2.3, 1991: 653–654):
III. Syntactic Phenomena

(77) a. ... _en_ bien parler. [literary French]
    of.it well speak.INF
    ‘... to speak well about it.’

b. _Il_ en parle bien.
    he of.it speaks well
    ‘He speaks well about it.’

An example from Galician is provided in (78), where the intervening element is the subject DP (from Raposo and Uriagereka 2005: 649):

(78) A bon _fado_ a Deus _encomende_. [Galician]
    to good fate her God entrust
    ‘May God entrust her to a good fate.’

The phenomenon displays different properties in different languages. Variation concerns for instance the type of arguments that can appear between the pronoun and the verb (some special simple adverbs, as in Romanian, any adverb or adverbial phrase, as in French, or any constituent, as in Galician), suggesting that different processes are perhaps at work in the different languages which display the phenomenon.

In all the cases discussed above, the pronoun appears before the verb, either in proclitic position or in a higher position than the verb. Let’s now consider how enclitic pronouns, which follow the verb, are represented. Since Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetric approach bans right adjunction, enclisis can only be obtained as in (79), i.e., the verb left-adjoins to the clitic pronoun left-adjoined to F:

(79) 

The hypothesis represented in (79) accounts for the following very robust crosslinguistic generalization. While proclitics can appear independently of the verb (see [76]–[78] above), enclitics cannot. In (80) and (81), two possible situations are schematized: the intervening material is either an adverbial XP or the subject DP – see Kayne (1991: 657, n. 27) and Rizzi (2000b: 117–118) for Romance languages, and Starke (1993) for Slavic languages:

(80) a. clitic Verb
b. clitic _Verb

(81) a. *Verb XP clitic
b. *Verb DP clitic
The generalization concerning enclisis can be formulated as in (82) (Rizzi 2000b: 118) (apparent counterexamples to this generalization are discussed in section 7.2 below):

(82) If the verb moves to a position past the landing site of the clitic, it carries the clitic along.

It is also possible, although rare in the Romance languages, that the pronoun appears between the verb stem and the verbal inflection, a phenomenon called *mesoclisis*. The examples in (83) come from European Portuguese (see Vigário 2003; Luís and Spencer 2005 among others):

(83) a. *Ela levá=lo=ia.*
    she take=it=would
    ‘She would take it.’

    b. *Eles dar=mo=lo=ão.*
    they give=us=it=will
    ‘They will give it to us.’

The phenomenon is also found in imperatives in e.g. Spanish varieties – Halle and Marantz (1994); Harris and Halle (2005); Kayne (2008). As shown in (84b), a clitic cluster appears between the verb stem and its plural -n inflection. This order contrasts with the enclitic pattern of standard Spanish in (84a):

(84) a. *De=n=me=lo!*
    give=you.pl=me=it
    ‘Give it to me!’

    b. *De=me=lo=n!*
    give=me=it=you.pl

Mesoclisis is also found in other Romance and Albanian varieties (see Manzini and Savoia 2009).

6.3. On the landing site of cliticization: Proclisis vs. Enclisis

As mentioned above, typologically there are two main locations for clitic pronouns: either in the second position of the clause (i.e., independently of the position of the verb), as in Slavic and Germanic languages (cf. Wackernagel 1892), or adjacent to a verbal form, as in Romance languages. In section 6.1 we have seen that with 2nd position clitics, as in Czech, proclisis and enclisis is a matter of phonology. The location of adverbal clitic pronouns in proclitic or enclitic position is instead a syntactic matter. In the case of subject pronouns, proclisis and enclisis correlate with sentence types, declarative and interrogative, respectively. Data come from the northern Italian Emilian dialect of Donceto (province of Piacenza) – Cardinaletti and Repetti (2008); for other dialects, see Brandi and Cordin (1981), (1989); Rizzi (2000a); Poletto (2000):
III. Syntactic Phenomena

(85) a. ɚ t ʰəv
       you drink
       ‘You drink.’

       b. ɚl ʰəvə
           he drinks
           ‘He drinks.’

(86) a. ʰəv=Ʉ?
       drink=you
       ‘Do you drink?’

       b. ʰəvə=Ʉ?
           drinks=he
           ‘Does he drink?’

The difference in placement can be easily captured by assuming that the postverbal position of the clitic in (86) is due to verb movement to a higher position in interrogatives than in declarative sentences (cf. Rizzi 2000a, b; Cardinaletti and Repetti 2008, 2010 for slightly different analyses), similarly to what happens in English and Germanic interrogative sentences and complying with (79). As we have seen in (25), a similar derivation is adopted for the enclitic placement of French subject pronouns in interrogatives (see Cardinaletti and Repetti 2008, 2010 for the comparison of French and Northern Italian dialects):

(87) Est=il parti?
     is=he left
     ‘Has he left?’

Note that French preverbal subject pronouns (as in Il est parti ‘he has left’) are weak and not clitic – see Cardinaletti and Starke (1996: 49–50), who reinterpret Kayne’s (1983) proposal that they are phonological clitics. For the different behaviour of preverbal subject pronouns in French and Northern Italian dialects, also see Brandi and Cordin (1981) and Rizzi (1986), (2000a). For arguments against a morphological analysis of French subject clitics, see De Cat (2005).

As for object clitics, the position varies depending on the finiteness and mood of the verb. In Italian, for instance, clitic pronouns precede finite verbs (88), and follow imperative and infinitival verbs (89):

(88) a. Lo compro.
      it buy.I
      ‘I buy it.’

      b. Lo comprerei.
      it would.buy.I
      ‘I would buy it.’

      c. Se lo comprassi, ...
         if’ it bought.I
         ‘If I bought it, …’
(89) a. Compra=lo!
   buy=it
   ‘Buy it!’

   b. Penso di comprar=lo.
      think.I to buy=it
      ‘I think to buy it.’

   c. Comprando=lo, Maria ha dimostrato il suo cattivo gusto.
      buying=it Maria has demonstrated her bad taste
      ‘By buying it, Maria has demonstrated her bad taste.’

   d. Comprato=lo, Maria uscì dal negozio.
      bought=it Maria went.out of.the shop
      ‘After having bought it, Maria left the shop.’

As with subject clitics, enclisis with object clitics is explained by movement of the verb across the pronoun, see (79). The generalization seems to be that enclisis is found if (i) the verb is morphologically complete under the cliticization site, and (ii) the verb must move at least as far as the cliticization site (Rizzi 2000b:109). There have been many attempts at analyzing the enclitic vs. proclitic placement of object clitic pronouns. Since the analyses of the various proposals would exceed the limits of the present paper, I refer the interested reader to Kayne (1991); Benincà and Cinque (1993); Rivero (1994); Rivero and Terzi (1995); Belletti (1999); Rouveret (1999); Terzi (1999); Shlonsky (2004); Ouhalla (2005); Raposo and Uriagereka (2005), among many others, and the references quoted there.

The distribution of proclisis and enclisis is similar in Italian and Spanish. In French, proclisis is also found with infinitival verbs, see (62a, b). In Portuguese and Galician, enclisis is also found with finite verbs.

Various proposals have tried to account for language variation in clitic placement in terms of the different functional heads which host clitic pronouns. For instance, while Romance languages such as Italian and French use the head T as the clitic host (a head that also contains the finite verb, as in [75a]), Slavic languages such as Czech, Slovak and Croatian are said to make use of a structurally higher head which does not contain the verb, called AgrC in Starke (1993), as in (75b) (cf. Rivero 1986, 1994, 1997). This type of language variation is also found Romance-internally. In Galician and Portuguese, a functional head higher than T, probably corresponding to AgrC in Slavic, is said to be the clitic host (Madeira 1992, 1993; Uriagereka 1995a, 1995b; Rouveret 1999; Raposo and Uriagereka 2005 among others; see Galves 1996, 1997 for the history of clitic placement in Brazilian Portuguese).

The assumption of a high number of functional heads in the clause (cf. Pollock 1989; Cinque 1999), gives a potentially broad range of language variation, still to be fully evaluated. The French data in (62) provide an example of more than one location for the clitic pronouns with respect to adverbs and finite and infinitival verbs.

What is striking, however, is that language variation always involves functional heads which are located in the clausal areas either immediately above the VP or between the Comp and the Infl domain. As seen in section 5.2, the two clitic positions are clearly visible in restructuring contexts; especially when reduplication occurs, see (56)−(57). The following sections discuss this generalization and a possible way to account for it.
6.4. Arguments of nouns, adjectives, prepositions, and quantifiers

In most examples so far, clitic pronouns realize arguments of the verb. A clitic pronoun can also realize the object of other categories: nouns (90) (also see [44]), adjectives (91), prepositions (92) (also see [46a−c]), and quantifiers (93)−(94) (also see [47]). These categories do not provide a clitic host internally to the phrase they project (b. examples), and clitic pronouns are adjoined to the verb in these cases, too (c. examples). In restructuring contexts, the clitic pronoun can appear either on the infinitival lexical verb (d. examples) or on the superordinate functional verb (e. examples) (see section 5.2). Note that according to the QP-hypothesis, quantifiers realize the head of the projection QP, which embeds DP, as depicted in (93) and (94) (Cardinaletti and Giusti 2006). This allows us to consider partitive ne in (93) on a par with all other clitic pronouns, namely as realizing a (deficient) maximal projection. The phenomenon in (94) is known as floating quantifier and is also possible with full DPs: I ragazzi sono partiti [QP tutti [DP i ragazzi]] ‘the boys have all left’:

(90) a. *Ho visto [DP il ritratto [PP di Gianni]].
   have.I seen the portrait of Gianni
   ‘I saw Gianni’s portrait.’

b. *Ho visto [DP il ritratto ne [PP ne il ritratto [PP ne]].
   have.I seen the portrait of.him / of.him the portrait

c. Ne ho visto [DP il ritratto [PP ne]].
   of.him have.I seen the portrait
   ‘I saw his portrait.’

d. Voglio veder=ne [DP il ritratto [PP ne]].
   want.I see=of.him the portrait
   ‘I want to see his portrait.’

e. Ne voglio vedere [DP il ritratto [PP ne]].
   of.him want.I see the portrait
   ‘I want to see his portrait.’

(91) a. Sono [AP contento [PP delle tue parole]].
   am.I happy of.the your words
   ‘I am happy of your words.’

b. *Sono [AP contento ne [PP ne] / [AP ne contento [PP ne]].
   am.I happy of.them / of.them happy

c. Ne sono [AP contento [PP ne]].
   of.them am.I happy
   ‘I am happy of them.’

d. Voglio esser=ne [AP contento [PP ne]].
   want.I be=of.them happy
   ‘I want to be happy of them.’
e. Ne voglio essere \( [AP \ contento \ [PP \ ne]] \).
    of.them want.I be happy
    ‘I want to be happy of them.’

(92) a. Sono saltato \( [PP \ addosso \ [PP \ a \ Gianni]] \).
    have.I jumped on o Gianni
    ‘I jumped on Gianni.’

b. *Sono saltato \( [PP \ addosso \ gli \ [PP \ gli]] / [PP \ gli \ addosso \ [PP \ gli]] \).
    have.I jumped on to.him / to.him on

c. Gli sono saltato \( [PP \ addosso \ [PP \ gli]] \).
    to.him am.I jumped on
    ‘I jumped on him.’

d. Voglio saltar=gli \( [PP \ addosso \ [PP \ gli]] \).
    want.I jump=to.him on
    ‘I want to jump on him.’

e. Gli voglio saltare \( [PP \ addosso \ [PP \ gli]] \).
    to.him want.I jump on
    ‘I want to jump on him.’

(93) a. Ho letto \( [QP \ due \ [DP \ giornali]] \).
    have.I read two newspapers
    ‘I read two newspapers.’

b. *Ho letto \( [QP \ due \ ne \ [DP \ ne]] / [QP \ ne \ due \ [DP \ ne]] \).
    have.I read two of.them / of.them two

c. Ne ho letti \( [QP \ due \ [DP \ ne]] \).
    of.them have.I read two
    ‘I read two of them.’

d. Voglio legger=ne \( [QP \ due \ [DP \ ne]] \).
    want.I read=of.them two
    ‘I want to read two of them.’

e. Ne voglio leggere \( [QP \ due \ [DP \ ne]] \).
    of.them want.I read two
    ‘I want to read two of them.’

(94) a. Ho letto \( [QP \ tutti \ [DP \ i \ giornali]] \).
    have.I read all the newspapers
    ‘I read all the newspapers.’

b. *Ho letto \( [QP \ tutti \ li \ [DP \ li]] / [QP \ li \ tutti \ [DP \ li]] \).
    have.I read all them / them all

c. Li ho letti \( [QP \ tutti \ [DP \ li]] \).
    them have.I read all
    ‘I read all of them.’
III. Syntactic Phenomena

6.5. Person/number features

The fact that in languages like Italian, clitic pronouns can only attach to heads of the clausal skeleton means that the clitic host (F in [75]) necessarily belongs to the extended projection of a verb. This generalization might be related to the fact that only the extended projections of verbs encode case and phi-features.

On the one hand, only verbs assign case, while nouns and adjectives do not. Prepositions, which seem to assign case to their DP complement, might indeed be seen as functional elements of the clausal skeleton (Kayne (2004). On the other hand, the phi-features person and number are relevant in Agree relations only in the case of finite verbs; in other configurations (e.g. nominal expressions and infinitival verbs such as past participles), the phi-features number and gender enter Concord relations - for this important difference between Agree and Concord, see Giusti (2008) and the references quoted there.

It has been suggested that clitic pronouns have to move to the relevant clausal heads to check their case (see Belletti 1999 among others) and/or phi-features against them (see Bianchi 2006 among others). Italian clitic clusters provide evidence that clitic pronouns check both sets of features, and that these features are encoded in the two different clausal areas see in the structure in (55): case is checked against heads in the lexical domain of the verb (what was called AgrO in previous accounts, see Rizzi 2000b), while phi-features are checked in the high inflectional layer of clausal structure, roughly corresponding to the highest portion of the IP layer. The relevant clitic cluster data are however too complex to be summarized here, and the reader is referred to Cardinaletti (2008) for discussion. A reasonable hypothesis is that the heads against which clitic pronouns check person/number features are criterial in the sense of Rizzi (2006). The proposal that criterial heads have freezing effects (ibid.) might also explain why clitic movement is not long distance (50)−(51).
If these proposals are correct and if cartographic approaches are correct in assuming that the array of functional projections is universal (Cinque 1999), then language variation in clitic placement cannot be understood in terms of the different functional heads which host clitic pronouns (section 6.4), but rather, it must be attributed to the different scope of verb raising in different sentence types and in different languages (cf. Kayne 1991; Belletti 1999; Rizzi 2000b, among others).

7. Clitic vs. weak pronouns: Two case studies

Some Romance languages display problematic cases for the generalizations on enclisis formulated so far. In the following sections, two such counterexamples are discussed. In section 7.1, we address cases in which clitic pronouns follow prepositions; in section 7.2, cases are presented in which clitic pronouns follow past participles in finite clauses (for past participles in absolute constructions, which allow enclisis [89d], see Belletti 1990). We show that in fact, these cases do not involve clitic, but weak pronouns, which are expectedly found in lower positions than clitic pronouns – see (28b) and (31) above. These cases are therefore only apparent counterexamples to the generalizations discussed in the previous sections.

7.1. Cases of apparent enclisis on prepositions

In Old Italian, clitic pronouns can follow some (lexical) prepositions (Renzi 1989: 369, n. 12):

(95) (in)contro gli ‘against him’, allato gli ‘beside him’

These data are surprising in view of the ungrammaticality of the similar cases in (92b) in Modern Italian. It would be hard to suggest that Old Italian prepositions provided a clitic host PP internally, which is no longer available in Modern Italian (but see Kayne 1991: 649, n. 4). It can instead be claimed that in (95), the pronoun is not clitic, but weak.

Note that the complement of a preposition is a context which differentiates clitic from weak pronouns (see Cardinaletti 1999: 66). As shown by the Italian contrast in (96), the clitic pronoun lo ‘it/him’ is ungrammatical as a complement of P, but the weak pronoun esso ‘it’ is possible. This is true of both functional prepositions such as di ‘of’ in (96a) and lexical prepositions such as addosso ‘on to’ in (96b) (also see [92b]):

(96) a. *Di lo_{clitic} / Di esso_{weak} abbiamo parlato a lungo. 
   of It/him / of it have.we talked at long
   ‘About it, we talked at length.’

   b. Sono saltati *addosso glio_{clitic} / addosso ad esso_{weak}.
   are.they jumped on to.it/him on at it
   ‘I jumped on it.’
The Dutch paradigm in (97) (due to Riny Huijbregts, personal communication) goes in the same direction: ze ‘her’ is a clitic pronoun, while r ‘her’ and ze ‘them’ are weak pronouns. Also consider the fact that in languages which do not have clitic pronouns, weak pronouns can follow prepositions. In (98a) and (98b), we see data from English and the Rhaeto-Romance dialects discussed in Benincà and Poletto (2005: 228–229), respectively – differently from what is assumed by Benincà and Poletto, the pronoun el in (98b) cannot be analyzed as a strong pronoun because it has [−human] reference, see (16):

(97)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{*Ik kijk naar ze.} \\
& \text{I look at her} \\
& \text{‘I look at her.’} \\
\end{align*}

cf. \text{Ik bekijk ze.} \\
\text{I watch her} \\
\text{‘I watch her.’}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{Ik kijk naar r.} \\
& \text{I look at her} \\
\end{align*}

cf. \text{Ik bekijk’ r.} \\
\text{I watch her}

\begin{align*}
\text{c. } & \text{Ik kijk naar ze.} \\
& \text{I look at them} \\
\end{align*}

cf. \text{Ik bekijk ze.} \\
\text{I watch them}

(98)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{I count on it.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Koy figesas kun el?} \quad \text{[Rhaeto-Romance dialect]} \\
& \text{What should we do with it} \\
& \text{‘What should we do with it?’}
\end{align*}

In conclusion, the Old Italian cases in (95) are not counterexamples to the generalization reached on the basis of (96)–(98). The proposal that they contain weak pronouns is not an ad hoc solution since there is independent evidence that Old Italian possessed this class of pronouns alongside clitic and strong pronouns. The sentence in (99) is another example in which a weak pronoun (without the functional preposition a ‘to’) occurs in the complement to a lexical preposition (Cardinaletti 2010b:421). Compare (99) with Modern Italian intorno a lui ‘around him’:

(99)  
\begin{align*}
& \text{… io vidi intorno lui / quattro donne valenti} \\
& \text{I saw around him four women beautiful}
\end{align*}
7.2. Cases of apparent enclisis on past participles

In most Romance languages, clitics do not attach to participles in compound tenses and passive sentences (100a), (101a). These are contexts of obligatory clitic climbing, i.e., clitic pronouns appear in the high clitic position (100b), (101b) (see section 5.2):

(100)  a. *Ho visto=lo.
       have.I seen=him

       b. L’ ho visto.
          him have.I seen
          ‘I have seen him.’

(101)  a. *È stato consegnato=gli.
       has.it been delivered=to.him

       b. Gli è stato consegnato.
          to.him has.it been delivered
          ‘It was delivered to him.’

Some apparent exceptions to this very robust cross-linguistic generalization are discussed here.

In Franco-Provençal dialects, a clitic pronoun appears enclitic on the past participle (see Kayne 1991: 660, which reports data from Chenal 1986: 340):

(102)  L’ an tot portà=lèi vià.
[Franco-Provençal]
       they have everything carried=to.him away
       ‘They have taken everything away from him.’

Two observations suggest that the exceptionality of the pattern in (102) is only apparent. First, as orthography shows, the pronoun bears stress (lèi), something which is incompatible with its clitic status (Property B1 in section 3). Second, these dialects allow split clitics, (103). As the Italian contrasts in (58) shows, two clitics must form a cluster (see Rizzi 1982). Note that this is however not the case when a clitic and the weak pronoun loro ‘to them’ co-occur, as shown in (104a) for compound tenses and (104b) for restructuring contexts:

(103)  a. T’ an=të prèdzà=nen?
       to.you have=they spoken=of.it
       ‘Did they speak of it to you?’

       b. T’ an=të deut=lo?
          to.you have=they said=it
          ‘Did they say it to you?’

(104)  a. Mi ha presentato loro ieri.
       me has.he introduced to.them yesterday

       b. Mi voleva presentare loro ieri.
          me wanted.he introduce to.them yesterday
The post-verbal pronouns in (102) and (103) can be analyzed as weak pronouns, which occupy the same post-participle clausal area as the Italian dative weak pronoun loro – see sentences (28b) and (31) above. The post-participle clausal space can thus be taken to be the typical position for weak pronouns. The question that is raised by the data in (102) and (103) is not why in these Romance languages clitic pronouns occur in a low clausal position, but rather what prevents clitic movement to the high clausal position so that a weak pronoun must be used instead. See the choice generalization in (24) and (32b). The same question is raised by declarative vs. imperative clauses in French. In (105a), the possibility of clitic pronouns blocks the merging of weak pronouns; in (105b) the situation is reversed: clitics are impossible, and weak pronouns are merged instead (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999: 221, n. 32):

(105)  
a.  *Donne=me / Donne=moi un livre!  
     give=to.me give=to.me a book  
     ‘Give me a book!’

b.  Il me donne / * donne moi un livre.  
     he to.me gives gives to.a book  
     ‘He gives me a book.’

A similar analysis might perhaps be offered for the Piedmontese dialect discussed by Burzio (1986: Ch. 2), in which pronouns that follow the past participle, such as ye in (106a), are morphologically more complex than proclitic ones, e.g. y in (106b). Note that the final vowel on the post-participle pronoun, /e/, is different from the final /a/ displayed by the proclitic pronoun na in (106c), which can be taken to be an epenthetic vowel (Burzio 1986: 172, n. 47 observes the different forms of enclitic and proclitic pronouns without analyzing them):

(106)  
a.  A lé riva=ye dui regai.  
     A is arrived=there two presents  
     ‘Two presents arrived.’

b.  A y riva i client.  
     A there arrives the clients  
     ‘The clients are arriving.’

c.  A y na riva tanti.  
     a there of.them arrives many  
     ‘Many of them are arriving.’

Another Northern Italian dialect which apparently displays post-participle clitics is Borgomanerese, discussed by Kayne (1994: 144, n. 8) and Tortora (1997), (2002). In this dialect, pronouns follow not only past participles (107a), but also clausal adverbs such as più ‘no more’ (107b), and the postverbal subject pronoun mé ‘I’ (107c); the contrast between (107b) and (107d) shows that pronouns occur in the clausal area between the adverbs corresponding to Italian più ‘no more’ and sempre ‘always’ (see Tortora 2002, based on Cinque’s 1999 adverbial hierarchy):
As shown in (107b, c), clitic pronouns can be separated from the verb by adverbs and postverbal subjects. These data are problematic for the robust cross-linguistic generalization that clitic pronouns can be separated from the verb only if they are higher than it, see (80)–(82) above. A way of making the Borgomanerese facts compatible with this generalization is to say that the pronouns in (107) are weak and not clitic (for the order ‘verb – adverb – weak pronoun’ in Italian, see [31]). Some phonological properties of the data can provide an argument for the weak status of the post-participle pronouns. In (107a), the past participle takes a final vowel /a/, which is not present in (107b), where the past participle does not immediately precede the pronoun. If this /a/ expressed past participle agreement, agreement with a postverbal element would be found, an unprecedented situation in modern Romance languages (see also Roberts 1993 for the same dialect family; past participle agreement with the following complement was possible in Old Italian, see Egerland 1996; Salvi 2010). The fact that the same phenomenon is found with finite verbs and adverbs, whose final /i/ (107d), (108) is replaced by /a/ when they are followed by a pronoun (107e), (109), suggests an alternative analysis of /a/ (data from Tortora 2002: 726–728):

(107) a. *Io vüsta=la.  
   I have seen=her  
   ‘I have seen her.’

b. *Io vüst piö=lla.  
   I have seen nomore=her  
   ‘I haven’t seen her anymore.’

c. I dis mé=vvi.  
   I say me=to.you  
   ‘I say to you.’

d. *I mængi sempra=la.  
   I eat always=it

e. I mængia=la sempri.  
   I eat=it always  
   ‘I always eat it.’

(108) a. *I porti la to|t
   I bring the cake  
   ‘I bring the cake.’

b. *I porti denti la torta.  
   I bring inside the cake  
   ‘I bring the cake inside.’

(109) a. *I porta=la.  
   I bring=it,E.SG  
   ‘I bring it.’

b. *I porti denta=la.  
   I bring inside=it  
   ‘I bring it inside.’
The /a/ could be taken to be part of the pronoun itself, and the sequences in (107a, e) and (110) could be analyzed as viüst=ala, mængi=ala, port=ala, dent=ala, respectively, where bisyllabic ala is a weak pronoun. The vowel /a/ is also found with accusative masculine pronouns (I trat=alu mal ‘I treat him badly’, from Tortora 2002: 731).

Tortora (1997: 23, n. 14) suggests that in cases like (107b), the geminate consonant displayed by the clitic pronoun is due to the presence of a preceding stressed vowel on the adverb piö, a phonological phenomenon similar to Raddoppiamento Sintattico in Italian. This phenomenon is not incompatible with the weak status of the pronoun, however, since Raddoppiamento Sintattico also applies to the Italian weak pronoun loro: Gianni parlò [l]oro ‘Gianni spoke to them’.

Note that with the partitive pronoun corresponding to Italian ne, a different vowel, /u/, is found both on the finite verb (110a) and the past participle (110b) (data from Tortora 2002: 730 and 1997: 78, n. 49, respectively):

(110) a. I mængiu=nu. 
   I eat=of.them
   ‘I eat some of them.’

b. I o vustu=nu tre.
   I have=of.them three
   ‘I have seen three of them.’

On a par with the vowel [a], the vowel [u] cannot be taken to be part of the verbal inflection, since it would imply that the verb (i) agrees with the partitive object, (ii) is sensitive to the accusative vs. partitive status of the complement (see [a] vs. [u], respectively), (iii) has the same inflection when it is finite (110a) or infinitive (110b), which are to our knowledge three unprecedented situations in Romance. As we have done with the vowel /a/ above, the vowel /u/ can be taken to be part of the weak indefinite pronoun unosu (I mængi=unosu, I o vust=unosu tre). This indefinite pronoun is parallel to English one as in I have seen three ones.

That some Romance languages do not possess clitic pronouns at all is not unknown. The Rhaeto-Romance dialects analyzed by Benincà and Poletto (2005) also display only weak and strong pronouns. Note that el in a sentence like Vus amflayas bec el ‘you do not find it’ cannot be analyzed as a strong pronoun (pace Benincà and Poletto 2005: 228) because it has [−human] reference (see [16] and the discussion of [98b]).

8. Conclusions

Clitic pronouns display a quite intricate array of properties. As far as their internal syntax is concerned, they are deficient from all points of view. As for their external syntax, clitic placement is sensitive to syntactic notions such as finite vs. infinitive, indicative vs. imperative mood, declarative vs. interrogative sentences, noun vs. verb, and so on.

Clitic pronouns must be seen as deficient phrases, which cannot stay in their merge position. They undergo syntactic movement, which displays properties of both XP and head movement. This has led to the view that clitic movement is indeed a two-step
derivation, XP-movement followed by local head movement. The first step of the clitic derivation is shared by weak pronouns, which also are deficient phrases.

The landing site of cliticization is a functional head of the extended projection of a verb. Other categories do not provide a clitic host internally to their extended projections. A way to explain this generalization is to suggest that clitic pronouns check case and phi-features against functional heads encoding these features, and this type of functional heads are present in the extended projections of verbs.

Sentences containing restructuring verbs provide evidence for more than one clitic position per clause: one high clitic area corresponding to functional heads encoding person/number features, and one low clitic area corresponding to functional heads encoding case features.

Language-internal and cross-linguistic variation in clitic placement is due to the scope of verb movement in different sentence types and in different languages.

Finally, we have shown that some apparent instances of enclitic pronouns are better analyzed as weak pronouns, the third class of pronouns made available by Universal grammar in addition to clitic and strong pronouns, with the advantage of keeping robust cross-linguistic generalizations on the distribution of enclitic pronouns.
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