

Introduction

The Grammar of Clitics

Joan Mascaró
Gemma Rigau

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona. Departament de Filologia Catalana
08193 Bellaterra (Barcelona). Spain

Interest in clitics originates probably from their special character. As elements which are neither words nor affixes but share some of their properties, they are an especially fruitful ground to test grammatical theories. Such properties include phonological shape, allomorphy, cooccurrence restrictions, position in the sentence, and semantic interpretation, thus covering a wide range of phenomena that affect all grammatical components. It is not at all clear whether the notion «clitic» corresponds to some linguistic primitive (or several), although some clitic-related categories, like *clitic group* as a prosodic category, have been proposed. The general properties of what has been classified as a clitic also varies, depending on the language and the specific clitic analyzed. Some authors, beginning with Zwicky (1977), follow the distinction *simple clitic/special clitic*. According to this view, simple clitics are usually deaccented, sometimes phonologically reduced function words, like the French preposition *de*, the reduced auxiliaries ‘s, ‘d, ‘ll, etc. in English, or the enclitic conjunction *que* in Latin. This kind of clitics does not seem to present far-reaching syntactic differences when compared to their nonclitic counterparts or equivalent forms (French preposition *contre*, English *is*, *would*, *will*, etc., and Latin conjunction *atque*).

- (1) a. John is a lawyer.
b. John’s a lawyer.

Special clitics, on the other hand, show many properties which are specific to them, and that their nonclitic counterparts do not share. Typical examples of this type are pronominal clitics, which attach to the verb, as in Romance, or to second position in the sentence, as in some Slavic languages. The *special* character of clitics is usually related to syntax or semantics. Consider the following Spanish examples, which display the pronominal clitic *lo* and its strong counterparts.

- (2) a. **Míralo!**
look-IMP+it/him
‘Look at it!’

- b. **María lo** miró.
 Mary it/him looked
 ‘Mary looked at it/him.’
- c. ***María** miró (a) **él/ello**.
 Mary looked to him/it
 ‘Mary looked at it/him.’
- d. **María lo** miró **a él**.
 Mary it/him looked to him
 ‘Mary looked at him/*it.’

These examples show that the position of the clitic varies (2a,b) and that the distributional and semantic properties of the clitic and its corresponding full form are different. The full form in (2c) is impossible when not doubled by the clitic, as in (2d), and in this case only the animate reading is possible; but both readings are possible when the sentence contains the clitic alone (2b).

Clitics often display special morphological properties. They present, for instance, allomorphic changes, which are typically a property of root-affix combinations (as in Spanish *¡vamos!* ‘let’s go!’ vs. *¡vámonos!* ‘let’s leave!’ instead of the expected **¡vámosnos!*). In other cases we find different phenomena that are also typical of affixation, like syncretism. As a typical case, consider the following Catalan examples that illustrate clitic-source mismatches. Consider first (3d) where a single clitic is related to two different sources (*elzi* is the colloquial form of the dative plural):

- (3) a. **La** dono.
 it-ACC FEM (I) give
 ‘I give it.’
- b. **Elzi** dono **això**.
 them-DAT (I) give this
 ‘I give this to them.’
- c. ***Elzi** **la** dono.
 them-DAT it-ACC FEM (I) give
 ‘I give it to them.’
- d. **Elzi** dono.
 them-DAT+IT ACC FEM (I) give
 ‘I give it to them.’

The opposite situation, two clitics related to a single source, is also possible. Consider a Catalan sentence with a verb like *perdre* ‘to lose’ in reflexive form.

- (4) **Te** perds.
 2ND SG REFL (you) lose
 ‘You get lost.’

If we add a 1st sg. ethical dative to (4), we get three different solutions, depending on the dialect. Sentence (5a) exemplifies the neutral case with the expected 2nd-1st combination. In (5b) the «reflexive» clitic is replaced by a spurious *se* (as in Spanish *le lo* → *se lo*), whereas in (5c) the single reflexive 2nd sg. source is represented by two clitics, by a 2nd person sg. clitic *te* and by the reflexive clitic *se*.

- (5) a. Te 'm perds.
 2ND SG REFL 1ST SG DAT (you) lose
 'You get lost on me.'
- b. Se 'm perds.
 3RD REFL 1ST SING DAT (you) lose
 'You get lost on me.'
- c. Se te 'm perds.
 3RD REFL 2ND SG 1ST SG DAT (you) lose
 'You get lost on me.'

Other special features of clitics are phonological in nature. The lack of stress has been often considered one of the main properties of clitics, even a defining property. Although this surface property is not always fulfilled, as the examples in (6) show, a more careful statement of the accentual properties of clitics might solve the apparent contradiction: clitics can be defined in this respect as elements that do not define a stress domain by themselves.

- (6) a. Allez -y! [alezí]
 go-IMP there
 'Go (there)!'
- b. ¡Cómetelo! [kòmeteló]
 eat-you-it
 'Eat it up!'
- c. Canta-m'ho! [kəntəmó]
 sing me it
 'Sing it to me!'
- d. Canta'n! [kəntón] cf. Canta! [kántə] 'Sing!'
 sing it-PART
 'Sing some!'

Sentence (6a) shows the French clitic *y* stressed in enclitic position. The domain of stress is formed by the word-clitic sequence: both *allez* and *mange-la* are stress domains, but not *y* alone. Notice that if *y* were a stress domain, we would get two stresses in (*vous*) *y allez*. A similar effect obtains in Spanish in some sentences with imperatives or gerunds such as (6b), where the stress

domain, usually the word, is extended to sequences of verb plus enclitic, in which case a secondary stress is retained on the verb form. Sentences (6c,d) show the case of Majorcan Catalan; here, as in the other cases, the stress domain includes the enclitic. Stress falls on the last syllable of the domain, i.e. on the clitic itself or, when the clitic does not include a syllable nucleus, on the last vowel of the verb.

Enclitic or proclitic character is determined usually by the kind of clitic and by the host on which it cliticizes, but in some cases more complex states of affairs can arise. Consider as an illustration the case of pronominal clitics in Northwestern Catalan. For some of them we find two allomorphs whose phonetic shape cannot be derived from regular phonological processes; the choice of the allomorph is nonetheless governed by phonological properties of its host: the assyllabic allomorph appears in contact with a vowel (marked in boldface in the examples), the syllabic allomorph when no vowels appear adjacent to it:

(7) Neuter clitic *ho* = [o], [w] 'it'

a. Com [o] fa [o] fa Fes [o]!
 how it does it does do it
 'how (s/he) does it' '(s/he) does it' 'do it!'

b. **Qui** [w] fa Porta [w]!
 who it does bring it!
 'who does it' 'bring it!'

c. [w] **agafa** Com [w] **agafa**
 it (s/he) takes how it (s/he) takes
 '(s/he) takes it' 'how (s/he) takes it'

3 masc. sg. clitic *lo* = [lo], [l] 'he, it'

d. Com [lo] fa [lo] fa Fes [lo]!
 how it-MASC. does it-MASC does do it-MASC
 'how (s/he) does it' '(s/he) does it' 'do it!'

e. **Qui** [l] fa Porta [l]!
 who it-MASC does bring it-MASC
 'who does it' 'bring it!'

f. [l] **agafa** Com [l] **agafa**
 it-MASC (s/he) takes how it-MASC (s/he) takes
 '(s/he) takes it' 'how (s/he) takes it'

Since the [o]/[w] and the [lo]/[l] variation cannot be derived by purely phonological processes, its analysis seems to imply that allomorphy appears within the host-clitic or clitic-host sequence. In (7b,e) the preceding vowel determines the allomorphic choice, hence *ho* and *lo* are enclitics in these sentences; in (7c,f) it is the following vowel that governs the choice, hence *ho* and *lo* are proclitics in the cor-

responding sentences. On the other hand, the position of the clitic is determined by the verb since the clitic is always adjacent to it, which seems to imply that the host is always the verb. In other words, in (7b) *Qui [w] fa*, the clitic [w] seems to be proclitic to the verb syntactically, since it is the verb that requires clitic adjacency, but it also seems to be phonologically enclitic to *Qui* because allomorphy is defined within the *Qui-clitic* domain.

The preceding considerations illustrate the connection of clitics with all the components of grammar. As a result there are many problems of grammatical theory that involve clitics in a crucial way and for which the analysis of clitics proves decisive. The papers in this issue cover some of the most representative ones. A typical topic is the position in which pronominal clitics are merged and the positions where they surface, which is why four of the papers deal with it (Manzini & Savoia, Nash & Rouveret, Ordóñez, Solà). Delfitto's paper addresses questions more related to their semantics, Bonet and Lloret the special phonology of pronominal clitics. Finally, the study of nonpronominal clitics is represented by a single paper, in which Kayne studies clitic prepositions.

In his article, Francisco Ordóñez argues that an analysis of clitic combinations that is solely determined by morphological templates is insufficient. He claims that some ordering properties of clitics must be obtained in the syntax. In the line of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999), he further argues that some «deficient» pronouns are neither clitics nor strong pronouns, but «weak pronouns,» an intermediate category which shows more structure than ordinary clitics. One such case is the clitic *me* that appears in some Romance varieties which allow the order *lo_{acc} + me_{dat}*, as in Cheso Aragonese *Lo me quiés dar* 'You want to give it to me', *Dalomé* 'Give it to me!'

M. Rita Manzini and Leonardo M. Savoia go a step further in their paper by claiming that order properties are all determined by the syntax. Clitics are merged directly into the positions they occupy in the surface according to a universal string or hierarchy of functional positions which coincides with the basic structure of the noun phrase, namely [D_{Op} [D [R [Q [P [Loc [N, where D_{Op} is associated with modal/intensional, D with definiteness, R with referentiality, Q with quantification, P with person, Loc with locative, N with the head. The main objective of the paper is to use data from Romance languages spoken in Italy to argue that the category 'dative case' is spurious. Dative is a descriptive category, not a syntactic one, and dative clitics are better analyzed as quantificational and locative elements.

Like the aforementioned paper, Lea Nash and Alain Rouveret's objective is to predict positional properties of clitics syntactically, and not through specific morphological constraints on clitic sequences. In contrast with Manzini and Savoia, their analysis is based on the assumption that clitics neither merge nor move to prelabelled positions, but take advantage of the feature content of the functional categories Infl and *v*. Their paper analyzes the properties of the node Infl and the syntax of clitics in Semitic and Romance. In both groups clitic phi-sets are unselectively attracted by Infl, giving rise to enclitics. Proclisis/enclisis contrasts in Romance are accounted for by principles that control the incorporation of a clitic into Infl: the

incorporation is licensed only if Infl does not already host an attracted inflectional morpheme.

A classical topic in clitic analysis in Romance is clitic climbing, the object of the paper by Jaume Solà. He argues that restructured constructions, which make transparent effects possible (e.g. Catalan *Hi miraré d'anar* 'I will try to go there'), should minimally differ from their non-restructured counterparts (e.g. Catalan *Miraré d'anar-hi*). Restructuring verbs are analyzed as raising verbs that take a defective clause as its complement; consequently, restructuring is always raising. Assuming that clitic climbing is analyzed as an A-dependency, and that raising in null-subject languages is a transparent structure for A-dependencies, Solà derives clitic climbing in restructuring contexts from the null-subject property.

Denis Delfitto's article offers an original view of the status of the argument to which clitics are related. In opposition to the traditional view that considers that the role of pronominal clitics is to reduce the valence of its predicate, this author argues that pronominal clitics encode the presence of an unsaturated argument position. The empirical evidence for this hypothesis comes from Romance clitic left dislocation constructions, from acquisition data on binding principle B effects, and from historical data.

The special phonological behavior of clitics is the subject of the paper by Eulàlia Bonet and M. Rosa Lloret. The OCP affects in Catalan sequences of sibilants in different ways depending on prosodic factors, which must make reference to the category *clitic*. An expression like *més sap* 'more knows', underlyingly /mes sab/, resolves the /s/ clash by deletion of the first consonant, [meØsap]. When the first element is a clitic, though, epenthesis takes place: /s sab/ 'se knows' → [səsap], /əlz sab/ 'knows them' → [əlzə sap]. This asymmetry is resolved by the authors by means of a constraint that favors alignment of the left edge of a tensed verb with the right edge of a pronominal clitic and by a constraint that requires that clitics have some phonological exponent in the output.

Richard S. Kayne analyzes the unstressed French preposition *de* and its English equivalent *of* in those syntactic contexts in which Romance languages license the partitive clitic *en/ne* (*Jean a beaucoup d'argent*, *John has lots of money*). Kayne shows that despite appearances, *beaucoup d'argent* / *lots of money* is not a constituent, a phrase. In the derivation, *de/of* is merged outside VP, and a *k(ase)-de* / *k(ase)-of* node is also mergeable above VP. As a consequence, what looks like movement of bare quantifiers (*beaucoup*) turns out to be a case of remnant movement.

Notice that Kayne's analysis throws doubt upon the belief that all unstressed prepositions are 'simple clitics'. The prepositions *de/of* studied in Kayne's article do not have the distribution of other prepositions in the languages studied, or the distribution of equivalent prepositions in other close languages. Thus French *de* and Catalan *de*, although apparently similar (*beaucoup d'argent* / *molts de diners*) would differ considerably in complexity, since Catalan *de* shouldn't be linked to *k(ase)-de*, given the fact that Catalan does not allow splitting of the French sort: **Quant ha comprat de llibres?* (Catalan) / *Combien a-t-il acheté de livres?* (French).

Finally, we wish to express our warmest thanks to the authors who have contributed to this first issue of the *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* for their readiness to help us launch this new project with their valuable works. We also wish to thank the reviewers, who had the difficult task of even improve them.

References

- Cardinaletti, A. and M. Starke. (1999). «The Typology of Structural deficiency: On the Three Grammatical Classes». In: van Riemsdijk, H. (ed.). *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 145-233.
- Zwicky, A.M. (1977). *On clitics*. Bloomington: Indiana University Linguistics Club.