Claude Muller (Université de Bordeaux-3)

On the Position of Romance Clitics.

in : Hermes, Journal of Linguistics, 20-1998 (Aarhus), p. 115-138

1. Introduction[1].

Cliticization is one of the most striking properties of Romance languages. It is very difficult to determine why this property experienced such great development in this linguistic area, and also why there are now so many differences on this point between the different modern Romance languages.

The study of the morphological and syntactical properties of these pronouns in early Romance was a matter of controversy in classical diachronic research at the end of the 19th and the first half of this century, between Meyer-Lübke's analysis and Lerch: see Ramsden, 1963.

Recently, this difficult and still unresolved problem came up again in discussion, mostly in the generative framework (Zwicky 1987; Halpern & Zwicky, 1995; Rouveret,1989; Kayne, 1991, 1992). Despite the progress this new research accomplished, their results are problematic. It is unclear, if one does not accept the whole of the theory, to determine what in the explanations depends on the problem itself, and what on the theory. Thus, it is possible to explain a lot of the positionning of clitics by verb movements, in combination with clitic movements, but if one is not convinced of the necessity of such movements, not much remains of these explanations.

In what follows, I want to avoid such problems, by postulating only what is strictly necessary, and so I shall speak of "clitic placement" without supposing anything of the grammatical processing, movement or direct placement. What I suppose is a type of modular grammar, in the way Henning Nølke defined it, but with a stress on the syntactic modules. Quite roughly, I need at least two different modules in interrelation: one, of the predicate-argument type, with an extended notion of "predicate", more like the transformational grammars of Zellig Harris, than the more traditional definition of Tesnière. This module is a framework, which gives the dependancy relations between predicates and the scope-relations; but nothing of the agreement rules, nor of the grammatical functions, like subject, nor of more superficial structures like theme and rheme or topic and focus. I see it as a source of the grammatical structure of the sentence, in which peculiar operators - predicates in my view- like tenses determine relations like that of subject, the existence or not of conjunctions, and thus select those predicates which play a central role in that syntactic level -the verbs-, opposed to predicates like adverbs. Syntactic relations at that level, like the relative position of adverbs, show that the predicate-argument level remains active in the building of the syntactic level. That peculiar type of governing relationship is quite important to our discussion, as we will see below.

In the case, to which I now return, of Romance clitics, I suppose that they are selected as full pronouns in the predicate-argument level, like nominals. Therefore, clitics appear only at the syntactic level as variants of these full nominals.

[1] This article is a revised version of a lecture which was first presented at the Handelshøjskolen i Århus, in September 1997. I must thank Povl Skårup, for very helpful comments thereon during my stay in the University of Århus. I am also indebted to Henning Nølke and Kjaer Jensen for their invitation, their comments during and after the lecture, and for having provided me with the text of Ingmar Söhrman's article on the same subject. This paper gives an excellent overview of the position of Romance clitics, with a focus on infinitive clauses.

In what follows, I shall try to describe the parameters at work in cliticization. I see these parameters as functional, having a cumulative value. I shall at first explain what I mean by "clitic", then I shall successively examine the tense parameter, the diachronic parameter, and the secondary relations of dependancy. From the values of these parameters, a system of rules describes the possibilities of clitic placement.
Romance languages here examined are essentially French, Italian, Spanish and Portuguese, but it does not seem to me that other Romance languages, like Catalan, Roumanian or Rhaeto-Romance, as far as I know, should contradict what follows.

2.Clitics.

This word currently designates terms which have special prosodic and syntactic properties. They are "reduced allomorphs, which cannot stand alone, like affixes. "As in most instances of allomorphy, clitics and their corresponding full forms display complementary distribution" (Napoli, 1996).
And for the prosodic properties: "clitics further have the property that they must be phonologically attached to a host" (Napoli, ibid).
They are sometimes described as unstressed terms. It seems better to say that they have no accent of their own. So we can continue to call "clitics" the French pronouns that appear on the right of the imperative in sentences like:
(1) Donne-le
although such pronouns are stressed: the stress does not come from the word, but from the sentence, as a final stress. Besides, such pronouns certainly share with other clitics the typical property of inseparability from the verb, thus excluding any insertion:
(2) *Donne donc le / Donne-le donc
According to these criteria, not only pronouns are clitics, but also, for instance, French negative *ne* (as an allomorph of the full term *non*) and the interrogative pronoun *que* (allomorph of the full form *quoi*). On the other hand, such words like the general conjunction *que* or the definite articles *le la les*, although identical to the pronoun clitics, are not clitics; or may belong to another category of clitics, because they have no corresponding full words in the present-day French.
I wont discuss these criteria any futher, because it is simply a question of definition. For the purpose of my argument, I must recall another frequent distinction, first made by Zwicky in 1977, between "simple clitics" and "special clitics". The simple clitic is a mere phonological variant of the full term, having a reduced distribution in comparison with the full term: for example, English *n't* for *not*, *'m* for *them*. The special clitic has a different distribution, as is the case with all the Romance clitics we will consider.

2.1. Subclasses of special clitics.

The classification must also take into account the type of cohesion which links the clitic to its support: we must distinguish the three following cases:
1: The clitic is free in syntax, but obeys phonological laws, like Wackernagel's: this law, discovered by Wackernagel in 1892, establishes that free unstressed reduced forms, in old stages of Indo-European, attach as enclitic (that is to say, on the right) upon the first stressed term of the clause or of the sentence. This was perhaps the situation in early stages of

Romance, if we follow de Dardel & de Kok, 1996[2], but it is no longer true in any present-day Romance language, although the law still holds good in many languages in the world.
2: The clitic is loosely linked in the phrase, remaining separable from its support. It is what happens with the French negative *ne* in the infinitive clause:
(3) Promets-moi de *ne* plus toujours immédiatement te *plaindre* de ce que je fais
cf. the clitic *te* in the same sentence:
(4) *...de ne *te* plus toujours *plaindre*
3: The clitic is linked in a morphological way: it forms a single word with its host, like *ne* with finite verbs or present participles:
(5) *Il ne plus toujours se plaint / correct: Il ne se plaint plus toujours
(6) Ne pas fumer vs.: *Ne pas fumant / correct: Ne fumant pas...
It is also the case with the French subject *je tu il* : in the following example, the whole sentence, except *pas*, is a single word (morphemes are not separable):
(7) Je ne le lui donnerai pas
I not it to-(him/her) give+FUT NEG: I shall not give it to him / to her

This last category must be subdivided into two subclasses:
-Firstly: clitics which obey syntactic procedures of reduction, that is to say, those clitics which can be omitted in coordinated or elliptical structures, for example the French pronoun on the left:
(8) Il mange et boit de bon appétit / =Il mange et il boit...
-Secondly: clitics which cannot be omitted, like affixes, as complement clitics or as the subject clitic on the right of the verb:
(9) *Mange-t-il et boit? *Mange et boit-il? /vs.: Mange-t-il et boit-il?...
In any case, there remain distinctive properties between clitics and affixes, like the placement other than that determined by the word-formation rules (here, for the clitics, the predicate/arguments relationships): compare the following:
(10) Jean le lui donne / Jean le lui a donné / Jean le lui a fait donner
In these sentences, the clitics come from the argument structure of *donner*, but they must occupy the finite verb position. Compare with:
(11) Jean recommence / Jean a recommencé
It is impossible to say:
(12) *Jean ra (re-a) commencé

We see from the foregoing that clitics have several functional relationships (at least one with grammatical tense), and not just that of argument to predicate. We will now examine that.

3. The cliticization in Romance: a verb form-directed relation.

The bulk of clitics found in Romance are pronominal arguments, either complements or adverbials. French adds the pronoun subject and the negative particle. All these terms are cliticized in relation to the tense (or, more generally, the verbal inflection), independently of

[2] This was the opinion of Meyer-Lübke in his famous paper of 1897. This analysis was strongly challenged, by Lerch and later by Ramsden. The respective positions crucially depend on what is considered: that is to say, attested texts of late Latin, or reconstructed structures following comparative methods (« Proto-Romance »).

the predicate-argument relationship. In fact, cliticization is not possible with a nominal equivalent of the predicate, and is generally excluded with the past participle[3]:

(13) Une personne à lui présentée / *Une personne lui présentée
A person to-him (pron) presented / A person to-him (clitic) presented

In general, the clitic must "climb" to the auxiliary:

(14) *Elle a été me présentée / Elle m'a été présentée

vs.: Elle a été présentée à moi (?..à moi présentée)/ *Elle à moi a été présentée

However, there are some cases which permit the construction past participle+clitic in Romance. In Spanish:

(15) Quando volvió, Nicolás habia comido y marchádo**se**
(J.Bouzet, Grammaire Espagnole, Belin, 1960)

The usual context is that of a vebal ellipsis, but in some cases, it seems possible to attach the pronoun to the past participle even when the auxiliary is present[4]:

(16) No **se** había hecho cargo / No había**se** hecho cargo / No había hecho**se** cargo
(not he-had made-to himself account = he had not realised it)

The use of a past participle as an host for clitics is also found in Italian:

(17) Una volta conosciuta**mi**, Gianni... (from Kayne, 1991, 659)

and Italian dialects offer other possibilities, as does Piedmontese, which repeats the clitic on the past participle:

(18) **L**'ei savü**lu** trop tart (=l'ho saputo tropo tardi)

(De Dardel & de Kok, p.314,from Rohlfs)

Kayne, 1991, gives also an example[5] in the Franco-Provençal dialect of the Val d'Aoste:

(19) Dz'i batia-**la** tot solet
(I-had built-it all alone)

Therefore, we cannot exclude the past participle as host for clitics. We could see it as a verb form having a very weak parametric value for any of the two positions of cliticization which it nevertheless contains. Thus, the « climbing » to an upper position is almost obligatory.

In contrast, the infinitive can keep clitics; but the same phenomenon exists, namely the possibility of changing the support, as we whall see below. This could also depend on the relative « weakness » of the infinitive compared with finite verb forms. This « weakness » of infinitive constructions has independent symptoms: for example, in French, it does not cliticize the negative morpheme *ne*, at least as an attached morpheme. We suppose that the properties of (finite) tenses consisting of building subjects positions and occurrences of nominative pronouns, are related to the same parameter which reinforces, in the same conditions, the proclitic position for complement clitics. Another example: the present participle in French has the same construction as finite verbs with the negation *ne*, but it never allows subject clitics.

Let us now examine wether the changing of the verbal host could be related to the same parameter which does or does not allow the anteposition. The « weakness » of a type of verbal inflection, like tenseless forms, would thus lead either to a situation of enclisis on the weak

---

[3] This construction is attested in Belgian French: *Les documents* **leur** *envoyés, la somme* **me** *due* (Grevisse, §1057,1). In standard French, the locative clitic *y* is also possible in: *la lettre y incluse*. Another locative clitic, *ci*, is restricted to this verbal collocation: *la lettre ci-jointe*, but also occurs with adjectives: *les témoins ci-présents.*

[4] The following sentence is a variant of a sentence given by de Dardel & de Kok (p.314):
...pues aún no había héchos**elo** cargo
My informants contest the acceptability of this sentence, with the two clitics.

[5] From A. Chenal, 1986: *Le franco-provençal valdôtain*, Aoste.

verb form, or to the « climbing » to an auxiliary. It is in fact the case with past participles, and the same situation is observed with other non-finite verbal forms, like gerunds or infinitives, in Spanish, Italian or Portuguese[6]. Because of the action of an interfering parameter, namely that of the diachronic stage of development from early Romance to the modern stage, the situation can vary: thus, French has no longer the climbing construction with infinitives, which existed in classical French:

(20) Je **le** veux faire (Je veux **le** faire)

but we observe that the alternative was between the choice of the auxiliary and the proclitic construction, not directly between auxiliary and enclisis (situation in the early stages of medieval French). This could be seen as an argument against the linking of the two possibilities: choice of the position or choice of the support. However, it can also be interpreted as a result of the strengthening of the proclitic position before non-finite verbal forms in French, resulting in the gradual abolition of the climbing construction. In languages opposing enclisis to climbing, the situation seems more stable, as in Spanish and Italian:

(21)Spanish: ¿Quieres traer**me** el gabán? / ¿**Me** quieres traer el gabán?
(Will-you bring-me the coat?)
Voy a traér**telo** / **Te lo** voy a traer
(I-come to bring-you-it)

(22)Italian: Devi far**lo** / **Lo** devi fare
(you-must do-it)
Te lo puoi figurare / Puoi figurar**telo**
(to-yourself it you-can imagine)

The same variation is observed in Portuguese, except that the enclitic construction can also appear with finite forms of the verb:

(23) Pode levantar-**se** / Pode-**se** levantar
He-can stand up (himself)
Nâo pode levantar-**se** / Nâo **se** pode levantar

The possibility of enclisis with finite verb forms leads us to suppose that, in the languages allowing this, the climbing could also appear with dependent tensed verbs . It is in fact what marginally happens, at least in some dialects, according to these sentences (North-Western Portuguese dialect, Barbosa 1996, p.15):

(24) ?Quanto dinheiro **lhe** achas que devo dar?
how-much money to-him (you) think that (I) must give

(25) ?A quem **a** queres que eu apresente?
to-whom her (you) think that I introduce

Thus the type of verb form plays a role in the different constructions of pronominal clitics.
Although cliticization differs from one Romance language to another, we will suppose the same hierarchy of verb forms in relation to the cliticization process for all of them.

[6] But in Belgian French, as we noticed above (also, Kayne 1991), the pronoun is proclitic with past participles, maybe because of the « language parameter »: proclisis had early a maximal extension in French (see §4 below). However, full pronouns can sometimes occur before the past participle in these constructions: *Les documents* à eux *présentés...*

3.1.Criteria for a hierarchy of verb forms[7].

The criteria for establishing such a hierarchy are the following:
A verb form is a "stronger" support of cliticization if:
1-It allows more clitics (for example, finite verb forms in French opposed to non finite ones)
2-It binds more narrowly some clitics (for example in French, tensed forms and present participle, opposed to the infinitive, because of the negative particle *ne*, loosely linked to the infinitive, as we have seen).
3-It possibly attracts to itself a clitic that would normally be attached to another (lower) verb form.
4-It does not allow the attraction of another higher verb form, or of another support (such as a preposition in some cases).
As we have seen, not much remains of theses possibilities in French. But, in certain limited cases, the criterion of attraction has some residual expressions: a preposition or the negative can attract a clitic normally tied to an infinitive, in a literary (or pretentious or conceited) style; but it was common in classical French:

(26) Nous tâcherons d'**en** bien mesurer les conséquences
(...de bien en mesurer les conséquences)
(We shall try to of-it well evaluate the consequences)

(27) Désireux d'**y** mieux parvenir / ...de **les** mieux servir
(Wishing to-there better to reach) (them better to serve)

(28) J'avoue n'**y** rien comprendre

Compare with:

(29) *Nous en bien mesurons les conséquences (vs.: nous en mesurons bien...)

(30) ??Je souhaite y mieux parvenir (...mieux y parvenir)
*J'admets y tout comprendre (...tout y comprendre)

That possibility concerns only the permutation with a small list of adverbs (it is known in the literature under the name of "residual interpolation" -see Barbosa). Like climbing to an auxiliary, that possibility was more widespread in earlier stages of French. Here also, the gradual disappearance of that construction is related to the strengthening of the proclitic position: in the first stages of Old French, the pronoun in anteposition was governed by the preposition[8], and received a stress, resulting in the strong form:

(31) ...pour moi veoir

But the future evolution shows the growing influence of the infinitive, leading to a cliticization on the verb, with the following steps: first, a loose linking[9], XX being interpolated material, secondly, the proclisis:

---

[7] This term covers all the verbal inflections, mood, tense, and tenseless forms.

[8] After the first, reconstructed level of Proto-Romance, following the Wackernagel law (according to de Dardel & de Kok): the pronoun is first unstressed and enclitic on the preposition :...*pro me videre*.

[9] That type of linking explains what happened with *ne*: while the pronouns became enclitic on the infinitive, the negative clitic has kept that type of linking, perhaps because of the possibility of being attached to an adverbial position, whose occurrence is usually *pas*.
Different explanations have been proposed of the peculiar construction of infinitives, either on a synchronic point of view, or on a diachronic one: see Skårup 1990. It also concerns the place of adverbs before infinitives. Skårup's analysis (the presence of a verbal « zone ») anticipates recent analysis of an empty Tense position (Rouveret 1989 among others; see also Kayne 1992 postulating an « empty modal » in Italian negative infinitival imperatives).

(32) Prep *lui* (XX) *voir* / Prep *le* (XX) voir / Prep *le voir* (XX)
as in the following sentences (De Dardel & de Kok)
(33) a lui en droiture endoctriner > a le en droiture endoctriner > a l'endoctriner en droiture
to-him rightly (to) teach.

With these criteria, we obtain for French the following hierarchy[10]:
Finite verb forms > Present participle, Imperative > Infinitive > (Past participle)

3.2.The opposition between enclisis and proclisis.

If we observe what happens in Spanish and Italian, we see that enclisis is the most usual position with infinitives and gerunds, and we already know that these verb forms are weak governors of clitics. At this point, we can therefore suppose that enclisis, in modern Romance, is tied to the weakness of the government by the verbal inflection. In languages which maintain enclisis, and in the case of a "weak" verb form, the governent by the verbal inflection is reinforced by the direct government by the verb itself. In the case of a "strong" verb form, the government by the verb form doesn't need any reinforcement, so the proclisis could be obtained.
In some cases, this opposition is the only one which can be expressed; thus in Italian, between the indicative and the imperative:
(34) **Glielo** prendiamo / Prendiamo**glielo**! (Renzi, III, p.157)
Although finite, the imperative appears to be a « weak » verb form. The « weakness » of the imperative has nothing to do with the absence of the subject, or with the speech act that it expresses: the polite form of the imperative, which uses the subjunctive, shows it in Italian:
(35) **Mi** dia la penna! / Da**mmi** la penna!
(Give me the pen!)
We must suppose that the imperative is a weak governor, and more generally that enclisis is an indicator of the weakness of the verb form, among other factors.

We shall admit that, generally speaking, the Romance hierarchy of verb forms will be:
Finite verb forms> Non finite verb forms, Imperative > Past participle

4. Grammaticalization of cliticization: the language parameter.

The overall evolution shows a gradual replacement of the purely prosodic factors, such as the Wackernagel law, by syntactic ones, increasingly restrictive. In the first steps, interpolation would have been possible (inclusion of intermediate terms between clitics and the verb); type:
(36) pater me hodie videt (De dardel & de Kok)
That possibility has nearly disappeared[11]. But some constructions of this type remain, belonging to the most conservative Romance languages: principally the dialects of Northern Portugal and Galician, according to Barbosa 1996:

[10] Within tenses, a more detailed analysis would place indicative before subjunctive: P.Skårup noticed that enclisis was longer in use with subjunctive than with indicative in Old French.
[11] If it existed at all. The reconstruction of Proto-Romance remains hypothetical: Meyer-Lübke and the pertinence of the Wackernagel law for Romance have been contested (Ramsden, Skårup 1975). The existence of

(37) O livro que **lhe** ainda não entreguei
The book that to-him yet not (I) delivered
The book that I haven't given to him yet

Even this possibility is tightly controlled. In other Romance languages, clitic placement no longer obeys prosodic rules. A tie is established with the verb, though not necessarily the one whose clitic is an argument as we have seen. In a certain stage of cliticization, this tie prevents any breaking, leading to the present situation of most Romance languages.

The precise reasons for that tie with the verb are discussed. According to De Dardel & de Kok, following Lausberg, the first step of purely prosodic laws would have been followed by a stage of double-binding (named "emphiclisis" by Lausberg), where the weak pronoun would have a prosodic relation with the preceding term, and a syntactic one with the following, this one being the verb. So interpolation (for example (38)) would have been ruled out:

(38) pater me hodie videt

and the authorized configurations exhibit this double relation:

(39) pater me videt
nunc me videt pater

with the enclitic position when the verb comes first (which we can also consider a case of double relation, but with the first term only):

(40) videt me pater

This stage is what is known in the litterature as the Tobler-Mussafia law: the clitic does not occupy the first position (but it doesn't exclude that the clitic could be in a third or more position).

From this stage, the evolution of modern Romance languages is divergent.

Portuguese is the closest; but it doesn't seem possible to say that it has remained at this stage: the prosodic link has been replaced by a syntactic one, as can be seen by the difference in clitic placement when the first term is a definite or an indefinite noun phrase:

(41) O Pedro viu-o / *O Pedro o viu
(The) Pedro saw him

(42) Alguem o viu / *Alguem viu-o
Somebody him saw

But Portuguese remains the only language to have maintained enclisis with finite verb forms on a large scale. At the opposite end of the scale, French had the strongest evolution towards a grammaticalization of cliticization, and jointly to proclisis. At a median stage, in Italian and Spanish, we find enclisis still being used with non-finite verbs, and some remains of this construction are still possible with some finite verbs.

Let us suppose that there is a parameter characteristic of the language, which we shall call the "language parameter". It will be fixed for each Romance language according to the following properties:

-the degree of extension of cliticization (to adverbial pronouns, to negation, to subject);
-the degree of use of initial Proclisis;
-the type of cliticization (i.e. the relative autonomy of clitics in the sentence).

According to these properties, French has the strongest parameter of cliticization: maximal extension, proclisis with non finite verb forms and in first position (type: *le voilà*), strong

---

interpolations is seen as happening in a relatively late stage of Spanish or Portuguese by Ramsden, and not as a remainder of an archaic construction.

binding between clitics and the verb. Italian and Spanish are in a median position with a larger use of enclisis (for example, *eccolo* in Italian). European Portuguese has the weakest parameter, with a wide use of enclisis, and a loose binding between clitics and verb. For example, it is the only language which permits, though marginally (in dialects) , a clitic movement from a dependent finite verb to a dominant one; it is also the only one allowing an interpolation with a negation (not a clitic in Portuguese):

(43) É porque não **o** conheço / É porque **o** não conheço
It-is why not him I-know / It-is why him not I know (It is why I don't know him)

It seems also easier in Portuguese than in Spanish or in Italian not to repeat clitics under clausal coordination:

Italian (Barbosa)

(44) **Lo** vedo spesso e *(**lo**) sento tutti i giorni
him I-see often and him I-hear all the days

Portuguese (ibid.):

(45) O Carlo disse que **te** traz às segundas e leva as sextas
the Carlos said that you he-brings on Mondays and takes on Fridays
"Carlos said that he will bring you on Mondays and take you on Fridays"

The Portuguese weak pronouns seem then more autonomous in cases of anteposition, and here it is difficult even to speak of proclisis, as interpolation clearly shows.

5. Anteposition and multiple dependancy relationships.

Thus , we can describe cliticization in the modern Romance languages as the result of the combination of the language parameter with the verb form parameter, which we suppose invariable. But another parameter can interfere, that of possible secondary relationships of dependancy, which we call multiple dependancy relationships: the weak pronoun is possibly moved before its natural host, if such a relationship exists, in contrast with cases where no such relationships intervene. As we supposed above, we now suppose that given the weak values of the two parameters first described, the basic position of a weak pronoun is enclitic (as if the direct government by the verb were necessary). A secondary relationship thus acts as a reinforcement of the proclitic position, reinforcement added to the pronoun-verb relation[12].

5.1. Asymetry between enclisis and proclisis.

Before coming to these secondary relationships, we must examine what is the basic position of clitics. It is easy to notice that clitics never go down, either towards a subordinate verb, or towards any host situated on the right of the predicate of which they are arguments (there are no interpolations on the right, if we admit that all the words between the verb and a weak pronoun in enclitic position must be cliticized).

[12] This relation is of the command-precede type (for example, command when the « governor » is a matrix verb; precede with a negation or an adverb).

This has already been noticed by Pol Skarup for Old French[13]. It has been generalized to Romance by De Dardel & De Kok, (p.313): it is impossible to find enclisis with a right disjunction, such as:

(46) *Videt pater-me (Sees father me: "(My) father sees me")

Conversely, clitics frequently "climb" (whatever meaning we agree for this term) to a higher position. It is normally what happens with past participles, as we saw it above.

This could explain the lefthand position, even in imperatives, of the French negative *ne*: *ne* refers to a predicate which is « higher » than the verb on which it bears. Naturally, the negative *pas*, not being a clitic, can be placed lower.

5.2. Cumulative value of the parameters.

Now we can try to describe the concrete placement of complement clitics from their argument position, with the general competing rules:

-enclisis is the default situation, when nothing else can be used to support a proclitic placement. It will be found only with a sum of weak parameters, which is the normal consequence of our hypothese. In cases of enclisis, the verb itself (as a lexical term) and not only the verb form, lends its support. With the past participle, even the enclitic position is usually too weak to support any clitic construction in most of the Romance languages.

-proclisis is the prefered situation and when something permits it, it occurs in most cases. It happens either when the sum of the parameters of the language and of the verb form are strong, or when secondary relationships of dependancy reinforce the proclitic position. Those relationships cause a sort of tide-effect, by attracting the clitic on the left, without a rupture between clitic and verb.

The language parameter defines the intrinsic value of the proclitic position. The tense parameter adds either a reinforcement, or adds nothing. If there are secondary relationships of dependancy, they can also add a reinforcement, leading to a possible anteposition due to them. It is also possible that the two positions are equally balanced, allowing a free variation between enclisis and anteposition.

5.3. The secondary relationships of dependancy.

They play a very reduced role in a language like modern French, where the proclitic position is so strong that nearly all weak pronouns are proclitic. The sole enclitic construction of complement pronouns is the affirmative imperative. It is clear that the imperative is a weak governor of clitics, as is shown by all the Romance languages. With a negation, the French imperative has proclitic pronouns, which is clearly a result of the secondary relationship between negation and the proclitic position, at least in the genesis of the construction.

In other Romance languages, these secondary relationships play a very important role when the other parameters have a weak value. Typically, this happens in modern European

[13] P.Skårup,1975, p.36. The pronoun can follow a postposed nominal subject, but it is then a full pronoun. When weak, however, it can follow a postposed pronominal subject (Skårup, p.38):

Et verai je la?

With a closely reasoned argumentation, P.Skårup shows that the postposed pronominal subject was already a clitic in Old French; differing in that with the same pronoun on the left of the verb (along his terms, the subject pronoun on the right is inside the « verbal zone »). Therefore, the complement pronoun is in the same enclitic sequence: it is not a case of interpolation.

Portuguese, where this effect of multiple dependancy is important because of the weakness of the language parameter. The relationship must be that of the predicative type, which explains why it is not realized by a definite subject, which is intrinsically an argument.
Broadly speaking, the « governors » of such secondary relationships are:
-subordination (described as a cause of anteposition by Skårup 1975 (for Old French), by Ramsden (for medieval Ibero-Romance); it can also be observed in modern Portuguese.
-negation (cf.also Ramsden);in modern Romance, in Portuguese, also in Italian and Spanish, and even in French (imperative).
-adverbs of aspect (cf. Barbosa).
-indefinites (pronouns, and some indefinite determiners): in Portuguese.
All those constructions have in common what we can consider as a predicative value: it is quite clear for subordination, but such an analysis is also usual for negation, adverbs and indefinites. I suppose that there remains, in the background of the sentence, the predicative hierarchy of predicate-argument relationships, inducing such secondary relationships on the syntactical level. What is not clear is the reason why some terms also having a predicative value do not trigger the anteposition (as does the indefinite article in Portuguese)[14].

6. A sketch of the rules.

There are two types of rules: rules of placement on a host other than the verb which is the predicate of the clitic; rules of positioning, before or after the verb.

6.1. Choice of the support.

The normal support is a verb, but the variability depends on the hierarchy of verb forms. In general, the clitic is only attracted by auxiliaries, but there are some exceptions:
We have the following possibilities:

a) Finite auxiliary > Past participle
b) Finite auxiliary > Infinitive / Gerund
c) Dominant finite verb > Dependent finite verb

a) is quite general; (b) depends on the language parameter (marginal in French; frequent in Spanish, Italian, Portuguese); (c) is quite marginal (only in conservative Portuguese dialects)
The choice of a non-verbal host is a result of what we described a secondary relationship of dependancy, in stages of Romance where the weak pronoun could be attached (always as enclitic) to a non verbal term. It makes possible an interpolation, as in the following case (Old Spanish, from D.Wanner,p.554):

(47) ...Ca sy **la** yo aun non veo yo morre
(for if her I still not see I will-die = for if I then do not see her, I will die)

6.2. Combination of parameters and clitic placement.

[14] If we look at ancient studies on evolution of early Romance from that point of view, we see that the same secondary relationships seem to have been responsible for the anteposition of weak pronouns; for example Ramsden; while in subordinate clauses, anteposition was dominant in Old Spanish, Ramsden noticed that the two constructions (anteposition and postposition) appeared in matrix or independent clauses. He gives a list of 40 examples (pp.81-82) of postposed weak pronoun: in that list, only one of them has an indefinite subject.

Language	*L.parameter*	*Verb form*	*Dependancy*	*Position*
Portuguese	weak	weak	single	enclisis
"" ""	""	""	multiple	proclisis possible
"" ""	""	strong	single	enclisis
"" ""	""	""	multiple	proclisis
Italian/Spanish	medium	weak	single	enclisis
"" ""	""	""	multiple	proclisis possible
"" ""	""	strong	single	proclisis
"" ""	""	""	multiple	proclisis
French	strong	weak	single	proclisis (enclisis with imperative)
"" ""	""	""	multiple	proclisis
"" ""	""	strong	single	proclisis
"" ""	""	""	multiple	proclisis

The general rules that we can infer from this table are:
-multiple dependancy can produce proclisis in every Romance language, and with every tense. However, that possibility is limited to a narrow group of potential governors, principally negation, in Italian and in Spanish.
-the combination of a strong language parameter and of a weak verb form, as observed in French, allows proclisis; the positive imperative remains the unique case of enclisis. Within this framework, we can give a satisfactory explanation of the variation observed with negation in imperative clauses: it is clearly a case of multiple dependancy. It is often described as a survival of the old prosodic Tobler-Mussafia rule. This is ruled out because of such sentences as:
(48) Le voilà! / *Voilà-le
In such a case, the word *voilà* is no more imperative, therefore the placement of the clitic follows the general pattern in French. In Italian, in such a sentence, enclisis is observed:
(49) Eccolo!
showing that we are nevertheless at an intermediate state (like infinitives), with a difference in the language parameter.
Nevertheless, what we observe in modern French is the reduction of the formerly wider possibility of a proclitic construction with imperatives. This is rather surprising if we suppose that the overall evolution of Romance goes towards proclisis. In classical French, it was still

possible to use a secondary relationship of dependancy with a coordinating conjunction for anteposing the clitic, as we can see in 19th century litterary use:

(50) Poète, prends ton luth et **me** donne un baiser (A.de Musset)

What may explain the further evolution is perhaps the growing grammaticalization of the verbal constructions, associating the positive imperative with enclitic order.

The general evolution still at work can dissociate two variants of the same language: while European Portuguese makes an extensive use of enclisis, Brazilian Portuguese shows a quick evolution towards proclitic constructions.

-other combinations give no surprising results: with a medium or a weak parameter, weak verb forms result in an enclitic placement. In such cases, the secondary relationships of dependancy are very important.

We shall examine now in greater details the situation in Italian and in Portuguese.

6.3. Clitics in Italian.

In the standard language, clitics include, like in French, adverbial pronouns. Enclisis appears with the positive imperative:

(51) Quando ti parlo, ascolta**mi**
When to-you I-speak, listen-to-me

and a negation logically entails proclisis:

(52) Non **vi** levate
Not you(rself) stand up

Tenseless verb forms produce enclisis:

(53) Puoi figurar**telo**
(you)can imagine-yourself-it ("you can imagine it")

(54) Senza figurar**melo**
Without imagine-to myself-it

But the "weakness" of the support can entail a higher placement, on an auxiliary:

(22) **Te lo** puoi figurare
Devi far**lo** / **lo** devi fare ("you must do it")

(55) **Gli** vado a aprire
to-him (I)go to open ("I'll go and open to him")

It is also possible that a negation produces proclisis (Pézard, p.65):

(56) Levando**si** il vento... / Non **si** levando il vento...
getting-up itself the wind...

With an infinitive:

(57) Promise di non **si** levare

also Söhrman 1997, p.101:

...al pericolo de non **ci** riuscire (Manzoni)

but these constructions do not seem usual[15].
Some idiomatic constructions with finite, non imperative verb forms, are remainders of the older situation, where enclisis was more widespread (which we see now as a stage where the language parameter was weaker):

(58) affita**si** legge**si** dica**mi** si....
("to let") one reads... could anyone tell me...

6.4. Clitics in Portuguese.

With a finite verb form, we find enclisis in the cases of single-word lefthand dependancy (the weak pronoun depends only on the verb, without any supplementary relationship of dependancy). This happens when the verb has no realized subject, or a definite NP (including a full pronoun) subject on the left, and no predicative element on the same position.

(59) Viu-**me** (he saw me)
Eles odeiam-**se** (They hate themselves/each other)
O Pedro viu-**o** (Pedro saw him)
Viu-**o** alguem (somebody saw him)

The presence on the left of the verb of a predicative element: an indefinite pronoun, some (not all) indefinite NPs, a negation, an aspectual adverb, can or must lead to the proclitic placement[16]:

(60) Nâo **me** viu (He didn't see me)

(61) Alguém **o** tinha avisado
somebody him informed (Somebody informed him)

but:

(62) Viu-o alguém (*O viu alguém)

(63) Só o Pedro o viu (*...viu-o)
Only the Peter him saw

(64) Todos o conhecem
All him know

(65) O mesmo se pode dizer de...
The same itself can say of... (the same can be said of...)

(66) Ainda **o** encontrei varias veces
Again him I-met several times

Interrogation plays no role:

(67) Ele escondeu-**se**? (Did he hide?)

but the wh-question does:

[15] Rohlfs, 1968,(p.172) explains such constructions by the joint influence of the preposition and of the negation, in clauses like *per non* **lo** *fare, per non* **la** *vedere*. The action of a preposition as a secondary « governor » is attested in dialects, as in Neapolitan: *pe* **mme** *sanà sta capo* (=*per guarir***mi** *la testa*).
[16] Examples from Teyssier, 1984, P. Barbosa, 1996.

(68) Que **te** disse ele? (What did he tell you?)

In embedded clauses with finite verbs, proclisis is always the case:

(69) Eu duviddo que ele **a** visse
I doubt that he her see+past+subj

We suppose that subordination induces a dependancy relationship leading to the multiple dependancy case, which is sufficient alone to trigger proclisis with strong verb forms. With non finite embedded verbs, subordination does not work (or is not sufficient) and enclisis appears, as in Italian or Spanish, even with an inflected infinitive[17]:

(70) Nâo é razoável encontrarmo-**nos** todos os das
Not it-is reasonable (to-)meet+1stpl-us all the days

But multiple dependancy has a cumulative effect; thus, either it permits or it requires proclisis; negation requires it:

(71) Custa-me muito não te ver
It-costs me much not you (to-)see

When the infinitive is introduced by a preposition, the position of the clitic depends on the preposition; some of them have no influence on the placement of the clitic:

(72) Ficou a contemplá-**la**
He remained contemplating her

(73) Ao levantar-**se** sentiu uma dor...
By getting up, he felt an ache...

With some others, the choice is possible:

(74) Antes de **os** ver.../ antes de vê-**los**
before them (to-)see

But the adjunction of one more possible governor, or a slight modification, may lead to an obligatory placement; for example, if the tensed infinitive replaces in this context the tenseless one, we must have proclisis:

(75) Antes de **os** vermos (*antes de vermo-los)

As in Italian, it is often possible to build the clitic on the auxiliary, but in this case, the clitic must obey the same placement rules as these already described for independent clauses:

(23) Não pode levantar-se / Não se pode levantar / Pode-se levantar
(he cannot stand up)

7. Conclusion.

The language parameter, which is the result of the present stage of evolution of the Romance language, acts like a reinforcement of the proclitic position, just before the verb. When strong, it can be sufficient and proclisis becomes the rule, as it is in modern French, apart from the positive imperative.

In languages with a medium strength language parameter, it is essentially the choice of the verb form which decides wether the clitic will be proclitic or enclitic. We know that a weak tense does not allow by itself a proclitic position. Here, an external governor, like negation,

[17] From Teyssier, 1984.

can reinforce the proclitic solution, thus allowing proclisis. In a language with a weak parameter, even a strong verb form cannot trigger proclisis -or anteposition: the term « proclisis » is perhaps too strong for a language like European Portuguese, allowing some interpolations. Here, the external governors play a central role.
Further investigations is naturally needed and the present results seem to me a first approach to these complicated problems. But the combination of the three factors taken in account: the intrinsic parameter of the language as a measure of evolution since early Romance; the verb form parameter; the single versus multiple dependancy, plus the predicate/argument structure behind the syntactic level, allowed us to describe the main lines of cliticization in Romance without the help of such dubious operations like verb-movements, verbal inflection-movements, or different types of subjects-verb relationships, all things that we find in the existing litterature on that difficult subject.

References:

Barbosa, Pilar, 1995: "Clitic Placement in European Portuguese and the Position of Subjects" in: Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky, Eds: *Approaching Second, Second position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, CSLI Publications, Standford, 1-40.
De Dardel, Robert & Ans de Kok, 1996: *La position des pronoms régimes atones en protoroman*, Droz, Genève.
Galet, Yvette, 1971: *L'évolution de l'ordre des mots dans la phrase française de 1600 à 1700*, Presses Universitaires de Rennes, Rennes.
Hopper & Traugott, 1993: *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge University Press.
Kayne, Richard S., 1991: "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22-4, 647-686.
Kayne, Richard S., 1992: "Italian Negative Infinitival Imperatives and Clitic Climbing" in Liliane Tasmowski & Anne Zribi-Hertz, Eds: *Hommages à Nicolas Ruwet*, Communication & Cognition, 300-312.
Muller, Claude, 1991: *La négation en français*, Droz, Genève.
Muller, Claude, 1996: *La subordination en français, le schème corrélatif*, Armand Colin, Paris.
Napoli, Donna Jo, 1996: *Linguistics*, Oxford U.P.
Pézard, André, 1946: *Grammaire italienne*, Hatier, Paris.
Ramsden, Herbert, 1963: *Weak-pronoun Position in the Early Romance Languages*, Manchester University Press.
Renzi, L.,
Rohlfs, G., 1968: *Grammatica storica della lingua italiana e dei suoi dialetti*; *Morfologia*. Einaudi, Torino (trad. de l'allemand, 1949).
Rouveret, Alain, 1989: "Cliticisation et temps en portugais européen", Revue des Langues Romanes, 337-371.
Skårup, Povl, 1975: *Les premières zones de la proposition en Ancien Français*, Etudes Romanes de l'Université de Copenhague, Akademisk Forlag.
Skårup, Povl, 1990: "La structure positionnelle du syntagme infinitif de l'ancien français au français moderne" in: Lindvall, L., éd.: *Actes du Xe congrès des romanistes scnadinaves*, Lund University Press, 427-435.

Söhrman, Ingmar, 1997: « The Position of Clitices in Phrases with an Infinite Verb Form in Romance Languages», *Hermes, Journal of Linguistics*, 19, 93-113.
Teyssier, Paul, 1984: *Manuel de langue portugaise,* Klincksieck, Paris.
Wanner, Dieter, 1996: “Second Position Clitics in Medieval Romance” in: Aaron L. Halpern & Arnold M. Zwicky, Eds: *Approaching Second, Second position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, CSLI Publications, Standford, 537-578.
Watson, Keith, 1997: "French complements clitic sequences: a template approach", *Journal of French Language Studies*, 7-1, 69-89.
Zwicky, Arnold M., 1987: *On Clitics,* Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington.