Two Types of Clitics in natural Languages

Lorenzo Renzi

This paper tries to compare the behaviour of clitic pronouns belonging to two different types: those which obey Wackernagel's law and the ad-verbal clitics. Whereas the first group is present in many language-families of the world, the second is limited to the Romance family and a few Indoeuropean languages of the Balkans.

After giving a description of the differences between the two types, an attempt will be made to show their similarities.

The very kernel of these similarities is shown to be in the general pragmatic principle according to which clitic elements tend to be at the beginning of the sentence, where, generally, the *given* part of the information is presented.

The behaviour of different types of clitics can be explained by the interface between this general principle and the syntactic properties of the different languages or typologically defined groups of languages. *

1. The studies on pragmatics, in linguistics, and those on information theory, which are too often overlooked nowadays, all agree on the principle that what we say normally proceeds from the given to the new and from the less to the more informative. Known (or Given) and New are the terms of a pair which, with Theme-Rheme, and other similar pairs, have supplied the heuristic tools for a detailed and in-depth study on word-order in the various natural languages. However, since the days of Mathesius, the first man to begin to study this problem, up to today, this topic has required a great deal of study, and this is because the generalisation mentioned above is rarely to be found exemplified in its pure state.[1] The idea of the

* For the final version of this article I made great use of the observations of Pierangelo Berrettoni and Guglielmo Cinque, whom I should like to thank. I also wish to thank for their help Rosanna Benacchio, Monica Genesin and in particular Laura Vanelli.

[1] If Mathesius is undoubtedly regarded as the initiator of studies on the "functional perspective of the sentence", later developed by the Second Prague School and by M. A. K. Halliday, another pioneering work by the Viennese romance scholar Elise Richter (1903, 1919-20 and 1922-23) should not be forgotten (see Renzi 1987). For the development of studies on word order in Italian one can see Renzi (1984), section 4.1.2 (to which has to be added the new volume by various authors edited by H. Stammerjohann (1986)).

progression from Given to New has to be enucleated amid endless complications.

Thus in Italian the sentence (1), which is contrasted with the following one (2), can express the newness of the subject compared to a known action expressed by the verb:[2]

(1) Partono i ragazzi
"Leave the children"

(2) I ragazzi partono
"The children leave"

and also

(3) Cantano i ragazzi
"Sing the children"

(4) I ragazzi cantano
"The children sing".

But if, differently from what happens in (3)-(4), the object of *sing* (*cantare*) is expressed by a nominal (for example, *the song*) (*la canzone*), the order VS becomes impossible, and along with that the representation of the newness of the subject by means of linearity, as for example in:[3]

*Cantano la canzone i ragazzi
"Sing the song the children".

What cannot be expressed through linear relations, will be expressed through intonation; but for our purposes the exemplification can end here.

What we are interested in underlining is that in Italian the linear expression of pragmatic relations is limited by the syntax and the phonological (intonational) features which accompany it. Andrea Calabrese (1982) has expressed some refined hypotheses regarding this matter. Without going through them all here, it is sufficient to bear in mind that Calabrese tries to explain the apparent contradictions and anomalies present in constructions like those already mentioned and others, through the interaction of syntactic and phonological factors with the pragmatic one: in fact, different levels of the language impose limits on the expression of the progression from Given to New obtained through linearity. We are convinced that some of the particularities of word order in different languages derive from this kind of interaction; thus, due to the diverse

[2] I said sentence (1) "can" express the newness of "children" as compared to "leave" because it is also possible that the whole sentence is new.

[3] The expression of the newness of the subject through linearity remains possible even with transitive verbs in marked orders, such as left dislocation (*La canzone, la cantano i ragazzi*, "The song, the children are singing it"), in which the resumption with *la* is necessary. The passive too can express the novelty of the subject (*La canzone è cantata dai ragazzi*, "The song is sung by the children"), but this time following a different grammatical structure.

syntactic and intonational nature of languages, different constraints modify the universal pragmatic tendency.

In this study, we shall be trying to examine the problem of clitics in the light of this principle. Even the problem of clitics has to be seen as a pragmatic problem, in fact, as we are about to demonstrate. On the other hand, clitics immediately come to mind when considering the problem of word order: in fact, their salient characteristic is their position in the linear chain; that is, their fixed position in a particular point in the sentence. After having gathered together a fair number of elements in section 4 in order to define the behaviour of clitics in various languages of the world, we shall try to demonstrate in the final section that their different behaviours all derive from the general principle described above and from the combination of conditioning factors of the kind alluded to earlier.

(Limiting this study to clitic *pronouns* only should not be prejudicial to the formation of general conclusions. This delimitation can certainly be explained by the deeply-rooted prejudice of a Romance philologist like me: to the romanist, the clitics naturally appear in the form of pronouns. It is a false identification, which I do not wish to support, but, without hazarding a universal prediction, I must say that I do not know of any cases of languages that have clitics, but that do not have clitic pronouns. Pronouns can be considered a kind of clitic hard core).

2. Pronouns are one of the technical solutions adopted by languages to represent coreferentiality (cf. Karolak 1983). For example, in

(5) (a) È venuto Antonio e *gli* ho detto alcune cose
"Anthony came and I told him a few things".

(b) È venuto Antonio e sono uscito con *lui*
"Anthony came and I went out with him"

both the clitic *gli* (him) and the free non-clitic *lui* (him) are coreferential with the preceding NP Antonio. To be precise, in (5) (a) with *to NP* and in (5) (b) with the NP Antonio.

We also witness the same thing with the reflexive:

(6) Antonio *si* lava le mani
"Anthony washes his hands"
Antonio *si* guarda allo specchio
"Anthony looks at himself in the mirror"
Antonio pensa solo a *sé*
"Anthony only thinks about himself"

here, *si* is coreferential with *Antonio*, as is also the free pronoun *sé*.

Therefore, pronouns do not refer back autonomously to a referent, since this has either already been introduced into the linguistic context, as in examples (5) and (6), or it depends on the extralinguistic situation. This latter case is always realised with the first and second person pronoun, and

sometimes with the third person one. In these cases, the pronouns are deictic: that is, they refer back to the actual situation of the communication act for correct comprehension:

(7) Attento, *ti* passo lo specchio
"Careful, I'm passing you the mirror".

In this case, the pronoun refers back to the addressee of the message, who must be present in the extralinguistic context.

Now we must concentrate on the two series of pronouns in Italian: the free one and the clitic one. The free series is used when its referent is contrasted (see example 9), or focussed upon (example 10), or when it is introduced as new or unexpected. If on the other hand the referent is expected, for example, if it is the subject/theme of the previous sentence, the clitic is used. In the case of the subject, in Italian there are no clitic pronouns, and we can spot the alternance between expected and unexpected referent by the presence/absence of the pronoun (Antinucci 1977, Cordin 1981, Duranti 1980, Calabrese 1980):

(8) È venuto Antonio e gli ho dato il documento
"Anthony came and I gave him the document"

(**a lui*, because *Antonio* had been introduced in the previous clause, unless the conditions that we see in the following example are present.)

(9) È venuto Antonio e ho dato il documento a *lui* (non a Maria)
"Anthony came, and I gave the document to him (not to Maria)".

(Here, *lui* is contrasted, whether explicitly or not, with Maria.)

(10) È venuto Antonio e ho dato il documento (proprio) a *lui*
"Anthony arrived, and I gave the document to *him*".

(Here, *lui* is being focussed on, sometimes even with the use of a "focussing word" like *proprio* (precisely) or something similar.)

(11) Quando Carlo$_i$ ha visto Mario$_j$, $\varnothing_i$ / lui$_j$ è scappato
"When Charles saw Mario, he$_i$ (the former) / he$_j$ (the latter) fled".

Here, of the two referents introduced in the first sentence, expressed by *Carlo* and *Mario*, the more obvious is the subject/theme of the sentence, that is, Carlo. Therefore, if it is he who ran away, the pronoun will not be used (this has been indicated by the sign $\varnothing$), but if it is Mario who ran away, the free pronoun will be used.

On comparing the informational capacity of the free pronoun with that of an NP, it is clear that the latter is more informative. However, what we wish to emphasise is that, as far as the syntactic position is concerned, the position of the NP and of the free pronoun in the sentence is the same, while that of the clitic is different. Nominals and free pronouns occupy

the same canonical position (see examples 12 a and b), and can also occupy other positions, provided that the conditions are the same: see (13) (a) (b):

(12) (a) Ho dato il documento *a Carlo*
"I gave the document to Charles"
(b) Ho dato il documento *a lui*
"I gave the document to him".

(13) (a) *A Carlo* ho dato il documento
"To Charles I gave the document"
(b) *A lui* ho dato il documento
"To him I gave the document"

and thus *Ho dato* a Carlo *il documento* (I gave to Charles the document) has the same parallel in *Ho dato* a lui *il documento* (I gave him the document). As a reply to: *A chi hai dato il documento?* (Who did you give the document to?) one can answer: *A Carlo* (To Charles) and *A lui* (To him).

The clitic pronoun on the other hand has completely different characteristics from those of the nominal and the free pronoun, since it has a fixed position. In comparison with

(14) *Gli* ho dato il documento
"I gave him the document"

every other position of the clitic (apart from a proclitic one in relation to the verb — in this case an auxiliary) is impossible:

(15) *ho*gli* dato, *ho dato*gli*, *ho dato il documento*gli*.

When there is no verb which the clitic can stand next to — for example, when it is in isolation — the clitic cannot be used:

(16) A chi hai dato il documento? **Gli*
"Who did you give the document to? To him".

This probably accounts for another characteristic of the clitic, i.e. its inability to enter into combination with another preposition, even when the pronoun refers to something previously given: **con gli*: thus the additional pronoun needed is supplied by the corresponding free pronoun *lui* (*con lui*).

3. The expression of deixis and coreferentiality varies from one language to another; however, even in different linguistic families, common traits can be found, or features with sufficient points in common to be comparable. In the next part, we shall try to show the similarities in the use of the clitic pronouns in two different language groups, despite their differences in syntax.

It should first be stated that not all languages have clitics. The difference in Italian between *lo vedo* and *vedo lui* cannot be expressed in English through syntactic means. In both cases it would be expressed by *I see him*; nevertheless, the pronoun would be accompanied by an intonational

difference, and if this is only slight, as in the case when there would be a clitic in Italian, it could bring about a process of phonological reduction, as, for example, *I see 'm*. (Selkirk 1984: section 7.2.2.4). But the process of reduction of a form, and a clitic form are two different things.[4] We do not consider therefore *'m* reduced from *him* as a clitic, but we can say that in English we can obtain through phonetic means what in Italian is obtained through syntactic means. Apart from English, other languages in which the clitic pronouns do not exist are Russian, White Russian and Ukrainian (Benacchio and Renzi 1986), Hungarian, etc., etc.

4. The two groups of languages in which we intend to compare the properties of clitic pronouns are:

Group A) Ancient Indoeuropean: Greek, Latin (Panhuis 1982 with bibliography), Old Indian (Banti 1980), Hittite (Friedrich 1960: 147 ss.), Lydian (Gusmani 1964: 46-47), Old Germanic and Gothic (Behaghel 1932: 67 ss.), common Slavonic; modern branches of the Indoeuropean family: a part of Slavonic: Slovenian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, Sorabian, Polish (Benacchio and Renzi 1987); in the Germanic branch, German and Dutch (see the bibliography in Benacchio and Renzi 1987: note 35); Iranian: Pashto.

Outside the Indoeuropean group, Tagalog, a language of the Philippines (Schachter 1974), some Australian languages, like Walbiri (Hale 1973, 1981) and Warramunga (Hale 1973), several Uto-Aztec languages, amongst which Luiseño (Steele 1976, 1977; Kaisse 1981) and several others (Steel 1976).

See also Kaisse (1982).

Thus, this group consists of at least four linguistic groups, spread out over four continents.

In these languages, the position of the pronoun (and that, in many cases,

[4] Our idea of the clitic, as opposed to that of other scholars (Klavans 1982, Antinucci and Marcantonio 1980), considers the phonological factor as being secondary. Obviously this does not mean that we deny the evidence of special phonological processes that can be originated by the clisis. However we feel we should not be talking about clisis only because an atonic element is influenced by processes of phonological reduction. Most of all, we should like to underline that clitics without any phonological character can exist apart from atony of course (but there are also instances of clitics bearing an accent, see Benacchio and Renzi 1987: note 5). In other words, we regard the phonological facts as unnecessary consequences, and not as causes of the clisis considered as a semantic and syntactic fact (see par. 1).

In ancient Indoeuropean languages, for instance, the processes of reduction of clitics are rather rare. However, there are some cases in which we can obtain the constitution of a single phonological word. In Latin the only examples do not concern the personal pronoun, but particles such as *ne, ce*: for example *qui* + *ne* can become *quin* (see Bernardi Perini 1986[4]: 53), or *est*: *actum est* > *actumst*.

Finally, we consider clitics only those that are sometimes called "syntactic clitics". We shall thus exclude from our consideration those elements — such as articles, prepositions etc. in Italian and other languages — which indeed possess fixed position and are normally atonic, but do not have tonic and free correlatives. Clitics are those elements that have fixed position, different from that of their possible free correlatives. (The notion of "correlative" must be sufficiently refined so as not to become an obstacle in putting this principle into practice; however the problem does not exist as far as pronouns are concerned).

of other clitic elements: copula, conjunction, adverbial and interrogative particles, etc.) is regulated by the so-called law of Wackernagel.

Group B) Romance (the whole family); Slavonic: Bulgarian and Macedonian; Albanian; Greek. All these languages belong to recent branches of the Indoeuropean family. They all originate from languages that once adopted Solution A.

According to certain authors, such as Perlmutter (1971: note 25) and George and Toman (1976), the two types of collocation of clitic pronouns represented by A and B are the only existing ones in the languages of the world. But in fact other solutions are also possible (cf. Renzi, in press).

Now let us sum up the main points of the two technical solutions which we are interested in.

Solution A

Clitics (pronouns or other types) are to be found after the first non-clitic word in the sentence, or after the first constituent (Wackernagel 1892). This first word, or first constituent, will be known as the *host* (or support) of the clitic, or of the group of clitics. Moreover, this first word, or first constituent, is formed by any part of speech: noun phrase, verb phrase, adjectival or adverbial phrase, or by any part of these. This possibility is fully realised in that these languages possess great freedom as regards word order, and practically any structural/functional constituent can occupy the first position in the sentence. This is the case, as is well-known, in the ancient branches of Indoeuropean, and it also continues to apply, although to a lesser extent, in the Indoeuropean languages that continue to follow the law of Wackernagel. Walbiri (Hale 1981) is a type of language in which the word order is totally free, apart — and this is the point — from the clitics. This also applies, as far as we know, to the other "exotic" languages mentioned above.

In the literature, the position of the clitics is often known as "second position". Nevertheless, we would like to avoid this definition, because the position of the clitic cannot be considered a true position, compared with that of the word or the phrase that precedes it. In reality, the clitic is added to that word or to that phrase. Therefore, we can say, in agreement with Zuzanna Topolinska (personal communication) and with Nikolaeva (1985), that the clitics belonging to Group A share the *first position* in the sentence with their host. That they seem to be in second position comes from the fact that the clitics in this group are always *enclitics*, that is, they follow the host. That it is a question of first and not second position is clear from the fact that clitic insertion can take place after one part only of the phrase and not after the entire phrase, as is shown in the Latin and

Serbo-Croat examples (17) and (18) (a): how can one speak of second position when the clitic precedes a part of the phrase standing in first position?[5]

Let us examine, from Renzi (in press), some examples of clitics in various languages from Group A:

Latin

(17) (a) Populus *se* (cl.) Romanus erexit (Cic. Brut. 12, in Wackernagel 1892: 409)
"People itself Roman took heart again"

(b) Populus Romanus *se* (cl.) erexit
"People Roman itself took heart again"

(d) Heri *se* (cl.) populus Romanus erexit
"Yesterday itself people Roman took heart again"

(c) Erexit *se* (cl.) populus Romanus
"Took heart again itself people Roman"

(e) Populus Romanus *se* (cl.) heri erexit
"People Roman itself yesterday took heart again"

(f) **Se* (cl.) populus Romanus erexit
"Itself people Roman took heart again"

(g) ?Populus Romanus erexit *se* (cl.)
"People Roman took heart again itself"

(h) *Te*, dea, *te* fugiunt venti, *te* nubila caeli
adventumque tuum, *tibi* suavis daedala tellus
submittit flores, *tibi* rident aequora ponti.

(Lucr. I, 6-9)

Serbian

(18) (a) Taj *mi* pesnik čita knjigu danas
"That *me* poet reads book today"

(b) Taj pesnik *mi* čita knjigu danas
"That poet *me* reads book today"

(c) Čita *mi* taj pesnik knjigu danas
"Reads me that poet book today"

(d) Danas *mi* taj pesnik čita knjigu
"Today me that poet reads book"

(e) Taj pesnik mi čita danas knjigu
"That poet me reads today book"

(f) **Mi* taj pesnik...
"Me that poet..."

(g) ?Taj pesnik čita *mi* knjigu danas
"That poet reads me book today"

(h) *Meni* taj pesnik čita knjigu danas
"To me that poet reads book today".

[5] Even certain cases of the so called "tmesis" lead to the conclusion that the position of the clitic must not be defined as secondary but as the primary enclitical: for example from *qui – cunque* we have "quo te cunque verteris" (wherever you turn) (Cic., De divin. 2,149, cit. in Wackernagel 1892: 407); or from *per-benigne*: "per mihi benigne respondit" (he answered me amably) (Cic., Ad Quintum fr. 17,2). In these cases the morpheme in first position has even less autonomy.

Examples (17) (a) and (17) (b) in Latin and (18) (a) and (18) (b) for Serbo-Croatian demonstrate the double possibility of pronoun clisis occurring either after the entire first phrase or after the latter's first word.[6] Again in examples (17) and (18), the two c.s show, in Latin and in Serbo-Croatian, respectively, that the clitic host can be the verb. Example (f) shows that proclisis is impossible, unless *se* can be interpreted as being free, so that the sentence signifies "The Roman people freed *itself*", in which case (17) (f) will be grammatical. Example (g) demonstrates the marginality of the case in which the clitic occupies a position further back in the sentence — postverbal, say: this possibility, which is a marked one, is not completely excluded in Serbo-Croatian (Benacchio and Renzi 1987: note 11), nor in Latin (Panhuis 1982: 82). Examples (h) show that free pronouns, and not clitic ones, can occupy the very first position, as can any nominal. Example (e) gives another example of the fact that contiguity of the clitic to the verb, realised in (b), (c) and (g), but not in (a) and in (d), is fortuitous.[7] This aspect is of particular importance because it is essential when making the distinction between the clitics in Group A and those in Group B.

Solution B

In all languages the category of clitics is limited to the oblique personal pronouns,[8] except for Bulgarian and Macedonian, in which the verbal copula

[6] As is well known, this characteristic cannot be found in all languages. For Indoeuropean languages in their most ancient phases it was probably compulsory to put clitics after the first word not after the phrase, a pattern encountered today in Tagalog; in Latin or, today, in Serbo-Croatian, Walbiri or in Luiseño there is a choice between the two systems, but the other descendents of Indoeuropean admit only clitics following a whole phrase.

[7] In German the application of this law is more restricted, for it can only occur with personal pronouns and only in certain kinds of sentences. Thus, the raising of clitics in first enclitic position allows the host to be only a subordinating conjunction or a verb, and not another part of speech, whereas in other languages the choice is virtually unlimited. Moreover the raising can take place only if the subject that follows is a noun and not a pronoun. For example, from: "Karl hat dem Kind ein Spielzeug geschenkt" (Charles has presented the child with a toy) becomes: "Es heisst, dass es Karl dem Kind geschenkt hat": "It is said that it Charles to the child presented has" that is to say "It is said that he has presented it to the child",
but neither:

*Karl es hat dem Kind geschenkt

nor

*Es heisst, dass es er dem Kind geschenkt hat.

With a verb we have:

Hat es Karl dem Kind geschenkt

with an interrogative meaning ("Did Charles present it to the child"?) or hypothetical ("If Charles has presented it to the child").

In spite of the limitations we have discussed, there is no doubt that in German clitic pronouns occupy, in some cases, the Wackernagel position. It remains to be ascertained the continuity with Old German, in which this law was applied as well as in the other Indoeuropean languages.

[8] In all Romance languages there are also reflexives. In many of them we can find forms such as Italian *ci* and *ne*. Therefore, apart from the alternation with NP, there are clitics

and the auxiliary and modal verbs are clitics. The clitics occupy an ad-verbal position: that is, they are always adjacent to the verb, which always constitutes their host. In the case of a compound verb, depending on the circumstances, the host of the clitics consists of either the finite verb (auxiliary or modal), or the infinitive form (past or present participle, gerund or infinitive). So clisis is sometimes realised in the form of proclisis, and sometimes as enclisis, and in each language certain cases require one form, while other cases require the other.

The fundamental character of the type B clisis is illustrated by the following examples:

(19) Incontro sempre *Gianni* / "I always meet John"

(20) Incontro sempre *lui.* / "I always meet him"

(21) *Incontro sempre *lo*

(21) is ungrammatical because the clitic pronoun *lo* is not adjacent to the verb. According to the rules of Modern Italian, it should be proclitic (*lo incontro*). According to Old Italian, though, enclisis would have taken place: *Incontrolo*. For example,

(22) Ruppe*mi* l'alto sonno...
(Dante, D.C. Inf. IV,1)
(see Mussafia 1886).

In Modern Italian we have proclisis in the finite modes (23), apart from the imperative (24), and enclisis in the infinitive ones (25):

(23) *Lo* guardo / "I look at him"

(24) Guarda*lo*! guardate*lo*! / "Look at him"

(25) Guardar*lo* / "To look at him"
guardando*lo* / "Looking at him"
guardato*lo* / "having seen him"
guardante*si* / "having looked at himself".

In the negative imperative, which is constructed in the singular in Italian with the infinitive, we can have proclisis or enclisis:

(26) Non *lo* guardare! / non guardar*lo*! / "Don't look at him".

In Spanish, the phenomenology is the same, apart from the last example of the use of the infinitive to form a negative imperative, which does not occur. Rumanian is like Italian, apart from the fact that in the infinitive the proclitic pronoun is used, and that proclisis is obligatory with the negative imperative, which is formed, as in Italian, with the infinitive: *te tai* / "you cut yourself"; *a se tăia* / "to cut himself"; *tăindu-mă* / "cutting

that alternate with PP. This also holds, if we consider, in accordance with the recent generative literature, that the phrases introduced by *a* are NPs and not PPs; therefore, for example, *gli* corresponding to *a Piero* would be a NP and not a PP.

myself"; *nu te tăia* / "dont cut yourself" / **nu tăia-te* (Pop 1943: 293). In French there is enclisis only in the imperative, otherwise there is always proclisis: *je le regarde* / "I look at him", *le regarder* / "to look at him", *le regardant* / "looking at him", but *regarde-le* / "look at him"![9] In European Portuguese there is enclisis in the finite forms (*disse-lhe* / "(he/she) told him/her"), unless they are preceded by a subordinating conjunction, a negation, an interrogative word or some other grammatical element, in which case there is proclisis. For example, *se me fizeres* / "if you will do (it) for me", *não me deste nada* / "you did not give me anything", and others. With the infinitive form, there is pure alternance between enclisis and proclisis, while with the participle there are never clitics. (See Teyssier 1976, par. 48; Salvi 1985: 329). In Brazilian, proclisis prevails, but enclisis is also present, at least in the infinitive: *Ver-nos foi amar-nos* / "to see each other was to love each other". (See Thomas 1969, paras. 178-186 and Teyssier 1976, par. 49).[10]

As regards the non-Romance languages, let us schematically cite modern Greek, Bulgarian, Macedonian (repeating what is said in Benacchio and Renzi 1987) and Albanian:

Modern Greek

(27) (a) μοῦ εἶπε "(he, she) me told"
(b) ἡ μητέρα της μοῦ εἶπε "her mother me told"
(c) —; ἀγαπῶντας τον "loving him"
(d) πές μου τα "tell me it".

Bulgarian

(28) (a) Az *go* viždam "I him see"
(b) Viždam *go* "(I) see him"
(d) Četi *go* "Read it!"
(e) Ne *go* četi "Don't it read!"

Macedonian

(29) (a) *Gu* gledam "(I) see him"
(b) Jas *gu* gledam "I see him"
(c) —; zemaíki *mu go* "taking it from him"
(d) Daj *mu go* "give him it".

Albanian (Fizì 1940, Solano 1972, Ressuli 1985)

(30) (a) *E* marr "(I) take it"

[9] In *Regarde-moi* ("look at me"), *tais-toi* etc. we have cases of suppletion, in which the free pronoun substitutes the clitic pronoun (thus *regarde me, tais te* are excluded). This tendency to suppletivism has already had wide development in Old French: see Foulet (1924) and 1958[3].

[10] The description of the Brasilian system is problematic because there is a tension between spontaneous use and European and scholastic norms.

(b) Nëna *më* thotë "Mother me tells"
(c) Për ta *e* marrë (Partic. + cl. + "taking" = "to take it"); duke *e* marrë "it taking"
(d) *më* hap derën / hap*më* derën "for me / open the door / for me"
(e) moss *e* merr "don't it take".

In the compound tenses, in Italian the clitics stand with the auxiliary, and proclisis occurs if this has a finite form (*l'ho visto* / "I have seen him"), while enclisis occurs if the auxiliary is in a non-finite mood (*avendolo visto* / "having seen him"; *averlo visto* / "to have seen him"), and this is usually the case in the other Romance languages. This is also the case in Rumanian, except that the feminine direct object clitic follows the past participle, while in all the other cases the clitics are attached to the auxiliary: *am văzut-o* / "I have seen-her" as opposed to *l-am văzut* / "I have seen him (him I have seen)", *i-am văzut* / "them (masc.) I have seen" and *le-am văzut* / "them (fem.) I have seen".

Finally, let us take into consideration the case in which a modal verb or other "servile" verbs take a verb in the infinitive. The clitics which relate to this last case, are often moved into a position of contiguity with the verb in the infinitive mode. This phenomenon has been described by Rizzi (1982: Chapter 1), who has called it "restructuring", a term that we too shall adopt. The consequence of restructuring is a more or less perceptible forward movement of the clitics towards the beginning of the sentence. In general, in Italian restructuring is optional: *lo devo vedere* / *devo vederlo* / "I must see him"; *ti verrà a parlare* / *verrà a parlarti* / "he will come to talk to you". In Old Italian, restructured forms were more common, and probably, at least in certain cases, obligatory. Generally restructuring with its consequential clitic raising, is present in some forms in all Romance languages (apart from, it seems, Brasilian). In Rumanian restructuring is compulsory, even if its range is smaller than that of other languages, since only the verb *a putea* "can" takes the infinitive: *nu-l pot vedea* "I can't see him". In European Portuguese restructuring is optional: *queria-se agora afastar* "he wanted to go away" and we can say also *queria agora afastarse* which is the non-restructured form, whilst we find in Brasilian only the non-restructured form: *queria agora se afastar*. In Spanish both restructured and non-restructured forms are permitted: *quieren molestarte* / *te quieren molestar* "they want to disturb you"; *iban diciendole* / *le iban diciendo* "they were telling her" (Gili Gaya 1976[11]: par. 177).

In Modern French we can hardly ever find restructured forms, and only in literary language: for example *Une voiture te peut broyer* "a car can crush you" (Alain, *Entretiens au bord de la mer*, quoted by Grevisse 1975[10]: par. 483), while in Standard French we would have *Une voiture peut te broyer* (other examples in Sandfeld 1970: par. 5). However, in Old French

restructuring was compulsory: for example *ne me quier de chi remuer* "I don't want to move from here", Courtois d'Arras, ed. Faral, v. 337 (cfr. Foulet 1958: par. 187). In classical French it was possible to have forms such as *On les veut brouiller* "One tries to incense them" (Racine, Andr. I, 1, in Grevisse: loc. cit.).

5. This table schematically shows the difference between solutions A and B:

character of the host	clitic position
A free	ENCLISIS
B VERB	proclisis, enclisis.

The biggest constraint in A is that enclisis is compulsory; in B, adverbiality is compulsory. Neither A nor B provide for exceptions as regards this point. Both A and B enjoy some kind of freedom, one in the kind of support, the other in the clitic position (proclisis and enclisis).

What have they got in common? Is there a hidden unity that lies behind both these solutions?

In previous articles (Benacchio and Renzi 1987: par. 3; Renzi: in press) I have described the relationships between Latin and Romance languages. I have therefore illustrated the problem from a diachronic point of view. I have started from the premise that the languages in group B all derive historically from those of type A. This is proven fact as far as Romance languages, Greek, Bulgarian and Macedonian are concerned, and can easily be extended to Albanian since it can be considered plausible that the law of Wackernagel is a characteristic of ancient Indo-European in its totality; thus, this principle can also be applied to the ancestor of Modern Albanian.

It is thus possible and interesting to tackle this problem from the typological point of view too and ask ourselves what rules govern these two different formations. An answer can be found by examining the pragmatic function of the language, and taking into consideration the influences to which it is subjected, in the light of what we have said in section 1. The purpose of the clitic elements, including the pronouns, is to summarize some known elements, whilst the expression of what is new is necessarily left to other parts of the message. Now, as we have already said, one of the general characteristics of what is known is to precede, at least in the non-marked form, what is new. This is the principle of the progression from given to new.

Solutions A and B are both governed by the need for clitic raising towards the beginning of the sentence. But this requirement conflicts with other principles. It is from the moderation of the two different principles that the two adopted solutions emerge. In solution A the only limit to the absolute

ante-positioning of the clitics is the fact that enclisis is compulsory. There are no exceptions to this: according to Steele (1977: 560), there is no language with proclisis to which Wackernagel's law can be applied. The explanation of this fact necessarily lodges in the general typological characters of both a phonetic and syntactic kind common to all these languages. These characteristics still need investigating fully, after the penetrating observations made by Jakobson (1935) (See also Kaisse 1982). Anyhow, solution A forces the clitics to occupy the *first place* in the sentence, as I have said, and it scarcely matters if, from a purely linear point of view, something precedes them.

In solution B, the same tendency to ante-positioning is less evident. In fact, if there is clitic raising towards the left, it occurs within the VP. For typological reasons, in fact (see Jakobson, 1935, once again, and Benacchio and Renzi 1987), this time the collocational ambit of the clitics is not the sentence, but, as we have said, the VP. In the ambit of the verbal phrase, the relevant phenomena, proclisis (apart from type A) and the tendency of the clitics to move towards the auxiliary, are both related to this tendency of the clitics to move towards the beginning. The phenomenon of restructuring can be interpreted in the same way: clitics, when attached to modal or subordinate verbs rather than to the main verb, move to the left, towards the beginning of the period. Obviously, these tendencies, as we have already seen, are not absolute. In every language along with proclisis there is also enclisis (but to a lesser extent), and the movements to the left all have their own limitations. However, these tendencies are not absolute, because the ad-verbial clitic is obliged to alternate between proclisis and enclisis in order to avoid the definitive fusion of the clitic with its support, as Jakobson again noted (1935) (cfr. Benacchio and Renzi 1987). One has also often wondered why there is proclitic and enclitic alternation in these kinds of languages, but it is this alternation that guarantees they remain clitics, and the numerous oscillations, from language to language and in the historical phases of the same language or even within a single language in the same synchronic state — in short, the complex phenomenology described in section 4 — only prove that alternation is necessary, whereas the way it is realized is less important. It is this alternation which constitutes a limit to clitic raising in the VP.[11]

In conclusion, the tendency to raising typical of the known elements in the sentence, appears in solution B, too, even if, since this principle has to cohabit with other principles, it does not always present itself in an extreme form. Finally, we would like to underline the fact that the literature on this subject is full of observations about "clitic raising", whereas very

[11] There are even languages which present only a pre-verbal clisis such as Somali, or only post-verbal, such as Arabic and Hebrew. But these languages create other strategies to avoid univerbality (see Renzi, in press).

few cases were observed, in which clitics move towards the right, that is, towards the portion of the sentence that typically contains the new elements.[12]

Address of the author:
Istituto di Filologia Neolatina, v. Beato Pellegrino 1, I-35100 Padova.

[12] Exceptions to the principle of adverbiality are extremely limited in Romance languages. These consist of:

I) possibility of clisis of the pronoun to an adverb like the Italian *ecco*: *eccomi*, *eccolo* etc. ("here I am", "here it is"), French *me voici*, *me voilà*, Rumanian *iatã-mă*, "here I am". This fact depends on the partially verbal nature of *ecco* (see Salvi 1988: par. 3.4.2.1);

II) possibility of enclisis to certain preposition such as *(in) contro*, *dietro*: Old Italian *(in)controgli*, *allatogli*, "against him", "beside him"; also in Modern Northern Italian varieties. I intend to illustrate this case in a study I am preparing:

To these two cases have to be added:

III) cases in which the pronoun is separated from the verb by a "light" element, which has a general meaning and which is often monosyllabic: for example a negative, the personal pronoun as a subject, or an adverb.

Probably, in this latter case the separation of the clitic pronoun from the verb is only apparent, for as a matter of fact, the semantically and formally "light" element which divides them is also treated as a clitic.

Several examples regarding the oldest phases of Romance languages can be found in Ramsden (1963) (to be considered separately from the cases described below under IV). For Old Spanish see also many cases in Bazzolo (1986-87: 56). To these examples, other examples can be added regarding the introduction of *pur* in Old and Renaissance Italian: "ma dacché vi pur piace" (but since you do like...) (*Novellino* LXV, ed. Segre); "quantunque alcuna qualità di madrigali si pur trova" (although you indeed find a certain amount of madrigals) (Bembo, *Prose della volgar lingua*, ed. Dionisotti). In Modern French it is possible for the clitic to be separated from the verb in the infinitive by a negation (*point*, *pas* etc.), or *tout*, *rien*, *bien*, *mieux*, *vite*, *presque*, *mal*. In literary style, especially with *y* and *en*, we can have *pourrais-je n'y pas penser?*; *si vous vous étonnez de ne le plus voir* (for: *ne plus le voir*) ("if you are amazed that you don't see him anymore"); *craignant d'en trop dire* (for: *trop en dire*) being afraid to say too much), *à l'idée qu'on a pu me mal juger* (for: *mal me juger*) (at the idea that one could misjudge me).

In Rumanian there is compulsory separation of clitics from the verb (in a simple form), when this is preceded by *cam* "almost", *mai* "more", *prea* "too much", *şi* "also", *tot* "always". For example: *nu ţi-l* mai *dau* "I will not give it to you any more", *îl şi văd* "I see him too".

IV) Finally, in Old Spanish and Portuguese certain cases of separation of the clitic from the verb in a subordinate clause introduced by a conjunction, should be seen as remnants of the law of Wackernagel: in fact, the clitic, being separated from the verb, moves into the first enclitic position after the conjunction (see Benacchio and Renzi 1987, 3.1).

The inserted element is not necessarily "light": for example in Old Portuguese "pois que o Deus assi quis" (Since God wanted that way) (Salvi 1985: 323). On this ground we can observe that in many of the cases described in point III), if we do not consider the inserted light element as being a clitic, we obtain structures of the Wackernagel type with the clitic situated in the first enclitic position (for instance in the examples from the *Novellino* and in the structure of French). These examples of the law of Wackernagel, if proved, can be interpreted either as a survival or the appearance of a universal tendency.

As it can be seen, the range of "exceptions" is not wide enough to doubt the central principle of ad-verbiality in Romance languages.

References

Antinucci, F. (1977), "L'interazione dei sistemi della competenza linguistica: la pronominalizzazione in italiano", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 2:3-42.

Antinucci, F. & Marcantonio, A. (1980), "I meccanismi del mutamento diacronico: il cambiamento d'ordine dei clitici in italiano", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 5:3-50.

Banti, G. (1980), "I clitici antico-indiani", *Problemi di analisi linguistica*, a cura di P. Berrettoni, Roma, Cadmo: 9-42.

Bazzolo, E. (1986-87), *Proverbios en dos romanceamientos bíblicos medievales, E 6 y General Estoria. Estudio morfosintáctico*, Padova, dissertation.

Behaghel, O. (1932), *Deutsche Syntax*, vol. IV, Heidelberg, Winter.

Benacchio, R. & Renzi, L. (1987), *Clitici slavi e romanzi*, Padova, Clesp.

Bernardi Perini, G. (1986[4]), *L'accento latino*, Bologna, Patron.

Calabrese, A. (1980), "Sui pronomi atoni e tonici dell'italiano", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 5:65-116.

Calabrese, A. (1982), "Alcune ipotesi sulla struttura informazionale della frase in italiano e sul suo rapporto con la struttura fonologica", *Rivista di grammatica generativa*, 7:3-70.

Cordin, P. (1981), "Sull'interpretazione anaforica del soggetto 'vuoto'", *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa*, s. III, vol. IX, 1:269-279.

Feizi, A. (1940), *Grammatica albanese*, Roma.

Foulet, L. (1924), "L'accent tonique et l'ordre des mots. Formes faibles des pronoms personnels après le verbe", *Romania*, 50, 53:54-93.

Foulet, L. (1958[3]), *Petite syntaxe de l'ancien français*, Paris, Champion.

Friedrich, J. (1960), *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, 1. *Teil: Kurzgefasste Grammatik*, Heidelberg, Winter.

George, L. & Toman, J. (1976), "Czech clitics in universal grammar", *Chicago Linguistic Society*, 12:235-249.

Gili y Gaya, S. (1976[11]), *Vox. Curso superior de sintaxis española*, Barcelona, Dep. Editorial.

Grevisse, M. (1975[10]), *Le bon usage*, Gembloux, Duculot.

Gusmani, R. (1964), *Lydisches Wörterbuch. Mit grammatischer Skizze und Inschriftensammlung*, Heidelberg, Winter.

Hale, K. (1973), "Person marking in Walbiri", *Festschrift for M. Halle*, ed. by S. Anderson & P. Kiparsky, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston: 308-344.

Hale, K, (1981), *On the position of Walbiri in a typology of the base*, Bloomington Ind., IULC.

Jakobson, R. (1935), "Les enclitiques slaves", *Atti del congresso di linguistica tenuto a Roma* etc., Firenze: 384-390; also in *Selected Writings II: Word and Language*, The Hague - Paris, Mouton, 1961: 16-22.

Kaisse, E. (1981), "Luiseño Particles and the Universal Behaviour of Clitics", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 12, 3:424-434.

Kaisse, E. (1982), "Sentential Clitics and Wackernagel's Law", in Proceedings of the 1.st West-Coast Conference on formal Linguistics, ed. by D. P. Flickinger et alii, Stanford, Ling. Dept, 1-14.

Karolak, St. (1983), "The structure of the sentence relative to its place in context", *Polish Text Linguistics*, ed. by L. Lönngren, Uppsala: 20-31.

Klavans, J. L. (1982), *Some problems in a theory of clitics*, Bloomington Ind., IULC.

Mussafia, A. (1886), "Una particolarità sintattica della lingua italiana dei primi secoli", *Miscellanea... N. Caix e U. A. Canello*, Firenze: 255-261 and 474-475; also in A. Mussafia, *Scritti di filologia e linguistica*, a cura di A. Daniele & L. Renzi, Padova, Antenore: 291-301.

Nikolaeva, T. M. (1985), *Funkcii častic v vyskazyvanii na materiale slavjanskich jazykov*, Moskva, Nauka.

Panhuis, D. G. J. (1971), *The Communicative Perspective in the Sentence. A Study of Latin Word Order*, Amsterdam, Benjamins.

Perlmutter, D. M. (1971), *Deep and Surface Constraints in Syntax*, New York, Rinehart & Winston.

Pop, S. (1948), *Grammaire roumaine*, Berne, Francke.

Ramsden, H. (1963), *Weak-Pronoun Positions in the Early Romance Languages*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Renzi, L. (1984), *La linguistica italiana oggi. Tendenze, metodi, centri. Un panorama bibliografico*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft.

Renzi, L. (1987), "Elise Richter (1865-1943)", *Studi Goriziani*, 65, 99-111.

Renzi (in press), "Sviluppi paralleli in italiano e nelle lingue romanze. I pronomi clitici nella lunga durata", *Atti del XX Congresso della SLI (Bologna 1986)*.

Ressuli, N. (1985), *Grammatica albanese*, Bologna, Patron.

Richter, E. (1903), *Zur Entwicklung der romanischen Wortstellung aus der lateinischen*, Halle, Niemeyer.

Richter, E. (1919-1920), "Grundlinien der Worstellungslehre", *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 40:9-61; also in Elise Richter, *Kleinere Schriften zur allgemeinen und romanischen Sprachwissenschaft*, ed. by Y. Malkiel, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft: 27-74.

Richter, E. (1922-23), "Zur Klärung der Worstellungsfragen", *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie*, 42:704-721; also in *Kleinere Schriften* etc. quoted above: 75-90.

Rizzi, L. (1982), *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.

Salvi, G. (1985), "Galego portoghese", in *Nuova Introduzione alla Filologia romanza*, by L. Renzi & G. Salvi, Bologna, Il Mulino.

Salvi, G. (1988), "Frase", in L. Renzi (ed.), *Grande Grammatica italiana di consultazione*, Bologna, Il Mulino, 1st vol.

Sandfeld, Kr. (1970), *Syntaxe du français contemporain*, I. *Les pronoms*, Paris, Champion.

Schachter, P. (1974), "Constraints on Clitic Order in Tagalog", *UCLA Working Papers in Syntax*, 5: 96-118.

Selkirk, E. (1984), *Phonology and Syntax*, Cambridge Mass., MIT University Press.

Solano, F. (1972), *Manuale di lingua albanese*, Corigliano Calabro.

Stammerjohann, H. (1986), ed. by, *Tema-Rema in italiano / Theme-Rheme in Italian/ Thema-Rhema im Italienischen*, Tübingen, Narr.

Steele, S. (1976), "On the count of one", *Linguistic Studies offered to J. Greenberg*, ed. by A. Juilland, Saratoga Calif., Amma libri: 591-613.

Teyssier, P. (1976), *Manuel de la langue portugaise. Portugal-Brésil*, Paris, Klincksieck.

Thomas, E. W. (1969), *The Syntax of Spoken Portuguese*, Nashville, Vanderbilt Univ. Press.

Tzartzanu, A. (1963), *Neoellenikì sintaxis*, Athenai.

Wackernagel, J. (1892), "Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung", *Indogermanische Forschungen* 1: 333-436; also in J. Wackernagel, *Kleinere Schriften*, Göttingen, Vandenhoek und Ruprecht, 1953, 1st vol.: 1-104.