

Some Clitic Combinations in the Syntax of Romance*

Francisco Ordóñez

State University of New York at Stony Brook
Department of Hispanic Languages and Literature
Melville Library N3017, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3371
francisco.ordonez@stonybrook.edu

Abstract

The purpose of this paper is to account for certain gaps in the syntactic distribution of certain combinations of clitics in varieties of Aragonese, Catalan, Occitan and Spanish. A view in which ordering of clitics is only determined by templates is insufficient since templates enter into play after the syntactic component, either in the morphology or in some other post-syntactic component. The alternative I propose is to assume that the ordering of clitic combinations can be done in the syntax, as anticipated by Kayne (1994) and Terzi (1999). I will specifically propose that some of the anomalies involve clitic combinations that are actually non-constituents (split clitics) while in others one element is not actually a clitic but an element with a different morphological status or weak pronominals as in Cardinaletti and Starke (1999).

Key words: clitic combination, templates, split clitics, weak pronouns, morphology.

1. Introduction

The shape and order of clitic combinations has been the point of controversy among syntacticians and morphologists in generative grammar. The aim of this paper is to challenge a purely morphological view of the order in clitic combinations in Romance and re-think an explanation of apparent peculiarities in terms of the syntax. Given the new views about how clitic order might be conceived as in Kayne (1994), I would like to propose with him and Terzi (1999) that many of the patterns on clitic combinations might be explained by a restrictive theory of adjunction possibilities and how this structure interacts with movement processes such as head movement and XP movement. Another important factor is the different morphological composition of pronominal types. For that case I am going to rely on theories of pronominal deficiency such as Cardinaletti and Starke (1999).

* I would like to thank Antonio Coarassa, Vicén Pérez, Rosario and the people of Echo for their data on Cheso, M. Nariou and «l'Institut Occitan» in Pau for Gascon, Daniel Lodo for Languedocien, Zulema Borràs for Menorcan Catalan, Joana Roselló for Mallorcan Catalan, Marisa Martínez-Mira for Murcian Spanish. This research was conducted with the support of the Research Board at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. Special thanks to Gemma Rigau, Michel DeGraff and an anonymous reviewer for his/her comments.

1.1. *Properties of clitic combinations*

There are two aspects of clitic combination that makes them especially intriguing. The first involves the changes in form that clitics undergo when they appear in combination. An example is the combination of object clitics in the third person in Spanish. Since both dative and accusative clitics may appear in isolation as shown in (1) and (2), it is to be expected that the combination of the two forms should be available. However, the combination of these two clitics is totally ungrammatical as in (3). The output of the combination is what we find in (4) in which the clitic *se* appears instead of the expected dative clitic *le*. These cases were labeled by Bonet (1991) as non transparent clitic combination.

Changes in form

- (1) Juan *le* compró un libro.
 Juan to him/her (DAT) bought a book
 ‘Juan bought him/her a book.’
- (2) Juan *lo* compró.
 Juan it (ACC) bought
 ‘Juan bought it.’
- (3) *Juan *le* *lo* compró.
 ‘Juan to him/her (DAT) it (ACC) bought’
- (4) Juan *se lo* compró

The second challenge for any study in clitic combination is that the order in which the elements appear seems to vary randomly from language to language. For example, comparing French and Italian we observe that in the combinations of two third person clitics, the accusative precedes the dative in French, whereas the opposite order occurs in Italian as shown in (5) and (6):

The ordering

- (5) Jean *le* *lui* donnera (French)
 Jean it (ACC) to him/her (DAT) will give
 ‘Jean will give it to him/her.’
- (6) Gianni *glielo* darà (Italian)
 Gianni to him/her(DAT)it (ACC) will give
 ‘Gianni will give it to him/her.’

The final puzzle is that the combinatorial possibilities of arguments exceed the combinatorial possibilities of clitics. An example is that in Italian it is possible to combine a first or second person direct object with a third person indi-

rect object as in (7). However, the equivalent clitic combination is totally impossible:

- (7) a. Ha presentato me al direttore del film.
 has introduced me to-the director of-the film
 ‘He has introduced me to the director of the film.’
- b. *Me gli ha presentato.
 me to-him has introduced

1.2 *The formulation of the templates*

Taking into account the three problematic aspects exposed above, Perlmutter (1971) tries to account for some of its restriction under a theory of Surface Structure Filters. Perlmutter’s surface filter constraints are templates that determine all the combinatorial possibilities of clitics in a given language. For instance, Perlmutter (1971) proposes the following filter for Spanish combinatorial possibilities:

- (8) se- II - I -III (DAT)-III (ACC)

This filter can explain why the only combinatorial possibilities for two clitics in Spanish are the ones we find below:

- (9) se me / se nos / se te / se os / se le / se lo / me lo / te lo / te me / te le / me le

This template-based account was soon extended to other languages. For instance Wanner (1977) proposes the following filter for Italian in (10a) and Argenti (1976) for Catalan in (10b):

- (10) a. MI-VI-TI-CI-GLI-SI-NE {LO LA LI LE} -SI
- b. ES- II- I - III (DAT) -III (ACC) - en -{hi, ho}

Similar filters have been proposed for French and other languages. Bonet (1991, 1995) updates this proposal by integrating it into the GB framework. She proposes that clitic combinations be dealt with in an independent module called the morphological component (see also Halle and Marantz 1993) located between syntax and phonology. Contrary to the S-structure that only contained filters and constraints, the morphological component is more structured and contains fields, principles and specific operations that link, de-link and erase features coming from the different syntactic elements. Bonet (1995) takes the view that this morphological component acts on the different arguments in the syntax and maps them into different slots in the template. According to Bonet (1995), templates contain two types of slots: those of whole clitics and those of morphological features. The mappings into whole clitics or morphological features depend on different factors (e.g.,

first/second versus third) in each dialect. The template she proposed for Central Catalan is in (11). First and second person clitics would map into a clitic while the clitic for *en* would map into a feature.

(11)	1	2	3	4	5	6
	CL	CL	CL	[Arg]	[GEN]	[OBL] [NEUT]
	Arg	Arg	Arg			
	1	2				

Despite their obvious advantages such as being able to account for non transparent forms for clitics, linguists started to notice that templates are unable to account for all the combinatorial properties of clitics in natural language. The first shortcoming was that combinations of clitics do not necessarily obey the property of transitivity as stated in both previous approaches. On this point, Wanner (1977) already noted that not in all the cases in which A precedes B and B precedes C, A precedes C. He gave the example of the combination of clitics *ne* (partitive), *lo* (accusative) and *si* (impersonal) in Italian. While *ne* can precede *lo* and *lo* precedes *si*, it does not follow that *ne* can precede *si* as shown in the following three examples:

(12) *Ne la convinse facilmente.*
of it (GEN) it (ACC) convinced easily

(13) *Lo si vede.*
it (ACC) si (IMP) sees

(14) **Ne si vede.*
of it (GEN) si (IMP) see

In the same vein, another challenge to the transitivity property is that in some cases the combination does not yield the pattern the template predicts, but no output at all. This is the case of the so called *me lui* restriction. For instance, in French *me* precedes *le* and *le* precedes *lui*, one might expect *me* should precede *lui*, but the result is ungrammatical:

(15) **Il me lui présentera.*
he me(ACC) lui (DAT) will-introduce
'He will introduce me to him.'

Facts like these, lead Perlmutter propose the existence of negative constraints or restrictions on the output of clitic combinations. Bonet also adopts these constraints in the morphology component, at the cost of a considerable complication of the model.

Another problematic aspect of the template approach to clitic combinations is fact that these elements mix different types of information. For instance, Perlmutter's templates contain information about phonology and syntax (DO, IO). In Bonet's approach they include feature and syntactic constituency information as well as whether the clitics are arguments or non arguments (a distinction relevant to the syntax). Finally, they also contain morphological features internal to the clitic itself such as person and gender.¹

Another broader question posed by templates, one that I would like to focus in this work, is whether they can exclusively determine order of clitics. Perlmutter maintains the position that templates are the only factor responsible for clitic ordering. Bonet claims that the order is mostly determined by templates, but in some cases some syntactic factors could play (Bonet 1991: 45; fn. 22).² The most difficult challenge posed by this mixed position is finding the criteria that will decide when the ordering is determined on one level or the other. Certainly, in recent years the trend has been to avoid accounts in which the same phenomenon is determined in more than one level as in Chomsky's minimalist enterprise.

One solution to that problem is to take the strong position that order is determined exclusively by templates, but this tactic leads to giving up important generalization on clitic combinations. By contrast, it is possible to find interesting generalizations on ordering if the different possibilities of adjunction of clitic combinations, their morphological characterization and their syntactic position in the sentence are taken into account. In this paper, I am going to suggest that the predominance of the *me lo* (dative 1/2-person, accusative 3-person) order in Romance should not be treated as a coincidence. Instead, it reflects the double object construction familiar in the Germanic languages.

The final problem is that since templates are formulated in the morphology component (Bonet 1995, Halle and Marantz 1993, Harris 1998) or in S-structure (Perlmutter 1971), ordering is determined exclusively after syntax. Therefore, clitic combinations should be insensitive to the syntactic configurations in which they take place. There should consequently be no difference between the distribution of one clitic alone and the combination of that clitic with another. Syntax would move the clitics together and morphology would determine the order between them. As we will see in the next section this is not always the case. To explain why, proponents of the template approach have to admit language-specific non-morphological input, complicating their theories. However, a closer look at the pat-

1. Gender is a morphological feature that does not seem to play any role on the possible combinations of clitics. This is not the case with person, which crucially determines which combinations are possible.
2. This is what she proposes for the ordering of clitics of Italian versus Spanish (Bonet 1991: 45; fn. 22).

terns suggests that viewing it in terms of syntax yields a more coherent and elegant account.

2. Considerations that argue against clitic ordering only in templates

There are two problems in making clitic ordering depend on templates. The first relates to optionality on how clitics might combine, which defies the (by definition) rigidity of a template. The second is that clitic combinations are not blind to the syntactic context. In a given syntactic context a clitic may appear alone, while it will be not able to appear in a combination with another clitic. In this paper, I examine three scenarios in which the combination of two clitics is flexible and in which the flexibility or not of that combination crucially depends on a specific syntactic environment. The syntactic environment I will focus on is the position with respect to the verb or the verbal complex, which in Romance and Greek are the categories clitics are attached to phonetically.³

The table below shows three verbal contexts. In Context A a clitic combination is rigid pre-verbally, while two orders are possible post-verbally. Context B is the exact opposite, with two possibilities preverbally and only allow one possible combination post-verbally. In Context C one combination is possible pre-verbally but no combinations are allowed post-verbally.⁴

Table 1.

Combination CL1-CL2	Preverbal	Postverbal
A	CL1 CL2 V	V CL1 CL2 V CL2 CL1
B	CL1 CL2 V	V CL1 CL2 CL2 CL1 V
C	CL2 CL1 V CL1 CL2 V	no combination

Case A: Greek. Terzi (1999)

Terzi (1999) discusses certain Greek facts in which double object clitics are permitted to combine in only one possible way preverbally. As in Romance the dative has to precede the accusative:

- 3. The same scenarios should be found in other languages in which clitics revolve around other elements which are not verbal, as in the case of Clitic Second in Slavic.
- 4. One fourth case that we might consider is when one combination is allowed post-verbally, but no combination is allowed pre-verbally. Gemma Rigau points out to me that in her dialect the combination *se n'ho* is possible post-verbally, but not pre-verbally. These cases involve three clitics. I leave for further research to explain this third context:

(i) Vol endur-se-n'ho / * Se'n'ho vol endur
 wants to take-se-from there-it / Se-from there-it wants to take

- (16) a. Mou to diavase.
 me (DAT) it(ACC) read-3s
 ‘S/he reads it to me.’
- b. *To mou diavase.
 it (ACC) me (DAT) read-3s

However for imperatives the ordering of clitics is flexible and both orders are equally possible. There seems to be no difference between both orders in terms of register or phonology or accentual patterns.

- (17) a. Diavase mou to!
 read me (DAT) it (ACC)
 ‘Read it to me!’
- b. Diavase to mou!
 read it to me

B. Me (DAT) Se (REFL) /Se (REFL) Me (DAT) Spanish and Catalan dialects

Context B corresponds to the combination of a dative first or second person clitic with inherent *se* in the different Romance varieties. In standard Spanish the order of these two clitics is the one shown in (18a) in which the inherent reflexive precedes the dative clitics.⁵ However, in many nonstandard Spanish varieties the reverse order is possible. These facts have been noticed and studied by Heap (1998) for Murcian Spanish and in the Baraona region of Dominican Republic (Rivera Castillo 1997). At least in the Murcian Spanish variety the two possible alternations co-exist according to Heap (1998).⁶

- (18) a. *se me* escapa.
 se (REFL) me(DAT) escape-3s
- b. *me se* escapa.
 me(DAT) se (REFL) escape-3s
 ‘I’m losing it.’/ ‘It’s getting away from me.’

5. The same order is found with impersonal *se* or non inherent reflexive *se*:

- (i) Me *se* ve cansado en esta foto.
 me se-imper sees tired in this photo
 ‘One sees me tired.’
- (ii) Me *se* presentó sin más preámbulo.
 Me se introduced without further ado

6. These authors are mainly looking at the combinations involving inherent *se*. They do not report any examples with impersonal *se* or reflexive *se* as previously. According to a Murcian speaker who I consulted, there is no distinction between type of *se* for the combination to yield the opposite order. I will assume that there is therefore no crucial difference involving the type of *se*.

In all these varieties it is not possible to have the non standard combination in post-verbal position as shown in (19b). After the infinitive the only order allowed is the one in which *se* precede the 1/2 person as in Standard Spanish.

- (19) a. Puede escaparse *me*.
 b. *Puede escaparse *me se*.
 'I could lose it.'/ 'It could get away from me.'

Another variety that shows the same type of contrast in Judeo-Spanish.⁷

Judeo-Spanish

- (20) a. *Se mos* eskapa.
 se (REFL) mos (DAT) escape-3s
 b. *Mos se* eskapa.
 mos (DAT) se (REFL) escape-3s
 'We are losing it.'/ 'It's getting away from me.'

- (21) a. El livro podia kayerse *mos*.
 b. *El livro podia kayerse *mo se*.
 'The book could fall.'

Baix-Ebre Catalan (dialectal varieties of Catalan)

The third set of data comes from Ribera de l'Ebre Catalan according to a survey about clitic combination in this variety done by Vega, Mir, Sáez and Pons (1990). They notice that the two combinations are possible with finite verbs in pre-verbal position, while the *me se* order is impossible in post-verbal position.

- (22) a. *Me s'* / *se m'* escapa.
 me (DAT) se (REFL) / se (REFL) me (DAT) escape-3s
 'I'm losing it.'
 b. *Mos s'* escapa.
 mos (DAT) se (REFL) escape-3s
 'We are losing it.'
- (23) a. No podia escapar-se *m*
 b. *No podia escapar-se *me se*
 'This could get lost.'

7. This data was extracted by judgments asked to native speakers of Judeo-Spanish.

C. Italian *Mi Si*

Scenario C occurs in Italian according to Cardinaletti (2000). Italian contrary to Standard Spanish allows the dative to precede the inherent reflexive, as in Dominican Spanish and Baix Ebre Catalan. Cardinaletti points out that these individual clitics can appear after finite verbs, but the combination of the two clitics is not permitted (24c).

Italian (Cardinaletti 2000)

- (24) a. *Mi si è rivolto in inglese.*
 to me(DAT) se (REFL) has spoken in English
- b. **Vorrebbe rivolgermi in inglese.*
 would speak-me(DAT) se(REFL) in English
- c. *Vorrebbe rivolgersi a me in inglese.*
 would speak-se(REFL) to me in English

In conclusion, the examples above show that sometimes clitics might combine in more than one way as in case A and B. Also we have shown that clitics combinations are sensitive to the syntactic environment. Greek shows that only one type of combination is allowed in preverbal position in double object clitics, while in imperatives it allows two possible alternatives. In most Romance varieties the combination of dative and ethical allows two orderings pre-verbally but only one postverbally. Italian only allows one order and that order cannot surface after the verb. In all these examples one possible combination is banned in a specific syntactic context.


3. Theoretical approach. The syntax of clitic combination

In order to explain the gaps in the syntactic distribution of clitics, I will adapt Kayne's (1994) and Terzi's (1999) proposals on the restrictions on clitics adjunction and their interactions with verb movement.

According to Kayne (1991, 1994) clitics can only left adjoin to their host, either an functional or lexical projection. This crucially eliminates all previous right adjunction proposals (e.g., Kayne 1984)⁸ and makes the theory of clitics more constrained. In the specific proposals made in Kayne (1994), multiple adjunction to the same head is also banned. If verbs in moving to infl adjoin to it, a proclitic would not be able to adjoin to the same site to which the verb adjoined since this would lead to a non linearized tree with multiple adjunctions as in (25).⁹


8. Eliminating right adjunction captures the fact that proclisis and enclisis are not symmetrical in their syntactic behavior as shown by Benincà and Cinque (1993). For instance, there does not seem to be any language in which there is an intervention of an adverb and the enclitic element. However there are some examples of languages in which the proclisis might be interrupted by an adverbial element as in (i). Cinque and Benincà conclude that enclisis forms more of a unit with the verb than proclisis.
- (i) *en bien faire*
 to rightly do
9. A multiple adjunction tree like the one above would be in violation antisymmetry because the *Linear Correspondence Axiom* LCA as formulated in Kayne (1994).

(25) Banned by antisymmetry





As a consequence, Kayne (1994) has to propose that proclitics are not adjoined to the same head than the verb is adjoined to. Namely, a preverbal clitic and verb do not form a constituent or a head.¹⁰ As a consequence, the clitic-verb sequence can be phonologically adjacent but it truly reflects two heads in different functional projections (26):¹¹ The clitic might be adjoined to an inflectional projection or a pure head voided of phonetic content, what Kayne calls a place holder.

(26)



According to this view, more than one clitic might adjoin one to another as the verb adjoined to the inflection or each clitic might adjoin to a different functional projection. In both circumstances the clitics are split from the verb. However in the first one the two clitics are syntactically adjacent in one unit (cluster) and in the second case they are split from each other (split clitics). The corresponding trees are the following:

(27) a. *Cluster*b. *Split*

10. This is not necessarily the case for enclisis as it is assumed in Rivero's analysis of imperatives.

11. In a way the analysis is assuming that proclitic and verb are split in the syntax.

The syntactic clitic cluster option represents no novelty to earlier approaches to clitic combination. The novelty appears in assuming that two clitics adjacent phonetically might be a nonconstituent in the syntax. In support of this view however, there are languages that have the possibility of having phonetic material appearing between two clitics. One of them is Franco-Provençal. In this dialect, with a double object construction clitic, the dative clitic might appear before the auxiliary verb, while the accusative clitic will only appear after the past participle as shown in the following example from Chenal (1986):

- (28) T' an të deut-lo? (Chenal 1986)
 you_{dat} have they said it


An interesting result of Kayne’s proposal is that two adjacently phonetic clitics might be ambiguous between one possibility or the other. Kayne suggests that such a distinction between split and cluster might be behind the fact that no *me lui* restriction occurs when one of the clitics is an ethical one as in (29).

- (29) Elle me lui semble infidèle
 she me(DAT) him (DAT) seems unfaithful
 ‘She seems to me unfaithful to him.’


Terzi (1999) exploits differences between between clusters and split clitics to explain some of the asymmetries we find in Greek. She proposes that the double object construction is ambiguous between a split combination or a cluster combination. The analyses for the examples repeated below as (30) follow in (31):

- (30) Mou to diavase
 me (DAT) it(ACC) read-3s
 ‘S/he read it to me.’

- (31) a. *Cluster*




- b. *Split*



According to Terzi (1999), the fact that the order of the clitics might be reversed in imperatives has to be related to the special option of having the clitics adjoined

in a split fashion. Also she assumes with Rivero (1994) that enclisis in imperatives is the outcome of the verb left adjoining to the clitic and moving to a higher functional projection. Further movement of the verb would pied pipe the clitic, and if the cluster option is generated as in (32a), the verb would move to the projection in which clitics sit and take the whole complex without changing the original order of the cluster. However, in the split clitic option in (32b) the verb would only take the lower clitic and would pied pipe it. Further movement of the verb-clitic complex to a higher C projection as in Rivero (1994), would invariably lead to the reversal of the order.¹² Therefore, with the option of split clitics we obtain a mirror image effect between proclisis and enclisis,¹³ whereas with the cluster option we obtain invariability between proclisis and enclisis.


(32) a. Cluster



Output:

V-mou-to

b. Split



Output

V-to-mou


In conclusion, mirror images of clitics are obtained in Terzi's (1999) proposal by having hidden split clitics¹⁴ optional in conjunction with the idea that the verb pied pipes the clitic in the lower head into a higher projection and reverses its order with respect to the higher clitic in the combination. I would like to propose a similar analysis for the Spanish, Catalan, Judeo-Spanish data discussed above. However, contrary to Greek, in which the same sequence is ambiguous between split and cluster, I propose that the two ordering *se me* and *me me se* in Spanish correspond unambiguously

12. I have not said anything about whether further movement would take place through the higher clitic or would skip it. Terzi (1999) proposes that it skips the upper clitic.
13. It is crucial for this analysis to work that there should be no excorporation. If excorporation is allowed for the cases of split not necessary reversal is obtained and we do not obtain the mirror results.
14. I use the term hidden to mean that there is no phonetic material between the two clitics.


ly to the two possible combinations of clitics: *se me* corresponds to a cluster and *me se* corresponds to a split clitic combination. This is shown in the following trees:

• *Cluster vs. Split combinations in Spanish *me se se me* constructions*

(33) a. *se me* preverbal



b. *me se* preverbal



The idea that *me se* corresponds to a split clitic option comes from the parallelism with Greek in which the split clitic option creates mirror image in post-verbal position. All the *me se* dialects of Context B yield the mirror image *se me* after the infinitive. The same effect is not found in the opposite direction: There is no Romance language that admits *se me* preverbally with finite verbs and creates the mirror image *me se* in postverbal position in infinitives or imperatives, or any other postverbal position for that matter.

The other important consideration supporting the view that *me se* as a split clitic option is related to certain crosslinguistic comparisons about the different behavior of first/second versus third person. One important claim of the split clitics hypothesis made in (27b) is that the first and second person *me* or *te* are located in a higher position in the tree. Namely, none of the above dialects permits the appearance of a third person dative before the reflexive *se* shown in the contrast in (34).

(34) a. *Se le* escapó.
se him (DAT) escaped
'It escaped to him'.

b. **Le se* escapó.

Under the split clitics proposal above, we can make sense of this asymmetry if third person clitics cannot access that higher position under investigation.¹⁵ Support for this proposal comes from the work on Northern Italian dialects done by Parry (1984). Parry points out that in Cairese, a Ligurian dialect, first and second person might access a higher position than third person with respect to negation (35):

15. There is the exception of Italian, which does not have any asymmetry in this respect and third persons might access this higher position.

(35) U *men* *le* *da* 'nenta.
 s.cl me(1p) -neg it(3p) gives neg

(36) U *ten* *la* 'kata 'nenta.
 s.cl you(2p) -neg it(3p) buys neg
 'He won't buy it for you.'

(from Zanuttini 1997)

Also the idea finds further support from the cross-linguistic comparison among Romance languages. There are consistent reflexive – dative languages like standard Spanish, and there are consistent dative — reflexive languages like Italian. On the proposal presented here, this distinction can be seen as a function of a more general difference. Languages like Spanish consistently form clusters whereas those like Italian form splits respect to this combination. It also follows that there is a third, mixed, type of languages in which only first and second person might be split, while third person remains a cluster with the reflexive. Interestingly, we find no variety of the opposite mixed type, one that would allow third person split and makes first and second person remain cluster with the reflexive:

Table 2.


Italian	Standard Spanish	Non standard Spanish	Non attested
<i>mi/ti si</i>	<i>se me/te</i>	<i>me/te se</i>	<i>se me/te</i>
<i>gli/le si</i>	<i>se le</i>	<i>se le</i>	<i>le se</i>

The non attested variety would represent a case in which only third person would be able to access the higher functional projection; if an element is allowed to access that higher position it must be a first or a second person¹⁶. Even if we attribute the exceptional behavior of *me se* to the ability of first and second person to access a higher projection, we need to understand why it has to access that position and why *me* could not have adjoined as a cluster to *se* as in the following tree:¹⁷

16. Something more needs to be said about Italian that allows also third person access this higher position. One might conceivably think that the asymmetry in Spanish and in Catalan is also due to the fact that first and second person can qualify as weak pronouns or that they have more structure than third person pronoun and that allows them to access this higher inflectional projection. Italian seems to be insensitive to this distinction or we might assume that third person clitics in Italian could also qualify as weak elements.

17. A question arises about the origin of the *me se* as a cluster. An anonymous reviewer suggests that all clitic combination might start as split *me se* and the order *se me* is derived by right adjunction of *se* to *me*. This would correctly predict why *Se* always is the first clitic in a cluster. The question of the origins of cluster is a very interesting question that deserves special attention and that needs further research under this approach.



(37)



However, clustering of *me se* would involve adjunction of *me* to *se*. Assuming that inherent *se* is still anaphoric (Kayne 1975), we would obtain a configuration in which it is c-commanded directly by *me*. *me* would qualify as a closer antecedent¹⁸ and would lead to a violation of principle A of the binding theory.¹⁹

Considering the distinction between split clitics and clusters, the next step involves determining how the enclitic order in infinitive clauses is derived. To do so, I will assume with Kayne (1991) that enclitic order in Romance infinitives is the product of movement of the infinitive above a projection higher than the host for clitics in declaratives, which leads to the same configuration found in Terzi (1999). The cluster, by definition, is never altered when movement of the verb adjoins to it in (37a). However, in the split movement of the verb adjoining to the lower clitic in Y⁰ leads to the mirror image (37b):²⁰

- (38) a. *se me* preverbal → *se me* postverbal cluster b. *me se* preverbal → *se me* postverbal split



18. If *me* was adjoined to a higher inflectional projection it would not constitute the only potential antecedent since a Spec would intervene in between. Thanks for an anonymous reviewer for pointing this out to me.
19. With respect to the question why *se* could not access the higher inflectional projection above *me* leading to a splitting *se me* I would like to assume that if only elements with more structure like *me* can access that position, *se* crucially cannot qualify as a weak element.
20. It is also conceivable that the verb skips the higher clitic and it lead to a split combination in the higher clause as in Terzi (1998). Since I find no empirical or theoretical reasons to decide between the two options, I will leave it open.

Further evidence that there is a mirror image effect with infinitives and the *me se* combination comes from Valencian Catalan as reported by Todolí (1998). Valencian, also like Baix Ebre Catalan has the combination of a first/second person, and like Italian it makes no distinction between first/second and third person. Under the proposal above Valencian Catalan corresponds to the split clitic option.

- (39) Li s' ha acabat
 it(DAT) se(REFL) has finished

Valencian Catalan, contrary to Italian as reported in Cardinaletti (2000), reverses the order of clitics in infinitives²¹:

Valencian

- (40) No *li s'* ha acabat la paciència però pot
 no li(DAT) se(REFL) has finished the patience, but can
 acabar-*se-li*.
 finish-se(REFL)-li(DAT)
 'You have not run out of patience, but could run out.'
- (41) *Te s'* ha acabat, o està a punt d'acabar-*se-te*.
 te(DAT) se (REFL) has finished, or is about to finish-se(REFL)-te(DAT)
 'Did you run out of it, or you are about to run out of it.'

(from Todolí 1998: 105)

As a conclusion, there is important evidence that *me se* order has to be characterized syntactically in a different way from the *se me* order. Specifically, *me se* represents a split clitic combination.

4. Other Clitic combinations. The LO (ACC) ME (DAT) combination

The previous conclusions concerning the combinations of datives and reflexives can be extended to other combinations that show some restriction in their syntactic behavior. For instance the order obtained in most Romance languages for the combinations of double object clitics with a first or second person dative, is dative —accusative. This combination is maintained in all the possible syntactic contexts in which one clitic is possible. Examples (42a) and (42b) show their proclitic and enclitic order with infinitives. Given the previous discussion, it is logical to assume that first and second person dative —accusative corresponds to the case of a cluster as in (43):²² This order of clitics corresponds clearly to the dou-

21. The author reports those examples in discussing other issues not related to the specific order among the two clitics.
22. A question arises about why Greek should behave differently from Romance and allow the same type of combination to be both: a cluster and a split clitic combination. I think that the difference might be related to the fact that Greek allows some of these clitics to be weak pronouns much as will shown to be the case for Occitan varieties.

(42) a. *Me lo quiere dar.*
me(DAT) it(ACC) wants to-give
b. *Quiere dárme lo.*
wants to-give-me(DAT)-it(ACC)

```

graph TD
    Root(( )) --- me
    Root --- Node1(( ))
    Node1 --- lo
    Node1 --- X0
  
```

(44) a. *La te dirai.*
la(ACC) te(DAT) will-say
'I will say it to you.'

b. *Lo me dussèt pas veire.*
lo(ACC) me(DAT) let not see
'You did not let me see it.'

The flexibility in the order in post-verbal position contrasts with the *me lo* Romance Languages, which only has this order uniformly pre-verbally and post-verbally. Recent fieldwork in Languedocien, an Occitan variety spoken in the area around Toulouse revealed that the pronominals containing the dative are obligatorily stressed in post-verbal position in imperatives.

- (46) *bálha-lo-mé* (Languedocien)
give it(ACC) me(DAT)

Gascon spoken to the west of the Languedocien region also allows the same pattern *lo me* with the same stressing on the final dative clitic (Hourcade 1986).²³

- (47) *Dítz-lo mé* (Gascon)
tell it(ACC) me(DAT)

Outside the Occitan area there are still a few Romance varieties that show the exceptional behavior and permit the *lo me* order. This is the case of Lo Cheso, an Aragonese dialect still preserved in the valley of Echo in Huesca. This is the only Aragonese dialect that had preserved this order which used to be common in Old Romance. Also, one of the properties that this dialect shows the same obligatorily stressing of the final dative clitic in imperatives:

- (48) *Lo me* quiés dar
it(ACC) me(DAT) want-2ps to-give

- (49) *Dálo mé*
give it(ACC) me(DAT)

Finally, Mallorcan Catalan spoken in the interior of the island shows this same order as welltogether with the obligatory stress on the clitic *me*:²⁴

- (50) *dóna-la-mé*
give -it(ACC)-me(DAT)

Another syntactic commonality among these varieties is that they disallow appearance of the clitic after the infinitive whenever clitic climbing is a possibility. This pattern is also shown by Mallorcan Catalan *me lo*.

- (51) a. *la me vols donar* (Mallorcan Catalan)
it(ACC) me(DAT) want-2ps give
'You want to give it to me.'
b. **vols donar-la-mé*
want-2ps give-it(ACC)-me(DAT)

23. The atlas of Gascon by Séguy reports all the stressing of clitics in a very detailed way.


24. For the case of Mallorcan Catalan the stressing seem to be still required in the varieties that have *me lo*. Menorcan Catalan, which also has the *me lo* order differs from the Mallorcan variety discussed above in displacing the stress on the *me*. I would like to propose that Menorcan Catalan is akin to the colloquial French *Donne-moi-le*.

(i) *Dóna-mé-la*
give-me(DAT)-la(ACC)
'Give it to me.'

25. Most *ME LO* Romance languages do not stress the clitics altogether. The only cases we find they do is Southern Italian dialects Monachesi (1999). I would suggest that those *me lo* languages contain a weak pronoun ME as well.
26. The accentual pattern in this dialects could not be the consequence of any accentual requirement on the final syllable. These languages have variable accent location as Catalan or Spanish. The accentual pattern cannot either be the reason for *moi* in French since that would not explain why French does not have *Régarde-eux* instead of *regarde-les*.
27. Some Aranese speakers accept this order in imperatives and they also obtain the stress the final clitic *me*. This is form which is disappearing from Aranese altogether. I could only find one speaker, which permitted it.
28. The idea that *me* would have more structure is also reflected in Uriagereka's (1996) treatment of these clitics for western Romance. In it also would lead to an explanation on why in Menorcan dialects the accent displacements correspond precisely to the accent on the first/second person pronoun in this combination *Dona-mé-la*. Also Southern Italian Dialects and Sardinian stress the first/second person pronominal as would be expected on this account: *Dammilla* (cf. Monachesi 1999).

Occitan, Mallorcan Catalan, on the one hand, and French, on the other, is that the weak pronoun has a wider distribution and it is not consigned to a post-verbal position in imperatives.²⁹ If weak pronouns have more structure as proposed by Cardinaletti and Starke (1994), they would not be able to cluster with a more deficient element like the accusative for third person. They could not adjoin to each other due to the same problem of the adjunction of a maximal projection to a head, which is not permitted according to Kayne's (1994) view.³⁰ One can assume that weak pronouns are in a specifier of a lower projection very close to the verb, while the clitic is in a higher functional projection (Kayne 1991). On this view, we can explain the post-verbal *lo me* order in the following way: Movement of the verb across the weak pronoun, which is in a lower specifier position, would take place and yield the expected *Da-lo-mé / donne-le-moi* order reported above. The stressing of the first/second person pronoun is taken as a sign of its morphological status as a weak pronoun. If that is accurate, all clitics in these varieties are located in an agreement projection or tense and that the verb has to move to it before it moves further to CP to get its illocutionary force Rivero (1994).

(55) Derivation of *donne-le-moi / Da-lo-mé*




Compare the former derivation with the one involving the cluster *me lo*, which is derived as in the cases of double object in Germanic. Since it involves two heads in a cluster, movement of the imperative verb in Spanish, French varieties (see Laenzlinger 1998) would invariably lead to the order *dá-me-lo*. If this hypothesis

29. The question of why they have a wider distribution needs to be addressed. French has a choice between clitic and weak pronoun, while these dialects according to this view have no clitic *me* altogether. Thus French can use its clitic in finite clauses.

30. One anonymous reviewer suggests that alternatively the clustering of clitic and weak pronoun is ruled out under the order assume in the text in (55) because either the clustering would involve lowering of the clitic to the weak pronoun or either the weak pronoun would move to the specifier of the projection in which the clitic is sitting and the clitic would have to move into that specifier, which is also impossible.


is correct, and there is only one possible way to combine two heads with first and second person datives, then we would have to propose that Greek give-it-me involves a form of weak pronoun, contrary to the Give-me-it example

(56)



Colloquial French (54) and Occitan examples (45a) would have to differ in the location of the agreement projection in imperatives. In these varieties clitics are located above this agreement projection.³¹ Movement of the verb would not reach the clitic.

(57)




If movement of the illocutionary force in the CP field does not involve head movement but XP movement of the whole agreement projection of the CP, we

31. This agreement projection might be related to the agreement projection proposed by Rooryck (1992).

could obtain the final analysis in (58), in which Donne-MOI forms a constituent and the clitic *le* is left behind in some other lower projection:

(58)



Thus, clusters of two clitics only lead to the double object configuration *me le* whereas the *lo me* orders involve a clitic and a weak pronoun which cannot be located in the same head but must be split into different heads. The weak pronoun is in a lower position than the clitic, it is in a lower Spec. Any movement of the verb passing the weak pronoun yields always *le moi* or '*lo mé*' order. The reverse order of the weak pronoun with the clitic *moi le*s is permitted in colloquial French and certain Occitan varieties by pied piping the V-MOI constituent above the position of the clitic. Thus the possibility of allowing both orders in these varieties is tied to the idea that the combination involves weak pronouns and to the optionality of pied piping the weak pronoun above the clitic, depending on the position of the agreement projection.³² Crucially, such optionality is not ever permitted with a cluster of pure heads as in (59), which according to Laenzlinger (1998) is impossible for French speakers who might allow *donne-le-moi* or *donne-me-le*.

(59) *Donne-le-me

In conclusion, if the above discussion is accurate, it lends further support to a syntactic view of clitic combinations. Mallorcan Catalan and Central Catalan would not have a different specifications for the ordering of clitics dative (first and second

32. As an anonymous reviewer points out, no material might intervene between the verb-weak pronoun and the clitic. As a matter of fact as pointed out by Laenzlinger (1998), no material might intervene between verb and weak pronoun:

(i) *Regarde donc moi
 Look-at then me

In order to avoid such a situation the Agr Projection has to be above any possible intervening adverb or subject or this material might have to vacate these projections before further movement.

person) and accusative in a template, but would have different syntax for the two pronominal elements involved in this combination: Mallorcan Catalan would involve a weak pronoun *me*, and a clitic whereas Central Catalan contains two clitics. Moreover, this view leads to the conclusion that *me le* is the only possible combination of two totally reduced clitics in Romance, coinciding with the order obtained in the double object construction in Germanic.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, I have shown that a syntactic view to clitic combinations is desirable in order to account for certain gaps in the paradigm in the syntactic distribution and morphological properties of clitic combinations. The gaps suggest that combinations are sensitive to syntax. Following an approach in which combinations of clitics come in two different varieties (split and cluster) in conjunction with the idea that verb movement pied pipes clitics, leaving some behind, permits an explanation of some of those syntactic gaps. This idea also leads to the conclusion that pronominal elements might differ in the amount of structure they involve (weak pronouns versus clitics) and that some combinations that appear to be solely composed of clitics might really involve weak pronouns. This view supports wider generalizations about clitic combinations that one can start to make such as the generalization that the universal combinations for first and second dative combined with accusative is dative—accusative as it is the case of the double object construction in Germanic.

References

- Argenté, J. (1976). «Un exercici d'anàlisi transformacional entorn del pronom *en*». In: Sánchez de Zavala, V. (ed.). *Estudios de Gramática Generativa*. Barcelona: Labor.
- Benincà, P.; Cinque, G. (1993). «Su alcune differenze fra enclisi e proclisi». In: *Ommaggio a Gian Franco Folena*. Padova: Programma.
- Bonet, E. (1991). *Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance*. MIT, doctoral dissertation.
- (1995). «Feature structure of Romance clitics». *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13: 607-647.
- Cardinaletti, A. (2000). «On different types of clitic clusters». *Workshop on the Antisymmetry Theory*, Cortona, May 15-17.
- Cardinaletti A.; Starke, M. (1999). «The typology of structural deficiency: a case study of the three classes of pronouns». In: van Riemsdijk, H. (ed.). *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Chenal, A (1986). *Le franco Provençal Valdotain*. Val D'aoste: Musumeci Editor.
- Concello de la Villa de Val d'Echo (1990). *De la grammatical de Lo Cheso, Fable Altoaragonesa*.
- Halle, M.; Marantz, A. (1993). «Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection». In: Hale, K.; Keyser, J. (eds.). *The view from Building 20*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

- Harris, J. (1995). «The Morphology of Spanish Clitics». In: Campos, H.; Kempchinsky, P. (eds.). *Evolution and revolution in linguistic theory*. Georgetown U Press Washington.
- Heap, D. (1998). «Optimizing Iberian Clitic Sequences». In: Lema, J.; Treviño, E. (eds.). *Theoretical Analyses on Romance Languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hourcade, A. (1986). *Grammaire Bearnaise*. Association «los Caminaires». Le conseil Général des Pyrénées-Atlantiques.
- Kayne, R (1975). *French Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- (1984). *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- (1991). «Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO». *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647-686.
- (1994). *The antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- (2000). *Parameters and Universals*. Oxford University Press.
- Laenzlinger, C. (1998). *Comparative Studies in word order variation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Monachesi, P. (1999). *A lexical Approach to Italian Cliticization*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Parry, M. (1984). *The dialect of Cairo Montenotte*. The University of Wales, doctoral dissertation.
- Perlmutter, D. (1971). *Deep and Surface Constraints in Syntax*. New York: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
- Rivero, M. L. (1994). «Clause Structure and V-Movement in the Languages of the Balkans». *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12.1: 63-120.
- Rivera-Castillo, Y. (1997). «Proclitic group and word order in Caribbean Spanish». In: Back, J; Motapanyane, V. (eds.). *Clitics, Pronouns and Movement*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Rooryck, J. (1992). «Romance enclitic ordering and universal grammar». *Linguistic Review* : 219-250.
- Teulat, R. (1976). *Momento grammatical de l' occitan referentiel*. Editions occitanas.
- Terzi, A. (1999). «Clitic Combinations, their Hosts and their Ordering». *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 17: 85-121.
- Todolí, J. (1998). *Els pronomes personals*. València: Publicacions de la Universitat de València.
- Vega, C.; Mir, J.; Sáez, X.; Pons, A. (1990) *La parla de la Ribera d'Ebre. Aspectes morfològics: la pronominalització àtona*. Centre d'estudis de la Ribera d'Ebre.
- Uriagereka, J. (1996). «Aspects of the Syntax of Clitic Placement in Western Romance». *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79-123.
- Wanner, D. (1977). «On the Order of Clitics in Italian». *Lingua* 43: 101-128.
- Zanuttini, R. (1997). *Negation and Clausal Structure*. Oxford University Press.