David Heap, Michèle Oliviéri and Katerina Palasis

5 Clitic pronouns

Abstract: This chapter provides an overview of the rather heterogeneous category of pronominal clitics in a range of Romance languages from a morpho-syntactic perspective. We describe the shapes of Romance clitic paradigms, including distinctions of person, number, gender, case, and animacy, as well as markedness restrictions and syncretism. Different types of clisis, clitic placement, and alternations between proclisis and enclisis, as well as allomorphic variations and clitic clusters are all placed in their theoretical contexts. In addition to considering clitic ordering with finiteness and their distribution in different types of clauses, we examine the distinction between clitic / weak pronoun / strong pronoun and present a typology of Romance subject clitics, including expletives and partial subject paradigms.

Keywords: clitic pronouns, object, subject, features, clitic clusters, templates, partial paradigms, gradual emergence

1 What is a clitic pronoun?

The modern term "clitic"[1] is backformed from *enclitic*, from the Ancient Greek ενκλίνειν 'to lean on' used by the second century grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus to describe pronouns which in prosodic terms "lean" on the preceding item (Householder 1981). From a phonological point of view, a clitic is a linguistic item which lacks independent stress. Hence, it cannot be used in isolation and needs to be attached to a stressed element, i.e., its host, in order to appear in an utterance.[2] Clitics and hosts can belong to different grammatical categories, e.g., determiners and nouns, respectively. Nevertheless, it is the category of pronominal clitics (nominative, accusative, dative, genitive/ablative/partitive and locative, as well as reflexive), which has mainly caught the attention of Romance philologists and linguists over the years (as reported in Nevis et al. 1994; Heap/Roberge 2001; Spencer/Luís 2012), and which is still highly debated at least in phonology (prosodic structure), morphology (affix or word), syntax (structure, placement, order, status), interfaces, language acquisition, and language change

1 This chapter deals with clitic pronouns and, where applicable, negation clitics. Other clitics, such as determiners, are therefore left aside. See ↗12 for full details on "Negation and polarity" and ↗20 on "Determination and quantification".

2 A clitic can however be stressed if it occurs in a position which requires stress (e.g., after French imperatives: *prends-le* 'take it'), but in such cases the clitic bears group stress and does not supply a stress of its own. See Wanner (1987a, 418) for other examples of clitics which may receive stress in certain contexts, but do not supply their own stress to a phonological word.

DOI 10.1515/9783110377088-005

(Hopper/Traugott 1993; van Riemsdijk 1999; Gerlach/Grijzenhout 2000; Heggie/Ordóñez 2005; van Gelderen 2011; Grohmann/Neokleous 2015, among others). Romance clitic pronouns have also been investigated in various theoretical frameworks, e.g., in Distributed Morphology (Bonet 1995; Dobrovie-Sorin 1999; Goldbach 2007; Pescarini 2010; Sandalo/Galves 2013), in Generative Syntax (Kayne 1975; Rizzi 1986; Uriagereka 1995; Sportiche 1996; Belletti 1999), in Head-Driven Phrase Structure Grammar (Miller 1992; Miller/Sag 1997), in Lexical-Functional Grammar (Luís/Sadler 2003), in Optimality Theory (Legendre 2000; Grimshaw 2001; Gerlach 2002), and in Paradigm Function Morphology (Bonami/Boyé 2007, among others).

Romance philologists and linguists traditionally distinguish strong pronouns, which pattern syntactically with nominal phrases, from clitic pronouns, which have reduced phonological forms compared to the strong paradigm, and sometimes have distinct syntactic positions. One of the modern benchmarks in the study of clitichood was set by Kayne (1975), who formalized the fact that French object and subject clitics have "some special syntactic status" compared to strong pronouns and nominal phrases. Both series of clitics share a number of characteristics (Kayne 1975), which are often referred to in the literature. Although Kayne initially analyzed French, some of the properties can be extended across Romance languages (with rare exceptions, see Section 3.1), as illustrated for French and Spanish (1) where the clitics are ungrammatical without a verbal host:

(1) Definitional characteristics of clitic pronouns:

a. Clitics cannot appear without a verb:

i. Fr. Qui viendra avec nous? Moi. / *Je=.
who come-FUT.3SG with us me / I=
'Who will come with us? Me.'

ii. Sp. ¿A quién ven? A mí. / *Me=.
to whom see-PRS.3PL to me / me=
'Who do they see? Me.'

b. Nothing can take place between a clitic and its host (except another clitic):

i. Fr. Jean / *Il=paraît=il, est fou.
Jean / he=seem-PRS.3SG=it be-PRS.3SG crazy
'Jean / He, so it seems, is crazy.'

ii. Sp. Lo=veo a veces / *Lo=a veces veo.
him=see-PRS.1SG at times / him=at times see-PRS.1SG
'I see him sometimes.'

c. Clitics cannot be coordinated:

i. Fr. Jean et lui / *il=partiront bientôt.
Jean and him / he=leave-FUT.3PL soon
'Jean and he will leave soon.'

ii. Sp. *La=y Juan veo / *La=y lo=veo.
her=and Juan see-PRS.1SG / her=and him=see-PRS.1SG
'I see her and Juan. / I see her and him.'

d. Clitics cannot receive contrastive stress:
i. Fr. LUI / *IL=partira le premier.
him / he=leave-FUT.3SG the first
'HE will leave first.'
ii. Sp. *LO=veo, pero no LA=veo.
him=see-PRS.1SG but NEG her=see-PRS.1SG
'I see HIM but I don't see HER.'

The "special syntax" described in Kayne (1975) is also highlighted in Zwicky (1977). Zwicky defined "special clitics" as forms with a stressed counterpart, e.g., French *me* vs *moi* 'me', and a different syntax from the full counterpart, e.g., *je connais Jean* 'I know Jean' vs *je le connais* 'I know him'.[3] Zwicky (1977, 5) distinguished these "special clitics" from "simple clitics", which are cliticized for stylistic reasons and do not have a specific syntax, e.g., *he sees her* vs *he sees'r*. Following Givón (1971), Zwicky (1977) considered special clitics as "remnants of an earlier system of simple clitics", since object proclitics reflect earlier object-verb orders found for instance in French and Spanish.[4]

As illustrated above, the host of a clitic pronoun in modern Romance is always a verb, which can be finite or non-finite (Ramsden 1963; Wanner 1987b). Three possibilities for the clitic to attach to the verb are attested in modern Romance languages (see examples in (2)): (a) proclisis, when the clitic precedes its host, (b) enclisis, when the clitic follows its host, and (c) mesoclisis, when the clitic is inserted between its host and inflectional affixes.[5] Described since the second century by the Greek grammarian Apollonius Dyscolus (cf. Householder 1981), pronominal enclisis was initially the dominant pattern in the early Indo-European and Romance languages (Wackernagel 1892; Meyer-Lübke 1897). Proclisis came later in the evolution of Romance languages from Latin, first as a competitor to enclisis, then as the dominant pattern with finite

3 Special clitics are mainly found in Romance and Slavic languages, according to Zwicky, though as a descriptive category, clitics can be found in many language families.

4 The third class described by Zwicky (1977) is that of "bound words", which are clitic forms with no full counterparts, e.g., the Latin conjunction *–que* 'and'. These forms necessarily cliticize to one word and form a semantic unit with the entire phrase or clause.

5 Among modern Romance languages, mesoclisis is specific to Portuguese (see Section 3.2), though it is more widely attested in Old Spanish and Old Catalan (Ramsden 1963). The term "proclitic" was coined during the nineteenth century by the German philologist Gottfried Hermann (Lambert 2001, 28). The term "clitic" is consensually attributed to Eugene A. Nida (1949, vii; as in Anderson 2005, 1). Romance languages do not display endoclitics (but see Zwicky 1977 and Harris 2002 for examples of endoclitics in Indonesian and Caucasian languages).

verbs, except in European Portuguese, Galician and Asturian. Dating the transition remains controversial however, depending on the language under investigation.[6]

(2) Types of clisis:

a. Proclisis:

Fr.	Je=ne=te=le=donne	pas.[7]
	I=NEG=you.DAT=it.ACC=give-PRS.1SG	NEG
	'I do not give it to you.'	

b. Enclisis:

It.	Voglio	dar=ti	un	libro.
	want-PRS.1SG	give.INF=you.DAT	a	book
	'I want to give you a book.'			

c. Mesoclisis:

EPt.	Levar=vo=los=ia.
	take-INF=you.PL=them.ACC=COND.1SG
	'I would take them to you.'

Another significant step in the study of clitics was introduced by Cardinaletti/Starke (1999), who defined clitics in opposition to two classes of pronouns, i.e., strong and weak pronouns, considering the standard bipartition strong vs clitic as "descriptively insufficient", as illustrated in (3) (examples from Cardinaletti 1991).

(3) Cardinaletti/Starke's (1999) tripartition of pronominal systems (It.):

a. A strong paradigm:

Non	*a	lui	dirò	mai	*a	lui	tutto	a	lui.
NEG	to	him	say-FUT.1SG	never	to	him	everything	to	him
'I will never say everything to him.'									

b. A weak paradigm:

Non	*loro=	dirò	mai	=loro	tutto	*=loro.
NEG	them.DAT=	say-FUT.1SG	never	=them.DAT	everything	=them.DAT
'I will never say everything to them.'						

c. A clitic paradigm:

Non	gli=	dirò	mai	*=gli	tutto	*=gli.
NEG	him.DAT=	say-FUT.1SG	never	=him.DAT	everything	=him.DAT
'I will never say everything to him.'						

6 For French, both the thirteenth through sixteenth centuries and the seventeenth century have been proposed (Meyer-Lübke 1897 vs Geisler 1982, as reported in Pusch 2001, 383), whereas the fourteenth century seems consensual for Occitan (Ronjat 1908), and the fifteenth century has been proposed for Spanish (Fontana 1993).

7 Since our approach here is morpho-syntactic rather than phonological, all the clitics cited are glossed showing cliticization to their syntactic hosts.

The authors consider syntactic, morphological, phonological, and semantic characteristics throughout different languages (as recapitulated in Table 1), and rank the three classes of pronouns in terms of "structural deficiency", i.e., missing functional projections (C the locus of referential features and Σ the locus of prosodic features). In this framework, (i) all languages display three classes of pronouns (but some are homophonous, e.g., *il* 'he' in French can be weak or clitic), (ii) there are always two classes of deficient pronouns (clitic and weak) vs one class of non-deficient pronouns (strong), and (iii) clitics are considered as "severely deficient" elements (lacking C and Σ) compared to weak pronouns, which are "mildly deficient" (lacking only Σ). The latter are intermediate elements and share some properties with clitics and others with strong pronouns, as shown in Table 1. The relevant pronoun is chosen following the "Minimize Structure" economy principle (Cardinaletti/Starke 1999, 198).

Table 1: Cardinaletti/Starke's (1999) classes of pronouns

Classes	**Strong**		**Weak**		**Clitic**
Syntax	Phrase (XP)		Phrase (XP)		Head (X)
Missing projections	None		C		C and Σ
Position	Non derived		Derived		Derived
Distribution[8]	+		–		–
Morphology	*lui*	≥	*il*	≥	*il*
Semantics	[+ human][9] [–expletive]		[± human] [±expletive]		[± human] [±expletive]
Restructuring[10]	–		+		+
Word-accent	+		+		–

Cardinaletti/Starke (1999) claim that their three-way distinction sheds light on a number of matters, such as the form of object enclitics in French imperatives, e.g., *aide-moi* 'help me', which are analyzed as weak pronouns in this framework, not strong ones. The authors also address doubling, and claim that doubling can only be clitic-doubling. Example (4b) shows that French preverbal subject pronouns can be analyzed as clitics in the variety of French which also requires repetition in coordination, but are analyzed as weak pronouns in other varieties.[11]

8 Refers to isolation, separation, and coordination, as exemplified in (1a), (1b) and (1c), respectively.

9 This characteristic is controversial. See our discussion in Section 2.

10 Refers to phonological processes such as *liaison* (e.g., Fr. *elle[z] ont* 'they have') and reduction phenomena, such as contraction (e.g., *I saw 'ya*).

11 French postverbal subject pronouns are also analyzed as clitics in this framework. A discrepancy between pre- and postverbal subject pronouns in French is also highlighted in Sportiche

(4) Doubling can only be clitic-doubling (Cardinaletti/Starke 1999):

a. Northern Italian Dialect: strong + clitic
   Ela la=canta.
   she it.FEM=sing-PRS.3SG
   'She sings.'

b. Colloquial French: NP + clitic
   Jean il=mange.
   John he=eat-PRS.3SG
   'John eats.'

Doubling vs dislocation is also a topic of much debate in Romance languages (since e. g. Jaeggli 1982).[12] Doubling is generally defined as the obligatory co-occurrence of a clitic and a co-referential nominal phrase or strong pronoun, as exemplified in (5a,b) with Spanish. This phenomenon is also observed in dialects of Spanish and in Romanian (Strozer 1976; Rivas 1977; Jaeggli 1986; Suñer 1988, and Borer 1984; Dobrovie-Sorin 1990, respectively), considered impossible in Italian (5c), and controversial in French (5d,e), where grammaticality depends to a large extent on the (standard vs colloquial) register used:

(5) Clitic doubling in Romance languages:

a. Sp. Le_i=mandé una carta a $ella_i$.
   her.DAT=send-PRF.1SG a letter to her
   'I sent a letter to her.' (Fontana 1993, 44)

b. Sp. *Mandé una carta a ella.
   send-PRF.1SG a letter to her
   'I sent a letter to her.' (Fontana 1993, 44)

c. It. *Lo_i=vedrò domani $Gianni_i$.
   him=see-FUT.1SG tomorrow Gianni
   'I will see Gianni tomorrow.' (Anagnostopoulou 2006, 524)

d. Fr. *Marie le_i=voit $Jean_i$.
   Marie him=see-PRS.3SG Jean
   'Marie sees Jean.' (Jaeggli 1986, 18)

e. Fr. Jean me_i=connaît moi_i.
   Jean me=know- PRS.3SG me
   'Jean knows me.' (Kayne 2000, 164)

(1999) and Roberts (2010). The status of subject clitics in French is further discussed in Section 4.2.2.

12 This chapter will limit itself to doubling since dislocation is dealt with in ↗13 Dislocations and framings.

The co-occurrence of the clitic with a co-referential constituent raises a number of questions with regard to movement or base-generation of the clitic, case-assignment, interpretational features of the nominal phrase/strong pronoun (specificity, animacy), and the morpho-syntactic status of the clitic (syntactic argument or agreement marker). A number of characteristics have therefore been put forward in order to disentangle these matters, among which the presence or not of a preposition preceding the nominal phrase/strong pronoun (known as "Kayne's Generalization", Kayne 1975),[13] and the presence or not of an intonational break between the nominal phrase/strong pronoun and the clitic (Jaeggli 1986). Both arguments are discussed by Anagnostopoulou (2006), and Deshaies/Guilbault/Paradis (1993), Rossi (1999), and De Cat (2007), respectively.

This introduction aimed at sketching the backdrop: clitics are heterogeneous, paradoxical and fascinating linguistic elements which have been examined by philologists and linguists for quite a while now and which are still the focus of many investigations. Let us now move forward, and get into the detail of more specific matters revolving around the morphology of clitics (Section 2), object clitics (Section 3), subject clitics (Section 4) and their interaction with negation (Section 5). Section 6 concludes this chapter on clitic pronouns.

2 Clitic morphology

As seen above, across Romance languages, pronominal paradigms distinguish strong (also called "stressed" or "disjunctive") pronouns from clitic ("unstressed", "conjunctive") forms. Clitics often have distinct forms according to grammatical person, number, often case, sometimes gender and other features.

2.1 Case, person, and number

Romanian is exceptional in having a fully parallel set of distinct dative and accusative clitics in all six persons, and two genders in the third singular, with minimal syncretism: third plural dative has the same form for masculine and feminine, otherwise all forms are distinct (Table 2):[14]

13 "Kayne's Generalization" (Kayne 1975) states that clitic doubling is possible only when the co-referential constituent to the clitic is a prepositional phrase, e.g., Sp. *lo*$_i$ *vimos a él*$_i$ 'we saw him'. The generalization holds for direct objects in Spanish and Romanian, and indirect objects in French (e.g., *Paul la lui*$_i$ *présentera à Juan*$_i$ 'Paul will introduce her to Juan', Borer 1984, 40). The preposition assigns Case to the nominal phrase/strong pronoun, which is also assigned a theta role. The clitic is generated directly to the left of the verb, absorbs the Case assigned by the verb, but bears no theta role. It has no argument status.

14 Table 2 includes only clitic pronouns: like most Romance languages, Romanian also contrasts clitics with strong pronouns (in the nominative, there is no distinction).

Table 2: Romanian clitic pronouns

	Accusative clitics	Dative clitics
P1[15]	*mă*	*îmi (mi)*[16]
P2	*te*	*îţi (ţi)*
P3m	*îl*	*îi (i)*
P3f	*o*	
P4	*ne*	*ne (ni)*
P5	*vă*	*vă (vi / v-)*
P6m	*îl*	*le (li)*
P6f	*le*	

In most Romance languages (see below for French, Spanish and Italian), first and second person (singular and plural) clitics show syncretism for case. In (6) the clitics *te* (Spanish and French) and *ti* (Italian) have identical forms in each language, whether the clitic is an accusative or a dative one:

(6) a. Sp. Cuando te=ve, te=habla.
b. It. Quando ti=vede, ti=parla.
when 2SG.ACC=see-PRS.3SG 2SG.DAT=speak-PRS.3.SG
c. Fr. Quand elle te=voit, elle te=parle.
when she 2SG.ACC=see-PRS.3SG she 2SG.DAT=speak-PRS.3.SG
'When she sees you, she speaks to you.'

Along with Romanian, distinct dative and accusative forms are also found in some varieties of Rhaeto-Romance (Haiman 1988), and in Galician only for second person singular accusative *te* vs second person singular dative *che*. Otherwise, case distinctions only appear with third person (singular or plural) clitics. Table 3 illustrates this distinction in a paradigm where there is just a single series of strong pronouns with no case distinctions, a subject/object contrast among clitics in all persons except first and second plural, and distinct nominative, accusative and dative clitics in the third person singular and plural:

15 These tables number grammatical persons using P1 through P6, rather than using the corresponding glosses, to underline that 1PL forms are not really plurals of 1SG forms, etc.
16 Short forms of the dative clitics are used in contact with vowels and with certain verbal moods.

Table 3: French personal pronoun paradigms[17]

	Strong pronouns	Nominative clitics	Accusative clitics	Dative clitics
P1	*moi*	*je*	*me*	
P2	*toi*	*tu*	*te*	
P3m	*lui*	*il*	*le*	*lui*
P3f	*elle*		*la*	
P4	*nous*			
P5	*vous*			
P6m	*eux*	*ils*	*les*	*leur*
P6f	*elles*			

While the French paradigm shows a single strong pronoun for all cases, in all six grammatical persons, the Spanish (Table 4) and Italian (Table 5) paradigms have a subject/object contrast in some or all of the strong pronouns, and case distinctions among third person (singular and plural) clitics:

Table 4: Spanish personal pronoun paradigms[18]

	Strong subject pronouns	Strong object pronouns	Accusative clitics	Dative clitics
P1	*yo*	*mí*	*me*	
P2	*tú (vos)*[19]	*ti (vos)*	*te*	
P3m	*él*		*lo (le)*	*le*
P3f	*ella*		*la*	
P4	*nosotros / nosotras*		*nos*	
P5	*vosotros / vosotras*		*os*	
P6m	*ellos*		*los*	*les*
P6f	*ellas*		*las*	

17 This table does not include the reflexive clitic *se*, nor the generic subject pronoun *on*, the locative *y* or the genitive-ablative-partitive *en*.

18 Table 4 does not include the clitics corresponding to the formal *usted*, *ustedes*, which share P3 and P6 forms respectively, nor the reflexive *se*.

19 The second person singular *vos* is regularly used in River Plate (Argentine, Uruguayan) and some Central American (Nicaraguan, Guatemalan) varieties of Spanish and sporadically in a few others, instead of *tú*, with distinct verbal morphology but an identical clitic form *te*.

Table 5: Italian personal pronoun paradigms[20]

	Strong subject pronouns	Strong object pronouns	Accusative clitics	Dative clitics
P1.SG	*io*	*me*	*mi (me)*	
P2	*tu*	*te*	*ti (te)*	
P3m	*egli/lui*	*lui*	*lo*	*gli (glie)*
P3f	*ella/lei*	*lei*	*la*	*le (glie)*
P4	*noi*		*ci (ce)*	
P5	*voi*		*vi (ve)*	
P6m	*essi/loro*	*loro*	*li*	*loro/gli (glie)*
P6f	*esse/loro*	*loro*	*le*	*loro/gli (glie)*

In addition to dative and accusative case marking in third person singular and plural clitics, a number of Romance languages have distinct clitics for genitive-partitive (French and Catalan *en*, Italian *ne*, Occitan *n'en*, Oliviéri 1991–1992) and for locative arguments and/or adjuncts (Italian *vi*, Catalan *hi*, French *y*). In French, Occitan and Catalan, genitive-partitive forms can also be used as ablatives, while in some Sardinian varieties there is a unique three-way distinction amongst these "adverbial" clitics: locative *bi*, genitive-ablative *nde*, and non-initial *-nke*, which could once only be ablative but became a general locative in other varieties (Lai 1996, 44).

Ethical or non-argumental datives do not correspond to any argument of the verb in question, but rather express how a participant is involved in or affected by an action, as in (7) from Gasiglia (1984):

(7) Nissart (Occ.)
Lou=mi=pènsi.
it.ACC=me.DAT=think-PRS.1SG
'I think it over.'

Very common in Ibero-Romance, Occitan varieties and Italian, ethical datives are less frequent in French (where however they can be responsible for otherwise ungrammatical sequences, cf. Goldbach 2007). They can occur alone (8a) or grouped with other clitics as in (8b) from Hourcade (1986). In Galician two datives can occur in the same clause (8c):

20 Again, reflexives are omitted. The parenthetical forms correspond to a regular vowel alternation before sonorants (*me*, *te*, *ce*, *ve*) or to more colloquial alternate forms (*glie*, *gli*) rather than to paradigmatic differences in clitic forms.

(8) a. Sp. Me=apagaste la tele.
1SG.DAT=shut.off-PST.2SG the.F TV
'You shut the TV off on me.'

b. Gsc. Que u= se= t= at= mingè tot.
QUE it.M= himself.DAT= you.DAT= it.N= eat-PST.3SG all
'He ate it all up on you.'

c. Gal. Non che=me=gustou nada.
NEG 2SG.DAT=1SG.DAT=pleased nothing
'I didn't like anything.'

Note that in (8b) there are two different clitics expressing *it*, the masculine *u* and the neuter *at* (see Section 2.2). Bastida (1976) and Smith (2001) characterize forms like (8c) as "datives of solidarity".

2.2 Gender and animacy

Across Romance, gender is never explicitly marked on participant clitics (first and second persons, singular and plural), regardless of whether they have masculine or feminine reference. In (9), the clitic can trigger feminine agreement with its intended referent, despite not showing any overt marking of a gender feature:

(9) a. Sp. Te=veo cansada.
2SG.ACC=see.PRS.1SG tired.FSG
'You seem tired to me.' (said to a person of feminine gender)

b. Fr. On=me=croyait heureuse.
one=1.SG.ACC=believe.PST happy.FSG
'People thought I was happy.' (said by a person of feminine gender)

On the other hand, gender is widely marked in non-participant clitics, i.e., third persons singular and (less often) plural, particularly accusative forms (see French, Spanish and Italian paradigms above). These third person accusative forms are often identical to definite articles (typically descended from the same Latin etyma: ILLUM, ILLA, ILLOS, ILLAS). Romanian is unique in having also distinct third person feminine forms for both singular and plural dative clitics (see Table 2 above). In other Romance languages, this is a common area of syncretism: French and Spanish have no gender distinctions among third person dative clitics, singular or plural, while Italian only has distinct gender forms in the third person singular objects. Many varieties of Colloquial French show syncretism by neutralizing 3F forms to 3M (Moignet 1965, 158).

Since there is no systematic neuter gender in modern Romance in the sense of a third nominal class that parallels feminine and masculine for a group of

nouns,[21] the mixed gender nouns in Italian, Romanian and Rhaeto-Romance take masculine agreement in the singular and feminine agreement in the plural, and therefore the corresponding clitics are either masculine or feminine, accordingly: no 'neuter' clitic is needed. Among Romance clitics, Catalan *ho* (and various equivalent forms in different Occitan dialects, see for instance (8b) above) used for non-lexical or clausal objects may be called "neuter" pronouns to distinguish them from other third singular feminine and masculine forms (10a); in other Romance languages, these functions are fulfilled by third singular masculine forms, as in (10b,c):

(10) a. Cat. Això que dieu, ho faré.
that what say-PRS.2PL it.NEUT do-FUT.1SG
b. Fr. Ce que vous dites, je= le=ferai.
c. Sp. Lo que ustedes dicen, yo lo=haré.
that what you.2PL say-PRS.2PL I it.ACC=do-FUT.1SG
'What you say, I will do it.'

Another place where a clitic called "neuter" occurs is in Asturian, where there is indeed a systematic morphological feature which is distinct from feminine and masculine, not as a nominal class but as a morphological category. These so-called "neuters" are used to mark uncountable or "mass" readings of nouns, as opposed to count readings, which are necessarily either masculine or feminine. While not really a lexically "neuter" gender (despite the traditional term *neutro de materia* used in this area as well as for an analogous phenomenon in central Italian dialects, see Hall 1968; Haase 2000), non-countable reference in these varieties is used for antecedents that are understood to be part of a "mass", as in (11a,b), rather than discrete countable individuals, as in (11c,d).[22]

(11) Ast. a. El vino, vendemos=lo / *=lu.
the.M wine sell-PRS.1PL=it.NEUT.ACC =it.M.ACC
'Wine, we sell it.'

21 Some Romance languages have traditionally used the term 'neuter' for nouns that have masculine agreement in the singular and feminine in the plural, e.g. It. *il dito* 'the finger' MSG, *le dita* 'the fingers' FPL, Rom. *loc* 'place' MSG, *locuri* 'places' FPL. Although in some cases these nouns are descended etymologically from Latin neuter nouns, they do not in fact form a distinct nominal class which is morphologically separate from masculine and feminine, and so they are in fact more accurately described as 'mixed gender'.

22 These eastern Asturian data are drawn from Fernández-Ordóñez (2012, 82–83), but similar distinctions are found in other Asturian varieties.

b. La lana, vendemos=lo / *=la.
the.F wool sell-PRS.1PL=it.NEUT.ACC =it.F.ACC
'Wool, we sell it.'
c. El coche, vendemos=lu / *=lo.
the.M car sell-PRS.1PL=it.M.ACC =it.NEUT.ACC
'The car, we sell it.'
d. La moto, vendemos=la / *=lo.
the.F motorbike, sell-PRS.1PL=it.F.ACC =it.NEUT.ACC
'The motorbike, we sell it.'

A mass/count distinction similar to the one in Asturian carries over into some Spanish varieties of Northern Spain, where *loísta* varieties use *lo* in "mass" or uncountable contexts analogous to (11a,b) above, regardless of gender (12a) or case (12b), see Heap (2002b) for a Feature Geometry analysis:

(12) Sp. a. La cerveza lo=tomamos con tapas.
the.F beer it.NEUT=drink-PRS.1PL with tapas.PL
'Beer, we drink it with tapas.'
b. Lo=añaden de todo hoy día.
it.NEUT=add-PRS.3PL of everything today day.
'They add all sorts of things to it nowadays.'

In such varieties of Spanish, *le* is no longer used only for dative contexts, but also in masculine accusative cases, where the object is definite and (archetypically) human: animate *leísmo* as in (13a) and (more rarely) inanimate *leísmo* (13b). Feminine accusative clitic *la* is used for dative contexts, or *laísmo* (13c):

(13) Sp. a. Le=conocí.
him.DAT=meet-PST.1PL
'I met him.'
b. Le=compramos.
it.ACC=buy-PST.1PL
'We bought it.'
c. La=di un regalo.
her.DAT=give-PST.1SG a.M gift
'I gave her a gift.'

Most speakers of Spanish varieties from Northern Spain accept (13a) with definite animate objects, especially humans, but the acceptance of (13b) with inanimates is much less widespread. It has been proposed by Kayne (1975) and Cardinaletti/Starke (1999) that while clitics can refer to inanimates (14b, Table 1), such readings are not so

felicitous with strong pronouns (14a).[23] What is however clear is that the feature [human] plays a role in for example the selection of French dative animate *lui* (14c) vs its inanimate counterpart *y* (14d):

(14) Fr.
a. ?Ses livres$_i$, il=ne pense plus qu' à eux$_i$.
his books he.NOM=NEG think-PRS.3SG only to them
'His books, he can only think of them.'
b. On le$_i$=lit partout, ton bouquin$_i$.
one.NOM it.ACC=read-PRS.3SG everywhere your book
'One reads it everywhere, your book.'
c. Son fils lui=ressemble.
his son 3.SG.DAT=resemble-PRS.3SG
'His son looks like him.'
d. Ça y=ressemble.
that 3.SG.DAT=resemble-PRS.3SG
'That looks like it.'

A similar effect applies in Catalan for the selection of locative *hi* and dative *li* (Rigau 1982). Thus, the role of features relating to [+/– animate] or [+/– human] referents in clitic paradigms still needs further study.

2.3 Syncretism and allomorphy

As the above non-exhaustive sampling of forms makes clear, clitics potentially mark an accumulation of different morphological features: grammatical person-number, combined with case and gender. These combinations make for a high level of syncretism in clitic paradigms: as noted, gender is uniformly absent from first and second persons, and case is mostly absent. Masculine and feminine genders are typically marked in third person singular clitics, but not always in third person plural: gender marking is less likely in the marked (plural) number. As seen above, gender is also less likely to be marked with dative forms than with accusative forms. Syncretism is generally more likely in plurals, with shared forms predominating in first and second persons plural, in many paradigms. There is also a tendency in some areas (dialects of North Western Italy, Eastern Spain, and Valencian) for reflexive clitics to spread from third plural to second plural and first plural (Bonet 1991; Parry 1997; de Benito Moreno 2015), leading to an invariable reflexive clitic in some cases (e.g. Sursilvan Rhaeto-Romance, Haiman 1988).

23 This proposal is however controversial: see Dannell (1973) and Zribi-Hertz (2001) on French; Tasmowski/Reinheimer (2001) on Portuguese and Romanian.

Allomorphic variation in clitic systems can be relatively trivial, as in the case of the morphophonological process (called elision or apocope in different philological traditions) whereby final vowels of clitics are dropped before a vowel initial host:

(15) Fr. Elle me=parle et elle m'=appelle.
she 1SG.DAT=speak-PRS.3SG and she 1SG.DAT=call-PRS.3SG
'She speaks to me and she calls me.'

This can be seen as a syllabification process that is not specific to clitic pronouns, since something similar happens with other stressless words, such as definite articles, in similar circumstances. Syllabic conditioning is carried even further in Catalan, where a given clitic can have up to four different forms: preceding a consonant, preceding a vowel, following a consonant or following a vowel (16).[24]

(16) Cat. a. M=apropava a casa i em=vaig
REFL.1SG=approach-PST.1SG to home and REFL.1SG=AUX.PST.1SG
enutjar.
angry
'I was approaching home and I got angry.'
b. Puc apropar=me a casa.
can-PRS.1SG approach=REFL.1SG to home.
'I can get myself home.'
c. Apropa=m a casa.
approach-IMP.SG=1SG to home
'Take me home.'

Somewhat more complex is the case of Italian clitics ending in *-i* in the absence of other clitics (17), which regularly end in *-e* before certain other clitics (17b):

(17) It. a. Gianna mi=parla.
Gianna me.DAT=speak-PRS.3SG
'Gianna speaks to me.'
b. Gianna me=lo=da.
Gianna me.DAT=it.ACC=give-PRS.3SG
'Gianna gives it to me.'

The precise reasons that govern this vowel lowering are subject to some debate (see for example Pescarini 2011).

24 Bonet (2002, 954) suggests that these clitics are in fact underlyingly asyllabic, and that the schwa is supplied where needed as a default vowel in order to create licensed syllables.

Because of multiple syncretisms and allomorphy, some Romance clitics can be quite ambiguous in reference, especially when in sequences or clusters (see below).

3 Object clitics

3.1 Typology of object clitics across Romance

According to Wanner (1987a) almost all modern Romance languages have clitic pronoun systems that share (in varying degrees) two basic groups of properties: (i) stresslessness: "attachment in prosodic and segmental terms to some element(s) in the surrounding string, and unavailability for expressive purposes" (1987a, 415), and (ii) placement of the clitic with respect to the verb in its clause: "linearization of clitic and anchor according to some distribution key, cluster internal ordering restrictions, various types of co-occurrence limitations" (1987a, 415). The only (qualified) exceptions Wanner cites are Brazilian Portuguese (which appears to be replacing clitic object pronouns with non-emphatic strong forms) and Sursilvan Rhaeto-Romance (where clitic object pronouns have been completely replaced by strong forms). Creoles (sometimes called neo-Romance languages e.g., by Posner 1996) would be other exceptions, to the extent that they are viewed as part of the Romance family. So, object clitics can be broadly viewed as a characteristic property of most of the Romance family, though of course one shared by some other language families, whether geographically nearby or related, or more distant.

3.2 Object clitic placement

While the overwhelming trend in modern Romance is for pronominal clitics to appear as proclitics on finite verbs as in (18a,b,c), there are a few cases (European Portuguese, Galician, Asturian) where pronominal clitics can appear as enclitics to finite verbs in certain contexts, as in (18d).

(18) a. Sp. Ella te=ha llamado.
b. Rom. Ea te=a sunat.
c. Fr. Elle t=a appelé.
she you.2SG.ACC=AUX-PRS.3SG call-PTCP
'She called you.'
d. EPt. Ela chamou=te.
she call-PST.3SG=you.SG.ACC
'She called you.'

By having proclisis with infinitives (19a), French sets itself apart from other Romance languages, where enclisis is the norm (19b), whether negated or not (Hirschbühler/ Labelle 1994; 2001):

(19) a. Fr. Tu peux le=faire ou ne pas le=faire.
you can-PRS.2SG it=do-INF or NEG NEG it=do-INF
b. Sp. Puedes hacer=lo o no hacer=lo.
can-PRS.2SG do-INF=it or NEG do-INF=it
'You can do it or not do it.'

With multi-verb constructions, possible positions for clitics increase. Typically clitic pronouns can procliticize (or "raise") to a higher finite verb or encliticize to the lower infinitive (20). With causatives as well, Spanish allows two positions (21), as do other Romance languages other than French. Standard French however allows only one position for clitics, leading to some potential ambiguity, (22):

(20) Sp. a. Me=lo=puedes hacer./
me.DAT=it.ACC=can-PRS2SG do-INF/
b. Puedes hacér=me=lo.
can-PRS.2SG do-INF=me.DAT=it.ACC
'You can do it for me.'

(21) Sp. a. Me=lo=puedes hacer pintar.
me.DAT=IT.ACC=can-PRS.2SG do-INF paint-INF
b. Puedes hacér=me=lo pintar.
can-PRS.2SG do-INF=me.DAT=it.ACC paint-INF
'You can have it painted for me.'

(22) Fr. Tu peux me=le=faire peindre.
you can-PRS.2SG me.DAT=it.ACC=do-INF paint-INF
'You can have it painted for me.' / 'You can have me paint it.'

Again, Modern Standard French is the exception in requiring the proclitic on the infinitive (23a), though earlier and regional varieties allow a clitic to "climb" to the higher verb (23b), and Standard French still displays "clitic climbing" to the higher verb in the case of causatives (23c), see ↗8 Causative and perception verbs, for more detail:

(23) a. Modern Standard French
Je peux le=faire.
I can-PRS.1SG it.ACC=do-INF

b. Southern Regional French
Je le=peux faire.
I it.ACC=can-PRS.1SG do.INF
'I can do it.'

c. Modern Standard French
Je le=lui=fais écrire (le livre).
I it.ACC=him.DAT=make-PRS.1SG write.INF the book
'I make her/him write it (the book).'

In Occitan dialects, the constructions in (23a,b) are attested but the most frequent one has clitic climbing to above the finite verb, as in (24):

(24) Occ. Vous=lou=dève dire.
you.PL.DAT=it.ACC=must-PRS.3SG say-INF
'She/he must say it to you.'

In some languages, multiple verb constructions provide more possible sites for clitics to appear:

(25) Cat.
a. Hi=vaig voler contribuir.
LOC=AUX-PST.1SG want-INF contribute-INF
b. Vaig voler=hi contribuir.
AUX-PST.1SG want-INF=LOC contribute-INF
c. Vaig voler contribuir=hi.
AUX-PST.1SG want-INF contribute-INF=LOC
'I wanted to contribute to it.'

Positive imperatives regularly show enclisis (26a,b), while negative imperatives (in some situations these forms are actually subjunctives) usually show proclisis (26c,d), again with a few exceptions (26e):

(26)
a. Sp. Di=lo! Dígan=lo! Digámos=lo!
b. Fr. Dis=le! Dites=le! Disons=le!
say-IMP.2SG=it say-IMP.2PL=it say-IMP.1PL=it
'Say it, let's say it!'
c. Sp. No lo=digas! No lo=digamos!
NEG it=say-IMP.2SG NEG it=say-IMP.1PL
d. Fr. Ne le=dis pas! Ne le=disons pas!
NEG it=say-IMP.2SG NEG NEG it=say-IMP.1PL NEG
'Don't say it, let's not say it.'

e. Québécois, Colloquial French
Dis=le pas! Disons=le pas!
say-IMP.2SG=it NEG say-IMP.1PL=it NEG
'Don't say it, let's not say it.'

The Italian imperatives present a mixed case, with enclisis in affirmative imperatives as in French and Spanish above, but mixed proclisis and enclisis with negative imperatives (27):[25]

(27) It. a. Non dir=lo! Non diciamo=lo!
NEG say-INF=it NEG say-IMP.1PL=it
b. Non lo=dire! Non lo=diciamo!
NEG it=say-INF NEG it=say-IMP.1PL
'Don't say it, let's not say it!'

The normal position for clitics is of course "outside" finite verbal morphology, but in some vernacular varieties of Spanish, the formal imperative third person plural verbal morpheme *-n* can be found "doubled" after a clitic, as in (28a) and in some cases this "outside" *-n* can replace the normal verbal morpheme "inside" the clitic, as in (28b).

(28) Vernacular Sp.[26] a. Siénten=se-n! vs Sp. siénten=se!
sit-IMP.3PL=REFL-3PL sit-IMP.3PL=REFL
b. Siénte=se -n!
sit-IMP=REFL-3.PL
'Sit down!' (plural)

This phenomenon is particularly common following *se*, but can also occur with other clitics in some varieties. Harris/Halle (2005) analyze such forms as 'Kopy' (28a) or Verbal Inflection Metathesis (28b), which in turn are seen as cases of either full or partial reduplication in a Distributed Morphology framework (see Halle/Marantz 1993). They do not however extend their account to cover cases where plural *-n* inflection occurs after pronouns which are encliticized to nonfinite forms such as infinitives (29a) or gerundives (29b) (Harris/Halle 2005, 213–214), although Pato/Heap (2012) show that in Spain the dialects which allow structures like (29a) are a subset of those which allow (28a,b):

25 There is also proclisis with formal affirmative imperatives *Lo dica! Lo dicano!*, but as Russi (2008, 64) points out, these can be considered subjunctive, i.e., finite forms.

26 As Harris/Halle (2005, 196, note 2), "Examples of this sort are documented in regions of Spain and every Latin American country as well as in dialects of contemporary Ladino (diaspora Judeo-Spanish)."

(29) Vernacular Sp.[27]
a. Quieren ver=me-n.
want-PRS.3PL see.INF=1SG-3PL
'They want to see me.'
b. Están besándo=se-n.
are-3PL kissing=3REFL-3PL
'They are kissing each other.'

These nonstandard Spanish constructions are somewhat reminiscent of cases of mesoclisis in European Portuguese, where one or more clitics can appear after a verb stem but before future or conditional morphology:

(30) EPt. Mostrar=t=o-emos.
show.FUT=2SG.DAT=3MSG.ACC-1PL
'We will show it to you.'

With compound tenses, on the whole, the overall trend follows the generalization of proclisis to the finite verb.

(31) a. Sp. Lo=he visto.
b. It. L=ho visto.
it=have.1SG see.PTCP
'I saw it.'

In Standard French and Italian, proclitics are among the class of preverbal nominal objects which can trigger past participle agreement (see also ↗3 Objects, and ↗7 Auxiliaries).[28]

(32) a. Fr. La pomme, je l=ai mise sur la table.
the.F apple I it=have.1SG put.PTCP.F on the.F table.
b. It. La mela, l=ho messa sulla tavola.
the.F apple it=have.1SG put.PTCP.F on-the.F table.
'The apple, I put it on the table.'

Romanian, where there is no participle agreement, follows the general pattern of clitics preceding the auxiliary, but with one idiosyncratic exception, the feminine singular object clitic, which instead follows the past participle:

27 Vernacular forms found in a number of Peninsular Spanish varieties (Pato/Heap 2012).

28 According to Tsakali/Anagnostopoulou (2008), there is a correlation between clitic doubling and agreement of past participles, such that if a language has clitic doubling, it lacks participle agreement, and if a language has participle agreement, it lacks clitic doubling. They propose that this correlation "provides the key to an understanding of the clitic doubling parameter" (2008, 322).

(33) Rom. a. L=am văzut.
3MSG.ACC=have-PRS.1SG see-PTCP
'I saw him.'
b. Am văzut=o.
have-PRS.1SG see-PTCP=her.ACC
'I saw her.'

Piedmontese clitic "inversion" (Wanner 1987a; Parry 1997) provides another example of exceptional clitic placement in compound tenses (34a), as does clitic placement under negation in Albidona Calabrian (34b) (Manzini/Savoia 2008).

(34) a. Piedmontese
Ha tirato=mi un sasso.
have-PRS.3SG throw-PTCP=me a stone.
vs Italian
Mi=ha tirato un sasso.
me=have-PRS.3SG throw-PTCP a stone.
'S/he threw a stone at me.'
b. Calabrian
[ɔ llə=ddʒ u=βistə]
NEG him=have-PRS.1SG him=see-PTCP
'I have not seen him.'

French is also distinct from other Romance languages in having fixed-form presentational structures which are derived from verbal proclisis as in (35a), while the Spanish (35b) and Italian (35c) equivalents attest enclisis from earlier stages of the language:

(35) a. Fr. Me=voici. Me=voilà.
me=here.is me=there.is
'Here I am. There I am.'
b. Sp. He=me aquí.
here.is=me here.
c. It. Ecco=mi.
here.is=me
'Here I am.'

3.3 Clitic clusters

When more than one pronoun is cliticized to the same verb, the clitics usually appear in a fixed order. In most cases, this fixed order is the same in both proclisis and enclisis, as in Spanish and Catalan (36a,b,c,d). In Standard French (36e,f) the order is

reversed in enclisis, but not in Québec French and some varieties of Colloquial French (36g):

(36) a. Sp. Se=me=lo=ha podido llevar.
b. Cat. Se=m=ho =va poder endur.
REFL=me.DAT=it.ACC=AUX-3SG can(-PTCP) take.away-INF
'S/he was able to take it away from me.'
c. Sp. Ha podido llevár=se=me=lo.
d. Cat. Va poder endur=se=m=ho.
AUX.3SG can-(PTCP) take.away-INF=REFL=me.DAT=it.ACC
'S/he was able to take it away from me.'
e. Fr. Elle me=les=envoie.
she me.DAT=them.ACC=send-PRS.3SG
f. Fr. Envoie=les=moi!
send-IMP=them.ACC=me.DAT
'She sends them to me. Send them to me!'
g. Québec French
Envoie=moi=les!
send-IMP=me.DAT=them.ACC
'Send them to me!'

Since at least Perlmutter (1971), this (largely) fixed order has been described in terms of a morphological "template" with slots for each clitic or class of clitics. This approach corresponds to the recognition that the order of clitics in a cluster cannot be determined solely by syntactic roles, since it is typically sensitive to morphological features (person, number, etc.) as well. This leads to the template or "output condition on clitic pronouns" proposed by Perlmutter (1971, 45) for Spanish clitic pronouns, where II, I and III represent grammatical persons:

(37) Surface structure constraint for Spanish clitic pronouns:
se II I III

As Perlmutter (1971, 51) shows, this template allows the sequences in (38) but filters out any sequence of clitics which is not ordered according to the template, as in (39):

(38) Sp. a. Se=me=le=perdió el pasaporte al niño.
REFL=me.DAT=it.M.DAT=lost-3SG the passport to.the boy
'The boy's passport went missing on me. / I lost the boy's passport.'
b. Nuestra finca, te=nos=la=robaste.
our.F farm you.DAT=us.DAT=it.F.ACC=robbed-2SG
'You stole our farm from us.'

c. Te=le=comiste el pan, pero a mí
you.DAT=him.DAT=ate-2SG the bread but to me
no te=me=lo=comas.
NEG you.DAT=me.DAT=it.ACC=eat-IMP
'You ate his bread up, but don't eat mine up as well.'

(39) Sp. a. *Se=le=me=perdió el pasaporte al niño.
REFL=it.M.DAT=me.DAT=lost-3SG the passport to.the boy
'The boy's passport went missing on me. / I lost the boy's passport.'
b. *Nuestra finca, la=te=nos=robaste.
our.F farm it.F.ACC=you.DAT=us.DAT=robbed-2SG
'You stole our farm from us.'
c. *Le=te=comiste el pan, pero a mí
him.DAT= you.DAT=ate-2SG the bread but to me
no lo=me=te=comas.
NEG it.M.ACC=me.DAT=you.DAT=eat.IMP
'You ate his bread up, but don't eat mine up as well.'

In some cases, such as French and Occitan, case distinctions also play a role, but in all cases morphological features come into play as well. The equivalent template for French, from Perlmutter (1971, 57), relies on specific clitic forms, except for third person clitics, where reference to grammatical function (accusative vs dative in third person) is necessary:

(40) French Template:

Nominative	*ne*	*me/te/nous/vous/se*	III ACC	III DAT	*y*	*en*

Note however that in some regional varieties of French, the order for third person clitics can differ from the standard one described in (40), and the order DAT-ACC is also attested, even if less frequent (see Avanzi/Stark 2016). Clusters of two third person clitics often present challenges for templates, as their order can vary, one or the other can be deleted, or the two can be combined into another opaque form, in regional French (Heap/Kaminskaïa 2001) as in other Romance varieties.

In Occitan we find both orders: third person dative followed by third person accusative in some dialects, and third person accusative followed by third person dative in others. Often one or the other can be omitted.

For Italian clitics, Vincent (1988, 291) gives the following relative order:

(41) Italian Template

1SG	3SG/PL (DAT)	2PL	2SG	1PL	REFL	3SG/PL	IMPERS	PART
mi	*gli* (m.) *le* (f)	*vi*	*ti*	*ci*	*si*	*lo*, *la*, *li*, *le*	*si*	*ne*

This template in fact requires a number of stipulations in interpretation (Wanner 1987a, 423–424). In addition, the third person plural clitic *loro* always follows verbal expressions (Wanner 1987a, 425), not clustering with other clitics.

There have been decades of debate with arguments in favor of and opposed to a filter or template-based approach (summarized in Heap/Roberge 2001; see also Goldbach 2007 for a review and a Distributed Morphology treatment of French preverbal clitics using impoverishment and filters; and e.g. Heger 1966, Bossong 2003 for treatments of clitic objects in e.g. French, Spanish and Romanian as "object conjugation"). Templates have been criticized as purely descriptive devices which do not motivate clitic orders in any way, and do not predict why a given order should be allowed while others are filtered out. Alternative approaches which attempt to derive the order of clitic clusters from syntactic movements have never been entirely successful either (Kayne 1975; Uriagereka 1995; Heap/Roberge 2001).

In the Optimality Theory framework, constraints of the ALIGN family have been used to describe possible clitic orderings (Grimshaw 2001; Gerlach 2002; Anderson 2005). But again, without underlying principles which explain why one order should be preferred or ranked higher than another, such mechanisms remain purely descriptive. Some authors have proposed that the internal order of clitic sequences reflects the relative morphological markedness of the pronoun's internal featural makeup, from least to most specification (Harris 1995; Heap 2005), but this hypothesis has yet to be generalized and tested with a broad range of Romance clitic data. Other researchers (e.g. Sportiche 1996; Manzini/Savoia 2008) attempt to correlate clitic order with positions of different functional heads, but as in other cases these solutions are only partially satisfactory. When we consider the Romance languages as a whole, clitic clustering remains a puzzle: partial solutions appear promising in some areas but less than adequate in others. The robust generalization across the Romance family appears to be that the ordering of clusters cannot rely on syntactic information or on morphological features or specific phonological forms alone, but that clitic linearization must be able to access these different types of information at various times and in different ways.

While the overwhelming majority of clitic clusters appear with fixed orders, a certain number of Spanish varieties allow vernacular orders (42a) to appear variably alongside standard orders (42b), just for a subset of clitics:

(42) a. Vernacular Spanish[29]

Si	no	riego,	me=se=seca	todo.
if	NEG	water-PRS.1SG	me.DAT=REFL=dries-PRS.3SG	all

b. Standard Spanish

Si	no	riego,	se=me=seca	todo.
if	NEG	water-PRS.1SG	REFL=me.DAT=dries-PRS.3SG	all

'If I don't irrigate, everything dries up on me.'

Such variable orders occur in various vernacular varieties of Spanish and they affect a fairly small part of the clitic paradigm: just the order of the reflexive *se* with first singular and second singular clitics (*se me* / *me se*; *se te* / *te se*), but not for example with first plural and second plural clitics. These variable ordering data present serious challenges for syntactic movement, template or constraint-based accounts of clitic ordering, but an analysis using Feature Geometry allows for just the attested range of variation at least in these varieties (Heap 2005).

Opacity is a related phenomenon which arises when a sequence of underlying clitics produces a surface form which cannot be directly derived from the input. The most well-known example is the so-called "spurious *se*" (Perlmutter 1971) in Spanish, where a third person dative *le* or *les*, when followed in a cluster by a third person accusative *la*, *lo*, *las* or *los*, surfaces as *se*:

(43) Sp. a. Les=doy las flores.
them.DAT.3PL=give-PRS.1SG the.F.PL flowers
Se=las=doy.
REFL=them.ACC.F.PL=give-PRS.1SG
'I give the flowers to them. I give them to them.'

b. Las flores, a ellas, puedo
the.F.PL flowers to them.F.PL can-PRS.1SG
dár=se=las pronto.
give-INF=REFL=them.ACC.F.PL soon
'The flowers, to them, I can give them to them soon.'

While it may be the most (in)famous instance, spurious *se* is certainly not the only case of opacity amongst Romance clitic clusters. In Italian the sequence reflexive *si* + impersonal *si* becomes *ci si* (Wanner 1987a). Bonet (1991, 88) offers a striking Catalan example of clitic opacity, in which the combination of the neuter object clitic *ho* (44a) and the ablative clitic *en* (44b) does not produce what might appear to be the

29 These "inverted" or variable sequences are documented in a number of nonstandard Peninsular Spanish varieties (Heap 2005), and they have also been reported in various South American varieties as well.

combination of the two, **n'ho* (44c) but rather a cluster of completely different clitics, a third person direct object and locative *l'hi* (44d). Similarly, Soto-Corominas (2017) examines sequences of clitics which are transparent in Standard Catalan, combining a second-person object clitic with an inherent reflexive as in (44e), but are opaque in vernacular Central Catalan, where the equivalent nonstandard cluster has the first person reflexive *me* (which is recoverable because it shares the φ-features of the co-indexed subject) replaced by the default reflexive *se* as in (44f):

(44) Cat.
a. Això, ho=vaig treure de la caixa.
this it.NEUT.ACC=AUX.1SG take-INF from the.F box
'This, I took it out of the box.'
b. De la caixa, en=vaig treure això.
from the.F box ABL=AUX.1SG take-INF this
'Out of the box, I took this out.'
c. Això, de la caixa, *n=ho=vaig treure.
this from the.F box ABL=it.NEUT.ACC=AUX.1SG take-INF
d. Això, de la caixa, l=hi=vaig treure.
this from the.F box, it.3=LOC=AUX.1SG take-INF
'That, from the box, I took it out.'
e. Standard Cat.
Te=m=acosto.
2SG=REFL.1SG=approach-PRS.1SG
f. Central Cat.
Se=t=acosto.
REFL.3=2SG=approach-PRS.1SG
'I approach you.'

These sorts of data are among the evidence which leads Bonet to propose what has been called "Bonet's generalization" about surface opaque clitic sequences more generally:

(45) Bonet's generalization: "nontransparent output forms will have the same surface form as other clitics of the language instead of becoming an arbitrary phonological sequence." (1991, 2–3)[30]

30 The few exceptions to this otherwise fairly robust generalization include the historical predecessor of the spurious *se*. In Old Spanish this combination surfaces as *gelo*, *gela*, *gelos*, *gelas*, where the first element *ge-* /ʒe/ does not correspond to anything else in the grammar (it is a phonetic reflex of the corresponding Latin pronoun ILLI(S) in this position, before another clitic). Significantly, this outlier form did not survive, but instead was replaced by *se*, another clitic existing in the system (not the result of any regular sound change), thus bringing it into line with Bonet's generalization (see Heap 2005).

In a number of Spanish dialects, the standard "spurious *se*" construction has vernacular variants in which the plural feature of an underlying indirect object surfaces instead of the direct object clitic *los*, despite its singular antecedent:

(46) Vernacular Spanish[31]

El	libro,	a	los	chicos,	se=los=doy.
the	book	to	the.M.PL	boys	REFL=them.M.PL=give-PRS.1SG

'The book, to the boys, I give it.'

Even more surprising, in a subset of these varieties it is not only the plural feature that can transfer from one clitic to another, but also the feminine gender:

(47) Vernacular Spanish

El	libro,	a	las	chicas,	se=las=doy.
the	book	to	the.F.PL	girls	REFL=them.F.PL=give-PRS.1SG

'The book, to the girls, I give it.'

Harris/Halle (2005) see phenomena like (46) and (47) as outside their Distributed Morphology analysis, since in this case the plural *-s* "moves" before Vocabulary Insertion, unlike the forms in (28a,b) above, which analyze as (fully or partially) reduplicative.

In addition to the constraints mentioned so far, there exist in a number of Romance languages morpho-syntactic filters that bar certain sequences of clitics, such as the well-known person case or *me lui* constraint (e.g., Bonet 1994), which bans sequences where first or second person clitics precede a third person dative clitic (see also the French and Italian Templates in (40) and (41) above).

4 Subject clitics

4.1 Typology of subject clitics across Romance

While all Romance languages display a full paradigm of strong pronouns (see Tables 3, 4, 5), most of them lack a full paradigm of clitic pronouns in subject position. Strong subject pronouns are usually optional and grammatical person is normally marked by the (rich) verbal morphology as shown in Table 6:[32]

31 See note 29.

32 Note that Swiss Rhaeto-Romance stands out here since (strong) subject pronouns are almost always obligatory although the language possesses quite strong verbal morphology (see Haiman 1988). These varieties reportedly also have inverted subject clitics or particles, especially in interrogation and other V2 contexts, that do not directly correspond to a preverbal particle in form or regularity. These elements

Table 6: Present indicative of verb 'to speak', showing no obligatory subjects

	Italian	Spanish	Catalan	(European) Portuguese	Romanian	Nissart (Occitan dialect)
P1	*parlo*	*hablo*	*parlo*	*falo*	*vorbesc*	*parli*
P2	*parli*	*hablas*	*parles*	*falas*	*vorbeşti*	*parles*
P3	*parla*	*habla*	*parla*	*fala*	*vorbeşte*	*parla*
P4	*parliamo*	*hablamos*	*parlem*	*falamos*	*vorbim*	*parlan/-èn*
P5	*parlate*	*habláis*	*parleu*	*falais*	*vorbiţi*	*parlas/-ès*
P6	*parlano*	*hablan*	*parlen*	*falam*	*vorbesc*	*parlon*

As shown in ↗2 Subjects, the verbal endings in these languages seem to be sufficient to distinguish the persons, at least for this mood-tense (present indicative). Indeed, in other mood-tenses, such as the imperfect or the subjunctive, the verbal endings can display syncretisms and a strong subject pronoun can be inserted in the subject position in order to specify the person (e.g., It. *che io parli*, *che tu parli*, *che egli/ella parli*, Sp. *que yo hable*, *que él/ella hable*, EPt. *que eu fale*, *que ele/ela fale*, etc.). Moreover, the gender for P3 is not marked by the verbal ending and again, speakers can resort to a strong pronoun if they want to disambiguate the form (It. *che egli/lui parli*, *che ella/lei parli*). In the generative tradition, the observation that overt subject agreement morphology tends to correlate with the optionality of overt subject pronouns is attributed to Taraldsen's Generalization (1980), though Chomsky (1981; 1982) is often cited as a source for the hypothesis of a Null Subject Parameter (see below).

By contrast, other Romance languages, most notably Standard French, display a full paradigm of subject clitic pronouns (see Table 3). In Standard French, these elements are obligatory, unless a full referential nominal phrase or a strong referential pronoun occupies the subject position ((48a) vs (48b)). Consequently, (48c) without dislocation of the first subject, is ungrammatical in this system.

(48) Fr. a. *(Il) parle.
he speak-PRS.3SG
'He speaks.'

b. Tom / Lui / Le professeur parle.
Tom him the teacher speak-PRS.3SG
'Tom/He/The teacher speaks.'

are formally distinct from the preverbal subject clitics and cannot just be derived via syntactic inversion (Dieter Wanner, p.c.).

c. *Tom il parle.
Tom he speak-PRS.3SG
'Tom he speaks.'

This division between languages that require the presence of a subject (either a pronoun or a noun phrase) and those that do not is postulated to reflect the "Null Subject Parameter" or "Pro-drop Parameter" said to distinguish "Non Null Subject Languages" (NNSL) like Standard French from "Null Subject Languages" (NSL) like Italian (Perlmutter 1971; Chomsky 1981; 1982; Rizzi 1982).[33] Safir (1985), Wanner (1993) and Heap (2000) among others argue that the various properties this "parameter" is claimed to "bundle" together do not in fact constitute a unified grammatical phenomenon.

The parameter is generally conceived of as binary. However both values can appear in the history of a given language (e.g., Adams 1987; Vance 1997; Kaiser 2009, for French). In such cases, transitions from one value to the other are obviously not sudden, and the progressive change can be evidenced by the intermediate stages represented by the dialects. In fact, apart from the clear-cut distinction between NSLs, located in the South of the Romance area, and NNSLs, in the North, a number of Romance systems display frequent subject pronouns but not for all persons, nor all moods or tenses or all syntactic contexts. Many scholars have studied the behavior of these varieties, notably of the Northern Italian Dialects (henceforth "NIDs", see among others Renzi/Vanelli 1983; Rizzi 1986; Brandi/Cordin 1989; Renzi 1992; Poletto 1995; 1999; 2000; Manzini/Savoia 2005), the Northern Occitan Dialects (henceforth "NODs", see Heap 2000; 2002a; Oliviéri 2010; 2011; Kaiser/Oliviéri/Palasis 2013; Oliviéri/Lai/Heap 2014; Oliviéri/Lai/Heap 2017) or Franco-Provençal (see Diémoz 2007; Hinzelin/Kaiser 2012), where different configurations are observed.[34]

Firstly, when broken down by the Person feature (P1 through P6), subject clitic paradigms can show from one to almost all clitics, as shown in Table 7.[35]

33 See ↗2 Subjects.

34 For a complete presentation of the Brazilian pronoun system, see ↗2 Subjects.

35 Unless otherwise indicated, all the examples in this section are from Manzini/Savoia (2005) and from the THESOC database (Dalbera et al. 1992–).

Table 7: Subject paradigms in northern Italian Dialects (NIDs) and northern Occitan Dialects (NODs)

	NIDs			NODs		
	Chioggia	Tende	Firenze	St-Sauves d'Auvergne	Vélines	St-Pardoux-la-Rivière
	to sleep	*to sing*	*to sleep*	*to be*	*to be*	*to be*
P1	'dɔrmɔ	'kantu	(e) 'dɔrmo	jo se	sej	sø
P2	ti 'dɔrmi	ti 'kanta	tu d'dɔrmi	si	te ʃɛʲ	ty se
P3m	a 'dɔrme	aɻ 'kanta	e 'dɔrme	e	ej	u e
P3f	la 'dɔrme	a 'kanta	la 'dorme	e	ej	l e
P4	dor'mimo	kan'tamu	e si 'dɔrme	sɔ̃	sɔ̃	nu sũ
P5	dor'mi	kan'tai	vu ddor'mihe	si	bu ʃej	vu se
P6m	i 'dɔrme	li 'kantaⁿ	e 'dɔrmano	sɔ̃	sɔ̃	i sũ
P6f	le 'dɔrme	le 'kantaⁿ	le 'dɔrmano	'sɔ̃	sɔ̃	la sũ
it rains	'pjɔve	aɻ 'tʃou	e 'ɸjɔve	kwɔ plø	plɛɔ	kɔ plɔ

Secondly, the data in Table 7 (last row) indicate that expletives can be present or not in meteorological constructions (Kaiser/Oliviéri/Palasis 2013; Oliviéri/Lai/Heap 2014). Thirdly, at least for NODs, the clitic has not yet become completely obligatory, hence the contrasts in (49), where forms with and without subject clitics coexist in the same grammar:

(49) a. Eyvirat
[**j**=a'bite dɛ̃ la ʁy 'a a ku 'tɑ]
I=live-PRS.1SG in the street at side
[aˈbite dɛ̃ la ʁy'a da kuˈtɑ]
live-PRS.1SG in the street at side
'I live in the next street.'

b. Bugeat
[**kɔ**=ˈpløu]
that=rain-PRS.3SG
[ˈpløu]
rain-PRS.3SG
'It rains.'

Fourthly, in many NIDs, the subject clitic (50a) can or must double referential noun phrases like (50b) and indefinites (50c):

(50) a. Pigna
[eɾ u=ˈdɔɾme]
him he=sleep-PRS.3SG
'He sleeps.'

b. Firenze
[la mi fiʎˈʎola la=sˈtudja ˈθrɔppo]
the my daughter she=study-PRS.3SG too much
'My daughter studies too much.'

c. Grizzo
[niˈsun al=ˈveŋ]
nobody he=come-PRS.3SG
'Nobody comes.'

There are many research questions still to be investigated regarding partial subject paradigms, particularly in under-studied vernacular varieties, but it seems clear that reducing the presence or absence of subjects to a single binary parameter is not a descriptively adequate approach.

4.2 The status of subject clitics

The question of the morpho-syntactic status of subject clitics is a longstanding one. Indeed, while the term "clitic" refers in principle to a phonological property, these elements can be analyzed as syntactic arguments (Kayne 1975; Rizzi 1986; De Cat 2005; Roberts 2010) or as morphological agreement markers (Roberge 1990; Auger 1995; Culbertson 2010).[36] The debate is very vigorous, in particular with respect to French, where both analyses compete. Under the latter analysis, some authors consider French to have become a null subject language once again, with subject clitics reanalyzed as inflectional prefixes (Roberge 1990).

Throughout the years, key studies on standard and dialectal systems have devised criteria in order to assess the morpho-syntactic status of these subject clitics (e.g. Kayne 1975; Zwicky/Pullum 1983; Rizzi 1986; Auger 1994; Poletto 2000, 15–30). These properties are synthesized in Table 8:

36 See Section 4.3 on their emergence.

Table 8: Criteria for the morpho-syntactic status of clitics

	Property	Tests	Syntactic argument	Morphological marker
(i)	Obligatory clitic	α: coordination β: doubling	–	+
(ii)	Fixed preverbal position	γ: interrogation	–	+
(iii)	No intervening elements between clitic and verb	δ: negation	–	+

Property (i) focuses on the contexts of appearance of the clitic, i.e., coordination (test α) and doubling (test β). An agreement marker, unlike a syntactic argument, should always appear in both these contexts. Property (ii) hinges upon the placement of the clitic with regard to the verb in interrogative structures (test γ). An agreement marker should remain preverbal, whatever the position of the verb. Finally, Property (iii) concentrates on the type of constituents found between the clitic and the verb. Only other agreement markers can intervene between the verb and an agreement marker, which excludes intervening negative markers (test δ).

Recent research on micro-variation in Romance dialects and oral French helped shed new light on this controversial point, since it now appears that the status of the clitic is not the same in all the different systems.

4.2.1 Dialects: NIDs and NODs

Italian scholars generally agree that subject clitics in the various NIDs are morphological affixes or agreement markers in these languages (see among others Renzi/Vanelli 1983; Rizzi 1986; Brandi/Cordin 1989; Renzi 1992; Poletto 1993; 1995; 2000; Manzini/Savoia 2005).[37] More precisely, Poletto (1999; 2000) proposes that the subject clitics are different functional heads in the inflectional domain. The facts on which their conclusions rely are illustrated in (51), where the NIDs are submitted to the different tests listed above. The clitic is obligatorily present (tests α and β), even with an indefinite pronoun like *nobody*, it is always preverbal (test γ) and cannot be separated from the verb by the negative marker (test δ).

37 However, for an alternative analysis, see Cardinaletti/Repetti (2010).

(51) The NIDs

(α) Obligatory clitic?: coordination

Trento

La=magna	pan	e	*(la)	beve	vin.
she=eat-PRS.3SG	bread	and	she	drink-PRS.3SG	wine

'She eats bread and (she) drinks wine.' (Poletto 1993)

(β) Obligatory clitic?: doubling

a. Fontanigorda

[a=maˈria *(a)=ˈduɔrme]
the=Maria she=sleep-PRS.3SG
'Mary sleeps.'

b. Pozzaglio

[niˈsøn *(i)=ˈdorma]
nobody he=sleep-PRS.3SG
'Nobody sleeps.'

(γ) Fixed preverbal position?: interrogation

Airole

[ke ˈlibru ty=ˈvøi]
what book you=want-PRS.2SG
'What book do you want?'

(δ) Intervening elements between clitic and verb?: negative markers

Longare

[non te=ˈðɔrmi]
NEG you=sleep-PRS.2SG
'You do not sleep.'

Contrastively, the same tests all turn out negative when applied to the NODs (see (52), details in Oliviéri 2015). Indeed, tests α and β show that clitic subjects can be omitted in coordinated structures and with referential subject noun phrases. Moreover, the clitic can be manipulated by a syntactic operation, since it is either preverbal or postverbal (test γ reveals that the two constructions alternate freely), and it can be separated from the verb by the negative marker in dialects which display a preverbal negative marker (test δ).

(52) The NODs

(α) Obligatory clitic?: coordination

a. Sencenac

ju=me=sjˈet	a	ˈtawlɔ	e	ju=eˈpɛre	lo	ʃuˈpa]	
I=REFL.1.SG=sit-PRS.1SG	at	table	and	I=wait-PRS.1SG	the	dinner	

b. Faux-Mazuras
[i=meˈsicie a ˈtablə e aˈtɛ̃de la suˈpo]
I=REFL.1.SG=sit-PRS.1SG at table and wait-PRS.1SG the soup
'I sit down at the table and I wait for the dinner.'

c. Sencenac
[ty=riˈzja e paʁˈlaj tu lø tɛ̃]
you=laugh-PST.2SG and speak-PST.2SG all the time

d. Biras
[ty=riˈʒja e pɛrˈlavi tu lø tɛ̃]
you=laugh-PST.2SG and speak-PST.2SG all the time
'You laughed and spoke all the time.'

(β) Obligatory clitic?: doubling
No occurrence of this construction has been found in the NODs.

(γ) Fixed preverbal position?: interrogation

a. La Chassagne
[ki kø ty=sɛ]
who that you=be-PRS.2SG
[ki sɛj=ty]
who be-PRS.2SG=you
'Who are you?'

b. Faux-Mazuras
[ˈkaw tɛ̃ fɛ=ko]
what weather do-PRS.3SG=that
[ˈkau tɛ̃ ka=ˈfɛ̆]
what weather that=do-PRS.3SG
'What is the weather like?'

(δ) Intervening elements between clitic and verb?: negative markers

a. La Chassagne
[i n=ɑ̃ saˈbɛ̃ ʁɛ]
he NEG=of-it know-PRS.3SG nothing
'He does not know anything about that.'

b. Sorges
[kɒ nø pˈlɔŭ pa]
that NEG rain-PRS.3SG NEG
'It does not rain.'

Therefore, unlike the NIDs and despite the fact that they only constitute partial paradigms, the NODs' subject clitics behave like syntactic arguments. The obvious variability of these elements' status among languages leads us to reconsider the

longstanding controversy about other languages like French, taking into account the different systems coexisting in this language.

4.2.2 The case of French

The debate around the status of subject clitics in French is lively. A central problem arises from the fact that "French" does not constitute a uniform and unique system worldwide, but manifold systems incorrectly called just "French" in a simplifying way (in Quebec, Ontario, Switzerland, Belgium, various African countries, as well as in different regions of Metropolitan and Overseas France). It is thus not possible to establish a single status for these elements and so different analyses are proposed, depending on the variety considered.

Another confusion concerns the French spoken in France, conflating Standard French and Colloquial French. Indeed, the two varieties do not behave identically, in particular with respect to subject clitics (Lambrecht 1981; Renzi 1992; Blanche-Benveniste 1994; 2003; Zribi-Hertz 1994; 2011; Auger 1995; Cabredo Hofherr 2004; Culbertson 2010; Roberts 2010; Massot 2010; Palasis 2013; 2015). Recent analyses lead to the diglossic hypothesis following Ferguson's (1959) original work according to which speakers manage two distinct grammars when confronted with a diglossic situation (here between Colloquial and Standard French). Applying the above-mentioned tests to acquisition data, Palasis (2015) proposes that the subject clitics behave like agreement markers in the initial, colloquial grammar and like syntactic arguments in the second, standard grammar.

Concerning criterion (i), the clitic is always present in Colloquial French in coordination (53a) and with a full nominal phrase (53b,c,d), while it is not in Standard French (53a',b',c',d'). Moreover (53a) shows that the form of the third singular masculine clitic is not the same in both systems. In Standard French, it is always *il*, while in Colloquial French, there are two allomorphs: *il* before a vowel and *i* before a consonant. As a result, a sentence like **Tom il dort* is definitively ungrammatical, since it would be either *Tom i dort* in Colloquial French or *Tom*, *il dort* in Standard French, with a left dislocation of the noun phrase *Tom*.

(53) Two Grammars: obligatory clitic?

(α) Coordination

a.	CollFr.[38]	I=dort	et	*(i)=rêve.
a'.	StFr.	Il=dort	et	(il)=rêve.
		he=sleep-PRS.3SG	and	(he)=dream-PRS.3SG
		'He sleeps and (he) dreams.'		

38 The Colloquial French examples are from Palasis (2012).

(β) Doubling

b. CollFr. L' escargot i=dort.
the snail he=sleep-PRS.3SG
'The snail sleeps.'

c. CollFr. Lui i=s=appelle Raphaël.
him he=REFL.3=call-PRS.3SG Raphaël
'Him, his name is Raphael.'

d. CollFr. Personne i=m=l=a dit.
nobody he=me.DAT=it.ACC=has tell-PTCP
'Nobody told me that.'

b'. StFr. Il/Tom/Lui dort.
he/Tom/him sleep-PRS.3SG
'He/Tom sleeps.'

c'. StFr. Tom/Lui, il=dort.
Tom/him he=sleep-PRS.3SG
'Tom/him, he sleeps.'

d'. StFr. *Personne, il=dort.
nobody he=sleep-PRS.3SG
'Nobody sleeps.'

The test γ for criterion (ii) shows the same contrast between Colloquial and Standard French, since the clitic is always preverbal in Colloquial French (54a), while it can be postverbal in Standard French (54b).

(54) Two Grammars: fixed preverbal position?
(γ: interrogation)

a. CollFr. Où elle=est la voiture?
where she-be-PRS.3SG the.F car

b. StFr. Où est-elle la voiture?
where be-PRS.3SG=she the.F car
'Where is the car?'

Finally, test δ for criterion (iii) reveals that there is no preverbal negative marker in Colloquial French, hence no intervening syntactic head between the clitic and the verb (55a). On the contrary, with the introduction of the preverbal *ne* in Standard French, the subject clitic can be separated from the verb and the third person singular masculine clitic displays the allomorph *il* although it is before a consonant (55b).

(55) Two Grammars: intervening elements between clitic and verb?
(δ: negation)

a. CollFr. I=pleure plus.
he=cry-PRS.3SG anymore

b. StFr. Il=ne=pleure plus.
he=NEG=cry-PRS.3SG anymore
'He does not cry anymore.'

All these tests reveal that if subject clitics are indeed syntactic arguments in Standard French, they behave as morphological agreement markers in Colloquial French, which is then a Null Subject Language. In this perspective, Quebec and Swiss French are then similar to Colloquial French (Roberge 1990; Auger 1995; Fonseca-Greber 2000), while Belgian French described in De Cat (2002; 2007) is more like Standard French. Related matters, such as the status of intervening object and adverbial clitics, interrogative and relative pronouns, are dealt with in Auger (1994) and Palasis (2015).

4.3 A progressive emergence

Both dialectal and colloquial data of French varieties suggest evidence in favor of a diachronic change that leads progressively from a NSL (Latin) to a NNSL (French) then back to a NSL (Colloquial French), with intermediary stages. Thus, subject clitics in contemporary Romance languages are at different stages of the "cline of grammaticality" as described by Hopper/Traugott (1993), see also Lehman (1985): content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix (see Table 9). During this grammaticalization process, the personal pronoun – which is initially a full nominal phrase, a "personal substantive" according to Tesnière (1959), thus an argument – first becomes a phonological clitic and then acquires the status of a morphological agreement marker. The first step of this emergence might be in subordinate clauses (in the subjunctive mood) in the NIDs, where even NSLs like Italian or Spanish introduce a

Table 9: The successive stages of subject clitic grammaticalization

	Languages	Full paradigm	Phonologically cliticized	Syntactic argument
stage 1	NSL (Italian, Southern Occitan, Spanish, ...)		–	+
stage 2	NODs and Old French	–	+	+
stage 3	Standard French, Belgian French	+	+	+
stage 4	NIDs	–/+	+	–
stage 5	Colloquial French, Quebec French	+	+	–

strong pronoun, or the meteorological subject *ko* in the NODs (Oliviéri/Lai/Heap 2017). Then the mechanism can spread to other contexts, and gradually generalize to constitute a (partial or full) paradigm, these elements becoming clitics. The last stage is illustrated by the change of status of the clitics, which can finally become verbal affixes or agreement markers.

Additionally, in grammars displaying partial paradigms of subject clitics, the order of appearance of the clitics is also controversial. First, from the observation of NIDs, Renzi/Vanelli (1983) established the following generalization, where the subject clitics successively emerge depending on the verbal person (56):

(56) P2 > P3 > P6 > P5 > P4 > P1

However, this progression does not hold for other systems such as the NODs (where P3 or P1 can appear first) and it has been successively refined by Heap (2000; 2002a), Cabredo Hofherr (2004), Kaiser/Oliviéri/Palasis (2013) and Oliviéri (2010; 2011), the latter proposing an analysis based upon the progressive introduction of features (57) which incorporates observations of the acquisition of subject clitics in Colloquial French:

(57) [person] > [speaker] > [plural] > [feminine]

It appears then that this progression cannot be formulated in terms of the emergence of pronouns but rather the introduction of features based on distinctive oppositions (for an alternative analysis within a Feature Geometry framework, see also Oliviéri/Lai/Heap 2017).

5 Clitics and negation

Many Romance languages display preverbal negative markers. These preverbal markers can surface either alone, as in Italian, Spanish, Catalan, (European) Portuguese, Romanian, Galician, some Italian and Occitan dialects, and varieties of eastern Rhaeto-Romance, or along with a postverbal marker, as in Standard French and some Occitan (Oliviéri/Sauzet 2016) or Italian dialects (Zanuttini 1997). Interestingly, different relative orders are observed when these preverbal markers occur with preverbal subject and/or object clitics.

Indeed, in some varieties preverbal negative markers precede all complement clitics (58a), whereas in others they follow them (58b) (Zanuttini 1997, 18–19). Tasmowski/Reinheimer (2001, 328) further point out that (European) Portuguese also permits a clitic to be separated from its verbal host by the negation *não* which is considered a stressed form (58c).

(58) a. Sp. Maria no se=lo=dio.
Maria NEG REFL=3SG.M.ACC=give-PST.3SG
'Maria did not give it to her/him/it/herself.'

b. Cairese (Northwestern Italy)
U mi=n sent nent.
he me.ACC=NEG hear-PRS.3SG NEG
'He does not hear me.'

c. EPt. Descubro uma coisa de que me=não
discover-PRS.1SG a thing of which REFL.1SG=NEG
lembrava já.
recall-PST.1SG anymore
'I discover something which I no longer remembered.'

The linear order also varies according to person and type of clitic. Some negative markers precede all complement clitics, whereas others follow first- and second-person complement clitics and reflexives (CL-1), but precede third-person, locative and partitive clitics (CL-2). Thus Zanuttini (1997, 21) suggests that complement clitics and preverbal negative markers each have two possible structural positions, i.e., Neg-1 CL-1 Neg-2 CL-2. In this framework, the preverbal markers which can negate by themselves are always in the highest position (e.g., Italian *non*), whereas the others ("the weak negative markers") can be in either Neg-1 or Neg-2 (e.g., French proclitic *ne* or Cairese enclitic *n*).

The facts are equally intricate when it comes to languages which also display subject clitics, e.g., NIDs and French. On the one hand, the NID preverbal negative marker can surface either higher or lower than the subject clitic (Poletto 2000), as exemplified in (59). This relative position therefore became one of the tests (along with coordination and inversion, as mentioned in Section 4.2) that led Poletto (2000) to hypothesize four different positions for subject clitics, i.e., invariable and deictic clitics located in the CP field, and number and person clitics in the lower IP field.

(59) Ligurian (Cosseria)
I=n=te=n=dan nent u libru.
3PL.NOM=NEG=2SG.DAT=NEG=give-PRS.3PL NEG the book
'They do not give you the book.'

Parry (1997, 251) points out that these multiple negative markers are also sensitive to person distinctions: the second negative marker only occurs with first person singular, second person singular and third person reflexive object clitics.

On the other hand, French displays no optionality with regard to ordering, since the preverbal negative marker always follows the subject clitic and precedes the other clitics. Nevertheless, the presence or the absence of the preverbal negative marker has served for a while now (at least since Ashby 1977) as an uncontroversial indicator of

the register/grammar a French speaker is using, and more recently as a more controversial indicator of the morpho-syntactic status of the subject clitic (details in Section 4.2.2).

6 Conclusion

As should be clear from the (necessarily constrained) overview presented in this chapter, the term clitic covers a highly heterogeneous range of phenomena. Even limiting ourselves to just pronominal clitics, as we do here, it seems more useful to think of "clitic" as a descriptive cover term rather than a single, unified theoretical concept which can be rigorously defined (Wanner 1987b). That said, there are many strong trends and near-universals about clitic pronouns which are shared by almost all Romance languages. Recurring patterns in the forms of object clitic paradigms and their placement with respect to verbs are among the characteristics that give them all a recognizable Romance "family resemblance". As with all trends (and language families) there are always outliers that do not follow overall patterns. Understanding how exceptional cases fit into the wider panorama of Romance clitic phenomena is one of the important functions of an overview such as this one, which endeavors to paint as detailed a portrait of clitic pronouns across Romance languages as space allows. It is precisely these exceptions and the variability of clitic pronouns which make them so important to the study of this language family.

As an alternative to a single unified phenomenon defined by recurring patterns or parametric categories, we suggest that it is most helpful to view clitics and cliticization as a process (or a series of processes) in progress, with the grammars of individual varieties being situated at different points along a gradual cline.

7 References

Adams, Marianne (1987), *From Old French to the theory of pro-drop*, Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 5, 1–32.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2006), *Clitic doubling*, in: Martin Everaert/Henk van Riemsdijk (edd.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, Oxford, Blackwell, 519–581.

Anderson, Stephen R. (2005), *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Ashby, William J. (1977), *Clitic Inflection in French: A Historical Perspective*, Amsterdam, Rodopi.

Auger, Julie (1994), *Pronominal clitics in Québec Colloquial French: A morphological analysis*, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. dissertation.

Auger, Julie (1995), *Les clitiques pronominaux en français parlé informel: une approche morphologique*, Revue Québécoise de Linguistique 24, 13–60.

Avanzi, Mathieu/Stark, Elisabeth (2016), *A crowdsourcing approach to the description of regional variation in French clitic clusters*, Paper presented at *New Ways of Analyzing Syntactic Variation 2*, Ghent University, 19.–20.05.2016.

Bastida, Salvador (1976), *Restricciones de orden en las secuencias de clíticos del castellano: dos requisitos*, in: Víctor Sánchez de Zavala (ed.), *Estudios de gramática generativa*, Barcelona, Labor, 59–99.

Belletti, Adriana (1999), *Italian/Romance clitics: structure and derivation*, in: Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 543–579.

Blanche-Benveniste, Claire (1994), *Quelques caractéristiques grammaticales des "sujets" employés dans le français parlé des conversations*, in: Marina Yaguello (ed.), *Subjecthood and Subjectivity. Proceedings of the Colloquium "The Status of the Subject in Linguistic Theory"*, London, Ophrys, 77–107.

Blanche-Benveniste, Claire (2003), *Les formes grammaticales de réalisation des sujets et leur inégale représentation en français contemporain*, in: Jean-Marie Merle (ed.), *Le sujet*, Paris, Ophrys, 73–90.

Bonami, Olivier/Boyé, Gilles (2007), *French pronominal clitics and the design of Paradigm Function Morphology*, in: Geert Booij et al. (edd.), *Proceedings of the Fifth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting*, Bologna, University of Bologna, 291–322.

Bonet, Eulàlia (1991), *Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance Languages*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Bonet, Eulàlia (1994), *The person-case constraint: A morphological approach*, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 22, 33–52.

Bonet, Eulàlia (1995), *Feature structure of Romance clitics*, Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 13, 607–647.

Bonet, Eulàlia (2002), *Cliticització*, in: Joan Solà et al. (edd.), *Gramàtica del català contemporani*, vol. 1, Barcelona, Empúries, 933–989.

Borer, Hagit (1984), *Parametric Syntax: Case Studies in Semitic and Romance Languages*, Dordrecht, Foris.

Bossong, Georg (2003), *Nominal and/or verbal marking of central actants*, in: Giuliana Fiorentino (ed.), *Romance Objects: Transitivity in Romance Languages*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 17–48.

Brandi, Luciana/Cordin, Patrizia (1989), *Two Italian dialects and the null subject parameter*, in: Osvaldo Jaeggli/Kenneth Safir (edd.), *The Null Subject Parameter*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 111–142.

Cabredo Hofherr, Patricia (2004), *Les clitiques sujets du français et le paramètre du sujet nul*, Langue Française 141, 99–109.

Cardinaletti, Anna (1991), *On pronoun movement: the Italian dative "loro"*, Probus 3, 127–153.

Cardinaletti, Anna/Repetti, Lori (2010), *Proclitic vs enclitic pronouns in Northern Italian dialects and the null-subject parameter*, in: Roberta D'Alessandro/Adam Ledgeway/Ian Roberts (edd.), *Syntactic Variation: The Dialects of Italy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 119–134.

Cardinaletti, Anna/Starke, Michael (1999), *The typology of structural deficiency: a case study of the three classes of pronouns*, in: Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 145–233.

Chomsky, Noam (1981), *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht, Foris.

Chomsky, Noam (1982), *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Culbertson, Jennifer (2010), *Convergent evidence for categorial change in French: from subject clitic to agreement marker*, Language 86, 85–132.

Dalbera, Jean-Philippe, et al. (1992–), *Thesaurus Occitan, "THESOC"*, Univ. Nice Sophia Antipolis, CNRS, BCL, UMR 7320, http://thesaurus.unice.fr.

Dannell, Karl Johan (1973), *L'emploi des formes fortes des pronoms personnels pour désigner des choses en français moderne*, Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Studia Romanica Upsaliensia 13, 1–78.

de Benito Moreno, Carlota (2015), *Pero se escondíamos como las ratas: syncretism in the reflexive paradigm in Spanish and Catalan*, Isogloss. A Journal on Variation of Romance and Iberian Languages 1, 95–127.
De Cat, Cécile (2002), *French dislocation*, University of York, Ph.D. dissertation.
De Cat, Cécile (2005), *French subject clitics are not agreement markers*, Lingua 115, 1195–1219.
De Cat, Cécile (2007), *French Dislocation. Interpretation*, *Syntax*, *Acquisition*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Deshaies, Denise/Guilbault, Christian/Paradis, Claude (1993), *Prosodie et dislocation à gauche par anaphore en français québécois spontané*, in: André Crochetière/Jean-Claude Boulanger/Conrad Ouellon (edd.), *Actes du XV^e Congrès International des Linguistes*, Sainte-Foy, Presses de l'Université Laval, 31–34.
Diémoz, Federica (2007), *Morphologie et syntaxe des pronoms personnels sujets dans les parlers francoprovençaux de la Vallée d'Aoste*, Tübingen/Basel, Francke.
Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1990), *Clitic doubling*, *"wh"-movement*, *and quantification in Romanian*, Linguistic Inquiry 21, 351–397.
Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen (1999), *The typology of pronouns and the distinction between syntax and morphophonology*, in: Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 249–255.
Ferguson, Charles A. (1959), *Diglossia*, Word 15, 325–340.
Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés (2012), *Dialect areas and linguistic change: pronominal paradigms in Ibero-Romance dialects from a cross-linguistic and social typology perspective*, in: Gunther De Vogelaer/Guido Seiler (edd.), *The Dialect Laboratory: Dialects as a Testing Ground for Theories of Language Change*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 73–106.
Fonseca-Greber, Bonnibeth (2000), *The Change from Pronoun to Clitic and the Rise of Null Subjects in Spoken Swiss French*, University of Arizona, Ph.D. dissertation.
Fontana, Josep M. (1993), *Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish*, University of Pennsylvania, Ph.D. dissertation.
Gasiglia, Rémy (1984), *Grammaire du nissart*, Nice, Institut d'études niçoises.
Geisler, Hans (1982), *Studien zur typologischen Entwicklung: Lateinisch*, *Altfranzösisch*, *Neufranzösisch*, München, Fink.
Gelderen, Elly van (2011), *The Linguistic Cycle: Language Change and the Language Faculty*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Gerlach, Birgit (2002), *Clitics between Syntax and Lexicon*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
Gerlach, Birgit/Grijzenhout, Janet (edd.) (2000), *Clitics in Phonology*, *Morphology and Syntax*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
Givón, Talmy (1971), *Historical syntax and synchronic morphology: An archeologist's field trip*, Chicago Linguistic Society 7, 394–415.
Goldbach, Maria (2007), *The Distributed Morphology of object clitics in Modern French*, Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft 26, 41–81.
Grimshaw, Jane (2001), *Optimal clitic positions and the lexicon in Romance clitic systems*, in: Géraldine Legendre/Jane Grimshaw/Sten Vikner (edd.), *Optimality-theoretic Syntax*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 205–240.
Grohmann, Kleanthes K./Neokleous, Theoni (edd.) (2015), *Acquisition of clitics*, Lingua 161, 1–158.
Haase, Martin (2000), *Reorganization of a gender system: the central Italian neuters*, in: Barbara Unterbeck/Matti Rissanen (edd.), *Gender in Grammar and Cognition*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 221–236.
Haiman, John (1988), *Rhaeto-Romance*, in: Martin Harris/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *The Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 351–390.
Hall, Robert A. Jr. (1968), *Neuters*, *mass nouns and the ablative in Romance*, Language 44, 480–486.

Halle, Morris/Marantz, Alec (1993), *Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection*, in: Ken Hale/Samuel J. Keyser (edd.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honour of Sylvain Bromberger*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 111–176.
Harris, Alice C. (2002), *Endoclitics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Harris, James (1995), *The morphology of Spanish clitics*, in: Héctor Campos (ed.), *Evolution and Revolution in Linguistic Theory*, Georgetown, Georgetown University Press, 168–197.
Harris, James/Halle, Morris (2005), *Unexpected plural inflections in Spanish: reduplication and metathesis*, Linguistic Inquiry 36, 195–222.
Heap, David (2000), *La variation grammaticale en géolinguistique: les pronoms sujet en roman central*, München, Lincom Europa.
Heap, David (2002a), *Split subject pronoun paradigms: feature geometry and underspecification*, in: Teresa Satterfield/Christina M. Tortora/Diana Cresti (edd.), *Current Issues in Romance Languages: Selected Papers from the 29th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, *Ann Arbor*, *8–11 April 1999*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 129–144.
Heap, David (2002b), *Morphological complexity and Spanish object clitic variation*, in: Caroline Wiltshire/Joaquim Camps (edd.), *Romance Phonology and Variation*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 55–68.
Heap, David (2005), *Constraining optimality: clitic sequences and Feature Geometry*, in: Lorie Heggie/Francisco Ordóñez (edd.), *Perspectives on Clitic and Agreement Affix Combinations*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 81–102.
Heap, David/Kaminskaïa, Svetlana (2001), *Variable clitic sequences in Nonstandard French: Feature Geometry or Optimality?*, University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 7.3, 101–114.
Heap, David/Roberge, Yves (2001), *Cliticisation et théorie syntaxique*, *1971–2001*, Revue québécoise de linguistique 30, 63–90.
Heger, Klaus (1966), *La conjugaison objective en français et en espagnol*, Langages 3, 19–39.
Heggie, Lorie/Ordóñez, Francisco (edd.) (2005), *Clitic and Affix Combinations: Theoretical Perspectives*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
Hinzelin, Marc-Olivier/Kaiser, Georg A. (2012), *Le paramètre du sujet nul dans les variétés dialectales de l'occitan et du francoprovençal*, in: Mario Barra-Jover et al. (edd.), *Études de linguistique gallo-romane*, Saint-Denis, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, 247–260.
Hirschbühler, Paul/Labelle, Marie (1994), *Changes in verb position in French negative infinitival clauses*, Language Variation and Change 6, 149–178.
Hirschbühler, Paul/Labelle, Marie (2001), *La position des clitiques par rapport au verbe à l'impératif dans l'évolution du français*, Recherches linguistiques de Vincennes 30, 13–37.
Hopper, Paul J./Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1993), *Grammaticalization*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Hourcade, André (1986), *Grammaire béarnaise*, Pau, Association Los Caminaires.
Householder, Fred W. (1981), *The Syntax of Apollonius Dyscolus*, translated, and with commentary by Fred W. Householder, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
Jaeggli, Osvaldo (1982), *Topics in Romance Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.
Jaeggli, Osvaldo (1986), *Three issues in the theory of clitics: Case*, *doubled NPs*, *and extraction*, in: Hagit Borer (ed.), *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*, New York, Academic Press, 15–42.
Kaiser, Georg A. (2009), *Losing the null subject. A contrastive study of (Brazilian) Portuguese and (Medieval) French*, in: Georg A. Kaiser/Eva-Maria Remberger (edd.), *Null-subjects*, *Expletives*, *and Locatives in Romance*, Konstanz, Universität Konstanz, 131–156.
Kaiser, Georg A./Oliviéri, Michèle/Palasis, Katerina (2013), *Impersonal constructions in northern Occitan*, in: Xosé Afonso Álvarez Pérez/Ernestina Carrilho/Catarina Magro (edd.), *Current*

Approaches to Limits and Areas in Dialectology, Newcastle upon Tyne, Cambridge Scholars Press, 345–366.
Kayne, Richard S. (1975), *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
Kayne, Richard S. (2000), *Parameters and Universals*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 163–186.
Lai, Jean-Pierre (1996), *La particule "Ke" dans la construction verbale du parler de Nuoro (Sardaigne): proposition d'analyse*, Université Stendhal-Grenoble 3, Mémoire de D.E.A.
Lambert, Frédéric (2001), *Aux sources de l'enclise: réflexions sur les théories d'Apollonios Dyscole*, in: Claude Muller (ed.), *Clitiques et cliticisation*, Paris, Champion, 17–29.
Lambrecht, Knud (1981), *Topic, Antitopic and Verb Agreement in Non-standard French*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
Legendre, Géraldine (2000), *Positioning Romanian verbal clitics at PF: an Optimality-theoretic analysis*, in: Birgit Gerlach/Janet Grijzenhout (edd.), *Clitics in Phonology, Morphology and Syntax*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins 219–254.
Lehmann, Christian (1985), *Grammaticalization: synchronic variation and diachronic change*, Lingua e stile 20, 303–318.
Luís, Ana R./Sadler, Louisa (2003), *Object clitics and marked morphology*, in: Claire Beyssade (ed.), *Empirical Issues in Formal Syntax and Semantics 4*, Paris, Presses de l'Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 177–228.
Manzini, M. Rita/Savoia, Leonardo M. (2005), *I dialetti italiani e romanci: morfosintassi generativa*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso.
Manzini, M. Rita/Savoia, Leonardo M. (2008), *Clitics: between arguments and inflections*, in: M. Rita Manzini/Leonardo M. Savoia (edd.), *Work Notes on Romance Morphosyntax*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso, 297–321.
Massot, Benjamin (2010), *Le patron diglossique de variation grammaticale en français*, Langue Française 168, 87–106.
Meyer-Lübke, Wilhelm (1897), *Zur Stellung der tonlosen Objektspronomina*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 21, 313–334.
Miller, Philip H. (1992), *Clitics and Constituents in Phrase Structure Grammar*, New York, Garland.
Miller, Philip H./Sag, Ivan A. (1997), *French clitic movement without clitics or movement*, Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 15, 573–639.
Moignet, Gérard (1965), *Le pronom personnel français. Essai de psycho-systématique historique*, Paris, Klincksieck.
Nevis, Joel A., et al. (1994), *Clitics: A Comprehensive Bibliography 1892–1991*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins.
Nida, Eugene A. (1949), *Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press.
Oliviéri, Michèle (1991–1992), *La forme "n'en" nissarde: aperçu sur quelques problèmes morphologiques, syntaxiques et diachroniques*, Travaux du Cercle Linguistique de Nice 13–14, 61–76.
Oliviéri, Michèle (2010), *From dialectology to diachrony: Evidence from lexical and morpho-syntactic reconstruction in Romance dialects*, in: Barry Heselwood/Clive Upton (edd.), *Proceedings of Methods XIII. Papers from The Thirteenth International Conference on Methods in Dialectology, 2008*, Frankfurt etc., Lang, 42–52.
Oliviéri, Michèle (2011), *Typology or reconstruction: the benefits of dialectology for diachronic analysis*, in: Janine Berns/Haike Jacobs/Tobias Scheer (edd.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2009. Selected Papers from "Going Romance" Nice 2009*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 239–253.
Oliviéri, Michèle (2015), *Le statut des pronoms sujets dans les dialectes du nord de l'Occitanie*, in: Stella Retali-Medori (ed.), *Paroddi varghji, mélanges offerts à Marie-José Dalbera-Stefanaggi*, Alessandria, Edizioni dell'Orso, 289–302.

Oliviéri, Michèle/Lai, Jean-Pierre/Heap, David (2014), *Meteorological subjects in transitional Northern Occitan dialects*, Paper presented at the *44th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, Western University, 02.–04.05.2014.
Oliviéri, Michèle/Lai, Jean-Pierre/Heap, David (2017), *Partial subject paradigms and Feature Geometry in Northern Occitan dialects*, in: *Romance Linguistics 2014: Selected Proceedings of the 44th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, *London*, *Ontario*, *May 2014*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 145–165.
Oliviéri, Michèle/Sauzet, Patrick (2016), *Southern Gallo-Romance (Occitan)*, in: Adam Ledgeway/Martin Maiden (edd.), *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 319–349.
Palasis, Katerina (2012), *Romance French Child Corpus 1 (2;5–4;0)*, CHILDES, http://childes.talkbank.org/access/French/Palasis.html.
Palasis, Katerina (2013), *The case for diglossia: describing the emergence of two grammars in the early acquisition of metropolitan French*, Journal of French Language Studies 23, 17–35.
Palasis, Katerina (2015), *Subject clitics and preverbal negation in European French: variation*, *acquisition*, *diatopy and diachrony*, Lingua 161, 125–143.
Parry, M. Mair (1997), *Preverbal negation and clitic ordering*, *with particular reference to a group of North-West Italian dialects*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 113, 243–270.
Pato, Enrique/Heap, David (2012), *Plurales anómalos en los dialectos y en la historia del español*, in: Emilio Montero Cartelle (ed.), *Actas del VIII Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, Madrid, Arco Libros, 1765–1776.
Perlmutter, David M. (1971), *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
Pescarini, Diego (2010), *Elsewhere in Romance: evidence from clitic clusters*, Linguistic Inquiry 41, 427–444.
Pescarini, Diego (2011), *Romance clitics: cluster formation and allomorphy*, in: Angella Ralli (ed.), *On-Line Proceedings of the Eighth Mediterranean Morphology Meeting (MMM8)*, Cagliari, vol. 8, 223–235.
Poletto, Cecilia (1993), *La sintassi del soggetto nei dialetti italiani settentrionali*, Padova, Unipress.
Poletto, Cecilia (1995), *The diachronic development of subject clitics in North Eastern Italian dialects*, in: Adrian Battye/Ian Roberts (edd.), *Clause Structure and Language Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 295–324.
Poletto, Cecilia (1999), *The internal structure of AgrS and subject clitics in the Northern Italian dialects*, in: Henk van Riemsdijk (ed.), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter, 581–620.
Poletto, Cecilia (2000), *The Higher Functional Field: Evidence from Northern Italian Dialects*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Posner, Rebecca (1996), *The Romance Languages*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Pusch, Claus D. (2001), *Prosthèse préclitique et morphogénèse. Le cas de l'énonciatif "e" en gascon*, in: Claude Muller (ed.), *Clitiques et cliticisation*, Paris, Champion, 381–393.
Ramsden, Herbert (1963), *Weak-Pronoun Position in the Early Romance Languages*, Manchester, Manchester University Press.
Renzi, Lorenzo (1992), *I pronomi soggetto in due varietà substandard: fiorentino e français avancé*, Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie 108, 72–98.
Renzi, Lorenzo/Vanelli, Laura (1983), *I pronomi soggetto in alcune varietà romanze*, *Scritti linguistici in onore di G.B. Pellegrini*, Pisa, Pacini, 42–56.
Riemsdijk, Henk van (ed.) (1999), *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
Rigau, Gemma (1982), *Inanimate indirect objects in Catalan*, Linguistic Inquiry 13, 146–150.

Rivas, Alberto M. (1977), *A Theory of Clitics*, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.
Rizzi, Luigi (1982), *Issues in Italian Syntax*, Dordrecht, Foris.
Rizzi, Luigi (1986), *On the status of subject clitics in Romance*, in: Osvaldo Jaeggli/Carmen Silva-Corvalán (edd.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, Dordrecht, Foris, 391–419.
Roberge, Yves (1990), *The Syntactic Recoverability of Null Arguments*, Montréal, McGill-Queen's University Press.
Roberts, Ian (2010), *Varieties of French and the null subject parameter*, in: Theresa Biberauer et al. (edd.), *Parametric Variation: Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 303–327.
Ronjat, Jules (1908), *Sur l'enclise des pronoms personnels et leurs formes assillabiques spécialement en Gascogne*, Revue des Langues Romanes 51, 501–511.
Rossi, Mario (1999), *L'intonation, le système du français: description et modélisation*, Paris, Ophrys.
Russi, Cinzia (2008), *Italian Clitics: An Empirical Study*, Berlin/New York, De Gruyter.
Safir, Kenneth (1985), *Syntactic Chains*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Sandalo, Filomena/Galves, Charlotte (2013), *Clitic placement and grammaticalization in Portuguese*, in: Christine Meklenborg Salvesen/Hans Petter Helland (edd.), *Challenging Clitics*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 119–134.
Smith, John Charles (2001), *Illocutionary conversion, bystander deixis, and Romance "ethic" pronouns*, Working Papers in Functional Grammar 74, 1–24.
Soto-Corominas, Adriana (2017), *Impoverishment but only so far: vernacular Catalan clitic clusters*, Probus 29, 181–204.
Spencer, Andrew/Luís, Ana R. (2012), *Clitics. An Introduction*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Sportiche, Dominique (1996), *Clitic constructions*, in: Johan Rooryck/Laurie Zaring (edd.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 213–276.
Sportiche, Dominique (1999), *Subject clitics in French and Romance, complex inversion and clitic doubling*, in: Kyle B. Johnson/Ian Roberts (edd.), *Beyond Principles and Parameters: Essays in Memory of Osvaldo Jaeggli*, Dordrecht, Kluwer, 189–222.
Strozer, Judith Reina (1976), *Clitics in Spanish*, University of California at Los Angeles, Ph.D. dissertation.
Suñer, Margarita (1988), *The role of agreement in clitic-doubled constructions*, Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 6, 391–434.
Taraldsen, Knut Tarald (1980), *On the Nominative Island Condition, Vacuous Application, and the "that"-trace Filter*, Bloomington, IL, Indiana University Linguistics Club.
Tasmowski, Liliane/Reinheimer, Sanda (2001), *Pronoms forts, pronoms faibles et formes zéro dans les langues romanes*, in: Claude Muller (ed.), *Clitiques et cliticisation*, Paris, Champion, 327–342.
Tesnière, Lucien (1959), *Éléments de syntaxe structurale*, Paris, Klincksieck.
Tsakali, Vina/Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2008), *Rethinking the clitic doubling parameter: The inverse correlation between clitic doubling and participle agreement*, in: Dalina Kallulli/Liliane Tasmowski (edd.), *Clitic Doubling in the Balkan Languages*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, Benjamins, 321–357.
Uriagereka, Juan (1995), *Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance*, Linguistic Inquiry 26, 79–124.
Vance, Barbara S. (1997), *Syntactic Change in Medieval French: Verb-second and Null Subjects*, Dordrecht, Kluwer.
Vincent, Nigel (1988), *Italian*, in: Martin Harris/Nigel Vincent (edd.), *The Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 279–313.
Wackernagel, Jakob (1892), *Über ein Gesetz der indogermanischen Wortstellung*, Indogermanische Forschungen 1, 333–436.
Wanner, Dieter (1987a), *Clitic pronouns in Italian: a linguistic guide*, Italica 64, 410–442.

Wanner, Dieter (1987b), *The Development of Romance Clitic Pronouns. From Latin to Old Romance*, Berlin, De Gruyter.
Wanner, Dieter (1993), *L'expression du sujet dans les langues romanes*, in: Gerold Hilty (ed.), *Actes du XXe Congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes*, Tübingen, Francke, vol. 3, 447–460.
Zanuttini, Raffaella (1997), *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Zribi-Hertz, Anne (1994), *The syntax of nominative clitics in Standard and Advanced French*, in: Guglielmo Cinque et al. (edd.), *Paths towards Universal Grammar: Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*, Washington, D.C., Georgetown University Press, 453–472.
Zribi-Hertz, Anne (2001), *L'opposition ± clitique est-elle visible en syntaxe?*, in: Claude Muller (ed.), *Clitiques et cliticisation*, Paris, Champion, 133–146.
Zribi-Hertz, Anne (2011), *Pour un modèle diglossique de description du français: quelques implications théoriques*, *didactiques et méthodologiques*, Journal of French Language Studies 21, 231–256.
Zwicky, Arnold M. (1977), *On Clitics*, Bloomington, IL, Indiana University Linguistics Club.
Zwicky, Arnold M./Pullum, Geoffrey K. (1983), *Cliticization vs inflection: English "n't"*, Language 59, 502–513.