

Non-canonical enclitics are not weak pronouns

Romance clitic pronouns are normally unstressed and adjacent to the inflected verb. However, some Romance varieties show cases of clitic pronouns contradicting the above generalizations: enclitic pronouns are sometimes stressed, do not always climb to the auxiliary in compound tenses, and may be separated from the verb by certain adverbs.

In the paper I revise several proposals by Laenzlinger 1993, 1994; Ordóñez and Repetti 2006, 2014; Cardinaletti 2015 which argue that non-canonical clitics are in fact weak elements in the sense of Cardinaletti 1991, 1998; Cardinaletti & Starke 1999. The goal of the paper is twofold:

- First, it aims to reconsider the diagnostics isolating weak elements. Although the paper does not aim to question the notion of weak (as proposed, for instance, by Manzini and Savoia 2014), it argues that some of the tests do not hold cross-linguistically, while others – in particular those regarding the morpho-phonological correlates of weak elements – are not very robust.
- Second, it shows that, according to many (syntactic) criteria, non-canonical enclitics cannot be considered weak elements.

For instance, Ordóñez and Repetti 2006, 2014 argue that postverbal pronouns triggering stress shift are not enclitic, but weak pronouns. The proposal is particularly promising for the analysis of Balearic and Ligurian dialects in which enclitics are always stressed (Rohlf's 1966: 442; Kenstowicz 1991: 182f.; Petracco Sicardi and Azaretti 1989), e.g. Viozene: *finir-lù* 'to end it', *saver-lù* 'to know it', *portama-rù* 'let us take it', *vindi-rù* 'sell it', *server-sì* 'to help oneself', etc.

Since in these dialects words are almost never oxytone, the above stress pattern cannot be easily accounted for under a phonological analysis advocating postlexical stress-assignment rules à la Peperkamp 1996, 1997; Loporcaro 2000 a.o.. However, the weak analysis is not more promising. First of all, it is worth noting that, when Cardinaletti & Starke (1999: 172) notice that weak pronouns can be stressed, they mean that they can bear their own stress, while in the cases above the pronouns attract their hosts' stress. Second, the weak analysis of stressed enclitics is untenable under a syntactic point of view: I will show that the above stressed pronouns exhibit all the properties of fully-fledged clitics; they can resume a dislocated dative phrase, they cannot be omitted in coordinated structures, they are subject to the PCC, etc.

The same holds for Piedmontese, Provençal, and Abruzzese dialects that allow enclisis to the past participle in compound tenses. I will show that, although these enclitics exhibit some non-canonical peculiarities (see below), they never behave like weak pronouns w.r.t. doubling, coordination, PCC, etc.

Besides being placed after the past participle, Provençal enclitics are often stressed and, in some varieties, can be split, i.e. the dative clitic can climb, while the accusative one remains enclitic to the past participle. Moreover, in certain dialects spoken at the Piedmont/Lombardy border, enclitics can be separated from the verb by aspectual adverbs (Tortora 2014a):

- (1) a. I porti mi-lla
I= bring NEG=her
'I'm not bringing her'
b. I vœnghi piö-lla
I= see anymore=her
'I don't see her anymore'

I will argue that the above peculiar placement (and related puzzles, e.g. interpolation) follows from the historical evolution of these varieties. It is worth recalling that in Piedmontese object clitics were proclitic to the auxiliary until the end of the 16th century (Parry 1995; Tortora 2014b) and, later on, these dialects started to exhibit cases of enclisis to the participle. In an intermediate stage, but the same happens in some present-day dialects, both proclitic and enclitic forms can co-

occur in the same sentence. Since present day enclitics originate from proclitics (through a stage of doubling), I will conclude that the weak analysis of Piedmontese clitics cannot hold. Above all, if Piedmontese postverbal pronouns were weak, they would be an unparalleled case of weak elements originating from clitic pronouns.

This means that the empirical generalization according to which clitics must adjoin to the inflected verb is biased by the fact that we are used to focus on varieties exhibiting the ‘canonical’ placement system originating from the (loss of) the Tobler-Mussafia law. However, when we turn to other placement systems (inside and outside the Romance domain), we must conclude that there is no principled reason preventing clitic elements from occurring elsewhere.

References

- Cardinaletti, Anna (1991). On pronoun dative movement. *The Italian dative loro*. *Probus* 3, 127–153.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (1998). ‘On the deficient/strong opposition in possessive systems’ in A. Alexiadou and Ch. Wilder, *Possessors, Predicates, and Movement in the Determiner Phrase*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 17-53.
- Cardinaletti, Anna (2015). ‘Cases of apparent enclisis on past participles in Romance varieties’ *Isogloss* 1.2: 179-197.
- Cardinaletti, Anna and Starke, Michel (1999). ‘The typology of structural deficiency: a case study of the three classes of pronouns’ in *Clitics in the Languages of Europe*, ed. by Henk van Riemsdijk. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 145–233.
- Kenstowicz, Michael (1991). ‘Enclitic Accent: Latin, Macedonian, Italian, Polish’, in Bertinetto and Loporcaro (1991), 173–85
- Laenzlinger, Christopher 1993. “A syntactic view of Romance pronominal sequences.” *Probus*, 5.3: 242-270.
- Laenzlinger, Christopher 1994. “Enclitic clustering: The case of French positive imperatives.” *Rivista di Grammatica Generativa*, 19: 71-104.
- Loporcaro, Michele 2000. ‘Stress stability under cliticization’ in *Phonological Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, ed. by Lori Repetti. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Manzini, Rita and Leonardo Savoia 2014. ‘From Latin to Romance: case loss and preservation in pronominal systems’. *Probus* 26.2: 217–248.
- Ordóñez, Francisco and Lori Repetti. 2006. ‘Stressed enclitics?’ In Jean-Pierre Montreuil and Chiyo Nishida (eds.), *New analyses in Romance linguistics*, 167-181. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Ordóñez, Francisco and Lori Repetti (2014) “On the morphological restriction of hosting clitics in Italian and Sardinian dialects” *Italia dialettale* 75: 173-199.
- Parry, M. M., 1995. ‘Some observations on the syntax of clitic pronouns in Piedmontese’, in M. Maiden, and J. C. Smith (eds), *The Romance Languages and Contemporary Linguistic Theory*, Amsterdam, Benjamins, 133-160.
- Peperkamp, Sharon. 1996. On the Prosodic Representation of Clitics. In *Interfaces in Phonology* [Studia Grammatica 41], U. Kleinhenz (ed.), 102-127. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.
- Peperkamp, Sharon. 1997. *Prosodic Words* [HIL dissertations 34]. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Petracco Sicardi, G. & E. Alzaretti, *Studi Linguistici sull’anfizona Liguria-Provenza*. Alessandria: Dell’Orso.
- Rohlf, Gerhard 1966. *Grammatica storica dell’italiano e dei suoi dialetti*. Vol. I: *Fonetica*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Tortora, Christina. 2014a. *A Comparative Grammar of Borgomanerese*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tortora, C., 2014b, ‘Patterns of variation and diachronic change in Piedmontese object clitic syntax’ in P. Beninca, A. Ledgeway, & N. Vincent (eds.) *Diachrony and Dialects*. Oxford: OUP: 218-240.