ON THE NATURE OF ROMANIAN PRONOMINAL CLITICS

Alina Tigău

Abstract. In the present article we present a range of properties which rank Romanian very high in the agreement continuum argued for by Franco (2000). This would entitle us to maintain that Romanian pronominal clitics are very advanced in the process of acquiring the status of verbal inflection. Thus the clitic could be considered an agreement marker which checks the uninterpretable features of the [T+v+V] head (the clitic spells out a D feature and also φ-features of the T head, which is thus [Cl(D, φ) + T]T^0).

Clitic doubling (pronominal reduplication) is a phenomenon by which clitic pronouns appear in verb phrases together with the full noun phrases that they refer to (as opposed to the cases where such pronouns and full noun phrases are in complementary distribution e.g. French). Clitic doubling (CD) is found in many languages, including Spanish, Romanian, Albanian, Macedonian, Bulgarian, Greek, Persian, Somali; in each case, it follows different rules. Let us consider the case of Romanian where the phenomenon of CD appears in a variety of cases. Thus, the examples below show that the clitic may resume a personal pronoun, a proper name, a bare singular, a demonstrative pronoun, a possessive pronoun, an indefinite pronoun, a pronoun of politeness. (Notice also that all the direct objects resumed by clitics are preceded by the preposition *p(r)e* and, furthermore, they refer to (+animate, + person):

(1) a**.** Îl văd pe el.
him.cl. see.I PE him
'I see him.'
b. Îl văd pe Mihai.
him.cl. see.I PE Mihai
'I see Mihai.'
c. Îl văd pe copil.
him.cl. see.I PE child.
'I see the child'
d. Îl vreau pe acela.
him.cl. want.I PE that
'I want that one.'
e. Nu cumva crezi că te-am fluierat pe dumneata?
'Do you think it was you that I whistled after? '
f. Avem timp să-i judecăm pe alţii şi să ne absolvim pe noi.
have.we time să.them.cl judge others and să us.cl. forgive
'We have time to judge others and to forgive us.'
g. L-am pierdut pe al meu.
it.cl. have lost PE mine
'I have lost mine.'
h**.** I-am văzut venind pe amândoi.
them.cl. have I seen coming PE both
'I have seen both of them coming'
i. I-am chemat pe toţi.

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

The very nature of clitics makes them susceptible of being considered at times independent elements with syntactic import, agreement markers that spell out phi-features, affixes that only play a role in morphology by spelling out the morpho-syntactic features of the verb, or phonetic entities dealt with at PF.

1. Lexical analyses

Jaeggli (1982), Borer (1984), Suner (1988),Roberge (1990),Auger (1994), Monachesi (1998), Miller and Monachesi (2003), supporters of this type of analysis, claim that a clitic is in effect a derivational affix modifying the lexical entry of a predicate. Thus 'lire un livre' is a VP with a transitive verb 'lire' whereas 'le lire' is an intransitive 'le+lire'.

However, this analysis appears to be faulty as there are many cases in which a clitic appears on a verb with which it bears no lexical relation. Consider the following examples provided by Sportiche (1996) in which a clitic appears on a verb with which it bears no lexical relation.

(2) a. Jean croit Pierre malade.
Jean thinks Pierre sick.
'Jean thinks that Pierre is sick.
Jean le croit malade.
Jean him.cl. thinks sick.
'Jean thinks he is sick.'

b. Jean est semblable à sa mère.
'Jean is similar to his mother.'
Jean lui est semblable.

c. Jean croit Pierre capable de tout.
'Jean thinks Pierre is capable of everything.'

d. Jean veut manger la pomme.
Jean wants eat the apple.
'Jean wants to eat the apple'
Jean la veut manger.
Jean it.cl. want eat.
'Jean wants to eat it'

e. Jean a peint la cheminée de l'usine.
'Jean has painted the chimney of the plant.'

In example a, the clitic stands for an argument DP which is a subject of the small clause (Pierre, malade) and which bears no thematic relation, hence no lexical relation with the main verb.

In the b. and c. examples, the clitic is an argument of the adjective and bears no lexical relationship with main verbs. In d. the so-called restructuring constructions (an example ungrammatical in standard French but well formed in middle French, or in many varieties of Spanish and Italian) the clitic bears no lexical relation to the verb it is affixed to –it might be argued that it is lexically related to the embedded verb. In e. the clitic stands for a dependent of the head of the object DP. Thus the examples above show that the sequence cl+V is not an intransitive verb.

Notice that all these examples are a portrayal of a fact already noticed in the literature, i.e. clitics appear on the highest verb of their clause (with amendments made for the restructuring

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

constructions). However, this generalization is syntactic in nature and thus seems incompatible with a lexical approach. At best, the detransitivisation property would have to be coupled with a syntactic device insuring that the clitic morpheme shows up in its proper place.

2. Syntactic analyses

2.1 The movement analysis

According to Kayne (1975,1989),Rizzi (1986)and Sportiche (1989,1990), object clitics are pronominal arguments generated in the canonical position of the arguments of the verb. The clitic moves and attaches to a host (presumably a phonological head) either because of their weak phonological nature –they are always unstressed- or because of their affixal nature-they are bound morphemes. The motivation underlying Kayne's (1975) movement analysis is the apparent complementary distribution between clitics and their associate DP found in French. Let us consider the following examples:

(3) a. Jean lit un livre chaque jour.
'Jean reads a book every day.'
b. Jean le lit.
Jean it.cl3re.sg.acc. reads
'Jean reads it.'
c. *Jean le lit le livre.
'Jean it read the book'

As one can clearly see sentence c, where both the clitic and its associate DP appear within the sentence is ill-formed (the reader should consider the sentence in c. as lacking any dislocation intonation or pause). Departing from examples such as these, Kayne (1975) suggests that clitics are base generated in the position of the DP (as internal argument of the verb) and then Chomsky-adjoined by a movement operation to an appropriate verb up the tree. The clitic moves and attaches to a host (presumably a phonological head) either because of their weak phonological nature –they are always unstressed- or because of their affixal nature-they are bound morphemes.

The ill-formedness of example c. is to be expected under Kayne's analysis since 'le livre' would be prevented (by the structure-preserving principles) from occupying the position of a trace that resulted from movement of the clitic.

2.2 Arguments against the movement analysis

Almost all the linguists challenging Kayne's proposal have done it on the basis of the so-called 'Clitic Doubling' constructions which show up in varieties of French (cf. Roberge 1990), Spanish (Strozer 1976, Rivas 1977, Jaeggli 1982), Romanian, Hebrew, Arabic (Aoun 1981, Borer 1983). Clitic Doubling constructions are counter-examples to a sentence like 2.c. in that the clitic and its nominal counterpart do appear in complementary distribution.
Consider:

(4) Pedro lai ha visto a Sandrai.
Pedro Cl3.sg have.3sg. seen to Sandra.
'Pedro has seen Sandra.'
(5) Petre l- a văzut pe Matei.
Peter cl.3sg.m has.3.sg. seen pe Matei.
'Peter has seen Mathew.'

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

These examples, as well as any other sentences wherein the clitic and its nominal counterpart are not in complementary distribution pose a problem for the movement hypothesis from various perspectives. Firstly, the structure-preserving principles would be nullified for Spanish and Romanian at first sight, since we assume that an element cannot occupy the trace of another element (which would be the case for the examples above).

Secondly, if both the clitic and the co-referential direct object were endowed with argument status, this analysis would violate the second clause of the θ-criterion of Chomsky (1981), i.e. 'Each argument is assigned one and only one theta role. Each theta role is assigned to one and only one argument'. Thus an analysis of these facts claiming that the doubled DP occupies the base-generated position of the clitic (i.e. as internal argument of V) would appear fundamentally incompatible with a movement analysis. This is why the position of the doubled DP has been the subject of substantial debate, because of its implications for the movement hypothesis.

Generally speaking, these discussions have concentrated on the external distribution of the doubling element. Thus one may claim that the doubled element does not occupy the position of the trace (of the clitic) but rather that of an adjunct related to this position. Hurtado (1984) defends for instance, the idea that the doubled DP in 3 and 4 occupies the position of right dislocated phrases, an A' position. A variant of this proposal is put forth by Aoun (1981).

Nevertheless such proposals have been proved untenable by Jaeggli (1986) and Suňer (1988) on the basis of the extraction properties these constituents display. Briefly, it is shown that rightward extraction of the clitic-doubled nominal is subject to subjacency, a fact unexpected for disclocations, as one can see in 5 a. and b. below:

(6) a. A Juani que le/loi hayan visto en la fiesta no me molesta.
Juan that they have seen him.cl. at the party does not bother me
'Juan, that they have seen him at the party does not bother me.'
b. * Que loi hayan visto en la fiesta no me molesta, a Juan.
that they have seen him.cl. at the party does not bother me, Juan
'Juan, that they have seen him at the party does not bother me.'

Schneider (1996) also remarks for Greek that doubled elements seem to occur in positions in which adjuncts are simply not tolerated, e.g. as subject of small clauses or ECM subjects:

(7) Yiorghos tin-perimene ((tin Maria) na paraponiente)
the G.cl.acc expected the Maria.acc.subj. complain.
'George expected Maria to complain.'

Binding Theory prompts us with further arguments supporting the A status of the doubled DP-since this DP can serve as the antecedent of an anaphor and anaphors must be bound from A-positions according to Principle C of this theory:

(8) a El decano (lesi) habló a los estudiantesi de sí mismosi.
The dean cl.dat.3.pl. talked to the students about themselves.
'The dean talked to the students about themselves.'
b. * El decano (lesi) habló de sí mismosi a los estudiantesi
The dean cl.dat.3.pl. talked about themselves to the students.
'The dean talked about themselves to the students.'

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

The examples in 8 prove that the doubled DP is the binder of the anaphor and not the clitic. If one changes the configuration wherein the clitic-doubled DP can c-command the anaphor (as is the case of 8.a.) the sentence is ill-formed (as can be seen in b.). Furthermore, if the clitic or its trace were the valid c-commanding antecedent for the anaphor, 7a. where clitic doubling appears, would be wrongly ruled out as a violation of principle C of Binding Theory since the clitic doubling DP would not be able to stay free in its governing category.

A second argument in favour of the argumental status of the clitic-doubled element contributed by Binding Theory, comes from the fact that object anaphors in Spanish can and must be clitic-doubled. This shows that object anaphors do not occupy non-argumental positions:

(9) Juan sei perjudicó a sí mismoi.
Juan cl.refl. hurt himself.
'Juan hurt himself.'

2.3 Arguments in favour of the movement analysis

Sportiche (1996) claims that in spite of arguments such as the ones above, the movement hypothesis remains unchallenged because it is 'quite difficult to conclusively establish this point (i.e. that the facts claiming that the doubled DP occupies the internal VP argument position are fundamentally incompatible with a movement analysis)'.

He also maintains that the complementary cases Kayne's analysis set out from, do not particularly support the movement approach. Thus, although complementarity of distribution might have provided an argument for a movement hypothesis, there may be other ways of handling this complementarity inspred by the treatment of clitic doubling constructions, particularly as many authors have done, capitalizing on Kayne's generalization.Kayne notices that in some languages and in some constructions at least, the doubled elements must appear affixed by a morpheme e.g 'a' in Spanish (see e.g. 3) and 'pe' in Romanian (see e.g. 4). The supporters of the base-generation analysis attribute the presence of this preposition on the DP to the loss of case of this DP- which is received by the clitic. Thus the doubled DP acquires case from the preposition-a rescuing device that renders the DP visible.

Sportiche (1996) maintains that there exist much stronger arguments in favour of a movement analysis. The strongest of these arguments would be, according to him, the fact that the clitic/DP relation displays defining distance properties of movement.

Kayne (1975) used as a first type of evidence in favour of his conclusions, the blocking effects of intervening subjects on clitic placement. Consider the examples below:

(10) a. Jean a laissé Pierre parler à Marie.
'Jean let Pierre speak to Marie.'
b.Jean l'a laissé lui parler.
Jean him let to-her speak.
'Jean let Pierre speak to her'
c.*Jean lui a laissé Pierre parler.
Jean to-her let Pierre speak.
'Jean let Pierre speak to her.'
d.*Jean le lui a laissé parler.
Jean him to-her let speak.
'Jean let him speak to her.'

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

The dative clitic cannot reach the main clause over the subject of the embedded clause, suggesting an SSC effect. If DP/trace or antecedent/anaphor anaphoric relations are indeed movement relations, obeying binding principle A is a diagnostic property of movement.

P-stranding under clear cases of movement is disallowed in French. Thus wh-movement of the object of a preposition is ill-formed unless the preposition is pied-piped. Consider:

(11) a. Jean a voté pour Maastricht.
'Jean voted for Maastricht.'
b. * Quel trait é a-t-il voté pour t ?
which treaty John voted for
'Which treaty did John vote for ?'
c. Marie est partie avec la valise.
'Marie left with the suitcase.'
d. * Marie lui est partie avec [sc]
Mary left with.
"Marie left with it"

The same holds for stranding under clitic placement :

(12) a. Jean a voté pour lui.
'Jean voted for him.'
b. *Jean lui a voté pour [sc].
'Jean him voted for.'
c. Marie est partie avec elle
'Marie left with it.'
d. * Marie lui est partie avec [sc].
Marie it left with.
'Marie left with it.'

Regarding the extractability out of the DP, clitic placement behaves like a movement process (cf. Giorgi and Longobardi (1991), Sportiche (1989), Valois (1991)).

Extractability Requirement: an XP may be extracted out of a DP in a given structure iff XP may otherwise appear as the possessor of this DP.

Consider the generalisation at work in the paradigm below:

(13) a. Jean a vu une/la photo de qui?
Jean saw a/the picture of whom
"Whose picture did Jean see?"
b. dont Jeanj a vu une/la/*ma/*cette photo tj.
'Of whom Jean saw a the picture.'
c. Jean a lu une depêche de Paris.
'Jean read a dispatch from Paris.'
d. *D'où Jean a-t-il lu [une depêchej]
wherefrom did Jean read a dispatch
'Wherefrom did Jean read a dispatch?'

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

Only when the extracted phrase could otherwise be a possessor –this is blocked by the presence of another possessor like 'ma' or the demonstrative like 'cette' as in b., or because only DPs and not locative PPs may be possessivized as in d. – can it be extracted. Sportiche (1990) claims that this pattern can be explained by appealing to antecedent government: extraction of a post nominal XP must proceed through the SpecDP position guaranteeing antecedent government and deriving the generalization above: dont Jeanj a vu [DP tj [une [NP photo tj]].

The same pattern appears to hold for clitic extraction :

(14) a. Jean a vu une/la photo de qui?
Jean saw a/the picture of whom
"Whose picture did Jean see?"
b. Jean enj a vu une/la/*ma/*cette photo tj.
Jean of-him saw a/the/*my/*this picture.
'Jean saw one/ the/my/this picture.'
c. Jean a lu une depêche de Paris.
Jean read a dispatch from Paris.
d. * Jean enj a lu une depêche tj.
Jean therefrom read a dispatch.
'Jean read a dispatch from there.'
e. Jean vient de Paris.
'Jean comes from Paris.'
f. Jean enj vient tj.
jean therefrom comes.
'Jean comes from there.'

Participle Agreement counts as a further argument in favour of adopting a movement analysis for clitics. Participles may/must (depending on the variety of French) agree with their accusative direct object when they precede the participle; when the participle follows, agreement is excluded.

(15) a. Jean a peint(*e) la porte
'Jean painted the door.'
b. La porte que Jean a peinte t.
'The door that John painted.'
c. Jean l'a peinte [sc].
John it painted
'John painted it.'

Sportiche claims that in this case, there is only one way for one to get such agreement, i.e. 1: participle/object agreement is similar to subject/tense agreement in being the reflex of a relation between a head and its specifier; 2: there is an intermediate specifier (of the participial morphology) through which the moved object may/must transit: Lej a [tj [peinte….tj]]

Sportiche claims that if the data were to be analyzed in view of base-generation, i.e. in which the sc in 16 c. is pro or PRO, this configuration appear arbitrary. Instead he encloses this case into a fuller picture of agreement- the participle agreement with the subject, which is obligatory unlike the optional participle agreement (and not object) when the verb uses the auxiliary **être** (including passive constructions).

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

(16) a. La porte a été peinte.
The door.fem. was painted.
'The door was painted.'

Sportiche notices that all these constructions are in fact cases containing a superficial subject which is in fact an undelying object. His endeavor, as he states it, would then be to account for: i. Why does NP-movement pattern with clitics in being able to trigger agreement; ii. Why is NP movement more restricted than clitics in that it must trigger participial agreement. It seems that under Sportiche's analysis, both these facts follow if clitic placement were analyzed as movement plus agreement under spec/head. Firstly, clitic placement and NP movement both trigger agreement because they both involve movement. Secondly, a movement analysis of clitic placement can account for the second observation: if both clitic placement and raising to subject involve movement, we expect this movement to pass through the specifier position of the participial phrase. One may suggest that the intermediate step through the spec position of the participial phrase is optional in the case of clitic placement but not in the case of NP-movement. If any difference is found between NP movement and clitic movement, it is reasonable to expect more latitude from clitic movement.

2.4 The base-generation analysis

The base generation approach meant a step forward with respect to previous analyses of Romance clitics by overcoming quite successfully some of the problems incurred by the movement hypothesis. This analysis is advocated for by Strozer (1976), Rivas (1977), Jaeggli (1982), Borer (1983), Bouchard (1982), Burzio (1983), Roberge (1990), Sportiche (1983).

In the first place, the analysis is centered on accounting for clitic doubling constructions and for non-thematical clitics, which could not be accounted for by Kayne's analysis. The basic tenet of the bese-generation hypothesis is that the clitic is a syntactic affix on the verb which appears at the left of the verb and which has subcategorization requirements. As any affix, it is base-generated in special position, neither A nor A', next to the verb, this enabling it to govern the complements of the verb, given that the government domain of the clitic is coextensive with the government domain of the verb.

A further issue that this analysis had to settle was related to the status of the clitic itself which was still considered as argument. Consequently, the analysis had to provide a mechanism to assign case both to the clitic and to the doubled NP (for CD). Thus Aoun (1981) and Hurtado (1984) propose that clitics may be theta-absorbers so that the doubled NP becomes an adjunct (we have already presented the arguments against such analysis above).

Jaeggli (1982) suggests on the other hand, that clitics absorb government form the verb, hence, they are case-absorbers. Such an analysis would hold for examples like 4 and 5. Thus, the verb gets the accusative case absorbed by the clitic whereas, simultaneously, the preposition-like element 'a' and 'pe' transmits it on the nominal. This assumption appears to be accurate for Romanian where only nominal headed be 'pe' can show up in CD constructions. However, it fails to account for those cases in Spanish where CD is possible in the absence of the preposition 'a':

(17) Lai comí la tortai. (Southern Cone Spanish)
It-cl. ate-I the cake.
'I ate the cake.' (in Franco (2000))

Again, the Case absorption approach cannot account for the dative clitics (in Spanish) which do not seem to have necessarily absorbed case (Jaeggli (1986))

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

Besides the CD construction which appears to receive a better account under the base-generation analysis, there seem to exist a number of other reasons that would favour such an approach. Sportiche (1986) classifies them into 'lack of source arguments' (i.e. there is no possible source for which the clitic could have moved) and 'impossibility of movement arguments' (the distance between the clitic and its source are not allowed by movement). Consider:

(18) a. Je t'achèterais un cadeau à Pierre.
I cl.2.sg.dat buy a present to Pierre.
'I tell ya, I would buy Peter a present.'(i.e. it is preposterous to even think of buying a present for Pierre.)
b. Pierre en a bave.
Pierre of-it drooled.
'Pierre suffered.'

As also seen above when we discussed the case of ethical datives, the clitic "te" simply cannot be replaced by any full DP. In fact the function of the clitic is not to link to any argument. This seems to argue against a movement analysis for these clitic structures. The same goes for e.g. in b. where the clitic "en" does not correspond to any DP slot. It seems that it is somehow part of the lexical entry of the verb 'en-baver' but behaves positonally like a regular clitic in preceding the auxiliary "avoir".

The distribution of stranded floating quantifiers seem difficult to reconcile with a movement analysis of clitics. Consider the following examples:

(19) a Les enfants ont tous mangé.
'The children all ate.'
b. Je les ai vu tous.
'I have seen them all.'
c. Il a tous fallu que Louis les lise.
'It was necessary that Louis read them all.'

Sportiche (1996) departs from Sportiche (1988) when analyzing these examples. Following the afore mentioned proposal, the distribution of these quantifiers is taken determined in part by the position of intermediate traces of their antecedents: the quantifiers are adjacent to a silent DP (trace, pro or PRO) bound by another DP (usually overt) they quantify over.

Thus, in 19.a. the presence of the quantifier 'tous' reveals that the subject of the sentence has raised form a lower position (accounting for the VP-internal hypothesis). Turning now to example 19.b., and adopting a movement analysis for the clitic, we obtain the following facts: the clitic is the head of the DP modified by or quantified over by 'tous', the clitic itself moves to its surface position, "tous" quantifying over this DP is licensed by this DP moving through the specifier positon of the Q.

Consider, under this state of affairs, what this would mean for a sentence like 18. c.- the configuration below will need to be arrived at: [QP [tous …[CP…[D lesi]….[DP ti]]]

The D head of the object DP (i.e. the clitic) has incorporated to some host. If the stranded Q gets to its surface position by movement, and gets stranded by movement of its complement DP (or the head D of such a DP) out of QP, the raised QP will contain the unbound trace of this D or this DP. If, on the contrary, the stranded Q is base-generated in the top clause, its licensing would go by the following scenario: by LF, This DP will have to raise to the

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

position SpecQP even though it would contain the trace of the incorporated clitic. This violates the requirement that traces be properly bound. This problem would not arise if the clitic is generated independently of the DP argument it is related to, a basic property of base generation analyses.

3. An overview of pronominal clitics

According to Abney (1987), Heim &Kratzer (1998) , clitics are pronominal forms which, unlike lexical (nominal) forms, do not encode concepts i.e. they refer without describing a linguistic concept; they are bundles of phi- features–they encode differences in number(m/ne), person (m/te), case (mi/m); they encode person features which are exclusively 3rd person.

Furthermore, they seem more similar to functional categories rather than to lexical ones: a limited number class –a closed set, no increasing word formation possibilities, phonologically and morphologically dependent;lack substantive meaning.

Moreover, clitics are much more independent than affixes as evidenced by the so-called clitic-climbing constructions and most relevantly, they do not obey the morphological laws defined in Di Sciullo and Williams (1987) such as the head of a word rule, the theta-role satisfactions and the functional composition.

3.1 Arguments in favour of the D-status of the clitic:

Postal (1969) first came with the original idea that clitics are **determiners**. By assuming that clitics are determiners we capture the diachronic development of Romance clitics from Latin demonstratives, i.e. (+ specific) expressions which became increasingly weak phonologically and morphologically. Clitics, just like the other pronominals, are referential elements in the sense of Curat (1999), i.e. they can be related to one of the entities/individuals that have been introduced in the discourse. Along the lines of Longobardi (1994), it is precisely the D projection that accounts for the referentiality of a nominal, i.e. turns a nominal into a referential expression (an argument). Several studies in the field seem to support this view. Thus Vergnaud and Zubizarreta (1992) propose the "Correspondance Law" – When a DP or NP denotes, the DP denotes a token and the NP denotes a type. Longobardi (1994) maintains that the DP cannot have type readings, whereas Chierchia (1998) argues that the NPs denote kinds of things and any notion of individual reference requires the presence of D. Carlson (2003) points to the fact that there is a fundamental asymmetry between the sorts of interpretation major phrases may have before and after the addition of their associated functional category.

If clitics are to be related to an entity/individual present in the universe of discourse, then this notion of an 'individual' is not part and parcel of the semantics of the NP but becomes available once the functional projection of the DP is added as this is the locus of referentiality.

Moreover, because clitics lack descriptive features (i.e. unlike lexical (nominal) forms do not encode concepts, that is they refer without describing a linguistic concept), we might infer that they lack the NP projection along the lines of Panagiotidis (2002) 'the D status of the clitic provides a perfect link between their lack of descriptive content and the fact that they lack a NP projection (i.e. a carrier of descriptive features)'.

3.2 Clitics as object agreement morphemes

Franco (2000) claims that, in different degrees, Romance pronominal clitics are in the process of acquiring the status of object verbal inflection(i.e. agreement markers);in his view, object clitics should be analyzed as object agreement morphemes on the verb, on a par with

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

subject-verb agreement, and not as pronominal arguments that are phonologically dependent. In case of clitic doubling, the relationship between clitics and the element they double is the same as a verb-argument agreement relationship.

Interestingly, as we will show, object clitics in Romanian pattern very much alike their counterparts in Spanish so that we have reasons to suppose them very advanced in the process of acquiring the status of verbal inflection.

Aware of their mixed syntactic and morphological properties (which poses problems for classification), Franco (2000) assumes that clitics, in general, are intermediate elements between bound words and inflectional affixes, that is between pronouns and inflectional affixes. Furthermore, due to the fact that not all pronominal clitics in the languages of the world have the same behavior or distribution, he places them along a spectrum such as the one given in 42 – their position on this spectrum will depend on how much the properties of each type of clitic resemble those of a pronoun or those of a verbal inflectional affix:

Consider: Inflectional Affix [-Z-Y-X-W-] Pronouns
Pronominal clitics

We have already claimed that Romanian pronominal clitics, just like their Spanish counterparts are ahead in the process of becoming inflectional affixes and we would like to prove this by making use of roughly the same type of evidence as Franco (2000), but implemented within the Romanian clitic system.

3.3 The same specific host [Aux/V]

The pronominal clitics in contemporary French, Italian, and Spanish (unlike their medieval counterparts which showed much freedom in affixation, a fact that ranged them closer to a world like status rather than to an inflectional one) are restricted to preverbal or post-verbal positions depending on the verb's feature [α finite]. Let us consider the following examples for Romanian:

(20) a. Maria îl cumpără.
Maria it.3.sg.m buys
'Maria buys it.'
b. Maria l-a cumpărat.
Maria it.3.sg.m has bought
'Maria bought it.'
c. Maria nu l-a cumpărat.
Maria not it.3.sg.m has bought
'Maria didn't buy it.'
d. Maria nu-l cumpără.
Maria not it.3.sg.m buy
'Maria doesn't buy it.'
e. Maria nu-l mai cumpără.
Maria not it.3.sg.m yet buy
'Maria doesn't buy it anymore.'
f. Maria vrea să-l cumpere.
Maria want să it.3.sg.m buy
'Maria wants to buy it.'
g. Dacă-l vede aici se va supăra.
If it.3.sg.m sees here will get mad
'If she sees it here she will get mad.'

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

h. De-l prind că vine, vă alung pe-amândoi.
If it.3.sg.m catch.I. that comes.he, you.cl. chase.I both
'If I catch him coming here, I'll chase both of you away.'
i. Maria-mi spune tot.
Maria cl.1.sg tells everything
'Maria tells me everything.'
j. Nemaivăzându-l, am crezut că plecase.
Not.yet.seeing.cl.3.sg.m, have.I thought that left.he
'Not seeing him, I thought that he had left.'
k. E Ion, pe care-l ştii deja.
Is Ion whom cl.3.sg.m know.you already.
'This is Ion whom you already know.'

Examples a, b, c, seem to obey the generalization holding for modern French, Italian, and Spanish i.e. the pronominal clitic exhibits a preference for a verbal host (either the verb or the auxiliary). The same can be said about example j where the pronominal clitic attaches to the non-finite verb. Notice also that because the form of the verb is non-finite the clitic appears post verbally in this case. Furthermore, the negation and the adverb 'mai' behave like clitics as well and attach to the verb just like them. The entire complex construct moves to the final landing site of the verb which appears to be MoodP for Romanian.

The rest of the examples seem to function as counterexamples to our assumption. Thus in e.g. d, the clitic attaches to the negation 'nu' and not to the verb. To make matters worse, e.g. e prompts us with a variant wherein the clitic is clearly severed from the verb by the adverb 'mai'. Examples f, g, and h are cases where the clitic seems to attach to a complementizer: the 'conjunctive' mood marker 'să ', and the connectors 'dacă' and 'de'. In i. the clitic surfaces on the DP 'Maria'. Lastly, example k. adjoins to the relative pronoun.

As we can see, the pronominal clitic can accept a variety of hosts of different nature. However, if we consider examples d and e again, we will notice that the pronominal clitic interacts with elements of the same type i.e. both 'nu' and 'mai' are actually clitics as we can clearly see form e.g. j. this amounts to saying that the three clitics cluster together on the verb.

In what examples f,g,h, i and k are concerned we would suggest that these are not actually cases of syntactic cliticization but of prosodic cliticization along the lines of Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) i.e. Romanian clitics undergo prosodic cliticization to a word that hes nothing to do with the selection of the clitic.

3.4 Strict adjacency to [Aux/V]

This refers to the absence of interpolation phenomena which amounts to the occurrence of intervening elements between the clitic and the host which is either the verb or the auxiliary.

Consider some Romance languages where nothing can intervene between the clitic and the verb; object clitics require strict adjacency to their host.

(21) a. (F) *Martine le souvent lit.
b. (I) *Martina lo non legge.
c. (S)*Martina lo no lee
Martina it often reads.
'Martina often reads it.'

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

Romanian behaves differently in this respect in that it allows the adverbial clitic *mai* 'still' to occur between the object clitic and the verb.

(22) Maria nu-l mai cumpără.
Maria not it.Acc *mai* buys
'Maria does not buy it anymore.'

However we would not count this fact as a violation of the strict adjacency condition since the intervening element is of the same nature with the clitic.

3.5 Syntactic unit with the host

This property refers to whether or not the clitic is left stranded after the host moves in the syntax. Indeed, for Romanian, the verbs and clitics do form a syntactic unit- this can be seen in instances in which the verb undergoes syntactic operations such as verb-subject inversion in questions: the clitic and the verb remain together as a unit.

(23) a. Maria a citit cartea cu uşurinţă.
Maria has read book.the easily.
'Maria read the book easily.'
b. Maria a citit-o cu uşurinţă.
Maria has read it.cl.3.sg.fem easily
'Maria read it easily.'
c. A citi- o cu uşurinţă sau nu?
Has read-it.cl.3sg.fem easily or not
'Has he/she read it easily or not?'

3.6 Fixed order

On a closer look at the morphology of cliticization, we can see that Romance languages (and Romanian as well) are subjects to ordering constraints in relation to other inflectional affixes.

The order of pronominal clitics in the cluster is fixed. Romanian has only accusative and dative object clitics and they occur in the order dative-accusative, as shown in (24a). The opposite order would be ungrammatical as can be seen in (24b):

(24) a. Alexandru mi-l trimite astăzi.
Alexandru CL.DAT CL.ACC sends today
'Alexandru sends it to me today'
b.*Alexandru îl-mi trimite astăzi.
Alexandru CL.ACC CL.DAT sends today
'Alexandru sends it to me today.'

As pointed out by Anderson (1992), there is a clear similarity between clitics and affixes, which also exhibit rigid ordering. Independent words are, on the other hand, usually allowed a certain degree of free ordering.

4. Conclusion

The properties we presented above rank the Romanian language very high in the agreement continuum argued for by Franco (2000). This would entitle us to maintain that

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

Romanian pronominal clitics are very advanced in the process of acquiring the status of verbal inflection. Thus the clitic could be considered and agreement marker which checks the uniterpretable features of the [T+v+V] head. (the clitic spells out a D feature and also φ-features of the T head, which is thus [Cl(D, φ) + T]T^0).

Alina Tigău
University of Bucharest
alina_mihaela_tigau@yahoo.com

References

Aoun, J. (1981). The Formal Nature of Anaphoric Relations. PhD dissertation, MIT.
Aronoff, M. (1976). *Word Formation in Generative Grammar*. Linguistic Inquiry Monographs 1.Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Aronoff, M. and Fudeman, K. (2005). *What Is Morphology?* Oxford: Blackwell.
Auger, J. (1994). Pronominal Clitics in Quebec Colloquial French: A Morphological Analysis. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
Avram, M. (1986). *Gramatica pentru toţi*. Bucureşti: Editura Academiei Republicii Socialiste România.
Borer, H. (1983). *Parametric Syntax*. Dordrecht : Foris.
Bouchard, D. (1982). On the Content of Empty Categories. PhD dissertation, MIT.
Burzio, L. (1983). *Italian Syntax*. Dordrecht: Reidel.
Cardinaletti, A. (1993). On the internal structure of pronominal DPs. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 3 (2): 1-20.
Cardinaletti, A. and Starke, M. (1999). The typology of structural deficiency. On the three pronominal classes. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 4 (2): 41-109.
Chierchia, G. (1987). Aspects of a categorial theory of binding. In R. Oehrle, E. Bach, and D. Wheeler (eds.), *Categorial Grammars and Natural Language Structure,* 72-128. Dordrecht: Reidel.
Chomsky, N. (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Chomsky, N. (1993). A minimalist program for linguistic theory. In K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honour of Sylvain Bromberger*, 1-52, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Chomsky, N. (1995). *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist inquiries: the framework. In R. Martin, D. Michaels, and J. Uriagereka (eds), *Step by Step. Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honour of Howard Lasnik,* 89-156. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1994). *The Syntax of Romanian*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Farkas, D. and Kazazis, K. (1980). Clitic pronouns and topicality in Rumanian. In *Proceedings of the 16th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 75–81. Chicago. Linguistic Society of Chicago.
Franco, J. (1991). Spanish object clitics as verbal agreement morphemes, *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 14:99-114.
Franco, J. (2000). Agreement as a continuum. In F. Beukema, M. den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages,* 146-189. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Giorgi, A and G. Longobardi (1991).*The Syntax of Noun Phrases Configurations: Parameters and Empty Categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
Giusti, G. (2001). The birth of a functional category: from Latin ille to the Romance article and pronoun. In G. Cinque and G.P. Salvi (eds.), *Essays in the Honour of Lorenzo Rrenzi,* 105-125. Amsterdam: North Holland Publishers.
Hurtado, A. (1984). On the properties of LF. In *Cornell Papers in Linguistics* 5: 121-49i.
Jaeggli, O. (1982). *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
Jaeggli, O. (1986). *Three issues in the theory of clitics*. In H. Borer (ed.), *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics,* 15-42, Dordrecht:, Academic Press.
Kayne, R. S.(1975). *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
Kayne, R. S. (1989). Null subjects and clitic climbing. In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.), *The Null Subject Parameter,*127-147 . Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Martins, A. (1995). A minimalist approach to clitic climbing. In A. Dainora, R. Hemphill, B. Luka, B. Need and S. Pargman *Papers from the 31st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 2 :235-260. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din Bucureşti
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)

Miller, P. (1992). *Clitics and Constituents in Phrase Structure Grammar*. New York: Garland.
Monachesi, P. (1999). *A Lexical Approach to Italian Cliticization*. Stanford: CSLI publications.
Miller, P and Monachesi, P. (2003). Les pronomes clitiques dans les langues romanes . In. D. Godard (ed.), *Les langues romanes : problèmes de la phrase simple,* 67-123. Paris : Editions du CNRS.
Perlmutter, D. (1971). *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Postal, P.M. (1969). On so-called 'pronouns' in English. In. D.A. Reibel and S.A. Shane (eds.), *Modern Studies in English: Readings in Transformational Grammar,* 15-27.Englewood Cliffs, N. J: Prentice Hall.
Progovac, L.(2000). Where do clitics cluster?. In F. Beukema and M. den Dikken (eds.), *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Rivas, A. (1977). A Theory of Clitics. PhD Dissertation, MIT.
Rizzi, L. (1986). On chain formation. In H. Borer (ed.), *The Grammar of Pronominal Clitics*. Syntax and Semantics 19. New York: Academic Press.
Roberge,Y. (1990). *The Syntactic Recoverability of Null Arguments*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
Sportiche, D. (1996). Clitic constructions. In: J. Rooryck, and L. Zaring (eds.), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, 213-277. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
Sportiche, D. (1990). Movement, case and agreement. Ms. UCLA.
Sportiche, D. (1989). Le mouvement syntaxique: contraintes et paramètres. *Langages* 95 : 35- 80.
Strozer, J.(1976). Clitics in Spanish. PhD Dissertation, UCLA
Suner, M. (1988).The role of agreement in clitic doubling constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6 (3): 391-434.
Uriagereka, J. (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26 (1) : 79-123.
Valois, D. (1991).The Internal Syntax of DP. PhD Dissertation.
Zamparelli, R. 1995. A null theory of bound variable pronouns. <http://wwwestern.unibg.it/dsfc/pers/zamparelli/index-eng.html..
Zwicky, A. (1977). On clitics. Bloomington: IULC.
Zwicky, A. (1985). Clitics and particles. *Language* 61(2):283–305.
Zwicky, A. and Pullum, G. (1983). Cliticization vs. inflection: English n't. *Language* 59(3):502–513.

BDD-A9766 © 2007 Universitatea din București
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.216.25 (2026-11-08 05:54:14 UTC)