0. Introduction

Clitics are, by definition, unstressed elements (for example, Halpern 1998). It is therefore surprising to find languages which consistently stress what otherwise looks like a clitic. In this paper we will explore the rather exceptional behavior of some Romance languages that allow stressed enclitics.

We have identified a number of basic Romance patterns in which the presence of enclitic pronouns may affect the stress assignment of the verb. We schematically exemplify some of these patterns in (1) for the verb *narra* meaning “tell” and the first person singular dative clitic *mi* (patterns are consistent with all first and second person dative enclitics) and the third person singular accusative feminine clitic *la* (patterns seem consistent with all third person accusative enclitics). We also include a partial list of the languages in which the pattern is attested.\(^1\) Other patterns, such as those involving asyllabic clitics, will not be discussed here.

\(^1\) Data for Aragonese and Menorcan and Majorcan Catalan come from field research; data on Gascon come from field research and Séguy (1954); Sardinian data come from Jones (1993); data on minor Romance varieties spoken in southern Italy come from Bafile (1991-1992), Bichelli (1974), Gioscio (1985), Iannace (1983), Lüdke (1979); and data on minor Romance varieties spoken in northern Italy come from Rohlfs (1966).
(1) Stress assignment patterns in Romance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>imper.</th>
<th>DAT enclitic</th>
<th>ACC enclitic</th>
<th>two enclitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I: Stress Stability (Ital, Span, Cat)</td>
<td>nárra</td>
<td>nárra-mí</td>
<td>nárra-la</td>
<td>nárra-mí-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: Generalized Penultimate Stress Shift (some Lucanian varieties)</td>
<td>nárra</td>
<td>narrá-mí</td>
<td>narrá-la</td>
<td>narrá-mí-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: Two-Clitic Penultimate Stress Shift (some S. Ital. varieties, such as the one spoken in Naples)</td>
<td>nárra</td>
<td>nárra-mí</td>
<td>nárra-la</td>
<td>narrá-mí-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV: Mixed Penultimate Stress Shift (some S. Ital. varieties, such as the one of Calvello)</td>
<td>nárra</td>
<td>narrá-mí</td>
<td>narrá-la</td>
<td>narrá-mí-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: Final Stress Shift (some varieties of Sardinian, Gascon)</td>
<td>nárra</td>
<td>narra-mí</td>
<td>narra-lá</td>
<td>narra-mí-lá</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Previous Analyses

Phonological analyses of these patterns are abundant in the literature (Kenstowicz 1991, Bafile 1991-92, Loporcaro 2000, Peperkamp 1997, Monachesi 1996) and make reference to different incorporation sites within the prosodic hierarchy or post-lexical re-assignment of stress. These approaches have focused on Stress Stability (pattern I) as compared to Generalized Penultimate Stress Shift (pattern II) and Two-Clitic Penultimate Stress Shift (pattern III).

Within a derivational model, Kenstowicz (1991) and Bafile (1991-92) argue that the Neapolitan data (pattern III) can be accounted for by assuming that stress assignment takes place in two stages: first the host is metrified, followed by the metrification of the host plus enclitics, but the precompiled metrical structure of the host is maintained. Stress is shifted only if it violates a certain metrical structure.

Loporcaro (2000) similarly argues that the difference between languages exhibiting Stress Stability (pattern I) and those exhibiting Penultimate Stress Shift (patterns II and III), and specifically Italian vs Lucanian and Neapolitan, is to be found in the setting of a parameter determining whether or not stress can be reassigned post-lexically. Languages having the former pattern do not allow reassignment of stress, while languages with the latter patterns do.

While Loporcaro (2000) argues that in all Romance varieties clitics adjoin to the Prosodic Word, Peperkamp (1997), following Selkirk (1995), claims that the patterns exhibited in Italian (Stress Stability), Lucanian (Generalized...
Penultimate Stress Shift), and Neapolitan (Two-Clitic Penultimate Stress Shift) are due to different ways in which a clitic is incorporated into prosodic structure. Peperkamp (1997) claims that clitics may be incorporated into the Phonological Phrase (PhPh) (as in Italian) or the Prosodic Word (PrWd) (as in Lucanian), or they may be adjoined recursively to the Prosodic Word (as in Neapolitan).

\[(2) \text{ Peperkamp (1997)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\text{PhPh-incorporation} & \text{PrWd-incorporation} & \text{PrWd-adjunction} \\
\text{(Italian: Stress Stability: pattern I)} & \text{(Lucanian: pattern II)} & \text{(Neapolitan: pattern III)} \\
\hline
\text{PhPh} & \text{PhPh} & \text{PhPh} \\
\text{|} & \text{|} & \text{|} \\
\text{PrWd} & \text{PrWd} & \text{PrWd} \\
\text{|} & \text{|} & \text{|} \\
\text{verb clitic} & \text{verb clitic} & \text{PrWd} \\
\text{|} & \text{|} & \text{|} \\
& & \text{verb clitic} \\
\end{array}
\]

Another approach is suggested by Monachesi (1996).

\[(3) \text{ Monachesi (1996)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{one enclitic} & \text{two enclitics} & \text{} \\
\text{PrWd} & \text{PrWd} & \text{\land} \\
\text{|} & \text{\land} & \text{\land} \\
\text{PrWd} & \text{PrWd} & \text{PrWd} \\
\text{|} & \text{|} & \text{|} \\
\text{verb clitic} & \text{verb clitic} & \text{cl cl} \\
\end{array}
\]

In her discussion of Italian and Neapolitan cliticization (pattern I and pattern III), Monachesi (1996) posits different prosodic structures for single clitics vs clitic clusters: one clitic adjoins to the host to form a single PrWd, while two clitics form a unit (PrWd) separate from the host resulting in a compound structure.

There are a number of problems with each these analyses when the full range of data is taken into consideration.
Certain varieties spoken in southern Italy (Calvello, San Leucio del Sannio) allow either stress stability or stress shift with one enclitic, but they require Penultimate Stress Shift with two enclitics (pattern IV). Why would variation be tolerated with one enclitic but not with two?

Furthermore, the mixed behavior of pattern IV sometimes seems to be determined by the character of the clitic. For example, in some Lucanian dialects the ACC clitic triggers stress shift, but the DAT clitic does not. Why would the ACC clitic but not the DAT clitic affect stress assignment?

(4) [nárra-mi] vs [narrá-la]

Further complications with all of these analyses arise when we consider those languages in which the final clitic consistently attracts stress (pattern V), but final stress is otherwise not productive (some varieties of Sardinian, Gascon, and Viozene Piedmontese). Why would the prosodic hierarchy force final stress only in these cases?

Finally, the order in which the clitics appear affects whether stress is shifted to the penultimate or final clitic in a cluster. The few Romance languages that allow the ACC - DAT order of clitics and that shift stress with enclitics (S. Gascon, Majorcan, Aragonese), have consistent final stress with two enclitics. Why would the order of clitics play a role in stress assignment?

(5) ACC-DAT order of clitics ~ Final Stress Shift

a. porto-la-mú (Gascon)
give-it(ACC)-me(DAT)

b. du-la-má (Majorcan Catalan)
give-it(ACC)-me(DAT)

c. da-la-mé (Cheso Aragonese)
give-it(ACC)-me(DAT)

There is a clear asymmetry in the stress patterns of languages that exhibit the more common DAT - ACC order and those with the rare ACC - DAT order. The former allows Generalized, Two-Clitic, and Mixed Penultimate Stress Shift and Final Stress Shift, while the latter requires Final Stress Shift. This asymmetry suggests that the order of clitics plays a role in stress assignment, a fact that is inconsistent with the phonological analyses suggested above.

2. “Weak Pronoun” Analysis

We suggest that the term ‘clitic’ has been used to refer to two groups of pronouns that are morphologically distinct, and this has lead to much of the
confusion regarding the unexpected behavior of so-called “clitics.” We propose that the data can be better understood if we divide postverbal pronouns into two morphological categories: true clitics and weak pronouns (Cardinaletti & Starke 1999). Thus, not all pronouns have the same morphological status.

As explained by Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) there is a tripartition among pronouns, illustrated in (7) with data from Italian.

(6) Cardinaletti & Starke (1999)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>strong pronoun</td>
<td><em>Telefono a loro.</em></td>
<td>“I telephone them.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak pronoun</td>
<td><em>Telefono loro.</em></td>
<td>“”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clitic pronoun</td>
<td><em>Gli telefono.</em></td>
<td>“”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We outline below four characteristics of weak pronouns identified by Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) that we believe apply to some of the postverbal pronouns illustrated above and that allow us to account for the attested patterns as well as the gaps in the data.

2.1. *Weak pronouns can be stressed* (Cardinaletti & Starke 1999: 172)

We claim that preverbally we find true clitics and postverbally we find either clitic or weak pronouns. And it is only the postverbal weak pronouns that affect stress. For example, preverbally, the Lucanian mas. sg. acc. pronoun is a true clitic, /u/, and it is never stressed (although it can be realized as long in clusters).

(7) preverbal pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucanian</td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>/u/nun u fá₃ʃə lũːfáʃtsə vedé</td>
<td>“he does not do it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>/v@llʃ</td>
<td>“I show him it”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With certain verbs, /u/ can be found in enclitic position as well. Crucially, enclitic /u/ (a true clitic) does not trigger stress shift, while another mas. sg. acc. pronoun does: enclitic /v@llʃ/ (a weak pronoun).²

(8) postverbal pronoun

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lucanian</td>
<td>clitic</td>
<td>/u/ fá-mmũ</td>
<td>“do (you:sg)-for me-it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weak</td>
<td>/v@llʃ da-mmɪllʃ</td>
<td>“give (you:sg)-to me-it”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² /v/ represents a stressed vowel whose quality may vary. We do not take a position on the actual lexical representation of this pronoun, which may be /llʃ/ (with stress of the heavy penult) or /lʃ/ (with epenthesis of final schwa and penultimate stress).
Another Lucanian dialect spoken in Calvello has Mixed Penultimate Stress Shift (pattern IV). Again, we claim the form of the pronoun found in the stress shifted case is weak /vllá/, while the form found in the non stress shifted case is a true clitic /lá/.

(9) postverbal pronoun
Calvello:  
clitic: /lá/  vínnə-lá  “sell (you:sg) it”
weak: /vllá/  vənni-llá  “sell (you:sg) it”

It is important to note that the geminate /ll/ of the weak pronoun in (8) and (9) is not due to raddoppiamento sintattico since these varieties do not have a phonological rule of raddoppiamento following stressed vowels.

Stress Stability languages (pattern I) use clitic pronouns only, while languages with consistent stress shift under enclisis (patterns II and V) have generalized the weak pronoun option postverbally. Languages exhibiting patterns III and IV use either weak or clitic pronouns postverbally.

2.2. Weak pronouns are morphologically more complex than clitic pronouns  
(Cardinaletti & Starke 1999: 178)

In those languages which stress enclitic pronouns, the proclitic form of some pronouns may differ from the enclitic form. And, crucially, it is always the postverbal form which is “fuller” than the proclitic one. This observation is consistent with our analysis: weak pronouns are morphologically more complex than clitic pronouns. For example, in some Lucanian dialects, the mas. sg. acc. pronoun is clitic /u/ preverbally and weak /vllá/ postverbally. (See also (7), (8), and (9) above.)

(10) preverbal clitic vs postverbal weak pronouns
Lucanian:  
clitic: /u/  u-pillé-gjá  "it-s/he takes"
weak: /vllá/  piggé-llá  "take (2sg)-it"

Furthermore, when there are two realizations of the same postverbal pronoun, the pronoun present in the stress shifting context is “fuller” than the pronoun present in the stress stability context. We claim that the former is a weak pronoun and the latter a true clitic pronoun. (See (8) and (9) above.)

This approach also has historical support. Rohlfs (1968:167) claims that those enclitic pronouns which trigger stress shift are closer to the “full Latin form” than the proclitic forms that do not affect stress.
2.3. Weak pronouns are syntactically lower than clitic pronouns (Cardinaletti & Starke 1999: 196)

Under our perspective languages are divided in three groups: (i) languages that use only clitic pronouns (pattern I); (ii) those that consistently use postverbal weak pronouns (patterns II and V); (iii) languages that use either weak or clitic pronouns postverbally (patterns III and IV).

This third type of language presents interesting question with respect to the assumptions on the final landing site of clitics and weak pronouns. Here we will follow the basic assumptions of Cardinaletti & Starke (1999) and assume that clitics land in a higher head projection than weak pronouns. For instance Cardinaletti (1991) has shown that the Italian DAT clitic gli lands in a higher tense head while the weak pronoun counterpart loro lands in a lower Spec Agr position.

    DAT I-have given the book.

b. Ho dato loro il libro.
    I-have given DAT the book

A similar proposal has been given for French under the assumption that there is an il clitic and an il weak pronoun. Cardinaletti & Repetti (ms) claim that interrogative clitic il is also higher than its weak pronoun counterpart.

(12) a. \[ AgrSP \_I_k \_ a \_ [VP t_k \_ bu ]] \_ (French declarative)
    he has drunk

b. \[YP a_k-t-il \_ [AgrSP t \_ t [VP t_k \_ bu ]]] \_ (French interrogative)
    has-he drunk

The idea that XP counterparts (weak pronouns under our proposal) of X^0 (clitics) are found lower in the structure is also implied in the two step movement approach of clitics defended by Belletti (1999). According to her analysis clitics move first as XP, being able to trigger past participle agreement, and then only the head part moves further to adjoin to tense or any higher inflectional projection. Thus, this analysis implies that the XP counterpart of the head, the one responsible for past participle agreement, is in a lower Spec position.
This first claim about the different landing site for clitics and weak pronominals (maximal projections) has interesting consequences when taken in conjunction with assumptions on how the verb-clitic order is determined in the syntax. Here we will adopt the proposal by Kayne (1991) and (1994) and assume that right adjunction of clitics is not permitted in the syntax. This restriction allows us to obtain the order *verb-clitic* in infinitives or imperatives by movement of the verb to a higher projection beyond the position in which the clitic has landed.

Rivero (1994) has argued convincingly that verbs move higher in imperative sentences than in declarative one. The landing site of the verb in imperatives is in the Comp area. Similarly, Kayne (1991) shows that infinitives in languages like Italian and Spanish have moved further to the left than their finite counterparts. In these proposals verbs either adjoin to the clitic or skip the clitic position.³

³ See Terzi (1999) which shows that clitics might skip some head positions depending on whether the clitic adjoins to a head with features the verb needs to check.
Enclisis should be obtained in a parallel fashion with the verb moving further to the left with a weak pronoun. The difference is that the higher X₀ projection is rendered irrelevant since there is no clitic.

However, in a mixed language, namely a language that has both weak and clitic pronominals, the base order in which the clitic and the weak pronoun appear should be the one in which the clitic is higher than the weak pronominal.
(16) Verb-Clitic-Weak

To yield this order the verb moves head to head resulting in the final verb-clitic-weak order. This is exactly what we find in Generalized Penultimate Stress Shift (pattern 2), which under our proposal involves a clitic and a weak pronominal element. The order is precisely clitic followed by weak pronoun. Thus, sequences like those in (17) are instances of adjunction of a second person clitic /tv/ with a weak pronominal /v@ll/ (18).

(17) v@nnɔ-tillé “sell-you it” (S.Italian varieties)

(18) tillè < clitic /tv/ + weak /v@ll/

This analysis predicts that head to head movement yields the final output verb-clitic-weak. This is consistent with the fact that the sequence verb-clitic-weak is encountered in Standard French in imperatives as in (19). Under our perspective, this sequence represents a case in which the weak pronominal moi follows the clitic le, reversing the DAT-ACC order otherwise obtained in purely clitic sequences like le me.4

(19) donne-le-moi
give-it-to me

4 Many dialects of French also permit the opposite order donne-moi-le as well. These dialects show variability between the order in (19) le-moi and the order moi-le. This additional case can be explained if the verb is capable of pied piping the weak pronoun in its way to the Comp area. The interesting prediction of our proposal is that we should not find a language which consistently has the order moi-le without permitting the opposite. This prediction is satisfied.
In addition to predicting the correct output with a clitic preceding a weak pronoun, our theory should also explain the asymmetry between one pronominal vs two pronominal sequences in pattern III. In this pattern, sequences of one pronominal only admit the clitic possibility.

Such an asymmetry can be explained if we appeal to an independent principle proposed by Cardinaletti & Repetti (ms) that deals precisely with cases in which a clitic position is required in Donceto (a Northern Italian Dialect) in interrogatives in preference to its weak pronominal counterpart. According to Cardinaletti & Repetti, the clitic $j\acute{o}$ in the $C^0$ area is made available, and it should be chosen in preference to its weak pronominal counterpart $pro$.

\[(20) \quad [\text{YP be:vi} \text{:\textit{j}\text{o}k} [\text{AGRSP t}k t_i [\text{VP t}k t_i ]]? \text{‘drink-}\text{I’}\]

\[(21) \quad *[\text{YP be:vi} [\text{AGRSP pro}k t_i [\text{VP t}k t_i ]]? \text{‘drink-}\text{I’}\]

Thus, Pattern III requires that the clitic head $X^0$ be realized and check with at least one clitic. With two pronominals however, one pronominal is sufficient to satisfy such a requirement leaving open the possibility of having the other pronominal in a lower Spec position as in (17). Observe that this economy principle would be very much in the same spirit of the principle of minimal compliance by Richards (2001). Once the $X^0$ gets one clitic, other pronominals can remain in situ in a lower Spec.

2.4 Weak pronouns land in a Spec position

As we mentioned at the beginning, languages that have the ACC - DAT order (with non-3rd persons) are very few compared to the more common DAT - ACC order. These languages (Gascon, Majorcan, Cheso Aragonese) all exhibit Final Stress Shift (pattern V) and obligatorily stress their pronominals in imperatives. When two pronominals are combined, stress is shifted to the final pronoun. Why should this be so? Under this proposal the generalization that underlies these languages is that they all have generalized the weak pronoun option in enclisis. On the opposite end of the spectrum, most languages with the DAT - ACC order correspond to languages with true clitics. The difference in morphological status of the pronouns (heads vs XP) might give us an interesting clue as to why the order of the pronouns is the mirror image of each other.
Weak pronouns, contrary to clitics, land in a Spec position (Cardinaletti & Starke 1999) while clitics are heads and land in a head position. For the case of double object construction, we will adopt the proposal by Collins and Thrainsson (1996) and claim that the basic structure is the one in which the dative arguments sits above the accusative one.

(22)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DAT} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ACC}
\end{array}
\]

From this basic order, two opposite surface orders are obtained: ACC - DAT with two weak pronouns and DAT - ACC with two clitics. Under this proposal this is realized by XP movement proceeding in the opposite direction of \(X^0\) movement. Either movement might nest or cross to yield the two mirror image orders.

(23)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{YP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{XP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Spec} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ACC} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Weak} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Spec} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DAT} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Weak} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{VP} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{DAT} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Weak} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{ACC} \\
\downarrow \\
\text{Weak}
\end{array}
\]
We will follow Richards (2001) and assume that movement of two XP’s nest because they necessarily have to go in search of two different Spec positions to check their different features.

At the opposite end of the spectrum two clitics yield crossing paths. Under our view, crossing paths correspond to the configuration in which both clitics end up checking the same inflectional head $X^0$. (see also Anagnostopoulou 2003.) Richards (2001) proposes a principle of ‘tucking in’ that leads precisely to the crossing paths configurations with two heads. By his principle of *attract closest*, the DAT moves first to the $X^0$ head. This first movement is followed by movement of the ACC, which *tucks into* the DAT yielding the desired order DAT - ACC.

(24) Clitics

Therefore, various well established assumptions about landing sites of XP’s vs $X^0$’s and the fact that XP might target two different agreement projections, while two $X^0$’s target one head, leads to the opposite ordering configurations DAT - ACC with clitics and ACC - DAT with weak pronouns. This proposal also leads to the conclusion that clitics must cluster and cannot be scattered in different inflectional projections, contrary to XP weak pronouns which seem to necessarily appear in different projections in the tree. Finally, this proposal captures the correlation between DAT - ACC languages and obligatory stress shift.
Further research on historical data, especially Old French, Old Italian and Old Catalan that had the unusual ACC - DAT order, might shed further light on our proposal if we assume that the loss of ACC - DAT order correlates with the loss of weak pronouns in favor of their clitic counterparts.

3. Conclusions

In this paper we have argued that once we consider the full range of possible patterns, the prosodic hierarchy is insufficient to account for all the cases in which there is consistent stress shift, as well as the mixed cases that depend on the character of the clitic. We have assumed that the pronouns that affect stress are weak pronouns, not true clitics. The evidence is found in asymmetries between preverbal vs postverbal pronouns and between postverbal pronouns that affect stress vs postverbal pronouns that do not affect stress. Further evidence comes from the fact that in many of the dialects studied, the stress-shifting pronominal element (i.e., the weak pronoun) has a richer morphological structure than its non-stress-shifting counterpart (i.e., the clitic pronoun). Finally, the obligatory stressing of postverbal pronouns in languages with ACC - DAT order can be linked to the fact that they are necessarily weak pronouns given that these pronouns must move to a distinct agreement projection which involves crossing paths.
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