Clitics: Head-movement vs. linearization

Motivation of the question. We observe that Romance pronominal clitics are merged in independently established functional projections, of which they largely preserve the relative order of precedence: accusative clitics introduce transitivity (v); locatives, datives, and 1/2P clitics are high/low Appls; Subject clitics are Agr(S) (Chomsky 2013).

(1)   [$_{Agr}$ il [T   [$_{Appl}$ me   [$_v$ les [$_{Appl}$ y [$_v$ achetera   Fr.
        he   to.me   them   there will.buy
        'He will buy them there for me'

In (1) clitics are not hosted in specialized positions, pace Sportiche 1996, nor are they mere Spell-Outs of Agree (Roberts 2010).
Standard tests (Pollock 1989) establish that the verb (and clitics) can be spelled-out in v (English, French infinitives), in I/Agr (French finite Vs), or in C (medieval French). Thus clitics become directly relevant for the theoretical issue whether syntactic displacement is effected
- by linearization at EXT (Chomsky 2001) or
- by syntactic movement (Kayne 1994).

Descriptive facets of the issue include whether clitics are *ad-verbal* (i.e. adjacent to V) or admit interpolation, see (2) – and whether they are enclitic, see (3), or proclitic (1).

(2)   logo *lhe*   el- rrei   taxava   que…   o.Port.
        soon to.him= the king   imposed   that
        'Immediately the king imposed on him that…'
(3)   Penso di comprar-*lo*   It.
        I.think of buying=it

Perspective A	Perspective B
1. The span from C/I (higher Spell-Out) to v/V (lower Spell-Out) is delimited by discourse peripheries (Rizzi 1997; Belletti 2004). Clitics are probed by anti-focal criterial heads and undergo *freezing*. Adjacency between clitics and V may be epiphenomenal, witness (2).	1. The span from C/I (higher Spell-Out) to v/V (lower Spell-Out) corresponds to the Spell-Out domain defined by the PIC (Chomsky 2001), at EXT. Agree/Minimality or syntactic movement via phase edges are not amenable to the same result.
2. Spell-Out points within the relevant span are governed by language-specific discourse factors (analogous to those triggering/allowing/banning wh in situ). Clitics move as XPs to the clause-internal/*v* periphery (Gallego 2016). Then, they are either incorporated to the verb (→ ad-verbal cl.) or undergo cyclic movement to the left/C periphery (→ Wackernagel cl.).	2. Spell-Out points within the relevant span are governed either by Earliness/Least Effort (Spell-Out in situ), or by Lateness/Last Resort (C-I, closing the Spell-Out domain). Syntactic head movement should in principle be able to target any intermediate head in the Spell-Out domain counter to fact (though see Cinque 1999).
3. Ad-verbal clitics are incorporated into the verb by an operation of word formation. Word formation and phrase building are interleaved and both result from the same labeling algorithm (Rizzi	3. Adverbal clitics are incorporated into the verb by a PF operation of phonological word formation. Lower Spell-out of V involves proclisis. Higher Spell-Out involves enclisis or depending on the structure of the

2016). Word formation is expected to yield proclisis, i.e. to preserve the relative order of precedence in (1), whereas enclisis in (3) obtains when word formation is overridden by V performing Long Head Movement (Vicente 2007 a.o.).	C-I phase. If Agr is a probe/inheritance head of phase, Spell-Out of the phonological word /Agr…V/ is in Agr (proclisis), e.g. (1). If there is no Agr phase head/probe, V is linearized in C and phonological word formation derives enclisis, e.g. (2). The infinitive has no clear modal/C-related meaning, excluding syntactic movement.

Relevance of the question. Clitics have so far hardly played a secondary role, if any, in the theoretical debate on what determines word order. Yet they enrich the empirical picture considerably providing a clear intermediate case of ordering between phrases/independent heads and affixal material. The issue involves at least three families intensively studied in the theoretical literature: Indo-European, Niger-Congo, Afro-Asiatic. Indo-European presents the most complex descriptive challenges, notably enclisis/proclisis alternations.

The two theoretical positions are clear. Kayne (1994 ff.), the previous head-movement literature, and subsequent cartographic models take word order to be an effect of merge and move in core syntax – variation is an effect of variation in movement. Chomsky (2001 ff.) has core syntactic structures ordered by dominance, while precedence is introduced at the EXT interface – as is head positioning, which is a mere matter of pronunciation.

A major descriptive and theoretical issue raised by clitics – namely whether they are referential or rather non-referential (object markers) – may mask the typological extension of the phenomenon. Romance (generally I-E) clitics have referential content (shared with determiners), which does not prevent them from entering doubling configurations and linker configurations (Balkan languages).

Belletti, Adriana (2004). Aspects of the Low IP Area. In Luigi Rizzi (ed.), The structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures (vol. 2). Oxford: Oxford University Press, 16-51.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In: Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: a life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2013. Problems of projection. *Lingua* 130. 33–49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.12.003.

Cinque, Guglielmo (1999). Adverbs and Functional Heads. A Cross-linguistic Perspective. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gallego, Ángel J. (2016). A phase-theoretic approach to cliticization in Romance. Studies in Hispanic and Lusophone Linguistics 9(1): 67–94.

Kayne, Richard (1994). The Antisymmetry of Syntax. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Pollock, Jean-Yves (1989). Verb movement, universal grammar, and the structure of IP. Linguistic Inquiry 20(3): 365-424.

Rizzi, Luigi (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), Elements of Grammar. Handbook of Generative Syntax. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 281-337.

Rizzi, Luigi (2016). Labeling, maximality, and the head – phrase distinction. The Linguistic. Review 33(1): 103-127.

Roberts, Ian (2010). Agreement and Head Movement. Cambridge (Mass.): MIT Press.

Sportiche, Dominique (1996) Clitic constructions. In Johan Rooryck, and Laurie Zaring (eds), Phrase Structure and the Lexicon. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 213-287.

Vicente, Luis (2007). The syntax of heads and phrases: a study of verb (phrase) fronting. Leiden University: Doctoral dissertation