

A History of Spanish Clitic Movement

Author(s): Dieter Wanner

Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society (1982), pp. 135-147

Please see “How to cite” in the online sidebar for full citation information.

Please contact BLS regarding any further use of this work. BLS retains copyright for both print and screen forms of the publication. BLS may be contacted via <http://linguistics.berkeley.edu/bls/>.

The Annual Proceedings of the Berkeley Linguistics Society is published online via [eLanguage](#), the Linguistic Society of America's digital publishing platform.

A HISTORY OF SPANISH CLITIC MOVEMENT

Dieter Wanner
University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

1. Within the constraints of a short paper, I will try to sketch briefly the more promising opinions voiced about clitic movement in modern Spanish, in order to trace its vicissitudes from the 12th century to the present, and to integrate the insights of this survey into one more analysis of the domain, structure, dynamics, and idiosyncrasies of this common Romance phenomenon in Spanish.¹ The modern Spanish alternating clitic pronoun position appears in (1).

- (1) a. no podemos comprenderlos = V(cm) + V(inf) - clit.
b. no los podemos comprender = [clit. - V(cm)] + V(inf)
'we cannot understand them'

The variable position of the clitic pronoun with the infinitive in (1a) and with the higher verb in (1b) does not affect meaning. The clitic is interpreted as an argument of the infinitive in both cases. Taking (1a) as basic, the derivation of (1b) is said to involve a rule tagged with different names, chiefly Clitic Movement (CM), Clitic Climbing, Clitic Promotion, Clitic Gliding, Clitic Raising, and more. The same phenomenon of moved clitics as in (1b) is also found throughout the history of Spanish, even in a much more extensive form in the Middle Ages, affecting more verbs, and appearing with very high relative frequency. The historical evolution consists in a gradual reduction of the domain and frequency of CM application down to the present day situation. While CM has been viewed as anchored in structural features, in the semantic content of the governing verbs V(cm), and perhaps also in the **dimension of normativity** (where it rates as informal), an insightful account cannot ignore the slow but constant evolution towards progressively constrained CM. CM has been noticed within Romance linguistics and Spanish philology, but it failed to produce any in-depth studies of its history.² However, in the recent tradition of transformational syntax, the interest in the synchronic dimension of CM soared high on account of its exquisite diagnostic virtues. The references included here indicate the extent of this investigative program.³ I will first discuss the modern phenomenon; this will lead to the historical data and some necessary conclusions in the following sections.

2.1. Another modern example (2) points up these observations: acabar belongs to the as yet undefined class V(cm) which optionally allows CM (as poder in (1)). The V(inf) ofrecer defines the arguments (DO and IO).

- (2) a. acabamos de ofrecerle nuestros servicios
b. le acabamos de ofrecer nuestros servicios
'we have just offered her our services'

For this reason (2a) is regarded as closer to the semantically expected surface result: Clitic placement chooses for le its natural host ofrecer within the simplex clause of origin. In (2b) the larger clause forms the domain of clitic placement. This is sketched in (3).

- (3) a. $\text{acab- } [_@ \text{ ofrecer } [\text{NP}] \text{ le }] \Rightarrow [_@ \text{ ofrecer+le } [\text{NP}]]$
 b. $[[[_V \text{ acab- ofrecer}] [\text{NP}] \text{ le }] \Rightarrow [[[_\text{le+acab- of.}] [\text{NP}]]$

The presence vs. absence of the clausal bracket pair [_@] allows one clitic placement rule to account for both versions of (1) and (2). On the other hand, a decision to regard the sentential structure as unchanged between the (a) and (b) versions requires two distinct processes: A general clitic placement for (a), and a special clitic climbing rule referring to V(cm) for (b). In addition, an overrich approach combining the two alternatives, with two structures and two placement processes, could be invoked if necessary. In all cases, optionality characterizes the operation of the structural reduction and/or the special climbing rule. Categorical absence or presence of CM is the case for most verbs which take an embedded infinitive (= V(-cm)); cf. (4); obligatory CM characterizes causative and perception verb constructions with overt reference to the embedded agent; cf. (5). This last type will not be considered further here.

- (4) a. Este problema, Marisa soñaba con resolverlo
 b. *Este problema, Marisa lo soñaba con resolver
 'This problem M. dreamed of solving'
 (5) a. Me hicieron copiarlo otra vez (or: Me lo hicieron...)
 b. *Hicieron copiármelo otra vez
 'they made me copy it again'

2.2. The solutions proposed so far are all unsatisfactory to different degrees, a fact which emerges clearly from Suffer 1980. In particular, it is not sufficient to let universal conditions account for the alternation (in the vein of Kayne 1975, Quicoli 1976; contrary Strozer 1976) since they cannot encompass the actual surface alternation. A structural change along the lines of the informal (3) has been proposed repeatedly.⁴ The best such analysis, Rizzi's Restructuring for Italian, can be directly transposed into Spanish. The salient feature is the creation of a unit constituent V(restruct) from a regular sentential source, so that clitic placement can now 'move' la in (6) to V(cm) instead of the infinitive. The unit constituent V(cm)+V(inf) is motivated on the basis of various parallel restrictions on movement/deletion: It cannot be broken up again; cf. (7).

- (6)
- VP

├── V(restr.)

├── V(cm)

├── V(inf)

├── NP

└── PP

'J. must introduce her
to Fr.'
- Juan [debe \emptyset presentar] la a Francisco
- (7) a. Mario sinceramente quisiera -- pero en mi opinión
no podrá nunca --pagarle su deuda por entero
- b. *Mario sinceramente quisiera -- pero en mi opinión
[no le podrá nunca \emptyset] -- pagar su deuda por entero
'Mario would like to -- but in my opinion will never be
able to -- pay him his debt entirely'

Other such crucial contexts include cleft sentence formation, relative movement, and heavy NP shift.⁵ While the structural anchorage of CM is clearly demonstrated, the synchronic problem remains as to which verbs can undergo the rule of restructuring. A classificatory approach as in Rivas 1977 is **obliged to** have recourse to frequent diacritic distinctions within otherwise homogeneous structural verb classes.

2.3. Luján's restriction on the material allowed to intervene between $V(\text{cm})$ and $V(\text{inf})$, such that no more than an optional complementizer may separate the two elements, captures another relevant aspect of CM (cf. (8)) without solving the problem entirely (cf. Suñer 1980).⁶

- (8) a. quisiera no verla más 'I'd like not to see her again'
 b. *la quisiera no ver más (intervening neg)

2.4. Napoli (1981) accepts restructuring as such; in her analysis this change is triggered by a semantic criterion of unitary interpretation for V(cm) and V(inf) where CM is visible vs. a more analytical semantic **interpretation** in the absence of CM in Italian. The contrast is said to show up in examples such as (9) where cercare makes differential semantic contributions in the given contexts.

- (9) a. ho cercato di finirlo, {_{ma ho fallito}
 e ci sono riuscito
 b. *l'ho cercato di finire, ma ho fallito (focus)
 c. l'ho cercato di finire, e ci sono riuscito⁷ (focus)

No such claims have been made for Spanish. Even for Italian it is questionable whether the differential grammaticality judgments are clear cut or rather secondary and interpretive. The periphrastic nature and degree of the relevant governing verbs is an unresolved issue for a non-circular determination in Italian and Spanish (cf. Gili Gaya 1969:104).

2.5. The most comprehensive list of V(cm) is found in Sufter 1980. It organizes the predicates into major semantic groups. Each successive category in (10) is **more restricted** with regard to the

number of verbs available for CM in the semantic class. The semantic classification thus cannot explain CM all by itself, neither in its domain nor in the heterogeneity of its subclasses.

- (10) a. Modal: deber (de), haber de, tener que 'must'; poder 'can'; tratar de 'try'; soler 'use'
 b. Aspectual: acabar de 'just have done'; comenzar a, empezar a 'begin'; dejar de 'stop'; cesar de, terminar de 'finish'
 c. Motion: volver a 'do again'; ir a 'go'; venir a 'come', salir a 'go out'; pasar a 'go on'
 d. Volition: querer 'want'; desear 'wish'; mandar 'order'; dejar, permitir 'let'; aconsejar 'advise'; impedir 'hinder'; ordenar 'order'
 e. Opinion: pensar 'think'; saber 'know'

V(cm) include thus some of the most basic predicates with stereotyped infinitival embedding; wherever CM occurs, the V(inf) does not have sentential status; given CM, no further movements and deletions may affect the presumed unit constituent of $V(cm) + V(inf)$. Finally, CM is unidirectional in that no lowering of clitics can ever take place parallel to the normal raising; cf. (11).

- (11) a. me permitió hacerlo 'she allowed me to do it'
 b. me lo permitió hacer CM
 c. *permitió hacérmelo 'inverse CM'

3.1. The most striking aspect of the medieval language with regard to CM is its extensive occurrence, with a wider class of predicates on a virtually exclusive basis. There is clear historical continuity in the membership of the class of V(cm) between the 12th and the 20th century, as Table I shows. The big difference concerns the structural domain: The unitary nature of the restructured verbal constituent does not hold in the older language since the two verbal elements are frequently separated by secondarily intercalated material of variable length and constitution.

- (12) a. porque se dexaron asi vencer (DT 120:449)
 'because they let themselves be defeated thus'
 b. et envialo tu llamar (PCG 316:184b6)
 'and you have him called!'
 c. Enviaronle ellos entonce menazar (PCG 314:183b5)
 'they had him then threatened'
 d. como vos podedes luego desto vengar (20R 253:15)
 'how you can revenge yourselves of this later on'
 e. sy ... nosotros lo podieremos, como suso dicho es, fazer (Cor 49) 'if ... we could, as has been said above, do it'

The intervening structures extend to adverbs, strong pronouns, and even full subordinate clauses. Whatever the mechanism of these complex constituent orderings, the unit character of the $V(cm) + V(inf)$ constituent is effectively negated in materials stemming from texts belonging to all style levels. In (13) conjunction reduction produces a truncated constituent [podia \emptyset]; even more surprisingly, the otherwise not separable clitic is factored out on the left. An acceptable (modern) surface form with Gapping would have been available, as in (13b).

- (13) a. e por esta razon non lo devia patir nin podia (20R 243:
48) 'and for this reason he should not suffer it nor could'
b. e por esta razon non devia nin podia patirlo

The syntactic behavior cannot be due to semantic differentiation since both poder and deber must be seen as on the same level of prominence; rather, a syntactic obligatoriness causes CM in a context which leads to syntactic problems in the second conjunct. The rare counterexamples (14a) where intervening material might have blocked CM lose much of their force since the same text is full of rather extreme cases of latinizing word order (14b).

- (14) a. e non queria con otra casarse muger (12T 48)
'and he did not want to wed another wife'
b. en la del infierno entrada (ib.)
'in the of hell entry'

In general, it will only be accidental if the structures used for crucial syntactic argumentation in synchrony are directly attested in the historical phases of a language. But the few glimpses that the old texts allow of the more peripheral constructions (e.g. (13)) show the irrelevance of the V + inf constituent to Old Spanish.

3.2. Table I summarizes the results of a limited investigation into the history of CM from the 12th to the 16th century, contrasting it further with the modern language. The texts are ordered chronologically; the symbolization of the frequency patterns is as follows:

(15) ++	only CM with the given V(cm)	= CM obligatory
+	majority of CM	} = CM optional
$\frac{+}{-}$	even split CM/non-CM	
-	minority of CM	
--	absence of CM	= CM ungrammatical

The table confirms the strong continuity and the constant decrease in importance of CM. Differences between the early centuries are insignificant indicating that the language was in a stable phase with regard to CM.⁸ Only in the 16th century, perhaps in part due to the larger sample, does change appear in the form of a relative reduction of CM applications with a given V(cm). In spite of the

lack of data from the 17th to the 19th century, the evolution from the 16th to the 20th century shows a continued reduction in CM frequency and at the same time also in its range. In the modern language no predicate reaches beyond a - rating in Keniston 1937b. The more sporadic medieval V(cm) predicates are no longer mentioned for modern Spanish. The stability of CM behavior between the 13th and 15th century derives more clearly from Table II which lists the actual number of CM occurrences in seven prose texts. The proportions between CM, non-CM, inversion forms, and original V(-cm) clitics remain essentially unchanged; equally unchanged is the strong concentration of most CM cases on a small number of different V(cm). The observed frequency of lack of CM with an otherwise attested V(cm) is constant at 5%. (16) lists the V(-cm) found in the same **selections**. Most of them occur only once in one text, contrasting sharply with the frequency concentration typical of V(cm). Many of the V(-cm) define possible clitic arguments of their own (either reflexives or indirect objects). Semantically, they seem to be more specific than the typical V(cm), even though they may fall marginally within one of the semantic groupings listed in (10). The low absolute frequencies preclude an easy periphrastic interpretation of these predicates, which thus guard their lexical and functional identity.

(16) List of Predicates Without CM

acostumbrarse de, apercebirse a, asentarse a, atreverse a, caber, consejar (ser aconsejado de), contentarse de, cogerse a, cumplir, cuytarse de, dar(se) a, denostar a, dexarse de, echarse a, enfirmarse de, entender, guardarse de, guisar de, mandar (#mandar in Table I), menospreciar, mostrarse, pertenecer, plazer (de), poner en su corazón de, ponerse a, punnar de, reducir a, ser + adj/NP, sostener + acc. with inf., tener logar de, tener por bien de, tener pro de, tomarse a, trabajarse de, valer
(All verbs with one occurrence in only one text, except for **the underlined items in two texts. 19 of the V(-cm) are reflexive.**)

3.3 The data for the 20th century are somewhat contradictory between the more restrictive Keniston 1937b and the typical transformational accounts. The former consciously uses only written language as a source so that the latter do not yield a commensurate picture with their **yes-or-no** rating of grammaticality in the spoken, spontaneous language. This judgment does not address the question of regularity/frequency/degree of expectation of any CM; Keniston on the other hand cannot express ungrammaticality beyond the quite different observation that no CM is found with a given verb in the examined corpus. This is also the only kind of information available for historical phases; a sufficiently long sample may provide a rather accurate picture of the frequency distribution within a given array of connected constructions. These can then be equated with the single grammaticality judgments so that ++, +, +, - (and with shorter corpora also --) translate into ✓ of Table I. If different style

Table I: CM According to V(cm) and Frequency per Text⁹

V(cm)	Cid	DT	PCG	Ber	20R	Luc	LBA	Gat	12T	Cor	K.a	K.b	other
poder 'can'	++	++	++	+	++	++	+	++	+	++	+	-	✓
querer 'want'	+	++	++	+	+	++	+	++	++	+	+	-	✓
deber 'must'	++	+	++	+	++	++	-	++	++	++	+	-	✓
haber de 'must'	++	++	++	+	.	++	+	.	.	++	+	-	✓
saber 'know'	++	--	++	++	.	.	++	.	.	++	+	-	✓
osar 'dare'	+	.	.	++	++	.	+	.	.	.	+	-	✓
soler 'use'	.	.	.	-	.	.	+	++	.	.	+	-	✓
enviar 'send'	.	.	++	-	✓
salir 'go out'	++
ir 'go'	++	.	.	-	.	++	+	++	.	.	+	-	✓
venir 'come'	+	.	.	+	.	.	+	--	.	+	-	-	✓
comenzar { 'be-	.	.	++	.	.	++	++	.	.	.	+	-	✓
empezar gin'	.	.	.	+	--	✓
dejar 'cease'	++	✓
mandar 'order'	.	++	.	.	++
cuidar 'think'	.	.	++
pensar 'think'	.	+	✓
cometer 'order'	.	.	++

Table II: Frequency Distribution of CM According to Type (tokens/lexemes)

Type	DT	PCGa	PCGb	13th	20R	Luc	14th	Gat	12T	Cor	15th	T
CM	24/9	19/7	20/8	63	16/9	28/8	(66)	23/5	5/3	25/9	53	182
inverse	2/2	2/2	6/4	10	6/3	8/3	(21)	5/4	2/2	4/3	11	42
-CM/ e-	0	0	2/1	2	0	0	0	0	1/1	0	1	3
-CM	2/2	2/2	0	4	1/1	0	(2)	2/1	2/2	2/2	6	12
Orig.V ₁	16/6	9/6	7/7	32	6/4	10/9	(24)	8/6	7/5	8/8	23	79

(Key: inverse = V(inf) + V(cm), undecided clitic attachment

-CM/ e- = no CM in [V(cm) V(inf) e V(inf) clitic]

-CM = no CM with a V(cm)

Orig.V₁ = higher verb with clitic complements of its own)

levels are taken into account, the **unreliability** of the $\sqrt{}/*$ classification increases dramatically. The range of uncertainty appears patterned, as is shown in (17).

- (17) a. Concordant judgments in four studies (Keniston 1937b, Aissen and Perlmutter 1976, Rivas 1977, Suñer 1980):
 $4\sqrt{}$: poder, deber, querer, soler
 $3\sqrt{}$: haber de, acabar, terminar, empezar, volver, permitir, ordenar
 $2\sqrt{}$: tener que, saber, ir a, venir a
 $2*$: sugerir, pedir, evitar, insistir, soñar; parecer
 b. Discordant judgments in the same four studies:
 1. Keniston 1937b: $*/--$ vs. other(s) $\sqrt{}$: deber de; tratar, comenzar, dejar de, llegar, pensar, desear, lograr, necesitar
 2. Rivas 1977: $*$ vs. Suñer 1980: $\sqrt{}$: aprender, forzar, mandar, prohibir

The agreements refer to the core of the V(cm) class, the discrepancies to the periphery of the spectrum.

4.1. A composite picture of the evolution of CM starts from the structural indifference of CM vs. non-CM strings; rather, the (nearly) obligatory appearance of CM with a wide group of V(cm) depends on the linear arrangement of V(cm) and V(inf) in the same surface clause, presupposing that the embedded V(inf) at all relevant stages of derivation represent a non-sentential constituent (constant VP embedding for Spanish as it has been proposed for French in Morin and St-Amour 1977). A clitic placement process which identifies the host structure as the left-most verb which is semantically in the domain of the simplex clause containing the clitic to be placed, succeeds in producing the desired effect of extensive CM. Moreover, the non-structural nature of clitic placement includes in a natural way the problematic cases of intervening constituents or deletions/extraction sites (cf. (12), (13)). CM, at least in the medieval language, can be viewed as a consequence of clitic placement; therefore, a change in the principle of clitic placement must also bring about a change in the appearance pattern of CM. This link does indeed exist since clitic placement and linearization (enclitic vs. proclitic verb attachment of the clitics) is controlled throughout the 12th to 15th century by an originally stricter, then looser, application of syntactic criteria, the so-called Law of Tobler-Mussafia.¹⁰ From the 16th century on the modern non-syntactic, rather morpho-syntactically and arbitrarily controlled enclisis/proclisis distribution has been taking hold. Here enclisis is found with non-finite verb forms plus affirmative commands, proclisis in the remaining cases (in particular finite verb forms). In the medieval system, enclisis is required with any verbal form placed initially in a major constituent, regardless of finiteness, whereas the same verb form preceded by at least one element which removes the verb from constituent initial position will show proclisis. For $V + V(\text{inf})$ situations, typical string situations will be as in (18).

- (18) a. [_S X clit-V V(non-finite) vs. [_S V-clit V(non-finite)
depending on left context
b. [_S V(non-fin.)-clit for absolute constructions, and
[_S complem. clit-V(non-fin.) if introduced by COMP
c. [_S V(non-fin.) clit V(finite) for inversion cases with
ambiguous clitic placement
d. [_V V(fin.) V(non-fin.)-clit.] as a variant on (a);
based on (b) and a reanalysis of (c) as V(non-finite)-clit.

(18d) represents a more difficult interpretation; but it is inherent in the system given the natural status of (b) and (c). The difference between the absolute/sentential interpretation of an infinitive as in (b) vs. a unit interpretation according to (a) is fluctuating. As appears from Table I and (16), the rarer treatment according to (b)/(d) affects the frequently lower V(finite), those that are less amalgamated with the infinitive as a periphrastic expression, that is, those that disfavor a necessary leftward placement of the clitic beyond its semantically solely binding V(fin). In a system consisting of the possibilities listed in (18) it is clear that material intervening between the finite and the infinitival verb will not block leftward placement of a clitic (= CM) since such a constituent does not affect the location of the targeted verb as host. For the same reason of structure-free clitic placement, Old Spanish did not distinguish between the clitic behavior in modal, aspectual, motion (and auxiliary) predicates vs. causative and perception verbs; they were all equally characterized by CM. The fact that causative and perception **structures** form a class by themselves can be seen from the slow development of non-CM strings which affects only the modal, aspectual, motion and other verbs; causative and perception verbs are structurally different from simple V(cm) strings, as hinted at in the beginning when their exclusion from consideration was announced.

4.2. Originally linearly oriented placement and linearization principles start diverging perceptibly by the 16th century, due to independent change which dismantled the Tobler-Mussafia syndrome. This produces an increasing shift towards more frequent non-CM strings which are syntactically motivated: Each argument is attached to the verb which governs it. Such a change is supported by the low text frequency of a given V(cm) (its lack of formulaic function), the semantically high profile of the V(cm) as an independent predicate, and the more conscious use of language in a formal written medium. A reflex of this last factor appears in the modern colloquial flavor of much CM uses. With the frequency balance tilted in favor the non-CM arrangement, a secondary structural differentiation becomes more reasonable where each verb defines its own clause domain, and with it a domain for narrow clitic

placement. On the basis of the competition of obligatory CM (causative, perception) and the preferential non-CM cases, a minor transition process, be it **the Cm rule** or Restructuring, seems to characterize the behavior of a number of special verbs V(cm). As a natural extension of the sustained change towards less CM, a final stage could be expected with no optional CM **whatsoever** (except for the obligatory cases of causative and perception verbs). This is not (yet) the case for Spanish; only French among the Romance languages has reached this stage since the 17th century, in an evolution which in its last phase was manifestly controlled by conscious intervention (cf. Galet 1971).

5. In conclusion, the strict structure correlation claimed for modern CM cannot accommodate the facts in an easy way; rather than being a primary cause of CM, the structural interpretation is a secondary phenomenon supported (passively) by much of the relevant data which however could also be described in functional terms (especially the tests applied to the Restructuring hypothesis). CM is rather an historical relic with a fuzzy periphery and a solid, frequency based core, anchored in the spoken language, and progressively being reduced in the more formal registers. There is no single cause underlying the phenomenon, rather a number of interacting variations and dimensions which produced the individualized and changing surface effect known as clitic movement.¹¹

Notes

¹This paper is a revised version of a LSA presentation (Annual Meeting 1981, New York) and of a more ambitious presentation on Romance clitic movement (Linguistics Seminar, Univ. of Illinois, Nov. 1981). In its bare outline format, it represents a condensed version of a comprehensive treatment of Romance clitic history (in preparation).

²Generally, an historical grammar will only mention the fact that in some cases the pronoun goes to the conjugated verb, without elaborating much further; cf. Gessner 1893:47-50.

³A survey of clitic types is found in Zwicky 1977 and Jeffers and Zwicky 1980. -- Not all references discussed here will concern Spanish directly; since the phenomenon is pan-Romance in all essential aspects, such parallel treatments of Italian, French, or Portuguese are topical. The comprehensive study (in preparation) will document the historical unity of CM.

⁴Cf. Aissen 1974; Aissen and Perlmutter 1976; Strozer 1976; Rivas 1977; Luján 1979; Burzio 1981; Napoli 1981; implicit also in Saltarelli 1978. Van Tiel 1979 (=1975) is an independent second source for the same idea.

⁵Cf. Bok-Bennema and Crouchs-Hageman 1980 for discussion of the Spanish side of the question.

⁶The **hypothesis** of an intervening complementizer (as in (2)) vs. a true preposition (as in (4) **con**) for CM/non-CM appears justified, but the tense/non-tense contrast for virtual indicative

vs. subjunctive complements (with non-CM vs. CM properties) cannot be maintained; cf. Suffer 1980.

⁷Napoli's (95), (96), 1981:870. The implication is that a focused *cercare* cannot at the same time be periphrastically reduced. Gloss for (9): 'I have tried to finish it, but I have failed/and I have succeeded'.

⁸The aberrations are idiosyncratic to the particular texts and very low in absolute number (e.g. the -- mark of *saber* in DT represents a context conditioned use of *saber* as 'to know an answer' rather than as near-modal verb; the - rating of *soler* and *ir* in Berceo, and *dever* in the *Libro de Buen Amor* remains unexplained). While the same lowness in number applies also to some of the **non-aberrant cases**, their composite effect of pointing (by accident?) in the same direction to such a degree lends them credibility in spite of their statistical irrelevance.

⁹Of these texts, Cid, Ber, LBA are in verse. The sample size for prose is 5000 words of text; for verse, all infinitives appearing in the respective concordances beginning with *a-d* are included. I would like to thank E. Pearce for letting me use her research results on the verse texts. K.a and K.b are both based on very extensive corpora. The column *other* refers to Aissen and Perlmutter 1976, Rivas 1977, Luján 1979, Suffer 1980. Table I includes only verbs which have at least one CM attestation overall. All others figure in example (16). Table II and example (16) contain only the prose texts and, in II, PCG is represented with two separate fragments; the parenthesized totals include the effect of enlarging the numbers for the 14th century by 3:2 to make them directly comparable to the 13th and 15th centuries.

¹⁰Cf. Ramsden 1963 for extensive, even though not always conclusive, discussion of clitic placement; Gessner 1893 *passim*.

¹¹A true solution needs a much larger frame for argumentation and documentation than is presently available; section 4 is thus only a summary of the most relevant points.

References

- Aissen, J. 1974. Verb raising. LI 5.325-366.
 Aissen, J. and D. Perlmutter. 1976. Clause reduction in Spanish. BLS 2.1-30.
 Bok-Bennema, R. and A. Croughs-Hageman. 1980. La subida de los clíticos en castellano. In *Clíticos en español*, 63-92.
 Bordelois, I. 1980. Hacia una gramática universal: Clíticos romances y la condición de frontera. In *Clíticos en español*, 51-62.
 Burzio, L. 1981. Intransitive verbs and Italian auxiliaries. Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis; MIT.
 Clíticos en el español actual (Los). 1980. (Diálogos hispánicos de Amsterdam, 1). Amsterdam: Rodopi.
 Galet, Y. 1971. L'évolution de l'ordre des mots dans la phrase française de 1600 à 1700. Paris: PUF.

- Gessner, E. 1893. Das spanische Personalpronomen. ZrPh 17.1-54.
- Gili Gaya, S. 1969. Curso superior de sintaxis española. Barcelona: Bibliograf (9th ed.).
- Jeffers, R. and A. M. Zwicky. 1980. The evolution of clitics. In ICHL 4.221-232.
- Kayne, R. S. 1975. French syntax. The transformational cycle. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Keniston, H. 1937a (=K.a). Syntax of Castilian prose. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Keniston, H. 1937b (=K.b). Spanish syntax list. New York: Holt.
- Luján, M. 1979. Clitic promotion and mood in Spanish verbal complements. Bloomington: IULC.
- Morin, Y.-C. and M. St-Amour. 1977. Description historique des constructions infinitives du français. Recherches Linguistiques à Montréal 9.113-152.
- Napoli, D. J. 1981. Semantic interpretation vs. lexical governance. Language 57.841-887.
- Pearce, E. H. 1981. Unpublished research on Romance clitic movement. Univ. of Illinois.
- Perlmutter, D. M. 1971. Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Quicoli, C. A. 1976. Conditions on clitic movement in Portuguese. LA 2.199-223.
- Radford, A. 1977. La teoria della traccia, la condizione del soggetto specificato e la salita dei pronomi clitici nelle lingue romanze. Rivista di Grammatica Generativa 2.241-315.
- Ramsden, H. 1963. Weak pronoun position in the early Romance languages. Manchester: Univ. Press.
- Rivas, A. 1977. A theory of clitics. Unpubl. Ph.D. thesis; MIT.
- Rizzi, L. 1978. A restructuring rule in Italian syntax. In Recent Transformational Studies in European Languages, ed. S. J. Keyser. Cambridge: MIT Press (LI Monograph, 3) 113-158.
- Roldán, M. 1974. Constraints on clitic insertion in Spanish. In Linguistic Studies in Romance Languages, ed. R. J. Campbell et al. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press. 124-138.
- Saltarelli, M. 1978. Sentential clitics and clause reduction in Italian. In Current Studies in Romance Linguistics, ed. M. Sufner. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown Univ. Press. 279-301.
- Schroten, J. 1980. Sobre la sintaxis de los pronombres átonos en español. In Clíticos en español, 1-33.
- Strozer, J. 1976. Clitics in Spanish. Unpubl. Ph.D. diss.; UCLA.
- Sufner, M. 1980. Clitic promotion in Spanish revisited. In Contemporary Studies in Romance Languages, ed. F. H. Nuessel, Jr. Bloomington: IULC; 300-330.
- Tiel-di Maio, M. F. van. 1979. Una proposta per la sintassi dell'italiano: V-raising. In La Grammatica (Atti IX Convegno SLI, 1975). Rome: Bulzoni; 2.445-477.
- Wanner, D. (in prep.) A history of Romance clitics.
- Zwicky, A. M. 1977. On clitics. Bloomington: IULC.

Texts

- Cid (12th cent.): F. M. Waltman. 1972. Concordance to Poema de Mio Cid. University Park: Pennsylvania State Univ. Press.
- DT (13th cent.): La historia de la Donzella Teodor. ed. W. Mettmann. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur: Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1962:3.75-173.
- PCG (13th cent.): Primera crónica general de España. ed. R. Menéndez Pidal. Madrid: Gredos 1955.
- Ber (13th cent.): B. Dutton. 1980. A concordance to the works of Gonzalo de Berceo. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois (unpublished).
- 20R (14th cent.): Crónica de 20 reyes. In Reliquias de la poesía épica española, ed. R. Menéndez Pidal. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe 1951 (240-256).
- Luc (14th cent.): Juan Manuel. El libro de los enxiemplos del conde Lucanor et de Patronio. ed. H. Knust and A. Birch-Hirschfeld. Leipzig: Seele 1900.
- LBA (14th cent.): P. Mignani, M. A. di Cesare, and G. F. Jones. A concordance to Juan Ruiz, Libro de Buen Amor. Albany: SUNY Press 1977.
- Gat (15th cent.): Libro de los Gatos, by Odo of Cheriton. ed. T. Northup. Modern Philology 5.1908.477-554.
- 12T (15th cent.): Enrique de Villena. Los doze trabajos de Hércules. ed. M. Morreale. Madrid: R. Academia Española (Bibl. selecta de Clásicos Españoles, Series 2, vol. 20) 1958.
- Cor (15th cent.): Alfonso Martínez de Toledo. El arcipreste de Talavera o sea el Corbacho. ed. L. B. Simpson. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press 1939.