

ON CLITICIZATION IN GERMANIC LANGUAGES

Anna CARDINALETTI
University of Venice and Geneva

*1. Introduction**

The goal of this paper is twofold: on an empirical level, I will argue for the existence of "weak" pronouns in German. Whereas this category of pronouns has been recognized in Dutch (cf. Koster 1978) and Scandinavian languages (cf. Holmberg 1986, 1990), current analyses deny the status of "weak" pronouns to German unstressed pronouns.¹ I will show that this position is untenable, since unstressed pronouns in German share the properties of unstressed pronouns in the other Germanic languages

On a more theoretical level, I will discuss whether an analysis of clitic placement in terms of head movement, as proposed for Romance clitic pronouns (cf. Kayne (1990)), can be extended to "weak" pronouns, which are the Germanic counterpart of Romance clitics. The fact that weak pronouns are not cliticized on the verb could appear to be sufficient evidence to state that they do not undergo head movement, but rather undergo an instance of XP-movement, usually known as scrambling.

However, it can be easily shown that the distribution and the syntactic behaviour of Germanic weak pronouns are different from those of full DPs: they share with Romance clitics the properties of occupying a special position in the clause and having a special syntactic behaviour. An analysis simply in terms of XP-movement does not solve the problem it was intended to solve and can be maintained only by undesirable *ad hoc* stipulations.

I will take the similarities between Germanic weak pronouns and Romance clitics to show that they obey the same principles, while the observed differences can be traced back to independent differences between the two groups of languages. In

particular, I will suggest that Germanic weak pronouns pattern like Romance clitic pronouns in that they undergo head movement and occupy a functional head position at S-structure, in the spirit of Kayne's (1990) proposal. The fact that Germanic weak pronouns are not cliticized on the verb and usually appear in a position which is not available to the verb, will be shown to depend on the nature of this head position in Germanic languages. Another important parallelism can be established in the way pronoun movement applies in the two groups of languages: in both groups, pronoun movement can be broken up into two steps, XP-movement followed by X°-movement.

The discussion will be restricted to object pronouns and will not take subject pronouns into consideration. Given that there seems to exist a general agreement on their clitic status,² the syntax of German subject pronouns does not deserve further discussion here.

The paper is organized as follows: In Section 2., I will present the particular distribution of Germanic weak pronouns, which occupy a position between the definite subject and sentence adverbs. In Section 3., I will exclude that the movement of weak pronouns can be analysed in terms of XP movement, in particular as a scrambling operation in those languages where full DPs can be scrambled. In Section 4., this conclusion is supported by the syntactic properties of Germanic weak pronouns, which behave like Romance clitics with regard to the tests for clitichood discussed by Kayne (1975). In Section 5., a general requirement for weak and clitic pronouns is suggested, namely that they enter in some relation with a functional head. This is an abstract head in Germanic, as argued for in Section 6. The last Section discusses some properties which differentiate Germanic weak pronouns from Romance clitics. These differences can all be reduced to the fundamental difference in the cliticization site between the two groups of languages: Contrary to Romance clitics, Germanic weak pronouns are not cliticized on the head which also contains the inflected verb.

2. The syntactic distribution of Germanic weak pronouns

In the Germanic languages, the status of "weak pronoun" can be attributed to two types of pronouns: some Germanic languages, notably Dutch (cf. Koster (1978)) and its dialects (cf. Haegeman (1991), (1992b)), have a morphologically distinct series of weak pronouns; in German and in Scandinavian languages, on the other hand, weak

pronouns are essentially unstressed pronouns.³ However, apart from their morpho-phonological inventory, all Germanic languages pattern alike in that weak pronouns have a special distribution: they do not appear in their base position, but in some position on the left. This phenomenon is usually known as "the Wackernagel law", referring to the particular position occupied by German pronouns (cf. Wackernagel (1892)), and "object shift" for Scandinavian pronouns (cf. Holmberg (1986)). The discussion of the syntactic distribution of Germanic weak pronouns will reveal that it parallels that of Romance clitics.

Germanic weak pronouns must leave their base position as do Romance clitics. So, (1) is the first property which they share with clitics:

- (1) Weak pronouns cannot appear in their base position.

This property is illustrated in (2) for a clitic pronoun in Italian. Notice that the constraint applies both in the position of complement of a verb and in the position of complement of a preposition:⁴

- (2) a. *Gianni ha invitato *lo*.
G. has invited him
b. *Cadde addosso *gli*.
[he] felt against to-him

Similar facts obtain in Dutch and Scandinavian. Contrary to strong pronouns and full DPs, weak pronouns cannot follow a sentence adverb (throughout the paper, the Scandinavian examples are Swedish, unless specified; for the corresponding Icelandic and Danish data, see Holmberg (1990) and Vikner (1990)):

- (3) dat Jan gisteren **r*/ haar/ Marie gekust heeft
that J. yesterday her/ her/ M. kissed has
(Zwart 1991)
- (4) Anna såg kanske inte **den*/ DEN. (Holmberg 1990)
A. saw maybe not it

(In (4) and throughout the paper bold indicates a stressed constituent.)

German displays a similar pattern. This can be shown on the basis of the unmarked VP-internal order of arguments, which is Dative - Accusative; an unstressed accusative pronoun, contrary to its stressed counterpart and to a full DP, cannot appear after a dative DP:

- (5) daß Peter dem Kind ??*sie* / *SIE*/ die Puppe gegeben hat.
that P. to-the child her/ her/ the doll given has

The ban against occurring in the base position extends to A' XP-positions. On a par with clitic pronouns (cf. (6)), a weak pronoun cannot occur as a left-dislocated item (see Cardinaletti (1988) for German Left Dislocation, "Linksversetzung"):

- (6) **Lo*, Gianni l'ha invitato.
him G. him has invited
- (7) a. **Ihn*, den habe ich schon gesehen.
him, him have I already seen
b. **Es*, das habe ich schon gelesen.
it, it have I already read

I take this evidence to mean that weak pronouns do not behave as independent maximal projections. We can formulate the constraint as in (8):

- (8) Weak pronouns are syntactically dependent elements.

The same lack of syntactic independence can be observed in the following examples. Like a clitic pronoun (cf. (9)), a weak pronoun cannot appear in isolation, e.g. as an answer to a question. In German, this is most evident in the case of the neuter pronoun *es*, which cannot bear stress: in isolation, its strong counterpart *das* must be used:

- (9) A. Chi hai invitato?
whom have (you) invited?
B. a. **Lo*.
b. Lui.
him.
- (10) A. Wen hast du getroffen?
who have you met
B. a. **Ihn*.
b. IHN.
him
- (11) A. Was hast du gekauft?
what have you bought
B. a. **Es*.

- b. Das.
it

Germanic weak pronouns also share with Romance clitics the following property:

(12) Weak pronouns have a special landing site.

However, contrary to Romance clitics, they are never cliticized on the verb, i.e. they never appear in the abstract configuration in (13), as the data in (14) confirm:

(13) XP + weak pronoun + C° (+ subject) (+ sentential adverbs)

- (14) a. *Hans *ihn* hat eingeladen.
Hans him has invited
b. *Anna *den* sg kanske inte.
Anna it saw maybe not

The typical S-structure position of weak pronouns in Germanic languages seems to be one which follows the subject and precedes sentential adverbs, as in (15):

(15) Cx + defin. subject + weak pronoun + sentential adverbs ...

Notice that (15) holds whatever the clause type in which the pronoun occurs, i.e. regardless of whether Cx is occupied by a complementizer or the finite verb.

The word order in (15) is exemplified for Dutch in (16) and (17):⁵

- (16) a. *dat Jan gisteren 'r gekust heeft.
that J. yesterday her kissed has
b. dat Jan 'r gisteren gekust heeft.
c. *dat 'r Jan gisteren gekust heeft. (Zwart 1991)
- (17) a. *Heeft Jan gisteren 'r gekust?
has J yesterday her kissed
b. Heeft Jan 'r gisteren gekust?
c. *Heeft 'r Jan gisteren gekust?

The same situation is found in the Scandinavian languages. According to Holmberg (1986), (1990), Scandinavian unstressed pronouns appear after the definite subject and before sentential adverbs.⁶

- (18) a. *Anna såg kanske inte *den*.
A. saw maybe not it

- b. Anna såg *den* kanske inte.
- c. *Såg *den* Anna inte?

In German, essentially parallel facts can be observed. The more detailed description I will devote to German is motivated by the existence of many reordering possibilities in the so-called "Mittelfeld", which makes things slightly more complicated.

The following sentences show that as in Dutch and Scandinavian languages, German unstressed pronouns cannot follow sentence adverbs:⁷

- (19) a. ?*daa der Soldat gestern *ihn* dem Offizier vorgestellt hat.
that the soldier yesterday him to-the officer introduced has
- b. daa der Soldat *ihn* gestern dem Offizier vorgestellt hat.
- (20) a. ?*daa dein Freund morgen *dir* das Buch zurückgibt.
that your friend tomorrow to-you the book gives
- b. daß dein Freund *dir* morgen das Buch zurückgibt.
- (21) a. *daß der Hans wahrscheinlich *es* nicht gelesen hat.
that the H. probably it not read has
- b. daß der Hans *es* wahrscheinlich nicht gelesen hat.
- (22) a. *daß er gestern's gekauft hat.
that he yesterday it bought has
- b. daß er's gestern gekauft hat.

The contrast in (22) is particularly interesting because it shows that the pronoun *es* can be cliticized on a subject as in b., but not on an adverb, as in a. It is clearly unsatisfactory to posit a categorial restriction on the constituent to which *es* can cliticize, so the crucial factor must be the different location of the pronoun with respect to the sentential adverb.

German displays a further possibility than do standard Dutch and Scandinavian languages: an unstressed pronoun can also precede the definite subject, if the latter is non-pronominal (as mentioned in Note 2., subject weak pronouns must occur in a position adjacent to C°):

- (23) a. daß *es* Peter dem Kind gegeben hat.
that it P. to-the child given has
- b. daß *ihm* Peter das Buch gegeben hat.
that to-him P. the book given has

- c. **daa es er dem Kind gegeben hat.*
that it he to-the child given has

This means that in German, the word order schematized in (24) is possible alongside (15):

- (24) C° + weak pronoun + defin. subject + sentential adverbs ...

In other words, in German there are at least two positions for unstressed pronouns: either immediately after or before the subject. This differs from what has been observed in traditional analyses, according to which the typical position of weak pronouns, the so called Wackernagel position, occurs on the left of the subject.⁸

Notice that even when the pronoun appears in the pre-subject position, a sentence adverb cannot precede it: the adverb must occur in a lower position:

- (25) a. ??*daß gestern ihn der Soldat dem Offizier vorgestellt hat.*
b. *daß ihn der Soldat gestern dem Offizier vorgestellt hat.*
c. *daß ihn gestern der Soldat dem Offizier vorgestellt hat.*

- (26) **daß gestern's Peter gekauft hat.*
that yesterday it P bought has

- (27) a. **daß wahrscheinlich es der Hans gelesen hat.*
b. *daß es der Hans wahrscheinlich gelesen hat.*
c. *daß es wahrscheinlich der Hans gelesen hat.*

The b. sentences of (19)-(22) above represent evidence that there is no requirement that the pronoun be in first position after the complementizer. This means that the ungrammaticality of (25a), (26) and (27a) cannot be explained in these terms. The generalization seems to be that a subject is allowed to appear before a weak pronoun, whereas a sentence adverb must occupy a structurally lower position.⁹ This is presumably a position adjoined to the maximal projection under the one which contains the subject, namely TP (or Agr2P in the more elaborate sentence structure discussed in Section 6.; see also Note 16).

Sentences (25c) and (27c) also show that the subject can occupy a position lower than the adverb, but this possibility never holds for pronouns ((28b) is acceptable if the adverb is understood as a modifier of the subject, rather than a sentence adverb; this reading is irrelevant here):¹⁰

- (28) a. ??daß gestern der Soldat *ihn* dem Offizier vorgestellt hat.
b. *daß wahrscheinlich der Hans *es* gelesen hat

Summarising, Germanic weak pronouns pattern like Romance clitics in having a special distribution: They appear in a fixed position in the clause, generally preceding sentence adverbials and following the subject:

- (29) C° + defin. subject + weak pronoun + sentential adverbs ...

German differs from the other Germanic languages in that it also allows the configuration in (30):

- (30) C° + weak pronoun + defin. subject + sentential adverbs ...

Henceforth, I will refer to the S-structure position of weak pronouns (as in (29) and (30)) as the "clitic" position.

Notice that the two possibilities in (29) and (30) seem to suggest that there is no requirement of encliticization in (30). Neither do weak Germanic pronouns appear procliticized on the verb, as we have already pointed out (cf. (13)-(14) above).

3. Against a scrambling analysis of pronoun movement in the Germanic languages

The question arises as to how to analyse the leftward movement of Germanic weak pronouns. There are two possible answers to this question:

- 1) Germanic weak pronouns are merely "scrambled" out of their base position.
- 2) Germanic weak pronouns also undergo "real" cliticization via "head-movement", as Romance clitics do, i.e., in addition to XP-movement, they are moved as a head and adjoined to a head.

The analysis in 1) is suggested essentially by two facts: pronouns never appear cliticized on the verb, and in some Germanic languages, definite DPs can also be moved leftwards. Then proponents of the analysis in 1) would regard the movement of pronouns, which are intrinsically definite, on a par with the movement of definite DPs, and would analyse it as an instance of movement of a maximal category.¹¹

The analysis in 2) associates Germanic weak pronouns with Romance clitic pronouns, although a strong evidence for head movement is available only for the latter, which are always cliticized on the verb.

It is evident that the analysis in 2) is superior to 1) from a theoretical point of view, in that it regards the movement of weak pronouns in Germanic languages as unitary and ruled by the same principles which apply to other languages. As a matter of fact, the movement of weak pronouns takes place in a very general way in Germanic languages. The point is now to establish whether these theoretical considerations can be given empirical support. A possible way to decide between the analyses in 1) and 2) is to show whether there are similarities or differences between the movement of weak pronouns and the movement of definite DPs. In the following sections, I will show that the two instances of movement must be distinguished in each of the languages we are considering.

3.1. Scandinavian languages

As for Scandinavian languages, an analysis in terms of scrambling cannot be available for object shift, since the two instances of leftward movement have different properties (see Vikner (1990) for detailed discussion). Under a scrambling analysis, it would also be difficult to explain why only weak pronouns can be shifted to the left, whereas strong pronouns, on a par with definite DPs, never are:

- (31) a. Hon såg kanskje inte Anna/ DEN.
 she say maybe not A./ him
 b. *Hon såg Anna/ DEN kanskje inte.

The restriction of movement to weak pronouns makes an analysis in terms of cliticization at least plausible (cf. also Deprez (1990)). Notice that in Icelandic, where full DPs can also be moved to the left, there is a difference between the preposing of pronouns and the leftward movement of DPs: the former is obligatory, the latter may apply optionally (from Vikner (1990)):

- (32) a. *I gær las Pétur eflaust ekki *hana*.
 yesterday read P. doubtlessly not it
 b. I gær las Pétur *hana* eflaust ekki
(33) a. I gær las Pétur eflaust ekki *bókina*.
 yesterday read P. doubtlessly not the book
 b. I gær las Pétur *bókina* eflaust ekki.

This difference suggests that the two instances of movement are not one and the same process. As discussed in Vikner (1990), the cross-linguistic difference between the movement of pronouns, which is always possible, and the movement of DPs, which is available only in some languages, cannot be traced back to Case theory, in terms of morphologically manifested Case (cf. Holmberg (1986)). A language such as Faroese, which patterns like Icelandic in that all DPs are morphologically case-marked, differs from the latter in the possibilities of object shift: as in Swedish and Danish, and unlike Icelandic, only pronouns can be moved to the left:

- (34) a. Jógvan keypti ikki *bókina*. (Barnes 1989: 11, fn. 2)
J bought not the-bookACC
b. *Jógvan keypti *bókina* ikki.
- (35) a. *Jógvan keypti ikki *hana*.
J bought not it
b. Jógvan keypti *hana* ikki.

We can conclude that in Scandinavian languages, pronoun movement applies in a more general fashion than movement of DPs, which can support the evidence discussed in Section 2, and lead to the hypothesis that it involves the movement of a head.

3.2. Dutch

Jaspers (1989) and Zwart (1991) have convincingly argued that Dutch weak pronouns do not undergo scrambling, although an analysis in these terms can be adequate for the full form of pronouns and for DPs, when they appear outside of their position, as in (36):

- (36) Jan heeft *haar* / *Marie* gisteren gekust.
Jan has yesterday her/ Marie kissed

There are in fact a number of differences between the syntactic behaviour of a scrambled DP and that of a weak pronoun. First, as we have noted above, weak pronouns move obligatorily, whereas scrambling applies as a possibility. The obligatoriness of pronoun movement extends to indefinite weak pronouns found in some dialects of Dutch (e.g. Brabants), which contrasts with the impossibility of scrambling an indefinite DP:

- (37) a. Heb je gisteren *meisjes* gezien?
have you yesterday girls seen
b. *Heb je *meisjes* gisteren gezien?
- (38) a. *Heb je gisteren 'r gezien?
have you yesterday of-them seen
b. Heb je 'r gisteren gezien?

Pronoun movement also manifests a greater freedom than movement of DPs via scrambling. This can be observed for example in double object constructions (cf. Zwart (1991)). An object pronoun can be moved in the presence of a dative DP, (39), whereas an object DP cannot usually be scrambled out of VP over the dative DP, (40a); if the DO precedes the IO, this must be expressed by a PP, (40b):

- (39) dat ik [*t*] gisteren [Marie] gegeven heb.
that I it yesterday to-M. given have
- (40) a. *dat ik [het boek] gisteren [Marie] gegeven heb.
b. dat ik [het boek] gisteren [aan Marie] gegeven heb.
that I the book yesterday to M. given have

Similar facts are found in ECM constructions. A clitic pronoun can be moved across the embedded subject, (41), whereas scrambling of a DP in the same configuration is impossible, (42) (cf. Zwart (1991))

- (41) dat ik [*t*] [Jan __ heb zien lezen].
that I it J. have seen read
- (42) a. *dat ik [het boek] [Jan __ heb zien lezen].
b. dat ik [Jan [het boek] heb zien lezen].
that I J. the book have seen read

The paradigms in (39)-(42) would be difficult to understand if the two processes were attributed to one and the same rule. If, on the other hand, pronoun movement is understood as clitic movement, the above contrasts are accounted for in a natural way. Head movement is in fact expected not to interfere with the movement of maximal categories, such as that of scrambled DPs.

3.3 German

In German, as well as in Dutch, definite DPs can be scrambled out of VP; so it could be possible to hypothesize that pronouns are also scrambled, on a par with definite DPs. The refutation of this hypothesis is made more difficult by the fact that contrary to Dutch, German does not display a morphological series of weak pronouns distinct from strong pronouns. However, although strong pronouns can be scrambled on a par with DPs, there seems to exist some evidence that a different instance of pronoun movement must be assumed, which applies to unstressed pronouns. This cannot simply be analysed as scrambling, since the two processes take place in a different way;¹² hence, it can be reasonably regarded as an instance of head movement.

a) As noted above, the fronting of weak pronouns takes place obligatorily, whereas scrambling merely represents a possibility offered by the language and constrained by categories such as definiteness and stress (cf. Lenerz (1977)).

b) If weak pronouns were moved on a par with scrambled DPs, the following contrast would not be expected. In the case of scrambled DPs, nothing requires that they reach adjacent positions. On the other hand, it seems that pronoun splitting, if at all possible, is a very marked phenomenon. Sentences in which one pronoun precedes the subject and one follows are only marginally accepted, and the two (or more) pronouns tend to form a cluster:

- (43) a. daß dem Bruder Hans das Buch gestern gezeigt hat.
that to-the-brother Hans the book yesterday shown has
b. daß das Buch Hans dem Bruder gestern gezeigt hat.
- (44) a. ??daß ihm Hans sie / es gestern gezeigt hat.
that to-him Hans her/ it yesterday shown has
b. ??daß sie / es Hans ihm gestern gezeigt hat.
- (45) a. daß sie / es ihm Hans gestern gezeigt hat.
b. daß Hans sie / es ihm gestern gezeigt hat.

These contrasts suggest that there is only one position available for unstressed pronouns; when there is more than one unstressed pronoun, they all appear in this

position. Sentences (44)-(45) parallel the Italian pattern (46), in which the two clitics cannot be split, and only the formation of a clitic cluster gives rise to grammaticality:

- (46) a. **Lo* voglio dargli.
 [I] it want give-him
 b. *Glielo* voglio dare.
 c. *Voglio darglielo*.

As predicted, pronoun splitting in German is only possible if both pronouns are stressed, or the second one is stressed. In this case, we deal with strong pronouns, which behave like the scrambled DPs of (43):

- (47) a. daß *SIE* der Hans *IHM* wahrscheinlich schon vorgestellt hat.
 that her the Hans to-him probably already introduced has
 b. daß *sie* der Hans *IHM* wahrscheinlich schon vorgestellt hat.
(48) a. daß *IHM* der Hans *SIE* wahrscheinlich schon vorgestellt hat.
 b. daß *ihm* der Hans *SIE* wahrscheinlich schon vorgestellt hat.

c) As Vikner (1990) points out, scrambled DPs and pronouns have a different location with respect to an adverbial PP such as *ohne Zweifel*:

- (49) a. Gestern hat Peter ohne Zweifel nicht *das Buch* gelesen.
 yesterday has Peter without doubt not the book read
 b. Gestern hat Peter ohne Zweifel *das Buch* nicht gelesen.
 c. Gestern hat Peter *das Buch* ohne Zweifel nicht gelesen.
(50) a. *Peter hat ohne Zweifel nicht *sie* gelesen.
 b. ??Peter hat ohne Zweifel *sie* nicht gelesen.
 c. Peter hat *sie* ohne Zweifel nicht gelesen.

As we concluded in Section 2., the landing site of unstressed pronouns is higher than sentence adverbs, whereas no such constraint operates on scrambled DPs. In a scrambling analysis of pronoun movement, it is hard to see how to derive this difference without *ad hoc* stipulations. If pronoun movement is instead analysed as head movement, the special position of pronouns would derive from the presence of a specific head hosting the clitic (see Section 6).

d) With causative verbs, belonging to the so-called class of coherent verbs, full DPs, on a par with pronouns, can be moved before the matrix subject; however, the

two processes seem to apply in a different way: for some speakers, full DPs must be focussed, whereas the same requirement is not at work in the case of pronouns:

- (51) a. weil das PROBLEM [der Lehrer den Schüler __ lösen läßt].
because the problem the teacher the schoolboy solve lets
b. weil *es* [der Lehrer den Schüler __ lösen läßt].
because it the teacher the schoolboy solve lets

The fact that the DP is focussed in (51a) shows that the DP is not even scrambled, scrambling being in general restricted to unstressed DPs representing old information. If pronouns were always scrambled out of VP, it would be difficult to explain why in (51) only pronouns can be scrambled, whereas DPs must undergo what might be tentatively called "focus movement". Under a head- movement analysis of pronoun movement, it is possible to explain why pronouns have more possibilities in (51) than DPs.

e) A further argument against a scrambling analysis of pronoun movement in German can be built up on the basis of the following evidence. Some German varieties allow for the pronoun *es* in the reduced form *s* to be encliticized on the dative pronoun (from Cardinaletti (1990a)):

- (52) a. daß ich *ihm's* gestern vorgeschlagen habe.
that I to-him-it yesterday proposed have
b. daß *ihm's* gelungen ist, den Hans zu besiegen.
that to-him-it successful was, the Hans to beat

As shown respectively by (52a) and (52b), the reduced form *s* can be either accusative or nominative. The fact that it can also be nominative suggests that the clitic cluster *ihm's* has escaped the VP, since *pace* den Besten (1985), nominative Case cannot be assigned VP-internally (cf. Belletti (1988)). Notice, however, that the possibility in (52) is only restricted to internal arguments, while an external argument *es* can be cliticized to a dative pronoun only very marginally (from Cardinaletti (1990a)):

- (53) a. ??daß *ihm's* ein Geschenk gegeben hat. (*s* = *das Kind*)
that to-him-it a present given has (it = the child)
b. ??daß *ihm's* vertraut hat.
that to-him-it trusted has

- c. ??daß *mir's* geholfen hat.
that to-me-it helped has
- d. ??daa ihm's viele Freude gemacht hat.
that to-him-it much pleasure made has

If German weak pronouns were moved by scrambling, the restriction just noted could be dealt with only by *ad hoc* stipulations. Under a cliticization analysis, it is instead possible to suggest that the pronoun *es* cliticizes from the basic position onto the adjacent dative pronoun giving rise to a cluster which is further moved to the "clitic" position.¹³

3.4. Conclusion

The pieces of evidence discussed so far lead to the conclusion that pronoun movement in Germanic languages cannot be accounted for simply in terms of scrambling or, in general, XP- movement, whereas an analysis which includes head movement seems to be more plausible. In the following sections, I will support this conclusion by showing that Germanic weak pronouns have the same syntactic properties as Romance clitic pronouns, something which would be unexpected if Germanic pronouns were analysed as XPs, on a par with scrambled definite DPs.

4. The clitic-like properties of Germanic weak pronouns

In addition to the special distribution discussed in Section 2., Germanic weak pronouns share most syntactic properties with Romance clitics. This can be made evident by applying to the former the tests for clitic-hood elaborated on the basis of the latter by Kayne (1975):

- (54) a. Germanic weak pronouns cannot be focussed
- b. they cannot be modified
- c. they cannot be conjoined
- d. they form a cluster with a fixed order.

Zwart (1990) and Holmberg (1990) have convincingly shown that Dutch and Scandinavian pronouns behave according to (54). I will not repeat the relevant examples here and refer the reader to these works. In what follows, I will show that German pronouns do not differ from weak pronouns found in other Germanic languages and also show that they behave in a similar way.

The exemplification will be mostly based on the pronoun *es*. Although it is reasonable to assume that the very same facts obtain with other pronouns as well, the results are not as clear as with *es*, since every other pronoun can be stressed and hence may count as a strong pronoun. Since this possibility does not arise with *es*, the evidence provided by this pronoun is the most reliable.

It is also important to note that all examples should contain an unstressed subject. Judgements may change if the subject receives focal stress. This is presumably due to the fact that in this case, the subject does not occupy its canonical S- structure position, but a different, lower position. This opens the possibility that the pronouns may also occupy a lower position, different from the clitic position, and consequently, they may manifest properties of strong pronouns. Since it is not relevant for the present discussion, I will leave this matter aside here.

4.1. Focussing

Like Romance clitic pronouns, (55)-(56), weak pronouns cannot be focussed, for example by using an adverb, (57), or by contrasting them, (58):

- (55) *Gianni solo *lo* ha invitato.
G. only him has invited
- (56) *Gianni *lo* ha invitato, non me.
G. him has invited, not me
- (57) a. *?daß nur *es* der Student dem Professor gezeigt hat.
that only it the student to-the professor shown has
b. ??daß der Student nur *es* dem Professor gezeigt hat.
- (58) ??daß *es* Peter gestern gekauft hat, aber nicht die Milch.
that it P. yesterday bought has, but not the milk

As often pointed out (cf. Travis (1984) a.o.), unstressed pronouns in German cannot appear in specCP, which is only available for stressed XPs (with the exception of local subjects; cf. the discussion in Cardinaletti (1990b)). *Das*, which, as noted above, is the tonic counterpart of *es*, is the only grammatical option in this context:

- (59) a. *IHN* / **Ihn* habe ich gesehen.
him have I seen

- b. *Das / *Es* habe ich gesehen.
that / it have I seen

4.2. Modification

It is well-known that clitic pronouns cannot be modified; the same property is manifested by the pronoun *es*, which cannot be used as a strong pronoun:

- (60) *Gianni *li* entrambi ha invitati.
G. them both has invited
- (61) *Ich mag *es* allein.
I like it only

The pronoun *uns* can be modified by *beide*, both in pre-subject and in post-subject position; notice, however, that in both cases, either the pronoun or the modifier must be focussed, which suggests that we are not dealing any longer with a weak pronoun, but rather with a strong pronoun:

- (62) a. daß *uns* beide der Peter gestern dem Professor vorgestellt hat.
that us both the Peter yesterday to-the professor introduced has
b. daß der Peter *uns* beide gestern dem Professor vorgestellt hat.

However, the modifier *beide* can co-occur with a weak pronoun as a floating quantifier. The parallelism with Romance clitics can be reproduced once again: as shown in (64) for Italian and French, respectively, Romance clitics can strand a floating quantifier:

- (63) a. daß *sie* der Peter gestern *beide* dem Professor vorgestellt hat.
b. daß der Peter *sie* gestern *beide* dem Professor vorgestellt hat.
- (64) a. Gianni *li* ha invitati *entrambi*.
G. them has invited both
b. Marie *les* a tous vus.
M. them has all seen

4.3. Conjunction

Kayne (1975) noticed that Romance clitics cannot be conjoined. This is illustrated in (65) for Italian:

- (65) *Gianni [*li e le*] ha invitati.
G. themMASC and themFEM has invited

We find the same constraint in the Germanic area: Weak pronouns cannot be conjoined in German:

- (66) a. *?daß [*sie und ihn*] der Peter nicht leiden kann.
that her and him the Peter not stand can
b. *?daß der Peter [*sie und ihn*] gestern dem Professor vorgestellt hat.
that the Peter him and her yesterday to-the professor introduced has

The conjunction of *es*, which in general cannot count as a strong pronoun, with a DP gives rise to clear ungrammaticality:

- (67) *daß ich [*es und den Kugelschreiber*] auf dem Tisch gesehen habe.
that I it and the pen on the table seen have

Notice also the following contrast, taken from Boschetti (1986): the masculine accusative pronoun in the reduced form *n* cannot undergo conjunction with a DP, whereas this is possible for the full form *ihn*, which can be analysed as a strong pronoun:

- (68) Er hat 'n gestern im Restaurant getroffen.
he has-him yesterday in-the restaurant met
(69) a. *Er hat ['n und Marie] gestern im Restaurant getroffen.
b. Er hat [*ihn* und Marie] GESTERN im Restaurant getroffen.

4.4. Clitic clustering

As we already noted in Section 3.3., German pronouns pattern like Romance clitics in forming a clitic cluster (see (44)-(45) and (46) above). The Italian example in (70) shows that the order in the clitic cluster is fixed:

- (70) Gianni **logli / glielo* ha dato.
G. it to-him/ to-him it has given

German pronouns also manifest a fixed order, which is different from the unmarked order displayed by DPs. The latter is Dative - Accusative; pronouns are usually in the opposite order, Accusative - Dative.¹⁴

- (71) daß Peter [dem Kind] [die Geschichte] vorlesen wird.
that Peter to-the child the story read will
- (72) a. ?*daß ihm sie Peter gerne vorlesen wird.
that to-him her Peter willingly read will
b. daß sie ihm Peter gerne vorlesen wird.
- (73) a. ?*daß Peter ihm sie gestern/wahrscheinlich vorgelesen hat.
that Peter to-him her yesterday/probably read has
b. daß Peter sie ihm gestern/wahrscheinlich vorgelesen hat.

4.5. Conclusion

The preceding discussion has shown that German weak pronouns behave essentially like Romance clitics as far as the tests for clitichood are concerned. I take this to confirm that German, on a par with Dutch and Scandinavian languages, has a class of weak pronouns.

On a more theoretical level, notice that these properties cannot be taken to characterize pronouns which are cliticized on the inflected verb, as in the original proposal of Kayne (1975). Rather, they specify the category of weak pronouns, i.e. of unstressed pronouns which must leave their base position, independently of their landing site. Romance clitics clearly also belong to this class. That the two sets of properties must be kept apart is also indicated by the behaviour of the Italian dative pronoun *loro*. Although it is not cliticized on the verb, this pronoun patterns like clitics as far as the phenomena referred to in (54) are concerned (cf. Cardinaletti (1991) for evidence and discussion).

Notice also that these properties cannot be linked to the phonological "weakness" of clitic pronouns. Indeed, these properties also characterize Scandinavian weak pronouns and Italian dative *loro* which do not represent a phonologically reduced form. They must be regarded as purely syntactic properties.

5. A general requirement on weak pronouns

The preceding Sections have shown that Germanic weak pronouns cannot occupy canonical XP-positions, either A or A' positions, and must obligatorily appear at S-structure in a special, "clitic" position. Furthermore, the movement of pronouns in Germanic languages appears to have different properties with respect to the preposing

of DPs in the same languages. All these considerations make it plausible to analyse the movement of weak pronouns as an instance of head movement, on a par with clitic movement in Romance. In Section 4., we have supported this conclusion by illustrating that Germanic weak pronouns have the same syntactic properties as Romance clitics.

The question now arises as to why pronoun movement is obligatory. One solution for the movement of Romance clitics could be expressed in terms of a phonological requirement: phonologically dependent words must occur in combination with a host. However, this does not seem appropriate for Germanic weak pronouns, since they never combine with the inflected verb.

The fact that Germanic weak pronouns have the same syntactic properties as Romance clitic pronouns suggests that there is a general syntactic requirement on the movement of weak elements, including Romance clitics. It is reasonable to propose that weak pronouns must leave their base position and enter a relation with a functional head. This hypothesis is in the spirit of Kayne's (1990) analysis of Romance clitics, and Holmberg's (1990) study of Scandinavian pronouns. The requirement can be formulated as in (74):

- (74) Weak pronouns (including ad-verbal clitics) must be "licensed" by a functional head.

Although the recently developed DP-hypothesis (cf. Abney 1987 and subsequent works) may provide some insight into the derivation of (74), I will not attempt this here, leaving it for future work. I will only point out that requirement (74) cannot be totally derived from Case theory.

First note that the functional head to which weak pronouns are associated must be combined with (i.e., must head the extended projection of, in Grimshaw's (1991) terms) a lexical head of a verbal type. Romance clitics provide evidence that they can only combine with verbs (whether finite or infinitive), or, in particular cases, with prepositions (see Note 4.), i.e. -N categories, whereas we never find cliticization to nouns or adjectives. This observation could suggest that a Case-based approach is in order, since only -N categories can assign Case.¹⁵ A Case-based analysis of pronoun movement has been proposed in the recent literature by Holmberg (1990) and Roberts (1992) in very similar terms: Clitics are Case-marked as a lexical property. Thus, they

cannot occur in positions of Case-assignment, but since their Case must be licensed, they must combine with the Case-assigning head. Holmberg's and Roberts' analyses differ in that only the latter considers weak pronouns as true clitics, which adjoin to the inflectional head. The former rejects the head status of weak pronouns and suggests that they are adjoined to a projection (TP, in Pollock's (1989) and Belletti's (1990) terms) where they are governed by a Case-assigning functional head. These analyses, developed on the basis of SVO languages such as Scandinavian languages and Middle English, both admit that weak pronouns are licensed by the head-initial inflectional head.

Although Case theory may be relevant in explaining some differences between Romance clitics and Germanic weak pronouns (see Section 7.2.), SOV languages like German and Dutch provide evidence that pronoun movement is not Case driven. Weak pronouns do not move to the Case-assigning head: the inflectional head to which verbs move is head final, whereas weak pronouns move to a position in the initial part of the clause. One may object that this evidence is not compelling. Zwart (1991), essentially following Travis (1984), has proposed for Dutch that the functional head to which weak pronouns adjoin is the head-initial I'/Agr°, thus explaining why weak pronouns appear after the definite subject in the initial part of the clause. This analysis could easily be extended to German (cf. Abraham 1991). However, Zwart's proposal meets with the many problems mentioned in Vikner and Schwartz (1991); further criticism is contained in Haegeman (1991). Therefore, I will not assume this analysis here, continuing to argue that German and Dutch provide evidence against a Case-based approach to pronoun movement.

I take the requirement in (74) to hold universally. However, pronouns can differ with respect to the way in which the requirement is satisfied. As for Romance clitics, they adjoin to the head which contains the inflectional morphemes (Kayne 1990). Hence, at S-structure they appear cliticized on the inflected verb.

As no clitic-verb combination takes place in Germanic languages, we must propose that Germanic weak pronouns are cliticized on an empty head. This has already been suggested a number of times (cf. Jaspers 1989 and Zwart 1991 for Dutch; Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991 for German; Deprez 1990 for Scandinavian languages). The question is now to establish the nature of the host head in these languages.

6. *On the host head in Germanic languages*

In Section 2, we have arrived at the conclusion that the position of weak pronouns is higher than sentence adverbs. Assuming that sentence adverbs are adjoined to a maximal projection, which for concreteness I take to be TP, it turns out that pronouns must be higher than TP. Since they may follow the subject, the only position which can be attributed to them is a head position between the subject and TP.

In Section 5, I have rejected an analysis of cliticization to a head-initial Inflection in German and Dutch, assuming that Inflection is head-final in these languages. In what follows, I will adopt the clause-structure proposed in Cardinaletti and Roberts (1991), according to which Germanic languages such as German and Dutch have an Agr head distinct from the head which hosts the verbal agreement morphology. This additional Agr head is the position occupied by weak pronouns in these languages. The Agr1 projection, contrary to the verbal Agr2 projection, is head initial: this accounts for the fact that weak pronouns appear on the left side of the clause, whereas in SOV languages, the inflected verb appears sentence-finally in embedded clauses:

$$(75) \quad C^{\circ} [_{Agr1P} \text{subj} [_{Agr1'} \text{cl} [_{Agr2P} [_{Agr2'} \dots \text{verb}]]]]]$$

Strong support for the hypothesis that there is a projection between C° and AgrP is provided by West-Flemish, where more than one Agr1 head must be assumed, in order to host the several weak pronouns which may cooccur in a clause (cf. Haegeman 1991 for detailed discussion).

Such an analysis can probably be assumed for all Germanic languages and therefore extended to Scandinavian languages. Although these languages do not show agreement morphology on the inflected verb and appear therefore to lack the Agr2 projection (cf. Holmberg and Platzack (1988)), the particular distribution of weak pronouns seems to suggest that Agr1 is present.

Notice that Agr1 is not a possible target for verb movement (with the exception of Icelandic, if the analysis proposed in Cardinaletti and Roberts (1991) for embedded topicalization is on the right track): an inflected verb never occurs in the same position as weak pronouns. This represents an important difference between Germanic and (modern) Romance languages, where the position of clitics is in general also the position occupied by the verb, namely the Agr-head containing verbal morphology.

This account also provides a principled analysis for the minimal cross-linguistic difference concerning the location of the subject with respect to clitic pronouns, as shown in (15) and (24), repeated here as (76a) and (76b) respectively:

- (76) a. C° + definite subject + weak pronoun + adverbs ...
b. C° + weak pronoun + definite subject + adverbs ...

In order to account for the two clitic positions in German, one could assume that (object) weak pronouns can adjoin either to C° or to Agr1°. However, if we allow the former possibility, we cannot easily explain the linear word orders in (77). The subject pronoun must be adjacent to C° and cannot be separated from it, not even by an object pronoun:

- (77) a. C° + subject pronoun + object pronoun + ...
b. *C° + object pronoun + subject pronoun + ...

An ordering constraint is clearly unsatisfactory. Moreover, the restriction that a clitic cannot adjoin to a head to which a clitic has already adjoined (see Roberts 1991 for Valdôtain) cannot account for the difference.

Notice also that the sequence of subject pronoun and object weak pronoun(s) can be interrupted by an adverb, which suggests that the latter are not cliticized on C°:

- (78) daß er natrlich sie ihm vorstellen wird.
that he of course her to-him introduce will

(Poletto and Tomaselli 1992)

Instead of assuming that there are two clitic positions in a language like German, the proposal in (75) allows us to suggest that it is the definite subject that can occupy two different positions, either specAgr1P or specAgr2P: in the former case, the subject will precede the object pronoun in Agr1°, in the latter it will follow the pronoun:

- (79) a. C° [Agr1P subj [Agr1° cl [Agr2P [Agr2°.. verb]]]]
b. C° [Agr1P [Agr1° cl [Agr2P subj [Agr2°.. verb]]]]

The cross-linguistic variation concerning the position of the subject can be made to follow from Case theory, namely from the parametric variation of nominative Case assignment, as discussed at length in Cardinaletti and Roberts (1991). In languages like German, nominative Case can be assigned by Agr1° both under government and

under spec-head agreement, whereas Dutch and Scandinavian languages only allow the agreement option.¹⁶

Sentence (78) deserves further attention here. According to Poletto and Tomaselli (1992), it represents evidence against (75) because there would be no place for the adverb, if adverbs cannot be adjoined to an X' projection. However, this sentence seems to be possible only with a focalized adverb. This restriction could suggest that there is a further projection between C° and Agr1P, hosting focalized items (see Note 16). It is evident that the presence of this projection is not incompatible with the proposal that German weak pronouns are in Agr1°.

If the analysis in (75) can be maintained, then the special distribution and the special properties displayed by Germanic pronouns with respect to DPs can be accounted for in a principled way. This proposal also has the advantage of providing a unified account of the syntax of Germanic weak pronouns, and also of the similarities found across Germanic and Romance.

7. On some differences between Romance clitics and Germanic weak pronouns

7.1. Parasitic gaps

With regard to the phenomenon of parasitic gaps, there seems to exist an important difference between Germanic and Romance pronouns. Whereas Romance clitics never allow parasitic gaps, as shown by the Italian example in (80), this possibility holds for Dutch and German weak pronouns:

- (80) *Gianni l'ha dato *t* a Maria [senza leggere *e*].
John it has given to Mary without read
- (81) a. dat Jan 't [zonder *e* in te kijken] *t* aan Marie gegeven heeft.
(J. Zwart, p.c.)
that Jan it without in to look to Mary given has
- b. dat Jan 'r [zonder *e* aan te kijken] *t* het boek gegeven heeft.
that Jan her without at to look the book given has
- (82) a. daß Peter *sie* [ohne *e* kennengelernt zu haben] *t* einladen wollte.
(Vikner and Sprouse 1988)
that Peter her without met to have invite wanted

- b. daß *ihn* Peter [ohne *e* kennengelernt zu haben] *t* einladen wollte.
that ihm Peter without met to have invite wanted

Notice, however, that Germanic pronouns do not pattern alike. In Scandinavian languages, weak pronouns do not license parasitic gaps (Swedish sentence a. from Holmberg (1986); Danish sentence b. from Vikner (1990)):

- (83) a. *Jag kastade *den* inte *t* [innan jag hade lst *e*].
I threw it not before I have read
b. *Han inviterede *dem* ikke *t* [uden at kende *e* på forhånd].
he invited them not without to know beforehand

It seems possible to reduce this difference to an independent property of languages like German and Dutch, namely the fact that they also allow scrambling. It is a wellknown fact that scrambled elements license parasitic gaps (see Felix (1983) for German, Bennis and Hoekstra (1984/85) for Dutch):¹⁷

- (84) a. dat Jan het *haar* [zonder *e* aan te kijken] *t* gegeven heeft.
that J. it her without at to look given has
b. dat Jan *het* haar [zonder *e* in te kijken] *t* gegeven heeft.
that J. it her without in to look given has

(den Dikken and Mulder 1991)

- (85) a. daß Peter *die Frau* [ohne *e* kennengelernt zu haben] *t* einladen wollte.
that P. the woman without met to have invite wanted
b. ?daß *den Professor* Peter [ohne *e* kennengelernt zu haben] *t* einladen wollte.
that the professor P. without met to have invite wanted

The possibility that even weak pronouns license parasitic gaps can be reduced to the availability of the A' position that is the landing site of scrambling.¹⁸ Thus, the exceptional behaviour of German and Dutch is only apparent. And, more importantly, the grammaticality of parasitic gaps cannot be taken as evidence against an analysis of pronoun movement in these languages in terms of head movement.¹⁹

Notice that this phenomenon establishes another parallelism between Germanic weak pronouns and Romance clitics with regard to the way in which their movement takes place. In both cases, pronoun movement can be broken down into two steps. Germanic pronouns first move as maximal projections to the A' position, from which

they license the parasitic gap, and they undergo head- movement in a second step. Parallel evidence in Romance is provided by the past participle agreement obligatorily triggered by object clitics, as shown by the paradigm in (86):

- (86) a. Ho consegnato/ *consegnata la domanda in ritardo.
[I] have deliveredMASC/ deliveredFEM the application form late
b. L'ho *consegnato / consegnata in ritardo.
[I] itFEM have deliveredMASC/ deliveredFEM late

Taking Kayne's (1989) analysis of past participle agreement in terms of spec-head agreement seriously, the clitic pronoun must be assumed to move as a maximal category through the specifier position of the head which contains the past participle morphology (cf. Rizzi (class lectures 1990/91)):²⁰

- (87) L'ho [_{Agrop} [e] consegnata [e] in ritardo].

7.2. Clitic doubling phenomena

Weak pronouns differ from Romance clitics in two other respects: first, they cannot behave as resumptive pronouns in Left Dislocation constructions, (88), and second, clitic doubling phenomena are not found in Germanic languages, (90). Both properties are displayed by Romance clitics, as exemplified for Italian by (89) and (91), respectively:

- (88) a. **Den Hans, ihn* habe ich gestern gesehen.
the Hans, him have I yesterday seen
b. **Den Hans, Maria* hat *ihn* gestern gesehen.
the Hans, Maria has him yesterday seen
- (89) a. *Gianni, l'ho* visto ieri.
b. *Gianni, Maria l'ha* visto ieri.
- (90) **Er* hat es *ihnen* gestern *den Kindern* gegeben.
he has it to-them yesterday to-the children given
- (91) *Gl'el'ha* dato *ai bambini* ieri.

The contrasts in (88)-(91) can be reduced to the fundamental difference in the S-structure position of pronouns in the two groups of languages, namely the fact that Romance but not Germanic clitics are cliticized on the head which also hosts the inflected verb.

This cluster of properties can be made to follow from Case Theory. Assume that there are two ways of satisfying the requirement that nominals be associated with a Case feature, ultimately the Case filter: by assignment or by incorporation to the Case-assigning verb, the latter way being typical of clitic pronouns (cf. Baker (1988) and Rizzi and Roberts (1989) for relevant discussion):

(92) Clitics can satisfy the Case Filter via incorporation.

This means that in left dislocation structures, the resumptive clitic satisfies Case filter via incorporation, whereas the empty category in the base position, connected with the left dislocated item in sentence-initial A'-position, is assigned an independent Case feature by the verb. A similar procedure can be extended to clitic doubling constructions. The clitic is licensed via incorporation, and the full DP is Case-assigned by a preposition, which overtly realizes the Case feature of the verb²¹

Given that Germanic pronouns never incorporate to the Case-assigning verb, they cannot satisfy the Case filter in a similar way. This predicts that their cooccurrence with a full DP in Left Dislocation ("Linksversetzung") and clitic doubling constructions gives rise to a violation of the Case Filter, since two elements must be assigned Case in one and the same way, namely via true assignment²² Support for this analysis comes from the fact that in some Germanic languages, clitic doubling is found with subject weak pronouns, which cliticize to C°, the Case-assigning head (cf. Haegeman 1992a for West Flemish, and Abraham 1991 for German dialects).

If this interpretation of the contrasts in (88)-(91) is correct, it has the consequence of clearly excluding a Case-based approach to clitic movement, as proposed in Holmberg (1986), (1990) and Roberts (1992).

Notes

* Previous versions of the paper have been presented at the ESF meeting at Il Ciocco (May 1991), and at the Universities of Frankfurt (November 1991), Venice (November 1991) and Lund (February 1992). The audiences are kindly thanked for criticism and suggestions. A particular thanks goes to Guglielmo Cinque, Liliane Haegeman, Ur Shlonsky and Luigi Rizzi for discussing parts of the paper with me.

1. See for example Poletto and Tomaselli (1992).

2. Cf. among others den Besten (1983), Bayer (1983/84), Boschetti (1986), Tomaselli (1989), who argue for the clitic status of subject weak pronouns mainly on the basis of a strict adjacency requirement between them and C°.

3. Abraham (1991) points out the existence of particular reduced pronominal forms in German dialects. We will not take them into consideration here.

4. Clitics can appear on prepositions such as *dietro* in some Italian dialects and in Dutch:

- (i) Stava sempre dremmi. (Poletto and Tomaselli 1992)
(he) stood always behind-me
- (ii) Ik heb het voor ze gekocht. (Haegeman 1992b)
I have it for them bought

5. West Flemish differs from Standard Dutch in that object weak pronouns (the 3rd sg. fem. *ze*, the 3rd neuter *t* and the 3rd pl. *ze*) may either follow or precede the subject, as in German (see (23) below in the text):

- (i) a. da Jan *t* Valere gezeid eet. (Haegeman 1992b)
that J. it to-V. said has
- b. da-*t* Jan Valere gezeid eet.

6. The possibility for weak pronouns to appear in the position of (18) is dependent on the movement of the verb. In Swedish and Danish, it only holds in main clauses, in which the verb under goes movement to C°, but is not found in embedded clauses, in which the verb does not raise (neither to C° nor to Agr°) (see (i) and (ii) respectively). On the other hand, in a language like Icelandic, where the finite verb undergoes raising to Agr° even in embedded clauses, there will be no difference in the position of pronouns depending on the embedded/ main clause distinction:

- (i) a. ... att Anna inte såg *den*. (Holmberg 1990)
 ... that Anna not saw it
- b. *... att Anna *den* inte såg.
- (ii) a. ... at han ikke købte *den*. (Vikner 1990)
 ... that he not bought it
- b. *... at han *den* ikke købte.
- (iii) a. ... að Fríða sá *hann* ekki. (Holmberg 1990)
 ... that Fríða saw it not

However, the correlation between the position of weak pronouns and verb movement can also be observed in Icelandic in compound tenses. As in Swedish and Danish, the participle does not raise to the head containing the participial morphology, which predicts that weak pronouns cannot be shifted to the left in compound tenses:

- (iv) a. Anna har inte sett *den*. (Holmberg 1990)
 Anna has not seen it
- b. *Anna har *den* inte sett.
- (v) a. Studenterne har ikke læst *den*. (Vikner 1990)
 students-the have not read it
- b. *Studenterne har *den* ikke læst.
- (vi) a. ... að Jón hefur ekki keypt *pað*. (Holmberg 1986)
 ... that Jón has not bought it
- b. *... að Jón hefur *pað* ekki keypt.

For a possible analysis of these contrasts in terms of minimality barriers, cf. Deprez (1990).

7. Sentence (21a) is acceptable under the irrelevant reading in which the adverb modifies the subject.

Notice that the position of an object DP is usually structurally lower than sentence adverbs. Thus, the following sentence contrasts with (21a) in the text:

- (i) daß der Hans wahrscheinlich dieses Buch nicht gelesen hat.
that the Hans probably this book not read has

8. Yiddish seems to pattern like German in allowing a weak pronoun to appear either after or before the subject (from Vikner and Schwartz (1991)):

- (i) a. Miriam hot gezogt az [dos Bukh hot Mendele *ir* gegeben].
Miriam has said that the book has Mendele her given
b. Miriam hot gezogt az [dos Bukh hot *ir* Mendele gegeben].

9. A parallel contrast between subjects and adverbs is found in Bernese Swiss German, according to Penner (1990):

- (i) a. I weiss dass dr Vater-s gmacht het.
I know that the father-it made has
b. ??I weiss dass morn-s dr Vater bringt.
I know that tomorrow-it the father brings

10. Parallel to (27c) in the text and (i) of Note 7., we can have both the subject and the object lower than *wahrscheinlich* if they are full DPs:

- (i) daß [[wahrscheinlich [der Hans dieses Buch gelesen hat]]].

11. Among the recent discussions on the leftward movement of German pronouns in terms of scrambling, I refer the reader to Grewendorf and Sternefeld (1990), Vikner and Schwartz (1991), Poletto and Tomaselli (1992).

12. Yiddish also presents evidence that pronoun movement is different in principle from the leftward movement of DPs. Whereas both the direct and the indirect object can appear before the past participle if they are expressed by pronouns, the same is not true in the case of full DPs (from den Besten and Moed-van Walraven (1986))

- (i) a. Mendele hot *es ir* gegeben.
Mendele has it her given
b. ??? Er hot Soren dos bux gegeben.
he has to-Sara the book given

It seems that there is a ban on the movement of two DPs to the left. If pronouns are clitics and are moved as a clitic cluster, the full grammaticality of (ia) is predicted.

13. A derivation in which the dative pronoun first moves to the "clitic" position, followed by cliticization of *es*, is not possible, since in this case there would no way to exclude that even a subject *es* appears encliticized on the dative pronoun. The fact that the two pronouns must form a cluster before moving to the left further supports the cliticization hypothesis.

14. The order argument needs some qualification.

Yiddish data confirm that weak pronouns appear in a cluster with an order different from that of DPs (from den Besten and Moed-van Walraven (1986)):

- (i) a. Mendele hot *es ir* gegebn. DO - IO
Mendele has it her given
- b. ? Er hot dos bux gegebn Soren. DO - IO
he has the book given to-Sara
- c. Er hot Moisn gegebn dos bux. IO - DO
he has to-Moisn given the book

On the other hand, in Swedish and Danish, DPs as well as pronouns occur in the order "indirect object - direct object":

- (ii) Anna gav *mej den* inte. (Holmberg 1990)
Anna gave me it not
- (iii) a. Peter viste jo Marie bogen. (Vikner 1990)
Peter showed indeed to-Marie book-the
- b. Peter viste *hende den* jo.
Peter showed to-her it indeed

In Icelandic, where also DPs may be shifted to the left, the order "indirect object - direct object" is obtained both with pronouns and DPs (from Vikner (1990)):

- (iv) a. Pétur sýndi oft Maríu bókina.
Pétur showed often to-María book-the
- b. Pétur sýndi Maríu bókina oft.
- (v) a. Pétur sýndi *henni* oft bókina.
Pétur showed her often book-the
- b. Pétur sýndi *henni* bókina oft.
- (vi) Pétur sýndi Maríu *hana* oft.
Pétur showed to-María it often
- (vii) Pétur sýndi *henni hana* oft.
Pétur showed to-her it often

The order of pronouns thus seems to interact with independent properties of the double object construction in each particular language, a matter which is beyond the scope of this paper (cf. Vikner (1990) for discussion).

15. A possible counterexample to this claim is found in languages like Hebrew, where personal pronouns can be cliticized on nouns. However, they acquire a possessive meaning. It is thus reasonable to suggest that in this case, they are assigned Genitive Case from the head noun.

16. The proposal made above that sentence adverbs are adjoined to TP must be partly revised if the structure proposed in (75) turns out to be correct. Given that the order "pronoun - adverb - subject" is possible alongside the order "pronoun - subject - adverb" (see respectively (27c) and (27b) in Section 2), we are led to suggest that a sentence adverb can also be adjoined to Agr2P (for the possibility that adverbs of this type may occupy two different positions in Italian, see Belletti (1990)). However, the adjunction to Agr1P is excluded (see (25a), (26) and (27a))

above). This allows us to conclude that when adverbs appear in pre-subject position, the subject does not occupy specAgr1P, but the lower subject position specAgr2P.

For the sake of completeness, it must be noted that sentences like (25a) are grammatical if the adverb is focussed. This may suggest that a projection hosting focalized elements can be generated between C° and Agr1P (see also the remark concerning (78) in the text below).

17. The marginality of sentence (85b) with respect to (85a) is probably due to the independent restrictions on a scrambled DP appearing before the unstressed subject.

18. The status of the landing site of scrambling has been the topic of a long discussion in the last years. I follow here the proposal of den Dikken and Mulder (1991) and Vikner (1990), according to which it is an A' position. This proposal is compatible with Deprez' (1990) hypothesis that it is simultaneously an A and A' position.

19. West Flemish displays a curious situation. Clitic pronouns allow parasitic gaps in spite of the fact that scrambled DPs and pronouns cannot. See Haegeman (1991), (1992b) for discussion.

20. For a different possibility, entailing the base-generation of the clitic in the S-structure position and the movement of a related null category, see Sportiche (1992).

21. The preposition is not necessary, as shown by the possibility of clitic doubling with Italian dative *loro* (cf. Cardinaletti 1991):

- (i) ? *Glielo consegnò loro la settimana scorsa.*
to-them-it delivered to-them last week

What is crucial is that there be a different procedure to assign Case to the doubled element.

22. Left Dislocation ("Linksversetzung") in German is grammatical if a resumptive *d*-pronoun appears in specCP:

- (i) *Den Hans, den habe ich gestern gesehen.*
the Hans him have I yesterday seen

This phenomenon leads us to the proposal that one and the same Case-feature can be realized on the dislocated item and the resumptive pronoun since both occupy A'-positions.

References

- ABNEY, S. P. (1987), *The English Noun Phrase in its Sentential Aspects*, PhD Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- ABRAHAM, W. (1991), "Rektion und Abfolge pronominaler Glieder und ihrer klitischen Formen im Deutschen", in M. Kas, E. Reuland and C. Vet (eds.), *Language and Cognition*, 1, 1-17.
- BAKER, M. (1988), *Incorporation. A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago

- BARNES, M.P. (1989), "Faroese syntax - Achievements, Goals, and problems", ms., University College, London.
- BAYER, J. (1983/84), "Comp in Bavarian Syntax", *The Linguistic Review*, 3, 209-274.
- BELLETTI, A. (1988), "The Case of Unaccusatives", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 19, 1-34.
- BELLETTI, A. (1990), *Generalized Verb Movement: Aspects of Verb Syntax*, Rosenberg and Sellier, Torino.
- BENNIS, H. and T. HOEKSTRA (1984/85), "Gaps and Parasitic Gaps", *The Linguistic Review*, 4, 29-87.
- den BESTEN, H. (1983), "On the interaction of root transformations and lexical deletive rules", in W. Abraham (ed.), *On the Formal Syntax of the Westgermania*, Benjamins, Amsterdam, 47-131.
- den BESTEN, H. (1985), "The ergative hypothesis and free word order in Dutch and German", in J. Toman (ed.), *Studies in German Grammar*, Foris, Dordrecht, 23-64.
- den BESTEN, H. and C. MOED-van WALRAVEN (1986), "The Syntax of Verbs in Yiddish", in H. Haider and M. Prinzhorn (eds.), *Verb Second Phenomena in Germanic Languages*, Foris, Dordrecht, 111-135.
- BOSCHETTI, L. (1986), *Zur Syntax des Pronomens "sich"*, Tesi di laurea, University of Venice.
- CARDINALETTI, A. (1988), "Linksphere Phrasen in der deutschen Syntax", *Studium Linguistik*, 22, 1-30.
- CARDINALETTI, A. (1990a), *Impersonal Constructions and Sentential Arguments in German*, Unipress, Padova.
- CARDINALETTI, A. (1990b), *Pronomi nulli e pleonastici nelle lingue germaniche romanze. Saggio di sintassi comparata*, Tesi di Dottorato, Universities of Padua and Venice.
- CARDINALETTI, A. (1991), "On pronoun movement: The Italian dative *loro*", *Probus*, 3.2., 127-153.
- CARDINALETTI, A. and I. ROBERTS (1991), "Clause structure and X² second", to appear in W. Chao and G. Horrocks (eds.), *Levels, Principles and Processes: The Structure of Grammatical Representation*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- DEPREZ, V. (1990), "Parameters of Object Movement", ms., Rutgers / Princeton University.

- den DIKKEN, M. and R. MULDER, (1991), "Double Object Scrambling", ms., University of Leiden.
- FELIX, S. (1983), "Parasitic Gaps in German", *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik*, 22, 1-46.
- GREWENDORF, G. and W. STERNEFELD (eds.) (1990), *Scrambling and Barriers*, Benjamins, Amsterdam.
- GRIMSHAW, J. (1991), "Extended Projection", ms., Brandeis University.
- HAEGEMAN, L. (1991), "Scrambling, clitic placement and Agr recursion in West Flemish", ms., University of Geneva.
- HAEGEMAN, L. (1992a), *Generative Syntax: Theory and Description. A Case Study from West Flemish*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- HAEGEMAN, L. (1992b), "The distribution of object pronouns in West Flemish", Paper presented at the Second Plenary Conference of the European Science Foundation San Sebastian, 2.-5.9.1992.
- HOLMBERG, A. (1986), *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*, Stockholm, University of Stockholm.
- HOLMBERG, A. (1990), "The distribution of Scandinavian weak pronouns", in H. van Riemsdijk and L. Rizzi (eds.).
- HOLMBERG, A. and C. PLATZACK (1988), "On the role of Inflection in Scandinavian languages", *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 42, 25-42.
- JASPERS, D. (1989), "A Head Position for Dutch Clitics or: Wilma, Wim and Wackernagel", in D. Jaspers, W. Klooster, Y. Putseys and P. Seuren (eds.), *Sentential Complementation and the Lexicon. Studies in Honour of Wim de Geest*, Foris, Dordrecht, 241-252.
- KAYNE, R. (1975), *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- KAYNE, R. (1989), "Facets of past participle agreement", in P. Beninc (ed.), *Dialect Variation and the Theory of Grammar*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- KAYNE, R. (1990), "Romance Clitics and PRO", in J. Carter et al. (eds.), *Proceedings of NELS 20*, 255-302.
- KOSTER, J. (1978), *Locality Principles in Syntax*, Foris, Dordrecht.
- LENERZ, J. (1977), *Zur Abfolge nominaler Satzglieder im Deutschen*, Narr, Tübingen.

- PENNER, Z. (1990), "Pronominal Clitics in Bernese Swiss German", Paper presented at the Workshop "Clitics and their hosts", University of Geneva, 29.11.1990-1.12.1990
- POLETTI, C. and A. TOMASELLI (1992), "Verso una definizione di elemento clitico", to appear in G. Giusti and R. Dolci (eds.), *Atti della Ia e IIa giornata di grammatica tedesca*, Centro Linguistico Interfacoltà, University of Venice.
- POLLOCK, J.-Y. (1989), "Verb Movement, UG and the Structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 20, 365-424.
- RIZZI, L. and I. ROBERTS (1989), "Complex inversion in French", *Probus*, 1, 1-30.
- ROBERTS, I. (1991), "The Nature of Subject Clitics in Franco-Provençal Valdôtain", to appear in A. Belletti (ed.), *Syntactic Theory and the Dialects of Italy*, Rosenberg and Sellier, Torino.
- ROBERTS, I. (1992), "Object Movement and Verb Movement in Early Modern English", ms., University of Wales.
- SPORTICHE, D. (1992), "Clitics, voice and spec/head licensing", Paper presented at the GLOW Conference, Lisbon, 13.5.1992.
- TOMASELLI, A. (1989), *La sintassi del verbo finito nelle lingue germaniche*, Tesi di dottorato, University of Pavia [pubblicata in volume nel 1991 con lo stesso titolo, UNIPRESS, Padova].
- TRAVIS, L. (1984), *Parameters and Effects of Word Order Variation*, PhD Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, Mass.
- VIKNER, S. (1990), *Verb Movement and the Licensing of NP-positions in the Germanic Languages*, PhD Dissertation, University of Geneva.
- VIKNER, S. and B. SCHWARTZ (1991), "The verb always leaves IP in V2 languages", ms., University of Stuttgart/Boston University.
- VIKNER, S. and R. SPROUSE (1988), "Have / Be-Selection as an A-Chain Membership Requirement", *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax*, 38.
- WACKERNAGEL, J. (1892), "Über ein Gesetz der Indogermanischen Wortstellung", *Indogermanische Forschungen*, 1, 334-436.
- ZWART, C.J.W. (1990), "Clitics in Dutch: Evidence for the position of INFL", Paper presented at the Girona GISELLE Conference, 21.7.1990.

ZWART, C.J.W. (1991), "Clitics in Dutch: Evidence for the position of INFL", *Groninger Arbeiten zur germanistischen Linguistik*, 33, 71-92.