

# Word order as part of structure - Cliticisation as a word order-borne phenomenon

Lars Heltoft  
University of Copenhagen,  
Dept. of Nordic Studies and  
Linguistics

KØBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET



## Cliticisation part of morphology

Cliticisation involves increasing degrees of bondedness along the scale of grammaticalisation from free lexeme to affix.

Clitics are not affixes of their host, since affixes apply to categories in the sense of entire word classes.

## Word order and mainstream grammaticalisation

Sun & Traugott (2011):

- word order is not included among the parameters of grammaticalisation.
- it is rather an epiphenomenon.
- Tine Breban's analysis of the bleaching of *several* in English from 'separate' to 'numerous', 'rather many'. *Two several merchantmen > Several Dutch merchantmen*

I infer:

- If part of grammaticalisation in this sense only, cliticisation cannot have word order as a parameter.

## Part of Hjelmslev's position?

Hjelmslev's focus (1938) is on morphology. Syntax and henceforth word order are not part of structure, but of usage.

Hjelmslev would not recognise Diderichsen's word order template as a (partial) model of linguistic structure.

Diderichsen accommodates to Hjelmslev, not vice versa. (studied in detail by Gregersen 1991).

Meillet's 1912 article is mainly about morphologisation processes; however, when coded, word order contrasts can be just as grammatical as morphological contrasts.

We shall need to consider the template as a model of the possible sign contrasts of the modern Danish language.

## The sentence template: Agenda

Diagrammatic iconicity: positions express syntactic content.

Paradigmatic oppositions projected onto the syntagmatic axis.

*Nominals* (NPs) are differentiated as nom1, nom2, nom3 by way of positional structure and indexicality: pos1 pos2 pos3 point to their governing predicate as the locus to identify nom1 (subject), nom2 (direct object) and nom3 (indirect object).

Topological integrity: intact or lost? Cliticisation not confined to morphology, but applies to topological bondedness as well.

Preserved vs. lost integrity is found in the distinction between personal pronouns and reflexive pronouns.

These categories are twofold distinct in MD.

## Concerning cliticisation: preliminary answers

- Is cliticisation bound up with word order in any interesting way? **Yes, Scandinavian light pronouns are an example.**
- Can cliticisation include restrictions on word order potential? **Scandinavian light pronouns are an example.**
- Can words or constituents cliticise and still preserve topological integrity? **Yes, Scandinavian light pronouns are an example.**
- Can words or constituents lose their topological integrity - and therefore cliticise - without undergoing specific phonetic/ phonological reductions? **Danish reflexive middles are an example.**

# Elementary topological distinctions between nominals (NPs)

**E = expression**

**C = content**

<b>C</b>		<b>Finite V</b>	<b>Subject</b>		<b>Non-finite V</b>	<b>Indirect object</b>	<b>Direct object</b>	<b>Non-verbal pred</b>
<b>E</b>	<b>X pos</b>	<b>1st Pred pos</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Nom pos</b>	....	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Pred pos</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Nom pos</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> Nom pos</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> pred pos</b>

## Weak anaphoric pronouns in Danish

X/P1	V2	Subj	Encl	Dialogic Part	Rest
------	----	------	------	---------------	------

(1) <i>oHer</i>	<i>[bor vi]</i>			<i>jo</i>	<i>stadigvæk</i>
here	live	we		you know	still
(2) <i>[Vi</i>	<i>bor]</i>	-	<i>oher</i>	<i>jo</i>	<i>stadigvæk</i>
we	live		here	you know	still

The fronted weak pronoun in (1) fills a position in the word order system, just like the subject personal pronoun in (2). This filling is a precondition for declarative clause formation.

Weak pronouns will be said to be topologically intact and to preserve topological integrity.

This has no relation to the valence bearer. Insert *sove* 'sleep' for *bo* 'live': *hun sover her jo stadigvæk* 'she still sleeps here, you know'.



## Danish weak anaphoric pronouns cliticise to the subject - finite verb nexus.

X/P1	V2	Subj	Encl	Dialogic Part	Rest
	<i>[bor hun]</i>		<i>der</i>	<i>så</i>	<i>stadigvæk?</i>
	lives she		there	then	still

‘Does she live there still, then?’

## Enclitic positions

X	V2	Subj	Encl	Part	Rest
(3) [Han fortalte]	-		o <h style="color:red">hende</h> o <h style="color:red">det</h>	jo	aldrig
he	told		her	it	part
					never
(4) -	[Fortalte Peter]		o <h style="color:red">hende</h> o <h style="color:red">det</h>	-	aldrig?
	told	Peter	her	it	
					never
(5) I går	[fortalte Peter]		o <h style="color:red">hende</h> o <h style="color:red">det</h>	så	
yesterday	told	Peter	her	it	then
					‘yesterday, Peter told her about it, finally’
(6) *Fortalte			o <h style="color:red">hende</h> o <h style="color:red">det</h>	Peter	aldrig?
(7) *Fortalte			o <h style="color:red">det</h>	Peter	aldrig?
(8) *Fortalte			o <h style="color:red">hende</h>	Peter	o <h style="color:red">det</h> aldrig?

## Weak pronouns fill X/P1

- (9) [Forstod du] <sub>o</sub>den ikke selv?  
 Understood you it not yourself  
 ‘Didn’t you understand it yourself?’  
 Nej, <sub>o</sub>den [forstod jeg] ikke selv, men ...  
 No, it understood I not myself, but ...  
 No, I didn’t understand it myself, but
- (10) [Elsker du] <sub>o</sub>hende?  
 Love you her?  
 Ja, <sub>o</sub>hende [elsker jeg] helt vildt  
 Yes, her love I madly

## Example of weak pronouns in the early 14<sup>th</sup> century. No cliticisation. Pronominal NPs can precede their valence bearer.

(11) Weak pronouns      Valency bearer

*æn wilt thu **mic thæt** æi **sighæ** ac scal giuæ thit kiøt  
undæ diur at ætæ* (St. Christina. GL 284, 10-12)

'but if you will not tell me, I shall give your flesh to predators to devour'

## Example of weak pronoun in the late 17<sup>th</sup> century. No cliticisation. The pronoun can still precede its valence bearer.

(12)

*Thi eftterat det var bleven got med drengen,  
bleff min kiere Husbonde anfectet nat oc dag,*

was my dear husband attacked night and day

*saa ingen kand **det** troe eller tenke ...* so that nobody can  
it believe or imagine

'For after the boy had recovered, my dear husband had  
fits night and day, so that nobody can believe or imagine  
it'

(Brunsmann 1674, 118, about early 17th century crucible)

# Topological integrity

Topological integrity covers the ability of a word or constituent to fill in more than one position in the topological template, thereby manifesting a word order borne semantic contrast or difference.

## **Reflexive clitics preserve their exponence, but lose their topological integrity.**

Reflexive pronouns were topologically intact in Middle Danish, but have lost integrity in present-day Danish.

Dialogic particles have no integrity either.

## Cliticisation can consist in loss of topology

The reflexive *sig* is a middle form (Kemmer 1993). It cliticises along a topological ('word order') scale. It does not count as an A2 marker, but points out that only A1 is relevant. It is not an NP.

A full reflexive has the 3SG/PL form *sig selv*, serving as objects and as NPs in PPs. It can fill various positions, just like other NPs.



# The paradigm for the traditional reflexive pronoun. The reflexive middle.

	<b>SG</b>	<b>PL</b>
<b>1P</b>	<b>mig</b>	<b>os</b>
<b>2P</b>	<b>dig</b>	<b>jer</b>
<b>3P</b>	<b>sig</b>	

# The paradigm for the A2/A3-reflexive.

	<b>SG</b>	<b>PL</b>
<b>1P</b>	<b>mig selv</b>	<b>os selv</b>
<b>2p</b>	<b>dig selv</b>	<b>jer selv</b>
<b>3P</b>	<b>sig selv</b>	

## Reflexive clitics preserving their exponence, but losing their topological integrity.

- (13) jeg barberede mig  
I shaved REFL.1P.SG
- (14) du morede dig  
you enjoyed REFL.2P.SG
- (15) de skjulte sig  
they hid REFL.3P.PL
- (16) \*mig barberede jeg
- (17) \*dig morede du
- (18) \*sig skjulte de

## Referential reflexives have topological integrity. Test for referential reflexive.

- |      |                 |                   |                        |               |
|------|-----------------|-------------------|------------------------|---------------|
|      | A1              |                   | A2                     |               |
| (19) | jeg barberede   | <b>mig selv,</b>  |                        | ikke Peter    |
|      | I shaved        |                   | REFL.REFERENTIAL 1P.SG | not Peter     |
|      |                 |                   |                        |               |
|      |                 |                   | A2                     |               |
| (20) | <b>mig selv</b> | har jeg barberet, |                        | ikke Peter    |
|      |                 |                   | A2                     |               |
| (21) | <b>Peter</b>    | har jeg barberet, |                        | ikke mig selv |

## Do the reflexive middles take up a position in the topological balance sheet?

An extra argument comes from presentative constructions. The object position is occupied by the argument 1 under VP-domination.

This split between personal pronouns and reflexive middles has normally been overlooked (see e.g. Vikner 2005).

### Non-finite V Object position

(22a) *Der vil vise sig en ny stjerne på himmelen*  
 there will show REFL a new star in the sky  
 ‘a new star will show in the sky’

(22b) *Der samlede sig 100000 mennesker på slotspladsen*  
 there gathered REFL 100000 people in palace square-DEF  
 ‘100000 people gathered in palace square’

## Reflexives - examples of their former topological integrity

- (24) *sa Haraldr æs ser wan Danmørk alla ok Norwæg*  
 that Harold who REFL.DAT won Denmark all and Norway  
 ‘the Harold who won for himself Denmark in its entirety  
 and Norway’ Jelling runic stone 2, app. 930.
- (25) *then man thær ... sig orket ey sielf at hielpe*  
 the man that ... REFL capable=was not on his own to help  
 ‘the man who wasn’t able to help himself’  
 K4, GL 277, 22-23. Ms. app. 1430

**V2 SCs have an open position X. Reflexives can fill this position as can all other constituents.**

Subjunction

X      V2

*æs*

*seR    wan    Danmørk alla*

*thær*

*sig    orket    ey sielf at hielpe \_\_*

## Scanian Law, early 13<sup>th</sup> century

(26)

at hialpa sæ            mæth slicum mannum ær han ma til fa  
to help REFL.DAT with such men            that he can get to  
'to help himself with such men that he can bring to do it'

(SkL, GL 103, 1-2)

(27)

Bithi            sæ            swa guth hialpa at han ær rætar ægande  
pray-SUBJ REFL.DAT so God help that he is just owner  
'that he is the legal owner, so help him God'

(SkL, GL 103, 11)



## Middle Danish Middle field

(28) (giff thætte barn toll at) iach motte ok henne see  
 give this child endurance that I might also her see  
 ændæ sith liff i fulkomen troo  
 end refl. life in perfect faith

Aff sancta Sophia och hennes døttær, HellKv 85, 23-25

	Finite V	background	OP	focus	Non-finite Vs
<b>x pos</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> V pos</b>	<b>NPs and PPs</b>		<b>NPs, PPs and predicatives</b>	
<i>iach</i>	<i>motte</i>		<i>ok</i>	<i>henne</i>	<i>se ændæ (sith liff)</i>
	<i>wilt</i>	<i>thu mic thæt</i>	<i>æi</i>		<i>sighæ</i>

# Comparison of middle field in 13<sup>th</sup> century Danish and the alignment system of the Modern language.

	<b>Finite V</b>	<b>Backgrounded constituents</b>	<b>Focus operators</b>	<b>Focused constituent</b>	<b>non-finite V</b>
<b>X pos</b>	<b>1st verbal pos</b>	<b>Positions for NPs and PPs</b>		<b>Positions for NPs, PPs and Predicatives</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup> verbal pos</b>

	<b>Finite V</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Intact enclitics</b>	<b>Particles, adverbs and focus operators</b>	<b>Non-finite V</b>
<b>X pos</b>	<b>1st Pred pos</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> Nom pos</b>	<b>Positions for pronominal forms</b>		<b>2<sup>nd</sup> pred pos</b>

## Something exotic from the Nordic kitchen?

Examples are found in Old French where the word order system is V2, with the addition that atonic variants of personal pronouns do not hold an independent position:

V2 + atonic dative	Subj	Verbal field
Avez li	vos	son pere ne son frere tué?
have him.D	you	his father or his brother killed?
Buridant § 587		

X	V2	Subj	Verbal field
et de ces trois choses	vos dirè	je	bien la senefiance
and about these three things	you tell-FUT.1P	I	well the meaning
Vance 165			

## Conclusions

- Danish reflexive middle clitics are possibly at the brink of shifting to univerbation processes, but still, they demonstrate full bondedness at the level of word order.
- Danish reflexive middle forms can only be enclitic (they can never be fronted or promoted).
- The contrast between anaphors and reflexive middles documents 1) that cliticisation can take place along the word order parameter, and 2) that word order is a domain of grammaticalisation in its own right.
- If Hjelmslev would ever have given way, this might have been an opportunity. A number-and-person paradigm is defined on the basis of topological criteria.

Thank you!

## References

Buridant, Claude. 2000. *Grammaire nouvelle de l'ancien français*. Sedes.

Frotscher, Michael & Robert Mailhammer. 2021. Workshop introduction for ICHL 25.

Gregersen, Frans. 1991. *Sociolingvistikens (u)mulighed*. Bd. 1-2. Viborg: Tiderne skifter.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2022. Types of clitics in the world's languages. Draft, 2022 July 2022.

Hjelmslev. Louis. 1938. *Essais d'une théorie des morphemes*. Reprint *Essais linguistiques*. Deuxième édition, 152-164. Copenhagen: Nordisk Sprog- og Kulturforlag.

## References (2)

Hvilshøj, Ulrik. 1999. Refleksivitet i dansk. *Sig og sig selv* i et typologisk perspektiv. [Reflexivity in Danish. *Sig and sig selv* in a typological perspective]. *Ny Forskning i Grammatik* 6, 81-106.

Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Luraghi, Silvia. 2011. Clitics. In Silvia Luraghi & Claudia Parodi (eds.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Syntax*. 165-193. London: Bloomsbury.

Meillet, Antoine. 1965 [1912]. L'évolution des formes grammaticales. Reprinted in *Linguistique historique et linguistique générale par A. Meillet*, 130-148. Paris: Champion.

.

## References (3)

Nielsen, Peter Juul & Lars Heltoft (in press). Indexicality across the boundaries of syntax, semantics and pragmatics: The constructional content of the Danish free indirect object. In *Ditransitive Constructions in Germanic Languages: Diachronic and Synchronic Aspects*. Timothy Colleman & Eva Zehentner (eds.). John Benjamins.

Seuren, Pieter A. 2009. The clitics mechanism in French and Italian. *Probus* 21, 83–142.

Sun, Chaofen & Elizabeth Traugott. 2011. Grammaticalization and Word Order Change. In Heiko Narroq & Bernd Heine (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Grammaticalization*. 378-388. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



## References (4)

Vikner, Sten. 2005. Object Shift. In Henk van Riemsdijk & Martin Everaert (eds.), *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*. 392-436. Oxford: Blackwell.

Zwicky, Arnold M. 1994. What is a clitic? In Joel A. Nevis, Brian Joseph, Dieter Wanner, and Arnold M. Zwicky, *Clitics: A Comprehensive Bibliography 1892–1991*, xii-xx. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

# The North Germanic middle

North Germanic middle forms in *-sk* or *-s* (from enclitic *\*sik/\*sis* in a reflexive construction) is a classic example of such grammaticalisation, but the full reflexive form *sik* and its followers were preserved as an alternative. The *-sk/-s* middle form had three main functions: reflexive, reciprocal and intransitive, and as an extension: the passive.

The reflexive meaning of *-s* was lost in later Danish, and the reflexive pronoun was redefined (3sg/pl *sig*; 1/2sg/pl are homophonous with the personal pronouns).

The reciprocal and intransitive meanings of the middle turn unproductive).

Forms like *gemm-es* ('hide')-es can no longer mean 'hide, hide oneself' (where earlier Danish allowed

(1) *fluerne gemme-s ved ovnen*  
 flies-DEF.PL hide-MIDDLE by the oven  
 'the flies hide by the oven')

(2) *sætt-es* can no longer mean 'to sit down'.  
 sit-MIDDLE

This meaning demands the reflexive 'construction' *gemme sig*, *sætte sig*.