

Gerards, David Paul. 2022. "Clitics in Informal Written Sources of Angolan Portuguese and their Similarity to Informal Brazilian Portuguese." In Anja Hennemann & Benjamin Meisnitzer (eds.), *Linguistic Hybridity. Contact-induced and Cognitively Motivated Grammaticalization and Lexicalization Processes in Romance Languages*. Heidelberg: Winter, 15–46.

Contents

Anja Hennemann and Benjamin Meisnitzer

An introduction to contact-induced and cognitively motivated grammaticalization and lexicalization processes in Romance languages 7

David Paul Gerards

Clitic placement in informal written sources of Angolan Portuguese and its similarity to informal Brazilian Portuguese 15

Barbara Schäfer-Prieß

The obligatory use of subject pronouns in French and the increased use of subject pronouns in Brazilian Portuguese and Caribbean Spanish: a result of language contact? 47

Sybille Große

Contact-induced language change in Paraguayan Spanish? – *ndaje* and evidential marking in print and social media communication 65

Hans-Jörg Döhla

Contact-induced grammaticalization – Spanish influence on Paraguayan Guaraní 85

Verónica Böhm, Anja Hennemann and Benjamin Meisnitzer

Language contact and the linguistic coding of evidentiality in varieties of Spanish in Latin America 117

Waltraud Weidenbusch

The discourse marker *pues* in Latin America: an example of grammaticalization due to language contact? 143

Franz Meier

Italian translation equivalents of the German modal particles *eben* and *einfach*: indicators for the existence of modal particles in Italian? 161

Joachim Steffen and Miguel Gutiérrez Maté

The significance of language contact in the restructuring of Brazilian Portuguese: historical evidence from Southern Brazilian bilingual communities of German origin 183

Anna Ladilova

Linguistic hybridity and lexicalization processes in the context of the Spanish-German-Russian language contact

201

Gerda Haßler

Aspectual periphrases in Romance languages in contact with the English progresse form

215

Clitic placement in informal written sources of Angolan Portuguese and its similarity to informal Brazilian Portuguese

DAVID PAUL GERARDS (LEIPZIG)

1. Introduction

This paper investigates clitic object placement in informal written sources of Angolan Portuguese (IWAP) and compares it to that of clitics in European Portuguese (EP) and informal Brazilian Portuguese (IBP). The first main aim is to empirically assess the direction of cliticization in IWAP. The second main aim is to assess the availability of clitic climbing. Contrary to most findings in previous studies, the data examined – 500 clitics collected from freely accessible Facebook profiles – suggest that IWAP is generalizing proclisis in (almost) all syntactic contexts and losing clitic climbing. In both aspects, IWAP is shown to be similar to IBP rather than to EP.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides an introduction to the sociodemographic and linguistic situation of Angola. Section 3 compares the general lines of clitic placement in EP and IBP and resumes the contradictory positions regarding these issues in Angolan Portuguese (AP). Section 4 presents the methodology and the empirical basis of the study. The results of the data analysis are presented in Section 5 and discussed in Section 6. Section 7 presents the conclusion.¹

2. Overview of the linguistic situation of Angola

Portuguese in Angola coexists with a large number of (mostly Bantu) precolonial languages (Dele Zau 2011; Undolo 2014; Adriano 2015). During the colonial era, Portuguese was the language of the – largely European – upper class and served for all administrative and other official matters. Remarkably though, and despite being tied to this colonial past, Portuguese has become the supraregional and supraethnic lingua franca since the independence of Angola in 1975 (Dele Zau 2011; Undolo 2014; Adriano 2015). Today, competence in Portuguese is a *conditio sine qua non* for social ascent in Angola. This high status of Portuguese has led to an increasing number of Angolans with Portuguese as L1. In this regard, a diachronic look at speaker percentages of

¹ I thank Ana Maria Martins and Benjamin Meisnitzer for their help with some of the Angolan data, as well as an anonymous reviewer of an earlier version of this paper. All remaining errors are, of course, my own. This work benefitted from financial support by *URPP Language and Space* (University of Zurich/Switzerland).

Portuguese in Angola is telling. Table 1, however, needs to be regarded with caution as the studies often do not distinguish between L1 and L2 speakers.

Year	Portuguese L1	Portuguese L2
1975	1-2 %	15-20 %
1985	33 %	
1996	26 %	?
2014	71 %	

Table 1. *Percentages of Portuguese speakers in Angola (1975-2014)*
(Correia Mendes 1985; Endruschat 1990; Barros 2002; Hodges ²2004;
national census 2014)²

The speaker percentages of Portuguese in Angola are lower in rural areas than they are in urban ones where, moreover, being a (young) L1 speaker of Portuguese is, nowadays, more and more synonymous with being monolingual in this language (Cruz 2013; Miguel ²2014; Undolo 2014; Adriano 2015). The latter tendency, though time-delayed, is also observed for rural areas (Dele Zau 2011, 23f.).

In present-day Angola, EP still widely serves as the unofficial reference norm (Dele Zau 2011, 101; Adriano 2015, 49). Actual EP-mastery is, however, heterogeneous (Dele Zau 2011, 122ff.; Miguel ²2014, 21ff.; Adriano 2015), and a growing number of Angolans are beginning to consider ‘their’ Portuguese a marker of identity (Dele Zau 2011, Ch. 3; Miguel ²2014, 16ff.; Adriano 2015, Ch. 3). Especially among young people, this is accompanied by a positive attitude toward Brazilian Portuguese, very present in Angola through telenovelas and other media formats (Chavagne 2005, 36; Cruz 2013, 170ff.; Miguel ²2014, 12). In this context, it has been repeatedly noted that present-day IWAP differs from EP in a number of properties with regard to which it aligns more with IBP (cf. Gärtner 1989 and 1997; Endruschat 1990; Vilela 1999; Chavagne 2005; Inverno 2009a and b; Dele Zau 2011; Gonçalves 2013; Miguel ²2014, 12; Undolo 2014; Adriano 2014 and 2015; Hagemeyer 2016). As is shown in this paper, one domain where IWAP is becoming IBP-like is clitic placement.

3. SOA: clitic placement in EP, IBP, and AP

Clitic placement is a complex domain of Portuguese grammar, both in synchrony (e.g., Galves et al. 2005; Magro 2006; Cyrino 2010; Bagno 2012, 760ff.; Martins 2013; Meisnitzer/Martins 2016) and diachrony (e.g., Martins 1994 and 2016; Martins 2012). Section 3.1 compares clitic placement in EP and IBP; Section 3.2 summarizes what is known about clitic placement in AP. Together, this provides the background for the empirical part of this paper.

² For the national census, cf. data.humdata.org/dataset/angola-census-2014-final-and-preliminary-population-results.

3.1. Clitic placement in EP and IBP

This section, the structure of which largely follows Martins (2013), compares clitic placement in EP and IBP in seven different syntactic contexts: simple verb main clauses with and without procliticizers (3.1.1-3.1.2), simple verb finite subordinate clauses (3.1.3), simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions and *qu*-words (3.1.4), simple verb gerundial subordinate clauses (3.1.5), verbal complexes (3.1.6), and ‘dictionary forms’ (3.1.7). The section on verbal complexes also discusses clitic climbing. Facts on EP reproduce Martins (2013); IBP facts, unless stated otherwise, reproduce Galves et al. (2005) and Cyrino (2010). In line with Galves and Cyrino as well Bagno (2012, 760ff.), I defend the extreme position that all IBP clitics are proclitics and that clitic climbing is no longer possible. Nonetheless, I am aware that enclisis and clitic climbing are attestable in IBP. Following Galves et al. (2005), I interpret this as grammar competition due to normative pressure.

3.1.1. Simple verb main clauses without procliticizers in EP and IBP

Clitic placement in simple verb main clauses without procliticizers differs between EP and IBP. In EP, clitic placement in such contexts is obligatorily enclitic; IBP requires proclisis. This is true of declarative clauses (1), even if a clitic ends up in absolute initial position (1c),³ imperatives (2),⁴ exclamatives (3), and interrogatives (4):

- | | | |
|--------|----------------------|---|
| (1) a. | ⁵ EP/*IBP | <i>A médica chamou-me.</i> |
| b. | *EP/IBP | <i>A médica me chamou.</i>
‘The doctor called me.’ |
| c. | *EP/IBP | <i>Me chamou.</i>
‘S/he called me.’ |
| (2) a. | EP/*IBP | <i>Chama-me!</i> |
| b. | *EP/IBP | <i>Me chama!</i>
‘Call me!’ |

³ Absolute initial proclitics in IBP seem to be subject to a stronger normative pressure than proclitics in other contexts (cf. Galves et al. 2005, 147f.).

⁴ Distinguishing [\pm imperative] is relevant as clitics with [+ imperative] occupy a structural position different from that in [– imperative] clauses (cf. Cruschina/Ledgeway 2016, 570). In this regard, consider French, Spanish and Italian, languages which all require enclisis with imperatives despite displaying generalized proclisis to finite verbs. Another interesting case in point is Vallader, a Romansh variety spoken in Switzerland, in which enclisis and proclisis with imperatives coexist, but where the former is gradually being abandoned in favor of the latter (Arquint ⁴2017, 67).

⁵ If no reference is given for an example, it was created according to the positions proposed in Martins (2013), for EP, and Galves et al. (2005) and Cyrino (2010), for IBP. Negative grammaticality judgments throughout the paper are my own, though always based on the positions of Martins (2013), for EP, and Galves et al. (2005) and Cyrino (2010), for IBP.

- (3) a. EP/*IBP *Você **saiu-me** um belo vigarista!*
 b. *EP/IBP *Você **me saiu** um belo vigarista!*
 ‘You really are a good cutthroat!’
- a. EP/*IBP *O rapaz **disse-te** onde estava a viver?*
 b. *EP/IBP *O rapaz **te disse** onde estava vivendo?*
 ‘Did the boy tell you where he lives?’
- ([1a-b; 2]: Luís/Kaiser 2016, [3a]: Martins 2013, [4a]: adapted from Martins 2013)

The only simple verb main clauses without procliticizers in which clitics are not enclitic in EP are with the synthetic future (5) and with the verb in conditional mood (6). Here, EP requires mesoclisism (5a, 6a), i.e., the clitic intervenes between the verbal stem and the inflectional morphemes.⁶ Again, IBP has proclisis (5c, 6c):

- (5) a. EP/*IBP *O João **dar-te-á** o recado.*
 b. *[?]EP/*IBP *O João **dará-te** o recado.*
 c. *EP/IBP *O João **te dará** o recado.*
 ‘John will give you the news.’
- (6) a. EP/*IBP *O João **escrever-te-ia**.*
 b. *[?]EP/*IBP *O João **escreveria-te**.*
 c. *EP/IBP *O João **te escreveria**.*
 ‘John would write to you.’

([5a-b; 6a]: adapted from Martins 2013)

3.1.2. Simple verb main clauses with procliticizers in EP and IBP

Procliticizers obligatorily trigger proclisis even in EP simple verb main clauses. IBP clitic placement in such contexts is proclitic, too. Procliticizers include negation (7), most quantifiers (8), focalizing (7), focalized (9), and emphatic (10) adverbs, preposed non-adverbial foci (11), interrogatives and exclamatives with *qu*-words (12-13), imperatives with *que* ‘that’ (14), and optatives (15) – the latter with the restriction that in EP the clitic must not end up in absolute initial position:

- (7) EP/IBP *O médico **não/já me chamou**.*
 ‘The doctor didn’t call/already called me.’
- (8) EP/IBP *Todos **me chamaram**.*
 ‘Everyone called me.’
- (9) EP/IBP *Sempre **me espantou** esta poderosa
confiança.
 ‘This powerful trust always scared me.’*

⁶ Mesoclisism is, however, slowly being abandoned in favor of enclisis in EP (Mateus et al. 2003, 866; Martins 2013, 2240), whence the question marks with (5b) and (6b).

- (10) EP/IBP *Eu até **te contava**, mas não posso.*
'I would even tell you, but I can't.'
- (11) EP/IBP *Nas **pernas se fiava** ele.*
'It was his LEGS he relied on.'
- (12) EP/IBP *Quem **te contou**?*
'Who told you?'
- (13) EP/IBP *Como **ele me irrita**!*
'How he gets on my nerves!'
- (14) EP/IBP *Que **Deus te valha**!*
'May God help you!'
- (15) EP/IBP ***Deus te valha**!*
'May God help you!'

([7-8]: Luís/Kaiser 2016; [9-15]: Martins 2013)

3.1.3. Simple verb finite subordinate clauses in EP and IBP

In simple verb finite subordinate clauses, both EP and IBP require proclisis, irrespective of whether a procliticizer (Section 3.1.2) is present or not:⁷

- (16) EP/IBP *Acho **que me chamou**.*
'I think s/he called me.'

(Luís/Kaiser 2016)

3.1.4. Simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions/*qu*-words in EP and IBP

In infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions (17) and *qu*-words (18), EP allows both enclisis and proclisis.⁸ IBP displays proclisis:⁹

⁷ There are sporadic attestations of enclitics in some EP subordinate clauses, as well as in some cleft constructions (Martins 2013, 2276f.). Given the very low frequency of these enclitics, this paper considers simple verb finite subordinate clauses contexts of obligatory proclisis in EP (and IBP).

⁸ Except for inflected infinitives. Here, EP has obligatory proclisis with most prepositions (Martins 2013, 2285ff.).

⁹ Enclitics in IBP in finite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions are relatively easy to attest. Galves et al. (2005, 151f.) interpret this as a consequence of normative pressure (cf. also note 3).

- (17) a. EP/*IBP *Estou aqui para **ajudar-te**.*
 b. EP/IBP *Estou aqui para te **ajudar**.*
 ‘I am here to help you.’
- (18) a. EP/*IBP *Não temos a quem **queixar-nos**.*
 b. EP/IBP *Não temos a quem nos **queixar**.*
 ‘We don’t have anyone to complain to.’

([17a, 18]: Martins 2013)

One exception to the general rule exemplified by (17) and (18) are infinite subordinate clauses introduced by the preposition *a* ‘to’. In such cases, EP requires enclisis (19a). IBP again displays proclisis (19b):

- (19) a. EP/*IBP *[...] habituaram-se a ver-te àquela mesa.*
 b. *EP/IBP *Se habituaram a te ver àquela mesa.*
 c. *EP/*IBP *[...] habituaram-se a te ver àquela mesa.*
 ‘They got used to seeing you at that table.’

([19a]: adapted from Martins 2013)

3.1.5. Simple verb gerundial subordinate clauses in EP and IBP

In simple verb gerundial subordinate clauses, EP requires enclisis (20a), whereas IBP requires proclisis (20b). In the presence of procli-ticizers (Section 3.1.2), proclisis is obligatory in EP, too ([20c] vs. [20d]):

- (20) a. EP/*IBP *falando-te carinhosamente [...] insistia
 para que [...]*
 b. *EP/IBP *te falando carinhosamente [...] insistia
 para que [...]*
 c. EP/IBP *não te falando carinhosamente [...] insistia
 para que [...]*
 d. *EP/*IBP *não falando-te carinhosamente [...] insistia
 para que [...].*
 ‘(Not) speaking to you gently [...], he insisted that [...].’

([20a]: adapted from Martins 2013)

3.1.6. Verbal complexes and clitic climbing in EP and IBP

In EP, clitics in verbal complexes can be (Section 3.1.6.1), must be (Section 3.1.6.2), or cannot be (Section 3.1.6.3) subject to clitic climbing. Whenever clitic climbing in verbal complexes occurs, the clitic attaches to the first verb of the verbal complex despite being an argument of the second. IBP does not have clitic climbing.

3.1.6.1. Verbal complexes with optional clitic climbing in EP

In EP, clitics in verbal complexes with restructuring verbs – i.e., modal, aspectual and movement verbs (Rizzi 1982, *apud* Cyrino 2010; for a non-exhaustive list, cf. Martins 2013, 2288ff.) – are subject to optional climbing (21a). In IBP, in turn, clitic climbing is not available (21a,b). In the absence of clitic climbing, the placement of clitics in EP is enclitic to the infinite verb (21c) and proclitic to the infinite verb in IBP (21d):

- (21) a. EP/*IBP *O João quis-me telefonar ontem.*
 b. *EP/*IBP *O João me quis telefonar ontem.*
 c. EP/*IBP *O João quis telefonar-me ontem.*
 d. *EP/IBP *O João quis me=telefonar ontem.*
 ‘John wanted to call me yesterday.’

([21b]: Cyrino 2010)

In the presence of procliticizers (Section 3.1.2) scoping over the entire verbal complex or if the verbal complex is embedded into a subordinate clause (Section 3.1.3), a climbed EP clitic obligatorily attaches proclitically to the finite verb (22a,d). IBP still does not allow climbing in such configurations. In the absence of climbing, the direction of cliticization is the same as without procliticizers (22b,c,e,f):

- (22) a. EP/*IBP *Nem te saberia dizer.*
 b. EP/*IBP *Nem saberia dizer-te.*
 c. *EP/IBP *Nem saberia te=dizer.*
 ‘I wouldn’t even be able to tell you.’
 d. EP/*IBP *Parece que te quero chamar.*
 e. EP/*IBP *Parece que quero chamar-te.*
 f. *EP/IBP *Parece que quero te=chamar.*
 ‘It seems as if I want to call you.’

([22a,d]: adapted from Martins 2013)

If, in contrast to (22), a procliticizer in a verbal complex only scopes over the infinite verb, unclimbed EP clitics and IBP clitics coincide in that both are obligatorily proclitic to the infinite verb:¹⁰

- (23) EP/IBP *Pode até pouco (te) importar(*-te), mas...*
 ‘You may even not care much, but...’

(Martins 2013)

¹⁰ For an EP-exception with *não* ‘not’, see Martins (2013, 2279).

3.1.6.2. Verbal complexes with obligatory clitic climbing in EP

In contrast to verbal complexes with restructuring verbs (cf. Section 3.1.6.1), clitic climbing in verbal complexes in EP is mandatory in ECM-configurations, such as causatives (24a,b) and perception verbs (e.g., *ouvir* ‘hear’, *ver* ‘see’ and *sentir* ‘feel’); procliticizers (Section 3.1.2) exert their usual influence (24c):¹¹

- (24) a. EP *A pergunta fez-nos sentir* [...] *que* [...]
 b. *EP *A pergunta fez sentir-nos* [...] *que* [...]
 c. EP *A pergunta não nos fez sentir* [...] *que* [...]
 ‘The question (made/did not make) us feel that [...]’

([24a]: Martins 2013)

Another context with obligatory EP-climbing is past participles. These cannot be clitic hosts in EP (25a,b). IBP-past participles, in turn, can be clitic hosts, and clitics attach proclitically to the parti-ciple (25c). Procliticizers (Section 3.1.2) exert their usual influence in EP (25d) but do not influence the unavailability of climbing in IBP (25e):

- (25) a. EP/*IBP *A Maria tinha-me falado.*
 b. *EP/*IBP *A Maria tinha falado-me.*
 c. *EP/IBP *A Maria tinha me=falado.*
 ‘Mary had talked to me.’
 d. EP/*IBP *Já me tinha falado.*
 e. *EP/IBP *Já tinha me=falado.*
 ‘S/he had already talked to me.’

(all data modelled after Cyrino 2010 and Martins 2013)

3.1.6.3. Verbal complexes in which clitic climbing is not available in EP

In the absence of any of the conditions illustrated in Sections 3.1.6.1 and 3.1.6.2, EP clitic climbing in verbal complexes is not available. This is shown in (26a) vs. (26b), where *trazer aqui* ‘bring here’ is the complement of the copula *ser* ‘be’. In IBP, the clitic cannot climb either (26c), but is obligatorily proclitic to the infinite verb (26d):

- (26) a. EP/*IBP *A minha ideia era trazer-te aqui.*
 b. *EP/*IBP *A minha ideia era-te trazer aqui.*
 c. *EP/*IBP *A minha ideia te=era trazer aqui.*
 d. *EP/IBP *A minha ideia era te=trazer aqui.*
 ‘My idea was to bring you here.’

([26a]: adapted from Martins 2013)

¹¹ In IBP ECM-constructions, the subject of the infinite verb remains *in situ* and is a morphologically nominative strong pronoun (Cyrino 2010; *deixa eu te levar para*, ‘let me [lit. = I] take you to...’).

Finally, note that there are unclimbable EP clitics (27c) that can be either enclitic (27a) or proclitic (27b) to the infinite verb in EP (\neq [26a] vs. [26d], but not in IBP [27a]). This is the case of the periphrases *haver que* and *ter que* ‘have to’:

- (27) a. EP/*IBP *Tenho que **confessar-te** que [...]*
 b. EP/IBP *Tenho que **te confessar** que [...]*
 c. *EP/*IBP *(Te=)tenho(-te) que confessar que [...]*
 ‘I need to admit to you that...’

([27a-b]: adapted from Martins 2013)

3.1.7. Clitic placement in ‘dictionary forms’ in EP and IBP

By *dictionary forms*, I refer to verbs that are neither finite nor infinites subordinated to any other element. Such cases are not discussed in the literature. There is evidence that the general contrast between EP enclisis and IBP proclisis extends to such cases, too. Consider the following quotation from Bagno’s *Gramática Pedagógica do Português Brasileiro* (2012, 519; my emphasis and translation):

[list of verbs]: sair-de X, colocar X em Y, se referir-a X [...]
 ‘[list of verbs]: go out-of X, collocate X in Y, refer [oneself]-to X [...]’

Even though Bagno’s grammar mostly gives dictionary forms with enclisis, I take proclisis of *se* in *se referir-a X* as evidence that IBP dictionary forms produced without normative pressure are proclitic. A look at any EP dictionary reveals that, in the absence of procliticizers (Section 3.1.2), EP requires enclisis.

3.2. Review of the literature on clitic placement in AP

This section reviews existing literature on clitic placement in AP. Section 3.2.1 summarizes four contradictory positions as to the direction of cliticization in AP simple verb clauses. Section 3.2.2 comments on what has been said about the direction of AP cliticization and about AP clitic climbing in verbal complexes. Last, Section 3.2.3 identifies methodological problems to a different extent underlying all previous work on AP clitic placement.

3.2.1. Review: direction of cliticization in AP simple verb clauses

As for the direction of cliticization in AP simple verb clauses, four different, mutually exclusive positions can be identified in the literature:

- (i) It is largely instable, unpredictable and oscillates between proclisis and enclisis in all syntactic contexts;

- (ii) It is asymmetrical to that of EP, i.e., AP has proclisis in syntactic contexts in which EP has enclisis and vice versa;
- (iii) It more or less follows EP with a small margin of variation;
- (iv) It is always proclitic (like in IBP; cf. Sections 3.1.1-3.1.7).

Position (i), i.e., that the direction of cliticization in AP simple verb clauses is largely unstable and unpredictable, is defended or at least suggested by Domingos (2010), Miguel (²2014), Undolo (2014), and Adriano (2015).

Domingos (2010) is a study on clitic placement in oral AP based on data from *YouTube*, *Rádio Luanda*, as well as *MSN* and *Facebook* chats. The data are not further specified nor rigorously quantified, though Domingos does make a qualitative distinction between main clauses with and without procliticizers, finite subordinate clauses, and a series of further “special cases”.

Miguel (²2014) compares AP clitics in oral and written Luanda AP. While the oral data are an aleatoric collection of non-EP-conform examples from heterogeneous sources, most of the written data ($N \approx 4,500$) were produced by students in unspecified test settings. The quantifications of the written data show that in roughly a third of the attestations the direction of cliticization does not follow the EP norm. Syntactic contexts are not rigorously differentiated, and exact error types are not always specified.

Undolo (2014) studies the emergent norm of AP; one variable investigated is the direction of cliticization. The data obtained from 30 study participants with a university background stem from three different written tasks: a multiple-choice test (4 items), a cloze test (6 items), and a substitution exercise (6 items). Overall, the percentages of EP-conform answers oscillate between 0 % and 90 %. Exact error types are not specified and different syntactic contexts are not rigorously differentiated. The highest percentage of EP-conform answers are reported for EP proclitics. Undolo also notes that mesoclisism is not common in AP.

Adriano (2015) studies what he calls the “normative crisis” of AP. The data stem from 85 (future) teachers from Huila aged 22 to 52 and, as for clitics, originate from two different written tasks: a text correction task (30 target items), and a full NP replacement task (28 items). The 16 items targeting EP-conform use of enclitics were replied to correctly in 59 %/53 % of cases (correction vs. replacement task), the 17 items targeting EP-conform use of proclitics in 67 %/ 76 % of cases, and the 9 items targeting EP-conform use of mesoclitics in 54 %/38 % of cases.

Position (ii), i.e., that the direction of cliticization in AP simple verb clauses is asymmetrical to that of EP, is argued for by Chavagne (2005), Inverno (2009a), Gonçalves (2013), and Hagemeyer (2016). This position is, though less clearly, also asserted by Endruschat (1993), Gärtner (1989), Vilela (1999), and Adriano (2014).

Gärtner (1989) cites some cherry-picked examples of clitics in AP simple verb clauses from literary works and newspapers containing enclitics instead of EP proclitics and vice versa. He states that asymmetrical placement as compared to EP is frequent in AP and also gives examples of AP enclitics in contexts of EP mesoclisism. No quantifications are provided for any of his conclusions. A conclusion similar to Gärtner’s is reached by Endruschat (1993) on the basis of some enclitic examples in contexts of EP proclisis produced by Angolan students in academic situations.

Vilela (1999), Inverno (2009a), Gonçalves (2013), and Hagemeyer (2016) are similar in many respects to Gärtner (1989), even though they formulate their conclusions more

carefully than Gärtner. Gonçalves and Hagemeyer, however, draw their examples from other linguistic studies (= Chavagne 2005; Miguel ²2014).

Soma (2014), too, appears to assert position (ii). In addition, he notes that mesocclisis is uncommon in AP and that proclisis is also attested in absolute initial position. Problematically, only EP-deviant cases are considered. No quantifications are given. The empirical basis of his conclusions is a transcribed corpus of speech recorded from different TV and radio programs and produced by AP speakers aged 18 to 75.

The study with the largest empirical basis asserting position (ii) is Chavagne (2005). It is based on ten hours of oral speech from diverse sources and locations recorded in the mid 1990s (163 speakers), 130 mostly literary books, and 92 issues of 24 different newspapers. EP-asymmetrical placement is argued to be the most “popular, familiar and [...] Angolan” pattern (Chavagne 2005, 250). Yet, Chavagne notes the instability of the system. He also concludes that mesocclisis is lacking in AP. None of these conclusions are quantificationally corroborated.

Position (iii), i.e., that the direction of cliticization in AP simple verb clauses more or less follows EP, is asserted in Martins (2016). The paper is an overview of the diachrony of clitic placement in all varieties of Portuguese and as such limited to citing examples from previous studies (in the case of AP = Domingos [2010]).

Position (iv), i.e., that the direction of cliticization in AP is always proclitic like in IBP, is asserted in Inverno ([2009b]; contra Inverno [2009a]). The study is based on 27 oral interviews collected in 2004 from 31 speakers from the Dundo region (Northern Luanda), most of whom are L1 speakers of the Bantu language Cokwe. Inverno (2009b) illustrates her conclusion with the help of a number of examples and distinguishes between different syntactic contexts. Yet, she does not offer quantifications.

Summing up and comparing the contradictory **positions (i)-(iv)**, the literature does not permit us to draw secure conclusions about the direction of cliticization in AP simple verb clauses.

3.2.2. Direction of cliticization and clitic climbing in AP verbal complexes according to the literature

Cliticization in AP verbal complexes has been less studied than that in AP simple verb clauses. Gärtner (1989) notes the existence of unclimbed proclitics to infinite verbs, yet without drawing conclusions or giving quantifications. Chavagne (2005) and Adriano (2015) also contain such examples but do not discuss clitic climbing. Inverno (2009b), providing some examples, states that AP clitics never climb and attach proclitically to the infinite verb (this is the situation in IBP; cf. Section 3.1.6). Inverno does not offer quantified evidence for her conclusions. More carefully, Inverno’s position is also suggested by Hagemeyer (2016), based on examples from Chavagne (2005), and by Soma (2014). Note that Hagemeyer states that it is unclear how AP behaves with regard to clitics in ECM-configurations – in which climbing is obligatory in EP and for which IBP, lacking clitic climbing, has an “avoidance” strategy (cf. Section 3.1.6.2, note 10). Interestingly, Soma’s only examples of climbed clitics appear in ECM-configurations. Finally, Miguel (²2014) contradicts the scholars mentioned so far and states that clitics in AP verbal complexes almost always climb and attach enclitically to the finite verb

(an option only available in EP; cf. Section 3.1.6). Gonçalves (2013), citing Miguel, replicates this conclusion.

Summing up, the literature does not permit us to draw secure conclusions about the direction of cliticization or about clitic climbing in AP verbal complexes.

3.2.3. Methodological problems of previous studies on clitics in AP

As will have become clear, the methodologies of previous studies on AP clitics cited in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 suffer from at least one – and more often than not from a combination – of the following shortcomings:

- a) The data analyzed stem exclusively from formal written sources and/or were collected in formal settings or settings subject to the observer's paradox;
- b) Different registers/varieties of AP are not distinguished;
- c) Different syntactic contexts are insufficiently differentiated;
- d) The data are not (rigorously) quantified.

Points (a)-(d) may explain the mutual incompatibility of the positions on AP clitics cited in Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.2. Yet, in retrieval of the scholars' honor, it needs to be pointed out that the majority of the studies cited explicitly mention at least part of (a)-(d). The remainder of this paper provides an empirical assessment of clitic placement in informal written sources of Angolan Portuguese (IWAP) that at least partly circumvents (a)-(d). The methodology for this is presented in the following section.

4. Methodology

The review of the literature on AP clitic placement showed that it is controversial if clitics in AP simple verb clauses attach enclitically or proclitically to their host (Section 3.2.1). The same holds for clitics and verbal climbing in AP verbal complexes (Section 3.2.2). It is, hence, unclear whether AP clitic placement follows EP or IBP rules (cf. Sections 3.1.1-3.1.7). The existence of different, mutually exclusive positions with regard to AP clitic placement was linked to several methodological shortcomings of previous studies on AP clitic placement (Section 3.2.3).

The aim of this paper is to empirically assess clitic placement in informal written sources of Angolan Portuguese (IWAP) by at least partially 'fixing' these shortcomings. In order to do so, it will analyze 500 clitics produced by 500 different Angolan Facebook users. This approach, though based on written sources, ensures that the examined data are as informal as possible and not subject to the observer's paradox (cf., e.g., de Benito/Estrada 2016). The data will be analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively, differentiating between the syntactic contexts identified in Sections 3.1.1-3.1.7.

The data were collected as follows: in a first step, the Facebook group *Angolan Gamers* was chosen as a starting point. Then, the profiles of the group members were accessed, beginning with the most recent (as of June 7th, 2017). In case the profile

contained explicit information that the user did not live in Angola or was not of Angolan origin, it was discarded and the next profile was accessed. If no such information was found, posts were read beginning with the most recent one until the first clitic was found. The sentence containing the clitic was then checked to exclude reposts of others and quotations. If the clitic was found to be an original production by the profile owner, it was entered into a *Filemaker* database and annotated according to six criteria specified below. Until the first such clitic was found, clitics produced by other people in answers and comments were also entered into the database if they were clearly of Angolan origin and if the posts met the conditions specified above. The six annotation criteria are as follows:

1. Type of verb clause [simple/complex/dictionary form];
2. Direction of cliticization [proclitic/enclitic/mesoclitic/unclear];¹²
3. Type of host [finite verb/infinite verb/unclear];
4. Normative position of clitic in EP [proclitic/enclitic/proclitic or enclitic/mesoclitic];
5. Reason for normative EP proclisis, if applicable [multiple answers possible; cf. Sections 3.1.2-3.1.4 and 3.1.6 (27)];
6. Lemma of normative EP procliticizer, if applicable [free text answer];

Criterion 1 allows us to differentiate between AP simple verb clauses (EP/IBP differences: Section 3.1.1-3.1.5), verbal complexes (EP/IBP differences: Section 3.1.6), and ‘dictionary forms’ (EP/IBP differences: Section 3.1.7). Criterion 2 is pivotal in assessing the direction of cliticization of the respective IWAP observation. Criterion 3 is necessary to assess whether an IWAP clitic in a verbal complex has climbed or not (EP/IBP differences: Section 3.1.6). Criterion 4 allows us to assess whether the placement of an IWAP clitic follows the norm of EP, IBP, or, if these coincide, both. Criterion 5 allows us to assess whether the direction of cliticization of the IWAP data is identical in all syntactic contexts that trigger EP proclisis (Sections 3.1.2-3.1.4, 3.1.6.3). Criterion 6 allows us to assess whether the direction of cliticization in the IWAP data is identical for all members of one lexical class of EP procliticizers (Section 3.1.2).

The methodology described is obviously not free of problems. First, the nature of the data does not allow us to rigorously control for sociodemographic variables because Facebook users can choose whether or not to provide such information.¹³ Second, as not all Facebook users disclose their nationality and/or place of residence, it cannot totally be excluded that sporadically clitics produced by non-Angolans were entered into the database. However, the choice of the Facebook group *Angolan Gamers* as a filter for

¹² Direction of cliticization was considered unclear if, in verbal complexes, no other element (preposition/adverb) besides the clitic intervened between the finite and the infinite verb (*posso lhe fazer uma visita?* ‘Can I come and visit you?’). Note that this means that observations with hyphens (*posso-lhe fazer uma visita?*) were also classified as unclear, as I do not consider orthography a reliable criterion.

¹³ In 2016, Angola had a very low internet penetration rate of 23 % (www.internetlivestats.com/internet-users-by-country). Hence, access to the internet in rural Angola is presumably rather uncommon. If true, the choice of the internet as a data source brings about a bias towards Angolans from (semi-)urban areas.

data collection minimizes this risk (cf. also above for the exclusion of data if member profiles contained explicit evidence of non-Angolan origin).

Despite these two problems, an analysis of data collected as described brings about scientific progress bearing in mind the shortcomings identifiable in previous work on AP clitic placement (cf. Section 3.2.3).

5. Results

This section presents the results obtained from the analysis of the data collected as described in Section 4. Globally speaking, the data show that proclisis is being generalized in nearly all syntactic contexts in IWAP (\neq EP/ \surd IBP). In addition, the results point toward a loss of clitic climbing in IWAP (\neq EP/ \surd IBP). Both are discussed in detail in Section 6. The structure of Section 5 is strictly parallel to that of Section 3.1.

5.1. Clitics in simple verb main clauses without procliticizers

In the IWAP dataset analyzed, 155/500 clitics (31.0 %) occur in simple verb main clauses without procliticizers, 27 of these in imperatives. EP requires enclisis in all these cases, whereas proclisis is the placement pattern in IBP (cf. Section 3.1.1). The results are reported in Table 2, differentiating between [\pm imperative].

	[- Imperative]	[+ Imperative]	
Proclisis	104 (81.3 %)	14 (51.9 %)	
Enclisis	24 (18.8 %)	13 (48.1 %)	
Total	128 (100 %)	27 (100 %)	155

Table 2. *Cliticization in IWAP simple verb main clauses [\pm imperative], [- procliticizer]*

The distribution in the IWAP data between proclisis and enclisis in non-imperative simple verb main clauses without procliticizers (N = 104 vs. 24) is very highly significant under H_0 : probability enclisis = probability proclisis = 0.5 (Pearson's $\chi^2 \approx 50.0$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 1$; phi-coefficient = 0.625, i.e., large effect size). For IWAP imperative main clauses without procliticizers, in turn (N = 14 vs. 13), the same H_0 cannot be rejected (Pearson's $\chi^2 \approx 0.037$, $p \approx 0.85$, $df = 1$, phi-coefficient = 0.04, i.e., small effect size). Last, if we compare the distribution of proclisis and enclisis among imperatives (N = 104 vs. 24) with that among non-imperatives (N = 14 vs. 13), the difference among the two groups is highly significant (Pearson's $\chi^2 \approx 10.6$, $p < 0.01$, $df = 1$, phi-coefficient = -0.26, i.e., small effect size). In sum: (i) IWAP non-imperative simple verb main clauses without procliticizers favor proclisis, (ii) IWAP imperative simple verb main clauses without procliticizers neither favor proclisis nor enclisis, (iii) proclisis is more common in IWAP non-imperative simple verb main clauses without procliticizers than in imperative simple verb main clauses without procliticizers.

The following (28) and (29) illustrate the major proclitic pattern and the minor enclitic pattern with [– imperative]; (30) and (31) illustrate the proclitic and the enclitic pattern with [+ imperative]; the proclitic in (32) is the only IWAP simple verb main clause observation in which EP requires mesoclitisis (see also [46] below):

- (28) **Proclitic [– imperative]** (104/128 = 81.3 %)

*Não dançaste. Me=mentiste Julião.*¹⁴

‘You didn’t dance. You lied to me, Julião.’
- (29) **Enclitic [– imperative]** (24/128 = 18.8 %)

a. *Wey, não falam coisas atoa eu enganei=me.*

‘Buddy, they don’t talk rubbish; I was wrong.’

b. *Gosto do sorriso, vê-se há quilómetros que é sincera e humilde.*

‘I like the smile. You can tell from kilometers away that she is sincere and humble.’
- (30) **Proclitic [+ imperative]** (14/27 = 51.9 %)

Alice, me=dEixa em paz[!]

‘Alice, leave me alone!’
- (31) **Enclitic [+ imperative]** (13/27 = 48.1 %)

diz-me, estas triste porque?

‘Tell me! Why are you sad?’
- (32) **Proclitic for EP mesoclititic**

Quando eu tiver na cela t[e]=faremos isto kkkk

‘When I am in prison, we will do this to you, ok?’

Three further remarks are in order on the data represented in Table 2 and exemplified in (28)-(32). First, (28), (29b), and (31) show that in the IWAP data, proclisis of obligatory EP-enclitics in simple verb main clauses is also attested with verbs in absolute initial position. This is noteworthy as absolute initial IBP-proclitics are subject to stronger normative pressure than other IBP-proclitics (cf. Section 3.1.1). The IWAP [– imperatives] (N = 128) do not show a significantly different proportion of proclisis vs. enclisis according to different verb positions (absolute initial verb = 51/66 proclitics vs. 15/66 enclitics; non-initial verb = 53/62 proclitics vs. 9/62 enclitics; Pearson’s $\chi^2 \approx 1.41$, $p \approx 0.23$, $df = 1$). In other words, absolute initial verbs do not increase the probability of enclisis in IWAP [– imperative] simple verb main clauses without procliticizers (in contrast to what is the case of IBP; cf. above). In [+ imperatives], this issue was not assessable as all 27 observations are verbinitial. Second, an anonymous reviewer notes that IWAP might show different directions of cliticization for referential clitics and

¹⁴ All examples represent the original orthography, corrected in square brackets only, if necessary for comprehension. The equal-to sign (=) has been added in order to indicate the direction of cliticization (if uncontroversial), unless the original example already contained a hyphen (-), in which case the latter was maintained.

impersonal clitics (cf., e.g., [28] vs. [29b]). In fact, among the [– imperative] observations (N = 128), 6/24 of the enclitics are impersonal clitics, whereas only 1/104 of the proclitics is an impersonal clitic. Again, this finding is very highly significant ($p < 0.001$; Fisher’s exact test). This suggests that impersonal clitics increase the probability of enclisis in IWAP [– imperative] simple verb main clauses without procliticizers. No impersonal clitics were found among the 27 [+ imperative] observations. Third, among the [– imperative] observations (N = 128), 5/24 of the enclitics occur in birthday wishes with the formulaic expression *desejo-te ...* ‘I wish you...’, whereas only 1/104 proclitics represents such a case. Again, this finding is very highly significant ($p < 0.001$; Fisher’s exact test). This suggests that formulaic expressions, just like impersonal clitics (cf. above), increase the probability of enclisis in IWAP [– imperative] simple verb main clauses without procliticizers. No formulaic expressions were found among the 27 [+ imperative] simple verb main clauses without procliticizers.

5.2. Clitics in simple verb main clauses with procliticizers

In the IWAP dataset analyzed, 108/500 clitics (21.6 %) occur in simple verb main clauses with procliticizers. Both EP and IBP require proclisis in such cases (cf. Section 3.1.2). The results are reported in Table 3, distinguishing between negation, focalizing and emphatic adverbs, *qu*-interrogatives and *qu*-exclamatives, *que*-imperatives and optative constructions, non-adverbial foci, and quantifiers. Observations with more than one procliticizer are reported separately.

	Neg. Only	Focalizing / Emph. Adv. Only	<i>Qu</i> -Inter- rog. / <i>Qu</i> - Exclam. Only	<i>Que</i> -Imper. / Optat. Only	Foc	Q	> 1 Procli- ticizer	Total
Pro-clisis	44 (100%)	30 (96.8%)	9 (100%)	14 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	6 (85.7%)	106 (98%)
En- clisis	0	1 (3.2%)	0	0	0	0	1 (14.3%)	2 (1.9%)
Total	44 (100%)	31 (100%)	9 (100%)	14 (100%)	1 (100%)	2 (100%)	7 (100%)	108 (100%)

Table 3. *Cliticization in IWAP simple verb main clauses [+ procliticizer]*

Table 3 shows that the overwhelming majority of 106/108 clitics (98.1 %) in IWAP simple verb main clauses with procliticizers are proclitics. This distribution in the IWAP data is very highly significant under H_0 : probability enclisis = probability proclisis = 0.5 (Pearson’s $\chi^2 \approx 100.15$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 1$, phi-coefficient = 0.96, i.e., large effect size).¹⁵ This suggests that proclisis is favored in IWAP simple verb main clauses with procliticizers. Comparing the distribution of proclitics vs. enclitics in the last column of Table 3 with that of the first column in Table 2 (cf. Section 5.1), we find that the observed difference is very highly significant (Pearson’s $\chi^2 \approx 17.06$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 1$, phi-coeffi-

¹⁵ Calculi discriminating between different types of procliticizers were not carried out.

cient = 0.27, i.e., small effect size). This second finding suggests that proclisis is more likely in IWAP simple verb main clauses with procliticizers than it is in IWAP non-imperative simple verb main clauses without procliticizers (where it is, however, also the preferred pattern; cf. Section 5.1).

Some examples of proclitics in IWAP simple verb main clauses with procliticizers are given in (33)-(38):

- (33) **Proclitic [negation]** (44/44 = 100 %)
*[Proper name], tuas fotografias não se=compa**ra**[m] com as minhas.*
 ‘[Proper name], your photos don’t compare to mine.’
- (34) **Proclitic [foc./emph. adverb]** (30/31 = 96.8 %)
 a. *nessa altura a mãe dele ainda **lhe=limpava** ranho*
 ‘Back then, his mother was still cleaning his snot.’
 b. *eu só **te=ignoro***
 ‘I just ignore you.’
- (35) **Proclitic [qu-interrogative/qu-exclamative]**
 (9/9 = 100 %)
 a. *quem **te=mandou** mal agradecido[?]*
 ‘Who sent you, ungrateful you?’
 b. *QUEM **MI=dera** trazer devolta a nossa relação [!]*
 ‘How much would I give to get our relationship back!’
- (36) **Proclitic [que-imperative/optative]** (14/14 = 100 %)
 a. *Muitos parabéns e que deus **te=abenco**i*
 ‘Congratulations and may God bless you!’
 b. *Deus **te=abençoe** Amado [!]*
 ‘May God bless you, my beloved!’
- (37) **Proclitic [non-adverbial focus]** (1/1 = 100 %)
*Amor com amor **se=paga**, eu te amo.*
 ‘Love is paid back with love, I love you.’
- (38) **Proclitic [quantifier]** (2/2 = 100 %)
*Vários homens **te=tocaram** no corpo Mais eu fui o único que te tocou na Alma.*
 ‘Several men touched your body, but I was the only one to touch your soul.’

Example (39) provides the only two observations of enclisis in IWAP simple verb main clauses with procliticizers; (39a) contains the procliticizer *já* ‘already’; in (39b), there are two procliticizers (*só* ‘only’ and *não* ‘not’):

(39) **Enclitic [foc./emph. adverb only [\pm negation]]**

(2/108 = 1.9 %)

- a. *Wua, já faltei-te com respeito.*
‘Wow, so I already disrespected you (once).’
- b. *Só não le[m]bro-me.*
‘The only thing is that I don’t remember.’

5.3. Clitics in simple verb finite subordinate clauses

In the IWAP dataset analyzed, 63/500 clitics (12.6 %) occur in simple verb finite subordinate clauses. Both EP and IBP require proclisis in such cases (cf. Section 3.1.3). The results are reported in Table 4, distinguishing between observations where finite subordination is the only trigger of proclisis in EP and observations also featuring a procliticizer (cf. Section 3.1.2).

	Finite Subordination Only	Finite Subordination + Procliticizer	Total
Proclisis	54 (100 %)	9 (100 %)	63 (100 %)
Enclisis	0	0	0
Total	54 (100 %)	9 (100 %)	63 (100 %)

Table 4. *Cliticization in IWAP simple verb finite subordinate clauses [\pm procliticizers]*

Table 4 shows that all 63/63 clitics in IWAP simple verb finite subordinate clauses are proclitics. The distribution of proclisis and (unattested) enclisis in simple verb finite subordinate clauses without additional procliticizers (N=54 vs. N=0) is very highly significant under H_0 : probability enclisis = probability proclisis = 0.5 (Pearson’s $\chi^2 \approx 54.0$, $p < 0.001$, $df = 1$, phi-coefficient = 1, i.e., perfect association). This suggests that proclisis is favored in IWAP simple verb finite subordinate clauses without additional procliticizers. For IWAP simple verb finite subordinate clauses with additional procliticizers, the overall N=9 is too small for statistical hypothesis testing.

The following (40) exemplifies the (exclusively attested) proclitic pattern in IWAP simple verb finite subordinate clauses by means of a conditional clause (40a) and a relative clause (40b):

(40) **Proclitic [finite subordination] (63/63 = 100 %)**

- a. *se me=fatigas fatigo devolta*
‘If you get on my nerves, I will get on yours.’
- b. *amigos amo a família que Deus me=concedeu*
‘Friends, I love the family God granted me.’

5.4. Clitics in simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions or *qu*-words

In the IWAP dataset analyzed, 27/500 clitics (5.4 %) occur in simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions or *qu*-words. Except for cases with *a* ‘to’, with which enclisis is mandatory, EP allows both proclisis and enclisis (unless with inflected infinitives, which require proclisis). IBP, in turn, requires proclisis in all cases (cf. Section 3.1.4). The results are reported in Table 5, distinguishing between lexical entries.

	<i>para</i> ‘for’	<i>por</i> ‘for’	<i>de</i> ‘to’	<i>a</i> ‘to’	<i>quem</i>	Total
Pro-clisis	15 (83.3 %)	1 (100 %)	2 (50 %)	3 (100 %)	1 (100 %)	22 (81.5 %)
En-clisis	3 (16.6 %)	0	2 (50 %)	0	0	5 (18.5 %)
Total	18 (100 %)	1 (100 %)	4 (100 %)	3 (100 %)	1 (100 %)	27 (100 %)

Table 5. *Cliticization in simple verb infinite IWAP subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions or qu-words*

Table 5 shows that 22/27 (81.5 %) clitics in simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions or *qu*-words are proclitics, whereas 5/27 (18.5 %) are enclitics. Interestingly, all three observations with *a* ‘to’ are proclitics (the only case of mandatory enclisis in EP; cf. above; see also [49], [54]). Note, too, that of the 22 proclitics, three observations feature a preposition governing an inflected infinitive (the only case of mandatory proclisis in EP; cf. above). None of the five enclitics occurs with an inflected infinitive. The overall distribution in Table 5 (last column) minus the three proclitics with inflected infinitives is highly significant under H_0 : probability enclisis = probability proclisis = 0.5 (Pearson’s $\chi^2 \approx 8.17$, $p < 0.01$, $df = 1$, phi-coefficient = 0.58, i.e., large effect size). This suggests that proclisis is favored in IWAP simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions or *qu*-words. Comparing the distribution of proclitics vs. enclitics in the last column of Table 5 minus the three proclitics with inflected infinitives with that of the first column of Table 4 (cf. Section 5.3), we find that the observed difference is highly significant ($p < 0.01$; Fisher’s exact test). This second finding suggests that proclisis, though the preferred option (cf. above), is less likely in IWAP simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions or *qu*-words than it is in IWAP simple verb finite subordinate clauses without additional procliticizers.

The following (41)-(43) exemplify proclisis and enclisis in IWAP simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions or *qu*-words; (41) features *para* ‘for’; (42) contains two examples of proclisis with *a* ‘to’, one with a regular infinitive (42a), and one with an inflected infinitive (42b); (43) contains the only clitic hosted by an infinite verb introduced by a *qu*-word (a proclitic):

- (41) **para ‘for’: proclisis vs. enclisis**
 (15/18 = 83.3 % vs. 3/18 = 16.6 %)
- Procura uma igreja para se=co[n]verter*
 ‘Go look for a church to convert.’
 - um dia desses passo ai pra fazer=vos uma visita*
 ‘One of these days I will drop by to visit you’
- (42) **a ‘to’: proclisis** (3/3 = 100 %)
- esta ai a ti=fazer companhia.*
 ‘S/he is there to bear you company.’
 - Tenha cuidado ao me=puxares no chat*
 ‘Be careful when you poke me in the chat.’
- (43) **qu-word para que ‘why, to what aim’: proclisis**
 (1/1 = 100 %)
- praque se=espor assim?*
 ‘Why expose oneself like this?’

5.5. Clitics in simple verb gerundial subordinate clauses

In the IWAP dataset, only 1/500 clitics (0.2 %) occurs in a simple verb gerundial subordinate clause. The datum also contains the procliticizer *não* ‘not’ and is a proclitic (as it would be in both EP and IBP; cf. Section 3.1.5):

- (44) **Gerundial subordinate clause with procliticizer: proclisis** (1/1 = 100 %)
- Mesmo não te=conhecendo pessoalmente o meu amor por ti cresce de 20 % a cada dia.*
 ‘Even not knowing you personally, my love for you grows 20 % every day.’

5.6. Clitics in verbal complexes

In Section 3.1.6, it was shown that verbal complexes in EP are subject to optional clitic climbing with restructuring verbs (cf. Section 3.1.6.1) or obligatory clitic climbing with ECM or if the infinite verb is a past participle (cf. Section 3.1.6.2). In all other verbal complexes, clitic climbing in EP is not available (cf. Section 3.1.6.3). It was also shown that clitics in EP verbal complexes show the same sensitivity to the absence/presence of procliticizers and to subordination as clitics in simple verb clauses. In IBP, clitic climbing is never available. The present section reports the results for the 141/500 (28.2 %) clitics in verbal complexes in the IWAP data analyzed and is subdivided as follows: Section 5.6.1 focuses on clitics in verbal complexes with optional EP climbing, Section 5.6.2 is concerned with clitics in verbal complexes with obligatory EP climbing, and Section 5.6.3 provides the results for clitics in verbal complexes where EP climbing is not available. The results for cliticization in IWAP verbal complexes are less straightforward than those of simple verb clauses presented in Sections 5.1-5.5. Nevertheless,

Section 6 argues that they can be interpreted as evincing a gradual loss of clitic climbing in IWAP.

5.6.1. Clitics in verbal complexes: contexts of optional clitic climbing in EP

In the IWAP dataset analyzed, 115/500 clitics (23.0 %) occur in verbal complexes subject to optional climbing in EP (cf. Section 3.1.6.1). Out of these, 85/115 would be obligatory enclitics in EP to either the finite or the infinite verb; 30/115 would be obligatory proclitics to the finite verb in EP, if climbed (due to procliticizers; cf. Section 3.1.2), and obligatory enclitics to the infinite verb, if unclimbed. In IBP, all 115 cases would be unclimbed proclitics to the infinite verb. The results for the 85/115 categorical EP enclitics are reported in Table 6:

	[+ Climbing]	[– Climbing]	[Climbing unclear]	Total
Proclisis	0	14 (77.8 %)	0	14 (16.5 %)
Enclisis	0	4 (22.2 %)	0	4 (4.7 %)
Unclear	0	0	67 (100 %)	67 (78.8 %)
Total	0	18 (21.2 %)	67 (78.8 %)	85 (100 %)

Table 6. *Clitics in IWAP verbal complexes: optional EP climbing, [EP enclitics]*

Table 6 shows that 18/85 (21.2 %) clitics in verbal complexes with optional EP climbing and obligatory EP enclisis to either the finite or the infinite verb have unequivocally not climbed (\checkmark EP/ \checkmark IBP). Out of these, 14/18 are proclitics to the infinite verb (\checkmark EP/ \checkmark IBP), whereas only 4/18 are enclitics to the infinite verb (\checkmark EP/*IBP). For 67/85 observations (78.8 %), climbing and the direction of cliticization could not be assessed conclusively (cf. note 12). There is no unequivocally climbed observation (\checkmark EP/*IBP). Despite the partly inconclusive findings, Section 6.1 argues that IWAP is gradually losing clitic climbing in contexts of optional EP-climbing.

The following (45)-(47) exemplify the three configurations attested; (45) contains an unclimbed proclitic to the infinite verb (as evinced by intervening *lá* ‘there’); (46) is an unclimbed enclitic to the infinite verb; (47) is a case in which climbing and the direction of cliticization could not be conclusively assessed:

- (45) [– climbing] (18/85, 21.2 %) > **proclisis to infinite verb** (14/18, 77.8 %)
vou la te=ver.
 ‘I go there to see you.’
- (46) [– climbing] (18/85, 21.2 %) > **enclisis to infinite verb** (4/18, 22.2 %)
Poderias facultar-me no off?
 ‘Could you give it to me offline?’

(47) [**? climbing**] (67/85, 78.8 %) > **? direction of cliticization***Desculpa, Tava (?=) Me (?=) Olhando No Espelho*

‘Sorry, I was looking at myself in the mirror.’

Table 7 visualizes the results for the 30/115 clitics in IWAP verbal complexes subject to optional clitic climbing in EP, and which, in contrast to the data in Table 6, if climbed, would be obligatory EP proclitics to the finite verb (due to procliticizers; cf. Section 3.1.2).

	[+ Climbing]	[– Climbing]	[Climbing unclear]	Total
Proclisis	3 (100 %)	6 (66.7 %)	0	9 (30.0 %)
Enclisis	0	3 (33.3 %)	0	3 (10.0 %)
Unclear	0	0	18 (100 %)	18 (60.0 %)
Total	3 (10.0 %)	9 (30.0 %)	18 (60.0 %)	30 (100 %)

Table 7. *Clitics in IWAP verbal complexes: optional EP climbing, [(only) if climbed: obligatory EP proclitics]*

Table 7 shows that 3/30 (10.0 %) of these IWAP clitics have unequivocally climbed ($\sqrt{\text{EP}}/\ast\text{IBP}$). All three are proclitics to the finite verb ($\sqrt{\text{EP}}$). In turn, 9/30 (30.0 %) observations in such configurations have unequivocally not climbed ($\sqrt{\text{EP}}/\sqrt{\text{IBP}}$). Out of these, 6/9 are proclitics to the infinite verb ($\ast\text{EP}/\sqrt{\text{IBP}}$), while 3/9 are enclitics to the infinite verb ($\sqrt{\text{EP}}/\ast\text{IBP}$). For 18/30 observations (60.0 %), climbing and the direction of cliticization could not be conclusively assessed (cf. note 12). In spite of this, Section 6.1 argues that IWAP is gradually losing clitic climbing in contexts of optional EP-climbing. The following (48)-(51) exemplify the four configurations attested:

(48) [**+ climbing**] (3/30, 10.0 %) > **proclisis to finite verb** (3/3, 100 %)*Nn deixe pra amanhã oq se=pode fazer hoje!*

‘Don’t leave for tomorrow what can be done today.’

(49) [**– climbing**] (9/30, 30.0 %) > **proclisis to infinite verb** (6/9, 66.7 %)*Só estão a se=mentir.*

‘They are only lying to each other.’

(50) [**– climbing**] (9/30, 30.0 %) > **enclisis to infinite verb** (3/9, 33.3 %)*Não precisas **dize-lo** aos outros.*

‘You don’t need to tell the others.’

(51) [**? climbing**] (18/30, 60.0 %) > **? direction of cliticization***E serio, ñ posso (?=) te (?=) menti*

‘For real, I can’t lie to you.’

5.6.2. Clitics in verbal complexes: contexts of obligatory clitic climbing in EP

In the IWAP dataset analyzed, 12/500 clitics (2.4 %) occur in verbal complexes subject to obligatory clitic climbing in EP (cf. Section 3.1.6.2). IBP would not use clitics in most cases (cf. discussion around [24], but see [25]). Out of these 12 clitics, 7/12 would be obligatory climbed enclitics to the finite verb in EP; 5/12 would be obligatory climbed proclitics to the finite verb (due to procliticizers; cf. Section 3.1.2). The results for the 7/12 obligatory EP climbed enclitics are reported in Table 8:

	[+ Climbing]	[– Climbing]	[Climbing unclear]	Total
Proclisis	4 (80.0 %)	0	0	4 (57.1 %)
Enclisis	0	0	0	0
Unclear	0	0	3 (100 %)	3 (42.9 %)
Total	4 (57.1 %)	0	3 (42.9 %)	7 (100 %)

Table 8. *Clitics in IWAP verbal complexes: obligatory EP climbing, [EP enclitics]*

Table 8 shows that 4/7 (57.1 %) of these IWAP clitics have unequivocally climbed ($\sqrt{\text{EP}}$). But these are all proclitics ($\ast\text{EP}$). For 3/7 (42.9 %), climbing and the direction of cliticization could not be conclusively assessed. There are no clearly unclimbed observations ($\ast\text{EP}$). Despite the partly inconclusive findings, Section 6.1 argues that contexts of obligatory EP-climbing are possibly the only ones where IWAP, too, allows climbing. The following (52) illustrates clear proclisis with climbing for an ECM-causative construction with *fazer* ‘make’:

- (52) [+ climbing] (4/7, 57.1 %) > **proclisis to finite verb**
 (4/4, 100 %)
Você me=fez aprender a “suportar” essa dor.
 ‘You made me learn to “stand” this pain.’

Table 9 visualizes the results for the 5/12 clitics in IWAP verbal complexes subject to obligatory EP climbing and which, differently from the data in Table 8, would be obligatory EP proclitics to the finite verb (due to procliticizers; cf. Section 3.1.2):

	[+ Climbing]	[– Climbing]	[Climbing unclear]	Total
Proclisis	5 (100 %)	0	0	5 (100 %)
Enclisis	0	0	0	0
Unclear	0	0	0	0
Total	5 (100 %)	0	0	5 (100 %)

Table 9. *Clitics in IWAP verbal complexes: obligatory EP climbing, [EP proclitics]*

All of these IWAP clitics are climbed proclitics to the finite verb (\sqrt{EP}). An example is given in (53), a passive construction containing the past participle *atribuído* ‘attributed’:

- (53) [+ climbing] (5/5, 100 %) > **proclisis to finite verb**
(5/5, 100 %)

*O nome que **lhe**=é atribuído é o que ele morre com ele.*
‘The name he is given; he’s going to die with it.’

5.6.3. Clitics in verbal complexes: contexts of impossible clitic climbing in EP

In the IWAP dataset analyzed, 14/500 clitics (2.6 %) occur in verbal complexes in which clitic climbing is not available in EP (cf. Section 3.1.6.3). Out of these, 11/14 would be obligatory enclitics to the infinite verb in EP; 3/14 could be either enclitics or proclitics to the infinite verb in EP. All cases would obligatorily be proclitics to the infinite verb in IBP. The results are reported in Table 10, differentiating between the two EP types:

	[+ Climbing]	[– Climbing]	[Climbing unclear]	Total
Proclisis	0	4 [EP enclisis] + 3 [EP variation] = 7 (63.6 %)	0	7 (50.0 %)
Enclisis	0	4 [EP enclisis] (36.4 %)	0	4 (28.6 %)
Unclear	0	0	3 [EP enclisis] (100 %)	3 (21.4 %)
Total	0	11 (78.6 %)	3 (21.4%)	14 (100 %)

Table 10. *Clitics in IWAP verbal complexes: no EP climbing available*

Table 10 shows that 11/14 (78.6 %) of these IWAP clitics are unequivocally unclimbed (\sqrt{EP}/\sqrt{IBP}); out of these, 7/11 are proclitics to the infinite verb (4/7 *EP/ \sqrt{IBP} ; 3/7 \sqrt{EP}/\sqrt{IBP}) and 4/11 are enclitics to the infinite verb ($\sqrt{EP}/*IBP$). For the remaining 3/14 observations (21.4 %), climbing and the direction of cliticization could not be

conclusively assessed. In spite of this, Section 6.1 argues that IWAP does not have clitic climbing in contexts in which EP-climbing is banned.

The following (54)-(56) illustrate the two unequivocal configurations attested. Only (55) would allow both proclisis and enclisis to the infinite verb in EP, as it contains the modal periphrasis *ter que* ‘have to’ (cf. Section 3.1.6.3):

- (54) [– climbing] (11/14, 78.6 %) > **proclisis to infinite verb** (7/11, 63.6 %)
n[ãõ] [es]tou acostumado a te=ver assim.
 ‘I am not used to seeing you like this.’
- (55) [– climbing] (11/14, 78.6 %) > **proclisis to infinite verb** (7/11, 63.6 %)
Sendo joven quando estiveres para sair tens que se=tratar...
 ‘When you’re young and about to go out, you have to dress up.’
- (56) [– climbing] (11/14, 78.6 %) > **enclisis to infinite verb** (4/11, 36.4 %)
Adorei ver=te [es]tas espectacular lindo.
 ‘I loved seeing you; you’re looking spectacular, handsome.’

5.7. Clitic placement in ‘dictionary forms’

In the IWAP dataset analyzed, 5/500 clitics (1 %) occur in ‘dictionary forms’. In EP, such forms require enclisis, whereas IBP requires proclisis (cf. Section 3.1.7). The results are reported in Table 11:

Proclisis	4 (80.0 %)
Enclisis	1 (20.0 %)
Total	5 (100 %)

Table 11. *Direction of Cliticization in IWAP ‘dictionary forms’*

Table 11 shows that 4/5 (80 %) of the ‘dictionary form’ attestations are proclitics (*EP/√IBP), whereas 1/5 (20 %) is an enclitic (√EP/*IBP); (57) exemplifies proclisis; (58) contains the only enclitic example:

- (57) **Proclisis** (4/5 = 80 %)
Arranjar emprego e se=casar e ter filhos
 ‘to get work, marry and have kids.’
- (58) **Enclisis** (1/5 = 20 %)
Sentir=se feliz
 ‘to feel happy’

The following section discusses the results presented in Section 5.

6. Discussion

The results of the empirical analysis of clitics in IWAP presented in Section 5 lead to the following two conclusions:

1. Contrary to some recent literature (cf. Section 3.2.2), IWAP is losing clitic climbing (though maybe not in verbal complexes with obligatory EP-climbing). This conclusion is argued for in Section 6.1;
2. Contrary to most of the literature (cf. Section 3.2.1), IWAP is generalizing proclisis in (almost) all syntactic contexts. This conclusion is argued for in Section 6.2.

With regard to both aspects, IWAP clitics are thus similar to IBP clitics and different from EP clitics (cf. Section 3.1).

6.1. IWAP is losing clitic climbing

The data analyzed contained 141 clitics in verbal complexes (Section 5.6). This Section asserts that, contrary to some recent literature (cf. Section 3.2.2), clitic climbing is being lost in IWAP, with the possible exception of clitics in verbal complexes with obligatory EP climbing. In order to show this, I separately discuss clitics of optional (cf. Section 3.1.6.1) and obligatory EP climbing (cf. Section 3.1.6.2), as well as those banned from climbing in EP (cf. Section 3.1.6.3).

In the IWAP data, 115/141 attestations are **clitics of optional EP climbing** (Section 5.6.1). Of these, 3/115 (2.6 %) have clearly climbed, whereas 27/115 (23.5 %) have clearly not climbed. For 85/115 (73.9 %), climbing could not be assessed (cf. Tables 6 and 7). Based on the following three arguments, I argue that most of the 85 unclear cases have not climbed:

1. Among the 30/115 assessable attestations of optional EP climbing for (cf. Tables 6 and 7), the majority (27/30; 90 %) have clearly not climbed. Only 3/30 (10 %) have clearly climbed. It would be surprising, if the proportion of climbed vs. unclimbed clitics among the 85 unclear cases differed significantly. This is especially true in view of the fact that enclisis to finite verbs (which would be the case of the unclear cases, if climbed) is clearly marked in all other syntactic contexts in the data, except for imperatives (cf. Sections 5.1-5.5 and 6.2; note, too, that the 115 attestations of optional EP climbing contain only one imperative);
2. Further supporting (1), the 3/30 clearly climbed attestations are all proclitics to the finite verb (cf. Tables 6 and 7). Clear cases of climbed enclitics (i.e., $V_{fin}=Cl_Adv/P_V_{inf}$) are unattested, whereas there are 20 attestations of clear

proclisis to the infinite verb (i.e., V_{fin}_Adv/P_Cl=V_{inf}; [45], [49]). Given this, it would be surprising, if the 85 unclear attestations contained many climbed enclitics to the finite verb.

3. Further supporting (2) and connected to (1), 18/85 of problematic attestations occur in verbal complexes with procliticizers (cf. Table 7; [51]). In Section 5.2, it was shown that attestations in *simple verb clauses with procliticizers* are very highly significantly proclitics. Hence, it is expected that the procliticizer in the 18/85 problematic attestations in verbal complexes exert the same influence (cf. also [48]). If we analyzed the 18/85 problematic attestations as climbed, this would, however, mean stipulating *enclisis* to the finite verb, i.e., to negate this procliticizer influence.

In sum, and considering 1-3, I argue that clitic climbing in verbal complexes subject to optional EP climbing is at least strongly dispreferred in IWAP.

In the IWAP data, 14/141 attestations are **clitics banned from EP climbing** (Section 5.6.3). Of these, 11/14 have clearly not climbed (cf. Table 10). For 3/14, climbing could not be assessed. In view of the fact that a) the data do not contain a single clearly climbed clitic in such verbal complexes, and that b) EP does not allow climbing, the three unclear cases have most likely not climbed, either. In addition, even if they had climbed, the resulting hypothetical distribution of 11 (unclimbed) vs. 3 (climbed) suggests that the H_0 : probability climbing = probability no climbing = 0.5 can be rejected (Pearson's $\chi^2 \approx 4.57$, $p \approx 0.03$, $df = 1$, phi-coefficient = 0.57, i.e., large effect size). I therefore assert that clitics in verbal complexes not allowing EP climbing cannot climb in IWAP either.

In the IWAP data, 12/141 attestations are **clitics of obligatory EP climbing** (Section 5.6.2). Of these, 9/12 have clearly climbed (cf. Tables 8 and 9). For 3/12 attestations, climbing could not be unequivocally assessed. In view of the fact that a) the data do not contain a single clearly unclimbed clitic in such verbal complexes and that b) EP requires climbing in such cases, the three unclear cases have most likely climbed, too. Therefore, I argue that verbal complexes of obligatory EP climbing are the only context in which IWAP, too, prefers (or even requires) climbing. It would be interesting to assess whether such climbed data reflect normative EP pressure. In order to do so, it would be necessary to investigate whether IWAP has the same or a similar “avoidance” strategy for ECM-constructions as IBP (cf. Section 3.1.6, note 11). As noted in Section 3.2.2, this is, to date, an open question – and is also beyond the scope of this paper.

In summary, it appears that IWAP, contrary to some recent studies on AP clitics (Section 3.2.2), is losing clitic climbing and is, thus, gradually aligning with IBP (and not with EP; cf. Section 3.1.6). The only possible exception is verbal complexes with obligatory EP climbing. Further prosodic investigations on AP, such as the *Interactive Atlas of the Prosody of Portuguese* (still in progress for AP), will shed additional light on this issue.¹⁶

¹⁶ http://labfon.letras.ulisboa.pt/InAPoP/pt_africa.html.

6.2. IWAP is generalizing proclisis in (almost) all syntactic contexts

This section argues that IWAP is generalizing proclisis in (almost) all syntactic contexts. For the argumentation, it is necessary to first discuss clitics in simple verb clauses and dictionary forms and to then turn to clitics in verbal complexes.

IWAP clitics in simple verb clauses and in dictionary forms (359/500; cf. Sections 5.1-5.5, 5.7) are overwhelmingly proclitics (314/359; 87.5 %). Statistically speaking, the H_0 that proclisis and enclisis are equally frequent could be rejected for simple verb main clauses with and without procliticizers (Section 5.1-5.2), simple verb finite subordinate clauses (Section 5.3), and simple verb infinite subordinate clauses introduced by prepositions and *qu*-words (Section 5.4). In addition, absolute initial proclitics were shown to be equally frequent in IWAP as non-initial proclitics (Section 5.1). I take all this as evidence that IWAP is generalizing proclisis in these syntactic contexts. Additional evidence for this is that in simple verb main clauses without procliticizers, formulaic expressions and impersonal clitics enhance the probability of enclisis (cf. Section 5.1). This suggests that enclisis is, by trend, in need of specialized ‘refugia’. As for clitics in simple verb subordinate gerundial clauses (Section 5.5) and in dictionary forms (Section 5.7), absolute frequencies were too low for statistical hypothesis testing. Nevertheless, in these contexts, too, proclisis in the data outnumbers enclisis in absolute terms (1 vs. 0; 4 vs. 1). Given this and the results from statistical hypothesis testing for clitics in other types of simple verb clauses, it seems at least reasonable to expect that in the latter syntactic contexts, too, IWAP is generalizing proclisis.

From all the above – and contradicting most existing studies on AP clitics (cf. Section 3.2.1) – I conclude that IWAP is generalizing proclisis in all simple verb clauses and dictionary forms. IWAP is, thus, gradually aligning with IBP (and not with EP; cf. Sections 3.1.1-3.1.5; 3.1.7). The fact that clitics in simple verb imperative clauses do not display a statistical bias for proclisis (cf. Section 5.1) does not falsify this conclusion. First, these clitics do not display a statistical bias for enclisis either (cf. Section 5.1). Second, extension of proclisis to imperatives is a late step in languages undergoing a change from context-sensitive variation between proclisis and enclisis towards generalized proclisis (cf. note 4). I now turn to IWAP clitics in verbal complexes.

IWAP clitics in verbal complexes (141/500; cf. Section 5.6): In the following, I argue that the generalization of proclisis in IWAP also holds for some verbal complexes. In order to do this, I need to separately look at clitics of optional and obligatory EP climbing, as well as those banned from EP climbing (cf. Sections 3.1.6.1-3.1.6.3).

For attestations of **optional EP climbing**, Tables 6 and 7 in Section 5.6.1 showed that 23/115 are proclitics to either the finite or the infinite verb, whereas 7/115 are enclitics to the infinite verb. For the remaining 85/115 attestations, the direction of cliticization could not be unequivocally assessed. However, Section 6.1 argued that most of these unclear cases have not climbed. Given this, most unclear cases are proclitics to the infinite verb. Even though no precise numbers can be given and, therefore, no statistical hypothesis testing can be carried out, this suggests that a vast majority of the 115 attestations of optional EP climbing are proclitics, too.

For attestations of **obligatory EP climbing**, Tables 8 and 9 in Section 5.6.2 showed that 9/12 are proclitics to the finite verb. For the remaining 3/12 attestations, the direction of cliticization could not be unequivocally assessed. However, Section 6.1 argued that these unclear cases have climbed. Hence, all unclear cases are enclitics to the finite

verb. The resulting hypothetical distribution of 9 proclitics vs. 3 enclitics is only marginally significant with regard to H_0 : probability enclisis = probability proclisis = 0.5 (Pearson's $\chi^2 \approx 3.00$, $p \approx 0.083$, $df = 1$, phi-coefficient = 0.50, i.e., large effect size). From my point of view, and considering the clear evidence for generalizing proclisis in IWAP simple verb clauses (cf. above) and the strong arguments for generalizing proclisis in verbal complexes of optional EP climbing (cf. above), it is more reasonable to draw the same conclusion also for IWAP clitics in verbal complexes of obligatory EP climbing than to sustain the contrary. Yet, I leave it to the reader how she/he wishes to interpret marginal significance.

For attestations of **clitics banned from EP climbing**, Table 10 in Section 5.6.3 shows that 7/14 are proclitics to the infinite verb, whereas 4/14 are enclitics to the infinite verb. For the remaining 3/14 cases, the direction of cliticization could not be unequivocally assessed. However, Section 6.1 argued that these unclear cases have not climbed. If true, then all unclear cases are proclitics to the infinite verb. The resulting hypothetical distribution of 10 proclitics vs. 4 enclitics does not allow us to reject the H_0 : probability enclisis = probability proclisis = 0.5 (Pearson's $\chi^2 \approx 2.57$, $p \approx 0.108$, $df = 1$, phi-coefficient = 0.43, i.e., medium effect size).

In summary, there is ample evidence that IWAP is generalizing proclisis in all simple verb clauses. In this, IWAP is gradually aligning with IBP (cf. Sections 3.1.1-3.1.5; 3.1.7). For verbal complexes, this conclusion is more risky. Still, I argued that there is more reason to believe that the generalization of IWAP proclisis extends to verbal complexes than to claim the opposite. If true, then IWAP is gradually aligning with IBP in this regard, as well (cf. Section 3.1.6).

7. Conclusions and desiderata

This paper argued, on the basis of a fine-grained (morpho)syntactic analysis of 500 clitics collected from freely accessible Facebook profiles, that informal written Angolan Portuguese is generalizing proclisis in almost all syntactic contexts and that it is losing clitic climbing (possibly except for verbal complexes of obligatory EP climbing). In both aspects, the paper contradicted many or some of the existing studies on AP clitics and showed that clitics in IWAP are different from EP clitics and instead similar to IBP clitics. At least, the following questions remain:

1. Is IWAP, just like IBP (cf., e.g., Galves et al. 2005) and unlike EP, losing 3rd person clitics? Both the literature (cf., e.g., Inverno 2009b; Adriano 2014 and 2015) and a first look in this regard at my own data point to this direction.
2. Is generalizing proclisis and the loss of clitic climbing in IWAP due to language contact (as suggested by many; cf., e.g., Inverno 2009a and b; Miguel ²2014; Undolo 2014) or not necessarily (cf., in part, Hagemeyer 2016)? If the answer turns out to be positive, is this contact necessarily contact with Bantu languages or does Brazilian television play a role, too (cf. Section 2)?

3. Will future investigations on AP prosody confirm the conclusion of this paper that IWAP is losing clitic climbing (cf. Section 6.1)?
4. Will generalized proclisis and a lack of clitic climbing – if confirmed by future studies – as a change from below come to also characterize more formal register or even a future endogenous Angolan standard in the sense of Clyne (1992)?

I hope that this paper will be seen as an invitation to further investigate these and other issues concerning clitics in AP.

References

- Adriano, Paulino Soma (2014): *Tratamento morfossintático de expressões e estruturas fráscas do português em Angola. Divergências e relação à norma europeia*, PhD thesis, Évora: Universidade de Évora.
- Adriano, Paulino Soma (2015): *A crise normativa do português em Angola – Cliticização e regência verbal: Que atitude normativa para o professor e o revisor?*, Luanda: Mayamba.
- Arquint, Jachen C. (⁴2017 [1964]): *Vierv Ladin: Grammatica elementara dal rumantsch d'Engiadina Bassa*, Zurich: editionmevinapuorger.
- Bagno, Marcos (2012): *Gramática pedagógica do português brasileiro*, São Paulo: Parábola.
- Barros, Angela (2002): *A situação do português em Angola*, in: Mateus, Maria Helena Mira (ed.): *Uma política para o português*, Lisbon: Colibri, pp. 35-44.
- De Benito Moreno, Carlota/Estrada Arráez, Ana (2016): *Variación en las redes sociales: Datos twilectales*, in: *Revista de Lingüística Iberoamericana* 28, pp. 77-111.
- Chavagne, Jean-Pierre (2005): *La langue portugaise d'Angola: Étude des écarts par rapport à la norme européenne du portugais*, PhD thesis, Lyon : Université de Lumière Lyon.
- Clyne, Michael (1992): *Introduction*, in: Clyne, Michael (ed.): *Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, pp. 1-10.
- Cruschina, Silvio/Ledgeway, Adam (2016): *The Structure of the Clause*, in: Ledgeway, Adam/Maiden, Martin (eds.): *The Oxford Guide to the Romance Languages*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 556-574.
- Cruz, Arsénio da Silva (2013): *Estudo comparativo entre o perfil linguístico do falante urbano do Lubango e do Huambo e suas implicações no ensino do português*, PhD thesis, Lisbon: Universidade Nova de Lisboa.
- Cyrino, Sonia (2010): *On Romance Syntactic Complex Predicates: Why Brazilian Portuguese is different*, in: *Estudos da Lingua(gem)* 8 (1), pp. 187-222.
- Domingos, Manuel da Silva (2010): *A colocação dos pronomes clíticos no português (oral) de Angola (POA)*, seminar paper presented at *Seminário de Linguística Comparada: Tópicos de Gramática do Português numa Perspetiva Comparativa*, Universidade de Lisboa.

- Endruschat, Annette (1990): *Studien zur portugiesischen Sprache in Angola (unter besonderer Berücksichtigung lexikalischer und soziolinguistischer Aspekte)*, Frankfurt am Main: TFM.
- Endruschat, Annette (1993): *A crítica da colocação dos pronomes clíticos no português de angolanos e moçambicanos, sua problemática no contexto dos diferentes registos e na aquisição da linguagem*, in: Brauer-Figueiredo, Maria de Fátima Viegas (ed.): *Actas o 4.º Congresso da Associação Internacional de Lusitanistas*, Lisbon/Porto/Coimbra: Lidel, pp. 95-102.
- Galves, Charlotte/Torres Moraes, Maria A./Ribeiro, Ilza (2005): *Syntax and Morphology in the Placement of Clitics in European and Brazilian Portuguese*, in: *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics* 4 (2), pp. 143-177.
- Gärtner, Eberhard (1989): *Remarques sur la syntaxe du portugais en Angola et au Mozambique*, in: Massa, Jean-Michel/Perl, Matthias (eds.): *La langue portugaise en Afrique*, Rennes: Université de Haute Bretagne, pp. 29-54.
- Gärtner, Eberhard (1997): *Coincidências dos fenómenos morfo-sintácticos do substandard do português do Brasil, de Angola e de Moçambique*, in: Degenhardt, Ruth/Stolz, Thomas/Ulferts, Hella (eds.): *Afrolusitanistik – eine vergessene Disziplin in Deutschland*, Bremen: University of Bremen, pp. 146-180.
- Gonçalves, Perpétua (2013): *O português em África*, in: Raposo, Eduardo B. Paiva/Nascimento, Maria F. Bacelar do/Mota, Maria A. Coelho da/Segura, Luísa/Mendes, Amália (eds.): *Gramática do Português*, Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, pp. 157-178.
- Hagemeyer, Tjerk (2016): *O português em contacto em África*, in: Martins, Ana Maria/Carrilho, Ernestina (eds.): *Manual de linguística portuguesa*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, pp. 43-67.
- Hodges, Tony (²2004 [2001]): *Angola: Anatomy of an Oil State*, Oxford: James Currey; Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Inverno, Liliana (2009a): *A transição de Angola para o português vernáculo: Estudo morfossintáctico do sintagma nominal*, in: Carvalho, Ana Maria (ed.): *Português em contacto*, Frankfurt am Main/Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana, pp. 87-106.
- Inverno, Liliana (2009b): *Contact-Induced Restructuring of Portuguese Morphosyntax in Interior Angola. Evidence from Dundo (Luanda Norte)*, PhD thesis, Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra.
- Luís, Ana R./Kaiser, Georg A. (2016): *Clitic Pronouns: Phonology, Morphology, and Syntax*, in: Wetzels, Leo/Menuzzi, Sergio/Costa, João (eds.): *The Handbook of Portuguese Linguistics*, Malden MA: Wiley Blackwell, pp. 210-233.
- Magro, Caterina (2006): *Clíticos: Variação sobre o tema*, PhD thesis, Lisbon: Universidade de Lisboa.
- Martins, Ana Maria (1994): *Clíticos na história do português*, PhD thesis, Lisbon: Universidade de Lisboa.
- Martins, Ana Maria (2013): *Posição dos pronomes pessoais clíticos*, in: Raposo, Eduardo B. Paiva/Nascimento, Maria F. Bacelar do/Mota, Maria A. Coelho da/Segura, Luísa/Mendes, Amália (eds.): *Gramática do português*, Lisbon: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, pp. 2229-2302.
- Martins, Ana Maria (2016): *A colocação dos pronomes clíticos em sincronia e diacronia*, in: Martins, Ana Maria/Carrilho, Ernestina (eds.): *Manual de linguística portuguesa*, Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, pp. 401-430.

- Martins, Marco Antonio (2012): *A colocação de pronomes clíticos na escrita brasileira. Para o estudo das gramáticas do português*, Natal: EDUFRN.
- Mateus, Maria Helena Mira/Brito, Ana Maria/Duarte, Inês/Faria, Isabel Hub (2003): *Gramática da língua portuguesa*, Lisbon: Caminho.
- Meisnitzer, Benjamin/Martins, Marco Antonio (2016): *The Use of Clitics in Brazilian Portuguese – The Development of an Endogenous Standard Variety*, in: Muhr, Rudolf/Duarte, Eugênia/Mendes, Amália/Amorós Negre, Carla/Thomas, Juan A. (eds.): *Pluricentric Languages and Non-Dominant Varieties Worldwide. Part II: Pluricentricity of Portuguese and Spanish. New Concepts and Descriptions*, Frankfurt am Main/Bern et al.: Peter Lang, pp. 67-84.
- Mendes, Beatrice Correia (1985): *Contribuição para o estudo da língua portuguesa em Angola*, MA thesis, Lisbon: Universidade de Lisboa.
- Miguel, Maria Helena (2014 [2003]): *Dinâmica da pronominalização no português de Luanda*, Luanda: Mayamba.
- Undolo, Márcio E. da Silva (2014): *Caracterização da norma do português em Angola*, PhD thesis, Évora: Universidade de Évora.
- Vilela, Mário (1999): *A língua portuguesa em África: Tendências e factos*, in: *Africana Studia* 1, pp. 175-191.
- Zau, Domingos G. Dele (2011): *A língua portuguesa em Angola. Um contributo para o estudo da sua nacionalização*, PhD thesis, Covilhã: Universidade da Beira Interior