

# Agreement, Predication, and Pronouns in the History of Portuguese.

Charlotte Galves,  
Unicamp, Br sil

## O. Introduction

The recent history of Portuguese provides an interesting case of change from one grammar, Classical Portuguese (henceforth CIP), to two grammars, Modern European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese (henceforth respectively EP and BP). This chapter aims to describe and analyze, in the framework of the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995b), the basic aspects of this double change, which give interesting evidence of the deep correlation existing in grammars between the licensing of subjects and the licensing of clitics and weak pronouns ("deficient" pronouns in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke 1994). Though this correlation clearly appears in many analyses of various pronominal systems, it has received little theoretical status. Here, it will be argued that it derives from the fact that both deficient pronouns licensing and predication relations are dependent on the parametrization of languages with respect to Agr, which will be considered not as a category, in accordance with Chomsky (1995b), but as a feature.

Despite their differences, the three Portuguese grammars considered here share an important syntactic characteristic: they license constructions in which the verb and the subject are not in a Spec/head configuration. This will be argued to derive from the peculiar combination of the V-feature and the Agr-feature in these languages.

The paper will be organized as follows. In the first section, relevant aspects of the syntax of subjects and deficient pronouns in the three grammars will be presented. The second section will discuss the nature of Agr in the Minimalist Program, as well as the categorial nature of deficient pronouns. Finally, the third section will propose a minimalist analysis of the change from CIP to EP and to BP.

## I. Facts and analyses

### I.1. Classical Portuguese

The history of European Portuguese is traditionally divided in three periods, Old Portuguese (henceforth OP), CIP, and EP. CIP is generally defined as the period which goes from the 16th century up to the middle of the 19th century. Here, the language in focus will be the 18th century CIP, since it can be considered as the common origin of both EP and BP. But it is worthwhile recalling some relevant aspects of the whole history of the language.

The striking fact about the history of Portuguese is that it did not lose, in its classical

period, two syntactic properties which disappeared from other Romance languages at the end of their archaic period[1]. These two properties are V2 order and obligatory enclisis in V1 contexts, in application of the so-called Tobler-Mussafia law ( see among others Fontana 1992 for Spanish; Adams 1987, for French; Benincà 1994, for Italian.). The following examples, drawn from texts of the 16th century up to the 19th century illustrate this claim[2]:

-V2 order:

(1) Eem quanto faziamos alenha, *faziam* dous carpenteiros huua grande cruz dhuu paa  
(16th c.)

while (we) did the-wood, made two carpenters a big cross out of wood

(2) No mesmo homem *descobriram* os homens dois livros sempre abertos e patentees.. (17th c.)

in the same man discovered men two books always open and manifest

(3) Com a lingua *faz* o arrieiro a celebre cantiga (18th c.)

with his tongue does the muleteer the famous song

(4) O outro dia *compus* eu uma modinha para ela (19th c.)

the other day composed I a song for her

-Enclisis in V-1 sentences:

(5) veedeo-**lhe** hua terra de pão com terra de mato (16th c.)

(he) sold-to-him a land of bread with land of forest

(6) Levanta-**se** este assunto sobre toda a esfera da capacidade humana (17th c.)

raises-SE this topic about all the sphere of human capacity

(7) Obrigão-**me** os médicos a tomar vinho quinado em jejum (18th c.)

oblige-me the doctors to take wine with quina on an empty stomach

(8) Trouxe- **me** grande tranquilidade a tua carta (19th c.)

brought-me great quietness your letter

Note that enclisis in V1 contexts is categorical in European Portuguese throughout its history, since the first documents of the 12th century up to our days (cf. Martins 1994 and Ribeiro 1995 for the archaic period, Lobo 1992 and Torres Moraes 1995 for the Classical period, and all the works quoted in the next section for EP). Besides differentiating EP from all the modern Romance languages, except Galician, this categorical nature of enclisis in V1 contexts already differentiates OP from other Romance languages which very soon present exceptions to the law (cf. Fontana 1992 who reports a case of proclisis in this context as soon as the 13th century, and Benincà 1994 for similar cases in Old French and Old Italian dialects.).

Enclisis also appears in non V1 contexts, in alternation with proclisis[3]. It concerns any

construction of the type XP V, with XP a subject, a topic (NP or PP) an adjoined clause, or an adverb.

In 18th century Classical Portuguese, enclisis and proclisis coexist in non V1 contexts, with a variation between authors which goes from 0 % to 40 % of enclisis (Torres Moraes 1995):

- (9) e depois o irei repondo por ser dinheiro dotal  
and afterwards (I) it-will return for being dowry money
- (10) depois segue-se a sintaxe  
afterwards follows-SE the syntax
- (11) O nosso amigo Coelho me deu cabal noticia  
Our friend Coelho to-me-gave important news
- (12) Filena converteu-se em burro  
Filena changed-herself into a monkey

This alternation was studied by Salvi (1990) who assigns different structures to proclitic and enclitic constructions. According to him, what crucially differentiates these constructions is the position of the topic or subject preverbal phrase, as represented in (13) a and b. (13a) corresponds to the proclitic construction, in which the preverbal XP is in the specifier position of the head which hosts the verb. According to Salvi, this head is Comp. (13b) corresponds to the enclitic construction, in which the preverbal XP is outside the projection of the head which hosts the verb, i.e outside CP:

(13a) [<sub>CP</sub> XP cl-V [<sub>IP</sub> ...] ]

(13b) XP [<sub>CP</sub> V-cl [<sub>IP</sub> ...] ]

This analysis allows Salvi to formulate the Tobler Mussafia Law in an abstract framework: enclisis is obligatory whenever the verb is in first position in CP. The same idea is found in Benincà (1994), who shows that this alternation also exists in Northern Italian Languages, for which the same explanation is available. Note that this analysis makes a strong claim about the relation between the position of the clitic and the type of predication relation instantiated by the clause. In systems allowing alternation between proclisis and enclisis, the former corresponds to a V2-like topicalization and the latter to a structure containing an external topic.

## I.2. Modern European Portuguese

One of the most described feature of European Portuguese is clitic-placement. I won't propose here a new description of it but base myself on the numerous recent works on this matter ( cf. Barbosa 1991, 1996, Duarte e Matos 1995, Galves 1992a e b, Madeira 1992, Manzini 1992, 1994, Martins 1993, Raposo 1995, and Rouveret 1987, 1992,1996).

All these works observe that EP makes a crucial difference in main clauses between quantified subjects, which require proclisis, and specific subjects, which force enclisis, as exemplified below.

- (14) Alguém me viu  
\* Alguém viu-me  
"Somebody saw me"
- (15) O Paulo viu-me  
\* Paulo me viu  
"Paulo saw me"

The obligatory enclisis in (15) differentiates EP from CIP, in which proclisis is possible, and even preferred, with specific subjects (cf. sentence 2). The possibility of proclisis is also lost in EP when the first element of the sentence is a topic. This means that sentences like (4) are also a-grammatical. This is the first aspect of the change between CIP and EP.

The second aspect is that EP is no longer a V2 language. Sentences like (1)-(4) are no longer produced by the grammar[4]. In EP, sentences (1) and (4), for instance, would have the following form, with the verb following the subject instead of preceding it[5]:

- (16) Enquanto faziamos a lenha, dois carpenteiros faziam uma grande cruz  
While (we) did the-wood, two carpenters made a big cross out of wood
- (17) O outro dia eu compus uma modinha para ela  
The other day I composed a song for her

Salvi (1990) derives the loss of proclisis from the loss of V2, since, according to his analysis, once Spec/CP is no more an available position for subjects and topics, the verb is always in first position in the clause, and the only option is enclisis. The same analysis is proposed by Benincà (1994). The price this attractive analysis has to pay is the odd hypothesis that subjects[6] in EP are always external to CP in main clauses.

Other researchers came to a similar conclusion only on the basis of synchronic properties of EP. Rouveret (1987), for example, argues that the subject is external to S (cf. also Barbosa 1991, 1996.). In a more recent framework, allowing more positions for subjects, the idea that the subject is in some sense external in EP has been reformulated in two types of analysis:

- the subject is not in the specifier position of the category which hosts the verb. (Rouveret 1996)
- the subject and the verb are in a spec/head agreement configuration, but this configuration involves a functional category higher than Infl (or Agr) (W for Rouveret 1992, Comp for Madeira 1992 e Manzini 1994, Sigma for Martins 1993,1994)

In other words, according to these analyses, either it is only the subject is external to the rest of the clause, or it is the whole complex subject/verb which is higher than Infl[7].

The main argument for the first position is that adverbs may always occur between the subject and the verb in EP, even when this subject is a non dislocatable expression. Rouveret quotes Costa (1995) who observes that the grammaticality of the following sentences shows that the subject is not left-dislocated, contrary to what seems to be the case in Italian (Belletti 1990)[8]:

(18) Todos provavelmente errarão

all probably will-fail

(19) Ninguém provavelmente errará

nobody probably will-fail

If one makes the hypothesis that adverbs cannot be attached at the X' level, this argument definitively favors the first representation of the externality of the subject over the other one. I'll adopt this hypothesis in the third section. Furthermore, it is interesting to point out that (18)-(19) show that even subjects which require proclisis, like "todos" and "ninguém" are external in this sense in EP.

### I.3. Brazilian Portuguese

Unlike what is sometimes claimed in papers on Portuguese, BP clitic-placement in tensed sentences is not simply like Spanish or Italian, nor can it be identified with the French system only because clitics are pre-verbal in infinitival clauses. It is true that BP has lost enclisis[9] in tensed as well as in infinitival sentences, but its syntax of clitic placement crucially differs from all these languages by two facts:

-1) its paradigm is deficient. Third person accusative clitics *o/a* appear to be acquired at school and used only in written texts and formal contexts. In normal spoken language, even educated people use either the third person tonic pronoun *ele*, or the null object, whose distribution is much less constrained than in EP (Farrell 1990, Galves 1997). Furthermore, the third person dative form *lhe* no longer refers to a third person but is used as an equivalent for the second person form *te*, both functioning as the oblique form corresponding to *voce* "you"[10]. It seems therefore that the third person has entirely disappeared from the paradigm.

-2) in compound tenses, first and second person clitics are not attached to the auxiliary but to the main verb. As already noticed by Teyssier (1974), the sequence Aux-cl-V does not correspond to the same structure in EP and BP. Adverbs occur between the clitic and the verb in EP, and between the auxiliary and the clitic in BP. Furthermore, in the latter, but not in the former, the clitic remains in the same position independently of the presence of negation or a conjunction. (20) and (21) respectively illustrate the BP and the EP paradigm [11].

(20) a. Tinha **me** lembrado

- (I) had me-remembered
- b. agora não tinha **me** lembrado  
now (I) neg had me-remembered
- c. essas industrias novas que estão **se** implantando  
those new factories that are SE-installing
- d. Estava sempre **te** vendo  
(I) was always you-seeing
- e. **me** chocou  
(it) me-chocked
- (21)a. Tinha- **me** lembrado  
(I) had-me remembered
- b. agora não **me** tinha lembrado  
now (I) neg me-had remembered
- c. essas industrias novas que **se** estão a implantar  
those new factories that SE-are installing
- d. Estava-**te** sempre a ver  
(I) was-you always seeing
- e. chocou-**me**  
(it) choked-me

The contrast between (20) and (21) clearly shows that, unlike what happens in EP, BP clitic placement is insensitive to syntactic processes like negation and subordination. Furthermore (20d) show that in compound tenses, clitics are attached to the past participle, and not to the auxiliary. This strongly distinguishes BP clitic placement from French clitic placement, and seems to indicate that clitics are licensed in a very low position in the clause. Furthermore, as already mentioned, BP breaks off the long standing prohibition of clitic first which, as we saw above, is strongly maintained in EP. We conclude that the BP clitic paradigm instantiates a very strong change with respect to Classical Portuguese which, as far as sentences of (21) are concerned, behaved exactly as EP.

As for the main predication relation of the sentence, BP is no longer a V2 language but it was defined by the pioneer study of Pontes (1981) as a “topic-oriented” language. One of kind of constructions which leads Pontes to make this claim is illustrated in (22)-(23):

- (22) O relógio estragou o ponteiro  
the clock broke the hand  
"The clock has its hand broken"
- (23) A revista está xerocando  
the journal is Xeroxing

"The journal is being Xeroxed"

In these examples, an internal argument has raised to the subject position without any morphological modification of the verb. In (22) this argument is the genitive complement of the direct object of the verb. In (23), it is the direct object itself. These sentences are completely impossible in EP [12], and in CIP. That the preverbal NP is the subject of the clause is shown by the agreement relation instantiated in (24), which is the plural version of (23):

(24) A revistas estão xerocando

"The journals are being Xeroxed"

Again, this kind of phenomena raises the question of the position of the subject in (23)-(24). Observe that this kind of construction has in common with V2 constructions the fact that the NP which precedes the subject is not its external argument. But there are some important differences between the two constructions. First, there is overt agreement between the preverbal NP and the verb. Second, the external argument of the verb is not lexically present. The following contrast shows that, contrary to passive sentences, the agent argument is completely inactive in the sentence :

(25) A revista foi xerocada para ganhar tempo

the journal was Xeroxed to save time

(26) ?? A revista xerocou para ganhar tempo

the journal Xeroxed to save time

In (25) the subject of "ganhar tempo" is controlled by the implicit agent of "foi xerocada". In (26), this interpretation is not available. This indicates that no null external argument is projected in the sentence.

Finally, this kind of constructions may appear in embedded sentences.

(27) Você sabe se a revista está xerocando?

you know whether the journal is Xeroxing?

Topic-Oriented Languages are characterized by the possibility for the subject of the sentence not to be the external argument of the verb, without any morphological marking on the verb. In other words, they are languages in which topics are treated as subjects, independently of their argumental status. An interesting case is given by BP sentences (22)-(24) above.

Inversely, in these languages, argumental subjects are frequently expressed like topics, as we shall see below. Figueiredo Silva (1994) argues that there is a topic position lower than Comp in BP. Interestingly enough, this proposal somehow characterizes BP as the reverse of EP. In the latter, the subject is external to the clause, in the former, it is the topic which is internal to the clause. Notice however that the well-formedness of (18) and (19) in BP shows that subjects can

be also characterized as external in this language.

The remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a discussion and an unified analysis of these rather unexpected forms of predication in languages, and their relation with the corresponding pronominal systems. It will be argued that they depend on the peculiar way Agr is associated with functional categories in the languages considered, and its interaction with the V-feature of the same categories. This discussion will be conducted in the framework of the last version of the Minimalist program proposed by Chomsky (1995b).

## II. The nature of Agr and of the weak pronouns

### II.1 Agr and $\phi$ -features in the Minimalist Program

In his very influent (1989)'s article, Pollock goes against a long-standing tradition which considered Agr merely as a part of Infl, and argues that Agr is an autonomous functional category. At the origin of Pollock's analysis is essentially the necessity of extending the available positions for subjects. The need for more positions is also the main reason for the multiplication of Agr nodes, as well in the sentential domain (Chomsky 1995b, chapter 2, for AgrO, Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991 for Agr1 and Agr2, among others) as in non-sentential domains. The first minimalist model adopts this view of Agr and even reinforces it by assigning Agr a crucial role in Case theory since in this model, Case-checking is always mediated by an Agr head.

In the last version of the Minimalist Program, however, Chomsky breaks off this line of thinking, and proposes a restrictive theory of functional categories which makes no place for Agr. His main argument is that Agr, unlike the other functional categories Comp, Tense and D, consists of [-Interpretable] features only, hence do not provide any instructions to the interface levels[13]. Therefore, it is "present only for theory internal reasons" ( Chomsky 1995b, p.349). Essentially, as in Pollock's analysis, its only function is to make available different overt positions for DPs and verbs in the clause. In this view, "Agr exists only when it has strong features".

Here I'll explore an alternative view which is entirely compatible with Chomsky's argumentation that Agr is not a category, but is based on two possible conclusions of this argumentation that he does not draw.

#### 1. Though Agr is not a category, it does have a role in the syntactic computation.

Coherently with some proposals in former frameworks, Agr can be considered as a formal feature. This was the current analysis before Pollock (1989), and this is in the spirit of Rizzi (1990), when he claims that "Agr can both be an independent head with its own autonomous inflectional projection (AgrP) and be assigned to another head as a feature or a set of feature" (op. cit. p.52).

According to this view, it is a matter of parametrization what categories are endowed with a feature Agr in languages. The main hypothesis this chapter intends to bring support to is that this feature is responsible for two major differences between languages: the licensing of deficient pronouns, and the position of subjects.

As for the licensing of deficient pronouns, we generalize the hypothesis put forth by many



researchers for particular languages (cf. for instance Cardinaletti 1994, Haegeman 1994, Zwart 1994) that clitics and weak pronouns are licensed by an Agr head, and rephrase it in terms of a functional head endowed with an Agr feature.

As for subjects, the proposal is that Agr plays in grammars the role assigned by Chomsky to the D-feature, i-e, its presence forces the projection of the specifier of the category which bears it. Besides providing an unitary analysis for clitic placement and subjects licensing, this proposal has the advantage of getting rid of the conceptual problems of the notion of D-feature, in particular of its exact definition. Chomsky (1995b) in effect assumes that it is a "nominal" feature, leaving open the question of whether it is a D or a N feature. Furthermore, this feature seems to be sometimes satisfied by a non nominal phrase, for instance in English locative constructions where the phrase preceding the verb is a PP. No such problems arise with Agr which only requires a phrase in its specifier, being neutral with respect to the category which checks it[14]. Since in Chomsky (1995b)'s framework, specifiers are projected only in overt syntax, Agr is by definition a strong feature.

2. Though the category which dominates Tense is not Agr, there is such a category.

I'll propose that this category is Person[15]. Person fulfills the requirements imposed by Chomsky (1995b) on functional categories, since it arguably has [+ Interpretable] features at LF. Furthermore, it is comparable with Tense in its deictic interpretation. Finally, in many languages, it plays a crucial role in syntax. For instance in many ergative languages, there is a split between ergative-absolutive and nominative-accusative Case-marking depending on the person mark on the verb (cf. for instance Nash 1997).

A further rather natural claim is that the formal features intrinsically associated with Person are  $\phi$ -features. As is the case for all the features associated with functional categories (Chomsky 1995b), they are [- Interpretable] and must therefore be checked. This checking can be performed either by the  $\phi$ -features of some phrase in Spec/Person, or by  $\phi$ -features moving to Person. Recall that in the framework developed here, the first option depends on the presence of Agr on Person. It will be argued below that the latter can be instantiated either by overt movement, when verb-movement pied-pies  $\phi$ -features, or by autonomous covert movement of  $\phi$ -features.

Unlike what was claimed in the first version of the model, Chomsky (1995b) argues that some formal features are interpretable at LF. Interpretable features do not need to be checked, and therefore erased, since they are legitimate objects at the interfaces. With respect to  $\phi$ -features, he makes a distinction between the  $\phi$ -features of nouns, which are interpretable, and the  $\phi$ -features of verbs which are not.

It has been recently argued by some researchers that deficient pronouns are  $\phi$ -features. Dobrovie-Sorin (1994) claims that the only difference between agreement morphemes and deficient pronouns is that the former are bound morphemes. The same idea is defended at length by Everett (1996) who claims that: "pronominal clitics, argument affixes, and pronouns are epiphenomena, produced by the insertion of PHI-FEATURES into different syntactic positions" (op. Cit. p.2). I'll adopt this view here.

In Chomsky's last framework, it is natural to assume that deficient pronouns are interpretable  $\phi$ -features, and their behavior is therefore not governed by checking theory. I'll assume without further discussion that they move for a reason of visibility at LF. Since their interpretation require some antecedent in discourse, they must occupy a designated position[16].

To summarize, we now have Agr as a formal feature, Person as the highest functional category of the Infl layer, and deficient pronouns as interpretable  $\phi$ -features.

## II.2 Pronouns and predication

This analysis is based on the claim that weak pronouns and bound agreement morphemes are the same element, with the only difference that the latter are inserted in the derivation as a part of a word. A further support for this analysis can be found in the fact that, in some languages, free weak pronouns play an agreement role which is entirely comparable to that of bound morphemes. We can find an example of this functioning in BP. In this language, subjects generally show up in a dislocated position, with a resumptive pronoun immediately preceding the verb.

- (28) Essa competência, ela é de natureza mental  
this competence, it is of nature mental  
"This competence is mental in nature"

Beyond its frequency, it can be shown that this construction has different properties from its equivalent in other Romance languages, including EP. Namely, it can be embedded in subordinated clauses and in relative clauses, as illustrated below:

- (29) Eu acho que o povo brasileiro ele tem uma grave doença (Duarte 1995)  
I think that the Brazilian people he has a serious illness

- (30) Um país que o presidente, ele não obedece mais as leis não pode ser respeitado pelos outros (Kato, 1993)  
a country that the president, he does not obey the laws, cannot be respected by the others

Cinque (1983) and Benincà (1989) for Italian, and Duarte (1987) for EP, claim that this kind of dislocation, which involves a tonic pronoun either in subject or in another position ("hanging topic construction"), cannot be embedded, in contrast with constructions in which the pronominal element is a clitic ("clitic left dislocation construction"). For Cinque, this is due to the fact that it is not sentence-grammar which is responsible for the connection between the NP and the tonic pronoun, but the same principle of discourse-grammar which rules the relation between a full NP and a pronoun in two adjacent sentences in discourse. By the same reasoning, the well-formedness of (29) and (30) shows that the relation between "o povo brasileiro", and "o presidente" and the following pronoun, is ruled by sentence grammar. In other words that the tonic pronoun has the same status in BP as the clitic in EP and Italian. This calls for an explanation.

Clitic-left-dislocation sentences are constructions in which the clitic plays a role of morphological agreement between a dislocated phrase and the head of the sentence. It is likely that the licensing of embedded topics depends on this agreement relation, which characterizes the dislocated phrase as the subject of a predication. In contrast, tonic pronouns cannot enter in this kind of relation because they occupy a full DP position. BP sentences above are therefore

unexpected, unless some property of the language enables tonic pronouns to function as clitics. It is what will be proposed below.

The last version of Chomsky's theory of movement allows us to implement this idea in a very simple way. In effect, after Spell-Out, only features move, and they always adjoin to a head. At LF, the features of a pronoun which occupy an argument position in overt syntax can move for checking reasons to a category endowed with  $\phi$ -features and act exactly like a clitic, i-e, establish an agreement relation with an external DP which licenses this DP as a subject. Chomsky's theory of feature-movement allows us to consider that in (28)-(30), there are hidden clitics which correspond to the features of the tonic pronoun, moved in the covert syntax in order to check the  $\phi$ -features of Person.

### II.3 Enclisis

The theory of enclisis developed here is based on the hypothesis made so far that clitics are  $\phi$ -features. This is far from being an uncontroversial claim. Most authors, in effect, argue that they are Determiners (cf. Uriagereka 1995, Corver e Delfitto 1993, among others) .

Though it seems attractive, mainly because of the morphological identity of the third person clitic and the article in Romance languages, this hypothesis is problematic. If D is the category which codifies reference, how can we explain the total absence of referential interpretation associated with clitics in the following French constructions in which the clitic is not interpreted as an argument but as a proposition or an adjective?

(31) Je le sais

I it-know

(32) Belle, elle ne l'a jamais été

pretty, she neg it-has never been

"Pretty, she never was"

On the contrary, if we admit that they are  $\phi$ -features which simply allow a position to be interpreted as anaphoric of a previous argument or predicate, independently of any referential interpretation, their whole behavior becomes coherent.

This analysis allows us to distinguish proclisis and enclisis in the following way. In proclisis, the  $\phi$ -features are generated independently, in argumental position, and they must adjoin to the verb for the reasons suggested above. Enclisis, instead, is a case of inflectional morphology. In this case, the  $\phi$ -features are adjoined to the verb as soon as the lexicon. Note that this assumption allows us to formulate, in minimalist framework, the claim made by Benincà e Cinque (1993) that, in enclitic constructions, the verb and the clitic form a morphological unit. They show how coordination facts clearly distinguish the two type of constructions. Observe the following French examples:

(33) Il chantera et dansera avec nous

he will sing and dance with us

(34) \* Chantera-t-il et dansera avec nous?

sing-he and dance with us

(35) Jean le lit et relit sans cesse

John ir reads and reads again

(36) \* Lis et relis-la!

read and read-it again

When the pronoun is proclitic, it is licit not to repeat it in the second segment of a coordinate structure. When it is enclitic, this is impossible. Furthermore, in some languages like Rumanian, two clitics can be coordinated when they are proclitics but not when they are enclitics[17].

(37)  $\hat{I}$ mi si  $\hat{i}$ ti scribe

CL and CL Verb

(38) \* $\hat{D}$ indu-mi si  $\hat{i}$  cartea

Verb-CL and CL

All these facts show that verb + clitic and clitic + verb are not the same object and that the clitic and the verb function as an indissociable morphological unit in the former but not in the latter. Obviously, there are different manners of interpreting this fact. In this analysis, clitics are considered as  $\phi$ -features, i-e of the same nature of inflectional morphemes. The interpretation proposed for the cases in which they appear on the right side of the verb, which is the side of the inflectional morphology in Romance languages, is therefore coherent with the assumption made by Chomsky (1995 a,b) that inflectional morphemes are affixed to the words in the lexicon. Furthermore, it is the only way to morphologically distinguish proclisis and enclisis if we assume that in both cases, the clitic and the verb are in the same head in the visible syntax [18]. Proclisis is the result of the adjunction of the clitic to the verb. Enclisis corresponds to a word formed in the lexicon.

The last point which requires explanation is the licensing of enclitic structures. Obviously, few modern Romance languages legitimate enclisis in tensed affirmative sentences, and this seems to be a highly restricted option. This has been generally related with the activation of a functional category higher than Infl (or Agr) which attracts the tensed verb. In the Minimalist framework, this amounts to assigning a V-feature to this category. According to the analyses, either the clitic is stranded in Infl (Martins 1994), or it occupies the head of the functional category, and attracts the verb (Madeira 1992, Manzini 1994, Rouveret 1992). In both cases, enclisis obtains. In this view, enclisis depends on verb-movement.

Here it will be argued that it is more accurately described in terms of interplay between Agr and the V-feature. We'll maintain the idea that in Portuguese tensed sentences enclisis is dependent on the properties of Comp, but this is not true for all the cases of enclisis, since Infl is likely to be the licensing category for enclisis in infinitival sentences in languages like Italian and Spanish.

The common property between topicalization and infinitival clauses is that the head which contains the verb and the clitic enters in no spec/head relation. In infinitival clauses, there is no lexical subject to agree with, and in topicalized constructions, as represented in (15b) above, the

topic is outside CP. If we lie on this similarity between these two cases of enclisis, we can formulate the generalization that enclisis is incompatible with the existence of a spec/head relation involving the head which contains the clitic. This incompatibility was already observed by Benincà (1994) for EP and the medieval Romance languages, and by Galves (1996) for CIP and EP[19].

In the analysis proposed here, this generalization can be formulated in such a way that the complementary distribution of enclisis and proclisis straightforwardly follows. In effect, the incompatibility of enclisis with the existence of a spec/head relation involving the verb can now be formulated in terms of the association of an Agr-feature with the category hosting this verb. We have assumed with many researchers that proclitic constructions obey the opposite requirement since clitics must adjoin to a head endowed with Agr. Putting things together, we can formulate the following generalization about clitic-placement:

- a) clitics adjoin to the verb in a head endowed with an Agr-feature,
- b) enclisis requires that the verb be at Spell-Out in a head which does not contain Agr.

The distribution of enclisis and proclisis is therefore dependent on the movement of the verb, as in the analyses mentioned above, but not only. It is sensitive to the parametrization of the host of the verb with respect to the Agr-feature. In a theory of parameters formulated in terms of the formal features of functional categories, clitic-placement derives therefore from the combination of two of them: the Agr-feature and the V-feature[20]. We shall see now how this hypothesis accounts for the differences between CIP, EP and BP.

### III. A minimalist approach of the change from CIP to EP and BP .

The properties considered in section I. can be summarized in the following table:

*Comparative table of the syntactic properties of CIP, EP and BP*

	CIP	EP	BP
enclisis	yes	yes	no
V2	yes	no	no
external subjects	no	yes	yes
embedded dislocation	no	no	yes
subject topics	no	no	yes

In this table, "external subject" refers to the possibility of occurrence of an adverb between a non-referential subject and the verb, as illustrated in (18) and (19) above. We therefore make a distinction between topicalized subjects on one hand, and "external" subjects on the other hand. Though they share the property of not being in a spec/head relation with the verb, only the latter are internal to CP. It must be noted that the "no" assigned to CIP with respect to this property is more an hypothesis than an attested fact, given the absence of a systematic description on the position of the adverbs in this language. Evidence for this claim, however, can be found in the fact that the V3 orders are very rare in CIP, and are always analyzable as V2 constructions in which the adverb occupies Spec/CP, and the subject is in an external to CP topic position.

As for "subject topics", this refers to the kind of constructions exemplified in (22)-(24), in which a non external argument behaves exactly like a subject. No construction of this type has been reported in CIP.

This table evidences a more drastic change between BP and CIP than between EP and CIP. In fact, CIP and BP can be considered as two opposite realizations with EP as an intermediate form. EP shares at least one positive property with each one of the other languages: enclisis with CIP and external subjects with BP.

In this section, it will be shown that these differences derive from the following parametrization of the functional categories Comp, Person and Tense[21].

CIP:

Comp : +V/-Agr

Person : +V/+Agr

Tense: +V/-Agr

EP:

Comp : -V/+Agr

Person : +V/-Agr

Tense: +V/-Agr

BP:

Comp : -V/-Agr

Person : -V/-Agr

Tense: +V/+Agr

The change from CLP to EP consists of an inversion of the values of the V-feature and the Agr-feature of Comp and Person.

From CLP to BP we observe a much more catastrophic change, probably correlated with the weakening of the pronominal system mentioned above (cf. Galves 1997). In BP, V-movement is limited to Tense, and Tense is also the category which bears the Agr-feature[22].

The analyses adopted so far characterize CIP as a V2 language. I'll adopt the natural assumption that V2 languages are languages in which the verb raises to Comp because of the V-feature of Comp. This movement has the effect of licensing the so-called V2 topicalization, i-e

topicalization in the specifier of Comp[23]. This is a case in which a Spec/head relation is not forced by Agr, but by a strong operator feature.

According to Salvi's analysis, which was adopted above, two different structures are available in CIP when the subject or a topic precedes the verb. These structures are repeated below in (39a) e (39b). (39c) represents the a-grammaticality of enclisis in a Spec/head configuration, implicit in Salvi's analysis.

(39a) XP [<sub>CP</sub> V-cl [<sub>IP</sub> ... ] ]

(39b) [<sub>CP</sub> XP cl-V [<sub>IP</sub> ... ] ]

(39c) \* [<sub>CP</sub> XP V-cl [<sub>IP</sub> ... ] ]

Assuming these representations, the analysis proposed here straightforwardly accounts for enclisis in (39a), since by the parametrization above, the verb in Comp is in a position which does not bear Agr. (39b,c) however show that even when there is no Agr, a Spec/head relation involving the verb blocks enclisis.

We conclude that the feature Agr is incompatible with enclisis because it forces a Spec/head configuration. At the CP level, the presence of strong operator features have the same effect when Comp has a V-feature. In this case, proclisis is legitimate because the clitic adjoins to the verb in Person, which bears Agr, and raises with it to Comp. The rule governing enclisis proposed above should be therefore reformulated as follows:

Enclisis requires that the verb be at Spell-Out in a head which contains no strong feature (besides the V-feature itself).

Two kinds of strong features appear in derivations: strong operator features and Agr. They are in complementary distribution, and in many languages, Agr is limited to the Infl level. However, if the analysis proposed here is right, it is not an exclusive property of this level. It will be suggested below that operator features can be associated with categories other than Comp as well.

In the next sections, we'll see how the parametrization proposed above accounts for the changes in clitic placement from CIP to respectively EP and BP.

### III.1 From CIP to EP

It will be shown now that the differences between CIP and EP derives from the inversion of the values of the V-feature and Agr-features of Person and Comp.

Let's recapitulate EP's relevant properties.

- It is not a V2 language
- Its subject is external

- It forces enclisis when the verb is preceded by a topic or a specific subject.

The first property derives from the absence of V-to-Comp raising [24].

The two others derive from the fact that Agr is now associated with Comp[25]. The absence of V-movement to Comp has the effect, already noted by Salvi(1990) that Spec/CP in EP is no more an adequate position for topics, in contrast with CIP . But, according to our assumptions, the presence of Agr makes Spec/CP a subject position, since the subject must raise to the checking domain of Comp in order to check Agr, yielding the structure represented below.

(40) [<sub>CP</sub> DP [<sub>-PersP</sub> V ] ]

Crucially, in this structure, the subject and the verb are not in Spec/head relation, and enclisis is licit.

We are now able to face one of the most intriguing problems of EP: the sensitiveness of clitic-placement to the referential nature of the subject. In a structure like (40), the subject has to be interpreted like a sort of topic, predicated of the projection of Person, in which there are co-referring  $\phi$ -features on the verb[26]. This implies that the subject independently refer. On the contrary quantified elements cannot co-refer with  $\phi$ -features, since they have no reference. This means that (40) is not a well-formed structure when the subject is not referential. But it must be reminded that sentences like (18) and (19), in which a sentential adverb occurs between *alguém/ todos* and the verb, show that quantified subjects are as external as referential subjects. The discussion above about the complementary distribution of Agr and operator features suggests that Person in EP matrix sentences may receive operator features, since it is not assigned an Agr feature. I'll adopt this hypothesis and propose that Person may optionally be assigned a feature which attracts quantified subjects in its specifier[27]. Because of the Agr feature of Comp, they must also raise to Spec/Comp, yielding the following structure:

(41) [<sub>CP</sub> *alguém*<sub>i</sub> [<sub>PersP</sub> *t*<sub>i</sub> V ] ]

In (41), the relation between the subject and the  $\phi$ -features on the verb is mediated by the trace in the specifier of the category hosting the verb. This structure, which licenses quantified subjects excludes enclisis, because it creates a specifier for the category hosting the verb.

### III.3 From CIP to BP

As shown by the table above, BP corresponds to a more drastic change with respect to CIP. Not only V2 disappears but so does enclisis. This indicates that Comp is no more associated with Agr and V features. Moreover, as we have seen above, constructions in which either a topic is treated like a subject, or there is a left-dislocation involving a tonic pronoun, can be embedded. This means that these constructions do not display the effects normally observed when a predication relation involves either Comp, as in V2 languages, or a phrase external to Comp like in



the so-called "hanging topic" constructions. We conclude that in BP, there is a topic position lower than C.

Instead of calling this category Top, as Figueiredo Silva (1994) does, I'll propose that it is Person itself, whose special properties are explained by the fact that it is associated with no strong feature at all.

As in other languages which have lost V-to-Person, this can be correlated with a morphological modification of the verbal paradigm. In BP, this modification results from the loss of the second person of the singular, "tu", which is substituted by a third person form "você", with consequently the loss of the 2nd person form in the verbal paradigm, and a general confusion between the pronouns of second and third person (cf. Galves, 1994, 1997. ).

However, the familiar tests show that V moves out from VP in this language (Galves 1994, Figueiredo Silva 1994). For instance manner adverbs occur between the verb and the object:

(44a) As crian\cas acabaram cuidadosamente a sua tarefa  
the children finished carefully their homework

(44b) ?? As crian\cas cuidadosamente acabaram a sua tarefa  
the children carefully finished their homework

I'll therefore assume that V is in Tense at Spell-Out. Let's suppose now that Tense bears Agr as well, and attracts the external argument. The structure of the proposition when the derivation reaches Person will be therefore:

(45) [<sub>PersP</sub> Pers [<sub>TP</sub> DP V] ]

The  $\phi$ -features of V agree with, and are checked by [28], the subject DP in Spec/TP. Person, however, must have its  $\phi$ -features checked. As there is no Agr feature in Person, this cannot be performed under Spec/head agreement. The only option left by UG is feature movement in covert syntax.

We already saw that covert feature movement can explain the fact that embedded topics are licensed even if they are doubled by a tonic pronoun, in contrast with what happens in other Romance languages. The negative value for the features Agr and V is what explains this possibility in BP, since neither the verb nor the subject can check the  $\phi$ -features of Person. What sentences like (29)-(30) show is that it is the pronoun which plays this role, acting as a null clitic. In languages in which the  $\phi$ -features of Person are checked by the agreement morphology on the verb, there is no room for such null clitics, and these sentences are ruled out because, in the absence of agreement between the head of the clause and the adjoined DP, only a discursive relationship can be established between this DP and the pronoun, as was already pointed out by Cinque. But this relationship does not occur inside clauses, since it is the domain of grammatical relations.

The structure underlying "hanging topic" constructions is represented below [29]:

(46) [<sub>PersP</sub> DP [<sub>PersP</sub>  $\phi_i$  [<sub>-TP</sub>...  $ele_i$  V] ] ]

(46) is subjacent to sentences (28)-(30), in which the tonic pronoun *ele* plays the role of an agreement element because its features raise to Person after Spell-Out and license the agreement relation of the clause with the external DP.

The consequence of this analysis for the subject is that in sentences in which there is no “hanging topic”, there is a *pro* in the specifier of TP, whose features move to check Person, and the lexical subject occupies the same position as topics do, *i-e* is adjoined to PersP, as represented in (47):

(47) [<sub>PersP</sub> DP [<sub>PersP</sub>  $\phi_i$  [<sub>-TP</sub>  $pro_i$  ...] ] ]

(47) provides us with a representation of the externality of the subject in BP. However, we cannot assign this structure to sentences like (19)-(20), in which the subject is not referential. Again, a structure like (47) is interpretable only if the subject is referential, since it implies a co-reference relation between the  $\phi$ -features of the null subject and the external DP. That this is impossible is evidenced by the grammaticality in BP of sentences like (48)

(48) \* Ninguém ele veio.  
nobody he came

The grammar of BP therefore shares with the grammar of EP the property of requiring two different structures for referential and non-referential subjects. The question is now what is the position of the subject in sentences like (19)-(20). Again, our assumption about the complementary distribution of Agr and operator features allows us to suggest that since Person is not assigned an Agr feature in BP, it may receive operator features and attract quantified subjects in its specifier, yielding the following structure:

(49) [<sub>PersP</sub> DP<sub>i</sub> [<sub>TP</sub>  $t_i$  ...] ] ]

This analysis makes the prediction that, in the presence of an operator feature, there is no room for a hanging topic construction, since the  $\phi$ -features of Person are checked by the quantifier. This prediction is borne out, as shown by the ill-formedness of sentences like (50):

(50) \* Quem o João ele encontrou ?  
who John he met  
"Who did John meet"?

So far, we have accounted for two properties of BP: the "externality" of the subject and the

possibility for dislocated “hanging topic” constructions to be embedded. The fact that only the former is a shared property with EP derives from the fact that while both grammars generate structures in which the subject is outside the projection of the head which contains the verb, the position of this subject is different. It is in the specifier of C in EP, and adjoined to Person in BP. This difference accounts for the two peculiar aspects of the pronominal syntax of these languages. In BP, tonic pronouns can play a role of agreement in embedded sentences since they are clitics on Person at LF. In EP, enclisis is licit, and obligatory in root tensed clauses, if the subject is referential.

The other phenomenon which strongly differentiates EP and BP is the existence in the latter of what we have been calling "subject topics", as illustrated in (22)-(24). It has been shown that in sentences like (23) which contain a transitive verb, the external argument of the verb is completely inactive.

I'll assume that in these constructions, this argument is not projected. In the minimalist framework, such an assumption is possible because there is no Projection Principle which requires all the arguments of a verb to be present in a derivation. The only requirement is that the output of the computation be interpretable by the “Conceptual-Intentional” performance system.

The sentences in (22)-(24) coexist in BP with structures in which the pre-verbal DP is dislocated and doubled by a resumptive pronoun, as illustrated in (51b), to be compared with (22), repeated below as (51a):

(51a) O relógio estragou o ponteiro  
the clock broke the hand

(51b) O relógio, estragou o ponteiro dele  
the clock broke the hand of it

(51b) is a sentence of the type already exemplified in (28)-(30) above. The interesting question is what is the underlying difference between (51a) and (51b). Let's consider their superficial differences:

- there is a lexical resumptive pronoun in b), but not in a)
- there can be agreement between the verb and the post-verbal DP in b) but not in a), as illustrated below:

a) \* O relógio estragaram os ponteiros  
the clock broke+pl the hands

b) O relógio, estragaram os ponteiros dele  
the clock broke+pl the hands of it

- there can be agreement between the verb and the pre-verbal DP in a) but not in b), as illustrated below:

- a) os relógios estragaram o ponteiro  
the clocks broke+pl the hand
- b) \* os relógios, estragaram o ponteiro deles  
the clocks broke+pl the hand of them

These facts show that there are two ways for the preverbal DP to be licensed, either by co-indexation with a pronoun, or by agreement with the verb. In the first case, the  $\phi$ -features of the verb are checked in Spec/TP by an expletive pro. As was argued above, the features of the resumptive pronoun check the  $\phi$ -features of Person in the covert syntax, and the topic adjoins to PersP. The structure of these sentences will be the following:

$$(52) [_{\text{PersP}} \text{DP} [_{\text{PersP}} \phi_i [_{\text{TP}} \text{pro}_{\text{expl}} \text{V} \dots \text{ele}_i]] ] ]$$

The other option of derivation consists in starting from a numeration which contains no resumptive pronoun and no expletive pro. Since we assume that the  $\phi$ -features of the verb are not interpretable in BP, the only way they can be checked in this case is against the  $\phi$ -features of Person to which they raise by covert movement, as represented in (53).

$$(53) [_{\text{PersP}} \text{DP} [_{\text{PersP}} \phi_i [_{\text{TP}} \text{V}_i ] ] ]$$

I'll assume that this movement has the effect of characterizing PersP as the extension of TP and consequently putting the DP adjoined to PersP into the checking domain of Tense. This entails that this DP is able to check the Agr feature of Tense [30]. The existence of agreement between the verb and the preverbal DP exemplified in (24) is the morphological effect of this derivation.

There is also a semantic effect. In effect, a further difference between (51a) and (51b) is that only in the former does a semantic restriction exist on the relationship between the pre-verbal and the post-verbal DPs. Observe the contrast between (54) and (55):

- (54a) Esta mesa quebrou o pé  
this table broke the leg
- (54b) Esta mesa, quebrou o pé dela  
this table broke the leg of it  
"This table had its leg broken"
- (55a) \*Esta mesa quebrou o pote  
this table broke the pot
- (55b) Esta mesa, quebrou o pote dela  
this table broke the pot of it  
"The pot which is on this table is broken"

Both (54b) and (55b) are well-formed but only (54a) is possible. The ill-formedness of (55a) illustrates the fact that in the absence of a resumptive pronoun, the preverbal DP must be interpretable as the whole of which the post-verbal DP is a part. This is the case between the table and its leg, but not between the table and the pot. This difference can be derived from the different grammatical status of the pre-verbal DP in the two structures. In (52), which underlies the (54b) and (55b), it is in a peripheral, A'-position. In this position, it is assigned any interpretation associated to the resumptive pronoun in argumental position. By contrast, in (53), there is no resumptive pronoun, and the preverbal position can be characterized as an A-position, since it is in the checking domain of Agr (cf. Rizzi 1991). The restriction illustrated above therefore derives from the compositional assignment by the VP of a semantic property to the subject, which implies a certain relationship between the two DPs.

Summarizing, all the topic-oriented constructions of BP derive from the lack of movement of the verb to Person, which has the following consequences:

- $\phi$ -features from a pronominal argument covertly raise to Person in order to check it, and license a predication relation with a DP external to PersP.
- in the absence of the projection of an external argument, the  $\phi$ -features of V raise to Person in order to be checked. This characterizes Spec/Person as an A-position, with morphological and semantic consequences.

In all these cases, the subject is external in the sense defined above, since it is never in the specifier of the category containing the verb. This explains that an adverb can always show up between the subject and the verb in BP.

#### IV. Concluding remarks

In conclusion, the contrastive description of PCI, PE and PB performed in this chapter brings evidence for an unitary approach of the syntax of subjects and the syntax of pronouns, since it clearly appears that changes in the latter are correlated with changes in the former. Here this correlation was studied in the framework of the Minimalist Program, and it was proposed that the feature which is responsible for the variation observed among languages is Agr, understood as a feature parametrically associated with functional categories. This proposal, together with the claim that there is a functional category above Tense which bears  $\phi$ -features, enables us to account in an unitary way for the following aspects of the syntax of Portuguese:

- the distribution of enclisis and proclisis in ClP and EP tensed sentences,
- the externality of the subject in EP and BP,
- the peculiar syntactic behavior of "hanging topic" constructions in BP,
- the "subject topic" constructions in BP.

It also allows us to show that, despite their divergence, the three Portuguese grammars have an important common property, which underlies their syntactic particularities. It is the fact that they all license constructions in which the subject and the verb are not immediately contained in the same maximal projection. This is at the origin of the possibility of enclisis in tensed sentences, as well as of the "subject topic" constructions of BP. The variation in the effects of this property is due to the nature of the functional categories involved, and the peculiar interaction between AGR and the V-feature in each language. Note however that this analysis leads us to make a crucial distinction between the subjects which are external to the projection of the verb inside the boundaries of CP, and the subjects which are outside CP. Only in the former case can non-referential subjects be licensed.

Finally, the analysis developed here is based on the conception of deficient pronouns, in particular of clitics, as interpretable  $\phi$ -features. This allows us to propose an account of enclisis in terms of a morphological affixation of the clitic to the verb in the lexicon, as a case of inflectional morphology. The generalization which emerges from the description of the distribution of enclisis and proclisis in EP as well as in CIP is that enclisis is incompatible with the existence of a phrase in the specifier of the head hosting the verb. I leave the exact reason of this incompatibility for further research.

## References

Adams, M. (1987) Old French, null subjects and verb second phenomena, unpublished dissertation, UCLA.

Ambar, M. (1992) Para uma sintaxe da inversão sujeito/verbo em português, Lisboa: Colibri.

Barbosa, P., (1991) "Clitic Placement in EP", manuscript, MIT.

Barbosa, P. (1996) "Clitic Placement in European Portuguese and the position of subjects", in A.L. Aalpern and A. M. Zwicky (eds) *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, CSLI Publications.

Belletti, A. (1990) *Generalized Verb-Movement: aspects of verb movement*, Torino: Rosenberg and Sellier.

Benincà, P. (1989), in *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, Bologna: Il Mulino.

Benincà, P. (1994) *La variazione sintattica (Studi di dialettologia romanza)*, Bologna: Il Mulino.

Benincà, P. and G. Cinque (1993) "Su alcune differenze fra enclisi e proclisi", in *Omaggio a Gianfranco Folena*, Padova: Editoriale Programma.

Bianchi, V. e Maria Cristina Figueiredo Silva, (1994). "On some properties of agreement-object in Italian and Brazilian Portuguese", in M. Mazzola (ed.) *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics: selected papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance languages XXIII*, Georgetown University Press.

Cardinaletti, A. (1994) "On Cliticization in Germanic Languages", in H. Van Riemsdijk and L. Rizzi (eds), *Clitics and their hosts*, ESF–Eurotyp, Tilburg University.

Cardinaletti, A. e M. Starke, (1994). "The typology of structural deficiency, on the three

grammatical classes", Working papers in Linguistics 4-2, 41-109, University of Venice.

Cardinaletti, A e I. Roberts, (1991) "Clause structure and X-second", in W. Chao e G. Horrocks (eds) Levels of Representation, Berlin: Mouton, in press.

Chomsky, N., (1995a) "Bare Phrase-Structure", in G. Webelhuth (ed.) Government and binding theory and the minimalist program, Blackwell .

Chomsky, N. (1995b) The Minimalist Program, MA: MIT Press.

Cinque, G. (1983) " 'Topic' Constructions in Some European Languages and 'Connectedness' ", in Connectedness in Sentence, Discourse and Text, K. Ehlich and H Van Riemsdijk (eds), Tilburg Studies in Language and Literature, 4.

Corver N., and D. Delfitto, (1993). "Feature asymmetry and the nature of pronoun movement", manuscript, Tilburg University and University of Utrecht.

Dobrovie-Sorin, C. (1994) " The typology of pronouns and the distinction between syntax and morpho-phonology", mimeo, UniversitéParis VII.

Duarte, I. (1987) A construção de topicalização na gramática do português : regência, ligação e condições sobre o movimento, unpublished dissertation, University of Lisbon.

Duarte, I. e G. Matos, (1995) "Romance Clitics and the Minimalist Program", comunicação ao 5 Colóquio internacional de Gramática Gerativa, La Coruña.

Duarte, M.E (1995) A perda do princípio "Evite pronome" no Português Brasileiro, unpublished thesis, University of Campinas.

Everett, D. (1996) Why there are no clitics. An alternative perspective on pronominal allomorphy. , S.I.L and University of Texas at Arlington, Publications in Linguistics 123.

Farrell, P. (1990) "Null objects in Brazilian Portuguese", Natural Language and Linguistic Theory 8, 325-346.

Figueredo Silva, M.C. (1994) La position sujet en portugais brésilien, doctoral dissertation, University of Geneva.

Fontana, J., (1992) Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish, unpublished thesis, University of Pennsylvania.

Galves, C. (1994) "V-movement, Levels of Representation and the Structure of S", revised version of the communication presented at the 13th GLOW Colloquium, Cambridge 1990, printed in Letras de Hoje, 96, Porto Alegre, 1994, 35-58.

Galves, C. (1992a) " Enclise, infinitif fléchi et extraction du sujet :évidences pour deux accords en portugais européen", Second Colloquium on Generative Grammar, Vitoria (Spain).

Galves, C. (1992b) "Clitic-placement in European Portuguese, evidence for a non-homogeneous theory of enclisis", Proceedings of the Workshop on Portuguese, Associação Portuguesa de Linguística, Lisbon, 61-80.

Galves, C. (1996) " Clitic-placement and Parametric Changes in Portuguese", Selected Papers from the 24th Linguistic Symposium Romance Languages. Georgetown University Press, 227-239.

Galves, C. (1997) " La syntaxe pronominale du portugais brésilien et la typologie des pronoms", in A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.) Les Pronoms, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, St Denis, 11-34.

Haegeman, L. (1994) "The distribution of object pronouns in West Flemish", in H. Van

Riemsdijk and L. Rizzi (eds), *Clitics and their hosts*, ESF-Eurotyp, Tilburg University.

Kato, M. (1993) "Recontando a história das relativas em uma perspectiva paramétrica", in M. Kato and I. Roberts (eds) *Viagem diacrônica pelas fases do português brasileiro*, Campinas: Ed. da UNICAMP.

Kayne, R., (1991) "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO". *Linguistic Inquiry*, 22, 647-686.

Lobo, T., (1992) *A colocação do clíticos em português. Duas sincronias em confronto*, unpublished thesis, University of Lisbon .

Madeira, A. M., (1992) "On clitic placement in European Portuguese". In H. van de Koot (ed.) *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics 4* University College London.

Manzini, M. R. (1994) "Triggers for verb-second: Germanic and Romance", *The Linguistic Review* 11 299-314.

Martins, A.M. (1993) "Clitic placement from Old to Modern European Portuguese", talk presented at the 13th ICHL, Los Angeles.

Martins, A.M., (1994). *Clíticos na história do português*, unpublished dissertation, University of Lisbon.

Nash, L. (1997) "La partition personnelle dans les langues ergatives" in A. Zribi-Hertz (ed.) *Les Pronoms*, Presses Universitaires de Vincennes, St Denis, 11-34.

Pollock, J.Y. (1989) "Verb-Movement, Universal grammar, and the Structure of IP", *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 365-425.

Pontes, E (1981) "Da importância do tópico em português", *Anais do Encontro Nacional de Linguística*, Rio de Janeiro.

Raposo, E. (1995) "Clitic Position and Verb Movement in European Portuguese", talk at the 5th *Colóquio internacional de Gramática Gerativa*, La Coruña.

Ribeiro, I. M., (1995). *A sintaxe da ordem no português arcaico: o efeito V2*, unpublished dissertation, University of Campinas.

Rizzi, L. (1990) *Relativized Minimality*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rizzi, L. (1991) "Proper Head-government and the definition of A-positions", *GLOW Newsletter*, 26, 46-47.

Rouveret, A. (1987). *Syntaxe des dépendances lexicales. Identité et identification dans la théorie syntaxique*, unpublished dissertation, Paris VII.

Rouveret, A. (1992). "Clitic placement, focus and the Wackernagel Position in European Portuguese". paper presented at the ESF workshop on clitics, Donostia.

Salvi, G., (1990) *La sopravvivenza della legge di Wackernagel nei dialetti occidentali della penisola iberica*. *Medioevo Romano*, 15, 177-210.

Teyssier, P. (1974) *Grammaire de la langue portugaise, Portugal - Brésil*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Torres Moraes, M. A., (1995). *Do português clássico ao português moderno: um estudo da cliticização e do movimento do verbo.*, unpublished dissertation, University of Campinas.

Uriagereka, J. (1995) "Syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance", *Linguistic Inquiry*, 26, 79-123.

Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa (1982) "Theoretical Implications of Subject Extraction in



Portuguese”, *The Linguistic Review* 2, 79-96.

Zubizarreta, Maria Luisa (1996) *Prosody, focus, and word order*, manuscript, USC.

Zwart, C.J.W (1994) "Notes on clitics in Dutch", in H. Van Riemsdijk and L. Rizzi (eds), *Clitics and their hosts*, ESF-Eurotyp, Tilburg University.

---

[1] It must be noted, however, that it lost another common property of archaic languages: the so-called interpolation constructions, in which the verb and the clitic are separated by one or more phrases. In contrast with Barbosa (1996) among others, I assume that the residual interpolation constructions are archaisms not produced by the grammar of EP.

[2] (1) is quoted in Ribeiro (1995), (3), (4) and (8) in Torres Moraes (1995), (5) in Martins (1994); (2) and (6) are from Pe Vieira, and (7) from Marquesa de Alorna.

[3] One of the most striking fact of the history of clitic placement in Portuguese is that there is a great variation in the relative frequency of the two constructions over the centuries, with two opposite movements. First, there is a gradual evolution from a very high proportion of enclisis in the 12th century to an almost categorical proclisis in the 16th century (cf. Martins 1994, Lobo 1992). From the 17th century on, the reverse tendency is observed, with a strong variation between authors (Martins 1994, Torres Moraes 1995). Finally enclitic constructions are again dominant at the beginning of the 19th century, and are the only option from the second half of the 19th century on.

[4] This claim does not imply that this kind of sentences cannot be judged as well-formed by some speakers. They can be found in literary texts and are part of the knowledge of educated people. Besides this, V2 continues to be possible in EP when the preverbal XP is focalized. In certain cases, it is not so easy to differentiate focus and topic in this position.

[5] That is not to say that subject inversion is no more available in EP (cf. Ambar 1992). But it is a complex matter which goes beyond the limits of this article. If possible, a sentence like (4) in EP cannot have the interpretation in which the whole sequence V S O is the focus of the utterance. cf. Zubizarreta (1995) for the various interpretations associated with this order.

[6] At least, specific subjects, since, as it is widely discussed in the works quoted above, quantified

subjects require proclisis. But see below an important reason to argue that quantified subjects are as external as specific subjects.

[7] Note that another difference between the authors concerns the difference in the position of the subject, and eventually of the verb, between enclitic and proclitic constructions, or between configurations with clitics and configurations without clitics. For Madeira, for instance, subjects are in Spec/CP in enclitic constructions, but are in Spec/IP in proclitic constructions.

[8] This fact was already noted by Galves (1994) for BP. See next section for the implications for this language.

[9] Again, this claim must be qualified. Enclisis appears in BP formal registers. But it can be shown that its distribution is not grammatically but lexically and stylistically governed (cf. Galves 1997).

[10] Furthermore, clitic clusters never occur, not even in written language.

[11] Sentences 20 b, c, e, are drawn from the NURC (Norma Urbana Culta) corpus.

[12] Duarte (1987) claims that a sentence like (22) is quite uninterpretable for a Portuguese speaker, since the only available interpretation is the one in which the clock intentionally broke its hand !

[13] This claim has to do, as long as PF is concerned, with the hypothesis that words enter the derivation already inflected so that Agr has no phonetic features.

[14] It must be emphasized that the agreement relation associated with this feature is independent of the morphological agreement which depends on  $\phi$ -features checking.

[15] Person was already proposed as a category projecting by its own in the context of the splitting of Agr (cf. for instance Bianchi and Figueiredo 1994, based on Schlosky 1989).

[16] As for why they move overtly, I'll suggest that that it is due to a constraint of morphological identity on the outputs of the computation which forces PF and LF to be made of the same words. If a clitic adjoined to a verb after Spell-out, it would form a word with the verb at LF, but not at PF.

[17] Benincà e Cinque also observe that in some languages, enclisis yields accentual modifications of the word, but this doesn't seem to occur with proclisis..

[18] This is not an obvious claim (see Kayne 1991). But given the impossibility of inserting something between a clitic and a verb in Modern Romance languages, it seems to me that the burden of the proof must be on the hypothesis that they occupy two distinct heads, which implies that there is a maximal projection boundary between them.

[19] Benincà (op. cit. p. 242) says that "in the medieval Romance languages ( and in EP) complement clitics are enclitic to the inflected verb iff the specifier of the CP projection is empty". Galves (op.cit. p.236) formulates the distribution of enclisis and proclisis in the following terms: "a) Proclisis is obligatory whenever there is an XP in Spec/Comp licensed by a Spec/head relation at PF with an operator in Comp. b) Enclisis is obligatory whenever a) does not apply."

[20] This analysis accounts for the difference in clitic-placement in Italian and French infinitival sentence in the following way. It was argued by Belletti that verbs move to AgrS in Italian, in contrast with French, in which, as argued by Pollock, the verb remains in a lower functional category, let us say Tense. In our terms, AgrS is Person. If we now assume that it is a common property to French and Italian that in Infinitival sentences Agr is not associated with Person but with Tense, the verb adjoins to a head endowed with Agr in French (Tense), yielding proclisis, but it adjoins to a head which does not contain Agr in Italian (Person), yielding enclisis.

[21] This parametrization concerns matrix sentences. In embedded sentences, the values +V and +Agr for Comp can be incompatible with properties of these clauses : the presence of a lexical

complementizer and sub-categorization features. This explains the asymmetries observed in V2 languages as well as in EP.

[22] The facts presented above however show that clitics are licensed in a lower position. In Galves (1997), I argue that AgrO is strong in BP. In the framework adopted here, this can be expressed in terms of the assignment of an Agr-feature to *v*. This feature licenses the first and second person clitics as well as object tonic pronouns and null objects.

[23] It must be recalled, however, that CIP is not phenomenologically a V2 language, in the sense that the verb is not obligatorily the second element of the clause. V1 sequences are frequent in texts, either because the subject is null, or because the lexical subject follows the verb, without any phrase in the preverbal position. Moreover, as we have seen above, even V2 sequences can be analyzed as Verb-first, with the first phrase outside CP. This is arguably a consequence of the fact that CIP is a pro-drop language.

[24] It is outside the scope of this paper to discuss the V2 order optionally found in EP with WH and focalized phrases.

[25] Zubizarreta (1982) explained the absence of ‘that-t effects’ in EP, which is a language which does not display free inversion, by positing an abstract *que > qui* rule. Following Rizzi (1990), this rule can be interpreted as the reflex of Agr in Comp. Galves (1992a) gives further evidence for this analysis on the basis of other aspects of EP syntax.

[26] Note that this analysis suggests that the  $\phi$ -features of the verb are interpretable in EP, contrary with Chomsky's claim that they never are. I won't address here the question of how null subjects are licensed, but it seems natural to admit that in languages in which the licensing of pro is dependent on the verbal morphology, the  $\phi$ -features of the verb are interpretable. In the framework proposed here, in which weak pronouns are interpretable  $\phi$ -features, this amounts to assigning a pronominal nature to the verbal agreement of pro-drop languages. cf. note 25.

[27] It will be argued below that the same option is available in BP.

[28] In contrast with what was claimed above about EP, the assumption here is that the  $\phi$ -features of the verb are non interpretable in BP. We'll see below that this assumption is crucial to explain another kind of topic-oriented construction. The fact that BP is a null subject language is not contradictory with this claim, since both the impoverishment of the verbal morphology and the constraints on the distribution of null subjects in this language (cf. Figueiredo Silva 1994) suggest that they are not identified by the verbal morphology. The consequences of the analysis proposed here for the licensing of null subjects in BP are beyond the scope of this text.

[29] The subscript indices represent the chains formed by movement.

[30] This analysis raises complex theoretical issues concerning the status of strong features that I will not address here. It is sufficient to point out that it does not enter in contradiction with what has been assumed in this article about Agr.