Syntax and Morphology in the Placement of Clitics
in European and Brazilian Portuguese♦

Charlotte Galves (UNICAMP)
Ilza Ribeiro (UFBa)
Maria Aparecida Torres Moraes(USP)

0.   Introduction

This article proposes an analysis of clitic placement in European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese (henceforth, respectively EP and BP), from a comparative perspective. In the first part of the article, we use as a comparative corpus the original text of Paulo Coelho's novel *O Alquimista* and the adapted version of the Portuguese edition in order to illustrate the differences between the two varieties of Portuguese.

The second part of the article presents a review of some recent proposals dealing with enclisis in tensed clauses in EP and of the few studies that explicitly raise the question of the difference between BP and EP clitic-placement.

In the third part we present a new comparative analysis for EP and BP clitic-placement. Our proposal is that the different behavior of clitics in EP and BP follows from the interaction of two different properties: i) a syntactic property: EP clitics are Infl-clitics and BP clitics are V-clitics. This analysis allows us to tighten the correlation between the placement of clitics in BP with the reduction of the paradigm of the accusative/dative clitics. We adopt Galves's (2002) idea that a pure accusative marking that is structural requires an Agreement node. Since Infl no longer contains Agr in BP, the only alternative left is the inherent case marking/checking of the clitic by the verb; ii) a morpho-phonological property: EP clitics, but not BP clitics, are required to be in a non-initial position with respect to some boundary. This part of the analysis is based in great part on Galves and Sândalo (2004) who consider clitics as phrasal affixes that are subject to word formation rules like any other affixes. This line of thinking is very much in accordance with recent proposals in the framework of Distributive Morphology.

Finally, in the fourth part of this article, we argue that our analysis is preferable to others for both empirical and theoretical reasons. We show that it is able to explain EP clitic-placement in both tensed and infinitival clauses and to account for the variation observed in some contexts. We also bring historical data into the discussion, which we argue can be harmoniously integrated into our explanation of the synchronic facts.

I.   Clitic placement in EP and BP: a comparative description

To illustrate the differences in clitic placement between EP and BP we shall use as a comparative corpus the original text of Paulo Coelho's novel *O Alquimista* and

the adapted version of the Portuguese edition[1]. In the remainder of this section, we shall refer to the sentences of the original text as BP and to the revised sentences of the adapted version as EP[2].

1. The contexts for obligatory enclisis in EP

As it is well-known, EP is characterized by the fact that enclisis is obligatory in certain finite contexts. We can divide these contexts into two main classes, according to the position of the verb in the clause. We shall thus distinguish V1 and V2 contexts[3].

1.1 *V1 contexts*

V1 contexts are the ones in which either there is no phrase at all preceding the finite verb inside the sentence (absolute V1) or the preceding material is not grammatically connected to the verb. This is the case at the left boundary of parentheticals, or just after parentheticals, or in coordinates not introduced by a connector. In all these cases, we find proclisis, with few exceptions, in BP, and enclisis without exception in EP.

It is worth noting that proclisis in absolute V1 contexts is one of the great innovations of BP syntax, since no examples of this placement are found in the history of European Portuguese (cf. Martins 1994, for Old Portuguese; and Galves, Britto and Paixão de Sousa 2005, for Classical Portuguese)[4].

(1) a. **Me   chamo** Fátima – disse a   moça... (BP)
        CL1sg call   Fatima said the girl
    b. **Chamo-me**   Fátima – disse a   moça... (EP)
        Call CL1sg Fatima said the girl
        'My name is Fátima said the maid...'

(2) a. Não   procurem entrar na vida do oásis,   concluiu,
        not   seek   enter   in-the life of-the oasis concluded
        se   afastando. (BP)
        CL3sg   going away

---

[1] Respectively, COELHO, Paulo. (1990). *O Alquimista*. 56ª. edição. Rocco, Rio de Janeiro. 248pp., and COELHO, Paulo. (1999). *O Alquimista*. 11ª reimpressão, Pergaminho, Lisboa, 224pp. Section I is based on Torres Moraes and Ribeiro (2005).

[2] We are aware that these sentences do not provide an exhaustive description of all the acceptable cases of clitic-placement in EP. But they are sufficient for our purposes, since they clearly illustrate the fundamental differences between BP and EP syntax. In Section IV, we discuss additional variation data.

[3] This distinction is not relevant from the point of view of BP, but it makes sense for EP and for historical Portuguese, cf. Section IV.

[4] In the examples, the verb and the clitic are in boldface and the part of the sentence that is relevant for clitic-placement is underlined.

b. Não procurem entrar na vida do   oásis, concluiu,
   not   seek   enter   in-the life of-the oasis   concluded
   afastando-se. (EP)
   going away CL3sg
   'Do not seek to come into the life of the oasis, he concludes, going away.'

(3) a. Tem sonhos, **se   emociona**,   e está apaixonado...(BP)
       Has dreams CL3sg gets emotional and is   in love
    b. Tem sonhos, **emociona-   se**,   e está apaixonado...(EP)
       Has dreams gets emotional CL3sg   and is   in love
       'He has dreams, gets emotional and is in love …'

The same variation is found in Coordinate clauses in which the verb immediately follows the coordination conjunction "e", *and*, or "mas", *but*:

(4) a. Depois   apanhou as duas pedras no   chão
       Afterwards   took   the two stones from-the earth
       e **as   recolocou** no   alforje. (BP)
       and CL3pl put back   in-the   bag
    b. Depois   apanhou as duas pedras no   chão
       Afterwards   took   the two stones from-the earth
       e **recolocou-as**   no   alforje. (EP)
       and put back CL3pl in-the   bag
       'And afterwards he took the two stones from the earth and put them back in the bag.'

(5) a. <u>Mas</u> **me   sinto**   feliz ... (BP)
       But   CL1sg feel   happy
    b. <u>Mas</u> **sinto-me**   feliz …
       But   feel CL1sg   happy (EP)
       'But I feel happy …'

1.2 *V≥2 contexts*

Enclisis is categorical in V2 contexts in EP in root affirmative clauses unless the verb is in the scope of some focalized or quantified phrase[5] or adverbs of certain classes. The pre-verbal phrase can be the subject of the verb or some other fronted phrase, PP or adverb. Accordingly, we systematically find enclisis in these cases in the Portuguese version, when the original text is proclitic.

(6) a. <u>Ele</u> **me   parece** mais velho e   mais sábio. (BP)
       He CL1sg seems   more old   and more wise
    b. <u>Ele</u> **parece-me**   mais velho e   mais sábio. (EP)
       He seems CL1sg   more old   and more wise

---

[5] For the exact characterization of the kind of quantifiers which require proclisis, see Martins (1992) and Duarte (2003).

'He seems to me older and wiser.'

(7) a.   quando ele   era criança, <u>seu</u> <u>avô</u>   **lhe**   **dissera** ... (BP)
          when   he   was child   his grand-father CL3sg said
      b.   quando era   criança, <u>o   avô</u>   **dissera-lhe...** (EP)
          when   was   child   the grand-father said   CL3sg
          'when he was a child, his grand-father told him...'

(8) a.   <u>E</u>   <u>de</u> <u>repente</u>, **me**   **pegava** pelas   mãos... (BP)
          And   of suddenly CL1sg took   by-the hands
      b.   <u>E</u>   <u>de</u> <u>repente</u>, **pegava-me**   nas   mãos... (EP)
          And   of suddenly took   CL1sg by-the hands
          'And suddenly, he took me by the hands....'

(9) a.   <u>Depois</u>   **me**   **ensinou** coisas belas... (BP)
          Afterwards   CL1sg taught   things   beautiful
      b.   <u>Depois</u>   **ensinaste-me**   coisas belas... (PE)
          Afterwards   taught CL1sg   things   beautiful
          'Afterwards you taught me beautiful things...'

1.3 *Variation in BP*

Enclisis is also found in these contexts in BP. This reflects the written norm, which is specially strong in the absolute first position since proclisis in this position is an innovation of BP[6], not yet recognized as a legitimate construction. We also find some variation in V2 contexts, after subjects, PPs and adverbs, as well as in V1 coordinate clauses. We interpret this variation as the effect of grammar competition, in the sense of Kroch (2001). This means that, although they occur in the original Brazilian version of the text, the following sentences are not produced by the BP grammar, but correspond to pieces of other grammars, learned by the speakers by means of a special training:

(10) **Procurei- o**   a   manhã   inteira, disse. (BP-EP)
      Looked for CL3sg the morning whole   said
      'I have looked for him during the morning, he said.'

---

[6] But, as Coelho's style is very close to the Brazilian colloquial speech, such a variation is relatively marginal. In other kinds of written texts, we find much less proclisis in V1 contexts. Cf. Duarte, Matos and Gonçalves (2002), who report that in 37 occurrences of V1 sentences, they only find 4 cases of proclisis. They also comment that in imperative sentences, they only find enclisis. Example (i) shows proclisis in this context in Coelho's novel

(i)   Me devolva o livro, disse.
      CL 1sg give back the book, said
      'Give me the book back, he said'

(11) O   velho folheou o   livro, e **distraiu-   se** (BP-EP)
      The old   leafed   the book and distracted   CL3sg
      'The old man leafed through the book.'

(12) <u>No</u>   <u>dia</u> <u>seguinte</u> **deu- lhe**   uma   bolsa ...(BP-EP)
      In-the   day after   gave CL3sg   a   bag
      'The day after, he gave him a bag ….'

(13) <u>Depois,</u>   **virou- se**   para   o   rapaz. (BP-EP)
      Afterwards   turned CL3sg to   the boy
      'Afterwards he turned to the boy.'

(14) <u>O</u>   <u>coração</u>   **contou-lhe**   pela   primeira   vez
      The   heart   told CL3sg for-the   first   time
      suas   grandes   qualidades. (BP-EP)
      his   great   qualities
      'His heart told him for the first time his great qualities.'

It is interesting to note that the variation observed in (6)-(9) vs. (10)-(14) is also found in Classical Portuguese (see Section IV). This raises the question of whether the competition found in BP written texts is a competition with the EP grammar or with the Classical grammar or both. We won't go further into this issue in this paper.

2 Clitic placement in verbal clusters

As already mentioned by Teyssier (1976), one important aspect of the difference between EP and BP clitic-placement concerns the position of the clitic in verbal sequences. Two main cases should be considered:

2.1 *Auxiliary+participle*

In many cases, it seems, at a first glance, that the only difference has to do with hyphenization.

(15) a. E   **tinham se   entendido**   perfeitamente. (BP)
          And   had   CL3sg   understood   perfectly
      b. E   **tinham-se   entendido**   perfeitamente. (EP)
          And   had   CL3sg   understood   perfectly
          'And they had understood each other perfectly.'

But a closer look shows that things are more complicated than they seem. First, the absence of hyphen is not a general rule of the Brazilian orthography, since it is found in many other cases when the clitic is post-verbal. Second, we saw above that the general tendency of BP, which is clearly represented in the Brazilian text,

is not enclisis but proclisis. So we can interpret the superficial order AUX CL V not as the reflex of the encliticization of the pronoun to AUX, as in the Portuguese version, but as deriving from its procliticization to V. This is yet another Brazilian innovation with respect to Classical Portuguese which, like EP, does not allow the clitic to attach to participles (cf. Pagotto (1992) and Cyrino (1994) for the evolution of this construction in BP). In EP, by contrast, we have additional evidence that the clitic is enclitic to the auxiliary in examples in which a preposition appears before the verb:

(16) a.   E   você **está me**   **guiando** em silêncio... (BP)
            And you is CL1sg leading   in silence
      b.   O   senhor **está-me**   **a guiar** em silêncio… (EP)
            The sir   is CL1sg to lead in silence
            'You are leading me in silence ...'

Additionally, when some pre-verbal element prevents enclisis, we see that the clitic changes its position in EP, while it remains at the same place in BP.

(17) a.   <u>Como</u> **tinha se**   **comportado** de maneira correta... (BP)
            As   had Cl3sg behaved   of manner correct
      b.   <u>Como</u> **se**   **tinha comportado** de   maneira correcta...(EP)
            As   Cl3sg had behaved   of   manner correct
            'As he had behaved correctly ...'

(18) a.   e   da   praça   <u>onde</u>
            and of-the   square   where
            haviam se   **encontrado** um   dia; (PB)
            had Cl3sg met   one   day
      b.   e   da   praça   <u>onde</u>
            and of-the   square   where
            se   **tinham encontrado** um   dia; (EP)
            Cl3sg had   met   one   day
            'and of the square where they had met one day'

(19) a.   <u>Cada</u> <u>vez </u><u>mais</u> a   Lenda Pessoal **vai**   **se**
            Each time   more the Legend Personal goes CL3sg
            tornando a   verdadeira razão   de viver ...(BP)
            becoming the true   reason for living
      b.   <u>Cada</u> <u>vez</u> <u>mais</u>   a   Lenda Pessoal **se**   **vai**
            Each time more the Legend Personal CL3sg   goes
            tornando a   verdadeira razão   de viver...(EP)
            becoming the true   reason   for living
            'More and more the Personal Legend is becoming the true reason for living...'

(17)-(19) show that clitic-placement in BP is not sensitive to the presence of subordinators like "como" (*as*) and "onde" (*where*) , or quantified expressions like "cada vez mais" (*more and more*) which yield proclisis to the inflected verb in EP. In BP, the pronoun keeps attached to the thematic verb, independently of what happens in the left periphery of the clause[7].

2.2 *Infinitival clauses*

When the nonfinite form of the verbal cluster is infinitival, the general rule of proclisis to the thematic verb continues to apply in BP. In EP, the clitic can be either enclitic to the infinitival verb (20-21) or adjoined to the inflected verb (22-23). In the latter case, its being enclitic or proclitic follows from the general rule for tensed clauses. Like in other Romance languages, clitic-climbing to the inflected verb is dependent on the class of this verb. But it is not obligatory (see the contrast between 20b and 22b, with the verb "querer" –*to want*- or between 21b and 23b with the verb "ir" –*to be going to*-)[8]. If the inflected verb does not allow restructuring, the clitic invariably remains enclitic to the infinitive. Again, in BP, the typical position for the clitic in this context is proclisis to the thematic verb, which is not available in EP. As in the case of the participles and gerunds above, the position of the clitic is completely independent of the kind of elements which precedes the verb and the class of the verb itself.

(20) a.   Entretanto, **quero lhe   pedir**   um   favor. (BP)
            However   want CL2sg   ask   one   favor
      b.   Entretanto, **quero pedir-te**   um   favor. (PE)
            However   want   ask   CL2sg   one   favor
            'However, I want to ask you a favor.'

(21) a.   As   ovelhas também **vão   se   acostumar**... (BP)
            The   sheep   also   go Cl3sg accustom
      b.   As   ovelhas também **vão   acostumar- se**... (EP)
            The   sheep   also   go   accustom Cl3sg
            'The sheep will also become accustomed...'

(22) a.   Por que **quis me   ver**? – disse o   rapaz. (BP)
            Why   want CL1sg see   -said   the boy
      b.   Por que **me   quis ver**? – disse o   rapaz. (EP)
            Why   CL1sg want see   -said   the boy
            'Why did you want to see me, asked the boy.'

[7] This important fact of the Brazilian syntax had already been acknowledged by many researchers as one of the most salient properties of the Brazilian syntax, among others Teyssier (1976), and in the Generative framework, Figueiredo Silva (1990), Abaurre e Galves (1996), Galves (2002). Cf. also, from a diachronic point of view, Pagotto (1992), and Cyrino (1994).
[8] For an analysis of clitic climbing in EP, see Martins (2000).

(23) a. E   quando ela **foi   me   mostrar** o   local   exato...(BP)
     And when   she going CL1sg show   the location exact
   b. E   quando ela **me   foi   mostrar** o   local exato... (EP)
     And when   she CL1sg going to show   the location exact
     'And when she was going to show the exact location...'

3. The case of prepositional clauses

The case of prepositional clauses is the one in which we find less apparent difference between EP and BP. This is due to the fact that in this context we find a great variation in both EP and BP. We see proclisis and enclisis with "para" (*to*) in both variants (24 and 25), and enclisis and proclisis with "de" (*to, of*) in EP (26b and 27b.). BP has enclisis and proclisis with "a" (*to*) (28a. and 29a.). In BP, this is the context which favors enclisis, in particular when the pronoun is the third person accusative clitic "o/a" (*it/him/her*). In the examples below, we see several cases in which the Portuguese translator leaves the clitic where it is in the original. The changes occur with the preposition "de" (enclisis>proclisis, ex.26b.) (but enclisis is maintained with "gostar de" -*to like*-, ex. 27b.), the preposition "a"[9] (proclisis>enclisis, ex. 29b.), and when the negation intervenes between the preposition and the verb (enclisis>proclisis, ex. 30b.).

(24) a. ...o   único conselho que eu   tenho para **lhe   dar**... (BP)
     ...the only advice   that I   have to CL2sg give
   b . ...o   único conselho que   tenho para **te   dar...** (EP)
     ...the only advice   that   have to CL2sg give
       'For this is the only advice that I have to give you...'

(25) a. Porque   meu amigo viajou muitos meses
     Because   my   friend traveled many   months
     para **encontrá- lo**   - disse o   rapaz.(BP)
     to encounter CL3sg - said   the boy
   b. Porque   o meu amigo viajou   muitos meses
     Because the my   friend traveled many   months
     para **encontrá- lo**   -disse o   rapaz. (EP)
     to encounter CL3sg -said the boy
     'Because my friend traveled many months to
     encounter him – said the boy.'

(26)a. ...depois de **lembrar -se**   do   mercador de cristais; (BP)
      after of remember Cl3sg   of-the dealer   of crystals
   b....depois de **se   lembrar** do   mercador de   cristais; (EP)
      after of CL3sg   remember of-the dealer   of crystals
      'after remembering the dealer in crystals;'

---

[9] In EP, the preposition "a" invariably requires enclisis; cf. Section IV.

(27) a   ...gostaria <u>de</u> **contar-lhe**   uma   pequena   história. (BP)
        ...like   of   tell   Cl2sg   a   little   story
    b. ...gostaria <u>de</u> **contar-te**   uma   pequena   história. (EP)
        like   of   tell   CL2sg   a   little   story
        'But first, however, I would like to tell you a little story.'

(28) a.   …quando o   dono   do   armazém   começou
        when   the owner of-the   warehouse   began
        <u>a</u>   **chamá-los**... (BP)
        to   call   CL3pl
    b. ...quando o   dono   do   entreposto   começou
        when the owner   of-the   warehouse   began
        <u>a</u>   **chamá-los**... (EP)
        to   call   CL3pl
        'When the owner of the warehouse began to call them...'

(29) a.   Começou <u>a</u> **lhe**   **contar** as coisas... (BP)
        began   to CL3sg tell   the things
    b.   Começou <u>a</u> **contar-lhe**   as   coisas .... (EP)
        began   to tell   CL3sg   the   things
        'he began to tell him things'

(30) a.   …<u>para</u> **não** **sentir-se**   humilhado... (BP)
        to   not   feel   CL3sg humiliated
    b.   ...<u>para</u> **não**   **se**   **sentir** humilhado... (EP)
        to   not   CL3sg feel   humilated
        'in order not to feel humiliated with his own ignorance...'

Again, we have evidence that the variation between enclisis and proclisis in this context in BP is a matter of grammar competition. Enclisis results from late acquisition in both tensed and infinitival sentences, and it is favoured by the clitic "o/a", which also originates in late acquisition.

As for the alternation enclisis/proclisis in EP infinitival clauses, apart from few exceptions, it has not been integrated into the discussion of clitic placement in Portuguese since it poses a challenge for any theory of clitics. Below we shall propose an alternative analysis to the analysis proposed by Duarte, Matos and Gonçalves (2002). We return to this matter in Section IV.

4. The 3rd person clitics in BP

Beyond the differences in placement, it is well-known that EP and BP differ in their use of clitics (cf. Galves 2001a, Monteiro 1992, Abaurre and Galves 1996, Kato 1999, Raposo 1999 among others). In particular, third person clitics have been argued to no longer belong to the BP paradigm (cf. Correa 1991, Galves

2002, among others). In written texts, we do find both the accusative and the dative 3rd person clitics "o" (*it/him/her*) and "lhe" (*to it/him/her*). But, when we compare the BP and the EP version of *O Alquimista*, there is evidence that the former tends to avoid the use of these forms, in accordance with what we find in spoken language.

4.1 *Null objects*

In many cases, a 3rd person clitic in the Portuguese version corresponds to a null argument in the Brazilian counterpart[10]. (31)-(32) show null accusative arguments, and (33)-(34) show null dative arguments. Note that the EP version of (34) contains a possessive dative clitic, which is completely absent from spoken BP.

accusative

(31) a. O   rapaz   **acordou**   -- uma   a   uma   (BP) (as ovelhas)
          The   boy   woke up   -- one   by   one   (the sheep)
      b. O   rapaz   **acordou- as**   uma   a   uma
          The boy   woke up CL3pl   one   by   one (the sheep) (EP)
          'The boy woke them up one by one'

(32) a. **Envolveu-as**   num   lenço
          wrapped   CL3pl   in-a   handkerchief
          e   tornou   a   **colocar** --   no   bolso. (BP)(as pedras)
          and   turned   to   put   --   in-a   pocket   (the stones)
      b. **Envolveu-as**   num   lenço   e   tornou
          wrapped Cl3pl   in-the   handkerchief   and   turned
          a   **colocá-las**   no   bolso. (EP)
          to   put   CL3pl   in-the   pocket   (the stones)
          'He wrapped them up in a handkerchief and put them
          back in his pocket.'

dative 3rd person

(33) a. Um certo   amigo   **tinha**-- indicado   a   loja... (BP)
          A   certain   friend   had   referred   the   store
      b. Um certo   amigo   **tinha-lhe**   indicado   a   loja... (PE)
          A   certain   friend   had CL3sg   referred   the   store
          'A certain friend had referred him to the store...' -

(34) a. a   velha   **segurava suas**   mãos. (BP)
          the   old   held   his   hands
      b. a   velha   **segurava-lhe**   as   mãos. (EP)
          the   old   held   CL3sg(poss)   the   hands
          'The old lady held his hands.'

---

[10] Null objects do exist in EP, but they are more constrained than in BP (Cf. Raposo, 1986).

4.2 *Repetition of the referential noun*

We also find cases in which the EP clitic corresponds to a repetition of an argument in two successive sentences or in a coordinated clause.

(35) a. Então   começaram a   bater **no**   **rapaz**.
              then   began   to beat in-the   boy.
              Espancaram   **o**   **rapaz**...(BP)
              Beat   the boy
      b. Então   começaram a   bater   **no**   **rapaz**.
              Then   began   to beat   in-the boy.
              Espancaram-**no**...   (EP)
              Beat   CL3sg
              'Then they began to beat the boy. They beat on the
              boy/him…'

4.3 *Use of strong pronouns*

Another strategy to avoid clitics in BP is the use of strong pronouns. We see in the examples below that the dative clitics "lhe" (*to it/him/her/you*), "te" (*to you*), "nos" (*to us*), "a" (*her*) correspond in the EP sentences to the pronouns "ele" (*it/him*) or "você" (*you*) governed by the prepositions "para" or "a" (*to*)[11].

(36) a. Vamos,   **pergunta a**   **ela**! (BP)
          Come on ask   to   her
      b. Vamos,   **pergunta-lhe**!   (EP)
          Come on ask   CL3sg
          'Come on, ask her!'

(37) a. Para **mostrar a você** uma simples lei do   mundo (PB)
          To   show   to you a   simple law of-the   world
      b. Para **te**   **mostrar** uma simples lei do   mundo (PE)
          To   CL2sg show a   simple law of-the   world
          'In order to show you a simple rule of the world'

(38) a. ...mas na   verdade **estão**   **ensinando a** **você**... (BP)
           but in-the   truth   are   teaching   to you
      b. ...mas na   verdade **estão**   **a**   **ensinar-nos**... (EP)
           but in-the   truth   are   to   teach   CL1pl
          'but, in truth, they are teaching us...'

(39) a. ... quando olho   suas areias **contemplo** também

---

[11] It must be noted that "para" is the natural way to express dative with ditransitive verbs in the spoken language in PB. (Cf. Torres Moraes and Berlinck 2005)

		…when	look	her	sand	contemplate	also
		a	**ela**.	(BP)			
		to	her.				

b. ...quando olho as tuas areias
…when look the your sand
contemplo- a também (EP)
contemplate CL3sg also
'… when I look at your sand I contemplate her also'

The preposition in (39a) allows the writer to avoid the use of the tonic pronoun in direct object position. This is very frequent in speech but stigmatized by the written norm. The Portuguese version keeps the accusative clitic, since the verb is transitive. We shall see in the next section that the variation in BP between dative and accusative can be observed also in the use of the clitics.

4.4 *2nd person lhe*

4.4 *2nd person lhe*

In BP, the clitic pronoun *lhe* tends to disappear as a third person pronoun, and is normally used to refer to the second person of the discourse, corresponding to the address form "você" (*you*). This is illustrated by the sentences below where "lhe" is systematically translated in EP by the second person pronoun "te":

(40) a. Exatamente como seu avô **lhe** **ensinou**. (BP)
Just like his grandfather Cl2sg taught
b. Exactamente como o teu avô **te** **ensinou**. (EP)
Just like the your grandfather CL2sg taught
'Just like your grandfather taught you'

(41) a. Entretanto, quero **lhe** **pedir** um favor. (BP)
However want CL2sg ask a favor
b. Entretanto, quero **pedir-te** um favor. (EP)
However want ask CL2sg a favor
'However, I want to ask you a favor.'

In its canonical use, "lhe" differs from "te" in that it is only dative, while "te", like "me" can be either dative or accusative. But in colloquial speech, we can find *lhe* as the direct object of a transitive verb. In the following examples, it is interesting to note that accusative "lhe" can correspond both to the 2nd person of the discourse, translated by "te" and the 3rd person translated by "a/o".

(42) a. Lá você encontrará um tesouro
There you find a treasure
que **lhe** **fará** rico. (BP)
that CL2sg make rich
b. Lá encontrarás um tesouro

There	find	a	treasure
que	**te**	**fará**	rico. (EP)
that	Cl2sg	make	rich

'There you will find a treasure that will make you rich.'

(43) a. ...mas aquilo **lhe**   **deixou** sobressaltado. (BP)
              ...but   it   CL3sg left   startled
         b. ...mas aquilo **deixou-o**   sobressaltado. (EP)
              ...but   it   left   CL3sg startled

'… but it still left him startled.'

In conclusion, the comparison between the original version of *O Alquimista* and its adaptation to EP interestingly confirms many grammatical aspects that had been already described for the two variants independently, on the basis of other corpora or the intuition of native speakers.

II. Main analyses in the recent literature

1.   Enclisis in tensed sentences in EP

Enclisis in tensed sentences in EP has been described and analyzed in many papers since the eighties. It is outside the scope of this paper to fully review the great number of analyses made. We shall only bring here some of the recent proposals, which we shall divide in three great groups, according to the theory of enclisis they put forward[12].

1.1 *The syntactic computation only generates proclisis.*

From this point of view, enclisis is the result of a special operation, which is sensitive to morpho-phonological properties of the categories involved. This operation can still be syntactic, as in Raposo (2000), or post-syntactic, as in Barbosa (1991, 1993) and Costa & Martins (2003).

Raposo (2000)

---

[12] All the analyses presented here can be characterized as a 2nd generation of analyses of clitic-placement in the sense that they do not assign to Syntax the unique responsibility of the respective order between the verb and the clitic. The purely syntactic analyses were essentially based on Kayne's (1991) proposal that adjunction to a head is invariably to its left. From this point of view, if the clitic raises to the category hosting the verb, the result will be invariably proclisis, while enclisis will not be derived unless the verb is attracted to a higher position. Alternatively, the clitic can raise first and the verb adjoins to its left, yielding enclisis. Both proposals were made to derive the characteristic enclisis of EP.

Raposo, based on Uriagereka (1995), assumes the existence of a category higher than Infl and lower than C, called F. According to his analysis, the crucial property of F in EP is that it is enclitic; as a consequence, when nothing lies on its left, the verb must raise to Spec/F, to provide F with a phonological host. According to this analysis, "Verb movement to Spec-F is a Last Resort operation that applies to satisfy PF properties of the functional category" (Op. cit. p. 280). It is the movement of the verb to a position higher than the one occupied by the clitic that creates the order V-CL[13].

In order for this analysis to account for the distribution of enclisis in EP, as described in Section I, it is necessary to claim that when some phrase is on the left of the verb, and enclisis is required, this is due to the fact that this phrase is not in a position which counts as a possible host for F. This is straightforward for the fronted NPs, PPs and adverbs, but it needs a special claim for pre-verbal subjects. Following several papers by Pilar Barbosa, Raposo assumes that pre-verbal subjects occupy a peripheral position in EP, namely spec/Top.

Barbosa (1991, 1993)

According to Barbosa, there is a phonological restriction active in EP which blocks non-stressed elements at the left edge of the Intonational Phrase. In the line of works like Salvi (1990), and Benincà (1995), she thus attributes the obligatory enclisis in certain contexts in EP from the application of the so-called Tobler-Mussafia Law, which bans unstressed words at the absolute beginning of sentences. Barbosa (1991,1993) assigns to the morphological component the task of inverting the order between the verb and the clitic, in the framework of Distributed Morphology.

Again, the question of why enclisis is obligatory even when a subject precedes the verb needs special attention. Barbosa, following the analysis of the position of subjects in null subject languages, argues that pre-verbal subjects in EP do not occupy a position internal to the clause, but are dislocated, like topics. According to this line of argumentation, the A-position for subjects in NSLs is the post-verbal position and pre-verbal subjects occupy a A' -position.

Costa and Martins (2003)

Costa and Martins propose that the clause contains a functional head called Σ, similar to Raposo's F in that it is intermediary between Infl and C. According to them, this functional category is morphologically strong in EP. If no phrase raises to its specifier, it must be licensed by morphological merger or V-raising. Since, according to the authors, there is no evidence of V-raising to Σ in EP, the only possibility is merger, which is a morphological operation that puts together Σ and the verb. But since this operation requires adjacency between the elements to be merged, pre-verbal clitics block it. Thus, inversion must apply in order for the

---

[13] As for proclisis, it is produced when V and CL occupy the same head, either F or Infl.

merger operation to be possible. As in Raposo (2000), this operation is characterized as a Last Resort process.

All these analyses share crucial properties, which can be summarized as follows: (i) the property that provokes enclisis is not syntactic but morphological or phonological; (ii) the order V-CL is created by a late syntactic or a post-syntactic process that rearranges the order produced by the syntactic component in such a way that the phonological or morphological property involved is satisfied; (iii) the special feature that is responsible for this rearrangement, and, ultimately, accounts for the difference between EP and the other Romance languages, is not on the clitic but on the category that initiates the clause (F or Σ) or on the left boundary of the Intonational Phrase; (iv) in EP, pre-verbal subjects are peripheral. They occupy the same position as dislocated topics: they are either in Spec/Top or adjoined to the clause.

1.2 *The syntactic component generates enclisis*

An alternative conception of enclisis is proposed by Duarte and Mattos (2000), Frota and Vigário (1996) and Duarte, Matos and Gonçalves (2002). From their point of view, the relationship between syntax and phonology in the derivation of clitic-placement is somehow the reverse of what is proposed in the analyses presented above. In effect, the basic syntactic derivation yields enclisis. Proclisis only occurs in presence of a heavy functional category. Enclisis is thus characterized as the basic, non-marked, pattern of EP clitic-placement.

Enclisis is derived by the movement of the clitic to a functional position and the left adjunction of the verb to the left of the category that hosts the clitic[14]. As for proclisis, it is conditioned by phonological phrasing when heavy functional words c-command and precede the clitic. In this case, the clitic is attracted to a higher position, yielding the order clitic-verb. It is important to note that this attraction is dependent on the phonological phrasing. If the heavy functional head is outside the Intonational Phrase which contains the clitic, it ceases to work as a proclisis trigger.

The above claim allows Frota and Vigário (1996) to explain the variation between enclisis and proclisis when some phrase occurs between the complementizer and the verb[15]. If the functional category which yields proclisis is located inside the Intonational Phrase which contains the clitic, proclisis obtains. If it is outside, enclisis obtains, instead, as illustrated in (44)-(45):

(44) a. Acho [$_{Int P}$ que ao João,

---

[14] This category is Spec/AgrO in Duarte and Matos (2000), and Asp or T, according to the argumental or non-argumental status of the clitic in Duarte, Matos and Gonçalves (2002). The claim that enclisis derives from the movement of the verb to a position already occupied by the clitic is also found in Madeira (1992), Manzini (1994), and Rouveret (1992).

[15] There is some controversy with respect to the restrictions on the occurrence of enclisis in this context. For Frota and Vigário (1996), the pre-verbal phrase must be heavy (cf. Section IV). For Raposo (1994), there is no such restriction.

Think   that   to John
a   Maria   **lhe**   **ofereceu**   um livro.
the Mary   CL3sg offered   a   book

b. Acho que [Int P ao   João,
Think that   to   John
a   Maria   **ofereceu-lhe**   um   livro.
the Mary   offered   CL3sg a   book
'I think that to John, Mary offered to him a book.'

(45) a. Disseram-me   [Int P que   embora   tivesse sido difícil,
Told   CL1sg   that   although has   been dfficult
lhe   **concederam**   a   bolsa.
Cl3sg   gave   the   grant

b. Disseram-me   que [Int P embora   tivesse sido difícil,
Told   CL1sg that   althoug   has   been difficult
concederam-lhe   a   bolsa
gave   CL3sg the grant
'They told me that, although it was difficult, they gave the grant
to him.'

Finally, a question remains to be answered: from this point of view, what prevents enclisis from being derived in the other Romance languages? In other words, what is the special property of EP with respect to these other languages? The answer the authors give is that, in EP, the clitics have entered into a process of reanalysis that confers to them a status of quasi-suffixes. This is the reason why the presence of the clitic on the right of the functional category does not prevent the checking of the inflectional features of the verb. The locus of the difference is therefore no more a property of the clause, as in the analyses presented in 1.2, but a property of the clitics themselves[16].

1.3 *Clitic-placement is not derived at all by syntactic processes.*

Galves and Sândalo (2004), based on Anderson (2000) and Legendre (2000), assume a model of clitic placement in which the position of clitics in the sentence is not defined by syntactic rules but by morphological rules. In this model, clitics are considered as phrasal affixes and, like word affixes, are subject to alignment constraints. The interaction of these constraints is put in optimalistic terms: they are ranked in such a way that the satisfaction of the highest one leads to violations of the lowest one. Galves and Sândalo argue that the complex pattern of clitic

---

[16] An intermediate position is held by Pilar Barbosa in her most recent works (Barbosa, 1996, 2000). She adopts Duarte and Mattos's analysis of enclisis and proposes that when the movement of the verb to Infl (Tense) creates a configuration in which the clitic is at the left edge of the Intonational Phrase, the alternate derivation, with the clitic in a lower position (Asp or AgrO) and the verb adjoined to it, is chosen.

placement in EP simply derives from the interaction of the two following constraints:

Edgemost *(L, I-bar):* a clitic is aligned with the left edge of I-bar
Non-initial *(1 X-bar):* a clitic cannot be the first element of the first X-bar of the clause.

Non-initial being higher ranked than *Edgemost*, the model predicts that we find enclisis every time I-bar is the first X-bar of the clause. It is easy to see that the EP paradigm fits exactly within this prediction, since all the cases of obligatory enclisis are cases in which no functional category is projected above IP (matrix clauses with no operators), and all the cases of obligatory proclisis are the cases in which there is some functional category projected above IP (CP in the case of interrogative and subordinate clauses, some intermediate category like ΣP in the case of focalized or quantified phrase preceding the verb, NegP in negative clauses)[17].

Note, however, that this analysis also articulates a syntactic component and a prosodic component. The syntactic component has to do with the reference to I-bar as the locus of the realization of the clitic, and to X-bar as the domain in which the clitic cannot be initial. The prosodic component concerns the prohibition of the clitic at the initial position of some domain. However this approach differs from the proposals in 1.1 in that the initial position is defined in such a way that it does not require that the verb be in absolute first position in the clause. Namely, if the specifier of IP is filled by a subject, and no category higher than IP is projected, I-bar is still the first X-bar of the clause, and the clitic cannot be initial. This is an important difference with the other approaches that derive enclisis from a prohibition of the clitic in first position, since it does not force one to attribute a peripheral position to the subject. Another important difference regarding the other analyses presented above is that it does not refer to the Intonational Phrase. We come back to both points in Section IV.

2.   The contrast BP/EP

In this section, we shall briefly review the few studies that explicitly raise the question of the difference between BP and EP clitic-placement. They all share the basic idea that what crucially differs in the two variants is the nature of the pronoun itself. They do, however, differ in the way they formulate this idea, and how they articulate the special property of the clitics with the syntax of the language. According to Duarte, Matos and Gonçalves (2002), the reason why BP does not display enclisis like EP is that clitics in the former are no more re-analyzed as quasi suffixes. Interestingly, the loss of this reanalysis is correlated with the general weakening of inflectional morphology in BP, which opens the way to correlating clitic-placement with other syntactic phenomena. However,

[17] Alternatively, Neg could be located in Infl. In this case, its presence would create a context in which the clitic is not in first position. Galves and Sândalo (2004) leave this issue open.

underlying this analysis is the claim that BP evolved from EP, which is problematic. We'll come back to this question in Section IV.

Abaurre and Galves (1996) and Galves (2002) also argue that BP clitic pronouns are somehow stronger than EP clitic pronouns. According to these authors, while EP clitics behave like heads, BP clitics behave like phrases[18]. Additionally, they claim that in BP clitics do not adjoin to Infl, but to V, because of the lack of Agr in Infl. This again draws a correlation between the behavior of clitics and other syntactic phenomena typical of BP.

Costa and Martins (2003) also propose that the difference between EP and BP clitic-placement is that clitics attach to Infl in the former and to V in the latter. According to them, this is why there is no enclisis in BP although they argue that BP shares with EP the property of having a morphologically strong F.

III. A new comparative analysis for EP and BP clitic-placement

In this paper, we shall maintain some of the basic ideas of the previous analyses, but in a slightly different framework. Our proposal is that the different behavior of clitics in EP and BP derives from the interaction of two different properties:

a. The category to which clitics syntactically attach: EP clitics are *Infl-clitics* and BP clitics are *V-clitics*.

b. The phonological requirement that forces clitics to be in a non-initial position with respect to some boundary: This requirement is active in EP but not in BP.

The first part of the analysis will allow us to keep the correlation between the placement of clitics in BP with the loss of the third person accusative clitic. We shall adopt Galves's (2002) idea that accusative marking, which is structural, requires an Agreement node. Since Infl no more contains Agr in BP, the only alternative left is the inherent case marking/checking of the clitic by the verb.

The second part of the analysis is in great part drawn from Galves and Sândalo (2004) who rely on Anderson's (2000) and Legendre's (2000) account of clitic placement. For these authors, clitic placement is not governed by syntax, but by morphology. They consider clitics as phrasal affixes which are subject to word formation rules like any other affixes. This line of thinking is very much similar to the one advocated in Distributed Morphology (cf. for instance Harley and Noyer, 1999). In this framework, the syntactic computation does not manipulate words but roots and features. Words are formed post-syntactically by the general principles of morphology. The difference between the two approaches is that the former works with representations in the framework of Optimality Theory, and the latter is derivational. What mainly interests us here, nevertheless, is that they share the conception of Morphology as a post-syntactic component. This conception has

---

[18] These authors extend to the whole paradigm of BP clitics Uriagereka's (1992) idea that Romance first and second person clitics, which he calls strong clitics, move like phrases.

strong consequences for the analysis of clitic-placement, as already shown by Anderson (2000) and Legendre (2000).

In the remainder of this article, we shall argue that the division of work between Syntax and Morphology allows us to better understand the idiosyncrasies of clitic-placement in both EP and BP. Instead of studying each variety independently, we shall adopt a comparative approach on both levels of analysis.

1.   The syntactic level, or where to attach your clitics

It has been argued that in Romance Languages clitics adjoin to Infl. Leaving aside the question of whether the clitic attaches onto the right or left of the verb, EP displays the basic properties which have been taken as evidence for this claim, mainly the fact that in tensed sentences, clitics always attach to the inflected auxiliary, and never to the gerundive or participial form of the thematic verb. Additionally, EP behaves like other Romance null subject languages in allowing climbing of the clitic up to the inflected verb, as in (46) in constructions with some classes of verbs[19]. The attachment of the clitic to the infinitival form, as in (46b) which varies with (46a), cannot be taken as an argument that the clitic attaches to V, since, following Stowell (1982) it has long been assumed that infinitival clauses can also be projections of Infl.

(46)   a.   <u>Não</u>   **te**   **quero**   ver
               Not   CL2sg   want   see
        b.   <u>Não</u>   quero   **ver-te**
               Not   want   see CL2sg
               ' I don't want to see you'

In both sentences, the clitic is adjoined to Infl, tensed Infl in (46a) and Infinitival Infl in (46b) The difference between (46a) and (46b) simply derives from the restructuring of the clauses, as argued by Rizzi (1982) and others. In (46a), there is only one Infl, the tensed one. These arguments do not apply to the core case of clitic placement in BP. In effect, as we saw above, there is evidence that clitics do not raise to Infl. In any circumstances, they are attached to V. As we showed in Section I, the natural way to utter the sentences above is neither (46a) nor (46b) but (47):

(47)   <u>Não</u>   quero **te**   **ver.**
             Not   want CL2sg   see
             'I don´t want to see you.'

Furthermore, the fact that the clitic is proclitic to the infinitival verb, and not enclitic to the tensed verb is supported by sentences like (48), where an adverb occurs between the auxiliary and the clitic.[20]:

---

[19] See the discussion in Duarte, Matos and Gonçalves (2002) and in Martins (2000).
[20] The example (48) was extracted from the NURC Project. The project *Norma Urbana Culta* was designed in the seventies to describe the language spoken by educated people in

(48)   não   posso   <u>no</u>   <u>momento</u> **lhe**   **dar.**
        not   can   at-the   moment   Cl3sg   give
        'I can't at the moment give it to you.'

(48) could be taken as evidence that clitic placement in infinitival sentences is like in French, i.e., with proclisis to the infinitival verb. But as we have seen above, BP differs from French in having proclisis also to participles and gerunds. (49) clearly shows that the clitic is proclitic to the thematic verb and not enclitic to the auxiliary.

(49)   Estava   <u>sempre</u>   **te**   **vendo**
        Was   always   CL2sg   seeing
        'I was always seeing you'

It is worth emphasizing that this pattern concerns the first and second person clitics. Third person accusative clitics o/a, which are acquired later (cf. Correa 1991) normally follows the Portuguese pattern, i.e., attaches to Infl. (50b) is therefore more natural than (50a)

(50)   a.   *? <u>Não </u>   tinha   **o**   visto
              Not   had   CL3sg   seen
              'I haven´t seen you'
        b.   <u>Não</u> **o**   tinha   visto
              Not   CL3sg   had   seen
              'I haven´t seen you'

The reason why we find (50b) instead of (50a) in BP is not completely clear. It could be that the EP pattern is acquired altogether with the 3rd person pronoun. But alternatively, we can think that the different pattern of placement for the accusative clitic has to do with its morphological features, and the fact that it needs an inflectional head to be licensed. This alternative hypothesis is interesting because it is coherent with the idea that there exists a relationship between the peculiarities of the pronominal paradigm in BP and the category to which clitics attach. As we saw above, the differences between EP and BP concerning the use of clitics cannot be reduced to differences in clitic-placement. It also concerns the pronominal paradigm itself. As we showed in the first section from *O Alquimista,* there is a strong tendency to avoid the third person clitic, and to replace it with null objects, strong pronouns, repetition of a noun phrase, and even with the dative pronoun "lhe".

Taken together, the loss of the third person accusative clitic "o/a" and the use of the third person dative clitic "lhe" for direct objects allow us to understand what happened with the dative/accusative first and second person clitics "me" and "te" and the dative/accusative clitic "se": they have lost their accusative features, and become pure dative forms. This change is not morphologically visible, since the

the five greatest towns of Brazil.

form has always been the same, but it is coherent with what happens at the third person where different case-marking correspond to different forms

This analysis also gives us the key of the peculiar placement of the clitics in BP. As already suggested by Galves (2002), the relationship between the dative marking of the clitics in BP and their invariable attachment to the verb which assigns them their θ-role lies in the notion of inherent case. The clitics are inseparable from their thematic verb because it is the source of their casual licensing. This is compatible with the dative forms but excludes the accusative ones, since Accusative is the structural case by excellence. We shall not go further into why BP clitics are no more Infl clitics. Many researchers have suggested that this is due to the weakening of Infl in this language. We shall adopt this view here and suggest without discussion that Infl in BP lacks the property that structurally licenses clitics, forcing their licensing in association with their θ-marking.

2. *The morphological level, or how to attach your clitics*

As we have seen in Section II, most of the analyses proposed to account for clitic placement have a syntactic basis. Syntactic devices derive one of the two orders, proclisis or enclisis, as the basic order. Following Kayne's (1991) theory of clitics, the adjoined head is located on the left of its host. This derives proclisis if the clitic raises to the category which already hosts the verb, and enclisis if the verb raises to a category which is headed by the clitic.

Here, in the spirit of Galves and Sândalo (2004), we propose a radically different conception of the way clitics surface on their verbal hosts. We assume that clitics are not syntactically autonomous elements, but the morphological spell out of functional features, which, therefore, are subject to word formation rules, as any other affix. The difference is only that clitics are instances of phrasal morphology

This view is compatible with both the Optimality Theory framework, as in Galves and Sândalo (2004) and the Distributed Morphology framework. In the latter, there is a derivational component, in which the functional features corresponding to the clitics move to some category. According to the previous section, this category is Infl in EP and V in BP. The important point is that this movement has no effect on the pre-verbal or post-verbal position of the clitic. It is at the Morphological level that this position will be defined.

As mentioned above, the two constraints considered by Galves and Sândalo (2004) are: (a) *Edgemost*: a clitic is aligned with the left edge of I-bar (b) *Non-initial:* a clitic cannot be the first element of the first X-bar of the clause.

If we assume a derivational component, we can simplify the formulation of *Edgemost*. First, we do not need to mention I-bar, since it is defined on the grounds of syntactic properties. Second, we can assume that the realization of the functional features at the left edge of the I-bar boundary is the default linearization of features adjoined to Infl. *Edgemost* is therefore given for free by the model. The crucial point is *Non-Initial*. If this constraint is active in the morphology of a given language, it forces the realization of the clitic as a suffix on the verb.

Note that given the formulation of *Non-Initial*, enclisis continues to be dependent on the structure of the clause, since it depends on the non-embedding of I-bar in the clause. However, it does not derive from syntactic processes. Another important difference with all the analyses reviewed is that enclisis is not dependent on V1. Given its definition above, *Non-Initial* is not affected by the presence of a subject in the specifier of Infl. This means that we do not need to put the preverbal subject outside the boundaries of IP to derive enclisis. We shall come back to this important point below.

In the next section, we shall discuss the advantages of this analysis, and its empirical superiority over the others.

IV. Discussion

In this section, we shall argue that the analysis we have proposed is preferable to the others for the following reasons: (i) it avoids some empirical and theoretical problems encountered by the other proposals; (ii) it captures new correlations that are not grasped by the others; (iii) it does not discard the results obtained by the others.

1.   Empirical and theoretical problems of the other analyses

1.1 The position of pre-verbal subjects in EP

The first important result we obtain has to do with the position of pre-verbal subjects in EP. We obtain the distribution of enclisis and proclisis in tensed sentences without assigning the pre-verbal subject an external position, contrary to all the analyses reviewed, which depend on the externality of the subject.

The claim that subjects occupy a topic position in EP is problematic from both a synchronic and a diachronic point of view. As for synchrony, we refer the interested reader to Costa (1998, 2000) who brings evidence that subjects and dislocated topics behave differently in EP. As for diachrony, Galves, Britto and Paixão de Sousa (2005) show that enclisis in Classical Portuguese (henceforth ClP) was indeed a V1 phenomenon[21]. 16th and 17th texts instantiate the following pattern:

a)   Enclisis is obligatory when the verb is in absolute first position
b)   Proclisis is obligatory in the same contexts as in EP
c)   In the other cases, there is variation between enclisis and proclisis, the latter being highly dominant

Case c), which crucially differentiates ClP and EP, concerns the case in which enclisis is obligatory nowadays: matrix affirmative clauses in which the verb is

---

[21] Galves, Britto and Paixão de Sousa's (2005) results are based on the *Tycho Brahe Corpus*, freely available at the URL http://www.ime.usp.br/~tycho/corpus

preceded by either a referential subject, an adverb of a certain kind or a preposed phrase. In this case, we find proclisis in 90 to 100% of the cases[22].

This pattern begins to change in the texts of the authors born in the first half of the 18th century, and the change to the modern pattern almost gets to completion in authors born in the middle of the 19th century. The important point is that the change in clitic-placement is accompanied by a change in subject position, as shown by Paixão de Sousa (2004). Paixão de Sousa argues that in ClP, the A-position for subjects was the post-verbal position. From the 18th century on, all the syntactic phenomena associated with this grammar change together. The rate of post-verbal subjects goes from 20% in the 16th/17th centuries to 10% in the 18th/19th centuries. At the same time, we observe that the frequency of pre-verbal subjects with enclisis increases much faster than other pre-verbal phrases with enclisis. Finally, Galves and Paixão de Sousa (2003) observe that in V3 sentences, the sequence XSV-cl, which was absent from the texts in the classical period, becomes frequent in the texts of the authors born in the 18th and 19th centuries. All these observations taken together strongly suggest that in the new grammar, there is a position for pre-verbal subjects, distinct from the position of topics and fronted constituents. This conclusion is consistent with our analysis but not with the ones that need to assign a topic position to pre-verbal subjects in EP.

1.3 *The evolution of BP clitic-placement*

As we saw in Section II, Duarte, Matos and Gonçalves (2002) argue that enclisis in EP is due to the fact that clitics have entered into a process of reanalysis that confers to them a status of quasi-suffixes. Accordingly, they derive proclisis in BP from the loss of this process of reanalysis, which they associate with the general weakening of morphology in BP.

The problem with this analysis is that it implies that BP evolved from EP. This is a very dubious claim. In effect, as we mentioned above, the grammatical change that led to EP appears in texts of authors born in the first half of the 18th century. This change would have to be taken to Brazil by the Portuguese emigrants, and followed by another change, in the opposite direction. Since the phenomena typical of the modern Brazilian syntax begin to appear at the end of the 18th century (cf. Cyrino 1994), this picture seems difficult to sustain. It seems much more realistic to hypothesize that both EP and BP independently evolved from ClP. The generalized enclisis is a EP innovation. Therefore, there cannot be a loss of enclisis associated with the weakening of morphology in BP. The alternative explanation we propose here is that what changed in BP, in connection with the weakening of Infl, is that clitics no more adjoin to Infl, but to V. This change is not directly related to whether clitics are pre or post-verbal but it creates a new position for clitics, which exists neither in ClP nor in EP. This position is proclisis to non-finite

---

[22] There are some exceptions, the most famous of which are the Sermons of Pe Antonio Vieira, in which Galves Britto and Paixão de Sousa (2003) find 52% of enclisis with pre-verbal subjects (cf. also Martins 1994). Galves (2001b) shows that this is due to the stylistic peculiarities of the Sermons.

forms as illustrated in (15a)-(24a) above. Duarte et al.'s analysis says nothing about this Brazilian innovation.

1.4 *Theoretical problems*

Finally, we shall briefly comment on some theoretical problems encountered by the analyses presented in Section II.

First, in many analyses we find stipulations about the categories involved which have no independent motivation. For instance, Raposo (2000) derive enclisis from the claim that the functional category F is enclitic. Since F has no specific lexical realization in EP, we cannot say that this is a phonological property of the word that realizes F. It must be the property of the abstract category itself. Besides the issue of whether abstract categories have phonological properties independent of their morphological realization, there is no way to find independent evidence for this claim, and the analysis based on it becomes rather circular.

Another theoretical problem arises in connection with the effects of the special properties of the categories F or Σ. Since they have special requirements, they force movement of the verb to their specifier (Raposo, 2000) or merger with the verb (Costa and Martins, 2003). In both cases, these operations are defined as "last resort" operations. This is a problematic extension of the restrictive notion of Last Resort proposed by Chomsky in the Minimalist program. In particular, it is not limited by Greed (in Raposo's analysis the verb moves to solve the problem of F), and it is not involved in checking relations, since, crucially, there is no feature checking at stake in the derivation of enclisis. The use of the notion of strong category in Costa and Martins' analysis suffers from the same problem. This strength is not defined in terms of strength of features, which must be checked, but as a morphological property, which can be satisfied by a morphological operation like merger.

The analysis we propose here definitely assumes that the pre-verbal or post-verbal position of the clitics is a matter of Morphology. This means that it derives from conditions on the well-formedness of words, and not from the properties of functional categories, which is a matter of syntax. If clitics are affixes, they are subject to alignment constraints, like word-affixes. The constraint *Non-Initial* is such a condition. Its articulation with syntax lies in the definition of the relevant domain in which it applies, and we shall argue in the next section that this domain has changed during the history of Portuguese, and may be changing again.

2. New correlations that do not derive from the other analyses

2.1 *The interface prosody/syntax and the history of Portuguese*

Our analysis also differs from many others (see the references above) in that we do not derive the presence of enclisis in EP and its absence in BP from the properties of the clitic itself, but from the effect of the morphological constraint *Non-Initial*, which is active in EP but not in BP.

Non-Initial is clearly linked to prosody, since it defines a position in which a non-stressed element cannot occur. In this sense, it is similar to the Tobler-Mussafia Law. In fact, the Tobler-Mussafia law is a *Non-Initial Constraint* that defines its domain as the whole sentence (i-e the first XP). We have given evidence above that this constraint was active in ClP. But we have argued against Barbosa's claim that it is also active in EP. We have adopted Galves and Sândalo's claim that the domain of *Non-Initial* in EP is the first X-bar of the clause. We conclude that the change in clitic-placement from ClP to Modern European Portuguese is correlated with a change in the domain of *Non-Initial*. This is a satisfactory conclusion since we know that an important change occurred in the Portuguese prosody after the 16th century, which affected the pronunciation of the pre-tonic vowels[23]. It is beyond the limits of this paper to go further into this matter.

From the same point of view, we can say that from ClP to BP, *Non-Initial* was lost[24]. But this difference does not suffice to explain all the differences between BP and EP. It explains proclisis in absolute first position, but it does not explain the attachment of the clitic to the non-finite verbal form in verbal clusters. The latter innovation is not due to the prosodic evolution of BP, but to the weakening of the agreement system, which changed the properties of Infl in this language. This is why the change in clitic-placement from ClP to BP is much more dramatic than from ClP to EP.

In the next section, we shall see how our analysis can account for the new tendencies of clitic-placement in EP.

2.2 *The recent evolution of EP*

Several studies (cf. Duarte and Faria 1994, among others) show from acquisition data and pieces of written and oral colloquial speech, that there is a tendency in European Portuguese to extend the contexts of enclisis to the detriment of proclisis. Duarte et al.'s approach does not explain this fact straightforwardly. In effect, according to them, the basic property of the syntax of Standard EP is the fact that clitics are quasi-suffix. This explains the possibility of enclisis in tensed sentences. However, the increase of the use of enclisis cannot be explained by this same property, which already concerns all the occurrences of clitics, but only by a blocking of proclisis in certain contexts. In the framework proposed, the only reason for the increase of this blocking would be either a tendency to put the strong functional words that yield proclisis (the "proclisis triggers") outside of the Intonational Phrase that contains the clitic, or a weakening of the strong functional words. This would be a new fact, which has nothing to do with the basic property

---

[23] Teyssier (1980) mentions the existence of a reference to this fact in a French *Petite Grammaire Portugaise* of 1675.

[24] It is important to emphasize again that we are not claiming that BP evolved from EP, since, as we argued above, ClP had a version of *NonInitial*, whose domain was the first XP. As already claimed above, this version of the constraint can be considered as a reformulation of the Tobler-Mussafia Law.

that allows, and forces, enclisis in certain contexts, that is, the nature of quasi-affixes of the clitic pronouns in EP.

In our approach, it is possible to link the current tendency of the "advanced" language with the basic property that is responsible for enclisis. A simple explanation would be that what is changing, again, is the domain of *Non-Initial*. If the domain for the constraint is any X-bar (i-e, if we drop 1ʳˢᵗ from the definition) we shall obtain a generalized enclisis. The difference between the distribution of enclisis and proclisis in Standard EP and in the speech of children as well as in "advanced" colloquial speech is straightforwardly explained if *NonInitial* no longer makes reference to the first X-bar. We therefore expect to find a general pattern of enclisis. If this is true, we are currently observing the end of a process of generalization of enclisis, which corresponds to successive modifications of the domain of *Non-Initial* that have the effect of extending the contexts in which enclisis is produced.

3. Other advantages of the analysis

The analysis proposed also allows us to account for two other aspects of clitic placement in EP: the weight effects described by Frota and Vigário (1996, 2002) in finite subordinate clauses, and the complicated pattern of clitic-placement in infinitival clauses. These two contexts have in common the fact that they allow variation between proclisis and enclisis[25].

3.1 *Weight effects in EP*

One of the few contexts of variation between enclisis and proclisis in EP is illustrated in (51) below (cf. Frota and Vigário 1996). Also, according to Frota and Vigário (1996, 2000), (51a) contrasts with (51b):

(51) a. O Pedro disse que o livro encomendado à
          The Pedro said that the book ordered to-the
          biblioteca nacional **lhe** **foi**/
          library national Cl3sg was
          foi- lhe entregue ontem
          was CL3sg delivered yesterday
          'Pedro said that the book ordered to the national library was
          delivered to him yesterday'

      b. O Pedro disse que o livro **te** **foi**
          The Pedro said that the book CL2sg was
          (*foi- te) entregue ontem
          (*was CL2sg) delivered yesterday
          ´Peter said that the book was delivered to you yesterday'

[25] Preliminary research on these contexts in the texts of the *Tycho Brahe Corpus* have shown that this variation has existed for many centuries (cf. for instance Abdo 2001)

Frota and Vigário claim that enclisis is possible in a subordinate clause when either a pause, or a heavy constituent, or a parenthetical, or a topic phrase, intervenes between the element which triggers proclisis and the clitic.

An empirical study is still to be done on this variation. As already mentioned, the exact characterization of the contexts in which enclisis may occur in embedded tensed sentences is not very clear. Raposo (1994) for instance claims that in sentences like (51b) the clitic can be post-verbal.

What is at stake is the definition of "heavy", and its relationship with the notion of Intonational Phrase. The use of this notion by the authors reviewed must be rather abstract, since it is not the case that enclisis is always associated with an intonational boundary at the immediate left of the verb. This is a problem in particular for Barbosa's approach since subjects in EP can be in the same Intonational Phrase as the verb, and generally are. This is also a problem for structures like (44) and (45) above, since enclisis is not dependent on an intonational break between "que" and "o João" in the former and between "que" and "embora" in the latter. Finally, if Raposo is right in claiming that enclisis is possible in sentences like (51b), it is very unlikely that the embedded subject in this sentence has an intonational contour of its own, or that enclisis is dependent on an intonational break between the complementizer and the subject.

Our analysis straightforwardly accounts for the facts if we understand "1st X-bar in the clause" in the definition of *Non-Initial* as "1st X-bar in CP". All the cases of enclisis in embedded contexts would be therefore cases of CP recursion. We thus replace the representations in (44) and (45) by the representations in (52a)-(52b) and (53a)-(53b). Sentence (53b) with enclisis can be represented as (54):

(52) a. Acho   [$_{CP}$ que [$_{TopP}$ ao   João]
          Think   that   to-the   John
          [$_{IP}$ a Maria **lhe   ofereceu**   um livro.
            the Mary   CL3sg offered   a   book

      b. Acho [$_{CP}$ que   [$_{TopP}$ ao   João]
          Think   that   to-the   John
          [$_{CP}$ a   Maria **ofereceu-lhe**   um livro.
            the   Mary   offered CL3sg   a   book
            'I think that to John, Mary offered to him a book'

(53) a. Disseram- me   [$_{CP}$ que
          Said   CL1sg   that
          [$_{IP}$ embora   tivesse sido   difĩcil]
            although   had   been   difficult
          [$_{IP}$ **lhe   concederam**   a   bolsa
            CL3sg gave   the   grant

      b. Disseram-me [$_{CP}$ que
          Said   CL1sg   that
          [$_{IP}$ embora   tivesse sido   difĩcil]
            although   had   been   difficult

[CP **concederam-lhe**   a   bolsa
     gave   CL3sg   the   grant
'They told me that although it was difficult,
  they gave the grant to him'

(54)   O   Pedro disse [CP que [TopP o   livro]
         The Pedro said   that   the   book
         [CP **foi-**   **te**   entregue   ontem
            was   Cl2sg   delivered   yesterday
         'Peter said that the book was delivered to you yesterday'

As already mentioned above, we lack a description of all the discursive and prosodic aspects of this variation, which could empirically support this analysis. As far as subjects are concerned, we would expect this construction to be somehow marked, and associated to special discourse functions like contrastiveness or emphasis. This is a common point with the approach based on the Intonational Phrase. But the advantage of our analysis is that we do not predict that there are obligatorily intonational breaks or special intonational contours associated with enclisis, and that such breaks or contours are impossible when the clitic is pre-verbal.

It must be noted additionally that all the examples of enclisis in embedded contexts involve bridge verbs like "achar" (*to think*), or "dizer" (*to say*). This is predicted by our analysis, since the recursion of CP is a phenomenon limited to this kind of verbs[26].

3.2 *Clitic-placement in infinitives*

Finally, our analysis allows us to suggest an explanation for the other context in which we find variation in clitic placement in EP: infinitival clauses introduced by a preposition.

First, it is important to note that in this case an explanation based on prosodic considerations is not easy to defend, since there are clearly no prosodic correlates associated with the variation described in (24)-(30). An analysis based on this kind of explanation for tensed sentences cannot therefore be used to explain the variation in infinitival clauses.

(55)   a.   Saímos   para   **vê-**   **lo**
            Leave   to   see   CL3sg
      b.   Saímos   para   **o**   **ver**
            Leave   to   CL3sg   see
            'We left in order to see him'

---

[26] Note that we are not obliged to claim that the tendency of using more and more enclisis in this context in spoken language corresponds to an increase of CP recursion. As we argued above, such a tendency can be explained by a change in the domain of *Non-Initial*. In this case, we expect to find an extension of the class of verbs allowing enclisis in their subordinate clause.

(56) a. *Saíram para **verem- no**
        Leave   to   see   CL3sg
   b. Saíram   para **o   verem**
      Leave   to   Cl3sg see
      'They left in order to see him'

(55)-(56) show that the variation between enclisis and proclisis observed in non-inflected infinitival clauses is not found in inflected infinitival constructions, in which enclisis is impossible, except with the preposition "a", which invariably requires enclisis. According to Duarte et al., all the prepositions except "a" are heavy functional words, which are proclisis triggers. (55a) is therefore unexpected. They solve this problem by assigning different structures to (55a). and (55b). According to them, the former is an "elliptical structure" that contains a null verb with a modal or temporal value. No such verb is present in the latter.

(57) a. Saímos [PP para [TP [V e] vê-lo
   b. Saímos [PP para [TP o ver]

Because of the null verb in (57a), the clitic is no more in the scope of the preposition, and enclisis is derived. According to the same analysis, enclisis is blocked with inflected infinitival sentences because the modal or temporal null verbs do not select inflected infinitive. Additionally, this analysis straightforwardly derives the absence of proclisis with "a" from the claim that it is not a strong functional category.

We should now capitalize on how our analysis can account for the double contrast observed: inflected infinitive vs. non inflected infinitive and "a" versus the other prepositions.

First, we shall recall that enclisis is obligatory in infinitival sentences complement of verbs. This is expected in our framework if all infinitival clauses are CPs (cf. Boskovic, 1997), in which the first X-bar contains the verb. On this basis, we can derive the variation between enclisis and proclisis with prepositions from their ambiguous status. They can be either the category that selects CP, or the complementizer itself. Assuming *Non-Initial*, we obtain enclisis in the first case and proclisis in the second case, as represented below:

(58) a. Saímos [PP para [CP vê-lo
   b. Saímos [CP para o ver]

As for inflected infinitival constructions, we must assume that they only correspond to the structure. This is coherent with Raposo's (1987) analysis, since only in C is the preposition able to govern the agreement on the verb[27]. Outside CP,

---

[27] According to Raposo, infinitival clauses complement to prepositions are IPs. This is incompatible with Boskovic's analysis that we adopted above. For a discussion cf. also Galves (2001).

the preposition is not able to license inflected infinitive. We therefore straightforwardly derive the obligatoriness of proclisis in this context.

As for "a", our analysis leads us to propose that it is never in COMP. This claim is supported by another important difference between "a" and the other prepositions. In clauses introduced by "a", we never find a pre-verbal subject. Since we do find inflected infinitive clauses introduced by "a", we can rely again on Raposos's (1987) analysis to propose that in these constructions the verb raises to COMP in order to have its agreement features governed by the preposition. This explains why only the post-verbal position is available for a subject.

We conclude that our analysis of the distribution of enclisis and proclisis in tensed sentences based on *Non-Initial* is also able to account for the distribution of enclisis and proclisis in infinitival sentences.

V. Concluding remarks

The main conclusions of this article are the following:

- In BP, clitics are not licensed by Infl but by the verb that assigns their thematic roles to them. This explains the fact that they appear attached on the thematic verb even if it is a participle. Proclisis is the normal pattern since *Non-Initial* is not active in this language. Enclisis continues to appear more or less marginally according to the discourse and syntactic context. This is the effect of competition between the grammar people acquire in natural acquisition, and pieces of grammars learned at school or in contact with formal written and spoken language. The third person accusative clitic "o/a" is also reminiscent of old grammars. Its obsolescence is due to the fact that in this system the clitics that survive are the ones that have dative features compatible with the inherent case marking by the verb.
- In EP, the distribution of enclisis and proclisis both in tensed and infinitival sentences derives from the application of *Non-Initial*, which bans clitics at the beginning of the first X-bar of CP. This analysis derives both the cases of categorical enclisis and the cases of variation, which, contrarily to BP, are produced by the grammar itself.

References

ABAURRE, M. B., and Galves C. (1996). Os clíticos no português brasileiro: elementos para uma abordagem sintático-fonológica. In A. Castilho, and M. Basílio, eds., *Gramática do Português Falado*, vol. 4. Editora da Unicamp, Campinas, pp. 267-312.

ABDO, P. (2001). Colocação dos Clíticos em Orações Infinitivas introduzidas por Preposição no Português Clássico, final report to Fapesp, http://www.ime.usp.br/~tycho/papers.

ANDERSON, S. R. (2000). Towards an optimal account of second-position phenomena. In J. Dekkers, F. van der Leeuw and J. van de Weijer, eds.,

Optimality Theory Phonology, Syntax and Acquisition, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 302-333.

BARBOSA, P. (1991). Clitic placement in EP. Unpublished ms., MIT.

BARBOSA, P. (1993). Clitic placement in Old Romance and European Portuguese and the null subject parameter. Unpublished ms., MIT.

BARBOSA, P. (1996). Clitic placement in European Portuguese and the Position of Subjects. In: A. Halpern and A. M. Zwicky, eds., *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*. CSLI Publications, Stanford, pp. 1-40.

BARBOSA, P. (2000). Clitics: a window into the null subject properties. In J. Costa, ed., *Portuguese Syntax – New Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 31-93.

BENINCA, P. (1995). Complement Clitics in Medieval Portuguese: the Tobler-Mussafia Law. In A. Battye, and I. Roberts, eds, *Language Change and Verbal Systems*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 325-344.

BOSKOVIC, Z. (1997). *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

CORRÊA, V. R. (1991). O Objeto Direto Nulo no Português do Brasil. Dissertação de Mestrado. UNICAMP.

COSTA, J. (1998).Word Order and Constraint Interaction: A Constraint-Based Approach. Ph.D. thesis, HIL Leiden University.

COSTA, J., ed. (2000). *Portuguese Syntax – New Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

COSTA, J. and Martins, A. M. (2003). Clitic Placement Across Grammar Components. Talk presented at Going Romance, 17th Symposium on Romance Languages, University of Nijmegen.

CYRINO, S. M. L. (1994).O Objeto Nulo no Português do Brasil – um Estudo Sintático-Diacrônico. Ph.D. thesis, UNICAMP.

DUARTE, I. and Matos, G. (2000). Romance clitics and the minimalist program. In J. Costa, ed., *Portuguese Syntax – New Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 116-142.

DUARTE, I., Matos, G. and Gonçalves, A. (2002). Clíticos Especiais em Português Europeu e Brasileiro. Unpublished ms., Lisboa.

DUARTE, I., and Faria, I. (1994). Specificity of European Portuguese Clitics in Romance. In I. Faria and M. J. Freitas, eds., *Studies on the Acquisition of Portuguese*. APL / Colibri, Lisboa, pp. 129-154.

DUARTE, I. (2003). Padrões de Colocação dos Pronomes Clíticos. In M. H. M. Mateus, A. M. Brito, I. Duarte e I. H. Faria, eds., *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*. Cap. 20.6, pp. 847-868.

DUARTE, I., Matos, G., and Gonçalves, A. (2005). Special Clitics in Brazilian and European Portuguese, this volume.

FIGUEIREDO SILVA, M. C. (1990). Les Clitiques en Portugais du Brésil. Note pur une étude. Ms., Université de Genève.

FROTA, S. and Vigário, M. (1996). *Between Syntax and Phonology: On Phrasal Effects in European Portuguese,* Talk presented at the GLOW Workshop on Weight Effects, Athens.

FROTA, S. and Vigário, M. (2002). Efeitos de peso no Português Europeu. In M. H. Mateus and C. Nunes Correia, eds., *Saberes no Tempo*, Homenagem à Professora Henriqueta Costa Campos. Edições Colibri, Lisboa, pp. 315-333.

GALVES, C. (2001a). *Ensaios sobre as Gramáticas do Português*. Editora da UNICAMP, Campinas.

GALVES, C. (2001b). Syntax and Style: Clitic-Placement in Padre Antonio Vieira. In H. Sharrer and E. Raposo, eds., *Santa Barbara Portuguese Studies*, vol. 6, in print.

GALVES, C. (2002). Clitiques et Accord en Portugais du Brésil. In B. Schlieben-Lange, I. Koch, K. Jungbluth, eds., *Der Dialog zwischen den Schulen. Soziolinguistische, konversationsanalytische und syntaktische Beiträge aus Brasilien*. Nodus-Verlag, Münster. pp. 131-154.

GALVES, C., Britto, H. and Paixão de Sousa, M. C. (2005). The Change in Clitic Placement from Classical to Modern European Portuguese. *Journal of Portuguese Linguistics*, 4-1, in print.

GALVES, C. and Sândalo, F. (2004.). Clitic-Placement in European Portuguese and the Syntax-Phonology Interface. In A. Castro, M. Ferreira, V. Hacquard and A. P. Salanova. eds., *Romance Op. 47, Collected Papers on Romance syntax, MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 47*:115-128.

HARLEY, H. and Noyer, R. (1999). State-of-the-Article: Distributed Morphology. *GLOT International* 4.4:3-9.

KATO, M. A. (1994). Português Brasileiro Falado: Aquisição em Contexto de Mudança Sintática. Congresso Internacional sobre o Português. Ms. Lisboa.

KATO, M. A. (1999). Strong Pronouns, Weak Pronominals and the Null Subject Parameter. *PROBUS,* 11,1:1-37.

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

KROCH, A. (2001). Syntactic Change. In M. Baltin and C. Collins, eds., *The Handbook of Contemporary Syntactic Theory*. Blackwell Publishers Inc., Oxford, Mass, pp. 699-729.

LEGENDRE, G. (2000). Morphological and Prosodic Alignment of Bulgarian Clitics. In J. Dekkers, F. van der Leeuw and J. van de Weijer, eds., *Optimality Theory Phonology, Syntax and Acquisition*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp.423-462.

MADEIRA, A. (1992). On Clitic Placement in European Portuguese. In H. van de Koot, ed., *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 4. University College, London.

MANZINI, R. (l992). Second Position Dependencies. Unpublished ms., University College, London.

MANZINI, R. (1994). Triggers for Verb-Second: Germanic and Romance. *The Linguistic Review*, vol. 11:299-314.

MARTINS, A. M. (1992). Quantifiers and Clitics in European Portuguese. Unpublished ms.

MARTINS, A. M. (1994). História dos Clíticos no Português. Ph.D. thesis, Universidade de Lisboa, Lisboa.

MARTINS, A. M. (2000). A Minimalist Approach to Clitic Climbing. In J. Costa, ed., *Portuguese Syntax – New Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp.169-190.

MONTEIRO, J. (1994). *Pronomes Pessoais. Subsídios para uma Gramática do Português do Brasil*. EUFC, Fortaleza.

PAGOTTO, E. (1992) A Posição dos Clíticos em Português: Um Estudo Diacrônico. Unpublished MA Dissertation, UNICAMP.

PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, M. C. (2003). Colocação de Clíticos e Posição de Sujeito em Textos Portugueses dos Séculos 16 a 19. Talk at III Congresso Internacional da ABRALIN, Rio de Janeiro.

PAIXÃO DE SOUSA, M. C. (2004). Língua Barroca: Sintaxe e História do Português dos Seiscentos. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, UNICAMP.

RAPOSO, E. (1986). On the Null Object in European Portuguese. In JAEGGLI, O. and SILVA-CORVALAN, C. (orgs.). *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Dordrecht, Foris.

RAPOSO, E. (1987) "Case-Theory and Infl-to-Comp – The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese", *Linguistic Inquiry,* vol.18, pp. 85-109.

RAPOSO, E. (1994) Affective Operators and Clausal Structure in European Portuguese and European Spanish. 24th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, UCLA/USC.

RAPOSO, E. (1999). Some Observations on the Pronominal System of Portuguese. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics*, vol. 6, Universität Autonoma de Barcelona, Bellaterra, pp. 59-93.

RAPOSO, E. (2000). Clitic Position and Verb Movement. In J. Costa, ed., *Portuguese Syntax – New Comparative Studies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 266-297.

RIZZI, L. (1982). *Issues in Italian Syntax*. Foris Publications, Dordrecht.

ROUVERET, A. (1992). Clitic-Placement, Focus and the Wackernagel Position in European Portuguese. Talk at ESF Workshop on Clitics, Donostia.

SALVI, G. (1990). La Sopravvivenza della Legge di Wackernagel nei Dialettioccidentali della Peninsola Iberica. *Medioevo Romanzo* 15:177-210.

STOWELL, T. (1982). The Tense of Infinitives. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 13(4):561-570.

TEYSSIER, P. (1976). *Manuel de Langue Portugaise; Portugal-Brésil*. Klincksieck, Paris.

TEYSSIER, P. (1980). *Histoire de la Langue Portugaise*. Collection "Que sais-je". P.U.F, Paris. (Portuguese translation by Celso Cunha, História da Língua Portuguesa. 2nd ed. Martins Fontes, São Paulo, 2001.)

TORRES-MORAES, M. A. e R. Berlinck. (2005). O Objeto Indireto no Português: Aspectos Sincrônicos e Diacrônicos. Unpublished ms., USP.

TORRES-MORAIS, M. A. e I. Ribeiro. (2005). Contraste da Sintaxe dos Clíticos no Português Europeu e Português Brasileiro. *Linha D´Água*, 17:21-48. Humanitas FFLCH-USP, São Paulo.

URIAGEREKA, J. (1992). A Focus Position in Western Romance. Talk at 15th GLOW Colloquium.

URIAGEREKA, J. (1995). Syntax of Clitic-Placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 26(1):79-123.