

"Clitic Position and Verb Movement in European Portuguese"

Eduardo Raposo

University of California, Santa Barbara

Clitics in (finite) root clauses of European Portuguese (EP) and Galician (Gl) may appear basically in two different linear positions with respect to the finite verb: enclisis, as in (1a), and proclisis, as in (2a). (There is a third case, mesoclis, occurring in the same contexts as enclisis but with the future and the conditional tenses (cf. Lema and Rivero (1991)). Time permitting, mesoclis will also be considered in the talk).

- (1) a. Demos-lhe muito vinho.
(We) gave-to-him much wine
b. *Lhe demos muito vinho!
(2) a. Muito vinho lhe demos!
Much wine (we) to-him gave
b. *Muito vinho demos-lhe!

Recent work by Martins (1994), Raposo (1994) and Uriagereka (1992; to appear) seems to converge in the role assigned to a functional category higher than Infl but lower than C, call it 'F' (cf. also Laka's Σ) in the phenomenon of clitic placement. A rough generalization is that when the spec of FP is filled (such as in (2a)), then the clitic is proclitic; otherwise it is enclitic or mesoclitic (see also Benincà (n.d.) for a similar generalization but with C rather than F).¹ The works referred to hold that the position of the clitic is directly related to the position of the verb: enclisis results from raising the verb (or Infl containing the verb) to F, with the clitic "stranded" in Infl (for Martins and Raposo) or right-adjoined to F (for Uriagereka); proclisis results when Infl containing the verb does not raise to F (with the clitic left-adjoined to Infl for Martins and Raposo; or adjoined to F for Uriagereka). The rationale for verb (or Infl) raising to F is to license F morphologically (under the assumptions of Uriagereka (1992)); since F is licensed when its spec contains an affective operator, as in (2a), verb raising is not necessary and we get proclisis; otherwise the verb raises and we get enclisis.

In this talk we challenge this analysis. Consider first (3):

- (3) a. Muito vinho a Maria lhe tinha dado!
Much wine Mary to-him had given
b. Muito vinho lhe tinha a Maria dado!

In EP/Gl, both orders affective operator-subject-finite verb and affective operator-finite verb-subject are possible. We argue that in (3a) the subject is in the spec of IP and both the verb and the clitic are adjoined to Infl; while in (3b) the verb (or rather Infl containing V) has raised into F with the subject remaining in the spec of IP (rather than the verb remaining in (unraised) Infl with the subject lower in the structure).² In both cases, however, the clitic is proclitic, and enclisis is ungrammatical:

- (4) a. *Muito vinho a Maria tinha-lhe dado!
b. *Muito vinho tinha-lhe a Maria dado!

We conclude (i) that the clitic in EP/Gl may target either F or Infl as an adjunction site;³ (ii) that proclisis is the sole configuration that results whenever the clitic and the verb are adjoined to the same head, be it Infl or F (cf. Kayne (1991; 1994)); (iii) that the configuration of enclisis cannot be the unequivocal result of raising the verb (or Infl) to F, contrary to the analyses mentioned above (except Benincà (n.d.)). What is then enclisis in EP/Gl? In the tradition of Kayne (1991) we propose that enclisis is the result of moving the verb (Infl containing the verb) past the clitic; contrary to most instantiations of this idea in the literature, however (although not Kayne's, incidentally), we do not think that this movement either (i) involves excorporation; or (ii) is to a head higher than the one containing the clitic. Instead, we propose that enclisis is the configuration resulting when the clitic is in F and the verb (Infl with V) moves to the spec of FP past F. This analysis follows directly if we make the following three hypotheses: (i) F is always projected in EP/Gl, perhaps due to its (abstract) morphological nature (see Uriagereka (1992)) (ii) F has a strong 'spec' feature in the sense of Chomsky (1993) (in contemporary EP/Gl this is an 'operator' feature, [+affective], see note 1); (iii) Infl in these dialects may be specified for [+affective]. If it does, it raises to the checking domain for that feature, i.e. the spec of FP, past F (and it does so overtly, due to the strong nature of the feature in F). If there is a clitic in F, enclisis ensues. One immediate question arises: how can a head move into a spec position, contra what is assumed in the literature (cf. Chomsky (1994))?

We argue (with Uriagereka (1992)) that the spec of FP in EP/Gl may host an expletive pronoun, which can be overt in some dialects:

(5) Ele acontecem coisas extraordinárias nesta cidade!

It happen-pl extraordinary things in this city

Chomsky (1994) proposes a relational account of X-bar theory, in which a single terminal category (such as a clitic, for example) is simultaneously an X⁰ and an XP. Such a category, consequently, may display the behavior typical of an XP or of an X⁰ (clitics may move as X⁰s or as XPs). By the same reasoning, then, we expect that a single terminal category which can be the target of adjunction may be targeted either as an X⁰ or as an XP; in the former instance, evidently, by another head. This is, we claim, what goes on in encliticization in EP/Gl: Infl (containing V) adjoins to a null expletive in the spec of FP (very much in the same way as the associate of **there** adjoins covertly to **there** in the spec of IP in English). (Notice that given the word-order in (5) we are forced to say that this is right-adjunction). Another question involves the HMC. How can Infl move to the spec of FP (adjoining to an expletive in that position) *past* F? If the HMC reduces to the Minimal Link Condition of Chomsky (1994) (the Shortest Move Condition of Chomsky (1993)), this is a possible result, if this condition is implemented by a principle of equidistance similar to the one proposed in Chomsky (1993). In fact, obeying the MLC under this interpretation differentiates our analysis from those where the verb moves to a higher head.

Other phenomena that can be naturally handled by our analysis, and which we mention time permitting:

(i) mesoclysis in the future/conditional tenses; (ii) absence of interpolation in EP/Gl with the verb higher than the clitic; (iii) the reduction of the Tobler-Mussafia Law to a single syntactic parameter.

References

- Benincà, P. (n.d.) "Complement Clitics in Medieval Romance: the Tobler-Mussafia Law", ms., University of Padova.
- Chomsky, N. (1993) "A Minimalist Program for Linguistic Theory", in K. Hale and S.J. Keyser (eds.) The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger, 1-52, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Chomsky, N. (1994) "Bare Phrase Structure", in Occasional Papers in Linguistics 5, MIT.
- Kayne, R. (1991) "Romance Clitics, Verb Movement and PRO", Linguistic Inquiry 22, 647-686.
- Kayne, R. (1994) The Antisymmetry of Syntax, MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Laka, M.-I. (1990) Negation in Syntax: on the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections, PhD Dissertation, MIT.
- Lema, J. and M.-L. Rivero (1991) "Types of Verbal Movement in Old Spanish: Modals, Futures and Perfects", Probus 3, 237-278.
- Martins, A.-M. (1994) Clíticos na História do Português, Doctoral Dissertation, Universidade de Lisboa.
- Raposo, E. (1994) "Affective Operators and Clausal Structure in European Portuguese and European Spanish", paper presented at the 24th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, UCLA/USC.
- Uriagereka, J. (1992) "A Focus Position in Western Romance", paper presented at the GLOW meeting, Lisbon University; to be published in K. É. Kiss (ed.) Discourse Configurational Languages, Oxford University Press.
- Uriagereka, J. (to appear) "Some Issues on Clitic Placement in Western Romance", Linguistic Inquiry.

1. In contemporary EP/Gl., the spec of F is an 'operator' position which may be filled by an 'affective operator' (a term we borrow from Klima (1964) with approximately the same import): emphatic phrases such as in (2a), some QPs, negative phrases, Wh-phrases (we assume that these pass through the spec of FP on their way to the spec of CP), phrases with the overt focus operator *só* 'only', and a well-defined set of adverbs such as *não* 'not', *talvez* 'maybe' and *também* 'also', among others.

2. The argument is based on the distribution of the pre-verbal 'subject' of indefinite clauses with the morpheme SE, which can occupy a (left-periphery) topic position or a position lower in the clause (to the right of the verb), but not the spec of IP, and it will be presented in the talk.

3. The possibility of interpolation in some dialects of EP/Gl (**Muita felicidade lhe Deus trouxe!** 'Much happiness to-him God brought') suggests that the clitic can be adjoined to F independently of the raising of Infl (containing V) to F.