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1. Introduction

In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries in Portugal the literates and in general the aristocracy cultivated Spanish-Portuguese diglossia as a distinctive feature of culture and high class status. The appeal of the robust and innovative Castillian literature induced an increasing number of Portuguese authors to write in Spanish a significant part of their works. As an example we can mention the dramatic production of the outstanding poet and playwright Gil Vicente whose plays were performed between 1502 and 1536. In a total of forty six plays, nineteen are bilingual, twelve are written in Spanish, fifteen in Portuguese.

In the court circle spoken Spanish would be heard at the festive occasions when poetry would be sang and theatre performed. But possibly there would be room for spoken Spanish in day-to-day life as well, since most of the Portuguese kings' consorts were Castillian then and their entourage would include some Spanish native speakers. Spanish-Portuguese diglossia was thus the manifestation of a desired closeness between the Portuguese court and the Castillian court, between their cultural inclinations and literary productions. But this approach was unilateral as the Spanish-Portuguese diglossia did not emerge on the Castillian side. Moreover, the Portuguese authors were in general unable to see their works printed in Spain – although in contrast to the state of affairs in Portugal, several centers of Spanish printing were producing books on a high scale. The Spanish or bilingual production of the Portuguese writers thus circulated in the limited circle of the Portuguese literates. Its inward transmission and reproduction would have consolidated what has been called Castillian of Portugal. This was a variety of Spanish interfered in a quite systematic way by some features of the Portuguese grammar and having vis-à-vis standard Spanish an old fashioned and slightly dialectal flavour.

Borrowing a perspective developed by creolists, we can think of this fifteenth and sixteenth centuries ‘Spanish of Portugal’ as a relexified Portuguese, which resulted in a variety of Spanish given the broad syntactic identity between the substrate language (i.e. Portuguese) and the superstrate language (i.e. Spanish). Relexification is to be understood as a “mental process that builds new lexical entries by combining new phonological forms with the syntactic and semantic information of lexical entries that are already established.”(Lumsden 1999: 129). The existence in the period under consideration of an extensive cognate lexicon between the two languages (see Castro (Forthcoming)) smoothed and presumably accelerated the relexification process. A less distinct phonology eased the task of recognizing lexical correspondences. It was the unity of syntax however that would have provided a particular context of second language acquisition at a distance (through literary sources and with a reduced contact with native speakers) which led to the creation of an autonomous grammar by an unusual community of speakers.

In his reference work on the literary language of Gil Vicente, Paul Teyssier (1959) identifies one clear case of syntactic interference of Portuguese in Vicente's Spanish. This is the frequent use by the author in his Spanish writings of the Portuguese inflected infinitive, which the excerpts in (1) and (2) below exemplify.
Penitencia seraa harta
penitence will-be-3SG enough
pensares en mi tormento.
think-INF.INFIN-2SG in my torment
‘You will have enough penitence thinking of my torment’
(Floresta de Enganos 301-302. Taken from Teyssier 1959: 377)

porque tenéis gran razón
because have-2PL big reason
de llorardes vuestro mal.
of cry-INF.INFIN-2PL your misadventure
‘…as you have every reason to cry about your misadventure’
(Comédia do Viúvo 84-85. Taken from Teyssier 1959: 378)

Teyssier (1959: 385-387) also points out that Gil Vicente uses interpolation often when he writes in Spanish (see section 2.2.), and, on the other hand, does not make enough use of the preposition a ‘to’ before a personal object. It should be noted however that interpolation and the lack of the preposition a before a personal object were grammatical options both in Spanish and Portuguese in the first half of the sixteenth century. Differently from the inflected infinitive, which the grammar of medieval and early Renaissance Spanish did not allow, those two other cases only reflect some variation between Spanish and Portuguese with respect to the frequency of use of structures which were grammatical in both languages.

There are two points of interest in the results of Teyssier's work (in 1959) with respect to the syntax of Vicente’s Spanish. As for the slimness of the syntactic interference between Portuguese and Spanish, it shows that the syntax of Spanish and the syntax of Portuguese were much more alike at the beginning of the sixteenth century than they are today. The other relevant point is that Vicente's transfer of the inflected infinitive from Portuguese to Spanish was not an individual move. As Teyssier (1959: 379-380) accentuates all Portuguese authors of the time when writing in Spanish used the inflected infinitive “as if it was a normal construction”. Teyssier goes on to comment: “And so we can see, by observing a particular case, how this Castillian of Portugal that we are describing had developed: this branch grown from the hispanic stem had already got at the beginning of the sixteenth century its originality, its own life, and even its own traditions.” (Teyssier 1959: 380).²

In order to evaluate whether the unity of Spanish and Portuguese syntax at earlier times was as critical as I am suggesting to define the contours of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries diglossia in Portugal,³ we will need to have a clear image of such unity and of its ulterior partial breakdown. My aim in this paper will be to give a contribution to the assemblage of such an image.

I will be dealing with a case of syntactic splitting (between Portuguese and Spanish) after the sixteenth century. Clitic placement and other related phenomena will be the topic of the paper. In section 2, I will describe clitic placement in finite clauses in medieval and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish and will additionally bring into consideration the fact that the order OV with non clitic objects is attested in both languages in this period. In section 3, I will sketch the diachronic paths which led from medieval and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish to Modern Portuguese on the one side and Modern Spanish on the other. In section 4, I will bring into play new empirical data and will show how the medieval and early Renaissance postverbal placement of clitics in finite clauses (e agora llaman le Barcilona – and now (they-)call it Barcelona), which persists in Portuguese but was lost in
Spanish, correlates with the availability of a pattern of minimal answer to a yes/no question consisting of a bare verb (¿Quieres lo saber? – ‘Do you want to know it?’; Quiero. – want – ‘I do’). Moreover, section 4. offers an integrated account of all the facts of variation and change considered in the paper. Section 5. concludes the paper.

The divergent syntactic evolution of Portuguese and Spanish after the sixteenth century (which the issues addressed in this paper illustrate) shows that the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Spanish-Portuguese high class diglossia did not influence the historical development of the Portuguese syntax. Under the hypothesis that the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries ‘Spanish of Portugal’ is not just a learned foreign language but rather a relexified Portuguese this is an expected result.

2. Unity: Clitic placement in medieval and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish

From the earlier texts through the first half of the sixteenth century Portuguese and Spanish display similar patterns of clitic placement in finite clauses. The contemporary contrast between Portuguese and Spanish with respect to clitic placement is the result of later change. In the present section it will be shown how Portuguese and Spanish behaved alike in medieval and early Renaissance times. Further word order facts will be brought into consideration which reinforce the view that up to the sixteenth century Portuguese and Spanish shared significant grammatical features in the domain of syntax. In this section ample exemplification would be needed to support the intended descriptive generalizations. In order to not overload the text with data, however, I will use a limited number of examples and at times refer the reader to a final Appendix (§ 6) for further empirical evidence.

2.1. Unmarked main clauses: enclisis and proclisis as variant patterns

Medieval and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish display variation between enclisis and proclisis in the kind of sentences where enclisis is obligatory in Modern Portuguese while Modern Spanish only allows proclisis. This variable placement of the clitic with respect to the verb (either preverbal or postverbal) is found in affirmative main clauses without proclisis triggers (namely wh-phrases, focused constituents, quantifiers and certain adverbs). I will refer to such clauses as unmarked main clauses. Example (3) below, and (40) to (43) in the Appendix, taken from Spanish texts, as well as example (4) below and (44) to (46) in the Appendix, taken from Portuguese texts, illustrate how through the period under consideration enclisis (see sentences a.) and proclisis (see sentences b.) alternate in similar syntactic contexts. I give one example per century per language. Each example contains two sentences extracted from one same literary source and emerging as much as possible from analogous textual environments. The medieval and early Renaissance variation between proclisis and enclisis which sentences (3) and (4) below exemplify is not attested in verb initial sentences where enclisis was obligatory.

(3) a. e agora llaman le Barcilona
   ‘Nowadays, it is called Barcilona’
   (Spanish. Thirteenth century. Menéndez Pidal 1978: 10b)

   b. e oy.en dia le llaman Tarraçona
   ‘Nowadays it is called Tarraçona’
   (Spanish. Thirteenth century. Menéndez Pidal 1978: 10b)
(4) a. **à pessoa que vos tall dise ou espreveo, pergunte-lhe**
to-the person that you-DAT such-thing told or wrote, ask-him-DAT
vosalteza onde estava syman afomso
Your-Highness where was Syman Afomso
‘Your majesty should ask the person that told you or wrote such thing where Syman Afomso was’
(Portuguese. Sixteenth century. Pato 1884: 99)

b. **aos que imda lá saem, lhe tenho dado seguros e lhe**
to-those that still there are, them-DAT I-have given safe-conducts and them
mando agora noteficar ho voso perdam
(I-)send now notify-of the your pardon
‘I have been giving protection to the people that are still there and now I will notify them of your pardon’
(Portuguese. Sixteenth century. Pato 1884: 94)

In agreement with the empirical evidence given above, Barry (1987) observes that in Old Spanish “clitic pronouns may be either postverbal (...) or preverbal”, then adding: “The principles governing their placement have remained elusive (...). The present study is one more attempt to understand the fluctuation in pronoun placement” (Barry 1987: 213). Space considerations preclude me from reviewing the heavily extensive literature dealing with this same concern.¹⁰ Nevertheless, I will propose in section 2.3. a semantic motivation for this case of word order variation.

2.2. **Subordinate finite clauses and main clauses with proclisis triggers: proclisis, interpolation, and OV order**
In subordinate main clauses clitics are preverbal in all stages of the history of Portuguese and Spanish.¹¹ In the medieval and early Renaissance period however clitics occur either adjacent or non adjacent to the verb – the phenomena of non adjacency is known as **interpolation** in the Romance philological literature. During the period along which interpolation can be attested,¹² this word order is optional. Compare sentences a. to the minimally contrasting sentences b. in the pairs (5) to (7) below and (47) to (48) in the Appendix. In the former some material could have been interpolated, but was not; the latter are examples of interpolation.

(5) a. **como nesta carta se côthê**
how in-this letter itself contains
‘how it is stated in this letter’
(Portuguese. Year 1532. Martins 2001: 554)

b. **como se nesta carta contem**
how itself in-this letter contains
‘how it is stated in this letter’

(6) a. **se lo tu mandasses**
if it you would-order
‘if you would-order it’
b. *si te lo otorgares*
   *if you it concede*
   ‘if you concede it’

(7) a. *Et si vos lo touieredes por bien*
   *and if you it have for good*
   ‘And if you consider it good’

b. *Et si lo el rey por bien toviere*
   *and if it the king for good has*
   ‘And if the king considers it good’

As sentences (5b) and (7b) also show, and is further illustrated by sentences (8) to (10) below, medieval and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish allow IP-scrambling of non-clitic objects, therefore deriving the order (S)OV. (In section 4. it will be shown how object scrambling, interpolation, and the possibility of enclisis in finite clauses are to be interpreted as correlated grammatical options).

(8) *Se me Deus enton a morte non deu*
   *if me God then the death not gave*
   ‘If then God didn’t give me death’

(9) *quem vos tall cousa disse, mentivos mui grande mentira*
   *whoever you such thing told, lied-you-DAT very big lie*
   ‘Whoever told you that, lied to you’

(10) *Et de mas mando al omne que vos esta mi carta mostrara que enplase*
   *and of more (I-)order to-the man who you this my letter would-show that (he-)cites*
   *a todos los que lo contra ella fizieren*
   to all those that it against her [the letter] would-do
   ‘Moreover, I order the man showing you this letter of mine to call before a court of law all those acting against it’
   (Spanish. Year 1440. Menéndez Pidal 1919: 309 (text 234))

Interpolation structures give us the means to clearly identify OV sentences displaying object scrambling (in contrast to OV resulting from left dislocation or focusing). This is so because the clitic signals the border between left-dislocated and focused constituents on one side and scrambled constituents on the other. That is, while the former surface to the left of the clitic, the latter occur to its right. The word order found in subordinate clauses with interpolation is indicated under (11) and exemplified by sentences (12) to (15). The pre-clitic constituents are marked by a double-underline in sentences (12) to (15), being respectively a left-dislocated object in (12), a sentential adjunct in (13), a focused object in (14), a left-dislocated object followed by a focused object in (15). Scrambled objects, occurring to the right of the clitic, are underlined in sentences (12)-(13). Scrambled objects in the relevant
Some types of main clauses behave similarly to subordinate clauses with respect to clitic placement. Those are sentences introduced by wh-phrases, focused constituents, quantifiers and certain adverbs (such as ja, ya ‘already’ in (16) below and (50) in the Appendix; sempre ‘always’ in (49) in the Appendix; or asi ‘so’ in (51) in the Appendix). In these sentences, when a clitic occurs, it is obligatorily preverbal; on the other hand, in these proclitic-pattern main clauses, interpolation as well as scrambled objects can be found. In both respects, such sentences contrast with the unmarked main clauses, where enclisis is a grammatical option and interpolation or object scrambling are not attested. This is shown by sentences (16)-(17) below and (49) in the Appendix, from medieval Portuguese, as well as by sentences (18) below and (50)-(51) in the Appendix, from medieval Spanish.

(16) \textit{E ja m’ El tanto mal fez}
and already \textit{me-DAT he so-much harm did}
‘He has done me a lot of harm already’

(17) \textit{Dom Froyaz amaua-a muyto e nunca lhe tantas cousas pode fazer que}
don Froyaz loved-her-ACC much and never \textit{her-DAT enough things could do that}
a \textit{podesse fazer fallar}
her-ACC could make speak
‘Don Froyaz loved her heartily but he wasn’t able to do enough to get her to speak’

(18) Todos se luego ayuntaron
all themselves immediately assembled
‘Everybody assembled at once’
(Spanish. Fourteenth century. Cf. Chenery 1905: 123)

2.3. A gradual change in clitic placement through the medieval period
When we look at Portuguese texts corresponding to the period between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries, we realize that a slow and gradual change took place during this period with regard to clitic placement in unmarked main clauses – the kind of clause where the clitic could precede or follow the verb. In the thirteenth century, proclisis was possible but rare; in the sixteenth century, the situation is reversed: the occurrences of enclisis are very infrequent. This change takes place step by step (although there is perhaps some rupture point between the fourteenth and the fifteenth century, a matter I will not go into here) Table 1 provides the relevant data (see Martins 1994b).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1250-99</th>
<th>1300-49</th>
<th>1350-99</th>
<th>1400-49</th>
<th>1450-99</th>
<th>1500-49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clitic-Verb</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4/56)</td>
<td>(15/61)</td>
<td>(18/43)</td>
<td>(30/38)</td>
<td>(38/41)</td>
<td>(80/81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb-Clitic</td>
<td>92.9%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(52/56)</td>
<td>(46/61)</td>
<td>(25/43)</td>
<td>(8/38)</td>
<td>(3/41)</td>
<td>(1/81)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Data from Portuguese legal documents

Studies on clitic placement in Medieval Portuguese based on literary texts (see Lawton 1966, Ogando 1980, Silva 1989, Salvi 1990, Lobo 1996) make it possible to confirm the tendency showed by table 1, whose data come from legal documents only. As for the sixteenth century, I examined several letters, chronicles, and technical texts (cf. Martins 1994b). The order clitic-verb appears generally to dominate over the order verb-clitic, but the situation is not as extreme as in the legal documents. The rate of proclisis appears to oscillate between approximately 1% and 30%.

I do not know of comparable data concerning medieval and early Renaissance Spanish. I nevertheless have some information on the proportion of proclisis and enclisis at the fringes of the relevant period. Barry (1987) who studies thirteenth century Spanish points out that at that time “the overwhelming majority of main clause clitics are postverbal.” (Barry 1987: 215). On the other hand, Keniston (1937) describing clitic placement in sixteenth century Spanish observes that “already in the sixteenth century the representation of [the principles which govern pronoun position] in speech was establishing, by virtue of frequency of usage, a set of patterns which in contemporary speech have been elevated into grammatical rules.” (Keniston 1937: 90). In line with Keniston, but bearing more explicitly on the issue under consideration, Lesman (1980) states that in the sixteenth century Spanish authors “place the pronouns before or after the verb” but “there is a preference for proclisis” (Lesman 1980: 92). Hence I presume that a similar changing path developed in Spanish and Portuguese through the medieval period.

The change that takes place between the thirteenth and the sixteenth centuries patterns like a change in use. In fact the option between preverbal and postverbal placement of the clitics in main clauses of the relevant kind was never lost. Only the clear preference for the order verb-clitic in the thirteenth century was little by little dropped in favor of the preference for the order clitic-verb that became dominant in the fifteenth and sixteenth
centuries. The change was slow and progressive, as is characteristic of changes in use. Therefore, although in the sixteenth century the order verb-clitic is sparsely attested, I assume it was grammatically possible.

In former work, I suggested that sentences showing the order clitic-verb would be emphatic, in contrast to neutral sentences with the order verb-clitic. The alternative orders displayed by sentences like (19) and (20) below would thus correspond to the following semantic contrast:

(19)  
E Rotas lho outorgou  
and Rotas him-it conceded  
‘And Rotas did concede it to him’  

(20)  
E elle outorgou lho  
and he conceded him-it  
‘And he conceded it to him’  

Under this interpretation the variant clitic positions exhibited by unmarked main clauses would be semantically motivated. The change that developed between the thirteenth and the sixteenth centuries may accordingly be described as a case of increasing preference for the emphatic construction (with the order clitic-verb) over the non-emphatic verb-clitic construction, until the point that the verb-clitic order showed up very infrequently. The result of such a process is that speakers lose the possibility of contrasting the neutral and the marked constructions and come to interpret the emphatic one as neutral. This type of scenario may explain the ensuing changes in clitic placement in Portuguese and Spanish. As a consequence of the weakening of evidence for two positions available for clitics, each of them with a particular interpretative effect, a fixed word order ended up being acquired by a new generation of speakers. Note that this kind of approach accounts not only for the loss of variation between proclisis and enclisis in unmarked main clauses but also for the loss of variation between interpolation and adjacency to the verb in subordinate clauses and in main clauses introduced by wh-phrases, focused constituents, quantifiers and certain adverbs. Both types of word order variation depended on the availability of the option to place the clitic in one of two distinct positions in clause structure (see section 4).

As the hypothesis I am suggesting to account for the variant patterns of clitic placement found in medieval and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish can hardly be tested against the available historical data (being mainly supported on a theoretical basis), I will bring into consideration a different kind of data. Variation between enclisis and proclisis in unmarked main clauses can still be attested, although rarely, in contemporary Portuguese dialects. The example given below, taken from a corpus of spoken language, appears to bring support to the suggested semantic interpretation of the variant word orders. The dialogue reproduced in (21) took place during a session of field work conducted by researchers engaged in a project of linguistic atlas. The misapprehension behind the speech interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee is motivated by the unexpected phonetic form of the word nascente ‘orient’, which the informant pronounces with rhotacism of the coda segment in the initial syllable. When at request of the interviewer the informant repeats for the third time the same information, he changes the enclitic pattern in (21b) for the proclitic pattern in (21f). It seems legitimate to conclude, given the discourse situation in point, that the informant did wish to reinforce his assertion by using proclisis as a strategy to add emphasis to the sentence.
3. The broken unity: divergent outcomes of syntactic change.

In section 2, it has been shown that at an earlier stage (which I will refer from now on as stage I) similar facts are attested in Portuguese and Spanish with respect to clitic placement. At this stage (up to the sixteenth century) Portuguese and Spanish share interpolation, object scrambling and the possibility of enclisis in finite main clauses. See examples (3) to (18) above. As for interpolation, however, it should be noted that in Spanish it is well attested up to the fifteenth century but rare afterwards (see Kenison 1937:101) while in Portuguese it remains fairly productive in the sixteenth century. The high frequency of interpolation which Teyssier (1959: 385-386) identifies in the Spanish and bilingual plays of Gil Vicente is one example of the syntactic interference of Portuguese in the sixteenth century ‘Spanish of Portugal’. Cf. section 1 above, and the examples below.

(22) **Assi como o vos fazeis**
so as it-ACC you-NOM-2PL do-2PL
‘in the way that you do it’
(Portuguese. *Tragicomédia pastoril da Serra da Estrela* 676. Taken from Teyssier 1959: 385)

(23) **Como la vos desseáis**
as it-ACC you-NOM-2PL wish-2PL
‘(I will do it) as you wish’
(Spanish. *Amadis de Gaula* 1166. Taken from Teyssier 1959: 385)

(24) **Este he o didal do menino**
this is the thimble of the boy
que me tu aqui trazias
that me-ACC you-NOM here brought-2SG
‘This is the boy's thimble which you brought me here’
(Portuguese. *Auto da Lusitânia* 254-255. Taken from Teyssier 1959: 385)

(25) **Que se nos isto no val**
because if us-acq this not help
‘because if this cannot help us’
(Spanish. Auto da Festa 146. Taken from Teyssier 1959: 385)

In the ensuing chronological period (which I will refer from now on as stage II, from the second half of the sixteenth century) enclisis nearly disappears, except in V1 sentences where the Tobler-Mussafia constraint remains active. Proclisis becomes then the regular pattern of clitic placement in finite main clauses. On the other hand, medieval and early Renaissance interpolation (of both heads and XPs) is no more an option. Object scrambling is concomitantly lost. At this point Portuguese and Spanish seem to be evolving in the same direction.

After the seventeenth century the obligatory adjacency between clitic and verb resulting from the loss of interpolation is consolidated. In Portuguese however enclisis reappears strongly soon becoming the only allowed pattern of clitic placement in unmarked main clauses (Portuguese stage III). See table 2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Proclisis</th>
<th>Enclisis</th>
<th>Interpolation (of heads and XPs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Afonso de Albuquerque</td>
<td>(1462?-1515)</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damião de Góis</td>
<td>(1502-1574)</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernão Mendes Pinto</td>
<td>(1510?-1583)</td>
<td>98.1%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diogo do Couto</td>
<td>(1542-1616)</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francisco Manuel de Mello</td>
<td>(1608-1666)</td>
<td>92.3%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>yes (residual)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>António Vieira</td>
<td>(1608-1697)</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>António Verney</td>
<td>(1713-1792)</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeida Garrett</td>
<td>(1799-1854)</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>80.7%</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliveira Martins</td>
<td>(1845-1894)</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Clitic placement in Portuguese from the 16th century to the 19th century

Differently from Portuguese, Spanish stabilizes proclisis and after the seventeenth century extends it to verb initial sentences getting rid of the Tobler-Mussafia constraint. Hence the contemporary contrast between Spanish and Portuguese with respect to clitic placement, which sentences (26) vs. (27) below exemplify.

(26) Spanish:  
*El rojo te queda bien* 
the red you-DAT goes fine  
‘Red suits you’

(27) Portuguese:  
*O vermelho fica-te bem* 
the red goes you-DAT fine  
‘Red suits you’
4. A diachronic generative syntax approach to clitic placement in Romance, with special reference to Portuguese and Spanish

VP-ellipsis (a construction which allows that verbal objects be not expressed) is found in Portuguese in replies to yes/no questions and in the second conjunct of coordinate structures, as examples (28) and (29) show:

(28)  *A Marta deu um livro ao João?  Sim, deu.
      the Martha gave a book to-the John yes gave
      ‘Did Martha give a book to John? Yes, she did.’

(29)  *O João está a ler esse romance e a Marta também está.
      the John is reading that novel and the Martha also is
      ‘John is reading that novel and Martha is too.’

In contrast to Portuguese, Spanish does not allow VP-ellipsis in either of these contexts, as exemplified in (30) and (31) below:

(30)  *¿Marta le dio un libro a Juan?  *Sí, dio.
      Martha him gave a book to John yes gave
      ‘Did Martha give a book to John? Yes, she did.’

(31)  *Juan está leyendo esa novela y Marta está también
      John is reading that novel and Martha is also
      ‘John is reading that novel and Martha is too.’

The availability of VP-ellipsis in Portuguese makes possible that a minimal answer to a yes/no question consists of a bare verb. This is indeed the unmarked pattern in Portuguese, just as it was in Latin (see Hale & Buck 1903, Woodcock 1959):

      the John made the bed did
      ‘Did John make his bed? Yes, he did.’

(33)  Latin:  Clodius insidias fecit Miloni?  Fecit.
      Clodius-NOM plots-ACC made-3SG Miloni-DAT Made
      ‘Did Clodius plot against Milo? Yes, he did.’
      (Cicero. Example taken from Pinkster 1990: 1919)

Although Modern Spanish diverges from Portuguese in this respect, medieval and early Renaissance Spanish did not, as examples (34) to (36) below show. Since sentences (34) to (36) would be ungrammatical in Modern Spanish, we have tracked down one more case of syntactic splitting between Portuguese and Spanish after the sixteenth century. It should be noted that sentences with VP-ellipsis were common in Spanish in the sixteenth century. Keniston (1937), who carried out research based on a large corpus of sixteenth century Castillian prose, points out that “in direct discourse object pronouns are rarely used with a verb thus repeated with si” (Keniston 1937: 593).

(34)  ¿I traedes uostros escriptos? Rei, si traemos
and bring your books?  yes bring
‘And, do you bring your books? Yes, King, we do.’
(Spanish. Twelfth century. Gifford & Hodcroft 1959: 42)

(35) ¿Sois vos alguno dellos?  Si soy
are you any of them?  yes am
‘Are you one of them? Yes, I am.’
(Spanish. Sixteenth century. Keniston 1937: 593)

(36) – Pues ¿quien esta arriba?
‘Who is upstairs?’
– ¿Quiéreslo saber?
want-it to know?
‘Do you want to know it?’
– Quiero.
want
‘Yes, I do’
(Spanish. Late fifteenth century. Cejador y Frauca 1913: 62)

In this section I will take a theoretical approach (within the Chomskyan framework) to the facts which I have been describing. In that way I will be able to show how on an abstract level different apparently unrelated empirical facts depend upon common properties of grammar.

4.1. Modern Romance vs. Old Romance
In Romance, enclisis in tensed clauses correlates with the possibility of VP-ellipsis and concomitantly with a pattern of minimal answer to yes/no questions consisting of a bare verb. The contemporary Romance languages split in two groups with respect to such correlation. Portuguese and Galician have enclisis in tensed clauses and license VP-ellipsis, as the data in Table 3 below show; in Spanish, Catalan, French, Italian and Roumanian enclisis in tensed clauses is not allowed, proclisis being pervasive, and VP-ellipsis is not permitted either, as the data in Table 4 below show. In these languages an affirmative word (but crucially not the verb) occurs in minimal answers to yes/no questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Sentence 1</th>
<th>Sentence 2</th>
<th>Enclisis</th>
<th>VP-ellipsis</th>
<th>Proclisis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese:</td>
<td>(Tu) deste-lhe o livro?</td>
<td>Dei.</td>
<td>Enclisis</td>
<td>VP-ellipsis</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galician:</td>
<td>(Tu) décheselle o livro?</td>
<td>Din.</td>
<td>Enclisis</td>
<td>VP-ellipsis</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish:</td>
<td>Le diste el libro?</td>
<td>Sí.</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan:</td>
<td>Li has donat el llibre?</td>
<td>Sí.</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French:</td>
<td>Lui as-tu donné le livre?</td>
<td>Oui.</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian:</td>
<td>Gli hai dato il libro?</td>
<td>Sí.</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roumanian:</td>
<td>I-ai dat caietul?</td>
<td>Da.</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Enclisis and VP-ellipsis
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<td>VP-ellipsis</td>
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<td>(Tu) décheselle o livro?</td>
<td>Din.</td>
<td>Enclisis</td>
<td>VP-ellipsis</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
</tr>
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<td>Le diste el libro?</td>
<td>Sí.</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalan:</td>
<td>Li has donat el llibre?</td>
<td>Sí.</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
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<td>Lui as-tu donné le livre?</td>
<td>Oui.</td>
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<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
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<td>Gli hai dato il libro?</td>
<td>Sí.</td>
<td>Proclisis</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
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</table>

Table 4: Proclisis
In order to account for the correlation illustrated by the data displayed above, I propose that enclisis and VP-ellipsis emerge in languages where the functional category $\Sigma$ which encodes polarity values, i.e., affirmation, negation, modality – bears a strong V-feature (Portuguese and Galician), whereas such phenomena are absent from languages where the V-feature of $\Sigma$ is weak (Spanish, Catalan, French, Italian and Roumanian) – cf. Martins (1994a).

Admitting that checking theory should not be part of a minimalist model of grammar (compare Chomsky 2000 with Chomsky 1995), I take the ‘strenght’ property of a functional category to still be relevant (cf. Chomsky 2000: 132) in two ways: Strong functional categories can license null constituents. Strong functional heads are necessarily part of spelled out morphological words in the Morphology component of grammar (cf. Chomsky 1994, 2000, Halle and Marantz 1993, Harley and Noyer 1999, Embick and Noyer 2001). As for strong $\Sigma$ this requisit is satisfied by merging $\Sigma$ with a head related to $\Sigma$ by bearing polarity features.

I take the heads which encode polarity features and therefore can agree and merge with $\Sigma$ to be C, Neg and V. The merging operation may take place in the syntactic component or post-syntactically, in the Morphology component, as will be clarified farther on in this section. I assume that main clauses are usually IPs, not CPs, following ideas implemented by Bošković (1996, 1997), and Thráinsson (1996), among others, on the non-universality of clause structure – as a corollary of principles of economy of representations. In declarative affirmative main clauses, C and Neg being not projected, strong $\Sigma$ merges with V. Enclisis is the outcome of this merger between V and $\Sigma$, clitics occurring in a lower (or more rightward) position, which I will identify later on in this section. VP-ellipsis, on the other hand, is licensed by the Agree relation (cf. Chomsky 2000) between strong $\Sigma$ and V, independently of the fact that $\Sigma$ merges with V, C, or Neg.

Laka (1990) proposes that in Romance the lexical items that show up in minimal unmarked answers to yes/no questions incorporate in $\Sigma$. Under the analysis that I am proposing here, this is so independently of the strong or weak character of $\Sigma$. However, ‘bare verb’ minimal answers to yes/no questions can only be a property of languages where the strong nature of $\Sigma$ induces merging of this head with the V head; otherwise only an affirmative/negative word will be able to give lexical content to the $\Sigma$ head. Facts relating to VP-ellipsis and the patterns of answer to yes/no questions indicate that $\Sigma$ was a strong functional category across the Old Romance languages – see Martins (forthcoming b).

### 4.2. Change in clitic placement in Portuguese and Spanish: from unity to diversity

The analysis that I will put forward to account for the changes in clitic placement which took place in Portuguese and Spanish (see section 3. above) relies on the following assumptions:

a) Clitics are heads in Old and Modern Romance. Under a bare phrase structure perspective, however, clitics qualify both as minimal and maximal syntactic categories (Cf. Chomsky 1994, 1995)\(^\text{30}\), therefore clitics may move into positions unfit for regular heads.

b) Clitics move into the domain of AgrS (or of CH AgrS, after AgrS moves to $\Sigma$). See Martins (2000:171-172) for a motivation of this assumption.

c) A clitic occurs at the structural edge of the category ($X^0$ or XP) that contains it, that is, the clitic is dominated by the highest segment of that category. This is a reformulated version of the Edge Principle proposed by Raposo (2000) which I adopt in its essentials.\(^\text{31}\)

d) Strong $\Sigma$ merges with V when neither C nor Neg are projected, as is commonly the case in affirmative main clauses. In clauses that include C (like finite subordinate clauses) or
a functional category belonging to the CP field (as is presumably the case in main clauses with proclisis triggers) \( \Sigma \) merges with C.

e) In Old and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish AgrS has an uninterpretable selectional feature (i.e., an EPP-feature) with an *Attract-all-F* property, in the sense of Bošković 1999; therefore AgrS allows multiple Specs\(^{32}\) – cf. Chomsky (1994), Grewendorf and Sabel (1999), Martins (2002).

Given these assumptions, variation in clitic placement in Old and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish, i.e. at *stage I* (cf. section 3 above), can be straightforwardly derived.

In unmarked main clauses proclisis results from the formation of a complex head derived from movement of the clitic to \( \Sigma \) after AgrS, containing V, has moved to \( \Sigma \): \([\text{clitic}\Sigma]\)[AgrSV,T,AgrS]\(\Sigma\)]. Given the Edge Principle, the clitic must “meet AgrS” in \( \Sigma \); if the clitic would left-adjoint to the AgrS head, AgrS would be unable to move into \( \Sigma \) carrying the verb along\(^{33}\).

In subordinate clauses and in main clauses introduced by wh-phrases, focused constituents, quantifiers, and certain adverbs proclisis with adjacency arises when the verb and the clitic are incorporated in AgrS. Recall that in subordinate clauses as well as in main clauses introduced by proclisis triggers \( \Sigma \) merges with C, not with V\(^34\).

Both enclisis and interpolation, on the other hand, involve movement of the clitic to (the most external) Spec,AgrSP, a position accessible to clitics given its minimal/maximal nature. Interpolation emerges when other overtly filled Spec(s) of AgrS is/are projected and the verb does not move beyond AgrS (this being typically the subordinate clauses pattern). Enclisis is derived by movement of the verb into \( \Sigma \) while the clitic is incorporated in Spec,AgrSP. Enclisis arises in unmarked main clauses because this is the kind of clause that does not include C nor Neg. Thus strong \( \Sigma \) must be licensed by merging with the verb. Recall that I am following Bošković (1996, 1997) and Thráinsson (1996), among others, on the hypothesis of the non-universality of clause structure. According to this view, Universal Grammar defines the set of functional categories which particular languages select from; so it is not the case that all functional categories are instantiated in all languages. Moreover the subset of functional categories selected by a given language may not be present in all clause types of that language. Bošković (1996:290) formulates the Minimal Structure Principle (MSP) as shown under (37) below:

\[
\text{(37) Provided that lexical requirements of relevant elements are satisfied, if two representations have the same lexical structure, and serve the same function, then the representation that has fewer projections is to be chosen as the syntactic representation serving that function.}
\]

According to the MSP, main clauses will be C(omplementizer)P(hrases)s only if their CP status is imposed by lexical requirements (e.g., wh-questions). Otherwise, since (unmarked) main clauses are not introduced by a complementizer, CP will not be projected.

As for the kind of unrestricted IP-scrambling displayed by Old Portuguese and Old Spanish, it directly correlates with interpolation and enclisis because like interpolation and enclisis it depends on AgrS being associated with an *Attract-all-F* EPP-feature, therefore projecting multiple Specifiers.

The historical period identified as *Stage II* in section 3. emerges when AgrS loses the ability to select multiple Specs (see Martins 2002 on this matter). At this point, AgrS is associated with an *Attract-1F* EPP-feature, making available one Spec for the subject\(^{35}\). This change implies the concomitant losses of enclisis, interpolation, and IP-scrambling. The only options for clitics at this point will be incorporating in AgrS where the verb is also
incorporated (in subordinate clauses and main clauses with proclisis triggers) or moving into Σ after AgrS containing the verb has merged with Σ (in unmarked main clauses). In both situations proclisis and adjacency are derived.

As for the generalized enclitic pattern of Portuguese stage III, we could admit that it would reflect the emergence of excorporation as a grammatical option. In this scenario, enclisis would be derived by movement of the head \([\text{AgrSV}, T, \text{AgrS}]\) into Σ leaving the clitic incorporated in AgrS. Once excorporation would come into play, the clitic (which in Standard Modern Portuguese does not have features relating it to Σ) would not be allowed to move into Σ – cf. Bošković 1997. However, I will take here Kayne's view (in 1991) that excorporation is not a grammatical option.

As an alternative approach, I make the hypothesis that at Portuguese stage III AgrS ceases to select an EPP-feature; so AgrS does not project a Spec.36 This change makes possible that Σ merges with V post-syntactically, that is, in the Morphology component. Once this option becomes available, it appears to exclude the option for syntactic merger.37

Morphological merger takes place under adjacency (cf. Bolbjak 1995, Embick and Noyer 2001). Since at this stage there is no Spec intervening between Σ and ‘V-in-AgrS’, the two heads can in principle undergo morphological merger. If a clitic has left-adjointed to AgrS (in the Syntax component), however, the clitic breaks the required adjacency between Σ and ‘V-in-AgrS’ inhibiting morphological merger. This is so given the ambiguity of the relevant configuration with respect to the phrase structure status of both the category \([\text{AgrS V, T, AgrS}]\) and the clitic adjoined to it. Because \([\text{AgrS V, T, AgrS}]\) does not project a Spec position, it can be interpreted as a maximal projection to which a maximal category, the clitic, is adjoined. So the clitic is not clearly an X0 incorporated into an X0, that is a morphological subword (differently from T and V, which carry morphological features identifying them as a suffix and a root, respectively). This is the reason why the clitic has to be “removed” in order to permit merger of Σ with ‘V-in-AgrS’ under adjacency. I propose that enclisis is the outcome of Local Dislocation merger with inversion (cf. Embick and Noyer 2001) between the clitic and Agr38. Then Σ undergoes Local Dislocation merger with ‘V-in-AgrS’.

Local Dislocation merger is an operation that takes place after Linearization applies, converting the hierarchical structure received from Syntax into a linear structure. Therefore at this point (in the absence of syntactic hierarchical structure) the Edge Principle does not apply, being not violated by the inversion operation between clitic and Agr39.

In Spanish the pattern of clitic placement represented by Portuguese stage III is not attested. Stage III was not reached in Spanish because in this language Σ lost the strong property which induced merger between Σ and V in unmarked main clauses.

It is a well known fact that Proto and Old Romance morphology shows a tendency towards debilitation. The fact that the V-features of Σ become weak in Spanish (as well as in Catalan, French, Italian and Roumanian) is to be seen as part of this general process of morphological debilitation. Because there is no merging between Σ and V in Modern Spanish, enclisis is not derived. On the other hand, in minimal unmarked answers to yes/no questions Σ has to have lexical content; once the verb does not merge with Σ it cannot fulfill this role. It is the former adverbial si ‘yes’, which optionally co-occurred with the verb in affirmative replies to yes/no questions, that takes the role of ‘lexical-filler’ of Σ. The structures associated with the proposed change are given below (\(V_s = \text{strong V-features}; V_w = \text{weak V-features}\)).
5. Conclusion

A comparative approach to the syntax of two neighbour languages of the Romance family, Portuguese and Spanish, showed how their historical development resulted in syntactic splitting in some respects. While in the medieval and early Renaissance period Portuguese and Spanish are alike with regard to clitic placement and share a similar way of answering to yes/no questions (which directly relates to the availability/unavailability of VP-ellipsis), Modern Portuguese and Modern Spanish group apart with regard to such properties. The two changing features taken under scrutiny (which were nevertheless interpreted as distinct manifestations of one same syntactic change at a more abstract level) illustrate a ‘divergence’ pattern which is expected to reappear in a larger picture (still to be assembled). A better knowledge of the extent of the syntactic unity between Portuguese and Spanish at earlier times will be needed to fully understand how a ‘Spanish of Portugal’ emerged in a diglossic context at the late Middle Ages. Under the view that this variety of Spanish resulted largely from a relexification of Portuguese, it comes as no surprise that the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries Spanish-Portuguese diglossia did not have any visible impact in the ensuing historical development of Portuguese syntax.

6. Appendix

(40) a. *el rey dioles fideles*
    the king gave-*them* judges
    ‘The King appointed judges to decide the result of the competition between them.’
    (Spanish. Twelfth century. Menéndez Pidal 1946: 1159 (line 3593))
b. *El rey lo ha uedado*
the king it has forbidden
‘The King forbade it.’
(Spanish. Twelfth century. Menéndez Pidal 1946: 910 (line 42))

(41) a. *e mandolas fenchir de arena*
and (he-)sent-them fill of sand
‘And he sent to fill them with sand’
(Spanish. Fourteenth century. Menéndez-Pidal 1965: 325)

b. *e le desamo de allj adelante*
and him (he-)disliked from then on
‘And from that moment he despised him’
(Spanish. Fourteenth century. Menéndez-Pidal 1965: 324)

(42) a. *y acabada su habla respondióle*
and finished his speech (she-)anwered-him
‘Once he finished what he had to say, she anwered him’
(Spanish. Fifteenth century. Gili-Gaya 1950: 155)

b. *en el fin de su habla me desesperó*
at the end of his speech me (he-)tormented
‘after he spoke, I was driven to despair’
(Spanish. Fifteenth century. Gili-Gaya 1950: 137)

(43) *otro en la noche fuese el Duque con su gente, e yo con ellos (...)*
the-other(-day) in the night left-himself the duke with his people and I with them (...) 
*y otro día de mañana nos hecimos a la vela*
and other day in morning ourselves went on the sail
‘The next day at night the duke left with his people and I went with them (...) and the next day morning we set sail’
(Spanish. Sixteenth century. Keniston 1937: 94)

(44) a. *E a donzela foi-se e deu àgua à rainha*
and the damsel went-herself and gave water to-the queen
‘And the damsel left and brought some water to the queen’

b. *E a donzela lhe disse entom que achara um mouro doente*
and the damsel him said then that (she-)had-met a Muslim sick
‘And the damsel told him that she had met a sick Muslim’

(45) a. *E elle outorgoulho*
and he conceded-him-it
‘And he conceded it to him’

b. *E Rotas lho outorgou*
and Rotas him-it conceded
‘And he conceded it to him’

(46)  a.  E a aguia feze-o assy
and the eagle did-it so
‘And the eagle did it that way’

b.  E o asno lhe deu dous couces
and the donkey him gave two kicks
‘And the donkey gave him two kicks’

(47)  a.  de quem quer que sobre elles algũ embargo ou impedimento lhes poser
from who-ever that over them some obstruction or constraint them put
‘[protecting the renters] from whoever tries to block them [the lands] from them’
(Portuguese. Year 1544. Martins 2001: 561)

b.  de quem quer que lhe sobre elle (...) algũu embargo ou empedymento puser
from who-ever that him over it some obstruction or constraint puts
‘[keeping him free] from whoever tries to block it [the land] from him’
(Portuguese. Year 1540. Martins 2001: 556)

(48)  a.  E si él mejor lo faze
and if he better it does
‘And if he does it better’

b.  si las omne faze a entención que dios sea ende servido
if them man does with intention that god be of-it served
‘If people do it in order to serve God’

(49)  E sempre m’eu mal acharei
and always myself I bad will-feel
‘And I will always feel myself bad’
(Portuguese. Thirteenth/fourteenth century. Lapa 1965: 155 (text 93))

(50)  ¡Ya nunca vos yo más veré!
already never you-ACC I more will-see
‘I will never see you again’
(Spanish. Fourteenth century. Cf. Chenery 1905: 123)

(51)  Así les Dios aluengue los días de las vidas
so **them-DAT God** extends the days of the lives

‘May God extend their lives’

(Spanish. Fourteenth century. Chenery 1905: 123)
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Since in the medieval texts punctuation does not signal syntactic boundaries in the way it does in coordinate structures within embedded domains – relevant examples are found not only in Old Portuguese and Afonso de Albuquerque Portuguese but not in Modern Spanish because only in Portuguese enclisis in finite clauses persisted. Therefore, mesoclisis is found in the same type of clauses where enclisis arises; it is allowed in Modern suffixes (T+Agr). Mesoclisis is a particular instance of enclisis with the clitic leaning on the verbal root.

Spanish-Portuguese diglossia extends into the seventeenth century, not only while the kings of Spain (Philip I, Philippe II, Philippine III) rule over Portugal (from 1581 to 1640) but even afterwards, reaching the eighteenth century. The Spanish of seventeenth century Portuguese authors however seems to be just standard Spanish, not the former variety of Spanish. See Castro (Forthcoming).

I leave the issue of phonological cliticization out of the scope of this paper. Thus I use the terms 'enclisis' and 'proclisis' in a purely distributional vein to refer to the position of the clitic in relation to the verb.

With futur and conditional forms of the verb mesoclisis can be found in medieval and early Renaissance Portuguese and Spanish as well as in Modern Portuguese. "Mesoclisis" terms the situation in which a clitic is placed inside a morphological word, namely a verb, surfacing in between the verbal root and the inflectional suffixes (T+Agr). Mesoclisis is a particular instance of enclisis with the clitic leaning on the verbal root. Therefore, mesoclisis is found in the same type of clauses where enclisis arises; it is allowed in Modern Portuguese but not in Modern Spanish because only in Portuguese enclisis in finite clauses persisted.

Marked main clauses which like subordinate clauses induce obligatory proclisis will be considered in section 2.2.

As for twelfth century Portuguese, the written sources are too scarce to permit the intended exemplification.

The set of texts from which the sentences are taken is listed below, in chronological order:
contemporary texts, the level at which coordination applies is not always easily identified. Still we will possibly be left with a handful of clear examples of enclisis in clauses involving coordination below CP.

12 In Portuguese, interpolation remains fairly productive in the sixteenth century while in Spanish interpolation is well attested up to the fifteenth century but rare afterwards. A few examples of residual interpolation in sixteenth century Spanish prose are given by Keniston (1937: 101).

13 The sentence in (10) is found in Rivero (1991: 244). I quote from Menéndez Pidal (1919) because the example is incorrectly dated in Rivero (1991).

14 In Focus-movement configurations, the focused constituent is not ‘information’ focus associated with new information but rather identification focus associated with an exhaustive and exclusive reading.

15 Cf. Lesman (1980: 95): “Proclisis is the norm in the sixteenth century when the subject, the direct or indirect object (…), or an adverbial clause (…) precede the verb, but there is always the possibility of enclisis, triggered by a variety of factors. In the seventeenth century proclisis dominates in these sentences, with just very few exceptions”.

16 See http://www.clul.ul.pt/sectores/cordial-sin/projecto_cordial-sin.html. The project CORDIAL-SIN has been funded by Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia through the European Community programmes PRAXIS XXI and POSI (PRAXIS/P/PLP/13046/1998; POSI/PLP/33275/1999).

17 Some contemporary Portuguese dialects still allow interpolation; it differs from medieval and early Renaissance interpolation, however, as only heads (not XPs) can be interpolated.

18 In fact stage III emerges in Portuguese already in the seventeenth century but at the time the large majority of authors/texts still reflect the stage II grammar. See Martins (1994b) for details.

19 The values for proclisis and enclisis given in table 2 refer to clitic placement in unmarked main clauses. Since focused phrases are difficult to identify in the written sources, however, I admit that some of the percentage of proclisis obtained for each one of the authors represented in table 2 comes from clauses introduced by focused phrases (i.e. a proclisis trigger). The relevant emphatic/identificational focus-construction appears to be more productive until the 18th/19th centuries than it is nowadays.

21 See Góis (1566: 1-50).
22 See Pinto (1614: 1-60).
26 See Verney (1746: 17-81).
27 See Garrett (1938).
28 See Martins (1885: 1-50).
29 Cf. Laka (1990: 86): “I argue here that, similarly to the way in which the head Neg can head its own functional projection (…), there is also a X^0 Aff, which projects an Affirmation Phrase. These two heads (Neg and Aff) are further argued to belong in the same syntactic category, which I will call Σ. Thus, both NegP and AffP are claimed to be different instantiations of a more abstract projection: the Σ Phrase”.
30 “A category that does not project any further is a maximal projection XP, and one that is not a projection at all is a minimal projection X^min; any other is an X’, invisible at the interface and for computation. As we proceed, I will qualify the conclusion somewhat for X^0 categories, which have a very special role.” (Chomsky 1995: 242-243)

“A consequence is that an item can be both an X^0 and an XP. Does this cause problems? Are there examples that illustrate this possibility? I see no particular problems, and one case comes to mind as a possible illustration: clitics. Under the DP hypothesis, clitics are Ds. Assume further that a clitic raises from its position and attaches to an inflectional head. In its position, the clitic is an XP; attachment to a head requires that it be an X^0 (on fairly standard assumptions).” (Chomsky 1995:249)

31 Cf. Raposo (2000:290-291): “Clitics cannot appear embedded in a functional category that contains them. This is explicitly formulated in the following principle, which I take to be a primitive of the morphological component of UG:

(...) The Edge Principle

A clitic occurs at the structural edge of a head H that contains it”.

32 This selectional property of AgrS varies parametrically across languages and when available is optional

33 Cf. Raposo (2000: 289-291) for a clarification of why, given the Edge Principle, a (functional) head with an incorporated clitic is frozen in place.

34 Therefore in subordinate clauses [AgrS[TV,AgrS]] does not move into Σ.
Maybe Spec.AgrSP is still occasionally available for the clitic (when it is not taken by the subject). This would explain why enclisis, although sparsely attested, is not totally absent from non-V1 structures during stage II.

As for Modern Spanish, it is irrelevant whether AgrS selects a Spec position. Within the approach that I am proposing here the fact that enclisis is not a grammatical option in finite clauses in Spanish is independently motivated. An anonymous reviewer suggests that Modern Portuguese and Modern Spanish should be similar with respect to the EPP properties of AgrS because they are both null subject languages. I consider that the licensing of null subjects does not depend on the availability of the Spec of AgrS position. Space considerations, however, preclude me from going into the arguments which support this view. See Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) on this matter.

An anonymous reviewer notes that the analysis proposed in this paper derives in different ways Old Portuguese and Modern Portuguese enclisis (in finite clauses). I think this is a welcome result because Old Portuguese enclisis and Modern Portuguese enclisis are in fact dissimilar, even though many authors have thought differently (cf. Barbosa (1993, 1996, 2000), Benincà (1995), Galves (1997, 2000) and Salvi (1990, 1991, 1993, 1997), among others). It is worth to stress, with respect to the relevant type of clauses, that Modern Portuguese enclisis is obligatory while Old Portuguese enclisis is optional, displaying variation with proclisis. See Martins (forthcoming a).

Brazilian Portuguese contrasts with European Portuguese in that this inversion operation does not take place. So Brazilian Portuguese displays generalized proclisis although Σ bears a strong V-feature in Brazilian Portuguese, as shown by the fact that VP-ellipsis is a grammatical option. I interpret these facts as indicating that clitics in Brazilian Portuguese are verbal prefixes adjoined to the Vroot; therefore clitics in Brazilian Portuguese do not block the adjacency between Σ and V that morphological merger requires. (Cf. the account given by Embick and Noyer (2001: 590) of the contrast between constituent negation and prefixal negation in relation to do-support).

Using as a diagnosis test the position of adverbs, Costa (1998) proposes that in contemporary European Portuguese the verb does not move beyond T. The analysis presented in this paper to account for enclisis in Modern European Portuguese can be harmonized with Costa's proposal. Admitting that the verb stays in T in contemporary European Portuguese, enclisis would be derived following morphological Lowering of both clitic and AgrS to T (cf. Costa 2001). There are some complications to this picture though, and I will not be able to go into details here.

Spanish sí ‘yes’ can express emphatic affirmation in declarative sentences whereas Portuguese sim ‘yes’ cannot. Consider the translation of the emphatic affirmative statement: She DID come. In Spanish one can say Ella sí vino, but in Portuguese *Ela sim veio is ungrammatical. This contrast shows that Spanish sí is a Σ-head whereas Portuguese sim is not.