

Clitic placement, VP-ellipsis and scrambling in Romance¹

Ana Maria Martins (University of Lisbon)

1. Introduction

My goal in this paper will be to account for variation and change with respect to clitic placement, VP-ellipsis and scrambling in non V1 finite clauses in Romance. The analysis I will put forward derives synchronic and diachronic variation with respect to clitic placement, VP-ellipsis and scrambling in Romance from the variable featural make-up of the functional heads Σ and AgrS, namely from the interplay between the 'strength' property of Σ and the EPP property of AgrS. I depart from previous diachronic analyses of clitic placement in Romance in essentially two ways: (i) I take Romance clitics to be heads from Old to Modern Romance (against Rivero 1986, 1991, 1997, Fontana 1993, 1997, Barbosa 1993, 1996, Halpern & Fontana 1994, Halpern 1995)²; (ii) I contend that V2, V3, etc. finite clauses with enclisis are not always 'disguised' V1 clauses (departing from Salvi 1990, 1991, 1993, 1997 and Benincà 1995, among others); therefore I do not see variation between proclisis and enclisis in non V1 finite clauses in Old Romance as an illusion created by the optional character of Left Dislocation³.

The paper is organized in five sections. In section 2 it is shown that in Romance there is a correlation which holds both synchronically and diachronically between the availability of VP-ellipsis and enclisis in finite clauses. It is proposed that VP-ellipsis and enclisis emerge in the languages where the polarity encoding functional head Sigma (Σ) has strong features, being not allowed in the languages where Σ is a weak functional head. In section 3 the connection between clitic placement and Old Romance IP-scrambling is elucidated. Because clitics are minimal/maximal entities (Chomsky 1994, 1995), clitic movement may target either a head or a Spec position. If the later option is taken clitics move into the same domain as non clitic scrambled objects, that is Spec of AgrS. In some Old Romance languages AgrS allows multiple Spec positions. In these languages interpolation (i.e. non adjacency between the clitic and the verb) is derived with the clitic placed in the outer Spec, AgrSP while scrambled objects or the subject occupy 'embedded' Spec positions in the AgrS domain. In section 4 a concise description of the different patterns of clitic placement in Old and Modern Romance is presented and a unified account of synchronic and diachronic variation is proposed. Section 5 summarizes and concludes the paper.

2. The correlation between enclisis and VP-ellipsis

2.1. The Modern Romance split: strong Σ vs. weak Σ

In Romance, enclisis in tensed clauses correlates with the possibility of VP-ellipsis and concomitantly with a pattern of minimal answer to a yes/no question consisting of a bare verb. The Romance languages split in two groups with respect to such correlation. The relevant contrast is exemplified with data taken from Portuguese (cf. (1) below) and from Spanish (cf. (2) below). Galician groups with Portuguese; Catalan, French, Italian and Romanian group with Spanish (see Martins 2003b for further exemplification).

Portuguese:

- (1) a. Tu deste-lhe o livro? (Enclisis OK)
you gave him/her the book
'Did you give him the book?'
- b. *Tu lhe deste o livro? (*Proclisis)
you him/her gave the book
'Did you give him the book?'
- c. Dei. (VP-ellipsis OK)

- gave – ‘Yes, I did’
- d. Sim, dei. (idem)
yes gave – ‘Yes, I did’
- e. Sim, dei-lho.
yes, gave him-it – ‘Yes, I did’

Spanish:

- (2) a. *Tú distele el libro? (*Enclisis)
you gave him/her the book
‘Did you give him the book?’
- b. Tú le diste el libro? (Proclisis OK)
you him/her gave the book
‘Did you give him the book?’
- c. *Di. (*VP-ellipsis)
gave – ‘Yes, I did’
- d. *Sí, di. (idem)
yes gave – ‘Yes, I did’
- e. Sí, se lo di.
yes, gave him-it – ‘Yes, I did’

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 Σ – which encodes polarity values, i.e., affirmation, negation, modality (Martins 2000b) – bears strong features (Portuguese and Galician), whereas such phenomena are absent from languages where Σ is weak (Spanish, Catalan, French, Italian and Romanian) – cf. Martins (1994)⁴. Departing from Chomsky (2000), I take the ‘strength’ property of a functional category to be relevant in two ways: (i) strong functional categories can license null constituents; (ii) strong functional heads are necessarily part of spelled out morphological words in the Morphology component of grammar (cf. Chomsky 1994, 1995, 2000, Halle and Marantz 1993, Harley and Noyer 1999, Embick and Noyer 2001)⁵. As for strong Σ , this requirement is satisfied by merging Σ with a head related to Σ by bearing polarity features. I take the heads which encode polarity values and therefore can agree and merge with Σ 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 in section 4 below. I further assume that main clauses are usually IPs, not CPs, following ideas implemented by Boskovic (1996, 1997), and Thráinsson (1996), among others, on the non-universality of clause structure. In declarative affirmative main clauses, C and Neg being not projected, strong Σ merges with V⁶. Enclisis is the outcome of this merger between V and Σ , as will be shown in section 4 below. VP-ellipsis, on the other hand, is licensed by the Agree relation (cf. Chomsky 2000) between strong Σ and V, independently of the fact that Σ 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 Σ . Under the analysis that I am proposing here, this is so independently of the strong or weak character of Σ . However, verbal answers to yes/no questions can only be a property of languages where the strong nature of Σ induces merging of this head with the V head; otherwise only an affirmative/negative word will be able to give lexical content to the Σ head. Thus in Spanish, in contrast to Portuguese, only *Sí* ‘yes’ (not **Di* ‘gave’) is a good affirmative answer to the question *Le diste el libro?* (‘Did you give him the book?’).

2.2. The strong nature of Sigma in Old Romance

It is a well known fact that verbal answers to yes/no questions are pervasively attested in Latin (see example (3) below). So Latin licensed VP-ellipsis (as well as others kinds of null constituents)⁷. It follows from the hypothesis formulated in section 2.1 above that Σ was a strong functional head in Latin.

- (3) Clodius insidias fecit Miloni? – Fecit.
Clodius-NOM plots made Miloni-DAT? made
'Did Clodius plot against Milo? Yes, he did.'
(Cicero. Pinkster 1990: 191)

Hence Portuguese and Galician display a conservative feature which is absent from the other contemporary Romance languages. We may ask however when did the split between the two identified groups of Romance languages arise. The empirical evidence offered by Old Spanish, Old French, Old Catalan and Old Occitan texts suggests that Σ was a strong functional category across the Old Romance languages. Sentences (4)-(5) from Old Spanish, (6)-(7) from Old French, (8)-(9) from Old Catalan, and (10)-(11) from Old Occitan are relevant examples. Further illustration of VP-ellipsis in Old Romance can be found in Keniston (1937), Foulet (1928), Moignet (1937), Blasco Ferrer (1984), and Jensen (1994).
Spanish:

- (4) ¿I traedes uostros escriptos? – Rei, si traemos
and bring your books? king AFF bring
'And, do you bring your books? Yes, King, we do.'
(Auto de los Reyes Magos. Gifford & Hodcroft 1966: 42)
- (5) – Pues ¿quien esta arriba?
'Who is upstairs?'
– ¿Quiéreslo saber? – Quiero.
want-it to know? want
'Do you want to know it? Yes, I do.'
(La Celestina. Cejador y Frauca 1913:62)

French:

- (6) – Dame, je crois bien qu'il est vostre filz, més il n'est pas filz le roi.
lady, I believe well that he is your son, but he NEG is not son (of-)the king
'My dear lady, I am sure he is your son, but he is not the king's son'
– Si est, dit la reyne
AFF is, said the queen
'Yes, he is, said the queen.'
(Les Sept Sages de Rome. The Hamburg corpus of Old French – Collaborative Center on Multilingualism, University of Hamburg)
- (7) Phelippe dist...: "Sire, parlé a moy a une part, vous et vos quatre compaignons".
Phelippe said: Sir, speak to me to the side (aside), you and your four companions
Et il respondirent et crierent tous cinc:
and they answered and shouted all five:
"Si m'aït Des, ne ferons"
if me helps God, NEG will-do
'We will not do it, so God help us.'
(Philippe de Novare. Foulet 1928: 237)

Catalan:

- (8) “E havie-hi altre cavaller, menys de vós”? “Sí havia”. – dix Curial
and was-there another knight, other than you? AFF was. – said Curial
‘And was there any knight besides you? Yes, there was.’
(Curial e Güelfa. Blasco Ferrer 1984: 181)
- (9) “Senyor cavaller, prec-vos que em digats si partits d’aqueix monastir
Mister knight, (I-)beg-you that me-DAT (you-)tell if (you-)left from that monastery
qui está aquí prop”. “Sí fac”.
that is here nearby. AFF did
‘Sir, would you please let me know whether you are coming from that nearby
monastery? Yes, I am.’
(Curial e Güelfa. Blasco Ferrer 1984: 181)

Occitan:

- (10) et as per so to cor dolen? – Si ai
and (you-)have for that your heart painful? AFF have
‘And is this why you feel sick at heart? Yes, it is.’
(G. de Bornelh. Jensen 1994: 282. Quoted in Fischer 2003: 171)
- (11) non saps? – Si fas
not know? AFF do
‘Don’t you know it? Yes, I do.’
(Flamenca. Jensen 1994: 282)

While in Old Spanish different verbs can be found in sentences displaying VP-ellipsis, in Old French, Old Catalan and Old Occitan the attested manifestations of VP-ellipsis include mostly the verbs *être/ésser* ‘to be’, *avoir/haver* ‘to have’ and *faire/fer* ‘to do’. We should not conclude from this scenario however that only auxiliary verbs would license VP-ellipsis in these languages. In fact the umbrella verb *faire/fer* does not appear to be an auxiliary since *faire/fer* is also used as an umbrella substitute in contexts where an auxiliary would be excluded; this is shown by example (12) below, from Old French.

- (12) Je vous aim plus que vos ne faciés mi
I you-ACC love more than you-NOM NEG do me
‘I am fonder of you than you are fond of me’
(Aucassin et Nicolet. Foulet 1928: 236)

On the other hand, while verbal answers with different main verbs are well attested in Old Spanish, a use of *hacer* ‘to do’ similar to the umbrella use of *faire/fer* is found in Spanish, as noted by Keniston (1937: 593) – “The verb of the question may be replaced by a form of the vicarious verb *hacer*, usually without an object pronoun”. I believe that it is the paucity of the available data with respect to VP-ellipsis in Old Romance that creates the illusion of a contrast between Spanish, on the one side, and French, Catalan and Occitan on the other. In fact, although infrequent, verbal replies with main verbs (beyond *être*, *avoir*, *faire*)⁸ are found in Old French, as pointed out by Moignet (1967), and exemplified by (13) below.

- (13) – Por quoi le demandez vos? fet li roi.
for what-reason it ask you-NOM? said the king
‘Why are you asking that? – said the king’
– Por ce, fet messire Gauvains, que je ne cuit pas que vous le sachiez.
for the-reason, said sir Gauvains, that I NEG think not that you it would-know

‘Because I believe that you do not know about it’
 – Si sai bien, fet li roi, mes vos ne le savez pas
 AFF know well, said the king, but you NEG it know not
 ‘Yes, I certainly do, said the king, but you do not’
 (Mort Artu. Moignet 1973: 288)

That the availability of VP-ellipsis is not lexically constrained in certain Old Romance languages appears to be also confirmed by example (11) above, from Old Occitan, here repeated as (14):

(14) ...non saps? – Si fas
 not know? AFF do
 ‘Don’t you know it? Yes, I do.’
 (Flamenca. Jensen 1994: 282)

In (14) VP-ellipsis shows up in the answer with *faire*, but it seems to be also displayed in the question with the main verb *saber* ‘to know’ (although we lack the ellipsis antecedent).

From the data presented above I draw the conclusion that Old Romance was uniform with respect to the nature and the licensing of Σ (although I am aware of the fact that the empirical evidence supporting this conclusion needs to be strengthened). We thus expect that the correlation between VP-ellipsis and enclisis identified in section 2.1 above on the basis of Modern Romance is confirmed by the Old Romance data. As will be shown in section 4. below this is in fact the case.

3. Clitic placement and scrambling

Old Portuguese is a SVO language. Nevertheless the OV order is derived when the object is left-dislocated, focused (identificational focus), or scrambled into the IP domain. The third type of movement is not permitted in Modern Portuguese and is optional in Old Portuguese as shown by the pair of sentences in (15) below.

(15) a. sse pela uētujra uos alguẽ a dita vĩa enbargar
 if by chance you-DAT someone the mentioned vineyard blocks
 ‘and if by chance someone blocks the vineyard from you’
 (13th century legal document. Martins 2001: 377)
 b. sse pela uētujra uos alguẽ enbargar a dita vĩa
 if by chance you-DAT someone blocks the mentioned vineyard
 ‘and if by chance someone blocks the vineyard from you’
 (13th century legal document. Martins 2001: 376)

The OV order derived from IP-scrambling typically emerges in subordinate clauses, presumably instantiating an extraction out of focus strategy (cf. Costa 1998, Martins 2002). Object scrambling is found both in sentences with overt and null subjects (see sentences (15) and (16) respectively) and is not restricted to one constituent per clause. So sentences (17) and (18) below are examples of multiple object scrambling. Scrambling affects DPs, PPs, APs, AdvPs, and reduced clauses (both infinitival or participial).

(16) como lhe entregou as terras que lhe de dar avia
 how him-DAT returned the lands that him-DAT of give had
 ‘how he returned him the lands that he ought to give him’
 (Fernão Lopes – 15th century prose. Costa 2001: 1849)

- (17) de quẽ lhe ssobre elle embargo poser
 from whoever him-DAT over it obstruction puts
 ‘[protecting him] from whoever tries to block it [the land] from him’
 (16th century legal document. Martins 2001: 300)
- (18) herdade que de dar teudo ll’era
 property that of give obliged him-DAT was
 ‘property that he was bound to give him (he ought to give him)’
 (13th century Portuguese lyrics. Costa 2001: 181)

Martins (2002) proposes that object scrambling in Old Portuguese is movement to Spec of AgrS. In Old Portuguese AgrS has an uninterpretable selectional feature (i.e., an EPP feature) with an ‘Attract-all-F’ property, in the sense of Boskovic (1999). Owing to its EPP property, AgrS allows multiple Specs – cf. Chomsky (1994, 1995), Grewendorf and Sabel (1999). Because object IP-scrambling is movement to Spec,AgrSP, the order OV is not derived when the verb moves to Σ ; this usually happens in main clauses (in contrast to subordinate clauses). The analysis put forward to account for the Old Portuguese relevant facts extends to Old Spanish where similar data are found.

The connection between object scrambling and clitic placement becomes clear when we couple the proposed analysis of IP-scrambling with a few assumptions with respect to clitics:

(i) Under a bare phrase structure perspective, clitics qualify both as minimal and maximal syntactic categories (Chomsky 1994, 1995). Thus clitics may move into positions unfit for regular heads, namely Spec positions.

(ii) Clitics move enter the domain of AgrS (see Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991 and Martins 2000a) whenever AgrS is projected in the Syntax as an independent inflectional head. Otherwise clitics left adjoin to the higher inflectional head where the verb moves (Kayne 1991). Putting together assumptions (i) and (ii) we derive the fact that clitics and full scrambled objects may target the same structural position, that is, Spec,AgrSP.

(iii) 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).⁹

Given the Edge Principle, whenever verb movement and clitic movement target the same functional head proclisis is derived. This is the case when both the verb and the clitic left adjoin to AgrS. Note on the other hand that when the verb moves to Σ through AgrS, if the clitic undergoes head movement it must enter the domain of $CH(ain)_{AgrS}$, after head $[AgrS V, T, AgrS]$ moves to Σ . Otherwise the clitic would not end up at the outer layer of the head Σ in accordance with the Edge Principle. See Raposo (2000: 291) for details.

Still according to the Edge Principle, if the clitic moves (as a maximal category) to Spec,AgrSP in a configuration of multiple Specs, it will attach to the outer Spec. So the clitic will precede scrambled objects and an overt subject, ending up non adjacent to the verb if V is incorporated in AgrS. If V is incorporated in Σ , enclisis with adjacency will be derived as Σ immediately dominates AgrSP.

We have now set all the necessary ingredients to understand the contours of synchronic and diachronic variation in Old Romance clitic placement in finite clauses. Joining together the variability of the targets for clitic movement (either a head or a Spec) and for verb movement (either Σ or AgrS) we will be able to straightforwardly derive the different patterns of clitic placement that will be identified in the next section.

4. Syntactic variation and change: from Old to Modern Romance

4.1. Portuguese and Spanish

Old Portuguese (OP) and Old Spanish (OS) display variation between enclisis and proclisis in the kind of clauses where enclisis is obligatory in Modern Portuguese, that is, in affirmative main clauses (without ‘proclisis triggers’),¹⁰ as exemplified by (19) below.

- (19) a. e agora llaman **le** Barcelona
and now (they-)call **it** Barcelona
‘Nowadays, it is called Barcelona’
(Spanish. Primera Cronica General de España. Menéndez Pidal 1978: 10b)
- b. e oy en dia **le** llaman Tarraçona
and nowadays **it** (they-)call Tarraçona
‘Nowadays it is called Tarraçona’
(Spanish. Primera Cronica General de España. Menéndez Pidal 1978: 10b)

In subordinate tensed clauses clitics are generally preverbal,¹¹ but may occur either adjacent or non adjacent to the verb – the phenomenon of non adjacency is known as *interpolation* in the Romance philological literature. Observe the pair of sentences in (20) below: sentence (20a) displays adjacency between clitic and verb; sentence (20b), on the other hand, exemplifies interpolation.

- (20) a. como nesta carta **se** cõthẽ
how in this letter SE-[passive clitic] contains
‘how it is stated in this letter’
(16th century Portuguese legal document. Martins 2001:554)
- b. como **se** nesta carta contem
how SE-[passive clitic] in-this letter contains
‘how it is stated in this letter’
(16th century Portuguese legal document. Martins 2001:318)

As sentence (20b) also shows, and is further illustrated by sentence (21) below, OP and OS allow IP-scrambling of non-clitic objects, therefore deriving the order OV.

- (21) Et de mas mando al omne que **vos** esta mj 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 fizjeren
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’
(15th century Spanish legal document. Menéndez Pidal 1919: 309 (text 234). Quoted
in Rivero 1991: 244)

Portuguese and Spanish change in the same direction with respect to the fact that both interpolation and (unrestricted) IP-scrambling cease to be an option after the sixteenth century. As for clitic placement in finite main clauses, however, while in Modern Portuguese enclisis generalizes, in Modern Spanish proclisis becomes the only allowed pattern. Let us first see how the OP and OS facts can be accounted for. We will then take into consideration the ensuing change.

In affirmative main clauses strong Σ attracts V. Proclisis (which is optional in this context) results from the formation of a complex head derived from movement of the clitic to

Σ after AgrS, containing V, has moved to Σ : [$_{\Sigma}$ clitic[$_{\Sigma}$ [$_{AgrS}$ V,T,AgrS] Σ]]. Given the Edge Principle, the clitic must ‘meet AgrS’ in Σ . If the clitic would left-adjoin to the AgrS head, AgrS would be unable to move into Σ carrying the clitic along without violating the Edge Principle. As for enclisis, it is derived by movement of the verb into Σ while the clitic targets (the most external) Spec of AgrS.

In subordinate clauses (as well as in the main clauses that include C)¹² proclisis with adjacency arises when the verb and the clitic are incorporated in AgrS – recall that strong Σ merges with V when neither C nor Neg are projected; whenever C is available, Σ is licensed by merging with C. Interpolation, on the other hand, involves movement of the clitic to (the most external) Spec,AgrSP. Interpolation emerges when other overtly filled Spec(s) of AgrS is/are projected and the verb does not move beyond AgrS.

As for the kind of unrestricted IP-scrambling displayed by OP and OS, it directly correlates with interpolation and enclisis because it also depends on AgrS being associated with an Attract-all-F EPP feature, therefore allowing multiple Specifiers.

In both Modern Portuguese (MP) and Modern Spanish (MS), AgrS will lose the ability to select multiple Specs (cf. Martins 2002). This change implies the concomitant losses of interpolation and (unrestricted) IP-scrambling. We will have to consider now how Portuguese and Spanish came to diverge from each other with respect to clitic placement in main clauses: the former maintains and generalizes enclisis, the later loses it.

Let us start with the easier case. In MS enclisis is never derived in finite clauses because in this language Σ lost the strong property which induced merger between Σ and V in affirmative main clauses. In MS thus both the verb and the clitic left adjoin to AgrS, with the clitic standing in the edge of the AgrS head.¹³

As for the generalized enclitic pattern of MP, 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 [$_{AgrS}$ V,T,AgrS] into Σ , leaving the clitic incorporated in AgrS. Once excorporation would come into play, the clitic would not be allowed to move into Σ – cf. Boskovic (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 in MP AgrS ceases to select an EPP feature; so AgrS does not project a Spec.¹⁴ 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. Morphological merger takes place under adjacency (cf. Bolbajik 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-adjoined to AgrS, however, the clitic given its minimal/maximal nature breaks the required adjacency between Σ and ‘V-in-AgrS’ inhibiting morphological merger. 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 AgrS. Then Σ undergoes Local Dislocation merger with ‘V-in-AgrS’.¹⁵ 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 Agr.

4.2. Catalan and Occitan

In Old Catalan (OC) and Old Occitan (OO) variation between enclisis and proclisis is found in affirmative main clauses, as exemplified by sentences (22) and (23) below. This feature is shared with OP and OS.

- (22) e el clerge comptá **li** e **li** dix tot lo feyt, axi con yo vos he escrit.
and the clergyman told **him** and **him** said all the affair, so as I you-DAT have written
'And the clergyman told him everything about the affair, so as I told you in my letter'
(Early 14th century Catalan letter. Rusell-Gebbett 1965: 143)
- (23) a. Ilh recebia-**os** alegramentz
she received-**them** happily
(Occitan. Ste Douceline, 14th century. Vance 2001)
- b. Filha, ieu **t**'aduc e **t**'apòrti gazinh
daughter, I to-you-lead and to-you-bring merit.
(Occitan. Ste Douceline, 14th century. Vance 2001)

But OC and OO differ from OP and OS in not allowing interpolation in subordinate clauses. In OC and OO there is always adjacency between clitic and verb.

These facts can be accounted for if we admit that in OC and OO the EPP feature of AgrS has an Attract-1-F (not an Attract-all-F) nature. AgrS can thus project one only Spec position. This position (if not taken by the subject) may be filled with a clitic. In this case, movement of the verb to Σ (in affirmative main clauses) will derive enclisis. As for interpolation, it cannot be derived because in interpolation structures both the clitic and an interpolated constituent target Spec positions selected by the AgrS head. Interpolation is only possible if AgrS can project multiple Specs. The unavailability of multiple Specs of AgrS also accounts for the fact that only one object per clause can undergo IP-scrambling in OC and OO, as illustrated by sentences (24) and (25) below.¹⁶

- (24) yo cresegí lo feyt que veritat era
I believed the affair that truth was
'I believed that the affair (I was told about) was true'
(14th century Catalan. Rusell-Gebbett 1965: 143-144)
- (25) et Petrus de Lobeira dix que aqueis C solidos feria pagar
and *Petrus de Lobeira* said that those hundred solidos (he-)would-make pay
'And *Petrus de Lobeira* said that he would make [*A. de Prades*] pay the hundred *solidos* (a monetary unit) that he owed to [*Petrus Estrader*].'
(12th or 13th century Catalan. Rusell-Gebbett 1965: 91)

The fact that beyond / besides the scrambled object an adverb (like in sentence (26) below) or the subject (like in sentence (27) below) can appear in preverbal position indicates that these constituents may occupy positions to the left of AgrSP (being adjunct or dislocated constituents).

- (26) de.so.qua axi gran honor los avia feta (167)
because so great honour them (he-)had done
'because in that way he had deeply honoured them'
(Catalan. 14th c. Rusell-Gebbett 1965: 167)
- (27) Respos lo paire que el aquesta causa cresia fermament
answered the father that he this thing believed firmly
'His father answered that he firmly believed it'
(Occitan. Miracles. Vance 2001)

Modern Catalan (MC) and Modern Occitan (MO) display a pattern of clitic placement in finite clauses similar to the pattern of clitic placement found in Modern Spanish. The three Romance languages have in fact undergone the same type of change, i.e. the weakening of the Σ functional head. Because the verb does not move to Σ , enclisis cannot be derived. As for the loss of IP-scrambling, I will leave undecided whether AgrS does not project a Spec in MC and MO or whether Spec,AgrSP can only be targeted by the subject. In any case there would have been a change in the featural make-up of AgrS with respect to its EPP property (cf. Martins 2002).

4.3. French

Old French (OF) differs from OP, OS, OC and OO in not displaying variation between enclisis and proclisis in finite main clauses. The proclitic pattern is always found in OF in non V1 clauses,¹⁷ as illustrated by sentences (28) and (29).

- (28) E cest áfaire **li** mustrad é sun conseil **li** dunad que...
and this matter **him** showed and his advise **him** gave that...
(Quatre Livre des Rois. Kok 1985: 75)
- (29) L'endemain **se** partirent de Wincester
The-next day **themselves** left from Wincester
(Mort Artu. Kok 1985: 75)

As for interpolation, OF is similar to OC and OO (although a few cases of residual interpolation can be found in the earlier texts). OF also displays restricted scrambling, as shown by sentences (30) and (31) below.

- (30) devant que cil sera venuz qui ceste aventure doit eschoir
before that he will-be come who this adventure must finish
'before the coming of the one who must bring this adventure to a close'
(La Queste del Saint Graal. Vance 1997: 136)
- (31) que je devant mon frere viegne
that I before my brother might-come
'that I might come before my brother'
(La Queste del Saint Graal. Vance 1997: 136)

In order to account for these facts, I propose that in OF AgrS is not associated with an EPP feature. Because AgrS does not project a Spec position neither enclisis (derived from movement of the clitic to Spec, AgrSP) nor interpolation are available. Although in OF, like in MP, AgrS does not project a Spec position, morphological merger between the verb and the clitic does not arise (cf. section 4.1. above); therefore enclisis is not derived in this way either. This is so because in OF (a V2 language) the verb targets a position higher than Σ , in the CP domain – cf. Poletto 2002, among others. Given the cyclic nature of head movement, the verb moves through Σ in its way to C. Thus strong Σ is always licensed in the Syntax and there is no place for post syntactic licensing.

Restricted IP-scrambling (of one only constituent) is presumably derived in OF subordinate clauses with O in Spec,TP and V in T. Maybe OF does not have a split IP.¹⁸ So in OF the verb would target C in main clauses and T in subordinate clauses.

The account given in the preceding sections with respect to clitic placement and lack of OV with full objects in Modern Spanish, Modern Catalan and Modern Occitan naturally extends to Modern French.

5. Summary and conclusion

The main facts considered in this paper are summarized in Table 1 below. Table 2 shows how such facts are explained under the views developed in the paper. Note that although Old Italian is left out of the picture (Modern Standard Italian patterning with MS, MC, MO and MF), it is likely that some varieties of ‘Old Italian’ (a cover term) will pattern with OC and OO while other varieties of Old Italian will pattern with OF.

Table 1

	OP, OS	OC, OO	OF	MP	MS, MC, MO, MF
Clitic placement in (non V1) main clauses	enclisis or proclisis	enclisis or proclisis	proclisis	enclisis	proclisis
Clitic placement in subordinate clauses	interpolation or adjacency	adjacency	adjacency	adjacency	adjacency
Object scrambling	Unrestricted IP-scrambling	Restricted IP-scrambling	Restricted IP-scrambling	no IP-scrambling	no IP-scrambling
VP-ellipsis	allowed	allowed	allowed	allowed	not allowed

Table 2

	OP, OS	OC, OO	OF	MP	MS, MC, MO, MF
Σ	strong	strong	strong	strong	weak
AgrS	multiple Specs	one Spec	no Spec	no Spec	<i>not settled</i>
V movement in main clauses	to Σ	to Σ	to a position above Σ	to a position below Σ	to a position below Σ

Within the approach undertaken in the present investigation the availability of VP-ellipsis depends on the strong property of Σ . The availability of object IP-scrambling, on the other hand, depends on a certain type of EPP property of AgrS. As for clitic placement, it was shown that both the enclitic pattern and the proclitic pattern (in finite clauses) may be derived in two distinct ways.

Enclisis is derived in the Syntax or post syntactically. In the former case enclisis is the outcome of verb movement to Σ plus clitic movement to Spec,AgrSP. This type of enclisis is unavailable in Modern Romance either because Σ is weak and does not induce V movement (MS, MC, MF) or because there is no available Spec of AgrS (MP). Post syntactic enclisis is a side effect of morphological merger (i.e. Local dislocation) between Σ and V. This morphological operation can only take place after clitic and verb change positions (through Local dislocation merger with inversion) because the clitic breaks the required adjacency between Σ and V.

Proclisis is obtained when the clitic and the verb left adjoin to the same inflectional head (Σ , AgrS, or T, depending on how high the verb moves and on whether there is a split or an unsplit IP). But proclisis may also be derived by clitic movement to Spec,AgrSP while the verb incorporates in AgrS. This option (which may feed interpolation) is restricted to

grammars where the structure of the clause may include a Spec position available to clitics. This does not appear to be the case with respect to any of the contemporary Romance languages.

A last remark is due to conclude. This paper is not intended to directly address the issue of linguistic change, concentrating instead on giving an integrated account of the set of grammars found in Romance with respect to clitic placement, VP-ellipsis and scrambling. The loss of unrestricted IP-scrambling in OP and OS is taken under scrutiny in Martins (2002). As for the weakening of Σ , the rationale of change is likely to emerge from a thorough diachronic inquiry on the patterns of answer to yes/no questions (an area where the collection of historical data is certainly a heavy, but maybe not hopeless, task).¹⁹

References:

- Barbosa, P. 1993. 'Clitic Placement in Old Romance and European Portuguese'. *Papers from the Twenty-Ninth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Barbosa, P. 1996. 'Clitic Placement in European Portuguese and the position of Subjects'. *Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, ed. by A. L. Halpern. and A. M. Zwicky, 1-40. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Barbosa, P. 2000. 'Clitics: A Window into the Null Subject Property'. *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies*, ed. by J. Costa, 31-93. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Benincà, P. 1995. 'Complement clitics in Medieval Romance: the Tobler-Mussafia Law'. *Clause Structure and Language Change*, ed. by A. Battye and I. Roberts, 325-344. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blasco Ferrer, E. 1984. *Grammatica Storica del Catalano e dei suoi dialetti con speciale riguardo all'Algherese*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Bobaljik, J. D. 1995. Morphosyntax: On the syntax of verbal inflection. Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Boskovic, Z. 1996. 'Selection and the categorial status of infinitival complements'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 14: 269-304.
- Boskovic, Z. 1997. *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: MIT Press.
- Boskovic, Z. 1999. 'On multiple feature checking: multiple wh- fronting and multiple head movement'. *Working Minimalism*, ed. by S. D. Epstein and N. Hornstein, 159-187. Cambridge, Mass. & London: MIT Press.
- Cardinaletti, A. and I. Roberts. 1991. 'Clause Structure and X-second'. Ms. University of Venice and University of Geneva.
- Cejador y Frauca, J., ed. 1913. *Fernando de Rojas, La Celestina*. Madrid: Clasicos Castellanos - Ediciones de "La Lectura".
- Chomsky, N. 1994. 'Bare phrase structure'. *MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics*. Reprinted in: *Government and Binding Theory and the Minimalist Program*, ed. by G. Webelhuth, 383-439. Oxford & Cambridge: Blackwell. 1995. [Included in Chomsky, N. 1995]
- Chomsky, N. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, N. 2000. 'Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework'. *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, ed. by R. Martin, D. Michaels and J. Uriagereka, 89-155. Cambridge, Mass. & London: The MIT Press.
- Costa, J. 1998. *Word Order Variation: A Constraint-Based Approach*. The Hague: Holland Academic Graphics.
- Costa, J. 2003. 'Null vs Overt Spec,TP in European Portuguese'. *Romance Language and Linguistic Theory 2001: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance'*, Amsterdam, 6-8

- December 2001*, ed. by J. Quer, J. Schrotten, M. Scorretti, P. Sleeman and E. Verheugd, 31-47. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Costa, J. and A. M. Martins. 2003. Clitic placement across grammar components. Paper delivered at *Going Romance 2003*, Nijmegen, 20-22 November.
- Costa, M. J. 2001. 'Contributos para o estudo das perífrases verbais com "aver" e "teer" no português medieval'. *Actas do XVI Encontro Nacional da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística (Coimbra 2000)*, ed. by C. N. Correia and A. Gonçalves, 179-186. Lisboa: Associação Portuguesa de Linguística.
- Embick, D. and R. Noyer. 2001. 'Movement Operations after Syntax'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32: 555-595.
- Embick, D. and M. Halle. 2003. Latin Inflections. Paper delivered at *Going Romance 2003*, Nijmegen, 20-22 November.
- Fischer, S. 2003. *The Catalan Clitic System: A Diachronic Perspective on its Syntax and Phonology*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fischer, S. (forthcoming). 'Stylistic Fronting: a contribution to information structure'. *MLC-effects in Syntax*, ed. by G. Fanselow and R. Vogel. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Fontana, J. M. 1993. *Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish*. Ph. D. dissertation. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania.
- Fontana, J. M. 1997. 'On the integration of second position phenomena'. *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, ed. by Ans van Kemenade and Nigel Vincent, 207-249. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Foulet, L. 1928. *Petite Syntaxe de L'Ancien Français*. Paris: Librairie Honoré Champion. 1990.
- Gifford, D. J. and F. W. Hodcroft. 1959. *Textos Lingüísticos del Medioevo Español*. Oxford: The Dolphin Book.
- Grewendorf, G. and J. Sabel. 1999. 'Scrambling in German and Japanese: Adjunction versus multiple specifiers'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 17: 1-65.
- Halle, M. and A. Marantz. 1993. 'Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflexion'. *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, ed. by K. Hale and S. J. Keyser, 111-176. Cambridge, Mass. & London: The MIT Press.
- Halpern, A. 1995. *On the Placement and Morphology of Clitics*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Halpern, A. and J. M. Fontana. 1994. 'X⁰ Clitics and X^{max} Clitics'. *Proceedings of the West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL XII)*. Stanford, California: CSLI Publications.
- Harley, H. and R. Noyer. 1999. 'Distributed Morphology'. *Glott International* 4.4: 3-9.
- Jensen, F. 1994. *Syntaxe de l'Ancien Occitan*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag.
- Kayne, R. 1991. 'Romance Clitics, Verb Movement, and PRO'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22: 647-686.
- Kayne, R. 1994. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass. & London: The MIT Press.
- Keniston, H. 1937. *The Syntax of Castillian Prose: The Sixteenth Century*. Chicago & Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Kok, A. de 1985. *La Place du Pronom Personnel Régime Conjoint en Français: Une Étude Diachronique*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Laka, I. 1990. *Negation in Syntax. On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. Ph.D. dissertation. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Lobeck, A. 1999. 'VP ellipsis and the Minimalist Program: Some Speculation and Proposals'. *Fragments: Studies in Ellipsis and Gapping*, ed. by Sh. Lappin and E. Benmamoun, 98-123. New York & Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Martins, A. M. 1994. 'Enclisis, VP-deletion and the nature of Sigma'. *Probus* 6.173-205.
- Martins, A. M. 2000a. 'A minimalist approach to clitic climbing'. *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies*, ed. by J. Costa, 169-190. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press. [Reprinted, with minor revisions, from: A. M. Martins 1995, same title. *Papers from the 31st Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 215-239].
- Martins, A. M. 2000b. 'Polarity items in Romance: Underspecification and lexical change'. *Diachronic Syntax: Models and Mechanisms*, ed. by S. Pintzuk, G. Tsoulas and A. Warner, 191-219. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martins, A. M. 2001. *Documentos Portugueses do Noroeste e da Região de Lisboa: Da Produção Primitiva ao Século XVI*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional - Casa da Moeda.
- Martins, A. M. 2002. 'The loss of IP-scrambling in Portuguese: Clause structure, word order variation and change'. *Syntactic Effects of Morphological Change*, ed. by D. Lightfoot, 232-248. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Martins, A. M. 2003a. 'Deficient pronouns and linguistic change in Portuguese and Spanish'. *Romance Language and Linguistic Theory 2001: Selected Papers from 'Going Romance', Amsterdam, 6-8 December 2001*, ed. by J. Quer, J. Schrotten, M. Scorretti, P. Sleeman and E. Verheugd, 213-230. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Martins, A. M. 2003b. 'From unity to diversity in Romance syntax: Portuguese and Spanish'. *Multilingualism in European Language History*, ed. by K. Braunmüller and G. Ferraresi, 201-233. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Menéndez-Pidal, R. 1919. *Documentos Lingüísticos de España*. Vol. 1: *Reino de Castilla*. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos. 1929.
- Menéndez Pidal, R. 1978. *Primera Crónica General de España, editada por Ramón Menéndez Pidal con un estudio actualizador de Diego Catalán*. Vol. 1. Madrid: Gredos. 1979.
- Moignet, G. 1973. *Grammaire de l'Ancien Français: Morphologie – Syntax*. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Mussafia, A. 1886. 'Una particolarità sintattica della lingua italiana dei primi secoli'. *Miscellanea di Filologia e Linguistica in Memoria di Napoleone Caix e Ugo Angelo Canello*, ed. by G. I. Ascoli et alii, 255-261. Firenze: LeMonnier.
- Pinkster, H. 1990. *Latin Syntax and Semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Raposo, E. Paiva. 2000. 'Clitic Positions and Verb Movement'. *Portuguese Syntax New Comparative Studies*, ed. by J. Costa, 266-297. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Poletto, C. 2002. 'Si and e as CP expletives in Old Italian'. Paper delivered at the *VII Diachronic Generative Syntax Conference (DIGS VII)*. Girona, May 2002.
- Raposo, E. P. 2000. 'Clitic Positions and Verb Movement'. *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies*, ed. by J. Costa, 266-297. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rivero, M. L. 1986. 'La tipología de los pronombres átonos en el español medieval y en el español actual'. *Anuario de Lingüística Hispánica*, II, 197-220.
- Rivero, M. L. 1991. 'Clitic and NP Climbing in Old Spanish'. *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, ed. by H. Campos and F. Martínez-Gil, 241-282. Washington, D. C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Rivero, M. L. 1997. 'On two locations for complement clitic pronouns: Serbo-Croatian, Bulgarian and Old Spanish'. *Parameters of Morphosyntactic Change*, ed. by A. van Kemenade and N. Vincent, 170-206. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Russell-Gebbett, P. 1965. *Mediaeval Catalan Linguistic Texts*. Oxford: Dauphin Book.
- Salvi, G. 1990. 'La sopravvivenza della legge di Wackernagel nei dialetti occidentali della Penisola Iberica'. *Medioevo Romanzo* 15.177-210.

- Salvi, G. 1991. 'Difesa e illustrazione della legge di Wackernagel applicata alle lingue romanze antiche: La posizione delle forme pronominali clitiche'. *Per Giovan Battista Pellegrini: Scritti degli allievi padovani*, 439-462. Padova: Unipress.
- Salvi, G. 1993. 'Ordine delle parole e struttura della frase nelle lingue romanze antiche'. *Alfa* 37: 187-203.
- Salvi, G. 1997. 'From Latin weak pronouns to Romance clitics'. *Estudos Lingüísticos e Literários*, 19, ed. by R. V. Mattos e Silva, 85-104. Salvador: Universidade Federal da Bahia.
- Thráinsson, H. 1996. 'On the (non-)universality of functional categories'. *Minimal Ideas: Syntactic Studies in the Minimalist Framework*, ed. by W. Abrahams, S. D. Epstein, H. Thráinsson and C. J.-W. Zwart, 253-281. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Tobler, A. 1875. Review of 'J. Le Coultre, De l'ordre des mots dans Chrétien de Troyes'. *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen, Stück*. 34: 1057-1082. Reprinted in: *Vermischte Beiträge zur Französischen Grammatik* V. 1902 & 1971 [Amsterdam: Rodopi].
- Tobler, A. 1889. 'Pronominales Objekt zu Infinitiv oder Partizipium'. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 13: 186-191. Reprinted in: *Vermischte Beiträge zur Französischen* II. 1902 & 1971 [Amsterdam: Rodopi].
- Vance, B. 1997. *Syntactic Change in Medieval French: Verb-Second and Null Subjects*. Dordrecht, Boston & London: Kluwer.
- Vance, B. 2001. 'French and Occitan V2 systems in diachrony'. Paper delivered at the *Colloquium on Interaction of Language Systems*. Hamburg, October 2001.
- Zanuttini, R. 1994. 'Re-examining negative clauses'. *Paths Towards Universal Grammar: Studies in Honor of Richard S. Kayne*, ed. by G. Cinque, J. Koster, J.-Y. Pollock, L. Rizzi and R. Zanuttini, 427-451. Washington D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Zanuttini, R. 1997. *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.

¹ The research reported here was partially funded by the Collaborative Center on Multilingualism - 538 - Sonderforschungsbereich Mehrsprachigkeit (University of Hamburg) and by FCT - *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* through the European Community programme POSI. I wish to acknowledge the Collaborative Center on Multilingualism for the very stimulating and friendly research environment that I was offered during my stay in the Center in October 2001. FCT provided the financial support that enabled me to attend *DIGS VII* where this paper was presented.

² For evidence in favor of the claim that Romance clitics are heads throughout the history of the Romance, see Martins (2003a) and Fischer (2003).

³ Different authors addressing linguistic change in Romance have proposed that clitic pronouns evolved from second position clitics to verbal clitics, correspondingly changing their categorial status (from XP to X⁰) and their syntactic distribution. As clitics in Old Romance can surface in third or more rightward positions, it has been claimed that leftward sentential adjuncts or left dislocated phrases are freely allowed in certain Old Romance languages; these constituents would be irrelevant for the computation of the 'second position', being treated for this matter as sentence external. This type of analysis (that sees V2 sentences as 'disguised' V1 sentences) makes use across-the-board of the so-called *Tobler-Mussafia* law which bans clitics from the sentence initial position. Under this kind of approach it is predicted that in Clitic Left Dislocation constructions, if only the left dislocated constituent precedes the verb, clitics would obligatorily be enclitic on the verb in Old Romance (see Salvi 1991, Benincà 1995, Barbosa 2000), the verb counting as the first

sentence internal constituent. This prediction however is contradicted by the empirical data, as shown in Martins (2003a).

⁴ The Σ head (proposed by Laka 1990) parallels the Pol head of Zanuttini (1994, 1997). Differently from Laka (1990), I do not take affirmative Σ to (necessarily) express emphatic affirmation.

⁵ Costa and Martins (2003) propose the following generalization:

Strong F licensing

A strong functional head is licensed iff it is lexicalized,

- (i) under syntactic merger
- (ii) under head or XP movement
- (iii) under morphological merger

⁶ In yes/no questions Σ is similarly licensed by V. Even if yes/no questions are analysed as CPs containing a null operator, merging between Σ and C would not satisfy the licensing condition on strong functional categories (see footnote 5 above) because in yes/no questions neither C nor Spec of CP contain lexical material.

⁷ See the arguments given in Lobeck (1999) and Martins (1994) against an analysis of VP-ellipsis as a phonological process of deletion.

⁸ Note that *être* 'to be' and *avoir* 'to have' are not always auxiliaries. See the Old French example below:

- (1) Et por ce as tu cuidié que je fusse semblables a toi ... mes non sui
and for that have you believed that I would-be similar to you ... but not am
'And so you believed me to be like you ... but I am not'

(La Queste del Saint Graal. Foulet 1928: 235)

⁹ Cf. Raposo (2000: 291): "clitics ... always attach to the outer layer of any given functional category that contains them ... 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".

¹⁰ Proclisis is derived in wh- interrogatives and in main clauses introduced by focused constituents, certain quantifiers or certain adverbs. I take all these constituents to belong to the CP domain (within a split CP perspective).

¹¹ In all Romance languages some infrequent cases of enclisis in subordinate clauses can be found. This shows that embedded C (which generally encodes dependency relations between main and embedded clauses) may marginally not be associated with polarity features, being then unable to license Σ .

¹² See footnote 10 above.

¹³ We are assuming with Kayne (1991, 1994) that adjunction is always left adjunction.

¹⁴ Or AgrS is simply not projected and T does not have an (obligatory) EPP feature. Cf. Costa (2003) and Costa & Martins (2003).

¹⁵ To be precise, the minimal/maximal nature of the clitic is relevant with respect to Lowering. Lowering is a pre-Linearization morphological operation that cannot take place across XPs. Local dislocation is a post-linearization morphological operation which requires strict adjacency (cf. Embick and Noyer (2001)

¹⁶ In Catalan scrambling may occur in negative clauses (see example (1) below), against what is predicted by Fischer's analysis of clitic placement and 'stylistic inversion' (Fischer 2003, forthcoming). Note that I interpret as IP-scrambling what Fischer takes to be stylistic inversion. I believe that a comparative approach to word order in the Old Romance languages

favours the IP-scrambling analysis. It may turn out however that IP-scrambling and stylistic inversion reduce to the same phenomenon, a matter which I will not go into here.

- (1) que nos dar non.o deviem
that we give-INFN not it should
'that we should not give it'
(13th century Catalan. Rusell-Gebbett 1965: 108)

In sentence (1) above Σ is licensed by C not by Neg. In Old Romance the negative marker may either directly merge with Σ or be adjoined to the higher inflectional head where the verb incorporates. It is the later option that is displayed by sentence (1) above (with V and Neg adjoined to AgrS). The order 'negative marker – clitic' (instead of 'clitic – negative marker', with the clitic at the edge of the relevant inflectional category) is presumably derived in the Morphology component.

In example (2) below the preverbal object of the subordinate negative clause appears to be focused, not scrambled.

- (2) aqestes vergues no poden viure en nuyl loc si de l'ayga de la dita font non son
Those wickers not can live in any place if of the-water of the mentioned spring not are
reguades
watered
'Those wickers will die unless they are watered by the water of that particular spring'
(14th century Catalan. Rusell-Gebbett 1965: 149)

¹⁷ As for verb initial sentences (V1), enclisis is derived post syntactically in order to avoid the phonological ban against first position clitics observed by Tobler (1875, 1889) and Mussafia (1886). In this particular case enclisis is not an effect of the need to license strong Σ .

¹⁸ This means that in OF the Agr features would be introduced post syntactically, i.e. in the Morphology component (cf. Halle and Embick 2003).

¹⁹ See on this matter Martins (1994, 2002b).