On Clitic Placement in European Portuguese*

ANA MADEIRA

Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to consider the facts of pronominal clitic placement in European Portuguese (EP) and to show how an analysis along the lines of Kayne's (1991) may account for them. Romance clitics may occur either in preverbal or in postverbal position. Kayne takes clitics to left-adjoin to a functional head; movement of the clitic into the functional head where the verbal complex is found is assumed to yield the order verb-clitic, whereas movement of the clitic into an empty functional head, and movement of the verbal complex past it, is assumed to yield the order clitic-verb. Although both orders are found in EP, the conditions which determine each order are apparently very different from those in most other modern Romance languages. I propose to show that the principles governing clitic placement are the same in all these languages and I suggest that the variation observed may be due to differences in the properties of the functional heads involved. EP differs from all the other Romance languages considered in that only in EP is C a potential (and possibly the only) clitic position. In this sense, EP is a "clitic-second" language.

  The paper is organised as follows. Section 1 defines the assumptions on which the analysis will be based and sets the perspective for it, by looking at the predominant patterns of clitic placement in Romance languages and considering two analyses which have been proposed to account for these patterns. In section 2, I look at the syntactic conditions which determine clitic placement in EP and suggest an analysis for the phenomena observed. Section 3 evaluates the effectiveness of conditions such as Wackernagel's Law and Tobler-Mussafia Law in terms of the analysis proposed in section 2. Finally, in section 4, certain extra contexts which affect clitic placement will be discussed.

1 Clitic placement in Romance

1.1 Overview of the patterns

When looking at the distribution of pronominal clitics in Romance, one comes across a puzzling asymmetry. In view of the fact that Romance clitics are always associated with a verb, one would expect to find three types of languages:

(1)   A : languages with exclusively preverbal clitics
      B : languages with exclusively postverbal clitics
      C : languages with both preverbal and postverbal clitics

The vast majority of Romance languages belong to C, and there is at least one which belongs to A. However, B seems to be unattested; there isn't, to my knowledge, any modern Romance language with exclusively postverbal clitics.
      Brazilian Portuguese (BP) is a representative of an A-type language. It is different from C-type languages with strong proclitic tendencies, such as French, in that even in non-negative imperatives (the typical case of generalised verb-clitic order across languages) it displays the order clitic-verb.

(2)   Me ajude.
      me-acc help
      "Help me."

Another distinctive feature of BP is that clitics may always associate with any verb independently of its inflectional specifications. See (3), where the clitic is associated with a past participle, and (4), where it is associated with a gerund:

(3)   Ela tinha me ajudado.
      she had-3sg me-acc helped
      "She had helped me."
(4)   Ela estava me ajudando.
      she was me-acc helping
      "She was helping me."

C-type languages, on the other hand, show restrictions on the cooccurrence of clitics with past participles and gerunds. See the Spanish example in (5):

(5)   (a)   Ella me habia ayudado.
              she me-acc had-3sg helped
    (b)   *Ella habia ayudadome.
              she had-3sg helped me-acc

Spanish and Italian are the paradigmatic cases of C-type languages. Both display a clear asymmetry between preverval clitics, found with finite verbs, and postverbal clitics, found with untensed verbs. See the examples from Spanish in (6):

(6)   (a)   Ella le dio el libro.
              she him-dat gave-3sg the book
              "She gave him the book."
    (b)   Ella pensó en darle el libro.
              she thought-3sg in to give him-dat the book
              "She thought of giving him the book."

1.2 Recent analyses

In this section, I will look into two analyses that have recently been proposed to account for the facts of clitic placement described in the previous subsection. These are Ouhalla's (1988b and 1989a) and Kayne's (1991) analyses. Both take clitics to be affixal head categories and clitic placement to be an instance of head movement which adjoins the clitic to a functional head. Furthermore, both reject the possibility of adjunction to the V-position.

1.2.1 Ouhalla's analysis

Ouhalla's approach to clitic placement is developed around the notion that clitic movement obeys the following (possibly universal) S-structure condition:

(7)   Clitic Placement Condition (CPC): Clitics must attach to the highest affixal head in a clause.

From this condition it follows that attachment to an empty head is not allowed; clitics must attach to heads filled with lexical material. It also follows that attachment to V is excluded; not only is V not affixal by nature, it is never the highest head in a clause either. In view of Ouhalla's assumptions

about the structure of Romance clauses (represented in (8)), three options are open to pronominal clitics: attachment to C, to Agr or to T.

(8) $[_{CP} C [_{AgrP} Agr [_{TP} T [_{VP} V ...]]]]$

Movement to T is the option chosen for non-inflected infinitival clauses. Since C is empty and Agr is assumed not to project at all, T, containing the infinitival morpheme, is the highest affixal head. Hence the clitic moves to T, attaching to the verbal complex. See (9) ((40a) and (41) in Ouhalla (1989a)):

(9)   (a)   Gianni vuole leggerle.
             Gianni wants read-to-them
       (b)   Gianni vuole $[_{CP} [_{TNSP} [[[legg-]_j-ere] le_i][_{VP} t_j[_{NP} t_i]]]]$

Finite clauses differ from infinitival clauses in that the Agr projection is present. Whenever the C-position is empty, Agr is be the highest inflectional head and therefore the landing site for the clitic, which attaches to the verbal complex. See (10) ((39) in Ouhalla (1989a)):

(10)   (a)   Jean les mangera demain.
             Jean them eat-will-3s tomorrow
             "Jean will eat them tomorrow."
       (b) $[_{AGRP} Jean [_{AGR} cl_i+[[[V]_j+TNS]_k+AGR][_{TNSP} t_k [_{VP} t_j t_i ADV]]]]$

Movement of the clitic to C is argued to occur in Spanish wh-questions, where C is the highest affixal head position in the clause. The clitic attaches to the verbal complex in C, as shown in (11) ((64b) and (65) in Ouhalla (1988b)):

(11)   (a)   Qué le dio Juan?
             what to-him-gave Juan
             "What did Juan give to him?
       (b) $[_{CP} wh [_{C} cl_i+[[[V]_j+TNS]_k+AGR]_i [_{AGRP} Juan [_{AGR'} t_i [_{TNSP} t_k [_{VP} t_j t_i e]]]]]]$

In all of these cases clitics are assumed to move directly to their target position. Ouhalla rejects a stepwise analysis on two main grounds: on the one hand, clitics are usually found to be outside the domain of the inflectional morphology, which wouldn't be the case if the clitic moved alongside with the verb (this would also predict a wrong order in the case of movement to T); on the other hand, independent stepwise movement of the clitic would mean that

every intermediate head would dominate at least two distinct traces, in violation of the Head Opacity Condition.[1] Most importantly, all intermediate maximal projections being L-marked by virtue of successive V-movement, direct movement of the clitic is allowed by the ECP; and since stepwise movement of the clitic is not independently motivated, there is no reason to assume that it takes place at all.

A few questions can be raised about Ouhalla's analysis of clitic placement. One of such questions refers to the CPC. It has long been argued, following Williams (1981a), among others, that affixes are generated at D-structure as independent heads and share the same type of features as free morphemes, the only difference between the two being that affixes are assigned morphological subcategorisation frames in the lexicon and must attach to the right type of head by S-structure. This is a morphological requirement generally known in the literature as Lasnik's Filter (Pesetsky (1989)) or the Stray Affix Filter (Baker (1988)). Ouhalla's CPC seems to be a syntactic formulation of this filter referring solely to clitic words. What is disputable in his formulation of the condition is the claim that Lasnik's Filter may be satisfied by attachment to an affixal category. There seems to be some agreement in the literature to the contrary, i.e. that affixes must attach to free morphemes.[2] Moreover, considering Ouhalla's account of Romance clitic placement, it doesn't seem to be the case that clitics attach to affixal categories. Rather, what clitics attach to is the whole verbal complex, i.e. a complex head which can't be considered to be affixal by nature.

Another question that can be raised about Ouhalla's analysis refers to the different ordering of the clitic with respect to tensed and untensed verbs. Why should it be the case that clitics attach to the left of Agr and C to yield the order cl- V_{FIN}, but attach to the right of T to yield the order V_{INF}-cl? This is a problem ignored in Ouhalla's analysis but it is undoubtedly a phenomenon which needs to be accounted for.

1.2.2 Kayne's analysis

In his analysis of clitic placement in Romance embedded clauses, Kayne (1991) seeks to provide an answer to this question. Adopting Williams's

---

[1] Head Opacity Condition: the internal structure of X^0 categories is opaque to Move-alpha (Ouhalla 1988b).

[2] For instance, Pesetsky (1989) claims that an affix must occur as "sister to a non-empty category marked [-affix]" and Baker (1988) argues that affixes "must affix to stems rather than to other affixes".

(1981a) hypothesis about right-headedness in morphology, Kayne assumes that clitics always left-adjoin to a functional head. The different surface orders found are made to result from the interaction between the scope of verb movement and the (un)availability of abstract functional nodes in the clause. According to Kayne, two options are open to clitics: either they adjoin to the functional head into which the verb has moved, or they adjoin to an empty functional head, which is understood to be a non-trace abstract I-node, the empty counterpart of a legitimate functional category, such as Agr or T. The first option yields the order clitic-verb, which is found with tensed verbs, on the assumption that in tensed clauses there are no available non-trace empty I-nodes into which a clitic could move. This option also accounts for the case of French infinitival clauses, in which Kayne assumes both the verb and the clitic to move into the INFN-head containing the infinitival morpheme. The second option yields the order verb-clitic, by virtue of the verb moving past the clitic and adjoining to the X'-projection of the abstract I-head into which the clitic has moved. This accounts for the case of Spanish and Italian infinitival clauses. This second option may also yield the order clitic-verb if the verb doesn't move up to I', but instead stays in some lower I-head; according to Kayne, this is the case with Occitan infinitival clauses, where certain adverbs may intervene between the clitic and the infinitive.

Although Kayne's analysis is very successful in accounting for the differences in clitic/verb order, certain points remain unclear. One point refers to the motivation behind clitic movement. In Ouhalla's analysis, it is clear that clitic movement is partly motivated by the need to satisfy Lasnik's Filter. But what is the motivation for clitic movement into an abstract I-head? Although this is a very important question, I won't attempt to provide an answer for it in this paper.

Two other questions raised by Kayne's analysis are (i) what motivates movement of the verbal complex into I'?, and (ii) how does the clitic satisfy Lasnik's Filter when it moves into an empty I-head? In subsection 2.1.1 I will propose an alternative to verb movement into I' which takes these two questions into consideration.

1.3 Conclusion

In this paper I follow Ouhalla's and Kayne's assumptions in taking clitics to be affixal heads and clitic placement to be an instance of head movement. I also follow Kayne in taking clitic movement to be left-adjunction, and Ouhalla in assuming it to be direct movement into the landing site of the clitic.

In face of the language types described in subsection 1.1, Romance pronominal clitics appear to have two options: attachment to V and attachment to I. Furthermore, it seems that in one particular language clitics may attach to V, or they may attach to I, but not to both. This may be a matter of parametric choice or, more likely, the choice for each individual language may be contingent on independent factors.

Attachment to V is arguably the option chosen in BP. This would account for the generalised clitic-verb order, and also for the ability that clitics have to attach to any verb independently of its inflectional specifications.

In C-type languages clitics attach to I. I follow Kayne in taking the order verb-clitic to result from movement of the clitic into an empty functional head, and the verbal complex moving past it, and the order clitic-verb to result from adjunction of the clitic to the functional head containing the verbal complex. However, adopting Ouhalla's representation of clause structure shown in (8) above, I assume that in Spanish and Italian infinitival clauses this empty head is Agr rather than T, as Kayne proposes.

Under this view, the impossibility of finding a language with exclusively postverbal clitics is predicted. In such a language, clitics would consistently move into an empty I-head. Following Kayne's assumption that there are no special heads for clitics, there will always be cases where either all the functional heads are lexically filled or movement into an empty head is blocked. In these cases, only the order clitic-verb will be possible.

2 Clitic placement in European Portuguese

EP belongs to what I called in the previous section C-type languages, i.e. it displays both clitic-verb and verb-clitic orders. However, it differs from typical languages of this type in that the relative ordering of the clitic and the verb doesn't appear to be sensitive to the distinction tensed/untensed. In fact, both orders occur with both tensed and untensed verbs.

(12) (a) O Paulo deu-me um livro.
the Paulo gave-3sg me-dat a book
"Paulo gave me a book."
(b) Ele pensa dar-me um livro.
he thinks to give me-dat a book
"He is thinking of giving me a book."

(13)   (a)   O Paulo não me deu um livro.
             the Paulo not me-dat gave-3sg a book
             "Paulo didn't give me a book."
       (b)   Ele pensa não me dar um livro.
             he thinks not me-dat to give a book
             "He is thinking of not giving me a book."

Nevertheless I shall consider tensed and untensed clauses separately, as untensed clauses present problems of their own. As such, this section is divided into two subsections. Subsection 2.1 is devoted to tensed clauses; it attempts to define the most important syntactic conditions which determine each order, and to suggest an analysis for the phenomena observed, working on the assumptions spelt out in section 1. Subsection 2.2 deals with clitic placement in one particular case of untensed clauses, infinitival clauses. The aim of this subsection is to demonstrate that clitic placement in infinitival clauses obeys the same conditions as in tensed clauses, and to propose a slight modification of the analysis suggested in 2.1 on the basis of the new set of data.

2.1 Tensed clauses

2.1.1 Root vs embedded

The most obvious distinction to which clitic/verb order seems to be sensitive is that between root and embedded clauses. Observe the contrast in (14):

(14)   (a)   O Miguel encontrou-a no cinema.
             the Miguel met-3sg her-acc in-the cinema
             "Miguel met her at the cinema."
       (b)   O Pedro disse que o Miguel a encontrou no cinema.
             the Pedro said-3sg that the Miguel her-acc met-3s in-the cinema
             "Pedro said that Miguel met her at the cinema."

On the assumption that the order verb-clitic results from movement of the clitic into an empty functional head, it is clear that in (14a) this head can be neither Agr nor T, since in tensed clauses both heads contain affixes which must be picked up by the verb. Moreover, evidence from the positioning of sentence adverbials shows clearly that the clitic occupies a position higher than Agr.

(15)   (a)   Com certeza a Joana deu-lhe um pontapé.
             surely the Joana gave-3sg him-dat a kick
             "Surely Joana kicked him."
       (b)   A Joana deu-lhe com certeza um pontapé.
             the Joana gave-3sg him-dat surely a kick

Sentence adverbials can occur adjoined either to CP, which I take to be the case in (15a), or to AgrP, which seems to be the case in (15b). So both the verb and the clitic occur in a position above AgrP but below CP. In view of the configuration of clause structure adopted in this paper, the only available position for the clitic appears to be the C-position. The asymmetry in clitic placement found between root and embedded contexts would thus be accounted for. Whenever the C-position is filled by a complementizer, there are no empty functional heads in the clause; therefore it must adjoin to the verbal complex in Agr, yielding the order clitic-verb seen in (14b).

I would like to reject a suggestion by Kayne (1991) that there might be an extra functional node in root clauses in EP, into which the clitic would move. Confirmation for the hypothesis that the clitic moves into C in finite clauses with the order verb-clitic comes from the observation that this order is not limited to root contexts. It is also found in at least one type of embedded clause, namely in the protasis of a conditional.

(16)   Tivesse-me o Pedro ajudado, isto não teria acontecido.
       had-SUBJ-3sg me-acc the Pedro helped this not have-would happened
       "Had Pedro helped me, this wouldn't have happened."

It is commonly agreed that the auxiliary in (16) has undergone movement into C, as it is clear from the contrast in (17):

(17)   Se o Pedro me tivesse ajudado, isto não teria acontecido.
       if the Pedro me-acc had-SUBJ-3sg helped this not have-would happened
       "If Pedro had helped me, this wouldn't have happened."

In (17) the auxiliary is taken to be in Agr; movement into C is blocked by the presence of the complementizer in C. Comparing the position of the clitic in (16) and (17) with that in (14a) and (14b), the conclusion is that what clitic placement is sensitive to is not the distinction between root and embedded contexts, but rather the distinction between the absence and the presence of a complementizer. This is self-evident if the clitic is taken to move into the empty C-node in (14a) and in (16), but forced to adjoin to the verbal complex

in Agr in (14b) and in (17) by the fact that the C-node is filled by a complementizer.

There is another respect in which (14a) and (16) are similar. It was mentioned that the auxiliary in (16) occupies the C-position. I would like to suggest that in (14a) the verb has also moved into C, adjoining to the left of the clitic. Empirically it is not obvious how to separate this suggestion from a solution *à la Kayne* in which the verb would adjoin to C', in that both proposals make the same sort of empirical predictions. However, theoretically there is at least one point in favour of the claim that the verbal complex adjoins to the clitic in C. While it is hard to understand what would trigger verb movement to C', there is one clear reason why it would be forced to move up to C. Recall that, being an affix, the clitic has a morphological subcategorisation frame which, according to Lasnik's Filter, must be satisfied by S-structure. Since Romance clitics are invariably found attached to the verbal complex at the surface, it makes sense to assume that they subcategorise for a verbal category. I would like to claim that one of the ways in which clitics differ from other affixes is in the fact that clitics must obey both syntactic and morphological requirements. It is the syntactic requirement, the formulation of which is not yet clear at this stage, which forces the clitic to move independently from the verb into an available empty functional head. It is the morphological requirement which prevents the verb from staying in Agr, forcing its movement into C. In other words, movement of the verb into C can be accounted for in exactly the same terms as movement into T or Agr: it is motivated by the requirement to pick up an affix which must be attached by S-structure.

Lasnik's Filter can thus be satisfied in one of two ways: either the verbal complex moves up to C to pick up the clitic, yielding the order verb-clitic; or the clitic moves up from its base position to attach to the verbal complex, yielding the order clitic-verb. This latter alternative only takes place whenever there are no syntactic requirements to be satisfied by the clitic, due to the unavailability of empty functional heads in the clause.

The question is: what is the nature of this syntactic requirement imposed on clitics? Why does it force movement of the clitic into C in EP finite clauses but not in Spanish and Italian? I shall leave these questions aside for the moment and proceed with the description of the syntactic conditions determining clitic placement.

2.1.2 Wh-questions

Another environment in which the order clitic-verb is found is wh-interrogatives.

(18)   Onde a encontrou o Pedro?
          where her-acc met-3sg the Pedro
          "Where did Pedro meet her?"

It could perhaps be argued that at D-structure the C-head contains a [+WH] feature specification, and that therefore it isn't strictly empty, hence preventing movement of the clitic into it. However, if this hypothesis was correct, all interrogatives should display the order clitic-verb. That this isn't the case, is shown in (19a) for yes-no questions, and in (19b) for interrogatives with the wh-constituent *in situ*:

(19)   (a)   O Pedro encontrou-a no cinema?
                  the Pedro met-3sg her-acc in-the cinema
                  "Did Pedro meet her at the cinema?"
        (b)   O Pedro encontrou-a onde?
                  the Pedro met-3sg her-acc where
                  "Where did Pedro meet her?"

Rizzi's (1991a) claim that in matrix interrogatives it is I, rather than C, which is specified as [+WH] at D-structure, makes sentences such as the one in (18) problematic in view of the analysis of clitic placement developed so far. The question is: if C is empty at D-structure, why would movement of the clitic into it, and the resulting order verb-clitic, yield an ungrammatical structure?

Before attempting to answer this question, a few words are in order about the way in which the S-structure representation of the sentence may be derived. The wh-phrase moves into the Spec of CP, and the verbal complex must move up to C in order to satisfy the Wh-Criterion, which requires a wh-operator to be in a Spec-head configuration with a head specified as [+WH], and vice versa. Similarly to declaratives, the order clitic-verb results from the clitic having left-adjoined to the verbal complex. It is not clear whether the clitic adjoins to the verbal complex in Agr and moves alongside with it into C, or whether it adjoins directly to the verbal complex in C.

Going back to the question above, let us consider the conditions which allow movement of the clitic into C and the effects which such movement has on the CP-projection. So far I have been following Kayne (1991) in his

assumption that the only abstract functional categories allowed are the empty counterparts of legitimate functional categories. Assume that the only features for which empty functional projections are inherently specified are categorial features. Assume further that the feature specification for a given functional category may vary within a language and across languages. This is an idea that has frequently been proposed, for example, in the literature on V2 languages.[3] It is puzzling that if, according to Kayne, clitics move into an empty functional node whenever there is one in the clause, they don't move into C in Spanish and Italian root declaratives, yielding the order verb-clitic. One possibility is that not all empty functional heads are appropriate landing sites for clitics. The difference between Spanish and Italian on the one hand, and EP on the other, could be due to variation in the feature make-up of C in these languages, which makes C an appropriate landing site for the clitic in EP, but not in Spanish and Italian. Maybe the characterisation of what constitutes an "abstract functional head" for the purposes of clitic placement needs to be further defined. I won't be attempting to do that here.

So I take it that empty functional categories have no inherent features other than categorial ones. It has been suggested by Holmberg (1986) (as quoted in Vikner (1990)) that it is the lexical content of a head which determines the features of its maximal projection. Along different lines, Cardinaletti and Roberts (1991) claim that the nature of a specifier position is determined by the content of its head; for instance, if a head is a clitic position (a position which may host a clitic), its specifier will be a subject position (understood as both an A-position and a Case position). My claim is that movement of a clitic into a head turns the specifier position of that head into an A-position, but not into a Case position (as it is clear in Spanish and Italian infinitival clauses). So the Spec of CP in EP root declaratives containing a clitic is an A-position. It becomes a Case position once the verbal complex attaches to C and the subject moves into Spec of CP, as only Agr in the verbal complex may assign Case to the NP subject with which it is coindexed.

Now it becomes clear why movement of the clitic into C is incompatible with wh-movement into the Spec of CP. Both types of movement impose contradictory A/A' requirements on the specifier position of CP: the

---

[3] One example of variation in the feature make-up of a category has been suggested by Rizzi (1989) (quoted in Vikner (1990)) to account for the difference between V2 and non-V2 languages: taking functional categories to be composed of two features, [±C] and [±I], an X^0 with the feature [+C] being the head of a proposition, and an X^0 with the feature [+I] the head of a predicate, Rizzi characterises C as being [+C,+I] in V2 languages, and [+C,-I] in non-V2 languages.

wh-phrase requires an A'-Spec as its landing site; clitic movement will create an A-Spec, thus preventing wh-movement.

Two important questions arise out of this account: (i) why does a clitic in C turn the Spec of CP into an A-position?; and (ii) why does the subject move into the Spec of CP? At this stage I have nothing interesting to say about the first question. As to the second question, it doesn't seem enough to say that the subject moves for purposes of Case-assignment, as there are reasons to believe that in EP Agr can assign Nominative Case both under agreement (see (20a)) and under government (see(20b)).

(20) (a) Dizem que [$_{AgrP}$ o Paulo [$_{Agr'}$ ganhou o prémio]]
         say-3pl that the Paulo won-3sg the prize
         "It is said that Paulo won the prize."
     (b) [$_{CP}$ Onde [$_{C'}$ tinha [$_{AgrP}$ a Teresa comprado as flores?]]]
         where had-3sg the Teresa bought the flowers
         "Where had Teresa bought the flowers?"

Moreover, it is clear that the subject doesn't obligatorily have to move.

(21) Tinha-as a Teresa acabado de comprar.
     had-3sg them-acc-fem the Teresa finished of to buy
     "Teresa had just bought them."

Then why does it move in most cases? It is worth pointing out that this is a problem which isn't unique to this phenomenon, or even to EP. Roberts (1991) suggests that in Italian Nominative Case may be assigned either under government by T to the subject's base position (i.e. adjoined to VP), or under agreement by Agr to the specifier position of AgrP (see (22)).

(22) (a) Ha telefonato Maria.
         has rung Maria
         "Maria has rung."
     (b) Maria ha telefonato.
         Maria has rung

NP movement is usually assumed to be forced by Case considerations. If Nominative Case may be assigned to subjects in their base position, why do they ever move? This seems to be a variation on the question asked about EP. In the EP case, movement of the subject may be motivated by the general tendency to interpret postverbal subjects as the focus of the sentence.

2.1.3 Negative clauses

So far all the factors we have seen as disallowing raising of the clitic into C and the resulting verb-clitic order have been restricted to the CP level. In the case of embedded clauses introduced by a complementizer, it was the presence of the complementizer in C which prevented raising of the clitic. In the case of wh-questions, movement of the clitic into C would license a Spec of CP position inadequate as a landing site for wh-movement. In this subsection I look at a case where clitic movement into C is blocked by an intervening head. See (23):

(23)   (a)   A Maria viu-o.
              the Maria saw-3sg him-acc
              "Maria saw him."
       (b)   A Maria não o viu.
              the Maria not him-acc saw-3sg
              "Maria didn't see him."

The presence of the negative marker in (23b), the only aspect in which it differs from (23a), seems to block raising of the clitic into C, thus making the order verb-clitic impossible. The idea that Neg heads its own projection was first proposed for Romance by Kayne (1989) to account for the blocking effect it has on clitic climbing. This blocking effect seems to be a generalised phenomenon; Ouhalla (1988b) has shown that movement of the clitic into C in Berber is also blocked by the presence of negation.
    Adopting Zanuttini's (1991) view that in languages with preverbal negative markers NegP is structurally higher than IP, the clause structure of a negative clause in EP would thus be as represented in (24):

(24) $[_{CP} C [_{NegP} Neg [_{AgrP} Agr [_{TP} T [_{VP} V ...]]]]]$

How does Neg block clitic movement? Following the *Barriers* framework, Kayne (1989) accounts for this fact by assuming that Neg is unable to L-mark its complement, which therefore becomes a barrier, blocking antecedent government of the clitic's trace by the clitic. However, Ouhalla has shown that this doesn't account for the Berber case. Neg being affixal in Berber, some element must attach to it by S-structure if Lasnik's Filter is to be satisfied. Nothing would seem to prevent movement of the verbal complex into Neg, after which the complement of Neg (which Ouhalla takes to be TP in Berber) would become L-marked, hence allowing the clitic in C to antecedent-govern

its trace. On the other hand, if NegP is also a barrier, its barrierhood would be voided by movement of the clitic, which Ouhalla assumes to be an L-marker.

Kayne's explanation doesn't seem to be adequate for EP either. What would prevent a derivation in which the clitic moved into C, and the verbal complex moved in a stepwise fashion into C, picking up the Neg element on the way? This derivation is represented in (25a) and corresponds to a sentence as the one in (25b):

(25)   (a) $[_{CP} ..[_{C'}[Neg +[[[V]_j + T]_k + Agr]_i]_n + cl_i \ [_{NegP} t_n \ [_{AgrP} t_i \ [_{TP} t_k \ [_{VP} t_j \ t_i]]]]]]$

(b)   *A Maria não viu-o.
the Maria not saw-3sg him-acc

Even if the clitic is not an L-marker, the verb, on moving upwards from head to head, should be able to L-mark not only NegP and AgrP, but also TP and VP. Whether the negative marker is assumed to be a clitic or not, there is evidence to believe that, at least in cases where the verb undergoes movement into C, it must attach to Neg and it is the resulting complex which moves into C. This is clear in wh-questions:

(26)   (a)   A quem não deu o Pedro flores?
to who not gave-3sg the Pedro flowers
"To whom didn't Pedro give flowers?"
(b)   *A quem deu não o Pedro flores?
to who gave-3sg not the Pedro flowers

Under a different framework, Rizzi's Relativized Minimality, an alternative explanation for the blocking effect of negation on clitic movement may be found in Roberts's (1991) distinction between A-heads and A'-heads. Following Holmberg and Platzack (1988) (quoted in Roberts (1991)), Roberts proposes to extend the A/A' distinction to the level of heads. A-heads would be those that are somehow relevant for the determination of argument structure, such as V and Agr. A'-heads are operators or (licensers of) landing sites for operators, such as T, Neg and C. Similarly to specifier positions, a head position may behave alternately as A or A'. An example would be T, which is an A-head if morphologically selected, and an A'-head if not. Roberts then revises the Relativized Minimality system to include this distinction: only an A-head is a potential antecedent-governor for a trace in an A-chain, and only an A'-head is a potential antecedent-governor for a trace in an A'-chain.

The problem with Roberts's system is that it is sometimes hard to see the theoretical motivation behind the distinction between A-heads and A'-heads. The inclusion of a head into either category seems to be at times pure stipulation. This is the case with T, which, as mentioned above, is sometimes classified as an A'-head and other times as an A-head. As movement of the verb in a finite clause from T into Agr would be an instance of improper movement, from an A' to an A-position, Roberts has to say that whenever T is morphologically selected by Agr, as it is in a finite clause, it is an A-head. However, if T is still an operator, as it seems to be, it is not clear why it isn't an A'-head. So the distinction needs to be clarified. Nevertheless let us take it as it is, and consider how it might help us solve the problem at hand.

While it is clear that C in wh-questions is an A'-head, licensing a Spec position which is the landing site for a wh-operator, it is not so obvious whether, as a potential clitic position, it is an A'-head or an A-head. Let us assume that it is always an A'-head.[4] This would be compatible with the assumption I have been following, namely that the clitic moves directly from its base position into C. Since V, T and Agr are taken to be A-heads, they don't count as potential antecedent-governors for the trace of the clitic, and movement of the clitic can proceed in one swoop. However, in negative clauses, Neg, as an A'-head, does. Therefore movement of the clitic into a position structurally higher than Neg would yield an ill-formed structure. By Relativized Minimality, Neg would block antecedent government of the clitic's trace by the clitic in C.

This account makes crucial use of the idea that clitic-trace relations are subject to (Relativized) Minimality, which is an idea that has been contested by a number of authors (see, for example, Ouhalla (1988b)). As it stands, the analysis isn't very satisfactory, mainly because it is built on assumptions which need to be further defined and justified. However, I believe that any analysis of this phenomenon must follow the same lines, i.e. it must somehow make reference to the nature of the heads in question, and probably assume that clitic chains must indeed obey Minimality.[5]

---

[4] This might be problematic in view of the claim that the Spec of CP may be an A-head. It isn't clear in Roberts's argument how compatible heads and Spec-positions must be with respect to the A/A' distinction.

[5] An alternative solution to this problem would be to consider that what is disallowed is not movement of the clitic across Neg, but rather movement of the complex [Neg + V] into C. The CP defined by the clitic is a projection within which operators cannot be licensed. Call it a non-operator -projection, as opposed to NegP and a [+WH] CP, which

2.2 Infinitival clauses

In this subsection I shall look at clitic placement in one class of untensed clauses, infinitival clauses. The order found in these clauses is sometimes problematic for the analysis presented so far for two reasons. On the one hand, in certain infinitival clauses the order found is not the one expected, the order predicted by the analysis being ungrammatical. On the other hand, some infinitival clauses allow both orders, which seems to be disallowed under the current analysis which assumes that if there are empty functional nodes in a clause, the order verb-clitic is obligatory; if not, then only the order clitic-verb is possible.

Let us look first at the least problematic cases. See (27):

(27) (a) Eu penso convidá-la.
          I think-1sg to invite her-acc
          "I'm thinking of inviting her."
      (b) *Eu penso a convidar.
          I think-1sg her-acc to invite

According to Raposo (1987a), epistemic predicates such as *pensar* "to think" subcategorise for CP-complements. In a non-inflected infinitival clause there are therefore two empty functional heads into which clitics could move: C and Agr.[6] Evidence from negative infinitival clauses points towards clitic movement into C, rather than into Agr. See (28):

(28) Eu penso não a convidar.
      I think-1sg not her-acc to invite
      "I'm thinking of not inviting her."

---

would be operator-projections. Movement of [Neg + V] would be an instance of improper movement, from within an operator projection into a non-operator projection. I won't attempt to evaluate here whether such a solution may be sustained or not. The problem with negation is a classical one, hence not exclusive to clitic placement. Negation behaves as an island for many other instances of movement. Any solution to this problem must therefore take all those cases into consideration, which is beyond the scope of this paper.

[6] I am assuming that the infinitival morpheme appears under the T-node.

If the clitic moved into Agr, the presence of negation shouldn't affect the order verb-clitic. The fact that it does seems to indicate that the clitic moves into a position higher than Neg, i.e. C.

Further confirmation for the claim that the clitic moves into C comes from infinitival clauses with overt Agr, i.e. inflected infinitival clauses. In this case, the only empty functional head available is C. As it is clear from the example in (29), the order verb-clitic is still to be found:

(29)   (a) Eu penso terem-na convidado.
             I think-1sg to have-3pl her-acc invited
             "I think they have invited her."
       (b)   ?Eu penso a terem convidado.
             I think-1sg her-acc to have-3pl invited

The order in (29a) is predicted not only under our analysis of clitic placement, but also under Raposo's theory of inflected infinitival clauses, where he takes the verbal complex in (29a) to have moved into C for purposes of Case assignment. What is puzzling is the order in (29b), which is marginally tolerated by some speakers, including myself. Throughout this subsection I shall be taking the view that this is not a problem for the analysis of clitic placement, in that this oscillation is found exclusively in infinitival clauses. One hypotheses is that infinitival clauses lend themselves to an ambiguous interpretation, being sometimes interpreted as CPs and other times as IPs. This latter interpretation would account for (29b). It is not clear whether this ambiguity is only possible for inflected infinitival clauses.

The same phenomenon is found with subject clauses. See the inflected infinitival clause in (30):

(30)   (a)   É possível eles convidarem-na.
             is possible they to invite-3pl her-acc
             "It is possible that they will invite her."
       (b)   É possível eles a convidarem.
             is possible they her-acc to invite-3pl

Viewing subject clauses as IPs, as Raposo does, would only account for (30b) which, unlike (29b), is perfectly acceptable. However, (30a) is also grammatical. I suggest that subject sentences may optionally be interpreted as CPs. This would account for the well- formedness of (30a), with the clitic and the verbal complex moving into C.

Once again, it is not clear whether the subject clause in (31), the non-inflected infinitival equivalent of the subject clause in (30), should be treated as a CP or an AgrP. Either analysis would explain why the only possible order is verb-clitic.

(31) (a) É possível convidá-la.
is possible to invite her-acc
"It is possible to invite her.
(b) *É possível a convidar.
is possible her-acc to invite

Negation facts seem to point to the CP analysis, and, as in complement clauses, the clitic seems to undergo movement into C rather than into Agr.

(32) (a) É possível não a convidar.
is possible not her-acc to invite
"It is possible not to invite her."
(b) *É possível não convidá-la.
is possible not to invite her

Why attachment to C, rather than to Agr? The generalisation seems to be along the lines of Ouhalla's CPC. Whenever there is more than one potential landing site for the clitic, then the clitic is required to attach to the highest one. I ignore what the theoretical motivation behind this requirement would be. However, it is not obvious that even such a requirement is needed to account for clitic placement in non-inflected infinitival clauses in EP. There are reasons to believe that an empty Agr may not be an adequate landing site for clitic movement. The evidence comes from adjunct infinitival clauses introduced by a preposition. Compare the inflected infinitival example in (33) with the non-inflected infinitival one in (34):

(33) (a) Eles vieram cá para me visitarem.
they came-3pl here for me-acc to visit-3pl
"They came here to visit me."
(b) *Eles vieram cá para visitarem-me.
they came-3pl here for to visit-3pl me-acc

(34)   (a)   Eles vieram cá para me visitar.
              they came-3pl here for me-acc to visit
              "They came here to visit me."
        (b)   *Eles vieram cá para visitar-me.
              they came-3pl here for to visit me-acc

The obligatory clitic-verb order in (33) follows from Raposo's view that the adjunct clause is a PP, and clausal complements of Ps are IPs. Since Agr is overt, there is no empty functional head in the clause, the only possibility for the clitic being adjunction to the verbal complex in Agr. This argument doesn't, however, carry over to the example in (34), where we see the non-inflected equivalent of (33). In this example, the Agr head is empty; nevertheless the order verb-clitic is ungrammatical. Under our assumptions, this is evidence that there is no available empty functional head for clitic movement. The conclusion appears to be then that Agr doesn't count as an available empty head for clitic movement in EP.

Further evidence for the claim that empty Agr is not an adequate landing site for clitic movement is found with infinitival interrogative clauses, which are always non-inflected. See the examples in (35):

(35)   (a)   Não sei como lhe dizer.
              not know-1sg how him-dat to tell
              "I don't know how to tell him."
        (b)   ??Não sei como dizer-lhe.
              not know-1sg how to tell him-dat

By our assumptions, the embedded C in (35) isn't strictly empty at D-structure, as it contains a [+WH] feature specification. However, Agr is empty and the expected order would be verb-clitic. Once again it appears that an empty Agr is unable to host a clitic in EP.

This conclusion would tie up with the observation in subsection 2.1.2 that there is a need to redefine what counts as an empty head for clitic movement in Romance. Recall that in languages such as Spanish and Italian C in root tensed clauses doesn't count as an available landing site for the clitic. Now there seems to be evidence that Agr doesn't count in EP non-inflected infinitival clauses. One possibility is that the choice of head is a parametric one, and, moreover, that it is unique. So Agr would be the choice in Spanish and Italian, and C would be the choice in EP.

Another possibility is that the nature of heads which are appropriate landing sites for clitic movement is required to be identical in all Romance

languages.i.e. that they must share certain common features. In this case, the differences in clitic placement would be made to derive from differences between the nature of functional heads and, ultimately, from independent properties of these languages. This hypothesis would be consistent with Chomsky's (1989) and Ouhalla's (1991) theory that all parametric variation can be explained in terms of variation in the lexical properties of functional categories. As they stand, these comments are purely speculative. Some deeper comparative research into the properties of functional categories in Romance is needed before we can decide whether they are indeed correct.

3 Clitic-second effects

In the context of Romance languages, the phenomenon described in section 2 is, as far I know, exclusive to EP, but it is in no way exceptional. It was found in a number of old Romance languages, such as Old Spanish, Old French and Old Italian, and it has traditionally been described in terms of a condition which places weak, unstressed elements in the second position in the clause (Wackernagel's Law) and a constraint which, determining pronominal clitic position, forbids the occurrence of unstressed pronominals in sentence-initial position (Tobler-Mussafia Law).

Whichever way one chooses to look at these two laws, it is clear that, within a generative framework, they can't be considered as being phonological constraints on clitic placement. I agree with Benincà (1991) that it is hard to see how to implement any condition that takes a phonological factor (the lack of stress of weak elements) to be sensitive to and determine syntactic processes. Thus I would like to assume that clitic placement is essentially a syntactic process, and therefore "blind" to phonological considerations.

I want to look briefly at the way in which the analysis developed in section 2 satisfies the predictions made by these two laws. As for Wackernagel's Law, it is clear that an analysis which takes clitics to move into C captures the fact that they occupy the second position in the clause. It is evident from the examples in (36) that "second position" must refer to structural, rather than to linear position.

(36) (a) Telefonou-lhe o Paulo.
           rang-3sg him-dat the Paulo
           "Paulo rang him."
      (b) O Paulo telefonou-lhe.
           the Paulo rang-3sg him-dat

(c)   *O Paulo lhe telefonou.
      the Paulo him-dat rang-3sg

The Tobler-Mussafia Law has often been taken to mean that a clitic is obligatorily postverbal if the preverbal position would place it in first position in the clause. (36c) provides evidence against this interpretation. The preverbal clitic is not in first position; nevertheless, it is obligatorily postverbal. This is predicted by our analysis, which derives the order clitic-verb from failure of the clitic to move up to C. In cases where the C-head is empty, this yields ungrammaticality by violation of whichever syntactic requirement forces clitic movement into C.

Our analysis also predicts the ban on clitic-first sentences. Such a ban is found in languages where the clitic moves independently to the highest head in the clause (so it is found in EP but not in languages such as Spanish or Italian). In order to satisfy Lasnik's Filter, the verbal complex must move up, left-adjoining to the clitic in C. Whenever a clitic is in C, and potentially in sentence-initial position (if the Spec of CP is empty), the representation will be ruled out for violation of Lasnik's Filter if the verbal complex fails to attach to the clitic. If we assume that this attachment is always an instance of left-adjunction, the motivation for assuming the existence of an independent prohibition against clitic-first is lost. Furthermore, in all the cases we saw where clitic movement into C is disallowed there is always some constituent at S-structure preceding the clitic; this is true for embedded clauses introduced by a complementizer, for wh-questions, and for negative clauses.

I suggest therefore that such a condition as the Tobler-Mussafia Law may be dismissed, since its effects can be derived independently from Lasnik's Filter and from the syntactic conditions governing clitic placement. As to Wackernagel's Law, although it is captured in our analysis, it is not explained by it. Therefore it is worth keeping this condition in mind for future research into "clitic-second" phenomena, i.e. into the principles and conditions which trigger clitic movement into C.

4 Preverbal operators

Further evidence for the claim that the notion of "second position" in Wackernagel's Law should be interpreted as referring to structural rather than linear position is found in the contrast between (37) on the one hand, and (38), (39) and (40) on the other:

(37)   Os rapazes ajudaram-me.
           the boys helped-3pl me-acc
           "The boys helped me."

(38)   (a)   Todos os rapazes me ajudaram.
           all the boys me-acc helped-3pl
           "All the boys helped me."
      (b)   *Todos os rapazes ajudaram-me.
           all the boys helped-3pl me-acc

(39)   (a)   Poucos rapazes me ajudaram.
           few boys me-acc helped-3pl
           "Few boys helped me."
      (b)   *Poucos rapazes ajudaram-me.
           few boys helped-3pl me-acc

(40)   (a)   Alguém me ajudou.
           someone me-acc helped-3sg
           "Someone helped me."
      (b)   *Alguém ajudou-me.
           someone helped-3sg me-acc

The order clitic-verb isn't only obligatory with quantified subjects but also with other preverbal quantified NPs.

(41)   (a)   A alguém as ofereceram.
           to someone them-acc-fem offered-3pl
           "They offered them to someone."
      (b)   *A alguém ofereceram-nas.
           to someone offered-3pl them-acc-fem

On the other hand, not all preverbal quantified NPs seem to exclude the order verb-clitic.

(42)   (a)   Alguns rapazes ajudaram-me.
           some boys helped-3pl me-acc
           "Some boys helped me."
      (b)   ALGUNS RAPAZES me ajudaram.
           some boys me-acc helped-3pl
           "SOME BOYS helped me."

(43)   (a)   Muitos rapazes ajudaram-me.
           many boys helped-3pl me-acc
           "Many boys helped me."

   (b)   MUITOS RAPAZES me ajudaram.
         many boys me-acc helped-3pl
         "MANY BOYS helped me."

In fact, in (42) and (43) it is the order verb-clitic which is the most natural order. As shown, the (b) examples are only fine, provided the quantified NP receives focal stress and a focus interpretation.

In many languages, such as English, at S-structure quantified NP subjects are assumed to occupy the canonical subject position, i.e. the Spec of AgrP, an A-position. If this were the case in EP, then a sentence like (38b) should be well-formed; movement of the clitic into C should be possible, followed by movement of the verbal complex into C and movement of the subject into the A-Spec of CP, as I have been arguing is the case for a sentence such as the one in (37). I suggest that the preverbal quantified NP in all the sentences with the order clitic-verb occupies an operator position at S-structure. One hypothesis is that this position is the Spec of CP. The impossibility of obtaining the order verb-clitic would then be accounted for along the same lines as the impossibility of having this order in wh-questions. The observation that a preverbal quantified object triggers subject-verb inversion (see (44)) and that a quantified subject interferes with wh-movement (see (45)) seems to support this hypothesis.

(44)   (a)   Todas estas flores me ofereceram eles.
             all these flowers me-dat offered-3pl they
             "They offered me all these flowers."
       (b)   *Todas estas flores eles me ofereceram.
             all these flowers they me-dat offered-3pl
(45)   *A quem deu alguém flores?
             to who gave-3sg someone flowers
             "To whom did someone give flowers?"

An alternative hypothesis is suggested by the following sentences:

(46)   (a)   Ninguém o ajudou.
             nobody him-acc helped-3sg
             "Nobody helped him."
       (b)   *Ninguém ajudou-o.
             nobody helped-3sg him-acc

(47) (a) Nada me deram.
           nothing me-dat gave-3pl
           "They gave me nothing."
      (b) *Nada deram-me.
           nothing gave-3pl me-dat

Zanuttini (1991) takes the negative constituents in (46) and (47) to occupy the specifier-position of NegP. It is conceivable that the preverbal quantified NPs in the examples above also occur at S-structure in the Spec of a phrase between CP and AgrP, the head of which would block clitic movement into C. The account for clitic placement in these clauses would then run along the lines suggested for negative clauses. I take this phrase to be FP, the existence of which has been suggested for EP on different grounds by Uriagereka (1992).

This hypothesis would also be consistent with the facts in (44) and (45) above. The subject-verb inversion in (44) is consistent with Brody's (1990) claim that the verb must move to F in order to assign a [+f] feature to the constituent in the Spec of FP. As to the ungrammaticality of (45), it can be accounted for in terms of Relativized Minimality: if the specifier-position of FP is an operator position, it will block antecedent government of the wh-trace by the wh-phrase in the Spec of CP.

Moreover, the FP-hypothesis allows us to account for the obligatory focus interpretation of the quantified NPs in (42b) and (43b) above. It is clear that not all quantified NPs must undergo movement into the Spec of FP. For those that don't, the order clitic-verb is only possible if the NP has undergone optional movement into the Spec of FP; in this case, the NP is clearly being focussed.[7] All preverbal focussed constituents appear to trigger the order clitic-verb. See the following examples:

(48)   ATÉ O PEDRO me deu uma prenda.
          even the Pedro me-dat gave-3sg a present
          "EVEN PEDRO gave me a present."

---

[7] It might be more appropriate to think of this projection as an XP, rather than as an FP. XP would be a larger category of which FP and possibly NegP would be instantiations. Another instantiation would be the phrase into the Spec of which those QPs which must undergo movement into an operator position by S-structure would move. This would explain why only QPs for which movement is optional receive an obligatory focus interpretation.

(49) SÓ O PEDRO me deu uma prenda.
      only the Pedro me-dat gave-3sg a present
      "ONLY PEDRO gave me a present."

(50) TAMBÉM O PEDRO me deu uma prenda.
      also the Pedro me-dat gave-3sg a present
      "PEDRO ALSO gave me a present."

(51) SEMPRE me perguntam por ti.
      always me-dat ask-3pl by you
      "they ALWAYS ask me about you."

(52) (a) ISSO lhe disse eu.
           that him-dat told-1sg I
           "I told him THAT."

      (b) Isso, disse-lhe eu.
           that told-1sg him-dat I

Notice the contrast between focus and topicalization in (52). The topicalized constituent in (52b), being arguably outside CP, doesn't interfere with clitic movement and, therefore, the order verb-clitic is allowed.

Conclusion

In this paper I suggested that, within Kayne's (1991) framework, the differences in clitic placement between EP and other Romance languages may be derived from one single difference: the fact that only in EP is C a clitic position. Movement of the clitic into an empty C, followed by left-adjunction of the verbal complex to the clitic and movement of the subject into the A-Spec of CP, was taken to yield the order verb-clitic found typically in root tensed clauses. Evidence was presented to show that the order verb-clitic is only found when movement of the clitic into C is blocked. Movement is blocked if (i) the C-head is lexically filled (as in embedded tensed clauses); (ii) movement of the clitic would create a configuration in which other types of movement would be blocked (as in wh-questions); (iii) certain intervening heads (Neg/F) are present, which, by Relativized Minimality, would arguably prevent the clitic from antecedent-governing its trace. On the basis of evidence from infinitival clauses, it was suggested that Agr is not a clitic position in EP. Pending further research, I tentatively concluded that all variation found among Romance languages regarding clitic placement might be attributable to differences in the properties of their functional categories.

References

Baker, M. (1988) *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago University Press, Chicago.

Benincà, P. (1991) Complement Clitics in Medieval Romance: the Tobler-Mussafia Law. In H. van Riemsdijk and L. Rizzi (eds.) *Eurotyp Working Papers* 8, 1-22.

Brody, M. (1990) Some Remarks on the Focus Field in Hungarian. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 201-225.

Cardinaletti, A. and I. Roberts (1991) Clause Structure and X-Second. Ms, Università di Venezia and Université de Genève.

Chomsky, N. (1986b) *Barriers*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Chomsky, N. (1989) Some Notes on Economy of Derivation and Representation. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 10.

Holmberg, A. (1986) *Word Order and Syntactic Features in the Scandinavian Languages and English*. Department of General Linguistics, University of Stockholm.

Holmberg, A. and C. Platzack (1988) On the Role of Inflection in Scandinavian Syntax. *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 42, 25-42.

Kayne, R. (1989) Null Subjects and Clitic Climbing. In O. Jaeggli and K. Safir (eds.) *The Null Subject Parameter*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

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

Lema, J. and M.- L. Rivero (1989) Inverted Conjugations and V-Second Effects in Romance. Paper presented to the XIX Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages, Columbus, Ohio.

Motapanyane, V. (1992) On Clitic Movement in Romanian. Draft presented at Seminario di Linguistica, Università di Venezia.

Ouhalla, J. (1988b) *The Syntax of Head Movement: A Study of Berber*. Doctoral dissertation, University College London.

Ouhalla, J. (1989a) Clitic Movement and the ECP: Evidence from Berber and Romance Languages. *Lingua* 79, 165-215.

Ouhalla, J. (1991) *Functional Categories and Parametric Variation*. Routledge, London.

Pesetsky, D. (1989) Language Particular Principles and the Earliness Principle. Ms, MIT.

Raposo, E. (1987a) Case Theory and Infl-to-Comp: The Inflected Infinitive in European Portuguese. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18, 85-109.

Rizzi, L. (1989) Speculations on Verb Second. Ms, Université de Genève.

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

Rizzi, L. (1991a) Residual Verb Second and the Wh-Criterion. *Technical Reports in Formal and Computational Linguistics* 2, Faculté des Lettres, Université de Genève.

Rizzi, L. (1991b) Proper Head Government and the Definition of A-Positions. *GLOW Newsletter* 26, 46-47.

Rizzi, L. and I. Roberts (1989) Complex Inversion in French. *Probus* 1, 1-30.

Roberts, I. (1991) *Verbs and Diachronic Syntax (A Comparative History of English and French)*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht.

Tsimpli, I.- M. (1990) The Clause Structure and Word Order of Modern Greek. *UCL Working Papers in Linguistics* 2, 226-255.

Uriagereka, J. (1992) Focus in Iberian Languages. *GLOW Newsletter* 27, 52-53.

Vikner, S. (1990) *Verb Movement and the Licensing of NP-Positions in the Germanic Languages*. Doctoral dissertation, Université de Genève.

Wanner, D. (1987) *The Development of Romance Clitic Pronouns: From Latin to Old Romance*. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.

Williams, E. (1981a) On the Notion "Lexically Related" and "Head of Word". *Linguistic Inquiry* 12, 245-74.

Zanuttini, R. (1991) *Syntactic Properties of Sentencial Negation: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Zubizarreta, M.L. (1981) Subject Extraction in Portuguese and the Pro-drop Parameter. Ms, MIT.