Across-the-Board clitic placement in Romance languages

GABRIELA MATOS

Abstract

Studies on clitics emphasise that Across-the-Board (ATB) clitic placement is licensed only by proclitic pronouns and exhibits a different behaviour across Romance in what concerns its availability as a regular syntactic construction. Current proposals treat these properties either as the result of the LCA and the special status of clitics as parasitic gaps identifiers in some languages (Kayne 1994), or as the consequence of the projection of a functional category above the coordinate structure, where the clitic may remain stranded (Rouveret 1992, Uriagereka 1995). Departing from these analyses, I will claim that ATB clitic placement is not restricted to proclisis and may arise whenever the clitic has scope over the arguments it is related with in each conjunct. I will also argue that the different behaviour of ATB clitic placement in Romance must be entirely imputed to the status of the clitics as autonomous vs. non-autonomous syntactic heads, as well as to the strategies potentially available in each language for evidencing the coordinate structure as a unit the overt clitic has scope over.

Final version, published in

2000,

Probus 12:2, de Gruyter, pp. 229-261

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2000.12.2.0>

1. Introduction¹

On the basis of examples like (1), from French, it is usually assumed that ATB clitic placement is restricted to proclisis (cf. Benicà and Cinque 1990, Kayne 1994, Rouveret 1995, Uriagereka 1995).

1. I would like to thank Inês Duarte, Eduardo Raposo, Ana Brito, Madalena Colaço, Sónia Frota, Ana Maria Martins and, specially, two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on a previous version of this paper. I am also indebted to Léon Acosta and Roberto Castón for their help with the Spanish data.

- (1) a. *Paul les lit et relit sans cesse.*
 Paul them reads and rereads without stop
 'Paul reads and rereads them incessantly.'
 (Kayne 1994: 62)
- b. **Lis et relis -les!*
 'Read and reread them!'
 (Kayne 1994: 62)

Attempting to capture the contrast of acceptability between (1a) and (1b), Kayne (1994) suggests that, while in (1a) ATB clitic placement occurs in a legitimate coordinate structure, whose conjuncts are maximal projections, in (1b) it violates the Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA).

To account for (1a), Kayne (1994) extends Munn's (1992, 1993) proposal on ATB constructions, claiming that the clitic in the first conjunct must identify a null operator which binds a parasitic gap in the second conjunct. He assumes that the exceptional status of clitic ATB configurations in a language like French lies on the fact that clitics are not usually identifiers of parasitic gaps in these languages, allowing for such an identification only when the two verbs are sufficiently similar (Kayne 1994: 63).

Relating the availability of the clitic ATB construction with proclisis to its regular occurrence in Romance languages, such as European Portuguese, Spanish and Galician, Rouveret (1992) and Uriagereka (1995) argue for the existence of a functional projection higher than the core sentence projections in these languages (WP and FP, respectively). In ATB clitic placement, the clitic would raise to the head of this projection, while its verbal host would remain in a lower functional projection, inside the coordinate structure.

In this study, I will adopt the main proposals on coordination presented in Kayne (1994), according to which coordinate structures exhibit binary asymmetrical configurations, projected from a functional head, Conj, which selects for each conjunct either as its specifier or as its complement.² However, in contrast with Kayne (1994), I will claim, on the basis of comparative evidence, that ATB clitic placement is not exclusively restricted to proclisis and that the unacceptable cases of clitic ATB with enclisis may not be systematically explained as LCA violations.

Yet, ATB clitic placement has a much more limited range of occurrence with enclisis than with proclisis – while the former is confined to cases where the clitic and its verbal host have been extracted out of the coordinate structure, clitic ATB with proclisis, while allowing it, does not require such an extraction. This different behaviour is a consequence of the structural requirements for the c-command of the clitic to obtain in each conjunct.

In fact, European Portuguese presents compelling empirical evidence for both the incorporation of the clitic into its verbal host before Spell-Out and the possi-

2. See also Benmamoun 1992 and Aoun et alii 1994.

bility of ATB readings in configurations where the clitic has not been moved from the coordinate structure. These properties strongly argue against the approaches of ATB clitic placement which rely on the presence of the clitic in a functional head independent from the one occupied by its verbal host in overt syntax (cf. Rouveret 1992, Uriagereka 1995).

Spanish and European Portuguese exhibit ATB clitic placement more freely than French, allowing for the occurrence of different predicates headed by simple verb forms in each conjunct (see (2a) and (2b) vs. (2c)).

- (2) a. Spanish
Juan les hablará y perdonará.
 Juan them talk-will and forgive-will
 'Juan will talk to them and forgive them.'
 (Uriagereka 1995: 105)
- b. Portuguese
Só Roberto me viu e cumprimentou.
 Only Roberto me_{CLacc} saw and greeted
 'Only Roberto saw me and greeted me.'
 (cf. Cunha 1972: 218)
- c. **Jean vous parlera et pardonnera.*
 Jean you_{dat} will-speak and will-forgive.
 (Kayne 1994: 62)

Still, the non-exceptional character of ATB clitic placement in these languages may not be explained by reducing it to a case of the parasitic gap construction. Rather, the different behaviour of ATB clitic placement across Romance must be searched in the status of the proclitic pronouns in what concerns their syntactic autonomy with respect to their syntactic hosts, as well as in the different strategies employed by each language to identify the whole coordinate structure as the scope domain of the clitic.

2. ATB clitic placement with enclisis and extraction from the coordinate structure

Relating (1b), repeated in (3a), to (3b), Kayne (1994) suggests that the unacceptability of ATB clitic placement with enclisis is a consequence of LCA's violation. Both examples would be instances of head coordination, (3a) exhibiting coordination of verbal heads and (3b) showing an [Cl and Cl] configuration.

- (3) a. **Lis et relis -les!*
 'Read and reread them!'
 (Kayne 1994: 62)
- b. **Donne-moi et lui un livre.*
 'Give me and him a book.'

(Kayne 1994: 60)

Data from European Portuguese, where enclisis has a much wider range of occurrence than in other Romance languages, seem to suggest an alternative explanation.

In fact, enclisis in Spanish and Italian is restricted to non-finite domains, proclisis being triggered by the strength of Tense (Belletti 1993). This property is illustrated for Spanish in (4):

- (4) a. *Lo oímos.*
It heard-we
'We heard it.'
- b. *Para oírlo ...*
To heard-it
'To hear it ...'
- (Uriagereka 1995: 92)

In opposition, in European Portuguese, enclisis occurs in finite root sentences as well as in infinitival embedded ones (see (5)), and proclisis is confined to contexts where operator-like elements c-command the verbal host of the clitic – sentential negation (see (6a)); overt complementizers (see (6b)) and wh-operators (see (6c)), quantified NPs in preverbal subject position (see (6d)), fronted focused elements (see (6e)), certain preverbal adverbs (see (6f)) and coordination scope makers (see (6g)) (cf. Duarte 1983, Duarte and Matos 1999, Frota and Vigário (1996), among others).

- (5) a. *Ele viu-a.*
He saw-her_{CLacc}
'He saw her.'
- b. *Ele quer vê-la.*
He wants to-see-her_{CLacc}
'He wants to see her.'
- (6) a. *O João [não] o viu.*
The João not him_{CLacc} saw
'João did not see him.'
- b. *Ela disse [que] ele a amava.*
She said that he her_{CLacc} loved
'She said that he loved her.'
- c. *[Que] lhe ofereceste?*
What him/her_{CLdat} you-offered
'What did you offer him/her?'

- d. *[Todos os alunos] se riram.*
All the students themselves_{CL} laughed
'All the students laughed.'
- e. *[Até a ele] lhe contaram (elas) mentiras.*
Even to him him_{CLdat} told (they-fem) lies
'They told lies even to him.'
- f. *O João [já] o comprou.*
The João already it_{CLacc} bought
'João bought it already.'
- g. *Ele [tanto] lhes telefona [como] os visita.*
He as-much them_{CLdat} calls as them_{CLacc} visits
'He both calls them and visits them.'

The examples in (7) and (8), from European Portuguese, apparently confirm that ATB clitic placement is impossible with enclisis, but point to a different explanation from the one proposed in Kayne (1994) – an explanation not relying on the head status of the conjuncts, but on the structural position of the clitic:

- (7) a. *Só Roberto me viu e cumprimentou.*
Only Roberto me_{CLacc} saw and greeted
'Only Roberto saw me and greeted me.'
- b. **Viu-me e cumprimentou.³*
He-saw-me_{CLacc} and greeted
'He saw me and greeted.'
- (cf. Cunha 1972: 218)
- (8) a. *Todos o viram na aula e cumprimentaram delicadamente.*
All him_{CLacc} saw in-the classroom and
greeted politely
'They all saw him in the classroom and greeted him politely.'
- b. **Eles viram-no na aula e cumprimentaram delicadamente.*
They saw-him_{CLacc} in-the classroom and greeted
politely
'They saw him in the classroom and greeted politely.'

In contrast with (3a), in (7b) and (8b) the enclitic pronoun targets the verb in the first conjunct as its host; furthermore, in (8b) the verb co-occurs with other constituents, whose presence discards the possibility of word coordination. The examples in (7b) and (8b) do not violate the LCA, yet they are unacceptable. Thus, this

3. Examples like this one, where the direct object is missing in the second conjunct, may be marginally interpreted as instances of the Null Object construction, initially described for European Portuguese in Raposo 1986.

unacceptability must be imputed to some other factor, presumably the structural position of the clitic.

Moreover, contradicting the current assumptions, European Portuguese provides ample evidence for the ATB clitic placement with enclisis (see (9)):

- (9) a. *Eles tinham-nas ouvido às avós e*
They had-them_{CLacc} heard from-the grandmothers and
contado aos filhos.
told to-the children
'They had heard them from their grandmothers and told them to their children.'
- b. *Ele estava-lhe sempre a telefonar e a pedir*
He was-him/her_{CLdat} always to call and to ask-for
conselhos.
advices
'He was always calling him/her, asking for advice.'

However, clitic ATB with enclisis is severely restricted: it only occurs in sentences where the clitic is hosted by an auxiliary and where there is a single instance of this verb – see the contrast between (10) and (11). In (11), the only interpretation available is the marginal one where the indirect object of the verb in the second conjunct exhibits arbitrary reference.

- (10) *O João tem-lhes lido romances e emprestado vídeos.*
The João has-them_{CLdat} read novels and lent videos
'João has read them novels and lent them videos.'
- (11) a. **O João leu-lhes romances e emprestou vídeos.*
The João read-them_{CLdat} novels and lent videos
'João read them novels and lent videos.'
- b. **O João tem-lhes lido romances e tem*
The João has-them_{CLdat} read novels and has
emprestado vídeos.
lent videos
'João has read them novels and has lent videos.'

When the coordination overtly includes the verbs in both conjuncts, as in (11), the ATB interpretation is lost and a clitic is required:

- (12) a. *O João leu-lhes romances e emprestou-lhes*
The João read-them_{CLdat} novels and lent-them_{CLdat}
vídeos.
videos
'João read them novels and lent them videos.'

- b. *O João tem-lhes lido romances e tem-lhes*
The João has-them_{CLdat} read novels and has-them_{CLdat}
emprestado vídeos.
lent videos
'João has read them novels and has lent them videos.'

The same dependence on the presence of a single auxiliary is found in proclisis, in French (cf. Kayne 1975, 1994), where these cases apparently constitute the only fully grammatical ones – see (13).

- (13) *Jean vous aurait parlé et pardonné.*
Jean you_{dat} would-have spoken and forgiven
'Jean would have spoken to you and forgiven you.'
(Kayne 1994: 145, footnote 12)

These facts suggest that the same general solution should be devised for the Portuguese and French data. Yet, Kayne's analysis of the French case relies on ellipsis. In opposition to (1a), repeated in (14), (13) is conceived as an instance of gapping involving the auxiliary and the complement clitic (cf. Kayne 1994: 145, footnote 12).

- (14) *Paul les lit et relit sans cesse.*
Paul them reads and rereads without stop
'Paul reads and rereads them incessantly.'
(Kayne 1994: 62)

According to this proposal, there is no difficulty in assigning the correct interpretation to the second conjunct if we assume that deletion applies at PF. At LF all the relevant material, i.e. the verb and the clitic, is still available. Accepting, as usual, that in the languages under consideration, the tensed auxiliary verb raises in overt syntax to check its features against the sentence functional projections, the minimal admissible level for coordination would be the functional projection involved in this checking, as represented in (15), for the Portuguese enclitic cases.

- (15) [_{ConjP} [_{IP} ... [_I V_{aux}[CL_i]] [_{VP} V ... cl_i ...]] [[_{Conj}] [_{IP} ...
[_I V_{aux}[CL_j]] [_{VP} V ... cl_j ...]]]]

In (15), *cl* stands for the copy of the moved clitic, CL. Notice that in this example, as in the rest of this paper, the term IP refers to the core sentence functional projections.

The sentences in (16), from European Portuguese, apparently argue for the gapping hypothesis, since they seem to prove that the so called ATB clitic placement with enclisis is compatible with an overt subject in the second conjunct.

- (16) a. (?) *O Paulo tem-lhe lido romances e a Maria*
 The Paulo has-him/her_{CLdat} read novels and the Maria
emprestado vídeos.
 lent videos
 'Paulo has read him/her novels and Maria (has) lent (him/her) videos.'
- b. (?) *Ele tem-nos lido ao Pedro e a Maria*
 He has-them_{CLacc} read to-the Pedro and the Maria
emprestado ao António.
 lent to-the António
 'He has read them to Pedro and Maria (has) lent (them) to António.'

However, in spite of the correctness of this approach in dealing with the sentences in (16), it can not be generalised to all cases apparently presenting the same structural pattern, as shown in (17) and (18), where a conjunction or a scope expression introducing the first conjunct correlates with the conjunction in the second one.⁴

- (17) a. *O João tem-lhes [não só] lido romances [como]*
 The João has-them_{CLdat} not only read novels as
emprestado vídeos.
 lent videos
 'John has not only read them novels but also lent them videos.'
- b. *Ele tinha-os [ora] comprado na livraria [ora]*
 He had-them_{CLacc} either bought in-the bookshop either
requisitado na biblioteca.
 borrowed from-the library
 'He had either bought them in the bookshop or borrowed them from the library.'
- (18) *Jean vous aurait [et] parlé [et] pardonné.*
 Jean you_{CLdat} would-have both spoken and forgiven
 'Jean would-have both spoken to you and forgiven you.'

In these examples, the presence of the conjunction or the scope marker introducing the first conjunct explicitly indicates that the coordinate structure is restricted to the complement of the auxiliary verb, i.e., the coordinated Past Participial Phrase. In these sentences, true clitic ATB occurs, and standard gapping is not allowed, as attested by the contrast between (17)–(18) vs. (19)–(20).

4. Adopting Kayne's proposals on coordination, I admit that, when both conjuncts are preceded by a conjunction, each conjunction heads a complement phrase, the first one taking the phrase headed by the second one as complement, i.e., [conj [XP [conj YP]]]. In what concerns the cases exhibiting an initial scope expression, I will assume that the scope expression may be in the first conjunct (see Kayne 1994: 58, footnote 2).

- (19) a. **O João tem-lhes [não só] lido romances [como]*
 The João has-them_{CLdat} not only read novels as
a Ana emprestado vídeos.
 the Ana lent videos
 'João has not only read them novels but also Ana lent videos.'
- b. **Ele tinha-os [ora] comprado na livraria [ora]*
 He had-them_{CLacc} either bought in-the bookshop either
a Ana requisitado na biblioteca.
 the Ana borrowed from-the library
 'He had either bought them in the bookshop or Ana borrowed from the library.'
- (20) **Jean vous aurait [et] parlé [et] Marie pardonné.*
 Jean you_{CLdat} would-have both spoken and Marie forgiven

This contrast can be easily accounted for admitting that, in subcategorization contexts, each conjunct must be compatible with the c-selection of the subcategorizing head. In the gapping cases presented above this is not observed: the auxiliary verb c-selects for a verbal Past Participial projection but the second conjunct must be analysed as an IP. In fact, even accepting the VP Internal Subject Hypothesis, standard gapping must involve IP, or otherwise the subject DP would not check its case features against the relevant functional projection.⁵

5. This contrast would also be expected if we considered that both conjuncts in a coordination must exhibit categorial identity or, as suggested by a reviewer, must share level identity. In this later case we would have to consider that IP and PastPartP belong to the same category (presumably, V projections) but to different level category. However, as shown in (i) and (ii), this syntactic parallelism does not hold as a necessary constraint.

- (i) *Ele considera [[SC o problema resolvido] ou [CP que não tem de o resolver].*
 He considers [[the problem solved] or [that not has to solve]
it_{CL} solve]
 'He considers the problem solved or that he has not to solve it.'
- (ii) *Ele não nos contou [nem [DP isso] [nem [CP que a Ana vai chegar amanhã]]].*
 He not us_{CL} told neither that nor that the Ana will arrive tomorrow
 'He did not tell us that nor that Ana will arrive tomorrow.'

So, I will assume Munn's proposal that the Law of the Coordination of Likes must be conceived as a semantic condition. This condition allows for the different categorial status of the conjuncts if they both belong to the same semantic category (Munn 1993: 167, 168). This explains the contrast between the following examples, from Munn (1993: 121):

- (iii) *John is sick and in a foul mood.*
- (iv) **John is sick and in the park.*

Thus, in (17) and (18), disregarding its enclitic vs. proclitic status, the clitic c-commands the empty argument positions in both conjuncts, because it has been extracted from the coordinate structure and adjoined to a higher functional head, also targeted by the auxiliary, its V-host, as sketched in (21), where *cl* represents the copy of the clitic in each conjunct.

- (21) [... [CL[Vaux] / Vaux [CL]]_i [ConjP {PPartP ... *cl*_i ... } [Conj {PPartP ... *cl*_i ... }]]]⁶

On the contrary, in examples like (11b), repeated in (22), the verb and the clitic remain inside the coordinate structure. In this case, the enclitic pronoun is too embedded to c-command outside of its own clause domain.⁷

6. The exact nature of the gap in the second conjunct depends on the way how ATB Movement is implemented. We may assume the standard approach, suggested in Ross 1967 and elaborated in Williams 1978, 1986/7 in terms of the ATB principle, which conceives the ATB Movement as an extraction out of both conjuncts. Alternatively, we may suppose that only the clitic in the first conjunct moves from the coordination and binds a clitic, presumably without phonetic content, in the second conjunct. This later analysis violates the Coordinate Structure Constraint, but, as illustrated in (i), this constraint does not hold for clitics, which form X° chains instead of A' operator-variable chains — the CSC being a condition against vacuous quantification (cf. Goodall 1987 and Munn 1993), which applies only in coordinate structures exhibiting semantic parallelism (cf. Culicover and Jackendoff 1997).

- (i) *Eles tinham-nas [não só] visto [como] conversado com elas.*
They had-them_{CLacc-fern} not only seen as talked with them
'They had not only seen them but also talked with them.'

This later approach, which dispenses with the ATB principle, a specific formalism to deal with a subclass of coordinate structures, is welcome in a Principles and Parameters framework, where principles are not expected to apply to particular constructions. Nevertheless, it faces a problem: the gap in the second conjunct is sensitive to island contexts, suggesting that it moves to the target functional head for checking purposes (see (ii) and (iii)):

- (ii) **Ele tinha-o tirado da prateleira e aberto a gaveta onde*
He had-it_{CLacc} taken from-the shelf and opened the drawer where
ia guardar.
he-was-going to store
'He had taken it from the shelf and opened the drawer where he was going to store.'
- (iii) ??**Ele tem-lhe telefonado e pensado na possibilidade de*
He has-him/her_{CLdat} called and thought about-the possibility of
mandar uma prenda.
sending a gift
'He has called him/her and thought about the possibility of sending a gift.'

Since the choice between these alternatives is not crucial for the present work, I will postpone the study of the ATB Movement until future research.

7. As evidenced by a reviewer, independent confirmation for this analysis is provided by ATB scrambling in Dutch. In clauses displaying the V2 phenomena, ATB scrambling, is allowed only when there is an auxiliary verb c-selecting for the coordinate structure, since only in this case may the

- (22) a. **O João tem-lhes lido romances e tem*
The João has-them_{CLdat} read novels and has
emprestado vídeos.
lent videos
'João has read them novels and has lent videos.'
- b. ... [ConjP [IP [Vaux [CL]] PPartP] [Conj IP]]

In fact, the examples in (16) and in (21) seem to show that the c-command domain of the clitic pronoun in enclisis is determined by its verb host.⁸ So, while in (16) the verb hosting the clitic c-commands the whole coordinate structure, in (21) it only has scope over the Past Participial Phrase inside the first conjunct.

scrambled constituent be extracted out of the coordination and c-command the argument positions in each conjunct — see the following examples, which exhibit ATB scrambling of the direct object (*de/haar lakens* 'the/her sheets').

- (i) *Catarina heeft [de lakens] niet gestreken, maar meteen in the kast*
Catarina has the sheets not ironed, but directly in the closet
gelegd.
put
'Catarina has not ironed the sheets, but she has put them directly in the closet.'
- (ii) **Catarina strijkt [haar lakens] niet, maar legt meteen in de kast.*
Catarina irons her sheets not, but puts directly in de kast
'Catarina doesn't iron her sheets but puts directly in the closet.'

As the above mentioned reviewer remarks, in embedded clauses, where the finite verb remains inside the coordinate structure but the scrambled constituent may be external to it, the presence of the auxiliary is not required:

- (iii) *Ze zeggen dat Catarina haar lakens niet strijkt, maar meteen in de*
They say that Catarina her sheets not irons, but directly in the
kast legt.
closet puts
'They say that Catarina doesn't iron her sheets, but puts them directly in the closet.'

8. Independently from the status of the pronoun as a syntactic clitic, undergoing incorporation in overt syntax, or as a phonological clitic remaining in an independent functional head, the enclitic pronoun is too embedded to c-command outside its conjunct. However, in what concerns European Portuguese, empirical evidence favours the incorporation analysis (cf. Duarte and Matos 1999). So, I depart from Galves 1992, Madeira 1992 and Martins 1994, who consider that in enclisis in European Portuguese the verb has raised to a functional head (Comp or Sigma) higher than the one occupied by the clitic, leaving the clitic stranded behind, in AgrSP (see (i), where XP is a Comp or Sigma projection).

- (i) [XP [X V] [AgrSP [Agr CL] ...]]

In fact, these analyses do not explain why the enclitic pronoun has to move with the verb in configurations of I to C movement (see (ii)), nor why the interposition of maximal projections between the verb and the clitic is forbidden, even when the interposed element is the specifier of the presumed functional projection occupied by the clitic — see (iii):

This analysis allows us to account for the exclusion of clitic ATB in French imperatives as (23). In (23), in opposition to (1b), from Kayne (1994), the pronoun depends on the verb in the first conjunct.⁹ This example reveals the same structural pattern as the Portuguese enclitic ATB cases, entitling us to suppose that the coordinate structure involves regular phrasal conjuncts rather than the word coordination configuration banned by the LCA.

- (23) **Lis-les et relis!*
Read-them_{CLacc} and reread

Considering that in ATB with enclisis the possibility of c-command of the empty categories in each conjunct by the pronoun relies on the presence of a verb hosting the clitic which selects for the coordinate structure, ATB clitic placement in (23) is ruled out, because that verb is missing. This analysis is confirmed for French by (24), which shows that whenever the required configuration occurs, the ATB reading with enclisis is also allowed. This is the case of (24a), presenting a causative imperative and of (24b), showing an imperative with an auxiliary verb:¹⁰

- (24) a. *Fais-les lire et relire sans cesse!*¹¹
Make-them_{CLacc} read and reread without stop
'Make them read and reread incessantly!'
b. *Ayez-les lus et relus avant mon retour!*¹²
Have-them_{CLacc} read and reread before my coming-back
'Have them read and reread before I come back!'

- (ii) [CP *Tinha-os [ele visitado ultimamente]]?*
Had-them_{CL} [he visited lately]
'Would he have visited them lately?'

- (iii) *[CP *Tinha [ele os visitado ultimamente]]?*
Had [he them_{CL} visited lately]

9. I will not discuss the question of the status of the pronouns in French imperative sentences, either as clitics or as weak pronouns, in the sense of Cardinaletti and Stark (1994).
10. I would like to thank Inês Duarte and an anonymous reviewer for having brought these examples to my attention.
11. As illustrated below, the correlates of this example in Spanish and Italian are also possible:

- (i) *Haz[los] leer y reler sin cesar!*

- (ii) *Fa[lli] leggere e rileggere senza sosta!*

12. The presence of auxiliary verbs in French imperatives is considered rather formal.

3. Clitic ATB without extraction from the coordinate structure

The interpretative effects associated with the clitic ATB construction are not confined to the configurations presented in the previous section. They also occur, with proclisis, in structures where the clitic has not been extracted from the coordination. As expected, the crucial requirement imposed on the licensing configurations is that the clitic c-commands the argument positions it is related with in each conjunct.

As mentioned in section 2., ATB clitic placement with proclisis may appear in contexts of extraction of the clitic out of the coordinate structure, as in (25a). However, in sentences like (25b) it is not possible to assume that the ATB reading results from such an extraction.¹³

- (25) a. *Ela pensava que ele os tinha [tirado da*
She thought that he them_{CLacc} had [taken out of-the
estante e posto na gaveta].
bookcase and put in-the drawer]
'She thought that he had taken them out of the bookcase and put them in the drawer.'
b. *Ela pensa que o João os tirou da*
She thinks that the João them_{CLacc} took out of-the
estante e pôs na gaveta.
bookcase and put in-the drawer
'She thinks that João took them out of the bookcase and put them in the drawer.'

In fact, as illustrated in (26) and (27), and in opposition to what has been assumed (see, for instance Uriagereka 1995), it is not plausible to posit that in European Portuguese the proclitic pronoun and the verb remain in two different functional projections:

- (26) a. *Acho que o João [hoje] o cumprimentou.*
I-think that the João today him_{CLacc} greeted
'I think that João greeted him today.'
b. **Acho que o João o [hoje] cumprimentou.*
I-think that the João him_{CLacc} today greeted
(27) a. [CP *Quando [C lhe telefonou] [IP o João]?*
When him/her_{CL-dat} called the João
'When did João call him/her?'

13. Since European Portuguese is a language exhibiting generalised Verb Movement, I will assume that in (25) the finite verb in both conjuncts has raised to I in overt syntax to check its strong V-features. Consequently, (25) is an instance of IP coordination.

- b. *[_{CP} Quando [_C telefonou] [_{IP} o João lhe]]?
When called the João him/her_{CL-dat}

The sentences in (26) show that the clitic may not be isolated from its V-host. Similarly, the sentences in (27), displaying V Movement to C, indicate that the clitic is incorporated in its V-host before Spell-Out.¹⁴

Moreover, the following examples with the initial coordination marker, confirm that, in spite of the ATB interpretation, the clitic is inside the first conjunct.

- (28) a. *Ela pensa que o João [não só] os tirou*
She thinks that the João not only them_{CLacc} took out
da estante [como] pôs na gaveta.
of-the bookcase as put in-the drawer
'She thinks that João not only took them out of the bookcase but also put them in the drawer.'
- b. *Todos os seus admiradores [tanto] lhe telefonam*
All the her admirers as much her_{CLdat} call
[como] mandam flores.
as send flowers
'All her admirers both call her and send her flowers.'
- c. *A que alunos [não só] o recomendaste*
To which students not only it_{CLacc} you-recommended
[como] leste?
as you-read
'To which students did you not only recommend it but also read it?'

In sum, these data challenge the analyses of ATB clitic placement which posit the existence of an additional functional projection where the clitic would remain stranded (cf. WP in Rouveret 1992, and FP in Uriagereka 1995), its verbal host occupying a lower functional head inside the coordinate structure.

However, the availability of clitic ATB without extraction of the clitic is severely constrained, apparently being limited to the configurations where the clitic is the outermost element in the coordinate structure – see the contrasts in (29) and (30).

14. According to Barbosa (1996), in some Northwest dialects of European Portuguese, it is possible to interpolate adverbials and tonic pronouns between the proclitic pronoun and the verb. This property, shared with Medieval Romance varieties, is no longer available in standard European Portuguese. However, as suggested in Rivero 1992 and Barbosa 1996, for these varieties, complement clitics are still full DP instead of heads.

- (29) a. *Ela pensa que o João os tirou da*
She thinks that the João them_{CLacc} took out of-the
estante e pôs na gaveta.
bookcase and put in-the drawer
'She thinks that João took them out of the bookcase and put them in the drawer.'
- b. ??**Ela pensa que* [_{ConjP} [_{IP} o João [os tirou
She thinks that the João them_{CLacc} took-out
da estante]] e [_{IP} [*a Maria/ele próprio*] pôs
of-the bookcase and the Maria/ himself put
*na gaveta]].*¹⁵
in-the drawer
'She thinks that João took them out of the bookcase and Maria/he put in the drawer.'
- (30) a. *Ele [até] não só os comprou como ofereceu à*
He even not only them_{CL} bought as offered to-the
Ana!
Ana
'He even bought them and offered them to Ana!'
- b. ??**Ele não só [até] os comprou como ofereceu à*
He not only even them_{CL} bought as offered to-the
Ana!
Ana
'He not only even bought them but also offered to Ana!'

In (29a) and (30a), the ATB reading is possible, since the subject DP, *o João*, and the adverb, *até* 'even', are external to the coordination. In (29b), (30b) the outermost element in the coordinate structure is not the clitic and consequently this interpretation is not available.

The examples in (31) further confirm this analysis: the adverb *ainda* 'still' may not be extracted from, nor have scope over the whole coordinate structure, preventing the clitic from being the outermost adjunct in the coordination; therefore, the ATB reading is impossible and an overt clitic must occur in the second conjunct.

15. Notice that the unacceptability of (29b) may not be explained in terms of a lack of parallelism between the conjuncts, since these ones are strictly parallel, both in semantic and in syntactic category.

- (31) a. ??*Ele não só [ainda] os lê como recomenda*
 He not only still them_{CL} reads as recommends
aos alunos.
 to-the students
 'He not only still reads them but also recommends to his students.'
- b. *Ele não só [ainda] os lê como os*
 He not only still them_{CL} reads as them_{CL}
recomenda aos alunos.
 recommends to-the students
 'He not only still reads them but also recommends them to his students.'

Thus, at the first glance, the relevant configuration for an example like (29a) seems to be (32), where *cl* is the copy of the clitic in the first conjunct, omitting, for the moment, the exact nature of the gap in the second conjunct.

- (32) ... [X_P o João [ConjP [I_P os tirou *cl* da estante] [ConjP [Conj e] [pôs [-] na gaveta]]]]]

Notice that the subject DP in (32) occurs in a position external to the coordinate structure, appearing in the specifier of a functional projection different from the one occupied by the inflected verb, a proposal independently presented for European Portuguese in Costa 1996.¹⁶

However, in this configuration, even adopting the definition of c-command in terms of categories instead of segments¹⁷ and assuming that specifiers are adjuncts as in Kayne (1994), the clitic does not c-command outside its own conjunct. In

16. Rouveret (1995) suggests a similar analysis, though he does not present any configuration for the coordinate structure. Rouveret considers that in proclitic structures in European Portuguese, the clitic is an X⁰ specifier of TP which checks the strong D-feature of T. From its alleged specifier nature, he deduces the aptitude of the proclitic pronoun to c-command outside the TP projection into the second conjunct in ATB constructions, as well as its impossibility to co-occur with a specifier maximal projection, European Portuguese being a language where the multiple specifier strategy does not apply. This assumption does not seem consistent, both conceptually and empirically: it is not required in Rouveret's approach, since he claims that the strong D-features of T may also be checked in enclitic configurations, where the clitic is an inner adjunct; it is empirically dubious, since it wrongly predicts that sentences like the following one, from Rouveret (1995), are not well-formed:

- (i) [CP *A quem* [CP *o deu o José e pediu de novo*]?]
 To whom it_{CL,acc} gave the José and asked back
 'To whom did José give it and ask it back again?'

Notice that, in order to explain ATB clitic placement without extraction from the coordinate structure, it is enough to assume that the clitic is the outermost adjunct of the coordination.

17. Recall the relevant definition of *c-command*: X c-commands Y iff X and Y are categories and X excludes Y and every category that dominates X dominates Y.

fact, the IP in the first conjunct counts as a category dominating I but not the second conjunct. Under these circumstances, the c-command of the clitic in adjunction to I into the second conjunct would be prevented, and the sentence would be predicted as marginal, contrary to fact.

Therefore, an additional property of coordination, that enables the relevant c-command relation to be established, must be at work. I assume that this additional property relies on the nature of Conj, as a functional head categorially underspecified, which shares the categorial feature of its specifier by Spec-Head Agreement – see Johannessen (1996) and a suggestion of Munn (1992), based on the proposals of Gazdar et alii (1985) on coordination.¹⁸

In this case the required c-command relation obtains, as shown in (33): the clitic in the first conjunct, being the outermost adjunct of I, is neither dominated by I, nor by IP, and may c-command into the second conjunct.

Reconsidering now the derivation of (29a), we may suppose that a clitic is inserted in each conjunct by Merge; Move applies in overt syntax and the clitics in both conjuncts are raised to the relevant functional projection for checking purposes, leaving a copy in their initial position.¹⁹ Elaborating on the proposal of

18. Johannessen (1996) argues for Spec-Head Agreement within coordination, presenting examples like (i), where number features of the co-ordination are determined by its specifier.

- (i) *Es stürzte der Berg und das Land in*
 It collapsed_{3sg} theNomSg mountainNomSg and theNomSg landNomSg in
sich zusammen.
 itself together
 'The mountain and the land collapsed into each other.'
 (H. Hesse, quoted in Johannessen 1996: 665)

Munn (1992: footnote 16) suggests the possibility of inheritance of categorial features in coordination by Spec-Head Agreement, though he does not adopt this hypothesis in his work.

19. As in ATB clitic placement with extraction, in the cases without extraction, there is also islands effects in the second conjunct, corroborating the existence of clitic movement:

Kayne (1994), I will accept that the clitic in the second conjunct is a null element, whose content is fixed under c-command of the overt clitic in the first conjunct, as in (34):²⁰

- (34) [[IP [I CL [VP ... *cl* ...]] [Conj [IP CL_ø [VP ... *cl*_ø ...]]]]]

I assume that it is the availability of the configuration in (33) that renders ATB clitic placement possible across Romance, independently of the existence of concurring additional factors that determine its status as a regular or an exceptional construction, within these languages.²¹

- (i) **Eu acho que ele o tirou da prateleira e abriu a*
I think that he it_{CLacc} took from-the shelf and opened the
gaveta onde ia guardar.
drawer where he-was-going to-store
'I think that he took it from the shelf and opened the drawer where he was going to store.'

20. Kayne, who adopts Munn's view on standard ATB constructions, claims that there is a null operator in the second conjunct which is interpreted as a null clitic, having the overt clitic as its antecedent. This antecedent must precede and/or c-command the empty clitic (Kayne 1994: 63).

21. The behaviour of the adverb *já* 'already' in the clitic ATB construction, suggests that this analysis may be slightly relaxed in European Portuguese. In fact, in (i) the clitic is not the outermost adjunct of the co-ordination, the inclusion of *já* inside the coordinate structure being mandatory (see (ii)).

- (i) *Ele não só [já] os comprou como recomendou aos*
He not only already them_{CLacc} bought as recommended to-the
alunos.
students
'He not only bought them already but recommended them to his students.'
- (ii) **Ele [já] não só os comprou como recomendou aos*
He already not only them_{CLacc} bought as recommended to-the
alunos.
students

However, this adverb presents a crucial property: though remaining inside the first conjunct, it may have scope over the whole co-ordination, as shown when an overt clitic occurs (cf. (iii)). The ATB reading is legitimated only in this circumstance. If some element cancels this scope, as for instance the presence of a closer proclisis trigger in the second conjunct, the ATB reading is lost – cf. (iv), where a null object reading is still possible:

- (iii) *O João [já] os comprou e os recomendou*
The João already them_{CLacc} bought and them_{CLacc} recommended
aos alunos.
to-the students
'João already bought them and recommended them to his students.'
- (iv) ??*Ele [já] os comprou e [não] recomendou aos alunos*
He already them_{CLacc} bought and not recommended to-the students
apesar disso.
in spite of-that
'He already bought them and did not recommend to his students in spite of that.'

4. ATB clitic placement across Romance

ATB clitic placement exhibits a different behaviour across Romance in the cases where the clitic and its verbal host remain inside the coordinate structure. While it has a rather exceptional status in French and Italian.²² (cf. Kayne 1994, it is allowed more freely in Spanish (cf. Uriagereka 1995, Bosque 1987), and, in particular, in European Portuguese (cf. Rouveret 1995, Barbosa 1996): in French, it occurs only when the verbs in both conjuncts are similar, as shown by the contrast between (35) and (36); in Spanish and Portuguese, different verbs are possible inside the coordination (see (37) and (39)); however, in Spanish the occurrence of this construction seems to be more constrained than in European Portuguese, as illustrated by the contrast in (38) vs. (39):

- (35) *Paul les lit et relit sans cesse.*
Paul them reads and rereads without stop
'Paul reads and rereads them incessantly.'
(cf. Kayne 1994: 62)
- (36) **Jean vous parlera et pardonnera.*
Jean you_{dat} will-speak and will-forgive
(cf. Kayne 1994: 62)
- (37) *Juan les hablará y perdonará.*
Juan them talk-will and forgive-will
'Juan will talk to them and forgive them.'
(cf. Uriagereka 1995: 105)
- (38) a.??**Creo que ellos les compraron muchos libros,*
I-think that they them_{CLdat} bought many books
pero regalaron pocos juguetes.
but offered few toys
'I think that they bought them many books but offered few toys.'

Thus, for European Portuguese the generalisation that seems to emerge is the following one: the ATB reading without extraction is possible whenever the clitic is the outermost adjunct of the coordinate structure or when its c-command domain overlaps with the scope domain of a proclisis trigger in the first conjunct which has scope over the whole coordination. Notice that *já* presents a singular behaviour. Typically, the adverbs that act as proclisis triggers, may not have scope over the second conjunct when they are inside the first one; this is the case for *também* 'also', *até* 'even', *ainda* 'still', *quase* 'almost'.

22. In this paper, I will not try to account for ATB clitic placement in Italian, leaving it for future work.

- b. ??*Todos ellos las oyeron de sus abuelas*
 All they them_{CLacc} heard from their grandmothers
y contaron a sus hijos.
 and told to their children
 'They all heard them from their grandmothers and told to their children.'
- (39) a. *Acho que eles lhes compraram muitos livros mas*
 I-think that they them_{CLdat} bought many books but
*ofereceram poucos brinquedos.*²³
 offered few toys
 'I think that they bought them many books but offered them few toys.'
- b. *Todos eles as ouviram às avós e*
 All they them_{CLacc} heard from-the grandmothers and
contaram aos filhos.
 told to-the children
 'They all heard them from their grandmothers and told them to their children.'

So, we must accept that, besides the essential requirement of c-command by the clitic, other factors intervene that prevent, or enable, each one of these languages to make use of ATB clitic placement as a regular syntactic construction. One of the most articulated hypotheses to deal with this problem is suggested in Kayne 1994. It will be considered in the next section.

23. Notice that usually the conjunction *mas* 'but' cancels the ATB reading:

- (i) ??*Eles só lhes compraram dois livros mas ofereceram muitos*
 They just them_{CLdat} bought two books but offered many
brinquedos.
 toys
 'They just bought them two books but offered many toys.'

However, this does not happen in (39), because the Conj is under the scope of the complementizer *que* 'that', which induces proclisis in both conjuncts, as it can be attested in (ii), which presents an overt clitic in the second conjunct:

- (ii) *Acho que eles lhes compraram muitos livros mas lhes*
 I-think that they them_{CLdat} bought many books but them_{CLdat}
ofereceram poucos brinquedos.
 offered few toys
 'I think that they bought them many books but offered them few toys.'

5. Clitics vs. licensing operators of parasitic gaps

Kayne claims that the exceptional status of clitic ATB structures in French and Italian is due to the fact that clitics are not usually identifiers of parasitic gaps in these languages – they are not able to identify the null operator needed in the second conjunct to bind the parasitic gap, except when the two verbs are sufficiently similar. In this case the empty operator would be "reinterpreted as an empty clitic having the overt clitic as its antecedent" (Kayne 1994: 63).

Under this hypothesis, which reduces ATB clitic placement to a subcase of the parasitic gap construction, we would expect clitics to behave like parasitic gap identifiers in European Portuguese, given the non exceptional character of ATB clitic placement in this language.

In the Principles and Parameters Theory, parasitic gaps have been characterised by a certain amount of descriptive properties, among which, that only operators may license parasitic gaps, and that the *real* gap must be a variable licensed by an A'-Operator (cf., among others, Brody 1995, Cinque 1990, Chomsky 1982, 1986, Engdahl 1983, Longobardi 1991, Manzini 1994). However, if we assume that ATB clitic placement is an instance of the parasitic gap construction, these defining properties must be ignored.

In fact, as shown by the contrast in acceptability between the examples in (40) and (41), there is no evidence for the status of clitics as licensers of the standard parasitic gap construction in European Portuguese:

- (40) **O João não o_i comprou t_i ao filho sem antes*
 The João not it_{CLacc} bought t_i to-the son without first
ler e_i.
 to-read e_i
 'João did not buy it for his son without reading first.'
- (41) *Que livro compraste t ao Pedro sem antes ler*
 Which book you-bought t to-the Pedro without first to-read
e?
e
 'Which book did you buy t for Pedro without reading e first?'

Besides, in adjunct sentences, while the substitution of the gap for the corresponding pronominal clitic decreases the well-formedness of the true parasitic gap sentences, it improves the acceptability of the clitic ones (see (42) vs. (43)):

- (42) *??*Que livro compraste t ao Pedro sem antes o*
 Which book you-bought t to-the Pedro without first it_{CLacc}
ler?
 to-read
 'Which book did you buy t for Pedro without reading it first?'

- (43) *O João não o comprou ao filho sem antes*
 The João not it_{CLacc} bought to-the son without first
o ler?
 it_{CLacc} to-read
 'João did not buy it for his son without reading it first?'

Furthermore, as shown by the contrast between (44) and (45), coordinate structures containing clitic pronouns differ from operator-variable chains in admitting the violation of the Coordinate Structure Constraint – the examples in (46) attest that the unacceptability of (45) is due to a violation of this constraint.

- (44) *Eles tinham-nas não só visto cl como conversado*
 They had-them_{CLacc-fem} not only seen cl as talked
com elas frequentemente.
 with them frequently
 'They had not only seen them but also talked with them frequently.'
- (45) a. **Os livros que ela [não só comprou t como*
 The books that she not only bought t as
os leu] ...
 them_{CLacc} read
 'The books that she not only bought t but also read them ...'
 b. **Que raparigas não só viste t como conversaste*
 Which girls not only you-saw t as you-talked
com elas?
 with them
 'Which girls did you not only see t but also talk with them?'
 c. **A que professor não só telefonaste t como lhe*
 To which professor not only you-called t as him_{CLdat}
pediste conselhos ?
 you-asked-for advices
 'Which professor did you not only call t but also ask him for advice?'
- (46) a. *Os livros que ela [não só comprou t como leu*
 The books that she not only bought t as read
t] ...
 t
 'The books that she has not only bought t but also read t ...'
 b. *A que professor [não só telefonaste t como*
 To which professor not only you-called t as
pediste t conselhos]?
 you-asked-for t advices
 'Which professor did you not only call t but also ask t for advice?'

In fact, as claimed in Goodall 1987 and Munn 1993, the core cases of the Coordinate Structure Constraint are motivated by restrictions on operator-variable chains, having to do with vacuous quantification.²⁴ Therefore, the sentences in (44), with clitics, contrast with (45), which presents wh-movement, because clitics do not form operator-variable chains, but X^o chains headed by definite Determiners.

In summary, there is no empirical evidence that in ATB clitic placement construction in European Portuguese, the clitic's trace is a variable, nor that the clitic is, or may bind, an A'-bar operator. This fact challenges the correctness of the explanation of the exceptional vs. non exceptional status of the clitic ATB construction across Romance in terms of parasitic gaps.

5.1. The status of the clitic and the unity of the coordinate structure

Consequently, an alternative explanation for the different behaviour of ATB clitic placement without extraction of the clitic must be found. We must be able to explain why this construction, though structurally legitimate, is exceptional in French and progressively more regular in Spanish and in European Portuguese. These facts suggest that a partially different account must be provided for each one of these languages.

The fact that, in French, ATB clitic placement is heavily dependent on the lexical similarity of the verbs seems to confirm Uriagereka's (1995) hypothesis that proclitic complement pronouns in this language are closer to an affixal status than their proclitic counterparts in Spanish and in European Portuguese.²⁵ In these languages, in particular in European Portuguese, it is the enclitic pronouns that are most obviously undergoing a process of reanalysis tending to convert them into verbal affixes.²⁶ The proclitic pronouns present syntactic autonomy, which man-

24. Since in (45) the wh-phrase is in the minimal CP that includes both conjuncts, it will have scope over them. The computational system seems to assume the existence of such scope as an instruction to Form Chain in each conjunct. However, the definite pronoun in the second conjunct (either clitic, as in (45a) and (45c), or not as in (45b)) does not count as an adequate variable for the wh operator in European Portuguese.

25. Uriagereka 1995 does not deal with European Portuguese, but with Galician.

26. As reported in Duarte et alii 1995, compelling empirical evidence for this process of reanalysis of enclitic pronouns is found in language acquisition and development stages, where enclisis tends to substitute proclisis in all the contexts where it should be required in standard European Portuguese, as illustrated by the examples below:

- (i) *[Nã] chama-se nada!* (M., 20 months)
 Not calls_{CLref3sg} nothing
 'That is not his name!'
- (ii) *[Porque] é que foste-me interromper?* (R., 29 months)
 Why is that you-went-me_{CLacc} interrupt
 'Why did you interrupt me?'

ifests itself in the possibility of licensing the ATB construction independently of their V-hosts.²⁷ Notice, however, that this is not to say that, presently, proclitic complement pronouns in French are analysed as true affix elements, or otherwise we would expect them not to be able to license ATB clitic placement without extraction, not even exceptionally.

The lack of syntactic autonomy of proclitic complement pronouns in French explains their behaviour in ATB constructions, both in configurations with extraction and without extraction from the coordinate structure.

In what concerns the extraction cases, the only ones allowing for different verbal predicates in each conjunct, data from Kayne (1975) show that, in this configuration, clitic ATB with proclisis in French behaves exactly like the enclitic cases in European Portuguese: the clitic may not legitimate the ATB reading if there is no auxiliary (see (47)) nor if both auxiliaries remain inside the conjuncts (see (48)):

- (47) a. *Paul m' a bousculé et poussé contre Marie.*
 Paul me_{CLacc} has shoved and pushed against Marie
 'Paul shoved me and pushed me against Marie.'
 (cf. Kayne 1975: 99)
- b. *Paul l' a insulté et mis à la porte.*
 Paul him_{CLacc} has insulted and expelled
 'Paul has insulted him and expelled him.'
 (cf. Kayne 1975: 99)
- (48) a. **Paul te bousculera et poussera contre Marie.*
 Paul you_{CLacc} will-shove and will-push against Marie
 'Paul will shove me and push against Marie.'
 (cf. Kayne 1975: 100)
- b. **Paul l' a frappé et a mis à la porte.*
 Paul him_{CLacc} has insulted and has expelled
 'Paul has insulted him and has expelled.'
 (cf. Kayne 1975: 101)

Hence, we are lead to conclude that the reason why the above sentences are ill-formed is similar to the one that excludes ATB clitic placement with enclisis in

- (iii) ... [*porque*] [*não*] *apercebeu-se* *que* ... (12 years old child, written speech)
 because not realised_{CLrefl3sg} that
 '... because he did not realise that ...'

27. Notice that this does not commit us to accept that, in proclisis, the clitic and the verb remain in two different functional heads in overt syntax. For Uriagereka (1995), the syntactic autonomy of proclitic pronouns in Spanish and Galician is taken as a motivation for positing a functional head F in both languages — in proclisis, the clitic would be adjoined to F and the verb would remain in a lower independent functional head. However, as shown in section 3, European Portuguese data show that, the hypothesis of isolating the clitic from its verbal host in overt syntax cannot be maintained, at least in what concerns this language.

these contexts — not being syntactically autonomous, the clitic relies on the scope domain of its host. However, the verbal host of the clitic may only have scope over the whole coordinate structure when it c-selects it, that is to say, in the cases of extraction of the clitic.

In the ATB cases without extraction from the coordination, as in the examples repeated below, the clitic may c-command into the second conjunct whenever it is the outermost element of the coordination. Nevertheless, not being syntactically autonomous, the clitic mainly relies on the scope domain of its verbal host, in the first conjunct. Thus, the lexical similarity of the main verb in the second conjunct is the only way for the clitic to identify this conjunct as a syntactic domain it has scope over, and to recover the argument position it is associated with inside it.

- (49) a. *Paul les lit et relit sans cesse.*
 Paul them reads and rereads without stop
 'Paul reads and rereads them incessantly.'
- b. **Jean vous parlera et pardonnera.*
 Jean you_{dat} will-speak and will-forgive
 (Kayne 1994:62)

In what concerns Spanish and European Portuguese, proclitic pronouns present syntactic autonomy with respect to the c-command domain of their V-host. Consequently, even remaining inside the first conjunct, they may identify an argument position in the second conjunct when different predicates occur in the coordinate structure.

Still, ATB clitic placement without extraction out of the coordination does not behave in the same way in these languages. In Spanish, according to Bosque (1987), it is limited to sentences where the verbs in both conjuncts constitute a semantic unit denoting a single activity²⁸ — see the contrast in (50) and (51). In European Portuguese, however, it is not so restricted, and each conjunct may denote an independent, though correlated, activity as illustrated in (52):

- (50) a. *Juan les hablará y perdonará.*
 Juan them talk-will and forgive-will
 'Juan will talk to them and forgive them.'
 (Uriagereka 1995: 105)
- b. *Lo compró y vendió en una sola operación.*
 It_{CLacc} he-bought and he-sold in a single operation
 'He bought it and sold it in a single operation.'
 (cf. Soriano 1993: 355)

28. This position concerning the range of occurrence of ATB clitic placement in Spanish is also shared by Soriano (1993: 23 and 355, footnote 7).

- (51) a. ??**Creo que ellos les compraron muchos libros,*
I-think that they them_{CLdat} bought many books
pero regalaron pocos juguetes.
but offered few toys
'I think that they bought them many books but offered few toys.'
- b. ??*Todos ellos las oyeron de sus abuelas*
All they them_{CLacc} heard from their grandmothers
y contaron a sus hijos.
and told to their children
'They all heard them from their grandmothers and told to their children.'
- (52) a. *Acho que eles lhes compraram muitos livros mas*
I-think that they them_{CLdat} bought many books but
ofereceram poucos brinquedos.
offered few toys
'I think that they bought them many books but offered them few toys.'
- b. *Todos eles as ouviram às avós e*
All they them_{CLacc} heard from-the grandmothers and
contaram aos filhos.
told to-the children
'They all heard them from their grandmothers and told them to their children.'

These data show that an additional property operates in European Portuguese that enables this language to preserve the intrinsic unity of each conjunct in co-ordination under ATB clitic placement, in spite of partially relaxing the semantic (and lexical) correlation between the conjuncts.

The examples in (53) and (54) suggest that this property relies on the possibility of the proclisis triggers in European Portuguese to have scope over the clitic inside the second conjunct.²⁹

- (53) a. [*Só ele*] *o reconheceu e cumprimentou*
Only he him_{CLacc} recognised and greeted
delicadamente.
politely
'Only him recognised him and greeted him politely.'

29. These data corroborate the analysis concerning the adverb *já* 'already'. See footnote 21.

- b. [*Todos*] *os compraram e recomendaram aos*
All them_{CLacc} bought and recommended to-the
alunos.
students
'They all bought them and recommended to their students.'
- c. *Eu penso [que] eles lhe telefonaram e pediram*
I think that they him_{CLdat} called and asked
para resolver o problema.
for solve the problem
'I think that they called him and asked him to solve the problem.'
- (54) a. *? [*Nem ele*] *o reconheceu mas cumprimentou*
Not he him_{CLacc} recognised but greeted
delicadamente.
politely
'Not even him recognised him but greeted politely.'
- b. ?? [*Todos eles*] *os compraram e já*
All they them_{CLacc} bought and already
recomendaram recomendaram aos alunos.
recommended to-the students
'They all bought them and recommended to their students already.'
- c. ?? *Eu penso [que] eles lhe telefonaram e apesar*
I think that they him_{CLdat} called and in spite
disso [não] pediram para resolver o problema.
of-that not asked for solve the problem
'I think that they called him and in spite of that did not ask him to solve the problem.'

In (53) *Só ele* 'only him', *Todos* 'they all' and *que* 'that' have scope over the whole coordinate structure and may act as the proclisis triggers in both conjuncts. This is confirmed in sentences where an overt clitic pronoun occurs in each conjunct:

- (55) a. [*Só ele / nem ele*] *o reconheceu e o*
Only he / not he him_{CLacc} recognised and him_{CLacc}
cumprimentou.
greeted
'Only him /not even him recognised him and greeted him.'
- b. [*Todos*] *os compraram e os*
All them_{CLacc} bought and them_{CLacc}
recomendaram aos alunos.
recommended to-the students
'They all bought them and recommended them to their students.'

- c. *Eu penso [que] eles lhe telefonaram e lhe*
 I think that they him_{CLdat} called and him_{CLdat}
pediram para resolver o problema.
 asked for solve the problem
 'I think that they called him and asked him to solve the problem.'

In the examples (54), on the other hand, although the proclisis triggers potentially have scope over the whole coordinate structure, they do not trigger proclisis in the second conjunct. This is so because the semantic content of the conjunction cancels their scope (this is the case of *mas* 'but' in (54a)), or because there is a closer proclisis trigger inside the second conjunct (as *já* 'already' in (54b) and *não* 'not' in (54c)). In this case, the ATB reading is impossible and an overt clitic must occur in the second conjunct (enclitic in (56a) and proclitic in (56b), (56c)):

- (56) a. *[Nem ele] o reconheceu mas cumprimentou*
 Not he him_{CLacc} recognised but greeted
-o delicadamente.
 -him_{CLacc} politely
 'Not even him recognised him but greeted him politely.'
- b. *[Todos eles] os compraram e [já] os*
 All they them_{CLacc} bought and already them_{CLacc}
recomendaram aos alunos.
 recommended to-the students
 'They all bought them and recommended them to their students already.'
- c. *Eu penso [que] eles lhe telefonaram e apesar*
 I think that they him_{CLdat} called and in spite
disso [não] lhe pediram para resolver o
 of-that not him_{CLdat} asked for solve the
problema.
 problem
 'I think that they called him and in spite of that they did not ask him to solve the problem.'

These data entitle us to suppose that the property that distinguishes European Portuguese from Spanish in allowing for a less restrictive occurrence of clitic ATB without extraction from the coordinate structure is the specificity of the proclisis triggers in European Portuguese (recall the examples in (6)). The proclisis triggers in this language may occupy a position which is external to the coordination, thus having scope over the whole coordinate structure and triggering proclisis in the second conjunct. In this circumstances, the c-command domain of clitic in the first conjunct overlaps with its proclisis trigger scope domain. Seemingly, the occurrence of ATB clitic placement in European Portuguese as a regular syntactic

construction is the result of this property, which favours the connection between the conjuncts both as a semantic and a structural unit.

On the contrary, in Spanish the proclisis trigger – i.e., T with strong V-features (see the examples in (4)) – is inside each conjunct. Thus, the clitic, while having syntactic autonomy to c-command into the second conjunct, as the outermost adjunct in the coordination, may not rely on its proclisis trigger as a structural connective over its entire c-command domain. This connection must be fixed by the co-operation of the predicates in both conjuncts – together they must denote a semantic unit.

Summarising:

Though clitic ATB without extraction is possible whenever the clitic is the outermost element of the coordinate structure, its status as a non-exceptional syntactic construction relies on additional requirements concerning the syntactic autonomy of the clitic, and the availability of semantic and structural properties aiming at establishing the coordinate structure as a unit under the scope of the overt clitic.

6. Conclusions

In this paper it has been shown that the ATB clitic construction is not limited to proclisis, but also occurs with enclisis, in configurations where the clitic is hosted by a verb which c-selects, and hence c-commands, the whole coordinate structure.

Empirical evidence has also been given in support of ATB clitic reading with proclisis without extraction of the clitic from the coordination. In this case, it has been claimed that the clitic must be the outermost adjunct of the coordinate structure in order to c-command into both conjuncts.

Finally, it has been shown that the non exceptional status of the ATB clitic construction should not be attributed to the aptitude of the clitics in licensing parasitic gaps, but to the status of the clitic as an autonomous syntactic head and to the strategies available in each language for delimiting the coordinate structure as a syntactic and semantic unit. In what concerns EP, the regular syntactic nature of the clitic ATB construction seems to depend on the proclisis triggers, which may be external to, and have scope over, the whole coordinate structure; in these circumstances the clitic assumes the scope domain of its proclisis trigger as its c-command domain.

Though the study of ATB structures goes far beyond the aim of this paper, one concluding comment may be drawn on the basis of data previously considered. These data showed that there are two different structural sources for the interpretative effects associated with the ATB construction: according to one of them, the constituents, are apparently extracted from both conjuncts and moved to a single landing site external to the coordinate structure; according to the other source, the constituents involved in the ATB interpretation remain inside the coordinate structure and move to the highest position in each conjunct; under c-command, the

constituent in the first conjunct fixes the content of the constituent in the second one — this one being usually characterised as a null element. Thus, in opposition to some of the current proposals,³⁰ ATB clitic placement argues against the reduction of ATB constructions to one of these structural configurations and shows that they are both available. In a Principles and Parameters framework, where constructions have no theoretical status (cf. Chomsky 1981, 1995), this is predictable. In fact, what we expect is that the ATB reading faces up whenever the adequate configurations are available.³¹

Universidade de Lisboa

References

- Aoun, Joseph, Elabbas Benmamoun and Dominique Sportiche (1994). Agreement, word order and conjunction in some varieties of Arabic. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 195–220.
- Barbosa, Pilar (1996). Clitic placement in European Portuguese and the position of subjects. In *Approaching Second: Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, Halpern, Aaron and Arnold Zwicky (eds), 1–40. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Belletti, Adriana (1993). Case checking & clitic placement. *GenGenP* vol. 1, 2: 101–118.
- Benincà, Paola and Guglielmo Cinque (1990). On certain differences between enclisis and proclisis. Ms..
- Benmamoun, Elabbas (1992). Functional and inflectional morphology: Problems of projection, representation and derivation. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Southern California. California.
- Bosque, Ignacio (1987). Constricciones morfológicas sobre la coordinación. *Linguística Española Actual* 9: 83–100.
- Brody, Michael (1995). *Lexico-Logical Form: A Radical Minimalist Theory*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Cardinalletti, Anna and Michal Starke (1994). The typology of structural deficiency – On the three grammatical classes. Ms.
- Chomsky, Noam (1981). *Lectures on Government and Binding*. Dordrecht: Foris Publications.
- (1982). *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- (1986). *Barriers*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- (1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Cinque, Guglielmo (1990). *Types of A-bar Dependencies*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Colaço, Madalena (1996). O Princípio Across-the Board. In *Quatro Estudos em Sintaxe do Português*, Gonçalves et alii (eds.), 51–99. Lisboa: Edições Colibri.
- Costa, João (1996). On the behavior of adverbs in sentence-final context. *The Linguistic Review* 14: 43–68.
- Cunha, Celso (1972). *Gramática do Português Contemporâneo*. Belo Horizonte: Editora Bernardo Álvares S.A.
- Culicover, Peter and Ray Jackendoff (1997). Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28: 195–217.
- Duarte, Inês (1983). Variação Paramétrica e Ordem dos Clíticos em Português. *Revista da Faculdade de Letras*. Lisboa: Faculdade de Letras da Universidade de Lisboa.
- Duarte, Inês and Gabriela Matos (1999). Clitic placement in Romance – a minimalistic approach. *Santa Barbara Portuguese Studies*, vol. IV: 1997, 242–273. Santa Barbara: University of California at Santa Barbara.
- Duarte, Inês, Gabriela Matos and Isabel Faria (1995). Specificity of European Portuguese Clitics in Romance. In *Studies on the Acquisition of Portuguese*, Isabel H. Faria and M. João Freitas (eds.), 129–154. Lisboa: APL and Ed. Colibri.
- Engdahl, Elisabet (1983). Parasitic gaps. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 6: 5–34.
- Frota, Sónia and Marina Vigário (1996). On weight effects in European Portuguese. Paper given at the Glow Workshop On Weight Effects, Athens.
- Galves, Charlotte (1992). Clitic placement in European Portuguese. Evidence for a non homogeneous theory of enclisis. *Actas sobre o Workshop sobre o Português*. Lisboa: APL.
- Gazdar, Gerald, Ewan Klein, Geoffrey Pullum and Ivan Sag (1985). *Generalized Phrase Structure Grammar*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Goodhall, Grant (1987). *Parallel Structures in Syntax — coordination, causatives and restructuring*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johannessen, Janne (1996). Partial agreement and coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry* 27: 661–676.
- Kayne, Richard (1975). *French Syntax. The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press. (French translation: *Syntaxe du Français. Le cycle Transformationnel*. Paris: Editions du Seuil.)
- (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Longobardi, Giuseppe (1991). On the correspondence hypothesis. In *Logical Structure and Linguistic Structure*, Huang, James and Robert May (eds.), 149–196. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Madeira, Ana Maria (1992). On clitic placement in European Portuguese. *Working Papers in Linguistics* 3, London: University College.
- Manzini, M. Rita (1994). Locality, minimality and parasitic gaps. *Linguistic Inquiry* 25: 481–508.
- Martins, Ana M. (1994). Enclisis, VP-deletion and the nature of sigma. *Probus* 6: 173–205.
- Munn, Alain (1992). A null operator analysis of ATB gaps. *The Linguistic Review* 9: 1–26.
- (1993). Topics in the syntax and semantics of coordinate structures. Ph.D. dissertation. Faculty of the Graduate School, University of Maryland, Maryland.
- Pesetsky, David (1982). Paths and categories. Ph.D. Dissertation. MIT, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Raposo, Eduardo (1986). On null object in European Portuguese. In *Studies in Romance Linguistics*, Osvaldo Jaeggli and Carmen Silva-Corvalán (eds), 373–390. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Rivero, Maria-Luisa (1992). Clitic and NP climbing in Old Spanish. In *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, Hecctor Campos and F. Martínez Gil (eds). Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Ross, John (1967). Constraints on variables in syntax. Ph.D. Dissertation. MIT, Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Rouveret, Alain (1992). Clitic placement, focus and the Wackernagel position in European Portuguese. University of Paris-8. Ms.
- (1995). Clitics, subjects and tense in European Portuguese. Ms.
- Soriano, Olga (1993). Los pronombres átonos en la teoría gramatical. Repaso y balance. In *Los pronombres átonos*, Olga F. Soriano (ed.). Madrid: Taurus Ediciones.
- Uriagereka, Juan (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26: 79–123.
- Williams, Edwin (1978). Across-the-Board rule application. *Linguistic Inquiry* 9: 31–43.
- (1986/1987). The ATB theory of parasitic gaps. *The Linguistic Review* 6: 265–279.