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1 Introduction *

In this paper, I argue that UG makes available two different functional projections in the clause where complement clitic pronouns may surface by PF, or SPELL-OUT (Chomsky 1993) : a Complementizer or C-oriented position, and an Inflection or I-oriented position. More precisely, I adopt the idea that the I-system is L-related to V, while the C-system is not (Chomsky and Lasnik 1993), and argue that clitics can surface in a functional position that is L-related to V, or in a position related to C and not to V. Languages with clitics in only one of these positions represent pure types, while languages with clitics in both of them represent mixed types. Pure type languages include Bulgarian (B), which has an I-oriented system, and Serbo-Croatian (SC), which has a C-oriented system with Wackernagel properties. Old Spanish (OSp) is interesting in that it represents a mixed type because it uses both of these systems. The mixed character of OSp and its syntactic consequences are lost in diachronic evolution; the C-oriented or Wackernagel-like system OSp shares with SC disappears, while the I-oriented system OSp shares with B survives, with the following change. The OSp and B I-oriented systems are sensitive to a first position prohibition; by contrast, after the 17th century, the Spanish I-oriented system is no longer sensitive to such a prohibition, resembling in this respect the I-oriented Modern Greek system.

I also argue that B, OSp, and SC are symmetric languages as to clitic structure, with C or I-orientation in root and non-root clauses. Without exception, all types of clauses display I-properties in B, while SC shows exceptionless C-properties. By contrast, OSp has the mixed characteristics which derive from the combination of its I and C-systems in embedded clauses, but seldom in main clauses. In main clauses, OSp shows an overwhelming preference for the I-system that survives in later stages, and exhibits restrictions in its use of the C-system, which provides the basis for the diachronic evolution that eliminates it in later periods.

In section 2, I characterize I and C-systems in embedded clauses, establishing how OSp combines the two systems which exist in pure form in SC and B. In Section 3, I argue that these systems are symmetric and found without restrictions in main clauses in B and SC, but with important restrictions in OSp main clauses. In section 4, I discuss the effect of this assumed symmetry on root Verb + Clitic order or ‘enclisis’ in these languages, coming to three typological conclusions, and one specific conclusion for
OSp, with consequences for the evolution of this language. First, since V+ CL order is found in both SC and B, I conclude that it cannot be essentially connected to the C or I-orientation of clitics; by contrast, CL + V order is sometimes seen as a symptom of C-orientation in the literature on Old Romance. Second, SC and B are not V2 languages, and I contend that OSp is not V2. Thus, I conclude that V+ CL order cannot be intrinsically connected to V2; by contrast, this order is sometimes seen as a clear symptom of V2 in the literature on Old Romance. Third, since SC and OSp have C-oriented, or Wackernagel-like, clitics and are not V2 languages, I conclude that Wackernagel phenomena must be independent from V2 phenomena as well. Fourth, as to OSp, I show that V + CL order in this period has properties compatible with an analysis where clitics are I-oriented, but incompatible with the analysis where clitics are C-oriented like in SC. Thus, OSp structures with V+ CL order can only be analyzed as resulting from the I-system, not the C-system, so in the period where the two systems coexist, enclitics reinforce the I-system.

2 I-oriented vs. C-oriented clitic systems in embedded clauses.

In this section, I examine complement clitic pronouns in embedded clauses to determine the essential differences between the I-system and the C-system, and contrast the mixed characteristics of OSp with the pure characteristics of B and SC. In 2.1., I present the data, and in 2.2. and 2.3., the analyses for the C and I-systems respectively. In 2.4., I discuss some OSp patterns that appear problematic for the specific C and I-systems set in 2.2.- 2.3., and propose that they fall under an alternative C-system absent in SC, but present in Ancient Greek and German.

2.1 Clitic position in I and C-oriented systems. OSp clitics are documented in two different locations in subordinate clauses, as in the if-clauses in (1) vs. (2):

(1) a. E si él mejor lo faze - dixo el rey - , ¿en qué lo podremos nos_ and if he better it does - said the king- in what him can we castigar? [Z154
advise
‘And if he does it better - said the king- in which way will we be able to advise him?’

b. Seméjame que vos tienen en estrechura, si Dios non vos ayuda. seems.to.me that you have in difficulties, if God not you helps ‘It seems to me that if God does not help you, they have you in a difficult position.’ [Z91

(2) a. Si lo el rey por bien toviere, mándeme quemar. if it the king for good had, order.me burn [CD243
‘If the king considered it good, let him order that they burn me.’

b. E grant derecho sería que me matases ..., si me de ti non and big right would.be that me kill ..., if me from you not guardase. [Z238
protect
‘And it would be your right to kill me ..., if I did not protect myself from you.’

On the one hand, in the if-clauses of (1) clitics precede and are adjacent to the inflected V, and follow but are not adjacent to the complementizer si ‘if’; descriptively speaking, clitics in such clauses are I-oriented, and are not in second position (2P). On the other hand, clitics in (2) are in 2P, follow and are strictly adjacent to si, and precede but are not adjacent to V. In (2a), a NP and a PP separate clitic and V; in (2b) PP and Neg stand between the two. Descriptively speaking, the clitics in (2) are C-oriented, as opposed to those in (1). By contrast with (1), the order in the if-clauses of (2) is now ungrammatical. In many OSp texts, these alternations are found under parallel syntactic conditions, as in (3). In my view, they are grammatical because two systems based on the I vs. C-oriented dichotomy apply to complement clitics:

(3)  a. E el arçobispo dixo que se non trabajase ende ..., and the archbishop said that himself not work of it ..., ca non ge-lo darían. since not to him it would give ‘And the archbishop said not to get excited about it ..., since they would not give it to him.’

b. Fue a la corte a demandar el palio e non lo pudo acabar, ..., went to the court to ask the pennant and not it could obtain, que ge-lo non darían en ninguna manera. that to him it not would give in no manner ‘He went to court to ask for the pennant and could not get it, ..., since they would not give it to him at all.’

C and I-oriented clitics are documented in structures that disallow CP-recursion, like the adjunct and if-clauses in (2-3), or in contexts where CP-recursion may exist, as in the complement of the bridge V dixo ‘said’ in (3a). Thus, clitic position in embedded clauses is independent from, and unrelated to, the sites that result from OSp CP-recursion. As discussed next, the I-oriented system is shared with B, while the C-oriented system is shared with SC, which contrasts with OSp in that it lacks CP-recursion.

In modern standard B, clitic pronouns in subordinate clauses must be adjacent to V, as in (4), corresponding to the if-clauses in (1): the clitic is fourth after C, NP, and AdvP, and V ends the clause, like in OSp. However, (5) shows that B tolerates no variation as to clitic position, and is exclusively I-oriented, which OSp is not. In B, I-orientation appears to be an innovation, with (5) being found in some dialects, and in religious texts early this century. Thus, it seems as if B and Sp have experienced parallel evolutions.

(4)  a. Ako toj burzo go napravi, ... B
if he fast it does, ...
‘If he does it fast, ...’

b. Ako bog ne ti pomogne, ...
if God not you helps, ...
‘If God does not help you, ...’

(5)  a. *Ako go toj burzo napravi, ...
    b. *Ako ti bog ne pomogne, ...

In SC subordinate clauses, clitic pronouns must be adjacent to C, as in (6), similar to the OSp if- clauses in (2), not to those in (1):

(6)  a. Ako to on bolje radi, ...  SC
    if it he better does,...
    ‘If he does it better, ...’
    b. Ako ti bog ne pomogne, ...
    if you God not helps,...
    ‘If God does not help you, ...’

As (7) illustrates, SC contrasts with standard B, but is not identical to OSp, as it tolerates no variation in clitic position, being exclusively C-oriented, which OSp is not. In Slavic, C-orientation seems to be shared by Czech, Slovak, and Slovenian:

(7)  a. *Ako on bolje to radi, ...
    b. *Ako bog ne ti pomogne, ...

I propose that the contrasts between B and SC, and the similarities OSp shares with both of them derive from the idea that C-oriented and I-oriented clitics surface in different functional projections in the clause.\(^1\) This could be because they are base-generated in that position, or move to it out of the VP, an independent issue I do not discuss.

2.2  C-oriented clitics and Spec-WP. For the C-oriented system, I assume a functional projection that complements C, in tune with Cardinaletti and Roberts’ AGrP (1991), Halpern’s CleftP (1992), Rouveret’s WP (1992), and Uriagereka’s FP (1992, 1995), among others. With Rouveret, I label this projection WP, suggesting Wackernagel (1892). I also adopt the idea that C-oriented clitics may occupy the Spec of this projection, following a proposal of Shlonsky (1994) for West Flemish subject clitics. This results in the structure in (8), which, as stated, is independent from CP-recursion.

(8)  \[[\text{CP} \text{C [WP CL [W \ W YP]]]]\]

If WP belongs to the C-system, as Shlonsky argues, in (8) the clitic is in a position related to C. In 2.4., I discuss a second alternative in OSp, with the clitic in W, not Spec-WP.

Together with (8), I adopt Kayne’s system (1994), which disallows multiple adjuncts / specifiers in one \(X^{\text{max}}\). This means that WP does not allow further adjunction, since it already contains one specifier = adjunct. These assumptions correctly predict what I consider the most salient and exceptionless feature of clitics in the pure C-system of SC: namely, the clitic must always be strictly adjacent to an overt C, as in (6) and
(9a), an exceptionless situation given the absence of CP-recursion. As illustrated by (9b) from Haegeman (1992: 62), the distribution of SC complement clitics and West Flemish subject clitics in embedded clauses is identical, which follows if both types are in Spec-WP.

(9)  a. Ivan kaze [CP da WP [nam YP [Olga niSta ne dovikuje]]]  
Ivan says that us Olga nothing not tells

‘Ivan says that Olga is not telling us anything.’ SC

b. [CP da [WP se YP [zie da kleed gisteren gekocht eed]]]  
that she that dress yesterday bought has

‘that she bought that dress yesterday’ West Flemish

OSp shares clitic structure with SC. In the medieval period, clitics that precede V need not be adjacent to it, as in (10a). This word order is dubbed Interpolation (Gessner 1893; Meyer-Lübke 1897; Chenery 1905; Ramsden 1963; Rivero 1986, 1992; Wanner 1987, 1992; 1993). In my view, Interpolation exists because clitics can occupy a position in WP that is related to C, and they almost always appear in Spec-WP, like SC clitics. Thus, as traditionally observed, the great majority of instances of Interpolation show clitics that are strictly adjacent to C. On this view, (2a) (si lo el rey por bien tovier) and (10a), from Wanner (1992a:345), receive analyses like in (10b): 3

(10)  a. Ca syla yo avn non veo yo morre. SME 494
then if.her I still not see I will.die
‘Then, if I still do not see her, I will die.’

b. [CP sy [WP la [YP yo avn non veo]]]  

OSp differs from SC in allowing CP-recursion with bridge Vs (Lema and Rivero 1991), but this is immaterial for WP, a projection unrelated to CP-recursion.

Word-order motivates that the clitic is in a Spec in (10); in addition, Rivero (1992) argues that OSp clitic pronouns and ordinary NPs undergo an identical process of ‘clitic’ climbing with Vs like querer ‘want’. Ordinary NPs are Xmax and must ‘clitic climb’ to a Spec-position; thus, OSp clitics also share this option. In brief, Xmax movement phenomena provide a second type of motivation for the idea that clitics can surface in the Spec of a projection, as opposed to its head. This argument cannot be used for SC, which lacks bona fide clitic climbing. However, we saw in fn. 2 that under a movement view, SC clitic pronouns also exhibit Xmax properties.

On conceptual grounds, Kayne’s system (1994) disallows right-adjunction, so C-oriented clitics cannot be right-adjointed to C, but are unproblematic if in WP, as in (8-10). An empirical argument that such clitics are not in C is based on OSp relatives with the clitic after the wh-phrase and before the subject, as in (11):

(11)  a. Puede ser por la ventura de que se ninguno non puede

can be because the luck of which Refl no one not can

amparar. CD157
obtain
'It can be because of the good luck that nobody can obtain.'

b. la ventura [CP de que [CØ [WP se [YP ninguno non ...]]]]

In Rivero (1984), I argue that OSp relatives display 'doubly-filled COMP effects', like counterparts in modern Spanish. Then, in (11) C must be phonologically null, because de que 'of which' is in Spec-CP. However, if C-oriented clitics were right-adjoined to C, both Spec-CP and C would be phonologically filled in (11). Thus, I conclude that these clitics are strictly adjacent to C because they are in Spec-WP. The relative in (12) is like OSp (11), so this conclusion applies to SC (contra Cavar and Wilder (1994), who right-adjoin the clitic to C, as also advocated for Czech (Toman 1986), and for Slovak (Saez 1991)):

(12) a. Sve bi to moglo biti zbog istine koje se niko ne može setiti.
   'It could all be because of the truth which no one can remember.'

b. istine [CP koje [CØ [WP se [YP niko ne može setiti]]]]

This analysis implies that C cannot contain overt material if Spec-CP is filled. This interpretation of ‘Doubly-filled Comp’ effects seems correct, since order in questions is Wh-phrase - Subject - Verb as in Sta Ivan kupuje? ‘What is John buying?’. In these questions, V-to-C does not apply, and Spec and C are not both filled, as required.

To conclude, SC clitics are C-oriented and in the Spec of the WP projection which complements C as part of the C-system, and is independent from CP-recursion. Strict adjacency between the clitic and the right edge of C follows if adjunction to the right and multiple specifiers are disallowed (Kayne 1994). The OSp patterns of this section conform to the SC situation, suggesting participation in a C-system with identical properties. However, I show in 2.4. that OSp exhibits a flexibility absent in SC: clitics may sometimes occupy W, not just Spec-WP.

2.3 I-oriented clitics and TM. Clitics in the I-system are in a functional projection whose defining characteristic is to take the Agreement(s)/Tense complex, for short IP, as complement. I label this projection TMP, suggesting Tobler (1875), and Mussafia (1886, 1888). In contrast with W-clitics, the core descriptive characteristic of TM-clitics is that they surface adjacent to the inflected V, that is, they are 'adverbal' in the sense of Renzi (1989), who also distinguishes two types of clitics based on location. In addition, in some languages and/or historical stages of a given language, TM-clitics cannot appear first in the clause, a restriction Romance philologists label the ‘Tobler-Mussafia law’. This restriction is shared by B, and by TM-clitics in OSp. However, roughly after the 17th century, it is lost for the surviving TM-clitics of Spanish. In this paper, I maintain that the core contrast between W and TM clitics is their assumed location, that is C vs. I-orientation. Both types can be sensitive to a first position prohibition (W: Serbo-Croatian; TM: Bulgarian), or escape it (W: Slovenian; TM: Modern Spanish), so this cannot be the crucial difference. From my perspective, Tobler
and Mussafia discussed the first position prohibition of TM-clitics exclusively, because the languages they examined (Old French and Old Italian) lack productive W-clitics with the characteristics of the SC and OSp type discussed above, but show TM clitics that cannot be first like B.

If I-oriented clitics are adjoined to the head of TMP, as in (Kayne 1989) and later work on Romance, these assumptions result in the structure in (13a). If I-oriented clitics are in Spec, as in (Rivero 1994a [1988]) for Balkan languages including B, the structure is as in (13b). 4

\[(13)\]

\[a. \ [CP \ C \ [YP \ Y \ldots[TMP \ [TM' \ CL \ IP]]]] \]
\[b. \ [CP \ C \ [YP \ Y \ldots[TMP \ CL \ [TM \ ø \ [IP]]]] \]

If TMP belongs to the V-system like IP, in (13) the clitic occupies a position which is L-related to V, as opposed to SC clitics, which are related to C.

A first difference between the C and I systems motivating the different analyses of clitics comes from negative clauses, as in the contrast illustrated by B (4b) and SC (6b). In subordinate negative clauses, clitics falling under the C-system must precede Neg but need not be adjacent to it, as in SC Ako ti bog ne pomogne: CL - NP - Neg - V. By contrast, clitics falling under the I-system must follow Neg, as in B Ako bog ne ti pomogne: Neg - CL - V. As we saw, variation in these orders leads to clear ungrammaticality in both SC and B. In my view, the contrast between the two languages derives from the structure of Neg, and the presence or absence of WP. In both B and SC (Rivero 1991, 1994a [1988]), Neg heads a X\text{max}, and must complement the C-system. Thus, when the WP part of this C-system is projected for the SC clitics, NegP must be below WP, and Neg^o will always follow the clitic. Thus, the structure of the SC negative conditional is (14):

\[(14)\]

\[CP \ [WP \ ti \ [NegP \ bog \ [Neg' \ ne \ [IP pomegone]]]] \quad C\text{-system} \]

Word order eliminates a series of alternative analyses. First, the clitic cannot be an X^o that adjoins to Neg as X^o. Second, the clitic cannot be an X^o that adjoins to NegP, as this violates structure-preservation. Third, the clitic cannot be a X\text{max} that adjoins to NegP, since this implies a double adjunction (of the clitic and the NP-subject). Fourth, right-adjunction of the clitic to C is impossible on conceptual and empirical grounds. The analysis in (14) does not face any of these problems.

In B, clitics must surface in TMP, and WP is not projected. Then, NegP must appear directly below CP, as its complement. Under these assumptions, (4b) corresponds to (15), and the contrast between B and SC follows from the effect of WP in the last case:

\[(15)\]

\[CP \ ako \ [NegP \ bog \ [Neg' \ ne \ [TM \ [ti \ [IP pomegone]]]]] \quad I\text{-system} \]

That the TMP position is also unrelated to CP-recursion is suggested by the fact that (15) is an embedded context disallowing such recursion.
I contend that OSp shares the C-system of SC, and the I-system of B. Thus, since OSp Neg also heads a X_{max} complement of the C-system, the two orders of non and clitics documented in this period correspond to the two options making SC and B differ. From this perspective, the OSp clitics preceding Neg in (2b), (3b), (10), and (11b) are as in (16a-d), and signal participation in the C-system:

(16) a. \[ CP \text{ si [WP me [NegP de ti [Neg' non [IP guardase]]]]} \]
    b. \[ CP \text{ que [WP gelo [NegP [Neg' non [IP darían]]]]} \]
    c. \[ CP \text{ y [WP la [XP? yo [NegP avn [Neg' non [IP veo]]]]} \]
    d. \[ CP \text{ de que [C' [Co Ø] [WP se [NegP ninguno [Neg' non [IP]]]]]} \]

The order with non preceding clitics in (1b), (3a), or the complement clause in (17) signals that the OSp clitic is operating in the I-system shared with B schematized in (18), as opposed to the C-system of SC.\footnote{5}

(17) Entendió que el su saber non le tenía pro.
He understood that his knowledge Neg him had benefit
‘He realized that his knowledge did not benefit him.’ CD 93

(18) a. \[ CP \text{ si [NegP Dios [Neg' non [TMP vos [IP ayuda]]]]} \]
    b. \[ CP \text{ ca [NegP non [TMP gelo [IP darían]]]} \]
    c. \[ CP \text{ que [NegP el su saber [Neg' non [TMP le [IP tenía pro]]]} \]

Several arguments motivate the above analysis of OSp Neg. First, (19) illustrates that OSp Long Head Movement (LHM) constructions with an untensed V moved to C across a tensed Aux are always affirmative (Lema and Rivero 1991: sect. 2.4):

(19) a. \[ Dezir-vos he cosa. \]
    b. \[ C^{\text{V}^{\text{o}}_1} \cdot [1 \text{ Aux}^{\text{a}}] \cdot [V \text{ t}_1] \]

The same holds in SC (Rivero 1991: sect. 4) and B (Rivero 1994a [1988]: sect. 3.1). In all three languages, Neg blocks LHM for the same reason. Namely, Neg is an X\text{o} that c-commands the untensed V, and Neg and C are the same type of head (Rivero 1994a [1988]: sect. 3.4), based on Roberts (1992), so when V crosses Neg to move to C, it violates Relativized Minimality.

Second, OSp Imperative Vs can only appear in affirmative sentences. In this respect OSp is like modern Spanish. For modern Spanish, two recent proposals exist to account for this restriction, based on Neg being an X\text{o} that takes as complement the remainder of the clause. Since these solutions entail that OSp Neg must also be a head like in (18), I just mention them. Rivero proposes (1994a[1988]-1994b) that Imperative Vs must raise to C to check a strong feature with illocutionary force, and cannot cross Neg because this would violate Relativized Minimality, like raising the untensed V to C.
across Neg in the LHM construction in (19). For Laka (1990) and Zanuttini (1994), Neg and Imperative Vs must head the same ∑P-projection, so they are in complementary distribution. In brief, Long Head Movement and Imperative constructions motivate that OSp Neg must be the head of a X\textsubscript{max} that c-commands V and I, and cannot be an Adverb in a Spec-position.

Third, OSp Neg counts as the first constituent for items in the clitic cluster, which clitic pronouns cannot, in this way OSp Neg resembles B Neg. Fourth, OSp Neg can be split from the cluster, which clitics cannot; in this way it resembles SC Neg. These two factors indicate that even though B, SC, and OSp Neg are X\textsubscript{o}, as shown above, they differ importantly from clitic pronouns, whether those behave like X\textsubscript{o} or X\textsubscript{max}.

In my analysis, functional heads like the B and OSp Neg head a X\textsubscript{max}, and clearly establish that the clitic which necessarily follows them is not in the projection that complements C. This same conclusion can be reached in view of X\textsubscript{max} that intervene between C and CL, as in (20):

(20) a. A esta cosa non ay sufrimiento, ..., que nunca estas dos cosas se allegaron a ome que non lo llegasen a punto de muerte. Refl arrived to man that not him put to point of death ‘In this there is no suffering, ..., because these two things never happened to someone in a way that they would not practically kill him’

b. [CP que [XP? nunca [TMP estas dos cosas [TM\textsuperscript{'} se [IP allegaron ...]]]]]

c. ... , porque con ellos Dios nos guarde de las maneras de ellos. ..., because with them God us protect of the manners of them. ‘Because God should protect us from their actions with them.’

d. [CP porque [XP? con ellos [TMP Dios [TM\textsuperscript{'} nos [IP guarde ...]]]]]

If multiple adjunctions to one X\textsubscript{max} are not possible, (20) strongly suggests that I-oriented clitics need not be in the complement of C, unlike C-oriented clitics; this is because the item in CP is separated from the clitic by two different phrases. If the OSp if-clause in (1a) is as in (21a), and the B if-clause in (4b) is as in (21b), the same conclusion applies:

(21) a. [CP si [XP? él [TMP mejor [TM\textsuperscript{'} lo [IP faze]]]]]
‘If he does it better.’

b. [CP ako [XP? toj [TMP burzo [TM\textsuperscript{'} go [IP napravi]]]]]
‘If he does it fast.’

In brief, two kinds of evidence support that I-oriented clitics need not be in the structural complement of C: (a) X\textsubscript{o}s that intervene between C and clitic, and (b) two or more X\textsubscript{max} between the two (or a combination of both types).

A salient word-order difference is that C-oriented clitics must necessarily be in 2P, or after C, while I-oriented clitics escape 2P-requirements altogether. This is because
the essential factor for clitics in the ‘I-mode’ is to be in the projection which takes IP as complement, while the essential factor for clitics in the ‘C-mode’ is to appear in the complement of C. This difference is lost in embedded contexts like affirmative clauses with null subjects. To exemplify, if subject and Neg are removed, the B and SC if-clauses in (14-15) become identical and are asymptomatic as to the clitic system they represent, resulting in the C-CL-V sequences of (22):

(22)  a. [CP ako [WP ti [IP pomogne]]] C-system
     b. [CP ako [TMP ti [IP pomogne]]] I-system

‘If he helps you, ...’

In OSp, similar sequences like (23) contribute to uncertainty as to the appropriate analysis, since two systems coexist. Thus, the clitic could be in the ‘essential’ 2P-position defined as Spec-of-WP in (23b), or in the TM-position second ‘by accident’, as in (23c). This means that the analysis of proclitic structures need not be uniform, even in one language (also (Rouveret 1992: 104)):

(23)  a. Creo que si lo desçercasedes, que faréedes mesura e bondat. believe that if him unsorrounded, that would.do good ‘I think that if you ceased to surround him, you would do a good and appropriate thing.’ Z155
     b. [CP si [WP lo [IP desçercases]]] C-system
     c. [CP si [TMP lo [IP desçercases]]] I-system

Summarizing, I propose two structures for clitics on the basis of non-recursive embedded clauses. I-oriented clitics are in the functional projection TMP which is above IP, and is part of the V-system L-related to V. By contrast, C-oriented clitics are in the WP part of the C-system. Identical C-CL-V sequences may result from either system, and since OSp combines the two systems, in this language they are structurally ambiguous.

2.4 Variation in the OSp C-system: clitics in W. OSp clitics are like SC clitics and can be located in Spec-WP, but they are also like B clitics and can be located in TMP. If in Spec-WP, they are strictly adjacent to C. If in TMP, clitics are strictly adjacent to V. However, a small number of OSp examples appear problematic for these systems. They are not numerous, but recur in different centuries, texts, and styles. Consider (24) with examples from my previous work (except for (24c)). This paradigm shares a problematic characteristic: the lack of adjacency between clitic and C, and between clitic and V.

(24)  a. Se de nos te non partes ... A133d (O)
     if from us yourself not depart ...
     ‘If you do not leave us, ...’
     b. Que ellos te non digan en que puede finar ... A2842c (O)
     that they you not tell in what can end ...
     ‘Let them not tell you how it can end.’
c. Si dios lo non fizies ... (GE-1.3r) (Fontana 1993:36)
   if god it not did ...
   ‘If God did not do it ...’

d. Sy el físico la bien connosçe ...
   if the physician it well knows ...
   ‘If the physician knows it well’

e. Si buen entendimiento le Dios quiso dar para entender ...
   if good understanding him God wanted give to understand ...
   ‘If God wanted to give him a good mind to understand...’

f. So cierto que tan buen entendimiento vos Dios dió...
   am sure that so good understanding you God gave...
   ‘I am sure that God gave you such a good mind ... ’

In each case, one constituent separates C and clitic (a PP, a subject NP, or an object NP) and another separates clitic from V (Neg, Adv, or a subject NP), in environments excluding CP-recursion. Paradigm (24) does not the result from the I and C-systems discussed above since parallel orders are ungrammatical both in SC and standard B: *Ako bog ti ne pomogne. In SC, the clitic must follow C: Ako ti bog ne pomogne. In standard B, the clitic must precede V: Ako bog ne ti pomogne.

I propose that (24) results from a different option of the C-system, as in (25): the clitic fills W, and Spec-WP is filled by a phrase. Thus, the core aspect of WP-clitics is not that they are Xmax (Spec) or X0 (head), but the height of the projection where they surface in the clause. As we shall see, this is exceptional in OSp, but regular in other languages:

(25)   a. [CP se [WP de nos [W’ te [NegP non partes]]]]
   b. [CP que [WP ellos [W’ te [NegP non digan]]]]
   c. [CP si [WP dios [W’ lo [NegP non fizies]]]]
   d. [CP sy [WP el físico [W’ la [IP bien connosçe]]]]
   e. [CP si [WP buen entendimiento [W’ le [IP Dios quiso dar]]]]
   f. [CP que [WP tan buen entendimiento [W’ vos [IP Dios dió]]]]

I attribute (25) to the co-existence of the I-oriented and C-oriented systems. In section 4 on enclisis I provide evidence that the OSp I-oriented clitic is in TM0, or in a head-position; if this aspect is extended to the C-system, then the clitic can head WP as well.8

The C-system sketched in (25) is not unique, and applies to Ancient Greek clitic pronouns and pronouns in the German Wackernagel position, as interpreted by Cardinaletti and Roberts (1991). First, in Ancient Greek, various discourse particles (PCL) such as de ‘but’ must, without exception, appear in strict 2P in all types of clauses. In non-root clauses, these particles follow C, as illustrated by the conditional sentence in (26):

(26)   a. Ei de duo eks enos agoonos gegenesethon ouk egoo aitios.
   if PCL two from one trial have.been.made not I responsible
   ‘But if two trials have been made out of one, I am not responsible.’
In my view, the Ancient Greek particles are in Spec-WP, and roughly speaking encode point of view (and see note 5). Their location derives the strict adjacency to the left edge of C, and gives them, in embedded clauses, the same overall distribution as the SC clitic pronouns, the West Flemish subject clitics, and the OSp clitic pronouns in 2.3. When a particle co-occurs with a clitic pronoun, the pronoun follows the particle, and is strictly adjacent to it in many cases. In her important study of second position and clitic pronouns, Taylor (1990) observes this situation, but discounts particles when computing positions. My proposal differs from Taylor’s in that I consider particles, which occupy Spec-WP, the crucial factor in defining 2P in Ancient Greek. Clitic pronouns are less symptomatic than particles, and offer more variation in their position as Taylor points out, but I will assume that when they are adjacent to the left edge of the particle, they have been attracted to the head of W. Under this analysis, the structure of the conditional clause in (27a), borrowed from Taylor (1990: 45), is as in (27b):

(27) a. Ei de moi ouk epeess’ epipeisetai, ...
   if PCL my not words obey
   ‘If he will not obey my words, ...’  Il. 15. 162

b. [CP ei [WP de [IP duo eks enos agoonos gegeneesthon]]]

As shown in (27b), clause structure in Ancient Greek is identical to the one in SC, as argued in Rivero and Terzi (1995): CP takes WP as complement, and NegP takes IP as complement. Under this analysis, the difference is that Ancient Greek clitic pronouns are in W, while SC clitics are in Spec-WP. This treatment correctly entails that, in the presence of particles, Ancient Greek clitic pronouns are not second, but third.

Under the C-system, OSp and SC share identical clause structures, namely [CP C [WP W [NegP Neg IP]]]. Thus, the analysis in (27b) also captures the parallelism between the (exceptional) C-system of OSp in (24=26), and the distribution of Ancient Greek clitic pronouns when adjacent to particles. The difference is that the Ancient Greek Spec-WP must be occupied by the discourse particle, while the OSp Spec-WP in (24) can hold an ordinary phrase such as a NP or PP, if it does not hold a clitic.

The second case concerns pronouns in the German Wackernagel position, as in Cardinaletti and Roberts (1990: 2.1):

(28) a. ... dass es ihm der Johann gestern gegeben hat.
   that it him the John yesterday given has
   ‘... that John gave it to him yesterday.’

b. ... dass der Johann es ihm gestern gegeben hat.
   ‘... that Johann gave it to him yesterday.’

For Cardinaletti and Roberts, es ihm is in the equivalent of W. In (29a), Spec-WP is empty; in (29b) it is filled by the subject NP. Under this analysis, OSp (24b-c) and German (29b) are parallel. The difference is that in OSp Spec-WP can be filled by a phrase that is not a subject, which is not possible in German.
In conclusion, in 2.2 I argued that OSp C-clitics almost always distribute like SC clitics: they occupy Spec-WP, so are adjacent to C and in strict 2P. In 2.3. I showed that OSp and B I-clitics are in TM adjacent to V, and escape 2P constraints. In this section, I have shown that some OSp clitics depart from this characterization, because they are neither adjacent to C nor to V, and proposed that they belong to a C-system where they fill W, as opposed to Spec-WP, resembling Ancient Greek clitic pronouns, also in W, and those German pronouns that follow the subject. By contrast with OSp clitics, SC clitics have a homogeneous 2P-distribution, which follows if they always occupy Spec-WP, like West Flemish subject clitics.

This section has three aims. The first is to argue that complement clitic structure in B, SC, and OSp is symmetric, because clitics in main clauses are in the same structural position they occupy in embedded clauses. The second aim is to establish that even though OSp displays two symmetric systems, the C-system is seldom displayed in root clauses, which is important for diachronic evolution. The third aim is to establish that V+CL order or ‘enclisis’ is not homogeneous, because it arises in the C-oriented system of SC and the I-oriented system of B, and is also found in OSp, which combines both types. From this, I also conclude that the restriction about clitics in first position these languages share is independent from the structural position of the clitics: WP or TM.

This section motivates the symmetry hypothesis, beginning with SC, and concluding with OSp, and does not exhaustively survey clitic position in main clauses (and see Ewen 1979, Hauge 1976 for B; Browne 1974, 1975, Cavar and Wilder 1994, Halpern 1992, Radanovic-Kocic 1988 for SC; Dimitrova-Vulchanova 1993 for various Slavic languages; and the cited references for OSp).

3.1. C-oriented clitics in main clauses: SC. SC clitics are always C-oriented, and in Spec-WP. In main clauses, this is motivated by questions. Compare (29a) and (29b): da li opens the clause, followed by clitic nam, which must necessarily precede all other constituents.

(29)  a. Pita da li nam Olga neSto dovikuje.
      asks whether us Olga something tells
      ‘He asks whether Olga is telling us something.’

b. Da li nam Olga neSto dovikuje.
      Q us Olga something tells
      ‘Is Olga telling us something?’

(30)   (Pita) [CP da li [WP nam W’[ W [YP Olga neSto dovikuje] ]]]

I propose that (29a-29b) share the structure in (30), with da li as [+wh]-item in CP, and clitic always in Spec-WP, which is the essential point. Thus, in SC there is no difference in the position of clitics in main vs. subordinate clauses.

With several wh-phrases, the pronominal clitic must follow the first wh-phrase, which Rudin (1988) argues is in Spec-CP, and must precede all others, which she assumes are adjoined to IP, as in (31a). In my approach, (31a) has the initial wh-phrase
also in Spec-CP, the clitic in Spec-WP, and the second wh-phrase adjoined to the complement of WP, as schematized in (31b):

(31)  
   a. Koliko im ko daje?  
       how.much to.them who gives  
       ‘Who gives how much to them?’  
   b. [CP koliko [WP im [YP ko daje]]]  

In brief, questions motivate that in root clauses the clitic is strictly adjacent to the left edge of C, with no $X^0$ or $X^{\text{max}}$ separating the two, like in embedded clauses. Thus, clitic structure is symmetric.

Constituents other than wh-phrases can also front to Spec-CP, as in (32):

(32)  
   a. NiSta nam Olga ne dovikuje.  
       ‘Olga is not telling us anything.’  
   b. [CP NiSta [WP nam [YP Olga ti ne dovikuje]]]  
   c. Olga nam niSta ne dovikuje.  
       ‘Olga is not telling us anything.’  
   d. [CP Olga i [WP nam [W' W [IP ti niSta ne dovikuje]]]]

These examples cannot result from the alternative C-system in 2.4. for OSp, Ancient Greek, and German. Namely, in SC the initial $X^{\text{max}}$ is not in Spec-WP, with the clitic in W, because questions exclude this option. If the clitic was in W, two wh-phrases could precede it: one in Spec-CP, and another in Spec-WP. However, this word order is ungrammatical in SC.

If a $X^{\text{max}}$ precedes the clitic in a negative clause, a root sentence is similar to an embedded clause: the clitic must precede Neg, but need not be adjacent to it, as in (32). This makes clitic position symmetric. However, root clauses where no $X^{\text{max}}$ has fronted past the clitic differ from embedded negative clauses: they must have Neg+V+CL order, as in (33), which is excluded in embedded clauses. Here clitic position remains symmetric with the analysis in Rivero (1991) further justified in Rivero (1994b): V raises to Neg, and the two form the complex head that moves to C and precedes the Spec-WP clitic, as in (33b). The V-to-C analysis in (33b) also serves for V+CL order in affirmative clauses: V raises without Neg, as in (34):

(33)  
   a. Ne dovikuje nam niSta.  
       ‘(He/she) is not telling us anything.’  
   b. [CP [Co ne+do (CP dovikuje)]] [WP nam [NegP ti [IP ti nista]]]

(34)  
   a. KaZe mu da je kukavica.  
       tells him that is coward  
       ‘He tells him that he is a coward.’  
   b. [CP [C V] [WP CL [W' W [IP ti]]]]
Under the symmetry hypothesis, the clitic in (34a-b) must be in Spec-WP like in embedded clauses, and V must then be in C, since current assumptions forbid V₀ to adjoin to Spec-WP, or WP. Thus, V₀ must move to the immediate superordinate head C₀.

The same treatment serves for affirmative and negative questions with V preceding li, which in turn precedes the complement clitic, as in (35). For Rivero (1993b), li is an alternative to dali in C, and (Neg) + V adjoins to it, as shown in (35b) and (35d):

(35) a. Ne govori li nam istinu?
   ‘Is he not telling us the truth?’
 b. [CP [Co ne+govori i [Co li]][WP nam [NegP ti [IP ti istinu]]]]
 c. Govori li nam istinu?
   ‘Is he telling us the truth?’
 d. [CP [Co govori i [Co li]][WP nam [IP ti istinu]]]

Finally, left-dislocations are external to the CP-node of the above diagrams, so in such constructions, clitics in WP can be third, or fourth (see Radanovic-Kocić 1988 for examples). That left-dislocated phrases do not ‘count’ when determining 2P has been documented in many languages, including my work on OSp, so I will not reiterate this point for SC.

To summarize, complement clitics are always in Spec-WP, so SC displays a symmetric C-oriented system. With clitics in Spec-WP, our formal system entails that SC enclisis necessarily involves movement of V to C. In declaratives, (Neg)+V+ CL order results when (Neg)+V raises. In questions, (Neg) + V + li + CL order arises when (Neg)+ V adjoins to li in C.

3.2 I-oriented clitics in main clauses: B. Clitics in B are consistently I-oriented or in the V-related projection identified as TMP in section 2. Thus, B is also symmetric.

B direct questions with a modal layer like (36) provide conclusive evidence that complement clitics in root clauses are in TMP. The clitic must immediately precede V, and can be separated from dali, as in (36a), but cannot be separated from V, and precede NP, as in (36c). Recall that SC da li must immediately precede the clitic, as in Da li nam Olga neSto dovikuje ‘Is Olga telling us something?’

(36) a. Dali Olga Ste ti dade knigata?
   Q    Olga fut them give book.the?
   ‘Will Olga give you the book?’
 b. [CP dali [MP Olga [M' Ste [TMP ti dade knigata]]]]
 c. *Dali ti Olga Ste dade knigata?

If multiple specifiers / adjuncts are disallowed, (37a) suggests that the clitic is not in the X\textsuperscript{max} complement of C₀. Two phrases separate dali in C₀ from the clitic, so these phrases are adjoined to each other, which is unlikely, or the adverb is in a Spec that is higher than the subject, as in (37b):
(37) a. Dali vinagi Olga ti dava knigata?
   ‘Does Olga always give you the book?’
   Q always Olga you gives book+the

b. [CP dali [XP? vinagi [TMP Olga [TM’ ti dava knigata]]]]

Rizzi (1986: 395ff.) proposes that quantified NPs do not function as left dislocated phrases, which can be used to motivate the position of B clitics. In (38a), the clitic must be in TMP, because if the subject is not left-dislocated, it must be CP-internal. For the sake of the argument, if this NP is as high as Spec-CP, the following adverb strongly suggests the TM-analysis sketched in (38b). Clauses embedded under verbs that disallow recursion, such as factives, may exhibit parallel word orders, as in (38c):

(38) a. Nikoj nikoga ne go Cete.
   no.one never not it reads
   ‘No one ever reads it.’

b. XP[nikoj [NegP nikoga [Neg’ ne [TMP go Cete]]]]

c. SuZaljavam Ce nikoj nikoga ne go Cete.
   regret.1s that no.one never not it reads
   ‘I regret that no one ever reads it.’

The examples in (38) show that in B negative clauses, Neg always precedes CL in root and embedded environments, in contrast with SC. Under my approach, B and SC differ because the prohibition against first position clitics discussed in 4 has a different effect on Neg, due to clitic structure. On the one hand, in SC WP takes NegP as complement, so the clitic precedes Neg\(^0\). Since the clitic cannot be first, the two movement options discussed in the previous section arise: (a) An XP fronts to Spec-CP, giving XP - CL - Neg order, or (b) Neg and V form a complex that raises to C, giving Neg - V - CL order. Thus, Neg - CL - V order, which is the only option in B, is excluded in SC. On the other hand, B NegP takes TMP as complement, so Neg precedes the clitic and provides the required first constituent in the absence of fronting rules, as in Ne go Cete ‘He does not read it’. A consequence of this situation is that B ne cannot be considered a ‘clitic’ for two reasons. As shown, it escapes first position restrictions on pronouns, which are clitics, and can count as the initial constituent for those pronouns.

Clitic structure in Modern Greek is like in B: clitics are in TMP in an I-oriented symmetric system. Thus, in root and non-root clauses alike, the clitic follows Neg and M like in B, as illustrated by the root clause in (39):

(39) a. I María den tha to girísi anápoda.
   Modern Greek
   the Mary Neg Fut it turn upside.down
   ‘Mary will not turn it upside down.’

b. [NegP I María [Neg’ den [MP [M’ tha [TMP to girísi anapoda]]]]]

In brief, questions, quantifiers, and negation show that B root clauses differ from SC as to the structure of clitics: TMP vs WP. However, the systems of both languages are
symmetric. In addition, the above sentences indicate that B like SC lacks V2-characteristics in main clauses.

Now let us consider the orders with V before CL found in two types of B affirmative constructions. The first type is illustrated by declaratives like (40a), which cannot be embedded, as shown in (40b-c):

(40)  
  a. Pomaga im.  
       helps them  
       ‘He is helping them.’  
  b. Znam Ce im pomaga.  
       ‘I know that he is helping them.’  
  c. *Znam Ce pomaga im.

Earlier, I concluded that the apparently identical SC order always involves movement of V to C, since CL is in Spec-WP and V precedes it: \([\text{CP} V_i [\text{WP} CL [\text{IP} t_i]]]\). However, B V + CL sequences like (40a) have the clitic in TMP, so nothing forces the landing site of V to be C. Minimalist principles like Shortest Movement, and Procrastinate suggest other options. First, if clause structure in B is \([\text{CP} C [\text{NegP} \text{Neg} [\text{MP} M [\text{TMP} CL [\text{IP} ... V...]]]]]\) (Rivero 1994a [1988]), the landing site of V could be M\(^0\), as in (41a). This is ‘long’ head movement of V past CL, and the only option under the assumption that CL is in Spec-TM. Second, if CL is in TM\(^0\), the landing site of V could be adjunction to CL, as in (41b):  

(41)  
  a. \([\text{MP} [\text{Mo} \text{pomaga}_i] [\text{TMP} \text{im} [\text{IP} t_i]]]]\)  
  b. \([\text{TMP} [\text{TMo} \text{pomaga}_i [\text{TMo} \text{im}]] [\text{IP} t_i]]\)

Option (41a) makes enclisis with I-oriented clitics similar to enclisis with C-oriented clitics in SC, with a different projection holding the raised V: the higher C for SC vs. the lower M for B. Analysis (41b) resembles the treatment for Romance Infinitive + CL in (Kayne 1991), and the analysis in (Rouveret 1992: 108) for V + CL in European Portuguese. In section 4, I provide an empirical argument favoring (41a) over (41b) in B. By contrast the formal characteristics of enclisis in OSp seem to favor a structure like (41b), which is important in explaining diachronic evolution. Thus, the two options for the analyses of TMP-clitics mirror those of WP-clitics: namely, Spec vs. Head.

Modern Greek lacks the restriction against initial clitics ensuring V-raising in B (40a), so word-order is always CL + V, as in (42):

(42)  
  To girizi anápoda.  
       it turns upside down  
       ‘He turns it upside down.’

The second type of B enclisis is found in questions with lii like (43a), and can be embedded under a question V, as in (43b). Rivero (1993b) argues that B lii is in C, like its SC counterpart. Then V in (43a-b) raises to C and adjoins to lii, as shown in (43c):

(43)  
  a. [\text{MP} [\text{Mo} \text{pomaga}_i] [\text{TMP} \text{im} [\text{IP} t_i]]]]  
  b. [\text{TMP} [\text{TMo} \text{pomaga}_i [\text{TMo} \text{im}]] [\text{IP} t_i]]

Option (41a) makes enclisis with I-oriented clitics similar to enclisis with C-oriented clitics in SC, with a different projection holding the raised V: the higher C for SC vs. the lower M for B. Analysis (41b) resembles the treatment for Romance Infinitive + CL in (Kayne 1991), and the analysis in (Rouveret 1992: 108) for V + CL in European Portuguese. In section 4, I provide an empirical argument favoring (41a) over (41b) in B. By contrast the formal characteristics of enclisis in OSp seem to favor a structure like (41b), which is important in explaining diachronic evolution. Thus, the two options for the analyses of TMP-clitics mirror those of WP-clitics: namely, Spec vs. Head.

Modern Greek lacks the restriction against initial clitics ensuring V-raising in B (40a), so word-order is always CL + V, as in (42):

(42)  
  To girizi anápoda.  
       it turns upside down  
       ‘He turns it upside down.’

The second type of B enclisis is found in questions with lii like (43a), and can be embedded under a question V, as in (43b). Rivero (1993b) argues that B lii is in C, like its SC counterpart. Then V in (43a-b) raises to C and adjoins to lii, as shown in (43c):
In section 4 I argue that this V-raising occurs to check the features of li in both main or embedded clauses. This forces ‘enclisis’ in indirect questions, an option always absent in Old Romance, including OSp. Notice, however, that the requirement imposed by li does not affect the symmetric position of the complement clitic: CL is in TMP in all clauses, including (43). Li and the complement clitic need not be adjacent, as in Koj li Ste im pomogne? Who Q M him help ‘Who on earth will help him?’; lack of adjacency follows if CL is in TMP, li is in C, and M separates the two.

In brief, B ‘enclisis’ is of two types. One type is for root clauses, and consists of affirmative declaratives with V strictly adjacent to the clitic pronoun. In this case, I argue in sect. 4 that V raises to M so as to license the complement clitic. The second type is found in root and non-root interrogatives with V before li, and li before the clitic pronoun. In this case, I show in sect 4 that V adjoins to li in C, so as to license this item, and not the clitic pronoun. We shall see that licensing conditions for clitic pronouns and for li differ, and this accounts for the fact that enclisis is possible in non-root environments only in the presence of li. Since OSp lacks a lexical item with the language-specific properties of B li, enclisis in embedded questions is impossible, which is general across Old Romance.

Other than XPs in Spec-CP (focus for Rudin (1986, 1993)) and those attached to the highest functional projection of the I-system (a second focus for Rudin), B allows XPs external to CP (left-dislocated phrases and topics for Rudin), but those are not indicative of clitic structure. As a consequence, I have argued that B clitic pronouns are in TMP and not WP on the basis of CP-internal XPs, avoiding affirmative left-dislocations, topicalizations, and focalizations, where B and SC may look alike.

To summarize, B complement clitics are always in TMP, so this language displays a symmetric I-oriented system like modern Greek or modern Spanish, but is subject to an additional first position prohibition. The order with V before CL arises in two types of affirmative clauses. (a) In root declaratives, V raises to M to license the clitic pronoun that cannot be first. (b) In root and non-root questions with li, V raises to li in C in order to license this item and not the pronoun that follows it when both are present.

3.3 C and I-oriented clitics in Old Spanish main clauses. In this section, I argue that OSp is symmetric, and exploits the I and C-oriented systems of embedded clauses also in main clauses. However, in main clauses, the C-system is seldom used, and the I-system is overwhelmingly favored. This quantitative factor is important for the subsequent evolution that abandons the C-system, since ambiguous main clause patterns open in principle to either the C or the I-analysis are more likely to receive the I-analysis which will fit in an unproblematic way almost all the evidence found in main clauses.
In addition, I show in sect. 4 that the OSp V + CL order found in root clauses shows characteristics that are compatible with the analysis with CL as head in TM, and incompatible with analyses with CL as Spec in WP. This means that OSp enclisis in main clauses has an I-analysis as its only option, which constitutes an important qualitative factor in the subsequent death of the C-system. In brief, clitics in OSp main clauses provide the quantitative and qualitative basis for the subsequent changes Spanish undergoes, while clitics in embedded clauses offer less crucial properties for the abandonment of the C-system.

Positive evidence for the C-system in main clauses is limited, consisting of isolated examples, which nevertheless recur in different styles and authors. They belong to two main types. First, questions with clitics adjacent to Wh-phrases and separated from V by Neg, as in (44a-b) from Rivero (1992:245), look like SC questions, and correspond to deviant structures in B. This type is documented in Gonzalo de Berceo, Mio Cid, and Calila e Dimna, among others:

(44) a. Por qué me non recudes? B. Milg. 293c
   why me Neg answers
   ‘Why don’t you answer me?’
 b. [CP Por qué [WP me [NegP non [IP recudes]]]]

The second type in (45-47) consists of declaratives with clitics separated from V by the NP-subject, like SC but unlike B. In (45), the adverb is in Spec-CP, and the clitic in WP in strict 2P. Example (46) has a left-dislocated phrase external to CP in TopP, an adverb in Spec-CP, and the resumptive clitic in WP, so not in strict 2P. Example (47) contains a hanging topic with no resumptive item, and a vocative, both outside Spec-CP, and an adverb in Spec-CP, with the clitic in WP in ‘fourth’ position:

(45) a. Nin me yo pornía en tan grandes grandías
   and.not.even me I would.put in such big bigness
   ‘And even I would not consider myself so great.’ Z156
 b. [CP nin [WP me [IP yo pornía en tan grandes grandías]]]

(46) a. Elo que yo quis nunca lo uos contradixiestes.
   and.the that I wanted never it you contradicted
   ‘What I wanted, you were never opposed to it.’ A 2284c-d (O)
 b. [TopP lo que yo quis[CP nunca [WP lo [IP uos contradixiestes]]]]

(47) a. Et alo que cosa son los angeles, fijo, ya uos yo dixe
   and.to.the which thing are the angels, son, already you I told
   that.the questions that me make are of many sciences.
   ‘And as to what angels are, son, I already told you that the questions
   you ask me pertain to many sciences’ (from Chenery 1905)
 b. ... [CP ya [WP uos [IP yo dixe ....]]]

In embedded clauses these two patterns are the most frequent instances of Interpolation, so it does not seem unusual that they establish that the C-system is also found in root
clauses. In addition, these patterns show that OSP lacks V2-characteristics in those cases where clitic structures resembles SC, another language that is not V2.

Now consider clitics in the I-system. If quantified NPs are not left dislocated phrases (Rizzi 1986: 395ff.), (48a) illustrates a clitic in TMP, because the subject of this sentence must CP-internal. As in parallel patterns in B, the position of the adverb strongly suggests the TM-analysis shown in (48b):

(48)  a. Mas, mal pecado, algunos de los señores grandes mas aina se
     and, bad sin, some of the lords big more now Refl
     inclinan a creer las palabras falaguerras de los mentirosos. Z61
     tend to believe the words flattering of the liers
     ‘And, unluckily, some of the nobles now tend to lend more
     credibility to the flattering words of those who lie.’

b. Mas, mal pecado, [xp algunos de los señores grandes
     TMP [mas aina [TM’ se inclinan ...]]]

In addition, (48) shows that when OSP is like B as to clitic structure, it lacks V2-characteristics, and is similar to Modern Spanish: Algunos incluso todavía se inclinan a creer esas mentiras. ‘Even now, some tend to believe those lies.’

Let us now see how Neg in root clauses impinges on the I vs. C-systems. In negative sentences, OSP shows two word orders. It shares with B the order Neg CL V, absent in SC, and it shares with SC the order XP CL... Neg V, absent in B. OSP, however, lacks the root Neg V CL order also found in SC, which would be the third word order option in root negative clauses if OSP is mixed, as I claim. This absence follows if OSP Neg is a head that c-commands I, as assumed, but in contrast with SC Neg disallows Incorporation of the inflected V. Recall that SC Neg V CL order results in root clauses when V incorporates to Neg and the two move to C to licence CL in WP. If this incorporation is absent in OSP, in root clauses Neg + V will never precede CL. Under these assumptions, when non precedes the clitic, as in (49a-b), it must be in TMP, like in B, which gives Neg CL V order:

(49)  a. Ninguno de los otros non lo osavan al Papa demandar. Z 54.
     None of the others Neg it dare to the Pope ask
     ‘None of the others dared ask the Pope for it.’

b. [Neg’ Ninguno de los otros [Neg’ non [TMP lo osavan ...]]]

The OSP alternative option CL... Neg V must be similar to SC in its analysis, so it indicates that the clitic is in WP, as in Por qué me non recudes?. Thus one of the OSP orders for Neg and clitics is symptomatic of the I-system (Neg-CL), while the other one is symptomatic of the C-system (CL -Neg).

Qualitatively speaking, OSP root negative sentences are like embedded negative clauses in providing clear evidence as to the structural position of clitics. However, if we consider main clause evidence quantitatively, a difference picture emerges. As stated, negative root sentences almost always are of the Neg CL V type, including cases where a phrase precedes Neg, as in (49). Recall that in this last situation, SC shows CL...Neg order, given that clitics are always in WP in this language. Thus, quantitatively, the presence of non in main clauses favors the clitic-in-TM option in (49) over the clitic-in-
WP option in (44). Thus OSp favors I-oriented clitics in main clauses, to the detriment of C-oriented clitics, even though the two systems in principle coexist. This preference opens the door to the disappearance of the C-oriented system, since it must be concluded that WP is very seldom projected in main clauses even in the period when examples with Interpolation are at their peak in frequency. In addition, I argue in section 4 that WP cannot be projected in cases that involve V+ CL orders.

Neg also provides evidence that root negative sentences lack V2-characteristics. When no precedes clitic and V in (49), it indicates that the finite V has not raised past IP in main (or embedded) clauses; when no precedes V but follows the clitic in Interpolation in (44), it also shows a V not in C. Thus, we must conclude that both I and W-orientation are independent of V2 properties, as B and SC clearly suggest.

OSp root clauses that look like both B and SC sentences should in principle be open to two analyses under the two systems approach, and I will exemplify this point with only one case. The affirmative Wh-question with obligatory CL+ V order in (50a) looks like a question in B, SC, or modern Spanish. Cliticwise, it could be analyzed as in (50b), or as in (50c), (traces are omitted):

(50)  a.  E quién lo mató?  
     and who him killed?                              ‘And who killed him?’
  b.  [CP quién [WP lo [IP mató]]]
  c.  [CP quién [TMP lo [IP mató]]]

However, if unambiguous root W clitics are rare, and Neg quantitatively favors an I-analysis in main clauses, analysis (50c) will be compatible with the great majority of patterns found in main clauses, and is likely to be preferred on these grounds.

Now, let us consider V+CL orders. In OSp, enclisis is restricted to OSp affirmative root declaratives like (51), affirmative direct Yes-no questions, and a few cases of CP-recursion (neither of which is exemplified):

(51)   Dígo- vos -dixo el capellán- que este vuestro amigo muere.
       tell- you- said the priest- that this your friend dies
       ‘The priest said: I am telling you that your friend is dying.’

If V+ CL order is found both within the C and the I-system, and OSp uses both systems, (51) should in principle be an ambiguous pattern. However, my contention is that it was analyzed along the lines where the clitic is a head in the I-system, which is the second factor, this time qualitative, that contributed to the disappearance of the C-system.

Under this perspective let us consider the different analyses available for enclisis. For reasons given for SC, in the C-system clitics are in Spec-WP, and enclisis in (51) should be as in (52). The defining characteristic of a clitic in this system is its strict adjacency to C in main and subordinate clauses alike, so enclisis indicates that V is in C.

(52)  [CP [C Vi] [WP CL [W’ W [IP ti .... ]]]]]            C-system

In the I-system, however, enclisis is open to several analyses, as in (53a-b-c). The first two options represent Long Head Movement of V to a higher head than TM, with V and
CL retaining their independence from each other, and the third option is Incorporation of V as X₀ to CL in TM₀, with the two forming a complex head:

\[(53)\]

a. \[XP [X V_i] [TMP CL [TM CL [IP t_i]]] \]

b. \[XP [X V_i] [TMP [TM₀ CL] [IP t_i]] \]

c. \[TMP [TM CL [IP t_i]] \]

If OSp contrasts with B in lacking M (but see Pollock 1993 for M in French), in (53a-b) the landing site of V labelled X is likely to be Σ, for negation and affirmation (Laka 1990).

Thus, if OSp is mixed, it should exhibit several possibilities for the analysis of enclisis in root clauses. However, on the basis of coordination facts, I contend in sect. 4 that this ambiguous situation appears to be missing, because the analysis of enclisis in the medieval period reduces to (53c) exclusively, with the verb and the clitic functioning as a morphological complex. This shows that my earlier contention (Rivero 1986) that OSp clitics behave exclusively as X\textsuperscript{max}, and Halpern and Fontana’s idea (1993) that V+ CL order signals X\textsuperscript{max} status for clitics unambiguously cannot be right.

The status of enclisis in Spanish is important for diachronic purposes. It means that while the first position prohibition for clitics survives roughly until the 17th century, enclitic structures provide positive evidence for the hypothesis that clitics in main clauses are heads in TM. As a result, enclitic structures are also instrumental in eliminating the three other alternatives, where clitic and V do not form a morphological complex, and in particular WP-analyses as in (52). Thus, the properties of enclisis in OSp appear to contribute to the survival of the I-system, and to the demise of the C-system which involves the projection of WP to hold clitics in its Spec, like in SC.

To summarize, OSp authors like 13th c. Gonzalo de Berceo and 14th c. Juan Manuel, among others, symmetrically employ both the C and the I-systems in embedded and main clauses. In this sense, their language is doubly symmetric, with clitics in either WP or TMP in all types of clauses. However, it has traditionally been observed that Interpolation—the order symptomatic of C-orientation—is not usually found in root clauses in OSp. In my system, this means that even though OSp combines two options to locate clitics, TMP and WP, WP is seldom projected in main clauses, and is more often projected in subordinate clauses. By contrast, TMP shows no restrictions and is frequently and systematically projected in both main and subordinate clauses, and is the almost exclusive choice in main clauses. Neg has a clear symptomatic value as to the structure of clitics in this period, and quantitatively speaking, the presence of non also favors the TMP option in root clauses. In addition, in sect. 4 I discuss in more detail the qualitative factor which eliminates the WP analysis for enclitics. Namely, root V CL orders show properties incompatible with a WP analysis for clitics, but compatible with a TMP-analysis where the clitic is a head. Thus the enclisis resulting from the first position prohibition all clitics share during this period irrespective of WP or TMP orientation creates difficulties for the diachronic survival of the C-system, and favors a head analysis under the I-system, paving the way for the later I-system that treats clitics as heads, but after the 17th century lacks the first position restriction.
I just suggested that enclisis in OSp is instrumental in the demise of the C-system and the survival of the I-system. In this section, I substantiate this idea and its effect on the diachronic evolution of Spanish, while examining aspects of V+ CL order that are relevant to B, OSp and SC at the same time. In 4.1, I begin by motivating the idea that V+ CL orders are not intrinsic to a specific clitic system, so they can receive non-unitary analyses, and I establish properties of enclisis in SC and B vs. OSp, motivating this idea. At this point I also show that, against what can be expected due to its mixed character, enclisis in OSp root clauses shows properties that are only compatible with the system with clitics as heads in TM. This is important for the later disappearance of the WP system. I continue in 4.2 with the discussion of the general first position-prohibition for complement clitics shared by B, SC, and OSp, which induce enclisis in root environments. I then conclude this section with the first position-restriction on B 'lì which induces a language-specific enclisis in root and non-root questions absent in SC and Old Romance, including OSp.

4.1 WP, TMP, and first position. We already saw that V+ CL order is found in languages such as B and SC that differ in clitic structure, if they share a prohibition against first position-clitics. Thus, it must be concluded that this prohibition cannot be essentially tied to either the WP or the TMP location of the complement clitic. In addition, we now see that WP clitics and TMP clitics may escape first position prohibitions, which reinforces the same conclusion.

WP clitics displaying no first position restrictions are West Flemish subject clitics. Recall that West Flemish and SC clitics have identical distributions in embedded clauses. In main clauses, however, a difference emerges. SC clitics must follow a constituent. By contrast, West Flemish clitics satisfy V2 (Haegeman 1992:96), as in (54a), and cannot follow a phrase, as in (54b):

(54) a. Z’ ee gewerkt.  
    she-CL has worked
    ‘She worked.’

b. *Gisteren Z’ ee gewerkt.  
    yesterday she-CL has worked.

For Shlonsky (1994), the subject clitic Z in (54a) is in Spec-WP and satisfies the V2 requirement of the auxiliary EE in W. Here, then, we have a WP clitic insensitive to the factor triggering V-raising in V + CL orders in SC. A second case of a first position WP clitic is found in Slovenian. In this language, complement clitics in embedded clauses distribute like SC clitics, so they are in Spec-WP. Some root clauses like Yes-no questions, however, allow initial clitics. As pointed out by Kudra (1993), the question particle ali can be absent, no V-raising applies, and the clitic opens the sentence, as in (55b):

(55) a. Ali ga je pustila?  
    Q him has left

    Slovenian
‘Has she left him?’

b. Ga je pustila?

c. [CP (ali) [WP ga je pustila]]

Recall that, in my view, the core characteristic of TMP-clitics is adjacency to the inflected V. Thus, most Modern Romance clitics are of this type, even though they escape first position prohibitions in that they can open the clause: MSp Lo lees ‘You are reading it’. In addition, Modern Greek has CL+ V order where B must display V + CL order, because in the first language clitics must be adjacent to the inflected V, or in TMP, but can be first in the clause, while in the second clitics also in TMP and adjacent to the inflected V must be protected by an initial constituent.

Now consider V2. SC is not V2 and displays V+ CL, while West Flemish is V2 and lacks the V+ CL orders characteristic of SC; thus, V+ CL is also independent of V2. However, V+ CL orders are found in V2 languages such as Old French, whose clitics are sensitive to a first position-restriction like B and SC.

In brief, enclisis arises if a first position-restriction exists, irrespective of the structural location of the clitic, and I will discuss the nature of this restriction in 4.3.

4.2 Structures for V + CL. A consequence of the various systems underlying V + CL orders stressed in the above sections is that enclisis need not have a homogeneous analysis from the perspective of the landing site of V, or the structural slot for CL, as in the analyses summarized in (56):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(56) a. } & \quad [CP [C V_i] [WP CL [W W [IP t_i \ldots]]]]] \quad \text{C-system} \\
\text{b. } & \quad [XP [X V_i] [TMP CL [TM \emptyset] [IP t_i]]] \quad \text{(LHM) I-system} \\
\text{c. } & \quad [XP [X V_i] [TMP [TM CL] [IP t_i]]] \quad \text{(LHM) I-system} \\
\text{d. } & \quad [TMP [TM' [TM V_i [TM CL]] [IP t_i]]] \quad \text{(Incorporation) I-system}
\end{align*}
\]

Empirical evidence showing that enclisis is not homogeneous comes from coordination. It has been noticed that in some Romance languages, clitics and Vs are in a tight relation when Vs precede clitics, but not when Vs follow clitics (Bosque 1987:§2 for Spanish; Benincà and Cinque 1993 for Italian; Rouveret 1992 for European Portuguese). This is shown by the fact that coordinated Vs may share a proclitic pronoun, as in European Portuguese (57a) from Rouveret, but enclitic pronouns must be repeated with each V, as in (57b):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(57) a. } & \quad \text{Que livro a Maria lhe deu e pediu de novo?} \\
& \quad \text{which book the Mary him gave and asked of new} \\
& \quad \text{‘Which book did Mary give him and asked to be returned?’} \\
\text{b. } & \quad \text{Ele viu-me e cumprimentou-me.} \\
& \quad \text{She saw me and complimented me} \\
\text{c. } & \quad \text{*Ele viu-me e cumprimentou.}
\end{align*}
\]

The idea is that in these languages V + CL sequences form a morphological complex. The analysis Benincà and Cinque propose for Italian enclitics is that they incorporate to
V; enclitics must appear on each V in cases like (57b) so as not to violate the Coordinate Structure Constraint: Incorporation cannot affect just one of the conjuncts.

SC and B CL+V and V+ CL orders escape the above contrast. Like in European Portuguese, coordinated finite Vs share proclitic pronouns, as in (58a) and (59a). Unlike European Portuguese, however, an enclitic with just the first finite V is grammatical, as in (58b) and (59b). These intuitions are more secure in SC than in B (this could indicate that SC and B clitics differ as to X-bar status, contrary to what I conclude next):

(58) a. Svaki dan je kupuje i Cita. SC
     every day it buys and reads
     ‘Every day he buys it and reads it.’
     b. Kupuje je i Cita svaki dan.
        ‘(He) buys it and reads it every day.’

(59) a. Maria ja kupi i proCete. B
     Mary it bought and reads
     ‘Mary bought it and read it.’
     b. Kupi ja i proCete.
        ‘(He) bought it and read it.’

In view of this, I extend to B the conclusion Radanovic-Kocic (1988:62) offers for SC: (58) and (59) show that enclitics behave ‘as independent words syntactically’. Without giving an analysis of coordination, I suggest that (58b) and (59b) show that the clitic as a syntactic constituent in the first conjunct identifies an empty category functioning as syntactic constituent in the second conjunct, similar to Spanish examples like Yo como y tú no ‘I eat and you (do) not’, with the second V missing. Under this view, (58) motivates that enclisis in SC is as in (52), since V must bypass the clitic in Spec-WP in order to precede it. Under the Shortest Movement principle, B enclisis in (59b) is as in (53a) or (53b), since V must raise to bypass the clitic, but must remain independent from it. In both (52) and (53a-b), V and clitic are separate syntactic constituents, as required by (58) and (59), but the landing site of V differs, as it must be C in SC, which is not the case in B.

The situation in OSp is less clear, as we must rely on the presence/absence of certain patterns and not grammaticality judgments. Nevertheless, I come to a tentative conclusion with important diachronic consequences. Cases with one proclitic with two coordinated finite Vs like (57a), (58a), and (59a) are documented since Gessner (1893), and exist in modern Spanish (Bosque 1987). Cases with one enclitic on each coordinated finite V like (57b) are found, and Gessner lists several examples. One case I have mentioned in the past is (60):

(60) Et el padre firio- l et maltrexo lo. Por 45
     and the father wounded-him and mistreated him

However, Gessner does not cite a single case of one enclitic just on the first of two coordinated finite Vs, like (58b) and (59b). To my knowledge, this type has not been documented in later work, but since I have not surveyed texts as to missing clitics, I have no information to add. This absence does not appear accidental, and the likely conclusion is that the pattern was ungrammatical, like (57c). Thus, the properties of
enclisis in finite coordination in OSp appear to be like those of European Portuguese today. I suggest that this is because (a) OSp clitics in main clauses are analyzed as in the I-system, and not the C-system, and (b) V-raising in OSp enclisis is incorporation of V to the clitic functioning as the head of TM in the I-system, resulting in the structure in (53c). In this analysis, V and CL form a complex X0, so the clitic cannot serve as the independent syntactic constituent that identifies the ‘clitic’-like empty category in the second conjunct. Under this view, OSp V + CL + et + V orders are deviant, so the absence of examples of this type is principled and not accidental.

In brief, the mixed system of OSp should in principle allow for several analyses of enclisis, with one of them identical to what is found in SC enclisis. However, those various analyses are in fact not exploited, and with one exception seem impossible. Coordination properties suggest that OSp enclisis is compatible only with a head-analysis of CL in TM, and incompatible with the clitic system OSp shares with SC. If this is correct, we have evidence that in OSp, WP is never projected in structures which show enclisis, with TM being exclusively involved in such cases. In conclusion, OSp enclisis cannot be the result of V in C and CL in Spec-WP, in contrast with the situation in SC. Nevertheless, OSp exhibits clitics in Spec-WP in other syntactic patterns, and particularly embedded clauses.

Summarizing, TMP and WP systems may share a prohibition against initial clitics that triggers V-raising. This results in V + CL or enclitic word orders, as in SC and B, which receive different analyses depending on the structural position of CL. Even though the WP system is seldom used in main clauses, OSp nevertheless has TMP and WP clitic systems, and resembles both B and SC. In addition, OSp is parallel to B and SC in being sensitive to a first position prohibition that survives until approximately the 17th century, giving rise in root clauses to the V+ CL orders found with finite Vs. As stated, OSp offers two systems of clitics, but the analysis of its V+ CL orders appears unambiguous, as these sequences belong to the TM-system with CL as head exclusively, and not the WP system.

As to the later diachronic evolution of Spanish, the situation is as follows. On the one hand, the OSp Interpolation phenomena that unambiguously signal the existence of the C-system with CL in WP begin to disappear in the 15th century. This quantitative change affects mainly embedded clauses, since in main clauses Interpolation is always scarce in all existing documents. On the other hand, the prohibition against initial clitics responsible for V + CL orders that we saw in principle arise from either the C or the I-systems continues for a longer period, until roughly the 17th century. However, in OSp they are treated as the result of the I-system. This means that as Interpolation declines, positive evidence for WP disappears, while V + CL sequences in main clauses continue to constitute a clear obstacle to the projection of WP, and provide positive evidence for the projection of TMP with CL as head. In brief, if these proposals are correct, the first position restriction that lead to enclisis in root clauses constituted in the history of Spanish a major qualitative factor both in the disappearance of the WP system OSp shared with SC, and in the growth of the TMP system with CL as head that survives up to present, a period where the first position restriction no longer exists, but the location of CL is still TM.

The conclusion of this section is that enclisis of pronouns on V is not a unitary phenomenon; thus it can arise from various clitic systems, such as the ones found in B
and SC. The specific conclusion about OSp is that it mixes two clitic systems, so that its enclisis should in principle be open to several analyses, but this does not seem to happen. Rather, the properties of OSp enclisis in coordination appear to be such that they favor the I-system, and are incompatible with the C-system OSp shared with SC. This is an important analytical clue for the subsequent demise of the C-system, and the survival of the I-system no longer sensitive to the first position prohibition topic of the next section.

4.3 On first position prohibitions. Let us begin with clitic pronouns. Discussing first position restrictions in B and SC, I previously proposed (Rivero 1994b) that clitic pronouns are sensitive to two licensing requirements, as in (61), which are reminiscent of the split ECP (Jaeggli 1982 and later work), and conditions for little pro proposed by Rizzi (1986).

(61) Licensing principles for clitic pronouns:

a. A clitic must have its features identified by $H^o= $ a head.

b. A clitic must be formally licensed by $H^o= $ a head.

The core idea is that clitics are functional categories, so fall under licensing systems designed in UG for such categories. For instance, Rivero (1993c) and Borsley, Rivero, and Stephens (1993) discuss in detail how the first position prohibition applying to all finite Vs in Breton is the result of a licensing system for Tense that relies on a formal principle like (61b), in addition to the familiar V-raising procedure that checks (some of) the features of Tense. Under this view, clitic pronouns and Tense exhibit positional restrictions because they fall under similar licensing principles for functional categories.

When a clitic cannot be first, the core idea is that its identifier and its formal licenser are different items, and that formal licensing derives from precedence. The identifier of the clitic in (61a) must be V, which contains the appropriate features to establish the role of the clitic as complement. The formal licenser in (61b) is, roughly speaking, the preceding constituent. Rephrasing this idea in minimalist terms, I propose that clitics as functional categories have two types of features: one type serves for identification, the other serves for formal licensing. I assume that the identification feature is consistently weak, and satisfied/checked in LF, perhaps because V raises at that point to the projection where the clitic is scoped out of the VP in overt syntax, and I do not discuss it further. The formal feature, however, is open to parametric variation. In SC, B, and OSp, this feature is strong and triggers the first position-restriction, because it must be licensed before SPELL-OUT, and, as stated, the licensing mode involves precedence. In view of the structural position of clitics in SC, B, and OSp, let us see how their shared strong formal feature is licensed in each case.

Clitics subject to the first position-restriction must always be preceded by a constituent. Within the formal system adopted in this paper, this word order aspect has different consequences for clitics that are Specs and clitics that are heads. In my analysis, this salient fact follows in SC from the idea that the Spec-WP clitic must appear in the Internal Domain or minimal complement domain (Chomsky 1993) of C in order to have its strong formal feature licensed, as in (62). In other words, this type of licensing involves a Head-Complement relation, similar to Uriagereka (1988), not a Spec-Head
relation. This mechanism also licenses Tense in Breton (Rivero 1993c), a language whose clitic pronouns escape positional restrictions:

(62) \[
\text{[CP C} \quad \text{[WP CL W']]
\]

\text{Licensor} \quad \text{Internal Domain of C}

That the clitic appears in the internal domain of C follows from Kayne’s system (1994) without stipulation. The internal domain is overtly established when V raises to C past the clitic in Spec-WP, as in (63a), or when a phrase raises to Spec-CP and is coindexed with C by Spec-Head Agreement, as in (63b). These movements never combine, as overt V-raising is last resort (Cardinaletti and Roberts 1991, Rivero 1993a, Wilder and Cavar 1993), and applies to support the clitic only when that is necessary, and not to check V-features (Rivero and Terzi 1995). Thus, (63c) is deviant: 15

(63) a. \[
\text{[CP [C V]i} \quad \text{[WP CL W'} [W [IP ti]])]
\]
b. \[
\text{[CP YP}i [C Ø]i \quad \text{[WP CL W'} [W [IP V ti]])]
\]
c. \[
*\text{[CP YP}i [C V]j \quad \text{[WP CL W'} [W [IP tj ti]])]
\]

Now consider B. If the B clitic is in Spec-TMP, its strong formal feature is always licensed in an internal domain, like in SC. The difference between the two languages resides in the nature of the domain: in view of the structural position of the B clitic, it need not be the complement of C. For instance, the B structure corresponding to (63a) is (64), and the domain where the clitic is contained is internal to M and not to C. However, the idea that clitics are licensed in a Head-Complement relation remains unchanged:

(64) \[
\text{[MP [M V]i} \quad \text{[TMP CL [IP ti]])]
\]

V-raising to M in (64) is last recourse like in SC: it will only apply if no item such as ste in a filled M formally licenses the clitic in syntax, which for Rivero and Terzi (1995) means that it complies with Enlightened Self-Interest (Lasnik 1993) and not Greed (Chomsky 1993). Thus, no differences arise between movement to C in SC, and movement to M in B, even though the assumed landing site of V differs.

However, under the assumption that the clitic is in TM°, as opposed to Spec-TMP, licensing relations may be more complex. The Head-Complement relation of SC is required in questions with dali and Wh-phrases in (65a), negative sentences in (65b), future sentences in (65c), and enclisis in (64). Thus, licensing through the Internal Domain Condition must obtain when the clitic is a Spec or a head in TM:

(65) a. \[
\text{[CP \{dali /wh-phrase\} [TMP CL [IP V]]}
\]
b. \[
\text{[NegP Neg [TMP CL [IP V]]}
\]
c. \[
\text{[MP M [TMP CL [IP V]]}
\]

In addition, the salient factor of a first position restriction is a preceding constituent, so a head clitic could have a licensing option not available to the Spec clitic. Namely, the TM°
clitic could allow as formal licensor a $X^{\text{max}}$ in Spec-TMP, as in (66) (a subject or an adverb with no focus characteristics):

(66) \[\text{[TMP XP [TM'} \text{ CL [IP V]]]}\]

In (66), CL is not licensed in an internal domain, but through a different formal relation: the Spec-Head configuration where the $X^{\text{max}}$ in the Checking Domain of CL licenses its strong formal feature, and is the ‘first’ constituent. Under this view, the Head-Complement relation to license pronominal clitics in (65) could be supplemented with the Checking Domain Condition used for the Spec-Head relation of (66). In the system of this paper, Spec-XP clitics sensitive to first position-restrictions do not have a Checking Domain, so this licensing mode using a $Y^{\text{max}}$ as opposed to a $Y^\circ$ is not available to them. However, if TMP does not project a Spec, and (66) is not generated, then licensing relations must be limited to the Internal Domain Condition like SC. Under this view, subjects preceding clitics would be higher than TMP, and occupy a topic-like position in a projection that is superior to the one holding the clitic, similar to subjects preceding clitics in SC, which in my analysis must be higher than WP. That is, clitics that are not in strict 2P, but cannot be first, are open to more analyses than 2P clitics; more formally, in the system adopted in this paper, C-oriented clitics like those of SC offer a clearer analytical situation than the I-oriented clitics B and OSp share, which becomes relevant in OSp as the following discussion illustrates.

Like SC and B, OSp must appeal to the Head-Complement relation, or an Internal Domain, to license clitics sensitive to first position at least in Wh-questions, equivalent to (65a) or, less often in Interpolation, (63b), and in negative sentences. In negative sentences, the clitic infrequently before no is in Spec-WP, so the first constituent licenses it through the Internal Domain Condition, projecting CP: \[\text{[CP XP [WP CL [NegP no [IP]]]]}\]. The clitic frequently after no is in TMP, so Neg as dominating head defines the internal domain for the clitic to be formally licensed: \[\text{[NegP no [TMP CL [IP]]]}\]. In the last case, it is immaterial to the licensing relation whether the clitic is seen as in Spec-TM or as in TM$^\circ$.

OSp shares with B and SC a licensing mechanism based on an Internal Domain, but the properties of OSp enclisis have an important effect on the licensing systems of this period. We saw that OSp enclisis in coordination suggests that V incorporates to CL, producing a morphological complex, which means that in enclisis CL functions as a head, as in \[\text{[TMP [TM'} [TM V_i [TM CL]] [IP ti]]}\]. This has consequences for the licensing of clitics, because it implies that this period does not have a homogeneous system for this purpose. Rather, OSp must appeal to a Checking Domain Condition in enclisis, and thus cannot exclusively rely on the Internal Domain Condition used in SC, whose system of clitics OSp nevertheless shares. That is, in OSp V + CL orders, V is in the Checking Domain of CL in TM, and this relation formally licenses the strong feature of the clitic, much like the Internal Domain relation does in the other cases. In SC licensing is homogeneous, in that all clitics are licensed in an Internal Domain, and the same could be maintained for B, where V and CL can function as independent constituents in a way that makes an internal domain approach for the licensing of enclitics a viable alternative. By contrast, in OSp licensing of clitics that precede finite Vs involves an Internal Domain,
but this environment cannot be used by clitics that follow finite Vs, since those have V in their Checking Domain for licensing purposes. This has two consequences. First, as discussed in section 3 from a somewhat different perspective, this situation hurts the chances of survival of Spec-WP clitics, because enclitics can never belong to this type in OSp. Second, as opposed to enclisis in B, the properties of enclisis in OSp also eliminate the analysis where TMP clitics occupy Spec-TMP, as Spec-clitics can never have a Checking Domain in order to be licensed. This is because, in our formal system based on Kayne (1994), Spec-clitics do not have a checking domain, so can only be licensed in an internal domain. The result of this is that OSp TM° clitics can survive unscathed, as we know they do, while the Spec-WP type should be seen as an endangered species that eventually disappears. Under this view, the logically possible Spec-TMP clitic is equally at danger in OSp, but remains an option in B, because enclitic structures in this language contrast with those of OSp in not showing incorporation properties. In brief, enclisis in OSp indicates that CL is licensed in a Checking Domain. This unambiguously establishes the existence of CL as a head, in a period when CL also behaves like a Spec.

Other environments where the Checking Domain Condition of OSp could be at work are less decisive. As a case in point, consider the well-known alternation between enclisis and proclisis with preverbal NP-subjects most recently discussed by Wanner (1992b), who cites the following examples (and see (60) above).

(67) a. E el respondióI. (EE §316,184b22)
   and he answered.him
   ‘And he said to him.’

b. Et el te mostrará una albuhera. (EE §316,184b7)
   and he you will.show a pond
   ‘And he will show you a pond.’

If my proposals are correct, (67a) is unproblematic: we are dealing with an enclitic, so it must involve the Checking Domain Condition. Thus, CL must be in TM° and the licenser is V. Furthermore, if V-raising is last recourse, and applies only if it becomes absolutely necessary to license CL, as I assume, the subject in (67a) is in a distant projection as in Left Dislocations, and thus not used to license CL, which triggers V-raising. What about (67b)? The situation involves proclisis and is less clear. Here, we could assume that the subject is in the projection immediately superior to CL; then, CL is licensed by appearing in the internal domain of the projection holding the subject, which prevents last recourse V-raising. Alternatively, the Checking Domain Condition available to license CL in OSp in view of enclisis could be generalized. Namely, it could be assumed that since CL in TM can be licensed by the V in its Checking Domain in enclisis, CL can also be licensed by the phrase in its Spec as another item in the Checking Domain of CL. Under this assumption, the subject could be in Spec-TMP, and be the licenser or ‘first position’ item, and this would also prevent last recourse V-raising. Since this generalization is based on the notion of Checking Domain, it is compatible with the analysis that treats CL as head, but not as Spec, and would in my approach contribute to reinforce the analysis independently required by enclitics, which function as heads and not Specs.

Under the view just developed, the loss of first position prohibitions for CL in later Spanish implies that CL no longer exhibits the strong feature which needs to be
licensed in either a Checking Domain or an Internal Domain. This loss is independent of the abandonment of the C-system, since C-clitics disappear much earlier than the first position restriction. This again shows that the first position prohibitions is independent from C and I-orientation. We have seen that it can exist in both systems, or be absent in both, and I have now suggested that this prohibition disappears from Spanish after it abandons its C-system, but retains the I-system in existence today.

Now let us consider enclisis with B li, which differs from enclisis with clitic pronouns. Recall that in questions with li, V may precede li, and the clitic pronoun in main and embedded questions alike, as in (43) repeated now as (68).16 In OSp, clitics are not preceded by V in non-root environments such as an embedded Yes-no question; rather, only CL + V order is found in such constructions. From this Romance perspective, (68) is surprising:

(68)  
   a. Dava li ti knigata?
       ‘Does he give you the book?’
   b. Pitam se [dava li ti knigata].
       ‘I wonder if he gives you the book.’

To account for (68) I propose that clitic pronouns and clitic li are sensitive to first position-restrictions deriving from different licensing requirements, which is of interest in view of the systems discussed above. In brief, as I now show, li appeals to a Checking Domain condition exclusively, while we saw above that clitic pronouns can always use an Internal Domain Condition.

Recall that in (68a-b), V adjoins to li in C (Rivero 1993b, Rudin 1993), as in (69):

(69)  
(\(V\) [\(CP\) [\(Co\) V_i [\(Co\) li ]]][\(TMP\) [\(TM'\) CL [\(IP\) ti .... ]]])

In (69), V-raising is triggered by li, and not the pronoun, which accounts for the root/ non-root symmetry, and V+CL order in a bona fide embedded context. If li heads a higher projection, as assumed, the pronoun in (69) is in the complement domain of li; that is, it is in a configuration where its strong formal feature can be satisfied. Thus, V-raising in (68a) cannot be for the pronoun, and must be for li. As to (68b), in non-root clauses the pronoun is in the internal domain of C, so from this perspective, V-raising to C is unnecessary, and not usually found; thus, V-raising in (68b) must be triggered by li, not by the pronoun. Pronouns and the li particle are alike in requiring a preceding constituent, being subject to a first position-restriction. However, in non-root clauses, pronouns cannot be preceded by the raised V, unless li is present. Thus pronouns and li differ. Let us see what the difference is by looking at the licensing requirements of li. With Rudin (1993), I assume that li has a focus feature (see (King 1993) for Russian). In minimalist terms, the focus feature is strong, so must be licensed by PF in the Checking Domain of li. Recall that I argued that pronouns subject to the first position-restriction can always satisfy their strong feature by appearing in an Internal Domain, and often do not have a Checking Domain. However, li differs from pronouns, and can only be licensed in a Checking Domain. In the absence of a Checking Domain, li is not licit. As a consequence, V raises and adjoins to C to provide the Checking Domain for li in two environments: when li appears within a complement, as in the embedded question in
(68b), or when the CP containing \li is not a complement, as in the main question in (68a). In this way, when \li is involved no asymmetry arises between root and non-root clauses : V raises and precedes \li and clitic pronouns in both cases. However, if \li is absent, and the pronouns are present, B displays same asymmetry for V + CL orders as OSp. This is because both the B and the OSp pronouns can satisfy their first position-restriction by appealing to the Internal Domain Condition, which B \li can never do.

5 Conclusion

Old Spanish offers two alternative systems for its clitic pronouns. The first system shared with Serbo-Croatian leads to Wackernagel effects, as is observed mainly in nonroot clauses. In such clauses, Old Spanish clitics that are not adjacent to the Verb are almost always in 2P. I argue that such clitics are C-oriented, occupying a functional projection that is the complement of C, and takes NegP as complement; clitics in this projection are usually in the Spec, so they are \Xmax. The second system shared with Standard Bulgarian leads in root clauses to Tobler-Mussafia effects. Clitics that are adjacent to the Verb can never be first in such clauses, but may appear in positions other than 2P in root and nonroot clauses. I argue that such clitics are I-oriented, occupying a functional projection that is the complement of NegP, if present, and takes IP as complement. Through diachronic evolution, Spanish loses the medieval C-oriented system, and preserves as the only alternative the I-oriented system. In Old Spanish, two characteristics of root clauses already favor this change. Clear cases of C-oriented clitics are never too numerous, but in root clauses evidence to postulate such clitics is extremely limited. Second, formal properties of V+ CL sequences, found only in root clauses, suggest Incorporation of the Verb to the Clitic for this word order. Since a head cannot incorporate to a phrase, root enclisis disfavors the analysis of the C-system with the Clitic as \Xmax. Thus, while nonroot clauses display evidence for I-clitics and some clear but quantitatively limited evidence for C-clitics, root clause properties in the medieval period combine to favor a treatment of CL as I-oriented and in a head position, and against an analysis of CL as C-oriented and in a Spec position.
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1. My proposal contrasts with Dimitrova-Vulchanova’s (1993), who places clitics in B, Macedonian, SC, and Czech in a shared position labelled FRONT.

2. On this view, in syntax clitic pronouns can behave as \Xmax, as in SC, or as either \Xmax or \Xo at different points of the derivation, as suggested for Modern Romance since Kayne
Chomsky (1994) states that clitic pronouns may be indeterminate as to \( X^o / X^{\text{max}} \) status, which the proposals in this paper seem to confirm. Word order suggests that SC clitics occupy Spec-WP, as in (9a). In addition, SC clitic pronouns can precede Neg, which under a movement analysis may indicate that they encounter no problems in bypassing Neg as intervening \( X^o \), when they raise as \( X^{\text{max}} \). This contrasts with SC auxiliaries that in negative clauses must follow Neg, which may indicate that they move as \( X^o \) and not \( X^{\text{max}} \), so cannot cross Neg. Finally, SC li is an in situ clitic in \( C^o \) (Rivero 1993b). Thus, clitic clusters with li, auxiliaries, and pronouns must be formed postsyntactically, as in the model of distributed morphology of Halle and Marantz (1993), which also allows permutations and mergers.

This analysis updates ideas in (Rivero 1986, 1992). There I argued that OSp clitics are \( X^{\text{max}} \) and adjoin to IP by a movement I called ‘topicalization’, which probably resembles scrambling. More recently, Halpern and Fontana (1993) also adopt the view that OSp clitics are \( X^{\text{max}} \). My new proposal with OSp clitics in Spec-of-WP captures both the maximal and ‘adjunct’ nature of my early analysis, since the distinction between specifiers and adjuncts is obliterated in Kayne’s system (1994). In previous work, I did not contemplate that OSp clitics could receive a double analysis, which does not depend as much on the \( X^{\text{max}} \) vs. \( X^o \) distinction, as on the surface location of clitics in the clause. Halpern and Fontana (1993) and Fontana (1993) also see OSp clitics as homogeneous, so the new distinction I make here concerns their proposals as well.

The dichotomy I propose differs from the division between \( X^{\text{max}} \) and \( X^o \) clitics in (Halpern and Fontana 1993). For them, the equivalent of my C-oriented clitics must necessarily be \( X^{\text{max}} \), so in a Spec-position, while I envision C-oriented clitics that are \( X^o \)s and head WP. In addition, Halpern and Fontana propose that \( V + CL \) order necessarily results from clitics that are \( C \)-oriented, while I argue later that this order can arise with different types of clitics, irrespective of \( C \)- and \( I \)-orientation, and \( X^{\text{max}} \) or \( X^o \) status. As suggested in fn. 2, the \( X^{\text{max}} / X^o \) distinction for CL appears tangential, since one and the same clitic may show a double behavior. In my view, the crucial issue seems to be the relative height where clitics surface in the clause.

Under this analysis, several differences emerge between the WP in the text and parallel projections for clitics in the literature, and I mention a few of them. Cardinaletti and Roberts (1991) consider their AgrP1 part of a recursive AgrP; the WP in the text is not in a recursive AgrP, since NegP stands between the two, and is not part of the V-system (in
this, it differs from Rouveret’s WP as well). In addition, Cardinaletti and Robert’s AgrP1 participates in Nominative assignment, while WP resembles the AgrcP projection proposed by Shlonsky (1994), and need not. WP may be the site of 2P-particles in Ancient Greek (Rivero and Terzi 1995); this differs from Cardinaletti and Roberts and Shlonsky since their projections always make reference to Agr. The use of WP for clitic pronouns and discourse particles can be unified using Uriagereka’s views on his FP (1995); roughly, he proposes that clitics as old/specific information move to FP, because this slot encodes point of view, an idea resembling informational approaches like Renzi’s (most recently 1989). In my approach Ancient Greek particles encode point of view, and are in Spec-WP (=FP), while the head of this projection may attract the ancient Greek pronouns as old information. In OSp, W is available, but clitics may move not only there, but also to the I-oriented position, in contrast with both Uriagereka and Rouveret. Perhaps this is because C-structure encodes illocutionary force and point of view, and I-structure tense and modality, so when clitics are scoped out of the VP, they can be attracted to either structure. WP is different and independent from Culicover’s PolP (1991) and Laka’s ΣP for Neg (1990); as seen in the text, WP is above NegP. Finally, WP is not to be confused with the Modal Phrase (MP) in (Rivero 1994a [1988]) for Balkan languages: MP stands below NegP. It seems reasonable to assume that these different functional phrases are projected in view of positive evidence. On this view, B projects CP, NegP, MP, and TMP, but not WP. In SC, there is evidence for CP, WP, NegP, but not MP or TMP. In OSp, the status of MP is unclear, but there is positive evidence for CP, WP, NegP and TMP, but WP and TMP are not projected in the same clause.

7. The OSp patterns in section 2 are not unusual, but problematic for the idea in Fontana (1993) that OSp, like Yiddish, is a symmetric V2-language, with V2 in main and embedded clauses. In this analysis, V2 means that the inflected V is in I, with Spec-IP holding any type of constituent. Examples making this hypothesis untenable for non-root clauses include if-clauses with V-final order, cases of two XPs standing between C and V, and all negative sentences, since OSp no heads its own X_{max}, as argued in this paper. This type of ‘V2’ must involve (a) V-to-I in an IP complementing NegP, (b) multiple X_{max} adjunctions to either IP or NegP, (c) the X_{max} for the C-oriented clitic, and (d) the C-layer.

As to root clauses, I have argued elsewhere (Rivero 1993a) that OSp does not have the ‘V2’-characteristics resulting from the obligatory V-to-C of German wh-questions and topicalizations. Here, I differ from Benincà (most recently, 1995), who does not discuss OSp, but suggests that medieval Romance languages are all V2. The reasons to conclude that OSp is not of this type of V2 are: (a) V1 is frequent, and null subjects unrestricted, (b) V need not raise past I, so is not always second within CP, as argued in 3 here, (c) if the Long Head Movement construction like Dar te he ‘I will give you’ has the non-finite V in C, C cannot be reserved for finite items, and (d) if V+ CL order results from finite V-to-C (but see section 4), this fronting has a last resort and altruistic nature absent in Germanic V2. SC and B are not V2 languages, and share with OSp characteristics (a) through (d); I will exemplify some of them in passing in section 3.
8. Earlier (Rivero 1992), I analyzed (24) through multiple adjunctions /scramblings to IP or NegP. However, under such an analysis these patterns should be as frequent as the C - CL- XP alternatives, but they are not. The new analysis captures Chenery’s idea (1905) that (24) departs from what is the norm in OSp interpolation, or the situation identical to SC. In (24), the clitic could raise from TM₀ to W₀ by X₀-movement. This resembles the clitic movement from I₀ to C₀, with right-adjunction to C₀, for all interpolated clitics in Wanner (1992a:352). My analysis captures the third position of clitics non-adjacent to V; OSp 2P clitics are in Spec-WP, like in SC.

A restricted Interpolation of type (24), only with Neg, is also found in contemporary northern dialects of European Portuguese (Rouveret 1992: 110):

(i) Se a memória me não falha ...
‘If my memory does not fail me ...’

9. As discussed by Haegeman (1992: 63ff), the West Flemish focus marker tet follows subject clitic pronouns, as in (i):

(i) da-me tet wunder die boeken gekocht een
that-we FOC we those books bought have
‘that we have bought those books’

This order could suggest that clitic me is in Spec-WP while tet heads W, filling one of the logical possibilities of the C-system I discuss. For Shlonsky (1994), however, the equivalent of my W is headed by an Agr₀ that raises to C₀ and produces the agreeing complementizer effect; under this analysis, WP cannot be headed by tet, so is not the focus phrase in West Flemish.


11. For Kayne (1989, 1994), clitics cannot adjoin to traces. If the clitic is in TM₀, and V is in I₀, V-raising past the clitic is unproblematic ; if V and clitic are adjoined to the same X₀, V-raising without the clitic is problematic from Kayne’s perspective.

12. Under this approach, (i) from (Rivero 1986: (46a)) has a NP containing a universal quantifier, but which functions as a definite description; alternatively, this NP is not left-dislocated, strictly speaking:

(i) Todas las animalias, ellas se gobiernan que no an mester que
all the animals they themselves govern that not have need that
ninguno ge-lo aparege. Luc 318
no.one them-it organize
‘All the animals, they govern themselves in a way that they need no organizer.’

13. A third case appears to be Czech. This language has Spec-WP clitics; however, as Toman (1993: 113) points out, ‘the first constituent of the clause can under certain conditions be truncated, leaving the clitic in the clause initial position’, as in Se uvidi vs. To se uvidi ‘One will see.’ Truncation is restricted to two or three lexical items.
14. By contrast, reformulating his earlier proposals, Roberts (1994) derives 2P effects from a Spec-Head configuration, and assumes the existence of an AgrcP as part of the C-system and above CP, where the required agreement relation can be established. For Roberts, an additional projection like WP in the text complements C and holds clitics.

15. Wilder and Cavar (1994) offer an important discussion of the last recourse nature of this V-movement, which, as they show, is a challenging process for the minimalist program. In their view, Vs necessarily raise to C by LF to check features; for instance, finite Vs must check the finite feature in C. In the enclisis case at hand, V raises early to license the clitic and not to satisfy its own needs, but it lands in the target required by LF. Wilder and Cavar consider this early altruism, minimally departing from the principle of Greed, as in Chomsky (1993). For Rivero (1994b) and Rivero and Terzi (1995), C in languages like SC does not hold specific features, and all Vs, including non-finite imperatives, may raise overtly to C in order to license clitics. As Rivero and Terzi argue, under this approach, V-raising is an instance of what Lasnik (1993: 12ff) terms ‘enlightened self-interest’: roughly, a category A raises to satisfy the requirements of B as associate; this position is coherent with the view that Vs may move just to M in B. In modern Spanish, clitics must follow imperative Vs: cantadlo ‘Sing it!’ (Rooryck 1992 for recent discussion). In OSp, however, clitics in imperatives distribute like in other root clauses, motivating Rivero and Terzi’s approach:

(i)  E quando demandáredes consejo a Dios, mucho orgullosamente.  
and when you ask advice to God, very proudly
ge-lo demandat.  
to.him-it ask.Imp.2pl
‘And when you ask God for advice, ask him very proudly.’

16 Similar phenomena may exist in some varieties of Serbian. For D. Kudra, from northern Bosnia, li is for main clauses, and dali is for main and embedded clauses; thus, the situation reported for B embedded clauses is excluded for her. However, a Zagreb speaker Kudra questioned on my behalf considered sentences similar to (68b) grammatical, suggesting a geographical difference.
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