

## V2 AND ENCLISIS: A UNIFORM ANALYSIS FOR GERMANIC AND (SOME) ROMANCE VARIETIES

**GOAL:** The goal of this paper is to provide a uniform analysis of two previously unrelated phenomena in the generative tradition, namely V2 in Germanic and enclisis in Western Iberian Romance languages. We argue, building on Roberts (2012), that these pervasive and persistent syntactic properties can be accounted for uniformly assuming that  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  is a phase-head that parametrically bears distinct types of features. We contend that  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  bearing [+D, +V] and [EF] – i.e., an “edge feature,” accounts for Germanic V2, with enclisis in Western Iberian arising as a result of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  instantiating exclusively [EF]. Our proposal accounts uniformly for these two phenomena and opens a new venue to account for the presence and loss of these structures in previous stages of Romance languages that no longer exhibit these constructions.

**BACKGROUND ON HISTORICAL V2 AND ENCLISIS:** V2 (1) and enclisis (2) are attested in previous stages of Romance that no longer exhibit these syntactic structures.

(1) De ceste novele ot Galaaz grant joie  
of this news had<sub>3SG</sub> Galahad great joy  
“Galahad took great pleasure in this news.” [Old French]

(2) Tomol consigo por compannero [\*Lo tomo]  
took<sub>3SG</sub>-him<sub>CL</sub>with-him for companion  
“He took him with him as his companion.” [Old Spanish]

**MODERN V2 AND ENCLISIS:** Modern Germanic languages (3) and Western Iberian (Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese) (4) still exhibit V2 and enclisis features respectively.

(3) <i>Modern Scandinavian (Norwegian)</i>	(4) <i>Modern Asturian</i>
a. Det regner i dag. it rains in day “It’s raining today.”	a. Téoles tayaes. [*Les teo] have <sub>1SG</sub> -them <sub>CL</sub> cut “I have them cut.”
b. I dag regner det. [*I dag det regner] in day rains it “It’s raining today.”	b. Cómo t’atreves? [*Cómo atréveste] how refl <sub>CL</sub> -dare <sub>3SG</sub> “How dare you?”

The predominant analysis for V2 in Germanic is that it involves V movement to a head in the left periphery (den Besten 1983, Schwarz & Vikner 1996, Holmberg to appear) followed by the obligatory movement of a +D element to its specifier position. Enclisis is traditionally analyzed as a phonological phenomenon (see Rivero 1986, Fontana 1993, Barbosa 1995, 2000): Clitics require a phonological host to their left, in the absence of which last-resort verb-movement is triggered and enclisis obtains. According to these proposals, the phonological enclitic property of clitics is lost in modern stages of these languages, which explains the generalized proclisis. However, this analysis predicts incorrectly the unavailability of enclisis in subordinate contexts, a syntactic construction attested in Asturian, as we show below.

**OUR ANALYSIS:** Assuming a  $\text{C}^\circ$ -decomposition in (5) along the lines of Rizzi (1997), we argue that  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  is responsible for both V2 and enclisis in Germanic and Romance languages as in (6).

(5) [<sub>ForceP</sub> Force<sup>o</sup> [<sub>TopicP</sub> Topic<sup>o</sup> [<sub>FocusP</sub> Focus<sup>o</sup> [<sub>FinitenessP</sub> Finiteness<sup>o</sup> [TP ...]]]]]]

(6) Feature composition of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$

a.  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  [+D, +V, EF] (Germanic)

b.  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  [EF] (Western Iberian Romance)

The feature composition of  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  in Germanic languages in (6a) requires that both a nominal and a verbal element target that projection, movements that in turn trivially satisfy the [EF] we propose. Enclisis/proclisis in Western Iberian arises as a result of (6b), with [EF] requiring the displacement of an element to  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ , satisfied either by an element undergoing A’-movement to the left-periphery of the clause or by last-resort movement of the closest head to  $\text{Fin}^\circ$ .

(7) V2 – cf. (3): [<sub>FinP</sub>  $\text{Fin}^\circ$  [+D, +V, EF] [TP]]

- (8) Enclisis/proclisis alternations – cf. (4):  
 a. Enclisis: [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin<sup>o</sup><sub>[EF]</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> **les** teo]] > [<sub>FinP</sub> [téoles Fin<sup>o</sup><sub>[EF]</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> **les** teo]]]  
 b. Proclisis: [<sub>FinP</sub> Fin<sup>o</sup><sub>[EF]</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> **te** atreves cómo]] > [<sub>FinP</sub> cómo [Fin<sup>o</sup><sub>[EF]</sub> [<sub>TP</sub> te atreves **eómo**]]]

We will further argue that Fin<sup>o</sup> in Old Romance (OR) had both [+D] and [+V] in addition to [EF], but that the majority of the OR languages lost these in the transition into the modern languages. Western Iberian languages, however, retained the [EF] feature, which explains the enclitic/proclitic patterns we still find in this group of languages.

**FURTHER EVIDENCE.** V2 and enclisis also attested in subordinate environments (see Julien 2007, 2009, Truckenbrodt 2006 for Germanic; and Fernández-Rubiera 2009, and Viejo 2009 for Asturian, and Salvesen & Walkden (ms) for a comparison of Old English and Old French). Phonological approaches fail to account for the availability of enclisis in this environment: the complementizer may act as a host and this explains the proclitic pattern, but the attested enclitic pattern is incorrectly ruled out and unaccounted for.

- (9) Han sa at i dag regnerdet. [at det regner i dag] [Norwegian]  
 he said that in day rains it  
 “He said that it is raining today.”

- (10) Digo qu’ayúdame [que me ayuda] [Asturian]  
 say<sub>1SG</sub> that-help<sub>3SG-IND-meCL</sub>  
 “I say that s/he helps me.”

Our proposal also accounts for these data uniformly: If complementizers may instantiate different heads in the left-periphery (see Demonte and Fernández Soriano 2009 for Spanish, Ledgeway 2005, 2012 for Old Romance, Salvesen 2014 for French), a complementizer in Fin<sup>o</sup> licenses this phase-head’s features and blocks further operations triggering V2 and enclisis. In turn, a complementizer in Force<sup>o</sup> does not license the features of Fin<sup>o</sup> and consequently, the same operations that give rise to V2 and enclisis/proclisis alternations are triggered.

**HISTORICAL DATA.** Our proposal opens a new line of inquiry. We hypothesize that the features attributed to Fin<sup>o</sup> as a phase-head had suffered from erosion and are no longer attested in those modern languages that no longer exhibit V2 or enclisis.

**REFERENCES:** Barbosa, P. (1995). *Null Subjects*. Department of Linguistics, MIT: PhD dissertation. • Barbosa, P. (2000). “Clitics: A Window into the Null Subject Property,” in *Portuguese Syntax: New Comparative Studies*, João Costa (ed.), 31-93. New York: Oxford University Press. • den Besten, H. (1983). “On the Interaction of Root Transformations and Lexical Deletive Rules,” in *On the Formal Syntax of Westgermania*, W. Abraham (ed.), 47-131. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. • Demonte, V, and Fernández Soriano, O. (2009). “Force and Finiteness in the Spanish Complementizer System,” *Probus* 21(1): 23-49. • Fernández-Rubiera, F. J. (2009). *Clitics at the Edge: Clitic Placement in Western Iberian Romance Languages*. Department of Spanish and Portuguese, Georgetown University: PhD dissertation. • Fontana, J. (1993). *Phrase structure and the syntax of clitics in the history of Spanish*. Department of Linguistics, University of Pennsylvania: PhD dissertation. • Holmberg, Anders (to appear). “Verb second,” in Tibor Kiss and Artemis Alexiadou (eds), *Syntax: an international handbook of contemporary research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter. • Julien, M. (2007). “Embedded V2 in Norwegian and Swedish,” in *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 80: 103-161. • Julien, M. (2009). “Embedded clauses with main clause word order in Mainland Scandinavian.” <http://ling.auf.net/lingBuzz/000475>. • Ledgeway, Adam (2005). “Moving through the left periphery: the dual complementiser system in the dialects of Southern Italy,” in *Transactions of the Philological Society* 103, 336–396. • Ledgeway, Adam (2012). *From Latin to Romance: Morphosyntactic Typology and Change*, Oxford, Oxford University Press. • Rizzi, L. (1997). “The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery,” in *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, Liliane Haegeman (ed.), 281-337. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. • Roberts, Ian (2012). “On the nature of syntactic parameters: a programme of research,” in C. Galves et. al. (eds.), *Parameter Theory and Linguistic Change*, 319-334. Oxford: OUP. • Salvesen, Christine Meklenborg (2014). “Le complémentateur *que* et la périphérie gauche. Analyse diachronique,” in *Syntaxe et Sémantique* 15, 47–80. • Salvesen, Christine Meklenborg & George Walkden.(ms.) Diagnosing embedded V2 in Old French and Old English. • Schwartz, Bonnie D., and Sten Vikner (1989). ‘All verb second clauses are CPs’, *Working Papers in Scandinavian Syntax* 43, 27–49. • Truckenbrodt, H. (2006). “On the Semantic Motivation of Syntactic Verb Movement to C<sup>o</sup> in German”, *Theoretical Linguistics* 32(3): 257-306. • Viejo Fernández, X. (2008). *Pensar asturiano. Ensayos programáticos de sintaxis asturiana*. Uviéu: Ed. Trabe.