V2 AND ENCLUSIS: 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 enclusis 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 Finº is a phase-head that parametrically bears distinct types of features. We contend that Finº bearing [+D, +V] and [EF] – i.e., an “edge feature,” accounts for Germanic V2, with enclusis in Western Iberian arising as a result of Finº 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 ENCLUSIS: V2 (1) and enclusis (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 had3SG Galaad great joy “Galahad took great pleasure in this news.” [Old French]
2. Tomol consigo por compannero [*Lo tomo] took3SG-himCLwith-him for companion “He took him with as his companion.” [Old Spanish]

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

3. Modern Scandinavian (Norwegian) (4) Modern Asturian
   a. Det regner i dag. it rains in day a. Tëoles tayaes. [*Les teo] have1SG-themCLcut “I have them cut.”
   “It’s raining today.”
   “It’s raining today.”

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. Enclusis 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 enclusis 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 enclusis in subordinate contexts, a syntactic construction attested in Asturian, as we show below.

OUR ANALYSIS: Assuming a Cº-decomposition in (5) along the lines of Rizzi (1997), we argue that Finº is responsible for both V2 and enclusis in Germanic and Romance languages as in (6).

(5) [ForceP Forceº [Topicº Topicº [Focusº Focusº [Finitenessº Finitenessº [TP …]]]]]
(6)  Feature composition of Finº
   a. Finº [+D, +V, EF] (Germanic)  b. Finº [EF] (Western Iberian Romance)

The feature composition of Finº 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. Enclusis/proclisis in Western Iberian arises as a result of (6b), with [EF] requiring the displacement of an element to Finº, 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 Finº.

(7) V2 – cf. (3): [Finº Finº [+D, +V, EF] [TP]]
(8) Enclisis/proclisis alternations – cf. (4):
  a. Enclisis: \([\text{Fin}^\text{EF}] [\text{TP} \langle \text{les} \rangle \text{teo}] > [\text{Fin}^\text{EF}] [\text{te} \langle \text{les} \rangle \text{teo}]\)
  b. Proclisis: \([\text{Fin}^\text{EF}] [\text{TP} \langle \text{te} \rangle \text{atroves cómo}] > [\text{Fin}^\text{EF}] [\text{TP} \langle \text{te} \rangle \text{atroves cómo}]\)

We will further argue that \(\text{Fin}^\text{EF}\) in Old Romance (OR) had both [+D] and [+V] in addition to \([\text{EF}]\), but that the majority of the OR languages lost these in the transition into the modern languages. Western Iberian languages, however, retained the \([\text{EF}]\) 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 regnered. [at det regner i dag] [Norwegian]
  he said that in day rains it
  “He said that it is raining today.”

(10) Digo que ayúda me [que me ayuda] [Asturian]
  say[S]g that-help[SG,IND,MECL]
  “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 \(\text{Fin}^\text{EF}\) licenses this phase-head’s features and blocks further operations triggering V2 and enclisis. In turn, a complementizer in \(\text{Force}^\text{EF}\) does not license the features of \(\text{Fin}^\text{EF}\) 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 \(\text{Fin}^\text{EF}\) as a phase-head had suffered from erosion and are no longer attested in those modern languages that no longer exhibit V2 or enclisis.