V2 and enclisis: a uniform analysis for Germanic and (some) Romance varieties
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V2 in Germanic

(1)  V2-structures

a.  *Det regner i dag.*
    it rains in day
    “It’s raining today.”

b.  *I dag regner det.* [*I dag det regner]*
    in day rains it
    “It’s raining today.”
    [Norwegian]
Enclitic structures in Western Iberian Romance languages
(Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese)

(2) **Enclitic structures**

a. \[ Téo=les tayaes. \] [*Les teo]  
   have1SG=them.CL cut  
   “I have them cut.”

b. \[ Fízo=me dañu. \] [*Me fizo]  
   made.3SG=me.CL pain  
   “S/he / It hurt me.”
   [Asturian]
(3) **Purpose:** provide a uniform treatment and analysis to account for these two previously unrelated phenomena: V2 in Germanic and enclisis in Western Iberian Romance (WIR) languages.

(4) **Ultimate goal:** tie together V2 in Germanic and enclisis in WIR by showing how enclisis in WIR is linked to the V2 configuration in Old Romance.
Purpose of talk and research project

(5) Parametric difference for Fin⁰ as a phase-head:

a. Germanic and Old Romance $\rightarrow$ [Finiteness⁰ [±V, EF]]

b. Western Iberian $\rightarrow$ [Finiteness⁰ [EF]]
(6)  

a. *Jeg liker det ikke*.
   
   I like it not
   “I don’t like it.”

b. *Det liker jeg ikke*.
   
   it like I not
   “I don’t like it.”

   [Norwegian]
(7) De ceste novele ot Galaaz grant joie.
of this news had.3SG Galahad great joy
“Galahad took great pleasure in this news.”
   [O.Fr., Graal, III 51]

(8) Motas outras consolacions li=fes le Senhers.
many other consolations her.CL=make the lord
“The Lord made her many other consolations.”
   [O.Occ; Wolfe (2014)]
V2 in Old Romance

(9) *Este logar mostro dios a Abraam.*
this place showed God to Abraham
“God showed Abraham this place.”

[O.Sp.; Fontana 1993:64, cit. by Benincà (2006)]

(10) *Con tanta paceença sofría ela esta enfermidade.*
with so-much patience suffered she this disease
“She suffered this disease so patiently.”

[O.Port.; Ribeiro 1995:114, cit. by Benincà (2006)]
Enclisis in WIR

(11) \( Téo=les \text{ tayaes.} \) [*Les teo]  
    have.1SG-them.CL cut  
    “I have them cut.”  
    [Asturian]

(12) \( Cómo t’atreves? \) [*Cómo atréves=te]  
    how refl.CL-dare.3SG  
    “How dare you?”  
    [Asturian]

(13) \( Tomo=l \text{ consigo por compannero.} \) [*Lo tomo]  
    took.3SG=him.CL with-him for companion  
    “He took him with him as his companion.”  
    [Old Spanish: ✓ / Modern Spanish: *]
The V2 requirement

(14) The V2 property is made up of the two components:

   a. A functional head in the left periphery attracts the finite verb.

   b. This functional head wants a constituent moved to its specifier position. (Holmberg, 2015)

This requirement may be reformulated:

(15) The feature composition of Finiteness° in Germanic and Old Romance > [Finiteness° [+V, EF]]
Enclisis

(16) The feature composition of Finiteness\(^o\) in Western Iberian
> [Finiteness\(^o\) [EF]]

(17) Two types of evidence to depart from phonological approaches to account for enclisis:

a. Undergeneration: Incorrectly predict ungrammaticality of enclisis in finite subordinate environments.

b. Provide a uniform treatment of V2 and enclisis.
(18) \[
  \text{[ForceP [Force}^\circ \text{ [TopicP [Topic}^\circ \text{ [FocusP [Focus}^\circ \text{ [FinitenessP [Finiteness}^\circ \text{ [TP [T}^\circ \cdots \text{ ]]]]]]]]]]]]
\]

(14) The feature composition of Finiteness$^\circ$:

a. Germanic and Old Romance $> [\text{Finiteness}^\circ [+V, EF]]$

b. Western Iberian $> [\text{Finiteness}^\circ [EF]]$
Fin° and V2

(19) a. *Jeg liker det.*
   I like it
   “I like it.”

   [Norwegian]

b. *Det liker jeg.*
   it like I
   “I like it.”

   [Norwegian]

(20) **Subject initial:**

   \[
   \text{[Fin}° \ [EF] \ [+\text{V}] \ [TP \ jeg \ [TP \ liker \ (...) \ det]]] \]

   \[\rightarrow \ \text{[FinP \ jeg \ [Fin}° \ liker \ [EF] \ [+\text{V}] \ [TP \ jeg \ liker \ (...) \ det]]} \]

(21) **Object initial:**

   \[
   \text{[Fin}° \ [EF] \ [+\text{V}] \ [TP \ jeg \ [TP \ liker \ (...) \ det]]] \]

   \[\rightarrow \ \text{[FinP \ det \ [Fin}° \ liker \ [EF] \ [+\text{V}] \ [TP \ jeg \ liker \ (...) \ det]]} \]
Finº and clisis

(11)  $Téo=les$ tayaes. [*Les teo]  
have.1SG-them.CL cut  
“I have them cut.”  

(12)  $Cómo t'atreves?$ [*Cómo atréves=te]  
how refl.CL-dare.3SG  
“How dare you?”  

(22)  **Enclisis:**  
$[\text{Finº}]\ [\text{EF}]\ [\text{Clº}\ \text{les}\ [\text{TP}\ [\text{Tº}\ \text{teo}]])$  
$\rightarrow [\text{Finº}\ \text{téo=les}\ [\text{EF}]\ [\text{Clº}\ \text{les}\ [\text{TP}\ [\text{Tº}\ \text{tee}])]$  

(23)  **Proclisis:**  
$[\text{Finº}]\ [\text{EF}]\ [\text{Clº}\ \text{te}\ [\text{TP}\ \text{atreves cómo}]$  
$\rightarrow [\text{FinP}\ \text{cómo}\ [\text{Finº}]\ [\text{EF}]\ [\text{Clº}\ \text{te}\ [\text{TP}\ \text{atreves cómeo}]]$
Further evidence

(24)  Further evidence

a. Subordinate V2 and enclitic structures in Scandinavian and Western Iberian

b. V3 in both Old Romance and Western Iberian
Embedded V2 and enclisis

(25) *Han sa at i dag regner det.* [at det regner i dag]
    He said that it is raining today.
    “He said that it is raining today.” [Norwegian]

(26) *Digo qu’ ayúda=me.* [que me ayuda]
    say.1SG that help.3SG-IND=me.CL
    “I say that s/he helps me.” [Asturian]
Embedded V2 and enclisis

(27) Phonological approaches: enclisis in (26) incorrectly ruled out and unaccounted for.
Embedded V2 and enclisis

Embedded V2 and enclisis (recap)

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

(26) *Digo qu’ ayúda=me.* [que me ayuda]
say.1SG that help.3SG-IND=me.CL
“I say that s/he helps me.” [Asturian]

(5) The feature composition of Finiteness°:

a. Germanic > [Finiteness° [+V, EF]]
b. Western Iberian > [Finiteness° [EF]]
Embedded V2 and enclisis (recap)

(29) **Embedded V2**

\[ \text{han sa} \ [\text{Force}^o \ \text{at} \ [\text{Fin}^o \ [+V] \ [EF] \ [TP \ \text{det} \ \text{regner} \ (\ldots) \ i \ \text{dag}]]]] \]

\[ \rightarrow \ [\text{Force}^o \ \text{at} \ [\text{FinP} \ i \ \text{dag} \ [\text{Fin}^o \ [+V] \ [EF] \ \text{regner} \ [TP \ \text{det} \ [T^o \ \text{regner} \ (\ldots) \ i \ \text{dag} ]]]]] \]

(30) **Enclisis in subordinate contexts**

\[ \text{digo} \ [\text{Force}^o \ \text{que} \ [\text{Fin}^o \ [EF] \ [Cl^o \ \text{me} \ [TP \ [T^o \ \text{ayuda}]]]]]] \]

\[ \rightarrow \ [\text{ForceP} \ \text{que} \ [\text{Force}^o \ [\text{FinP} \ [\text{Fin}^o[EF] \ \text{ayuda} \ [Cl^o \ \text{me} \ [TP \ [T^o \ \text{ayuda}]]]]]]] \]
Embedded non-V2 and proclisis

(31)  

a. *Jeg beklager at det ble sånn denne gangen.
   I regret that it became so this time
   “I regret that it turned out this way this time.”

b. *?Jeg beklager at denne gangen ble det sånn.
   [Norwegian]

The finite verb may not move to the left of the negation.

(32)  

a. *Jeg beklager at han ikke har (*ikke) kommet.
   I regret that he has NOT come
   “I regret that he hasn’t come.” [Norwegian]

(33)  

jeg beklager [Fin at [EF] [TP det [To ble (...)]]]
Proclisis in subordinate contexts

(34)  *Digo* *que* *me* *ayuda*

say.1SG that me.CL help.3SG-IND

“I say that s/he helps me”

[Asturian]

(35)  *digo* [*Fin° que* [*EF* [*Cl° me* [*TP [*To ayuda]*]]]]
I don’t know why they sell these book so expensively”

[Norwegian]
In Germanic the LD topic must be immediately followed by its anaphor. (Salvesen, 2013)
(38) *Bilen deres er helt ny.*

Their car is brand new  

[Norwegian]

(39) *Naboene; er opptatt av bilen sin; /deres*

The neighbours' care about their car.  

[Norwegian]
Norwegian possessives

(40) \[[\textit{Bilen sin}_i \quad (/^{*}\textit{deres}_i), \textit{den er alle}_i \textit{opptatt} \quad \textit{av}}

car their their it is all concerned about
\[/ \textit{bilen-sin}_i\]

“Everybody cares about their car.” \[\text{[Norwegian]}\]
LD Topics in Romance

(41) In Romance the LD topic does not have to be immediately followed by its anaphor. (Salvesen, 2013)
(42) [Cest chevalier], je ne l’aim pas
this knight I NEG him love NEG
“I don’t love this knight.”
[Old French]

(43) [Madonna per cui stava tuttavia in allegranza],
my.lady for whom was.1SG always in happiness
or no la veggio né notte né dia.
now NEG her see.1SG NEG night NEG day
“Now I no longer see mylady, who used to cause me such
happiness.”

Old Sicilian, from Benincà (2006)
Topics in Western Iberian

(44) *Tou empleáu recibió la su nómina*
    all employee received the his paycheck
    ‘all employees received their paycheck’
    [Bound reading:* Referential reading: ✓]

(45) *La su nómina, tou empleáu la recibió*
    the his paycheck all employee it.CL received
    ‘all employees received their paycheck’
    [Bound reading:* Referential reading: ✓]

(46) *La su nómina recibió tou empleáu (, y non el*
    the his paycheck recieved all employee ( and not the
    *despidu)*
    sack-compensation)
    ‘all employees received their paycheck (and not the sack-
    compensation)’
    [Bound reading: ✓ Referential reading: ✓]
Topics in Western Iberian do not exhibit reconstruction.

For direct objects, a clitic must be present in the structure if the dislocated element is a Topic ((48) vs. (49)).

Topics trigger enclisis ((47) and (48)), whereas Focus constituents trigger proclisis ((49)).
(47)  $El \ bancu \ dio=y \ el \ créditu$  
The bank gave-him/her.CL the loan
“ The bank gave him/her the loan.”

(48)  $El \ créditu, \ dió=y=lu \ el \ bancu$  
The loan gave=him/her.CL=it.CL the bank
“ The bank gave him/her the loan.”

(49)  $El \ créditu=y \ dio \ el \ bancu \ (,y \ non \ la \ Mastercard)$  
The loan-him/her.CL gave the bank and not the Mastercard
“ The bank gave him/her the loan (but not the Mastercard)”
4 Topics are not sensitive to wh-islands (50), but focus constituents are (51).

(50)  \textit{Esi llibru, nun sé quién lu escribió}  
That book, not know.1SG who it.CL wrote  
“I don’t know who wrote that book.”

(51)  *\textit{Esi llibru nun sé quién escribió t (,y non}}  
That book not know.1SG who wrote and not that  
\textit{esi poema})  
poem  
“I don’t know who wrote that book (and not that poem).”
5 If a Topic is present, the clitic needs not be adjacent to the dislocated element.

(52)  

\[ \text{El crédito}, \text{nun sé} \quad \text{por qué} \]

The loan not know.1SG why want.3PL

\[ \text{quieren} \quad \text{\textit{da}y=lu} \]

give-him/her.CL-it.CL

“I don’t know why they want to give the loan to him/her.”
A uniform analysis can account for Germanic V2 and enclisis/proclisis in Western Iberian in terms of Finiteness° being parametrised as follows:

- Germanic V2: \([EF] + [+V]\)
- Western Iberian: \([EF]\)
Evolving from a medieval V2 language, Modern Western Iberian has undergone a process of feature erosion, whereby only the Edge Feature has survived, which is responsible for the clitic placement alternations observed.

This unified analysis also captures the embedded V2 and enclitic structures that Germanic and Western Iberian may exhibit: If the matrix predicate selects Force°, Fin°’s features need to be satisfied and trigger the same mechanism.
Conclusion

- Topics in the Germanic languages are moved to their final position, whereas topics in Romance are base generated in the left periphery.
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