

Bouzouita, Miriam (2008) 'At the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface: Clitics in the History of Spanish', In: *Language in Flux: Dialogue Coordination, Language Variation, Change and Evolution*, Cooper, Robin & Ruth Kempson (eds), London: College Publications, 221-263.

At the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface: Clitics in the History of Spanish

MIRIAM BOUZOUITA

1 Introduction

This paper¹ tries to contribute to a better understanding of the diachronic changes in clitic placement with respect to the finite verb in the history of Spanish (13th - 20th c.).² Additionally, it uses this clitic account as a case study to argue that it is essential for a grammar formalism to consider (i) the interdependency of syntax, semantics and pragmatics, and (ii) the time-linear processing aspect of parsing and production in order to obtain a better understanding of language change. The framework chosen for this study is the Dynamic Syntax grammar formalism (DS; [Kempson *et al.*, 2001; Cann *et al.*, 2005]), in which syntax is seen as the progressive construction of semantic representations, following the dynamics of parsing, hence a left-to-right process.

Firstly, I examine in detail clitic placement with respect to the finite verb for various stages in the diachronic development of object clitics: namely, for Medieval (13th -14th c.), Renaissance (16th c.) and Modern Spanish (20th c.). Secondly, synchronic accounts are presented within the DS framework for each of these periods. The diachronic changes are then set out in order to outline the progressive shift from a clitic system with a pragmatic basis to one in which the position of the clitic pronoun is determined by the verbal mood which the clitic appears with. Medieval Spanish (MedSp) presents a notoriously complex set of clitic patterns. What I shall show is that, in this stage of the evolving Spanish system, it is the process whereby semantic content is constructed for the left-peripheral constituents that affects the syntactic positioning of these weak pronouns in finite verb clauses. Furthermore, I

¹This paper reports preliminary results from my doctoral research. I would like to thank Ruth Kempson, Ronnie Cann, Lutz Marten, Eleni Gregoromichelaki, Stergios Chatzikyriakidis and Jieun Kiaer for helpful input at various stages, Concepción Company for providing me with an electronic version of her corpus (*DLNE*) and Andrés Enrique Arias for giving me access to the facsimile of *Faz.*. Further, I would like to acknowledge the financial support provided by the Arts and Humanities Research Council, the School of Humanities of King's College London and the Mexican Secretaría de Relaciones Exteriores. Normal disclaimers apply.

²I will use throughout this paper the labels clitic and weak pronoun as pre-theoretical notions. The terms proclisis and enclisis are used to denote preverbal and postverbal placement respectively.

shall show that the availability of more than one strategy, which is endemic to parsing, provides a basis for explaining syntactic intra-speaker variation between pro and enclisis within one environment. I shall go on from there to argue that what had initially been a pragmatic basis for MedSp clitic placement became lexically encoded for the clitics due to a routinisation process ([Pickering and Garrod, 2004]), thereafter side-stepping any such pragmatic reasoning. Once this was in place, a production/parsing mismatch between speakers could arise, due to the availability of a number of strategies. The immediate consequence of any such mismatch on the hearer's part with respect to the processing of the clitic would have to involve some reanalysis of the lexical entry of the clitic whose preverbal placement thereby became interpreted as unrestricted, lacking the limitations of the former system. The result is a spread of proclitics in Renaissance Spanish (RenSp) across those environments that previously allowed only postverbal clitics. A second reanalysis subsequently takes place as enclitics became increasingly associated with imperatives, resulting eventually in the Modern Spanish system (ModSp) in which the position of the clitic is determined by the mood of the accompanying verb.

2 Clitic Placement in Medieval Spanish

To illustrate the extent of the syntactic variation found in the MedSp clitic system, I shall first briefly sketch some of its main characteristics. MedSp clitics occur in a complex disjunction of environments and in two discrete positions, preverbal (but not necessarily immediately adjacent to the verb, allowing a phenomenon known as 'interpolation') and immediately postverbal:³

- (1) Que **te** *dixo* *Heliseus?*
 what CL said.3SG Heliseus
 'What did Heliseus tell you?' (*Faz.*: 134)
- (2) Oyol *Ruben*
 heard.3SG-CL Ruben
 'Ruben heard it.' (*Faz.*: 51)

Some environments fully determine which of these two positions is selected, but other environments allow variation, notably the subject position.

- (3) *e* *el conde* *respondiol* *que*
 and the count replied.3SG-CL that
 'And the count replied him that [...].' (*Luc.*: XVI)
- (4) *El conde* **le** *pregunto* *commo*
 the count CL asked.3SG how

³For visual clarity, the clitics under consideration have been highlighted in bold and are glossed as CL while the constituents preceding the weak pronouns that influence their positioning, and the interpolated items have been underlined and bracketed respectively.

‘The count asked him how [...]’ (*Luc.*: V)

Unlike in ModSp, there seems to be a restriction precluding sentence-initial clitic pronouns, the so-called Tobler-Mussafia Law. Moreover, unlike in Classical Latin or Ancient Greek, Spanish interpolation can only occur with preverbal clitics:⁴

- (5) *Et esto que te [yo] [agora] mostrare aqui*
 and this that CL I now will-show.1SG here
 ‘And this that I will now show you here.’ (*Gen.Est.I*: 324 apud [Sánchez Lancis, 1993, p. 327])

The predominant position in main clauses is postverbal: in my corpus only 26% (647/2464) of proclisis is registered (see Table 2, section 2.3). In non-root clauses, on the other hand, the most frequently encountered clitic position is proclitic, with clitics occurring after relative pronouns, complementisers and subordinating conjunctions:⁵

- (6) *no quiero que me sirbas en balde*
 not want.1SG that CL serve.2SG in vain
 ‘I don’t want you to serve me in vain.’ (*Faz.*: 48)
- (7) *Quant le conocio Abdias*
 when CL recognised.3SG Abdias
 ‘When Abdias recognised him [...]’ (*Faz.*: 121)
- (8) *Di a fijos de Israel que prendanse unos blagos*
 tell.2SG to sons of Israel that take.3PL-CL some sticks
 ‘Tell the sons of Israel that they find themselves some sticks.’ (*Faz.*: 86)

Given this lack of variation in subordinate clause clitic placement, in what follows, I shall focus primarily on the change in root clause clitic distributions, where we shall see that an initially complex disjunctive set of environments triggering clitic placement progressively simplifies.⁶ As part of this, we shall see that clitics in imperative verb contexts in the earlier system have a very similar distribution to their non-imperative counterparts, only evolving towards a placement system based on verbal mood later on.

⁴Although I will not give analyses for this phenomenon here, I shall relate its existence and disappearance with other syntactic changes that occurred in the history of Spanish (see section 5, and [Bouzouita, 2007; Bouzouita, in preparation]).

⁵There are a few exceptions, most explicable as mimicking direct speech or as syntactic calques from Latin. For more details on variation in non-root clauses, see [Bouzouita, in preparation], [Castillo Lluch, 1996, p. 142–196] and [Granberg, 1988].

⁶It should be highlighted that this simplification is only visible at the formal level and not at the data level, considering that in RenSp, for instance, more environments show variation in comparison to ModSp.

2.1 Non-imperative Contexts

The MedSp clitic environments in root clauses can be grouped into (i) strict proclitic constructions, (ii) strict enclitic constructions and (iii) variation constructions, which license both pro- and enclisis ([Nieuwenhuijsen, 1999; Nieuwenhuijsen, 2002; Nieuwenhuijsen, 2006; Elvira, 1987] *inter alia*).

Strict Proclitic Constructions

Some constructions retained exclusive preverbal clitic placement throughout the history of Spanish, namely those in which the clitic is immediately preceded by one of the following five left-peripheral constituents:

(i) *Wh*-ELEMENT

- (9) Quien *te* *fizo* *rey?*
 who CL made.3SG king
 ‘Who made you king?’ (*Faz.*: 107)
- (10) Por que *nos* *faze* *el* *Criador* *esto?*
 why CL does.3SG the Lord this
 ‘Why does the Lord do this to us?’ (*Faz.*: 55)

(ii) NEGATION⁷

- (11) Non *los* *destroyré*
 not CL will-destroy.1SG
 ‘I will not destroy them.’ (*Faz.*: 77)
- (12) Nunca *se* *allegó* *al* *rey*
 never CL adhered.3SG to-the king
 ‘He never adhered to the king.’ (*EG*: f.57v apud [Granberg, 1988, p. 131])
- (13) & nil *prestaron* *armas* *nin* *auer*
 and nor-CL lent.3PL weapens nor good
 ‘Nor did they lend him weapons nor goods.’ (*Gen.Est.IV*, *CDE* s.v. *nil*)

(iii) NON-COREFERENTIAL COMPLEMENT NP

- (14) Tal gualardon *me* *dyo* *el* *Criador*
 such prize CL gave.3SG the Creator
 ‘Such a reward did the Lord give me.’ (*Faz.*: 102)

⁷Only [Gessner, 1893, p. 37] and [Eberenz, 2000, p. 172] report enclitic cases in negation environments. For a discussion of these examples, some of which contain transcription or scribal errors, see [Bouzouita, in preparation].

- (15) *A to linnaje la daré*
 to your lineage CL will-give.1SG
 ‘To your lineage I will give it.’ (*Faz.*: 81)

(iv) PREPOSITIONAL COMPLEMENT⁸

- (16) *e de todas vuestras ydolas vos mondaré*
 and of all your idols CL will-purify.1SG
 ‘And of all your idols I will rid you.’ (*Faz.*: 171)

(v) PREDICATIVE COMPLEMENT

- (17) *Dia [de] angunstia ed aquexadura nos es est*
 day of anguish and distress CL is.3SG this
 ‘This is a day of anguish and distress for us.’ (*Faz.*: 155)

- (18) *Huecas las faras*
 empty CL will-make.3SG
 ‘You will make them hollow.’ (*Faz.*: 82)

Strict Enclitic Constructions

On the other hand, there are some constructions that occur with enclitic pronouns in MedSp:⁹ (i) when the verb appears sentence-initially (ii) when in a paratactic root clause also with the verb in initial position, and (iii) with a contrastive coordination marker such as *pero/mas* ‘but’:

(i) VERB IN SENTENCE-INITIAL POSITION

- (19) *Enbiol Juda un cabrito*
 sent.3SG-CL Juda a little goat
 ‘Juda sent her a little goat.’ (*Faz.*: 52)

⁸Nieuwenhuijsen ([Nieuwenhuijsen, 1999, p. 56-57], [Nieuwenhuijsen, 2002, p. 362], [Nieuwenhuijsen, 2006, p. 1362-1363]) regards the prepositional complement environment as one which admits both pro- and enclisis. However, her examples, given in (i)-(ii) (personal communication), are more appropriately analysed as adjuncts, being fully optional.

- (i) *e por amor de su mugier pusol nombre Libira*
 and out-of love for his wife gave.3SG-CL name Libira
 ‘Out of love for his wife, he named her Libira.’ (*EE*:12)
- (ii) *E el rey con grand miedo acogiose a vn nauio*
 and the king with great fear took-refuge.3SG-CL to a ship
 ‘And the king, with great fear, took refuge in a ship.’ (*Hist.Troy.*: XI)

Many studies, like Nieuwenhuijsen (e.g. [Castillo Lluch, 1996], [Elvira, 1987, p. 71], [Gessner, 1893, p. 37-38]) fail to recognise the prepositional complement environment as a strictly proclitic one exactly because they don’t distinguish adverbial complements from adjuncts.

⁹See [Bouzouita, in preparation] for a list of potential counterexamples.

- (20) *Miembrat* *quando* *lidiamos* *cerça* *Valençia* *la*
 remember.3SG-CL when fought.1PL near Valencia the
grant
 great
 ‘Do you remember when we fought near the great city of Valencia?’
 (*Cid*: 3315 apud [Fontana, 1993, p. 133])

(ii) VERB IN PARATACTIC ROOT CLAUSE¹⁰

- (21) *Alli en Gaza(r) fo Sampson luengos tienpos;* *contalo* *Libre*
 there in Gaza was.3SG Samson long times tell.3SG-CL Book
Judicum
 of-the-Judges
 ‘Samson stayed there in Gaza for a long time; the Book of Judges tells
 this.’ (*Faz.*: 207)

(iii) CONTRASTIVE COORDINATION (PERO/MAS)

- (22) *nin so nombre non me dixo* *mas* *dixom*
 nor his name not CL told.3SG but told.3SG-CL
 ‘Nor did he tell me his name but he told me [...]’ (*Faz.*: 207)
- (23) *ovo muy grand pesar* *pero* *dixoles* *que*
 had.3SG very great grief but told.3SG-CL that
 ‘He had a lot of grief but he told them that [...]’ (*Luc.*: XLVI)

Variation Constructions

There is additional complexity, in virtue of there being environments in which variation between proclisis and enclisis occurs:

(i) SUBJECTS (whether pronominal or nominal)

- (24) *e ella dixogelo*
 and she told.3SG-CL-CL
 ‘And she told it to him.’ (*Faz.*: 47)

¹⁰As reported in [Bouzouita, 2007, p. 56], one counterexample was registered in my corpus, given in (iii), reproduced here as punctuated by [Lazar, 1965]:

- (iii) *murio (lo mala) [de] mala muert en Judea;* *lo comieron gusanos.*
 died.3SG of bad death in Judea; CL ate.3PL maggots
 ‘He died horribly in Judea; the maggots ate him.’ (*Faz.*: 203)

However, it may be the case that the punctuation is as follows: *murio (lo mala) [de] mala muert; en Judea lo comieron gusanos*, in which the semi-colon is placed before the PP. In this case, the pronoun position is not unusual, as we shall see when discussing adverbial environments. The facsimile of this text reveals that this alternative is indeed a valid possibility considering there is also a punctuation mark present before the PP. Accordingly, this example cannot be considered a counterexample. See [Bouzouita, in preparation] for more details.

- (25) Yo vos enbiaré
I CL will-send.1SG
'I will send you.' (*Faz.*: 67)
- (26) santo domingo fizolo
saint Dominic did.3SG-CL
'Saint Dominic did it.' (*Luc.*: XIV)
- (27) Sant Mate lo testimonia
saint Matthew CL testify.3SG
'Saint Matthew attests it.' (*Faz.*: 97)

Several authors have claimed that the variation in clitic placement in subject environments can be explained on the basis of phonological pauses, more specifically, that if there is a phonological pause between the left-peripheral subject and the verb, the clitic will appear postverbally (e.g. [Ramsden, 1963, p. 80-83], [Staaff, 1907, p. 626]). However, this explanation fails to explain the existence of proclitic examples in which the subject is followed by a relative clause or an apposition (or by the combination of the aforementioned), as in (28) and (29):

- (28) Estas bestias grandes que son .iiii. reyes se levantarán
these animals big that are.3PL four kings CL will-stand-up.3PL
'These big animals which are four kings will stand up.' (*Faz.*: 181)
- (29) El Dios de mio padre Abraam e de Ysaac, el Sennor que dixo
the God of my father Abraham and of Isaac, the Lord who said.3SG
'tornat a tu tierra o nacist' me aya merced
return.2PL to your land where born.2SG CL have.3SG mercy
'May the god of my father Abraham and of Isaac, the Lord who said
'Return to the land where you were born' have mercy on me.' (*Faz.*: 50)

Granberg ([Granberg, 1988, p. 200-213], [Granberg, 1999]) proposes a relationship between emphasis and clitic placement in subject environments: proclisis is found after emphatic subjects and enclisis is the absence of such emphasis. [Martins, 2003] more generally argues that all the variation constructions in both MedSp and Medieval Portuguese appear to be emphatic when a preverbal clitic is present and neutral otherwise. Although Granberg's hypothesis seems broadly apposite for the subject environment, it does not straightforwardly extend to all variation environments, in particular in the case of adverbials, as we shall see shortly.

(ii) ADVERBIALS

These unsurprisingly are heterogeneous, with clitics appearing both in enclisis or in proclisis, some consistently with preverbal positions, such as *siempre* ‘always’ (30), others, e.g. *ahora* ‘now’, allowing variation (31)-(32):¹¹

- (30) & *siempre los uencio*
 and always CL defeated.3SG
 ‘And he always defeated them.’ (*Est.Esp.II, CDE s.v. siempre los*)

- (31) *et agora prísolo*
 and now took.3SG-CL
 ‘And now he took him.’ (*EE: 108 apud [Granberg, 1988, p. 176]*)

- (32) *Ahora me quieres fer matar*
 now CL want.2SG make kill
 ‘Now you want to have me killed.’ (*Faz.: 122*)

It is the adverbial environment with *siempre* that is problematic for Martins’ view that variation in clitic positioning invariably is correlated with emphasis on the preceding constituent (or lack of it); and cross-linguistic evidence from Modern Galician corroborates the lack of any such straightforward correspondence with emphasis: [Álvarez Blanco *et al.*, 1986, p. 190] (apud [Granberg, 1988, p. 184]), for instance, state that emphatic readings are rare, although possible, for those adverbs that always trigger proclisis.

(iii) VOCATIVES

Although some (e.g. [Barry, 1987]) have claimed that vocatives require enclisis, proclisis is also option, when the vocative is the imperative subject (see section 2.2).¹² However, no unambiguous proclisis examples have been encountered for the non-imperative environments.

- (33) *O mio Sennor, priegot que*
 Oh my Lord beg.1SG-CL that
 ‘Oh my Lord, I beg you that [...]’ (*Faz.: 121*)

(iv) CO-REFERENTIAL OBJECT NPS

Despite the predominance of enclisis in Clitic Left Dislocation/Hanging Topic Left Dislocation (CLLD/HTLD) constructions as in (34), proclisis has also been attested, to wit when the left-peripheral constituent contains the indefinite pronoun or adjective *todo(s)* ‘all’ or *am(b)os* ‘both’, as in (35)-(36):

¹¹I do not aim to give an exhaustive account of the adverbial environment here but a mere overview of the possible variation patterns. For an extensive account on clitic placement after left-peripheral adverbials, I refer the reader to [Granberg, 1988, p. 155-194] and [Castillo Lluich, 1996, p. 232-247].

¹²It is indeed difficult to distinguish in MedSp command contexts between imperative subjects and vocatives.

- (34) *al rey mataronle en so lecho sos syervos*
 ACC-the king killed.3PL-CL in his bed his slaves
 ‘The king, his slaves killed him in his bed.’ (*Faz.*: 159)
- Levo cativo el rey de Babilonia al*
 brought.3SG captive the king of Babylon ACC-the
rey Joachim e a sue madre, a sus
 king Joachim and ACC his mother ACC his
 (35) *mugieres e a sos vassallos e todos los*
 wives and ACC his vassals and all the
mayores de toda su tierra; todos los cativo
 elders of all his land; all CL captured.3SG
 ‘The king of Babylon captured king Joachim, his mother, his wives,
 his vassals and all the elders of all his land, he captured them all [...]’
 (*Faz.*: 160)
- (36) *con el so manto a amas las cubrió*
 with the his cape ACC both CL covered.3SG
 ‘With his cape he covered them both.’ (*Cid2*: 2807 apud [Ramsden, 1963,
 p. 86])

Although Granberg’s ([Granberg, 1988; Granberg, 1999]) hypothesis of a correspondence between emphatic subjects and proclisis cannot be extended to the adverbial environment, as suggested by [Martins, 2003], it seems plausible to assume that left-peripheral constituents in CLLD/HTLD constructions that appear with proclitic pronouns, are pragmatically salient in some sense, in view of examples such as (35) where the quantifier *todos* ‘all’ clearly bears emphatic stress (it summarises an extensive list of people who got captured by the king of Babylon). As we shall see later, imperative verb contexts show a similar pattern.

(v) COORDINATION¹³

Despite the predominance of enclisis with *e(t)/y* ‘and’, as in (37), preverbal placement is possible if a preceding conjunct contains a proclisis-inducing element in what appears to be a parallelism or alignment effect, as in (38)-(39).

- (37) *Sonno Joseph un suenno e contolo a*
 dreamt.3SG Joseph a dream and told.3SG-CL to
sos ermanos
 his brothers
 ‘Joseph had a dream and he told it to his brothers.’ (*Faz.*: 50)

¹³I will not discuss disjunctive constructions as I did not encounter any examples in my corpus. Similarly, other studies, such as [Castillo Lluch, 1996, p. 113] and [Granberg, 1988, p. 252-254], lament the scarcity of relevant data. Accordingly, I will leave this issue aside.

- (38) *Yot acreceré e te muchiguaré*
 I-CL will-enlarge.1SG and CL will-multiply.1SG
 ‘I will enlarge and multiply you.’ (Faz.: 58)
- Por esto que dizie, lo firio*
 because-of this that said.3SG CL wounded. 3SG
- (39) *Phashur, fijo de Hymer, e lo metio en cepo*
 Phashur son of Hymer and CL put.3SG in trap
 ‘Because of what he said, Phashur, son of Hymer, injured him and trapped him.’ (Faz.: 167)

Proclisis in the first conjunct is not however a prerequisite for the occurrence of preverbal clitics in subsequent conjuncts as (40)-(41) demonstrate. What is necessary is the occurrence of a proclisis-inducing element in a preceding conjunct, which in the following examples are the adverbs *por esto* ‘because of this’ and *alli* ‘there’. But any such parallelism is in any case not obligatory, as illustrated in (42):

- por esto bendixo Dios al dia septimo*
 because-of this blessed.3SG God to-the day seventh
- (40) *e sanctiguo*
 and-CL consecrated.3SG
 ‘Because of this, God blessed the seventh day and consecrated it.’
 (Faz.: 76)
- alli convertio sant Peydro a Cornelius*
 there converted.3SG saint Peter ACC Cornelius
- (41) *Centurio e lo babtizo*
 Centurio and CL baptised.3SG
 ‘There Saint Peter converted Cornelius Centurio and baptised him.’
 (Faz.: 125)
- El Criador te fizo rey e diot*
 the Creator CL made.3SG king and gave.3SG-CL
- (42) *las mugieres de to enemigo e de to*
 the women of your enemy and of your
sennor en to poder
 lord in your power
 ‘God made you king and gave you the wives of your enemy and of your lord.’ (Faz.: 141)

(vi) NON-ROOT/ABSOLUTE CLAUSES

Again though an absolute clause construction (more colloquially, a clausal adjunct) or a non-root clause will generally be followed by postverbal clitics, as

exemplified in (43) and (44), my corpus contains a few exceptions to this: namely, when the subordinating element of the preceding non-root clause is *antes que* ‘before that’, as in (45):

- (43) andando el muy sin reçelo, *violo* *el* *Raposo*
 walking he very without suspicion saw.3SG-CL the fox
 ‘While he was walking without any suspicion, the fox saw him.’ (*Luc.*: XII)
- (44) quant le vyo, *dixol*
 when CL saw.3SG said.3SG-CL
 ‘When he saw him, he told him [...].’ (*Faz.*: 122)
- (45) antes que saliestes del vientre *te* *santigué*
 before that left.2SG of-the belly CL blessed.1SG
 ‘Before you were born, I blessed you.’ (*Faz.*: 165)

According to Leavitt (apud [Granberg, 1988, p. 139]), the preverbal placement in (45) can be explained as a consequence of adverbial force of *antes*.¹⁴ However, a quick search in the online *CDE* reveals that *antes que* clauses also occur with postverbal clitics:

- (46) antes que el emperador muriesse *perdonole*
 before that the emperor died.3SG forgave.3SG-CL
 ‘Before the emperor died, he forgave him.’ (*GranCon.*, *CDE* s.v. *antes que*)

On the face of it, then, environments that license both pro- and enclisis positioning seem an ineliminably heterogeneous set, yet each primarily displays enclisis.

2.2 Imperative Contexts

Although some (e.g. [Barry, 1987, p. 215]) claim that only the enclitic ordering is found with imperative verbs in MedSp, it has been noted that proclisis is also attested in these contexts. I shall show here that clitics occur in essentially the same positions with respect to the verb, irrespective of it being imperative or not, so whatever systematicity there is to the complex distribution patterning needs to be seen as carrying over to these imperative constructions.¹⁵ Here I shall illustrate less comprehensively.

¹⁴[Granberg, 1988, p. 141] also mentions other exceptions which can be explained with this notion of adverbial force, namely those non-root clauses which occur with *assy como* ‘considering’. For a detailed overview of the first attestations of a change for this syntactic environment, I refer the reader to this work ([Granberg, 1988, p. 136-146]).

¹⁵I classified sentences containing wishes, as in (54), (59) and (60), in the imperative clitic environments although wish contexts always appear with preverbal clitics, except if the verb occurs as the first constituent. For more details on the behaviour of clitics in these contexts, see [Bouzouita, in preparation].

Imperative examples with preverbal pronouns have been found for all the strict proclitic constructions except for those that commence with a *wh*-element: negation (47)-(49), non-coreferential complement NPs (50), prepositional and predicative complements (51)-(52):

- (47) *No!* *fagas mal*
not-CL do.2SG hurt
'Don't hurt him.' (*Faz.*: 49)
- (48) *Nunca te metas o puedas auer malandaça*
never CL put.2SG where can.2SG have misfortune
'Never put yourself in a unfortunate situation.' (*Luc.*: XXXIV)
- (49) *Ni los adores ni los sirvas*
neither CL adore.2SG nor CL serve.2SG
'Neither adore them nor serve them.' (*Faz.*: 75)
- (50) *A vuestros [fijos] lo recontat*
to your children CL tell.2PL
'Tell it to your children.' (*Faz.*: 186)
- (51) *A las cosas çiertas vos comendat*
to the things certain CL entrust.2PL
'Confide in certainties.' (*Luc.*: VII)
- (52) *Testimonias me sed oy*
witnesses CL be.2PL today
'Be my witnesses today.' (*Faz.*: 200)

Then, as expected on the non-imperative pattern, postverbal clitics are found in verb-initial constructions (53)-(54), paratactic root clauses (55), and constructions with contrastive coordination (56):

- (53) *Sacada fuera*
take.2PL-CL out
'Take her out.' (*Faz.*: 52)
- (54) *Vealo Dios*
see.3SG-CL God
'May God see it.' (*Faz.*: 65)
- (55) *Andat e matemosle, echemosle en aquel pozo*
walk.2PL and kill.1PL-CL throw.1PL-CL in that well
'Walk and let's kill him, let's throw him in that well.' (*Faz.*: 51)

- (56) *mas dales a comer e a beber*
 but give.2SG-CL to eat and to drink
 ‘But give them to eat and drink.’ (*Faz.*: 126)

As we might now expect, this close parallelism of distribution carries over to the variation constructions, as illustrated, for instance, for the adverbials in (57)-(59).

- (57) *Agora danos rey*
 now give.2SG-CL king
 ‘Now give us a king.’ (*Faz.*: 104)

- E vos Sennor Conde Lucanor siempre vos*
 and you Lord Count Lucanor always CL
 (58) *guardat*
 be-careful.2SG
 ‘And you, Count Lucanor, always be careful [...]’ (*Luc.*: XIII)

- (59) *Asym faga Dios*
 like-this-CL make.3SG God
 ‘May God treat me like this.’ (*Faz.*: 126)

The situation for the subject and vocative environments is slightly more complicated. Only preverbal clitics have been encountered in wish contexts with a left-peripheral subject, as shown in (60), whereas variation is observed for non-wish imperative contexts, as in (61)-(62). The parallelisms between the imperative vocatives, on the one hand, and the non-imperative subject and CLLD/HTLD cases, on the other hand, deserve somewhat more comment. Firstly, the vocatives in these imperative contexts can be regarded as imperative subjects based on several criteria. To begin with, they have a similar semantic role as the declarative/non-imperative subjects. More specifically, while non-imperative subjects can be agents, the vocatives in these imperative contexts can be described as *intended agents* i.e. the agents designated by the utterers of these clauses to carry out the given command ([Jensen, 2003, p. 155]). Furthermore, both agree in number with the verb. Recall further that, for the non-imperative subject environments, we concluded that there exists some correlation between the emphasis of the subject and the placement of the subsequent clitic (see section 2.1): namely, enclisis is found with unemphatic subjects while proclisis appears with emphatic ones. Similarly, this pattern arises in vocative environments with imperative verbs since vocatives that don’t seem to be emphasised, as for instance in (61), appear with postverbal pronouns whereas others which do seem to bear emphatic stress, such as (62)-(64), trigger proclitic placement.¹⁶

¹⁶Because my corpus did not contain any vocative examples with proclisis, I consulted *BMIg.* and

- (60) *Dios te aya merced, myo fiyo*
 God CL have.3SG mercy my son
 ‘May God have mercy of you, my son.’ (*Faz.*: 56)
- (61) *Rey, salvam*
 king save.2SG-CL
 ‘King, save me.’ (*Faz.*: 126)
- (62) *Madre, plena de gracia, reina poderosa, tú, me guía*
 Mother, full of grace, mighty queen, you CL guide.2SG
en ello
 in this
 ‘Mother, full of grace, mighty queen, you, guide me through this.’
 (*BMIg.*: 46c-d)
- (63) *Tú, me libra Señora*
 You CL free.2SG Lady
 ‘You free me Lady.’ (*LPal.*: 3871)
- (64) *Rachel e Vidas, amos, me dat las manos*
 Rachel and Vidas both CL give.2PL the hands
 ‘Rachel and Vidas, both, give me your hands.’ (*Cid3*: 106)

With regards to the parallelism with the CLLD/HTLD cases, it is striking that most of the preverbal vocative examples encountered contain invocations (to God, the Virgin Mary, etc.) in which the personal pronoun *tú* ‘you’ appears as the last vocative in a list of several epithets. Consider for instance (62). This example contains an invocation to the Virgin Mary, who gets addressed with several epithets, such as mother and mighty queen, which characterise different aspects attributed to her.¹⁷ These epithets are then followed by the personal pronoun *tú* which then seems to ‘summarise’ in a sense the previous epithets as it does not refer to just one aspect of her.¹⁸ The same also applies for example (64) which contains as the final

SDom. by Berceo and *LPal.* by López de Ayala since [Gessner, 1893, p. 43] cites an example from each of them. A quick search for the personal pronoun *tú* in these texts reveals that proclisis in the vocative environment is not uncommon as I encountered in total 37 different cases. The search for occurrences with *am(b)os*, as in (64), on the contrary, did not give any results. Searching in the *CDE* reveals that proclitic vocative examples are not restricted to poetry only as examples can also be found in the *Gen.Est.IV* and the *Est.Esp.II*, which are historiographical texts.

¹⁷Most of these examples contain this figure of speech, known as a merism, which is commonly used in biblical poetry and by which an entity is referred to by a conventional phrase that enumerates several of its parts, or which lists several synonyms for the same referent.

¹⁸Notwithstanding this, proclisis after the personal pronoun *tú* is not obligatory as the following clearly illustrates:

- (iv) *e tú, díla a nos*
 and you tell.2SG-CL to us

vocative the indefinite pronoun *amos* ‘both’, compromising as such the previous vocatives *Rachel e Vidas*. Recall that we concluded for CLLD/HTLD environments with the indefinite pronoun *todos* ‘all’, as in example (35), that this pronoun bears emphatic stress since this left-peripheral pronoun summarises a list of people who got captured. Likewise, we can deduce that these vocatives which also occur with preverbal clitics and ‘summarise’ previous vocatives/epithets, are emphatic.

As regards the CLLD/HTLD constructions, again the determining factor seems to be emphasis, with enclisis found whenever the left-peripheral constituent seems to be unemphatic, as in (65), whereas proclisis arising with emphatic CLLD/HTLD constituents such as *todos* ‘all’ in (66).

- (65) *e la cosa graf que non podran judgar aduganla*
 and the thing serious that not will-can.3PL judge bring.3PL-CL
a ty
 to you
 ‘And the serious things that they won’t be able to judge, bring them to you.’ (*Faz.*: 74)

- (66) *todos los metet a espada et todos los matat*
 all CL put.2PL to sword and all CL kill.2PL
 ‘Put them all on your swords and kill them all.’ (*EE*: 374, 36a apud [Castillo Lluch, 1996, p. 226])

2.3 Data Summary

In sum, we have seen that MedSp clitic placement in main clauses can be classified into the three groups: (i) strict proclitic environments, (ii) strict enclitic environments, and (iii) variation environments, with no major differences between non-imperative and imperative verb contexts, as shown in Table 1. The significance of this is that what emerges later as a categorial distinction between imperative and non-imperative environments is a relatively late basis for differentiation. Preverbal clitics are recorded exclusively in a disjoint set of environments: when the clitic is preceded by a left-peripheral (i) *wh*-element, (ii) negation marker, (iii) non-coreferential complement NP, (iv) prepositional or (v) predicative complement. Conversely, the postverbal pronoun position is attested for those environments in which the verb is located in a sentence-initial or paratactic position, or in which the contrastive coordination marker *pero/mas* ‘but’ precedes the verb. The variation environments, again with no significant differences found between imperative and non-imperative contexts vis-a-vis clitic placement, range over yet a further somewhat heterogeneous set: (i) left-peripheral subjects, (ii) adverbials, (iii) vocatives¹⁹, (iv) coordination markers *et/y*, (v) object NPs that are co-referential with

‘And you, tell it to us.’ (*Faz.*: 209)

¹⁹As seen in section 2.2, variation is only attested for the command environments.

the clitic (CLLD/HTLD), and (vi) non-root/absolute constructions. The possibility of assigning a principled syntactic basis for such a heterogeneous set of distributions seems remote. This constitutes a challenge for any attempt to formally model the synchronic system or, more ambitiously, provide a diachronic account for a sequence of such systems. What underlying pattern could indeed be recovered from these disparate distributions?

Table 1: Clitic Placement in 13th and 14th c. Medieval Spanish

	Non-imperatives		Imperatives	
	Proclisis	Enclisis	Proclisis	Enclisis
<i>Wh</i> -word	X	-	-	-
Negation	X	-	X	-
Complement NP	X	-	X	-
Prepositional complement	X	-	X	-
Predicative complement	X	-	X	-
Verb	-	X	-	X
Paratactic root clause	-	X	-	X
<i>Pero/mas</i> ‘but’	-	X	-	X
Subject	X	X	X	-*
Adverbial	X	X	X	X
Vocative	-	X	X	X
Coordination	X	X	X	X
Object NP (CLLD/HTLD)	X	X	X	X
Non-root/absolute clause	X	X	X	X

*: Wish contexts only

As Table 2 shows, the overall predominant clitic position in MedSp root clauses is the postverbal one: 75% of all 13th c. cases and 68% of all 14th c. examples exhibit this placement, despite there being systematic exceptions in certain syntactic environments. Furthermore, enclisis can be considered as the default position which can be overridden in certain circumstances ([Bouzouita, 2007, p. 53]). We saw, for instance, that for the coordinate constructions preverbal placement seems only possible if a preceding conjunct contains a proclisis-inducing element, such as e.g. a subject, a *wh*-element, etc. Proclitic CLLD/HTLD contexts, on the other hand, only arise in the presence of a left-peripheral *todo(s)* ‘all’ or *am(b)os* ‘both’ which seem to bear emphatic stress. We also concluded that the imperative vocative environment shows that there exists a correlation between the emphasis of the left-peripheral element and the placement of the subsequent clitic, as do the subject and CLLD/HTLD contexts. However, this principle cannot be extended to the adverbial environments. Enclisis also seems to be the default position whenever

a non-root/absolute clause precedes the matrix clause, unless this non-root clause contains the subordinating element *antes que* ‘before that’. We shall see later on that a unified account can be given for all these environments.

Table 2. Percentage of Proclisis in 13th and 14th c. Medieval Spanish

	Total	13 th c.	14 th c.
Wh-word	100% (41/41)	100% (41/41)	-
Negation	100% (207/207)	100% (168/168)	100% (39/39)
Complement NP	100% (24/24)	100% (18/18)	100% (6/6)
Prepositional compl.	100% (14/14)	100% (10/10)	100% (4/4)
Predicative compl.	100% (6/6)	100% (6/6)	-
Verb	0% (0/336)	0% (0/335)	0% (0/1)
Paratactic root cl.	0% (0/34)	0% (0/33)	0% (0/1)
<i>Pero/mas</i> ‘but’	0% (0/10)	0% (0/3)	0% (0/7)
Subject	66% (172/259)	69% (114/165)	62% (58/94)
Adverbial	64% (147/228)	70% (119/170)	48% (28/58)
Vocative	0% (0/17)	0% (0/14)	0% (0/3)
Coordination	2% (24/1155)	2% (23/997)	1% (1/158)
Object NP	27% (9/33)	19% (5/27)	67% (4/6)
Non-root/absolute cl.	3% (3/100)	8% (3/39)	0% (0/61)
TOTAL	26% (647/2464)	25% (507/2026)	32% (140/438)

Additional evidence that corroborates enclisis as the default MedSp clitic position, even though able to be overridden, is provided by those cases in which a proclisis-triggering constituent follows other constituents that would normally occur with postverbal clitics, as exemplified by the following:²⁰

- (67) [Mas] non **los** *seruen* *todos*
 but not CL serve.3PL all
 ‘But not all serve them.’ (*Luc.*: Prólogo)
- (68) [sos castiellos] a espada **los** *metras*
 his castles to sword CL will-put.2SG
 ‘His castles you will siege them.’ (*Faz.*: 133)
- (69) [a los ricos e al ganado grueso] no **los** *quiso*
 ACC the rich and ACC-the livestock fat not CL wanted.3SG
matar
 kill
 ‘The rich and the fat livestock, he didn’t want to kill them.’ (*Faz.*: 106)

²⁰The constituents that override the enclitic norm have been underlined whereas those that appear with postverbal clitics when not preceded (or followed) by other constituents have been bracketed.

- (70) [*Sus decimas e sus primycias*] *fidel myentre* *las* *dava*
 his tithes and his duties on first fruits faithfully CL gave.3SG
 ‘His tithes and duties on first fruits, he paid them faithfully.’ (*Faz.*: 114)

In example (67), for instance, the contrasting coordination marker *mas* ‘but’, which occurs always with postverbal clitics if not preceded by other elements, is followed by a negation adverb *non*, which overrides the default enclitic positioning. Similarly, in examples (68)-(70), the left-dislocated NPs that are co-referential with the following clitics, are followed by proclisis-inducing elements: to wit, the prepositional complement *a espada* ‘to sword’, the negation adverb *no* ‘no’ and the manner adverb *fidel myentre* ‘faithfully’.

Although proclisis-inducing constituents can override the enclitic norm, the opposite does not hold. In other words, proclisis-inducing constituents need not immediately precede the clitic in order to be able to influence its positioning with respect to the verb. In (71)-(72), for instance, the vocative *sennor conde* (*lucanor*) is preceded by the adverb *agora* which is capable of inducing preverbal placement (see also (31)). Although proclisis has been recorded with imperative vocatives, no unambiguous attestations exist for the non-imperative contexts (see section 2.1). Accordingly, I conclude that the proclitic placement is very likely to be due to the adverb and not the vocative.²¹

- (71) *Agora*, [*sennor conde*], *vos* *he* *dicho* *el* *mio*
 now lord count CL have.1SG said the my
consejo
 advice
 ‘Now, Count, I have given you my advice.’ (*Luc.*: Quinta Parte)

- (72) *Agora*, [*sennor conde lucanor*], *vos* *he* *contado*
 now lord count Lucanor CL have.1SG told
 ‘Now, Count Lucanor, I have told you [...]’ (*Luc.*: XLVIII)

3 Clitic Placement in Renaissance Spanish

3.1 Novel Proclisis Cases

As we saw previously, the overwhelming majority of MedSp clitic cases exhibit enclisis in finite main clauses. When we turn to Renaissance Spanish (RenSp), we

²¹As I commented elsewhere ([Bouzouita, 2007, p. 52-53]), these examples show that the strict string-linear methodology for identifying the different clitic environments is problematic as it presupposes that only the constituent immediately preceding the clitic can influence its placement (e.g. [Nieuwenhuijsen, 1999; Nieuwenhuijsen, 2002; Nieuwenhuijsen, 2006]). In view of this, I adopted a more DS-oriented approach whereby only the elements of the tree to which the clitic pronoun contributes are considered relevant, and not necessarily the entire sentential sequence (see [Cann and Kempson, this volume] for the concept of linked structure and [Bouzouita, in preparation] for more details).

see evidence of change, which started taking place in the 15th c. ([Arias Álvarez, 1995], [Eberenz, 2000, p. 133], [Nieuwenhuijsen, 1999, ch. 5] inter alia).

Table 3. Clitic Placement in 16th c. Renaissance Spanish

	Non-imperatives		Imperatives	
	Proclisis	Enclisis	Proclisis	Enclisis
Wh-word	X	-	-	-
Negation	X	-	X	-
Complement NP	X	-	X	-
Prepositional complement	X	-	X	-
Predicative complement	X	-	X	-
Verb	X	X	X	X
Paratactic root clause	X	X	X	X
<i>Pero/mas</i> 'but'	X	X	X	X
Subject	X	X	X	-*
Adverbial	X	X	X	X
Vocative	X	-	X	X
Coordination	X	X	X	X
Object NP (CLLD/HTLD)	X	X	X	X
Non-root/absolute clause	X	X	X	X

*: Wish contexts only

Table 4. Percentage of Proclisis in 16th c. Renaissance Spanish

	16 th c.
Wh-word	100% (1/1)
Negation	100% (33/33)
Complement NP	100% (11/11)
Prepositional complement	100% (5/5)
Predicative complement	-
Verb	20% (3/15)
Paratactic root clause	100% (1/1)
<i>Pero/mas</i> 'but'	25% (1/4)
Subject	100% (67/67)
Adverbial	96% (73/76)
Vocative	100% (1/1)
Coordination	62% (31/50)
Object NP (CLLD/HTLD)	100% (17/17)
Non-root/absolute clause	38% (8/21)
TOTAL	83% (252/302)

As Table 3 demonstrates, in 16th c. RenSp proclisis is also found in those very environments that had in MedSp been strictly enclitic: (i) those which contained a sentence-initial verb, (ii) a preceding paratactic root clause and (iii) those with a contrastive coordination marker *pero/mas* ‘but’, as exemplified respectively in (73)-(74), (75)-(76) and (77)-(78) for both non-imperative and imperative contexts.

- (73) *Se dize publicamente que*
 CL says.3SG publicly that
 ‘Publicly it is being said that [...].’ (DLNE: 1529.9)
- (74) *Le deis allá por él quarenta o çinquenta*
 CL give.2SG there for him forty or fifty
pesos
 pesos
 ‘Give him there forty or fifty pesos.’ (HDO: IX, 14)
- (75) *Asi mismo ha reçibido de Alonso Davila muchos cohechos*
 likewise has.3SG received of Alonso Davila a-lot-of harvests
speçial en çierta compañia de hazienda que tienen, le
 especially in certain company of estate that have.3PL CL
haze pagar las costas
 makes.3SG pay the costs
 ‘Likewise he received a lot of harvests from Alonso Davila, especially from a certain estate that they have, it makes him pay the costs.’ (DLNE: 1529.9)
- (76) *I ansí en esto como en todo lo demás que le tocare i vos le*
 and so in this as in all the rest that CL would-touch.3SG and you CL
podáis hazer plazer lo hazed
 can.2SG do pleasure CL do.2SG
 ‘And so in this as well as in all the rest that concerns him and in which you could please him, do it.’ (HDO: VI, 1)
- (77) *pero se hazen ocho o diez géneros de atole*
 but CL make.3PL eight or ten types of atole
 ‘But eight or ten types of *atole* are made.’ (Prob.Secr., CORDE s.v. *pero*)²²
- (78) *mas los rompan luego*
 but CL break.3PL afterwards
 ‘But break them afterwards.’ (ARC, CDE s.v. *mas los*)

²²*Atole* is a Mexican corn-starch based hot drink.

Examples (73) and (74) also show that in 16th c. RenSp the Tobler-Mussafia Law is no longer rigidly enforced, despite a clear preference for postverbal placement still remaining, as shown in Table 4 (see also [Arias Álvarez, 1996, p. 131]). Table 3 and 4 also reveal that nothing changed for the strict proclitic constructions compared to 13th and 14th c. MedSp. The variation environments, however, show an increase in the use of preverbal positioning, in spite of enclisis still remaining an option.

The higher frequency of proclisis for the variation environments in 16th c. RenSp is not simply due to a higher occurrence of those preverbal cases also found in MedSp, such as for instance coordination cases in which a preceding conjunct contains a proclisis-inducing constituent. For, as (79) and (80) exemplify respectively for the non-imperative and imperative coordination cases, RenSp can feature preverbal clitics despite lacking a proclisis-triggering constituent in a preceding conjunct:

- (79) *Y porque les suelo reprehender, han*
 And because CL use-to.1SG tell-off have.3PL
huido mis sermones e se van a banquetes
 fled my sermons and CL go.3PL to feasts
cada domingo
 every Sunday
 ‘And because I usually tell them off, they have fled my sermons and they go to parties every Sunday.’ (DLNE: 1529.7)

- (80) *A buestro padre y madre le puedes decir*
 to your father and mother CL can.2SG tell
que por amor de Dios, que me perdonen; y
 that due love of God that CL forgive.3PL and
le da mis encomiendas
 CL give.2SG my greetings
 ‘To your father and mother, you can tell them that they for the love of God forgive me, and give them my greetings.’ (DLNE: 1574.44)

Similarly, for the CLLD/HTLD cases, we find proclitic cases that do not contain an emphatic *todo(s)/am(b)os*, as in (81)-(82) (see also [Bouzouita, 2007, p. 58] and [Keniston, 1937, p. 93]):

- (81) *a otro le hazen esclavo porque hurtó*
 ACC other CL make.3PL slave because stole.3SG
diez maçorcas de maiz
 ten cobs of maize
 ‘Another one, they made him a slave because he stole ten cobs of maize.’ (DLNE: 1525.1)

- (82) *Al señor mi hermano le diga que*
 to-the gentleman my brother CL tell.2SG that
 ‘My brother, tell him that [...].’ (DLNE: 1572.40)

And, for the preceding non-root/absolute clause environment, proclitic cases equally occur without the subordinating element *antes que*, that had previously been the trigger for proclisis:

- (83) *Y porque tan bien acostunbrados a la carne humana, les*
 And because so good used to the meat human CL
es más dulce
 is.3SG more sweet
 ‘And because they are so used to [eating] human meat, they find it sweeter.’ (DLNE: 1525.1)

- (84) *Y trayendolos, os venj [sic] lo más presto*
 And bringing them CL come.2SG the more fast
que pudieredes
 that can.2SG
 ‘And bringing them along, come the fastest you can.’ (DLNE: 1571.38)

Accordingly, the relatively restricted conditions under which proclisis was licensed in the MedSp variation environments no longer restrict preverbal placement in RenSp. In other words, the preverbal distribution is spreading. Observe as well that again no substantial differences have been found between clitic placement in non-imperative environments and imperative ones.

4 Clitic Placement in Modern Spanish

It should not be concluded from the previous that enclitic placement was on the wane. On the contrary, in ModSp, both proclitic and enclitic placement are retained. However, the circumstances which license this syntactic intra-speaker variation differ significantly from those found in earlier periods. Whereas in MedSp and RenSp pre- and postverbal positioning is attested both in imperative and non-imperative finite verb contexts, in ModSp the only available option for clitics in non-imperative environments is proclisis, as shown in (85)-(86). Notice also that, unlike in MedSp, ModSp does not have a restriction on sentence-initial clitics. Enclitic placement became restricted to imperative contexts, as exemplified in (87)-(88) and shown in Table 5, indicating that clitic placement in ModSp seems to be determined in some sense by the mood of the associated verb. Syntactic variation in clitic positioning is still observed in the imperative contexts. Notwithstanding this, this variation is not unrestricted but seems to depend on the syntactic environment, as shown in (87)-(90).

- (85) *¿Te hacían muchas preguntas?*
 CL made.3PL a-lot-of questions
 ‘Did they ask you a lot of questions?’ (*Habla*: 2.30)
- (86) **¿Hacíante muchas preguntas?*
 made.3PL-CL a-lot-of questions
 Intended: ‘Did they ask you a lot of questions?’
- (87) *Cuéntame cómo es*
 tell.2SG-CL how is.3SG
 ‘Tell me how it is.’ (*Habla*: 2.26)
- (88) **Me cuenta cómo es*
 CL tell.2SG how is.3SG
 Intended: ‘Tell me how it is.’
- (89) *No me hables*
 not CL talk.2SG
 ‘Don’t talk to me.’ (*Habla*: 2.22)
- (90) **No hables-/hábla-me*
 not talk.2SG-CL
 Intended: ‘Don’t talk to me.’

Table 5. Clitic Placement in 20th c. Modern Spanish

	Non-imperatives		Imperatives	
	Proclisis	Enclisis	Proclisis	Enclisis
Wh-word	X	-	-	-
Negation	X	-	X	-
Complement NP	X	-	-	X
Prepositional complement	X	-	-	X
Predicative complement	X	-	-	X
Verb	X	-	-	X
Paratactic root clause	X	-	-	X
<i>Pero/mas</i> ‘but’	X	-	-	X
Subject	X	-	X*	-*
Adverbial	X	-	X*	X
Vocative	X	-	-	X
Coordination	X	-	X*	X
Object NP (CLLD/HTLD)	X	-	-	X
Non-root/absolute clause	X	-	-	X

*: Wish contexts only

Table 6. Percentage of Proclisis in 20th c. Modern Spanish

	20 th c.
Wh-word	100% (49/49)
Negation	100% (99/99)
Complement NP	100% (5/5)
Prepositional complement	100% (6/6)
Predicative complement	-
Verb	77% (115/150)
Paratactic root clause	82% (47/57)
<i>Pero/mas</i> 'but'	73% (11/15)
Subject	100% (101/101)
Adverbial	91% (170/186)
Vocative	-
Coordination	95% (79/83)
Object NP (CLLD/HTLD)	100% (24/24)
Non-root/absolute clause	91% (21/23)
TOTAL	91% (727/798)

5 Diachronic Changes

5.1 Towards a Verb-Centered Clitic System

In sum, we have seen that syntactic variation in clitic positioning is observed not only in MedSp but also in RenSp and ModSp. This syntactic variation does not manifest itself in each of these clitic systems in the same way. This might be taken to suggest that different principles underly each of these clitic distributions; however, these are not categorically discrete distinctions.

Table 7. Percentage of Proclisis per Verbal Mood

	MedSp		RenSp	ModSp
	13 th c.	14 th c.	16 th c.	20 th c.
Non-imperatives	25% (446/1771)	32% (130/410)	88% (215/244)	100% (723/723)
Imperatives	24% (61/255)	36% (10/28)	64% (37/58)	5% (4/75)
TOTAL	25% (507/2026)	32% (140/438)	83% (252/302)	91% (727/798)

As regards the diachronic changes, enclisis, the most frequently encountered position for MedSp clitics in root clauses, was only gradually replaced by proclisis in the non-imperative contexts, leading to ModSp in which enclisis is no longer

a valid option for these environments. The imperative environments underwent a similar shift towards proclisis up until RenSp. Table 7 illustrates this diachronic shift in clitic placement throughout the history of Spanish per verbal mood (imperatives vs. non-imperatives). Recall also that RenSp clitics had in both imperative and non-imperative contexts a similar distribution, as did MedSp. Notwithstanding this, Table 7 shows that in RenSp proclisis was more prevalent for the non-imperative cases considering that 88% (215/244) of non-imperatives exhibit proclisis while only 64% (37/58) of imperative cases display this positioning. Similarly, [Keniston, 1937, p. 97] notes that for 16th c. imperatives ‘the postposition of the pronoun becomes more and more the rule’. In other words, even though RenSp imperative and non-imperative environments exhibit the same syntactic variation (see Table 3), enclisis was used more frequently in imperative contexts in comparison with the non-imperative ones. This difference becomes even greater in ModSp – 100% (723/723) and 5% (4/75) respectively –, where enclisis is the only possible clitic position for commands (except for negative commands).²³ In sum, we can conclude that the ModSp clitic system, unlike the MedSp one, is a verb-centered clitic system with the distribution of clitics determined by the mood of its associated verb ([Wanner, 1996]).

5.2 Interpolation

Confirmation that the Spanish clitics shifted towards a verb-centered system comes also from the loss of interpolation. In ModSp, clitics have to be adjacent to the verb. Recall that in the MedSp clitic system, on the other hand, this was not the case for preverbal clitics. In MedSp, interpolated constituents can be found both in root and non-root clauses, as illustrated in (91) and (92) respectively (contra [Chenery, 1905]). Nonetheless, most examples proceed from non-root contexts given that in MedSp proclisis is found overwhelmingly in these environments whereas postverbal placement prevails in the root ones (see Table 7).²⁴

(91) *Ont me [yo] loo mucho de la tu amor*
 thus CL I praise.1SG a-lot of the your love
 ‘Thus I praise your love a lot.’ (*Faz.*: 43)

(92) *Et esto que te [yo] [agora] mostrare aqui*
 and this that CL I now will-show.1SG here

²³For more detailed information on clitic placement in the period from the 16th c. till 20th c., I refer the reader to [Bouzouita, in preparation]. See also [Keniston, 1937; Parodi, 1979; Rubio Perea, 2004] for the 16th c., [Lesman St. Clair, 1980] for the 17th c., [Buffum, 1927] for the 19th c. and [Armijo Canto, 1985; Armijo Canto, 1992] for the 16th - 19th c. period.

²⁴As regards the range of possible interpolating constituents, I refer the reader for MedSp to [Castillo Lluch, 1996; Castillo Lluch, 1998; Chenery, 1905], and for RenSp to [Eberenz, 2000]. See [Bouzouita, 2007; Bouzouita, 2008; Bouzouita, in preparation] for DS analyses of interpolation.

‘And this that I will now show you here.’ (*Gen.Est.I*: 324 apud [Sánchez Lancis, 1993, p. 327])

- (93) *Le* [yo] *daré*
 CL I will-give.1SG
 ‘I will give her [...]’ (*Corbacho*: 264 apud [Company Company, 1985-6, p. 96])

Interpolation examples are also found in RenSp, despite no preceding initial triggering expression, as illustrated in (93). This example, which dates from 1438, displays novel preverbal placement along with interpolation. This seems to indicate that the appearance of sentence-initial clitics predates the loss of interpolation.²⁵ In my view, this observation is critical to understand the diachronic changes in Spanish clitic placement. In consequence, the view that Spanish only started allowing sentence-initial clitics once the clitic formed a complex unit with the immediately following verb (e.g. [Meyer Lübke, 1897], see also [Nieuwenhuijsen, 1999, p. 116, p. 149], summarised by the syntactic re-bracketing in (94), is simplistic and needs to be reformulated as in (95) since the former conflates different changes.²⁶ More specifically, (94) suggests that sentence-initial clitics are allowed only once interpolation is lost. However, examples such as (93) indicate that there was an intermediate step (X) + CL + (X) + V, as shown in (95), in which the occurrence of proclisis no longer depends on the preceding constituent nor is there necessary verbal adjacency.

(94) [X + CL] + (X) + V > (X) + [CL + V]

(95) [X + CL] + (X) + V > (X) + CL + (X) + V > (X) + [CL + V]

I acknowledge that examples such as (93) are rare. However, I do not find this surprising in view of the following. Firstly, the occurrence of interpolation decreases sharply after the 14th c. ([Eberenz, 2000, p. 166]). Secondly, interpolation is hardly found in root clauses even in the 13th and 14th c., a period in which interpolation is relatively frequent in non-root clauses ([Chenery, 1905; Castillo Lluch, 1996; Castillo Lluch, 1998; Sánchez Lancis, 1993]). In consequence, the low occurrence of examples such as (93) is expected.

It must be pointed out that, despite the existence of interpolation, the prevalent pattern is for the verb and not some interpolated constituent to immediately follow

²⁵The first uncontroversial indications that the restriction on sentence-initial unstressed pronouns is disappearing date from the beginning of the 15th c. (1438). The last known interpolation examples, on the other hand, are from the end of the 16th c. (1594) ([Keniston, 1937, p. 101], [Rini, 1990, p. 362-363]).

²⁶Both (94) and (95) are syntactic representations and thus do not represent phonological cliticisation.

the clitic pronoun, even in MedSp ([Wanner, 1996] *inter alia*). [Castillo Llach, 1996, p. 310-314], for instance, registers for her corpus of MedSp – the period at which the use of interpolation is at its height – 53 interpolation cases out of a total of 245 complement clauses that could have displayed this phenomenon. In other words, only 22% of these examples exhibits interpolation (calculation is mine). As we shall see later on, the fact that the clitic pronoun is mostly followed by the verb will influence the diachronic development of Spanish clitic placement.

6 Dynamic Syntax Analyses

The accounts to be given for the MedSp, RenSp and ModSp clitic systems adopt the Dynamic Syntax framework (DS; [Kempson *et al.*, 2001; Cann *et al.*, 2005]).²⁷ DS is a grammar formalism that reflects the dynamics of parsing, with syntax defined as the incremental growth of semantic trees following the time-linear parsing/production process. These semantic trees represent a possible interpretation of the natural language string. Once the processing process is completed, the top node of the tree is decorated with some propositional formula and each daughter node with some sub-term of that formula, representing a predicate-argument structure. Various processing strategies *i.e.* different ways of building up semantic content for a natural language string, are made available. More specifically, DS licenses the construction of (i) fixed nodes, (ii) unfixed nodes, which represent structural underspecification (or functional uncertainty) and which can be constructed locally or non-locally, and (iii) linked structures, *i.e.* trees that are hooked together and often share semantic content (see [Cann and Kempson, this volume] for more details in connection with Latin). Moreover, as a set of strategies for parsing, the grammar standardly makes available more than one sequence of strategies for parsing a string with little or no difference in content associated with the distinct output structures. For example, in parsing a pro-drop language with case such as Latin, there are three strategies available for the parsing of a subject expression, as was displayed in [Cann and Kempson, this volume]. The subject expression may be parsed following the strategy available for parsing all argument expressions, which is to (i) construct an unfixed node merely indicating argumenthood, (ii) decorate it as indicated by the nominal, and (iii) then use case to immediately fix the structural relation as that of subject. The second strategy is to take that subject expression as providing a context relative to which the reminder is interpreted, that is in DS terms to build a linked structure decorated solely with information provided by the subject expression and use that structure as the point of departure for constructing an independent tree containing a proposition with subject agreement indicating the identification of that term with the already presented context. Finally, there is also the possibility of taking the subject expression to decorate a node initially constructed as unfixed that is not immediately updated, but rather

²⁷For a short introduction to DS, I refer the reader to [Cann and Kempson, this volume, section 3].

is identified as subject only subsequent to parsing the verb, this decision to fully determine its role in the propositional structure at only this very late stage as the means of achieving a non-backgrounding/contrastive effect.


6.1 Medieval Spanish

In this section, I shall argue that it is the availability of these different strategies for processing the constituents preceding the clitics MedSp that govern clitic placement (extending analyses proposed in [Bouzouita, 2007; Bouzouita, 2008; Bouzouita and Kempson, 2006]). We shall see that preverbal placement is found after a disjunct set of triggers, to wit, whenever a negation marker, a tense marker, or a constituent that can be represented as structurally (syntactically) underspecified i.e. an expression decorating an unfixed node, precedes the weak pronoun. This cluster of triggers will thus be stored as part of the clitic pronoun's lexical specification. Postverbal pronouns, on the other hand, appear in the absence of these triggers, a complementary cluster of restrictions.

Strict Proclitic Constructions

More specifically, recall from section 2 that the various MedSp root clause environments in which only preverbal clitics occur are those with (i) a *wh*-word, (ii) a negation adverb, (iii) a non-coreferential complement NP, (iv) a prepositional or (v) a predicative complement. From a DS perspective, these environments, all except negation, share a structural property, that of involving an unfixed node.²⁸ Thus, after the starting point of the parse, **Adjunction* may construct an unfixed node which can then be decorated by one of these left-peripheral elements once its lexical actions have been processed, as illustrated in Figure 1 for a *wh*-question, such as example (9). A similar analysis can be given for the left-peripheral non-coreferential complement NPs, prepositional and predicative complements. Accordingly, these environments can also be analysed as involving the introduction of an unfixed node, which the left-peripheral complement will then annotate, to be subsequently fixed within the emergent tree.

Figure 1. Parsing a Wh-Word




²⁸Negation remains without formal characterisation in DS. In view of this, I shall use the feature [NEG +] to mark the presence of a negation operator.

The DS analyses for non-root clauses also involve unfixed nodes, except for the complement clauses (see [Gregoromichelaki, 2005] for more details).

Strict Enclitic Constructions

The analyses for the strict postverbal constructions, on the other hand, do not involve structural underspecification nor do the complement clauses. Recall that the MedSp environments that always appeared with postverbal pronouns are those in which the verb appears in an absolute sentence-initial or paratactic position, or those constructions with *pero/mas* ‘but’. These latter, for instance, are analysed as different $Ty(t)$ -trees between which a link relation has been established (without requirement for a copy of a formula). Once *pero/mas* introduces the linked structure, constructed as a quasi-independent tree linked only anaphorically, the verb is parsed and its lexical actions give the full subject-predicate template, decorate the subject-argument node with a metavariable (e.g. **U**) and then place the pointer at the newly constructed object-argument node decorated with the requirement $?Ty(e)$, as exemplified in Figure 2 for example (22). The postverbal pronoun can then decorate this fixed object node.

Figure 2. Parsing ‘mas dixo-’




Observe that in these analyses the postverbal clitics pattern with postverbal complement NPs both only decorating a fixed argument node within the tree (see also [Rivero, 1991; Bouzouita, 2008; Bouzouita, in preparation]). The analyses for the other two strict postverbal constructions are very similar as, in these, the lexical specifications of the verb will also build the full subject-predicate structure and leave the pointer at the (in)direct object node. The only difference is that, unlike the *pero/mas* constructions, these do not involve linked structures.

Variation Constructions

We can now see that, with alternative processing strategies being presumed to be available, variation in clitic placement is expected, given its sensitivity to partic-

ular parsing choices. More specifically, the analyses of certain left-peripheral expressions involve the construction either of an unfixed node (triggering preverbal placement), or of fixed nodes with/without linked structures (triggering postverbal positioning). Preverbal subjects, for instance, can be represented in subject-drop languages such as Spanish, as decorating a (locally) unfixed node or a $Ty(e)$ -linked structure with a requirement for a shared formula, since the lexical specifications of the verb decorate the subject node with a metavariable as an anaphoric placeholder, exactly as though a morphologically expressed pronoun were present.

Figure 3. Parsing Possibilities for Left-Peripheral Subjects



Relative to this first alternative, if the subject is then processed as decorating an unfixed node, this unfixed node will merge later on in the parse with the subject node which the verb introduced and annotated with a metavariable, as shown on the left-hand side in Figure 3 for the left-peripheral subject *Sant Mate* ‘Saint Matthew’ in (27). Relative to the second alternative, if the subject is parsed/produced as a $Ty(e)$ -linked structure, the subject metavariable introduced by the verb will duly be replaced by a term that is identical to whatever decorates the linked structure, fulfilling its requirement for a shared term, as illustrated on the right-hand side in Figure 3 for example (26).

The same alternative strategies are expected to be available for the left-peripheral constituents in other variation constructions. The intra-speaker variation between preverbal and postverbal clitic placement within the same syntactic environment is thus expected; and, equally, the heterogeneous positioning in these environments does not pose a problem. More generally, MedSp clitic placement seems indeed to be regulated by different processing strategies used for the constituents preceding the clitics. Preverbal placement is encountered when a negation marker, a tense marker or a constituent decorating a left-peripheral unfixed node, precedes the unstressed pronoun. Postverbal weak pronoun positioning, on the contrary, occurs in the absence of these triggers.

Lexical Characterisation of Clitic Pronouns

Now that the various clitic environments have been examined and their respective analyses introduced, I shall discuss the lexical characterisation of the MedSp clitic. We saw in section 2.1 that [Granberg, 1988], for instance, observed that

pragmatic considerations were at the basis of the MedSp subject environments, as the appearance of preverbal pronouns is associated with a focus reading of the preceding subject. I go further by claiming that the whole MedSp clitic system can be seen as a consequence of the encoding of a pragmatically driven strategy, as we shall see shortly (see also [Bouzouita, in preparation; Cann and Kempson, this volume; Kempson and Cann, 2007]). As has been noted in the literature, Latin weak pronouns occur close to the left-edge of a clause ([Adams, 1994; Devine and Stephens, 2006; Janse, 2000] *inter alia*). Moreover, they follow a structurally heterogeneous set of categories, very similar to the triggers for occurrence of MedSp unstressed pronouns (e.g. following negative expressions, verbs etc.). In my view, the positioning of these Latin weak pronouns can be explained in terms of minimising production costs. As in all other languages, Latin anaphoric expressions enable argument terms to be identified independently of the verb and often appear early in the clause. In relying on context, speakers/hearers need the search for a substituent to be over as small a domain as possible, by general relevance considerations minimising cognitive cost ([Sperber and Wilson, 1995]). Accordingly, unless there is reason to the contrary, the position of an anaphoric expression requiring context-identification is as early as possible in the setting out of propositional structure - quite literally, a minimisation of what constitutes the context (see also [Bouzouita, in preparation; Cann and Kempson, this volume; Kempson and Cann, 2007]). It is this relevance-driven distribution that became calcified in the lexical specification of the clitic pronoun through a routinisation process. Being phonologically weak, clitics need some other expression to co-occur with, unlike their strong-pronoun counterparts. This other expression must involve the initiation of a new propositional domain in order that the clitic itself will occur as close as possible to the domain within which its antecedent is to be found (the relevance-based constraint). It is the requirement for this structural trigger and the actions inducing an early tree relation for the clitic to decorate that becomes routinised, itself a means of ensuring processing economy ([Pickering and Garrod, 2004, p. 181]). The most well-known examples of routines are the non-productive ones such as idioms (e.g. *kick the bucket*), whereby the component words get stored as a complex in the lexicon. In the lexical entry for the MedSp clitic, it is the pragmatic basis of weak pronoun placement that got stored in the lexicon: the requirement of its structural trigger, and the actions inducing the tree node for it to decorate. Accordingly, the once fully pragmatic basis for determining the tree-growth process associated with the unstressed pronouns got replaced with a sequence of tree-growth actions specific to the individual (clitic) pronouns. MedSp clitic distribution is then no longer determined simply by pragmatic reasoning itself as this has got shortcut by the presence of such a lexically stored sequence of actions. An immediate consequence of this routinisation process is that the pragmatic basis can atrophy and eventually vanish, as happened in the pe-

riod between MedSp and RenSp, a matter I shall return to in due course. Another consequence of this routinisation is that the lexical encoding of the clitic is highly disjunctive, the only property held in common by the different triggers for clitic placement being that they all reflect confirmation that an emergent propositional boundary has definitively been established. As Figure 4 illustrates, the lexical entry of the MedSp accusative clitic *lo* reflects this lexical calcification of the earlier pragmatic basis since preverbal pronouns can only be constructed in the presence of a negation marker, an unfixed node or a requirement for a tense marker whereas the postverbal ones only occur in the absence of such triggers.²⁹

Figure 4. Lexical Entry of Medieval Spanish Accusative Clitic ‘*lo*’

P	IF	$?Ty(t),$	
R		$Tn(a)$	
O	THEN	IF	$[NEG+] \vee$ } Negative marker
C		$(\langle \downarrow_* \rangle Fo(\alpha), ?\exists x.Tn(x)) \vee$	} Unfixed node
L		$?\exists x.Tns(x)$	} Tense requirement
I		THEN	$make(\langle \downarrow_1 \rangle \langle \downarrow_0 \rangle),$
S			$go(\langle \downarrow_1 \rangle \langle \downarrow_0 \rangle),$
I			$put(Fo(\mathbf{U}), Ty(e),$
S			$?\exists x.Fo(x),$
			$[\downarrow] \perp, ?\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle Ty(e \rightarrow t))$
		ELSE	ABORT
E	ELSE	IF	$?Ty(e), \langle \uparrow \rangle \top$
N		THEN	IF
C			$(\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle \langle \uparrow_*^1 \rangle (?Ty(t) \wedge [NEG+])) \vee$
L			$(\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle \langle \uparrow_*^1 \rangle (?Ty(t) \wedge \langle \downarrow_* \rangle (Fo(\alpha),$
I			$? \exists x.Tn(x)))) \vee$
S			$(\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle \langle \uparrow_*^1 \rangle (?Ty(t) \wedge \langle \uparrow \rangle \top))$
I		THEN	ABORT
S		ELSE	$put(Fo(\mathbf{U}), Ty(e), ?\exists x.Fo(x),$
			$[\downarrow] \perp, ?\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle Ty(e \rightarrow t))$
		ELSE	ABORT

It should be noted that both preverbal and postverbal accusative clitics are taken to annotate fixed object nodes.³⁰ The nodes decorated by the postverbal clitics have been introduced by the lexical specification of the verb, as discussed earlier

²⁹This account assumes that complementisers annotate the $?Ty(t)$ -node of the complement clause with a requirement for a tense marker ($? \exists x.Tns(x)$). No such assumption is necessary for the other non-root clauses if one adopts [Gregoromichelaki, 2005]’s account, which involves the construction of an unfixed node.

³⁰Not all clitics involve the construction of a fixed argument node. In *leísta* dialects, for instance, the clitic *le* will be taken to introduce and annotate a locally unfixed node due to its case ambiguity (see also [Bouzouita, in preparation]).

(see Figure 2). Those being annotated by proclitics, on the other hand, have been constructed by the lexical entry of the weak pronoun itself due to the lexical calcification of the accusative case in Old Romance. The self-evident complexity of the disjunctive form is what then gets progressively simplified, as we can now see with a characterisation of the RenSp *lo*.

6.2 Renaissance Spanish

In RenSp, recall, a much freer use of proclisis is found. This can be faithfully reflected in the DS characterisation.

Figure 5. Lexical Entry of Renaissance Spanish Accusative Clitic ‘*lo*’

P	IF	$?Ty(t), Tn(a)$	
R	THEN	$make(\langle \downarrow_1 \rangle \langle \downarrow_0 \rangle),$	
O		$go(\langle \downarrow_1 \rangle \langle \downarrow_0 \rangle),$	
C		$put(For(\mathbf{U}), Ty(e),$	
L.		$? \exists x.Fo(x),$	
		$[\downarrow] \perp, ? \langle \uparrow_0 \rangle Ty(e \rightarrow t))$	
E	ELSE	IF	$?Ty(e), \langle \uparrow \rangle \top$
N		THEN	IF
C			$(\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle \langle \uparrow_*^1 \rangle (?Ty(t) \wedge [NEG+])) \vee$
L.			$(\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle \langle \uparrow_*^1 \rangle (?Ty(t) \wedge \langle \downarrow_* \rangle (Fo(\alpha),$
			$? \exists x.Tn(x))) \vee$
			$(\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle \langle \uparrow_*^1 \rangle (?Ty(t) \wedge \langle \uparrow \rangle \top))$
		THEN	ABORT
		ELSE	$put(For(\mathbf{U}), Ty(e), ? \exists x.Fo(x),$
			$[\downarrow] \perp, ? \langle \uparrow_0 \rangle Ty(e \rightarrow t))$
	ELSE	ABORT	

The major change between lexical specification for *lo* in MedSp and RenSp is the loss of proclisis constraints, while retaining the disjunctive specifying enclisis placement. A notable property of this lexical entry is its disjunctive nature, with a cluster of triggering environments. This is strikingly redolent of the clustering property of lexical meanings as they emerge in semantic change environments (see [Larsson, this volume]). This lexical entry reflects directly the fact that all MedSp strict enclitic environments in the intervening period acquired the possibility of also licensing preverbal pronouns (see section 3). As this specification shows, this was due to a relatively small change in the lexical entry of the weak pronoun: the so-called proclisis triggers that were present in MedSp (the presence of a negation marker, an unfixed node or a tense requirement) are dropped from the RenSp characterisation, as shown in Figure 5. The immediate result of the loss of these triggers is the occurrence of proclisis in substantially more environments: RenSp clitics can appear preverbally as long as there is a $?Ty(t)$ -requirement. Note however that the same does not apply to the occurrence of enclitics, as these

restrictions remain unchanged. The diachronic shift from using predominantly enclisis to proclisis is thus modelled in this account as the simplification of the lexical characterisation of the clitic pronoun. Perhaps surprisingly, the effect of this lexical simplification is not a more simplified distribution, as what emerges is a greater number of environments in RenSp that exhibit syntactic variation.

There remains the question why this simplification in the lexical entry occurred. Recall that DS regularly makes available more than one strategy for interpretation: for the variation environments in particular, (i) the strategy of building a pair of linked structures, with the left-peripheral NP decorating that first linked tree as an independent structure, and, in addition, (ii) the strategy of inducing the construction of an unfixed node for that left-peripheral expression to decorate. Recall also that once routinisation took place in MedSp, the original pragmatic motivation underpinning weak pronoun placement gradually disappeared, as it had been shortcut. With no pragmatic basis or intonation cues present, there is then nothing to determine which of these two processing strategies to select. Accordingly, a processing mismatch between speaker and hearer is then plausible for these variation environments. In particular, the change could have happened because dialogue exchanges are never algorithmically determinable. The left-peripheral subject in a sentence containing a preverbal clitic, for instance, can be produced relative to a strategy for building and annotating an unfixed node, as in the left-hand side of Figure 3 (see [Purver *et al.*, 2006] for a DS characterisation of generation). The hearer, on the other hand, can parse this subject as annotating a $Ty(e)$ -linked structure, as in the right-hand side of Figure 3. Once the preverbal clitic has been heard, the hearer has two processing choices: (i) they can access the lexical entry for MedSp clitics and notice that the left-peripheral subject should have been parsed as an unfixed node due to the occurrence of this preverbal pronoun and consequently choose to parse this subject as an unfixed node instead or (ii) they can ignore this MedSp lexical entry and infer that proclitic pronouns are allowed after linked structures since that is how they just parsed the left-peripheral subject. In the latter option, the hearer will have effectively reanalysed the lexical entry for the weak pronoun as given in Figure 5. In other words, a production-parsing mismatch in the variation environments could accordingly have led to the inference that there are no conditions on the occurrence of preverbal pronouns. Once the hearer has made such a move, and indeed has done so on a recurrent basis, this reanalysis could be used as the basis for a production decision, thereby confirming a shift of analysis in the system itself. Notice further that this production-parsing mismatch, restricted to taking place in variation environments only, led to the reanalysis of the weak pronoun's lexical entry, hence affecting all the other environments as well. Furthermore, such a reanalysis can only take place once the original pragmatic reasoning behind weak pronoun placement vanished and with it its specific intonation patterns. Such atrophying has been attributed to the routinisation process

whereby the pragmatic considerations becoming lexically calcified. Importantly, this reanalysis does not affect interpolation which is still observed in RenSp; it only affects the Tobler-Mussafia pattern. In other words, while the restriction on sentence-initial weak pronouns is loosened, verbal adjacency is still not required in RenSp.

6.3 Modern Spanish

As mentioned in section 5.2, despite the existence of interpolation, the verb and not some interpolated constituent follow most frequently the MedSp preverbal clitic pronoun. This pattern becomes even more widely used once the occurrence rate of interpolation decreases after the 14th c. ([Eberenz, 2000, p. 166]). This predominance of the verb following the clitic pronoun is all that is needed to provide the grounds for a second step of routinisation, whereby the actions of the clitic get stored alongside information on the following verb, as shown in Figure 6. In other words, a second reanalysis takes place whereby the positioning of the clitic becomes associated with the mood of the verb, as seen in ModSp, where enclisis in finite contexts is now only allowed with imperative verbs (by the feature *IMP*). When comparing Figure 5 and 6, one will notice that, apart from this imperative feature another small change took place in the lexical entry of the clitic: to wit, two ‘negative triggers’, previously present in the enclisis part, vanished. These two negative triggers prevented in MedSp and RenSp postverbal clitics from appearing after tense markers or unfixed nodes.

Figure 6. Lexical Entry of Modern Spanish Accusative Clitic ‘lo’

P	IF	$?Ty(t), Tn(a)$	
R	THEN	$make(\langle \downarrow_1 \rangle \langle \downarrow_0 \rangle),$	
O		$go(\langle \downarrow_1 \rangle \langle \downarrow_0 \rangle),$	
C		$put(Fo(\mathbf{U}), Ty(e),$	
L.		$? \exists x.Fo(x),$	
		$[\downarrow] \perp, ? \langle \uparrow_0 \rangle Ty(e \rightarrow t))$	
E	ELSE	IF	$?Ty(e), \langle \uparrow \rangle \top,$
N			$\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle \langle \uparrow_1 \rangle IMP$
C		THEN	IF
L.			$\langle \uparrow_0 \rangle \langle \uparrow_*^1 \rangle (?Ty(t) \wedge [NEG+])$
			THEN
			ABORT
			ELSE
			$put(Fo(\mathbf{U}), Ty(e), ? \exists x.Fo(x),$
			$[\downarrow] \perp, ? \langle \uparrow_0 \rangle Ty(e \rightarrow t))$
		ELSE	ABORT

Dating this second routinisation is not that straightforward. However, we saw that the appearance of novel proclisis cases predates the loss of interpolation, as exemplified by example (93) in section 5.2. In consequence, we can conclude that the reanalysis whereby the proclisis triggers get lost predates the completion of

the routinisation process which results in a system in which the clitic positioning is determined by the mood of the verb along which it appears. Once again, a cognitive economy measure seems to be responsible for one of the diachronic changes observed in Spanish clitic placement.

7 Conclusion

In conclusion, I have argued that MedSp clitic placement is governed by different processing (producing/parsing) strategies i.e. different ways of building up semantic content. More specifically, preverbal placement is observed when the clitic is preceded by a negation marker, a tense marker or a structurally underspecified constituent, whereas postverbal pronouns are precluded from arising after these triggers but occur in all other environments (fixed nodes/linked structures). Accordingly, MedSp placement is no longer governed by pragmatic considerations but by different processing (producing/parsing) strategies since the original pragmatic underpinning became routinised i.e. lexically calcified in the weak pronoun characterisation in order to create a processing shortcut. Furthermore, syntactic variation between preverbal and postverbal clitic positioning within one and the same syntactic environment is expected since different processing strategies are made available for any one sequence of words to be parsed. Accordingly, we can conclude that processing factors contribute to the syntactic intra-speaker variation observed in the MedSp clitic system.

As concerns the diachronic changes, a diffusion of preverbal pronouns was observed in RenSp as those environments that were previously strictly postverbal started using preverbal pronouns as well. This was attributed to a reanalysis of the lexical characterisation of the clitic pronoun: namely, the loss of restrictions on the occurrence of preverbal pronouns. Additionally, once the pragmatic reasoning behind clitic placement vanished (due to routinisation), the various processing strategies could have played a role in this diachronic change since their availability within one syntactic environment makes a processing mismatch between speaker and hearer possible. On the assumption that the routinisation process has consolidated into a fixed encoding, any such processing mismatch would have to result in a reanalysis of the lexical entry of the clitic pronoun, which if buttressed by further use would lead to loss of restrictions on preverbal placement. We can thus conclude that routinisation – the cognitive shortcuts whereby whole chunks of pragmatic or computational actions become lexically stored – played an important role in the syntactic changes that occurred between MedSp and RenSp. Similarly, routinisation is responsible for the second reanalysis which led to the ModSp system, in which the clitic position becomes associated with the mood of the verb, since the actions of the clitic got stored alongside information on the following verb.

More generally, it has been shown that it is essential to take into account (i) the

interdependency of syntax, semantics and pragmatics, and (ii) the time-linear processing aspect of parsing and production in order to obtain a better understanding of language change in view of the following. Firstly, the pragmatic basis for the syntactic variation in weak pronoun placement, already present in Latin, became lexically encoded for the MedSp clitics, which led to the fade-out of this pragmatic basis (and its associated intonation patterns). Accordingly, the diachronic changes in clitic placement in the history of Spanish cannot be fully understood if one does not take into account the intertwining of syntax, semantics and pragmatics. Secondly, we saw that a subsequent production-parsing mismatch could have given rise to the reanalysis of the lexical entry of the clitic, whose preverbal placement became interpreted as not having any restrictions in RenSp, resulting thus in the spread of proclisis across other environments. In other words, the diachronic account given here does not only take into consideration the fact that the possible interpretation(s) of a natural language string is/are built up progressively but, more importantly, is based on the assumption that a processing mismatch can result in a reanalysis, without having a complete breakdown in communication since both speaker and hearer will end up with the same semantic interpretation of the string in question. Such a processing mismatch is possible due to the availability of various processing strategies for the same string. Accordingly, the availability of various processing strategies also played a role in the diachronic changes observed in Spanish clitic placement.

TEXTS AND CORPORA CITED

ARC = Saint Juan of Ávila (1499-1569), *Avisos y reglas cristianas ... compuestas ... sobre aquel verso de David : audi, filia ...*, *BVMC*, Alicante, 1999.
<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=1535>

BMlg. = Gonzalo de Berceo (1195-1253?), *Milagros de Nuestra Señora*, *BVMC*, Alicante, 2005. <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=13691>

BVMC = *Biblioteca Virtual Miguel de Cervantes*, <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/>

CDE = *Corpus del Español*, <http://www.corpusdelespanol.org/>

Cid = Anonymous (12th c.), *Poema de Mio Cid*, edition of C. Smith, Cátedra, Madrid, 1987.

Cid2 = Anonymous (12th c.), *Cantar de Mio Cid*, edition of R. Menéndez Pidal, Espasa Calpe, Madrid, 1946.

Cid3 = Anonymous (12th c.), *Cantar de Mio Cid*, *BVMC*, Alicante, 2003.
<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=10379&portal=68>

- Corbacho* = Alfonso Martínez de Toledo (1398-1470?), *Arcipreste de Talavera o Corbacho*, edition of J. González Muela, Castalia, Madrid, 1970.
- CORDE* = *Corpus Diacrónico del Español*, <http://corpus.rae.es/cordenet.html>
- DLNE* = C. Company. *Documentos lingüísticos de la Nueva España: Altiplano central*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico, 1994.
- EE* = Alfonso X el Sabio (1252-1284), *Primera Crónica General de España [Estoria de España]*, edition of R. Menéndez Pidal, Gredos, Madrid, 1977.
- EG* = Anonymous (1243-1271), *Estoria de los godos*, BNC Ms. 302.
- Est.Esp.II* = Alfonso X el Sabio (1252-1284), *Estoria de España II, MC*, Escorial Monasterio X-I-4.
- Faz.* = Almeric, Arçidiano de Antiochia (begin 13th c.), *La Fazienda de Ultra Mar* = [Lazar, 1965]
- Gen.Est.I* = Alfonso X el Sabio (1252-1284), *General Estoria I*, edition of A.G. Solalinde, Centro de Estudios Históricos, Madrid, 1930.
- Gen.Est.IV* = Alfonso X el Sabio (1252-1284), *General Estoria IV, MC*, Roma Vaticana Urb lat 539.
- GranConq.* = Anonymous (13th c.), *Gran Conquista de Ultramar, MC*, Salamanca Giesser 1503-06-21.
- Habla* = J. M. Lope Blanch. *El habla de la Ciudad de México*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico, 1971.
- HDO* = J. M. Lope Blanch. *El habla de Diego de Ordaz: contribución a la historia del español americano (2nd edition)*. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico, 1998.
- Hist.Troy.* = Leomarte (mid 14th c.), *Sumas de Historia Troyana*, edition of A. Rey, *Revista de filología española*, Anejo XV, Madrid, 1932.
- LPal.* = Pedro López de Ayala (1378-1403), *Libro de Palacio, BVMC*, Alicante, 2004. <http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=383>
- Luc.* = Don Juan Manuel (1330-1335), *Libro del conde Lucanor, MC*, BNC Ms. 6376.
- MC* = Electronic Texts and Concordances of the Madison Corpus of Early Spanish Manuscripts and Printings. Prepared by John O'Neill. Hispanic Seminary of Medieval Studies, Madison/New York, 1999. CD-ROM.

Prob.Secr. = J. de Cárdenas (1591), *Primera parte de los problemas y secretos maravillosos de las Indias*, re-published by CILUS, Salamanca, 2000.

SDom. = Gonzalo de Berceo (1195-1253?), *Vida de Santo Domingo de Silos*, *BVMC*, Alicante, 2005.

<http://www.cervantesvirtual.com/FichaObra.html?Ref=516>

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [Adams, 1994] J. Adams. Wackernagel's Law and the Position of Unstressed Personal Pronouns in Classical Latin. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 92: 103–178, 1994.
- [Álvarez Blanco *et al.*, 1986] M. R. Álvarez Blanco, X. L. Regueira, and H. Monteagudo. *Gramática Galega*. Editorial Galaxia, Vigo, 1986.
- [Arias Álvarez, 1995] B. Arias Álvarez. Colocación de los pronombres átonos en el 'Libro de los gatos'. In A. González, L. Von der Walde and C. Company (eds), *Palabra e imagen en la Edad Media*, 113–125. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico, 1995.
- [Armijo Canto, 1985] C.E. Armijo Canto. *Colocación de los pronombres átonos lo, la, le durante los siglos XVI al XIX en documentos mexicanos*. Licenciatura Dissertation, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico, 1985.
- [Armijo Canto, 1992] C.E. Armijo Canto. Colocación de los pronombres átonos *lo, la, le* durante los siglos XVI al XIX en documentos mexicanos. In L. Traill (ed.), *Scripta philologica: in honorem Juan M. Lope Blanch*, vol. 1, 213–260. Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico, 1992.
- [Arias Álvarez, 1996] B. Arias Álvarez. El orden de colocación de los clíticos pronominales durante la primera mitad del siglo XVI. *Revista de Humanidades* 1: 128–137, 1996.
- [Barry, 1987] A.K. Barry. Clitic Pronoun Position in Thirteenth-Century Spanish. *Hispanic Review* 55: 213–220, 1987.
- [Bouzouita and Kempson, 2006] M. Bouzouita and R. Kempson. Clitic Placement in Old and Modern Spanish: a Dynamic Account. In O. Nedergaard Thomsen (ed.), *Competing Models of Linguistic Change*, 253–268. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2006.
- [Bouzouita, 2007] M. Bouzouita. Processing Factors in Syntactic Variation and Change: Clitics in Medieval and Renaissance Spanish. In J. Salmons and S. Dubenion-Smith (eds), *Historical Linguistics 2005: Selected papers from the 17th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Madison, 31 July - 5 August 2005*, 51–71. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2007.
- [Bouzouita, 2008] M. Bouzouita. Modelling Syntactic Variation. *Diálogo de la lengua* 1, 2008.
- [Bouzouita, in preparation] M. Bouzouita. *The Diachronic Development of Spanish Clitic Placement*. PhD Dissertation, King's College London, in preparation.
- [Buffum, 1927] M.E. Buffum. The Post-Positive Pronoun in Spanish. *Hispania* 10.3: 181-188, 1927.
- [Cann *et al.*, 2005] R. Cann, R. Kempson, and L. Marten. *The Dynamics of Language*. Elsevier, Oxford, 2005.
- [Cann and Kempson, this volume] R. Cann and R. Kempson. Production Pressures, Syntactic Change and the Emergence of Clitic Pronouns. In R. Cooper and R. Kempson (eds), *Language in Flux*. King's College London, London, this volume.
- [Castillo Lluch, 1996] M. Castillo Lluch. *La posición del pronombre átono en la prosa hispánica medieval*. PhD Dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, 1996.
- [Castillo Lluch, 1998] M. Castillo Lluch. La interpolación en español antiguo. In C. García Turza, F. González and J. Mangado (eds), *Actas del IV Congreso Internacional de Historia de la Lengua Española*, vol. I, 409–422. Universidad de la Rioja, Logroño, 1998.
- [Chenery, 1905] W. Chenery. Object-Pronouns in Dependent Clauses: a Study in Old Spanish Word-Order. *Publications of the Modern Language Association* 20: 1–151, 1905.
- [Company Company, 1985-6] C. Company Company. Los futuros en el español medieval. Sus orígenes y su evolución. *Nueva Revista de Filología Hispánica* 34.1: 48–108, 1985-6.
- [Devine and Stephens, 2006] J. Devine and L. Stephens. *Latin Word Order: Structured Meaning and Information*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.

- [Eberenz, 2000] R. Eberenz. *El español en el otoño de la Edad Media: sobre el artículo y los pronombres*. Gredos, Madrid, 2000.
- [Elvira, 1987] J. Elvira. Enclisis pronominal y posición del verbo en español antiguo. *Epos* 3: 63–79, 1987.
- [Fontana, 1993] J. Fontana. *Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish*. PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1993.
- [Gessner, 1893] E. Gessner. Das spanische Personal-pronomen. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 17: 1–54, 1893.
- [Granberg, 1988] R. Granberg. *Object Pronoun Position in Medieval and Early Modern Spanish*. PhD Dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1988.
- [Granberg, 1999] R. Granberg. Clitic Position in Thirteenth-Century Spanish: Sentences with Preverbal Subject. *La corónica* 27.2: 89–113, 1999.
- [Gregoromichelaki, 2005] E. Gregoromichelaki. *Conditionals in Dynamic Syntax*. PhD Dissertation, King's College London, 2005.
- [Janse, 2000] M. Janse. Convergence and Divergence in the Development of the Greek and Latin Clitic Pronouns. In R. Sornicola, E. Poppe and A. Shisha Ha-Levy (eds), *Stability, Variation and Change of Word-Order Patterns over Time*, 231–258. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2000.
- [Jensen, 2003] B. Jensen. Syntax and Semantics of Imperative Subjects. In A. Dahl, K. Bentzen and P. Svenonius (eds), *Nordlyd: Proceedings of the 19th Scandinavian Conference of Linguistics*, 31.1: 150–164, 2003.
- [Kempson et al., 2001] R. Kempson, W. Meyer-Viol, and D. Gabbay. *Dynamic Syntax*. Blackwell, Oxford, 2001.
- [Kempson and Cann, 2007] R. Kempson and R. Cann. Dynamic Syntax and Dialogue: Preliminaries for a Dialogue-driven Account of Syntactic Change. In J. Salmons and S. Dubenion-Smith (eds), *Historical Linguistics 2005: Selected papers from the 17th International Conference on Historical Linguistics, Madison, 31 July - 5 August 2005*, 73–103. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2007.
- [Keniston, 1937] H. Keniston. *The Syntax of Castilian Prose: the Sixteenth Century*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1937.
- [Larsson, this volume] S. Larsson. Formalizing the Dynamics of Semantic Systems of Dialogue. In R. Cooper and R. Kempson (eds), *Language in Flux*. King's College London, London, this volume.
- [Lazar, 1965] M. Lazar. *La Fazienda de Ultra Mar: Biblia Romanceada et Itinéraire Biblique en Prose Castillane du XIIe Siècle*. Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, 1965.
- [Lesman St. Clair, 1980] A. Lesman St. Clair. *El pronombre átono en la prosa española del siglo XVII*. PhD Dissertation, University of Maryland, 1980.
- [Martins, 2003] A.-M. Martins. From Unity to Diversity in Romance Syntax: Portuguese and Spanish. In K. Braunmüller and G. Ferraresi (eds), *Multilingualism in European Language History*, 201–233. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 2002.
- [Meyer Lübke, 1897] W. Meyer Lübke. Zur Stellung der tonlosen Objektspronomen. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 16: 313–334, 1897.
- [Nieuwenhuijsen, 1999] D. Nieuwenhuijsen. *Cambios en la colocación de los pronombres átonos en la historia del español*. PhD Dissertation, University of Groningen, 1999. <http://elies.rediris.es/elies5/>
- [Nieuwenhuijsen, 2002] D. Nieuwenhuijsen. Variación de la colocación de los pronombres átonos en el español antiguo. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 118: 360–375, 2002.
- [Nieuwenhuijsen, 2006] D. Nieuwenhuijsen. La colocación de los pronombres átonos. In C. Company (ed.), *Sintaxis histórica del español*, vol. 2, 1337–1404. Fondo de Cultura Económica & Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, Mexico, 2006.
- [Parodi, 1979] C. Parodi. Orden de los pronombres átonos durante el primer cuarto del siglo XVI en el español novohispano. *Nueva revista de filología hispánica* 28: 312–317.
- [Pickering and Garrod, 2004] M. Pickering and S. Garrod. Towards a Mechanistic Psychology of Dialogue. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 27: 169–226, 2004.
- [Purver et al., 2006] M. Purver, R. Cann, and R. Kempson. Grammars as Parsers: Meeting the Dialogue Challenge. *Research on Language and Computation* 4.2-3: 289–326, 2006.

- [Ramsden, 1963] H. Ramsden. *Weak-Pronoun Position in the Early Romance Languages*. Manchester University Press, Manchester, 1963.
- [Rini, 1990] J. Rini. Dating the Grammaticalization of the Spanish Clitic Pronoun. *Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie* 56.3-4: 350–370, 1990.
- [Rivero, 1991] M. L. Rivero. Clitic and NP Climbing in Old Spanish. In H. Campos and F. Martínez-Gil (eds), *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, 241–282. Georgetown University Press, Washington D.C., 1991.
- [Rubio Perea, 2004] E. Rubio Perea. La posición del pronombre personal átono en un manuscrito del siglo XVI: ‘las ordenanzas de Canena’ 1544. *Interlingüística* 15.2: 1207–1216, 2004.
- [Sánchez Lancis, 1993] C. Sánchez Lancis. La interpolación de complementos entre el pronombre personal átono y el verbo en español medieval. In G. Hilty (ed.), *XXe Congrès international de linguistique et philologie romanes*, vol. 2, 323–334. Francke Verlag und Basel, Tübingen, 1993.
- [Sperber and Wilson, 1995] D. Sperber and D. Wilson. *Relevance: Communication and Cognition (2nd edition)*. Blackwell, Oxford, 1995.
- [Staaff, 1907] E. Staaff. Contribution à la syntaxe du pronom personnel dans le ‘Poème du Cid’. *Romanische Forschungen* 23: 621–635, 1907.
- [Wanner, 1996] D. Wanner. Second Position Clitics in Medieval Romance. In A. L. Halpern and A. M. Zwicky (eds), *Approaching Second. Second Position Clitics and Related Phenomena*, 537–579. CSLI, Stanford, 1996.

Miriam Bouzouita

Philosophy Department, King’s College London, London, United Kingdom.

miriam.bouzouita@kcl.ac.uk