

## **Patterns of Object Movement and the Object Agreement Cycle from Latin to Spanish**

Matthew L. Maddox

*University of Illinois @ Urbana Champaign / Southeast Community College-Nebraska*

Object movement in Old Spanish (OldS) (1) was common (Sitaridou 2011); it is much more constrained in Modern Spanish (ModS). Clitic-left dislocation (CLDT) (2) appears in the 13<sup>th</sup> century and persists in ModS. Accusative clitic doubling (ACD) (3) develops in the 14<sup>th</sup> century (Vilanova et al 2018); it is obligatory with pronominal objects in ModS. ACD and object movement show interpretational and binding parallels. These patterns are due to: 1) reduction in information structure-based object movement and 2) grammaticalization of object clitics. I show that object movement feeds grammaticalization of pronouns into agreement; i.e., the “object agreement cycle” (OAC) by which pronouns are reanalyzed from DP to D to  $v$  (Gelderen 2011). Object movement decreases after an EPP/D-feature on  $v$  is lost (Mensching 2012), but the OAC continues. This predicts that if a language had object movement it will develop clitics that occur in CLDT at an early stage and later in ACD. This prediction holds in modern Romance varieties.

Latin object movement targets Spec, $v$ . It is triggered by an EPP/D-feature. The object moves to Spec, $v$  so it is interpretable to the interfaces. Null objects are evidence for D in  $v$ . Null subjects are licensed via D in T (Holmberg 2005). I propose null objects are licensed similarly. Latin had referential null objects (4) (Luraghi 2004); ModS only has non-referential null objects (5) (Campos 1986). Unlike Latin, OldS only allowed movement of certain object types (MacKenzie & van der Wurff 2012). ModS object movement is restricted to focus fronting and VOS. Diagnostics of movement and coordination show Latin pronouns were DPs. OldS interpolation and auxiliary selection are evidence that clitics were reanalyzed from DPs to D (Maddox 2016).

ACD and object movement pattern together with respect to weak-crossover and Principle C binding effects and both yield a specific interpretation, hence they are the same per Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (1997). I propose pronominal object movement, CLDT, and ACD are available depending on the status of the clitic. Object movement is possible when the clitic is a DP (Latin/OldS). It merges in VP, moves to Spec, $v$  and higher up depending on discourse. In OldS the clitic appears due to the loss of D in  $v$ . OldS clitics are DPs with a D-feature. The CLDT object merges in VP. A clitic merges in Spec, $v$  for EPP/D, which the object subsequently skips. For ACD I follow Kramer (2014) wherein the object moves to Spec, $v$  where m-merger with  $v$  takes place. Both copies are pronounced; the higher one as a clitic. Object movement thus feeds ACD; i.e., it moves the object close to  $v$ . I propose this is also true diachronically. M-merger encourages reanalysis of clitics from D to  $v$ ; i.e., the OAC. After this, ACD yields the same surface string but the derivation is different. The copy analysis applies when clitics are D-heads. When clitics are  $v$  the DP object merges again as complement and the cycle is renewed.

This analysis accounts for similarities between object movement, CLDT, and ACD. It also lends support to a movement analysis of ACD at an early stage. A prediction falls out of this whereby if a language had object movement and object clitics, it will develop CLDT first and later ACD. This holds for Romance. All Old Romance had extensive object movement similar to OldS (Sitaridou 2012). ModS and Romanian have both CLDT and ACD. Italian and French only have CLDT. This is because French object clitics are less grammaticalized than ModS; e.g., standard French object clitics take wide scope over conjoined VPs (Kayne 1975); ModS clitics must be repeated since they are now object agreement. European Portuguese (EP) also is consistent with my prediction. Old Portuguese had object movement; EP has CLDT but lacks ACD (Barrie 2000) because clitics are at an early stage in the OAC. EP patterns like French with respect to coordinated VPs and interpolation is still allowed with negation (Luis & Kaiser 2016). Rioplatense Spanish is the most advanced since it allows unrestricted ACD (Suñer 1988).

## Examples:

- (1) este poder ovo Sant Pedro... (Old Spanish)  
this power had Saint Peter  
'Saint Peter had this power...'
- (2) los basos<sub>i</sub> que eran en la casa del Criador aduxo-los<sub>i</sub>... (Old Spanish)  
the cups that were in the house of-the Creator brought-them  
'he brought the cups that were in the house of the Creator...'
- (3) otro que la<sub>i</sub> amasse a ella<sub>i</sub> tanto commo él o más. (Old Spanish)  
other that her would-love DOM she as-much as he or more  
'other one who would love her like he, or even more.'
- (4) Caesar exercitum<sub>i</sub> reduxit et ... in hibernis pro<sub>i</sub> conlocavit. (Latin)  
Caesar army led-back and in winter-camp it established  
'Caesar led his army back and established it in the winter camp.'
- (5) a. ¿Compraste leche<sub>i</sub>? (Modern Spanish)  
bought milk  
'Did you buy milk?'
- b. Sí, compré pro<sub>i</sub>?  
yes bought  
'Yes, I bought some.'

**References:** Alexiadou, A. & E. Anagnostopoulou 1997. Toward a Uniform Account of Scrambling and Clitic Doubling. In Abraham, W. & E. van Gelderen (eds.), *German: Syntactic Problems-Syntactic Problems*. Niemeyer: Tübingen. Barrie, M. 2000. The Syntax of Clitic Placement in European Portuguese. *Revue québécoise de linguistique* 28:91–109. Gelderen, E. van. 2011. *The Linguistic Cycle*. Oxford: UP. Kramer, R. 2014. Clitic Doubling or Object Agreement: The View from Amharic. *NLLT* 32:593-634. Luis, A.R. & G.A. Kaiser. 2016. Clitic Pronouns: Phonology, Morphology, and Syntax. In W. Leo Wetzels et al., *The Handbook of Portuguese Linguistics*. John Wiley & Sons: New Jersey. Luraghi, S. 2004. Null Objects in Latin and Greek and the Relevance of Linguistic Typology for Language Reconstruction. In Jones-Bley et al., *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual UCLA Indo-European Conference*. Institute for the Study of Man: Washington, D.C. MacKenzie, I. & W. van der Wurff. 2012. Relic Syntax in Middle English and Medieval Spanish: Parameter Interaction. *Language* 88:846-876. Mensching, G. 2012. Parameters in Old Romance word order: A comparative minimalist analysis. In Galves et al., *Parametery Theory and Linguistic Change*. Oxford: UP. Sitaridou, I. 2011. Word order and information structure in Old Spanish. *Journal of Catalan Linguistics* 10:159-184. Sitaridou, I. 2012. A comparative study of word order in Old Romance. *Folia Linguistica* 46:553-604. Vilanova, J.V., S. Fischer & M. Navarro. 2018. The Clitic Doubling Cycle: A Diachronic Reconstruction. In Dindelegan et al., *Comparative and Diachronic Perspectives on Romance Syntax*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing: Cambridge.

**Diachronic data:** (1) Alfonso X, *El Espéculo*, 1255-1260; (2) Anon., *La Fazienda de Ultra Mar*, 13<sup>th</sup> cent.; (3) Juan Manuel, *El Conde Lucanor*, 1335; (4) Caesar, *de bello Gallico*, 58-49 BCE.