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Abstract
Studies on clitics emphasise that Across-the-Board (ATB) clitic placement is licensed only by proclitic pronouns and exhibits a different behaviour across Romance in what concerns its availability as a regular syntactic construction. Current proposals treat these properties either as the result of the LCA and the special status of clitics as parasitic gaps identifiers in some languages (Kayne 1994), or as the consequence of the projection of a functional category above the coordinate structure, where the clitic may remain stranded (Rouveret 1992, Uriagereka 1995). Departing from these analyses, I will claim that ATB clitic placement is not restricted to proclisis and may arise whenever the clitic has scope over the arguments it is related with in each conjunct. I will also argue that the different behaviour of ATB clitic placement in Romance must be entirely imputed to the status of the clitics as autonomous vs. non-autonomous syntactic heads, as well as to the strategies potentially available in each language for evidencing the coordinate structure as a unit the overt clitic has scope over.

1. Introduction

On the basis of examples like (1), from French, it is usually assumed that ATB clitic placement is restricted to proclisis (cf. Benicà and Cinque 1990, Kayne 1994, Rouveret 1995, Uriagereka 1995).

1 I would like to thank Inês Duarte, Eduardo Raposo, Ana Brito, Madalena Colaço, Sónia Frota, Ana Maria Martins and, specially, two anonymous reviewers, for their valuable comments on a previous version of this paper. I am also indebted to Léon Acosta and Roberto Castón for their help with the Spanish data.
(1a. *Paul les lit et relit sans cesse.
Paul them read s and rereads without stop
'Paul reads and rereads them incessantly.'  
(Kayne 1994:62)

b. *Lis et relis -les!
'Read and reread them!'  
(Kayne 1994:62)

Attempting to capture the contrast of acceptability between (1a) and (1b), Kayne (1994) suggests that, while in (1a) ATB clitic placement occurs in a legitimate coordinate structure, whose conjuncts are maximal projections, in (1b) it violates the Linear Correspondence Axiom (LCA).

To account for (1a), Kayne (1994) extends Munn's (1992, 1993) proposal on ATB constructions, claiming that the clitic in the first conjunct must identify a null operator which binds a parasitic gap in the second conjunct. He assumes that the exceptional status of clitic ATB configurations in a language like French lies on the fact that clitics are not usually identifiers of parasitic gaps in these languages, allowing for such an identification only when the two verbs are sufficiently similar (Kayne 1994: 63).

Relating the availability of the clitic ATB construction with proclisis to its regular occurrence in Romance languages, such as European Portuguese, Spanish and Galician, Rouveret (1992) and Uriagereka (1995) argue for the existence of a functional projection higher that the core sentence projections in these languages (WP and FP, respectively). In ATB clitic placement, the clitic would raise to the head of this projection, while its verbal host would remain in a lower functional projection, inside the coordinate structure.

In this study, I will adopt the main proposals on coordination presented in Kayne (1994), according to which coordinate structures exhibit binary asymmetrical configurations, projected from a functional head, Conj, which selects for each conjunct either as its specifier
or as its complement. However, in contrast with Kayne (1994), I will claim, on the basis of comparative evidence, that ATB clitic placement is not exclusively restricted to proclisis and that the unacceptable cases of clitic ATB with enclisis may not be systematically explained as LCA violations.

Yet, ATB clitic placement has a much more limited range of occurrence with enclisis than with proclisis — while the former is confined to cases where the clitic and its verbal host have been extracted out of the coordinate structure, clitic ATB with proclisis, while allowing it, does not require such an extraction. This different behaviour is a consequence of the structural requirements for the c-command of the clitic to obtain in each conjunct.

In fact, European Portuguese presents compelling empirical evidence for both the incorporation of the clitic into its verbal host before Spell-Out and the possibility of ATB readings in configurations where the clitic has not been moved from the coordinate structure. These properties strongly argue against the approaches of ATB clitic placement which rely on the presence of the clitic in a functional head independent from the one occupied by its verbal host in overt syntax (cf. Rouveret 1992, Uriagereka 1995).

Spanish and European Portuguese exhibit ATB clitic placement more freely than French, allowing for the occurrence of different predicates headed by simple verb forms in each conjunct (see (2a) and (2b) vs. (2c)).

(2) a. Juan les hablará y perdonará. [Spanish]
   Juan them talk-will and forgive-will
   'Juan will talk to them and forgive them.'
   (Uriagereka 1995:105)

   b. Só Roberto me viu e cumprimentou. [Portuguese]
   Only Roberto meCLacc saw and greeted
   'Only Roberto saw me and greeted me.'
   (cf. Cunha 1972: 218)

---

2See also Benmamoun 1992 and Aoun et alii 1994.
c. * Jean vous parlera et pardonnera.

Jean you_dat will-speak and will-forgive.

(Kayne 1994:62)

Still, the non-exceptional character of ATB clitic placement in these languages may not be explained by reducing it to a case of the parasitic gap construction. Rather, the different behaviour of ATB clitic placement across Romance must be searched in the status of the proclitic pronouns in what concerns their syntactic autonomy with respect to their syntactic hosts, as well as in the different strategies employed by each language to identify the whole coordinate structure as the scope domain of the clitic.

2. ATB clitic placement with enclisis and extraction from the coordinate structure

Relating (1b), repeated in (3a), to (3b), Kayne (1994) suggests that the unacceptability of ATB clitic placement with enclisis is a consequence of LCA's violation. Both examples would be instances of head coordination, (3a) exhibiting coordination of verbal heads and (3b) showing an [Cl and Cl] configuration.

(3) a. * Lis et relis -les!

'Read and reread them!'

(Kayne 1994:62)

b. * Donne-moi et lui un livre.

'Give me and him a book.'

(Kayne 1994:60)

Data from European Portuguese, where enclisis has a much wider range of occurrence than in other Romance languages, seem to suggest an alternative explanation.
In fact, enclisis in Spanish and Italian is restricted to non-finite domains proclisis being triggered by the strength of Tense (Belletti 1993). This property is illustrated for Spanish in (4):

(4)a. *Looimos.*
   It heard-we
   'We heard it.'

   b. *Para oirlo ...*
   To heard-it
   'To hear it…'

   (Uriagereka 1995:92)

In opposition, in European Portuguese, enclisis occurs in finite root sentences as well as in infinitival embedded ones (see (5)), and proclisis is confined to contexts where operator-like elements c-command the verbal host of the clitic — sentential negation (see (6a)); overt complementizers (see (6b)) and wh-operators (see (6c)), quantified NPs in preverbal subject position (see (6d)), fronted focused elements (see (6e)), certain preverbal adverbs (see (6f)) and coordination scope makers (see (6g)) (cf. Duarte 1983, Duarte and Matos 1998, Frota and Vigário (1996), among others).

(5)  
   a. *Ele viu-a.*
   Hesaw-herCLacc
   'He saw her.'

   b. *Ele quer vê-la.*
   Hewantsto-see-herCLacc
   'He wants to see her.'

   The João not himCLacc saw
'João did not see him.'

b.  *Ela disse [que] ela amava.*  
She said that she loved  
'She said that he loved her.'

c.  *[Que] lhe ofereceste?*  
What did you offer him/her?  
'What did you offer him/her?'

d.  *[Todos os alunos] se riram.*  
All the students laughed  
'All the students laughed.'

e.  *[Até a ele] lhe contaram (elas) mentiras.*  
Even to him told (they-fem) lies  
'They told lies even to him.'

The bought  
'João bought it already.'

He calls them visits  
'He both calls them and visits them.'

The examples in (7) and (8), from European Portuguese, apparently confirm that ATB clitic placement is impossible with enclisis, but point to a different explanation from the one proposed in Kayne 1994 — an explanation not relying on the head status of the conjuncts, but on the structural position of the clitic:

(7) a.  *Só Roberto me viu e cumprimentou.*  
Only Roberto saw and greeted  
'Only Roberto saw me and greeted me.'
b. * Viu-me e cumprimentou.³

He-saw-meCLacc and greeted

'He saw me and greeted.'

(cf. Cunha 1972: 218)

(8) a. Todos o viram na aula e cumprimentaram

All himCLacc saw in-the classroom and greeted
delicadamente.

politely

'They all saw him in the classroom and greeted him politely.'

b. * Eles viram-no na aula e cumprimentaram

They saw-himCLacc in-the classroom and greeted
delicadamente.

politely

'They saw him in the classroom and greeted politely.'

In contrast with (3a), in (7b) and (8b) the enclitic pronoun targets the verb in the first conjunct as its host; furthermore, in (8b) the verb co-occurs with other constituents, whose presence discards the possibility of word coordination. The examples in (7b) and (8b) do not violate the LCA, yet they are unacceptable. Thus, this unacceptability must be imputed to some other factor, presumably the structural position of the clitic.

Moreover, contradicting the current assumptions, European Portuguese provides ample evidence for the ATB clitic placement with enclisis (see (9)):

---
³ Examples like this one, where the direct object is missing in the second conjunct, may be marginally interpreted as instances of the Null Object construction, initially described for European Portuguese in Raposo 1986.
(9)a. *Eles tinham-nas ouvido às avós e contado aos filhos.  
They had-them\textsubscript{CL\text{acc}} heard from-the grandmothers and told to-the children  
'They had heard them from their grandmothers and told them to their children.'
b. *Ele estava-lhe sempre a telefonar e a pedir conselhos.  
He was-him/her\textsubscript{CL\text{dat}} always to call and to ask-for advices  
'He was always calling him/her, asking for advice.'

However, clitic ATB with enclisis is severely restricted: it only occurs in sentences where the clitic is hosted by an auxiliary and where there is a single instance of this verb — see the contrast between (10) and (11). In (11), the only interpretation available is the marginal one where the indirect object of the verb in the second conjunct exhibits arbitrary reference.

(10)  
\textit{O João tem-lhes lido romances e emprestado vídeos.}  
The João has-them\textsubscript{CL\text{dat}} read novels and lent videos  
'João has read them novels and lent videos.'

(11) a.* \textit{O João leu-lhes romances e emprestou vídeos.}  
The João read-them\textsubscript{CL\text{dat}} novels and lent videos  
'João read them novels and lent videos.'  
b.* \textit{O João tem-lhes lido romances e tem emprestado vídeos.}  
The João has-them\textsubscript{CL\text{dat}} read novels and has lent videos  
'João has read them novels and has lent videos.'

When the coordination overtly includes the verbs in both conjuncts, as in (11), the ATB interpretation is lost and a clitic is required:
(12) a. O João leu-lhes romances e emprestou-lhes vídeos.
The João read-them<sub>CL,dat</sub> novels and lent-them<sub>CL,dat</sub> videos
'João read them novels and lent them videos.'
b. O João tem-lhes lido romances e tem-lhes emprestado vídeos.
The João has-them<sub>CL,dat</sub> read novels and has-them<sub>CL,dat</sub> lent videos
'João has read them novels and has lent them videos.'

The same dependence on the presence of a single auxiliary is found in proclisis, in French (cf. Kayne 1975, 1994), where these cases apparently constitute the only fully grammatical ones — see (13).

(13) Jean vous aurait parlé et pardonné.
Jean you<sub>dat</sub> would-have spoken and forgiven
'Jean would have spoken to you and forgiven you.'

(Kayne 1994:145, footnote 12)

These facts suggest that the same general solution should be devised for the Portuguese and French data. Yet, Kayne's analysis of the French case relies on ellipsis. In opposition to (1a), repeated in (14), (13) is conceived as an instance of gapping involving the auxiliary and the complement clitic (cf. Kayne 1994:145, footnote 12).

(14) Paul les lit et relit sans cesse.
Paul them reads and rereads without stop
'Paul reads and rereads them incessantly.'

(Kayne 1994:62)
According to this proposal, there is no difficulty in assigning the correct interpretation to
the second conjunct if we assume that deletion applies at PF. At LF all the relevant material,
i.e. the verb and the clitic, is still available. Accepting, as usual, that in the languages under
consideration, the tensed auxiliary verb raises in overt syntax to check its features against the
sentence functional projections, the minimal admissible level for coordination would be the
functional projection involved in this checking, as represented in (15), for the Portuguese
enclitic cases.

\[(15) \text{[ConjP [IP…[I Vaux[CLi]][VP V…cl₁ …]] [ [Conj] [IP…[I Vaux[CLj]][VP V…clj…]]]]} \]

In (15), \(cl\) stands for the copy of the moved clitic, CL. Notice that in this example, as in the
rest of this paper, the term IP refers to the core sentence functional projections.

The sentences in (16), from European Portuguese, apparently argue for the gapping
hypothesis, since they seem to prove that the so called ATB clitic placement with enclisis is
compatible with an overt subject in the second conjunct.

\[(16) \text{a. (?) O Paulo tem-lhe lido romances e a Maria} \]
\[\text{The Paulo has-him/herCLdat read novels and the Maria} \]
\[\text{emprestado vídeos.} \]
\[\text{lent videos} \]
\[\text{‘Paulo has read him/her novels and Maria (has) lent (him/her) videos.’} \]

\[\text{b. (?) Ele tem-nos lido ao Pedro e a Maria} \]
\[\text{He has-themCLacc read to-the Pedro and the Maria} \]
\[\text{emprestado ao António.} \]
\[\text{lent to-the António} \]
\[\text{‘He has read them to Pedro and Maria (has) lent (them) to António.’} \]

However, in spite of the correctness of this approach in dealing with the sentences in (16),
it can not be generalised to all cases apparently presenting the same structural pattern, as
shown in (17) and (18), where a conjunction or a scope expression introducing the first conjunct correlates with the conjunction in the second one.\footnote{Adopting Kayne’s proposals on coordination, I admit that, when both conjuncts are preceded by a conjunction, each conjunction heads a complement phrase, the first one taking the phrase headed by the second one as complement, i.e., [conj [XP [conj YP]]]. In what concerns the cases exhibiting an initial scope expression, I will assume that the scope expression may be in the first conjunct (see Kayne 1994: 58, footnote 2).}

(17) a. O João tem-lhes [não só] lido romances [como]
The João has-themCL\textsubscript{dat} not only read novels as emprestado vídeos.
lent videos
'John has not only read them novels but also lent them videos.'

b. Ele tinha-os [ora] comprado na livraria [ora]
He had-themCL\textsubscript{acc} either bought in-the book shop either requisitado na biblioteca.
borrowed from-the library
'He had either bought them in the book shop or borrowed them from the library.'

Jean youCL\textsubscript{dat} would-have both spoken and forgiven
'Jean would-have both spoken to you and forgiven you.'

In these examples, the presence of the conjunction or the scope marker introducing the first conjunct explicitly indicates that the coordinate structure is restricted to the complement of the auxiliary verb, i.e., the coordinated Past Participle Phrase. In these sentences, true clitic ATB occurs, and standard gapping is not allowed, as attested by the contrast between (17)-(18) vs. (19)-(20)
(19) a. * O João tem-lhes [não só] lido romances [como] a
   The João has-themCL dat not only read novels as the
   Ana emprestado vídeos.
   Ana lent videos
   'João has not only read them novels but also Ana lent videos.'

   b. * Ele tinha-os [ora] comprado na livraria [ora] a
   He had-them CL acc either bought in-the book shop either the
   Ana requisitado na biblioteca.
   Ana borrowed from-the library
   'He had either bought them in the book shop or Ana borrowed from the library.'

Jean you CL dat would-have both spoken and Marie forgiven

This contrast can be easily accounted for admitting that, in subcategorization contexts, each conjunct must be compatible with the c-selection of the subcategorizing head. In the gapping cases presented above this is not observed: the auxiliary verb c-selects for a verbal Past Participle projection but the second conjunct must be analysed as an IP. In fact, even accepting the VP Internal Subject Hypothesis, standard gapping must involve IP, or otherwise the subject DP would not check its case features against the relevant functional projection.5

5 This contrast would also be expected if we considered that both conjuncts in a coordination must exhibit categorial identity or, as suggested by a reviewer, must share level identity. In this later case we would have to consider that IP and PastPartIP belong to the same category (presumably, V projections) but to different level category. However, as shown in (i) and (ii), this syntactic parallelism does not hold as a necessary constraint.

(i) Ele considera [[SC o problema resolvido] ou [CP que não tem de o resolver].
   He considers [[ the problem solved] or [ that not has to itCL solve]
   'He considers the problem solved or that he has not to solve it.'

(ii) Ele não nos contou [nem [DP isso] [nem [CP que a Ana vai
   He not usCL told neither that nor that the Ana will
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Thus, in (17) and (18), disregarding its enclitic vs. proclitic status, the clitic c-commands the empty argument positions in both conjuncts, because it has been extracted from the coordinate structure and adjoined to a higher functional head, also targeted by the auxiliary, its V-host, as sketched in (21), where $cl$ represents the copy of the clitic in each conjunct.
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On the contrary, in examples like (11b), repeated in (22), the verb and the clitic remain inside the coordinate structure. In this case, the enclitic pronoun is too embedded to c-command outside of its own clause domain.  

(ii)*  
*Ele* tinha *tirado* da prateleira e *aberto* a gaveta onde  
He had-it\textsubscript{acc} taken from-the shelf and opened the drawer where  
He was-going to store  
"He had taken it from the shelf and opened the drawer where he was going to store."

(iii) ?!/*  
*Eleetem-lhe* telefonado e *pensado* na possibilidade de  
He has-him/her\textsubscript{dat} called and thought about-the possibility of  
sending a gift  
"He has called him/her and thought about the possibility of sending a gift."

Since the choice between these alternatives is not crucial for the present work, I will postpone the study of the ATB Movement until future research.

As evidenced by a reviewer, independent confirmation for this analysis is provided by ATB scrambling in Dutch. In clauses displaying the V2 phenomena, ATB scrambling, is allowed only when there is an auxiliary verb c-selecting for the coordinate structure, since only in this case may the scrambled constituent be extracted out of the coordination and c-command the argument positions in each conjunct — see the following examples, which exhibit ATB scrambling of the direct object (*de/haar lakens* 'the/ her sheets').

(i)  
*Catarina* heeft [de lakens] *niet* gestreken, maar *meteen* in *de kast* gelegd  
Catarina has the sheets not ironed, but directly in the closet put  
"Catarina has not ironed the sheets, but she has put them directly in the closet."

(ii)*  
*Catarina* strijkt [haar lakens] *niet*, maar *legt* *meteen* in *de kast*.  
Catarina irons her sheets not, but puts directly in de kast  
"Catarina doesn't iron her sheets but puts directly in the closet."

As the above mentioned reviewer remarks, in embedded clauses, where the finite verb remains inside the coordinate structure but the scrambled constituent may be external to it, the presence of the auxiliary is not required:

(iii) *Ze zeggendat* *Catarina* *haar lakens* *niet strijkt*, maar *meteen* in *de kast* *legt*.  
"Catarina doesn't iron her sheets and puts directly in the closet."

---

7 As evidenced by a reviewer, independent confirmation for this analysis is provided by ATB scrambling in Dutch. In clauses displaying the V2 phenomena, ATB scrambling, is allowed only when there is an auxiliary verb c-selecting for the coordinate structure, since only in this case may the scrambled constituent be extracted out of the coordination and c-command the argument positions in each conjunct — see the following examples, which exhibit ATB scrambling of the direct object (*de/haar lakens* 'the/ her sheets').
(22) a.* O João tem-lhes lido romances e tem emprestado

The João has-themCLdat read novels and has lent videos videos

'João has read them novels and has lent videos.'

b. ... [ConjP [IP [ Vaux [ CL ]] PPartP [ Conj IP ]]]

In fact, the examples in (16) and in (21) seem to show that the c-command domain of the clitic pronoun in enclisis is determined by its verb host. So, while in (16) the verb hosting the

They say that Catarina her sheets not irons, but directly in the closet puts

'They say that Catarina doesn't iron her sheets, but puts them directly in the closet.'

8 Independently from the status of the pronoun as a syntactic clitic, undergoing incorporation in overt syntax, or as a phonological clitic remaining in an independent functional head, the enclitic pronoun is too embedded to c-command outside its conjunct. However, in what concerns European Portuguese, empirical evidence favours the incorporation analysis (cf. Duarte and Matos 1998. So, I depart from Galves 1992, Madeira 1992 and Martins 1994, who consider that in enclisis in European Portuguese the verb has raised to a functional head (Comp or Sigma) higher than the one occupied by the clitic, leaving the clitic stranded behind, in AgrSP (see (i), where XP is a Comp or Sigma projection).

(i) [XP [X V] [AgrSP [Agr CL ]…]]

In fact, these analyses do not explain why the enclitic pronoun has to move with the verb in configurations of I to C movement (see (ii)), nor why the interposition of maximal projections between the verb and the clitic is forbidden, even when the interposed element is the specifier of the presumed functional projection occupied by the clitic — see (iii):

(ii) [CP Tinha-os [ele visitado ultimamente]]?

  Had-themCL [he visited lately]

  'Would he have visited them lately?'

(iii) * [CP Tinha [ele os visitado ultimamente]]?

  Had [he themCL visited lately]
clitic c-commands the whole coordinate structure, in (21) it only has scope over the Past Participle Phrase inside the first conjunct.

This analysis allows us to account for the exclusion of clitic ATB in French imperatives as (23). In (23), in opposition to (1b), from Kayne (1994), the pronoun depends on the verb in the first conjunct. This example reveals the same structural pattern as the Portuguese enclitic ATB cases, entitling us to suppose that the coordinate structure involves regular phrasal conjuncts rather than the word coordination configuration banned by the LCA.

(23) * Lis-les et relis!

Read-themCLacc and reread

Considering that in ATB with enclisis the possibility of c-command of the empty categories in each conjunct by the pronoun relies on the presence of a verb hosting the clitic which selects for the coordinate structure, ATB clitic placement in (23) is ruled out, because that verb is missing. This analysis is confirmed for French by (24), which shows that whenever the required configuration occurs, the ATB reading with enclisis is also allowed. This is the case of (24a), presenting a causative imperative and of (24b), showing an imperative with an auxiliary verb:

(24) a. Fais-les lire et relire sans cesse!11

Make-themCLacc read and reread without stop

'Make them read and reread incessantly!'

9 I will not discuss the question of the status of the pronouns in French imperative sentences, either as clitics or as weak pronouns, in the sense of Cardinalletti and Stark (1994).

10 I would like to thank Inês Duarte and an anonymous reviewer for having brought these examples to my attention.

11 As illustrated bellow, the correlates of this example in Spanish and Italian are also possible:

(i) Haz[los] leer y reler sin cesar!
b. Ayez-les lues et relus avant mon retour!\textsuperscript{12}:

'Have them read and reread before I come back!' 

3. Clitic ATB without extraction from the coordinate structure

The interpretative effects associated with the clitic ATB construction are not confined to the configurations presented in the previous section. They also occur, with proclisis, in structures where the clitic has not been extracted from the coordination. As expected, the crucial requirement imposed on the licensing configurations is that the clitic c-commands the argument positions it is related with in each conjunct.

As mentioned in section 2, ATB clitic placement with proclisis may appear in contexts of extraction of the clitic out of the coordinate structure, as in (25a). However, in sentences like (25b) it is not possible to assume that the ATB reading results from such an extraction.\textsuperscript{13}

\begin{enumerate}[\textit{(25)}]
\item a. Ela pensava que ele os tinha \textit{tirado da estante}
\item b. \textit{Fa[llo] leggere e rileggere senza sosta!}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{12}The presence of auxiliary verbs in French imperatives is considered rather formal.
\textsuperscript{13} Since European Portuguese is a language exhibiting generalised Verb Movement, I will assume that in (25) the finite verb in both conjuncts has raised to I in overt syntax to check its strong V-features. Consequently, (25) is an instance of IP coordination.
b. *Acho que o João [hoje] o cumprimentou.
   'I think that João greeted him today.'

   The sentences in (26) show that the clitic may not be isolated from its V-host. Similarly, the sentences in (27), displaying V Movement to C, indicate that the clitic is incorporated in its V-host before Spell-Out.\footnote{According to Barbosa (1996), in some Northwest dialects of European Portuguese, it is possible to interpolate adverbials and tonic pronouns between the proclitic pronoun and the verb. This property, shared with Medieval Romance varieties, is no longer available in standard European Portuguese. However, as suggested in Rivero 1992 and Barbosa 1996, for these varieties, complement clitics are still full DP instead of heads.}
Moreover, the following examples with the initial coordination marker, confirm that, in spite of the ATB interpretation, the clitic is inside the first conjunct.


She thinks that the João not only them\textsubscript{CLacc} took out-of-the bookcase as put in-the drawer

'She thinks that João not only took them out of the bookcase but also put them in the drawer.'


All the her admirers as much her\textsubscript{CLdat} call as send flowers

'All her admirers both call her and send her flowers.'

c. *A que alunos [não só] o recomendaste [como] leste?*

To which students not only it\textsubscript{CLacc} you-recommended as you-read

'To which students did you not only recommend it but also read it?'

In sum, these data challenge the analyses of ATB clitic placement which posit the existence of an additional functional projection where the clitic would remain stranded (cf. WP in Rouveret 1992, and FP in Uriagereka 1995), its verbal host occupying a lower functional head inside the coordinate structure.

However, the availability of clitic ATB without extraction of the clitic is severely constrained, apparently being limited to the configurations where the clitic is the outermost element in the coordinate structure — see the contrasts in (29) and (30).
(29) a. *Ela pensa que o João os tirou da estante*

She thinks that the João them\text{CLacc} took out of-the bookcase and put in-the drawer.

'She thinks that João took them out of the bookcase and put them in the drawer.'

b. **Ela pensa que [\text{ConjP} [IP o João [ os tirou} \text{da estante}] e [IP [ a Maria/ele próprio] pôs na gaveta]].^{15}

She thinks that the João them\text{CLacc} took-out of-the bookcase and the Maria/himself put in-the drawer.

'She thinks that João took them out of the bookcase and Maria/he put in the drawer.'

(30) a. *Ele [até] não só os comprou como ofereceu à Ana!*

He even not only them\text{CL} bought as offered to-the Ana.

'He even bought them and offered them to Ana!'

b. **Ele não só [até] os comprou como ofereceu à Ana!**

He not only even them\text{CL} bought as offered to-the Ana.

'He not only even bought them but also offered to Ana!'

In (29a) and (30a), the ATB reading is possible, since the subject DP, *o João*, and the adverb, *até* 'even', are external to the coordination. In (29b), (30b) the outermost element in the coordinate structure is not the clitic and consequently this interpretation is not available.

The examples in (31) further confirm this analysis: the adverb *ainda* 'still' may not be extracted from, nor have scope over the whole coordinate structure, preventing the clitic from being the outermost adjunct in the coordination; therefore, the ATB reading is impossible and an overt clitic must occur in the second conjunct.

\^{15} Notice that the unacceptability of (29b) may not be explained in terms of a lack of parallelism between the conjuncts, since these ones are strictly parallel, both in semantic and in syntactic category.
Thus, at the first glance, the relevant configuration for an example like (29a) seems to be (32), where cl is the copy of the clitic in the first conjunct, omitting, for the moment, the exact nature of the gap in the second conjunct.

(32) …[XP o João [ConjP [IP os tirou cl da estante ] [ConjP [Conj e ] [ pôs [-] na gaveta]]]]

Notice that the subject DP in (32) occurs in a position external to the coordinate structure, appearing in the specifier of a functional projection different from the one occupied by the inflected verb, a proposal independently presented for European Portuguese in Costa 1996.16

-----

16 Rouveret (1995) suggests a similar analysis, though he does not present any configuration for the coordinate structure. Rouveret considers that in proclitic structures in European Portuguese, the clitic is an X° specifier of TP which checks the strong D-feature of T. From its alleged specifier nature, he deduces the aptitude of the proclitic pronoun to c-command outside the TP projection into the second conjunct in ATB constructions, as well as its impossibility to co-occur with a specifier maximal projection, European Portuguese being a language where the multiple specifier strategy does not apply. This assumption does not seem consistent, both conceptually and empirically: it is not required in Rouveret's approach, since he claims that the strong D-features of T may also be checked in enclitic configurations, where the clitic is an inner adjunct; it is empirically dubious, since it wrongly predicts that sentences like the following one, from Rouveret (1995), are not well-formed:
However, in this configuration, even adopting the definition of c-command in terms of categories instead of segments\textsuperscript{17} and assuming that specifiers are adjuncts as in Kayne (1994), the clitic does not c-command outside its own conjunct. In fact, the IP in the first conjunct counts as a category dominating I but not the second conjunct. Under these circumstances, the c-command of the clitic in adjunction to I into the second conjunct would be prevented, and the sentence would be predicted as marginal, contrary to fact.

Therefore, an additional property of coordination, that enables the relevant c-command relation to be established, must be at work. I assume that this additional property relies on the nature of Conj, as a functional head categorically underspecified, which shares the categorial feature of its specifier by Spec-Head Agreement — see Joahnnessen 1996 and a suggestion of Munn (1992), based on the proposals of Gazdar et alii (1985) on coordination\textsuperscript{18}.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \[CP \quad \text{quem} \quad CP \quad o \quad \text{deu} \quad o \quad \text{José} \quad e \quad \text{pediu} \quad \text{de novo} \]\?

To whom \text{it}\textsubscript{CLacc} gave the José and asked back

'To whom did José give it and ask it back again?'

Notice that, in order to explain ATB clitic placement without extraction from the coordinate structure, it is enough to assume that the clitic is the outermost adjunct of the coordination.

\textsuperscript{17} Recall the relevant definition of c-command: X c-commands Y iff X and Y are categories and X excludes Y and every category that dominates X dominates Y.

\textsuperscript{18} Joahnnessen (1996) argues for Spec-Head Agreement within coordination, presenting examples like (i), where number features of the co-ordination are determined by its specifier.

(i) \[Es \quad \text{sturzte} \quad \text{der} \quad \text{Berg} \quad \text{und} \quad \text{das} \quad \text{Land} \quad \text{in} \quad \text{sich} \quad \text{zusammen}.\]

'It collapsed\textsubscript{3sg} the\textsubscript{NomSg} mountain\textsubscript{NomSg} and the\textsubscript{NomSg} land\textsubscript{NomSg} in itself together

'The mountain and the land collapsed into each other.'

(H. Hesse, quoted in Joahnnessen 1996:665)

Munn (1992: footnote 16) suggests the possibility of inheritance of categorial features in co-ordination by Spec-Head Agreement, though he does not adopt this hypothesis in his work.
In this case the required c-command relation obtains, as shown in (33): the clitic in the first conjunct, being the outermost adjunct of I, is neither dominated by I, nor by IP, and may c-command into the second conjunct.

(33) \[ \text{XP DP} \ [\text{ConjP=IP} \ [\text{IP[I CL [I V I]} \text{ VP}] \ [\text{ConjP=IP Conj IP}]]] \]

Considering now the derivation of (33), we may suppose that a clitic is inserted in each conjunct by Merge; Move applies in overt syntax and the clitics in both conjuncts are raised to the relevant functional projection for checking purposes, leaving a copy in their initial position.\(^{19}\) Elaborating on the proposal of Kayne (1994), I will accept that the clitic in the second conjunct is a null element, whose content is fixed under c-command of the overt clitic in the first conjunct, as in (34):\(^{20}\)

(34) \[ [\text{IP I CL [VP ... cl ...]}] [\text{Conj [IP CL} \text{ ø [VP ... cl} \text{ ø ...]}]]] \]

I assume that it is the availability of the configuration in (33) that renders ATB clitic placement possible across Romance, independently of the existence of concurring additional

\(^{19}\) As in ATB clitic placement with extraction, in the cases without extraction, there is also islands effects in the second conjunct, corroborating the existence of clitic movement:

(i) * Eu acho que ele o tirou da prateleira e abriu a gaveta
I think that he took from-the shelf and opened the drawer
onde ia guardar.
where he-was-going to-store
'I think that he took it from the shelf and opened the drawer where he was going to store.'

\(^{20}\) Kayne, who adopts Munn's view on standard ATB constructions, claims that there is a null operator in the second conjunct which is interpreted as a null clitic, having the overt clitic as its antecedent. This antecedent must precede and/or c-command the empty clitic (Kayne 1994:63).
factors that determine its status as a regular or an exceptional construction, within these languages.21

21 The behaviour of the adverb já 'already' in the clitic ATB construction, suggests that this analysis may be slightly relaxed in European Portuguese. In fact, in (i) the clitic is not the outermost adjunct of the co-ordination, the inclusion of já inside the coordinate structure being mandatory (see (ii)).

(i)  Ele não só [já] os comprou como recomendou aos alunos.
    'He not only already themCLacc bought as recommendedto-the students'

(ii) * Ele[já] não só os comprou como recomendou aos alunos.
    'He already not only themCLacc bought as recommendedto-the students'

However, this adverb presents a crucial property: though remaining inside the first conjunct, it may have scope over the whole co-ordination, as shown when an overt clitic occurs (cf.(iii)). The ATB reading is legitimated only in this circumstance. If some element cancels this scope, as for instance the presence of a closer proclisis trigger in the second conjunct, the ATB reading is lost — cf. (iv), where a null object reading is still possible:

(iii) O João [já] os comprou e os recomendou aos alunos.
    The João already themCLacc bought and themCLacc recommendedto-the students
    'João already bought them and recommended them to his students.'

(iv)?? Ele[já] os comprou e [não] recomendou aos alunos apesar
    He already themCLacc bought and not recommendedto-the students in spite
    disso.
    of-that
    'He already bought them and did not recommend to his students in spite of that.'

Thus, for European Portuguese the generalisation that seems to emerge is the following one: the ATB reading without extraction is possible whenever the clitic is the outermost adjunct of the coordinate structure or when its c-command domain overlaps with the scope domain of a proclisis trigger in the first conjunct which has scope over the whole coordination. Notice that já presents a singular behaviour. Typically, the adverbs that act as
4. ATB clitic placement across Romance

ATB clitic placement exhibits a different behaviour across Romance in the cases where the clitic and its verbal host remain inside the coordinate structure. While it has a rather exceptional status in French and Italian.22 (cf. Kayne 1994, it is allowed more freely in Spanish (cf. Uriagereka 1995, Bosque 1987), and, in particular, in European Portuguese (cf. Rouveret 1995, Barbosa 1996): in French, it occurs only when the verbs in both conjuncts are similar, as shown by the contrast between (35) and (36); in Spanish and Portuguese, different verbs are possible inside the coordination (see (37) and (39)); however, in Spanish the occurrence of this construction seems to be more constrained than in European Portuguese, as illustrated by the contrast in (38) vs. (39):

(35) * Paul les lit et relit sans cesse.
    Paul them reads and rereads without stop
    'Paul reads and rereads them incessantly.'

(36) * Jean vous parlera et pardonnera.
    Jean you dat will-speak and will-forgive

(37) Juan les hablará y perdonará.
    Juan them talk-will and forgive-will
    'Juan will talk to them and forgive them.'
    (cf. Uriagereka 1995:105)

proclisis triggers, may not have scope over the second conjunct when they are inside the first one; this is the case for também 'also', até 'even', ainda 'still', quase 'almost'.

22 In this paper, I will not try to account for ATB clitic placement in Italian, leaving it for future work.
(38) a. ??*Creo que ellos les compraron muchos libros, pero
I-think that they bought many books but
regalaron pocos joguetes.
offered few toys
'I think that they bought them many books but offered few toys.'

b. ??Todos ellos las oyeron de sus abuelas y
All they heard from their grandmothers and
tcontaron a sus hijos.
told to their children
'They all heard them from their grandmothers and told to their children.'

(39) a. Acho que eles lhes compraram muitos livros mas
I-think that they bought many books but
ofereceram poucos brinquedos.23
offered few toys
'I think that they bought them many books but offered them few toys.'

23 Notice that usually the conjunction mas 'but' cancels the ATB reading:

(i)?? Ele só lhes compraram dois livros mas ofereceram muitos brinquedos.
They just bought two books but offered many toys
'They just bought them two books but offered many toys.'

However, this does not happen in (39), because the Conj is under the scope of the complementizer que 'that', which induces proclisis in both conjuncts, as it can be attested in (ii), which presents an overt clitic in the second conjunct:

(ii) Acho que eles lhes compraram muitos livros mas lhes ofereceram
I-think that they bought many books but offered
poucos brinquedos.
few toys
'I think that they bought them many books but offered them few toys.'
b. *Todos eles as ouviram às avós e contaram aos filhos.*

All they heard from-the grandmothers and told to-the children

'They all heard them from their grandmothers and told them to their children.'

So, we must accept that, besides the essential requirement of c-command by the clitic, other factors intervene that prevent, or enable, each one of these languages to make use of ATB clitic placement as a regular syntactic construction. One of the most articulated hypotheses to deal with this problem is suggested in Kayne 1994. It will be considered in the next section.

### 4.1. Clitics vs. licensing operators of parasitic gaps

Kayne claims that the exceptional status of clitic ATB structures in French and Italian is due to the fact that clitics are not usually identifiers of parasitic gaps in these languages — they are not able to identify the null operator needed in the second conjunct to bind the parasitic gap, except when the two verbs are sufficiently similar. In this case the empty operator would be "reinterpreted as an empty clitic having the overt clitic as its antecedent" (Kayne 1994: 63).

Under this hypothesis, which reduces ATB clitic placement to a subcase of the parasitic gap construction, we would expect clitics to behave like parasitic gap identifiers in European Portuguese, given the non exceptional character of ATB clitic placement in this language.

In the Principles and Parameters Theory, parasitic gaps have been characterised by a certain amount of descriptive properties, among which, that only operators may license parasitic gaps, and that the *real* gap must be a variable licensed by an A'-Operator (cf., among others, Brody 1995, Cinque 1990, Chomsky 1982, 1986, Engdahl 1983, Longobardi 1991,
Manzini 1994). However, if we assume that ATB clitic placement is an instance of the parasitic gap construction, these defining properties must be ignored.

In fact, as shown by the contrast in acceptability between the examples in (40) and (41), there is no evidence for the status of clitics as licensors of the standard parasitic gap construction in European Portuguese:

(40) * O João não o comprar a filho sem antes ler e.

The João not itCLacc bought ti to-theson without first ler e.
	o-to-read e

'João did not buy it for his son without reading first.'

(41) Que livro compraste a Pedro sem antes ler e?

Which book you-bought t to-the Pedro without first to-read e

'Which book did you buy t for Pedro without reading e first?'

Besides, in adjunct sentences, while the substitution of the gap for the corresponding pronominal clitic decreases the well-formedness of the true parasitic gap sentences, it improves the acceptability of the clitic ones (see (42) vs. (43)):

(42) *??Que livro compraste a Pedro sem antes o ler?

Which book you-bought t to-the Pedro without first itCLacc ler?
	o-to-read

'Which book did you buy t for Pedro without reading it first?'
Furthermore, as shown by the contrast between (44) and (45), coordinate structures containing clitic pronouns differ from operator-variable chains in admitting the violation of the Coordinate Structure Constraint — the examples in (46) attest that the unacceptability of (45) is due to a violation of this constraint.

(43) * João não o comprou ao filho sem antes
    The João not itCLacc bought to-the son without first
    o ler?
    itCLacc to-read
    'João did not buy it for his son without reading it first?'

(44) * Eles tinham-nas não só visto cl como conversado
    They had-themCLacc-fem not only seen cl as talked
    com elas frequentemente.
    with them frequently
    'They had not only seen them but also talked with them frequently.'

(45) a. *??Os livros que ela [não só comprou t como os leu] ...
    The books that she not only bought t as themCLacc read
    'The books that she not only bought t but also read them...'

b. *??Que raparigas não só viste t como conversaste com
    Which girls not only you-saw t as you-talked with
    elas?
    them
    Which girls did you not only see t but also talk with them?
c. * A que professor não só telefonaste t como lhe pediste conselhos?

To which professor not only you-called t as himCLdat you-asked-for advices

'Which professor did you not only call t but also ask him for advice?'

(46) a. Os livros que ela [não só comprou t como leu t]...

The books that she not only bought t as read t

'The books that she has not only bought t but also read t…'

b. A que professor [não só telefonaste t como pediste]

To which professor not only you-called t as you-asked-for t conselhos t?

t advices

'Which professor did you not only call t but also ask t for advice?'

In fact, as claimed in Goodall 1987 and Munn 1993, the core cases of the Coordinate Structure Constraint are motivated by restrictions on operator-variable chains, having to do with vacuous quantification.24 Therefore, the sentences in (44), with clitics, contrast with (45), which presents wh-movement, because clitics do not form operator-variable chains, but X° chains headed by definite Determiners.

In summary, there is no empirical evidence that in ATB clitic placement construction in European Portuguese, the clitic's trace is a variable, nor that the clitic is, or may bind, an A'-bar operator. This fact challenges the correctness of the explanation of the exceptional vs. non exceptional status of the clitic ATB construction across Romance in terms of parasitic gaps.

24 Since in (45) the wh-phrase is in the minimal CP that includes both conjuncts, it will have scope over them. The computational system seems to assume the existence of such scope as an instruction to Form Chain in each conjunct. However, the definite pronoun in the second conjunct (either clitic, as in (45a) and (45c), or not as in (45b)) does not count as an adequate variable for the wh operator in European Portuguese.
4.2. The status of the clitic and the unity of the coordinate structure

Consequently, an alternative explanation for the different behaviour of ATB clitic placement without extraction of the clitic must be found. We must be able to explain why this construction, though structurally legitimate, is exceptional in French and progressively more regular in Spanish and in European Portuguese. These facts suggest that a partially different account must be provided for each one of these languages.

The fact that, in French, ATB clitic placement is heavily dependent on the lexical similarity of the verbs seems to confirm Uriagereka's (1995) hypothesis that proclitic complement pronouns in this language are closer to an affixal status than their proclitic counterparts in Spanish and in European Portuguese. In these languages, in particular in European Portuguese, it is the enclitic pronouns that are most obviously undergoing a process of reanalysis tending to convert them into verbal affixes. The proclitic pronouns present syntactic autonomy, which manifests itself in the possibility of licensing the ATB

---

25 Uriagereka 1995 does not deal with European Portuguese, but with Galician.
26 As reported in Duarte et alii 1995, compelling empirical evidence for this process of reanalysis of enclitic pronouns is found in language acquisition and development stages, where enclisis tends to substitute proclisis in all the contexts where it should be required in standard European Portuguese, as illustrated by the examples bellow:

(i) [Não] chama-se nada! (M., 20 months)
   Not calls-CLrefl3sg nothing
   'That is not his name!'
(ii) [Porque] é que foste-me interromper? (R., 29 months)
    Why is that you-went-meCLacc interrupt
    'Why did you interrupt me?'
(iii) …[porque] [não] apercebeu-se que … (12 years old child, written speech)
       because not realised-CLrefl3sg that …
       '…because he did not realise that …'
construction independently of their V-hosts. Notice, however, that this is not to say that, presently, proclitic complement pronouns in French are analysed as true affix elements, or otherwise we would expect them not to be able to license ATB clitic placement without extraction, not even exceptionally.

The lack of syntactic autonomy of proclitic complement pronouns in French explains their behaviour in ATB constructions, both in configurations with extraction and without extraction from the coordinate structure.

In what concerns the extraction cases, the only ones allowing for different verbal predicates in each conjunct, data from Kayne (1975) show that, in this configuration, clitic ATB with proclisis in French behaves exactly like the enclitic cases in European Portuguese: the clitic may not legitimize the ATB reading if there is no auxiliary (see (47)) nor if both auxiliaries remain inside the conjuncts (see (48)):

(47) a. *Paul m' a bousculé et poussé contre Marie.*
   Paul meCLacc has shoved and pushed against Marie
   'Paul shoved me and pushed me against Marie.'
   (cf. Kayne 1975: 99)

b. *Paul l' a insulté et mis à la porte.*
   Paul himCLacc has insulted and expelled
   'Paul has insulted him and expelled him.'
   (cf. Kayne 1975: 99)

Notice that this does not commit us to accept that, in proclisis, the clitic and the verb remain in two different functional heads in overt syntax. For Uriaguereka (1995), the syntactic autonomy of proclitic pronouns in Spanish and Galician is taken as a motivation for positing a functional head F in both languages — in proclisis, the clitic would be adjoined to F and the verb would remain in a lower independent functional head. However, as shown in section 3, European Portuguese data show that, the hypothesis of isolating the clitic from its verbal host in overt syntax cannot be maintained, at least in what concerns this language.
Paul you\textsubscript{CLacc} will-shove and will-push against Marie  
'Paul will shove me and push against Marie.'  
(cf. Kayne 1975: 100)  
b. * Paul l’ a frappé et a mis à la porte.  
Paul him\textsubscript{CLacc} has insulted and has expelled  
'Paul has insulted him and has expelled.'  
(cf. Kayne 1975: 101)

Hence, we are lead to conclude that the reason why the above sentences are ill-formed is similar to the one that excludes ATB clitic placement with enclisis in these contexts — not being syntactically autonomous, the clitic relies on the scope domain of its host. However, the verbal host of the clitic may only have scope over the whole coordinate structure when it c-selects it, that is to say, in the cases of extraction of the clitic.

In the ATB cases without extraction from the coordination, as in the examples repeated below, the clitic may c-command into the second conjunct whenever it is the outermost element of the coordination. Nevertheless, not being syntactically autonomous, the clitic mainly relies on the scope domain of its verbal host, in the first conjunct. Thus, the lexical similarity of the main verb in the second conjunct is the only way for the clitic to identify this conjunct as a syntactic domain it has scope over, and to recover the argument position it is associated with inside it.

(49) a. Paul les lit et relit sans cesse.  
Paul them read s and rereads without stop  
'Paul reads and rereads them incessantly.'  
b. * Jean vous parlera et pardonnera.  
Jean you\textsubscript{dat} will-speak and will-forgive  
(Kayne 1994:62)
In what concerns Spanish and European Portuguese, proclitic pronouns present syntactic autonomy with respect to the c-command domain of their V-host. Consequently, even remaining inside the first conjunct, they may identify an argument position in the second conjunct when different predicates occur in the coordinate structure.

Still, ATB clitic placement without extraction out of the coordination does not behave in the same way in these languages. In Spanish, according to Bosque (1987), it is limited to sentences where the verbs in both conjuncts constitute a semantic unit denoting a single activity—see the contrast in (50) and (51). In European Portuguese, however, it is not so restricted, and each conjunct may denote an independent, though correlated, activity as illustrated in (52):

(50)  
(a) *Juan les hablará y perdonará.*  
Juan them talk-will and forgive-will  
'I Juan will talk to them and forgive them.'  
(Uriagereka 1995:105)  
(b) *Lo compró y vendió en una sola operación.*  
ItCLacc he-bought and he-sold in a single operation  
'He bought it and sold it in a single operation.'  
(cf. Soriano 1993:355)

(51)  
(a) **Creo que ellos les compraron muchos libros, pero**  
I-think that they themCLdat bought many books but  
regalaron poco joguetes.  
offered few toys  
'I think that they bought them many books but offered few toys.'

---

28 This position concerning the range of occurrence of ATB clitic placement in Spanish is also shared by Soriano (1993: 23 and 355, footnote 7).
b. ?? Todos ellos las oyeron de sus abuelas y
All they heard from their grandmothers and
contaron a sus hijos.
told to their children
'They all heard them from their grandmothers and told to their children.'

(52) a. Acho que eles lhes compraram muitos livros mas
I-think that they bought many books but
ofereceram poucos brinquedos.
offered few toys
'I think that they bought them many books but offered them few toys.'
b. Todos eles as ouviram ãs avós e
All they heard from-the grandmothers and
contaram aos filhos.
told to-the children
'They all heard them from their grandmothers and told them to their children.'

These data show that an additional property operates in European Portuguese that enables this language to preserve the intrinsic unity of each conjunct in coordination under ATB clitic placement, in spite of partially relaxing the semantic (and lexical) correlation between the conjuncts.

The examples in (53) and (54) suggest that this property relies on the possibility of the proclisis triggers in European Portuguese to have scope over the clitic inside the second conjunct.²⁹

²⁹ These data corroborate the analysis concerning the adverb já 'already'. See footnote 21.
(53) a. [Só ele] o reconheceu e cumprimentou delicadamente.

Only he him\textsubscript{CLacc} recognised and greeted politely

'Only him recognised him and greeted him politely.'

b. [Todos] os compraram e recomendaram aos alunos.

All them\textsubscript{CLacc} bought and recommended to-the students

'They all bought them and recommended to their students.'

c. Eu penso [que] eles lhe telefonaram e pediram para resolver o problema.

'I think that they called him and asked him to solve the problem.'

(54) a. *??[Nem ele] o reconheceu mas cumprimentou delicadamente.

Not he him\textsubscript{CLacc} recognised but greeted politely

'Not even him recognised him but greeted politely.'

b. ??[Todos eles] os compraram já recomendaram aos alunos.

All them\textsubscript{CLacc} bought and already recommended to-the students

'They all bought them and recommended to their students already.'

c. ??Eu penso [que] eles lhe telefonaram e, apesar disso, [não] pediram para resolver o problema.

'I think that they called him and, in spite of that, did not ask him to solve the problem.'
In (53) Só ele 'only him', Todos 'they all' and que 'that' have scope over the whole coordinate structure and may act as the proclisis triggers in both conjuncts. This is confirmed in sentences where an overt clitic pronoun occurs in each conjunct:

(55) a. [Só ele / nem ele] o reconheceu o cumprimentou.
    Only he / not he himCLacc recognised and himCLacc greeted
    'Only him /not even him recognised him and greeted him.'

    b. [Todos] os compraram os recomendaram aos
    All themCLacc bought and themCLacc recommended to-the
    alunos.
    students
    'They all bought them and recommended them to their students.'

    c. Eu penso [que] eles lhe telefonaram e lhe pediram para resolver o problema.
    I think that they himCLdat called and himCLdat asked for solve the problem
    'I think that they called him and asked him to solve the problem.'

In the examples (54), on the other hand, although the proclisis triggers potentially have scope over the whole coordinate structure, they do not trigger proclisis in the second conjunct. This is so either because the semantic content of the conjunction cancels their scope (this is the case of mas 'but' in (54a)), or because there is a closer proclisis trigger inside the second conjunct (as já 'already' in (54b) and não 'not' in (54c)). In this case, the ATB reading is impossible and an overt clitic must occur in the second conjunct (enclitic in (56a) and proclitic in (56b), (56c)):

(56) a. [Nem ele] o reconheceu mas cumprimentou-o
    Not he himCLacc recognised but greeted -himCLacc
    delicadamente.
politely

'Not even him recognised him but greeted him politely.'

b. [Todos eles] os compraram e [já] os recomendaram aos alunos.

All they bought and already recommended to the students

'They all bought them and recommended them to their students already.'

c. Eu penso [que] eles lhe telefonaram e, apesar disso, [não] lhe pediram para resolver o problema.

I think that they called him and, in spite of that, not asked for solve the problem

'I think that they called him and, in spite of that, they did not ask him to solve the problem.'

These data entitle us to suppose that the property that distinguishes European Portuguese from Spanish in allowing for a less restrictive occurrence of clitic ATB without extraction from the coordinate structure is the specificity of the proclisis triggers in European Portuguese (recall the examples in (6)). The proclisis triggers in this language may occupy a position which is external to the coordination, thus having scope over the whole coordinate structure and triggering proclisis in the second conjunct. In this circumstances, the c-command domain of clitic in the first conjunct overlaps with its proclisis trigger scope domain. Seemingly, the occurrence of ATB clitic placement in European Portuguese as a regular syntactic construction is the result of this property, which favours the connection between the conjuncts both as a semantic and a structural unit.

On the contrary, in Spanish the proclisis trigger — i.e., T with strong V-features (see the examples in (4)) — is inside each conjunct. Thus, the clitic, while having syntactic autonomy to c-command into the second conjunct, as the outermost adjunct in the coordination, may not rely on its proclisis trigger as a structural connective over its entire c-command domain. This
connection must be fixed by the co-operation of the predicates in both conjuncts — together they must denote a semantic unit.

Summarising:

Though clitic ATB without extraction is possible whenever the clitic is the outermost element of the coordinate structure, its status as a non-exceptional syntactic construction relies on additional requirements concerning the syntactic autonomy of the clitic, and the availability of semantic and structural properties aiming at establishing the coordinate structure as a unit under the scope of the overt clitic.

5. Conclusions

In this paper it has been shown that the ATB clitic construction is not limited to proclisis, but also occurs with enclisis, in configurations where the clitic is hosted by a verb which c-selects, and hence c-commands, the whole coordinate structure.

Empirical evidence has also been given in support of ATB clitic reading with proclisis without extraction of the clitic from the coordination. In this case, it has been claimed that the clitic must be the outermost adjunct of the coordinate structure in order to c-command into both conjuncts.

Finally, it has been shown that the non exceptional status of the ATB clitic construction should not be attributed to the aptitude of the clitics in licensing parasitic gaps, but to the status of the clitic as an autonomous syntactic head and to the strategies available in each language for delimiting the coordinate structure as a syntactic and semantic unit. In what concerns EP, the regular syntactic nature of the clitic ATB construction seems to depend on the proclisis triggers, which may be external to, and have scope over, the whole coordinate structure; in these circumstances the clitic assumes the scope domain of its proclisis trigger as its c-command domain.
Though the study of ATB structures goes far beyond the aim of this paper, one concluding comment may be drawn on the basis of data previously considered. These data showed that there are two different structural sources for the interpretative effects associated with the ATB construction: according to one of them, the constituents, are apparently extracted from both conjuncts and moved to a single landing site external to the coordinate structure; according to the other source, the constituents involved in the ATB interpretation remain inside the coordinate structure and move to the highest position in each conjunct; under c-command, the constituent in the first conjunct fixes the content of the constituent in the second one — this one being usually characterised as a null element. Thus, in opposition to some of the current proposals,\textsuperscript{30} ATB clitic placement argues against the reduction of ATB constructions to one of theses structural configurations and shows that they are both available. In a Principles and Parameters framework, where constructions have no theoretical status (cf. Chomsky 1981, 1995), this is predictable. In fact, what we expect is that the ATB reading faces up whenever the adequate configurations are available.\textsuperscript{31}
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