In Portuguese, as in many other languages, personal pronouns may appear in two forms: a 'strong' form, and a 'weak' form or 'clitic' form. Clitic pronouns are transformationally derived from pronouns introduced in the base in the position of an NP (Cf. Kayne, 1975). While in some languages a clitic pronoun must appear, in the surface structure, immediately after the verb, in other languages, and Portuguese among them, a clitic pronoun can appear, in the surface structure, in more than one position in relation to the verb to which it is attached.

In this paper I will examine the conditions on the positioning of non-reflexive clitic pronouns in Portuguese. I will argue that clitic pronouns can be reordered only inside the sentences where they are generated and that, consequently, they cannot be moved out their original sentences to be attached to a verb in a higher sentence. A grammar of clitic placement in Portuguese will be offered to generate only the grammatical sentences and to block the ungrammatical ones. I will argue also that those cases in Portuguese in which a pronoun originated in an embedded sentence appears in the surface structure as a clitic attached to a verb in the matrix sentence do not get there via clitic movement, but by a different transformation, namely Raising from Subject to Object.

In this paper I will be referring to Quicoli's "Conditions on Clitic Movement in Portuguese" (1975), which is, to my knowledge,
the most careful analysis of this problem. Even though we differ in certain points, some of which essential.

Any traditional grammar of Portuguese will state that clitic pronouns can appear in three different positions in relation to the verb they are attached to. A clitic pronoun may follow a verb, as in (1)

(1) Ele viu-me na rua.
    'He saw me in the street'.

or it may precede the verb, as in (2)

(2) Ele me viu na rua.
    He me saw in the street
    'He saw me in the street'.

or it may appear inside two verbal forms which are considered as simple forms by the traditional grammars of Portuguese, the Future of the Indicative (or Future of the Present), and the Conditional (or Future of the Preterit), as in (3) and (4)

(3) Ele ver-me-á na rua.
    'He will see me in the street'.

where verá is 'will see, 3rd person-singular'.

(4) Ele ver-me-ia na rua.
    'He would see me in the street'.

where veria is 'would see, 3rd person-singular'.

Constructions like (3) and (4) are obsolete in spoken Brazilian
Portuguese, and in these cases the clitic pronoun is placed before the verb, as in (5) and (6)

(5) Ele me verá na rua.
    He me will see in the street
    'He will see me in the street'.

(6) Ele me veria na rua.
    He me would see in the street
    'He would see me in the street'.

but never after the verb, as in (7) and (8)

(7) * Ele verá-me na rua.
(8) * Ele veria-me na rua.

As we can see from examples (1)-(8), the grammar of Portuguese must incorporate a rule to account for the different surface structures we can have. Let us call this rule Clitic Movement Rule (CMR, from now on). It seems to be obvious that we will want our CMR to be an optional rule. What is not obvious at all is the way we are going to formulate this rule. If we say that our CMR moves a clitic pronoun, optionally, from the right to the left of the verb, we will derive (2) from a structure corresponding to (1). But, if this is the case, then

A - There is no way to block the derivation of sentences like (7) and (8), unless we impose any kind of constraint on these two verbal forms.

B - There is no way to derive sentences like (3) and (4) unless, again, we allow an idiosyncratic positioning for the clitic in these two verbal forms.

On the other hand, if we say that our CMR moves a clitic pronoun,
optionally, from the left to the right of a verb, we will derive (1) from a structure corresponding to (2), but we still cannot derive (3) and (4), and there is no way to block the derivation of sentences like (7) and (8), unless we work out the ad hoc devices suggested in A and B above. In fact our second possibility has an additional problem. If CMR is to move a clitic pronoun from the left to the right of a verb, how can we explain the fact that the clitic pronoun precedes the verb before the application of CMR, as in (2), if it is a direct object, and so it would be expected to follow the verb? Instead of trying to solve these problems now, let us examine two other points. First, whenever there is a sequence of Aux-V in a sentence, the clitic pronoun may precede the Aux, or it may come in between the Aux and the V, but it cannot follow the V. Consider the sentences of (9)

(9) a- Ele _nos_ tinha visto na rua.
   b- Ele tinha _nos_ visto na rua.
   c- *Ele tinha visto-nos na rua.
   'He had seen us in the street'.

Second, whenever there is a sequence _V1-V2_, where _V1_ is a finite verb and _V2_ is an infinite one, a clitic pronoun may occur in between _V1_ and _V2_ without restriction. It can precede _V1_ only if it can function as the object of _V1_ and the subject of _V2_. On the other hand, a clitic pronoun can follow _V2_ only if it is the object of _V2_. Consider the sentences below.

(10) Ele viu-nos sair.
   'He saw us to leave'.

(11) Ele pretende _nos_ ver.
    He intends us to see
'He intends to see us'.

(12) Ele nos viu sair.
He us saw to leave
'He saw us to leave'.

(13) Ele pretende ver-nos.
'He intends to see us'.

To make this point clear, in a sequence like (14)

(14) V1 - V2 - Clitic

the clitic pronoun is the object of V2, as in (13).

In a sequence like (15)

(15) Clitic - V1 - V2

the clitic pronoun is the object of V1 in the surface structure but it is the subject of V2 in the deep structure, as in (12).

In a sequence like (16)

(16) V1 - Clitic - V2

the clitic pronoun is either the object of V2 as in (11), or it has the characteristics mentioned for the clitic in (15), as in (10).

Notice now that if the clitic pronoun is the object of V2 it cannot appear in a sequence like (15). Consider the underlying structure (17)

(17) [Pedro - lamentou s [PRO - informar - nos - sobre - isto]]

Pedro regretted PRO to inform us about that
If the clitic follows the second verb we have (18)

(18) Pedro lamentou informar-nos sobre isto.

If the clitic appears between the two verbs we have (19)

(19) Pedro lamentou nos informar sobre isto.

But if the clitic precedes the first verb the result is (20)

(20) * Pedro nos lamentou informar sobre isto.

Consider also the sentences of (21) and (22)

(21) a- Pedro alegou ter nos informado sobre isto.
     b- Pedro alegou nos ter informado sobre isto.
     c- * Pedro nos alegou ter informado sobre isto.
        'Pedro claimed to have informed us about that'.

(22) a- Pedro preferiu visitar-nos.
     b- Pedro preferiu nos visitar.
     c- * Pedro nos preferiu visitar.
        'Pedro preferred to visit us'.

Notice that an attempt to explain the ungrammaticality of (20), (21c) and (22c) in terms of factivity will fail. While lamentar 'to regret' and alegar 'to claim' are factive verbs, preferir 'to prefer' is not.

Now that we have the facts, let us see how they can be
accounted for. Quicoli (1975), working on the same problem, proposes the following rule of clitic movement:

(23) **Clitic Movement** (Optional) (Quicoli's number (4))

\[ X - V - Y - PRO - Z \]

1  2  3  4  5 \[\Rightarrow\] 1  4+2  3  \emptyset  5

Quicoli explains the use of the variable Y and says that "there is, in principle, no definite number of elements that may intervene between the verb and the pronoun". The examples below are extracted from Quicoli's paper, and they show that (23) may move a clitic pronoun over the following constituents or sequences of constituents:

a) over \( V \), as in (24) (Quicoli (1b))

(24) O médico queria nos examinar.

The doctor wanted us to examine

'The doctor wanted to examine us'.

b) over \( V-V \), as in (25) (Quicoli (2))

(25) O médico nos queria examinar.

The doctor us wanted to examine

'The doctor wanted to examine us'.

c) over \( V-V-V \), as in (26) (Quicoli (1))

(26) O médico não nos queria vir ver.

The doctor not us wanted to come to see

'The doctor did not want to come see us'.
d) over V-NP, to form (27) (Quicoli (iiia)) from (28) (Quicoli-(iib))

(27) José nos deu um livro.
José us gave a book
'José gave us a book'.
(28) \[ José - deu - um livro - nos \]

e) over V-V-NP, to form (29) (Quicoli(iiia)) from (30) (Quicoli(liiib))

(29) José nos queria dar o livro.
José us wanted to give the book
'José wanted to give us the book'.
(30) \[ José - queria \[PRO - dar - o livro - nos \] \]

Finally, "Clitic Movement can move the pronoun over a participle to form sentences like (iv) (our (31)), which has undergone Passive at an earlier stage"

(31) Este livro me foi dado por José.
This book me was given by José
'This book was given me by José'.

"and it can move the pronoun over an intervening adverb to form (va) (our (32) ) from (vb) (our (33) )"

(32) Ele lhes quer bem.
He them likes well
'He likes them well'.
(33) \[ Ele - quer - bem - lhes \]
So, (23) avoids the complexity of a formulation which would list the actual constituents which can intervene between the verb and the clitic pronoun by using the variable \( y \). (23) is, surely, a very elegant rule, but we think that it presents, from what we already know, some problems. The first set of problems comes from the optional character of (23), which is the only rule in Quicoli's paper. First, if (23) is optional, there is no way to derive sentences (3) and (4), and also there is no way to block sentences like (7) and (8). Quicoli does not consider cases like (3), (4), (5), (6), (7) and (8), but even if we consider only his own examples this problem still remains. For instance, if we choose not to apply (23) we get (34) instead of (31).

(34) *Este livro foi dado-me por José.

or we get (35) from (33)

(35) *Ele quer bem lhes.

or we get (36) from (30)

(36) *José queria dar um livro nos.

or we get (37) from (28)

(37) *José deu um livro nos.

and, just to mention another case, there is no way to block (9c) under Quicoli's analysis. Second, (27) is not the only grammatical sentence we can derive from (28). We can have also (27')
But (23) is not able to predict (27') since it states that the clitic pronoun will be moved and sister adjoined to the left of the verb. This problem does not exist for sentences (1) and (2). In (1) the clitic is generated to the right of the verb since it is a direct object. If (23) is not applied the result is (1). If (23) is applied the result is (2). But in (28) the clitic is an indirect object and it does not follow immediately the verb, and so (27') cannot be said to be a case of non-application of (23). Third, the variable Y in (23) makes it possible to have more than one factorization for some structures. Let us take (38) as the underlying structure to (24) and (25) before CMR is applied.

(38) \[ \text{O médico - queria} \quad \text{[PRO - examinar - nos]} \]

The doctor wanted PRO to examine us

If (23) is not applied we get (39)

(39) O médico queria examinar-nos.

'The doctor wanted to examine us'.

Now, if we factorize (38) as (40)

(40) \[ \text{O médico - queria} \quad \text{[PRO - examinar - nos]} \]

where Y and Z are null, the application of (23) will produce (24).

(24) O médico queria nos examinar.
But if we factorize (38) as (41)

\[
\begin{align*}
(41) & \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
O \text{ médico} - \text{ queria} \\
\text{s}
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{PRO - examinar - nos} \\
\text{s}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{X} & \quad \text{V} & \quad \text{Y} & \quad \text{PRO} \\
1 & \quad 2 & \quad 3 & \quad 4
\end{align*}
\]

where Z is null, the application of (23) will produce (25)

\[
\begin{align*}
(25) & \quad \* \text{ O médico nos queria examinar.}
\end{align*}
\]

As for me, I find (25) ungrammatical, as well as (26) and (29), and I found just one other person who accepts (25) as a good sentence (but not (26) and (29)). On the other hand I found no one who accepted either (20), or (21c) or (22c), even though they could be derived by (23) under one of the possible factorizations we can have for their underlying structures. Let us take (17) and see what we can get by means of (23)

\[
\begin{align*}
(17) & \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Pedro - lamentou} \\
\text{s}
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{PRO - informar - nos - sobre isto} \\
\text{s}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{Pedro regreted} & \quad \text{PRO to inform us about that}
\end{align*}
\]

If CMR (23) is not applied we get (18). As (23) is ambiguous in relation to which verb the clitic will be attached to, if we choose to apply (23) we can do this according to the factorization in (42) or to the factorization in (43)

\[
\begin{align*}
(42) & \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Pedro - lamentou} \\
\text{s}
\end{array} \right] \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{PRO - informar - nos - sobre isto} \\
\text{s}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{X} & \quad \text{V} & \quad \text{PRO.} & \quad \text{Z} \\
1 & \quad 2 & \quad 4 & \quad 5
\end{align*}
\]
where $Y$ is null and the application of (23) will produce (19)

(19) Pedro lamentou _nos informar sobre isto_.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Pedro} & \text{- lamentou} & [\text{PRO - informar - } \text{nos - sobre isto}] \\
X & V & Y & \text{PRO} & Z \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 \\
\end{array}
\]

where the application of (23) will produce (20)

(20) * Pedro _nos_ lamentou informar sobre isto.

The same thing is true of (21c), and (22c), and this kind of bad predictions by (23) appears again in the sentences below.

(44) a- José desistiu de convidar-nos para a festa.
    b- José desistiu de _nos_ convidar para a festa.
    c- *José, _nos_ desistiu de convidar para a festa.
    'José gave up inviting us for the party'.

(45) a- José sentiu ter _nos_ reprovado.
    b- José sentiu _nos_ ter reprovado.
    c- *José _nos_ sentiu ter reprovado.
    'José regreted that he had flunked us'.

(46) a- José concordou em enviar-nos um camelo.
    b- José concordou em _nos_ enviar um camelo.
    c- *José _nos_ concordou em enviar um camelo.
    'José agreed in sending us a camel'.

(47) a- José decidiu dizer-_nos_ a verdade.
    b- José decidiu _nos_ dizer a verdade.
    c- *José _nos_ decidiu dizer a verdade.
    'José decided to tell us the truth'.


On the basis of these facts we think that the solution to this problem has to be further refined. If we pay attention to the ungrammatical sentences that can be derived when (23) is applied we see that they have one thing in common: whenever a clitic pronoun is extracted out of its original sentence the result turns out to be ungrammatical. So, we have to do two things. First, we will want to write the rule, or rules, necessary to account for the correct sentences and block the ungrammatical ones. Second, we will want a principle to explain why a clitic pronoun cannot be moved to a higher sentence.

Let us consider first our sentences from (1) to (9). The first thing one notices is the similarity between (3), (4), (5) and (6), on the one hand, and (9a)-(9b) on the other hand. In both sets a clitic pronoun cannot come in last position in relation to the main verb, as we see in (7), (8) and (9c). Also, sentences (3) and (4) have something unique, a clitic pronoun 'inside' a verbal form. Suppose we do not consider the verbal forms in (3), (4), (5) and (6) as simple forms, at least in one level of representation, and take them as a sequence of Aux + V. This is, certainly, true on historical grounds since we know that both futures are derived from Infinitive + Haver (\(<\) lat. habere). So, we could propose a rule in the grammar of Portuguese by which the auxiliar haver is moved obligatorily into the VP, sister-adjointed to the verb, under certain circumstances. This rule would be, essentially, (48)

(48) Haver-Attachment (Obligatory)

\[
W1 - \text{Haver} - \text{Verb} - W2 \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad \Rightarrow \quad 1 \quad \emptyset \quad 3+2 \quad 4
\]

This would be a late rule in the grammar, following Subject/Verb Agreement. After the application of (48) a morphophonemic rule
would delete all the pre-tonic segments in the forms of *haver*, and we would have

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fut. Pres</th>
<th>Fut. Prot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Infinitive +</td>
<td>ei</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>às</td>
<td>ias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>á</td>
<td>ia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>emos</td>
<td>íamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eis</td>
<td>ieis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ão</td>
<td>iam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This being the case we reduce the possible positions for the clitic pronoun to two: before or after the verb. Assuming the existence of (48), let us see how we can account for the two positions of the clitic pronoun. Up to now we have seen facts which point to the existence of an optional rule of CMR. On the other hand, we have also seen that the optionality of CMR puts a very serious problem, i.e., if it is not applied we derive sometimes sentences which are totally ungrammatical (e.g., (9c), (34), (35), (36), (37)). It seems then that a CMR will not solve the problem by itself. We need something else. Now, let us use some fresh examples to make our point. First of all, we will assume that clitic pronouns are derived from pronouns introduced under NP's, according to Kayne (1975). Second, we will put aside, for the moment, subject pronouns, to which we will return later. Third, we are going to consider only direct and indirect object NP's.

A clitic pronoun in Portuguese can be derived either in direct object position, or in indirect object position. Compare (49) - (50) and (51) - (52)
(49) Eu enviei as cartas hoje.
'I sent the letters today'.

(50) Eu enviei-as hoje.
'I sent them today'.

(51) Eu enviei as cartas aos meninos hoje.
'I sent the letters to the boys today'.

(52) Eu enviei-lhes as cartas hoje.
'I sent them the letters today'.

Notice that, while a full NP may appear separated from the verb, as the underlined NP's in (51) and (53)

(53) Eu enviei hoje as cartas.
'I sent today the letters'

a clitic pronoun corresponding to them cannot appear separated from the verb, as in (54) and (55)

(54) *Eu enviei hoje as.
'I sent today them'

(55) *Eu enviei as cartas lhes.
'I sent the letters them'

This points to the obvious fact that whenever a clitic pronoun appears in a structure it has to be attached to a verb. So, we will assume that the grammar of Portuguese has a rule of Clitic Attachment which attaches, obligatorily, a clitic pronoun to a verb. If Clitic Attachment is
a separate rule, or if it is just a subpart of a Cliticization rule, this is not an important issue here. Whatever its status is, our problem is to formulate it. But, before formulating this rule, we must know what its effect is. Will it attach a clitic to the right or to the left of the verb? One thing seems to be clear: whatever the result of Clitic Attachment is, Clitic Movement will reverse, optionally, the positions of the verb and the clitic. If we consider cases like (1) and (2), it seems that it makes no difference if Clitic Attachment attaches the clitic to be right or to the left of the verb. In either way we do it, Clitic Attachment will give us one sentence and Clitic Movement will give us the other one. But, consider the sentences of (9), where we have a sequence of Aux-V, which turns out to be a sequence of V-V. Let us call them Va and Vb, respectively. The ungrammaticality of (9c) shows that we will not want to have a derived structure like (56) as the result of Clitic Attachment,

\[ (56) \text{ } \text{Va} - \left[ \text{Vb} # \text{Clitic} \right] \]

since a possible non-application of Clitic Movement would make (9c) a derivable sentence. Now, if the result of Clitic Attachment is (57)

\[ (57) \text{ } \text{Va} - \left[ \text{Clitic} - \text{Vb} \right] \]

then (9b) will be derived by Clitic Attachment and (9a) will be derived by another version of Clitic Movement. It is clear that we would need a different version of Clitic Movement since we were thinking about Clitic Movement as a rule which would reverse the positions between the clitic and the verb after the application of Clitic Attachment; and in this case we would need a rule of Clitic
Movement which would move the clitic further to the left. This is
certainly plausible, but in this solution we could never derive a
sentence like (1). So, we disconsider (57). We still have two
possibilities, (58) and (59), as candidates to the output of Clitic
Attachment.

\[(58) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{v} & \left[ \text{Va - Clitic} \right] & \text{Vb}
\end{array} \]

\[(59) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{v} & \left[ \text{Clitic - Va} \right] & \text{Vb}
\end{array} \]

With either (58) or (59), we don't have any problems for sentences
like (1) and (2). Under (58), (9b) is derived by Clitic Attachment,
and (9a) is derived by Clitic Attachment and Clitic Movement. Under
(59), (9a) is derived by Clitic Attachment, and (9b) is derived by
Clitic Attachment and Clitic Movement. Both (58) and (59) point to
two things: first, a clitic pronoun has to be attached to the left-
most verb in a sentence and, second, the rule of Haver-Attachment
has to precede Clitic Attachment\(^2\). How can we decide between (58) and
(59)? The examples we have up to now do not provide any way to deci-
de for one. So we will have to refer to another aspect of the
problem of clitic pronouns in Portuguese. Consider sentence (60)

\[(60) \quad \text{José tinha dado os livros a mim.} \]

'José had given the books to me'.

where \text{os livros} is a direct object and \text{mim} is an indirect object
pronoun in its 'strong' form (and so, not a clitic). If we have a
clitic pronoun either in the position of \text{os livros} or in the
position of \text{mim}, it will appear either before the auxiliary tinha or
between \text{tinha} and \text{dado}, as shown in (61)

\[(61) \quad \text{a José \underline{os} tinha dado \underline{a mim}.} \]
b- José tinha-os dado a mim.
    'José had given them to me'.
c- José me tinha dado os livros.
d- José tinha me dado os livros.
    'José had given me the books'.

Now, if we have two clitics, a direct and an indirect one, two things must be observed: first, they are amalgamated in a single form and, second, they have to precede the auxiliar. Of the sentences of (62), only the first one is grammatical

(62) a- José mos tinha dado.
    José me+them had given
    'José had given them to me'.
b- *José tinha mos dado.
c- *José tinha dado-mos.
d- *José me tinha os dado.
e- *José os tinha me dado.
f- *José me os tinha dado.
g- *José os me tinha dado.
h- *José tinha me os dado.
i- *José tinha os me dado.

These facts point to (59) as the correct result of Clitic Attachment, and to avoid the ungrammatical sentences of (62) we will have to write our Clitic Movement rule in a way to prevent it from moving clitics in a block (in both senses of the term). Now, how can we formulate our Clitic Attachment rule? As we have seen, a clitic can be derived in either direct or indirect object position. Also, we have seen that a sentence may contain one verb or more. Finally, we have seen that the clitic must be attached to the leftmost verb in
a sentence. The possible sequences we are considering, before Clitic Attachment is applied, are exemplified in (63)

(63) a- V - Clitic  
    b- V - NP - Clitic  
    c- V - V - Clitic  
    d- V - V - NP - Clitic

We can write our Clitic Attachment rule as (64)

(64) Clitic Attachment (Obligatory)  
    W1 - NP - V - W2 - Clitic - W3  
    1  2  3  4  5  6  \rightarrow  
    1  2  5\#3  4  \#  6

(64) can be optionally followed by a rule of Clitic Movement which will reverse the positions of constituents 5 and 3 in the output of (64). Our rule of Clitic Movement can be written as (65)

(65) Clitic Movement (Optional)  
    W1 - [Clitic-V] - W2  
    1  2  3  4  \rightarrow  1  3\#2  4

Notice that (64) and (65) will predict the correct sentences, and block the ungrammatical ones, whenever the verb in question and the clitic pronoun are clause mates. But the variable W2 in (64) does not prevent a clitic from being moved out of its original sentence. Consider, e.g., the factorization in (43), which is a possible one under (64), and the bad result in (20), both on page 55. How can we avoid a sentence like (20) (or (44c), (45c), (46c), (47c) ) if we have a rule like (64)? As we said on page 56, we
want two things: the rules to account for the facts we have and a principle to explain why a clitic cannot be moved to a higher sentence. As we will see, there is a constraint, independently motivated, that will make it possible for us to keep (64) (and (65)), and also to rule out sentences like (20). Let us see how our grammar of clitic placement works. Before Clitic Attachment, the structure underlying (1) and (2) can be represented as (66) (details apart)

(66)  
S  
  /\  
 /   \  
NP   VP  
  /\    /\  
 ele  V   Clitic  PP  
     viu  me  na rua

By (64), (66) is converted into (67)

(67)  
S  
  /\  
 /   \  
NP   VP  
  /\    /\  
 ele  V   PP  
     me  clitic  viu  na rua

which corresponds to (2). If (65) is applied to (67) we get

(68)  
S  
  /\  
 /   \  
NP   VP  
  /\    /\  
 ele  V   Clitic  PP  
     viu  me  na rua
which corresponds to (1).

The sentences of (9), before Clitic Attachment, can be represented by (69).

(69)

```
S
  /   |
/     |
NP    Aux    VP
  |      |
  |      |
ele  tinha  visto
   |      |
   |      |
  nos    na rua
```

By Clitic Attachment we get (70)

(70)

```
S
  /   |
/     |
NP    Aux    VP
  |      |
  |      |
ele  nos  tinha  visto
   |      |
   |      |
  Clitic  PP
   |      |
   |      |
  nos  visto  na rua
```

which corresponds to (9a). By Clitic Movement on (70) we get (71)

(71)

```
S
  /   |
/     |
NP    Aux    VP
  |      |
  |      |
ele  tinha  nos  visto
   |      |
   |      |
  Clitic  PP
   |      |
   |      |
  nos  visto  na rua
```

Now, what about sentences like (18), (19) and (20) (repeated here)?
(18) Pedro lamentou informar-nos sobre isto.
(19) Pedro lamentou nos informar sobre isto.
(20) *Pedro nos lamentou informar sobre isto.
    'Pedro regretted to inform us about that'.

with the underlying structure in (17)

(17) [Pedro - lamentou [s [PRO - informar - nos - sobre isto ]]
    Pedro regretted Pro to inform us about that

To solve this, let us refer to Quicoli (1975). In his paper Quicoli has the following problem. He accepts as grammatical a sentence like (72)

(72) *O médico a queria informar sobre o resultado. (Quicoli (59))
    The doctor her wanted to inform about the results
    'The doctor wanted to inform her about the results'.

Quicoli points out that, as the embedded sentence in (17) is not-tensed, and as the subject of the embedded sentence in (17) is missing in the surface structure, neither the 'Tensed-S Condition' nor the 'Specified Subject Condition' can prevent the clitic a 'her' from being moved from its position after informar 'to inform' in the embedded sentence to the position before queria 'wanted' in the matrix sentence. But, he points out, there are two other cases in which the same two conditions are also inoperative and, even though, the clitic pronoun cannot be moved out of the embedded sentence. These two cases are repeated here as (73) and (74)

(73) *Bruno a persuadiu o médico a informar sobre o resultado
    Bruno her persuaded the doctor to inform about the results
(74) *O médico a prometeu a Bruno informar sobre o resultado

The doctor her promised Bruno to inform about the results

The structures underlying (72), (73) and (75) are (75), (76) and (77), respectively.

(75) \[ \text{O médico - queria} \quad \text{PRO - informar - a - sobre o resultado} \]

(76) \[ \text{Bruno - persuadiu - o médico} \quad \text{PRO - informar - a - sobre o resultado} \]

(77) \[ \text{O médico - prometeu - a Bruno} \quad \text{PRO - informar - a - sobre o resultado} \]

Quicoli points out, correctly, that if we take into account the subpart of the 'Specified Subject Condition' (in fact the 'Subject Condition'), applying to controlled subjects (Cf. Chomsky, 1973), we would expect the blocking of (73, 74) as well as (72). The subject condition, in its relevant part to our case, is restated as (78)

(78) "No rule can involve X, Y (X superior to Y) in the structure

\[ ... X ... \quad \text{WYV} \quad \text{Z} \quad ... \]

where Z is the subject of WYV and is not controlled by a category containing X".

In (75), (76) and (77) X is the verb in the matrix sentence, Z is PRO and Y is a, and X does not control Z. Quicoli's problem is to explain why (72) is grammatical. As for us, who find (72) ungrammatical, if we have (64) and (78), we do not have any problems. (78) is the principle we want to explain why a clitic cannot be moved to a higher sentence: subjects of embedded sentences in
Portuguese are never controlled by a verb in a higher sentence. Also, even when the subject of the embedded sentence is missing in the surface structure, as in (20), (72), (73) and (74), (64) still assigns the clitic pronoun to its correct place since PRO's, which are interpreted subjects, are dominated by NP. Quicoli's solution to the problem he has is a very ingenious one. He says that there is a difference between persuadir and prometer, on the one hand, and querer on the other hand. The difference is that with persuadir and prometer the subject of the embedded sentence "must be obligatorily controlled by an NP in the higher sentence, whereas, in the case of querer 'control' is optional". So, whenever querer is followed by a sentence with a subject which is distinct from its subject, a 'that-Subjunctive' occurs in the complement sentence. On the other hand, if the complement of querer has the same subject of querer, and in this case the complement subject is 'controlled', this complement sentence has an infinitive. These situations cannot be reversed. Consider the sentences of (79) and (80)

(79) a- José queria que eu fosse.
    'José wanted that I went (subj)
    José wanted me to go'.

    b- *José queria eu ir.
    José wanted I to go'.

(80) a- José queria ir.
    'José wanted to go'.

    b- *José queria que ele fosse.
    José wanted that he went (subj)

We have the following observations. First, it is not always the case that the subject of the complement of persuadir and prometer are controlled by an NP in the higher sentence. Examples:
(81) José persuadiu João de que Maria tinha boas intenções.
   'José persuaded João that Maria had good intentions'.

(82) José prometeu a João que a operação seria um sucesso.
   'José promised João that the operation would be a success'.

Second, verbs like lamentar 'to regret', preferir 'to prefer' and concordar 'to agree' behave exactly like querer 'to want' concerning the distribution of infinitives and 'that-subjunctive' clauses in the complement sentence. Even though, a clitic pronoun originated in the embedded sentence cannot be attached to them, in the higher sentence, as can be seen in (20), (22c) and (46c). We think that the distinction between 'deleted' subjects in the complement of querer and 'interpreted' subjects in the complement of prometer and persuadir, made by Quicoli, is not necessary. We can say that the complement subject in (73), (74) and (72) is always interpreted and never deleted. The distinction between interpreted and deleted subjects is important under the analysis Quicoli presents. If the subject is really deleted, then no constraint can prevent the clitic from being moved to a higher sentence.

Finally, we still have to explain cases like (12)

(12) Ele nos viu sair
   He us saw to leave
   'He saw us leaving'.

where nos 'us' is a clitic, attached to the verb in the higher sentence, and originated from the embedded sentence in which it is the subject of sair 'to leave'. A case like (12) is explained, under Quicoli's analysis, by Clitic Movement and, according to the analysis we are trying to motivate (12) should be ruled out, since
we are saying that clitics cannot be moved out of their original sentences in Portuguese. One possible solution we could think of to avoid the problem that (12) presents to our analysis would be to say that ver 'to see' is followed by NP-S, and not by S. In this case we would say that the underlying structure to (12) is (83)

\[(83) \quad \left[ \text{Ele viu nos} \right] \left[ \text{PRO sair} \right] \]

(83) guarantees the correct interpretation of the subject of sair (as in (76)), and we do not have any problems anymore, since (12) would not be a case where a clitic is moved to a higher sentence. However, Quicoli (1975) shows, convincingly, that ver 'to see' is followed by S, and not by NP-S. He gives 5 arguments for this, and I will repeat here 3 of them, which are enough to show that (83) is undefensible. First, Quicoli points out that "there is no difference in 'cognitive synonymy' between embedded active and passive" complements of ver. E.g.,

\[(84) \quad \text{Joana viu o policial agredir a mulher (Quicoli)}
\]

'Joana saw the policeman hit the woman'.

\[(85) \quad \text{Joana viu a mulher ser agredida pelo policial. (Quicoli)}
\]

'Joana saw the woman be hit by the policeman'.

and, Quicoli says, "verbs which are subcategorized as V-NP-S, ..., typically display lack of 'cognitive synonymy' between embedded active and passive". E.g.,

\[(86) \quad \text{Joana persuadiu o policial a agredir a mulher (Quicoli)}
\]

'Joana persuaded the policeman to hit the woman'.
(87) Joana persuadiu a mulher a ser agredida pelo policial (Quicoli)
'Joana persuaded the woman to be hit by the policeman'.

Second, "the infinitive under ver undergoes Subject-Verb Agreement with the preceding NP", and \textit{V-NP-S} does not. E.g.

(88) a- Joana viu os homens se barbear. (Quicoli)
   'Joana saw the men to shave (3rd person-plural) themselves'.

   b- *Joana viu os homens se barbear. (Quicoli) (For me, OK)

(89) a- *Joana persuadiu os homens a se barbear.

   b- Joana persuadiu os homens a se barbear.

   'Joana persuaded the men to shave (unmarked) themselves'.

Third, "unlike verbs subcategorized as \textit{V-NP-S}, ver allows the presence of 'subjectless' sentences as its complement". E.g.,

(90) Nós vimos relampujar nas montanhas.

   'We saw that it was lightening in the mountains'.

Besides these arguments Quicoli points out, too, that verbs which are subcategorized as \textit{V-NP-S} can undergo passive in the matrix sentence, but \textit{ver} cannot. E.g.,

(91) Joana persuadiu o homem a roubar o dinheiro.

   'Joana persuaded the man to steal the money'.

(92) O homem foi persuadido por Joana a roubar o dinheiro.
'The man was persuaded by Joana to steal the money'.

(93) Joana viu o homem roubar o dinheiro.
 'Joana saw the man to steal the money'.

(94) *O homem foi visto por Joana roubar o dinheiro.
 'The man was seen by Joana to steal the money'.

So, if we had (83), there is no way to prevent us from deriving by Passive a sentence like (95)

(95) *Nós fomos vistos por ele sair
 We were seen by him to leave.

Notice that we cannot block (95) by saying that ver does not undergo Passive. Consider (96)

(96) a- O menino viu o ladrão
 'The boy saw the thief'.
 b- O ladrão foi visto pelo menino
 'The thief was seen by the boy'.

On the basis of this convincing evidence we have no alternative but giving up (83). So, the problem remains for us to explain (12). But before presenting our solution, let us consider the analysis by which (12) is derived by Clitic Movement. Assuming for the moment that CMR(23) presents no problems and that a clitic can be moved to a higher sentence, we would say, with Quicoli, that CMR(23) is applied to (97) instead of (83)

(97) \[ \text{Ele - viu} \quad \text{nos - sair} \] (Cf. Quicoli (20))
 We saw us to leave
The problem with (98) is that the subject of sair is being considered a clitic; we have nos 'us', instead of nós 'we'. This analysis is certainly derived from Kayne's (1975) analysis of French, where subject pronouns are clitics. This may be true of French, but this is not true of Portuguese. As we have seen before, clitic pronouns cannot be separated from the verb in Portuguese (Cf. (54), (55)).

One of the reasons that Kayne presents for considering subject pronouns as clitics in French is that they cannot be either separated from the verb or coordinated with a full NP, exactly as it happens to the object clitic pronouns. Consider the sentences of (98)

(98) a- *Je souvent mange du fromage.
   'I frequently eat cheese'.

b- *Nous deux partirons demain.
   'We two will leave tomorrow'

b- *Marie et 1l partiront demain.
   'Mary and he will leave tomorrow'.

But, consider the Portuguese equivalents to (98) in (99)

(99) a- Eu frequentemente como queijo
b- Nós dois partiremos amanhã
  'Mary and he will leave tomorrow'.

So, the first objection we have to (97) is the lack of motivation to consider subject pronouns in Portuguese as clitics. This being the case, we do not see why nos 'us' instead of nós 'we' in (97). And, consequently, we cannot see how (12) can be derived by CMR(23) in (97) if there is no clitic to be moved. Someone could say that whenever we have a sequence of V-NP, and this NP is a pronoun, this
NP has to be a clitic pronoun, and it does not matter whether this NP is in subject or in object position. The fact that we have (100a) but not (100b)

\[(100)a-\text{Maria viu-os}\]

'Maria saw them'

\[(100)b-\text{*Maria viu eles.}\]

'Maria saw they'.

is an evidence for this proposal when the pronoun is in object position, and (12), from (97), would be an evidence when the pronoun is in subject position. But this would be true if we could show that, like (100), we cannot have a non-clitic pronoun in subject position after a verb. As Quicoli pointed out (Cf. (89a)), an infinitive under *ver undergoes Subject-Verb Agreement with the preceding NP. Notice that in Portuguese there is no agreement between clitics and verbs. We can have (12) but not

\[(101)\text{*Ele nos viu saírmos.}\]

'He saw us to leave (1rst person-plural)'

But we can have, instead of (12), a sentence like (102)

\[(102)\text{Ele viu nós saírmos}\]

'He saw we to leave (1rst person-plural)'

where *nós 'we' is a pronoun under *NP, following a verb (viu) and is not a clitic. The same two options, illustrated by (12) and (102), are considered in Quicoli (1974), where he uses the following examples:
(103) a- Convém-nos comprar uma ratoeira. (Quicoli (91a))
Is-convenient-us to buy(unmk.) a mousetrap
b- Convém nós comprarmos uma ratoeira. (Quicoli (89b))
Is-convenient we buy (1rst person-plural) a mousetrap
'It is convenient for us to buy a mousetrap'.

So, if (12) is not derived from (97) by CMR(23) (or, alternatively, by our Clitic Attachment rule), how can it be derived? Up to now we know that neither (83) nor (97) is the underlying structure of (12). We know also that Cliticization is an obligatory rule (Cf. (100)) and that it does not affect subject pronouns (Cf. (12)-(102) and the pair in (103)). So, if we have nós 'we', and not nos 'us', as the subject of sair in the structure undelying (12) and (102), it seems that the only way to derive (12) is by raising the subject nós of sair to the position of object of ver in the matrix sentence. We propose (104) as the underlying structure to (12) and (102)

\[
(104) \begin{array}{c}
\text{s[Ele - Past - ver s[nós - sair ]]} \\
\end{array}
\]

If nós is not raised, Subject-Verb Agreement will be applied, post-cyclically, to (104), giving (102). Now, if Raising from Subject to Object is applied to (104) we get (105)

\[
(105) \begin{array}{c}
\text{s[Ele - Past - ver - nós s[sair ]]} \\
\end{array}
\]

where nós is in object position. As we have seen in (100), in these cases the pronoun has to become a clitic. So, by Cliticization in (105) we get (106)

\[
(106) \begin{array}{c}
\text{Ele - Past - ver - nos s[sair ]} \\
\end{array}
\]
which is the input for our obligatory rule of Clitic Attachment. Clitic Attachment converts (106) into (107)

\[
(107) \quad s^{\text{Ele - Past}} v^{\text{nos - ver}} s^{\text{sair}}
\]

which corresponds to (12). Under this analysis we avoid the inconveniences of calling subject pronouns clitics, and we do not contradict our claim that clitics cannot be moved out of their original sentences. But we still have a problem. How can we avoid the derivation of a sentence like (95)? We know from independent facts that Passive is a cyclical rule in Portuguese. So, after Raising, (105) provides the conditions for the application of Passive. To avoid this we propose that Raising is a post-cyclical rule in Portuguese, ordered before Subject-Verb Agreement. I know of no counter evidence to say that Raising from Subject to Object is post-cyclical in Portuguese. In fact, I know of another case of Raising (Cf. Quicoli's NP-Detachment, 1972) in which a constituent is raised to a non-subject position, that is proved to be post-cyclical.

In this paper we presented a grammar of clitic placement in Portuguese, namely (64) and (65), which, together with the 'Subject Condition' in (78) assigns the correct place for a clitic pronoun in a sentence and blocks its moving out of its original sentence. We tried to show that the distinction between 'deleted' and 'interpreted' subjects is not necessary to account for these facts of Portuguese. Several inconveniences which we found elsewhere are not found here. Also, our analysis is much more simple and general than Quicoli's analysis, since we did not make use of any other conditions but the 'Subject Condition' to explain the facts. Cases like
(108) *Marta a viu que o menino apanhou. (Quicoli (9))
Marta it(fem.) saw that the boy caught

(109) *Paulo a viu o especialista examinar. (Quicoli (17))
Paulo her saw the specialist examine

which are explained by Quicoli as violations to the 'Tensed-S Condition' and to the 'Specified Subject Condition', respectively, can all be explained as violations to the 'Subject Condition' in (78).
NOTES

1. This is not quite so. If the clitic pronoun is 3rd person, accusative, it has to follow V2. This is a problem that any analysis of clitic placement in Portuguese must face and I think that we will need a surface constraint to rule out a 3rd person accusative clitic pronoun between VI and V2.

2. If Clitic Attachment applies before Haver-Attachment, if we have the output in (58) it will be possible to derive (7) and (8) by the non-application of Clitic Movement, and either (3)-(4) or (5)-(6) would be ruled out. On the other hand, if we have the output in (59) Clitic Movement will have to move a clitic to the left if we want (3), (4), (5) and (6). But, in this case we cannot derive, e.g., (1).

3. My thanks to Ivan Sag, who pointed several problems in the previous formulations of this rule, and who discussed some possible ways to present it. Needless to say, any defect in the analysis is my own responsibility.

4. The two derivations exemplified in (12) and (102) can be used to explain a controversy among grammarians of Portuguese. Some grammarians accept (a) but not (b), and some others accept both.

(a) Eu vi os cavalos correrem.
   I saw the horses to run (3rd, plural)

(b) Eu vi os cavalos correr.
   I saw the horses to run (unmk)

Quicoli rejects (b). But Perini (1974) accepts (b) and (a) as grammatical (although he says that ver is followed by NP-S). I accept both of them (see observation at the right of (88b)), and I would say that (b) involves the application of Raising from Subject to Object (post-cyclically, before Subject-Verb
Agreement, blocking its application in the infinitive), whereas (a) does not (and so Subject-Verb Agreement is obligatorily applied to the infinitive correr 'to run').
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