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ABSTRACT

This dissertation focuses on the distribution of pre- and postverbal clitic alternations in both matrix and finite embedded environments, in three Western Iberian Romance languages: Galician, European Portuguese, and Asturian. The analysis of these clitic alternations in Romance has a long tradition within the generative enterprise, and different analyses have capitalized on different triggers to account for those alternations.

In this study, I show that the inclusion of Asturian raises interesting issues for analyses dealing with clitic placement alternations. In short, while pre- and postverbal clitic patterns in all Western Iberian Romance languages are subject to the same conditions in the matrix environment, crosslinguistic differences arise the moment one turns to the finite embedded one: In Asturian, unlike in Galician and European Portuguese, postverbal clitics arise obligatorily after a Topic in finite embedded contexts as that in (1).

(1) Repítote [que yo dexélo aquel diecisiete de mayu] Ast
repeat\textsubscript{\textsc{isg-you}}\textsubscript{\textsc{cl}} that I left\textsubscript{\textsc{isg-nd}}\textsubscript{\textsc{it-cl}} that seventeenth of May
“I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth” [de Pablo, Memoria]
Furthermore, speakers of a variety of Asturian which I refer to as Conservative Asturian (CAst) report data as that in (2), where both a post- and a preverbal clitic can be found. Interestingly, each pattern correlates with a different interpretation.

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) \quad \text{a. Digo [qu’ayúdame]} & \quad \text{CAst} \\
& \quad \text{say}_{\text{SG}} \text{ that-help}_{\text{SG-IND}} \text{-me}_{\text{CL}} \\
& \quad “I \text{ say that s/he helps me out”} \\
\text{b. Digo [que me ayuda]} & \quad [\text{From Viejo (2008)}] \\
& \quad \text{say}_{\text{SG}} \text{ that me}_{\text{CL}} \text{ help}_{\text{SG-IND}} \\
& \quad “I \text{ say that s/he helps me out”}
\end{align*}
\]

In this dissertation, I argue that pre- and postverbal clitic alternations in Western Iberian Romance languages may be captured as follows: in Western Iberian, Finiteness° (cf. Rizzi (1997)) is a phase-head (cf. Chomsky (2008)) which (i) is responsible for the different clitic patterns, and (ii) is the locus of crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context.

Under this analysis, I show that both similarities in clitic alternations in the matrix context and the noted variation in the finite embedded one in this group of languages can be easily captured. Moreover, I claim that this analysis can naturally explain the interpretation differences I observe between a postverbal and preverbal pattern in (2a) and (2b).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>First person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Second person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Third person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>Adverbs / Adverbial phrases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGR</td>
<td>Agreement (morphemes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>Conservative Asturian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHSP</td>
<td>Chilean Spanish (modern variety)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>Clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>Conditional (Tense)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Direct Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>European Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOC</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUT</td>
<td>Future tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAL</td>
<td>Galician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HT</td>
<td>Hanging Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>Indicative Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INF</td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Indirect Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Left Dislocation Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>List Interpretation Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAST</td>
<td>Modern Asturian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MR</td>
<td>Medieval Romance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSL</td>
<td>Null Subject Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFL</td>
<td>Reflexive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Spanish (Modern varieties)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUB</td>
<td>Subjunctive Mood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Western Iberian Romance languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCO</td>
<td>Weak Cross Over</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION AND OUTLINE OF THE DISSERTATION

This dissertation focuses on the distribution of pre- and postverbal clitic alternations in both matrix and finite embedded environments, in three Western Iberian Romance languages: Galician, European Portuguese, and Asturian. The analysis of these clitic alternations in Romance has a long tradition within the generative enterprise, and different analyses have capitalized on different triggers to account for those alternations.

In this study, I show that the inclusion of Asturian raises interesting issues for analyses dealing with clitic placement alternations. In short, while pre- and postverbal clitic patterns in all Western Iberian Romance languages are subject to the same conditions in the matrix environment, crosslinguistic differences arise the moment one turns to the finite embedded one: In Asturian, unlike in Galician and European Portuguese, postverbal clitics arise obligatorily after a Topic in finite embedded contexts as that in (1).

(1) Repítote [que yo dexélo aquel diecisiete de mayu] Ast
repeat1SG-youCL that I left1SG-IND-itCL that seventeenth of May
“I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth” [de Pablo, Memoria]

Furthermore, speakers of a variety of Asturian which I refer to as Conservative Asturian (CAst) report data as that in (2), where both a post- and a preverbal clitic can be found. Interestingly, each pattern correlates with a different interpretation.

(2) a. Digo [qu’ayúdame] CAst
say1SG that-help3SG-IND-meCL.
In this dissertation, I argue that pre- and postverbal clitic alternations in Western Iberian Romance languages may be captured as follows: in Western Iberian, Finiteness° (cf. Rizzi (1997)) is a phase-head (cf. Chomsky (2008)) which (i) is responsible for the different clitic patterns, and (ii) is the locus of crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context.

Under this analysis, I show that both similarities in clitic alternations in the matrix context and the noted variation in the finite embedded one in this group of languages can be easily captured. Moreover, I claim that this analysis can naturally explain the interpretation differences I observe between a postverbal and preverbal pattern in (2a) and (2b).

This dissertation is organized as follows. In chapter 1, I show that post- and preverbal clitics arise uniformly in the matrix environment in the three Western Iberian Romance languages under consideration. Next, I present and discuss two different types of approaches that account for the different clitic patterns exhibited, namely what I call “traditional approaches” and “left-peripheral” ones. In short, “traditional approaches” (e.g. Lema and Rivero (1990, 1991) and Barbosa (1995, 2000)) claim that the enclitic phonological status of clitics in this group of languages is ultimately the trigger for the observed post- and preverbal clitic alternations, while “left-peripheral approaches” (e.g., Raposo and Uriagereka (2005) and Benincà (2006)) argue that the different clitic patterns arise as a side-effect of independently
required verb-movement targeting a head in the left-periphery, namely Fº in Raposo and Uriagereka (2005), and Focusº/Topicº in Benincà (2006). I close this chapter concluding that none of these analyses predicts the availability of postverbal clitics as that in (2a) above.

In chapter 2, building on the so-called “cartographic” approaches to the left-periphery, I first present a detailed map of the left-periphery for Western Iberian Romance languages, following Benincà and Poletto’s (2004) analysis for Italian. Next, I argue that clitics in this group of Romance languages should be analyzed as agreement morphemes (cf. Murphy-Armstrong (1987) and Franco (1991) for Spanish) which head a Clitic-Phrase projection (cf. Murphy-Armstrong (op. cit.) and Sportiche (1996)) that immediately dominates that to which the verb moves in Romance – Tº, by assumption. Lastly, I present the analysis that I will argue for. In short, I claim that Finitenessº (Finº) in the left-periphery (cf. Rizzi (1997, 2004)) is a phase-head (cf. Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2008)) which requires that either an XP or an Xº move to this projection thus satisfying what I call an “edge condition” in Western Iberian Romance languages. The remainder of the chapter shows how the different ways in which this edge condition of Finº is satisfied account for the observed post- and preverbal clitic alternations in the matrix context in Western Iberian Romance languages.

Further evidence for this analysis is presented in chapter 3, where I tackle the finite embedded context in a variety of Asturian that I call Conservative Asturian (CAst). As I show, unlike in other varieties of Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese, post- and
preverbal clitic alternations as those in (2a) and (2b) are also attested, alternations that are also reported to correlate with different interpretations. In particular, I show that the postverbal clitic pattern in (2a) gives rise to what I call a pragmatic [+conviction] interpretation of the embedded sentence. This is an interpretation that marks the content in the embedded clause as part of the belief state of the matrix predicate’s subject in the case at point, but it can also be the belief state of the speaker. On the other hand, the preverbal clitic pattern in (2b) encodes a [-conviction] interpretation of the embedded clause. I argue that both the availability of post- and preverbal clitic patterns and the different interpretations follow from the complementizer system in CAst. I claim that this language has two different complementizers which are subject to selectional restrictions. There is que1 “that1” that is merged in Forceº, which I argue is the locus of a pragmatic [+conviction] interpretation, and que2 “that2” that is merged in Finº, associated with a [-conviction] interpretation. Next, I show that my proposal that Finº is a phase in Western Iberian Romance languages together with the different positions of the que1 and que2 complementizers predicts the availability of postverbal clitics with que1 in Forceº, and also the different pragmatic [±conviction] interpretations that we find.

In chapter 4, I discuss the crosslinguistic variation in clitic placement we find in the finite embedded context in Western Iberian Romance languages. I claim that the source of this variation can be attributed to the different complementizer systems in Modern Asturian (MAst), in Galician and in European Portuguese. In short, I contend that microparametric
variation between CAst and MAst can be attributed to a process of Force° collapsing to Fin° in the absence of left-peripheral material in the embedded clause, as a result of which Fin° hosts a hybrid complementizer that I call que1/que2. This idea of Force° collapsing to Fin° in the absence of left-peripheral material is extended to Galician and European Portuguese, which I claim also exhibit this hybrid complementizer que1/que2 hosted in Fin°.

Furthermore, I discuss another difference between the complementizer systems of CAst and MAst on the one hand, and those of Galician and European Portuguese on the other. Differently from that CAst and MAst, selection of Force° hosting que1 always coexists with a que2 / ø (zero) complementizer in Fin° in Galician and European Portuguese, and I claim that the presence of this complementizer in Fin° licenses its edge condition and renders T°-to-Fin° verb-movement unnecessary and therefore, postverbal clitics. Furthermore, I hypothesize that the noted crosslinguistic differences depict a continuum of language change taking place in WI. The remainder of the chapter discusses further evidence and predictions of my proposal, such as the availability of postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context in earlier stages of Portuguese and Spanish, and I briefly discuss how the analysis I propose also extends to the finite subordinate context in modern varieties of Spanish, in turn explaining the different [±conviction] interpretations that speakers report in this environment.
Chapter 1

Post- and preverbal clitic alternations in the matrix context in Western Iberian Romance languages and previous analyses

The placement of clitics in the matrix context in Western Iberian Romance languages (namely, Asturian (Ast), Galician (Gal) and European Portuguese (EP)) has been a topic of much debate since the eighties (cf. Rivero’s (1986) influential work on Old Spanish), raising issues regarding both the clausal structure and the status of clitics in these languages. What makes these languages interesting is that sometimes the clitic appears postverbally and sometimes preverbally, as shown in (1) and (2) respectively: ¹

(1) a. Téoles tayaes [*Les teo] Ast
   have_{SG} them_{CL} cut
   “I have them (my hands) cut” [Álvarez, Llames]

   b. Contoumo todo [*Mo contou] Gal
   told_{SG} me_{CL} it_{CL} everything
   “He told me everything” [Álvarez et al. (1986: 183)]

   c. Estudara-o a fundo [*O estudara] EP
   had-studied_{SG} it_{CL} to depth
   “He had studied it in depth” [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 165)]

(2) a. Nun me mancó [*mancó-me] Ast
   not me_{CL} hurt_{SG}
   “S/he didn’t hurt me” [Orton, Mayordomu]

   b. Non cho dicía por iso [*dicía-cho] Gal
   not you_{CL} it_{CL} said_{SG} for that
   “I didn’t say it to you for that (reason)” [Álvarez et al. (1986: 185)]

¹ Clitics are in bold here and in subsequent examples for the readers’ convenience. I indicate in brackets here and elsewhere the source of the examples in Asturian, with the author’s last-name and the name of the play where it can be found. See the Asturian corpus-bibliography for details.
In this chapter, first, I describe the different environments that give rise to post- and preverbal clitics in the matrix context in WI, concluding that clitic alternations in the root environment are subject to the same conditions in Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese. Next, I discuss two different approaches to clitic placement alternations as those in (1)-(2) above, namely what I call “traditional approaches”, such as Lema and Rivero’s (1990, 1991) for Old Spanish and Barbosa’s (1995, 2000) for European Portuguese, which contend that post- and preverbal clitic alternations as those exhibited in (1)-(2) are the result of PF-filters ultimately triggered by the enclitic phonological status of the clitics in WI, and those that I call “left-peripheral approaches”, such as Raposo and Uriagereka (2005) for Galician and European Portuguese and Benincà (2006) for Medieval Romance, which argue that those clitic alternations are not triggered by PF-filters, but rather related to the verb undergoing movement to the left-periphery.

---

2 The inclusion of analyses dealing with Old Spanish and older forms of Romance is only tangential to the fact that similar post- and preverbal clitic alternations in matrix contexts as those shown for WI are also observed.  
3 Traditionally, the term “enclitic” has been used to refer to the (syntactic) order V + CL while the term “proclitic” to the (syntactic) order CL + V. It must be observed however, that in Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese all clitics are uniformly phonologically enclitic, i.e., they lean (phonologically) on the element that appears to their left. Throughout this dissertation, I will use the terms “preverbal” and “postverbal” to refer to the different positions in which the clitic may appear in relation to the verb.
1.1. The matrix context: Post and preverbal clitic alternations in WI languages

1.1.1. Postverbal clitics in the matrix context in WI languages

A postverbal clitic pattern arises uniformly in all Western Iberian Romance languages in the following matrix environments: in verb-initial contexts, after different preverbal elements, such as (non-quantified) subjects, dislocated Topics and temporal adverbial phrases, and also after matrix coordination. Each of those contexts is illustrated below.

As noted, clitics occur postverbally in WI when no preverbal element appears, as in (3).

(3) a. Téoles tayaes [Les teo] Ast
    have$_{1SG}$-them$_{CL}$ cut
    “I have them (my hands) cut” [Álvarez, Llames]
    
    told$_{3SG}$-me$_{CL}$-it$_{CL}$ everything
    “He told me everything” [Álvarez et al. (1986: 183)]
    
    had-studied$_{1SG}$-it$_{CL}$ to depth
    “He had studied it in depth” [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 165)]

Clitics also occur postverbally in WI after preverbal (non-quantified)$^4$ subjects, as in (4), and also after Topic$^5$ constituents – cf. (5):

$^4$ The “non-quantified” distinction will be shown to be crucial – cf. (12a), where a preverbal focalized subject triggers a preverbal order of the clitic.

$^5$ Note for now the presence of a resumptive clitic coindexed with the preverbal element. As I will show in chapter 2, Topics are dislocation constructions that exhibit two diagnostics, among others. The first one is that they do not show WCO effects, and the second one is that they must be resumed by a clitic (if there is one in the language). See chapter 2 for a more elaborate description and analysis of this and other constructions that appear in the left-periphery in Western Iberian Romance languages.
(4) a. El xenru matóse nun accidente na mina "His son-in-law got killed in an accident in the mine" [González, Comedies]

b. O veciño tróuñache estas cereixas "The neighbor brought you these cherries" [Carballo Calero (1968: 227)]


(5) a. Esoi sábeslo per lleeer les cartes "That know2SG-itCL for reading the cards" [González, Comedies]

b. iso publicaron os críticos insidiosos "That, the insidious critics published it" [CORGA (2008)]

c. issoi digo-vo-lo eu "That, I say it to you" [O Corpus do Português (2007)]

Preverbal temporal adverbial phrases as those in (6) also give rise to postverbal clitics in WI.6

(6) a. Depués dixéronme qu’una valla metálica (...) "Later on, they told me that a metallic fence (stopped the old-woman)" [Camilo, Psicokiller]

6 Adverbs and adverbial phrases (henceforth, adv) that trigger postverbal clitics in Asturian when found in preverbal position can be grouped under the following categories: (a) temporal adv (i.e., a vegaes/veces “sometimes”, agora “now”, anguan “these days”, dacando/dacandu “from time to time”, de(m)pués “later (on)”, de nen “as a kid”, entór “then”, esta nueche “tonight”, güei “today”, mañana “tomorrow”, un día “one day”, una vegaie/vez “once”, among others), (b) manner adv (i.e., de sutrucu/de sópitu “suddenly”, adultes/selemente/suaviquino “smoothly”, davezu “as it is custom”, dulcemente “in a sweet way”, among others), (c) locative adv (i.e., al otru llau “on the other side”, equi “here”, ebi/ell “there”, those introduced by tres de + DP “behind”, en + DP “in”, dende + DP “from”, etc.), (d) other types of adv, for instance, a lo meyor “perhaps”, polo menos “at least”, de tois maneres “in any case”, pa’micima/pa’arriba/enxima “on top of that”, etc. Anticipating the discussion to come in subsequent chapters, I argue that these elements are base-generated Topics (i.e., not A’-moved constituents) in the left-periphery, which thus trigger a postverbal clitic pattern akin to other Topic constituents. See the analysis I propose to account for these preverbal elements in 2.4.1 below.
Moreover, different combinations of those preverbal elements mentioned earlier also trigger a postverbal order of the clitic in WI. Consider (7) below,

(7) a. Polo menos yo entiéndolo asina [*lo entiendo] Ast
   “At least I understand it this way” [Corte & García, Gasolina]

b. Unha mañá, moi cedo, os escollidos pónense en camiño [*se poñen] Gal
   “One morning, very early, the chosen ones set off” [CORGA (2008)]

c. Ao Miguel, a Maria deu-lhe una prenda [*lhe deu] EP
   “Miguel, Maria gave him a gift” [Kuong (2006: 231, (6a))]

Finally, as (8) shows, coordination in matrix structures triggers postverbal clitics in WI.  

(8) a. Francí'l broche (...) [y prendí-yos un cachu a caún] [*y-yos] Ast
   “I broke the clasp (in half) and I pinned a piece to each of them” [Orton, Mayordomu]

b. Cepillou os dentes con rabia [e afeitouse] [*e se] Gal
   “He brushed his teeth with rage and shaved himself” [CORGA (2008)]

c. Vieste [e trouxeste-me um libro] [*e me] EP
   “You came and brought me a book” [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 168)]

---

7 The different preverbal elements are underlined for the reader’s convenience.
8 Although this context looks very similar to the verb-initial ones in (3), a distinction between matrix and embedded coordination must be established (see (14) below, where a preverbal clitic arises after coordination).
Having seen the different matrix environments where postverbal clitics may appear in Western Iberian Romance languages, let us turn to those matrix environments where clitics arise preverbally in this group of languages.

1.1.2. Preverbal clitics in the matrix context in WI languages

Preverbal clitics, on the other hand, arise uniformly in all Western Iberian Romance languages in the following matrix environments: after different preverbal elements, such as the negative marker, negative quantifiers, wh-elements, focalized constituents, and a certain class of adverbials, and also after coordination in the finite embedded environment. These different contexts are illustrated below.

Preverbal clitics arise in WI after both the negative marker and preverbal negative quantifiers, as (9) and (10) show respectively. As we can see in (10b), a preverbal clitic still obtains even after the Topic a min “to me” if there is a negative quantifier (cf. ninguén “nobody”).

(9) a. Nun me mancó [meCL hurt3SG] "S/he didn’t hurt me" [Orton, Mayordomo]
   b. Non cho dicía por iso [choCL said1SG for  that] "I didn’t say it to you for that (reason)" [Álvarez et al. (1986: 185)]
   c. Tu não lhe telefonaste hoje? [lheCL phoned2SG today] "You didn’t call him today?" [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 167)]
(10) a. Naide lo sabía
   nobody it CL knew 3SG
   “Nobody knew”
   [de Pablo, Memoria]

b. A min ninguén me dixo que viñera
   to me nobody me CL told 3SG that come 1SG-SUB
   “Nobody told me that I should come”
   [Álvarez et al. (1986: 185)]

c. Nunca os viste no teatro?
   never them CL saw 2SG in-the theater
   “You never saw them at the theater?”
   [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 167)]

Preverbal wh-elements always trigger preverbal clitics in WI – cf. (11).10

(11) a. Cómo t’atreves?
   how refl CL-dare 2SG
   “How dare you?”
   [Rodríguez Medina, Gaviotes]

b. Onde os puxeches?
   where them CL put 2SG
   “Where did you put them?”
   [Álvarez et al. (1986: 185)]

c. O que te disse ele?
   the what you CL say 3SG he
   “What does he tell you?”
   [Martins (1994a: 358, (64))]

Focalized/emphatic constituents, as those in (12), also trigger a preverbal order of the clitics in WI.11

---

9 Notice the following contrast for preverbal subjects: naide “nobody” in (10a) triggers a preverbal clitic pattern, while el xenru “the son-in-law” in (4a) triggers a postverbal clitic one. Anticipating the discussion to follow in chapter 2, I claim that the preverbal clitic pattern in (10a) arises as a side-effect of the preverbal element undergoing A’-movement to the left-periphery, while the postverbal clitic pattern in (4a) is a side-effect of those preverbal elements being base-generated constituents in a Topic position. See chapter 2 for more details and a discussion of this analysis.

10 All preverbal wh-elements trigger a preverbal clitic pattern in WI, a more elaborate discussion on this issue is delayed until chapter 2.
Adverbials like yá “already”, when in preverbal position, also license a preverbal order of the clitic in WI as shown in (13).12

    already-them asked
    “I already asked them” [de Pablo, Memoria]

    b. Xa te entendó, pillabán [entendote] Gal
    already you understand devil
    “I got you, you devil!” [Álvarez et al. (1986: 191)]

    already him told-about the case
    “I already told him/her about the case” [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 166)]

11 Focalization is signaled by a raising intonation of the Focus element in the three languages considered. As it is customary, capitals are used in the examples to indicate this distinctive intonation.
12 Other adverbials that trigger a preverbal clitic pattern in Asturian are asina “that way”, bien “much”, casi “almost”, de nada/ de ná “at all”, enseguida “soon”, encaminás “never”, inda “still”, yet”, malpens/ apenas “hardly”, mejor “d better”, namás/ namai “only”, nin siquier “not even”, por Dios “for Godsakes”, quiciás “perhaps”, sí “yes”, siempre “always”, solo “only”, tamien “also”, tampoco “neither”, toria “still”, yá “already”, among others. I refer the reader to Álvarez et al. (1986) and Martins (forthcoming) for the adverbials that trigger preverbal clitics in Galician and in European Portuguese respectively, which are the same as those in Asturian just discussed. I will argue in chapter 2 that these different adverbials are derived as instances of A'-movement (Focus) when in preverbal position – as opposed to the base-generation (Topic) of those adverbials discussed in fn. 6 above.
Lastly, coordination of subordinate clauses, like those in (14), triggers preverbal clitics in WI. Notice that the coordinated structures below are part of different subordinate contexts, as opposed to those in (8) above, which involve coordination of matrix clauses.

(14) a. Diz que lu garraron robando [y-y pegaron] [*y pegáron-y] Ast say\textsubscript{3SG} that him\textsubscript{CL} caught\textsubscript{3PL-IND} stealing and-him\textsubscript{CL} hit\textsubscript{3PL-IND} “S/he says that they caught him stealing and hit him” [D’Andrés, (p.c.)]

b. Sentía que a luz (...) se misturaba (...) [e lle chegaba (...) [*e chegaba-lle] Gal\textsubscript{13} felt\textsubscript{3SG} that the light rfl\textsubscript{CL} mixed\textsubscript{3SG-IND} and her\textsubscript{CL} came\textsubscript{3SG-IND} “S/he could feel that the light (...) mixed (...) and got to her...” [CORGA (2008)]

c. Conta-se que encontrou (...) [e lhe pediu (...) [*e pediu-lhe] EP\textsubscript{14} say\textsubscript{3SG-rfl\textsubscript{CL}} that found\textsubscript{3SG-IND} and him\textsubscript{CL} asked\textsubscript{3SG-IND} “It is said that (a manufacturer) found (a man) and asked him (for help)” [Adapted from O Corpus do Português (2007)]

From the data shown in sections 1.1.1 and 1.1.2, I can conclude that Asturian, a language which has not been discussed at large in the clitic placement literature\textsuperscript{15}, shows the same clitic placement patterns in main clauses as have been reported for European Portuguese and Galician. In what follows, I review what I call “traditional” and “left-peripheral approaches”

\textsuperscript{13} The complete sentence in (14b) reads as follows:

(i) Ali detida, sentía que a luz da tarde se misturaba coa música e lle chegaba desde atrás, tocándolle suavemente nos ombros “Keeping still, she could feel that the light of the afternoon was mixing with the music getting to her from behind, softly touching her shoulders”

\textsuperscript{14} The complete sentence for (14c) is shown in (i) below:

(i) Conta-se que um fabricante de colchões encontrou um homem do marketing e lhe pediu uma ajuda na promoção do seu produto “It is said that a mattress manufacturer found a marketing specialist and asked him for help to promote his own product”

\textsuperscript{15} To my knowledge, Asturian has only been considered in the clitic placement literature for WI in Lorenzo (1994, 1995), Longa, Lorenzo and Rigau (1996), Longa and Lorenzo (2001), and more recently in González-López (2008).
to clitic alternations as those discussed in the preceding sections, showing how they account for the different clitic patterns observed, and their relative advantages and disadvantages.

1.2. “Traditional approaches” to post- and preverbal clitic alternations in WI

Following a long philological tradition contending that unstressed elements cannot stand in absolute initial position (cf. Wackernagel (1892) for Germanic, and Tobler (1875) and Mussafia (1886) for Romance), Lema and Rivero’s (1990, 1991) account (L&R henceforth) for Old Spanish and Barbosa’s (1995, 2000) for modern European Portuguese explain clitic alternations in these languages as follows. Post- and preverbal clitic alternations are accounted for by saying that clitics in the languages under their studies are enclitic elements that must have a phonological host to their left. In short, these analyses propose PF-filters as those in (15)-(16) below to account for these clitic alternations.

(15) *[CP o clitic[ENCLITIC] ], where o = another clitic or a null element [L&R (1990, 1991)]
(16) *[IntP cl(itic) V… ], where IntP = Intonational Phrase [Barbosa (1995, 2000)]

1.2.1. Postverbal clitics and “traditional approaches”

For Lema and Rivero (1990, 1991), if an enclitic is found in absolute initial position in its CP, the PF-filter in (15) forces last-resort Tº-to-Cº (Iº-to-Cº in their terminology) to repair an otherwise crashing derivation at the PF-interface,16 resulting in a verb initial structure, in (17), which is derived as in (18).

---

16 See also Campos (1989), who analyzes post- and preverbal clitic alternations in Galician under similar terms.
(17) Téoles tayaes [*Les teo]
    have_{ISO-them}_{CL} cut  "I have them (my hands) cut"
    [Álvarez, Llames]

(18) a. [CP [Cº [TP les_{ENCLITIC} [Tº teo ... les tayaes]]]]

b. *[CP les_{ENCLITIC}] – cf. (15)

c. [CP [Cº teo [TP les_{ENCLITIC} [Tº teo ... tayaes]]]]

    "I have them (my hands) cut"

As shown above, L&R claim that the clitic adjoins to [Spec, TP] – in (18a), and as it is
found in first position within its CP, the filter in (15) forces a last-resort operation and
triggers Tº-to-Cº to ensure PF-convergence – shown in (18c), which explains the postverbal
critic pattern observed in (17).

Similarly to L&R, Barbosa (1995, 2000) also claims that clitics in EP are phonologically
enclitic elements sensitive to the PF-filter in (16). However, unlike L&R, Barbosa does not
assume that the repair mechanism triggered by (16) involves verb movement as last-resort.
Instead, she argues that as the syntax-building operations proceed, if the last stage is one
where the clitic appears initially as in (19), the derivation backtracks and pronounces a lower
copy of the clitic.18

(19) *[IntP cl(itic) V...], where IntP = Intonational Phrase     [Barbosa (1995, 2000)]

17 For L&R, clitics in Old Spanish are object DPs that adjoin to [Spec, TP] – [Spec, IP] in their terms. A similar
analysis of clitics in Old Spanish is found in Fontana (1993, 1996). As I discuss in chapter 2, I assume an
analysis of clitics in Western Iberian Romance languages along the lines of agreement morphemes. See 2.2 for
discussion.
18 According to Barbosa (2000), the PF-filter in (19) provides “an alternative derivation (i.e., pronounce a lower
copy of the clitic) [...] chosen when pronom (that is, a preverbal order of the clitic) crashes at the PF-interface.” [cf.
Barbosa (2000: 38), parentheses mine].
Thus, for Barbosa (4), repeated here as (20), is derived as in (21).

(20) El xenru mató se nun accidente na mina  
the son-in-law killed3SG-rflCL in-an accident in-the mine  
*se mató  
“His son-in-law got killed in an accident in the mine”  

[González, Comedies]

(21) **Stage #1:** \([\text{CP/TP el xenru} [\text{CP/TP se mató t, pro ... nun accidente na mina}]^{19}\)**

**Stage #2:** \([\text{IntP el xenru} \phi \left[\text{IntP se mató}\right]] \rightarrow \text{illicit structure (cf. (19))}\)

**Stage #3:** \([\text{IntP se mató se}] \rightarrow \text{Pronounce lower copy} \rightarrow \text{PF-convergence} = \checkmark\)

“His son-in-law got killed in an accident in the mine”

As shown in (21), the reflexive clitic *se* moves to the TP-domain, and the preverbal subject is adjoined to [Spec, CP/TP] (stage #1). Next, when the PF-mapping to Intonational Phrases\(^{20}\) takes place, the clitic is the first element in an Intonational Phrase, which is an ill-formed structure (stage #2), and the derivation is instructed to pronounce a lower copy of the clitic as last-resort (stage #3), which accounts for the postverbal clitic pattern observed.

In conclusion, “traditional” approaches analyze postverbal clitic patterns as those in 1.1.1 assuming that either there is no element to the left of the enclitics – cf. (17), or that the element is outside the domain to license the enclitic – cf. (20), which triggers different PF-

---

19 Barbosa (2000) follows her (1995) analysis and assumes three crucial points. The first one, that TP/CP is the minimal sentential domain; the second one, that [Spec, TP] is an A’-position in European Portuguese; and the third, that non-quantified subjects are adjoined to [Spec, TP/CP] and mapped in their own Intonational Phrase.

20 Intonational Phrases are portions of the structure that the PF-component organizes from the output of the syntactic component. I refer the reader to Barbosa (2000) for more discussion.
filters and consequently, last-resort operations to ensure well-formedness (namely, Tº-to-Cº, as in L&R, or pronounce a lower copy of the clitic, as in Barbosa).

1.2.2. Preverbal clitics and “traditional approaches”

Turning now to preverbal clitics, “traditional approaches” maintain that this clitic pattern arises when an element can host and satisfy the enclitic nature of the clitics, which renders the PF-filters proposed in (15)-(16) inoperative. Consider, for instance, the effect of focalized constituents in preverbal position, which trigger a preverbal clitic pattern in WI – cf. (12), a relevant example repeated below.

\[(22) \text{YO MESMA me la repito un ciento vegaes \quad \ast repitomela] Ast me la ENCLITIC repito yo mesma \ldots un ciento vegaes]]

“I myself repeat it to myself one hundred times”

[de Pablo, Memoria]

According to L&R, the underlying structure of (22) is the one in (23):

\[(23) \text{[CP yo mesma \quad [IT me la ENCLITIC repito yo misma \ldots un ciento vegaes]]]}

“I myself repeat it to myself one hundred times”

For these authors, the focalized constituent yo misma “I myself” raises to [Spec, CP] and forms part of the same prosodic domain as the enclitics me la “me it”. As a result, the PF-filter in (15) is inert and we obtain the preverbal clitic pattern. Similarly, Barbosa claims that those preverbal elements that trigger a preverbal clitic pattern are part of the same

\footnote{For L&R, the preverbal element in (22) involves A’-movement and raises to [Spec, CP] (i.e., it is a topicalization construction, cf. Cinque (1990)), whereas the preverbal element in (20) is base-generated adjoined to [Spec, CP] (i.e., thus an instance of left-dislocation following Cinque). As I discuss in the next chapter, Rizzi (1997) and what are generally called cartographic approaches to the left-periphery reformulate Cinque’s topicalization as a Focus construction, and left-dislocation as a Topic one.}
Intonational Phrase that contains the enclitics. Thus, consider the effect of the negative marker – cf. (9), an example repeated below.

\[ (24) \] Nun me mancó \[ \text{not me}_\text{Cl, hurt}_\text{SG} \]

\[ "\text{S/he didn't hurt me}" \]

\[ \text{[Orton, Mayordomu]} \]

Barbosa’s (1995, 2000) analysis derives (24) as in (25):

\[ (25) \] Stage #1: \[ [\text{CP/TP nun me mancó me}] \]

\[ \text{Stage #2: \{lo de nun me mancó\} \rightarrow PF-convergence = \checkmark} \]

\[ "\text{S/he didn't hurt me}" \]

In sum, “traditional approaches” account for preverbal clitics assuming that those elements are part of the same CP (for L&R) or Intonational Phrase (for Barbosa) as that of the enclitics, rendering the proposed filters in (15)-(16) inoperative.

1.2.3. A critique of “traditional approaches”

As we saw, both Lema and Rivero’s and Barbosa’s analyses propose different syntactic operations to ensure that the clitic will get a supporting element (e.g., T\(^{o}\)-to-C\(^{o}\) in Lema and Rivero’s, and pronounce lower copy in Barbosa’s) that are triggered by different PF-filters. Anticipating some of the data from the finite embedded context in what I call Conservative Asturian that I will discuss in chapter 3, these analyses make a wrong empirical prediction. Postverbal clitics as that in (26a) should be unattested, since the complementizer que “that” should license the enclitic as in (26b).
(26) a. Digo [qu’ayúdame]  
say$_{1\text{SG}}$ that-help$_{3\text{SG-IND}}$-me$_{\text{CL}}$  
                           CAst

b. Digo [que me ayuda]  
say$_{1\text{SG}}$ that me$_{\text{CL}}$ help$_{3\text{SG-IND}}$  
“I say that s/he helps me out”  
[From Viejo (2008)]

In (26a) we find a postverbal clitic in spite of the fact that *que* “that” could serve as a phonological support (as in (26b)) and also in spite of the fact that they would be part of the same Intonational Phrase. This suggests that there must be other constraints in question.

Leaving the discussion here, I will adopt in line with these analyses that clitics in WI are phonologically enclitic elements that lean phonologically on the element to their left, and I assume that this enclitic nature is satisfied through the course of the derivation.

1.3. “Left-peripheral approaches” to post- and preverbal clitic alternations in WI

Unlike the “traditional approaches” just reviewed, “left-peripheral approaches” argue that clitic alternations as those observed in Western Iberian Romance languages (WI) do not arise as a result of any PF-filter triggered by the clitics, but rather as the result of verb-movement targeting a head in the left-periphery in this group of languages. Two such analyses are Raposo and Uriagereka’s (2005) (R&U henceforth) for Galician and European Portuguese, and Benincà’s (2006) for Medieval Romance languages (MR). R&U, following previous work of their own (cf. Uriagereka (1995a, 1995b) and Raposo (2000)), claim that post- and preverbal clitic alternations arise as a side-effect of the interaction between clitics and the feature-composition of a left-peripheral Fº projection that they propose. On the other hand,
Benincà (2006), who analyzes the preverbal field of MR following a cartographic approach to the left-periphery (as in Rizzi (1997) and in Benincà and Poletto (2004) for Italian), contends that those clitic alternations are the result of verb-movement targeting different heads in the left-periphery; namely Focusº or Topicº. In what follows, I discuss the main underlying motivations for these “left-peripheral” analyses.

1.3.1. Postverbal clitics and “left-peripheral approaches”

For Raposo and Uriagereka (2005), postverbal clitics are not the result of clitics being phonologically enclitic in WI – in fact, they go a step further and reject the claim that clitics are phonologically enclitic in WI. Rather, they argue that postverbal clitics are the result of (i) the presence of morphological features in WI in a left-peripheral projection that they label Fº, located between Cº and Tº and which also hosts the clitics in this group of

---

22 R&U connect the presence of [+φ]-features in WI in their proposed Fº with two effects. Namely, the complex clitic patterns observed – cf. 1.1 and the availability of inflected infinitivals. However, while the same complexity of clitic patterns can be found in Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese, inflected infinitivals are unattested in Asturian (Xulio Viejo and Ramón D’Andrés (p.c.)).

23 According to R&U, this FP projection is parameterized as shown in (i) below, where Western Iberian refers to languages like Galician and European Portuguese (note that Asturian is not included in their analysis), while Central/Eastern Iberian to languages like Spanish, Catalan and Italian.

(i) Raposo and Uriagereka’s (2005) FP-parameterization

```
          FP
         /   \  
       Overt F-effects Covert F-effects (French)
        [+]syntactic [-syntactic]

Western Iberian       Central/Eastern Iberian
[+]morphological       [-morphological]
```

[Adapted from R&U (2005: 644, (8))]
languages, and of (ii) verb-movement triggered by Fº as last-resort to provide an element for the clitic elements in this projection to fuse to. In order to illustrate how R&U’s analysis accounts for postverbal clitics, consider (5), where a postverbal clitic pattern arises after a Topic constituent.

(27) Esoi sábeslo, per leer les cartes = (5) [*lo sabes] Ast that knowSG-ITCL for readINF the cards

“That, you know it from reading the (tarot) cards” [González, Comedies]

According to R&U (2005), the postverbal clitic pattern in (27) is derived as follows:

(28) a. \([\text{CP} \ Cº \ [\text{FP} \ Fº \ [+φ, +topic] \ [\text{FP}_\text{pro} \ [\text{TP} \ \overline{\text{pro}} \ [\text{T'} \ \text{sabes} \ [\text{v}_\text{P} \ \text{lo} \ [\text{v}_\text{P}' \ \ldots \ \text{per leer les cartes}]]]]]]\]

b. \([\text{CP} \ Cº \ [\text{FP} \ \overline{\text{pro}} \ Fº \ [+φ, +topic] \ [\text{FP}_\text{pro} \ [\text{TP} \ \overline{\text{pro}} \ [\text{T'} \ \text{sabes} \ [\text{v}_\text{P} \ \text{lo} \ [\text{v}_\text{P}' \ \ldots \ \text{per leer les cartes}]]]]]]\]

c. \([\text{CP} \ Cº \ [\text{FP} \ \text{lo} \ Fº \ [+φ, +topic] \ [\text{FP}_\text{pro} \ [\text{TP} \ \overline{\text{pro}} \ [\text{T'} \ \text{sabes} \ [\text{v}_\text{P} \ \text{lo} \ [\text{v}_\text{P}' \ \ldots \ \text{per leer les cartes}]]]]]]\]

d. \([\text{CP} \ Cº \ [\text{FP} \ \text{sabes} \ \overline{\text{pro}} \ Fº \ [+φ, +topic] \ [\text{FP}_\text{pro} \ [\text{TP} \ \overline{\text{pro}} \ [\text{T'} \ \text{sabes} \ [\text{v}_\text{P} \ \text{lo} \ [\text{v}_\text{P}' \ \ldots \ \text{per leer les cartes}]]]]]]\]

e. \([\text{CP} \ Cº \ [\text{FP} \ \text{eso} \ [+topic] \ [\text{FP} \ \text{sabes} \ \overline{\text{pro}} \ Fº \ [+φ, +topic] \ [\text{FP}_\text{pro} \ [\text{TP} \ \overline{\text{pro}} \ [\text{T'} \ \text{sabes} \ [\text{v}_\text{P} \ \text{lo} \ [\text{v}_\text{P}' \ \ldots \ \text{per leer les cartes}]]]]]]\]

“That, you know it from reading the (tarot) cards”

R&U claim that Fº bears [+φ] morphological features in WI – as in (28a). Next, according to them, these [+φ]-features spell out as a (silent)-clitic – i.e., f in (28b) – which attracts other clitics to Fº – in (28c). Further, R&U claim that the clitics in Fº (that is, f and lo “it”) need an

---

24 For R&U (2005), clitics move to Fº because the morphological features in this projection spell-out as a clitic (represented as f following R&U’s convention, see below) that attracts other clitics in the structure to the Fº head.

25 Recall that R&U claim that clitics in WI are not enclitic, so the host requirement that triggers verb-movement to Fº must follow from other factors. As I show next, they claim that verb-movement is triggered as last-resort because the clitics in Fº need an element to fuse to, following Lasnik’s (1999) analysis of fusion.
element to fuse to. This element is provided by verb movement to Fº, as in (28d). Next, the Topic eso “that” is adjoined to [Spec, FP], where it checks its [+topic] feature according to R&U27 – as in (28e). Moreover, the clitics in Fº cannot fuse to a Topic according to these authors,28 so last-resort verb-movement to Fº is triggered independently of the presence of a Topic, which explains the observed postverbal clitic pattern in (27).

Let us now turn to Benincà’s (2006) analysis of postverbal clitics in Medieval Romance, which bears a certain resemblance to R&U’s. Benincà (2006) analyzes the preverbal field of MR following a cartographic approach to the left-periphery (as in Rizzi (1997) and in Benincà and Poletto (2004) for Italian) and she claims following previous work of her own (cf. Benincà (1995)) that MR are V2 languages (i.e., verb in second position, as in modern German). She captures this V2 requirement in MR as verb-movement always targeting a head in the left-periphery. For Benincà (2006), postverbal clitics are derived by verb-movement to Topicº in the left-periphery, a movement independently triggered in order to license a pro in [Spec, TopicP], which Benincà connects to the pro-drop status of MR.29

---

26 R&U understand this fusion operation as follows. The clitic elements in Fº (that is the clitic(s) and /) need a host and in the absence of such host to either the left or the right of the clitics, last-resort verb-movement to Fº is triggered. As shown in the derivation in (28c), two elements could satisfy the fusion requirement of the clitics in Fº; namely the verbal head in Tº, or the subject-pro in [Spec, TP]. According to R&U, neither the verbal head nor the subject-pro are available for the clitics in Fº to fuse to. In short, they claim that the verbal head in Tº and the clitics in Fº cannot fuse because the subject-pro in [Spec, TP] intervenes; further, they argue that the subject-pro in [Spec, TP] and the clitics in Fº cannot undergo fusion either because the subject-pro is a complex specifier that undergoes multiple-spell-out (cf. Uriagereka (1999)), and this operation renders the subject in [Spec, TP] unavailable for the clitic elements in Fº to fuse to.

27 Both [+topic] and [+affective] are features hosted in Fº that correspond to the [+syntactic] parameterization of this head in Romance languages according to R&U – see fn. 23.

28 Similarly to subject-pro (see fn. 26 above), R&U claim that the Topic is a complex specifier that also undergoes multiple-spell-out and renders it unavailable for the clitics in Fº to fuse to (cf. R&U (2005, fn. 16)).

29 Benincà (2006: 69) argues that verb-movement to Topicº licenses a pro in [Spec, TopicP], which in turn licenses a pro in [Spec, TP]. According to her, verb-movement to Topicº in Medieval Romances accounts for their pro-drop nature.
In order to illustrate Benincà’s proposal, consider a verb initial contexts:

(29) Téoles tayaes [cf. (3)] [*Les teo] Ast
    have1SG-themCL-cut
    “I have them (my hands) cut” [Álvarez, Llames]

Benincà claims that the postverbal clitic pattern in (29) receives the analysis in (30):

(30) a. [\text{FocusP \text{Focusº les teo \text{TP \text{pro \text{[Tº les teo \ldots tayaes ]]}}}}}]

b. [\text{TopicP \text{proi \text{Topicº teo \text{[FocusP \text{Focusº lesi teo \text{TP \text{pro \text{[Tº les teo \ldots tayaes ]]}}}}]}}}]

   “I have them (my hands) cut”

Assuming that the verb always reaches the CP-domain in MR because of its V2 status, she claims that the verb then targets Topicº in order to license a pro in [Spec, TopicP], and the clitic is left behind.\(^{31}\) Following her analysis, clitics are licensed in the left-periphery of the clause,\(^{32}\) and their exact location in the left-periphery must be lower than Topicº, thus accounting for the postverbal clitic pattern observed.

\(^{30}\) Benincà does not dwell much on the pro in [Spec, TopicP], but she claims that it is a null-Topic inserted in the structure “possibly to satisfy some version of the EPP” [cf. Benincà (2006, 77)].

\(^{31}\) If we follow Benincà’s (2006) arguments that the verb always raises to the left-periphery, and then to Topicº to license a pro in [Spec, TopicP], it would seem that the clitic must be stranded in Focusº as in (30b). However, this is my interpretation, since she does not provide a full syntactic derivation.

\(^{32}\) Although Benincà (2006) does not address in what projection in the left-periphery clitics might be licensed, she claims (p.c.) that there is nothing empirically wrong if one assumes that clitics are present as part of the functional apparatus of IP, TP and CP – cf. (2006: 78, and fn. 29). While I do not disagree with that claim, why the clitic is left behind when the verb raises to Topº – in other words, why the verb excorporates when moving to Topicº if the clitic and the verb form a unit when moving to Focusº (cf. (30a)), does not follow from the analysis she proposes.
In conclusion, R&U (2005) argue that postverbal clitics arise as a side-effect of (i) the presence of morphological [φ]-features in Fº in Galician and European Portuguese, which spell-out and attract other clitics in the structure to Fº, and of (ii) the fusion conditions of the clitics in this head, which ultimately trigger Tº-to-Fº in order to ensure this fusion. For Benincà (2006), the postverbal clitic pattern is a side-effect of (i) verb-movement targeting the left-periphery, which she connects with a V2 status, and (ii) the verb moving to Topicº, which she claims to be related to the licensing conditions of a pro in [Spec, TopicP], and this movement leaves the clitic behind, resulting in a postverbal clitic pattern.

1.3.2. Preverbal clitics and “left-peripheral approaches”

If we now turn to preverbal clitics, for R&U (2005) a preverbal clitic arises when the fusion condition of the clitics in Fº is granted by an adjacent element, while for Benincà (2006) this clitic pattern obtains when verb-movement to Topicº is blocked. These two analyses are illustrated below.

Consider first R&U’s analysis of the preverbal pattern in (9) – repeated below, which they claim is derived as shown in (32):

(31) Nun me mancó
not meCL hurt3SG
“S/he didn’t hurt me” [Orton, Mayordomo]

33 As noted in fn. 26 above, this adjacent element which the clitics in Fº may fuse to must be one that has not previously undergone multiple spell-out – as the cases discussed of both the subject-pro and the Topic in (28).

34 For Raposo and Uriagereka (2005), wh-elements belong what they call “affective” elements, which for them bear [+affective] features that must be checked in the specifier of their proposed FP. Consider the derivation of the preverbal clitic pattern shown in (1) – cf. (34) for Benincà’s (2006) analysis of preverbal clitics with wh-words:

(1) [FP cómo [+affective] [F te f [TP pro [F atreves ... cómo [+affective]]]]]
The preverbal pattern in (31) is accounted for by assuming that $F^o$ bears [+φ] morphological features in WI – as in (32a). Next, according to their analysis, these [+φ]-features spell out as a (silent)-clitic – i.e., $f$ in (32b) – which attracts other clitics to $F^o$ – in (32c). Then, the negative marker is licensed in $F^o$ (cf. fn. 35), where it checks its [+affective] features and makes itself available for the clitics in $F^o$ to fuse to, as in (32d).

R&U include the negative marker (negative “morpheme” in their terms) under the class of “affective” elements realized on FP – cf. R&U (2005: 642), which entails that the negative marker bears [+affective] features, as I show in the derivation in (32d). What is not spelled-out in their article is whether the negative marker moves to FP from a lower position or whether it is base-generated there.

Benincà (2006) derives the preverbal clitic pattern in (33) as shown in (34):
Recall that Benincà assumes that the verb always targets the left-periphery, which she connects with a V2 status of these languages. As shown in (34), the verb raises to Focus°, and the wh-element cómo “how” raises to [Spec, FocusP] where it checks its [+wh] features against those in Focus°. According to Benincà (2006), the presence of an element in [Spec, FocusP] blocks further verb-movement to Topic°, which explains in turn the preverbal clitic pattern observed in (33).

1.3.3. A critique to “left-peripheral approaches”

While the “left-peripheral approaches” seem preferable to the “traditional approaches” in so far as they do not require novel assumptions about the interaction between syntax and phonology, they are not entirely free of problems. As noted, R&U reject the claim that clitics are enclitic in Western Iberian Romance languages. But this is a controversial claim as it has already been noted in the literature – see Otero (1996) for arguments that clitics in these languages “lean” on an element to their left, that is, they are enclitic. Furthermore, under their analysis, if clitics move to F° in Western Iberian Romance languages, and the lexical C°
can be a host for the clitic elements in Fº to fuse to, the preverbal pattern in (35b) below follows, but the postverbal clitic pattern in (35a) is predicted ungrammatical. However, as I will show in detail in the chapter 3, this pattern is attested in what I call Conservative Asturian. Finally, notice that the repair mechanism they propose to account for a postverbal clitic pattern is ultimately “phonological”, as it relates to the fusion operation that the clitic-elements in Fº must observe.

(35) a. Digo [qu’ayúdame]  
\textit{say} \textit{that} \textit{help} - \textit{me} \textit{CL}  

b. Digo [que \textit{me} ayuda]  
\textit{say} \textit{that} \textit{me} \textit{CL} \textit{help} - \textit{IND}  
“I say that s/he helps me out”  

[From Viejo (2008)]

The problem I see with Benincà’s (2006) approach is that she matches the availability of postverbal clitics with a V2 status (i.e., verb in second position). While that might be the case for MR, extending that analysis to modern WI varieties is very controversial. For instance, notice that the verb in WI may appear in first (cf. (3)), and even third position – as in (7), verbal patterns that bona fide V2 languages like German do not exhibit. Furthermore, why verb-raising to Topicº is blocked under the presence of a wh-element – as in (34) – does not follow from the analysis. Finally, as noted, if postverbal clitics are the result of further verb-movement in the left-periphery leaving the clitic behind, this would require some kind of excorporation of the verbal head, an unwanted operation following Kayne (1991). In turn, her analysis does not predict either the availability postverbal clitics in embedded clauses.
Leaving the discussion here, I will adopt two insights from these analyses. First, I argue that clitic placement alternations in WI are related to the left-periphery in this group of languages; and second, I show that assuming a cartographic approach to the left-periphery – as in Benincà (2006) – can also explain the availability of postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context.

1.4. Summary and conclusions:

In this chapter, I have shown that pre- and postverbal clitic alternations arise uniformly in the matrix context in Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese. This dissertation contributes data from Asturian to the Western Iberian paradigm, which is a Western Iberian language that has not received much attention in the literature.

Also, I have discussed different approaches to the question of post- and preverbal clitic alternations, which I have divided into “traditional approaches”, with tenets like Lema and Rivero (1990, 1991) and Barbosa (1995, 2000), and “left-peripheral” ones, as those argued for in Benincà (2006) and in Raposo and Uriagereka (2005). As I noted, these different approaches predict that the postverbal clitic pattern in (35a) should be unattested or ungrammatical, which is not borne out.

In the next chapter, I present the analysis that I will argue for to account for post- and preverbal clitic alternations in Western Iberian Romance languages, and I will show in the chapters to follow that it accounts for both matrix and finite embedded contexts alike.
Chapter 2

The syntax of clitic placement alternations in the matrix context in Western Iberian Romance languages

In this chapter, I propose a syntactic analysis that accounts for clitic placement alternations in matrix environments (cf. 1.1 above) in Western Iberian Romance languages (WI); that is in Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese. Building on previous works that connect postverbal clitics with verb movement to a left-peripheral projection, I argue that clitic placement alternations as those exhibited in WI can be accounted for as follows: Finiteness⁰ (Fin⁰) in WI is a phase – cf. Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2008) – with an edge condition which may be satisfied either by (a) an element undergoing A’-movement passing through [Spec, FinP], or by (b) an element undergoing head-movement to Fin⁰. As I show, part (a) of the analysis uniformly explains the preverbal clitic placement we find with Focus and wh-movement, while part (b) accounts for the clitic pattern we observe in verb initial contexts, with Topics and negation. In chapter 3, I present further evidence for treating Fin⁰ as a phase in this group of languages, showing how this analysis predicts post- and preverbal clitic alternations in the finite embedded context in what I call Conservative Asturian (CAst).

This chapter is organized as follows. In section 2.1, I extend Benincà and Poletto’s (2004) cartographic approach to the left-periphery in Italian to WI, which I use in order to determine first, the different available positions in the preverbal field in this group of

---

1 See for instance, Benincà (1995, 2006), Lema and Rivero (1990, 1991), Raposo and Uriagereka (2005), Rivero (1986), Rouveret (1992), Uriagereka (1988, and subsequent), among many others. See also 1.2 and 1.3 above for a review of some of these analyses.
languages, second, what constructions target those positions, and third, what diagnostics can
be deployed to distinguish among these constructions. Next, I lay out the analysis of clitics
that I will assume in 2.2, claiming that clitics in this group of languages are amenable to an
analysis along the lines of agreement affixes\(^2\) mapped in a TP-related functional projection
that dominates the one where the verb moves to in Romance.\(^3\) In 2.3, I spell out two key
assumptions about the clausal structure in WI; one is that preverbal subjects are not in [Spec,
TP] when found in preverbal position in Western Iberian Romance languages, and the
second one is that Finiteness\(^6\) is a phase with what I call an edge condition, a condition
whose licensing requires the displacement of an element to this projection, and which I
claim provides a uniform account of post- and preverbal clitic alternations observed in WI.
These two assumptions are taken up in 2.4, where I show how the proposed analysis
accounts for those alternations in the matrix contexts presented in 1.1 above.

2.1. The cartographic preverbal field in Western Iberian Romance languages

Before starting the discussion of clitic placement alternations in Western Iberian Romances,
it is important to determine what different positions are available in the preverbal field in
these languages, and what different tests can be used to characterize them. I argue that the
detailed analysis of the left-periphery proposed for Italian in Benincà and Poletto (2004)
given in (1) also applies to Asturian. Although I only concentrate on Asturian data, the
speakers I consulted from the other WI varieties show the same range of effects (unless

\(^3\) Following Sportiche (1996).
otherwise indicated), so I assume that the same conclusions may be extended to Asturian, as well as to Galician and European Portuguese. I will show that this approach to the left-periphery can easily explain the same interpretation effects pointed out in B&P’s analysis, as well as the same constraints on order permutations.

(1) The left-periphery of matrix clauses in Western Iberian Romance languages

\[
\text{ForceP} \\
\quad \begin{array}{l}
\text{(Hanging Topic)} \\
\text{(Scene Setting)} \\
\text{(Left Dislocation)} \\
\text{(List Interpretation)} \\
\text{(Contrastive Focus)} \\
\text{(Information Focus)}
\end{array}
\]

2.1.1. The Frame field

In (1), B&P claim that the Frame field hosts two types of dislocations, namely Hanging Topic (HT) and Scene Setting constructions. These must be kept separate from constructions licensed in the Topic field, such as Left Dislocation (LD). There are four diagnostics to characterize HT: Case, uniqueness, type of resumptive, and order with respect to Scene Setting.
Starting with Case, prepositions marking the arguments’ Case are compatible with Left Dislocation (LD), but not with HTs, which can only be DPs:  

(2) a. *(De) Isabelina, fala tol mundu d’ella, of Isabelina speak\textsubscript{3SG} all-the world of-her  
   “(*About) Isabelina, everybody talks about her”  
   \[HT = \text{DP)*PP}\]

   b. *(De) Isabelina, fala tol mundu of Isabelina speak\textsubscript{3SG} all-the world  
   “*(About) Isabelina, everybody talks”  
   \[LD = \text{PP)*DP}\]

Only one HT position per clause is available. LDs, on the other hand, may be multiple:

(3) a. *Mon, esti llibru, falé yo con él, d’él Mon this book talked\textsubscript{1SG} I with him of-it  
   “*Mon, this book, I talked to him about it”  
   \[\text{Multiple HTs: } \times\]

   b. A Mon, d’esti llibru nun-y\textsubscript{i} falaron muncho to Mon of-this book not-him\textsubscript{CL} talked\textsubscript{3PL} much  
   “To Mon, about this book, they didn’t talk much”  
   \[\text{Multiple LDs: } \checkmark\]

LD must be resumed by a clitic pronoun (if there is one in the language to indicate the function of the dislocated element), with which the LD element agrees in number, gender and Case. In contrast, the resumptive for HT may be a strong pronoun or epithet with which the HT may not agree in Case. Consider the contrast in (4) which shows that HT (and not LD) may be resumed by an epithet:

(4) a. Mon, nun fala naide d’esi manguán Mon not speak\textsubscript{3SG} nobody.of-that idiot 
   \[\text{HT + epithet: } \checkmark\]

---

\[4\text{ Following Benincà and Poletto (2006), among others, I assume that constructions in the Frame and Topic fields (for instance, Hanging Topic and Left Dislocation) are base-generated in the periphery of the clause, thus not derived as an instance of A’-movement. Evidence for this claim will be discussed in (10)-(11) below.}\]
b. *De Mon, nun fala naide d’esi manguán
   of Mon not speak\textsubscript{3SG} nobody-of-that idiot
   “(*About) Mon, nobody talks about that idiot”

Another test that B&P deploy to distinguish HT from LD comes from their interaction:
both HT and LD may cooccur, but the order is fixed with HT preceding LD.

(5) a. Mon, a los mios collacios, nun-yos\textsubscript{j} falo enxamás d’él\textsubscript{j}
      Mon to the my friends not-them\textsubscript{CL} talk\textsubscript{1SG} never about-him
      “Mon, to my friends, I never talk to them about him”

b. *A los mios collacios, Mon\textsubscript{j}, nun-yosi falo enxamás d’él\textsubscript{j}
   to the my friends Mon not-them\textsubscript{CL} talk\textsubscript{1SG} never about-him
   LD > HT: ×

Turning now to the second construction in the Frame field – Scene Setting (SceneSet), this
collection is used to set the context for the utterance. SceneSet is licensed in a projection
above HTs, as indicated by (6):

(6) a. Mon, nel 36, cuenten d’él\textsubscript{j} que desapaeció
      Mon, in-the 36, say\textsubscript{3PL} of-him that disappeared\textsubscript{3SG}
      “Mon, in 1936, they say about him that he disappeared”

b. *Nel 36, Mon\textsubscript{j}, cuenten d’él\textsubscript{j} que desapaeció
   in-the 36, Mon\textsubscript{j} say\textsubscript{3PL} of-him that disappeared\textsubscript{3SG}
   SceneSet > HT: ×

c. *Nel tayu, Mon\textsubscript{j}, cuenten d’él\textsubscript{j} que desapaeció
   on-the work Mon\textsubscript{j} say\textsubscript{3PL} of-him that disappeared\textsubscript{3SG}
   “At work, Mon, they say about him that he disappeared”
   SceneSet > HT: ×

Next, I illustrate the different constructions that can be found in the Topic field in WI.
2.1.2. The Topic field

Building on Rizzi’s (1997) cartography, Benincà and Poletto (2004), claim that what Rizzi (1997) subsumes under a high TopicP projection should be decomposed into a field too, the Topic field. As (1) shows, the Topic field may host two different types of constituents, namely Left Dislocation (LD) and List Interpretation (LI). Two tests identify these constructions. First, LD immediately precedes LI (see (7)) and LI – and not LD – can be substituted by “the former … the latter …”, see (8).

A man at the market is inquiring about some offer he has seen in a leaflet, where it said that the elderly people were given something free, yet he cannot remember whether it was fish or meat; a worker at the marker says …

(7) a. A los vieyos, el pescao vendémos-yoslo, la carne regalámos-yosla LD > LI: √
    to the elderly, the fish sell1PL-IOCL-DOCL the meat give-away1PL-IOCL-DOCL
    “To the elderly, the fish, we sell it; the meat, we give it to them for free”

    b. ??El pescao, a los vieyos vendémos-yoslo, la carne regalámos-yosla LI > LD: ??
    the fish to the elderly sell1PL-IOCL-DOCL the meat give-away1PL-IOCL-DOCL
    “The fish, to the elderly, we sell it; the meat, we give it to them for free”

---

5 Left Dislocation (LD) is a Topic construction that does not exhibit properties associated with A’-movement and that must be resumed by a clitic if there is one in the language. For Rizzi (1997), this construction is called a Topic, and for Cinque (1990) LD is an instance of what he calls Clitic Left-Dislocation (for Romance).

6 List Interpretation (LI) is also a Topic construction that shows the same properties as those for LD – cf. fn. above. However, unlike LD, LI is used to establish a predication about a referent as opposed to another referent in the discourse. See (7) and (8) for relevant data.

7 Sentences involving both a L(ist) I(nterpretation) Topic and a L(eft) D(islocation) Topic as in (7a) are perceived as a predication that relates the LD Topic to the rest of the sentence, including the LI Topic. Thus, (7a) is perceived as saying something about los vieyos “the elderly”. The reason why reversing the order gives rise to a marginal reading as shown in (7b) is because the Topic el pescao “the fish” should be predicated to the rest of the clause, but a los vieyos “to the elderly” interferes with the predication (that is, the order of the topics reflects a scope relation). In any case, the scope relations have been argued to follow from the licensing conditions of different operators in the sentence coindexed with the Topics field – see Cinque (1990) and Raposo (1996, 2000). I leave this issue for future research.

8 If there is no clitic in the structure, the preverbal element is generally identified as a Topic by its falling intonation as opposed to the raising one found with Focus. See Rizzi (1997) for discussion.
The patterns in (7)-(8) follow if it is assumed that LI and LD are different constructions, where only LI can be substituted by “the former … the latter…”, and that the only possible order is LD immediately preceding LI. Let us now turn to the next field, the Focus field.

2.1.3. The Focus field

Similarly to what they propose for Rizzi’s (1997) TopicP, Benincà and Poletto (2004) also argue for a decomposition of Rizzi’s FocusP projection into a field. Six diagnostics differentiate those constructions targeting the Focus field from Topic constructions. These diagnostics are the resumptive test, Weak Crossover (WCO) and wh-extraction effects, negative quantificational elements, the relative order between Topic and Focus, compatibility with wh-elements, and the relative order of elements within the Focus field.

First, B&P show that the availability of a resumptive clitic distinguishes a Focus from a Topic in that a Focus cannot (and a Topic must9) involve a resumptive clitic if there is one in

9 European Portuguese differs from Asturian and the other Romance varieties in that an object-DP Topic does not always require a resumptive clitic (see Duarte (1987), Raposo (1994, 1996), Barbosa (2001), etc.). This construction is generally called Topicalization (in (i)) – as opposed to (Clitic) Left Dislocation (in (ii)), which always requires the presence of a resumptive clitic.
the language – as already observed in Cinque (1990). Consider (9): 10

(9) a. A XULIAi (**lai) vi na verbena
    TO XULIA[FOCUS] her,cl saw,ISG in-the party
    “Xulia have I seen at the party (, not Isabel)”

b. A Xuliai, vi-*(lai) na verbena
    to Xulia saw,ISG-her,cl in-the party
    “Xulia, I have seen her at the party”

(i) O teu libro, comprei de certeza
    the your book bought,ISG of sure
    “Your book, I bought, for sure”

[From Barbosa (2001, 23, (8))]

Topicalization, however, is ungrammatical in Asturian without the presence of a resumptive clitic; consider:

(ii) El to llibru, compré*(lu) de xuru
    the your book bought,ISG-DOCL of sure
    “Your book, I bought it for sure”

Interestingly, a resumptive clitic may optionally surface in Asturian with an indefinite Topic – as in (iii), which makes it different from Spanish (this observation is due to Héctor Campos):

(iii) Perres, tengo(les) yo
    money have,ISG-DOCL I
    “Money, I have (it)”

A clarification is in order here, since it is not the case that Focus and resumptive clitics are always in complementary distribution in Asturian, as Rizzi (1997) claims for Italian. The constructions in (9) involve a direct object (DO) – as opposed to an indirect object (IO). The key difference between DOs and IOs is that DOs are amenable to the resumptive clitic test, but IOs are not, since IO are always “resumed” – doubled, henceforth – by a clitic in Asturian (and also in Spanish, see Campos and Zampini (1990)) regardless of whether the IO is a Focus or a Topic, as (i) shows:

(i) a. Díxe-yi eso a Xulio
    said,ISG-IOCL that to Xulio
    “I said that to Xulio”

b. A Xulio, díxe-yi eso
    to Xulio said,ISG-IOCL that
    “Xulio, I said that to him”

c. A XULIOi-yi dice eso
    to Xulio[FOCUS]-IOCL said,ISG that
    “To Xulio did I say that (, and not to Mon)”

This paradigm in (i) has lead many authors abandon the term “resumptive” to refer to the IO clitic, using instead “agreement marker” – as in Suñer (1988) and Campos and Zampini (1990), or “applicative morpheme” – as in Demonte (1995) and Cuervo (2003). See section 2.2 for further discussion of these ideas. Conversely, Focus constructions involving DOs, unlike Topic ones, are not resumed by a clitic – see the contrast between (9a) and (9b) above.
Weak Crossover effects and wh-island extraction show that Focus, in contrast to Topic, is derived by A’-movement.11

(10) a. A XULIO vio su, ma tA,XULIO nel chigre (, non a Xicu) to Xulio, [FOCUS] saw3SG his mom in-the bar

“Xulio did his mom see at the bar (, not Xicu)”

b. A Xulio, violui su, ma nel chigre to Xulio saw3SG-DO cl his mom in-the bar

“Xulio, his mom saw him at the bar”

(11) a. *A MON nun sé [CP quién vio tA,MON] to mon [FOCUS] not know1SG who saw3SG

“It was Mon that I don’t know who saw (, not Xicu)”

b. A Mon, nun sé [CP quién lui vio] to Mon not know1SG who DO cl saw3SG

“Mon, I don’t know who saw him”

In (10a), the Focus a Xulio can only marginally corefer with the possessive su “his”, thus an instance of WCO. It contrasts with (10b), which shows that coreference of the possessive with a Topic is fine and no marginality is detected. Furthermore, (11) shows that Focus as that in (11a) is subject to the wh-island constraint,12 whereas a Topic as that in (11b) is not.13

11 In the examples to follow, I stick to Direct Object complements (DO) throughout just to avoid the problems that Indirect Objects and their obligatory clitic-doubling raise noted in fn. 10. Extraction as in (11) for Asturian is similar to what Hernanz and Brucart (1987) argue for Spanish. It is worth noticing however, that Topic constructions are sensitive to Strong Islands (i.e., extraction from a complex DP), which I assume to follow from independent principles and not from the A’-movement properties of Topics. I must thank Adolfo Ausín for bringing up this reference and for his help on this section.


13 European Portuguese behaves similarly, as pointed out in Barbosa (2001).
Preverbal negative quantificational elements, such as *naide “nobody”, cannot be Topics, while they easily allow Focalization, as (12) shows: 14

(12) a. *A naide, lu, vi to no-one himCL saw1SG “No one, I saw him”

b. A NAIDE vi tA NAIDE to no-one[FOCUS] saw1SG “NO ONE I saw”

As for the relative order of Topic and Focus constituents, Benincà and Poletto (2004) claim that Topic constructions can only precede Focus ones. 15 As (13) shows, the same claim may be extended to Asturian:

(13) a. Pelos montes, A ANTÓN, vieron escondíu by-the mountains to Antón[FOCUS] saw3PL hidden “In the mountains, Antón did they see hidden (, not Colás)”

b. *PELOS MONTES, a Antón, viéron l, escondíu 16 by-the mountains[FOCUS] to Antón saw3PL hidden “*In the mountains Antón did they see hidden (, not at the market)”

14 See Barbosa (2000, 2001) and Kuong (2006) for the same effect in European Portuguese.

15 See Rizzi (1997), who claims that TopicP is a projection that both precedes and follows FocusP in the left-periphery – cf. (1).

16 Interestingly, what makes this sentence ungrammatical is the presence of the resumptive clitic. If the clitic is absent, the sentence is fine; consider (i) – the parentheses indicate that it is the clitic, and not its position, what gives rise to the ungrammaticality of the sentence:

(i) PELOS MONTES a Antón, (*lu) vieron(*lu) escondíu by the mountains[FOCUS] to Antón him saw3PL him hidden “In the mountains did they see Antón hidden (, and not at the market)”

(i) above could be considered an instance of a Topic without resumptive – that is, Topicalization as in European Portuguese, see fn. 9. However, recall that Asturian differs from European Portuguese in that Topicalization is ungrammatical. Why (i) is fine without the resumptive will be addressed in (20) below, where I show that (i) should be analyzed as an instance of a double Focus construction.
Another test that distinguishes Topic constructions from Focus ones comes from the interaction with wh-operators. A wh-operator in matrix contexts is compatible with a Topic in a fixed order (Top precedes Wh) as shown in (14), whereas it is incompatible with a Focus (cf. Rizzi (1997)), as (15) shows.

(14) a. A_mamina, quién la, vio?  
    to mom, who herCL saw3SG  
    “Mom, who saw her?”

    b. *Quién, a_mamina, (la) vio(la)?  
    who to mom herCL saw3SG-herCL  
    “*Who mom saw her?”

(15) a. *A_MAMINA quién vio (, non a Xicu)?  
    to mom[FOCUS] who saw3SG not to Xicu  
    “*MOM who saw (, not to Xicu)?”

    b. *Quién A MAMINA vio (, non a Xicu)?  
    who to mom[FOCUS] saw3SG not to Xicu  
    “*Who MOM saw (, not to Xicu)?”

Asturian also supports Benincà and Poletto’s (2004) claim that what Rizzi labels FocusP should be decomposed into a field too that may host two different types of focalized constituents; namely Contrastive Focus\(^{17}\) and Information Focus:

(16) A: Xicu vieno esta nueche a vete  
    Xicu came3SG this night to seeINF-youCL  
    “Xicu came last night to see you”

    B: Non, XULIO vieno esta nueche a veme (, non Xicu) \(\text{Contrastive Focus}\)  
    No Xulio[FOCUS] came this night to seeINF-meCL not Xicu  
    “No, XULIO came last night to see me (, not Xicu)”

\(^{17}\) In fact, Benincà and Poletto (2004) say that the Focus field hosts three projections: two hosting different types of Contrastive Focus constructions higher than the one hosting Information Focus. See (20) and fn. 23 below, where I show some data amenable to that analysis.
Xulío and lo/eso mesmo “the same” in the utterances in (16B) and (17B) are both Foci, but differ in interpretation: whereas the Focus in (16B) corrects the previous utterance (as the parentheses indicates) and thus, counts as an instance of Contrastive Focus,\textsuperscript{18} the Focus in (17B) does not correct but rather emphasize information from the previous discourse, and hence qualifies as an instance of Information Focus. Moreover, similarly to what B&P argue for standard Italian, Information Focus in Asturian is subject to contextual circumstances. For instance, Information Focus in question-answer pairs is not available, as shown by (18).\textsuperscript{19}

\textit{(18)} A: A quién visti na verbena? \\
to who saw\textsubscript{2SG} in-the party \\
“Who did you see at the party?”

B: Vi a Pepín \\
saw\textsubscript{1SG} to Pepín \\
[New information: ✓]

\textsuperscript{18} Notice that, akin to other Focus constructions, Contrastive Focus observes the two following properties. First, it triggers a preverbal clitic pattern in WI, and second, it does not license a resumptive clitic. Consider (iB) below:

\textit{(i) A: Díste-y un llibru a Xulio} \\
gave\textsubscript{2SG-himCL} a book to Xulio \\
“You gave a book to Xulio”

B: Non, UN XAMÓN-y (*lu) di(*-ylu), non un llibru \\
not a ham\textsubscript{FOCUS-himCL-itCL} gave\textsubscript{1SG-himCL-itCL} not a book \\
“Not, a ham did I give to him (, not a book)”

\textsuperscript{19} See Fernández-Rubiera (2006) for more data and evidence from Asturian, Barbosa (in press) for a similar claim for European Portuguese, and Campos (1986) for Spanish.
Nonetheless, likely to standard Italian, Information Focus is licensed in Asturian in the following contextual circumstances shown in (19): First, as a textual repetition of a previously mentioned element, in (19a); second, under the presence of a lexical anaphora, such as “the same”, “another”, “this”, which can be also accompanied by a textual anaphoric adverb in the body of the sentence, such as “too”, “only”, etc., as shown in (19b) and (19c); and third, with indefinite quantifiers, as in (19d).

(19) Information Focus activation in Asturian

a. Foi Xulia... Xulia-γ lo dixo
   was3SG Xulia Xulia-IOCL-DOCL said3SG
   “It was Xulia... Xulia (was who) said it to him/her”

b. (…) lo mesmo-γ da correr que tar paráu
   the same-himCL give3SG runINF than beINF still
   “It is the same for him to be running or still” [From González, Comedies]

c. Eso-γ dixo Mon tamién!
   that-himCL said3SG Mon too
   “So did Mon say too”

d. Eso-γ toi diciendo22
   that-youCL-FORMAL am3SG saying8GER
   “That (is what) I am saying” [From de Pablo, Memoria]

This type of Focus employed in question/answer pairs is explored in D’Andrés (1993: 37) for Asturian, who considers it pragmatically adequate. While I agree with his claim, its pragmatic felicity is subject to a context where the speaker is encoding new information, but entailing the following presupposition: the speaker expected the information in the answer-pair to be known to the hearer. In any case, what is clear from (18) is that Information Focus in the left-periphery to encode new information in question-answer pairs (cf. 18C) is pragmatically marked in Asturian, akin to what B&P claim for standard Italian.

Notice the position of the clitic in the examples, which must surface obligatorily preverbally akin to other Focus constructions – cf. fn. 10.

The preceding context is the following: “¿Ta diciéndome que Santiago ta vivu de verdá? ¿Que ta vivu de verdá?” [Are you telling me that Santiago is truly alive? That he is truly alive?]
Moreover, two Focus constituents may appear preverbally in Asturian, as (20) shows:

(20) Nero **NUNCA ANDARIQUES** comió! \[From Viejo (2008, 113), capitals mine\]

Nero never crabs ate3SG
“Nero, NEVER ate CRABS”

First, note that in (20) the Direct Object-DP *andariques* “crabs” is not resumed by a clitic, which is consistent with it being a Focus construction as in (9). Moreover, as shown in (12) above, preverbal negative quantifiers fail the Topic test, suggesting that the preverbal negative element *nunca* “never” is also a Focus. Therefore, following Benincà and Poletto (2004), I claim that (20) is an instance of Information Focus activation licensed by the presence of a higher Contrastive Focus, yielding the order Contrastive Focus > Information Focus. Moreover, notice that this order complies with the structure of the left-periphery assumed in (1) above.

23 Consider the following context for (20): Speaker A says that Nero likes going to Candás, which is a fisher-village in Asturias, because he is a crab-eating addict; however, Speaker B disagrees that Nero has ever eaten crabs, uttering (20). Notice that what is being contrasted is the *nunca* “never”, whereas the *andariques* “crabs” will be an Information Focus involving a textual repetition, akin to (19a) above. Barbosa (2001) reports two data that may be amenable to the same analysis. Consider:

(i) [Pouco afecto], [aos meus filhos], [nunca] darei!
little affectation to-the my children never will-give1SG
“Little affection, to my children, I will never give” [From Barbosa (2001, 40, (70), attributed to Duarte (1987)]

(ii) [Nem ao seu melhor amigo] [a Maria] [alguma ajuda] ofereceu
not-even to-the her best friend the Maria some help offered3SG
“Not even to her best friend did Maria offer any help” [From Barbosa (2001, 40, (71)), translation mine]

Thus, (i) could be analyzed as follows: “little affection” [Contrastive Focus1] > “to my children” [Contrastive Focus2] > “never” [Information Focus]. However, as noted in fn. 9, European Portuguese licenses Topicalization (that is, Topic constructions without a resumptive), so a Focus analysis might not be on the right track. But even if that is the case, (ii) provides clearer evidence for an analysis as multiple Foci: “not even to her best friend”, being a negative element, fails the Topic test – cf. (12), in which case the only available analysis is “not even to her best friend” [Contrastive Focus1] > “Maria” [Contrastive Focus2] > “any help” [Information Focus]. I leave this discussion here.
2.1.4. Interim summary

In the sections above, I have illustrated the decomposition of the left-periphery into different fields in Asturian, which I show is very similar to the one in Italian proposed by Benincà and Poletto (2004). Moreover, different tests can be used to determine the nature of different constructions in the left-periphery, which I summarize in the table below.

(21) Left-peripheral constructions and their diagnostics for Asturian

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostics</th>
<th>Hanging Topic</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Focus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Prepositions/case</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Multiple availability</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ [under contextual conditions]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Resumptive</td>
<td>Epithet/clitic</td>
<td>Clitic⁴</td>
<td>*⁵</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Order of fields</td>
<td>Precedes &gt;</td>
<td>Precedes &gt;</td>
<td>Precedes &gt; FinitenessP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Order within field</td>
<td>HT &gt; ScSt</td>
<td>LD &gt; LI</td>
<td>Contrastive Fº &gt; Informational Fº</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. WCO and wh-island</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Negative elements</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Compatible with wh</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In conclusion, I take (1) as the starting point from which I develop a syntactic analysis to account for clitic placement alternations in the matrix context in Western Iberian Romance languages. But first I lay out the analysis of clitics that I will assume.

²⁴ See fn. 10.
²⁵ See fn. 10.
2.2. Clitics in Western Iberian Romance languages as agreement affixes

Clitics in Romance have received a large amount of attention in generative grammar. There have been two main concerns in the different analyses of clitics proposed. The first concern relates to the nature of clitics. The question is whether to analyze clitics as pronouns, as in what is standardly called the “movement” approach, as pronominal elements that attach to the verbal head, as in what is generally known as the “base generation” approach, or finally, as functional elements of some sort. The second concern relates to where these elements are mapped in the phrase marker, ranging from analyses that take clitics to move from object position and adjoin to the verbal head, to form a unit with the verbal head from the lexicon, and to be licensed in their own projection. Following Franco (1991, 1994, 2000), I claim that clitics in Western Iberian are amenable to an analysis as agreement affixes which, following Murphy-Armstrong (1987) and Sportiche (1996), are merged in the phrase marker in an extended projection of the TP-domain; that is, clitics appear preverbally in Western Iberian Romance languages. Arguments for this analysis are given below.

Franco (1991, 1994, 2000) entertains the idea that clitics should not be considered a unified class across the board, but rather as elements in a continuum like the one represented below:

---

27 For Spanish, see Strozer (1976), Rivas (1977), Otero (1985), and Jaeggli (1986), among others.
According to the continuum depicted above, object clitics in Romance\textsuperscript{31} have developed from strong pronouns to agreement affixes (which I call AGR for shortage) through different intermediate stages as weak pronouns, which are represented as “W-X-Y-Z” in (22).\textsuperscript{32} I employ four tests to show that clitics in Western Iberian Romance languages are amenable to an analysis as inflectional agreement affixes (AGR); namely the obligatory adjacency that these elements observe with respect to the verb, the ordering constraints that clitics are subject to, the availability of clitic doubling, and lastly, the status of non-argumental / solidarity clitics. Each of these tests is discussed below.

Starting with adjacency, both in Modern Spanish and Asturian\textsuperscript{33} clitics are always adjacent to the verbal head, only allowing other clitics to intervene, which is a typical characteristic of clitics as AGR. Moreover, breaking this obligatory adjacency – that is, what is generally called

\begin{equation}
(22) \text{Strong Pronouns} \implies [W-X-Y-Z] \implies \text{Inflectional agreement affixes}
\end{equation}

\text{Weak pronouns}\textsuperscript{29} [Adapted from Franco (2000: 162, (18))]\textsuperscript{30}

\textsuperscript{29} Franco (2000) uses the term “pronominal clitics”; however, I believe “weak pronouns” (in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke (1999)) is more accurate. I will not go into the different proposals regarding the differences between morphosyntactic and phonological clitics – “special” vs. “simple” clitics in the sense of Zwicky (1977), referring the reader to this latter source, where these differences are explored in more detailed.

\textsuperscript{30} Franco (2000) presents this continuum the other way round. However, from a diachronic perspective, the development from (strong) pronouns $\rightarrow$ pronominal clitics $\rightarrow$ agreement affixes (where the arrows go from past to present) is more accurate.

\textsuperscript{31} See also Roberts (1991b), where the same continuum in (22) is proposed to underlie in the development of all kinds of clitics, not just object ones.

\textsuperscript{32} See also Wanner (1987, 1991) and Fontana (1993) for relevant discussion and evidence with regard to the development of clitics in all the Romance languages and Spanish, respectively.

\textsuperscript{33} In Galician and in European Portuguese, interpolation is available, but considered in regression (and lacking productivity – Rosario Álvarez (p.c.); see also González i Planas (2007) and Martins (forthcoming) for European Portuguese), except for some stock phrases. I take these observations to indicate that adjacency of the clitic and the verbal head is becoming the norm in these Western Iberian Romance languages, just like in Asturian – cf. (24).
interpolation – leads to ungrammaticality both in Modern Spanish and in Asturian, as shown below. 34

(23) a. pero que no lo hallamos en toda la historia
   “But we do not find it through the whole story”
   b. como Dios les había prometido
   “As God had promised them”
   c. por qué te encerraste así?
   “Why did you lock yourself up this way?”

(24) a. pero que nun lo topamos en toda historia
   “But we do not find it through the whole story”
   b. como Dios-yos prometiera
   “As God had promised them”
   c. por qué te encerrasti asina?
   “Why did you lock yourself up this way?”

Moreover, unlike strong pronouns, clitics are subject to ordering constraints among themselves (an idea that goes back to Perlmutter’s (1971) clitic template35). This is also a typical property of clitics as AGR, and clearly not one of clitics as pronoun-like elements. Moreover, the same ordering constraints that clitics are subject to in Modern Spanish, such as IO clitics preceding DO ones, are also observed in Asturian. Consider (25)-(26) below:

34 In the examples below, the clitic is in bold and the verb underlined for the reader’s convenience.
35 The template Perlmutter (1971) proposes is: SE II I III – that is, SE (reflexive or other), followed by second person, followed by first person, followed by third person.
Furthermore, both in Spanish and Asturian clitic-doubling is obligatory with strong
pronouns (Suñer (1988)), as shown in (27) and (28). Following Fontana (1993) and Rivero
(1986), I assume that this indicates that clitics are instances of AGR in these languages.36

(25) a. Elena se lo mandó
    [\*lo se mandó]  SP
    “Elena sent it to him/her”

b. Ella, a él, se lo mandó
    [A él, ella se lo mandó]  SP
    “Her, to him, she sent it”

(26) a. Elena mandó-y lo
    [*mandó lo -y]  Ast
    “Elena sent it to him/her”

b. Ella, a él mandó-y lo
    [A él, ella mandó-y lo]  Ast
    “Her, to him, she sent it”

(27) a. que a mí *(me) parece que estas preguntas …
    that to me   meCL seems that these questions
    “… that it seems to me that these questions …”

b. y a mí sólo *(me) dio España
    and to me only   meCL gave3SG Spain
    “And to me s/he only gave Spain”

(28) a. … que a mí paez *(me) que estas entrugues …
    that to me seems   meCL that these questions
    “… that it seems to me that these questions…”

b. ya a mí namás *(me) dio España
    and to me only   meCL gave3SG Spain
    “And to me s/he only gave Spain”

36 The strong pronouns are in bold in the examples for the reader’s convenience.
Lastly, as noted in Murphy-Armstrong (1987) for Spanish and in Campos (1989) for Galician, some clitics are not related to any internal argument. Consider (29):

(29) a. Teresa siempre se queja (*a sí misma)  
   Teresa always se<sub>cl</sub> complain<sub>3SG</sub> to herself  
   “Teresa always complains to herself”  
   [From Murphy-Armstrong (1987: 101, (36))]

b. Dói che me ben a cabeza (*a ti)  
   hurt<sub>3SG</sub>-che<sub>cl</sub>(you-familiar)-me<sub>cl</sub> well the head  
   “My head hurts”  
   [Adapted from Campos (1989: 15, (4a))]

In (29a), the clitic *se* appears with the predicate *queja* “(she) complains”, which is intransitive. Being intransitive, *queja* has no internal argument position as the parentheses indicate, so the clitic cannot be generated as an argument. I take this as evidence for analyzing the *se* clitic as AGR and not as a pronoun. Further evidence for clitics as AGR is shown in the Galician example in (29b). The clitic *che* is a solidarity clitic<sup>37</sup> that is not related to any internal argument as indicated by the ungrammaticality of the doubled element in parenthesis – cf. (27)-(28). Again, the availability of the clitic in (29b) follows from an analysis of clitics as AGR, but not from an analysis of clitics as pronouns.

For the reasons just given, I argue for an analysis of clitics in Western Iberian Romance languages as agreement affixes, similar to the proposal put forth in Murphy-Armstrong (1987) and Franco (1991, etc.) for clitics in Modern Spanish. However, in contrast with Franco’s proposal, and in line with Murphy-Armstrong’s (1987) and Sportiche’s (1996), I

---

<sup>37</sup> Álvarez et al. (1986: 174), describe the usage of this type of clitic as follows: “para implica-lo interlocutor nos feitos que se Narran ou nas opiniones que se expresan […] procurando a súa solidariedade, a súa complicidade ou simplemente unha maior aproximación afectiva entre el, a mensaxe e o emisor”. [“to involve the interlocutor in the facts that are being narrated or in the opinions being expressed… trying to obtain his/her solidarity, his/her complicity or simply a better affective approximation between the listener, the message and the speaker.”].
argue that clitics in Romance are mapped in a projection that dominates Tº, namely the
projection where the verb moves to in Romance. Moreover, from the properties discussed
above (lack of interpolation, etc.), I claim that these elements are “minimal” in the sense that
they lack a specifier.38 This gives us the structure shown in (30) below. 39

(30) CliticP
    clitic     TP
        ⬜

Anticipating part of the discussion to come when the analysis of clitic placement alternations
in Western Iberian Romances is presented, I argue that the structure in (30) observes the
following three conditions. First, clitics are always found in preverbal position with tensed
verbs40 in almost all modern Romance varieties, some exceptions being the languages under
scrutiny in this dissertation. In other words, I argue that clitics are generated in a fixed
preverbal position as in (30), and that post- and preverbal clitic alternations as those

38 In this sense, I depart from Sportiche (1996), who takes the specifiers of CliticPs (in his proposal, Clitic
VoiceP), which are the projections hosting the clitics in the structure, as available landing sites for movement. I
argue that there is no specifier to start with assuming a bare-phrase structure analysis, as in Chomsky (1994),
and that the movement properties of [Spec, DirectObject CliticVoiceP] in Sportiche’s analysis are captured
differently. In short, I will argue in the following sections that A’-movement targets a projection in the left-
periphery in (1) above.
39 Sportiche (1996) claims that each clitic in the structure heads its own projection. However, I will not commit
to this claim, leaving it open whether each of the clitics in the structure heads its own projection or whether
they are part of the same projection, being then ordered in the morpho-phonological component – as argued in
40 Since I just concentrate on clitic placement alternations in the finite context in Western Iberian Romances, I
leave for future research whether the same analysis can be extended to non-finite environments.
exhibited in the languages under study result from independently triggered operations. 41

Second, following Kayne (1994), I assume that only left-adjunction is available. Third, I contend that the moment the clitic and the verb form a unit, this unit is indivisible. 42 I argue that this last assumption rules out the possibility of excorporation in the sense of Roberts (1991a), thus departing from Benincà’s (2006) analysis of post- and preverbal clitic alternations discussed in section 1.3. I discuss next two further assumptions related to the analysis that I will argue for.

2.3. Two further assumptions: [Spec, TP], and the phase status of Finiteness *

Before presenting the analysis that I will pursue to account for clitic placement alternations in Western Iberian Romance languages, I want to lay out two important assumptions that I am making. The first relates to the status of [Spec, TP] in Western Iberian Romance languages. This group of languages shows the properties typically associated with Null Subject Languages (NSLs), 43 namely phonologically null subjects, S(subject)V(verb) / VS order alternations, and lack of that -trace effects. These properties are illustrated in (31) below:

(31) Illustration of Null Subject Languages’ properties in Asturian

(a) Calzó les madreñes
    wore_{3SG} the clogs
    “S/he wore the clogs”

41 Thus, I depart from Duarte and Matos (2000), Rouveret (1999), Barbosa (1995, etc.) and González-López (2008) who claim that postverbal clitics are instances of the clitic being pronounced lower in the structure. In this sense, I follow Lema and Rivero (1990, 1991) and Fontana (1993, 1996) in assuming that the clitic is in a fixed position and that post- and preverbal clitic alternations as those exhibited in the Western Iberian Romance languages under study are the result of independently triggered operations.


43 See Rizzi (1982), Jaeggi (1982), and especially Barbosa (in press) for an updated discussion.
Following Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) and Barbosa (1995, 2006), I relate these properties to rich inflection on the verbal head (that is, [+D] features\(^{44}\)) also in Asturian. As a consequence, and as Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou and Barbosa claim, both the [+D, +V] features on the verbal head (represented as “V [+D, +V]” in (32a) below) can check both the [+V] and the [EPP]\(^{45}\) feature on T\(^{\circ}\), as in (32b), rendering the presence of pro in [Spec, TP] unnecessary. This is shown in (32).

(32) Assumption #1: V [+D] checking T\(^{\circ}\)’s [EPP]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \left[ v^T \left[ T^\circ [+V, EPP] \left[ v^\rho \left[ v^\star V [+D, +V] \ldots \right] \right] \right] \right] \quad T^\circ \text{ agrees with } V [+V] \\
\text{b. } & \left[ v^T \left[ v^\rho \left[ v^\star V [+D, +V] \ldots \right] \right] \right] \quad \text{V raises and [+D] checks } T^\circ \text{'s [EPP]}
\end{align*}
\]

Under (32), I argue that preverbal subjects in Western Iberian\(^{46}\) are either instances of \(A^\prime\)-movement to the Focus field (for Focused subjects), or they are base-generated in the Topic

\(^{44}\) Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) call the [+D] features on the verb “pronominal features”, but I continue to use the [+D] notation for ease of exposition. [+D] features are those associated with Case and [\(\phi\)]-features on T\(^{\circ}\), while [+V] features are those associated with the verb – i.e., strong verbal features in the early Minimalism framework – cf. Chomsky (1995).

\(^{45}\) Recall that T\(^{\circ}\)’s [EPP]-feature is related to the need for an element bearing [+D] features in its specifier.

\(^{46}\) This claim has been argued for Spanish in Contreras (1991), Olarrea (1997), Ordóñez (1998), Ordóñez and Treviño (1999), and as already noted, in Barbosa (1995, and subsequent) for European Portuguese. Although see Goodall (1993, 2001), Gallego (2007) and Ortega-Santos (2008) for a different claim for Spanish.
field or Frame field in the left-periphery of the clause. This only leaves postverbal subjects as true instances in A-position checking Case through long-distance agree (cf. Chomsky (2000)) with Tº. 47

In contrast with Barbosa (1995), I claim that A’-movement does not target [Spec, TP]; in the syntax I propose, [Spec, TP] is not projected at all. In line with Chomsky (2008), I assume that Tº is not a phase-head and that A’-movement only targets phase-edges. 48 And this leads to the second assumption I will entertain: the status of Finitenessº in the left-periphery of the clause in Western Iberian Romance languages.

Rizzi (1997, 2004) shows that Finitenessº (Finº) and its complement Tº exhibit a strong connection related to the morphological features present in Tº. 49 Moreover, the position of Finº in the clausal architecture is like an edge/split between the TP-field and the peripheral-projections (i.e., fields in Benincà and Poletto (2004)) in (1). I will argue that Finitenessº (Finº) is ultimately responsible for clitic placement alternations in WI, thus departing from analyses that rely on the phonological properties of clitics as the trigger of postverbal patterns (cf. Lema and Rivero (1990, 1991) and Barbosa (1995, 2000)), and also from analyses that argue that a V2 (that is, verb in second position) is responsible for post- and

---

47 The question of whether subject-pron is necessary at all as Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998) claim, is a point I will not dwell on, as it is irrelevant for the discussion of clitic placement alternations in Western Iberian Romance languages.

48 Thus, I depart from claims like Gallego’s (2007) for Spanish that Tº is a phase. I argue that Finitenessº, and not Tº, is a phase-head in Western Iberian Romance languages, thus in compliance with Chomsky’s (2008) argument that A’-movement may only proceed through phase-edges, which I discuss next.

49 Rizzi (1997) shows this connection in relation to the complementizer system of Italian, which is sensitive to the [± finite] morphological specification of Tº, with che “that” and di “for” matching Tº[+finite] and Tº[−finite] respectively.
preverbal clitic alternations (cf. Benincà (2006)). Rather, and building on different intuitions present in the literature dealing with clitic placement in WI, I argue that pre- and postverbal clitic alternations in this group of languages are connected to verb-movement targeting a position higher than T°, which I relate to the phase properties of Fin° in WI. From a purely descriptive point of view, I argue that Fin° in WI languages observes (33):

(33) Empirical observation regarding Fin° in Western Iberian Romance languages

Fin° in the left-periphery requires that an element move to it.

From a more formal point of view, I claim that this empirical observation can be captured as follows:

(34) Assumption #2: Fin° is a phase in Western Iberian Romance languages

In WI, Fin° is a phase-head with an edge condition which triggers and ensures displacement of an element.

I claim that (34) is an asset of the analysis over those that posit any features on Fin°. For the purposes of discussion, let us consider how an analysis relying on features would work. Thus, let us assume that different features may be present in Fin° in WI, and let us consider

---

50 With this analysis, I do not mean that older stages of the language might not have been V2 as in Germanic languages. That might turn out to be the case, but I show that the analysis I propose is more elegant and accounts for post- and preverbal clitic placement alternations in modern WI languages without having to attribute a controversial V2 status to these languages.

51 Following Chomsky (2008), this edge condition I propose for Fin° could be considered as an Internal Merge requirement of this phase-head.
the three different options shown in (35). On the first option, Fin⁰ would bear [+D, EPP] features, as shown in (35a), on the second option in (35b) Fin⁰ would bear [+V, EPP] features, and on the third option Fin⁰ would bear [+D, +V, EPP] features, in (35c).

(35) A feature based approach to Finiteness⁰

(a)  

Fin⁰  CliticP  

[+D, EPP]  

clitic(s)  TP  

[+D, +V]  

(b)  

Fin⁰  CliticP  

[+V, EPP]  

clitic(s)  TP  

[+D, +V]  

(c)  

Fin⁰  CliticP  

[+D, +V, EPP]  

clitic(s)  TP  

[+D, +V]  

Under current syntactic assumptions, features can be checked long distance with the operation agree, with the exception of [EPP] features. Turning to the different options shown in (35), the only feature that would need checking would thus be an [EPP] feature, which would trigger movement in order to be satisfied. However, if we assume that Fin⁰ bears an [EPP] feature, the following question is immediately raised: what does an [EPP] feature do in Fin⁰? Moreover, if we assume that Fin⁰ has an [EPP] feature, we are establishing a parallelism with the [EPP] feature on T⁰. Furthermore, the presence of an [EPP] feature on T⁰ has been shown to have sound crosslinguistically validity for nominative case checking. However, extending the claim to Fin⁰ bearing an [EPP] feature requires different

---

52 In Chomsky (2000), movement is parasitic on the presence of [EPP] features of a head, which in rather informal terms entails “I need an element in my specifier”. Pesetsky and Torrego (2001) recast Chomsky’s proposal and argue that [+EPP] is a trait of a feature or a subfeature, thus barring [+EPP] features on their own. Thus, I do not consider this latter option.


54 I would have never arrived this far in the argumentation if it had not being for Héctor Campos’ help. I am very thankful to him for his patience and time devoted to discuss these matters with me.

55 For instance, the different ways in which the [EPP] feature on T⁰ can be checked provide a clear cut distinction between Null Subject Languages (NSLs) on the one hand and English on the other, such as the effects discussed in (31).
assumptions that make this claim sound stipulative. Rather than positing an [EPP] feature on this projection, what I claim is that Fin⁰ is a phase in WI with an edge condition (i.e., (34)), which forces the displacement of (at least) one element to this projection.

Let us then evaluate the claim that Fin⁰ is a phase in WI. Under Chomsky’s (2008) system, both CP and v⁰P are phases, “where C is a shorthand for the region that Rizzi (1997) calls ‘the left-periphery’” [from Chomsky (2008: 143)]. Moreover, notice that the moment one assumes Rizzi’s (1997) split-CP or left-periphery approach, what constitutes Chomsky’s CP-phase is up for grabs. In this dissertation, I claim that Fin⁰ in WI is what Chomsky (2008) considers the CP-phase. Although the phase-system started in Chomsky (2000) is still much under construction and debate, current syntactic research offers different intuitions of what phase-effects may be, some of which I consider in (36) below.

(36) Phase-effects

a. Complements of phase-heads undergo Transfer. This forces elements with unchecked features to escape this Transfer operation in order to avoid crashing at the interfaces;

---

56 I am not in a position to evaluate the overall crosslinguistic validity of positing [EPP] features on Fin⁰, thus I do not consider this option any longer in the discussion. Any interested reader can take the different options presented in (35) and see that all of them can account for the data just as well as the analysis I pursue. However, and again, the question remains of why an [EPP], and what it does in Fin⁰.

57 As I will show in 2.4 below, different elements may target either the head or the specifier of Fin⁰ to satisfy the proposed edge condition of this phase. Moreover, as I show next, the different elements that may move to or through Fin⁰ explains naturally the post- and preverbal clitic alternations exhibited in the WI languages under study in matrix and in also finite embedded context, as I discuss in chapters 3 and 4.

58 “Transfer” is the modern equivalent of “Spell-out” of early minimalism (cf. Chomsky (1995)).
b. \( (a) \) forces movement of elements with unchecked features that always target the “edge” of phase-heads (that is, elements with unchecked features target the phase-head’s specifier);

c. Movement as in (b) is ensured by the presence of “edge-features” in phase-heads, which thus act as escape-hatches for \( \Lambda' \)-movement.

I will now argue that Finº in WI observes the three diagnostics in (36).\(^{59}\) Moreover, I contend that if Finº is a phase head, a uniform explanation of post- and preverbal clitic placement alternations in Western Iberian becomes possible. Thus, I will argue that postverbal clitics in Western Iberian Romance languages arise from the need to satisfy (34).

(37) Postverbal clitics in WI and the edge-condition of Finitenessº

\[
\begin{align*}
a. \quad & [\text{TP} \ V \ [+D, +V] \ Tº [+V, \text{EPP}] \ [\text{vP} \ [+ \lambda_v]]] \\

b. \quad & \text{Finº} \ [\text{CliticP} \ \text{clitic(s)}] \ [\text{TP} \ V \ [+D, +V] \ Tº [+V, \text{EPP}] \ldots] \\
c. \quad & \text{Finº} \ [\text{CliticP} \ \text{clitic(s)}] \ [\text{TP} \ V \ [+D, +V] \ Tº + \text{clitic(s)}] \ \text{Finº} \ [\text{CliticP} \ \text{clitic(s)}] \ [\text{TP} \ \text{clitic(s)}] \\
\end{align*}
\]

---

\(^{59}\) Another possibility that I do not explore here is the following. Chomsky (2008) claims that \( Tº \) inherits its features from \( Cº \). I argue that Finº constitutes what Chomsky considers the \( Cº \)-phase in WI, and Rizzi (1997) contends that Finº holds a strong connection with the morphological features present in its complement \( Tº \). Putting these ideas together opens another possibility for analyzing Finº as a phase-head; namely Finº could bear a residue of those features inherited by \( Tº \) in WI, giving us (i) below:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{Finº}[+\phi] \quad \ldots \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Finº}[+\phi] \quad \ldots \\
& \quad Tº \quad \ldots \\
& \quad Tº[+\phi] \quad \ldots \\
\end{align*}
\]

However, I must leave this interesting issue open for future research, as it deserves more careful examination.
As in (37a), the verb raises to 'T°, checking 'T°'s [EPP] feature – cf. (32). Next, clitics are merged preverbally in Clitic° (see 2.2), and then Fin° is merged as in (37b). Fin° has an edge condition in WI – cf. (34). I assume that clitics, possibly due to their deficient/affix-like nature, cannot satisfy this edge condition requirement.⁶⁰ Thus, I argue that the verb moves to Fin° as last resort, picking up the clitics on its way up. This is shown in (37c).

Preverbal clitics in WI come from two possible sources, shown in (38). After the verb moves to T° and the clitics are merged, as in (38a), two situations may arise: Either there is a closer head to Fin° than T°, like Y° in (38b), or there is an XP that must undergo A'-movement to the left-periphery in order to check its [+wh/Foc] criterial features, like XP in (38c). I argue that both Y° in (38b) and XP in (38c) target Fin° or [Spec, FinP] respectively, as shown in (38b’’) and (38c’’), and that this movement satisfies the edge condition of the Fin° phase.

(38) Preverbal clitics and the edge condition of Finiteness°

a. \([\text{cliticP clitic(s)} [\text{TP V [+D, +V] T° [+V, EPP]} [\text{v*P v°} T V]]]]\)

b. \([\text{Fin° [YP Y° [cliticP clitic(s) [TP V [+D, +V] T° [+V, EPP]]]]]]\)

c. \([\text{Fin° [cliticP clitic(s) [TP V [+D, +V] T° [+V, EPP] [\text{XP[+wh/Foc]}]]]]}\)

b’’. \([\text{Fin° y° [YP [cliticP clitic(s) [TP V [+D, +V] T° [+V, EPP]]]}]\)

c’’. \([\text{Fin° XP[+wh/Foc] [Fin° [cliticP clitic(s) [TP V T° [\text{XP[+wh/Foc]}]]]}]\)

⁶⁰ This could follow from the enclitic nature of clitics in this group of languages, in line with the “traditional analyses” discussed in 1.2 above – cf. Lema and Rivero (1990, 1991), and Barbosa (1995, 2000). I leave this as an open issue.
Moreover, notice that there are two reasons why an XP undergoing A'-movement has to stop in [Spec, FinP] under the analysis I propose. First, XP has to escape Transfer because its criterial [+wh/Foc] features have not been checked yet. Second, Finº, being a phase head, has an edge feature which is checked by an element moving to [Spec, FinP] and which satisfies the edge condition on Finº stated in (34).

On my analysis for A'-movement, there is a parallelism between Finº and v*: being phase-heads, both Finº and v* provide an escape-hatch for elements undergoing A'-movement that must check their [criterial features] in the left-periphery of the clause. To summarize, I am claiming first, that Tº’s [EPP] is satisfied by the verbal head in Western Iberian Romance languages, and second, that Finº is a phase-head in WI with an edge condition. Moreover, I contend that this edge condition can be satisfied either by an element undergoing A'-movement to [Spec, FinP], or by the closest head in the structure moving to Finº. Next, I show how the proposed analysis of Finº as a phase in WI accounts for the post- and preverbal clitic alternations exhibited in this group of languages in the matrix environment.

2.4. Clitic placement alternations in the matrix context in Western Iberian Romance languages

As I showed in chapter 1, different matrix contexts give rise to pre- and postverbal clitics. In this section, I show how the cartographic structure that I assume in 2.1 and the analysis of

---

61 Following Rizzi (1997, 2004, 2007) and Rizzi and Shlonsky (2006), I assume that [+Focus], [+wh] and [+Topic] are so-called criterial features must be checked in a criterial position (i.e., FocusP, TopicP, etc.) in the left-periphery of the clause (cf. (1) above).
clitics that I entertain in 2.2, together with the different assumptions laid out in 2.3, can uniformly explain the placement of the clitic in matrix clauses in WI.

2.4.1. Finº and postverbal clitics in the matrix context in WI

On the analysis I propose, a postverbal clitic pattern obtains if there is no $A'$-movement, and also if there is no closer element to Finº than the verb in Tº. Under those circumstances, the verb moves to Finº to satisfy this phase head’s edge condition. Let me illustrate the analysis proposed with the data discussed in 1.1.1 above. Recall that clitics occur postverbally in WI when no preverbal element appears:

    havePG-themCL-cut "I have them cut" [Álvarez, Llamas]

    toldML-meCL-itCL-e verything "He told me everything" [Álvarez et al. (1986: 183)]

    had-studied PG-itCL to-depth "He had studied it in depth" [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 165)]

Now, consider the derivation for (39a) above, as in (40) – irrelevant parts omitted. 62

(40) a. [TP teo [+D, +V] Tº [+N, [PP [o (pro) [pro teo tayaes ]]]] 63

62 Whether Forceº projects in the matrix context encoding clause-typing features or not is irrelevant for the discussion, so I just concentrate in how the edge condition of Finº proposed in (34) can explain clitic placement alternations. In the derivations to follow, I omit Tº’s features checked by the verbal head just for ease of exposition.

63 In line with those approaches to clitics as agreement-morphemes (cf. Franco (1991), Murphy-Armstrong (1987) and Sportiche (1996)), I assume object-pro fills the object slot of the predicate sabes “you know”, as in (40a). As for subject-pro, recall that I do not commit to whether it is necessary, so I put it in parentheses here and in subsequent derivations.
As shown in (40a), I argue that the verb in WI has [+D, +V] features that check Tº’s [EPP] when it moves to Tº – cf. (32), so no subject-pro is assumed to be in [Spec, TP]. Next, the clitic is merged in Cliticº (cf. 2.2), followed by merge of Finitenessº (Finº), as in (40b). As discussed in (34), I am assuming that Finº is a phase-head with an edge condition. It is this condition, I argue, that triggers verb-movement of Tº to Finº picking up the clitic(s) in Cliticº on its way up as shown in (40c). Notice that this analysis of postverbal clitic patterns as those in (39) does not resort to an excorporation analysis of the verbal head leaving the clitic behind as Benincà (2006) proposes. Thus, we can maintain that when the verbal head and the clitic form a unit (i.e., once Tº-to-Cliticº movement takes place), they are indivisible, as argued in Kayne (1991). I assume that both the Galician and the European Portuguese sentences in (39b) and (39c), respectively, follow the same mechanism: Finº requires that an element move to satisfy the edge condition of this phase-head, triggering verb-movement – see (37).

Next, consider the effect of preverbal (non-emphatic) subjects in the matrix context. These are followed by postverbal clitics in WI, as (41) shows.

(41) a. El xenru matóse nun accidente na mina [*se mató] Ast the son-in-law killed3SG-rflCL in-an accident  in-the mine
   “His son-in-law got killed in an accident in the mine”  [González, Comedies]
b. O veciño tróuxo **che** estas cereixas  
the neighbor broughtSG-youCL these cherries  
“The neighbor brought you these cherries”  
[Carballo Calero (1968: 227)]

c. O António leu-o ontent  
the António read3SG-itCL yesterday  
“Antonio read it yesterday”  

As we saw earlier in 2.3, I claim that preverbal (non-quantified) subjects in WI are Topics that are base-generated in either the Topic or Frame field in the left-periphery. Since preverbal (non-quantified) subjects do not involve A'-movement, 64 Finº must satisfy its edge condition by attracting the closest available element in the structure, namely the verb in Tº. 65

This results in the following derivation for (41a):

\[
\begin{align*}
(42) \quad & a. \left[TP \ mató \ [+D, +V] \ Tº \ [+V, EPP] \ [\_p (pro) \ [\_mató \ldots]]\right] \\
& b. \left[Finº \ [\text{CliticP se} \ [TP \ mató \ Tº \ [+V, EPP] \ [\_p (pro) \ [\_mató \ldots]]]\right] \\
& c. \left[Fin' \ matóse \ Finº \ [\text{CliticP mató se} \ [TP \ mató \ldots]]\right]
\end{align*}
\]

---

64 I take wh-island extraction and the interaction with wh-movement in (i)-(ii) below as evidence for the lack of A'-movement properties and for the position of the subject in the periphery in (1) respectively; consider,

(i) El xenu, nun sé [qué dixo]  
the son-in-law not know1SG what said3SG  
“The son-in-law, I don’t know what he said”

(ii) *A quién el xenu vio? /El xenu, a quién vio? [wh > Top: * / Top > wh: √]  
to whom the son-in-law sawSG the son-in-law to whom sawSG  
“Who did the son-in-law see?”

65 This would also explain why elements in the Topic and Frame fields in the structure in (1) trigger postverbal clitics in the matrix context. See chapter 3 for the same pattern in the finite embedded context in Conservative Asturian, and chapter 4 for crosslinguistic variation in Galician and European Portuguese.
If the clitic appears postverbally in (41) because the subject is a base-generated Topic and the edge condition of Fin° can only be satisfied by verb movement to Fin°, we expect to also find postverbal clitics with other Topics that are not subjects. This is confirmed by the following examples:

(43) a. Esoi sábeslo_i  per leer les cartes

"That, you know it from reading the (tarot) cards”

[González, Comedies]

b. iso_i  publicaroono  os críticos insidiosos

"That, the insidious critics published it”

[CORGA (2008)]

c. isso_i  digo-vo-lo_i  eu

"That, I say it to you”

[O Corpus do Português (2007)]

I argue that the postverbal clitic pattern in (43a) receives the analysis in (44):

(44) a. [TP sabes [+D, +V]  T° [+V, EPP] _P (pro) [sabes pro … per leer les cartes]]

b. [Fin° [ClinicP lo [TP sabes T° [P (pro) [sabes …]]]]]

c. [Fin° sábeslo Fin° [ClinicP sabes lo [TP sabes …]]]

d. [L[60] D[60] el xenru [+Top] [LD° [+Top] [Fin° matóse Fin° [ClinicP mató se [T° mató …]]]]

"That, you know it from reading the (tarot) cards”
Again, the verbal head checks Tº’s [EPP]; then the clitic is merged in Cliticº, followed by merge of Finº. In line with previous discussion, verb-movement Tº to Finº is triggered to satisfy the edge condition of Finº, and this verb-movement picks up the clitics in Cliticº on its way up. As for the Left-Dislocated Topic eso “that”, I argue that it is base-generated in L(eft) D(islocation) P(hrase) in the Topic field, where it checks its criterial [+Topic] features.

Consider the next matrix context where postverbal clitics arise in WI, which involves preverbal temporal adverbial phrases as those in (45).

(45) a. Depués dixeronme qu’una valla metálica (...) [me dixeran] Ast later told3PL-meCL that-a fence metallic “Later on, they told me that a metallic fence (stopped the old-woman)” [Camilo, Psicokiller]

b. Pasadomañá dislllo e xa está [llo dis] Gal after-tomorrow tell2SG-himCL-itCL and already is3SG “You say it to him the day after tomorrow and that’s it” [Álvarez et al. (1986: 188)]

c. Depois dá-se-lhe trabalho [se-lhe da] EP later give3SG-rfl-himCL work “Afterwards work is given to him/ her” [Corpus do Português (2007)]

Assuming that those preverbal adverbial phrases (cf. chapter 1, fn. 6) that trigger a postverbal clitic pattern in WI are base-generated and not A’-moved in the Frame or Topic

---

66 Notice the presence of a coindexed DO resumptive clitic lo “it” – similar to (9), which I take to show that eso “that” must be a Topic, thus not derived as an instance of A’-movement but base-generated in the Topic or in the Frame field in the left-periphery of the clause.

67 Adverbial phrases, as opposed to DPs, are difficult to map in either the Frame or Topic field in (1) – see Benincà and Poletto (2004) on the same issue. These elements could be located in different projections in the periphery. Notice, interaction with a Hanging Topic (HT) shows that these adverbial phrases must be lower than HT constructions – see (6), a relevant example below:

[continued]
field in line with Benincà and Poletto (2004), and keeping everything else constant, postverbal clitics in (45) follow the same mechanisms as those involved in previous instances: the verb raises from T°-to-Fin° to satisfy the edge condition of Fin°, and it picks the clitics in Clitic° on its way up to Fin°, as shown in (46).

(46) a. \[
\left[\text{TP} \ dixeron \ [+D, +V] \ T° \ [+V, \text{EPP}] \ [\text{Clitic}_P \ (\text{pro}) \ [\text{TP} \ dixeron \ que \ ...]]\right]
\]

b. \[
\left[\text{Fin}° \ [\text{Clitic}_P \ me \ [\text{TP} \ dixeron \ T° \ [\text{Clitic}_P \ ...]]]\right]
\]

c. \[
\left[\text{Fin}' \ dixéronme \ [\text{Clitic}_P \ dixeron \ me \ [\text{TP} \ dixeron \ ...]]\right]
\]

d. \[
\left[\text{Depués}_{+\text{Top}} \ [\text{Fin}° \ dixéronme \ [\text{Clitic'} \ dixeron \ me \ [\text{TP} \ dixeron \ ...]]]\right]
\]

“Later on, they told me that a metallic fence (stopped the old-woman)”

As in previous derivations, the verbal head raises and satisfies T°’s [EPP]; next, the clitics are merged in Clitic° followed by merge of Fin°. Verb-raising to Fin° satisfies the edge condition

(i) \[
\text{Mon, depués dixéronme que falaron con él} \quad [\text{HT} > \text{Adv}: \checkmark]
\]

(ii) \[
\text{?? Depués, Mon, dixéronme que falaron con él,} \quad [\text{Adv} > \text{HT}: ??]
\]

The question is how low, since different positions are available in (1) below a HT. Consider the following interaction in (iii) with both LD (Left Dislocation) and LI (List Interpretation) – as in (8):

(iii) \[
\text{Depués a los vieyos (??depués) lo primero (??depués) vendiéron-yoslo, lo segundo regaláron-yoslo} \quad \text{Later to the elderly the former sold-IOCL-DOCL the latter gave-away-IO-DO}
\]

“Later on, to the elderly (later on), the former (later on) they sold it to them; the latter, they gave it to them for free”

Interaction with elements in the Topic field shows that the adverbial sounds better if it precedes them, in which case it must be in ScSt (Scene Setting) in (1). In any case, and regardless of where the adverbial phrases in (45) are mapped in the structure in (1), the wh-island test in (iv) below shows that the adverbial is not derived as an instance of A’-movement, which is the relevant factor for the proposed analysis of clitic placement alternations:

(iv) \[
\text{Depués, nun sé a quién-γ lo mandó} \quad [\text{wh-island}: \checkmark]
\]

“Later on, I don’t know who s/he sent it to”
of this phase-head and the verb picks up the clitics on its way up, which accounts for the postverbal clitic pattern with the same analysis.

As noted in 1.1.1, different combinations of multiple Topics trigger a postverbal clitic pattern, as I show in (47): 68

(47) a. Polo menos yo entiéndolo asina [*lo entiendo] Ast
   “At least, I understand this way” [Corte & García, Gasolina]

   b. Unha mañá, moi cedo, os escollidos pónense en camino [*se poñen] Gal
   “One morning, very early, the chosen ones set off” [CORGA (2008)]

   c. Ao Miguel, a Maria deu-lhe una prenda [*lhe deu] EP
   “Miguel, Maria gave him a gift” [Kuong (2006, (6a))]

The current analysis straightforwardly extends to these cases if we assume that the various

---

68 Recall that recursivity of projections is not an option in Benincà and Poletto (2004), so the different preverbal elements in the sentences must be licensed in different projections in the structure of the left-periphery in (1). Notice that although subtle, interpretation differences arise when changing the order of these elements. Consider (47a), repeated in (i) below, and (ii), with the preverbal elements in a different order:

(i) Polo menos yo entiéndolo asina
   “At least, I understand this way”

(ii) Yo polo menos entiéndolo asina
   “As far as I am concerned, I understand this way”

While (i) could be interpreted as opposing my opinion to somebody else’s, (ii) is harder to fit in that context, which simply states what the subject yo “I” thinks, as in “listen, this is what I think”. The interpretation in (i) is similar to what was discussed in 2.1.2 regarding List Interpretation Topics, so the subject, although dislocated, can be used to mark a contrast. Thus, I assume that yo “I” is a LI Topic, with the other preverbal element licensed in either LD Topic or in Scene SettingP. In turn, (ii) could be analyzed as an instance of yo “I” as a HT, with polo menos “at least” licensed in the Topic field in (1). I leave the discussion here.
Matrix coordination is another context where a postverbal clitic pattern is observed in WI.

(49) a. Francí'l broche (...) [y prendí-yos un cachu a caún] ["y-yos] Ast broke\textsubscript{1SG}-the clasp and pinned\textsubscript{1SG}-them\textsubscript{CL} a piece to each
“I broke the clasp (in half) and I pinned a piece to each of them” [Orton, Mayordomu]

b. Cepillou os dentes con rabia [e afeítou-se] ["e se] Gal brushed\textsubscript{3SG} the teeth with rage and shaved\textsubscript{rfl\textsubscript{CL}}-himself
“He brushed his teeth with rage and shaved himself” [CORGA (2008)]

c. Vieste [e trouxeste-me um libro] ["e me] EP came\textsubscript{2SG} and brought\textsubscript{2SG}-me\textsubscript{CL} a book
“You came and brought me a book” [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 168)]

Although I do not intend to provide a full analysis of coordination in WI, and since my approach to the question would be rather naïve, I want to note that coordination is relevant to the asymmetry found in matrix and embedded contexts. 71 In order to account for

\[\text{Although I do not intend to provide a full analysis of coordination in WI, and since my approach to the question would be rather naïve, I want to note that coordination is relevant to the asymmetry found in matrix and embedded contexts. 71 In order to account for}\]

---

69 Consider wh-extraction, which I take to show that these elements are not derived as instance of \(\Lambda^\text{-}\)movement, but as base-generated Topics in the Frame or the Topic field in the left-periphery (cf. (1)):

\[(i) \quad \text{Polo menos, yo, sabes a quién-y lo dije?} \quad \text{at-least, I know\textsubscript{2SG} to whom-IO\textsubscript{CL} DO\textsubscript{CL} said\textsubscript{3SG}} \]

“At least, me, do you know who I said it to?”

70 Cf. fn. 63 above.

71 Coordination in embedded clauses will be discussed in chapter 3, where I show that postverbal clitics may also be found in Conservative Asturian in embedded coordination contexts.
postverbal clitics in (49), I will follow Fontana (1993) and assume that those instances involve a coordination of two CPs. This can be recast under a left-periphery analysis as the one I argue for assuming that Finº at least projects in both conjuncts. Thus, I analyze matrix coordinated structures as in (50) following Munn (1993).

\[(50) \text{Boolean Phrase (BP)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Fin'} \\
\text{B'} \\
\text{Finº} \\
\text{CliticP} \\
\text{B° coord} \\
\text{Clitic(s)} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Finº} \\
\text{CliticP} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Tº} \\
\text{…} \\
\text{Clitic(s)} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{Tº} \\
\text{…}
\end{array}
\]

For Munn (1993), the coordinating element is mapped in the phrase marker as the head of a phrase that he calls BooleanP, with the conjoined elements mapped one in the specifier and the other in the complement of Booleanº as shown in the tree above. Thus, I assume that conjoined matrix clauses project (at least as much as) Finº, so Finº is present in both

\[72\text{I refer the reader to Munn (1993) for the motivation and evidence for this analysis of coordinated structures.}\]

\[73\text{Whether Forceº must also project is irrelevant for the analysis of clitic placement that I am arguing for, so I only concentrate on the analysis I propose that Finº is a phase-head in WI can explain clitic placement alternations. As for the presence of two Finº projections (one on each conjunct), I assume that Finº is present in all matrix contexts in WI, so conjoining two matrix clauses and having two independent ones should not be any different. Thus, consider (i), in which the speaker is listing different things that the listener cannot remember whether s/he did, with postverbal clitics as in (49c):}\]

\[(i) \text{Llegasti, comprésteme un llibru, …} \\
\text{arrived1SG bought1SG-meCL a book} \\
\text{“(First), you arrived, (then) you brought me a book, …”} \]

Furthermore, consider (ii) and the contrast with (iii):

[continued]
conjoined clauses. Thus, I analyze the postverbal clitic pattern observed in (49) as shown in (51) below. Similarly to the analysis of postverbal clitics discussed in the previous examples, I argue that the edge condition of Finº triggers Tº-to-Finº verb-movement, and that the verb picks up the clitics in Cliticº on its way up to Finº in the second conjunct,74 accounting uniformly for postverbal clitic patterns.

\[\text{(51)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Fin'} \\
\text{francí} \\
\text{TP} \\
\text{...} \\
\text{francí}
\end{array}
\hspace{1cm}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{B'} \\
\text{Bº} \\
\text{y} \\
\text{prendí-yos} \\
\text{TP}
\end{array}
\hspace{1cm}
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Fin'} \\
\text{Cliticº} \\
\text{prendí} \\
\text{... un cachu ...}
\end{array}
\]

(ii) Esti capítulu escribí lu y reescribí *(lu) un ciento veces
This chapter wrote1SG-itCL and wrote-again1SG-itCL one hundred times
“This chapter, I wrote it once and again one hundred times”

(iii) Esti capítulu nun lu escribí y (lu) reescribí un ciento veces
This chapter not  itCL wrote1SG and itCL wrote-again1SG one hundred times
“This chapter, I didn’t write it once and again one hundred times”

As shown in (ii), if a postverbal clitic appears in the first conjunct, the clitic must be repeated in the second one, and it must surface postverbally. On the other hand, if we have a preverbal clitic in the first conjunct as with negation, the clitic is optional, as shown in (iii). This follows if the coordinating element y “and” in (ii) conjoins (at least) two Finº phrases and Tº-to-Finº verb-movement satisfies Finº’s edge condition picking up the clitics in both conjuncts, while y “and” in (iii) conjoins either two CliticP phrases (and the clitic arises in both conjuncts) or two TP phrases, and this explains the optionality of the clitic in the second conjunct. However, notice that the optionality of the clitic in (iii) must be related to the semantic proximity of both predicates escribir “to write” and reescribir “to rewrite / write again”, as the lack of optionality in (iv) indicates:

(iv) Esti capítulu nun-y lu enseñé y *(·-y lu) devolví a Héctor a los tres días
This chapter not-himCL itCL showed1SG and himCL itCL returned1SG to Héctor to the three days
“This chapter, I didn’t show it to Héctor and returned it to him after three days”

I leave this issue for future research.

74 Since there is no clitic in the first conjunct, I assume Cliticº does not project. Also, recall from 2.2 that I assume clitics are part of the TP-extended domain, so the presence of Cliticº only in the second conjunct should not be an issue.
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Summarizing, I have shown that assuming Fin° is a phase with an edge condition in WI explains postverbal clitics as follows: In the absence of A’-movement or a closer head in the structure, Fin° triggers T°-to-Fin° verb-movement, and the verbal head T° picks up the clitic(s) in Clitic° on its way up to the Fin° phase-head. In the next section, I examine how the edge condition of the Fin° phase-head in WI can also account for preverbal clitics in the matrix context in this group of languages.

2.4.2. Fin° and preverbal clitics in the matrix context in WI

As shown in 1.1.2 above, different preverbal elements trigger a preverbal order of the clitics in the matrix context in WI. These elements are the negative marker, negative quantifiers, wh-elements, focalized constituents, and a certain class of adverbials. Furthermore, embedded coordination also triggers a preverbal clitic pattern. Leaving coordination aside which I discuss in chapter 3, I argue that preverbal clitics in these matrix environments are the result of the Fin° phase-head satisfying its edge condition either by the movement of a closer head to Fin° than T°, as I argue to be the case of the negative marker, or by an element (that is, a Focus or wh-element) undergoing A’-movement to the left-periphery of the clause. Each of these instances is illustrated below.

Consider first the negative marker, in (52), which triggers a preverbal order of the clitics in WI.
(52) a. Nun me mancó
not meCL hurt3SG
“S/he didn’t hurt me”

b. Non cho dicía por iso
not IOCL-DOCL said1SG for that
“I didn’t say it to you for that (reason)”

Álvarez et al. (1986: 185]

c. Tu não lhe telefonaste hoje?
you not himCL phoned2SG today
“You didn’t call him today?”

[Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 167)]

Following Laka’s (1990) and Zanuttini’s (1991, 1997) proposal for Spanish/Basque and different Romance languages respectively, I assume that the negative marker in Western Iberian is licensed in a projection that I label ΣP/NegP and that takes Tº as its complement, as in (53): 75

(53) [Finº [ΣP/NegP [Σº/Negº [CliticP [clitic(s) [TP [ Tº …]]]]]]]

This allows me to analyze the preverbal clitic pattern in (52) as in (54).

(54) a. [CliticP me [TP mancó Tº [v (*mancó-pro) [vº mancó …]]]]

b. [Fin Finº [ΣP/NegP nun Σº/Negº [CliticP me [TP mancó Tº …]]]]

c. [Fin nun Finº [ΣP/NegP nun Σº/Negº [CliticP me [TP mancó Tº …]]]]

“S/he didn’t hurt me”

75 Following Zanuttini (1997), I assume the negative marker in Western Iberian is a “strong negative marker”, as opposed to a “weak negative marker”, thus licensed in a NegP higher than the position of the inflected verb, TP by assumption. One piece of evidence for this analysis pointed out in Zanuttini’s work is the fact that clitics must always linearly follow the negative marker in WI – see (24). See Poletto (2000) for the same evidence in Northern Italian dialects and Martins (1993, 1994a, 1994b) for an analysis of clitic placement in European Portuguese along the lines of ΣP. What remains to be explained is how interpolation with the negative marker is derived in EP and Gal, which I leave for future research.

76 Evidence for the relative position of Finº with respect to Σº/Negº will be discussed in 3.5.2 and 3.5.3 below, where I tackle the finite subordinate context in Conservative Asturian.
After the verb raises and checks Tº’s [EPP], and the clitics are merged in Cliticº as in (54a), the negative marker is merged in Σº/Negº followed by merge of Finº - in (54b). In line with (34), I assume Finº is a phase-head with an edge condition. This now triggers Σº/Negº movement because this head is closer to Finº than Tº77 (see 2.3 above) and satisfies the edge condition of Finº, which requires that an element – head or XP – moves to Finº. This analysis derives the preverbal clitic pattern as an instance of (38b). 78 Moreover, notice that this analysis avoids positing any [criterial] feature on the negative marker. 79

The other matrix contexts where preverbal clitics obtain in WI are after negative quantifiers, wh-elements, focalized constituents, and a certain class of adverbials. I argue that these elements all involve A’-movement to the left-periphery. With the analysis I propose, A’-moved elements must pass through [Spec, FinP] in order to escape Transfer of the complement of the Finº phase with unchecked criterial [+wh/Focus] features. This intermediate movement to [Spec, FinP] satisfies the edge condition of Finº, and explains the preverbal clitic pattern observed.

Consider first (55), where a preverbal negative quantifier triggers a preverbal clitic pattern:

77 Notice that my assumption is that Σº/Negº satisfies the edge condition of Finº as required by this phase-head, not that the Σº/Negº head needs to check any feature – see (34). Thus, Finº attracts Σº/Negº instead of Tº as Σº/Negº is closer to the phase head Finº. I assume that raise of Σº/Negº instead of Tº follows from some version of “minimality” in the sense of Rizzi (1990) or “attract closest” in the sense of Chomsky (1995), which could be put in very informal terms as “the closer you are, all the more attracted to Finº you get”.

In turn, this Σº/Negº-raising, I argue, explains why postverbal clitics are not available: there is a “closer” element to Finº, in this case, Σº/Negº, so Tº-raising is ruled out.

79 See Raposo and Uriagereka (2005), where the negative marker is part of what they call “affective” elements.
(55) a. Naide lo sabía
   nobody itCL knewSG
   “Nobody knew it”
   [de Pablo, Memoria]

   b. A min ningún me dixo que viñera
   to me nobody meCL toldSG that comeSUB
   “Nobody told me that I should come”
   [Álvarez et al. (1986: 185)]

   c. Nunca os viste no teatro?
   never themCL sawSG in-the theater
   “You never saw them at the theater?”
   [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 167)]

Whether Σº/Negº also projects in (55) as in the examples discussed in (52) above is far from settled in the literature.\(^{80}\) In any case, I assume that preverbal negative quantifiers are Focus elements;\(^{81}\) that is, instances of A’-movement. Thus, I assume that the negative quantifier bears criterial [+Focus] features that must be checked in the left-periphery of the clause.

---

\(^{80}\) For Watanabe (2004), both Focº and Σº/Negº are present and each projection is responsible for the checking a different feature in the negative quantifier; Alonso-Ovalle and Guerzoni (2004) claim that Rizzi’s (1997) Focusº might bear [+Foc, +Neg] features, so both [+Foc, +Neg] features in the negative quantifier can be checked in Focº in one-fell swoop. Much of this discussion boils down to whether preverbal negative quantifiers are Negative Elements (NEs) or Negative Polarity Items (NPIs) – see Herburger (2001) for much discussion. It does not have any bearing on the analysis I pursue, so I do not commit to either option. However, I must point out that some varieties of Asturian – not mine – show “negative concord”, that is, a preverbal negative quantifier together with the preverbal negative marker without cancelling each other out, as in (i) below:

(i) A naide (nun)-y dixeron la verdad
to nobody not-himCL saidPL the truth
“To nobody did they tell the truth”
[From D’Andrés (1993: 30)]

As the gloss indicates, (i) does not mean that “they told the truth to somebody/everybody”, but rather that there was no X such that they told the truth to X; in short, a “negative concord” reading, not a “double negation” reading. Examples of this kind can be abundantly found in Asturian – see Eslema (2008). I leave this issue for further research.

\(^{81}\) Negative quantifiers in preverbal position are also analyzed as instances of A’-movement (Focus) in Barbosa (2001) for European Portuguese, in Zubizarreta (1998) for Spanish, and in Rizzi (1997) and Benincà and Poletto (2004) for Italian, among many others. Consider the wh-extraction and the interaction with wh-test in (i) and (ii) below respectively, cf. (11) and (15). The negative marker is in parentheses to show that it does not have any bearing on the ungrammaticality of the sentence: [continued]
Whether $\Sigma^o/Neg^o$ projects is irrelevant for the purposes of this discussion, so I put it in parentheses. Thus, the structure I assume is the one shown in (56), and (55a) receives the analysis in (57):

\[(56) \begin{array}{c}
\text{[Fin}^o (\text{[\Sigma^o/Neg^o]} \text{[ClinicP [clitics [TP [T^o \ldots]]]]])}
\end{array}\]

\[(57) \begin{array}{c}
\text{a. [ClinicP lo [TP saber T^o [+P naide, [+Foc, +Neg] [sabia \ldots prov]]]]}
\end{array}\]

\[(57) \begin{array}{c}
\text{b. ([\Sigma^P/NegP naide, [+Foc, +Neg] [Neg^o [naide]]] [ClinicP lo [TP saber T^o [+P naide, [+Foc, +Neg] \ldots]]]}^{82}
\end{array}\]

\[(57) \begin{array}{c}
\text{c. [Fin}^o ([\Sigma^P/NegP naide, [+Foc, +Neg] [Neg^o [naide]]] [ClinicP lo [TP saber T^o [+P naide, [+Foc, +Neg] \ldots]]])]
\end{array}\]

\[(57) \begin{array}{c}
\text{d. [FinP naide, [+Foc, +Neg] [Fin}^o ([\Sigma^P/NegP naide, [+Foc, +Neg] [Neg^o [naide]]] [ClinicP lo [TP saber T^o [+P naide, [+Foc, +Neg]]])]
\end{array}\]

\[(57) \begin{array}{c}
\text{e. [FocP naide, [+Foc, +Neg] [Foc}^o [+Foc, +Neg] [FinP naide, [Fin}^o ([\Sigma^P/NegP naide, [+Foc, +Neg] [Neg^o [naide]]]) [ClinicP lo [TP saber T^o [+P naide, [+Foc, +Neg]]])]
\end{array}\]

\[\text{“Nobody knew it”}\]

The subject negative quantifier is merged in [Spec, $\nu^*P$] with [+Foc, +Neg] criterial features and [+Foc] must be checked in the Focus field in the left-periphery, leaving open whether the negative quantifier checks its [+Neg] feature in $\Sigma^o/Neg^o$ (as in (57b)). Fin$^o$ is merged as in (57c), and I claim that Fin$^o$ phase-head has an edge-feature (cf. Chomsky (2008)) that allows

\[\text{(i) *A naide (nun) se quién vio }_3 \text{ naide to nobody not know1SG who saw3SG}
\]

\[\text{“To nobody (don’t) know I who saw”}\]

\[\text{(ii) *A naide quién (nun) vio }_3 \text{ naide? to nobody who not saw3SG}
\]

\[\text{“*Nobody who saw?”}\]

---

82 Recall that I am not committed to whether this intermediate step to [Spec, $\Sigma^P/NegP$] takes place.
the quantifier to reach $\text{[Spec, FinP]}$\(^{83}\) as in (57d)\(^{84}\) on its way to a position where its $[\text{+Focus}]$ criterial features must be checked, namely FocusP as in (57c). Being an instance of $\Lambda'$-movement to the left-periphery, I claim that the intermediate step the quantifier takes to $\text{[Spec, FinP]}$ satisfies the edge condition on this phase-head and accounts for the preverbal clitic pattern observed as an instance of (38c).

This analysis predicts that all other cases of $\Lambda'$-movement should also trigger a preverbal clitic pattern. This is borne out. Consider wh-elements as those in (58).

(58) a. Cómo t'atreves?
how refl$_{\text{CL}}$-dare$_{\text{2SG}}$ $^{[*\text{atréveste}] Ast}$

$\text{[Rodríguez Medina, Gaviotes]}$

b. Onde os puxeches?
where them$_{\text{CL}}$ put$_{\text{2SG}}$ $^{[*\text{puxeches-os} Gal]}$

$\text{[Álvarez et al. (1986: 185)]}$

c. O que te disse ele?
the what you$_{\text{CL}}$ say$_{\text{3SG}}$ he $^{[*\text{disse-te} EP]}$

$\text{[Martins (1994: 358, (64))]}$

I assume that those preverbal wh-elements in (58) undergo $\Lambda'$-movement to Information

---

\(^{83}\) Notice that the proposed phase status of Fin° provides an escape-hatch for the negative quantifier. Furthermore, under my analysis, if movement to $\text{[Spec, FinP]}$ did not take place, the negative quantifier would be stuck below Fin° and thus part of Transfer with an unchecked $[\text{+Focus}]$ criterial feature (cf. Rizzi (1997, 2004, 2007) and Rizzi and Shlonsky (2006)), which would make the derivation crash.

\(^{84}\) As the reader can verify, whether the intermediate step to $\Sigma P/\text{NegP}$ is taken or not, the negative quantifier still has a $[\text{+Focus}]$ feature to check in the left-periphery, which I assume proceeds through $\text{[Spec, FinP]}$ and grants the edge condition of Fin° under the analysis I propose.
FocusP\textsuperscript{85} in the Focus field in the left-periphery following Benincà and Poletto (2004), and that the wh-element bears [+wh] criterial features that must be checked in the left-periphery. This forces the wh-element to undergo \( \Lambda' \)-movement to the left-periphery, moving first to [Spec, FinP] which provides an escape hatch for the wh-element before it reaches a criterial

---

\textsuperscript{85} For Benincà and Poletto (2004), wh-elements target Information FocusP and exhaust the Focus field, blocking the presence of another Focus element. This is shown in (i):

(i) \*Cómo \text{**TU**} t’atreves (, non Xulio)? \[wh + focus; \*] Ast

How you[FOC] you[CL]-dare\text{2SG}

“How dare you (, not Xulio)?”

Evidence for their \( \Lambda' \)-movement properties comes from the resumptive test, shown in (ii) below:

(ii) Qué, te (*lo) díz él? \[wh + resumptive; \*]\ Ast

what you[CL] it[CL]-say\text{3SG} he

“What does he tell you?”

Héctor Campos (p.c.) raises a very interesting question: do “D-linked” wh-elements (in the sense of Pesetsky (1987)) also trigger preverbal clitics in Asturian? In Asturian, all the preverbal wh-elements trigger a preverbal clitic pattern. Moreover, and related to this question, there is the case of por qué “why”, which for Rizzi (2001, 2004) is not \( \Lambda' \)-moved, but merged directly in his proposed InterrogativeP. Rizzi uses as evidence the fact that Topic phrases may appear below perché “why” in Italian. The same observation extends to Asturian with por qué “why” appearing higher than LD topics (and even HT), consider:

(iii) Por qué a los tos guajes losi dexes salir? \[why + LD; \checkmark]\ Ast

why to the your kids DO\text{CL} let\text{2SG} go-out\text{INF}

“Why do you let your kids go out?”

(iv) Por qué (*con) los tos guajes naide quier falar con ellos? \[why + HT; \checkmark]\ Ast

why with the your kids nobody want\text{3SG} talk\text{INF} with them

“Why your kids, nobody wants to talk to them?”

The obligatory resumptive Direct Object clitic shows that the underlined element in (iii) must be a Topic (cf. fn. 10 above), while the incompatibility of a preposition in (iv) indicates that the underlined element must be a HT in the Frame field in (1) – cf (2). However, I depart from Rizzi’s claim that these wh-elements are merged in the left-periphery. Given that postverbal clitics are unattested with any preverbal wh-element, I assume that por qué “why” launches from a low position in the structure and satisfies the edge condition of Fin on its way to a criterial projection in the left-periphery. Regarding the exact final location of por qué “why”, (iv) shows that it must be higher than HT. One analysis that explains why D-linked wh-elements appear so high in the structure would be to assume that they bear two features, one possibly [+Focus] triggering movement to the Focus field, and a second criterial feature forcing subsequent movement to a higher projection, possibly ForceP in light of (iv). The presence of two features in the wh-element would explain two things. First, why por qué “why” and D-linked wh-elements differently from cómo “how” in (i) above, do not freeze in the Focus field (that is, why criterial freezing in the sense of Rizzi (1997, 2004, 2006, 2007) and Rizzi and Shlonsky (2005) does not prevent D-linked wh-elements from undergoing further movement); and second, why movement proceeds in two steps, since all the features in the wh-element must be checked. I leave this discussion here.
position in the left-periphery. This intermediate step satisfies the edge condition of Fin°, thus rendering verb movement to Fin° unnecessary and accounting for the preverbal clitic pattern observed.\(^8^6\)

\[(59)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
_{v^*}P \text{ cómo}_{[+Wh]} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ (pro)} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ (pro)}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{b. } & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{CliticP te} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ atreves} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ (pro)}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{c. } & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Fin}^0 \\
\text{CliticP te} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ atreves} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ (pro)}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{d. } & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{FinP cómo}_{[+Wh]} \\
\text{CliticP te} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ atreves} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ (pro)}
\end{array} \right] \\
\text{e. } & \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{InfFocP cómo}_{[+Wh]} \\
\text{Foc}^0_{[+Wh]} \\
\text{FinP cómo} \\
\text{CliticP te} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ atreves} \\
_{v^*}P \text{ (pro)}
\end{array} \right]
\end{align*}
\]

“How dare you?”

Notice that the same clitic pattern is expected in other instances of A’-movement, as those in (60) which involve Focalization.

\[(60)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{YO MESMA me la repito un cien
tu ve
gas } \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{me} \\
\text{la} \\
\text{repito} \\
\text{un} \\
\text{cientu} \\
\text{vegaes} \\
\text {*repítomela}
\end{array} \right] \text{ Ast} \\
\text{I myself repeat it to myself one hundred times}
\text{ “I myself repeat it to myself one hundred times”} \\
\text{[de Pablo, Memoria]}
\text{b. } & \text{NO SEU TRABALLO o prenderon } \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{o} \\
\text{prenderon} \\
\text{*prendero-no} \\
\text{Gal}
\end{array} \right] \text{ himCL caught3PL} \\
\text{“And it was in his job that they caught him”} \\
\text{[Álvarez et al. (1986: 184)]}
\text{c. } & \text{OS TRÊS HOMENS se sentaram à mesa } \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{se} \\
\text{sentaram} \\
\text{à mesa} \\
\text{*sentáram-se} \\
\text{EP}
\end{array} \right] \text{ the three men caught3PL sat3PL} \\
\text{“It was the three men who sat at the table”} \\
\text{[Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 166)]}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^8^6\) Lower parts of the structure omitted for ease of exposition.

\(^8^7\) Whether the verbal head also bears [wh] features as Rizzi (1996) and Barbosa (1995) claim is an issue I will not go into. One possibility is that the [wh] features are actually in the Fin°-phase head, and that the wh-element checks them through this intermediate step on its way to the Focus field the left-periphery.
Being an instance of A'-movement, the focalized elements in (60) above must move to the left-periphery in order to check their criterial [+Focus] features, satisfying the edge condition of the Finº phase-head on their way to a criterial position. This accounts for the preverbal clitic pattern observed, as shown in the derivation below.

\[(61)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & [\text{TP yo misma [+Focus] repito [TP repito pro pro]]} \\
\text{b. } & [[\text{ClinicP me la [TP repito Tº [TP yo misma [+Focus] repito ...]]}} \\
\text{c. } & [[\text{Finº} [\text{ClinicP me la [TP repito Tº [TP yo misma [+Focus] ...]]}} \\
\text{d. } & [[\text{FinP yo misma [+Focus]} [\text{Finº} [\text{ClinicP me la [TP repito Tº [TP yo misma [+Focus] ...]]}}] \\
\text{e. } & [[\text{FocP yo misma [+Focus]} [\text{Focº [+Focus]} [\text{FinP yo misma [Finº [\text{ClinicP me la [TP repito Tº ...]]}}]]] \\
\end{align*}
\]

“*I myself repeat it to myself one hundred times*”

The Focus\(^89\) subject is merged in [Spec, \(v^P\)], and bears [+Focus] criterial features that must be checked in the left-periphery. These criterial features force the element to adjoin to [Spec, FinP] in order to avoid Transfer, and in turn license the edge condition of Finº.

\(^88\) As shown, I assume two object pros (i.e., pro-IO and pro-DO) satisfy the predicate’s subcategorization.

\(^89\) Two tests can be deployed to show its Focus status: wh-extraction and question answer pairs in (i)-(ii):

(i) *YO MESMA sabes [qué me pregunto YO MESMA] (, non Mon) [wh-extraction: *]  
I self+Foc knowSG what reflCL askSG  
“I myself you know what I to myself ask (, not Mon)”

(ii) A: Quién se pregunta eso?  
“Who asks that to him/herself?”  
B: #YO MESMA me lo pregunto / C: Pregúntamelo yo misma  
“It is I myself that I ask it to myself” / “I myself ask it to myself”
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The preverbal clitic pattern in cases as those in (62) ⁹⁰ is also uniformly explained. Being instances of A’-movement ⁹¹ when found in preverbal position, these adverbials must move to [Spec, FinP] to avoid Transfer before they reach a position where they can check their criterial [+Focus] features. This intermediate step to [Spec, FinP] satisfies the edge condition of this phase head, thus rendering verb movement to Finº unnecessary and accounting the preverbal clitic pattern observed, as the derivation in (63) shows.

(62) a. Yá-**yos** entrugué [Ast
already-them Cl asked₁SG
“I already asked them”]

[de Pablo, Memoria]

b. Xa **te** entendo, pillabán [Gal
already you Cl understand₁SG devil
“I got you, you devil”]

[Álvarez et al. (1986: 191)]

c. Já **lhe** relatei o caso [EP
already him Cl told-about₁SG the case
“I already told him/her about the case”]

[Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 166)]

---

⁹⁰ See Chapter 1, fn. 12, for a list of adverbs that trigger preverbal clitics in WI.

⁹¹ See Cinque’s (1999) seminal work on adverbs for the claim that these adverbs are in a Focus when found in preverbal position. Notice that wh-extraction as in (i), and interaction with wh-elements as in (ii), show the A’-properties of these adverbials when found in preverbal position:

(i) (*Yá) sabes qué fizo (yá)? already know₂SG what did already
“Do you know what s/he already did?” – ok with non-extraction reading: “Do you already know what s/he did”

(ii) Qué (*bien)-y presta (bien) a Mon? what really-IO Cl likes really to Mon
“What is it that Mon really likes?” Literally, “what really likes Mon?”

Thus, I assume that these adverbials, when in preverbal position, are instances of A’-movement licensed in the Focus field in the left-periphery.
In all the examples and derivations discussed in this section, Internal Merge (movement) to either Fin⁰ or [Spec, FinP] renders the movement of the verb to Fin⁰ unnecessary, thus always obtaining the order clitic + verb we observe.

2.5. Summary and conclusions

In this chapter, I have extended Benincà and Poletto’s (2004) cartographic analysis of the left-periphery in Italian to Asturian and other Western Iberian Romance languages in 2.1, showing that the left-periphery in Western Iberian can also be decomposed in a Frame field, a Topic field and a Focus field. Then, I argued in 2.2 for an analysis of clitics in Western Iberian as agreement affixes which are licensed in the TP-extended domain, in line with Murphy-Armstrong (1989) and Sportiche (1996). The evidence I provided for this analysis was the obligatory adjacency of the clitic with the verb, the ordering constraints that clitics are subject to, the obligatory clitic doubling with strong pronouns, and non-argumental and

92 I am assuming that the adverb ya “already” starts low in the structure, see fn. above for data. As for its exact location when found low, see Cinque (1999) for discussion. I leave it open for future research.
solidarity clitics. Next, I laid out in 2.3 two main assumptions regarding the clausal structure of Western Iberian. First, I argued that the verbal head checks T°'s [EPP] feature, and that the A-position for subjects was [Spec, v*
]. With this, I argued that preverbal subjects in Western Iberian are either A’-moved (Focus) or base-generated (Topic) in the left-periphery.

Second, I have proposed that Rizzi’s (1997) Finiteness° is a phase with an edge condition in Western Iberian Romance languages. I have argued that this analysis explains post- and preverbal clitic alternations in this group of languages as follows. A preverbal clitic pattern arises as a result of A’-movement passing through [Spec, FinP], which satisfies its edge condition. Alternatively a head higher than T° can move to Fin°. In the absence of A’-movement or a closer head, the verb in T° adjoins to Clitic° (thus obtaining the postverbal clitic order observed) to finally move to Fin°, thus satisfying the edge condition of Fin° that I proposed. In the chapters to follow, I show that the analysis of clitic placement alternations that I proposed for the matrix context can also be extended to the finite embedded context. Furthermore, I will claim that this analysis can also account for the crosslinguistic variation found in the embedded environment in the other Western Iberian Romance languages under study, which I tackle in chapter 4.
Chapter 3

The finite embedded context in Conservative Asturian

Analyses and grammars dealing with post- and preverbal clitic alternations in Western Iberian Romance languages have claimed that only a preverbal clitic pattern is found in the finite embedded context.1 As I show in this chapter however, speakers of a variety of Asturian that I refer to as Conservative Asturian2 (CAst) show that postverbal clitics may also be found obligatorily in certain embedded contexts after a preverbal Topic subject, as in (1). 3

(1) Repítote [que yo dexélo aquel dieciséis de mayu] [*lo dexé] CAst
repeat1SG-youCL that I left1SG-IND-itCL that seventeenth of May
“I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth” [de Pablo, Memoria]

Moreover, the clitic may optionally appear postverbally in other finite embedded contexts, as in (2).

---

1 See Carballo Calero (1968) for Galician and Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971) for European Portuguese. However, data showing a postverbal clitic pattern in the finite embedded context are attested to some extent in the Gramática de la llingua asturiana (2001) and D’Andrés (1993) for Asturian, in Álvarez et al. (1986) and Meier (1976) for Galician, and in Said Ali (1964) and more recently in Martins (forthcoming) for European Portuguese. See chapter 4 for discussion of crosslinguistic variation in this context in WI.

2 I use the term “Conservative Asturian” (for lack of a better one) in order to refer to this variety of Asturian where postverbal clitics can be found in the embedded context, as opposed to Modern Asturian and other varieties where postverbal clitics are less available. I am not aware of any factor (geographical, age-related, education, or other) that may be relevant for this dialectal split. I refer the reader to chapter 4, where I tackle crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context in the other Western Iberian Romance languages (that is, in Modern Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese).

3 The source for some of the examples is given in brackets. See Asturian corpus bibliography for details. I must express my gratitude to Xulio Viejo, Ramón d’Andrés, and to different members of the Seminariu de Filoloxía Asturiana at the Universidá d’Uviéu (Balbuena, Maniegu, etc.) for their continuous help and support with the data and judgements. Needless to say, usual disclaimers apply.
(2) a. Digo [qu’ayúdame]  
\[\text{say}_{\text{sg}} \text{ that-} \text{help}_{\text{sg-ind}} \text{-me}_{\text{cl}}\]  
 CAst

b. Digo [que me ayuda]  
\[\text{say}_{\text{sg}} \text{ that me}_{\text{cl}} \text{ help}_{\text{sg-ind}}\]  
 “I say that s/he helps me out”  
 [From Viejo (2008)]

In Conservative Asturian, whenever a clitic appears postverbally in a finite embedded context like the one in (2a), the embedded sentence has a special interpretation, ⁴ what I call a [+conviction] interpretation. This is an interpretation that marks the content of the embedded clause as part of the belief state of the matrix predicate’s subject or the speaker. Interestingly, however, we will see that the conviction interpretation is not restricted to sentences where a clitic appears postverbally, but can also arise in another set of well-defined circumstances where the clitic appears preverbally, as under the presence of an A’-moved (Focus) element in the embedded clause.

This chapter is organized as follows. I present new data from different finite embedded contexts in CAst showing that postverbal clitics are attested in the subordinate environment, and I illustrate the interpretation differences that these clitic alternations are subject to for speakers of CAst. In 3.3, I claim that the availability of these [+conviction] and [-conviction] pragmatic interpretations should be analyzed as selection properties of different matrix predicates and prepositions / complementizers, ⁵ which may select for two different types of

---

⁴ Some of these interpretation differences are reported in Viejo (2008).
⁵ This “preposition/complementizer” relates to the analysis I propose for finite embedded clauses introduced by *porque* “because”. See 3.3 for discussion.
CP-complements namely, Force° and Fin°, and which I claim correspond to the interpretations of [+conviction] and [-conviction], respectively. In 3.4, I discuss the analysis of the complementizer system in Conservative Asturian, and argue that this language has two homophonous complementizers that I call que1 “that1” and que2 “that2”, mapped respectively in Force° and in Fin° in the left-periphery. I contend that this analysis of the complementizer system in CAst makes three interesting predictions, discussed in 3.5. First, it predicts the availability of postverbal clitic patterns in the finite embedded context; second, it also predicts that if que1 (i.e., Force°) is selected, these sentences are compatible with a matrix-like left-periphery in the complement-CP; and third, it also predicts that if que2 (i.e., Fin°) is selected, no postverbal clitics are observed in those finite embedded clauses and no compatibility with elements in the left-periphery is found. In the remainder of the chapter I discuss further evidence of the analysis I argue for. In particular, I discuss the case of what I call “explicative” porque, wh-extraction effects and embedded coordination in CAst.

3.1. The finite embedded context in Conservative Asturian: The new data

In Conservative Asturian, postverbal clitics can be obligatorily (under the presence of a Topic) or optionally found (in the absence of an element in the left-periphery) in different in CP-complements selected by different types of matrix predicates, such as verbs of report, epistemic verbs, verbs of opinion, and other predicates such as negar “to deny”. Moreover, other finite embedded environments such as causal clauses introduced by porque “because”
also exhibit the same alternations. The obligatory and optional clitic patterns in the finite embedded environment are discussed in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 respectively.

3.1.1. New data (I): Obligatory postverbal clitics in Conservative Asturian

Starting with verbs of saying, consider (3)-(4), where a postverbal clitic pattern is obligatory in the complement CP with a Topic subject. As indicated in brackets, preverbal clitics are considered ungrammatical (Xulio Viejo and Ramón d’Andrés, (p.c.)).

(3) Tengo que dici-y [qu’eso ponlu nuna perronera situanza] [∗lu pon] have1SG to say-youCL that-this put3SG-IND-youCL in-a ugly situation  “I must tell you that this puts you in a very ugly situation”   [Camilo, Psicokiller]

(4) Repítote [que yo dexélo aquel diecisiete de mayu] [∗lo dexé] repeat1SG-youCL that I left1SG-IND-itCL that seventeenth of May  “I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth”   [de Pablo, Memoria]

CP-complements selected by epistemic verbs also show an obligatory postverbal clitic pattern if a Topic appears in the embedded clause, as in (5)-(6). Similarly to the examples above, preverbal clitics are also ruled out.

(5) (...) creer [que dempués de tou esti tiempu date más la mio opinión?] [∗te da]6 believe that after of all this time care3SG-IND-youCL the my opinion  “(Do you want me to) believe that after all this time you care about my opinion?”   [Álvarez & Fernández, Desconocida]

---

6 The full sentence from Álvarez and Fernández’s Desconocida reads as follows:

(i) ¿Qué quies, faceme creer que dempués de tou esti tiempu date más la mio opinión?
   “Do you want me to believe that after all this time you care much about my opinion?”
   Lit. “What do you want, to make me believe that after all this time you care much about my opinion?”
Postverbal clitics are also obligatory in embedded clauses selected by verbs of opinion like 

\textit{paecer} “to seem, to have the opinion that”, if a Topic appears after the complementizer as in (7)-(8). Note that preverbal clitics are reported to be ungrammatical.

\begin{align*}
(7) & \text{Paezme [que eso va-y mui bien]} & \text{[*-y va]} \\
& \text{seem$_{SG}$-me$_{CL}$ that that suit$_{SG,IND}$-him$_{CL}$ very well} & \text{“I think that that (thing) suits him very well”} \\
& \text{[Orton, Mayordomu]} \\

(8) & \text{Paezme [que tolo que faigo faígo$^{lo}$ por motivos (…)]} & \text{[*lo faigo$^{7}$]} \\
& \text{seem$_{SG}$-me$_{CL}$ that all-the that do$_{SG,IND}$ do$_{SG,IND}$-it$_{CL}$ for reasons} & \text{“It seems to me that all I do, I do it for (really selfish) reasons”} \\
& \text{[de Pablo, Memoria]} \\
\end{align*}

Also, CP-complements selected by the matrix verb \textit{negaer} “to deny” also exhibit the same clitic pattern if a Topic intervenes as in (3)-(8). Consider (9):

\begin{align*}
(9) & \text{Niega [qu’esti xueves (…) nueche comportó$^{se}$ porcazmente?][*se comportó$^{8}$]} \\
& \text{deny$_{SG}$ that-this thursday night behaved$_{SG,IND}$-rfl$_{CL}$ dirty-like} & \text{“Would you deny that this Thursday night you behaved in a dirty way?”} \\
& \text{[Orton, Mayordomu]} \\
\end{align*}

\footnotesize{
7 The full sentence from de Pablo’s \textit{Memoria} is shown below:

(i) \text{Paezme que tolo que faigo faígorlo por motivos enforma egoistes} \\
\text{“It seems to me that everything I do, I do it for really selfish reasons”}

\footnotesize{
8 The full sentence from Orton’s \textit{Mayordomu} is shown below:

(i) \text{¿Niega qu’esti xueves pela nueche comportó$^{se}$ porcazmente con un grupu del Colexu Priory Road pa moces?} \\
\text{“Do you deny that this Thursday night you behaved in a dirty way with a group from the Priory Road School for female?”}
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Finally, consider the causal embedded contexts in (10)-(11), which also show an obligatory postverbal clitic pattern after a Topic, with the preverbal clitic pattern reported ungrammatical.

(10) Debió ser en barcu, [porque don Marino sospendió se] [*se sospendió] must-have$_{3SG}$ be$_{INF}$ in ship because Mr Marino surprised$_{3SG-IND}$-rfl$_{CL}$ “It must have been in the ship, because Mr Marino was surprised” [Rodríguez Medina, Gaviotes]

(11) Porque yo a ti quierote comu si fueres mio padre [*te quiero] because I to you love$_{1SG-IND}$-you$_{CL}$ as if were$_{2SG}$ my dad “Because I love you as much as if you were my dad” [González, Comedies]

Thus, Conservative Asturian shows obligatory postverbal clitics in CP-complements selected by verbs of report, epistemic verbs, verbs of opinion, and other matrix predicates such as *nagar “to deny”, and also in embedded causal environments introduced by *porque “because” when a Topic is found in the left-periphery of the embedded CP. As I show next, when the left-periphery in the embedded clause is empty, these finite embedded contexts show both post- and preverbal clitic alternations.

3.1.2. New data (II): Post- and preverbal clitics in Conservative Asturian

Subordinate environments such as those discussed above exhibit both a post- and a preverbal clitic pattern when no left-peripheral element is found after the complementizer. Consider (12), where the matrix predicate is a verb of report.

(12) a. Digo [qu’ayúdamé] say$_{1SG}$ that-help$_{3SG-IND}$-me$_{CL}$ CAst
Similar post- and preverbal clitic alternations as those exhibited in (12) can be found when the selecting matrix predicate is an epistemic verb, as in (13).

(13) a. Xulia pensó [que dixéralo Mon] CAst
Xulia thought 3SG that had-said 3SG-IND itCL Mon

b. Xulia pensó [que lo dixera Mon]
Xulia thought 3SG that itCL had-said 3SG-IND Mon

"Xulia thought that Mon had said it"

As (14) shows, CP-complements to verbs of opinion like paecer “to seem, to have the opinion that” also show post- and preverbal clitic alternations as those in (12)-(13).

(14) a. (A mí) paezme [qu’escribiéronlo bien] CAst
to me seem 3SG-meCL that-wrote 3PL-IND-itCL well

b. (A mí) paezme [que lo escribieron bien]
to me seem 3SG-meCL that itCL wrote 3PL-IND well

"It seems to me that they wrote it well" [From D’Andrés (1993: 27)]

Consider also (15), where both a pre- and a postverbal clitic pattern can also be found in the CP-complement selected by negar “to deny”:

(15) a. Niega usté [que comportóse portazmente?] CAst
deny 3SG you that behaved 3SG-IND rflCL dirty-like

b. Niega usté [que se comportó portazmente?]
deny 3SG you that rflCL behaved 3SG-IND dirty-like

"Do you deny that you behaved in a dirty manner?"
Finally, consider the causal embedded contexts in (16), which also show the same post- and preverbal clitic alternations as in the cases illustrated above.

(16) a. Isabel marchó de la fiesta [porque mandó-\textit{ylo} l'hermanu] CAst
    Isabel left\textsubscript{3SG} of the party because told\textsubscript{3SG-IND} her\textsubscript{CL}-it\textsubscript{CL} the-brother

    b. Isabel marchó de la fiesta [porque-\textit{y} \textit{lo} mandó l'hermanu]
    Isabel left\textsubscript{3SG} of the party because-her\textsubscript{CL} it\textsubscript{CL} told\textsubscript{3SG-IND} the-brother
    “Isabel left the party because her brother ordered her to” [Adapted from Viejo (2008)]

Furthermore, speakers of Conservative Asturian report that post- and preverbal clitic patterns in these finite embedded contexts just discussed also differ in their interpretation. As I will show next, the post- and preverbal clitic patterns discussed in (12)-(16) are reported to differ in terms of what I call pragmatic “conviction” interpretation, which marks the content of the embedded clause as part of the belief state of the matrix predicate’s subject or the speaker.

3.2. Pragmatic “conviction” and post- and preverbal clitics in Conservative Asturian

A post- and a preverbal clitic pattern in those subordinate clauses where both options are available for speakers of Conservative Asturian (cf. (12)-(16)) relates to a subtle but systematic interpretation difference. Briefly put, postverbal clitics in the finite embedded environment give rise to a pragmatic “conviction” interpretation of the content of the embedded clause attributed to either the matrix predicate’s subject or the speaker, which I
formalize as [+conviction]. Interestingly, this [+conviction] pragmatic value is absent when a preverbal clitic arises in the same embedded CP (e.g., the pragmatic value encoded in those instances is [-conviction]). In what follows, I provide different contexts that clarify these interpretations differences in those CP-complements where this clitic placement alternation may be found in what I have called Conservative Asturian.  

Consider first the following context in brackets and a CP-complement selected by a verb of report as that in (12), repeated in (17). As I show, a postverbal clitic pattern in the CP-complement ensures a “conviction” pragmatic interpretation of the content in the embedded clause which is attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject, and no such “conviction” is detected with a preverbal clitic pattern in the embedded clause.

[Two people are discussing whether the new employee actually helps them at work or he is just a lazy soul; one of them says...]

(17) a. Digo qu’ayúdame  
\[say_{1SG} \text{ that-help}_{3SG-IND} \text{ me}_{CL}\]  

b. Digo que me ayuda  
\[say_{1SG} \text{ that me}_{CL} \text{ help}_{3SG-IND}\]  
“I say that s/he helps me out”  

[From Viejo (2008)]

If a speaker utters (17a), it must be the case that either a previous speaker asserted or implied that the new employee is lazy, or that s/he considers the topic of discussion pointless. (17a) 

---

9 I would like to thank Elena Herburger for helping me come up with a clear-cut distinction of those interpretation differences, which were blurred to me for (almost) my entire life, and Xulio Viejo for all the time he devoted to the discussion of these interpretation effects in the Fontán (Uviéu, summer 2008). Needless to say, I am responsible for all errors and misinterpretations.
attributes to the matrix predicate’s subject,\(^{10}\) who is also the speaker in this case, a pragmatic “conviction” ensuring that the new employee truly helps him, leaving no room to think otherwise. However, if (17b) is uttered, the matrix predicate’s subject is reported to only state what s/he thinks, without attributing any kind of “conviction” as to whether the new employee helps.\(^{11}\)

Three pieces of evidence confirm these interpretation differences in terms of “conviction”. First, if a contradiction regarding the matrix subject’s “conviction” is present in the discourse, as the one in the fragments in brackets in (18), the postverbal clitic pattern in (18a) is ruled out. But the preverbal clitic pattern in (18b) is pragmatically adequate. I take this to show that the preverbal clitic pattern does not encode a “conviction” of the content in the embedded clause attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject.

(18) a. Digo \(\text{qu’}^{9}\) \#ayúdame [anque nun toi enfotáu del too] CAst say\(_{1SG-IND}\) that-help\(_{1SG-IND}\)-me\(_{CL}\) though not am convinced of-the all

b. Digo que me ayuda [anque nun toi enfotáu del too] say\(_{1SG-IND}\) that me\(_{CL}\) help\(_{1SG-IND}\) though not am convinced of-the all

“I say that s/ he helps me, although I am not totally convinced (that s/ he does (help me))”

\(^{10}\) Consider (i) below, which clearly shows that the “conviction” holder must be the matrix subject Pedro, and not the speaker, since the postverbal clitic pattern is fine even under the presence of the subject’s contradiction in brackets:

(i) Pedro diz qu’ayúdalu, [pero yo sé que nun lu ayuda ná] CAst Pedro say\(_{1SG}\) that-help\(_{1SG}\)-him\(_{CL}\) but I know that not him\(_{CL}\) help\(_{1SG}\) at-all

“Pedro says (and is convinced) that s/ he helps him, but I know that s/ he does not help him at all”

\(^{11}\) A plausible context would be as follows: the new employee generally helps the matrix subject, but sometimes he has seen him just wasting time on the computer instead of helping, hence not committed to claim that the new employee helps him out.
Second, if someone asks a question regarding what it is that the matrix subject is “convinced” of, only a structure that ensures “conviction” is licensed, namely a postverbal clitic pattern in the embedded clause. This is shown in (19B).

(19) A: ¡Xulio! Entós, ¿de qué tas convencíu? Xulio so of what areSG convinced?
“Xulio! So, what are you convinced of?”

B: Bono, digo qu’ayúdalme /"me ayuda well, say1SG that-help3SG-IND-meCL/meCL help3SG-IND
“Well, I say that s/he helps me (, and I am convinced that s/he does help me)”

Finally, if someone asks whether the matrix subject’s “conviction” holds, there are two potential answers: Either s/he is “convinced” or s/he is not. As shown in (20), only a postverbal clitic is pragmatically adequate when “conviction” is encoded as in (20B), whereas only a preverbal clitic is pragmatically adequate when there is no such “conviction”, as (20C) shows.

(20) A: ¡Oye, Xulio! Entós, ¿tas convencíu de que te ayuda? listen Xulio so areSG convinced of that youCL help3SG
“Listen, Xulio! So are you convinced that s/he helps you?”

B: Sí, digo qu’ayúdalme /"me ayuda yes, say1SG that-help3SG-IND-meCL/meCL help3SG-IND
“Indeed, I say (and I am convinced) that s/he helps me”

C: Non, digo qu’/ayúdalme /me ayuda…12 no, say1SG that-help3SG-IND-meCL/meCL help3SG-IND
“No, I only say (and I am not totally sure) that s/he helps me”

---

12 This sentence could continue with something like …pero nun tengo munchu enfato de que lo fai – “but I am not sure one hundred percent that s/he does”. This interpretation matches the context discussed in fn. 11 above.
An epistemic matrix predicate may also select a finite CP-complement in which similar post- and preverbal clitic alternations arise in CAst. Again, a postverbal clitic correlates with a “conviction” interpretation of the content in the embedded clause attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject, while a preverbal clitic pattern does not show this effect.\footnote{Any interested reader can skip to (27) below, where I tackle the causal finite embedded context.} Consider the following context in brackets and (13), repeated in (21) below:

\[Two \text{ people are having a conversation at the bar, arguing who said that the miners were on strike; one of them says…}\]

(21) a. Xulia pensó que dixéralo Mon
    Xulia thought\textsubscript{3SG} that said\textsubscript{3SG,IND,ITCL} Mon

b. Xulia pensó que lo dixerá Mon
    Xulia thought\textsubscript{3SG} that it\textsubscript{ITCL} had-said\textsubscript{3SG,IND} Mon

“Xulia thought that Mon had said it”

If someone wants to emphasize that Xulia not only “thought” that Mon had said that the miners were on strike, but that she was also “convinced” that it was Mon who had said it,\footnote{A possible context would be that Xulia saw Mon saying it, or that she could recognize his voice out of all the people in the conversation at the bar.} they will tend to report what happened with (21a) rather than with (21b). Again, the postverbal pattern in (21a) gives rise to a reading which attributes a “conviction” to the matrix subject\footnote{Consider (i). As it is shown, the postverbal clitic pattern obtains even when the speaker is not convinced of the content in the embedded clause, which I take as evidence for attributing the [+conviction] to Xulia.} of the content in the embedded clause (in this case, Xulia’s “belief” that it

\[Xulia pensó que dixéralo Mon, pero yo sé que foi Xosé\] CAst
    Xulia thought\textsubscript{3SG} that said\textsubscript{3SG,IND,ITCL} Mon but I knew that was Xosé

“Xulia thought (and was convinced) that Mon had said it, but I know that it was Xosé”
was Mon who said that the miners were on strike). Thus, in Xulia’s mind, she “knew” that those words could only be attributed to Mon. In turn, this “conviction” does not hold with the preverbal pattern in (21b), where no “conviction” is attributed to Xulia. Thus, (21b) only states that Xulia “thought” that Mon said it, but that in her mind, she did “not know” whether Mon had really said it. 16 The same three arguments given earlier can be used to show that (21a) but not (21b) has a “conviction” interpretation.

As (22) shows, if the “conviction” attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject (Xulia) is contradicted by the fragment in brackets, the postverbal clitic pattern is ruled out – as in (22a), and only the preverbal clitic pattern is pragmatically adequate – as shown in (22b).

(22) a. Xulia pensó que "dixéra Mon, [pero nun taba del too enfotá] Xulia thought3SG that had-said3SG-IND Mon but not was3SG of-the all sure

b. Xulia pensó que lo dixer Mon, [pero nun taba del too enfotá] Xulia thought3SG that itCL had-said3SG-IND Mon but not was3SG of-the all sure

“Xulia thought (but was not sure) that Mon had said it, but she was not sure (that Mon did)”

Moreover, if someone asks a question regarding what Xulia is “convinced” of, only a postverbal clitic pattern is pragmatically adequate in the answer (i.e., a pattern that matches the interpretation related to a pragmatic “conviction”). This is shown in (23B).

16 A relevant context would be as follows: there were various individuals – among them, Mon – who were talking at the same time while the conversation about the miners and the strike was being held. Xulia was not looking at the people or paying much attention, and she only heard the words but she could not identify who it was that said them. She thinks it was probably Mon, perhaps because she identifies his tone of voice, or because only Mon was shouting and the rest of individuals in the conversation were whispering.
(23) A: ¡Guaje! Entós, ¿de qué taba convencía Xulia?  
   “Hey, man! So, what was Xulia convinced of?”

   man so of what was3SG convinced Xulia?

B: Bono, Xulia pensó que dixéralo /#lo dixera Mon  
   “Well, Xulia thought3SG that had-said3SG-IND he
   Xulia thought3SG that had-said3SG-IND Mon
   Xulia thought (and was convinced) that Mon had said it”

Finally, consider (24), which shows that if someone asks whether Xulia is “convinced”, only
a postverbal clitic pattern is pragmatically adequate with the “conviction” interpretation (cf.
(24B)), while only a preverbal clitic is pragmatically adequate if no pragmatic “conviction”
interpretation is encoded (cf. (24C)).

(24) A: ¡Oye, nin! Entós, ¿taba segura Xulia de que fuera Mon?  
   “Listen! So was Xulia sure that it was Mon (who said it)”

   listen boy so was3SG sure Xulia of that had-been3SG Mon?

B: Sí, Xulia pensaba que dixéralo /#lo dixera él  
   “Indeed, Xulia thought3SG that had-said3SG-IND he
   Indeed, Xulia thought (and was sure) that he had said it”

   yes, Xulia thought3SG that had-said3SG-IND he

C: Non, Xulia namás pensaba que #dixéralo /lo dixera él  
   “No, Xulia only thought that had-said3SG-IND he
   No, Xulia only thought (but was not fully convinced) that he had said it”

   no, Xulia only thought3SG that had-said3SG-IND he

Similar interpretation differences are detected in CP-complements selected by verbs of
opinion as illustrated in (25):
[Two professors are discussing whether the students’ argument is well-written or not; one of them says…]

(25) a. (A mí) paezme qu’escribieronlo bien to me seem3SG-meCL that-wrote3PL-IND-itCL well

b. (A mí) paezme que lo escribieron bien to me seem3SG-meCL that itCL wrote3PL-IND well

“It seems to me that they wrote it well”

[From D’Andrés (1993: 27)]

If a speaker utters (25a), it must be the case that either someone else asserted previously the opposite – namely, that the argument was poorly written, or that the speaker considers the topic of discussion pointless. The reason for these interpretation effects is that (25a) attributes to the matrix subject (who is also the speaker in this case) a “conviction” that the argument was well-written, leaving no room to think otherwise. On the other hand, if (25b) is uttered, the matrix subject is only stating his/her opinion, without attributing any kind of “conviction” as to whether the argument was well-written or not.

---

17 D’Andrés reports this datum, but he (p.c.) observes no interpretation difference between the patterns in (25a) and (25b). I tentatively assume that the unavailability of interpretation differences D’Andrés reports may be related to an intermediate stage between what I have called Conservative Asturian and Modern Asturian. See chapter 4 for discussion of crosslinguistic variation.

18 See Belletti and Rizzi (1988) for a treatment of the dative as the underlying subject with this type of verbs – i.e., in their terms, “psych-verbs”. Also, consider (i) below, which shows that the speaker may contradict the “conviction” in the embedded clause as shown in the fragment in brackets, yet the postverbal clitic pattern in the embedded clause is still pragmatically adequate.

(i) A Isabel paez-y qu’escribieronlo bien, [pero yo pienso que ta mal escrito] to Isabel seem3SG-herCL that-wrote3PL-IND-itCL well, but I think that is bad written

“It seems to Isabel that they wrote it well, but I think that it is poorly written”

19 The same effects as those previously discussed clearly show this “conviction” interpretation. Consider (ia), where the postverbal clitic pattern is pragmatically inadequate if the matrix subject’s “conviction” is contradicted in the discourse – cf. the fragment in brackets:
As shown in (9), a CP-complement selected by the matrix predicate *negr* “to deny” can also exhibit a post- and a preverbal clitic pattern. Moreover, I observe the same effects as those pointed out above; namely a postverbal clitic pattern gives rise to a “conviction” pragmatic interpretation of the content in the embedded clause attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject, while a preverbal one does not show this “conviction” interpretation.

Thus, consider the following context in brackets and (15), repeated below for convenience:

(i) 

a. A mí paezme qu’escribiéronlo bien, [#pero igual nun ye asina] CAst
tome seemSG that-wrotePPLIND-rflCL well but perhaps not is that-way

b. A mí paezme que lo escribieron bien, [pero igual nun ye asina] CAst
tome seemSG that itCL wrotePPLIND well but perhaps not is that-way

“It seems to me that they wrote it well, but it might not be so.”

(ii) Xulia niega [que *comportáre / se comportare asina] CAst

Xulia denies3SG that behaved3SG-SUB-rflCL rflCL behavedSUB that-way

“Xulia denies that she had behaved that way?”

Furthermore, speakers report that postverbal clitics are ungrammatical in other embedded contexts that take the subjunctive even under the presence of a Topic, which as we saw in section 3.1.1, always takes a postverbal clitic. Consider an embedded clause selected by the factive *lamenta* “s/he regrets”, as in (ii).

(ii) Llamentaba [que a les tres de la mañana *cerráre / se cerraren los chigres] CAst

regretted3SG that to the three of the morning closedPPLSUB-rflCL rflCL closed3PL the bars

“S/he regretted that at three in the morning, the bars were closed”

Interestingly, while a Topic in the embedded clause is fine, a Focus is not (cf. (ii) and (iii)).

(iii) Llamentaba [que (*A LES TRES) se cerraren los chigres (A LES TRES) (, non a les cuatro)] CAst

regretted3SG that to the threeFOC rflCL closed3PL-sub the bars to the three not to the four

“S/he regretted that at three were the bars closed (, not at four)”

I have no account for the facts in (i)-(iii), but they are easily incorporated into our analysis if the *que “that” complementizer which appears in subjunctive clauses has a similar behavior as the *que2 “that2” in my analysis. I leave this issue open for future research.
At a trial, during the accused’s testimony, someone asks…

(26) a. Niega usté que comportó se porcazmente?
    deny3SG you that behaved3SG-IND-rflCL dirty-like

b. Niega usté que se comportó porcazmente?
    deny3SG you that rflCL behaved3SG-IND dirty-like

“Do you deny that you behaved in a dirty manner?”

While (26a) above may be asked by the prosecution at a trial, it will surely not be what either the judge or the defending lawyer would say. The reason is that the (26a) sentence attributes a “conviction” of the content of the embedded clause to the matrix predicate’s subject – in this case, the accused, which at a trial is what the accusation and not the judge or the lawyer defending the accused would ask. On the other hand, the (26b) example may be asked by either the lawyer defending the accused or the judge, thus not attributing any “conviction” of the content in the embedded clause to the matrix subject.  

Finally, consider the causal embedded environment which also exhibits the same post- and preverbal clitic alternations in CAst as those found in CP-complements selected by verbs of report, etc. However, in this finite embedded context, and unlike in those previously

---

21 If this interpretation effect arises as indicated, a postverbal clitic pattern must be ruled out if the matrix subject cannot be attributed this “conviction”, and this is indeed what we find. Consider (i), where the sentence in brackets introduces a “non-conviction” attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject, which in turn cancels the postverbal clitic pattern in the embedded clause.

(i) Niega ud. que #comportó se /se comportó asina? [Porque ud. sabe que nun ye asina] CAst
    deny3SG you that behaved-rflCL rflCL behaved that-way because you know that not is that-way
    “Do you deny that you behaved that way? Because you know that you didn’t (behave that way)”
discussed, the “conviction” is not attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject, but rather to the speaker.22 In order to illustrate these effects, consider (16), repeated below.

(27) a. Isabel marchó de la fiesta porque mandó-\textit{ylo} l’hermanu CAst Isabel left\textit{SG} of the party because told\textit{SG-IND-her\textit{CL}-it\textit{CL} the-brother

b. Isabel marchó de la fiesta porque-\textit{y} \textit{lo} mandó l’hermanu Isabel left\textit{SG} of the party because-\textit{her\textit{CL} it\textit{CL} told\textit{SG-IND the-brother

“Isabel left the party because her brother ordered her to” [Adapted from Viejo (2008)]

Notice two things. First, the causal embedded clause relates to the matrix verb \textit{marchó “she left”} presenting the “reason why” the leaving event took place, and second, there is no comma separating the embedded clause from the matrix one.23 While (27a) establishes a pragmatic “conviction” attributed to the speaker that “\textit{her brother ordered her to}” was the reason why Isabel left24 - that is, the speaker “knows” that Isabel’s brother told her to leave, (27b) does not attribute any conviction to the speaker that “\textit{her brother ordered her to leave}” was the

\footnotesize

22 See 3.3 for the difference between \textit{porque “because”} and the other predicates discussed regarding who holds the “conviction”.

23 See the discussion in 3.6.1 below for a different embedded causal environment also introduced by \textit{porque “because”}, which I call explicative \textit{porque “because”}.

24 Consider the following context: The speaker and Isabel were dancing at the \textit{verbenas “party”}, and Isabel’s brother showed up and told her to stop dancing and go home. Moreover, evidence that the relevant “conviction” holder must be the speaker and not the matrix subject, is given in (i), which shows that the postverbal clitic pattern is ruled out if the speaker’s “conviction” is canceled by the fragment in brackets:

\begin{verbatim}
(i) Isabel marchó de la fiesta porque #mandó-\textit{ylo} l’hermanu, pero nun sé si foi por eso CAst Isabel left\textit{SG} of the party because told\textit{SG-her\textit{CL}-it\textit{CL} the-brother but know if was for that
“Isabel left the party because her brother told her to, but I don’t know if it was for that reason”
\end{verbatim}
reason why Isabel left, only stating what the “speaker thinks” that could have happened. 25

Evidence for these interpretation differences is shown in (28). If the context is such that it ensures the speaker’s “conviction”, the preverbal clitic pattern gives rise to infelicity. As the reply shown in (28B) indicates, by virtue of establishing that the speaker was dancing with Isabel when her brother told her to leave, only a pragmatic “conviction” attributed to the speaker can obtain, which arises with a postverbal clitic pattern, in turn ruling out a structure which does not attributes a conviction to the speaker, the one reported with a preverbal clitic pattern.

[Xulio (A) and Ramón (B) are discussing why it was that Isabel left the party…]

(28) A: ¿Ramón! ¿Tú sabes por qué marchó Isabel? CAst
Ramón you know why left Isabel
“Ramón! Do you know why Isabel left?”

B: Sí, ¡tábemos bailando! Marchó porque mandó-y lo mandó l’hermanu
yes were dancing left because told-herCL-itCL her it told the-brother
“Indeed, we were dancing! She left because her brother told her to”

The data discussed in this section and the different “ conviction” interpretations are summarized in (29).

25 A relevant context would be as follows: Isabel was dancing with Pericu (i.e., a different individual from the speaker), and the speaker saw Isabel’s brother talking to them while they were dancing. Few minutes later, the speaker sees Isabel leaving the party. The speaker does not know whether Isabel left because her brother told her to, or for some other reason. Yet, the speaker considers it plausible that it could have been Isabel’s brother who told her to leave, uttering then (27b).
Subordinate clause types, interpretation, “conviction holder” and clitic patterns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subordinate clause type</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>Clitic pattern</th>
<th>Conviction held by</th>
<th>Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CP-complements selected by report, epistemic predicates, etc.</td>
<td>[+conviction]</td>
<td>Postverbal</td>
<td>Matrix predicate’s subject</td>
<td>(17)-(26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-conviction]</td>
<td>Preverbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-complement CPs</td>
<td>[+conviction]</td>
<td>Postverbal</td>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>(27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[-conviction]</td>
<td>Preverbal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next section, I argue that the [+conviction] interpretations and also who it is attributed to can be captured under selection properties.

3.3. Selection of Forceº/Finº and pragmatic [+conviction] interpretation

The different matrix predicates that exhibit post- and preverbal clitic alternations in the CP-complement that they select in CAst (i.e., verbs of report and saying, epistemic verbs, verbs of opinion, etc.) have been reported to have a special syntactic status crosslinguistically in that they select for more structure than other predicates (cf. “bridge verbs” for Erteschik (1973), which differ from “non-bridge verbs”, like factive predicates, in that long wh-extraction is only available with “bridge-verbs”). Notice however, that while the “bridge” vs. “non-bridge” distinction may underline the post- and preverbal clitic alternations

26 See Kuong (2006), who claims that “bridge-verbs” select for more CP-structure than “non-bridge” ones.
exhibited in the finite embedded context in CAst, the same clitic alternations are reported
with what I call the preposition / complementizer *porque* “because” (cf. (27)), which is not a
verbal predicate.

Terrell (1974) and Bosque (1990) argue that verbs of report, epistemic predicates (among
others) and also *porque* “because” in Spanish (cf. Bosque (1990) for *porque* “because”, since
Terrell only focuses on verbal predicates) are special in exhibiting indicative mood
morphology in the finite CPs they select and in presupposing the content in the embedded
clause, which is said to be connected with an assertive interpretation. Building on their
intuitions regarding the interpretation of the CP-complements selected by these predicates, I
argue that both the presence of indicative mood morphology in the embedded CP and the
availability of different “conviction” interpretations in the finite embedded context in
Conservative Asturian can be given a uniform explanation in terms of selection. I claim that
these verbal predicates and the preposition/complementizer *porque* can select a Forceº or a
Finº complement, and that this selection is in turn related to the availability of [+conviction]
or [-conviction] interpretations respectively. This is shown in (30):

---

27 Previous ideas regarding presupposition in these embedded clauses are discussed in Kiparsky and Kiparsky
(1970) and in Karttunen (1973) for English (thanks to John Beavers (p.c.) for pointing out these references to
me), in Rivero (1971) for Spanish, and in Truckenbrodt (2006) for a correlation of assertive predicates and
embedded V2 structures in German. Although see Portner (2006) for the problems of extending the notion of
“assertion” to all matrix predicates that may select a CP-complements exhibiting a V2 structure (e.g., “to
dream”).

28 This way, I assume that selection of Forceº, the [+conviction] interpretation and the presence of Indicative
morphology in the embedded clause are all related. I leave the study of subjunctive CPs for future research, but
see fn.20 for some data and discussion.
(30) Selection of Force° and Fin° and [±conviction]

Verbs of report and saying (e.g., dicir “to say”), epistemic verbs (e.g., pensar “to think”), verbs of opinion (e.g., paecer “to seem”), and the causal preposition / complementizer porque “because” can select two types of CP-complements, as shown below:

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{Verb / porque “because”} + \\
&\quad\text{a. Force° [+conviction]} \\
&\quad\text{b. Fin° [-conviction]}
\end{align*}
\]

Furthermore, I claim that selection also helps us explain who holds the conviction. As noted in (29), CP-complements selected by verbal predicates attribute the [±conviction] to the matrix subject. I assume that this can be captured as follows: The verbal predicate selects Force° or Fin° and an external argument,\(^{29}\) which creates a syntactic configuration in which the [±conviction] can only be attributed to the matrix subject, as in (31):

\[\text{(31) } \nu^*\text{P}
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\text{subject} \\
\uparrow
\end{array} \quad \nu^{*}\nu
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\nu^*\nu \\
\text{pensar}
\end{array} \quad \nu^*\nu
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\nu^*\nu \\
\text{pensar}
\end{array} \quad \nu^*\nu
\]

\[\begin{array}{c}
\nu^*\nu \\
\text{Force°/Fin°}
\end{array} \quad \nu^*\nu
\]

\[\text{Complement}
\]

---

\(^{29}\) Recall that I am following Belletti and Rizzi (1981) so I assume the dative clitic in paecer “to seem, to have the opinion that” is the underlying subject.
On the other hand, *porque* “because” selects for Force° or Fin° whose [±conviction] pragmatic interpretation is attributed to the speaker. This is so because the preposition / complementizer *porque* “because” is merged in the structure as an adjunct, and as such, it is not c-commanded by any available antecedent. I argue that because the selected Force° or Fin° is part of an adjunct, the [±conviction] can only be attributed to the speaker, as in (32).

(32) SpeakerP³⁰
    
    Speaker'  
    
    Speaker  ... XP  
    
    XP  PP/CP³¹  
    
    ... porque  Force°/Fin°  
    
    [±conviction]

Next, I show that a Force° and a Fin° complement with the predicates just discussed correlates with different complementizers, that I call *que1* “that1” and *que2* “that2”.

---

³⁰ See Poletto (2000), who claims that a SpeakerP node is present in the left-periphery. As for its exact location in the cartographic left-periphery, I leave it open for future research.

³¹ The analysis I propose would entail that the sequence *porque que* “because that” should be attested, contrary to fact. I assume that the unavailability of *porque que* can follow from two different analyses. One could analyze *porque* “because” as a complementizer (CP), which takes a CP-complement, and a PF-filter deletes one *que* “that” in sequences *porque que*. Alternatively, *porque* “because” could be analyzed as a complex PP element formed by a preposition *por* “by” + selecting a CP, in which case the *que* complementizer that we find in *porque* “because” would either be *que1* or *que2*. Both analyses give the same result, so I do not commit to either one. I must thank Héctor Campos for the discussion of these different analyses.
3.4. The complementizer system in Conservative Asturian

Building on ideas developed in Demonte and Fernández Soriano’s (2005, 2007, to appear) analysis of the complementizer system in Spanish, I claim that Conservative Asturian has two different que “that” complementizers, a que1 “that1” in Forceº, and a que2 “that2” in Finº. I argue that these different complementizers are reflexes of the different [±conviction] pragmatic interpretations. As I show in the sections to follow, entertaining this idea of different complementizers being mapped in different projections in the left-periphery makes interesting predictions for the finite embedded context in Conservative Asturian.

Assuming a cartographic approach to the left-periphery (as in Rizzi (1997)) and following previous (2005, 2007) work, Demonte and Fernández Soriano (to appear) argue that the complementizer que “that” in Spanish can appear in different heads of the left-periphery. Using as evidence what is standardly called recomplementation32 patterns, shown in (33), which are subordinate clauses in which the complementizer appears twice,33 they claim that each of the complementizers in (33) is mapped in Forceº and in Finº respectively.

(33) a. Dijo que a ese empleado que no sabía cuánto le pagaban Sp said3SG that to that employee that not know3SG how-much him3PL paid3PL.

“S/He said that s/he didn’t know how much they paid that employee”

32 For recomplementation, see Fontana (1993) for Old Spanish, Uriagereka (1988, 1995a) and Raposo and Uriagereka (2005) for Galician and European Portuguese. See chapter 4 for more discussion on recomplementation and crosslinguistic variation in Western Iberian Romance languages.
33 The complementizers in the sentences are in bold for the readers’ convenience.
b. Dijo que a este tío que no podía ni verlo
“S/He said that s/he couldn’t stand that guy”

[From Demonte and Fernández Soriano (in press: ex. (43a) and (42a) respectively)]

As these authors show, the first instance of que “that” is higher than the projection hosting the Topics a este empleado “to this employee” and a este tío “to this guy”, while the second one is lower than these elements and higher than the verb. The data in (33) receives the analysis in (34): 35

(34) Force’
   Forceº  TopicP
   que
   a ese tío/ese empleado  Topic’
   Topicº  Fin’
   Finº  …
   que

I extend this kind of analysis to the complementizer system in Conservative Asturian and argue that selection of what I call the complementizer que1 “that1” in Forceº instantiates [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation, while selection of what I call the complementizer que2 “that2” in Finº correlates with [-conviction] interpretation, as shown in (35).

34 The evidence Demonte and Fernández Soriano (in press) provide for the Topic status of these elements is wh-extraction and DO clitic-doubling, in (33a) and (33b) respectively. See 2.1 above for the same Topic tests in Western Iberian Romance languages.

35 Although Demonte and Fernández Soriano (in press) later abandon this analysis, I claim that it can be maintained, using as evidence the selection of Forceº and Finº and the different “conviction” interpretations in the finite embedded environment in CAst; see (30).
The analysis proposed in (35) makes three predictions; first, it predicts the availability of postverbal clitics in CAst if Forceº and que1 is selected; second, it also predicts that que1 in Forceº must be compatible with material in the left-periphery; and third, this analysis also predicts that neither postverbal clitics nor left-peripheral material should be compatible with a que2 in Finº. These different predictions are discussed in 3.5.

3.5. Three predictions of the analysis

3.5.1. Postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context in CAst

I claim that the postverbal clitic patterns exhibited in Conservative Asturian are predicted by the analysis I propose as follows. First, the matrix predicate selects Forceº, mapped as que1 “that1” and giving rise to [+conviction] interpretation, but the Finº-phase head triggers Tº-to-Finº movement to satisfy its edge condition, as a result of which the clitic appears in a postverbal position. For illustration, consider (36), which receives the analysis in (37).
(36) Digo [qu’ayúdame] [#pero nun toi seguru] CAst
saySG that-helpSPG-IND-meCL
“I say that s/he helps me out, but I am not sure that s/he helps me”

(37) Digo … + Force° and [+conviction] interpretation
say3SG

  a. [TP ayuda T° [rP (pro) [v° ayuda … ]]]

  b. [Fin° Fin° [ClinP me [TP ayuda T° [rP (pro) [v° ayuda … ]]]]]

  c. [Fin° ayúdame Fin° [ClinP ayuda me [TP ayuda T° …]]]

  d. [Force° que1 [+conviction] Force° [Fin° ayúdame Fin° …]]

“I say that s/he helps me”

digo “I say” here selects Force°. After the verb ayuda “s/he helps” raises to T° and checks this
projection’s [EPP] feature, the clitic me “me” is merged in Clitic°, followed by merge of Fin°.
Fin°, being a phase-head in WI with an edge condition, T° to Fin° verb-movement is
triggered as last resort to satisfy this condition, and the verb picks up the clitic on its way up
to Fin°. Finally, the complementizer que1 is merged in Force° and the [+conviction]
interpretation is explained.37

36 Recall that I am not committed as to whether subject-pro is necessary at all, so I put it in parentheses.
37 I assume that the derivation for the other postverbal clitic patterns discussed in 3.1.2 follows the same
analysis, with the only difference that the [+conviction] in the causal embedded clause in (16), being an adjunct,
is attributed to the speaker – cf. (32).
One prediction that this analysis makes is that *que1* is compatible with a full left-periphery, and that when left-peripheral material appears after an instance of *que1* only a [+conviction] interpretation is available. Let us turn to this next.

### 3.5.2. *Que1* and compatibility with left-peripheral material

I argued in 3.4 that selection of Forceº *que1* results in a [+conviction] reading. If this analysis is on the right track, it predicts that other material may appear in the left-periphery. The examples I discuss show that this is indeed so. They involve elements in the Frame, Topic and Focus field. Consider (3), repeated in (38) below.

(38) Repítote          [que yo dexélo         aquel diecisiete      de mayu]         [*lo dexé]
                repeat₁SG-youCL that I   left₁SG-IND-itCL that    seventeenth of  May
       “I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth”        [de Pablo, *Memoria*]

Furthermore, the sentence in (38) cannot be followed by the fragment in (39).

(39) … #pero nun toi  seguru
       but   not  am sure
       “… but I am not sure (whether I left it then)”

I take the pragmatic inadequacy of (39) to show that the CP-complement selected by the matrix predicate *repito* “I repeat” encodes a [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation attributed to the matrix subject, which is also the speaker in this case. Thus, I argue that the analysis for (38) is as shown in (40).
(40) repito … + Forceº and [+conviction] interpretation

repeat₁SG

a. \[TP \text{ dexé } Tº [\text{pron } \text{ pro } \text{ dexé } \text{ pro } \ldots \text{ aquel diecisiete de mayo}]]\]

b. \[\text{Finº } \text{ Finº } [\text{CliticP lo } \text{ TP } \text{ dexé } Tº [\text{pron } \text{ pro } \text{ dexé } \text{ pro } \ldots ]]]\]

c. \[\text{Finº } \text{ dexélo } \text{ Finº } [\text{CliticP } \text{ dexé } \text{ lo } \text{ TP } \text{ dexé } Tº \ldots ]]]\]

d. \[\text{Force } queº [\text{left-D(islocation)P } \text{ yo } [\text{+Top } ] [\text{LDº } [\text{+Top } ] [\text{Finº } \text{ dexélo } \text{ Finº } \ldots ]]]\]

“I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth”

The matrix predicate repito “I repeat” selects Forceº, which is realized as que and receives a [+conviction] interpretation. As before, Finº has an edge condition which triggers Tº-to-Finº verb-movement and takes the clitic along with it. The subject is base-generated in L(eft)-D(islocation)P\(^{38}\) where it checks its criterial [+Topic] features. Finally que is merged in Forceº and [+conviction] interpretation is ensured.

---

\(^{38}\) I take the interaction with a preverbal constituent like yá “already”, which I analyze as an Λ*-moved (Focus) constituent when in preverbal position – cf. (62) and (63) in 2.4.2 above, to show that the subject yo “I” must be a Topic:

(i) Repítote \[que yo yá (*yo) lo dexé\] \[Interaction with Focus Adverbial\]
repeat₁SG-youCL that I already I itCL left₁SG

“I repeat to you that I have already left it”
This analysis extends directly to other cases of embedded finite clauses whose left-periphery is filled. Consider (41), where the underlined XP *les moces de Mieres* “girls from Mieres” is a Hanging Topic (HT). 39, 40

(41) Xulio cree [que *les moces de Mieres*, enfóta tou Dios n’elles,] CAST
Xulio believe<sub>3SG</sub> that the girls of Mieres trust<sub>rfl<sub>3SG</sub></sub> all God in-them

“Xulio believes that girls from Mieres, everybody puts much trust in them”

As predicted, (41) cannot be followed by #*pero nun ta seguru* “but he is not sure”, which indicates a [+conviction] interpretation. I claim that both the availability of a HT in (41) and the [+conviction] interpretation of the finite embedded clause follow from my analysis. *cree* “s/he believes” is an epistemic predicate which selects Forceº headed by *que*1, predicting the compatibility of a HT, the [+conviction] interpretation, and also the postverbal clitic pattern observed as follows. The HT is base-generated<sup>41</sup> in H(anging) T(opic)P in the Frame field –

---

39 The availability of HT in finite embedded clauses connects with different observations in the literature regarding “embedded root phenomena” as in Haycock (2006), or “main clause phenomena” as in Haegeman (2004, 2006a, 2006b) in different and unrelated languages. Drawing a full crosslinguistic parallelism deserves more time and space, so I will leave it for future research.

40 Recall one clear diagnostic that distinguishes a H(anging) T(opic)P from a L(eft) D(islocated) Topic construction. HTs are not compatible with prepositions marking Case, and can only be DPs – cf. (3) in 2.1.1. Notice that the DP *les moces de Mieres* “the girls from Mieres” is coindexed with the P(reposition) P(hrase) *n’elles* “in them”. As (i) shows, if the preposition marking Case appears with the dislocated DP, the sentence is ungrammatical. I take (i) below as evidence for the HT status of the underlined DP in (41).

(i)  

*Xulio cree [que *nes moces de Mieres*, enfóta tou Dios n’elles]*

“Xulio believes that in girls from Mieres, everybody puts much trust on them”

41 The wh-extraction test clearly indicates the base-generated status of the HT *les moces de Mieres* “the girls from Mieres”. This is shown in (i).

(i)  

*Les moces de * Mieres, Xulia nun sabe quién se enfota n’elles,  [wh-extraction: ✓]*

the girls from Mieres Xulia not know<sub>3SG</sub> who rfl<sub>CL</sub> trust<sub>rfl<sub>3SG</sub></sub> in-them

“Girls from Mieres, Xulia doesn’t know who puts much trust on them”
cf. 2.1 above, and the Fin° phase-head triggers T°-to-Fin° verb-movement to satisfy this phase head’s edge condition. As the reader can verify, this analysis accounts uniformly for the postverbal clitic patterns we find in (38) and (41).

An interesting prediction the proposal makes is that when an element has moved to FocusP below an instance of queI, then the embedded clause will have a [+conviction] reading but the clitic will appear preverbally. And this is indeed borne out. Consider (42) below.

(42) Repítote [que YO lo dexé aquel diecisiete de mayu] (, non él) [*dexélo]
repeat1SG-you that IFOC itCL left1SG-IND that sixteenth of May
“I repeat to you that I (, and not him) left it that May seventeenth”

Not only does the clitic appear preverbally, but (42) also exhibits a [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation as shown by the fact that the sentence cannot be followed by # pero nun toi seguru “but I am not sure”. The preverbal subject is a Focus. As a Focus constituent (that is, A’-moved), YO “I” satisfies the edge condition of the Fin°-phase head raising to [Spec,

42 As I discussed in 2.1.3, Focus constituents can only be multiple provided one of them is a Contrastive Focus and the other an Information Focus one. Let me abstract away from the Contrastive Focus + Information Focus interpretation. As (i) shows, if yo “I” is focalized and ya “already” appears in preverbal position, the sentence is ungrammatical.

(i) Repitote [que YO (*ya) lo dexé (ya)] (, non él) *[ Interaction with Focus adverbial]
repeat1SG-youCL that IFOC already itCL left1SG already
“I repeat to you that I (, and not him) have already left it”

Notice the contrast with the example in fn. 38 above, where the preverbal Topic subject yo “I” and the adverbial ya “already” may cooccur preverbally. I take (i) above as evidence for the claim that yo “I” in (42) is in a Focus position in the left-periphery.

43 I am very thankful to Ramón D’Andrés (p.c.) for this observation.
FinP\[44 before it reaches a FocusP position in the left-periphery to check the criterial

[+Focus] features it bears. As a result, the verb does not move to Fin° to satisfy the edge
condition and clitics are predicted to surface preverbally.

(43) repito … + Force° and [+conviction] interpretation
repeat\textsubscript{1SG}

a. \[TP \text{ dexé T°} \ [\text{yo [+Foc]} \ [\text{pro} \ldots \text{aquel diecisiete de mayu}]][45

b. \[\text{Fin' Fin°} \ [\text{CliticP lo} \ [\text{TP \text{dexé T°} \ [\text{yo [+Foc]} \ [\text{pro} \ldots ]}]][]

c. \[\text{FinP \text{yo [+Foc]} \ [\text{Fin°} \ [\text{CliticP lo} \ [\text{TP \text{dexé T°} \ [\text{yo} \ldots ]}]][]

d. \[\text{Force' que1 [+conviction] Force°} \ [\text{FocusP y° [+Foc]} \ [\text{Focus° [+Foc]} \ [\text{FinP y°} \ldots ]][]

“I repeat to you that I (, and not him) left it that May seventeenth”

This shows that the [+conviction] reading associated with this structure follows from the
fact that there is selection of Force° as in (43d). The preverbal nature of the clitic follows
from the edge condition of Fin°, which in this case is satisfied by the focused element
moving through [Spec, FinP], thus blocking the movement of the verb to Fin° and thus also
blocking a postverbal clitic (cf. (40)).

44 Following the analysis I proposed in chapter 2, I assume Fin° has an edge-feature, which allows the Focus
element to move to [Spec, FinP] and avoid being part of Transfer with an unchecked [+Focus] criterial feature.
45 I assume that subject yo “I” starts in its merged position in [Spec, v°P] and that it bears criterial [+Focus]
features that must be check in a criterial Focus position in the left-periphery, akin to the analysis I proposed for
(62) in 2.4.2 for matrix clauses.
Consider also another prediction of the analysis. If the matrix predicate selects Force° hosting que1, and the embedded clause contains a negative marker, the clitic must surface preverbally, as Neg° is closer to Fin° than T° - cf. 2.4.2 above. As (44) and its derivation in (45) show, this prediction is also borne out.

(44) Creo [que nun lo fizo] [¿pero nun toi seguru] CAst
    believe1SG that not itCL did3SG-IND
    “I believe that s/he didn’t do it (, and I am sure that s/he didn’t do it)”

(45) creo … + Force° and [+conviction] interpretation believe1SG

    a. [ΣP/NegP nun Σ°/Neg° [ClinicP lo [TP fizo T° [vP (pro) [vº fizo pro …]]]]]46
    b. [Fin’ Fin° ΣP/NegP nun Σ°/Neg° [ClinicP lo [TP fizo T° [vP (pro) [vº fizo pro …]]]]]
    c. [Fin’ nun Fin° ΣP/NegP Σ°/Neg° [ClinicP lo [TP fizo T° [vP (pro) …]]]]
    d. [Force' que1 [+conviction] Force° [Fin’ nun Fin° ΣP/NegP Σ°/Neg° [ClinicP lo [TP fizo T° ]]]]

    “I believe that s/he didn’t do it (, and I am sure that s/he didn’t do it)”

The analysis I propose predicts that if Force° headed by que1 is selected, a [+conviction] reading of the embedded clause must be available, which the infelicity of the fragment “but I am not sure” confirms.47

---

46 See section 2.4.2 for discussion of the analysis of the negative marker I follow.
47 Notice that my analysis also predicts that the embedded clause in (44) can also be interpreted with a [-conviction] reading. As I show in (49) in 3.5.3 below, this prediction is also borne out.
Summarizing, if matrix predicates of report and saying, opinion and epistemic predicates select for Forceº headed by *que1*, this selection is predicted to be compatible with elements in the Frame, Topic and Focus fields in the left-periphery of the embedded clause. I have shown that this is indeed the case. Furthermore, I have shown that selection of Forceº also gives rise to a [+conviction] interpretation of the embedded clause, which is also predicted by the analysis. The position of the clitic in the embedded clause is accounted for assuming the edge condition of Finº I propose. Thus, in the absence of A’-movement or a closer head to Finº, postverbal clitics arise as a result of last resort Tº-to-Finº movement to satisfy the proposed edge condition of Finº. Preverbal clitics on the other hand appear when an element undergoing A’-movement passes through [Spec, FinP] on its way to the left-periphery and thus licenses Finº’s edge-condition, or when there is a closer head to Finº than Tº. Let me now turn to the predictions of my analysis regarding selection of Finº headed by *que2*.

3.5.3. *Que2* and incompatibility with left-peripheral material

I claimed in 3.3 that those predicates that exhibit post- and preverbal clitic alternations in CAst may also select for Finº, which in turn encodes a [-conviction] pragmatic interpretation. If this analysis is on the right track, I predict that no left-peripheral material should be available in the selected embedded clause. Furthermore, this analysis also predicts that only a preverbal clitic pattern should be observed, as a *que2* is merged in Finº and licenses the edge condition of this phase-head, thereby rendering movement of the verb to Finº with its
consequent postverbal clitic order unnecessary. As I show, these predictions are also borne out.

Consider the preverbal clitic pattern in the finite embedded context in (13b), repeated below for convenience. I showed in 3.2 that this finite embedded clause exhibits a [-conviction] interpretation, as the felicity of fragments like “but s/he is not sure” indicates. This follows from the analysis I have argued for. The epistemic matrix predicate pensó “she thought” selects a Finº complement headed by que2, that is [-conviction] interpretation.

Consider (46) for illustration.

(46) Xulia pensó que lo dixera Mon [pero nun taba segura] CAst
Xulia thought3SG that it_CL had.said3SG-IND Mon
“Xulia thought that Mon had said it (, but she was not sure whether Mon had said it or not)”

The que2 in Finº licenses the edge condition of this phase-head. This renders Tº-to-Finº unnecessary, and the result is the preverbal clitic pattern we observe. The details are shown in (47).

(47) pensó … + Finº and [-conviction] interpretation

\[
\text{thought}_{3SG} \\
\text{a. } [\text{TP dixera } T^\circ [\text{\textasciitilde}_p \text{ Mon } [\text{\textasciitilde}_o \text{ dixera pro } \ldots ]]]^{48} \\
\text{b. } [\text{Fin'} \text{Finº } [\text{CliticP lo } [\text{TP dixera } T^\circ [\text{\textasciitilde}_p \text{ Mon } [\text{\textasciitilde}_o \text{ dixera pro } \ldots ]]]]]
\]

\[^{48}\text{I assume that DP subject Mon is merged in } [\text{Spec, } v^*P]\text{ and that } T^\circ \text{ checks Case features on this DP through long-distance agree - see 2.3 above for discussion. Also, I assume object-pro satisfies the subcategorization of dixera “had said” similarly to previous instances.}\]
c: \([\text{Fin}']\text{que2}_{[-\text{conviction}]}\) \(\text{Fin}'\) [\(\text{Clitic} \ lo\) \(\text{TP}\) \(\text{dixer}\) \(\text{T}'\) \(\rightarrow\) \(\text{Mon}\) \(\rightarrow\) \(\text{dixer}\) \(\text{pro}\) … ]]]

“Xulia thought that Mon had said it (, but she was not sure whether he did say it or not)”

Also, notice that this analysis predicts that no left-periphery should be available if the matrix verb selects Fin' and if que2 appears in Fin' which results in [-conviction] interpretation. In support of this prediction, notice that in (48), parallel to (42), the presence of a Focus subject Mon results in a [+conviction] interpretation, as the pragmatic infelicity of the fragment indicates – cf. (46).

(48) Xulia pensó que MON lo dixer (, non él) [#pero nun taba segura] CAst

“Xulia thought that Mon (, not him) had said it (, but she was not sure whether Mon had said it)”

Finally, consider the effect of the negative marker. I claimed in 2.4.2 that the position of the negative marker was below Fin'. Since NegP is generated under FinP, we expect to find que2 followed by negation. Moreover, since there is no ForceP, we expect to find a [-conviction] reading. This is indeed also borne out as it is shown in (49), since the fragment in brackets is felicitous even under the presence of preverbal negation (cf. (44)). Thus, I argue that (49) receives the analysis in (50).

(49) Creo [que nun lo fizo] [pero nun toi seguru] CAst

“I believe that s/he didn’t do it, but I am not sure whether s/he did do it or not”

(50) creo … + Fin' and [-conviction] interpretation

creo1SG ...

a: \([\text{XP}/\text{Neg}]\) nun \(\Sigma'\) \(\rightarrow\) \(\text{Clitic} \ lo\) \(\text{TP}\) \(\text{fizo}\) \(\text{T}'\) \(\rightarrow\) \(\text{pro}\) \(\rightarrow\) \(\text{fizo}\) \(\text{pro}\) … ]]]
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b. \( \text{Fin' } \text{Fin}^o \lfloor \Sigma^o / \text{Neg}^o \right\rfloor \text{CliticP lo } \lfloor \text{TP fizo } T^o \lfloor \text{pro} \right\rfloor \lfloor \text{pro } \right\rfloor \rfloor \rfloor \rfloor \rfloor \rfloor \rfloor

c. \( \text{Fin' que2[-conviction]} \text{Fin}^o \lfloor \text{Fin' } \text{Fin}^o \lfloor \Sigma^o / \text{Neg}^o \right\rfloor \text{CliticP lo } \lfloor \text{TP fizo } T^o \lfloor \text{pro} \right\rfloor \lfloor \text{pro } \right\rfloor \rfloor \rfloor \rfloor \rfloor \rfloor

“I believe that he didn’t do it (but I am not sure whether he didn’t or he did do it)”

The availability of a [+conviction] and a [-conviction] interpretation in (44) and (49) respectively, follows from the selection properties of the matrix epistemic predicate, which may select for Force°, headed by que1, or Fin°, headed by que2, and explains the two available interpretations. Moreover, the preverbal position of the clitic is also predicted in both cases. In (44), Neg° raises to Fin° and satisfies Fin°’s edge condition. In (49), que2 is merged in Fin°. In both instances, movement of the verb to Fin° is rendered unnecessary, thus explaining the impossibility of the postverbal clitic order in both instances.

3.5.4. Interim summary

In the preceding sections, I have shown that three predictions that my analysis makes are borne out. The first prediction relates to postverbal clitics. I have shown that this clitic pattern in the finite embedded context in CAs can be analyzed as a side-effect of the matrix predicate’s selection and to the way that the Fin° phase-head satisfies its edge condition. We find postverbal clitics in finite embedded clauses when the matrix verb selects Force° and there is no A’-movement or a closer head to Fin° to satisfy its edge condition. In this case, T°-to-Fin° movement is triggered as last resort. As a consequence, the clitic appears postverbally and we account uniformly for this clitic pattern in both matrix and finite
embedded clauses in CAst. The second prediction relates to the availability of material in the left-periphery. I have shown that selecting a que₁ is compatible with elements in the Frame, Topic and Focus fields in left-periphery, and that both the different clitic patterns exhibited and the reported [+conviction] interpretation follow from the analysis proposed. The last prediction I discussed related to the que₂ complementizer. I have shown that when the matrix predicate selects Finº headed by que₂, which amounts to a [-conviction] reading, no element in the left-periphery can appear and only the preverbal clitic pattern is found. In the final section of this chapter, I briefly discuss further evidence that supports the proposed analysis. One first piece of evidence comes from explicative porque, the second one is shown to come from wh-extraction in finite embedded contexts selected by the predicates discussed above, and the third from embedded coordination in CAst.

3.6. Further evidence: Explicative porque, wh-extraction and embedded coordination

3.6.1. Explicative porque

In 3.1.2 above I discussed the causal embedded context introduced by porque “because” in CAst that exhibits post- and preverbal clitic alternations – cf. (27). As I showed, this causal embedded environment can be identified by the strong connection it shows with the matrix clause and also by the absence of a comma between the embedded clause and the matrix
one. However, in CAst there is another causal context also introduced by *porque* “because”.

A relevant example is given in (51).

(51) Fáiseme que ta lloca, porque *vila* falando sola CAst  
make<sub>3SG</sub>-rfl-me that is crazy because saw<sub>1SG</sub>-her<sub>CL</sub> talking alone

“It seems to me that she is crazy, because I saw her talking to herself”

This causal environment has been differentiated in various grammars for Spanish from other causal environments introduced by *porque* “because”, and generally call it “explicative”, “conjunctive” or “epistemic” *porque* “because”. This causal environment does not introduce the “reason” the event or state described in the matrix clause occurred, but the “cause” for taking the matrix proposition (in this case, “*it seems to me that she is crazy*”) as veridical. The explicative *porque* “because” clause in (51) relates to *fáiseme* “it seems to me”, which is the higher predicate, and a comma separates this embedded clause from the previous one.

---

49 Some of the differences between this type of causal embedded context and that in (27) are discussed for Spanish within the functional grammar tradition in Lapesa (1978), Alarcos (1978) and Narbona (1989, 1990).  
50 Notice that this causal environment also differs from the one in (27) in terms of scope. Consider the (i) and (ii) pairs below, where (i) is similar to (27), and (ii) to (51). In (i), the subordinate clause only relates to the embedded clause (i.e., it has lower scope). Also, as the gloss shows, “the brother” can only relate to Isabel, not to Xulio:

(i) *Diz* Xulio que Isabel marchó porque *mandó-ylo* l’hermanu  
say<sub>3SG</sub> Xulio that Isabel left<sub>3SG</sub> because told<sub>3SG</sub>-her<sub>CL</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub> the-brother

“Xulio says that Isabel left because her brother told her to”

On the other hand, the second causal environment relates to the matrix clause (i.e., it has higher scope), and the antecedent for *the brother* can only be Xulio, and not Isabel, unlike (i):

(ii) *Diz* Xulio que Isabel marchó, *porque* *mandó-ylo* l’hermanu  
say<sub>3SG</sub> Xulio that Isabel left<sub>3SG</sub> because told<sub>3SG</sub>-him<sub>CL</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub> the-brother

“Xulio says that Isabel left, because his brother told him to”
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Its “explicative” nature is revealed by the fact that speakers of Conservative Asturian report that the fragment in brackets in (53) is pragmatically infelicitous, and that they prefer a postverbal clitic pattern.\(^{51}\)

\begin{enumerate}
  \item \textcolor{red}{(52)} Fáiseme \textit{que} ta lloca, \textit{porque} vi\textit{la} falando sola… C\textit{Ast}
  \begin{itemize}
    \item make\textsubscript{SG}-rfl-me that is crazy because saw\textsubscript{SG}-her\textsubscript{CL} talking alone
  \end{itemize}

  \item \textcolor{red}{(53)} \# pero nun toi seguru que \textit{la} viera falando sola
  \begin{itemize}
    \item but not am sure that her saw talking alone
  \end{itemize}

  \begin{itemize}
    \item “(It seems to me that she is crazy, because I saw her talking to herself,) but I am not sure whether I saw her talking to herself”
  \end{itemize}
\end{enumerate}

I claim that both the [+conviction] interpretation of this embedded context as well as the postverbal clitic pattern exhibited in connection with explicative \textit{porque} in C\textit{Ast} follow from the analysis I propose. Thus, I argue that explicative \textit{porque} always selects for Force\(^\circ\) headed by \textit{que}1, which ensures a [+conviction] interpretation that relates the content of the embedded clause to the conviction or epistemic state of the speaker.\(^{52}\) Notice that if Force\(^\circ\) is always selected in this context, I predict that in the absence of A’-movement (Focus) or a closer head to Fin\(^\circ\) like the negative marker, postverbal clitics should be exhibited in C\textit{Ast} in this context, as (52) confirms. Let me now turn to wh-extraction in C\textit{Ast}, which I show also provides further evidence for the analysis I am arguing for.

\(^{51}\) D’Andrés (1993: 27) reports this datum and observes that both a post- and a preverbal clitic pattern are available. To me, the preverbal clitic pattern sounds like an influence of Spanish in this finite embedded context, which Xulio Viejo (p.c.) confirms. As noted, I assume D’Andrés variety of Asturian is in transition between the Conservative and Modern Asturian varieties I propose.

\(^{52}\) Cf. fn. 31 for the different possible analyses of \textit{porque} “because”. Whether \textit{porque} “because” is a complex element or it should be decomposed into the preposition \textit{por} “by” and a \textit{que} “that” complementizer is irrelevant for the discussion. In any case, the fact that [+conviction] can only be attributed to the speaker also follows from the analysis I proposed in (32) for the other type of \textit{porque} “because”.
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3.6.2. Wh-extraction in CAst

The analysis I propose predicts that long wh-extraction should only exhibit a preverbal clitic pattern in CAst. The reason is that the edge condition of the Finº phase-head will be satisfied by the wh-element that moves through its specifier. Furthermore, this analysis also predicts that a verb of report, epistemic or opinion may select for Forceº headed by que1 or Finº headed by que2. This amounts to saying that the embedded clause can have a [+conviction] or a [-conviction] interpretation. As I show, this is also borne out. Thus, consider (54) and let me assume that the wh-element ónde “where” relates to compró “bought” and is thus extracted from the embedded CP, as shown in parentheses.

(54) Ónde dixo Xulia [que lo compró (ónde)]?
    where said<sub>3SG</sub> Xulia that it<sub>CL</sub> bought<sub>3SG</sub> where
    “Where does Xulia say that she bought it (where)?”

The matrix predicate dixo “she said” in (54) is a verb of report, and it may select for a either Forceº or Finº headed by que1 or que2 respectively, and giving rise to a [+conviction] or a [-conviction] interpretation of the embedded clause. The derivation for the [+conviction] interpretation is shown in (55). I claim that the wh-element proceeds through the different stages in the derivation, satisfying the edge-condition of the Finº-phase head in the embedded clause on its way to a criterial projection where the [+Wh] features in ónde “where” can be checked. I assume that after the point in the derivation shown in (55d), the wh-element reaches the left-periphery of the matrix clause, where the [+Wh] features the wh-
element bears are checked. Crucially, my analysis predicts that even though the sentence exhibits a [+conviction] reading the clitic appears preverbally.

(55) Ónde dixo Xulia... + Force° and [+conviction] interpretation where said₃SG Xulia

a. [TP compró T° [r Evo onde [+Wh] [r Evo (pro) [r Evo compró pro donde...]]]^{53}

b. [Fin° Fin P [ClinicP lo [TP compró T° [r Evo donde [+Wh] [r Evo (pro) [r Evo compró pro ...]]]]]

c. [Fin° donde [+Wh] [ClinicP lo [TP compró T° [r Evo donde [+Wh] [r Evo (pro) ...]]]]]

d. [Force° que1 [+conviction] [Fin° donde [+Wh] [Fin° ClinicP lo [TP compró T° [r Evo donde [+Wh] [r Evo (pro) ...]]]]]

... "Where did Xulia say that she bought it (, and she is sure that she bought it there)?"

Consider now the derivation if que² is selected by the matrix predicate dixo “she said”. Recall if que² is selected, the only available interpretation is [-conviction], which means that Xulia is not sure whether she bought it at a given place, and it is derived as shown in (56). I claim that the derivation is the same, with the only different that the que² satisfies the edge condition of Fin°. The wh-element donde “where” still moves through [Spec, FinP], as its criterial [+Wh] features are unchecked, thus forcing movement to avoid being part of Transfer. Notice that the here too, a preverbal clitic pattern still obtains in the embedded clause.

^{53} I assume object pro satisfies the subcategorization of compró “bought” similarly to what I discussed in previous examples. Also, I assume the v° phase-head bears an edge-feature, attracting the wh-element to its specifier and allowing it to escape the lower v° phase.
On the other hand, notice that the wh-element ónde “where” may also be related to the matrix predicate diso “she said”, meaning “where it was that she said it”. Given the analysis that I have developed, we expect to find both a preverbal and a postverbal clitic pattern depending on whether diso “she said” selects Forceº and is thus headed by que1, or Finº, in turn headed by que2. Recall that each of these selections are associated with [+conviction] or [-conviction] readings respectively, in this case “she is sure that she bought it” or “she is not sure whether she did”. This is indeed borne out. Consider (57). It exhibits a postverbal clitic pattern. As the infelicity of the fragment in brackets indicates, the embedded clause has a [+conviction] interpretation.

(57) Ónde dixo Xulia (ónde) que comprólo? [♯ pero nun ta segura] CAst
    where said_{3SG} Xulia where that bought_{3SG-itCL}
    “Where did Xulia say that she bought it (, and she is sure that she bought it)?”

54 Cf. fn. above.
The embedded clause in (57) receives the analysis in (58). Since *que1* is in Force°, in the absence of A’-movement or a closer available head, T°-to-Fin° is triggered in order to satisfy the edge condition of Fin°, which thus derives the postverbal clitic pattern observed.

(58)  
\[
\text{dixo} \quad \text{Xulia} \quad + \quad \text{Force}° \quad \text{and} \quad [+\text{conviction}] \quad \text{interpretation}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{said}_{\text{SG}} \quad \text{Xulia} \\
\text{a.} \quad & \quad [\text{TP compró } T° \ [r_p \ (pro) \ [r_\sigma \ \text{compró } pro \ \ldots]]] \\
\text{b.} \quad & \quad [\text{Fin'} \ \text{Fin}° \ [\text{CliticP lo} \ [\text{TP compró } T° \ [r_p \ (pro) \ [r_\sigma \ \text{compró } pro \ \ldots]]]]] \\
\text{c.} \quad & \quad [\text{Force'} \ \text{que1} \ [+\text{conviction}] \ [\text{Fin'} \ \text{comprólo} \ \text{Fin}° \ [\text{CliticP comprólo} \ [\text{TP compró} T° \ \ldots]]]]] \\
\text{d.} \quad & \quad [r_p \ \text{Xulia} \ [r_\sigma \ \text{dixo } \text{ónde}_{[+\text{Wh}]} \ [\text{Force'} \ \text{que1} \ [+\text{conviction}] \ [\text{Fin'} \ \text{comprólo} \ldots]]]]] \\
\text{e.} \quad & \quad [r_p \ \text{ónde}_{[+\text{Wh}]} \ [r_p \ \text{Xulia} \ [r_\sigma \ \text{dixo } \text{ónde}_{[+\text{Wh}]} \ [\text{Force'} \ \text{que1} \ [+\text{conviction}] \ [\text{Fin'} \ \text{comprólo} \ldots]]]]] \\
\text{f.} \quad & \quad [\text{Fin'} \ \text{Fin}° \ [\text{TP dixo} \ [r_p \ \text{ónde}_{[+\text{Wh}]} \ [r_p \ \text{Xulia dixo ... que1 comprólo} ...]]]]] \\
\text{g.} \quad & \quad [\text{FocP ónde}_{[+\text{Wh}]} \ [\text{Focº} \ [\text{Focº} \ [\text{FinP ónde} \ [\text{Fin'} \ \text{Fin}° \ [\text{TP dixo} \ [r_p \ \text{ónde}_{[+\text{Wh}]} \ [r_p \ \text{Xulia ... que1} ...]]]]]]]] \\
\end{align*}
\]

“Where did Xulia say that she bought it (, and she is sure that she bought it)?”

The preverbal clitic pattern is also predicted to be possible and moreover, we expect that his clitic order will correlate with a [-conviction] reading. (59) bears out these predictions.

(59)  
\[
\text{Ónde dixo} \quad \text{Xulia} \quad (\text{ónde}) \quad \text{que } \text{lo} \quad \text{compró?} \quad [\text{pero nun ta segura}] \quad \text{CAst}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{why said}_{\text{SG}} \quad \text{Xulia} \quad \text{why that } \text{it}_{\text{CL}} \quad \text{bought}_{\text{SG}} \\
\text{“Where did Xulia say that she bought it (, but she is not sure whether she bought it)?”}
\end{align*}
\]

One last piece of evidence for the analysis I propose is discussed next, namely embedded coordination.
3.6.3. Embedded coordination

With the analysis I propose, structures as those in (60) are also predicted (data reported by D’Andrés (p.c)).

(60) a. Diz [que lu garraron robando] y [que-y pegaron] CAst
say3SG that himCL caught3PL stealing and that-himCL beat3PL

b. Diz [que garráron lu robando] y [que pegáron-y]
say3SG that caught3PL himCL stealing and that beat3PL-himCL

“S/he says that they found him stealing and (that) they beat him up”

For (60a), I claim that diz “s/he says” selects two Finº complements coordinated by y “and”. que2 is merged in Finº in both complement clauses, and this complementizer satisfies the edge condition of the Finº phase head, resulting in the preverbal clitic pattern observed. This analysis predicts that both embedded clauses encode a [-conviction] interpretation, and the felicity of pero nun ta seguru “but s/he is not sure” indicates that this is indeed the case.

Turning to (60b), I argue that diz “s/he says” selects two Forceº complements coordinated by y “and”. Forceº is headed by que1 in both complements, and Tº-to-Finº and consequently, postverbal clitics arise in the embedded clause, as there is no closer head or A’-moved element in the embedded CP. The analysis I propose predicts these complement clauses have a [+conviction] interpretation, which the infelicity of the fragment #pero nun ta seguru “but s/he is not sure” confirms.
3.7. Summary and conclusions

In this chapter, I have presented new data from the finite embedded context in CAst that exhibit pre- and also postverbal clitics. Also, I have illustrated the difference in interpretation that speakers of CAst report for a post- and a preverbal clitic pattern in those finite embedded contexts in which no left-peripheral material appears in the embedded CP. In this finite embedded context, while a postverbal clitic pattern is reported to encode a [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation of the content expressed by the embedded clause, and this [+conviction] is attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject or the speaker, a preverbal clitic pattern is reported to exhibit a [-conviction] pragmatic interpretation. I have shown that both the different conviction interpretations and also the clitic pattern we find ultimately depend on whether the matrix predicate selects Forceº headed by que1, or Finº headed by que2. If Forceº is selected, [+conviction] interpretation obtains. Furthermore, the position of the clitic when the matrix predicate selects Forceº depends on how the edge condition of Finº is satisfied. Thus, in the absence of A’-movement or a closer head, Finº triggers last resort Tº-to-Finº verb-movement to satisfy its edge condition, which explains the availability of postverbal clitic patterns. In turn, if Finº is selected, pragmatic [-conviction] is observed. In these instances, que2 is merged in Finº, satisfies its edge condition and Tº-to-Finº is rendered unnecessary, which explains the uniform preverbal clitic pattern we find with this complementizer.
Finally, I have presented further evidence for the analysis proposed. I have shown that explicative *porque* always encodes [+conviction] interpretation, and exhibits a postverbal clitic pattern in the absence of A’-movement or a closer head to Finº than Tº in CAst. Finally, I have shown that both wh-extraction and embedded coordination present further evidence for the analysis proposed. In the next chapter, I tackle crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context in Western Iberian Romance languages, which I also claim to follow from the analysis proposed.
Chapter 4

Crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context in Iberian Romance languages

In the previous chapter, I discussed and analyzed clitic placement alternations in the finite embedded context in a variety of Asturian that I have called Conservative Asturian (CAst). I argued that predicates of report (among others, see 3.3 above) such as *digo* “I say” in (1) below select for either Forceº or Finº, a choice that I claimed to be related to two different complementizers (namely *que*¹ and *que*² respectively). As I showed, *que*¹ in Forceº explains the postverbal clitic pattern we find in (1a) as an instance of Tº-to-Finº to license the edge condition of Finº, and it also accounts for the [+conviction] reading that the embedded clause exhibits, as the pragmatic infelicity of the fragment in brackets shows. *Que*² in Finº, in turn, explains the preverbal clitic pattern in (1b), and correlates with a [-conviction] interpretation of the embedded clause, as indicated by the felicity of the fragment in brackets.

(1) a. Digo [qu’ayúdame] [#pero nun toi seguru de si me ayuda o non]       CAst
   say$_{B}G$ that-help$_{B}G$.IND-5SG CL
   “I say that s/he helps me out (, but I am not sure whether s/he does help me)”

---

1 This chapter has greatly benefited from very fruitful (and sometimes, hair-tearing) discussions with various speakers of Asturian, Galician, and European Portuguese. I would like to thank, Ramón d’Andrés, Xulio Viejo, Guillermo Lorenzo, different members of the Seminariu de Filoloxía Asturiana at the Universidá d’Uviéu (especially Balbuena) and Julia Rubiera (for the Asturian data), Juan Uriagereka, Rosario Álvarez (Charo) and different members of the Instituto da Língua Galega (for Galician), and Ana Maria Martins, Pilar Barbosa and Eduardo P. Raposo (for European Portuguese) for the data reported and all the time devoted to examine these constructions. Needless to say, usual disclaimers apply.
b. Digo [que me ayuda] [pero nun toi seguru de si me ayuda o non]
say\textsubscript{ISG} that me\textsubscript{CL} help\textsubscript{ISG-IND} “I say that s/he helps me out (, but I am not sure whether s/he helps me or not”

[Data from Viejo (2008)]

The analysis I developed furthermore accounts for the alternation in clitic placement that we observe in (2). As I showed, the preverbal subject in (2) can either be a Topic, as in (2a) or a Focus, as in (2b). In both instances the matrix predicate repito “I repeat” selects Forceº, which is headed by que\textsubscript{I} and followed by material in the left-periphery of the embedded-CP. I also showed how this analysis explains that both (2a) and (2b) exhibit the [+conviction] reading, and why the clitics appear in different positions. In particular, I accounted for the post- and the preverbal clitic patterns in (2) as a side-effect of the edge condition on the Finº phase-head. This condition may be satisfied either by Tº-to-Finº when we have a base-generated subject (that is, a Topic), as in the case of (2a), or by the A’-movement of the focused subject through the specifier of Finº, as in (2b):

(2) a. Repítote [que yo dexé\textsubscript{I}it\textsubscript{CL} that I left\textsubscript{ISG-IND}itCL that seventeenth of May] “I repeat to you that I left that May seventeenth” [de Pablo, Memoria]

b. Repítote [que YO (, y non él) lo dexé aquel diecisiete de mayu] “I repeat to you that I (, and not him) left it that May seventeenth”

Interestingly, while post- and preverbal clitic alternations in the matrix context are uniform across Western Iberian Romance languages (WI), finite embedded contexts show a
considerable amount of crosslinguistic variation in these languages. As I show in this chapter, while speakers of what I call Modern Asturian (MAst) accept the same clitic patterns in (2), for a sentence like (1), they only accept the preverbal pattern. Going one step further, speakers of Galician and European Portuguese accept only the preverbal clitic pattern not just in (1) but also in (2). This chapter deals with this crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context in Western Iberian Romance languages and, I argue, provides a uniform analysis that can explain both the parallelism these languages exhibit in the matrix context, and the crosslinguistic variation they show in the finite embedded one.

I organize this chapter as follows. First, I present in section 4.1 data reported by speakers of what I call Modern Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese which illustrate the crosslinguistic variation that I will be dealing with. I argue in section 4.2 and 4.3 that crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context in Western Iberian is related to the different complementizer systems that these languages have, and that these different complementizer systems clearly show a continuum within this group of languages. I conclude that CAst and European Portuguese stand on opposite sides of this continuum, and that MAst and Galician occupy stages in between. In particular, I argue that the complementizer system in Modern Asturian (MAst) is different from that of CAst in that selection of Force° and que1 in MAst is only available when a Topic or a Focus element appears in the left-periphery; in the absence of such left-peripheral material, the complementizer system in MAst differs from that of CAst in that Force° collapses to Fin°. Fin° in this context houses a hybrid complementizer that I call que1/que2. I hypothesize that
the collapse of Force° to Fin° is the initial part of process of linguistic change. This process, I suggest, is more advanced in Galician and European Portuguese. As I show, Galician and European Portuguese pattern with MAst in the availability of this que1/que2 in Fin°/Force° in the absence peripheral material, but unlike in MAst, when verbs of report in Galician select Force° headed by a que1 complementizer, this complementizer may, but need not, coexist with another complementizer in Fin°, a complementizer that I call que2/Ø. In other words, Galician already allows some instances of overt recomplementation, a process not yet available in either Conservative or Modern Asturian. Finally, European Portuguese is shown to exhibit the same properties as Galician, but in an even more pronounced manner.

In the remainder of the chapter, I present further evidence for the proposed process of language change in Western Iberian. I discuss historical data from European Portuguese and Spanish that support the analysis and continuum proposed. Finally, I also discuss the finite embedded context in modern Spanish, which I show to also exhibit [+conviction] interpretation when left-peripheral material is found in the embedded CP selected by verbs of report and porque “because” (cf. 3.3). I argue that the system found in modern Spanish is similar to that I observed for European Portuguese and Galician, where a complementizer que1 in Force° necessarily co-occurs with a complementizer in Fin°.
4.1 Crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context in WI: The data

4.1.1. Crosslinguistic variation (I): Conservative and Modern Asturian

As I discussed in chapter 3, finite embedded contexts selected by verbs of report (among others) exhibit post- and preverbal clitic patterns in Conservative Asturian (CAst) when no Topic element appears after the complementizer, as shown in (3). As we also saw, the sentences have different interpretations, (3a), but not (3b), has a [+conviction] reading.

(3) a. Digo [qu’ayúdame] 
    say\textsubscript{1SG} that\textsubscript{3SG}-IND\textsubscript{-meCL} 
    "I say that s/he helps me out"

b. Digo [que me ayuda] 
    say\textsubscript{1SG} that me\textsubscript{CL} help\textsubscript{3SG-IND} 
    "I say that s/ be helps me out"

But not all speakers of Asturian accept (3a). Speakers of MAst differ from speakers of CAst in requiring a preverbal clitic in this kind of context. This is shown in (4).

(4) a. *Digo [qu’ayúdame] 
    say\textsubscript{1SG} that\textsubscript{3SG-IND\textsubscript{-meCL}}

b. Digo [que me ayuda] 
    say\textsubscript{1SG} that me\textsubscript{CL} help\textsubscript{3SG-IND} 
    "I say that s/ be helps me out"

Interestingly, however, when a Topic is present in the left-periphery in the same finite embedded context, namely one selected by a verb of report, speakers of MAst still show the
same judgements as their Conservative counterparts and judge grammatical a postverbal clitic and reject a preverbal one:

(5) Yo dígote [que Luis ayúdame muncho] [*me ayuda] CAst/MAst
    I saySG-youCL that Luis helpSG-meCL much
    "I say to you that Luis helps me a lot"

(6) Pedro diz [que a los guajes, topólos nel chigre] [*los topó] CAst/MAst
    Pedro saySG that to the kids found-themCL in-the bar
    "Pedro says that the kids, he found them at the bar"

Summarizing, Modern Asturian and Conservative Asturian uniformly exhibit postverbal clitics after a Topic in clauses selected by a verb of report. In the absence of a Topic however, Modern Asturian differs from Conservative Asturian in that only a preverbal clitic is considered grammatical.

4.1.2. Crosslinguistic variation (II): Galician and European Portuguese

As we just saw, in MAst, but not in CAst, only the preverbal clitic pattern is found in the finite embedded context in the absence of a Topic in the left-periphery. Speakers of both Galician (Gal) and European Portuguese (EP) report similar judgments, as shown in (7) and (8) respectively.

2 For completeness' sake I should note that one of the speakers of Asturian that I consulted (Fernando Álvarez-Balbuena (p.c.)) reports to me that he accepts both the post- and the preverbal clitic patterns in (5) and (6). I will briefly return to this issue below. See fn. 13 below.
Xulia said that Mon had said it

Pedro says that Paulo had said it

But MAst and Galician and European Portuguese do not behave the same in all contexts.

Unlike speakers of MAst (and CAst), speakers of Galician and European Portuguese require a preverbal clitic pattern after a subject Topic in the finite embedded environment. This is shown in (9) and (10):

3 While Rosario Álvarez (p.c.) rejects the postverbal clitic pattern in (7) shown in brackets, Juan Uriagereka (p.c.) allows it only marginally, which I code in the brackets as */???. Interestingly, Uriagereka (p.c.) reports to me that a postverbal clitic pattern, although marginal, also shows a [+conviction] reading like the one I showed in the previous chapter for speakers of CAst. I return to this discussion in the sections to follow. However, the other speakers of Galician I consulted do not find the postverbal clitic pattern grammatical, so I leave for future research how extended the postverbal pattern is in this finite embedded context in Galician.

4 Ana Maria Martins (p.c.) reports to me the following: “I find such sentences acceptable as well, even if a little marginal like enclisis [i.e., postverbal clitics] in subordinate clauses in general”, and she provides the following examples that she (p.c.) finds grammatical: “Acho que perdeu-se uma boa oportunidade de recuperar o jardim” (“I think that s/he lost a good opportunity to recover the garden”). However, she (p.c.) did not report any difference in meaning between the post- and the preverbal clitic pattern. Postverbal clitics in finite embedded contexts in European Portuguese are reported in Said Ali (1964) and in Martins (forthcoming). I refer the reader to these sources.

5 Rosario Álvarez (p.c.) reports the following: “Valen as dúas, pero se non marcamos moito ese ‘Mon’, coas pausas e a curva, escolleriamos a próclise” [Both options are available, but if we don’t mark “Mon” with a pause and the intonation, proclisis (in our terms, a preverbal clitic) is chosen].

6 While Pilar Barbosa dislikes a postverbal clitic pattern, she (p.c.) tells me that she has heard it in casual speech. Eduardo P. Raposo (p.c.) accepts both post- and preverbal clitics, and indicates that the postverbal pattern is controversial. Furthermore, Ana Maria Martins (p.c.) tells me that she likes both clitic patterns.
Moreover, as (11) and (12) show, the same preverbal pattern is reported by speakers of Galician and European Portuguese with Topics other than subjects: postverbal clitics are either marginal or downright ungrammatical.

(11) Xulia di [que os nenos osi atopou no bar] [?? atopounos] Gal7
   Xulia say3SG that the kids themCL found in-the bar
   “Xulia says that the kids, she found them at the bar”

(12) O Pedro disse [que as crianças asi achou no bar] [??/* achou-as] EP8
   the Pedro say3SG that the kids themCL found in-the bar
   “Pedro says that the kids, he found them at the bar”

To sum up, in Galician and European Portuguese, unlike in CAs but similarly to MAst, clitics must appear preverbally in the finite embedded context if no left-periphery material is found. However, while MAst still patterns with CAs in requiring clitics to appear postverbally after a Topic, in Galician and European Portuguese not even in this context can a clitic appear postverbally; in finite embedded contexts they always must appear preverbally. The different finite embedded contexts and clitic patterns found are summarized in the table below. We can view the variation as a continuum, with CAs allowing more postverbal clitics than MAst, which in turn exhibits more postverbal clitics than its Galician and European Portuguese neighbors.

---

7 The os/nos “us” clitics are contextual allophones of the same clitic pronoun, this not having any bearing on the position of the clitic. See Álvarez et al. (1986) for more allophonic variations of this and other clitics in Galician. Also, and similarly to her observation above (cf. fn. 5 above), Rosario Álvarez (p.c.) reports the following: “Canto máis marquemos prosodicamente “os nenos” máis tendencia á énclise [i.e., a postverbal clitic pattern], canto menos marcado, máis próclise [i.e., a preverbal clitic pattern]” [the more one prosodically marks “os nenos”, the more tendency to use a postverbal clitic pattern; the less marked, the more likely to arise preverbally].

8 Pilar Barbosa (p.c.) reports that the postverbal clitic pattern “is only good with a heavy pause after “as crianças””, Eduardo P. Raposo (p.c.) accepts both, and indicates that the postverbal pattern is controversial, and Ana Maria Martins (p.c.) likes both, and reports much idiolectal variation.
(13) Crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded context in WI\textsuperscript{9}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>que + v-cl</th>
<th>que + cl-v</th>
<th>que + subj + v-cl</th>
<th>que + subj + cl-v</th>
<th>que + Top + v-cl</th>
<th>que + Top + cl-v</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAst</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAst</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gal</td>
<td>*/??/??</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>??/???</td>
<td>??/???</td>
<td>??/??</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>??/*/??</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>??/*/??</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the next section, I argue that the crosslinguistic variation illustrated in the table above can be explained in a principled way if we assume that MAst, Galician and European Portuguese have different complementizer systems.

4.2 The complementizer system in Modern Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese

In 3.4 above, I argued that the availability of postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context in Conservative Asturian (CAst) depends on whether the matrix predicate\textsuperscript{10} selects Force\textsuperscript{o} or Fin\textsuperscript{o}, and that each selection corresponded to a different complementizer, namely que\textsubscript{1} in the case of Force\textsuperscript{o} and que\textsubscript{2} in the case of Fin\textsuperscript{o}. Furthermore, I showed that only que\textsubscript{1} was

---

\textsuperscript{9} “v-cl” stands for a “Verb + clitic” (postverbal) pattern, and “cl-v” for a “Clitic + verb” (preverbal) one. Subj(ect) refers to the preverbal subject and Top to Topic. The ✓ symbol indicates that it is a grammatical option, as opposed to * indicating ungrammaticality and ??/??/*/? showing different marginality levels.

\textsuperscript{10} Recall that the matrix predicates that I discussed were verbs of report, epistemic predicates, verbs of opinion and the preposition/complementizer \textit{porque} “because”. See 3.3 above for discussion.
compatible with a postverbal clitic pattern, which arises in the absence of A’-movement or a negative marker. As I showed, these elements satisfy the edge condition of the Fin° phase-head, as a result of which no T°-to-Fin° movement takes place and the clitic appears exclusively preverbally.

As we also saw, once we go beyond CAst we see that the data reported by speakers of other Western Iberian Romance languages show a wide range of crosslinguistic (and idiolectal) variation. I would like to propose that the crosslinguistic variation found in the finite embedded context in this group of languages can be attributed to variation in their complementizer systems and the gradual appearance in the same embedded clause of a complementizer in Fin° even when there is one in Force°.

4.2.1. The complementizer system in Modern Asturian

In Modern Asturian, like in Conservative Asturian, CP-complements selected by verbs of saying, epistemic predicates, verbs of opinion and those subordinate environments I discussed in 3.3 above may either select Fin° headed by que2, or they may select for Force°, which is headed by que1. In the latter case, when the periphery contains material, everything works as in Conservative Asturian. In particular, Fin° is empty and its edge condition is satisfied by movement (Focus movement through the specifier, raising of the negation head or verb-movement to Fin° as a last resort, an option which results in a postverbal clitic pattern).
As we saw, however, in the absence of left-peripheral activity, Modern Asturian no longer behaves like Conservative Asturian and only allows for preverbal clitics. Given the proposal I have developed, I take this to be an indication that Finº is filled and that there is no longer a need for Tº-to-Finº verb-movement to satisfy the edge condition. I would like to propose that what fills Finº in these contexts is in fact a complementizer. There are two options to capture these facts. One is que2, as in Conservative Asturian. I will discuss this option later. The other option is that Finº is filled by a hybrid complementizer que1/que2; semantically, like que1, the complementizer que1/que2 encodes a [+conviction] reading, but syntactically, like que2, que1/que2 appears in Finº. In particular, I would like to propose that que1/que2 appears in Finº and correlates with a collapse of Forceº to Finº in the absence of peripheral material (cf. Rizzi (2004, ms.)).

---

11 For Rizzi (ms.), Finº collapses to Forceº. However, as I will show next, Modern Asturian provides evidence for the opposite claim, namely of Forceº collapsing to Finº. However, consider the following options. One could analyze Forceº and Finº as independently merged in the structure, with Forceº hosting a que1 and Finº a Ø-complementizer (zero) as in English, see Rizzi (2006 and ms.) for discussion. Alternatively, Forceº could host a que1 and Finº a que2, and the que2 is deleted by a phonological filter that prevents the sequence *que… que… “*that…that…” . Both analyses predict that either the Ø-complementizer or que2 should always appear in Finº in MAst, satisfying the edge condition of this phase head even under the presence of a Topic, which is not borne out as the availability of postverbal clitics in (5) and (6) above shows. Although the analysis I propose seems the least elegant, it captures the fact that recomplementation patterns in Modern Asturian are not attested, only in more “advanced” varieties of Asturian. See fn. 13 below.
The complementizer system in Modern Asturian (II): *que1/que2* in *Fin* in the absence of left-peripheral material or the collapse of *Force*.

In sum, the complementizer system in MAst is similar to that in CAst when left-peripheral material appears in the embedded CP. When no such material is present, however, *Force* collapses to *Fin* in MAst and the complementizer *que1/que2* appears in *Fin*, an option that is not available in CAst. With this in mind I would now like to consider the complementizer system of Galician.

4.2.2. The complementizer system in Galician

As in MAst, there is a reason to believe that in Galician, *Force* also collapses to *Fin* when no material intervenes between the two and the matrix predicates select *Force*. The reason is that Galician, as we noted above, only allows for preverbal clitics in such contexts. 12

---

12 Juan Uriagereka (personal communication) reports to me that he, unlike the other speakers I consulted, also accepts marginally a postverbal clitic in embedded clauses. I take this to indicate that some dialects of Galician are more conservative and Asturian-like than others. See the discussion in 4.3.1 below.
(16) The complementizer system in Galician (I): *que*/*que* in Fin° in the absence of left-peripheral material or the collapse of Force°

\[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{ForceP} \\
\text{Force°} \\
\text{FinP} \\
\text{Fin°} \\
\text{CliticP} \\
\text{...}
\end{array} \quad \Rightarrow \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{FinP/ForceP} \\
\text{Force°} \\
\text{Fin°/Force°} \\
\text{CliticP} \\
\text{que}/\text{que} \\
\text{...}
\end{array} \]

In this respect then, Galician behaves like MAst. What makes most dialects of Galician different from MAst is that when there is material in the left periphery, only preverbal clitics are possible. Given my account, this suggests that in Galician a clause headed by *que* that has overt material in its left periphery, Fin° is already filled and its edge condition satisfied. I would like to propose that Fin° is filled by *que*2. *Que*2 can either be overtly realized, as in (17a), resulting in recomplementation,\(^{13}\) or it can remain unpronounced as in (17b), which arises as a result of the structures shown in (18):

(17) a. di [que a cla que lle dá igual] say\_3SG that to her that her\_CL give\_3SG same
"S/he says that (as for) her, she doesn't care much"

b. di [que a cla Ø lle dá igual] say\_3SG that to her Ø her\_CL give\_3SG same
"S/he says that (as for) her, she doesn't care much"

---

\(^{13}\) For the claim that Galician exhibits recomplementation see Uriagereka (1988, 1995a, 1995b). That neither CAst nor MAst do show recomplementation is confirmed by both speakers of these languages and also by the data I found in the personal corpus and Eslema (2008). With this, I am claiming that the complementizer system of speakers of “advanced” varieties of Asturian like Fernando Álvarez-Balbuena’s is a step ahead from that in MAst, thus predicted to show recomplementation, which he (p.c.) confirms. Also, whether a Ø complementizer is a true complementizer as in English, or a *que*2 deleted at PF by virtue of the presence of a *que*1 higher in the structure is an issue that I will leave for future research.
4.2.3. The complementizer system in European Portuguese

European Portuguese seems to behave similarly to Galician, except that speakers are even more adamant in rejecting postverbal clitics than speakers of Galician. In light of this, I assume that European Portuguese has the same complementizer system as we saw for Galician. When Fin° is selected and que2 heads Fin°, no material appears in the left periphery. When Force° is selected headed by que1, then, when the left periphery is empty, we observe a collapse of Force° to Fin°.

(19) The complementizer system in European Portuguese (I): que1/2 in Fin° in the absence of left-peripheral material or the collapse of Force°
As in Galician, when the left periphery is filled, Fin is filled by an overt or covert instance of que2, as shown in (20a) and (20b).

(20) The complementizer system in European Portuguese (II): que1 + que2/Ø with left-peripheral material

(a) ForceP
    Forceoque1
    Frame/Topic/Focus field
    Finoque2
    CliticP
    ...

(b) ForceP
    Forceoque1
    Frame/Topic/Focus field
    FinØ
    CliticP
    Ø
    ...

Summarizing the proposal, I claim that the complementizer systems of the Western Iberian languages under study represent a continuum. All four languages have two complementizers, que1 and que2. Que1 heads Forceo and que2 heads Fin. The languages behave uniformly when only Fin is projected. Differences arise when Forceo is selected by the matrix predicate. In CAst in such a case Fin is empty and its edge condition needs to be satisfied by movement. In MAst Fin is also empty and its edge condition is satisfied by movement, but only when there is overt material in the left periphery. If not, Forceo and Fin collapse, and Fin projects and hosts a complementizer that I have called que1/que2. In Galician and European Portuguese, when there is no peripheral material, Forceo and Fin collapse as well, as in MAst. But when there is material in the periphery these languages no longer have an empty

14 The prediction of this analysis is that recomplementation should be found in European Portuguese, and this is indeed what we find, as (i) shows:

(i) Acho que1 amanhã que2 vai haver reunião]           EP
    think3SG that tomorrow that go3SG haveINF meeting
    “I think that tomorrow (that) there will be a meeting”    [From Barbosa (2000)]
Fin” whose edge condition must be satisfied by movement. Rather, Fin” in these instances is filled by a covert or overt instance of que2. I take the latter to be the beginning of recomplementation. Thus, I would like to suggest that the crosslinguistic differences we have seen correspond to a continuum that has CAst and European Portuguese on opposite ends, with MAst (and other varieties of Asturian) in the middle of this continuum.

In what follows, I give some concrete derivations showing how the analysis laid out in section 4.2 accounts for the data I presented in section 4.1.

4.3 Crosslinguistic variation in Western Iberian Romance languages: Two sources of variation and consequences for “conviction”

4.3.1. Que1/que2 in Western Iberian Romance languages

In 4.1.1, I showed that in Modern Asturian (MAst), unlike in Conservative Asturian (CAst), a postverbal clitic is ungrammatical in the absence of a Topic in the embedded CP, cf. (4) repeated below:

(21) a. *Digo [qu’ayúdame]
    say1SG that-help3SG-IND-meCL

b. Digo [que me ayuda]
    say1SG that meCL help3SG-IND
    “I say that s/he helps me out”
I claim that this microparametric variation follows from the complementizer system: when no left-peripheral material is found in Modern Asturian *digo* “I say” can either select Fin°, which is headed by *que2* or Force° which collapses to Fin°, and hosts a hybrid complementizer *que1*/*que2*. In both instances, no movement is necessary to satisfy the edge condition of Fin° and we correctly predict that we only find clitics in preverbal position, cf. for example the ungrammaticality of the postverbal clitic pattern in (21a). The two alternatives are shown in the tree structures below:

(22) Digo …
    
    (a) + Force° and [+conviction]          (b) + Fin° and [-conviction]

```
Fin°/Force°
    que1/que2
    Clitic°
    me
    TP
    T° 
    ayuda ...

Fin°/Force°
    que2
    Clitic°
    me
    TP
    T° 
    ayuda ...
```

“I say that s/he helps me out”

Turning now to the semantic properties of the two cases, notice that unlike speakers of Conservative Asturian, who clearly indicate whether the embedded content is [+conviction] or [-conviction] through the clitic placement in (1), the moment *que1*/*que2* enters the complementizer system and occupies Fin° word order no longer reveals if a [+conviction] or [-conviction] interpretation is intended. In other words, we expect that strings like the
following are ambiguous between the two readings, which is indeed what speakers report. Moreover, notice that the same analysis can be extended to the same finite embedded context in Galician and European Portuguese in (23) and (24). _Dixo “she said” and _disse “he says” may select for either Force°, which collapses to Fin° hosting the _que1/que2 complementizer, as in (22a), or for Fin° hosting _que2, as in (22b), predicting the uniform preverbal clitic pattern we find in these strings.

(23) Xulia dixo [que o dixera Mon] [*/?? dixérao] Gal
    Xulia said3SG that itCL had-said3SG-IND Mon
    “Xulia said that Mon had said it”

(24) O Pedro disse [que o dissera o Paulo] [*/?? disséra-o] EP
    the Pedro say3SG that itCL had-said3SG-IND the Paulo
    “Pedro says that Paulo had said it”

I would also like to note at this point that the postverbal clitic pattern may be still adequate for speakers of Galician and European Portuguese located on the “Conservative” side of the spectrum, predicting similarities with Conservative Asturian. As reported to me by Uriagereka (p.c.), the postverbal pattern in Galician is marginal but it shows a [+conviction] interpretation of the embedded clause. Under my analysis, this would indicate that for these speakers the collapse of Force° to Fin°, where Fin° is headed by _que1/que2 is not an option yet and that their complementizer system is like that of CAst. I assume that the same can be extended to EP and the variation speakers of this language report.
4.3.2. The content of Fin° in Western Iberian Romance languages and
“conviction” interpretation

Let me now turn to the next source of crosslinguistic variation, which separates both
Conservative and Modern Asturian from the other Western Iberian Romance languages
under study. This variation concerns the status of Fin° in a clause headed by que1 in Force°
in those instances where material appears in the left periphery.

I hypothesized that in such an instance, MAst has an empty Fin°; Fin° in Galician might be
empty (for very conservative speakers) or host an overt or covert instance of que2, and in
European Portuguese, too, it hosts either a phonologically realized or silent que2. If so, we
predict that under the presence of a Topic in the embedded clause, the empty Fin° in MAst
forces T°-to-Fin° movement to satisfy the edge condition of this phase head. This explains
the postverbal clitic pattern we find in (25).

(25) Yo dígote [que Luis ayúdame muncho] [*me ayuda] MAst
       I saySG-youCL that Luis helpSG-meCL much
       “I say to you that Luis helps me a lot”

In Galician on the other hand, T°-to-Fin° is not triggered as in MAst because Fin° already
hosts a que2/Ø complementizer, and this complementizer licenses the edge condition of
Fin°. This predicts the preverbal clitic pattern we can see in (26).

(26) Xulia dixo [que Mon o dixera] [??? dixerao] Gal
       Xulia saidSG that Mon itCL had-saidSG-IND
       “Xulia said that Mon had said it”
The marginal availability of postverbal clitics in (26) can be considered a residue of a previous stage of the language, which I hypothesize was the same as that in MAst. Finally, the lesser availability of postverbal clitics in European Portuguese with respect to MAst and Galician also follows from the analysis. In this language, the availability of a complementizer in Finº, be it *que2 or the Ø complementizer, licenses this phase head and we predict no postverbal clitics. (27) bears out this prediction.

(27) O Pedro disso [que o Paulo o dissera] the Pedro said3SG that the Paulo itCL had-said3SG-IND [???/* dissera-o] "Pedro said that Paulo had said it"

The different judgements reported also follow. European Portuguese is a step ahead in the development of a complementizer in Finº than Galician, and different speakers may exhibit different traits of previous stages in this language development I propose. Notice that all of the following examples only allow for the [+conviction] interpretation, which I attribute to the presence of *que1. Consider the derivations for the MAst example in (25) and the Galician one in (26) shown in (28a) and (28b), respectively.

---

15 The pause after the Topics that the speakers I consulted report could be taken as further evidence for the phase status of Finº in WI Romance languages. I leave this issue for future research.
The fact that all these examples only allow for a [+conviction] interpretation suggests that it is really the presence of *que1* that is responsible for this interpretation in these cases, and
more specifically that the presence of que2 in Galician and European Portuguese does not interfere with it. This suggests a reformulation of our earlier generalization regarding the semantic properties of que1 and que2. Rather than saying that que1 is responsible for a [+conviction] reading and que2 is responsible for a [-conviction] reading, I would like to suggest that [+conviction] reading arises in the presence of que1. When que1 is absent, the default is a [-conviction] reading. Finally, the hybrid complementizer que1/que2, having semantic properties of que1 and syntactic properties of que2, behaves in relevant respects like que1. Further evidence for this claim comes from the Galician example in (29), reported to me by Rosario Álvarez.16

(29) Un dos prexuízos que aínda pervive é que o galego só serve para falar das cousas dos galegos…

“One of the prejudices that still survives to this day is that the Galician language is only good to talk about things related to the Galician people…

[...porque o resto do mundo queda grande]  
because the rest of the world look3SG-IO_CL big  
... because the rest of the world is way too big for it (the Galician language)”

Rosario Álvarez (p.c.) tells me that both the postverbal pattern in (29), but also – and most importantly for this discussion – the preverbal one in (30) are grammatical.

(30) [...porque o resto do mundo lle queda grande]  
because the rest of the world IO_CL look3SG big  
... because the rest of the world is way too big for it (the Galician language)”

---

16 Many thanks to Rosario Álvarez for reporting this example to me via email, taken from an article in the Suplemento Cultural of the journal La Voz de Galicia under the title “Festín de libros para as letras galegas. Os críticos do Culturas fan as súas propostas literarias para celebrar o 17 de maio”, written by Xesús Fraga and published on May 17th 2008.
She observes (p.c.) that both a post- and a preverbal clitic pattern may appear, and most importantly, that pragmatic [+conviction] is ensured.¹⁷ The preverbal subject O resto do mundo “the rest of the world” is a Topic¹⁸ and it is licensed in the left-periphery. Under my assumptions, porque “because” selects Forceº and que1 in this case, which explains the [+conviction] interpretation. In turn, the availability of a post- and a preverbal clitic pattern in the embedded clause can also be explained. I claim that Galician is in transition between the complementizer system in MAst and that in European Portuguese, predicting two scenarios. Either Finº hosts a que2/Ø complementizer that satisfies its proposed edge condition, and a preverbal clitic pattern obtains, or Finº is empty, and Tº-to-Finº is triggered to satisfy the edge condition of Finº, hence deriving the postverbal clitic pattern.

Turning now to Topics other than subjects, the same analysis that I gave above can be extended to embedded contexts selected by a verb of report that have a different type of Topic, as those shown below:

(31) Pedro diz [que a los guajes, topólos, nel chigre] [los topó] MAst
Pedro say3SG that to the kids found-themcl in-the bar
“Pedro says that the kids, he found them at the bar”

¹⁷ As Rosario Álvarez (p.c.) correctly observes, the conviction of the embedded sentences selected by porque is not attributed to the speaker. In fact, the speaker has just the opposite opinion. This could be taken as an argument against the analysis I proposed for the “conviction” holder in clauses introduced by porque “because” in chapter 3, (32). However, as she also notes, the speaker is quoting what the people that have the prejudice think. Quotes might interfere with assigning the [+conviction] to the speaker, but I must leave this issue for future research. In any case, the relevant point for the purposes of this discussion is that both (29) and (30) are unambiguously interpreted as [+conviction].

¹⁸ Notice that if preverbal subjects were somewhere in the TP-domain, and not in the left-periphery, pragmatic ambiguity (that is, a [+] and a [-conviction] reading) should be observed, akin to (34) in Modern Asturian. But the interpretation of the embedded clause is clearly [+conviction], so it must be the case that the preverbal subject is somewhere in the left-periphery (be it a Hanging Topic, a Topic or a Focus). See 4.4.2 for further discussion and an extension of these ideas to the finite embedded context in Spanish.
The analysis proceeds as for the subject cases above. Furthermore, as above, the analysis I propose predicts that these sentences must be [+conviction], since the left-peripheral elements clearly indicate that the complementizer is que. The speakers I consulted report that this is indeed the case.¹⁹

4.3.3. Preverbal clitics in the finite embedded context in Modern Asturian and ambiguity of pragmatic “conviction”

Recall that speakers of Modern Asturian, unlike those of Conservative Asturian, and similarly to those of Galician and European Portuguese, dislike postverbal clitics in finite embedded contexts like the one in (3) above, and only exhibit a preverbal clitic pattern as in (4), repeated below for convenience.

(34) a. *Digo [qu’ayúdame]  
   saySG that-helpIND-CL

b. Digo [que me ayuda]  
   saySG that CL helpIND
   “I say that s/he helps me out”

¹⁹ I would like to thank Dr. Ricardo Bermúdez-Otero (from Manchester University), Manuel Simões Moreira, Sonia Colina and José Quintas Calviño for confirming the inadequacy of the fragment mais ele não tem certeza “but he is not sure” in European Portuguese and mais ela non esta certa “but she is not sure” in Galician. Needless to say, usual disclaimers apply.
Notice that two are the possible derivations for the strings above. The matrix predicate *digo* “I say” may either select for Forceº or Finº. Given the two possible derivations I suggested in (22), the prediction of this analysis is that (34b) should be ambiguous. Under the first derivation, it should have a [+conviction] interpretation by virtue of the matrix predicate selecting Forceº collapsing to Finº and hosting que1/que2. Under the second derivation, it should have [-conviction] interpretation, given the absence of que1 in this derivation. (34b) is indeed reported to ambiguous. Moreover, speakers of Galician and European Portuguese report that they find the same ambiguity.

**4.3.4. Summary and conclusions**

In this section, I have shown that the analysis of the complementizer system in for Galician and European Portuguese I proposed in 4.2 predicts the ungrammaticality of postverbal clitics in these languages. Merge of the que2 / Ø-complementizer in Finº in Galician and European Portuguese satisfies this phase-head edge condition. As a result, Tº-to-Finº does not take place and we do not find clitics in postverbal position. Also, the observation that postverbal clitics in MAst are less available in the finite embedded context than in CAst was attributed to a lack of que2 in MAst when there is que1 and to the collapse of Forceº to Finº in those instances where the periphery is empty. Regarding the semantic interpretation, I argued that a [+conviction] reading correlates with the presence of que1 (including que1/que2), and that a [-conviction] reading correlates with the absence of que1 (or que1/que2).
In the next section I discuss further evidence and predictions of the analysis I propose. One such prediction is the availability of postverbal clitics in earlier periods of European Portuguese, Galician and also Medieval Spanish. Also, I present some of the findings that speakers of different varieties of Spanish have reported to me, which I claim to also follow from the analysis I claim.

4.4 Further evidence: Historical data and modern Spanish

4.4.1. Historical data from earlier stages of European Portuguese and Old Spanish

Modern European Portuguese, Galician and MAst, as I showed above, unlike CAst, do not exhibit a postverbal clitic pattern in the absence of left-peripheral material. However, historical data indicate that postverbal clitics as those in (1) from what I called Conservative Asturian are also attested in early stages of European Portuguese. Consider the following examples below:20

(35) Historical data: European Portuguese

a. que depois de morto já diz [que punha-se a mijar] 16th c.
   that after of dead already say$_{3SG}$ that put$_{3SG}$+rfl$_{CL}$ to pee$_{INF}$
   “…that after his dead be already says that he started peeing” [From Gil Vicente]

---

20 I would like to thank Dr Michael Ferreira for all the time he devoted to help me find these and the Old Spanish examples discussed below in the different online corpora available.
Notice the elements that select the embedded clause: a verb of report in (35a), an explicative que “that” 21 in (35b), a verb of report/epistemic in (35c), an explicative que “that” and the epistemic predicate sente “she feels” in (35d) and (35e) respectively. I claimed in 3.3 that these predicates in Conservative Asturian can select Forceº que1 or Finº que2, correlating with [+conviction] and [-conviction] respectively. I would like to suggest that the analysis that I proposed for CAst also extends to earlier stages of Portuguese. The availability of the postverbal clitic pattern in the absence of left-peripheral material suggests that selection of Forceº headed by que1 and an empty Finº must have been available, and that Tº-to-Finº verb-movement was triggered as last resort, which explains the postverbal clitic pattern we observe. The historical data provides evidence for the continuum I am proposing.

21 I assume this explicative que “that” is parallel to the explicative porque “because” I discussed in 3.6.1 above in Conservative Asturian, which I showed to always encode pragmatic [+conviction] in the embedded-CP it selects. As I argued, it always selects Forceº and explains why in the absence of Aº-movement or a closer head to Finº verb-movement is triggered and consequently, a postverbal clitic pattern is found.
Furthermore, we also predict that those sentences in (35) must have been interpreted with a [+conviction] reading.

Similarly, consider the following data from Old Spanish. It, too, exhibits a postverbal clitic pattern in the embedded clause, in the one selected by *ca* “because” in (36a), and by a *que* “that” in (36b), which again are the same finite embedded contexts as those where we find postverbal clitics in CAst.

(36) **Historical data: Old Spanish**

a. [Ca entiendese] que la pena que dan al peccador... 13th c.
   because understand\(_{\text{3SG}}\)\(_{\text{rfl}}\) that the penalty that give\(_{\text{3PL}}\) to-the sinner
   “Because it is understood that the penalty imposed to the sinner…” [General Estoria]

b. … [que dizenle las Yslas Dotadas] 14th c.
   that call\(_{\text{3PL}}\)\(_{\text{it}}\) the Islands gifted
   “… which they call the Gifted Islands” [From Libro del Caballero Zifar]

   [Data obtained through Corpus del español (2009)]

I take these data to show that the postverbal clitic patterns attested in Conservative Asturian must have been available not only in earlier stages of European Portuguese but also in earlier stages of Spanish. Moreover, the decay of the postverbal clitic pattern (i.e., enclisis) has already been reported to occur first in the finite embedded context in languages that exhibit post- and preverbal clitic alternations in the matrix context (see Wanner (1987) and Nieuwenhuijsen (1995, 1998, 2002) for discussion). So, the crosslinguistic variation that is

\footnote{22 I assume that *ca* “because” is the explicative *porque* I discussed in 3.6.1 above.}

\footnote{23 I am very thankful to Ramón D’Andrés for bringing up Nieuwenhuijsen’s work to my attention.}
exhibited in the finite embedded context in Western Iberian Romance languages also fits in
the diachronic paradigm, and this is predicted by the analysis I propose.

4.4.2. The finite embedded context in Modern Spanish

Finally, I would also like to briefly consider finite embedded clauses in modern Spanish.

Although postverbal clitics are no longer available in Spanish, the analysis I propose for the
finite embedded context has two predictions for Modern Spanish. First, it predicts that those
predicates that I discussed in 3.4 above may also select for Forceº or Finº in Spanish, and
that in the absence of an element in the left-periphery of the CP-complement, a
[±conviction] ambiguity should be observed. This is what we find. In (37a) we have a verb
of report dice “says” that selects a finite CP, and the speakers I consulted report to me that
the embedded clause may be followed by pero no está seguro “but he is not sure” as in (37b).
However, they also report that there is one interpretation in which this fragment sounds
pragmatically odd, as shown in (37c). On my analysis, the interpretation in which (37b) is
fine corresponds to selection of Finº by dice “says” and the embedded CP is interpreted as
encoding pragmatic [-conviction], while the interpretation in which (37c) is marked
corresponds to selection of Forceº, and the embedded CP is interpreted with pragmatic
[+conviction].

(37) a. Treceño dice [que vio a Marcos en la fiesta…] SP
Treceño says3SG that saw3SG to Marcos in the party
“Treceño says that he saw Marcos at the party…”
b. …[pero (Treceño) no está seguro si lo vio o no]  
but Treceño not is sure whether him$_{CL}$ saw$_{3SG}$ or not  
“… but he (Treceño) is not sure whether he saw him or not”

c. …[#pero (Treceño) no está seguro si lo vio o no]  
but Treceño not is sure whether him$_{CL}$ saw$_{3SG}$ or not  
“… #but he (Treceño) is not sure whether he saw him or not”

Second, my analysis predicts that in the presence of a Topic or a Focus in the left-periphery of the embedded CP should not be ambiguous, but only have a [+conviction] interpretation. This is so because the left peripheral material makes clear that the que we are dealing with here is an instance of que$^{1}$. And this is indeed what I found. $^{24}$ Consider (38) and (39), where the matrix predicate is a verb of report, and the embedded CP has a Left-Dislocated Topic a Marcos “to Marcos” in (38), $^{25}$ and a Focus A MARCOS “TO MARCOS” in (39). All the speakers I consulted agree that (40) cannot follow either and that it is pragmatically inadequate.

(38) Treceño dice [que a Marcos, lo$_{1}$ vio en la fiesta…]  
Treceño says$_{3SG}$ that to Marcos him$_{CL}$ saw in the party  
“Treceño says that Marcos, he saw him at the party…”

$^{24}$ The speakers I consulted were from Asturias, Torrevieja, Madrid, Chile and Venezuela. I am very thankful to Héctor Campos, Elena Herburger, Adolfo Ausín, Isabel Ronda, Marcos Pañeda and Jesús Treceño for serving as my “Guinea Pigs”. Special thanks to Marcos Pañeda, who asked me (p.c.) when consulted about those sentences “¿Estás jugando con mi cabeza?” [“Are you playing with my head?”], thus confirming that the sentences in (38) and (39) sound pragmatically odd if followed by (40). Needless to say, usual disclaimers apply.  
$^{25}$ I take the grammaticality of extraction from a wh-island of a Marcos “to Marcos” shown in (i) and the obligatory clitic-doubling tests in (ii) as evidence for this analysis, and for the contrast between (38) and (39).

(i) A Marcos, no sabemos quién lo$_{1}$ vio  
to Marcos not know$_{1PL}$ who him$_{CL}$ saw$_{3SG}$  
“Marcos, we don’t know who saw him”

(ii) A Marcos, *(lo) vio en la fiesta  
to Marcos *him$_{CL}$ saw$_{3SG}$ in the party  
“Marcos, s/he saw him at the party”
Treceño says that MARCOS (, and not José) did he see at the party…"

…but Treceño not is sure whether himCL saw3SG or not

“… #but he (Treceño) is not sure whether he saw him or not”

Interestingly, I have tested with a non-quantified preverbal subject in the embedded CP, as in (41), and I found much variation. Some speakers dislike the sequence pero (Antonio) no está seguro “but Antonio is not sure” in (42) following the sentence in (41), while others do not. This bears directly on the issue of the position of the preverbal subject in Spanish. Notice, what my analysis predicts is that if the preverbal subject is a Topic in the left-periphery, the sequence in (42) should be pragmatically marked, while if the preverbal subject is somewhere in the TP-domain, the embedded CP should be ambiguous, and the fragment would be fine with a [-conviction] interpretation, and pragmatically marked under a [+conviction] reading.

“Antonio says that Jorge saw him at the party…”

but Antonio not is sure of whether saw3SG to Jorge in the party or not

“… but be (Antonio) is not sure whether he saw Jorge at the party or not”

Finally, we may wonder if in the same vein that que2 in Fin” may be phonologically silent (see the analysis of Galician and European Portuguese) it is also possible to find cases where que1 in Force” is phonologically silent. In light of this question, consider the following data
reported to me by Héctor Campos (p.c.) from his variety of Spanish, which I call Ch(ilean) SP(ish).  

(43) Dijo [a Pedro que lo quería mucho] ChSP
    said\textsubscript{3SG} to Pedro that him\textsubscript{cl} loved\textsubscript{3SG} much
   
   “He said Pedro, that he loved him much”

(44) Cree [a Pedro que lo vio en el cine] believe\textsubscript{3SG} to Pedro that him\textsubscript{cl} saw\textsubscript{3SG} in the cinema
   
   “He believes Pedro, that he saw him at the cinema”

(45) Fue al doctor [¿porque a José que le dolía la cabeza] went\textsubscript{3SG} to-the doctor because to José that him\textsubscript{cl} hurt\textsubscript{3SG} the head
   
   “He went to the doctor, because José (that) his head hurt him much”

In (43) and (44), the embedded clauses are selected by a verb of report dijo “he said” and an epistemic one cree “he believes”, which may select for Force\textsuperscript{o} or Fin\textsuperscript{o}. Also, notice that a Pedro is a Topic – cf. the resumptive lo “him”, which under the current analysis, these sentences are predicted to select Force\textsuperscript{o} and be interpreted with pragmatic [+conviction]. Héctor Campos (p.c.) reports that the sequence pero no está seguro “but he is not sure” are not pragmatically adequate. This indicates that we are dealing with a [+conviction] interpretation. However, notice that the complementizer shown above cannot be in Force\textsuperscript{o}, as it follows the Topic. I argue that those cases indicate that some varieties might have a que\textsubscript{1} / Ø-complementizer in Force\textsuperscript{o} and pronounce the que\textsubscript{2} in Fin\textsuperscript{o} - that is, the opposite of what I claimed to be found in European Portuguese – cf. (18) and (20). Turning now to (45), an embedded clause selected by the preposition / complementizer porque “because”, the prediction is again that the presence of a Topic in the left-periphery should be an indication

\[26\] Special thanks must go to him for the data reported and also for the discussion of the predictions.
that Force° and a que1 like complementizer was selected and that we should find a
[+conviction] reading. This seems to be the case, since the sequence pero no estoy seguro “but I
am not sure”27 is pragmatically infelicitous. Also, notice the location of the que in (45), which
again appears after the Topic. I contend that (45) exhibits again an instance of the lower
complementizer in Fin°, and that que1 in Force° is deleted – i.e., a Ø-complementizer, as
predicted by the system developed in this chapter to account for crosslinguistic variation.

4.5 Overall conclusions and future research

In this dissertation, I have examined the pre- and postverbal clitic alternations we observe in
Galician and European Portuguese, adding the Asturian language to the so-called Western
Iberian Romance (WI) group. I have showed that this language exhibits the same clitic
alternations we find in the other members of WI in the matrix context. However, and
differently from Galician and European Portuguese, pre- and also postverbal clitics can be
found in the finite embedded context in a variety of Asturian that I have called
“Conservative Asturian” (CAst). The pre- and essentially, the postverbal clitic patterns
attested in CAst are neither predicted nor accounted for under previous analyses and
accounts of clitic placement alternations in WI.

In chapter 2, I have also provided a cartographic mapping of the left-periphery for WI,
following the one proposed in Benincà and Poletto (2004) for Italian. I have shown that

27 Recall that the “conviction” holder for causal clauses is not the matrix subject but the speaker. See 3.3 above
for discussion.
Benincà and Poletto’s decomposition of the left-periphery in term fields can be also extended to WI. Also in chapter 2, and following current syntactic theory (cf. Chomsky (2000, 2001, 2008)), I have argued that Finiteness$^o$ (Fin$^o$) (cf. Rizzi (1997, 2004)) in the left-periphery is a phase head with what I call an edge condition in Western Iberian. This edge condition requires that an element must move to Fin$^o$, a condition that can be satisfied either by an element undergoing A’-movement to the left-periphery of the clause, or by the closest available head in the structure. I have shown that the different ways in which this edge condition is satisfied can easily explain the pre- and postverbal clitic alternations we find in matrix contexts in WI.

In chapter 3, I presented and discussed further evidence for this analysis. I have shown that this analysis predicts the availability of postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context. I have illustrated that this pattern is indeed attested, and I have provided new data from a variety of Asturian that I have called “Conservative Asturian” CAst. Furthermore, I have also shown that the post- and preverbal clitic alternations in embedded CPs that have no left-peripheral material are subject to interpretation differences. I defined these interpretations in terms of pragmatic “conviction”, and I have argued that the pre- and postverbal clitic patterns we find in these finite embedded contexts follow from the selection properties of the matrix predicate, and also from the complementizer system in CAst. I have contended that CAst has two complementizers namely, que1 and que2 which head Force$^o$ and Fin$^o$ respectively, and that the position of these complementizers in the clausal architecture
can also explain the different conviction interpretations we find in the finite embedded context in CAst. In short, a que1 in Forceº gives rise to what I called [+conviction] interpretation, an interpretation that marks the content of the embedded clause as part of the belief state of the matrix predicate’s subject or the speaker. que2 in Finº on the other hand encodes pragmatic [-conviction]. Moreover, I have shown that the position occupied by these different complementizers in the left-periphery also explain the clitic alternations we find in CAst. que1 in Forceº is compatible with postverbal clitics, which arise in the absence of A’-movement or a closer head to Finº than Tº, triggering verb movement to satisfy the proposed edge condition of this phase head and explaining the postverbal clitic pattern we observe. On the other hand, que2 only exhibits a preverbal clitic pattern, and this also follows from the edge condition of Finº licensed by merge of que2.

In chapter 4, I extended this analysis to account for crosslinguistic variation. Speakers of other varieties of Asturian Galician and European Portuguese consider postverbal clitics in the finite embedded marginal or downright ungrammatical, and much idiolectal variation is reported. I have argued that the crosslinguistic differences we find are also predicted by my analysis. I have claimed that crosslinguistic variation can be reduced to differences in the complementizer system in these languages. I proposed that Forceº collapses to Finº in the absence of left-peripheral material in the embedded clause, in which case Finº hosts a hybrid complementizer that I have called a que1/que2 complementizer. This analysis accounts for microparametric variation between Conservative and Modern Asturian (MAst), and I argued
that this process can also be extended to Galician and European Portuguese. I have also tackled a second source of crosslinguistic variation that distinguishes CAst and MAst from the other Western Iberian varieties. A Topic in the left-periphery of the clause exhibits a postverbal clitic pattern in MAst, but not in Galician and European Portuguese. I have argued that the complementizer system is also responsible for this variation. In MAst, selection of Forceº que1 and the presence of left-peripheral material indicates that Finº does not host a complementizer in these cases, and explains the postverbal clitic pattern we find, triggered by verb-movement Tº-to-Finº in the absence of A’-movement or a closer head in the structure akin to matrix clauses. On the other hand, selection of Force que1 in Galician and European Portuguese always coexists with another complementizer in Finº, which may be pronounced as a recomplementation pattern or not. I have claimed that the presence of this complementizer in Finº explains the unavailability of postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context in Galician and European Portuguese. Furthermore, I hypothesized that the different WI languages show a clear continuum of a process of language change, with CAst and European Portuguese standing at opposite sides, and MAst and Galician being somewhere in the middle. Evidence for this claim was taken from historical data from Old Portuguese and Old Spanish. Finally, I briefly discussed the complementizer system in Spanish and its modern varieties, showing that [+conviction] in the finite embedded context may obtain provided there is an element in the left-periphery in the selected subordinate clause.
For future research, clitic placement alternations as those illustrated in this dissertation for matrix and finite embedded contexts can also be found in non-finite environments in WI, namely with infinitivals and gerunds. Whether these clitic alternations can also be uniformly explained under the analysis I propose in terms of an edge condition of the Finitenessº phase head is worth exploring for future research. Furthermore, the attested crosslinguistic differences regarding clitic placement in these environments in different Romance languages and the proposed role of Finitenessº opens another line for further investigation.

In a similar vein, the availability of postverbal clitics with imperative forms in Romance might also be related to the status of Finitenessº in those contexts. Furthermore, why postverbal clitics are confined to imperatives and non-finite forms might exhibit residual traces of those alternations I illustrated from modern Western Iberian Romance languages in this dissertation. These are some of the different lines that I leave open for future research.
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