

Interface conditions and the syntax and pragmatics of enclisis/proclisis in Asturian
Francisco J. Fernández Rubiera
University of Central Florida

Problem: The study of clitic placement alternations in Western Iberian Romance languages (that is, in European Portuguese, Galician and Asturian) has generally concentrated on matrix environments like those in (1) and (2).

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(1) Téoles tayaes [*Les teo]
 have_{1SG} cut
 <i>“I have them (my hands) cut”</i></p> | <p>(2) Cómo t’atreves? [*atréveste]
 how reflexive_{CL}-dare_{2SG}
 <i>“How dare you?”</i></p> |
|---|---|

Traditionally, these alternations have been analyzed by capitalizing on the enclitic phonological status of clitics in this group of languages; that is, by arguing that clitics require a phonological host to their left (see for instance, Barbosa 1995 for European Portuguese and Campos 1989 for Galician). The postverbal clitic pattern in (1) is derived as last-resort verb-movement in order to provide a phonological host for the enclitic. In turn, the *wh*-element in (2) acts as a host for the enclitic and explains the preverbal clitic pattern observed. The goal of this talk is to draw attention to the behavior of clitic placement alternations in finite embedded contexts in Asturian. As (3)-(4) show, in Asturian, not only a preverbal, but also a postverbal clitic pattern can be found, a pattern that speakers of the other Western Iberian Romance languages reject as ungrammatical.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>(3) a. Digo qu’ayúdame
 say_{1SG} that-help_{3SG-meCL}
 b. Digo que me ayuda
 say_{1SG} that me_{CL} help_{3SG}
 <i>“I say that s/he helps me out”</i></p> | <p>(4) a. Isabel marchó de la fiesta porque mandó-ylo l’hermanu
 Isabel left_{3SG} of the party because told_{3SG-herCL-itCL} the-brother
 b. Isabel marchó de la fiesta porque-y lo mandó l’hermanu
 Isabel left_{3SG} of the party because-her_{CL-itCL} told_{3SG} the-brother
 <i>“Isabel left the party because her brother told her to”</i></p> |
|---|---|

If clitics in Western Iberian are enclitic elements and require a phonological host to their left, the *que* “that” and *porque* “because” complementizers can host the enclitic explaining the preverbal clitic pattern we find in (3b) and (4b). However, this analysis leaves the postverbal patterns in (3a) and (4a) unexplained, as last-resort verb-movement should be unnecessary under the presence of a complementizer – see (3b) and (4b).

Analysis: Assuming a left-periphery approach to CP as that in (5) (Rizzi 1997 and subs.), I argue that Finiteness^o (Fin^o) constitutes the CP-phase (cf. Chomsky 2008), and that this phase-head has an edge-condition in Western Iberian.

- (5) [_{ForceP} Force^o [_{TopicP} Topic^o [_{FocusP} Focus^o [_{FinitenessP} Finiteness^o [_{TP} T^o ...]]]]]

Following the analysis proposed in Fernández-Rubiera (2009), I contend that the proposed edge-condition of Fin^o triggers and ensures the displacement of an element, and that this edge-condition of Fin^o explains the different clitic patterns we find in matrix environments as follows. The postverbal clitic pattern in (1) arises as a result of T^o-to-Fin^o movement in the absence of A²-movement or a closer head to Fin^o. On the other hand, A²-movement of the *wh*-element *cómo* “how” through Fin^o on its way to FocusP licenses this edge-condition and explains the preverbal clitic pattern we find in cases as that in (2). In turn, I claim that the analysis proposed can easily account for the different clitic patterns we find in finite embedded contexts as those in (3)-(4). Following Demonte and Fernández Soriano’s (2009) analysis of the complementizer system in Spanish, I extend it to Asturian and claim that this language too exhibits two different *que* “that” complementizers mapped in two different heads in the left-periphery, namely *que1* “that1” mapped in Force^o and *que2* “that2” in Fin^o. With this, I contend that *digo* “I say” and *porque* “because” may select for Force^o or Fin^o in Asturian, and each selection explains the different clitic patterns we find as follows. If Force^o mapped as *que1* “that1” is selected, the proposed edge-condition of Fin^o triggers T^o-to-Fin^o movement in the absence of A²-movement or a closer head, thus accounting for the postverbal clitic pattern we find in (3a) and (4a). Selection of Fin^o on the other hand, is mapped as a *que2* “that2” complementizer, and merger of *que2* in Fin^o licenses the edge-condition of this phase-head and explains the preverbal clitic pattern in (3b) and (4b).

Further predictions and evidence: Clitic placement alternations as those in (3) and (4) are also reported to differ in interpretation – see Viejo 2008, Fernandez-Rubiera 2009. Briefly put, speakers report that the postverbal clitic pattern in (3a) and (4a) gives rise to 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, what I call a [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation. Evidence for this interpretation is given in (6), which shows that a fragment as that in brackets canceling this [+conviction] is pragmatically odd. The preverbal clitic pattern in (3b) and (4b) on the other hand, is interpreted as [-conviction], and thus the fragment in brackets in (7) is not perceived as pragmatically odd – cf. (6).

(6) Digo qu’ayúdame [#pero nun toi seguru]
 say_{1SG} that-help_{3SG}-me_{CL} but not am sure
 “I say that s/he helps me, but I am not sure (that s/he does help me)”

(7) Digo que me ayuda [pero nun toi seguru]
 say_{1SG} that me_{CL} help_{3SG} but not am sure
 “I say that s/he helps me, but I am not sure (that s/he does help me)”

While these interpretation differences are unexpected assuming a phonological approach to clitic placement alternations (cf. Barbosa, etc.), I argue that they can be naturally explained under the analysis I propose. Thus, I argue that selection of Force° correlates with a [+conviction] interpretation – cf. (6), while selection of Fin° with a [-conviction] interpretation (see (7)). As noted, the different clitic patterns observed can also be explained: selection of Force° and *que1* “that1” and the proposed edge-condition explains the postverbal clitic pattern, while selection of Fin° and *que2* satisfies Fin°’s edge-condition and explains the preverbal clitic pattern. Further evidence for the analysis I propose comes from (8). The wh-word *ónde* “where” can only be interpreted with a matrix reading (i.e., where it was that Xulia said it), and the embedded clause is reported to have a [+conviction] interpretation. Under my analysis, (8) is analyzed as follows: *dixo* selects Force° mapped as *que1* “that1”, which explains the [+conviction] interpretation, and the postverbal clitic pattern arises as a result of T°-to-Fin° triggered by Fin°’s edge-condition in the absence of A’-movement or a closer head.

(8) Ónde dixo Xulia que comprólo?
 where said_{3SG} Xulia that bought_{3SG}-it_{CL}
 “Where did Xulia say that she bought it?”

In turn, I will show how the exclusive proclitic pattern that speakers of Galician and European Portuguese report for finite embedded clauses exhibiting enclisis (i.e., the ungrammaticality that the examples in (3a), (4a) and (8) gives rise to) can naturally be accounted for with the same analysis. I hypothesize that this microparametric variation may be attributed to differences in the complementizer system in this group of languages. I contend that Galician and European Portuguese, differently from Asturian, exhibit a complementizer in Fin° even when Force° is selected by the matrix predicate. This analysis explains uniformly why (a) enclisis is barred in Galician and European Portuguese, as the presence of a complementizer (overt or covert) in Fin° will block T°-to-Fin° and consequently enclisis, and (b) a [+conviction] interpretation of the content in the embedded clause is also ensured in Galician and Portuguese regardless of the unavailability of enclisis, as it will ultimately depend on whether Force° is selected and on the complementizer system found in these languages.

References: Barbosa, P. 1995. Null Subjects, Department of Linguistics, MIT: PhD dissertation || Campos, H. 1989. Clitic Position in Modern Gallegan, *Lingua* 77, 13-36 || Chomsky, N. 2008. On Phases. In *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory: Essays in Honor of Jean-Roger Vergnaud*, eds. R. Freindin, C. P. Otero and M. L. Zubizarreta, 133-167. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press || Demonte, V., and Fernández Soriano, O. 2009. Force and Finiteness in the Spanish Complementizer System, *Probus* 21, 1, 23-49 || Fernández-Rubiera, F. J. 2009. Clitic at the Edge: Clitic placement in Western Iberian Romance languages, Georgetown University: PhD dissertation || Rizzi, L. 1997. The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery. In *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, ed. Liliane Haegeman, 281-337. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers || Viejo Fernández, X. 2008. *Pensar asturiano. Ensayos programáticos de sintaxis asturiana*. Uviéu: Ed. Trabe