

Ditropic cliticization, object shift, and phases: post-verbal subject positions in Galician

Brian M. Gravely, Jr.
University of Georgia

In this investigation, I follow the groundwork laid by Uriagereka (1996) regarding determiner cliticization in Galician. 3rd person accusative clitics and definite determiners in Galician share not one but two paradigms, commonly referred to as ‘first forms’ (*o, os, a, as*) and ‘second forms’ (*lo, los, la, las*). The second forms are suppletive, appearing obligatorily on a verbal host whose inflectional class ends in *-s* or *-r* (Freixeiro 2006) (1). In the phenomenon presented in this investigation, determiners in Galician take the second form and cliticize to a host that precedes the DP they head, provided the host be of a corresponding inflectional class (2). I claim these elements to be a special case of what are often called ditropic clitics, which are clitics that are attracted one way structurally and a different way phonologically. Galician determiners are a special case of ditropic clitics due to the fact that they only cliticize to certain elements (*pace* claims in Cysouw (2005) and Noyer & Embick (1999) regarding ditropic clitics), what Uriagereka called ‘structural governors’. I take structural governors to be c-commanding heads with which the determiner shares ϕ -features and/or assigns its DP Case. This rules out purely phonological accounts (e.g. Otero 1996) and ‘left-leaning’ accounts (e.g. Noyer & Embick 1999), as shown by the impossibility of cliticization to a conjunction (3), an adverb (4), or a verb with which it shares no features as in cases of reconstruction (5). Focusing on determiner cliticization to verbs, Uriagereka observed that accusative DPs freely cliticize in object narrow-focus contexts provided the inflectional constraints mentioned above (i.e. *-s, -r*) are met (6); furthermore, he claims that cliticization of a post-verbal subject is only possible from a base-object position (7), as cliticization of a post-verbal transitive subject is always interpreted as a direct object (8). Uriagereka’s (1996) analysis does not predict the grammaticality of subject cliticization in transitive sentences; however, I show that post-verbal agent subjects can indeed cliticize to the verb in specific contexts (9). My analysis of when this phenomenon can occur proceeds as follows.

I analyze post-verbal agent subjects (8) in order to show that the lack of determiner cliticization from their base-generated position shows strong parallels with that of subextraction from [Spec, v*P], motivating reason to believe that the determiner in these contexts leaves the DP it heads. I affirm that object shift in VSO constructions frees the subject DP from the base-generated agent position, a claim made by numerous authors (Gallego 2013; Belletti 2004; Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2007). In my analysis, the result of this movement mobilizes the determiner for cliticization/subextraction; furthermore, I show that the positions of both the shifted subject and object correspond to peripheral ‘topic’ and ‘informational focus’ readings within TP (e.g. Belletti 2004), formulating testable hypotheses for cliticization for post-verbal subjects in each of these contexts. Taking phase edges to have interface characteristics (Chomsky 2001, Uriagereka 2008), I follow Gallego (2013) in adopting a flexible interpretation of Belletti’s (2004) vP periphery in VSO contexts (10). Following Zubizarreta (1998), López (2009), and Gallego (2013), I assume that subjects in unergative VS constructions remain in their base-generated position [Spec, v*P]. I suggest that the lack of possible cliticization of agent subjects in VS constructions (8) reflects the lack of subextraction from this position as with subject-island effects (cf. Huang 1982 *et seq.*). I claim that OS plays a critical role in the cliticization of post-verbal agent subjects, essentially forcing the subject from its base-generated [Spec, v*P] position over the shifted DP and to a peripheral v*P site, as in (11). These observations lead me to claim

that, in Galician, post-verbal agent subjects that are able to cliticize must have a topical, common-ground reading (12). The fact that these subjects may only cliticize in this specific context suggests that there must also be a DP occupying the informational focus position, thus forcing the subject to move to a more peripheral site. This is confirmed upon observing the lack of cliticization in cases of object drop (Raposo 2017) where the subject remains in its base-generated position and receives an information-focus reading (13). I propose that the mobilization of the agent subject DP following OS is what permits cliticization/subextraction of the determiner in order for it to be in a well-formed prosodic word with the verb at PF. Taking Raposo & Uriagereka's (2005) 'active' left-peripheral projection FP as the host for clitics in Western Iberian, I believe that the cliticization behavior of post-verbal agent subjects serves as further motivation of Uriagereka's (1996) idea that verbal constructions with subject determiner cliticization end up in F as in cases of finite enclisis.

This analysis offers further support and understanding into DP subextraction and the subject-island debate, a study of much discussion in recent minimalist investigation; furthermore, it shows that different types of extraction (i.e. cliticization) undergird well-known conditions on extraction domains (CEDs). It also shows support for generalizations made regarding OS in Romance and interpretations of VSO/VOS patterns in the v*P-VP periphery as highlighted in Belletti (2004) and Gallego (2013). Lastly, due to the clear syntactic constraints on determiner cliticization, this investigation also provides new light on possible cliticization patterns in Western Iberian and Raposo & Uriagereka's (2005) notion of 'active F'.

Examples

- (1) *Comemos o → Comemo-lo
eat.PRS.1PL CL.ACC.3SG.M eat.PRS.1PL-CL.ACC.3SG.M
- (2) Xantamos as vieiras → Xantamo-las vieiras
eat.PRS.1PL the scallops eat.PRS.1PL-DET/CL.ACC.3PL.F scallops
- (3) Non me peta moito, mais o /*mai-lo
no CL.DAT.1SG like.PRS.3SG a lot but CL.ACC.3SG.M / but-DET/CL.ACC.3SG.M
que prefiras
that prefer.SUBJ.2SG
- (4) Iñantes a /*Iñante-la cousa era moito máis sinxelo
before the before-DET/CL.ACC.3SG.F thing be.IMFV.3SG a-lot more simple
- (5) Fixemos cantar os /*canta-los dous a Xabier
make.PST.1PL sing.INF CL.ACC.3PL.M / sing.INF-DET/CL.ACC.3PL.M two to Xabier
- (6) Mercaste-las navallas de Cangas?
buy.PST.2PL-DET/CL.ACC.3PL.F razor-clams from Cangas?
- (7) Chegaramo-las mulleres antes cóis homes
arrive.PST.1PL-DET/CL.ACC.3PL.F women before with-the men
- (8) Miramos os homes / Miramo-los homes
look.PRS.1PL the men (Subj/DO)/ look.PRS.1PL-DET/CL.ACC.3PL.M men (*Subj/DO)
- (9) Onte fixeste-los rapaces todo moi ben
Yesterday do.PST.2PL-DET/CL.ACC.3PL.M boys everything very well
- (10) [T [v*P (Top) [v*P (Foc) [Spec [v*]]]]
- (11) [_T [_V pintamos] [_{v*P(Top)} os homes [_{v*P(Foc)} cadros de Foz [_{v*} t_{os homes} [_{v*} t_{pintamos} [_{VP} t_{pintamos} t_{cadros de Foz}]]]]]]]]
- (12) — Que estudade-los lingüístas? 'What do you linguists study?'
— Estudamo-los lingüístas_[TOP] o galego_[FOC] 'Us linguists study Galician'

- (13) — Quen pediu algo? ‘*Who ordered something?*’
— Pedimos os mestres [*pro*]/*Pedimo-los mestres [*pro*] ‘*Us professors ordered [pro]*’

Selected References

- Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the Low IP Area. In Rizzi, L. (ed.) *The Structures of CP and IP: The cartography of syntactic structures Vol. 2*, 16-51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Freixeiro Mato, Xosé Ramón. 2006. *Gramática da lingua galega. Vol. II: Morfoloxía*. Vigo: A Nosa Terra.
- Gallego, Ángel J. 2013. Object shift in Romance. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory*, 31(2), 409-451.
- Uriagereka, Juan. 1996. Determiner clitic placement. In Freidin, R. (ed.), *Current Issues in comparative grammar*, 257-295. Dordrecht: Kluwer.