

Deep and Surface Clitics in Northern Castilian Spanish.

Alejo Alcaraz (UPV/EHU)

In Northern Castilian Spanish (NCSp: La Rioja & Soria), if the Direct Object DO is third person and human, this argument may be optionally cross-referenced by either the 3rd person DATIVE clitic LE or the 3rd person ACC clitic LO, as in (1).

- (1) (A tu hermano₁.) el jefe **lo₁/le₁** vio en el partido. LO: 41% vs. LE: 59%
A your brother, the boss 3_{ACC}/3_{DAT} saw in the match.
'(Your brother,) the boss saw him during the match.' [percentages from Klein-Andreu (2000:90)]

In this paper, I will bring new data showing that the syntactic differences between the clitic LE and LO in NCSp derives from nominal ellipsis. In particular, I will argue that LO doubles an elided NP, as in (2a), whereas LE doubles a null pronoun, as shown in (2b).

- (2) a. [_{VP} lo₁+v° [_{VP} V NP₁]] b. [_{VP} le₁+v° [_{VP} V ~~him~~₁]]

If this hypothesis is on the right track, we will expect the clitic LO to behave as an E-type pronoun (Evans 1980, Elbourne 2001), but the clitic LE as variable-like expression (Heim&Kratzer 1998). I will show this prediction to be borne in NCSp. I will further argue that the semantic derivation of both structures in (2) cannot be equated; i.e. while the structure in (2a) encompass noun incorporation (Chung&Ladusaw 2003), this option is banned for the structure in (2b), which must resort to an alternative semantic derivation.

Sloppy readings. The clitic LO in NCSp supports Sloppy Readings (3a), but crucially the clitic LE does not (3b).

- (3) a. María llevo a sus hijos al cole, pero Pedro **los** dejó en casa.
M. took A her children to school, but P. 3pl.ACC left in home.
'Mary brought her children to school, but Pedro left [Pedro's/Mary's children] in home' (✓Sloppy/✓Strict)
b. María llevo a sus hijos al cole, pero Pedro **les** dejó en casa.
M. took A her children to school, but P. 3pl.DAT left in home.
'Mary brought her children to school, but Pedro left[*Pedro's/Mary's children] in home' (✗Sloppy/✓Strict)

Donkey Sentences. E-type pronouns in donkey sentences have been argued to be the result of NP Ellipsis NPE (Elbourne 2001, 2005). In this respect, observe the clitic LO in NCSp can be felicitously employed in donkey sentences, while the clitic LE cannot.

- (4) Toda mujer con marido₁ que **lo₁/#le₁** traiga a la fiesta.
Every woman with husband that 3_{ACC}/3_{DAT} will.bring to the party.
'Every woman that has a husband must bring him to the party.'

Stranded Modifiers. The clitic LE in NCSp cannot be modified by a stranded adjunct, whereas the clitic LO can. This shows LO cliticization can affect different parts of the NP/DP, while LE cliticization in NCSp cannot.

- (5) Juan contrató a estudiantes de física, aunque su jefe **los₁/*les₁** buscaba [Δ_1 de química]
J. hired A students of physics, but his boss 3_{ACC}/3_{DAT} looked.for of chemistry
(lit)'John hired students of physics, but his boss was looking for ones of chemistry.'

Formal Link Problem. Even if a lexical predicate like *embarazada* 'being pregnant' implies the existence of a baby, this is not enough to license NPE of the noun 'baby' (Elbourne 2002:252). It comes thus as no surprise that LO in NCSp cannot refer back to the baby entailed by the lexical predicate *embarazada* 'being pregnant' in (6), while the clitic LE, which does not depend on ellipsis, can.

- (6) Si te quedas embarazada, ¿quién {#lo/le} va a criar?
If you get pregnant, who 3_{ACC}/3_{DAT} gonna raise
'If you get pregnant, who will raise him (=the baby you are pregnant with)?'

Missing Antecedents. When the clitic LO co-refer with a complex nominal antecedent, as in (7a), one part of this complex nominal (i.e., guns) can be further retrieved. On the contrary, the clitic LE does not allow making further reference to any sub-constituent of its antecedent, as shown by the deviant status of (7b).

- (7) En el desfile había [hombres [con armas]¹]^m. Tras el desfile nos asustamos ...
At the parade there.were men with weapons. After the parade us get.scared

- a. ... al ver=los^m de nuevo. Δⁱ Estaban todas cargadas. ⇨ [los₁ ... [~~hombres-con-armas~~]₁...]
 to see=3_{ACC} again. were all loaded.
- b. ... al ver=les^m de nuevo. #Δⁱ Estaban todas cargadas. ⇨ [les₁ ... pro₁ ...]
 to see=3_{DAT} again were all loaded.

‘At the parade there were men with weapons. After the parade we get scared when we saw them again. They (= the weapons carried by the men at the parade) were all loaded.’

Definiteness Effects DEs. Finally, the clitic LE does trigger DEs in existential sentences, but the clitic LO does not, as shown in (7’). This shows that the clitic LO doubles (or at least can double) a determiner-less NP, contrary to what happens with LE, whose nominal associate must project (at least) a DP layer.

- (7’) Los₁/*les₁ hay [Δ₁ (de cada región)]
 3_{ACC}/3_{DAT} there.was from every country
 (lit) ‘there are {ones from every country/them}.’

LO restricts, but LE over-saturates. Since NPE is typically optional, we must explain why NPE turns out to be mandatory under LO cliticization in NCSp, so as to account for the ungrammaticality of (8a). This problem does not arise under LE cliticization; since LE can optionally double an overt third person pronoun in NCSp (8b).

- (8) a. Su jefe los_{ACC} contrató (*estudiantes) (de física). ‘His boss hired physics students.’
 b. Su jefe les_{DAT} contrató (a ellos) (*de física). ‘His boss hired them.’
 His boss 3_{CL} hired students/them of physics

Adopting Chomsky (1995) Move-F analysis of Case Checking, I assume the Formal Features FF of the Bare NP *students* in (8a) adjoin to v^o in order for its Case feature to be checked, as in (9a).

- (9) a. [v’ FF(students) +v^o [VP V [NP students]]] b. FF(students_{3,PL,MSC}) ↔ /los_{3,PL,MSC}/ at PF

Once the FF(*students*) adjoin to v^o, the remaining NP *students* without its Formal Features becomes an illegitimate object at PF. As suggested by Lasnik (1999), such an inconsistency can be remedied by deleting the NP *students* at PF, as in (10). This will explain why NPE is mandatory under LO cliticization in NCSp (see 8a). Furthermore, since FF(students) in (9a) are spelt out as the clitic LO at PF (9b), the content of the elided NP *students* can be independently recovered after deleting this NP in (10).

- (10) [v’ FF(students) +v^o [VP V [NP *students]]] (NP-Deletion at PF)

However, this analysis poses a problem for the semantic interpretation of (9a). This comes from the fact that FF(students) in (9a) are equivalent to the the FF of a regular third person, masculine, plural pronoun (i.e., FF(students) is a pronoun; see Aoun&Nunes 2007). If so, how can both FF(students) and the NP *students* in (9a) be simultaneously interpreted at the semantic component? Following Chung&Ladusaw (2003), I analyze bare NPs as properties (of type <e,t>) that cannot saturate (via Function Application FA) the verbal predicate they are a syntactic argument of. Bare NPs are rather interpreted as restricted modifiers by the operation Restrict, as represented in the semantic derivation of (9a) in (11).

- (11) Restrict (λyλx [hire’(y)(x)], students’) = λyλx [hire’(y)(x) & students’(y)]

As a consequence of the nonsaturating nature of Restrict, the pronominal clitic LO (i.e., FF(students)) can saturate the internal argument position of the verbal predicate via Function Application, as shown in (12). Recall that FF(students) in (9) (i.e., the clitic LO at PF) is a pronoun-like expression and pronouns are of type e.

- (12) FA (Restrict (λyλx [hire’(y)(x)]<et>, students’<et>) LO<e>) = λx [hire’(LO)(x) & students’(LO)]

It is worth further noting that this analysis cannot be extended to LE cliticization in NCSp. This is so because the associate of the clitic LE is a pronoun (of type e), as shown in (13a), and thus saturates its verbal predicate. Thus, the clitic LE cannot be further interpreted as an argument of its verbal predicate (contrary to what happens with the clitic LO) under the assumption that the same argument slot cannot be targeted by two nominal arguments (e.g. LE and its *pro* associate) via FA (Chung&Ladusaw 2006: 10), as in (13b). I will assume that the clitic LE is deleted at LF, as suggested by Chomsky (2000) for uninterpretable features more generally.

- (13) a. [v’ FF(a ellos) +v^o [VP V [KP a ellos]]] [FF(a ellos) ↔ /les/ at PF] & [~~FF(a ellos)~~ at LF]
 b. * FA (FA (λx.[P(x)]<et>, pro<e>), LE<e>)