Variation in Clitic Placement
in Non-standard Varieties of Spanish

Natalia Pavlou and Laura Stigliano
The University of Chicago

npavlou@uchicago.edu & laurastigliano@uchicago.edu

TALV Workshop:
Transdisciplinary Approaches to Language Variation
Universitetet i Tromsø

April 19-20, 2018
The goal

Syntactic research aims to identify the building blocks of the architecture of grammar in ways that...
The goal

Syntactic research aims to identify the building blocks of the architecture of grammar in ways that...

- capture all natural languages
The goal

Syntactic research aims to identify the building blocks of the architecture of grammar in ways that...

- capture all natural languages

- define variation and its limits
Syntactic variation can be reduced to morphosyntactic properties of individual morphemes, i.e. to the **lexicon**.
Syntactic variation can be reduced to morphosyntactic properties of individual morphemes, i.e. to the \textit{lexicon}.

- Many of its properties are not innate but must be acquired on the basis of language input.
Syntactic variation can be reduced to morphosyntactic properties of individual morphemes, i.e. to the lexicon.

Many of its properties are not innate but must be acquired on the basis of language input.

Syntactic variation among languages is due to cross-linguistic differences in the morphosyntactic properties of functional heads.
• Syntactic variation can be reduced to morphosyntactic properties of individual morphemes, i.e. to the lexicon.
  • Many of its properties are not innate but must be acquired on the basis of language input

• Syntactic variation among languages is due to cross-linguistic differences in the morphosyntactic properties of functional heads
  • With an economy constraint on the storage of linguistic items, elements that are not functionally differentiated are excluded (Kroch 1994, Embick 2008)
What is the locus of variation?
Lexicalist and Distributed Architecture
(Fábregas & Gallego 2014)
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Three areas of variation

- The formal features that exponents spellout might be different or might be distributed differently among the syntactic heads.
  - A situation in which two given ‘languages’ that have the same set of features, distribute (or ‘bundle’) them differently (e.g. Tense-Agreement split).
Three areas of variation

- The operations that relate those features to exponents **might be different** in nature or even a system might have an extra operation that other systems lack
  - A situation in which a given language allows an additional process that marks an overt morphosyntactic difference from another language (e.g. late insertion)
Three areas of variation

- The exponents themselves might be different because they are associated to *minimally distinct sets of features*
  - A situation where same notion is denoted by exponents that sound differently in different varieties (e.g. *carro* vs. *auto*)
Three areas of variation

We focus on the two first or a combination of thereof:

(2) a. The formal features that exponents spellout might be different or might be distributed differently among the syntactic heads

b. The operations that relate those features to exponents might be different in nature or even a system might have an extra operation that other systems lack

c. The exponents themselves might be different because they are associated to minimally distinct sets of features
Clitic Duplication: Roadmap

- Clitic Duplication and its properties

- Previous analysis: Two functional heads and the problem of simultaneous exponence

- Alternative Proposal: Two functional heads, Morphological Reanalysis and Chain reduction

- Clitic Duplication, (non-) Clitic Climbing and the locus of variation

- Concluding Remarks
A well-known phenomenon

Standard Spanish shows variation in object clitic placement, a phenomenon known as *Clitic Climbing*:

\[(3)\]  
\[\text{a.} \quad \text{Quiero ver -la.}\]
\[\text{want.1SG see.INF -CL}_{3P.F.ACC}\]
\[\text{‘I want to see her/it}_{fem}.’\]

\[\text{b.} \quad \text{La quiero ver.}\]
\[\text{CL}_{3P.F.ACC} \text{ want.1SG see.INF}\]
\[\text{‘I want to see her/it}_{fem}.’\]

Chilean and Argentinian Spanish also allow double occurrence of the object clitics, known as *Clitic Reduplication* (González 2008; Mann 2012):

\[(4)\]  
\[\text{a.} \quad \text{La quiero ver -la.}\]
\[\text{CL}_{3P.F.ACC} \text{ want.1SG see.INF -CL}_{3P.F.ACC}\]
\[\text{‘I want to see her/it}_{fem}.’\]
Double object clitics

The phenomenon raises the following questions:

- **Variation:** Do varieties of Spanish that allow Clitic Duplication have two clitic pronouns in their numeration or allow two functional heads?

- **Analytical:** Is Clitic Reduplication a case of Clitic Climbing with overt presence of both copies?
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Double object clitics

The phenomenon raises the following questions:

- **Variation:** Do varieties of Spanish that allow Clitic Duplication have two clitic pronouns in their numeration or allow two functional heads?
  - Why do some varieties of Spanish not allow the phenomenon?
  - What areas of variation best explain the phenomenon?

- **Analytical:** Is Clitic Reduplication a case of Clitic Climbing with overt presence of both copies?
Properties of object clitics

- Clitics mark case, gender, number and person

\(5\) Quiero ver -la(s)/ -lo(s)/ -te/ -me/ -nos.
want.1SG see.INF -CL_{F.(pl)}/ CL_{M.(pl)}/ CL_{2p.sg}/ CL_{1p.sg}/ CL_{1p.pl}
‘I want to see (her/it\textsubscript{fem})(pl)/(him/it\textsubscript{masc})(pl)/you/me/us.’

Clitic placement in Spanish:

(a) Proclitic to finite verbs
(b) Enclitic to non-finite verbs (infinitives, gerunds, imperatives)
Standard enclitic patterns in Argentinian Spanish

(6) a. No está bien admirarla tanto.
not is good to.admire.CL so.much
‘It is not good to admire her so much.’ [Infinitive]
b. *No esta bien la admirar tanto.
not is well CL to.admire so.much

(7) a. Comélo
eat.CL
‘Eat it.’ [Imperative]
b. *Lo comé.
CL eat

(8) a. Estoy admirándolo.
am.1sg admiring CL
‘I am admiring him/it’ [Gerund]
b. *Estoy lo admirando.
am.1sg CL admirando
Attested verbs

- Verbs that allow Clitic Climbing also allow Clitic Duplication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ir a</th>
<th>acabar</th>
<th>poder</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>terminar de</td>
<td>soler</td>
<td>querer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>venir a</td>
<td>comenzar a</td>
<td>tener que</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aprender a</td>
<td>volver a</td>
<td>deber (de)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tratar de</td>
<td>dejar de</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Other particles also allow Clitic Duplication (con, que, a)
Clitic Duplication is the phenomenon where two copies of the same clitic appear simultaneously:

(9)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{ *La } \text{ quiero } \text{ ver } -\text{lo.} \\
\text{CL}_{3p,f,\text{ACC}} & \text{ want.1SG see.INF } -\text{CL}_{3p,m,\text{ACC}} \\
\text{Int. ‘I want to see her/it}_{fem}.’ \\
\text{b. } & \text{ *Lo } \text{ quiero } \text{ ver } -\text{la.} \\
\text{CL}_{3p,m,\text{ACC}} & \text{ want.1SG see.INF } -\text{CL}_{3p,f,\text{ACC}} \\
\text{Int. ‘I want to see her/it}_{fem}.’
\end{align*}
\]
Double object clitics

- In Clitic Duplication, the infinitive and the clitic show a V+CLI order
- Double occurrence of object clitics gives support of double occurrence of functional projections hosting object clitics (González López 2008)
Double Clitic Projections

• Assumption of two functional projections gives different underlying structures for (non-)Clitic Climbing cases

• Clitic climbing assumes a high CliP

\[
\text{AgrSP} \\
\text{lo estoy} \quad \text{TP} \\
< \text{lo estoy}> \quad \text{CliP}_{low} \\
< \text{lo estoy}> \quad \text{VP} \\
< \text{esto}> \quad \text{CliP}_{high} \\
\text{lo} \quad \text{TP} \\
\text{T} \quad \text{AgrOP} \\
\text{viendo} \quad \ldots
\]
• Non-Clitic Climbing assumes a low CliP
Which area of variation?

- The formal features that exponents spell out might be different or might be distributed differently among the syntactic heads.
• Assumption of lower CliP adjoined to vP always results in a visible amalgam of V+Cli order

(11) a. La quiero _ver-la_.
   CL3P.F.ACC want.1SG see.INF-CL3P.F.ACC
   ‘I want to see her/it_{fem}.’

• This analysis does not give the correct word order of V+Cli in Clitic Duplication

- Low CliP results in a complex head
- High CliP results in a clitic in the matrix clause

A contradiction?
An alternative

- How can we keep two different functional heads while capturing the correct surface word order of V-Cli?
**Proposal**: CliticDuplication results from the simultaneous occurrence of two CliP selecting both a matrix or embedded TP

**Consequences:**

- Modification of previous assumptions on merging position of CliP
- Clitic Climbing and Clitic Reduplication cannot be unified as the same phenomenon
- Separation of syntactic and post-syntactic operations
Proposal: clitics are part of a ‘big DP’
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- Clitics are generated in their argument position (Kayne 1975) as part of full DPs, and move to a functional head higher up

\[(12) \quad \text{La}_i \text{ vi} \quad [\text{DP la a María}_i] \]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{CL} & \quad \text{saw.1sg} & \quad \text{CL DOM Mary} \\
\text{‘I saw Mary.’}
\end{align*}
\]
Proposal: clitics are part of a ‘big DP’

- Clitics are generated in their argument position (Kayne 1975) as part of full DPs, and move to a functional head higher up.

(12) \[
\text{La}_i \text{ vi } [\text{DP } \text{la } \text{ a } \text{ María}_i ] \\
\text{CL saw.1SG} \quad \text{CL DOM Mary} \\
\text{‘I saw Mary.’}
\]

(13) Structure of the doubled, ‘big’ DP (Nevins 2011):

```
DP
   /\   /
DP/D  DP
  /\   /
clitic María
```
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Proposal: clitics move to Spec, ClP

- Clitics always move to a Clitic Projection (ClP)

- ClP is attached to a TP

(14) La$_i$ vi (a María$_i$)
    CL saw.1SG DOM Mary

\[ \text{ClP} \]
\[ \text{CL}_i \quad \text{TP} \]
\[ la \quad \text{V+v+T} \quad \text{vP} \]
\[ vi \quad \text{V+v} \quad \text{VP} \]
\[ \text{V} \quad \text{DP} \]
\[ \text{CL}_i \quad \text{la} \quad \text{DP} \quad \text{María} \]
Proposal: two positions for ClP

In (15) the embedded structure is a TP and ClP attaches lower.

(15) Quiero ver -la.
    want.1SG see.INF -CL3.F.ACC

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
\text{V+v+T} \\
\text{quiero} \\
\text{ClP} \\
\text{CL}_i \\
\text{la} \\
\text{V+v+T} \\
\text{ver} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{CL}_i \\
\text{ DP} \\
\text{la} \\
\end{array}
\]
Proposal: two positions for ClP

In (15) the embedded structure is a TP and ClP attaches lower. In (16) the embedded structure is smaller, and ClP attaches to the matrix TP.

(15) Quiero ver -la.
want.1SG see.INF -CL3.F.ACC

(16) La quiero ver.
CL3.F.ACC want.1SG see.INF
To obtain the order V-Cl (\textit{ver-la}) in cases of enclisis, the lower verb complex undergoes further head movement to attach to the clitic:
To obtain the order V-Cl (ver-la) in cases of enclisis, the lower verb complex undergoes further head movement to attach to the clitic:

(17) *Postsyntactic Raising* (Harizanov & Gribanova 2017):

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\cdots \\
ClP \\
V+v+T+\text{CL}_{i} & TP \\
\uparrow & \cdots \\
V+v+T
\end{array}
\]
Proposal: Postsyntactic Raising

- To obtain the order V-Cl (*ver-la*) in cases of enclisis, the lower verb complex undergoes further head movement to attach to the clitic:

(17)  *Postsyntactic Raising* (Harizanov & Gribanova 2017):

- This is a post-syntactic operation triggered by the defectiveness of $T_{inf}$
Proposal: deriving Clitic Duplication

Dialects that allow Clitic Duplication allow two ClPs in a given numeration. In these cases, the embedded clause is a TP:

(18) \[ \text{La} \quad \text{quiero} \quad \text{ver} \quad -\text{la}. \]

\( \text{CL}_3.\text{F.ACC} \quad \text{want.1SG} \quad \text{see.INF} \quad -\text{CL}_3.\text{F.ACC} \)

[CIP]

[TP]

[CL\text{la}]

[V\text{quiero}]

[\ldots]

[V\text{ver}]

[\ldots]

[DP]

[CL\text{la}]

[DP]
Multiple pronunciation of copies & Chain Reduction

Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky 1993)
movement = copy + deletion
Copy Theory of Movement (Chomsky 1993)  
movement = copy + deletion

The two copies of John count as “the same”, so no linear order can be established in accordance with Kayne’s (1994) LCA:

(19) *John\_i was kissed John\_i?

\[
\text{TP} \\
\quad \text{John}_i \\
\quad \quad \text{was} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{seen} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{DP} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{John}_i
\]
After *Chain Reduction* (Nunes 1995), all the links of the chain are deleted, except for one (usually the head of the chain):

(19) John$_i$ was kissed John$_i$?
Clitic Duplication: Multiple pronunciation of copies

Why are two copies of the same clitic pronounced in cases of Clitic Duplication?
The verb complex \((V+v+T)\) and the clitic forms a head. These morphemes undergo Morphological Reanalysis (i.e. the heads fuse into a single terminal node) \((Halle \& Marantz 1993)\)
Clitic Duplication: Multiple pronunciation of copies

- The verb complex (V+v+T) and the clitic forms a head. These morphemes undergo Morphological Reanalysis (i.e. the heads fuse into a single terminal node) (Halle & Marantz 1993)

- The clitic and the verbal complex are part of a single terminal element, becoming invisible to the LCA (Nunes 2004)
The verb complex (V+v+T) and the clitic forms a head. These morphemes undergo Morphological Reanalysis (i.e. the heads fuse into a single terminal node) (Halle & Marantz 1993).

The clitic and the verbal complex are part of a single terminal element, becoming invisible to the LCA (Nunes 2004).

The intermediate copy escapes deletion.
The verb complex \((V+v+T)\) and the clitic forms a head. These morphemes undergo Morphological Reanalysis (i.e. the heads fuse into a single terminal node) (Halle & Marantz 1993)

The clitic and the verbal complex are part of a single terminal element, becoming invisible to the LCA (Nunes 2004)

The intermediate copy escapes deletion

The result is the pronunciation of both copies
**Summary**

- Certain varieties of Spanish allow the multiple occurrence of the same clitic → there are two ClPs in the same sentence

- Clitic Duplication can obtain when there is a ClP in the complement clause (embedded TP)

- Morphosyntactic reanalysis forces the pronunciation of both copies
(20) a. The formal features that exponents spellout might be different or might be distributed differently among the syntactic heads

- Different distribution of functional heads

b. The operations that relate those features to exponents might be different in nature or even a system might have an extra operation that other systems lack

- Chain Reduction and deletion
Which areas of variation?

To simplify:

(21)  a. The formal features that exponents spellout might be different or might be distributed differently among the syntactic heads

- Different distribution of functional heads

b. The operations that relate those features to exponents might be different in nature or even a system might have an extra operation that other systems lack

- Chain Reduction and deletion
Conclusions

- The current analysis captures all the patterns of object clitic placement in a uniform way.
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Conclusions

- The current analysis captures all the patterns of object clitic placement in a uniform way.

- Theoretical implications that support the existence of post-syntactic operations.

- Variation in clitic placement in varieties of Spanish is restricted to the distribution of functional heads.
Thanks!
¡Gracias!


(22)  *Linear Correspondence Axiom* (Kayne 1994)  
Let X, Y be nonterminals and a, b terminals such that X dominates a and Y dominates b. Then if X asymmetrically c-commands Y, a precedes b.

(23)  *Chain Reduction* (Nunes 1995)  
Delete the minimal number of constituents of a nontrivial chain CH that suffices for CH to be mapped into linear order in accordance with the LCA.
Appendix 1:
Further evidence for clitic movement to Spec,ClP

Clitics always move.

(24) Quiero ver -la.
want.1SG see.INF -CL3.F.ACC
Clitics always move.

(24) Quise haber-la visto.
wanted.1sg have.inf-cl3p.f.acc.sg seen
‘I would have seen it_{fem}.’
## Appendix 2: Postsyntactic Raising (Harizanov & Gribanova 2017)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Postsyntactic Amalgamation</th>
<th>Syntactic Head Movement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Produces head-adjunction structures</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driven by morphological properties of heads</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obey the Head Movement Constraint</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential for interpretive effects</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Properties of syntactic head movement and postsyntactic amalgamation
Appendix 2: Postsyntactic Raising (Harizanov & Gribanova 2017)

Amalgamation:
- involves the formation of words out of independent morphosyntactic terminals (i.e. verla vs. ver la)
- as a postsyntactic operation, amalgamation is predicted not to have any interpretive effects
- Head Movement Constraint (HMC): An $X^0$ may only move into the $Y^0$ which properly governs it.
Appendix 3:
Finite clauses and Clitic Duplication

Clitic Reduplication is only allowed in contexts that allow Cl. Climbing:

(25) a. Quiero que la compres.
   want.1.sg that CL buy.SUBJ.2.sg
   ‘I want you to buy it.’

b. *La quiero que compres.
   CL want.1.sg that buy.SUBJ.2.sg
   Int. ‘I want you to buy it.’
Appendix 3: Finite clauses and Clitic Duplication

Clitic Reduplication is only allowed in contexts that allow Cl. Climbing:

\[(25)\]

a. Quiero que la compres.
   want.1.SG that CL buy.SUBJ.2.SG
   ‘I want you to buy it.’

b. *La quiero que compres.
   CL want.1.SG that buy.SUBJ.2.SG
   Int. ‘I want you to buy it.’

c. ?*La quiero que la compres.
   CL want.1.SG that CL buy.SUBJ.2.SG
   Int. ‘I want you to buy it.’
Clitic Duplication is also possible with clitic clusters:

(26) a. ?Se lo quiero decir -se -lo.
   \[CL_3P.DAT\] \[CL_M.ACC\] want.1SG tell.INF \[CL_3P.DAT\] -\[CL_M.ACC\]
   ‘I want to tell it to her/him.’

   b. ?Se la quiero mostrárm -se -la.
   \[CL_3P.DAT\] \[CL_F.ACC\] want.1SG show.INF \[CL_3P.DAT\] -\[CL_F.ACC\]
   ‘I want to show her/it to him/her.’

Clitic clusters cannot be separated:

   \[CL_3P.DAT\] \[CL_M.ACC\] want.1SG tell.INF -\[CL_M.ACC\]
   Int. ‘I want to tell it to her/him.’

   b. *Lo quiero decir -se -lo.
   \[CL_M.ACC\] want.1SG tell.INF \[CL_3P.DAT\] -\[CL_M.ACC\]
   ‘I want to tell him/it to her/him.’
Clitic climbing in other contexts

Certain prepositions and particles allow CC

(28)  a. Tengo que hacerlo.
        have.1sg to do.CL

   b. Lo tengo que hacer.
        CL have.1sg to do
        ‘I have to do it.’

   c. Voy a leerlo.
        go.1sg to read.CL

   d. Lo voy a leer.
        CL go.1sg to read
        ‘I am going to read it.’

   e. Cuento con leerlo.
        count.1sg with read.CL

   f. Lo cuento con leer.
        CL count.1sg with read
Appendix 4: Evidence from Coordination

Apparent Coordinate Structure Constraint violations:

(29)  a. Juan quiere ver-la$_i$ y besar-la$_i$

John wants.3 see.INF-CL$_3$.F.ACC and kiss.INF-CL$_3$.F.ACC

‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’
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Appendix 4: Evidence from Coordination

Apparent Coordinate Structure Constraint violations:

(29)  a. Juan quiere ver-la$_i$ y besar-la$_i$

John wants.3 see.INF-CL$_{3,F,ACC}$ and kiss.INF-CL$_{3,F,ACC}$

‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’

b. Juan la$_i$ quiere ver-t$_i$ y besar-t$_i$.

John CL$_{3,F,ACC}$ wants.3 see.INF and kiss.INF

‘John wants to see and kiss her$_i$.’

c. Juan la$_i$ quiere ver-t$_i$ y besar-la$_i$

John CL$_{3,F,ACC}$ wants.3 see.INF and kiss.INF-CL$_{3,F,ACC}$

‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss her$_i$.’

d. *Juan la$_i$ quiere ver-la$_i$ y besar-t$_i$

John CL$_{3,F,ACC}$ wants.3 see.INF-CL$_{3,F,ACC}$ and kiss.INF

Int. ‘John wants to see her$_i$ and kiss.’
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Clitic Climbing only occurs in the first conjunct. We claim that these are cases of coordination of two bigger structures (possibly CPs):

(30) a. \([\text{Juan quiere ver-la}] \quad y \quad [\text{Juan quiere besar-la}]\)

John wants see.INF-CL and John wants kiss.INF-CL

‘John wants to see her\(i\) and kiss her\(i\).’
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Clitic Climbing only occurs in the first conjunct. We claim that these are cases of coordination of two bigger structures (possibly CPs):

(30)  

a. \([\text{Juan quiere ver-la}] \quad y \quad [\text{Juan quiere besar-la}]\)  
John wants see.INF-CL and John wants kiss.INF-CL  
‘John wants to see her\(_i\) and kiss her\(_i\).’

b. \([\text{Juan la}\_i \text{ quiere ver-t}\_i] \quad y \quad [\text{Juan quiere besar-la}]\)  
John CL wants see.INF and John wants kiss.INF-CL  
‘John wants to see her\(_i\) and kiss her\(_i\).’
Appendix 4: Evidence from Coordination

Clitic Climbing only occurs in the first conjunct. We claim that these are cases of coordination of two bigger structures (possibly CPs):

(30) a. [Juan quiere ver-la] y [Juan quiere besar-la]
  John wants see.INF-CL and John wants kiss.INF-CL
  ‘John wants to see her and kiss her.’

b. [Juan la\(_i\) quiere ver-t\(_i\)] y [Juan quiere besar-la]
  John CL wants see.INF and John wants kiss.INF-CL
  ‘John wants to see her and kiss her.’

c. *[Juan la\(_i\) quiere ver-la] y [Juan quiere besar-t\(_i\)]
  John CL wants see.INF and John wants kiss.INF-CL
  ‘John wants to see her and kiss her.’
Appendix 4: Evidence from Coordination

Further evidence: Gapping

(31) [Juan quiere comprar-la] y [María quiere alquilar-la_{i}]
    John wants buy.INF & Mary wants rent.INF-CL
    ‘John wants to buy it_{i} and Mary rent it_{i}.’

(32) *María alquilarla.
    Mary rent-it
    Lit. ‘Mary renti it.’