

## Another Look at the [+finite] Subordinate Context in Western Iberian Romance

*por* FRANCISCO FERNÁNDEZ-RUBIERA

**I**N THIS PAPER<sup>1</sup>, I discuss the distribution of clitic pronouns in the subordinate context in Western Iberian Romance – a cover term used here to include Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese. I show that, contrary to standard descriptions, we do find enclisis –and not just proclisis– in this context in these three languages, a clitic pattern that previous analyses in the generative literature neither predict nor can account for. The main goal in this paper is to show that the (en)clitic patterns can be captured assuming a cartographic approach to the left-periphery (cf. Rizzi (1997, 2004), Benincà and Poletto (2004)) to be at play in these languages, thus building on the analysis developed in Fernández-Rubiera (2006) to account for clitic placement alternations in the matrix context and extending it to explain the enclitic patterns found in the [+finite] subordinate one.

---

<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank the many people in the Department of Spanish and Portuguese at Georgetown University, the Seminariu de Filoloxía Asturiana at the Universidá d'Uviéu, and the Instituto da Lingua Galega, for their help and discussion of the data: Michael Ferreira, Vivaldo Santos and Ana Delgado for the Portuguese data, Xulio Viejo for Asturian and Rosario Álvarez for Galician. Also, special thanks go to Héctor Campos for bringing to my attention Haegeman's references and to Elena Herburger for comments on this paper. Needless to say, I am solely responsible for all errors and misinterpretations.

This article is divided as follows. In section 1, I introduce the relevant data from the subordinate [+finite] context in Western Iberian, showing that an enclitic pattern may arise. In section 2, I discuss Raposo & Uriagereka's (2005) analysis for clitic placement in Western Iberian Romance, concluding that it does not predict the enclisis shown in section 1. Next, I present in section 3 Haegeman's (2006a, 2006b) typology of subordinate clauses in terms of central and peripheral, showing in section 4 that her typology may be connected to the availability of enclitic and proclitic alternations in this context in Western Iberian Romance. In section 5 I provide the analysis that explains the clitic patterns shown in section 1, concluding this article with a summary in section 6.

## 1. THE DATA

Traditional grammars for Western Iberian Romance (cf. Carballo (1979) and Álvarez *et alii* (1986) for Galician, Vázquez Cuesta & Mendes da Luz (1971) for European Portuguese, and Gramática de la llingua asturiana (2001) and D'Andrés (1993) for Asturian) argue that generally subordinate clauses show proclisis (i.e., a preverbal position of the clitic). However, certain subordinate constructions allow an enclitic order (i.e., postverbal). These constructions are attested in Asturian (cf. (1) below), Galician (cf. (2) below), and European Portuguese (cf. (3) below)<sup>2</sup>.

### *The data in Asturian*

- (1) a. Paezme [qu'escribiéron**lo** bien]  
 seem<sub>3SG</sub> -me<sub>CL</sub> that wrote<sub>3PL</sub> -it<sub>CL</sub> well  
 'It seems to me that they wrote it well'

<sup>2</sup> The clitics are indicated in bold in the relevant part of the structure for readability convenience.

- b. Ye que [molestábame enforma]  
is that bothered<sub>3SG</sub>-me<sub>CL</sub> very-much  
'It is just that it bothered me a lot'
- c. [Porque garráronlu robando]  
because caught<sub>3PL</sub>-him<sub>CL</sub> stealing  
'Because they caught him stealing'
- d. Fáiseme que ta lloca, [porque vila falando sola]  
make<sub>3SG</sub>-rfl<sub>CL</sub>-me<sub>CL</sub> that is crazy because saw<sub>1SG</sub>-her<sub>CL</sub> talking alone  
'I believe that she is crazy, because I saw her talking to herself'
- e. Agora doime cuenta [(de) que fixilo mal]  
now give<sub>1SG</sub>-rfl<sub>CL</sub> notice of that did<sub>1SG</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub> wrong  
'Now I realize that I have done it wrong'
- (From D'Andrés, 1993:67)
- f. Dí-ylo [porque pagómelo]  
gave<sub>1SG</sub>-him<sub>CL</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub> because paid<sub>3SG</sub>-me<sub>CL</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub>  
'I gave it to him because he paid me for it'
- g. Voi regala-y a Xuan esti llibru, [que présta-y de xuru]  
go<sub>1SG</sub> give<sub>INF</sub>-him<sub>CL</sub> to Xuan this book, that likes<sub>3SG</sub>-him<sub>CL</sub> of surely  
'I am going to give this book to Xuan, because he would surely love it'
- h. Les visites marcharon, [porque díxolo'l mio hermanu]  
the guests left<sub>3PL</sub> [because said<sub>3SG</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub>-the my brother  
'The guests left, because my brother told me'
- (Xulio Viejo, personal communication)
- i. Nun quiero que fales d'él [porque duélenme les tos pallabres]  
not want<sub>1SG</sub> that talk<sub>2SG</sub> of-him because hurt<sub>3PL</sub>-me<sub>CL</sub> the your words  
'I don't want you to talk about him because your words hurt me'
- (X. Álvarez, 2005)

*The data in Galician*

- (2) a. Non sigas insistindo niso, [porque eu *seiche* ben como foron ...]  
 not continue<sub>2SG</sub> insisting on-that because I know-ED<sub>CL</sub><sup>3</sup> well how were<sub>3PL</sub>  
 ‘Don’t carry on insisting on that because I know very well how things were...’
- b. Iso era verdade, [que eu *crieime* alí e *seino*]  
 that was true that I raised-rfl<sub>CL</sub> there and know<sub>1SG-it</sub><sub>CL</sub>  
 ‘That was true, because I was raised there and I know it’
- c. Apártate comigo un pouco, [que *quéroche* contar unhas cantas cousas]  
 move-away-rfl<sub>CL</sub> with-me a bit that want<sub>1SG-you</sub><sub>CL</sub> tell<sub>INF</sub> some few things  
 ‘Come out with me, because I want to tell you a few things’
- d. E mais paréceme unha xusticia ben feita, [que terras *habíalle* poucas]  
 and however seems-me<sub>CL</sub> a justice well done that lands were-him<sub>CL</sub> few  
 ‘However, it seems to me a well-done justice, because there were only a few lands’
- (from Álvarez *et alii*, 1986: 196-197)
- e. Pero antes tes que quitarme as ferraduras [porque avisou*me* moito meu amo que...]  
 but before have<sub>2SG</sub> to take-off-me<sub>CL</sub> the horseshoes [because warned-me<sub>CL</sub> much my master that...]  
 ‘However, you have to take off my horseshoes before, because my master warned me many times that...’

---

<sup>3</sup> This *che* clitic in Galician is considered an ED (i.e., «ethical dative») clitic in CARBALLO (1979). Since its structure and interpretation are irrelevant for the purposes of this paper, the reader is referred to the work cited for a discussion of this type of clitic in Galician.

- f. Eu supoño que sí [porque botéina así que usté marchou]  
 I suppose that yes because threw<sub>1SG</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub> as that you left  
 ‘I suppose so because I threw it away as soon as you left’

(From Meier, 1976: 47)

*The data in European Portuguese*

- (3) a. Os filhos escrevem bem [porque ensineiós]  
 the children write<sub>3PL</sub> well because taught<sub>1SG</sub>-them<sub>CL</sub>  
 ‘The children write well because I taught them’
- b. Que pomos-lhe as tábuas e depois temos um golete para a agua [...]  
 that put<sub>1PL</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub> the boards and later have<sub>1PL</sub> a channel for the water  
 ‘Because we can put the boards and then we will have a channel for the water...’
- c. Ai, [que esquece-me o nome daquilo]  
 Oh that forget<sub>3SG</sub>-me<sub>CL</sub> the name of-that  
 ‘Oh, that I forget the name of that’, literally ‘Oh, that forgets to me the name of that’
- d. [...] uma menina, toda a vida, marrequinha – [que chamam-lhe Marracos], não é?  
 a girl all the life Moroccan that call<sub>3PL</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub> Morocco not is  
 ‘...a girl, all her life, Moroccan – because they call it Morocco, right?’

(From O Corpus do português, 2007)

2. RAPOSO & URIAGEREKA’S ANALYSIS OF CLITIC PLACEMENT  
 ALTERNATIONS IN WESTERN IBERIAN ROMANCE

After presenting the relevant data for the purposes of this paper, I review in this section Raposo & Uriagereka’s analysis for clitic placement alternations in Western Iberian Romance. In short, Raposo & Uriagere-

ka (2005) derive pre and postverbal clitics in these languages under the following assumptions<sup>4</sup>:

*a)* Western Iberian Romance has an «extra» projection, labeled FP, located between T<sup>o</sup> and C<sup>o</sup>, which bears [*\*morph*] –i.e., strong morphological features– in this group of languages. Raposo & Uriagereka argue that this F<sup>o</sup> bearing [*\*morph*] spells-out as a clitic-like element.

*b)* Clitics are assumed to be merged in V<sup>o</sup>-object position, which then raise and adjoin to the spelled-out clitic in F<sup>o</sup> via a condition on clitic clusters (i.e., clitics must cluster together within a derivational cycle –cf. Chomsky [2000, 2001]).

*c)* Clitics, understood as PF-defective elements, must be licensed before Spell-out.

The clitics' licensing conditions at PF in *c)* above are explained in Raposo & Uriagereka in terms of «fusion», a morphological operation taking place at the PF-component, which applies as follows:

(i) if there is a right-adjacent head to the clitics (i.e., no specifier intervenes), right-fusion applies, thus obtaining proclisis – [clitics + X<sup>o</sup>]<sup>5</sup>; else,

(ii) if there is a left-adjacent head or (suitable)<sup>6</sup> XP to the clitics, left-fusion

---

<sup>4</sup> I will just concentrate on the relevant parts of Raposo & Uriagereka's analysis for this discussion. I refer the reader to RAPOSO & URIAGEREKA (2005) for the motivation behind the analysis they propose.

<sup>5</sup> Each type of fusion (i.e., left and right-fusion) has different demands to apply (i.e., an adjacent head or XP for left and only an adjacent head for right-fusion). This is related according to Raposo & Uriagereka to the fact that right-fusion «obeys morphological constraints» –i.e., it can only target a head– whereas left-fusion «obeys prosodic constraints» –whereby the clitics can target either a head or an XP for fusion to apply (see RAPOSO & URIAGEREKA [2005: 666, (52)]). This is assumed to follow from the cyclic structure of derivations –cf. CHOMSKY (2000, 2001).

<sup>6</sup> Raposo & Uriagereka call these «suitable» elements affective operators, defined as those that «[...] typically involve a value judgment [...] and include some quantifier phrases, phrases with overt focus operators, and elements encoding the polarity of a proposition, such as aspectual adverbs like *já* 'already', *ainda* 'yet', *também* 'also', the negative morpheme *não* 'not', and other



mely the  $C^{\circ}$  lexical «*que*» complementizer— which can act as a host for the clitics, thus licensed via left-fusion to it, in turn accounting for the preverbal clitic pattern in (5).

On the other hand, a postverbal clitic pattern obtains in (6), which for Raposo & Uriagereka is derived as shown in (8) below.

- (8)  $[_{CP}$  que  $[_{FP}$  esses panfletos  $[_{FP}$   $[_{F^{\circ}}$  distribuiu-*os-f*  $[_{TP}$  o partido  $[_{T^{\circ}}$  distribuiu  $[_{VP}$  *os*  $[_{VP}$  o partido  $[_{VP}$  distribuiu  $[_{VP}$  ontem  $[_{VP}$  distribuiu  $[_{DP}$  *os* ]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]]] > clitics licensed *via* «last-resort» displacement of  $T^{\circ}$  and subsequent fusion of the clitics >  $[_{F^{\circ}}$  distribuiu + *os-f*]

As in (7), right-fusion of the clitics to  $T^{\circ}$  is blocked by the intervening subject «o partido» in [Spec, TP]. In principle, left-fusion of the clitics to the element «esses panfletos» could apply; however, Raposo & Uriagereka argue this element is a topic, and that topics are not suitable elements for the clitics to left-fuse to<sup>8</sup>. Moreover, the intervening topic breaks the adjacency between  $C^{\circ}$  and the clitics in  $F^{\circ}$ , preventing left-fusion of the clitics in  $F^{\circ}$  to  $C^{\circ}$ . Thus, the clitics in (8) can only be licensed via «last-resort», triggering verb-movement to  $F^{\circ}$  with subsequent left-fusion of the clitics to it, accounting for the postverbal pattern in (6).

Turning now to the data in (1)–(3) above, notice that a postverbal clitic pattern arises, a relevant example repeated in (9).

- (9) Fáiseme que ta lloca, [porque *vila* falando sola]

Raposo & Uriagereka's analysis predicts that  $C^{\circ}$  be a close enough host for the clitics in  $F^{\circ}$ , hence licensing preverbal clitics across the

<sup>8</sup> Although not fully addressed in Raposo & Uriagereka's analysis, the reason why topics do not qualify as suitable hosts for the clitic(s) in  $F^{\circ}$  is explained as follows: «[...] the host for the clitic must be found within a specified prosodic domain containing the clitic, and [...] for some reason, a topic or a subject is outside such a domain, not counting as valid hosts» (cf. RAPOSO & URIAGEREKA [2005: 656]).





- b. [While Dr Williams' support for women priests and gay partnerships might label him as liberal], this would be a misleading way of depicting his uncompromisingly orthodox espousal of Christian belief [Peripheral > background]

(From Haegeman [2006a: 29], ex. 3a-b)

Notice that whereas the subordinate clause (IIa) introduces an event related to the matrix clause's time frame, the one in (IIb) establishes a looser connection with the matrix clause (i.e., it is part of the background information) which is clearly not a temporal one as the one in (IIa). In order to distinguish these two types of subordinate clauses, Haegeman provides different empirical clues, shown in the table below.

(12) Properties distinguishing central adverbial clauses vs. peripheral adverbial clauses

	Central	Peripheral	Examples
1. Epistemic modality	x	✓	(13)
2. Expressions of illocutionary force	x	✓	(14)
3. Tags - imperative licensing - (unselected) interrogatives	x	✓	(15)
4. Speech act adverbials	x	✓	(16)
5. Argument fronting	x	✓	(17)

In what follows, I review each of those clues in turn.

### 1. *Epistemic modality*

Modal constructions and adverbials related to an epistemic modality are only licensed in peripheral clauses –as in (13a), but not in central ones, as in (13b).

- (13) a. The ferry will be fairly cheap, while/whereas the plane *may/will* probably be too expensive
- b. \*Mary accepted the invitation without hesitation after John *may* have accepted it.
- (From Haegeman [2006a: 30], examples (5c) and (5a) respectively)

### 2. *Expressions of illocutionary force*

Illocutionary markers (such as the Korean declarative marker «ta») are only licensed in peripheral clauses –as in (14a), but not in central ones, as in (14b).

- (14) a. ku chayk-ul cohaha-n-ta-myen way kukes-ul ca-ci anh-ni?  
that book-ACC like-PRES-DEC-if why that-ACC buy-NMZ not do-Q  
'If you like that book, why don't you buy it?'
- b. (ku-ka) i chayk-ul ilk-umyen/ilk-ess-umyen ku-nun ama ku yenghwa-lul poko siphe hal kes-i-ta  
(he-NOM) this book-ACC read-if/read-PAST-if he-TOP probably that movie-ACC see want will-DEC  
'If he reads/read this book, he will probably want to see that movie'
- (From Haegeman [2006b: 1656], ex. (8))

### 3. *Question tags, imperatives and (unselected) interrogatives*

Whereas question tags, imperatives and (unselected) interrogatives may be licensed in peripheral clauses –as in (15a), these constructions are not licensed in central ones, as in (15b).

- (15) a. Bill took a degree at Oxford, while his daughter is studying at UCL, isn't she?  
 b. \*Mary went to college after/before her children had finished school, didn't they?

(From Haegeman [2004: 165], ex. (9b) and (11c) respectively)

#### 4. *Speech act adverbials*

As Haegeman points out, speech act adverbials, such as «frankly», may be licensed in peripheral clauses –as in (16a), but not in central ones, as (16b) shows.

- (16) a. A referendum on a united Ireland [...] will be a good thing, because frankly they need to be taken down a peg and come down to earth and be a little bit more sober in their approach to things.  
 b. \*I didn't drop the class because frankly I didn't like it; I dropped it because it was too expensive.

(From Haegeman [2006a: 32], ex. 11)

#### 5. *Argument fronting*

Argument fronting is licensed in peripheral subordinate clauses, as (17a) shows, but not in central ones, as in (17b).

- (17) a. *If anemones you don't like, why not plant roses instead?*  
 b. \**If these exams you don't pass you won't get the degree*

(From Haegeman [2006a: 33], examples (14g) and (12a) respectively)

#### *Haegeman's conclusion*

The differences between the two types of subordinate clauses follow from the composition of their respective CPS; in short, whereas central adverbial clauses have a reduced CP structure, peripheral adverbial clauses have a full-fledged one.

#### 4. A TYPOLOGY OF THE [+FINITE] SUBORDINATE CONTEXT IN WESTERN IBERIAN ROMANCE

Following Haegeman (2004, 2006a, 2006b), I argue that the sentences in (1)-(3) above have a full CP-structure<sup>9</sup>, which entails that these subordinate contexts should be treated as peripheral. In what follows, I present empirical evidence indicating that these subordinate contexts must be treated as peripheral, and not as central.

##### *Evidence 1: Epistemic modality in subordinate clauses*

Recall from the table in (12) that epistemic adverbials are only licensed in peripheral subordinate clauses, but not in central ones. As (18) shows, an epistemic adverbial, such as «probablemente», is licensed in (18a), where a postverbal clitic can also be licensed –cf. (1e), but not in (18b), which does not license a postverbal clitic either– see Viejo [2008]. I conclude that (18a) and (1e) must be peripheral subordinate clauses, and not central ones.

- (18) a. Agora doime cuenta (de) [que, probablemente, fíxilo mal]  
 now take<sub>1SG</sub>-1st<sub>CL</sub> notice (of) that, probably, did<sub>1SG</sub>-it<sub>CL</sub> bad  
 ‘Now I realize that I have probably done it wrong’
- b. \*Quiero [que probablemente-y lo digas]  
 want<sub>1SG</sub> that probably-him<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> say<sub>2SG</sub>  
 ‘\*I want that you probably tell him that’  
 (Xulio Viejo, personal communication)

<sup>9</sup> I will restrict my attention to Asturian, since similar grammaticality judgments were obtained in European Portuguese from my informants. Unfortunately, I will have to assume that the same extends to Galician since I have not been able to consult the data with any native speaker yet.

*Evidence 2: Unselected interrogatives*

Unselected interrogatives are only licensed in peripheral subordinate clauses, but not in central ones –as shown in (12). As (19) shows, an unselected interrogative is licensed in (19a), where a postverbal clitic can also be licensed– cf. (1c), but not in (19b)<sup>10</sup>, which does not license a postverbal clitic either. I conclude that (19a) –and (1c), (2a), (2e) and (3a)– must be peripheral subordinate clauses, and not central ones.

- (19) a. Porque ¿a quién más-y vas pedir perres?  
 because to whom else-him<sub>CL</sub> go<sub>2SG</sub> request<sub>INF</sub> money?  
 ‘Because who else are you going to ask for money?’
- b. \*Quieres que a quién más-y pida perres?  
 want<sub>2SG</sub> that to whom else-him<sub>CL</sub> request<sub>1SG</sub> money?  
 ‘\*You want that to whom I ask for money?’

(Xulio Viejo, personal communication)

*Evidence 3: Speech act adverbials*

As shown in (12), speech act adverbials are only licensed in peripheral subordinate clauses, but not in central ones. As (20) shows, a speech act adverbial is licensed in (19a), where a postverbal clitic can also be licensed –cf. (1c), but not in (19b), which does not license a postverbal clitic either, concluding that (20a) and (1c) must be peripheral subordinate clauses, and not central ones.

- (20)a. Ello ye [que, francamente, enfadóse abondo]

---

<sup>10</sup> The reading intended is not one in which the *wh*-element is interpreted as an echo question, whose grammaticality is fine, but which differs substantially from the reading in (19a), which is not an echo question one.

- it is that, frankly, got-angry<sub>3SG</sub>-rfl<sub>CL</sub> abundantly  
 ‘The thing is that, frankly, he got really angry’
- b. \*Xulio nun quier [que francamente-y lo digas]  
 Xulio not wants that frankly-him<sub>CL</sub> it<sub>CL</sub> say<sub>2SG</sub>  
 ‘\*Xulio doesn’t want that, frankly, you tell him’  
 (Xulio Viejo, personal communication)

*Evidence 4: Argument fronting and Hanging  
 Topic Left Dislocation*

As shown in (12), argument fronting is only licensed in peripheral subordinate clauses, but not in central ones. One such kind of fronting, called Hanging Topic Left Dislocation –cf. Cinque (1983), has been argued to be only licensed in root clauses, as shown in (21) for Italian.

- (21) a. Giorgio<sub>i</sub> hanno parlato bene di lui<sub>i</sub>  
 Giorgio have<sub>3PL</sub> talked well of him  
 ‘Giorgio, they have talked well of him’  
 (Example from Benincà *et alii*, 1988)
- b. \*Credo que Mario<sub>i</sub>, lui<sub>i</sub> non venga  
 believe<sub>1SG</sub> that Mario, he not will-come  
 ‘\*I think that Mario, he won’t come’  
 (Example from Cinque, 1983)

Now, assuming –following Haegeman– that peripheral adverbial clauses have a full-fledged CP, it predicts that Hanging Topic Left Dislocation should be licensed in this type of clauses (and not in the central ones). (22) shows that those subordinate contexts where a postverbal clitic may arise (cf. (1a)-(1b)) also license this kind of dislocation, thus indicating their peripheral status, whereas those subordinate context that do not license postverbal clitics –cf. (22c)– neither license Hanging

Topic Left Dislocation structures nor postverbal clitics, thus indicating that these subordinate clauses are central.

- (22) a. Paezme [que Xuan, nun te pues enfotar nél]  
 seems<sub>3SG</sub>-me<sub>CL</sub> that Xuan, not rff<sub>CL</sub> can<sub>2SG</sub> trust on-him  
 ‘It seems to me that Xuan, you cannot put any trust on him’
- b. Porque Xuan, nun te pues enfotar nél  
 because Xuan, not rff<sub>CL</sub> can<sub>2SG</sub> trust on-him  
 ‘Because Xuan, you cannot put any trust on him’
- c. \*Quiero [que Xuan, véante bailando con él]  
 want<sub>1SG</sub> that Xuan, see<sub>3PL</sub>-you<sub>CL</sub> dancing with him  
 ‘\*I want that Xuan, they see you dancing with him’

(Xulio Viejo, personal communication)

##### 5. HOW DOES ALL THIS EXPLAIN THE ENCLISIS SHOWN IN (1)-(3)?

I have shown that certain subordinate contexts behave like peripheral clauses (following Haegeman’s typology), which are in turn the same subordinate clauses that license a postverbal clitic in Western Iberian. In section 2, it was shown that Raposo & Uriagereka’s analysis fails to explain why enclisis obtains in this context.

In order to account for postverbal clitics in (1) above, I argue that (i) these peripheral subordinate clauses have a full-CP cartographic structure (see Rizzi [1997, 2004] and Benincà and Poletto [2004]), and (ii) determiner clitics target T<sup>o</sup> (either raising from the *v*\*P phase as in Raposo & Uriagereka or merged as agreement features –as argued in Suñer [1988] and Franco [1991, 1994, 2000] for Spanish clitics). Thus, building on Fernández-Rubiera’s (2006) analysis for clitic placement alternations in the matrix context in Asturian, I argue that the typology of subordinate clauses in Western Iberian Romance be captured as shown in (23):



- (23) a.  $[_{CP} \dots [_{TP} [_{T^o} \text{clitic} - V^o + v^o + T^o [_{vp} \dots]]]] >$  Central subordinate clauses  
> proclisis and FocusP not present
- b.  $[_{CP} \dots [_{\text{FocusP}} [_{\text{Focus}^o} [\text{EPP}] [_{TP} [_{T^o} \text{clitic} - V^o + v^o + T^o [_{vp} \dots]]]]]] >$  Peripheral  
subordinate clauses > *enclisis* and FocusP licensed (as in matrix clauses)

Moreover, I propose the following condition in (24):

- (24) FocusP creates a phase whenever part of the lexical array –cf. CHOMSKY (2000, 2001)

Thus, the backbone structure assumed for peripheral subordinate clauses is as shown in (25) below.

- (25)  $[_{CP} \text{porque/que } \bar{P} [_{\text{FocusP}} [_{\text{Focus}^o} [\text{EPP}] [_{TP} [_{T^o} \text{clitic} - V^o + v^o + T^o [_{vp} \dots]]]]]]]$

With the structure in (25), and assuming that FocusP is a phase –as in (24),  $T^o$ 's inaccessibility to any operations and elements outside of FocusP is granted– since it is not at the edge<sup>11</sup> of the phase. Hence, in a structure as that shown in (25) for peripheral subordinate clauses, I argue that the trigger for the enclisis (i.e., postverbal clitics) shown in section 1 is derived as follows: (i) the presence of the clitic in  $T^o$  forces a «last-resort» verb-movement to  $\text{Focus}^o$ , and (ii) this  $T^o$ -to- $\text{Focus}^o$  movement is triggered by the clitic in  $T^o$ , which being a prosodically deficient element (i.e., phonologically enclitic<sup>12</sup>) requires «lexical» material to its left. As shown in (25), there is no lexical material to the left of the clitic, hence forcing the derivation to take a «last-resort» step before the FocusP-phase undergoes Spell-out; namely verb-movement to  $\text{Focus}^o$  as shown in the structure below:

<sup>11</sup> Edge understood as the head and the specifier(s) of the phase-inducing projection, cf. CHOMSKY'S (2000, 2001) P(hase)I(mpenetrability)C(ondition) or PIC.

<sup>12</sup> The literature that considers this claim is vast. See, for instance, FONTANA (1993) for an overview of the relevant literature.

(26) [<sub>CP</sub> porque/que  $\uparrow$  [<sub>FocusP</sub> [<sub>Focus<sup>o</sup></sub> V<sup>o</sup>+V<sup>e</sup>+T<sup>o</sup> [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>T<sup>o</sup></sub> clitic V<sup>o</sup>+V<sup>e</sup>+T<sup>o</sup> [<sub>vP</sub> ...]]]]]]]

Moreover, notice that this analysis derives postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context in a similar fashion to those in the matrix one. Thus, consider (27) and (28):

(27) *A Ramón dieron-y perres asgaya*

to Ramón gave<sub>3PL</sub> -him<sub>CL</sub> money abundantly

‘They gave a lot of money to Ramón’

(28) [<sub>CP</sub> [<sub>TopicP</sub> a Ramón  $\uparrow$  [<sub>FocusP</sub> [<sub>Focus<sup>o</sup></sub> dieron [<sub>TP</sub> [<sub>T<sup>o</sup></sub> -y dieron [<sub>vP</sub> ...]]]]]]]]]

In (28), the moment FocusP –a phase-inducing projection, cf. (24)– is merged in the structure, the derivation detects a problem: the clitic in T<sup>o</sup> does not have a suitable host to its left to satisfy its prosodic «enclitic» nature. Thus, last-resort T<sup>o</sup>-to-Focus<sup>o</sup> movement is triggered to ensure convergence, accounting for the postverbal clitic pattern in (27) –a matrix context– in a similar fashion to what is proposed for the enclitic patterns in the subordinate contexts in section 1 above –cf. (25) and (26).

## 6. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this article, I have shown that the [+finite] subordinate context in Western Iberian Romance –that is, Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese– licenses postverbal clitics –in section 1, a clitic pattern that previous analyses to clitic placement alternations in this group of languages neither predict nor account for (cf. Raposo & Uriagereka [2005], reviewed in section 2). Building on Viejo’s (2008) intuitions that clitic placement alternations in this context in Asturian give rise to differences in interpretation, I claimed following Haegeman’s (2004, 2006a, 2006b) typology of subordinate clauses –in section 3– that those embedded contexts where postverbal clitics are licensed in Western Iberian Romance

be best analyzed as peripheral subordinate clauses –as opposed to central ones, showing how Haegeman’s cues regarding this typology in the subordinate context may be extended to capture the same observations in the group of languages considered– in section 4.

Thus, in order to account for the enclisis shown in section 1, I built on Fernández-Rubiera’s (2006) analysis for clitic placement alternations in the matrix context in section 5, arguing that (i) FocusP (cf. Rizzi [1997, 2004]) and Benincà & Poletto [2004]) creates a phase (cf. Chomsky [2000, 2001]) whenever it is part of the lexical array in Western Iberian Romance, and (ii) clitics in this group of languages are phonologically deficient elements –i.e., enclitics– which are licensed in the TP-domain. These two assumptions were shown to force a «last-resort» movement of the verbal head to Focus<sup>o</sup> in order to ensure convergence, providing a host for the offending (en)clitic in the derivation before the derivation undergoes Spell-out of the FocusP phase, accounting in turn for the postverbal clitic pattern observed. Moreover, it was shown that the analysis proposed uniformly derives the clitic placement patterns in both matrix and finite embedded clauses.

As future research, it will be interesting to see whether the syntactic structure proposed can in turn explain the interpretation differences pointed out in Viejo (2008) that pre and postverbal clitic alternations correlate with in the [+finite] subordinate context in Asturian.

#### REFERENCES

- ÁLVAREZ, REGUEIRA & MONTEAGUDO (1986) = ROSARIO ÁLVAREZ, XOSÉ LUIS REGUEIRA and HENRIQUE MONTEAGUDO, *Gramática galega*, Vigo (Galaxia), 1986.
- ÁLVAREZ (2005) = X. ÁLVAREZ, *Les llames del to llar antiguu*, Uviéu (Academia de la llingua asturiana), 2005.
- ANAGNOSTOPOULOU *et alii* (1997) = E. ANAGNOSTOPOULOU, H. VAN RIEMSDIJK, and F. ZWARTS, *Materials on Left Dislocation*, Amsterdam (John Benjamins), 1997.

BENINCÀ *et alii* (1988) = P. BENINCÀ, G. SALVI and L. FRISON, «L'ordine delle parole e le costruzioni marcate», In L. Renzi, *Grande grammatica italiana di consultazione*, págs. 115-225, Bologna (Il Mulino), 1988.

BENINCÀ & POLETTO (2004) = P. BENINCÀ and C. POLETTO, «Topic, Focus and V<sub>2</sub>», in Luigi Rizzi, *The Structure of CP and IP: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, págs. 52-76, Oxford (Oxford University Press), 2004.

CARBALLO (1979) = RAMÓN CARBALLO CALERO, *Gramática elemental del gallego común*, Vigo (Galaxia), 1979.

CHOMSKY (2000) = NOAM CHOMSKY, *Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework*, in Roger Martin *et alii*, *Step by Step: Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge, Massachusetts (The MIT Press), 2000, pp. 89-155.

CHOMSKY (2001) = N. CHOMSKY, «Derivation by Phase», in M. Kenstowicz, *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*, Cambridge, Massachusetts (MIT Press), 2001, pp. 1-43.

CINQUE (1983) = G. CINQUE, «Topic Constructions in some European Languages and Connectedness», in K. Ehlich and H. van Riemsdijk, *Connectedness in Sentence, Discourse and Text*, Tilburg (KBU), 1983 [Reprinted in Anagnostopoulou *et alii* (1997: 93-118)].

D'ANDRÉS (1993) = RAMÓN D'ANDRÉS, *Allugamientu de los pronomes átonos col verbu n'asturianu*, Uviéu (Universidá d'Uviéu, Departamentu de Filoloxía Española) 1993.

FERNÁNDEZ-RUBIERA (2006) = PACO FERNÁNDEZ-RUBIERA, «Clitic Placement in Asturian: Evidence for a Syntactic FocusP Interaction», *Georgetown University Working Papers in Linguistics*, 2006, pp. 90 - 126.

FONTANA (1993) = J. M. FONTANA, *Phrase Structure and the Syntax of Clitics in the History of Spanish*, PhD Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, Department of Linguistics, 1993.

FRANCO (1991) = J. FRANCO, «Spanish Object Clitics as Verbal Agreement Morphemes», *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, 14 (1991), pp. 99 - 113.

FRANCO (1994) = J. FRANCO, *On Object Agreement in Spanish*, PhD Dissertation, University of Southern California, Department of Linguistics, 1994.

FRANCO (2000) = J. FRANCO, «Agreement as a Continuum», in F. Beukema and M. den Dikken, *Clitic Phenomena in European Languages*. Amsterdam- Philadelphia (John Benjamins), 2000, pp. 147-189.

HAEGEMAN (2004) = L. HAEGEMAN, «Topicalization, CLLD and the Left Periphery», in B. Shaer *et alii*, *Proceedings of the Dislocated Elements Workshop, ZAS Berlin, November 2003*, Berlin (ZASPIL), 2004, pp. 157-192.

HAEGEMAN (2006a) = L. HAEGEMAN, «Argument Fronting in English, Romance CLLD, and the Left Periphery», in R. Zanuttini *et alii*, *Crosslinguistic Research in Syntax and Semantics: Negation, Tense and Clausal Architecture*, Washington DC (Georgetown University Press), 2006, pp. 27-52.

HAEGEMAN (2006b) = L. HAEGEMAN, «Conditionals, Factives and the Left Periphery», *Lingua*, 116 (2006), pp. 1651-1669.

MEIER (1976) = H. MEIER, «Problemas de gramática gallega (III)», *Verba*, 3 (1976), pp. 45-52.

RAPOSO & URIAGEREKA (2005) = E. P. RAPOSO and J. URIAGEREKA, «Clitic Placement in Western Iberian: A Minimalist View», in G. Cinque and R. S. Kayne, *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Syntax*, Oxford-New York (Oxford University Press), 2005, pp. 639-697.

RIZZI (1997) = L. RIZZI, «The Fine Structure of the Left Periphery», in L. HAEGEMAN, *Elements of Grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, Dordrecht, Netherlands (Kluwer Academic Publishers), 1997, pp. 281-337.

RIZZI (2004) = L. RIZZI, «Locality and Left Periphery», in Adriana Beletti, *Structures and Beyond: The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*, New York (Oxford University Press), 2004, pp. 223-251.

SUÑER (1988) = M. SUÑER, «The Role of Agreement in Clitic-Double Constructions», *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 6 (1988), pp. 391-434.

VÁZQUEZ CUESTA & MENDES DA LUZ (1971) = P. VÁZQUEZ CUESTA and M. A. MENDES DA LUZ, *Gramática portuguesa*, vol. II, Madrid (Gredos), 1971.

VIEJO FERNÁNDEZ (2008) = X. VIEJO FERNÁNDEZ, *Pensar asturiano. Ensayos gramáticos de sintaxis asturiana*, Uviéu (Ediciones Trabe), 2008.