The 43rd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages
April 17 – 19, 2013
Dear Friends,

The LSRL43 Organizing Committee would like to welcome you to New York City!

Together with the Program in Linguistics at The Graduate Center, we are very pleased to host the 43rd Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages.

Many of the CUNY linguists you will meet at LSRL43 have two academic homes. The numerous CUNY colleges in Brooklyn, Queens, The Bronx, Manhattan, and on Staten Island serve as the base-campuses for most of us. At the same time, the Program in Linguistics at The Graduate Center serves as an exciting focal point of activity for our shared scholarly interests. Thus, the joint involvement of the College of Staten Island and The Graduate Center in the organization of LSRL43 is emblematic of the robust cooperation of CUNY linguists spread out across the five boroughs of our great city. As the number of linguists at the City University of New York grows each year, we find our discipline exerting more and more of an influence on New York City students, something that we are very proud of.

We are thrilled that this year, LSRL is a part of this influence. As organizers of the first ever LSRL in NYC, we are particularly excited about this year’s program, which is placing a special focus on an important emerging area of research in Romance linguistics: Parsed Corpora. Our Special Plenary Session on Parsed Corpora of Romance Languages (supported by the NSF) involves three presentations from four leaders and innovators in this area of research, and encompasses both historical and synchronic corpora. We expect that this event will bring us all closer to gaining a better understanding of what these new and innovative tools have to offer.

This conference is a very happy event for us, but we also wish to remember that as a result of Hurricane Sandy, communities on Staten Island and in Brooklyn, Queens, Manhattan, and The Bronx faced tremendous challenges this year. In many ways, we are still recovering. Despite the losses we have suffered, we still love our city, and we look forward to the many ways in which your participation in LSRL43, as well as your visit to New York City, will make this an even better place to be.

Please do not hesitate to ask the LSRL43 organizers and helpers for any assistance during the conference. We are delighted that you are joining us, and we truly hope your stay with us is legendary!

Our best regards,

The LSRL43 Organizing Committee (Christina Tortora, Marcel den Dikken, Frances Blanchette, Ignacio Montoya, Teresa O’Neill, and Emily Wilson)
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### Wednesday Morning, April 17, 2013: Sessions on Concourse Level (C)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:30am</td>
<td><strong>Breakfast</strong> (Room C201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:30-10:00am</td>
<td>Opening Remarks (Room: C204/C205):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>William Fritz</strong>, President, the College of Staten Island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Louise Lennihan</strong>, Associate Provost and Dean for Humanities and Social Sciences, The Graduate Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Gita Martohardjono</strong>, Executive Officer of the Program in Linguistics, The Graduate Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:00am</td>
<td>Invited Talk (Room: C204/C205) Chair: Gita Martohardjono.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Ricardo Otheguy</strong>, CUNY Graduate Center. <em>A linguistic tour of Latino New York (with emphasis on second generation bilinguals)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30am</td>
<td>Coffee Break (Room C201)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30am-12:30pm</td>
<td>Session 1.1 (Room: C202) Chair: Maria Luisa Zubizarreta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Syntax/Semantics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>On capacities and their epistemic extensions</em>, Elena Castroviejo &amp; Isabel Oltra-Massuet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Root que in Spanish: Evidentiality vs. Insubordination</em>, Violeta Demonte &amp; Olga Fernandez-Soriano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-2:30pm</td>
<td>Lunch Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30am-12:30pm</td>
<td>Session 1.2 (Room: C203) Chair: Ricardo Otheguy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Acquisition</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Converging on probabilistic grammatical patterning</em>, Naomi Lapidus Shin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Atoms of intervention in the acquisition of A-bar dependencies</em>, Anamaria Bentea &amp; Stephanie Durrleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30am-12:30pm</td>
<td>Session 1.3 (Room: C204/C205) Chair: Cecilia Poletto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Syntax</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Italian locative lì as a topic head and the typology of topics</em>, Marco Nicolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The make-up of clitic clusters in the history of (Gallo-)Romance</em>, Diego Pescarini</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Wednesday AFTERNOON, April 17, 2013; SESSIONS ON CONCOURSE LEVEL (C)**

| Session 2: 2:30-3:30pm | Session 3.1 (ROOM: C202)  
**Chair:** Douglas H. Whalen  
**PHONETICS/PHONOLOGY**  
**Perception of consonantal and vocalic contrasts in heritage and native Spanish speakers, Natalia Mazzaro, Alejandro Cuza, & Laura Colantoni** | Session 3.2 (ROOM: C203)  
**Chair:** Marcel den Dikken  
**SYNTAX/SEMANTICS**  
**On the genericity of mass indefinites, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin**  
**Dimensions of definiteness in French-based creoles, Viviane Déprez** | Session 3.3 (ROOM: C204/C205)  
**Chair:** William Haddican  
**HISTORICAL SYNTAX**  
**Participle fronting and clause structure in Old and Middle French, Marie Labelle**  
**Old French possessives and ellipses, Deborah Arteaga & Julia Herschensohn** |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Session 2.1 (ROOM: C202)  
**Chair:** Lori Repetti  
**PHONETICS/PHONOLOGY**  
**French loanwords in Korean: Modeling Lexical knowledge in OT, Haike Jacobs**  
**“Toned-up” Spanish: stress → pitch → tone(?) in Equatorial New Guinea, John Lipski** | Session 2.2 (ROOM: C203)  
**Chair:** Gregory Guy  
**ACQUISITION**  
**Input variability and late acquisition: Clitic misplacement in European Portuguese, João Costa, Alexandra Fiéis, & Maria Lobo**  
**Plurals in Brazilian Portuguese and Chilean Spanish: Variation effects in L1 acquisition, Cristina Schmitt** | Session 2.3 (ROOM: C204/C205)  
**Chair:** Daniel Kaufman  
**SYNTAX**  
**At the PF Interface: negation and clitic clusters, Jacopo Garzonia & Cecilia Poletto**  
**Reviewing constituent negation in Spanish, Ricardo Etxepare & Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria** |
| 3:30-4:00pm: COFFEE BREAK (Room C201) | | | |
| Session 3: 4:00-5:00pm | Session 3.1 (ROOM: C202)  
**Chair:** Douglas H. Whalen  
**PHONETICS/PHONOLOGY**  
**Perception of consonantal and vocalic contrasts in heritage and native Spanish speakers, Natalia Mazzaro, Alejandro Cuza, & Laura Colantoni** | Session 3.2 (ROOM: C203)  
**Chair:** Marcel den Dikken  
**SYNTAX/SEMANTICS**  
**On the genericity of mass indefinites, Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin**  
**Dimensions of definiteness in French-based creoles, Viviane Déprez** | Session 3.3 (ROOM: C204/C205)  
**Chair:** William Haddican  
**HISTORICAL SYNTAX**  
**Participle fronting and clause structure in Old and Middle French, Marie Labelle**  
**Old French possessives and ellipses, Deborah Arteaga & Julia Herschensohn** |
| | | | |
| 5:00-7:00pm: RECEPTION (ROOM: Skylight, 9th Floor) | | | |
## Thursday MORNING, April 18, 2013; SESSIONS ON CONCOURSE LEVEL (C) UNTIL 5:00pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8:00-9:00am</td>
<td><strong>BREAKFAST</strong> (Room C201)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am-12:30pm</td>
<td><strong>SPECIAL PLENARY SESSION ON ROMANCE PARSED CORPORA</strong></td>
<td>Room C204/C205</td>
<td><strong>Christina Tortora</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:00am</td>
<td><strong>Anthony Kroch &amp; Beatrice Santorini</strong>, U. of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The syntactic evolution of French as seen in the MCVF corpus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 minute break (10:00-10:15am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15-11:15am</td>
<td><strong>Charlotte Galves</strong>, U. of Campinas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>The Tycho Brahe Corpus of Historical Portuguese: Methodology and results</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 minute break (11:15-11:30am)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30am-12:30pm</td>
<td><strong>Ana Maria Martins</strong>, U. of Lisbon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Dialect syntax through corpora: the subject doubling se construction</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-2:30pm</td>
<td><strong>LUNCH BREAK / Business Meeting</strong> (partially overlapping with lunch): 2:00-2:30 (Room C204/205)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Thursday AFTERNOON, April 18, 2013; SESSIONS ON CONCOURSE LEVEL (C) UNTIL 5:00pm**

| Session 4: 2:30-3:30pm | Session 4.1 (ROOM: C202)  
Chair: Julia Herschensohn  
SYNTAX/SEMANTICS | Session 4.2 (ROOM: C203)  
Chair: Isabelle Barrière  
EXPERIMENTAL | Session 4.3 (ROOM: C204/C205)  
Chair: Beatrice Santorini  
HISTORICAL SYNTAX |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>The epistemic and counterfactual interpretations of present perfect pouvoir in French, Alda Mari</em></td>
<td><em>Beyond the subject DP vs. the subject pronoun divide in agreement in Spanish, Juana Liceras, Raquel Fernández Fuertes, &amp; Anahi Alba de la Fuente</em></td>
<td><em>Pre-verbal subjects, information structure, and object clitic position in Old Occitan, Bryan Donaldson</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3:30-4:00pm: **COFFEE BREAK** (Room C201)

| Session 5: 4:00-5:00pm | Session 5.1 (ROOM: C202)  
Chair: Barbara Bullock  
PHONETICS | Session 5.2 (ROOM: C203)  
Chair: Cristina Schmitt  
SYNTAX | Session 5.3 (ROOM: C204/C205)  
Chair: Stefania Marzo  
LANGUAGE CHANGE |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **On Southwestern Sinalefa, Brian Funk**  
Development of a spontaneous speech corpus for the articulatory study of consonantal weakening, Laura Colantoni & Alexei Kochetov | **VP ellipses, null objects, and aspect as a licensing category in Brazilian Portuguese, Sonia Cyrino & Ruth Lopes** | **Stages of grammaticalization of the assertion structure in Spanish varieties, Maria Luisa Zubizarreta** |
|  |  | **Spanish por + a > para: Loss of compositionality in grammaticalization, Rena Torres-Cacoullos & Joseph Bauman** |

5:00-5:30pm: **COFFEE BREAK** (IN SKYLIGHT, NINTH FLOOR)

| 5:30-6:30pm | Session 6 (ROOM: Skylight)  
Chair: Anthony Kroch  
ROMANCE PARSED CORPORA | 5:30-6:00:  
The challenges and benefits of annotating bilingual corpora: The SPinTX corpus project, Barbara Bullock, Almeida Jacqueline Toribio, & Arthur Wendorf  
6:00-6:30:  
Diachronic syntax based on constituency and dependency annotated corpora, Achim Stein |

| 7:00-10:00pm | **CONFERENCE DINNER** at Via Emilia, 47 East 21st Street, between Broadway and Park Ave. (http://www.viaemilianyc.net/) |
**Friday MORNING, April 19, 2013; SESSIONS ON NINTH FLOOR**

| 8:00-9:00am: **BREAKFAST** (Room 9204) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Session 7: 9:00-10:30am | Session 7.1 (ROOM: 9205) Chair: Janet Fodor PROSODY/SYNTAX | Session 7.2 (ROOM: 9206) Chair: Ana Maria Martins SYNTAX/SEMANTICS |
| | A reconsideration of discourse-related syntactic movement motivated by prosody in Spanish, Carolina Barrera-Tobón & Bradley Hoot | Non-counterfactual past subjunctive conditionals in French, Fabienne Martin |
| | Prosodic boundary effect on the syntactic parsing of French utterance fragments, Amandine Michelas & Mariapaola D’Imperio | A fine-grained analysis of analytic causatives in Romance, Mihaela Marchis |
| | Epistemic adverbs, the theory of phases, and the prosody-syntax interface, Alessandra Giorgi | Resultatives with stative predicates: From Romanian to Mandarin Chinese, Monica Irimia |
| 10:30-11:00am: **COFFEE BREAK** (Room 9204) |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Session 8: 11:00am-12:30pm | Session 8.1 (ROOM: 9205) Chair: Robert Vago PHONETICS/PHONOLOGY | Session 8.2 (ROOM: 9206) Chair: John Bailyn ROMANIAN SYNTAX |
| | Phonetic cues in the production of aspectual periphrases, Patricia Amaral, Meghan Armstrong, & Luciana Lucente | Gerunds in Early-Modern Romanian, Gabriela Alboiu & Virginia Hill |
| | Phonological vowel reduction in Guatemalan Spanish, Benjamin Schmeiser | Romanian tough-constructions and multi-headed constituents, Ion Giurgea |
| | Spanish voiced obstruent alternation and underspecification in OT, Sonia Colina | The Romanian subjunctive: A delayed onset, Virginia Hill |
| 12:30-2:15pm: **LUNCH BREAK** (Please note slightly shorter lunch break today; only 1 hour and 45 minutes) | | |
### Friday AFTERNOON, April 19, 2013; SESSIONS ON NINTH FLOOR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Coalescence and hybrid vowels in the realization of Spanish four-vocoid sequences</strong>, Gabriela Vokic &amp; Jorge Guitart</td>
<td><strong>Prepositionless home in some Northern Italian dialects: From N to Particle (to P)</strong>, Silvia Rossi</td>
<td><strong>Convergence in feature mapping: Evidentiality, aspect, and nominalizations in Quechua-Spanish bilinguals</strong>, Liliana Sánchez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3:15-3:45pm COFFEE BREAK (Room 9204) |

### Session 10: 3:45-4:45pm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session 10.1 (ROOM: 9205) Chair: Charlotte Galves PORTUGUESE SYNTAX</th>
<th>Session 10.2 (ROOM: 9206) Chair: Carmen Dobrovic-Sorin SYNTAX</th>
<th>Session 10.3 (ROOM: 9207) Chair: José Camacho BILINGUALISM / SECOND LANG ACQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Reduced parenthetical clauses in Portuguese: A comparative approach</strong>, Gabriela Matos</td>
<td><strong>Polar positive answers in Brazilian Portuguese</strong>, Mary Kato</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4:45-5:15pm: COFFEE BREAK (Room 9204)

**Lori Repetti**, Stony Brook U. *The Phonology of Postverbal Pronouns in Romance Languages*  

Closing Remarks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alba de la Fuente, Anahí</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anahialba@gmail.com">anahialba@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Université de Montréal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alboiu, Gabriela</td>
<td><a href="mailto:galboiu@yorku.ca">galboiu@yorku.ca</a></td>
<td>York University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amaral, Patricia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pamaral@email.yorku.ca">pamaral@email.yorku.ca</a></td>
<td>U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armstrong, Meghan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mearms@uga.edu">mearms@uga.edu</a></td>
<td>U. of Georgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artega, Deborah</td>
<td><a href="mailto:deborah.arteaga@unlv.edu">deborah.arteaga@unlv.edu</a></td>
<td>U. of Nevada at Las Vegas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authier, Marc</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jma11@psu.edu">jma11@psu.edu</a></td>
<td>Penn State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrera-Tobon, Carolina</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cbarrer6@depaul.edu">cbarrer6@depaul.edu</a></td>
<td>DePaul University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bauman, Joseph</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jrb922@psu.edu">jrb922@psu.edu</a></td>
<td>Penn State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beline-Mendes, Ronald</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rbeline@usp.br">rbeline@usp.br</a></td>
<td>U. of São Paolo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bentea, Anamaria</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anamaria.bentea@unige.ch">anamaria.bentea@unige.ch</a></td>
<td>University of Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullock, Barbara</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bbullock@austin.utexas.edu">bbullock@austin.utexas.edu</a></td>
<td>U. of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castroviejo, Elena</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elena.castroviejo@cchs.csic.es">elena.castroviejo@cchs.csic.es</a></td>
<td>ILLA-CCHS-CSIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colantoni, Laura</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laura.colantoni@utoronto.ca">laura.colantoni@utoronto.ca</a></td>
<td>U. of Toronto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colina, Sonia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:scolina@email.arizona.edu">scolina@email.arizona.edu</a></td>
<td>U. of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa, João</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jcosta@fcsh.unl.pt">jcosta@fcsh.unl.pt</a></td>
<td>U. Nova de Lisboa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuza, Alejandro</td>
<td><a href="mailto:acuza@purdue.edu">acuza@purdue.edu</a></td>
<td>Purdue U.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrino, Sonia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sonia.cyrino@gmail.com">sonia.cyrino@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>U. of Campinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>de Cuba, Carlos</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lin200cde@hotmail.com">lin200cde@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>U. of Calgary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Déchaïne, Rose-Marie</td>
<td>dechaï<a href="mailto:ne@mail.ubc.ca">ne@mail.ubc.ca</a></td>
<td>U. of British Columbia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonte, Violeta</td>
<td><a href="mailto:violeta.demonte@cchs.csic.es">violeta.demonte@cchs.csic.es</a></td>
<td>Spanish National Research Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Déprez, Viviane</td>
<td><a href="mailto:viviane.deprez1@gmail.com">viviane.deprez1@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Rutgers University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D’Imperio, Mariapaola</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mariapaola.dimperio@lpl-aix.fr">mariapaola.dimperio@lpl-aix.fr</a></td>
<td>Aix-Marseille Université</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sorin.carmen2@gmail.com">sorin.carmen2@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>CNRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donaldson, Bryan</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bdonaldson@austin.utexas.edu">bdonaldson@austin.utexas.edu</a></td>
<td>U. of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufresne, Monique</td>
<td><a href="mailto:dufresne@queensu.ca">dufresne@queensu.ca</a></td>
<td>Queens University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durrleman, Stephanie</td>
<td><a href="mailto:stephanie.durrleman@unige.ch">stephanie.durrleman@unige.ch</a></td>
<td>U. of Geneva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estigarribia, Bruno</td>
<td><a href="mailto:retxepare@gmail.com">retxepare@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>U. of North Carolina at Chapel Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etxepare, Ricardo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:retxepare@gmail.com">retxepare@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>CNRS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandez Fuertes, Raquel</td>
<td><a href="mailto:raquelfuerter@gmail.com">raquelfuerter@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>Universidad de Valladolid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fernandez-Soriano, Olga</td>
<td><a href="mailto:olga.fernandez@uam.es">olga.fernandez@uam.es</a></td>
<td>Universitat Autònoma de Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiéis, Alexandra</td>
<td><a href="mailto:afieis@fcsh.unl.pt">afieis@fcsh.unl.pt</a></td>
<td>U. Nova de Lisboa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank, Joshua</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jfrank18@utexas.edu">jfrank18@utexas.edu</a></td>
<td>U. of Texas at Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funk, Brian</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bfunk@email.arizona.edu">bfunk@email.arizona.edu</a></td>
<td>U. of Arizona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galves, Charlotte</td>
<td><a href="mailto:galvesc@unicamp.br">galvesc@unicamp.br</a></td>
<td>U. of Campanas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garzonio, Jacopo</td>
<td><a href="mailto:garzonio@unive.it">garzonio@unive.it</a></td>
<td>U. of Venice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giorgi, Alessandra</td>
<td><a href="mailto:giorgi@unive.it">giorgi@unive.it</a></td>
<td>Inst. Lingvistica Iorgu Iordan–Al. Rosetti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giurgea, Ion</td>
<td><a href="mailto:giurgeaion@yahoo.com">giurgeaion@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>SUNY Buffalo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guitar, Jorge</td>
<td><a href="mailto:guitar@buffalo.edu">guitar@buffalo.edu</a></td>
<td>U. of Alcalá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gumiel-Molina, Silvia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:silvia.gumiel@uah.es">silvia.gumiel@uah.es</a></td>
<td>U. of Washington at Seattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herschenschmidt, Julia</td>
<td><a href="mailto:herschens@u.washington.edu">herschens@u.washington.edu</a></td>
<td>UNBSJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hill, Virginia</td>
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Abstracts for Special Plenary Session on Romance Parsed Corpora
The syntactic evolution of French as seen in the MCVF corpus

Anthony Kroch / University of Pennsylvania
Beatrice Santorini / University of Pennsylvania

The MCVF corpus (Modéliser le changement: Les voies du français (MCVF) / Modeling Change: The Paths of French) was constructed between 2005 and 2010 with funding from the CRSH/SSHRC (Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada / Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada) under the direction of France Martineau of the University of Ottawa, with extensive participation by our team at the University of Pennsylvania. The project produced a syntactically annotated (parsed) corpus of 1 million words of running text from 23 different sources. Since the end of that project, we have ourselves produced a supplementary corpus of 200,000 words from 14 additional sources at Penn. These corpora were annotated using a modified version of the annotation scheme developed for the series of Penn Parsed Corpora of Historical English, a scheme which was designed specifically to facilitate the diachronic investigation of word order patterns and changes.

Since its construction, the MCVF corpus has been used for research by a number of diachronic syntacticians, including ourselves. In our own work we have tended, as specialists in Germanic, to emphasize the comparative syntax of historical French and English, hoping thereby to stimulate a new field of corpus-based comparative diachronic syntax. In examining the evolution of medieval French and English, we have thus far discovered striking similarities and interesting differences in two domains: the well-known increasingly post-verbal position of objects and the declining frequency of so-called "verb-second" word order in the two languages. In our presentation we will show how these two diachronic processes manifest themselves as gradual changes in relative frequencies in the MCVF and Penn supplement corpora of French and make suggestions regarding the grammatical reanalyses that underlie the quantitative patterns that we have found. A brief comparison with the history of English will then be in order.
The Tycho Brahe Corpus of Historical Portuguese: Methodology and results
Charlotte Galves / University of Campinas

In the first part of the talk, the Tycho Brahe Corpus will be presented. This corpus is currently composed of 57 texts (2,547.503 words) written in Portuguese by authors born between 1386 and 1845 (cf. www.tycho.iel.unicamp.br/~tycho/corpus). At the present time, the great majority of the texts are from Portuguese authors, but a great number of Brazilian texts are currently being included, in cooperation with Brazilian teams working on the edition of non-literary texts produced in Brazil from the 17th century on. All the texts are formatted in XML, which allows them to be presented both in their original version and in a standardized version. The annotation systems were adapted to Portuguese from the Penn Parsed Corpora Project, and they could be easily transferred to other Romance languages. An automatic Part of Speech (POS) tagger was developed, whose accuracy is 95%. Presently, 33 texts are available with a corrected POS tagging. As for the syntactic parsing, the team has been training Dan Bickel’s universal parser. The output of the parser is corrected partly by hand, and partly by using the revision function of the automatic search tool Corpus Search. Presently, 16 corrected parsed texts (c. 750,000 words / 34,280 sentences) are available for syntactic research, and many other texts, representative of different periods and genres, will be soon released. It must be emphasized that the unrestricted access to the texts is an important feature of the Tycho Brahe Corpus, since it allows one to study in detail the way syntax and information structure interact, both at the level of entire periods and internal to individual authors.

In the second part of the talk, results obtained thus far, thanks to the syntactically annotated part of the Corpus, will be presented. These results mainly concern aspects of Portuguese that have changed over time: clitic placement, subject position, the position of the verb, the use of determiners, and the syntax of infinitival clauses. The quantitative analyses made possible by the access to large quantities of data gave rise to a much more precise picture of the evolution of Portuguese grammar from the 16th century on, and locate the change from Classical to Modern European in authors born at the beginning of the 18th century, in which the syntax of clitics and the syntax of subjects concomitantly change. Moreover, thanks to the development of the Brazilian part of the corpus, we are now able to initiate a comparative history of the syntax of Brazilian and European Portuguese from the 16th century on, which was totally inexistent up to now.
Dialect syntax through corpora: The subject doubling *se* construction

Ana Maria Martins / Universidade de Lisboa (FLUL/CLUL)

This talk will discuss novel syntactic data made available by the existence of the CORDIAL-SIN: Syntax-oriented Corpus of Portuguese Dialects (http://www.clul.ul.pt) and consider their empirical and theoretical relevance for Romance and general syntax. It will also illustrate how and why a corpus of spoken language can be an optimal tool to study syntactic variation.

European Portuguese (EP) dialects display a double subject construction where the impersonal clitic *se* shares with a strong pronoun, a null pronoun, or less commonly a full DP, the role of sentential subject. This construction, exemplified in (1)–(2) below, is fully ungrammatical in standard EP and has gone totally unobserved by philologists and linguists who dealt with dialect variation in European Portuguese. The corpus CORDIAL-SIN brought it into light.

(1) a. *A gente* *chama-se* rãs a *isto*. (CORDIAL-SIN. FLF)
   *pron.1PL* *calls-SE* *rãs* to that
   ‘We call these ones *rãs* (frogs).’

   b. *Chama-se*-lhe *a gente* espigas. (CORDIAL-SIN. AAL)
   *calls-SE*-it.DAT *pron.1PL* espigas
   ‘We call it *espigas* (spikes of cereal).’

(2) a. Há várias *qualidades* que até ainda *nós* *não se* conhecemos. (CORDIAL-SIN. ALV)
   *there.is* several *species* that even already *we* not *SE*
   know-*1PL*
   ‘There are so many species among fish that even we (fishermen) do not know all of them yet.’

   b. *Nunca se* *vimos* *este* peixe. (CORDIAL-SIN. CLC)
   *not* *SE* *saw-1PL* this *fish*
   ‘We never saw that kind of fish.’

The talk will describe in detail the subject doubling *se* construction, as it surfaces in the corpus, and discuss the relevance of the geolinguistic information offered by CORDIAL-SIN to make full sense of the particular features of the dialectal construction. It will finally be proposed that a nominal that lacks a person feature may also be devoid of Case. This is how the clitic *se* of the relevant EP dialects is like: it has number (plural), but no person or Case. Its deficient nature is what makes subject doubling a grammatical option in dialectal EP. In a few dialects, the expletive-like *se* drifted in the direction of a pure expletive:

(3) a. *Às vezes acontece*; *já se aconteceu*. (CORDIAL-SIN. PIC)
   sometimes happens already *SE* happened.3SG
   ‘Sometimes it happens; it has already happened.’

   b. *Nunca se* me aconteceu *isso*. (CORDIAL-SIN. CRV)
   *never* *SE* *me.DAT* happened.3SG that
   ‘It never happened to me a thing like that.’

Under the proposed analysis, the subject doubling *se* construction of European Portuguese dialects brings new empirical evidence that supports the contentions (i) to (iii) below.

(i) “If all other conditions are right, a given argument can be linked to, and coherently composed with, more than one expression”. (Chung and Ladusaw 2004, on the *extra object* in Chamorro).
(ii) The impersonal se/si of standard EP, Spanish and Italian is not deficient with respect to ϕ-features and Case (cf. Cinque 1988), but a full referential expression (D’Alessandro 2004). Therefore, subject doubling with impersonal se/si is not an option in standard EP, Spanish and Italian.

(iii) Overt pure expletives are not necessarily blocked when in competition with null pure expletives in a particular grammar (cf. Chomsky’s 1981 Avoid Pronoun Principle).

References
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Abstracts for Other Invited Plenary Talks
A linguistic tour of Latino New York (with emphasis on second generation bilinguals)

Ricardo Otheguy / Graduate Center - City University of New York

A linguistic tour of Latino New York for conference visitors to the Big Apple offers several proposals regarding contact and cross-generational transmission. A large scale, corpus based study of the Hispanic community’s lexical and grammatical resources provides evidence that, contrary to common assumptions, increasing amounts of lexical borrowing in the first generation are not related to growing bilingualism, but rather to the simpler fact of arrival and life in New York. And neither is extensive borrowing, as commonly believed, concentrated during the first generation stage on those with blue-collar occupations or little education (nor is it statistically led by nouns).

Following this lexical introduction, and using the same corpus, the linguistic tour takes participants to the most interesting morphosyntactic neighborhood of the City, the one inhabited by New York-born Hispanics. Here abundant theoretical context surrounds the home language of these second generation bilinguals. The research literature labels them with a distinct moniker (‘heritage speakers’); studies their home language in terms of a sharp comparison (with ‘Spanish’); and offers a clear linguistic construct to make sense of their speech (‘incomplete acquisition’). In an attempt to overcome the serious empirical and theoretical difficulties of these notions, the grammar that guides variable usage in these Latinos is studied in its own right, focusing on choice of mood inflection and subject pronoun in finite verbs. The comparison that is proffered with regard to the home language grammar of this generation of Latino New Yorkers is not with that of ‘Spanish’, but with that of the generation of their immigrant parents, yielding a different picture of continuity, contact, and change.
The Phonology of postverbal pronouns in Romance languages

Lori Repetti / Stony Brook University (SUNY)

Romance languages vary in the way in which prominence is assigned in phrases involving an imperative verb + postverbal pronoun(s). We find the following patterns: the stressed syllable of the verb may remain the prominent syllable of the phrase (standard Italian, standard Spanish, standard Catalan, etc.), stress may be shifted to the penultimate syllable (southern Italian varieties, Sardinian varieties, Catalan varieties, Corsican varieties, etc.), stress may be shifted to the final syllable (Ligurian varieties, Gascon, Argentinian Spanish, Sardinian varieties, etc.), or the pattern may vary depending on various factors, such as the number of enclitic pronouns: stress stability with one enclitic and stress shift with two (Neapolitan and other southern Italian varieties, Sardinian varieties, etc.).

(1) imperative verb + postverbal pronoun(s):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>cómpra + 1 enclitic</th>
<th>cómpra + 2 enclitics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stress stability:</td>
<td>cómpra-lo</td>
<td>cómpra-me-lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>penultimate stress shift:</td>
<td>compra-lo</td>
<td>compra-mé-lo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>final stress shift:</td>
<td>compra-ló</td>
<td>compra-me-ló</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A number of questions arise regarding these data.

(2) questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Why does the metrical structure of the phrase change?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>When does it change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What type of change is this? stress shift or something else?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we identify the type of change?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is another stress added to the phrase?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where does the new stress appear?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which syllable receives primary stress? secondary stress?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens to the stressed syllable of the verb?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I argue that the surface prominence patterns are actually the result of different processes. One is purely phonological and has been discussed widely in the literature: the stress shifts to repair a suboptimal metrical structure. For example, /cómpra-me-lo/ is not acceptable in some varieties because the stressed syllable is too far from the end of the phrase, so stress is shifted to the penult /compra-mé-lo/ (Loporcaro 2000, Peperkamp 1997, Torres-Tamarit 2010, etc.). Another is morpho-syntactic: two different types of pronouns that are morpho-syntactically distinct are involved in these patterns: true clitics and weak pronouns (Cardinaletti and Starke 1999). Morphological, syntactic, and phonological characteristics define weak pronouns vs. clitic pronouns, and some of the pronouns involved in stress shift can be considered ‘weak’, while those not involved in stress shift are true clitics (Ordóñez and Repetti 2006, 2008, 2012). Crucially, weak pronouns (but not clitics) consist of a foot, and therefore, can be stressed. A third is phonetic: the association of the pitch accent to the verb + pronoun phrase results in the perception of a stress shift, but various phonetic tests suggest that there is not a change in the word level stress (Kim and Repetti 2013).

---

1 This paper reports on work completed, in part, with Francisco Ordóñez and Miran Kim.
In other words, different parts of the grammar are involved in processes that result in a similar surface form: stress shift.

(3) stress shift can be caused by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a morpho-syntactic structure:</th>
<th>weak pronouns consist of a foot and are, therefore, stressed (even if certain phonological constraints are not violated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>metrical violations:</td>
<td>clitics can also be involved in stress shift if certain high ranked metrical constraints are violated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phonetics:</td>
<td>some cases of so-called ‘stress shift’ are actually a change in pitch accent alignment, and not a ‘shift’ in stress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using a wide range of data gathered from field research and available on the *Clitics of Romance Languages* database (Repetti and Ordóñez 2011), I show that once we understand the nature of the postverbal pronouns, the metrical structure of the verb + pronoun phrase, and the role of intonation, we can successfully answer the phonological questions in (2).

**References**
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Gerunds in Early Modern Romanian
Gabriela Alboiu / York University
Virginia Hill / University of New Brunswick – SJ

**Issue:** Early Modern Romanian (EMR), as attested in the Moldavian chronicles (17th–18th c.) displayed a productive use of gerunds, in matrix (1) and adjunct clauses (2), (3). Matrix gerunds may occur irrespective of the context, as “out-of-the-blue” constructions. Modern Romanian (MR) lost the pattern in (1), but preserved (2), (3). This paper aims to account for the mechanism that allows gerund verbs to generate finite and non-finite clauses in EMR.

**Data:** The EMR gerund has an invariable (-ind(u)) form. It is purely verbal, being incompatible with determiners (e.g., *mâncând-ul* ‘the eating’) (Caragiu 1957; Edelstein 1972), on par with its Latin gerund ancestor (Miller 2000). Also, sentential complements are rare or missing, so gerunds are ruled out in A-positions and have an exclusively verbal function. EMR displays gerunds in: (i) root clauses, in simple (1a) and complex sentences (1b), the latter showing coordination with indicative (or subjunctive verbs); (ii) in conjunction with perception verbs; (iii) in relative clauses (2) - Rel(ative) OP underlined, subject in italics; (iv) in a variety of adverbial clauses, either as absolute constructions, with lexical or pro subjects (unexceptional in Romance), or as in (3), with the gerund subject co-referential to the matrix subject.

1. a. Traian înfiu, împărătil, supuindu pre dahi. Trajan first emperor. the conquering DOM Dacians
   ‘First, Trajan, the Emperor, conquered the Dacians.’ (Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 11)

   b. iar vădzându că cuprindu leșii Tara Moldovei, au orînduit pre Caazi Cherei-soltan, hanul
   and seeing that invade Poles Moldova has coopted DOM Caazi Cherei Sultan han
   Crimeea and sending-him and 2.000 of soldiers towards 70.000 of army that had Tartar
   ‘But seeing that the Poles are invading Moldavia, he co-opted the Sultan Caazi Cherei,
   the Han of Crimea, and sent him 2.000 infantery soldiers; that was added to the
   70.000 Tartar army that he had.’ (Costin/Panaitescu 1979: 14–15)

2. De care lucru cu norocu semețindu-să Baiazitu, iar s-au vîrtelit la Tarigrad.
   of which thing with luck swelling-REFL Baiazid again REFL-has stormed to Istanbul
   ‘For which reason being swollen of his luck, Baiazid stormed back to Istanbul.’
   (Ureche/Panaitescu 1958: 129)

3. […] ce l-au îmbărbătat numai să meargă la Poartă, ca apoi, nemărgind el, pro
   but him-have encouraged just to go to Porte so.that then not.going he
   va aduci perirea țării și boierimei.
   will bring death. the country. GEN and lordship. GEN
   ‘… but they strongly encouraged him to go to the Ottoman Porte, because if he didn’t,
   he’d cause the destruction of the country and the boyars.’ (Neculce/Iordan 1955: 227)

**Proposals:** We argue for the following points: (1) Assertion in EMR root clauses can surface with either gerund or indicative morphology (cf. Adger & Smith’s 2005 Minimalist account of speaker intra-variation). Both are propositional, tensed domains that differ only w.r.t. whether [\u017f\u015f\u176\u00f8], an uninterpretable feature with no effect on meaning, is present (indicatives) or not (gerunds). (2) The EMR gerund is underspecified for M(ood), T(ense), & A(spect)—hence, its plurifunctionality—yet projects to a full CP (see Alboiu 2009 for MR). (3) While the EMR gerund could have an absolute or relative tense specification, the MR gerund lost its deictic tense specification, which explains its absence in root clauses.

**Analysis:** (i): EMR gerunds can occur with aspical adverbs, and their aspical interpretations are dependent from those of matrix predicates: in (4a), the matrix aspect is perfective but
the gerund is imperfective; in (4b), matrix tense is past, but past perfect in the gerund. Consequently, they can project T heads with valued [+tense] features.

(4) a. Mărs-au…la un sat a lui, avîndu şi curţi acolo.
   gone-has to a village of his having and courts there
   ‘He went to one of his villages, where he had a house.’ (Neculce apud Iordan 1955: 69)

   b. S-au închinat de bun voie şi viîndu-le şi poruncă de la leşi.
      REFL-have surrendered of good will and coming-them also order from the Poles.
      ‘They surrendered willingly, and they also got the order from the Poles.’
      (Neculce apud Iordan 1955: 144)

(ii): EMR gerunds allow for speaker-oriented adverbs (e.g. probably = epistemic modality), so are high in the CP (Cinque 1999). Pre-verbal topedalised and focused constituents (2), (5), also show a fully articulated CP, following the mapping in Rizzi (1997): Force>Top>Focus>Fin>T.

(5) iar leşii înceat păşind sprejeniè năvala turcilor. (Neculce apud Iordan 1955: 137)
   ‘and the Poles, walking in slowly, supported the Turks’ attack.’

(iii): EMR gerunds allow for Rel OP, see (2) - therefore they project up to ForceP (Rizzi 1997); but, similar to English gerunds (Pires 2007), they disallow wh-OP in Spec,FocusP. Since both root and adjunct clauses are necessarily phasal domains, the CP status of EMR gerunds is expected.

(iv): The gerund precedes clitics - bold, underlined in (1b), (2), (4b) -, which attach to the highest Infl head in Romance (Kayne 1991; Uriagereka 1995; Dobrovie-Sorin 1994 for MR). Word order indicates gerund V-to-Fin, Fin being the C-head required for licensing purposes.

(v) While finite verbs and infinitives in EMR take the free negative morpheme nu, EMR gerunds typically disallow nu and instead require the affixal ne-. This is predictable from the Neg>T hierarchy in Romance (Zanuttini 1997): nu blocks Head movement above T (i.e. V-to-Fin, Isac & Jakab 2004 for imperatives), interfering with gerund licensing in Fin.

(vi) Semantically, the mood marker –ind, merged in Fin, is underspecified for a particular value, but its environment assigns it specific interpretation: assertive/realis or irrealis.

Since gerunds in EMR have a fully articulated clause structure and the interpretation and distribution of finite clauses, following Adger & Smith (2005), similar interpretable features must be at stake. However, gerunds lack intrinsic values for TAM and have no phi-features (hence their underspecification resulting in plurifunctionality). While with finite verbs T is valued via the inflectional endings on V (Pesetsky & Torrego 1994), these are absent with gerunds, so T(AM) has to be recuperated contextually (syntactically or pragmatically). Guéron & Hoekstra (1995) argue that English verbal gerunds are headed by a Tense OP in Spec,CP resulting in a T-chain for INFL nodes. We similarly adopt the requirement of an OP in Spec,ForceP (e.g. Rel OP) but argue instead that in root clauses, which have truth values, this has to be an Illocutionary Force OP, such as Meinunger’s (2004) Assert(ion) OP. The presence of AssertOP binds all relevant TAM variables, thereby licensing feature values and deictic/absolute tense, resulting in main clause status of EMR gerunds. Accordingly, root gerunds disallow questions, since a wh-OP either interferes with the binding of TAM variables by the OP in Spec, ForceP, or semantically contradicts the AssertOP, so it will always be ruled out.

MR gerunds lack deictic tense, which rules out the use of gerunds in root clauses. Data comes from Avram (2003), who shows that MR gerunds disallow auxiliaries (marginally possible in EMR) and that temporal adverbs denote time of event and not time of reference.

Conclusions. Availability of an AssertOP in Spec,ForceP in EMR grants these gerunds propositional status and the semantics of indicatives, thereby allowing for free variation.
Phonetic cues in the production of aspectual periphrases
Patrícia Amaral / University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Meghan Armstrong / University of Georgia
Luciana Lucente / UNICAMP

This paper focuses on two distinct interpretations of the sequence viver ‘to live’ + gerund in Brazilian Portuguese (BP), depending on whether it constitutes a biclausal construction, exemplified in (1), or a frequentative aspectual periphrasis which is monoclausal, as in (2). In particular, we investigate whether there are phonetic cues related to the syntactic and semantic differences between both constructions.

(1) Ele viveu trabalhando com recicláveis.
  ‘He lived working with recyclables.’

(2) Meu carburador vive entupindo.
  ‘My carburator keeps getting stuck.’

Like other complex predicates in Ibero-Romance (Laca, 2005; Abeillé and Godard, 2010), the construction in (2) does not allow extraction of the gerund or constituent interpolation, while the biclausal construction does, and furthermore it allows for inanimate subjects (Amaral, 2013). However, Squartini (1998) claims that the aspectual periphrasis formed by viver + gerund is at an initial stage of grammaticalization. There is a great deal of evidence that the development of aspectual constructions involves phonetic reduction (Lehmann, 1985; Bybee et al., 1994). We asked then, whether tensed forms of the verb viver would show any evidence for phonetic distinctions between the biclausal and the more innovative aspectual uses. This was tested in the production study described below.

Nine speakers of BP were recorded with a Shure (Beta 58A) microphone. Participants pretended they were on a television show, interviewing famous Brazilians. They were presented with “fan letters”. Each subject read the “letter” out loud, and then read the target question, as in (3):

(3) É verdade que você vive pregando na favela?
  ‘Is it true that you live preaching in the shantytown?’

Each subject produced 4 pairs of identical segmental strings: the “fan letters” provided context to disambiguate them as either the biclausal or aspectual interpretation. 12 fillers were included for a total of 20 trials. All target utterances included the 3rd person singular present form of the verb viver, i.e. vive ([’vivi]). We hypothesized that if there were prosodic reduction, this could be identified by looking at the duration of the stressed vowel [i] in the word that was constant for all trials (vive). In addition to measuring the duration of the stressed vowel in [’vi.vi], we measured v-v duration, i.e. the duration from the onset of the vowel to the onset of the following vowel. This latter measure is known to be relevant for both speech production and perception (Barbosa, 2007) and we include this measure since it allows us consider vowel flow for speech production.

T-tests revealed a significant effect of interpretation (biclausal vs. aspectual) on the stressed vowel’s duration. The stressed vowel in [’vi.vi] was significantly shorter when produced for the biclausal interpretation, and showed little variation (1ms s.d. for the biclausal interpretation vs. 6ms for the aspectual interpretation) (t = -2.03, df = 60, p>0.04). Thus the duration of the lexically stressed vowel in the more innovative, aspectual interpretation tended to be longer, and showed more variability. Interestingly, the v-v measure revealed no significant differences for the production of the two
interpretations (t = -0.52, df = 62, p>0.06). Considering that the stressed vowel was significantly longer for the aspectual interpretation, this means that the onset of the second syllable was produced with a shorter duration, i.e. the second voiced labiodental fricative consonant in [‘vi.vi] tended to be produced with a shorter duration for the aspectual interpretation vs. the biclausal interpretation. This means that speakers maintain similar durations for v-v units when producing [‘vi.vi] for both interpretations, but make durational adjustments within the v-v unit, while still making a prosodic (durational) distinction between the two interpretations. It is possible that this strategy is used to preserve BP’s rhythmic template.

Our results show that the two constructions are distinct at the phonetic level. We argue that such a fine-grained distinction is used to guide the hearer to the innovative, aspectual interpretation. For instance, Tomlinson & Foxtree (2011), in their discussion of backward-looking versus the uncertainty functions of uptalk (rising pitch on declaratives), show evidence that whether the rise in pitch is prolonged or not helps listeners to disambiguate between the two interpretations. Similarly, the durational modifications in our study (a longer stressed vowel and shorter onset in the following syllable) would provide the speaker with additional cues for arriving at the intended interpretation of vive when it precedes a gerund. This work makes clear that it is crucial to investigate how fine-grained phonetic modifications are used to signal a distinction between possible interpretations. While our work examines this from a speaker-oriented point of view, future work should also examine how these cues are used by listeners.

References


Sáez (2011), to account for Spanish definite articles in ellipsis contexts, such as el libro y el [e] de Juan ‘the book and Juan’s’, proposes the Stress Condition on Remnants (SCR), which disallows unstressed syntactic elements to be anaphoric, while allowing definite articles to license empty categories. The focus of this paper is Old French (OF) possessives that we first describe. OF had a more extensive inventory of possessive constructions than Modern French (MF): lexical genitives, pre-nominal possessives, and lexical and possessive ellipsis constructions. We then present an analysis based on Arteaga & Herschensohn’s (2010, A&H) proposal for lexical genitives. Finally, we argue that two diachronic changes led to a difference in licensing of possessives: definite articles became clitics (in OF they could be stressed) and thus became subject to the SCR, and the pre-nominal nP domain (Carstens 2003) became a clitic zone that prohibited pre-nominal stressed possessives.

OF had three lexical genitive constructions, the genitive with à (1), with de (2), both of which resemble genitive structures in MF, and the juxtaposition genitive (JG) (3): (1) La suer a mon seigneur the-f-sg-NOM sister-f-sg-NOM to my-m-sg-OBL lord-m-sg-OBL ‘My lord’s sister’ (Dole 5041; Herslund 1980:84) (2) le cuer de son amy the-m-sg-OBL heart-m-sg-OBL of his-m-sg-OBL friend-m-sg-OBL ‘His friend’s heart’ (Palm 1977:63) (3) la niece [K] la f-sg-NOM niece-f-sg-NOM the-m-sg-OBL duke-m-sg-OBL (La Chasteleine de Vergi 376; Foulet 1982:14) ‘The duke’s niece’ The possessors are in the oblique case, in accordance with the two-case (nominative/oblique) system of OF, licensed by an overt preposition à-de or a null one[K] (Delfitto & Paradisi 2008, A&H 2010).

All three allowed ellipsis ([e] in (4)-(6)), licensed by the phi features and case of the antecedents and carried by the definite article. (4) les armes au soudanc de H […] les [e] au soudanc de B the-f-pl-NOM weapons-f-pl-NOM to the-m-sg-OBL sultan-m-sg-OBL of H […] the-f-pl-NOM to the-m-sg-OBL sultan-m-sg-OBL of B ‘the weapons of the sultan of H and those of the Sultan of B’ (Joinville, Gamillscheg 1957:58). (5) ne poursuite de campaignon se la [e] de Dieu nor pursuit-f-sg-OBL of companion-m-sg-OBL except for the-f-sg-OBL [e] of God-m-sg-OBL (Galeran de Bretagne, 4200-2; Foulet 1982 §70) (6) defension fors sol la [e][K] Deu. protection-f-sg-OBL except only the-f-sg-OBL [e] ‘No pursuit of a companion other than God.’ (Livre des rois; Anglade 1965:149)

OF also evinced two possessive forms, an unstressed definite determiner (7) and a stressed possessive (8)-(11), both pre-nominal: (7) Il est munté sur son destrier. he is-3sg mounted on his-m-sg-OBL horse-m-sg-OBL ‘He mounted his horse.’ (Eliduc 283; Moignet 1988:114). The stressed version had to be accompanied by a determiner [+/-def] article, a demonstrative, or a quantifier, evidence that it did not carry the feature [+/-def] (8) li miens cuers the-m-sg-NOM my-m-sg-NOM heart-m-sg-NOM ‘my heart’ (Saint Alexis 445; Jensen § 369) (9) un sien compere one-m-sg-OBL his-m-sg-OBL friend-m-sg-OBL (La male honte 16-17; Foulet 1982:166) ‘one of his sons’ (10) ceste meie barbe this-f-sg-OBL my-f-sg-OBL beard-f-sg-OBL (Roland 1719; Moignet 1988:120) ‘this beard of mine’. The stressed forms—but not the unstressed ones that are subject to the SCR—can also license ellipsis (11): (11) La lor terre […] a la nostre [e] the-f-sg-OBL their-f-sg-OBL land-f-sg-OBL […] to the-f-sg-OBL our-f-sg-OBL [e] ‘Their land and ours’ (Couronnement 77; Jensen 1990:179).

To account for the distribution of possessives in OF, including elliptical structures, we follow A&H’s proposal for lexical genitives (1)-(3) framed within the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 2001, 2008), adapting their DP shell (12) (cf. Carstens 2003, Pereltsvaig 2007): (12) [DP D [ap poss [ap [ap N1 ] [PP[P [DP D [ap [NP N2 ]]]]]]]]]]. Lexical genitive and pre-nominal possessive ellipsis constructions (4)-(6), (11) license ellipsis through the stressed definite article that agrees in gender-number-case with the repeated noun copy deleted at spell-out [e]. As for the stressed and unstressed possessives, they can potentially be projected in
one of the iterated nPs that D takes as complements (to account for functional projections such as numerals, gender, quantifiers, etc.). Using a probe-goal framework, we propose that a stressed possessive has a \([u\)\(\text{def}\)] feature that must get checked off by a \([+/-\text{def}]\) D. Since it’s stressed, it is not subject to the SCR but requires an article. In ellipsis cases, the null head nouns are licensed by the definite article whose interpretable \([+\text{def}]\) feature and oblique case check gender, number and case features of the null anaphor (A&H 2010). The nominal features match and delete uninterpretable features. The nP shell pre-nominal zone (Carstens 2003, D&P 2009, A&H 2010) in OF allows both clitic and stressed items, whose features and case are transparent. In contrast to the stressed possessive in the nP shell, the unstressed possessive has a \([+\text{def}]\) feature and raises to D. Because it is unstressed, it is subject to the SCR, prohibiting it from serving in ellipsis contexts.

Diachronic changes in definite articles and the nP shell pre-nominal zone, caused by morpho-phonological erosion, led to loss of the JG (D&P 2009, A&H 2010), the loss of N ellipsis, and the specialization of strong possessives as pronouns. Loss of oblique case and the weakening of definite determiners to clitics reduced their ability to license through overt features, whereas their status as clitics violated the SCR. The pre-nominal zone became almost exclusively clitic (except for earlier merged prenominal adjectives as \(la\) belle dame), obviating pre-nominal strong possessives. The convergence of morphological leveling and phonological loss of final consonants led to syntactic changes that have rendered MF lack of N ellipsis quite distinct from other Romance languages.
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A reconsideration of discourse-related syntactic movement motivated by prosody in Spanish
Carolina Barrera-Tobón / DePaul University
Bradley Hoot / DePaul University

This presentation reports on an empirical test of approaches to information structure in Spanish that rely on prosody to motivate discourse-related word order changes, such as p-movement (Zubizarreta 1998). It presents the results of two quantitative studies designed to test these approaches, providing new evidence against this common view.

It has been argued that in Spanish syntax plays the primary role in marking information-structural categories, such as topic and focus, while in other languages, like English, intonation plays the most important role (Büring & Gutiérrez-Bravo 2002, Vallduví 1991, Zubizarreta 1998). Though it is often recognized that most languages, including Spanish, have recourse to both strategies, the view that syntax is used to mark discourse status in Romance languages has long dominated the literature, and in fact much of the research on information structure in Romance has focused on how to explain discourse-related syntactic movement.

One fruitful line of research posits that discourse-related movement in Spanish is motivated by the requirements of the prosody. In this view, perhaps best exemplified by Zubizarreta’s (1998) influential notion of p-movement, focused elements must appear rightmost due to the fact that this is the position of main sentence stress. More specifically, Zubizarreta argues that there is a Focus Prominence Rule (FPR) requiring stress on focused constituents and a Nuclear Stress Rule (NSR) requiring stress on the lowest constituent in the asymmetric c-command ordering. These two rules can sometimes come into conflict, selecting different constituents to stress, as in (1a). This mismatch is corrected by p-movement, which moves the given material over the focus, allowing the focus to be in a position where it is stressed by both rules, as in (1b). Under this view, stressing the focus in situ, as in (1c), is not a possible way to resolve the conflict.

(1) Context: What did Ana hide under the bed? (Object focus)
   a. * Ana escondió la [muñeca]_{FPR} debajo de la [cama]_{NSR}.
      Ana hid           the doll             under       the bed
   b. Ana escondió debajo de la cama [la muñeca]_{FPR,NSR}.
   c. * Ana escondió la [muñeca]_{FPR,NSR} debajo de la cama.

One essential facet of this type of analysis is that it assumes that Spanish has ‘non-plastic’ (Vallduví 1991) intonation; that is, it assumes that Spanish main sentence stress must always be rightmost (Zubizarreta’s NSR), and this requirement is an essential part of any analysis motivating discourse-related movement with prosodic well-formedness.

However, several recent studies (e.g. Gabriel 2010, Hoot 2012, Leal-Méndez & Shea 2012) have posed an empirical problem to this kind of approach, finding that in fact both the word order and prosody of constructions like those in (1) are more variable than they are often thought to be. In particular, it appears that Spanish intonation is more ‘plastic’ than usually assumed. If these results hold true, they pose a significant problem for analyses like p-movement, for which the requirement that Spanish have rightmost stress is necessary.

This study adds to this database and tests the assumptions underlying prosodic approaches to discourse-related movement in Spanish by bringing multiple methods to bear on these questions:

(2) Research Questions
   a. Must stress in Spanish be rightmost?
   b. Do Spanish speakers use prosody-only strategies to realize information structure, such as shifting main stress to a focused constituent?

These questions are central to understanding information structure in Spanish and the relationship between prosody and syntax, yet much of the data in the literature comes from authors’ intuitions, while
quantitative data is comparatively scarce. Further, what quantitative data exists is often limited to a single paradigm. Here we present the results of two quantitative studies with different methodologies, providing new evidence of both speaker use and speaker intuition.

The first study uses the Otheguy-Zentella corpus of New York Spanish and analyzes the production data of 25 speakers of a variety of Spanish dialects, all of whom are what Otheguy and Zentella (2012) call ‘newcomers,’ having been born and raised in Latin America and having lived for fewer than six years in New York. From the 25 interviews, 233 tokens were extracted of copular constructions with adjectives, like in (3), in several different discourse contexts.

(3) Juan es feliz.
   ‘Juan is happy.’

The results showed that these speakers have multiple strategies for realizing information-structural categories. In cases of focus on the adjective, for example, these speakers used word order and prosody together to highlight the focus in 60% of the cases, while in 40% they used prosody alone. Further, speakers used both canonical and non-canonical word orders and stress patterns in all contexts; it was not the case that the focus always appeared finally.

The second study consists of an acceptability judgment experiment in which 56 monolingual speakers of Mexican Spanish judged sentences for felicity in context. Participants saw and heard context stories establishing narrow focus on a particular constituent (subject, object, or modifier) in a simple transitive sentence, and then judged 3–4 such sentences, which presented canonical and non-canonical word orders as well as rightmost and non-rightmost stress patterns.

The results showed that these speakers accept shifting the stress to the focused element in situ, as in (1c) above. In fact, in two of the three contexts, participants rated structures with stress shift significantly higher than those with rightmost focus.

Taken together, these two studies provide evidence from both language use and native speaker intuitions that indicates (i) that stress in Spanish need not be rightmost, and (ii) that prosody-only strategies are indeed used to realize information structure in Spanish (though syntax is also used). These results do not support accounts of focus in Spanish that motivate movement based on prosody, like p-movement. Instead, they add to the growing database that shows that the requirement that Spanish stress be rightmost does not hold, which indicates that prosody-based accounts of discourse-related movement may need to be reconsidered.
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Atoms of Intervention in the Acquisition of A'-dependencies in French

Anamaria Bențea / University of Geneva
Stephanie Durrleman / University of Geneva, CNRS-Lyon

Research on the acquisition of A'-dependencies has revealed that not all movement configurations are problematic for children: subject extraction is easier than object extraction [1-4], free dependencies are easier than headed dependencies [3]; an animacy mismatch between the subject and object facilitates object extraction [5]. Grammatical/intervention accounts explain such selective difficulties in terms of sensitivity to the structural similarity between the moved object and the intervening lexical subject [3]. However more remains to be understood about the atoms of intervention in A'-configurations: What role do they play in French? Are they on a par in terms of their impact across structures and across age groups? Is their computation related to working memory abilities? Here, we address these questions by investigating French-speaking children’s comprehension of object wh-questions and relative clauses (RCs), focusing on the nature of the moved object (+NP vs –NP; +Animate vs –Animate), while the intervener (i.e. the embedded subject) is kept constant: a DP with +NP +Animate features. Alongside this, we explore the link between parsing these structures and verbal short-term memory.

The experiment followed a 2x2x2 design with factors structure type (wh-questions/ RC), object type (+NP/–NP) and object animacy (+Animate/–Animate). In a character-selection task, 61 French-speaking children (5yo: N=14; 7yo: N=17; 9yo: N=16; 11yo: N=14) were prompted to choose the correct character as identified by a wh-question (1-2) or RC (3-4). Each test sentence was associated with two pictures in which the same action was depicted with reversed Agent-Patient roles (figure 1a,b). Verbal short-term memory was assessed through digit-span tasks.

The data revealed a significant interaction between structure type, object type and object animacy (F(1,60)=32.77, p<.001). In +NP questions and RCs, the mismatch in animacy between the A’-moved object and the subject did not improve comprehension in the 5yo (p>.05), whereas it yielded a significant difference in all the older groups (all ps<.001). The +Animate/–Animate object asymmetry did not extend to –NP questions (p>.05), but was present in –NP RCs (t=-7.35, p<.001) due to the fact that RCs headed by a –NP –Animate object (i.e. ce) led to robustly higher accuracy than –NP +Animate object RCs (i.e. celui, celle). We also found a significant correlation between response accuracy and age groups (r=.698, p<.001), as well as verbal short-term memory as measured by digit-span tasks (r=.660, p<.001).

The results obtained show that the most problematic configurations for children are those in which the features on the intervener (+NP, +Animate) are included in the set of features present on the A’-moved object. That the intervention effect does not disappear in ‘free’ RCs in the +Animate condition follows from the internal structure of celui/celle in French, which consists of ce and the pronominal form lui/elle [6]. This suggests that celui/celle bear at least a functional NP restriction, which leads to an inclusion relation between the featural specification on the intervening lexical subject and the moved object. The fact that 5 yo children did not perform better with A’-dependencies headed by a +NP –Animate object shows that they cannot exploit the mismatch in animacy with the intervener. Animacy, being a subfeature of NP, is too deeply embedded to be taken into account for computation by the younger systems. This argues in favour of a structured view of the feature hierarchy. Moreover, a mismatch in animacy did not significantly improve comprehension at any age in –NP questions (questions with qui and qu’). We interpret this as supporting the view that the animacy effect depends on the locus where the feature is expressed (whether it is associated with a +NP or a –NP feature). Thus, the factor that plays a crucial role in the comprehension of A’-dependencies is the +NP feature: children perform best with structures in which there is a disjunction in the +NP feature between the A’-moved element and the intervener. Featural intervention across the board increases cognitive load, as shown by the link between accuracy of performance and memory scores, suggesting that limitations of computational resources impact the processing of A’-dependencies in children.
Examples:
1. *Quelle dame /Qui est-ce que la fille embrasse?*
   “Which lady/Who ESK the girl is kissing?”
2. *Quelle balle/Qu’est-ce que la fille frappe?*
   “Which ball/What ESK the girl is hitting?”
3. Montre-moi la dame/celle que la fille embrasse.
   “Show me the lady/the one that the girl is kissing.”
4. Montre-moi la balle/ce que la fille frappe.
   “Show me the ball/what the girl is hitting.”
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Figure 1: a. b.

Tables for Mean Correct Answers per Age Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WH-Questions</th>
<th>Relative Clauses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="graph1.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="graph2.png" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Linguistic outcomes of bilingualism and language contact have long invited empirical scrutiny and inspired theoretical debates within all branches of the language sciences: Are there syntactic constraints on code-switching? Is an innovative variant contact-induced or internally motivated? Such questions persist, in part, because of differences among subfields over methods and data, and, more critically in our view, because rich, representative, accessible speech samples from bilingual speakers are simply lacking.

In this paper we introduce our efforts to provide such a data set and search tools; in addition, we address the specific annotation processes that we are designing to resolve the problems posed by bilingual corpora and demonstrate how corpus techniques shed new light on long-standing issues in bilingualism.

Bilingual speech phenomena can be broadly divided into two types: code-switching, with morphemes from two or more languages overtly manifested in an utterance, and convergence, where the influence of one language on the other is manifested without an overt language switch (Haugen 1956, Clyne 1987). Examples of each type appear below.

(1) Code-switching

Mi abuelita murió cuando yo tenía fourteen months old.

‘My grandmother died when I was 14 months old.’

(2) Convergence

Como no quiso agarrar ayuda del gobierno …(<conseguir)

‘Since he didn’t want to get help from the government…’

These examples, produced by the same speaker, are drawn from the Spanish in Texas corpus of SpinTX, a video corpus repository that currently holds 134 video-taped sociolinguistic interviews with Spanish speakers in Texas. The corpus, now ~500,000 words, is tagged for part of speech (POS) and includes comprehensive metadata for each speaker. Although the interviews are conducted primarily in Spanish, there is a great deal of English language usage, in the form of code-switching and convergence, which present unique problems for annotation.

Computational linguists and engineers have begun to address the challenge of annotating code-switched forms as in (1). This is generally resolved via a language identification process that proceeds sequentially, tagging in one language and then the other (Solorio & Liu 2008a,b for Spanish-English; Li et al. 2012 for Mandarin-English; and Diab & Kamboj 2011 for Hindi-English). In SpinTX, we POS tagged the entire corpus and created dictionaries of Spanish and English for the 5,000 most frequent English words from A Frequency Dictionary of Spanish: Core Vocabulary for Learners (Davies 2006) and A Frequency Dictionary of American English (Davies & Gardner 2010), respectively. We coded as English most words that matched up with words in our English dictionary, and coded all others as Spanish by default. Problems that arise, and that we are attempting to resolve via automation, include the presence of many interlingual homographs (e.g., me, a, Texas, files (<fields)) that are often incorrectly tagged as English, and the failure to tag infrequent English words (e.g., Tex-Mex, Spanglish) and loanwords (e.g., troquita ‘small truck’, pushándome ‘pushing me’); in addition, the procedure (correctly) tags each occurrence of the hedge “um” as English, thus overestimating the amount of code-switching or percentage of English used.

To date, no one has attempted to annotate the forms in (2) as possible covert bilingual variants, although identifying such expressions across corpora would provide valuable information for linguists who do not agree on whether such forms are contact-induced or internal semantic extensions (Otheguy & Stern 2010,
Slva-Corvalán 1994). This question can be resolved quantitatively by examining the probability of occurrence of particular collocations from the Spanish in Texas Corpus with their probability of occurrence in reference corpora. We conducted a regular search of agarrar + OBJECT, with an NP (object) appearing within five words of the {agarrar} lemma in SpinTX and then ranked them according to frequency of appearance. We repeated this procedure on an 80,000-word corpus of Argentine newspaper texts (Larsen Serigos 2012) and a large corpus (~4 million) of oral Spanish (Davies 2006). We wrote an original script to specifically return the words that appear in proximity to agarrar in SpinTX that never or very rarely appear in its proximity in other corpora. Results indicate that agarrar is used at significantly higher rates in the Spanish in Texas corpus than in the other corpora, indicating semantic extension at the very least. More importantly, the procedure was accurate in returning the collocations that we had manually identified as expressions that appear to be calqued on English “to get+NP” (e.g., agarrar trabajo ‘get a job’)—approximately 40% of the SpinTX agarrar uses—pointing to a contact effect. The implication of this study is that corpora can contribute to resolving whether or not an innovation is contact-induced, an enduring concern in bilingualism (see Treffers-Daller).

We conclude the presentation by discussing how corpus approaches allow for a reframing of multiple problems that have been central to the literature on language contact and bilingualism.
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The goal of this talk is to discuss the semantic properties of the Catalan modal *ser capaç* (and its Spanish counterpart *ser capaz*) ‘be able/capable’, which participates in both generic abilities and action dependent abilities (Mari & Martin 2007), but which doesn't have the same distribution as English ‘be able’. Our main claim is that the force of this modal is slight possibility, rather than human possibility. We also argue that an implicature arises according to which the event described by the complement VP is a daring event. We show that, along with other modals *ser capaç* exhibits an ambiguity between root (abilitative) and epistemic interpretations, and provide an analysis along the lines of Hacquard 2010, which reconciles Kratzer's semantics with Cinque's syntax.

This previously unexplored modal shows an interesting dual behavior in that it has both abilitative, (1a), and epistemic interpretations, (1b).

(1) En Joan és capaç de buidar la nevera. ‘John is capable of emptying the fridge.’
   a. John has the ability of emptying the fridge & this is quite an achievement.
   b. It is possible that John empties the fridge & this is something daring/audacious/unusual.

The differences between the two readings informally paraphrased in (1a,b) can be empirically tested. First, the abilitative (1a) but not the epistemic (1b) is found in *ser capaç* in perfective aspect, (2). And only the epistemic is compatible with perfective and progressive aspects of the embedded verb, (3).

(2) En Joan va ser capaç de buidar la nevera. ‘John was capable of emptying the fridge.’
John had the ability of emptying the fridge vs. # It was possible that John empties the fridge.

(3) En Joan és capaç d'haver buidat/estar buidant la nevera.
   ‘(lit.) John is capable of having emptied/being emptying the fridge.’
It is possible that John has emptied/is emptying the fridge vs. # John has the ability of having emptied/being emptying the fridge.

Second, only the epistemic licenses the modifier *qualsevol dia d'aquests* ‘one of these days’ when *ser capaç* is inflected in present tense, (4). If it is inflected in the future, only the abilitative works, (5).

(4) En Joan és capaç de buidar la nevera qualsevol dia d'aquests.
   It is possible that John empties the fridge one of these days vs. # John has the ability of emptying the fridge one of these days.
(5) En Joan serà capaç de buidar la nevera qualsevol dia d'aquests
John will have the ability of emptying the fridge one of these days vs. # It will be possible that John empties the fridge one of these days.

Third, the position of negation correlates with each one of the readings: *ser capaç* + negation yields an epistemic interpretation, (6), but negation + *ser capaç* yields an abilitative one, (7).

(6) En Joan és capaç de no fer els deures. ‘(lit.) John is capable of not doing his homework.’
It is possible that John doesn't do his homework vs. # John has the ability of not doing his homework.
(7) En Joan no és capaç de fer els deures. ‘John is not capable of doing his homework.’
John doesn't have the ability of doing his homework vs. # It is not possible that John does his homework.

We argue that *ser capaç p* denotes a slight possibility, in Kratzer's 1981/1991 terms. That is, there is only a world compatible with the conversational background f where p holds (and in the rest of the worlds compatible with f and a stereotypical ordering source, p is not the case), (8).

(8) \[
[\text{[ser capaç]}]^{w/f}(p) = 1 \text{ iff } \exists w \in \cap(f(w): p(w') = 1 \text{ and } \forall w'' \in \text{BEST}_g(w) \cap(f(w)): p(w'') = 0
\]

We propose that the two readings in (1) are the result of semantic change, which is in line with the pattern according to which epistemic modals tend to develop from root modals (Hacquard 2011 and references therein). *Ser capaç* starts out as having a modal base restricted to worlds where people have abilities to do things and where people are aware of these abilities (Giannakidou 2001), and has evolved into also allowing for a modal base that contains what is known about these abilities.
Abilitatives involve an effort inference analogous to the one conveyed by implicative verbs like manage (Bhatt 1999). This meaning component surfaces in the pragmatically odd sentence #John is able to breathe. Hacquard 2009 derives this inference as a conversational implicature. Specifically, if there is a world where p holds, then there are accessible worlds where John has the abilities that he has and yet p is not the case. Not breathing doesn't seem likely, but any other non-trivial eventuality can do. We argue that the daring component in ser capaç can be derived in a similar way, the basic difference being that ser capaç is weaker than be able and, consequently, the effort component is stronger. In particular, if there is only one world where p holds and ¬p is the norm, then p is interpreted as something unexpected, daring or unusual. Since we relate the strength of the modal with the flavor of the implicature, it follows that when ser capaç is intensified with the adverb ben (‘well’), then instead of yielding a slight possibility, human possibility obtains, and the daring component turns into plain effort. In a scenario where Pau is a regular teenager, (9) would be odd without the modifier ben, because reading a novel by Tolstoy is not a daring activity, but something that simply requires an effort.

(9) En Pau és #(ben) capaç de llegir una novel·la de Tolstoi.
‘Pau is well capable of reading a novel by Tolstoy.’

The contrast in the interpretation of (2)–(7) follows straightforwardly from what we know about the syntactic position of root vs. epistemic modals and the locus of aspect (Cinque 1999, Hacquard 2010). While root modals (which include abilitatives) sit below AspP, (10), epistemic modals sit above AspP, (11). It follows that the epistemic readings can combine with perfective aspect but abilitative interpretations are ruled out, (3). The time anchoring of roots is VP's time, so tense in (2) provides the time in which John empties the fridge. The time anchoring in epistemics is the speech time. Unlike may or can, ser capaç is inflected for tense, so we propose that ModP in (11) merges between TP and AspP.

(10) En Joan va ser capaç de buidat la nevera (cf. (2))
   a. [TP va ser [AspP t, [ModP capaç [vp John empty the fridge ]]]]
   b. There is an event in the actual world located in a past interval, and there is a world w’ compatible with the abilities of the VP subject in the actual world where this event is an event of emptying the fridge by John (and for all worlds w” compatible with John's abilities and a stereotypical ordering source, John doesn’t empty the fridge in w”).

(11) En Joan és capaç d’haver buidat la nevera (cf. (3))
   a. [TP és [ModP capaç [AspP haver [vp John empty the fridge ]]]]
   b. There is a world w’ compatible with what is known in the actual world about the abilities of the VP subject such that there is an event in w’ located at a past interval which is an event of emptying the fridge by John (and for all worlds w” compatible with what we know about John's abilities and a stereotypical ordering source, John doesn't empty the fridge in w”).

Concerning (4), since the sentence describes an event of emptying the fridge which is located in the present tense, and the adverbial is a temporal modifier that locates the event in the future, there is a clash. It is corrected in (5), where ser capaç is inflected for future tense. (4) is not problematic in the epistemic reading, because present tense identifies the speech event, so no incompatibility arises if the VP event is a future event. As for negation, we assume a structure where NegP lies right above AspP, so the facts in (6) and (7) follow straightforwardly.
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Development of a spontaneous speech corpus for the articulatory study of cross-dialectal consonantal weakening

Laura Colantoni / University of Toronto
Alexei Kochetov / University of Toronto

Although it is generally assumed that the loss of coda consonants is articulatorily motivated, the bulk of the research, particularly within Romance, has focused on either the extra-linguistic variables conditioning the variation or on some of the contextual factors accounting for the allophonic patterns, with little work on the articulatory characteristics of the resulting segments, and even less research exploring the connections between onset and coda weakening (e.g. Lipski 2011). The two weakening processes studied here—the velarization/assimilation of alveolar nasals and the aspiration and deletion of /s/ in codas—crucially distinguish Western Romance varieties (e.g. Hajek 1997). In French, coda nasals have resulted in vowel nasalization and coda /s/ has been lost. Within Spanish, some varieties are approaching the French pattern (i.e. Caribbean varieties), while others show extensive weakening of /s/ (in all coda contexts), but limited weakening of the nasal (before consonants only).

To investigate articulatory patterns of coda weakening and a possible relation between the realization of coda and onset consonants, we have been developing a corpus of semi-spontaneous speech containing electropalatographic (EPG) recordings of 9 speakers of 3 varieties of Spanish. These varieties represent different stages of the processes: generalized weakening (Havana); /s/ and /n/ weakening before consonants but maintenance pre-pausally or prevocally (Buenos Aires); and preservation of codas, except for /n/ preconsonantly (Madrid) (e.g. Lipski 2011; Terrell 1978). In this paper we report data from 3 female speakers representing each dialect. Words containing /s/ and /n/ in coda (before a pause, a vowel and a consonant) and onset positions were extracted from the narratives, giving approximately 120 tokens per speaker. Target sounds were analyzed using a standard set of EPG measurements of constriction location and degree (Fontdevila et al. 1994), as well as of duration and overall within-context variability.

Beyond the overall expected differences in the realization of coda consonants, results showed gradient onset-coda differences within speaker’s productions and differences in the overall degree and location of contact across speakers. For /s/ (Figure 1), the Madrid speaker showed a tight constriction in codas and onsets alike, with hardly any contextual differences; the Buenos Aires speaker had a highly constricted articulation in all contexts, but pre-consonantly, where [h] was the default realization; the Cuban speaker, albeit displaying an unexpected high proportion of /s/ realizations, exhibited an overall less constricted articulation in all positions. As for /n/ (Figure 1), the expected cross-dialectal place differences were found (alveolar realizations in Madrid and Buenos Aires vs. velarization in Havana Spanish), including the assimilatory patterns reported in other studies (e.g. Honorof 1999; Ramsammy 2011). Interestingly, the Cuban speaker also showed a less constricted articulation in onsets (Figure 2) compared to the Argentine and Peninsular speakers, as well as greater overall contextual variability. Results suggest that the two consonants under study differ in their variability patterns within and across speakers, with the nasal being overall more variable and more prone to contextual variation than /s/. The hypothesized onset-coda weakening relations are apparent when comparing the Cuban data against the other varieties (Figure 2). Our further work on the corpus will determine to what extent these findings are representative of the three dialects.

In summary, our results speak to the importance of supplementing sociolinguistic and acoustic studies with articulatory work to capture more gradient patterns in well-known processes (as coda weakening) as well as not previously described cross-dialectal differences in the degree of consonantal constriction.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>/s/</th>
<th>/n/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Onset</td>
<td>Coda_#V, Coda_#C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>![Table of Madrid]</td>
<td>![Table of Madrid]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>![Table of Buenos Aires]</td>
<td>![Table of Buenos Aires]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Havana</td>
<td>![Table of Havana]</td>
<td>![Table of Havana]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Contextual variability in the realization of /s/ and /n/ by speaker (linguopalatal contact profiles over 20 tokens per category; black = contact in all tokens, white = no contact).

![Graph of /s/ contact centrality (CC) and degree of contact (Q) for /s/](graph1.png)

![Graph of /n/ contact anteriority (CA) and degree of contact (Q) for /n/](graph2.png)

Figure 2: Mean values for contact centrality (CC) and degree of contact (Q) for /s/ (left) and for contact anteriority (CA) and degree of contact (Q) for /n/ (right), by context and speaker (Madrid, Buenos Aires, and Havana).
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Spanish voiced obstruent alternation and underspecification in OT
Sonia Colina / The University of Arizona

Introduction. Despite much stylistic and dialectal variation, Spanish voiced plosives have been traditionally described as having a continuant and a non-continuant realization. In the standard varieties that are the object of this study, the [-continuant] allophones appear after homorganic nasals and laterals, and in word-initial position, e.g., [dónде] ‘where’, [tóldo] ‘awning’ (1), and [+continuant] ones in the remaining contexts, [nááða], [ályo] (2). The same distribution applies across words. Recent phonetic studies (Cole, Iskarous, & Hualde 1999; Ortega Llebaria 2004) reveal a great deal of phonetic variability among continuant realizations that is not captured by traditional generative accounts. This paper proposes an analysis that accounts for the variability in the phonetic implementation of these phones. In addition, it reexamines the role of underspecification within an optimality-theoretic (OT) framework.

Previous generative accounts. Existing analyses differ with regard to: (i) the directionality of the process: fortition (Hammond 1976; Bakovic 1994) or lenition (Harris 1969); (ii) the feature that spreads, in autosegmental analyses ([acontinuant], Mascaró 1984; [-continuant] in homorganic clusters, Hualde 1989); and (iii) the nature of the underlying representation: stop (Harris 1969), continuant (Hammond, 1976, Bakovic 1994), and underspecified (Lozano 1979; Harris 1984; Mascaró 1984; Hualde 1989). Proponents of the underspecification account, the most numerous, justify an underspecified input because of the lack of solid evidence for any of the specified forms.

Analysis: I also argue for an underspecified input, but I show that there is solid evidence for it, with regard to: (i) voiceless obstruents in homorganic clusters, and (ii) phonetic variation. (i) In homorganic clusters, voiceless fricatives retain their underlying specification [-cont], rather than agreeing in continuancy with the preceding nasals, as voiced obstruents do: un bobo [um.bó.βo] ‘a silly person-masc.’, una boba [u.na.βó.βa] ‘a silly person-fem.’ vs. un solo [un.só.λo] ‘only one-adj-masc.’, una sola [u.na.só.la] ‘only one-adj-fem.’. I claim that this is so because voiceless fricatives are underlyingly specified as [+cont], while voiced obstruents are underspecified. Thus, obstruents in Spanish show a three-way contrast in continuancy: [+continuant] (voiceless fricative), [-continuant] (voiceless stops) and underspecified [continuant] (voiced obstruents). In OT terms, voiceless fricatives result from ID-[cont] >> NC[cont], where ID-[cont] says that the output matches the input with respect to [cont.] and NC[cont] that a nasal/lateral agrees in [cont] with the following obstruent (3). Underspecification does not go against Richness of the Base, as long as underspecified forms are determined by the learner through Lexicon Optimization and not by any constraints holding directly on underlying forms (Inkelas 95: 289). In fact, Richness of the Base requires that unspecified forms be considered as there are no restrictions on inputs. Various authors have shown the need for input underspecification in OT (Inkelas 95, Ito, Mester, & Padgett 1995, Inkelas Orgun & Zoll 1997, Harrison and Kaun [2001], Inkelas 2006). (ii) In addition to input underspecification, OT proposes output or phonetic underspecification (Hale and Kissock 2007, originally from Keating 1988). This is underspecification that persists from underlying representation through phonetic representation, resulting in forms which are never fully featurally specified and that are realized variably according to the surrounding segments, i.e., in the phonetic component. I propose that the continuant outputs of voiced obstruents are phonetically underspecified (output underspecification) for continuancy, thus accounting for the great degree of variation in aperture in continuant allophones, which are generally dependent on the adjacent sounds (cf., Bradley & Delforge 2006a, Bradley & Delforge 2006b, Bradely 2007, Colina 2009b for output underspecification in Judeo-Spanish and in Ecuadorian Spanish). An underspecified output constitutes additional evidence for the proposal that the input for voiced obstruents is underspecified because the best input for an underspecified output is the underspecified input (7). This in turn justifies the selection of the underspecified input (4) for the homorganic context, vs. the equally harmonious stop [5] (a fricative, as in (6) makes the wrong selections for the output). In absolute word-initial position, the stop in the output is the result of insertion of the unmarked candidate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ID-[cont]</th>
<th>NC-[cont]</th>
<th>ID-[voi]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/tens/o/ [tenso]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‹ tenso</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tenzo</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tendo</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tento</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/tanGo/ [tango]</th>
<th>ID-[cont]</th>
<th>NC-[cont]</th>
<th>ID-[voi]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tanGo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanγo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‹ tango</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>/tango/ [tango]</th>
<th>ID-[cont]</th>
<th>NC-[cont]</th>
<th>ID-[voi]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tanGo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanγo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‹ tango</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tanko</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Χ= candidate mistakenly selected as the output

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‹ aGo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aγo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ago</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ako</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Studies on the acquisition of clitics report that, although there are problems in some languages with the acquisition of clitics (e.g. clitic omission), in most languages there are no problems with clitic placement (see Guasti 1993/94; Wexler, Gavarrò & Torrens 2004; Pierce 1992; Grüter 2006; Marinis 2000). Italian, Spanish, French and Greek children place clitics in preverbal or postverbal position in a target-like manner.

Patterns of clitic placement in the majority of the Romance languages are linked to finiteness. In European Portuguese, however, as in Cypriot Greek (see Petinou & Terzi 2002), clitic placement, as is well known, is syntactically conditioned. In European Portuguese, clitics may be proclitic in a set of contexts (e.g. 1a) (in the presence of negation, certain adverbs, embedded contexts with a lexical C, wh-questions or quantified subjects), enclitic in all the other contexts (e.g. 1b), and mesoclitic in enclitic contexts with the verb in the future or in the conditional (1c):

(1) a. A Maria não te viu / *viu-te.
    the Maria not you saw / saw you
b. A Maria viu-te / *te viu.
    the Maria saw you / you saw
c. A Maria ver-te-á. / *te verá / *verá-te.
    the Maria see-you-future

There are several analyses of clitic placement in adult grammar (Rouveret 1992, Madeira 1992, Barbosa 1996, Martins 1994, Raposo & Uriagereka 1995, Duarte & Matos 2000, among others), but there is no systematic study on the acquisition of placement. In fact, only sparse observations saying that children generalize enclisis are found in the literature on the basis of some spontaneous productions (Faria et al. 1994, Duarte & Matos 2000). However, if one looks for occasional productions, all types of misplacement can be found, as illustrated in (2):

(2) a. enclisis pro proclisis:
    O mano não deixa-me dormir (J. 3; 8)
    ‘My brother does not let me sleep.’
b. proclisis pro enclisis:
    Eu te empresto um, pai. (J. 3;7)
    ‘I will borrow you one, daddy.’
c. mesoclisis in the absence of future or conditional:
    Ai, duas pessoas a agarrar-me-m! (J. 3; 5)
    ‘Oh, two people grabbing me!’

Given this variation in data from spontaneous production, it becomes relevant to find out, in a more controlled way, how children deal with clitic placement. In particular, this study aims at providing answers to the following questions:

A. Is the performance in clitic placement similar across contexts?
B. Do different patterns of clitic placement follow from language acquisition or do they mirror variation in adult grammar?
C. Can data from the acquisition of clitic placement help us choose between different theoretical proposals for clitic placement?
In order to provide answers to these questions, we ran an elicited production task targeting SE clitics in proclitic and enclitic contexts (we left mesoclicis out of the study, since independent studies (Santos 2002) show that mesoclicis is only learnt in school). We opted for eliciting SE clitics, since it is known that these are not generally omitted by children (Costa & Lobo 2009) and we wanted to make sure children would produce clitics. The task included the following conditions: Simple clauses with no proclisis trigger (enclisis) – 8 items; Coordinate clauses with no proclisis trigger (enclisis) – 4 items; Simple clauses with negation (proclisis) – 4 items; Simple clauses with negative subjects (proclisis) – 4 items; Simple clauses with DP quantified subjects (proclisis) – 4 items; Simple clauses with adverb ‘já’ – already (proclisis) – 4 items; Complement subord. clauses (proclisis) – 4 items; Adverbial subord. clauses (proclisis) – 4 items.

**Participants:** we tested 22 children aged between 5;0 and 5;11 (mean 5;4), 20 children aged between 6;0 and 6;10 (mean 6;4), as well as a control group of 20 adults.

**Results:**

a) Confirming the observations made in the literature and the idea that enclisis is overgeneralized, a preference for enclisis was found: 5 year old children produced proclisis instead of enclisis only at the rate of 0.5%, but they were target deviant in proclitic contexts 64% of the time; 6 year olds were at ceiling in enclitic contexts, but still had 46,2% deviant patterns in proclitic contexts;

b) However, not all contexts were identical; the rate of target production in children varies with the different contexts, as shown in the table below, according to the following ranking:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context</th>
<th>5 year olds</th>
<th>6 year olds</th>
<th>adults</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg Subj Neg</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>87,5%</td>
<td>97,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emb. Compl. Adv</td>
<td>48,3%</td>
<td>69,2%</td>
<td>96,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emb. Adv Q Subj</td>
<td>46,7%</td>
<td>74,6%</td>
<td>97,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv Q Subj</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>58,2%</td>
<td>93,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emb. Adv</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>77,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q Subj</td>
<td>9,9%</td>
<td>12,2%</td>
<td>70,8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) Interestingly, the control group also produced 11% of enclisis in the proclitic contexts, mainly in embedded adverbial clauses and with quantified subjects.

Going back to our original questions, our results show that enclisis is not overused across-the-board at identical rates. Instead, overuse of enclisis is context-sensitive, and it reflects the variation in adult grammar. Actually, the scale of development reflects the complexity of the input. When we consider each context, we see that the easier contexts are more specified:

**Negation:** no variation—earliest acquisition of proclisis. **Negative subjects:** other subjects do not trigger proclisis—acquisition requires defining subset of subjects that do trigger proclisis. **Embedded complement clauses:** only embedded clauses with a lexical complementizer yield proclisis—acquisition requires defining subset of embedded contexts that do trigger proclisis and distinguishing dependent clauses from non-dependent ones. **Adverb:** only a restricted set of adverbs are proclisis triggers—acquisition requires identifying subset of adverbs that do trigger proclisis. **Embedded adverbial clauses and quantified subjects:** variation between different types of quantifiers and variation in the status of adverbial clauses—slowest acquisition of proclisis. This variation in the input follows independently from the ambiguous status of some adverbial clauses—making them closer or more distant to coordination structures (cf. Lobo 2003), and from the different readings assigned to different quantifiers.

It follows from these results that children’s developmental path mirrors complexity in the target grammar, reflecting some earlier sensitivity to patterns of complexity. Interestingly, some of the cases where more instability is found are also contexts in which proclisis was not so categorical in old stages of Portuguese (Martins 1994, 2011, Fiéis 1997, 2003).

In line with previous findings for other domains (Costa & Lobo 2011), or for other languages (Grohmann et al. 2012; Miller & Schmitt 2010), these results indicate that complexity—induced by grammatical factors and by input variability—is a good predictor of delays in acquisition.
Both Brazilian and European Portuguese (BP, EP), differently from other Romance languages, allow VP ellipses (VPE). According to the literature (cf. Matos 1992; Cyrino & Matos 2002; 2005; Rouveret 2011; a.o.), the elided sequence is licensed by the main verb or by an auxiliary which has left VP (1):

(1) Ninguém leu/tinha lido esse livro nem admitia que alguém lesse/tivesse Ø.

No one read/had read that book nor admitted that someone read/had

‘No one read/had read that book nor admitted that someone did/had.’

However, BP differs from EP with respect to VPE. As shown by Cyrino & Matos (2002, 2005), elided sequences receive different interpretations in these varieties. While in BP (2) can be interpreted as a case of VPE, in EP (where the form of the periphrasis is está a ler) it is preferably interpreted as a sentence with an intransitive verb (i.e., he is not reading anything), which signals that the VPE licensing conditions in both varieties is not the same, involving different functional projections: T in EP and ASP(e ct) in BP.

(2) A Maria está lendo livros às crianças mas o João não está lendo Ø.

The Maria is reading books to-the children but the João not is reading

‘Maria is reading books to the children but João is not.’

Both varieties of Portuguese also allow null objects (NO) (cf. Raposo 1986; Galves 1989; Farrell 1990; a.o.). As pointed out by Matos 1992, Cyrino & Matos 2002, 2005, Santos 2009, and Rouveret 2011, among others, since an elided sequence can occur after a main verb, it is sometimes hard to distinguish between a VPE and a NO structure – see, for example, the glosses in (1). Rouveret (2011) (but see also Matos 1992) indicates that a distinction between these constructions can be made based on the fact that NOs only involve the direct object of the verb, while VPE includes all the complements of the verb and possible VP adjuncts. In Raposo’s (1986) analysis (see also Duarte 1987), the NO in EP cannot be subsumed under VPE, since it has some distinct properties from the latter, most notably the fact that it cannot occur in island structures, a restriction that does not apply to VPE. He concludes, then, that NOs in EP are variables. Costa et al. (forthcoming) also treat the EP NOs as variables although they assume that they share with VPE the ability to present strict and sloppy readings, a point to which we return. In any case, a crucial difference between EP and BP, however, is the fact that NOs in BP cannot be variables since they occur within islands:

(3) Joana guardou o casaco depois que lavou Ø.

Joana kept the coat after that washed

‘Joana put the coat away after she had washed it.’

In this paper, we argue that, differently from what occurs in EP, the NO in BP is, in fact, a case of ellipsis, licensed by the verb which has moved up to a lower functional projection, AspP. The proposal is based on the fact that NOs and VPE share many properties in this language.

First, just as in VPE, the NO in BP allows strict and sloppy readings (João’s or Pedro’s window), as in (4a). Yet, if an overt pronoun is used, as in (4b), the sloppy reading goes away. Considering that pro is the phonologically null counterpart of an overt pronoun, we take it as evidence that NOs as in (4a) cannot be represented by such a category.

(4) a. De noite, João abriu a janela, mas Pedro preferiu fechar Ø.

At night João opened the window but Pedro preferred to-close

‘At night, João opened the window, but Pedro preferred to close it.’

b. De noite, João abriu a janela, mas Pedro preferiu fechar ela.

‘At night, João opened the window, but Pedro preferred to close it.’

The NO in BP can only occur in a parallel structure wrt its antecedent (5):
The governor said that the congressman disrespected at the party.

Assuming this is a condition for ellipsis (cf. Fiengo & May 1994), we claim that the NO is a case of ellipsis, corresponding to an elided DP/NP, taken as reconstruction of the antecedent following identity and licensing requirements.

There is, however, one distinction between VPE and NO. The latter has an animacy restriction in relation to the antecedent which the former lacks. The NO antecedent has to be [-animate], unless it is also non-specific (see Cyrino, 1997 and Cyrino & Lopes, 2005):

(6) a. O policial insultou [o preso, antes de torturar *Ø/ele]  
   ‘The policeman insulted the prisoner before torture-inf him’
   
   b. Policial sempre insulta [preso(s), antes de torturar Ø]  
   ‘Policemen always insult prisoners before torturing them.’

We assume the structure in (7) for AspP (see Slabakova, 2001; MacDonald, 2008; a.o.), in which we have an outer AspP above vP responsible for the (im)perfectivity features. It is plausible to consider that there is an inner AspP between vP and VP to deal with telicity values associated with lexical aspect.

(7) [[TP [AspP [Asp [± perfective] [± SQA] [vP] [AspP [Asp [± telic] [vP]]]]]]

We are also assuming Verkuyl’s (1993) [SQA] – specified quantity of the argument – as a feature to be checked in outer AspP (see also Slabakova, 2001). For him, the aspectual calculus, especially of telicity, is not only dependent on the lexical features of verbs (Aktionsart) – housed in the inner AspP – but also on the specificity of the object, considered in terms of its cardinality. The object moves up to the specifier of outer AspP and the verb moves all the way up to the Asp head, where a spec-head relationship is established guaranteeing the compatibility of features for Full Interpretation. Both sets of features, [± perfective] and [± SQA], would be uninterpretable in the outer Asp head to be checked against the verbal element that ends up in the head and the DP/NP which moves to its specifier position, respectively.

BP has lost generalized verb movement (see (2) above), the verb movement becoming restricted to Asp (cf. Cyrino & Matos 2005, Cyrino & Reintges 2012) where it licenses the elliptical null object, its indexes being strictly reconstructed in LF (Fiengo & May 1994), with no phonological content since this is a post-spell out operation.

Language acquisition evidence seems to point into that track. NOs are attested in the production of children acquiring BP at the same age when relevant aspectual distinctions are found, considering the production of imperfective forms and the presence of varied verb types when lexical aspect is taken into account. Aspectual adverbs are also found in declarative sentences and VPE forms in short answers to polarity questions at the same age span, replacing non-adult patterns previously used by the children (see Lopes 2009). Comparing these results to those obtained for EP (Santos 2009), it is observed that Portuguese children converge into the VPE adult grammar much earlier than the Brazilian ones. Considering VPE is licensed by T in that language, Portuguese children would have to deal with less checking operations than the Brazilian ones.

Similar results were also found for comprehension. Lopes & Santos (2012) applied a Truth Value Judgment Task to test VPE comprehension in both varieties in children between 4 and 6 years of age (44 Portuguese and 30 Brazilian subjects). The lowest percentage of adult answers for EP was 77.4% for the 4 year-olds, the same age group where the Brazilian children are behaving at chance (58% of expected answers). The five year-olds display a similar behavior as the Portuguese 4 year-old ones, converging only at 6. These results suggest a protracted development in BP. The worst results in BP involved a condition, among the ones tested, which should be rejected if children teased apart VPE from NOs. While the error rate was 5.4% for EP, in BP it raised to 20%, with the 4 year-old subjects alone having 50% of non-expected answers.
Embedded fragment answers, sluices and referentiality in Spanish
Carlos de Cuba / University of Calgary
Jonathan E. MacDonald / University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Introduction: Fragment answers, as in (1b) answering (1a), and sluicing, as in (2), have both received a TP ellipsis account by Merchant (2004), with TP ellipsis being licensed by [E].


(2) Someone stole the money, and I know who.

They differ, however, as Merchant argues, in the final location within the left-periphery to which the remnants move. Sluicing remnants move to Spec,C, a s in (3a), while fragment answer remnants move to Spec,F, a functional projection above CP, as in (3b). The intermediate landing site in Spec,C is claimed to be the key aspect of why (details aside) fragment answers are sensitive to islands while sluicing is not. See Saab (2008) for the same patterns in Spanish.

(3) a. …[CP [who], [C [C [E]] [TP <who> stole the money ]]]
   b. …[FP [DP John], [F [CP <John> [C [C [E]] [TP <John> stole the money ]]]]

While matrix fragment answers have received a good deal of attention recently in the generative literature, to our knowledge, little has been said about embedded fragment answers, as in (4).

(4) Me dijeron/Repitieron/Parece/Creo *(que) Juan.
   To me they said/They repeated/It seems/I believe that Juan

Importantly, not all verbs allow embedded fragment answers. Observe the contrast between those in (4) that do (henceforth +EFA verbs), and those in (5) that do not (–EFA verbs).

(5) *Se/Recuerdo/Me enteré de/Descubrí/Me explicaron que Juan.
   I know/I remember/I found out of/I discovered/To me they explained that Juan

Interestingly, when it comes to sluicing we find the opposite patterns of grammaticality. +EFA verbs cannot partake in sluicing, as in (6b), while –EFA verbs can, as in (6c).

(6) a. Someone stole the money and…
   b. *…me dijeron que/repitieron que/me parece/creo quién.
   …to me they said/it seems/they repeated/I believe who
   c. …se/recuerdo/me enteré de/descubrí/me explicaron quién.
   …I know/I remember/I found out of/I discovered/to me they explained who

In this paper, we adopt Merchant’s analysis of matrix fragment answers and sluicing, and apply it to these embedded contexts to account for these contrasts. We claim that: (i) the fragment answer contrast in (4) and (5) results from differences in structure between +EFA and –EFA verb complement clauses; +EFA verb complements have more structure that –EFA verb complements; (ii) the sluicing contrast in (6b) and (6c) results from a corresponding difference in semantics between +EFA and –EFA verb complement clauses; while –EFA verb complements are referential (essentially discourse linked); +EFA verb complements are non-referential; and (iii) the que that obligatory appears in fragment answers, and which is prohibited in sluicing, heads a non-referential cP which is structurally higher than FP in (3b).

Differences in structure: In her discussion of embedded wh-words, Suñer (1991) observes that a clitic left dislocated constituent can appear above the wh-word under some verbs, as in (7a), but not under others, as in (7b). These correspond to our +EFA verbs and –EFA verbs respectively.

(7) a. Le dije que (a su hijo) dónde lo iban a mandar los militares.
   Him said.1s that (to his son) where him go.3pl to send the militaries
   “He asked him where the military was going to send his son.”
   b. Sabía (*a Juan) qué le había prometido el decano.
   Knew.1sg (to Juan) what him had promised the dean
   “I knew what the dean had promised John.”

Merchant (2004) claims that fragment answer remnants move to the same position as clitic left dislocated constituents, indicated as Spec,F in (3a). (See Saab 2008 for related discussion.) If –EFA verb complements have less structure, lacking FP, and fragment answer remnants move to Spec,F, then we can straightforwardly account for why –EFA verb complements disallow both embedded fragment answers.
Differences in semantics: Differences in structure alone cannot straightforwardly account for the contrast in sluicing since Spec,C is available for both complements of +EFA and –EFA verbs. We appeal to the observation in Chung et al. (1995) that remnants of (inner antecedent) sluicing tend to be discourse linked (in the sense of Pesetsky 1987). This is clear from (6b) from above, where quién refers to the individual introduced into the discourse context by alguien. Interestingly, we find strikingly similar observations from Suñer (1991 et seq.), illustrated in (8).

(8)  
a. (Te) recuerdo/se cuáles eran sus actores favoritos: Nicholson y Depardieu. You remind/know.1sg which were his/her actors favorite: Nicholson and Depardieu  
   “I (will) tell/remind/know (you) who his/her favorite actors were: N and D.”  
b. Te ’digo/repito que cuáles eran sus actores favoritos: #Nicholson y Depardieu.  
   You ask/repeat.1sg. that which were his/her actors favorites: #Nicholson and Depardieu  
   “I’ll ask you which his/her favorite actors are: N and D.”

In (8a), with our –EFA verbs, cuáles is discourse linked to the answer which is supplied felicitously: Nicholson and Depardieu. N and D are the specific members of the set to which cuáles refers. In contrast, in (8b), cuáles does not refer to any specific members of a set; it is not discourse-linked. Thus, it is infelicitous to interpret it as referring to N and D as the answer.

In this respect, our –EFA verbs take referential complements, while our +EFA verbs take non-referential complements. We follow Cinque’s (1990) definition of referentiality and adapt it to the CP domain, along the lines of de Cuba & Úrögdi (2009), as in (9):

(9)  
a. Referential CP: denotes an accepted (or pre-established) proposition in the existing discourse which has no illocutionary force.  
b. Non-referential cP: denotes a speech act which introduces a proposition (or an open question) which is not yet accepted (or pre-established) in the existing discourse.

The role of que: We claim that the que which appears above the wh-words in (7a) and (8b), and the que which introduces embedded fragment answers in (4) both head a non-referential cP which itself is higher than FP in (3a) (structurally parallel to Rizzi’s (1997) ForceP: see also Demonte & Fernandez Soriano (2010)). As support, consider verbs that can appear with or without this que: decir “say” and repetir “repeat”. Suñer (1991) notes that these verbs can show the same pattern and interpretation as the verbs in (8a), but crucially, only when que is not present (data not shown here). As (8b) shows, it is only in the presence of que that the embedded wh-word is interpreted non-referentiality. Since sluicing remnants tend to be referential, we can explain why these verbs cannot appear in sluicing with que, as in (6b), but can when que is not present, as in (10), a continuation of (6a): que would make the remnants non-referential.

(10) …me dijeron/repetieron (tres veces) (*que) quién  
    …to me they said/they repeated three times that who

The opposite is true of fragment answers - que must be present (4). The presence of que (heading cP) is an indication of the additional structure needed to house the remnant of fragment answers (FP is truncated along with cP in referential CPs). Since fragment answers are clauses, and since they introduce new information into the discourse (see (9b)), they are non-referential cPs.

References
1. Introduction: Evidentials are grammatical categories encoding speaker-oriented qualifications of propositions in terms of the evidence they are based on (Aikhenvald 2006). About a quarter of the world’s languages have evidentials. They have been identified for American Indian languages, where their marking is systematized mainly in verb suffixes, as well as for languages like Turkish, Balkan languages, Tibetan, Japanese, Korean, etc., which exhibit elaborated evidential systems (see Chafe & Nichols 1986). In this paper we will propose that one type of Spanish que (complementizer ‘that’) has to be incorporated into the crosslinguistically restricted list of evidentials. In particular, it will be shown to encode the (most basic) marks of non-first-hand or indirect (reported) evidence.

2. The data. Our point of departure is certain (apparently) independent clauses of Spanish which are headed by an overt complementizer que ‘that’, as in (1) and (2).

(1) a. (Oye), que el Barça ha ganado la Champions. [Etxepare 2010]
   Listen that the Barça has won the Champions (league)
   b. (Oye), que el paquete ha llegado.
   Listen that the parcel has arrived

(2) a. Que si me das un kilo de tomates.
   That if me you give one kilo of tomatoes
   b. –Se me ha olvidado decírselo.
   I forgot to tell her.
   –¿Que se te ha olvidado¡
   That you forgot

Both in descriptive and theoretical approaches these (Etxepare 2010, Spitzer 1942) instances of que are usually analyzed together. We will show, on the contrary, that the two sets of examples constitute different types of structures with different syntactic and semantic/pragmatic properties.

3. Main proposal. Careful examination of these cases reveals that only those in (1) are root clauses, which can be discourse initial (pronounced out-of-the blue). Furthermore, the presence of que involves a speech event heard and reported by the speaker. Our proposal is that que here is an (indirect) ‘reportative’ evidential parallel to what has been proposed for languages like Quechua (Faller 2002).

4. Evidence for the previous claim comes from the fact that que in (1) shares, among other, the following properties with reportative evidentials:

a) The speaker/ hearer cannot be the source of the reported information. For example, the president of a nation cannot report his own war declaration as in (3):

(3) #Ciudadanos, que {se ha/ hemos} declarado la guerra.
   Citizens, that it has/we have declared the war

b) Only declarative sentences are possible in structures like (1). Other clause types (exclamatives, interrogatives) will be shown to be excluded.

c) As it is the case with reportative evidentials (Faller 2002), the presence of ‘reportative’ que allows a conjunction of two different illocutionary acts (two reports), but this is not the case for disjunction, as seen in (4).

(4)#Oye, que la película es estupenda o que aún no la han estrenado. (vs. y que aún no la han…)
   ‘Listen (it was reported that) the film is fabulous or (it was reported that) it has not been presented yet.’ (vs. and it has been reported that…)

d) Que in (1) does not allow for the speech eventuality it implies to be accessed by linguistic operations bearing on propositional truth, such as negation/ dissention.

(7) - Oye que el Madrid ha ganado la Champions.
   Listen that the Madrid has won the Champions
   - #No, hombre, no has escuchado eso en ninguna parte. (vs. No pueden haber ganado)
   ‘No, man, you have not heard that anywhere.’ (vs. No, they cannot have won)
e) Examples will be provided to prove that ‘reportative’ *que*, like other reportative evidentials, shows so called ‘first person effects’ (Aikhenvald 2004), that is, it develops surprise, unawareness or “unprepared mind” overtones in the context of first person participants.

5. As for the **analysis of evidential que**, some evidentials have been characterized as epistemic modals encoding presupposition (Izvorski 1997, Chung 2007, Matthewson et al. 2007) and others as illocutionary operators. In particular Faller 2002 proposes such a characterization for Quechuan evidentials. It will be shown that reportative *que* does not encode any features related to epistemic modality (reliability or (im)probability) and we will propose that it is better analyzed as an illocutionary operator, affecting the illocutionary force, including the illocutionary points and sincerity conditions of the sentence: the speaker changes the ‘illocutionary point’ and converts an act of ‘assertion’ into one of ‘presentation’, where the speaker does not ‘commit’ herself to the truth of the prejacent but simply ‘presents’ it as something heard from someone else. With respect to its syntactic properties we claim that it is generated above F(orce)P(hrase), inside the S(peech) A(ct) P(hrase), a syntactic projection above CP that mediates the syntax–pragmatics interface and whose layered structure would host an evidential projection (Speas & Tenny 2003).

5. **Evidentiality vs. Insubordination.** The proposed account is further supported when sentences in (1) are contrasted with sentences in (2). None of the properties above are shared by the latter. We will describe the syntactic and semantic properties of this second *que* which we will characterize as **echoic**, in the sense that it introduces structures that are used attributively, not merely to report a particular content (an utterance or thought attributed either to the hearer, to a third person or to the speaker in the past) but also “to show that the speaker […] wants to inform the hearer of her own reaction to it” (Wilson 2006). We **conclude** that in (2) *que* is a real complementizer (with an extended use with special discourse values) heading a FP, in some cases selected by a silent verbal form. It thus instantiates a special case of "insubordination" (Truckenbrodt 2006), but different from the ones described for German, Scandinavian and other languages since it is not restricted to contexts with particular mood values (exclamatives, interrogative…). This ‘echoic’ *que* could provide certain hints on the internal structure of FP, as well as on the use of subordinators in pragmatic domains.
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Dimensions of definiteness in French-based Creoles

Viviane Déprez / Rutgers University, L2C2, CNRS

Research Questions: While a longstanding debate in the semantic and philosophical literature continues to oppose familiarity based (Heim 1991) and uniqueness based (Rusell 1905) accounts of definiteness, Schwarz (2009) recently argued that both are equally needed for languages that harbor two distinct forms of definite articles, side by side (e.g. Fehring). As described in typological works, so called strong and weak definites differ both in their phonological (in)dependence and their uses. Whereas strong definites keep their phonological integrity across contexts, and are used when the identification of referents relies on the immediate, specific context of utterance (pragmatic definiteness), weak definites tend to encliticizes in certain contexts (preposition) and are used when referent identification succeeds independently of the specific context of utterance used (semantic definiteness). Schwarz (2009) argues for a formal semantic reanalysis of these contrasts that emphasizes the dimension of familiarity/anaphoricity for strong definites, (cast in terms of an anaphoricity index in a DP internal situation variable), and that of uniqueness for weak ones. The question still arises of whether these contrasts exemplified with competing definites in a single language are also found cross-linguistically in distinct languages, and, more generally, of whether these distinct dimensions of definiteness suffice to carve out the cross-linguistic space. To begin addressing this issue, this paper examines the case of the French Based Creole (FBC) determiner ‘la’ which provides the interesting contrasting example of a largely identical definite form spanning across several distinct languages. The paper offers both a detailed quantitative and qualitative empirical exploration of the characteristic uses of the determiner ‘la’ in three distinct FBC, Mauritan Creole (MauC), Martinique Creole (MC) and Réunion Creole (RC) and sketches a formal semantic description of how the uses of ‘la’ are carved out, confronting the competing semantic model of definiteness in Schwarz (2009) to that of Wespel(2008), which distinguishes kinds of definites along dimensions that relies on how the nature of the nominal description (sortal (the book) vs. functional (the president of the US)) determines accessibility to an unambiguous referent, by resorting, or not, to a situation variable anchored to the immediate situation or to a topic situation. That is, in Wespel’s account, different ways of restricting the discourse domain to allow access to a unique referent is what is paramount in determining dimensions of definiteness, not familiarity and uniqueness.

Data set: French Based Creoles (FBC) are well known for the conspicuous similarities and striking differences that their determiner systems manifest. On the one hand, FBC employ a rather limited set of almost identical lexical determiners, on the other hand, their syntactic orders summarized in (1) display remarkable diversity, as does their discourse uses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reunion C</th>
<th>Dfavorable1 (PL) &gt; NP &gt; (def)</th>
<th>Le/se/(bann)NP (la)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles C</td>
<td>Dem PL &gt; NP</td>
<td>Sa bann NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritian C</td>
<td>Dem PL &gt; NP &gt; Def</td>
<td>Sa bann NP-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Lucie</td>
<td>PL &gt; NP &gt; Dem Def</td>
<td>Se NP sa-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martinique C</td>
<td>PL &gt; NP &gt; Dem Def</td>
<td>Se NP-ta-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadeloupe C</td>
<td>PL &gt; NP &gt; Def Dem</td>
<td>Se NP-la-sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MesoLouisiana C</td>
<td>DefPL &gt; NP &gt; Dem(def)</td>
<td>Le NP sa-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BasILouisiana C</td>
<td>NP &gt; Dem PL</td>
<td>NP-(sil)a ye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyan C</td>
<td>Dem &gt; NP &gt; PL Def</td>
<td>Sa NP ye-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian C</td>
<td>NP &gt; Dem Def/PL</td>
<td>NP-sa-(1)a/yo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While on the syntactic front, following Déprez (2007) among others, there is now solid consensus that the distinct orders all derive from a common syntactic base, much less is understood about the nature of the semantic diversity that underlies the uses of these common determiners. The paper analyses the uses of the determiner ‘la’ in a comparative corpus of 4 texts which are all translations of the same literary work The Little Prince by Antoine de St Exupery in the three distinct creoles, along with their lexifier version. The chosen corpus is particularly suited for this narrow semantic comparison because it is mostly narrated in the first person, in an informal style directed to both adult and child audiences, and it contains a significant
number of dialogues. At the outset, form distinctions in the realization of the definite determiner are immediately apparent. Thus while ‘la’ clearly preserves its phonological integrity across contexts in Mauritian Creole (MauC), the opposite is true in Martinique Creole (MC) where the very book title Ti Prens Lan displays contextual vowel nasalization. (Interestingly, however, the MC form displays a slightly less affected variant than Haitian Creole (HC), where nasalization also affects the consonant [la]=nan in addition to the vowel.) These phonological oppositions suggestively mirror the language internal strong/weak article distinctions described above. In some FBC, (Mauritian, Guyanese, Guadeloupean Creoles) the determiner is phonologically independent, in others (Martinique, Haitian) it is not. The question of interest here is: do these form distinctions correlate with the semantic distinctions cursorily described above, and formally modeled in the works of Wespel and Schwartz. The paper argues that they do.

**Methods:** Determiner use is manually coded throughout the texts for distinct categories. To allow a theory neutral coding that provided a sufficiently fine-grained classification, the following categories, adapted from Himmelmann (1997) were used:

Pragmatic/familiarity /sortal definiteness

1. Situational: a. Deictic: give me the hammer b. Shared: the sun, the boss…
2. Anaphoric: A man and a woman entered. The woman sat down
3. Associative: 3a: part-whole The village…the church, 3b: relational A car… the driver

Semantic/ uniqueness/functional definiteness

4. Description (superlative, number ordinal , relatives, relational): the first/best story
5. Generic/Kind: The cat is a domesticated animal

**Partial Results (MauC):** The total number of definites is about 1/10 of singular definites in the original French text. (64 la in MauC vs 604 sing def in French). The bulk of ‘la’ uses correspond to pragmatic definiteness (76%) being either direct anaphoric uses =2 (68%)(coded as such when N present within the 3 previous sentences) or situational deictic uses =1a, where the situation corresponds to the universe of the story (e.g fler la, the little prince’s rose, renar la, the fox in the story). In type 3a contexts, no determiner occurs. (Sa danpi ki nou ti trouve la pa ti parey kouma lezot dan dezer… Tou dan lord: pouli, seo, lakord. That well we found was not like others in the desert… Everything was in order. The pulley (of the well), the pail, the rope). This is a characteristic part-whole bridge context, where, as Shwartz shows, a weak determiner is required in Fehring. Likewise, in contexts 4 & 5. Interestingly, type 1b contexts also lack a determiner (Bizen atann soley kouse. We must wait for the sun to set), which is unpredicted in Wespel’s approach but predicted on Schwartz’ analysis. Together, these preliminary results, developed in the paper, support Schwarz’s approach. MauC ‘la’ is a strong determiner overwhelmingly used in anaphoric and familiar contexts. The paper reveals very different results in MC, also shown to differ from HC and Réunion Creole.
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On the genericity of mass (in)definites
Carmen Dobrovie-Sorin / CNRS-LLF, Université Paris 7

The goal of the paper is to explain the contrast between mass indefinite DPs and definite DPs in French regarding the (im)possibility of generic readings:

(1) a. L’eau est en général liquide. ‘The water is usually liquid.’
   b. *de l’eau est en général liquide de+def water is usually liquid

I will attribute the unacceptability of (1b) to the constraint on quantification stated in (2) below and I will analyze the acceptability of (1a) as indicating that names of kinds that are mapped onto the restrictor of Q-adverbs are not type-shifted to the corresponding property/set but instead denote partitions of kinds. A contrast similar to (1a-b) will be shown to exist for quantificational Determiners in Romanian.

1. Q-adverbs cannot bind variables that range over portions of matter. It is currently assumed that in generic sentences built with names of ‘plural kinds’, e.g., Les chats sont intelligents ‘The cats are intelligent’, the name of kind is shifted to the set of atomic individuals that realize the kind (Chierchia (1998) a.o.), which yields an LF of the type GENx (x is a realization of ‘cats’) [x is intelligent], where ‘cats’ notates the kind cats, obtained by applying the Down operator to the plural property cats. The problem is that an extension of this type of analysis to generic sentences built with mass kinds cannot explain the contrast in (1a-b). Since the set of the realizations of the kind ‘water’ is identical to the unrestricted set of portions of water denoted by the property ‘water’, the LF representation of (1a) would be indistinguishable from that of (1b). [In order to simplify the discussion I will assume that Q-adverbs can quantify not only over events but also over individuals (Kratzer 1988, 1995, Diesing 1992, Chierchia 1995), a type of configuration that might be more adequately analyzed as quantification over event-individual pairs in which events and individuals are in a one-to-one relation (Farkas & de Swart 07)]

(1') a. MOSTx (x is a realization of ‘water’) [x is liquid]
   b. MOSTx (x is water) [x is liquid]

Granting that (1'b) is indeed the LF of (1b), the observed unacceptability can be explained by assuming the constraint stated in (2), which is currently invoked when dealing with quantification over events/situations (Kratzer 95, a.o.):

(2) Quantifiers cannot quantify over elements ordered by the part-whole relation.
(1'b) violates (2) because sets of mass entities are ordered by the part-whole relation. In order to account for the acceptability of (1a) we need to reject the LF in (1'a), which is ruled out, on a par with (1'b). A different semantic analysis is proposed below.

2. The Semantics of Q-adverbs with entity-denoting restrictors. Consider (3), which is like (1a) in that a DP fills the restriction, but differs from (1a) in that the DP refers to a particular individual rather than to a kind:

(3) Cette eau est sale pour sa plus grande partie. ‘This water is dirty for its most part.’

Central to the semantic analysis proposed below is the notion of partition, or non-overlapping cover, i.e., a set of collectively exhaustive, non-overlapping parts of an object. In (3), the entity denoted by cette eau ‘this water’ can be assigned a partition notated Rthis_water. The Q-adverb can now be analyzed as denoting the relation between the set of elements belonging to a partition of [[cette eau]] and the set of dirty entities:

(3') MOST (this water)x is dirty] = ΞRthis_water [MOSTx (x ∈ Rthis_water) [x is dirty]]

This LF does not violate the constraint in (2) because the elements belonging to a partition are by definition non-overlapping, i.e., not ordered by the part-whole relation. This type of LF can be assigned a semantic interpretation by using measure functions. Thus, (3) is true iff (4) is true, where m notates a measure function and S the sum operator:

(4) ΞRthis-water [μ (Σx (x ∈ Rthis-water ∧ x is dirty)) > μ (Σx(x ∈ Rthis-water ∧ x is non-dirty))]

In words, (4) requires that the measure of the sum of the dirty elements of the partition of [[this water]] is larger than the measure of the sum of the non-dirty elements of the partition. The partition contains parts that are homogeneous either dirty or non-dirty (a relevant threshold of dirtiness can also be used). Because the scales of size (length, surface, volume) are additive (Lassiter 11), a particular choice of a measure unit (for the same dimension) does not affect the truth conditions of proportional quantifiers, and
therefore it was left unspecified in (4).

3. Measuring Kinds: Ratios. Coming back to (1a), it differs from (3) in that the Q-adverb takes a kind in its restriction; $R_{\text{water}} = \text{partition of the kind water}$. The LF (1"a) should thus be assumed instead of (1'a):

(1"a) $\text{MOST}(\cap_{\text{water}})[x \text{ is liquid}] = \exists R_{\text{water}} \text{ MOST}_x [x \in R_{\text{water}}] [x \text{ is liquid}]

In order to check whether (1a) is true we need to check whether (5) is satisfied;

(5) $\exists R_{\text{water}} [\mu(\sum(x \in R_{\text{water}} \wedge x \text{ is liq.})) > \mu(\sum(x \in R_{\text{water}} \wedge x \text{ is non-liq.}))]

(5) requires that the measure of the sum of the liquid elements of the partition of the kind water is bigger than the measure of the sum of non-liquid elements of the partition of the kind water. The problem is that run-of-the-mill measure functions (relying on measure units) are not defined for indeterminate/infinite entities such as kinds. The solution is an analysis in terms of ratios, which is possible for additive/ratio scales such as size. We take the measure of the kind as a whole to be 1, the minimum is 0, and the measure of any other element of the domain is a ratio comprised between 0 and 1 ($0 < r < 1$). (5) is satisfied iff the ratio of the sum of all the liquid elements of the partition of the kind water is larger than the complement of that ratio wrt to 1.

Summarizing our proposal, (1a) as well as (3) satisfy the constraint in (2) because the restrictor is filled with a partition (of the entity, individual or kind, denoted by the DP mapped onto the restrictor), which is a set of non-overlapping elements. (1b) differs from (1a) in that the Theme of the generalization is an indefinite expression, which does not contribute an entity to the semantic representation (specific indefinite DPs may be entity-referring, but generic indefinites cannot be assumed to be specific), but only the characteristic function of a set of entities; since mass NPs denote join semi-lattices, the constraint in (2) is violated.

4. Partitive Proportional Determiners. The contrast exhibited by Q-adverbs in (1a) vs (1b) is expected to be found with quantificational Determiners (Q-determiners). The parallelism can be illustrated only partially for French, which has only partitive proportional Q-det's e.g., _la plus grande partie de l'eau_ 'the largest part of the water', where the complement of _of the largest part_ is a DP marked for Genitive Case. As expected, such proportional Q-determiners allow mass quantification, on a par with examples like (1a) and (3): _La plus grande partie de l'eau est liquide._ 'The largest part of the water is liquid.' We also expect mass quantification to be blocked with proportional Q-determiners corresponding to the Q-adverbs in (1b), which have properties/sets (rather than entities) in their restriction. French does not have this type of Q-determiner, but the prediction can be verified in Romanian, which - in addition to partitive Q-det's e.g., _cea mai mare parte a apei_ 'the largest part GEN water-the_theme,' _"the largest part of the water" - has non-partitive proportional Q-det's e.g., _cea mai multă apă_ 'the more much water', _"(the) most water",_ where the superlative of _mult 'much'_ takes an NP (rather than a DP) as a complement. In such configurations the complement NP denotes the set of (overlapping) water entities denoted by the mass NP, and we correctly predict ungrammaticality, on a par with (1b): _*Cea mai multă apă e lichidă_ '[The] most water is liquid.'

5. Generic Bare NPs in English. Given the results obtained above, English generic bare mass NPs should not be analyzed as indefinite-like expressions but rather as kind-referring. Moreover, for the purposes of the semantic interpretation, the kind is not type-shifted to the corresponding property/set but instead it is assigned a partition, as explained above for (1a).
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Preverbal subjects, information structure, and object clitic position in Old Occitan

Bryan Donaldson / University of Texas at Austin

The position of object and adverbial clitic pronouns remains one of the most problematic areas of Old Occitan syntax (Mériz 1978; Wanner 2010). This presentation analyzes clitic position in one specific clause type, affirmative main declaratives with overt preverbal nominal or pronominal subjects. In this context, henceforth a SV declarative, clitics are either preverbal (1a) or postverbal (1b) with no apparent change in meaning.

(1a) E.N Constantis s’en ANET.
    and.Sir Constantine himself.from-there went
    And Sir Constantine left. (Razo about Bertran de Born, §8; Boutière 1964: 92)

(1b) E.N Guilhem ANET s’en.
    and.Sir Guillaume went himself.from-there
    And Sir Guillaume left. (Razo about Guilhem de Balaun, §34; Boutière 1964: 352)

Although this variation has been described often (e.g., Hinzelin 2007; Lafont 1967; Mézir 1978; Smith & Bergin 1984), explanations of the underlying grammatical system responsible for it remain inadequate. One suggestion, intimated in numerous earlier studies, is that the variation is essentially random (Mériz 1978: 173–174). A more recent hypothesis (Hinzelin 2007) attributes the variation principally to regional differences within the Old Occitan territory. Neither view satisfactorily addresses:

(a) the underlying structure of a grammar that generates both variants
(b) the sizable imbalance in frequency between (1a), which is the predominant order, and (1b), which is relatively infrequent
(c) the principles underlying the distribution of the variants in texts whose grammar generates both orders (if it is possible to identify such principles)

The present analysis combines theoretical claims about the organization of the clausal left periphery in medieval Romance (Benincà 2006) with a detailed examination of information-structural properties in Old Occitan prose. The data come from complete analyses of (a) the troubadour biographies (the vida and razos) and (b) the Vida of Saint Douceline.

In Benincà’s (2006) model of the clausal left periphery in medieval Romance, multiple projections are available to the left of the V2 core of main declaratives (on V2 in Old Occitan, see e.g., Kunert 2003; Lafont 1967; Smith & Bergin 1984). In the spirit of other recent work on Romance (e.g., Cardinaletti 2004, Gonzalez i Planas 2007, etc.), the present analysis posits multiple preverbal subject positions in Old Occitan, an idea whose basic premise can be traced at least back to Skårup (1975) but that has received little currency in subsequent work on Old Occitan (e.g., Hinzelin 2007). The analysis also follows Benincà’s (2006) contention that the position of object and adverbial clitics is sensitive to the saturation of SpecFocus, the traditional ‘first position’ in declaratives.

As a first step, I detail the discourse-functional properties of SV declaratives in which the subject is clearly left-dislocated, as in (2a) and (2b).

(2a) [ForceP [FrameP [TopicP Bertrans de Born [FocusP si [Focus' FO]]]] uns castellans.
    Bertran de Born thus was a nobleman
    Bertran de Born was a nobleman. (Vida XIA; Boutière 1964: 65)

(2b) Mas [ForceP [FrameP [TopicP ella [FocusP si [Focus' AMAVA]]]] N’Ugo de Lasigna.
    but she thus loved sir.Hugo of Lasigna
    But she loved Sir Hugo of Lasigna. (Razo of 167,52; Boutière 1964: 180)

I then demonstrate the information-structural equivalence of left-dislocated subjects like (2a,b) and subjects in sequences like (1b). I propose, contra Hinzelin (2007), that the subjects in (1a) and (1b) occupy
distinct syntactic positions. In (1a), the most frequent variant, the subject straightforwardly occupies SpecFocus, structurally adjacent to the verb. In (1b), however, the subject is left-dislocated—despite its surface adjacency to the verb—and occupies the same left-peripheral Topic position as the subjects to the left of the sentence adverb *si* in (2a,b). Unlike in (2a,b), however, SpecFocus remains empty in (1b), with the consequence that object and adverbial clitics appear postverbally.

The analysis contributes to a long-standing problem in medieval Romance syntax by drawing on recent formal insights on the clausal left periphery as well as findings from information structure and discourse organization. The proposal offers a theoretically principled explanation of the variable position of object clitics in Old Occitan SV declaratives. The relative rarity of order (1b) stems from the fact that it is pragmatically marked, and a careful analysis of discourse organization elucidates the principles behind the distribution of orders (1a) and (1b) in texts whose grammar licenses both.
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The distribution of bare nominals in Old French: A quantitative analysis of two 12th century texts
Monique Dufresne / Queen’s University
Mireille Tremblay / Université de Montréal
Rose-Marie Déchaine / University of British Columbia

1. Introduction For some authors (e.g. Longobardi 1994), nouns are essentially predicates (type <e,t>), while for others (e.g. Baker 2003), nouns are inherently arguments (type <e>). Strict bare argument languages (e.g. Latin) provide evidence in favor of the first hypothesis, while languages with obligatory determiners (e.g. French) argue in favor of the latter. Languages where bare nouns are part of the paradigm (i.e. limited to indefinites (Brazilian Portuguese), to plural indefinites (English), or plural indefinites in object position (Italian)) highlight the semantic and syntactic conditioning of bare nouns. In this paper, we argue that the emergence of determiners in Old French (OF) provides additional evidence in favor of an analysis of nouns as predicates.

2. Bare nominals in Old French Old French freely permits both singular and plural bare nominal arguments; illustrative examples are given in 0.

(1) a. Hom qui traïst altre, nen est dreiz qu’il s’en vant.
   ‘A man who betrays his fellows should not boast of it.’
   (Foulet 1928, cited in Boucher 2005)

b. Galois sont tuit par nature plus fol que bestes an pasture.
   ‘Gauls are all naturally crazier than beasts let out to pasture.’
   (Foulet 1928, cited in Boucher 2005)

Old French has a dedicated definite D, an emerging singular indefinite D un, but no clear plural indefinite D. Argument bare Ns are compatible with indefinite existential construal (2a), generic reference (2b), abstract nouns (2c), and mass nouns (2d) (Boucher 2005, Mathieu 2009)

(2) a. Donez moi armes por le besoing qu’abonde.
   ‘Give me weapons because the need is pressing.’
   (La Prise d’Orange, end of 12th century, line 964)

b. Cocodrille est uns animaus a .iiij. piez et de jaune color.
   ‘The crocodile is a four-legged animal and is yellow.’
   (Li livres dou tresor, year 1260-1267, V, Dou cocodrille, p.184, cited in Mathieu 2009)

c. Envie lor fait grant contraire.
   ‘Envy is not good for them.’
   (Eracle, year 1180, line 1061, cited in Mathieu 2009)

d. Mirre e timonie i Wrent alumer.
   ‘They burnt myrrh and incense.’
   (Epstein 1995, cited in Boucher 2005)

Both singular and plural definite count nouns require the presence of the definite determiner, which agrees in gender, case and number with the noun, although focus and metric have been argued to favor the definite (Mathieu 2009).

3. Methodology Our study relies on two Anglo-norman texts from the 12th century: Le voyage de St-Brendan (circa1106-21) and Les lais de Marie de France (circa1154-1189). These two texts, from the corpus Les voies du français, are entirely tagged and parsed with Corpus Search. We considered only definite and indefinite arguments in subject and object position. Therefore, all arguments inside a PP, predicate nominals (including complex predicates), possessive and demonstrative DPs, and QPs were excluded. Moreover we did not take into account indefinite pronominals or quantifiers such as on/hum, autre, rien... All instances of un were considered determiners, and not numerals.
4. Results

As shown in table 1, definite determiners with count nouns are well established in subject position in Saint Brendan and are almost categorical 50 years later in Marie de France. Mass nouns and abstract nouns appear without a definite determiner 50% of the time, accounting for the presence of bare nouns in subject position (with an increase in definite determination between St-Brendan (40%) and Marie de France (60%)). Plural indefinites are categorically bare in both texts (the partitive des not being reanalyzed as a plural indefinite determiner until Middle French), but singular indefinites show a slight increase of the determiner (20%). OF shows no subject/object asymmetry (unlike Italian) and the distribution of bare nouns in subject position does not seem to be restricted to postverbal position (unlike Spanish).

5. Analysis

In OF, definiteness is a predictor for D, which is consistent with treating definiteness as a primitive feature. (In)definiteness is an active contrast for count nouns, but not for mass and abstract nouns, which are progressively licensed definite expletives (Zubizaretta & Vergnaud). Within count nouns, the asymmetry between definiteness and indefiniteness (definites vs. plural indefinites) is consistent with the emergence of number marking as a licensor for bare nouns.

6. Conclusion

The expression of determiners in OF is linked to the morphological changes that occurred in the system (subject/object, case/number, singular/plural). These changes yielded ambiguous nominal structures resulting in an obligatory phonological realization of the determiner. The progressive morphologization of the determiner and the regression of bare nouns are indications that there is a null D morpheme in OF, as predicted by the N=predicate analysis.

References

Codeswitching (CS) is integral to negotiating identity in the linguistic arena (Niño-Murcia 2011; Sebba 2012). Paraguay’s case is unique: it is the only country in the Americas where an indigenous language (Guaraní) is spoken by a non-indigenous majority. Yet, Guaraní and Spanish do not coexist there as “pure” varieties. Rather, speakers employ a third variety, jopara, inconsistently described as an unstable language mixing (Lustig 1996; Pottier 1970), a Guaraní with hispanisms (Fernández Guizzetti 1966), an everyday ill-spoken Guaraní (Galeano Olivera n.d.), a Spanish spoken in Guaraní (Morínigo 1959); a transitional pidgin (Boidin 2006a), a third language (Bakker, Gómez Rendón, and Hekking 2008), or a creole (Boidin 2006b; Pic-Gillard 2003). Amid efforts by the Paraguayan government to institutionalize jopara as the Guaraní taught in schools, understanding what jopara is necessitates a systematic linguistic description.

We apply leading theories of CS to analyze the first novel written entirely in jopara: *Ramona Quebranto* (RQ) (Ayala de Michelagnoli 1989). We find that the language choices evinced in RQ-jopara don’t comfortably fit current models of CS structure. Following Deuchar et al.’s (2007) quantitative approach, we characterize RQ-jopara as predominantly *insertional* (i.e., insertion of single words or constituents), but with strong *alternational* features (i.e., alternation between longer stretches of words). This is consistent with Muysken’s (2000) proposal that colonial settings and asymmetric proficiency lead to insertional CS. Alternation is favored here by Paraguay’s bilingual stability, but disfavored by the lack of complete language separation or strong norms. However, while Deuchar and colleagues also propose that insertion is best captured by the Matrix Language Frame Model (MLF, Myers-Scotton 1997; Myers-Scotton 2002), RQ-jopara presents problems for the MLF. Word-internal CS clearly identifies Guaraní as ML. For example, if a content lexeme is Guaraní, the morphology (especially subject-verb agreement (1), but also case markers (2)) is Guaraní, but the reverse is never found:

1) \( \text{ovende} \) but *\( \text{rema} - \text{el} - \text{a} - \text{f} \)  2) nuestra \( \text{casitape} \) but *\( \text{ore rómani} \)
\( 3\text{-sell} \quad \text{sell-3sg} \quad \text{our house-little-IN} \quad \text{in our house-little} \\
\text{“sells”} \quad \text{“in our little house”} \)

Yet, Spanish words are in a 4:1 ratio to Guaraní in RQ, so it is difficult to see RQ-jopara as the insertion of Spanish into a Guaraní ML. Moreover, this is not due to the choice of ML being controlled by contextual variables (e.g., if speakers of higher socioeconomic status were addressed in CS with Spanish as ML).

While it is not particularly surprising that theories of spoken CS are not easily applied to a written text, the question remains as to what the exact relationship is between this “literary” jopara and its spoken counterpart. We propose that, whereas RQ-jopara is derived from spoken jopara whose ML is Guaraní, the novel as a genre favors Spanish as ML. These stylistic pressures further hispanicize jopara in this case, but without switching to Spanish as ML. This proposal explains the higher frequency of Spanish lexemes in RQ. It also allows us to maintain the general tenets of MLF, while at the same time relaxing constraints on the choice of ML, construing it more broadly as “discourse strategy” (Matras 2009). We conclude by discussing accommodations necessary when applying structural theories of spoken CS to written texts (Sebba, Mahootian, and Jonsson 2012), in particular when CS obtains between a highly standardized language with a strong written tradition and a mostly oral language.
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Negation in Spanish can head a finite clause (1a) (Laka, 90) or be merged to a constituent of that clause (1b), a case of Constituent Negation (CN) (Klima, 64; Horn, 89; Sanchez López, 99). CN applies to a wide range of quantifiers in Spanish (2a-b):

(1)  

a. [Pocos [ no han venido a la fiesta]]     b. [[no pocos] han venido a la fiesta]  

few neg have come to the party  neg few have come to the party  

“Few did not come to the party” “Not few came to the party”

(2)  

a. No muchos/pocos/más de tres han venido tarde  

not many /few/more than three have arrived late  

b. No todos/todo dios/cualquiera/cada uno de ellos ha(n) venido tarde  

not all /everyone /anyone /each of them has/have arrived late

The standard view of the syntactic structures in (2a-b) is that negation directly merges to the QP (Sanchez Lopez, 99; Kim&Sag, 02). Neg-QP sequences, however, do not behave uniformly when we consider other syntactic environments. Among the set of quantifiers, the universal ones (typically group todos, but also restricted cada and free-choice cualquiera) show an intriguing asymmetry: whereas in preverbal position they are not required to be contrastive (3a), they are bound to be so in postverbal position (3b). This is not the usual behaviour of universal quantifiers otherwise (3c):

(3)  

a. No todos han venido     b. Han venido no todos *(sino solo algunos)  

not all have come have come not all, but only some

c. Han venido todos  

have come all

This difference goes together with some others (see Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria, 2011):

(i) Unlike in the case of no pocos/muchos/más de Q, no cannot directly merge to todos, as witnessed by case-marked phrases (4a vs.4b):

(4)  

a. A no pocos les gusta el vino  

b. *A no todos/cualquiera le(s) gusta el vino  

to not many cl like the wine to not all/anyone cl like the wine  

c. No a todos/cualquiera le(s) gusta el vino

(ii) Negation, in the sequences no todos/todo dios/cualquiera licenses negative polarity items, unlike in the case of no pocos/muchos:

(5)  

a. *Han invitado a no pocos/muchos dirigentes ni simpatizantes  

have invited P not few/many leaders nor followers  

b. Ha(n) invitado no a todos los dirigente(s) ni simpatizante(s), sino…  

have invited not P all the leaders nor follower(s), but…

(iii) Coordination can break the purported negated constituent, as in the following conjoined (gapped) structure, with a downward intonation in the second term:

(7)  

No [a todo el mundo le gusta el vino] y/o [a cualquiera [e] el café]  

In (7), cualquiera is interpreted under the scope of negation (not>just anyone). This is only possible if negation c-commands the whole clause. The contrasts above suggest that sequences such as no todos, as opposed to sequences like no pocos/muchos, do not correspond to any constituent (see also Vicente, 2007, for evidence from fragment answers). The idea is further confirmed by the following contrasts in IP-ellipsis:

(8)  

a. Ha comido donde no muchos/pocos [IP]  

has eaten where not many/few

b. Ha comido donde todos [IP]  

has eaten where all
c. *Ha comido donde no todos [IP]
   has eaten where not all

Assuming that IP ellipsis is licensed under a Sigma Phrase (Laka, 1990) and that no is one of its overt manifestations, (9a-c) suggest that whereas no muchos and todos can occupy the Spec of SP (10), no todos corresponds to no single constituent:

(9)  [SigmaP [no muchos] S ...]

This structure also provides an immediate answer to the other properties we found in no todos/cualquiera sequences: (i) no takes clausal scope, so it can license NPIs both inside the QP and at the clausal level; (ii) no will always precede whatever projection the quantifier is embedded in, such as PPs; and (iii) since no todos corresponds to no constituent, the two elements can be separated in coordination.

Preverbal and postverbal sequences of neg-Strong Q give rise to the contrasts in (10):

(10)  a. *Se han ofendido porque han venido no todos, sino algunos

     cl have offended because have come not all, but some

b. Se han ofendido porque no todos han venido

     cl have offended because not all have come

We should compare the (a) cases to the following one, which is grammatical:

(11)  Dice Pedro que han venido no todos, sino algunos

     says Pedro that have come not all but some

Postverbal neg-QP sequences are sensitive to islands, preverbal ones are not. For preverbal cases we propose a syntactic representation where the position after negation hosts (non-contrastive) focus:

(12)  [NegP no [FocP todos, F [ han venido t]]]

Focused quantifiers can move successive cyclically, as in (13) (note that negation here licenses subjunctive, unlike constituent negation of the no muchos sort):

(13)  [No [FP todos, F [ parece [que hayan llegado t] tarde]]

     Neg all seems that have-subj come late

The postverbal cases involve an extra step: remnant movement of the non-focal part to a Topic position, which provides the background for contrastive interpretation. This means that the only way to get postverbal instances of neg-Qs in the preceding cases is by extracting the focus first, then moving the remnant. If extraction is barred, then remnant movement does not apply, and no postverbal neg-Q sequence is possible (Etxepare and Uribe-Etxebarria (2005, 2008) for related cases). The facts show that there is no constituent negation with strong quantifiers, but rather that “constituent negation” of strong Qs is a subcase of association with focus (Jackendoff, 1972; Rooth, 1985, 1992, 1997). One obvious issue raised by this analysis is the presence of two negations as in (14):

(14)  No todos no han llegado a tiempo

     neg all neg have come in time “Not everyone did not come in time”

But double negation interacts in an intriguing way with the size of the contrasting but phrase. But phrases can include an overt complementizer in preverbal position, but must be bare in the postverbal one:

(15)  a. No algunos, sino (que) todos, llegaron sucios

     b. Llegaron sucios no todos, sino (*que) algunos

     arrived untidy not all, but that some

     “Not all, but some arrived untidy”

Overt complementizers are impossible with double negation:

(16)  No todos, sino (*que) algunos no llegaron sucios

This asymmetry suggests the following analysis, assuming the presence of que signals that negation takes overt scope over a clause: “constituent negation” results from (i) the association of ordinary sentential negation with a focused strong Q, or (ii) from adjunction of negation to the edge of the strong Q. In this case, the scope of negation is just the QP, and no que is expected in the but phrase. The presence of two negations means that both strategies, the adjoining one and the sentential one co-occur, with the corollary that in that case, the but phrase in “constituent negation” cannot license que, since it must necessarily correspond to the narrow adjunction strategy.
“Good enough” representation in L2 Spanish and English *wh*-questions

*Joshua Frank / University of Texas at Austin*

Derivational Complexity Hypothesis (DCH) sets out to define the selective nature of structural transfer (e.g., Jakubowicz, 2011; Slavkov, 2011). Specifically, it predicts that structures with fewer internal merge operations taken before spell-out can transfer from the less to the more complex language. Jakubowicz (2011) suggests that DCH is applicable to L1 and L2 acquisition and adult language processing in general. Slavkov (2011) studied the acquisition of long distance *wh*-questions in native Bulgarian and French adults learning English. He found that the two groups produced a wide variety of alternative structures, which had a lower degree of derivational complexity. Consequently, DCH needs to be further investigated in the adult L2 population to determine whether there is a direct association between acquisition difficulties and this hypothesis.

In the present study I examine the acquisition of matrix and embedded *wh*-questions in both Spanish and English. These two languages diverge in the way they represent these constructions (e.g., Pesetsky & Torrego, 2001; Rizzi, 1996):

1. (a) ¿Qué quería el vendedor? (SPAN Matrix)
   
   *wh*-phrase + lexical verb + subject
   
   (b) What did the salesman want? (ENG Matrix)
   
   *wh*-phrase + auxiliary *do* + subject + lexical verb

2. (a) (María le preguntó a su padre) qué quería el vendedor. (SPAN Embedded)
   
   (ask/wonder verb) *wh*-phrase + lexical verb + subject
   
   (b) (Mary asked her dad) what the salesman wanted. (ENG Embedded)
   
   (ask/wonder verb) *wh*-phrase + subject + lexical verb

In both matrix and embedded constructions Spanish has a strong V-feature in the tense phrase (TP) which motivates the first of two lexical verb head movements, V-(to-T)-to-C. Contrastingly, the English lexical verb merges in [head, VP]. This is due to a weak V-feature. Furthermore, in the case of English matrix constructions, because of a strong T-feature in the complementizer phrase (CP), the finite auxiliary *do* moves from T-to-C.

Part one of this study examines the acquisition of Spanish matrix and embedded *wh*-questions. Fifteen (n=15) advanced SL learners of Spanish (English L1) and fifteen (n=15) Spanish native speakers (control group) participated in the investigation. Results from a dehydrated sentence task indicate that, relative to the control group, the SL learners have difficulty producing target word order, specifically in embedded contexts. This finding is supported by recent studies on bilingual adults and children (Cuza, 2012; Cuza & Strik, 2012; Frank, 2012). Part two investigates the reverse language combination. Fifteen (n=15) advanced SL learners of English (Spanish L1) and fifteen (n=15) English native speakers (control group) participated in the study. Results from a dehydrated sentence task indicate that the SL learners have relative difficulty producing English embedded *wh*-questions.

Based on the results, a native-like representation of embedded *wh*-questions in both Spanish and English does not seem to be in place in the bilingual grammar of advanced SL learners. Furthermore, there does not appear to be a direct association between acquisition difficulties and the DCH. While this hypothesis does provide a possible explanation for the results in part one (the external merge of the lexical verb in the English constructions is an initial step in the syntactic derivation of the Spanish ones), it does not accurately predict the results to part two. Furthermore, one might hypothesize that non-target production is
motivated by an extension of the matrix construction. While this hypothesis partially explains the results to part two (insertion of the finite auxiliary do), it cannot explain part one.

One possible explanation is that the SL learners’ representation of embedded constructions in both Spanish and English is conditioned by the input (e.g., Cuza & Frank, 2011; Sánchez, 2002). Embedded wh-questions are not very common in day-to-day input and in foreign language classrooms. Furthermore, the conditions for native-like attainment may not be ideal, where the L1 is infrequently used and dominance has shifted to L2 (e.g., Birdsong, 2009). Given that the processor is interested in speed and efficiency, a second possible explanation is that L1 processing prioritizes form, while L2 processing focuses on meaning, specifically in complex sentence constructions (Clahsen & Felser, 2006). In this view, the L2 shallow processing is “good enough” in the sense that there is no breakdown in communication (Ferreira & Patson, 2007). The role of input conditions, sentence complexity, and processing strategy is further suggested by the fact that the SL learners of both language groups produce target matrix questions with little difficulty.
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On Southwestern Sinalefa
Brian Funk / University of Arizona

In rapid speech, Spanish phrases that contain a vowel sequence across a word boundary can undergo a process of syllable contraction known as sinalefa (cf. Hualde 2005). One of the two vowels of the sequence must minimally lose its syllabic feature in this process. Two common results of sinalefa are gliding and vowel coalescence. In Castilian Spanish, acoustic analyses show that there are three possible results of sinalefa for sequences with an initial mid-vowel: a high-glide in the second position (V2), a mid-glide in the V1 position, or vowel coalescence (see Hualde, Simonet & Torreira, 2008). [See patterns and examples of Castilian sinalefa in (1)].

For the Spanish spoken in the US Southwest, impressionistic observations maintain that glides in V2 position are not permitted when speakers produce sinalefa. This restriction is said to affect mid-vowel gliding. Mid front vowels result in a high-front glide in a process I will refer to as palatalized gliding, /e/ > [i], and mid back vowels result in a high-back glide in a process I will call velarized gliding, /o/ > [u]. Vowel coalescence is also said to be more frequent in this dialect and to follow a pattern different from other dialects (Martinez-Gil 2000, Bakovic 2006, Colina 2009). [See patterns and examples of Southwestern sinalefa in (2).] Goal: The present paper reports the results of a phonetic production experiment of Southwestern sinalefa.

Method: Eight (8) female Spanish-English early-onset, proficient bilinguals from Southern Arizona participated in a speech-shadowing task in which they repeated Spanish phrases in which sinalefa was possible. All phrases had a /CV#VC/ sequence in which the consonants were bilabials, the first vowel was always a mid-vowel (/e o/) and the second vowel was any of the phonemic Spanish vowels (/i e a o u/). Five phrases were constructed for each of the ten possible vowel sequences. Four versions of each phrase were created as stimuli for the shadowing task: an unaltered female voice, a temporally condensed female voice. Gaussian noise was inserted to each stimulus to minimize effects of acoustic imitation of the stimulus. The study found 1107 utterances in which syllable contraction occurred in the target sequences. Formant values were extracted for each utterance at 20%, 40%, 60% and 80% of each vowel sequence. This was done to assess the coarticulatory patterns of these vowels and their dynamics. Linear regression was the statistical test of choice.

Findings: The contracted sequences /e#e/ and /o#o/ were considered monophthongs and used for comparison with other sequences to evaluate the acoustic behavior of those sequences, i.e. they were considered baseline tokens. (1) An analysis of sequences /e#i/ and /o#u/ revealed significantly more formant movement (measured as the Euclidean Distance across points between 20% and 80% of the sequence) for these two sequences than for the sequences /e#e/ and /o#o/ respectively. Consequently, these speakers did not produce coalesced vowels for the sequences /e#i/ and /o#u/ when they produced sinalefa. (2) Figure 1 shows F1 and F2 values for /e/-initial sequences at 20% of the sequence. A palatalized glide should have F1 and F2 values moving in the same direction as the coarticulated /e/ in the sequence /e#i/ relative to the /e/ in the sequence /e#e/. These speakers, therefore, did not produce palatalized glides for the sequences /e#i/, /e#o/, and /e#a/. (3) Figure 2 shows F1 and F2 values for /o/-initial sequences at 20% of the sequence. A velarized glide should have F1 and F2 values moving in the same direction as the coarticulated /o/ in the sequence /o#u/ relative to the /o/ in the sequence /o#o/. These speakers, likewise, did not produce velarized glides for the sequences /o#i/, /o#e/, and /o#a/. (4) Finally, it was found that mid-vowels in mid + mid (/e#o/, /o#e/) sequences are more susceptible to coarticulation in the V2 position, rather than in the V1 position. This suggests that the second vowel, rather than the first, glides in these sequences for these speakers.

Conclusion: The results of the present acoustic study find robust evidence for a process of assimilatory coarticulation not dissimilar from that reported in other dialects but no evidence for Southwestern sinalefa as it has been described in the phonological literature (see citations above). I will discuss reasons and implications of these findings.
(1) Sinalefa in Castilian Spanish
   a. High-glide: /o#i/ > [oi]; /o#u/ > [ou]
   b. Mid-glide: /o#e/ > [oe]; /o#a/ > [oa]
   c. Coalescence: /o#o/ > [o]

(2) Sinalefa in Southwestern Spanish
   a. Palatalized gliding: /e#u/ > [iu]; /e#o/ > [io]; /e#a/ > [ia]
   b. Velarized gliding: /o#i/ > [ui]; /o#e/ > [ue]; /o#a/ > [ua]
   c. Coalescence: /o#o/ > [o]; /e#e/ > [e]; /o#u/ > [u]; /e#i/ > [i]

Figure 1. /ei/, /ee/, /ea/, /eo/, /eu/.                 Figure 2. /oi/, /oe/, /oa/, /oo/, /ou/
At the PF interface: Negation and clitic clusters

Jacopo Garzonio / University of Venice
Cecilia Poletto / University of Frankfurt

1. In this work we intend to investigate the interface between phonology (and, more specifically, syllable structure and assimilation) and the syntactic realization of heads. We will show that resyllabification phenomena can only apply under syntactic proximity. We will also observe how syntactic conditions for phonological phenomena can vary across time. This is a well known observation for phenomena like “Raddoppiamento Fonosintattico” (Loporcaro 1997 a.o.).

2. The empirical domain we investigate is the “clustering” between preverbal negation and proclitics. Modern Sicilian, as well as Old Florentine and Old Sicilian, displays interesting interaction phenomena between the preverbal negative marker non/nun and clitics. In (1) we see that the negative marker in Catania is usually nun:

(1) a. S’avissi statu cchiu attentu, nun fussi a ssu punto. (Catania)
   if had.2SG been more careful NEG would-be.2SG at this point
   ‘Had you been more careful, you’d not be in this situation.’

   b. Nun ci su picciriddi.
      NEG there are.3PL children ‘There are no children.’

   c. Nun ti scantari, nenti fu.
      NEG you worry nothing was ‘Do not worry, nothing happened.’

(2) Siccomu nuddu ava vistu a me muggheri, n-a spittasturu cchiu.
    since no one had.3SG seen to my wife NEG-her waited.2PL anymore
    ‘Since no one had seen my wife, you did not wait for her.’

(2) shows that the Rime of the negative marker is deleted and the initial /n/ is resyllabified with the object clitic (in these varieties object clitics are represented by the following vowels: u, a, i).

3. We propose that this phenomenon has both phonological and syntactic restrictions: the phonology takes care of syllable structure, and clustering only occurs when negation and clitic form a single well-formed syllable, therefore not in cases like (1b) and (1c)( an alternative analysis is that consonant clitics are located in a different structural position). The syntactic side of the phenomenon is that clustering does not apply randomly to any two words that are linearly adjacent, but only to adjacent heads, like 3rd person clitics and the negative marker. We will propose that

   a) the negative marker is bimorphemic, as already proposed by Parry (1998) for a few Ligurian dialects, in which preverbal object clitics (1st, 2nd and 3rd reflexive) are inserted between the two negative morphemes (see also Manzini 2008). The structure of preverbal negation can be represented as follows:

   (3) \[ \text{Neg } n \ [ \text{Neg Vn} ] \]

   b) the phonological clustering is only possible when the clitic actually moves in the syntax to occupy the position of the lower negative morpheme /un/ deleting it:

   (4) \[ \text{Neg } n \ [ \text{Neg Vn [ Clit V ]} ] \rightarrow \text{Neg } n \ [ \text{Neg Vn Clit V [ Clit V ]} ] \]

   That negation is bimorphic in Sicilian is shown by the fact that in some varieties the higher negative morpheme can only occur when the complementizer position is spelled out, either by the complementizer or by verb when it moves to C in interrogative clauses:

   (5) a. Iddu (*n)un curri mai. (Sciacca)
       he NEG runs never ‘He never runs.’

   b. Chirinu chi io nun sia capaci.
       believe.3SG that I NEG am able ‘They believe that I am not able to do that.’

   Hence, the higher negative morpheme is only licenced by CP, a phenomenon which recalls the fact that in other languages negation can be marked in the CP (Latin, for instance, has negative complementizer). Furthermore, there are dialects that only have the lower negative morpheme:

   (6) Si fussi statu chiù attentu, nun fussi accussi. (Corleone)
       if had.2SG been more careful NEG would-be.2SG at this point ‘same as (1a)’
This type of dialects displays a different type of clustering, where the nasal of the negation assimilates the initial liquid of the object clitic:

(7) a. Di dù jorno, unnu vitti chiù. (Corleone)
   from that day NEG-him saw.1SG anymore ‘From that day I have not seen him anymore.’

We propose that the assimilation process is also sensitive to the syntactic adjacency of the two heads, though the clitic does not raise up to the position of the negative morpheme deleting it entirely.

(8) [Neg un [Clit CV]]

This means that there must be a general condition blocking the entire deletion of the negative marker:

(9) *[Neg o [Neg un Clit [ Clit ]…]

4. Further evidence that deletion of a negative morpheme is triggered by clitic movement is provided by Old Florentine, where not all clitics (even when the phonological restrictions are met) can cluster with the negative marker. The set of clitics which have this property varies across time. In the XIII century, clustering is observable with both object and dative clitics (examples in (10), from Bono Giamboni), while in the second half of the XIV century this happens only with 3rd person object clitics (examples in (11), from Boccaccio).

(10) a. Il prossimo tuo non ucciderai e no li
   the next your NEG will-kill.3SG and NEG-to him
   farai in persona alcuno rincrescimento
   will-do.3SG in person any damage
   ‘Thou shall not kill your neighbour, nor hurt him, nor make any damage to his person.’

b. no ti vo’ qui mostrare e aprire, perché (…) sarebe faticoso a mostrare
   NEG-to-you want.1SG show and open because would-be.3GS hard to show
   ‘I do not want to show and explain it here because it would be hard.’

(11) a. io vi promisi di niuna cosa farme che io prima no vi dicessi
   I to-you promised.1SG of no thing do-of-it that I before NEG-it to-you said.1SG
   ‘I promised you that I would have done nothing before telling you.’

b. pregò Leonetto che grave non gli fosse il nascondersi
   prayed L. that heavy NEG to-him was the hiding
   ‘L. prayed that he could easily hide.’

c. tu non mi scapperai delle mani che io non ti paghi sì
   you NEG to-me will-escape.2SG from-the hands that I NEG to-you pay.1SG so
dell’opere tue
   of-the deeds your
   ‘You will not escape from my hands before I pay you for your deeds.’

We will analyze this change assuming that these clitics occupy different positions in the different stages of Old Florentine: all clitics were adjacent to negation in the older stages, but, in the later stages, only 3rd person object clitics occupied that position.

5. To summarize: we will analyze cases of negation-clitic clusters in different Italo-Romance varieties, where phonological phenomena such as resyllabification, are driven by the syntactic structure; we will also argue that in some varieties, like Sicilian, the negative marker is morphologically complex and some clitics can move in the structure. Furthermore the expression of negation is linked to the activation of the CP layer. Finally, we will discuss cases where clitics do not interact with negation, and our explanation will be based on the idea that the clitic layer has a complex internal structure.
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The *a/di/Ø* alternation in Italian complex Ps: P selection or C selection?
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1. In our talk we take into consideration the well-known phenomenon of simple-P selection under lexical Ps in Italian in cases like *sopra al tavolo* ‘lit. on/to the table’. In particular, we investigate the distributional properties of the functional/grammatical Ps *a/di*, and show that the selection of *a, di* or no preposition at all is syntactically driven. More precisely we argue that in complex P structures there is an *a/Ø* alternation based on the internal structure of the PP and at the same time a *di/Ø* alternation dependant on the structural status of the DP object of P. We subsequently extend our analysis to *a/di* used as prepositional complementizers.

2. Rizzi (1988) notices that Italian presents three groups of lexical Ps: group 1 Ps which obligatorily require a simple P (e.g. *davanti a* ‘in front of’); group 2 Ps which optionally require a (*dietro (a)* ‘behind (of)’); and group 3 Ps which never require a simple P (*verso‘towards’).

With this classification in mind, we concentrate on the following minimal pairs:

(1)  
- a. Andate *dietro a*lla macchina  
  go behind to.the car ‘Go after the car’
- b. Andate *dietro* la macchina  
  go behind Ø the car ‘Go and place yourself behind the car’

(2)  
- a. La macchina si muoveva *verso di* noi  
  The car refl move towards of us ‘The car was moving towards us’
- b. La macchina si muoveva *verso il muro*  
  The car refl moved towards Ø the wall ‘The car was moving towards the wall’

The two alternations of (1)-(2) are blurred in a case like (3), where *a* seems to alternate with *di*:

(3)  
- a. L’aereo volava *sopra di* noi  
  The plane flew above of us ‘The plane was flying above us’
- b. L’aereo volava *sopra alla chiesa*  
  The plane flew above to.the church ‘The plane was flying above the church’

However, since *sopra Ø noi* is ungrammatical in Italian, we argue that lexical Ps like *sopra* can appear in two different structures, one in which its complement is introduced by *a*, and another in which it selects a DP. In the latter case, some DPs require *di*, which we take to be the prepositional complementizer observable, for instance, with infinitives:

(4)  
- a. L’aereo volava *sopra la chiesa*  
- b. *L’aereo volava sopra noi*

(5)  
- a. [PP *sopra* [XP *a/Ø* [YP Ø/*di* [DP]]]]

Accordingly, Rizzi’s (1988) group 3 Ps never show a *a* vs. *di* alternation.

3. The *di/Ø* alternation is based on a bare/complex alternation of the noun selected by P. Rizzi (1988) points out that *di* is required by personal and reflexive pronouns (6a-b). Our data show that this property is shared also by demonstratives (6c), proper nouns (6d) and wh items (6e):

(6)  
- a. Correvo verso *(di)* lui  
  run towards of him ‘I was running towards him’
- b. Rivolse l’arma verso *(di)* sé  
  turned the weapon towards of refl ‘He turned the weapon against himself’
- c. Rivolse l’arma verso *(di)* quelli  
  turned the weapon towards of those ‘He turned the weapon against those’
- d. Correvo verso *(di)* Mario  
  run towards of Mario ‘I was running towards M.’
- e. Verso *(di)* chi ha rivolto l’arma?  
  towards of who has turned the weapon ‘Against whom did he turn the weapon?’
There is variation in the acceptability of the cases (6c–e), but for all speakers the presence of *di is ungrammatical with a complex DP:

(7)  
   a. Rivolse l’arma verso (*di) sé stesso 
       towards of refl himself 
   b. Verso (*di) quale persona ha rivolto l’arma? 
       towards of which person 

We propose that *di is the same prepositional complementizer observable with infinitives and that it is present when the DP selected by P lacks a restrictor. More precisely, following Szabolcsi (1994) and Aboh (2010)(in particular the idea that D is simply a C that has a nominal complement), and taking into account *di/Ø alternations with infinitives, we propose that *di is a subordination marker in both the CP and DP domains required when verbal Tense and nominal Reference are interpreted deictically:

(8)  
[SubP *di [DP / IP]]

4. As for the *a vs. *di/Ø alternation, we follow Cinque (2010) and take the simple P *a of Italian to be either a case marker lexicalizing a lower functional head within the DPPlace in (9), P°, or a proper stative/directional P, lexicalizing the heads of PPdir or PPstat.

(9)  
[PPdir *a [PPstat *a [DPPlace … [AxPartP [PP/KP *a [Ground PLACE]…]]]]]

In the light of this, the interpretative differences associated with the alternation *a vs. *di/Ø in Rizzi’s group 2 Ps can be derived from the lexicalization possibilities of these heads together with the internal syntactic workings of the fine structure of PPs. In particular, as shown in Tortora (2008), *a vs. Ø/di after lexical Ps may reflect a difference in the unbounded vs. bounded nature of the object of P. In such case, we assume that this interpretative difference depends on whether the K/P head is moved to AspPlace, the projection encoding spatial aspect or not. The difference between *dietro all’albero and *dietro l’albero ‘behind (to) the tree’ is to be captured by the following minimally different structures:

(10)  
   a. [PPdir/stat *dietro [AspPlaceP *dietro all’albero PLACE [DPplace … [AxPartP *dietro all’albero as unbounded space]]] ]
   b. [PPdir/stat *dietro [AspPlaceP *dietro all’albero PLACE [DPPlace … [AxPartP *dietro all’albero as bounded space]]] ]

Moreover, in group 2 Ps, the alternation *a vs. *di/Ø may reflect a difference in the locative vs. directional interpretation of the Ground, cf. (1). In such cases, *a is to be considered a proper Goal P, lexicalizing the PPdir head.

5. The strong hypothesis we make is that *di, unlike *a, is neither a real P nor a case marker but rather a prepositional complementizer required by the bare nature of the DP object of P—a complementizer which is not required when the DP object of P has a complex nature (this in turn could be related to a deictic vs. referential opposition at the interpretative level). As regards the alternation with *a, we claim that this is to be captured exclusively PP-internally, i.e., in terms of different movement and/or lexicalization possibilities of the PP structure.
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Epistemic Adverbs, the theory of phases and the prosody-syntax interface
Alessandra Giorgi / University of Venice

Introduction

Epistemic adverbs in Italian (for instance, probabilmente (probably)), as well as in other languages, can appear in several positions inside the clause. Cinque (1999) proposed that the basic position of adverbs, epistemic ones included, is unique and that the different orders are due to the movement of the other phrases around them. This solution had a big heuristic impact and proved largely successful. However, in the light of more recent hypotheses about the structure of clauses and the properties of the interfaces, it can be refined to account for more fine-grained phenomena. The present work takes into account epistemic adverbs in Italian, but it can be extended to other left-periphery, “high”, adverbs, such as evidential and evaluative ones. The goal of this work is twofold: on one hand the empirical coverage of the theory of adverbs and clausal structure will be broadened, on the other it provides an argument in favor of the analysis of v*P as a phase.

The hypothesis

According to the Minimalist framework (Chomsky 2000, 2001) there are two Phases, CP and v*P. Both projections have the property of being propositional (Chomsky 2000). Epistemic adverbs, together with evidential (allegedly) and evaluative (fortunately) ones, might be defined as propositional adverbs (I’ll also address some questions concerning the non-propositional usage of epistemics) in that, by means of their presence, the speaker – or the superordinate subject for embedded contexts – qualifies the whole subsequent domain. I propose therefore that there are two basic positions for these kind of adverbs, one for each phase: one above v*P and a second above IP, in the domain of the C-layer, i.e., Cinque’s position.

This hypothesis accounts for some phenomena concerning the scope of negation and for the differences with respect to the parenthetical usage of the same adverbs. Moreover, it agrees with similar results in recent literature on evaluative items in other languages, such as Armenian and Palermitan (Giorgi and Haroutyunian 2011, Giorgi and Sorrisi 2012).

The data

Consider now the following paradigms. The paradigm in (1) corresponds to a “flat” intonation:

(1) (probabilmente1) Gianni (probabilmente2) ha (probabilmente3) mangiato (probabilmente4 DP-scope only) la torta (*probabilmente5)
(probably1) Gianni (probably2) has (probably3) eaten (probably4) the cake (probably5)
The position of probabilmente5 is ruled out (cf. Cinque 1999) and the one of probabilmente4 has only scope on la torta. Hence, the rightmost available position is the one on the left of the participle. Consider now the paradigm with the comma intonation associated to probabilmente:

(2) (probabilmente1,) Gianni (probabilmente2,) ha (probabilmente3,) mangiato (probabilmente4,) la torta (probabilmente5).
(probably1,) Gianni (probably2,) has (probably3,) eaten (probably4,) the cake (probably5).

In this case, all positions are available and the scope of the adverb is always on the whole sentence. Namely, the comma intonation is not compatible, at least under normal circumstances, with a local scope. Consider now the co-occurrence of probabilmente with sentential negation, with flat intonation:

(3) (probabilmente1 prob>NEG) Gianni (probabilmente2 prob>NEG) non ha (#probabilmente3)
mangiato (#probabilmente4) la torta (probabilmente5 NEG>prob)
(probably1) Gianni (probably2) NEG has (probably3) eaten (probably4) the cake (probably5)
The occurrences 1 and 2 do not present any special problem. The occurrence in 3, however, is found very odd by speakers, who report difficulties in having intuitions about the meaning of the sentence. The occurrence in 4 gives the same effect, even if some speakers seem able to assign it the NEG>prob reading, with the local scope of the adverb, a reading where NEG is not a sentential negation but focuses la torta (probably the cake). In 5, again NEG is not a sentential negation, but focuses the adverb. Hence, 1 and 2 are the only positions truly compatible with sentential negation. In particular, occurrences 3 and 4 sharply contrast with the same positions in the parenthetical paradigm:
(4) (probabilmente1,) Gianni (,probabilmente2,) non ha (,probabilmente3,) mangiato (,probabilmente4,) la torta (,probabilmente5).
(probably1,) Gianni (,probably2,) NEG has (,probably3,) eaten (,probably4,) the cake (,probably5).

Both probabilmente and NEG always have sentential scope. I will also consider some cases in which data seem to go in the opposite direction, i.e. where occurrences in positions 3 and 4 are grammatical with sentential scope of the negation, even without the comma intonation:

(5) Gianni non ha probabilmente avuto occasione di telefonarle
Gianni NEG has probably had occasion to call her

(6) Gianni non è probabilmente stato felice a Parigi
Gianni NEG has probably been happy in Paris

I propose that both these sentences instantiate a structure in which the projections of the verb have very different properties, making (5) and (6) possible.

Towards an explanation  Positions 1 and 3 are the base-generated ones in “flat” structures. Position 2 is derived (Cinque, 1999) by movement of the subject to a higher position. Both positions are higher then sentential negation (Zanuttini, 1997), hence in both cases probabilmente and neg have sentential scope. Position 3 is base-generated and is lower than negation. Therefore, on one hand this structure can be base-generated, but on the other it turns out to be un-interpretable with sentential scope of the negation. Hence, the contrast between the full grammaticality of position 3 in (1) and its oddness in (3). The explanation runs as follows: a) Negation has scope on probabilmente, due to its structural position, b) probabilmente must have propositional scope, because the position right above v*P is a “propositional” position, c) BUT negation is part of the propositional content, and probabilmente cannot have scope on it, d) a conflict arises, and this gives rise to a typical pattern of judgments. Syntactically, this might be formally expressed as a case of freezing. In 4 and 5 probabilmente is in the scope of negation, but it is not generated in a “propositional” position, having only local scope. Occurrence 4 is presumably inside the DP. Occurrence 5 is not licensed in absence of the negation, as expected.

The comma intonation makes all occurrences possible, with or without negation. According to the analysis developed in Giorgi (2011 and to appear), these parentheticals – together with several other types of parentheticals – are syntactically integrated and are generated in a position on the left of CP, in a layer called KommaP (KP), where the head K is the pause – idealizing on the complex characterization (see for instance, Dehé and Kavalova, 2007) of the comma intonation. The adverb occupies the Spec position of K:

(7) [KP probabilmente K [CP Gianni (non) ha mangiato la torta] ]
probably Gianni (NEG) has eaten the cake

All parenthetical occurrences are derived from this basic one, by means of topologicalization of a constituent in a still higher position. See for instance (8), where the spec of the higher K is occupied by the subject:

(8) [ KP Gianni K [CP e (non) ha mangiato la torta] ] ]
Gianni, probably, (NEG) has eaten the cake

In these cases, a K also appears at the left of the adverb, hosting the topologicalized part. I will provide a detailed discussion of these derivations.
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Romanian tough-constructions and multi-headed constituents
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Romanian is unique among Romance languages in that it disallows agreement on the adjective in tough-constructions (in the standard variety; some non-standard varieties do allow agreement); the adjective appears in the masculine singular form (see (1)a-b), which is a default form – it is also used when the adjective is the predicate of a sentence without a nominal subject (see (2)); the verb has a special non-finite form, the so-called “supine”:

(1) a. teorie greu de înțeles
   theory(F) hard.MSG SUP understand.SUP
b. Aceste teorii sunt greu de înțeles
   these theories(F) are hard.MSG SUP understand.SUP

(2) E greu \{ să înțelegem teoria / de rezolvat atâtea probleme\}
is hard.MSG SUBJ understand.1PL theory-the SUP solve.SUP so-many problems

The previous analyses of this construction are all problematic: (i) Based on the fact that the masculine singular form of most Romanian adjectives, including tough- adjectives, is also used as an adverb, Soare (2002), Soare and Dobrovie-Sorin (2002), Giurgea and Soare (2010) analyze the tough- adjective as an adverb occupying a specifier position in the extended projection of the verb (SpecMood in Giurgea & Soare 2010); greu de înțeles would be equivalent to difficulty intelligible. This analysis is problematic because it assumes that in TCs the non-finite clause is no longer a complement of the adjective, in spite of the fact that tough- adjectives can take clausal arguments (see (2)); moreover, it cannot explain why we do not find TCs built with adverbs in languages where adverbs do have distinct morphology (constructions which would correspond to Fr. *livres facilement à lire or Engl. *books easily to read do not appear to be attested). (ii) Dye (2006), assuming that in non-agreeing TCs, like in agreeing TCs, the adjective is the predicate and the supine is its complement, proposes that the object passes through SpecAP in the agreeing TC, undergoing A-movement, whereas in the non-agreeing TC the object is a null operator undergoing A-bar movement inside the complement clause and the subject is base-generated in a SpecPrP above the AP and coindexed with the null operator. This analysis faces several problems: first, it is unclear how the external argument is thematically interpreted; Dye assumes that it is somehow linked (“by some notion of predication coindexation”) to the null operator in the adjective’s complement; but this interpretative property can only be contributed by the tough- adjective, which implies that the subject must be argumentally related to the adjective; but then we expect agreement, like for any external argument of an adjective. Moreover, it is assumed that a DP in SpecPr does not trigger agreement on a predicative adjective, although Pr(edicate)Phrases have been introduced precisely for hosting the base (thematic) position of the external argument of adjectives in general (see Bowers 1993, Baker 2003), and predicative adjectives in Romanian do agree, like in the other Romance languages. Finally, there is no evidence in favor of A-bar movement in non-agreeing TCs: unlike in English, long distance dependencies are totally ungrammatical (see (3)); moreover, agent PPs are allowed (see (4)), which shows that the supine is passive and thus cannot assign case to an object null operator:

(3) a. * Această carte e greu de convinși copiii s(-o) citească
   this book is hard SUP convince.SUP children-the SUBJ(-CL.ACC) read.3PL
b. This book is hard to convince children to read

(4) cărți greu de înțeles de către copii
   books hard SUP understand.SUP by children

I propose a novel analysis which is supported by comparative data and has some interesting theoretical consequences: non-agreeing TCs are multi-headed constituents, similar to some of those analyzed by van Riemsdijk (2006) as “grafting” (e.g. fa [[far from obvious] matter], or numerals introduced by Ps: Rom. cele [[peste zece] zile] ‘the above ten days’ = “the more than ten days”): the adjective is the internal head, selecting the supine, but the supine (more precisely, the functional head which heads it, which I will call Mood) acts as an external head. Note indeed that supines can appear by themselves in the same environments as TCs, as passive modal reduced relatives:

(5) a. cărți de citit
   book SUP read
   ‘book to (be) read’
b. Cărțile sunt de citit până mâine

The books are to be read until tomorrow

This analysis is strongly supported by German, where a TC ending in the verb can appear prenominally, in which case the infinitive receives the agreement morpheme (see (6)); I analyze the -d- inserted between the infinitive and the agreement morpheme as an allomorph of the infinitive inflection used before agreement morphemes; since in German, prenominal modifiers must end in a lexical head, the infinitive is certainly the head of the TC. The head status is also indicated by the fact that it receives agreement (since adjectival/participial agreement is restricted to the prenominal position, we cannot test the headness of postnominal and predicative TCs). Moreover, like in Romanian, infinitives can appear by themselves as modal reduced relatives (see (7)).

(6) ein [schwer zu lesen-d-es] Buch
   a. hard to read.INF-d-NSG,NOM/ACC book(N)

(7) a. ein [zu lesen-d-es] Buch
   b. Das Buch ist zu lesen
       the book is to read.INF

This analysis solves all the problems noticed above: the adjective keeps its selectional pattern, rather than being an adverb, but it fails to agree because it is the verb which is the external head, and agreement is an external relation of the [A+Supine] constituent.

Technical implementation: In view of the various problems of the grafting analysis noticed by Grosu (2010), I propose to formalize multi-headedness by using flexibility of label projection (as proposed by Larson 1998, Donati 2006, a.o., for free relatives); Citko (2008) argues that a variety of constructions can be accounted for if we abandon the assumption that a constituent formed by merging a selector labeled a with a selected phrase labeled b is necessarily labeled a, and we allow it to receive its label from the selectee (b) or from both (a+b). In this system, multi-headed constituents can be analyzed as instances of inheritance of the label of the complement. In non-agreeing TCs, the non-finite verbal constituent projects its label. The [Adjective+Supine/Inf.] constituent thus obtained has the distribution of supine/infinitival reduced relatives (see (5) and (7), compared to (1) and (6)).

As this type of label projection is rather unusual, I assume that it is triggered by a feature of the selector head, which I call exceptional label projection – ELP.

A constraint on ELP in TCs: there seems to be a correlation between the widespread lack of distinct adverbial morphology (which characterizes both German and Romanian) and non-agreeing TCs (the other Romance languages, where adverbs with corresponding adjectives are normally marked by an adverbial suffix, don’t have non-agreeing TCs). I conclude that ELP in TCs requires that the adjective should be compatible with the verbal syntactic environment created by the projection of the complement’s label. I analyze the open class of adjectives which lack a special morphology for the adverbial use as items lexically underspecified between adjectives and adverbs (an ‘archicategory’ α, not to be confused with the totally uncategorized Marantzian roots).
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1. Goals and hypotheses. The goal of this talk is to show that (a) the aspectual properties of adjectives [As, henceforth] are aligned with their gradability properties: the (aspectual) property of being an individual or stage-level A [IL, SL, henceforth] is aligned with the property of being a relative or absolute A (in the sense of Toledo & Sasoon –henceforth, T&S- 2011a,b); (b) the gradability properties of As are built up in the syntax, following an exo-skeletal approach (as Husband 2012, Park 2008 suggest). To achieve these goals, we focus on the distribution of As as predicates with the Spanish copulas ser and estar (be) and also with depictive secondary predicates in Spanish (henceforth DSPs) traditionally accounted for in aspectual terms (ser combines with IL As, estar with SL As; DSPs are always SL predicates). We will show that ser combines with relative As (and non-scalar ones), and estar with absolute As; so that no aspectual classification of As is needed to account for these data. Moreover, if, as T&S (2011b) claim, the connection between SL vs. IL and absolute vs. relative As also obtains in other cases, it can be proposed that the aspectual properties of As derive from their gradability properties. We will also show that virtually any adjective can combine with ser and with estar (being interpreted as a relative or absolute A in each case). We thus conclude that the relative/absolute distinction is not a lexical property of As, but is built up in the syntax via combination of a root with a functional node (where the positive morpheme [pos] generates).

2. Adjectives with ser / estar and DSPs. It has been generally claimed that As like falso ‘forged’ combine with ser; As like lleno ‘full’ combine with estar and As like alto ‘tall’ combine with ser/estar, sometimes with different interpretations and different subjects. The general claim in the literature is that aspectual properties of As explain this distribution: IL As combine with ser, SL As combine with estar. In the same line, DSPs can be only SL adjectives; ILs adjectives are not able to appear in these environments, neither ambivalent adjectives (Juan llegó a casa contento/*inteligente ‘John arrived home happy / *intelligent’).

3. Theoretical background: adjectives and gradability. As are classified into gradable (alto ‘tall’) and non-gradable ones (semanal ‘weekly’). The former are further classified into relative and absolute As. According to T&S (2011), gradable As require a standard of comparison established in relation to a comparison class to be interpreted. The comparison class depends on the individual the A is predicated of, and can be established based on variance between individuals (this defines relative As, which are decoded relative to an extensional category, generating a ‘between individuals interpretation’ in the index of evaluation) or based on variance within the same individual (this defines absolute As; decoded relative to a counterpart comparison class and giving rise to an interpretation in which the A’s argument is compared to its counterparts in different indices). An economy principle applies in the selection of the standard of comparison for each class of As, which accounts for the default association of absolute As with endpoint standards, and relative As with midpoint standards. In This towel is wet (Esta toalla está húmeda), the A is interpreted as absolute. The comparison class includes counterparts of the towel which manifest different levels of wetness. Thus, the class is highly restricted by what is conceived as normal for that towel, including a counterpart that is regarded as minimally wet. Therefore, the economy principle dictates the sentence receives an interpretation based on a minimum endpoint standard. For The boy is tall (El niño es alto), the adjective evoke an extensional-category comparison class, there are no individuals that can be regarded as maximally or minimally tall, so that a midpoint standard is selected. It receives a relative interpretation. Relative and absolute As behave differently in comparatives, as shown by the entailments in (1), (2) and (3).

(1) Relative As: X is more ADJ than Y \(\rightarrow\) X/Y is (not) ADJ
   Ana es más alta/inteligente que Eva \(\rightarrow\) {A / E} (no) es alta/inteligente
   ‘A. isSer taller/more intelligent than E’ \(\rightarrow\) ‘{A/E} isSer (not) tall/intelligent’

(2) Absolute adjectives (Minimal standard adjectives): X is more ADJ than Y \(\rightarrow\) X is ADJ
   Mi toalla está más mojada que esa \(\rightarrow\) Mi toalla está mojada (‘My towel is wetter than that \(\rightarrow\) ’My t. is wet’)

(3) Maximal standard adjectives: X is more ADJ than Y \(\rightarrow\) Y is not ADJ
   Mi vaso está más lleno que el tuyo \(\rightarrow\) Tu vaso no está lleno (‘My glass is fuller than yours.’ \(\rightarrow\) ‘Your g. isn’t full’)

4. Ser/estar and the gradability properties of adjectives. Our claim is that the gradability properties of As explain their combination with ser/estar. Non-gradable As (4) and relative As (5) combine with ser. Estar combines with absolute As (7); therefore the As in the examples in (7) are absolute As with respect to their behaviour in comparatives, see (2), (3), (8). Note, (9), (10), that even those adjectives claimed to combine only with one of the copulas can in fact combine with both ser and estar, but the A is interpreted as relative with ser and as absolute with estar. So, in (9a) John’s cautiousness is evaluated with
respect with counterparts of John, and in (9)b interpreting the adjective requires taking into account previous stages of the house as a class of comparison (absolute interpretation). In 0b, the adjective gets a between-individuals interpretation.

(4) El periódico es/*esta semanal (‘The newspaper isSER/ESTAR weekly’)
(5) Juan es *inteligente/alto (‘Juan isSER {intelligent/tall}’), El clima es húmedo (‘The climate isSER humid’).
(6) a. Juan es más inteligente que Pedro, pero ninguno de los dos son inteligentes.
   ‘Juan is more intelligent than Pedro but none of them are intelligent’
   b. El clima en Guadalajara es más húmedo que el de Madrid, aunque los dos son secos.
   ‘The climate in Guadalajara is more humid than the climate in Madrid, but both are dry’
(7) La toalla está húmeda (‘The towel isSER wet’), El niño está alto (‘The boy isSER tall’).
(8) *Mi hija está más alta que tu hijo, pero mi hija no está alta.
my daughter isSER more tall than your son, but my daughter not isSER tall
(9) a. Juan está cautio desde su divorcio (‘Juan isSER cauto since his divorce’)
   d. Cuenta 1, 2, 3 y la casa estará grande (‘Say: one, two, three… and the house will beSER big’)
(10) a. El vaso es lleno (‘The glass isSER full’) [Someone says to the waiter in a restaurant, who is putting only a little amount of water in the glasses: “No, no, echa más agua, el vaso es lleno; la copa en cambio es solo hasta la mitad” Lit: No, put more water, the glass isSER full; the cup is only to the middle’].
   b. La camisa es arrugada (‘The shirt isSER wrinkled’)

The variable behaviour of adjectives in this context allows us to propose that the property of being a relative/absolute adjective is not a lexical one, that is, even assuming that the scalar structure of adjectives is a lexical property encoded in the root, the property of being a relative or absolute adjective should be severed from the lexical items (roots) themselves and is carried instead by functional structure. We claim that being a relative or absolute A is a consequence of the root occurring in the environment of a particular type of posititive morpheme (see Husband 2010, Park 2008). The pos morpheme is the functional node that also provides category (A) for the root and introduces the external argument.

(11) Relative tall [pos(tive)\[\text{open scale}\]] – Absolute tall [pos\[\text{absolute}\]\[\text{open scale}\]]

5. DSPs. McNally (1993) defines DSPs as adjunts that “express a state the referent of their controller is in at the time the state of affairs described by the main predicate holds”. In this sense, since the controller is compared with other stages of it, it seems adequate to propose that a comparison between individuals must be the one we get. In this line, T&S (2011b) point out that DSPs can be absolute adjectives but not relative ones (and argue that this follows from the fact that, as they show, an adjective that denotes transient properties is likely to have an absolute interpretation whereas an adjective that denotes enduring properties is likely to have a relative one). However, as McNally (1993) shows, there are some cases in which an IL A - that is interpreted as relative - can appear as a DSP. Most of these DSPs are licensed when the appropriate context is met. Our claim is that it is the context what gives the adjective the interpretation as a relative or an absolute A, as (12) shows. As the entailments in (13) shows, intelligent behaves as absolute in (12)b:

(12) a. Juan llegó al examen cansado / inteligente (‘John arrived at the exam tired / *intelligent)  
   b. Juan era un muchacho inteligente, pero el día anterior al examen de selectividad sufrió un shock que le hizo perder toda su inteligencia. Afortunadamente, pasó la noche en el hospital sometido a un tratamiento y, al día siguiente, Juan pudo llegar al examen inteligente.
(13) a. Después del tratamiento nocturno, Juan pudo llegar al examen más inteligente que el día anterior -> Después del tratamiento nocturno, Juan llegó al examen inteligente.

5. Conclusions. (A) the distribution of As with the Spanish copulas ser/estar can be explained on the basis of the relative/absolute distinction; (B) the relative/absolute distinction is not a lexical property of adjectives.
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The Romanian subjunctive: a delayed onset
Virginia Hill / University of New Brunswick-SJ

**Data.** The replacement of infinitives with subjunctives (see 3) has a late start in Romanian - i.e., in 16th – 17th c., versus, e.g., ≈10th c in Bulgarian; 7th c. in Greek (Joseph 1980) - so it is well attested in Early Modern Romanian (EMR) texts. The unquestioned assumption in Balkan linguistics (Sandfeld 1930 a.o.) is that the trigger for this replacement is the same for all the languages involved (a Balkan Sprachbund property; Tomic 2006 a.o.) and that it arises from the nominalization of infinitives (i.e., a categorial feature switch from [V] to [N]), which further triggers a feature switch from [-] to [+finite] in complements with unvalued [tense] (Joseph 1983; Roussou 2009). However, a closer look at the EMR data indicates a different situation: nominalized long infinitives (e.g., ieşire ‘to exit’) are replaced with short infinitives (e.g., a ieşi ‘to guard’) (see 1), and with de-indicatives (see 2), long before the să subjunctive emerges (see 3) (Frâncu 1969). Long infinitives are archaic in EMR (Frâncu 2009) and are always preceded by a ‘to’ (otherwise, they count as nouns).

(4)  cit să a hie apucat [a ieşi un bulucă de nemtă]
  as SUBJ not be.SUBJ3 got INF fin exit.INF a group of Germans
  ‘enough so that a group of Germans did not get to exit’ (18th c.; Costin 1979: 55)

(5)  Paşcilor apucase cazacii [de le stricase roatele]
  guns.the.DAT get.PAST3PL Cosacks.the.DE CL.DAT ruin.PAST3 wheels.the
  ‘The Cosacks got to ruin the wheels of the guns…’ (18th c.; Costin 1979: 54)

(6)  nu am apucat [să-ti dezićă]
  not have.1SG got SUBJ3-CL.DAT tell.1SG
  ‘I didn’t get to tell you’ (18th c.; Costin 1979: 65)

**Question.** If the nominalization of long infinitives triggered the replacements in (1) and (2) early in the emerging Romanian (presumably around 10th century, as in Old Bulgarian), why is it still the case: (i) that the să-subjunctive arises and replaces the replacements of the nominalized infinitive (i.e., (3) replaces both (1) and (2)); and (ii) that it happened so late?

**Thesis.** This paper argues that the switch to subjunctives in EMR is triggered by a need to better mark the irrealis in the CP with unselected operators (e.g., conditional operator; [directive] operator in imperatives) and in CPs selected by control verbs. This need arises from the weakening of the existing irrealis markers around the 16th c., and involves a change in the list of complementizers. Hence, the delayed onset of the subjunctive replacement in EMR follows from the type of trigger, which is different from what has been proposed for the Balkan Sprachbund (Rohlfs 1933 a.o.), and which stems from the idiosyncratic properties of EMR grammar (e.g., the lexical inventory for spelling out the features of C).

**Framework.** Rizzi’s (1997) articulation of the CP field provides the system for sorting out EMR complementizers and the functional features they spell out: [+/-qu]/[Op] in Force; [+/-finite], [+/-realis] in Fin. Roberts’ (2010) formalization of gradience in feature distinction and gradualness of change allows me to propose that the change consists in the dissociated mapping of the features of Fin when its irrealis feature is valued, as [mode] (i.e., wishes/beliefs versus underspecified non(counter)-factuality). In those contexts, [+finite] is mapped to Fin and it is spelled out as de or ca; [mode] is mapped to Mood and it is spelled out as să. Grammatical [mood] is mapped to T, as a subjunctive or indicative verb form.

**Observations.** On the basis of corpus search and philological information, I establish the assessments given in *italics.*

- EMR inherited, from Latin, subjunctive verb forms (Fischer 1985) that occur in imperative and conditional clauses, but never as subjunctive clauses. So, *although the subjunctive forms display [mood] morphology, they lack the properties needed to generate a subjunctive clause.*
- Short infinitives display a pre-verbal infinitive mood marker a ‘to’, and replaced the long infinitive in most contexts in pre-EMR (Frâncu 2009). Notably, a ‘to’ infinitives precede să subjunctives by centuries and preserve the [V] feature of the infinitive.
• The subjunctive clause arises after the re-analysis of the conditional complementizer să as a subjunctive mood marker (Frîncu 1969). Să is in complementary distribution with de as conditional complementizers before the time of re-analysis.
• Statistics show that, by the end of the 18th c., ‘want’ verbs and injunctive ‘order’ verbs adopted the subjunctive complement (90%), whereas aspectuals were resistant to the switch (2.4%) (Frîncu 1969). The subjunctive arises and thrives in clauses selected by control verbs with irrealis modality: it competes with de-indicatives and a ‘to’-short infinitives, as in (1), (2), (3).

**Analysis.** (i) In pre-EMR, să in Force spells out the conditional operator, which has an intrinsic irrealis modality. Change occurs as a gradient distinction in features, whereby să lost the operator feature, but kept the irrealis modality: it has been re-analyzed in Fin versus Force. Evidence: (a) Topic and focus constituents follow conditional să but precede subjunctive să; (b) Verb mood forms and finiteness are unrestricted with conditional să (indicative, conditional, infinitive, subjunctive), but restricted with subjunctive să. Hence, the irrealis feature of Fin is checked but unvalued with the former versus valued with the latter. Valuation of irrealis (as [mode]) triggers restriction on the type of mood in T, which has to agree with [mode]. (ii) Grammatical [mood] is associated with T: subjunctive verb roots occur in conditional or imperative clauses before the re-analysis of să in Fin (unrestricted for type of irrealis). (iii) de is a wild card for EMR CPs, occurring as a Force operator (in reduced relatives, conditionals), or in Fin, with no predictable values for finiteness or irrealis (e.g., it heads infinitives or indicative), in both [+/- irrealis] contexts. Modern Romanian has eliminated de from most constructions, and replaced it with less ambiguous complementizers. (iv) There is a short-lived transitional construction displaying the sequence de să in subjunctive complements. Word order indicates that both items are in Fin, i.e., above the Neg > T sequence, but lower than FocP. Hence, Fin has been split, with Fin de marking [+finite], and Mood să marking [mode] as a subset of irrealis. The split being a marked option in grammar, spell out is obligatory for [mode] – i.e., the marked value - but not for finiteness. Thus, de is dropped, and later (17th c.) it is replaced with ca ‘that (optional). On the other hand, de becomes the default conditional complementizer, replacing să. (v) Subjunctive să and infinitive a ‘to’ clauses are analyzed as structurally equivalent (i.e. Force/FinP), as they freely alternate as finite sentential complements. Evidence: contexts where the infinitive does not qualify as Force/FinP do not undergo the replacement (e.g., putea ‘can’+ bare short infinitives). The weakening of [tense] in selected infinitives (i.e., less evidence for Nominative subjects in these clauses) leads to their replacement with the subjunctive (which maintains the finite value).

**Summary.** In pre-EMR grammar, de spells out Fin synchronically ([+/- finite], [+/-realis]), the values for these features being established contextually. At the same time, grammatical [mood] is associated with T, and is unrelated to the feature mapping under Fin. De and să alternate as conditional complementizers; eventually, de becomes the preferred option as conditional Force, while să is re-analyzed in Fin, checking (but not valuing) both [+/-finite] and [+/-realis]. Gradually, să is re-analyzed as a certain type of Fin outside the conditionals, and the new subjunctive clause replaces de-indicative complements. The replacement extends to the structurally equivalent infinitive complements, which were losing their finiteness. This re-analysis of să, and the spread of the subjunctive clause, is not an isolated event, but it occurs in the wider context of replacement and/or specialization of de in CPs in general, a drift that starts around the 16th c.

**Conclusion.** The nominalization of infinitives – a drift that started presumably in a bi-lingual, language contact situation in the Dacic-Slavic population of the 9th-11th c. – evolved on a different path in old Romanian, compared to Bulgarian and other Balkan Slavic languages, due to the Latin factor (i.e., the re-analysis of Lat. ad). The emergence of să-subjunctives is a late consequence of this idiosyncratic path of change, and involves switches in the mapping and the spell out of features within the CP. The particular change involved concerns the separate mapping of the features of Fin. As a result, this analysis supports a clause hierarchy that involves a separate MoodP in Rom (i.e., Fin > Mood_{a/or} > T versus Fin > T in Italian dialects; D’Alessandro & Ledgeway 2010), but defines MoodP as part of the CP field, rather than of the TP field (Alboiu 2002, Cornilescu 2000).
The determiner restriction in Romance and Germanic nominalizations
Gianina Iordâchioaia / University of Stuttgart

It has been noted, at least as early as Lees (1960), that some nominalizations in English are fully flexible with respect to determiner selection, while others are restricted (see (1a) vs. (1b)).

(1)  a. *John's/the/that/a performance of the song    b. John's/the/that/*a performing the song

I take a syntactic approach to nominalization (e.g., van Hout & Roeper 1998, Borsley & Kornfilt 2000, Alexiadou 2001, Borer 2005) and on the basis of Romanian, Spanish and German I show that this contrast correlates with a distinction between nominalizations with full (1a) vs. defective (1b) nominal structure. I take the fully nominal structure to be introduced by the categorizing nP layer and argue that the restriction on determiners is due to unvalued gender and number features on D which can only be valued via Agree with the corresponding features of n (Pesetsky & Torrego 2007). Determiners in defective nominalizations (without an nP) receive a 'default' value just like verbs that agree with CP-subjects. The languages I discuss are particularly instructive, as they mark gender morphologically, thus evidencing syntactic gender features in full nominals, but not in defective ones (Picallo 2006), although the contrast is not a matter of a Romance/non-Romance parameter, but one of microvariation.

Full vs. defective nominalizations. The contrast in (1) can be replicated in German, Romanian and Spanish deverbal nominalizations in (2) and (3), where the fully nominal pattern is flexible, while the more verbal one only allows the definite determiner. Italian displays a similar contrast (see Zucchi 1993), while German also has it with deadjectival nominalizations.

(2)  a. *das/jenes/ein nächtliche(s) Beobachten der Sterne  
 the/that/a nightly-adj observe.Inf the.Gen stars  
 b. El/ese/aquel/un lamentar de dos pastores  
 the/this/that/a lament.Inf of two shepherds  
 c. o/acea încâlcare(a) (a) drepturilor omului de către ministru  
 a/that violate.Inf(the) of rights.Gen man.Gen by minister  

(3)  a. das/*jenes/*ein ständig (nachts) die Sterne Beobachten  
 the/that/a constantly at-night the stars observe.Inf  
 b. El/*ese/*aquel/*un haber él escrito esa carta  
 the/this/that/ a have.Inf he.Nom written that letter  
 c. (*un/*acel) spălat(ul) (al) rufelor  
 a/that wash.Sup(the) of laundry.Gen

Previous literature argued for a contrast in terms of nominal properties with respect to the above nominalizations (Plann 1981, Picallo 1991, Miguel 1996, Iordâchioaia & Soare 2008, AIS 2011), which is best illustrated by modification tests. While nominal in (1a)/(2) allow adjectives, the ones in (1b)/(3) only allow adverbs (see German (2a) vs. (3a) and Spanish (4a) vs. (4b)).

(4)  a. el dulce lamentar de dos pastores  
 the sweet lament.Inf of two shepherds  
 b. el (*constante) escribir ella novelas constantemente/*constante  
 the constant write.Inf she novels constantly/constant

German offers additional support for the correlation between adjectival modification and flexibility with determiners in that the verbal infinitive in (3a) builds a minimal pair with a more nominal version solely based on adverbial vs. adjectival modification. The flexibility of determiners shows up with the adjective in (5a) and is blocked with the adverb in (5b).

(5)  a. das/*jenes/*ein ständig (die) Sterne Beobachten  
 the/that/a constantly the stars observe.Inf  
 b. das/jenes/ein ständig(e)s (die) Sterne Beobachten  
 the/that/a constant the stars observe.Inf

Since adjectival modification is a property intrinsic to nominal categories, I follow AIS (2011)
and take it to indicate the presence of the categorizer level nP, which must be missing in nominalizations that disallow adjectives. The relevant levels of structure in the two kinds of nominalizations are given in (6). All nominals have external nominal syntax (introduced by DP), but only the fully nominal ones also have an internal nominal syntax (introduced by nP). In addition, various (external) projections can be inherited from the original category:

(6)  
   a. [DP [... nP ([... ExtP...]) orig-catP [Root full nominals ((1a), (2), (4a), (5b))]]  
   b. [DP [... ExtP... orig-catP [Root defective nominals ((1b), (3), (4b), (5a))]]

Gender valuation between DP and nP. I explain the determiner restriction in (6b) via the lack of the nP layer. Determiners have unvalued gender and number features that are valued by the corresponding valued features on n, via Agree (see Pesetsky & Torrego 2007). This happens in lexical nouns and full nominalizations. But languages also have a (grammaticalized) 'default' determiner that they use as in (3) to adapt a non-nominal category to a nominal syntactic context. This determiner (i.e., English 's, German das, Spanish el, Romanian -l 'the'), I propose, has unvalued gender and number features that receive a default value. Similar default values for gender and number are at play with CP-anaphora in (7a) and when a CP subject agrees with the verb as in (7b).

(7)  
   a. [John lost my book]. It bothers me.  

As a confirmation that defective nominalizations in (6b) receive a default gender feature I show that in Spanish, Romanian and German, they are anaphorically referred to by means of a CP-anaphor, while the fully nominal ones in (6a) are referred to by gender-marked anaphors (see Plann 1981, Miguel 1996 for Spanish, Iordachioaia & Soare 2008 for Romanian and AIS 2011 for German).

'Default'/Expletive determiners. A further question that arises is why languages differ as to the determiner that appears in defective nominalizations: English possessive vs. German/Spanish/Romanian definite determiner. First, possessives in German, Spanish and Romanian display a non-unitary behavior, but are more restricted by comparison to the English one, which may stand for a wide variety of semantic relations between the possessor and the nominal (see, e.g., yesterday’s/John’s destruction of the city, Marantz 1998). Second, I show that the definite determiner in English is more restricted than in German/Romanian/Spanish, where it can act expletively (cf. Brugger 1993, Longobardi 1994). Thus in German/Romanian/Spanish, the expletive definite determiner allows a Q-adverb to take scope over the nominal (German (8a), Romanian (8b)). English the cannot be used expletively, it is fully referential, so the Q-adverb in (8c) has no free variable to quantify over in the presence of an i-level predicate.

(8)  
   b. Castori-i/*Castori sunt adesea inteligenți.  
   c. Beavers/*The beavers are often intelligent.

This contrast can also be observed in English nominalizations, where the definite determiner in (9a) blocks the Q-adverb on a generic reading (like in (8c)), while the possessive in (9b) allows the Q-adverb (like in (8a) and (8b)). This confirms that the possessive in English behaves like expletive definite determiners in the other languages, while the definite determiner is referential. The expletive definite determiner appearing on nominalizations in the other languages allows the Q-adverb, as illustrated for the Romanian translation of (9) in (10).

(9)  
   a. The performance of the Traviata by John (*often) guarantees the attention of the others.  
   b. John’s performing/performance of the T. often guarantees the attention of the others.  

(10) a. Interpretarea Traviatei de catre Ion adesea garanteaza atentia totala a celor din jur.  
     b. Interpretatul Traviatei de catre Ion adesea garanteaza atentia totala a celor din jur.
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Resultatives with static predicates: From Romanian to Mandarin Chinese
Monica Alexandrina Irimia / University of Toronto

The puzzle. Two convergent accounts support investigations into the nature of resultative secondary predicates (ResSP), of the type in (1a). On the one hand, there is the classic Dowtian (1979) account of resultatives as derived accomplishments (1b). On the other hand, syntactically-oriented implementations see resultative interpretations as obtained via a dedicated process of conflation, parametrized cross-linguistically (e.g., Talmy’s 1991, 2000 co-event conflation, Mateu 2011, Snyder 2001, McIntyre 2004, Embick 2004, Folli 2005, Haugen 2009, Zubizaretta and Oh 2007, etc.). These accounts predict an important property of ResSPs, namely their clash with static manner roots. This absence is due to a restriction in the ontology of events: there are no such aspectual types as telic states (see also Levin and Rappaport 1995). This conclusion is apparently well-supported in English, a satellite-framed language where examples like those in (2) are impossible. Note that conceptually it makes sense to get bored as result of (too much) sitting/staying/laying/being sick, for example. However, what is almost ignored in the literature is that this restriction is not exceptionless cross-linguistically.

The data. Romanian. Farkas (2011) and Irimia (2011) discuss an unexpected (lexicalized) bare noun ResSP construction (as in 4) in Romanian, a verb framed language which does not allow robust canonical ResSP of the type in (1). As such ResSP have not been subject to extensive analysis, many aspects are still undere xplored or not fully understood; among these is the novel observation that the bare noun ResSP is possible with static adjectival roots (4b). Romanian bare noun ResSP are hence not only surprising within the Romance domain, but also predicted to be impossible, theory internally. This abstract shows that what Romanian illustrates is a second strategy for building ResSPs. Outside the Romance and the Indo-European domain, similar ResSPs with static main predicates are possible in Mandarin Chinese, although such examples are also understudied. Mandarin Chinese. In Mandarin Chinese sentences like (5) which contain V/Adj-V serial compounds with resultative semantics where the main predicate is a static root are well-formed. Several further observations are in order: a) roots like ‘hungry’ are inherently static in Chinese, as they can’t take progressive markers (see also Li 2008); b) they also behave differently from dynamic predicates when the perfective marker –le is added. Moreover, hints that such compounds are true resultatives come from the existence of both restitutive and repetitive readings (5b), as well as from the impossibility of temporal adjuncts indicating atelicity (5a).

Analysis. The questions are then: a) which process(es) can construct ResSPs from static manner roots? b) what accounts for the difference between English and Mandarin, and the less common distribution of static-based ResSPs? This paper makes two proposals: 1. The restriction against statics with ResSPs is to be lessened: if in the language there are independent means by which statics can be made dynamic/eventive, then ResSPs can be constructed from statics roots. 2. Static ResSPs appear to be more marked because their composition does not involve a perfect featural match between the aktionsart ([- dynamic]) of the static root and the null {cause/motion} dynamic verb with which it conflates by Direct Merge (3b). Resolving this conflict requires specific structural constraints which are not available to all languages as non-trivial factors, among which ways in which lexical categories are constructed might take precedence. What is needed for an explanation of the Romanian and Mandarin Chinese examples is an understanding of the means by which static roots (can) act as dynamic predicates. Following and extending Beavers (2012) it is assumed here that as long as there is a potential for change, eventivity/telicity can be introduced with statics. With adjectival static roots, the potential for change is provided by the presence of the degree component. Static roots can acquire the feature [+dynamic] once their degree specification is maximalized to superlativity, indicating that a characteristic has the potential for (inducing) change by holding to the highest degree. Hence the difference between English and Mandarin Chinese/Romanian reduces to the availability of the degree component to serve as a potential for a change/static telicity ingredient. This indicates that, as opposed to English, the degree head is in a visible position when the directional bounded Res projection is added. In English the addition of the adjectival
lexical category forming head $a$ blocks not only the access to the degree projection, but also stativizes the structure. In Mandarin Chinese and Romanian, on the other hand, the Deg head is merged above the lexical category forming head (if any), or other projections responsible for introducing the semantics of atelicity. The intuition that the Romanian and Mandarin Chinese constructions involve the presence of a Maximalized degree component is supported not only by their intensification readings, but also by the impossibility of overt degree morphology with the stative roots which introduce the ResSP (4c and 6).

(i) Mandarin Chinese/Romanian

```
MAXDegree ——— ResP
a [telic] .... √ROOT
```

(ii) English

```
* aSTATE + DEGREE ——— ResP
[ -dynamic ] .... √ROOT
```

(1) RESULTATIVES AS DERIVED ACCOMPLISHMENTS (Dowty 1979)
a) John wiped the floor clean;  b) [wipe'(j,t) CAUSE BECOME (clean'(f))] *(under a resultative reading; OK as a depictive)

(2) ENGLISH: NO RESSP FROM STATES/NON-DYNAMIC ACTIVITIES

*John was sick/stayed/sat/lay bored.

(3) CONFLATION
a) They hammered the metal flat.  b) [They [ v [hammer CAUSE] [sc the metal flat]]]

(4) ROMANIAN

a) A curăţa (casa) luna/*luna/*luni/*lunile.  To clean (house.the) moon/moon.the/moon.pl/moon.pl.the.
   ‘To clean the house as shiny as the moon’.

b) Curăţat/*curăţăt lună.  c)  *foarte curăţat luna
   Clean (static)/ cleaned (eventive Adj.) moon.

(5) MANDARIN CHINESE (Li 2008, ex.14b, adapted)

a) Zhangsan yige xiaoshi jiu e-bing *yige xiaoshi le.
   Zhangsan one hour after hungry-sick one hour PERF.
   ‘As a result of Zhangsan’s being hungry, he became sick.’ (in an hour/*for an hour)

b) Tā (you) zuò/dài lèi/nì le.
   He again sit/stay tired/bored PERF.
   ‘He sat/stayed (until) tired/bored.’
   RESTITUTIVE READING (with ‘again’): the state of boredom is restored
   REPETITIVE READING (with ‘again’): the eventuality of sitting/seeing till bored is repeated

(6) MANDARIN – NO OVERT DEGREE MARKERS

Zhangsan *hén e-bing le.
Zhangsan very hungry-sick PERF.
‘As a result of Zhangsan’s being very hungry, he became sick.’
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French loanwords in Korean: Modeling lexical knowledge in OT
Haike Jacobs / Radboud University Nijmegen

French words ending in postvocalic coronal voiceless plosives are adapted in two different ways in Korean. Either the final [t] is replaced by an aspirated one followed by vowel insertion as in (1a) or the coronal plosive is replaced by an underlying /s/ which shows up as surface [s] when followed by the locative suffix [ŋ] as in (1b). If not followed by a vowel /s/ is turned into surface [t] by Coda Neutralization.

(1a) baguette [pa.ŋe.ŋi] omelette /o.m.ŋi.ŋi/ [o.m.ŋi.ŋi]
(1b) Lafayette [la.ŋi.ŋi] etiquette /e.t.ŋi.k.ŋi/ [e.t.ŋi.k.ŋi]

Replacement of French word-final postvocalic plosives by /s/ is intriguing given that there are Korean words ending in surface [t], like [ŋat] ‘field’.

Kim (2010, to appear) argues that cases like these clearly show that, besides perception and production, knowledge of lexical forms also plays a determining role in the adaptation of loan words. Adaptation as /s/ is explained by the fact that Korean words in the lexical representations are more likely to end with /s/ rather than with any of the other coronal plosives /t, tʰ, t'/.

No Korean word ends in /t'/ and that there are but a few words ending in /t/ or / tʰ / . This paper purports to propose a formal way of modeling lexical knowledge in OT. Boersma and Hamann (2010) have proposed to model the replacement by /s/ by assuming a positional faithfulness constraint IDENT (stri(.)), which requires that, in coda position, the underlying and surface values of stridency should be identical. This constraint is split up into the two faithfulness constraints (2a-b):

(2a) */+stri/[-stri(.)] underlying +stri should not correspond to surface -stri
(2b) */-stri/ [+stri(.)] underlying -stri should not correspond to surface +stri

and the two anti-faithfulness constraints (2c-d):

(2c) */+stri/ [+stri(.)] underlying +stri should not correspond to surface +stri
(2d) */-stri/ [-stri(.)] underlying -stri should not correspond to surface -stri

The anti-faithfulness constraints become active if a surface form is recognized without meaning attached to it, or which has no underlying representation yet. This is crucial because Korean surface [pat] ‘field’ is stored in the lexicon as /patʰ/. Lexical constraints of the type */<field>/pas/ (the morpheme <field> does not link to underlying /pas/) are used. With the latter constraint dominating the anti-faithfulness constraint */-stri/ [stri(.)], the faithfulness constraint */+stri/ [-stri(.)] and the lexical constraint */<field>/patʰ/, perceived surface [pat] is correctly stored in the lexicon as /p tʰ/ as illustrated in tableau (3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(3) [p t]</th>
<th>*/&lt; &gt;</th>
<th>*/&lt;field&gt;/pas/</th>
<th>*/-stri/ [-stri(.)]</th>
<th>*/+stri/ [-stri(.)]</th>
<th>*/&lt;field&gt;/patʰ/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/pas/ &lt; &gt;</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>! /patʰ/ &lt;field&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/pas/ &lt;field&gt;</td>
<td>*!</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau (3):
On the assumption that loanwords are not yet in the lexicon, lexical constraints do not play a role in loanword adaptation. This implies that a French loanword containing a postvocalic final [t] is treated differently than a Korean native word ending in [t]. Boersma and Hamann provide the following account for English *shot*. Surface [sjat], enters the lexicon or is recognized without meaning attached to it. On that assumption perceived surface [sjat] is correctly stored as underlying /sjas/, as illustrated in (4).

((4) [sjat.] *) (4) [sjat.] | *[>]* | *[<field>/pas/] | *[/-stri/ [-stri(,)]] | *[/+stri/ [-stri(,)] | *[<field>/path/]
---|---|---|---|---|---
| /sjas/ < > | * | | | | |
| /sjat/ < > | * | | *! | | |
| /sjat/ < > | * | | | *! | |

Interestingly, a similar replacement of word-final postvocalic coronal plosives can be observed in native Korean phonology where next to locative /pa.t/. forms such as /pa.sin./ do occur. This paper critically reviews Boersma and Hamann’s proposal and points out a number of drawbacks, one of which is that the restructuring in native paradigms cannot be modeled in the same way as the loan adaptations. Instead of lexical constraints and anti-faithfulness constraints, we propose to model frequency and knowledge of likely inputs as input-output chain positions (McCarthy 2007) placed in a language-specific markedness hierarchy. We will argue that this proposal allows the same markedness hierarchy to account for both loanword adaptation of final coronal plosives as /s/ and for the analogical pressure in L1.
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Polar positive answers in Brazilian Portuguese
Mary Aizawa Kato / Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Minimal answers are a locus of language cross-linguistic variation, and a place where children can find clues for the type of target grammar they are learning (see Kato & Tarallo (K&T), 1992). Thus, for a yes/no question like (1), languages answer with different types of clause structure:

(1) Q: Have you seen John?
A:  a. – (Yes), I have.
    b. - Oui, je l’ai vu.
    c. - Sì, lo ho visto.
    d. – (Hai), mimashita
    e. – (Sim), vi.

The authors show that Portuguese, in this respect, resembles Japanese more than its Romance sister languages, due to the fact that both varieties (the European ,EP, and the Brazilian, BP) are apparently positively marked, like Japanese, for the Null Subject (NS) and the Null Object (NO) Parameters (see Hoji (1998) for Japanese).

(2) Q: Você comprou o carro?
   you bought the car? ‘Have you bought the car?’
A: pro, comprei pro

However, Brazilian Portuguese (BP) has recently been described as a language on the way to become a non Null Subject (NS) language (Duarte 2005), with the exception of a few residual contexts, among which minimal positive answers consisting of just the verb.

(3) Q: Você quer comer bolo?
   you want eat cake
A/A’: Quero. / *Eu quero.

Q’: Queres comer bolo?
   want2psg eat cake ‘Do you want to eat the cake
‘Yes he had.

Such verbal minimal answers have been analyzed for EP as consisting of a VP ellipsis structure in which the subject is inside VP and the verb moves from T to \(\Sigma\) (ex 5a) (Martins 2004). See a similar analysis for Irish (MacCloskey 1991). EP does not have to comply to the EPP-feature in TP, and the subject can stay inside VP. After the verb moves, the remnant VP is elided. But this analysis does not account for BP, in which subjects have to move to Spec of TP, and would not be affected by VP-ellipsis (see 5b and b’). The output of the derivation would be ungrammatical.

(5a. [EP[\(\Sigma\)- comprou [TP T’comprou [ VP O João, tcomprou um carro vermelho]]]] EP

b. [EP[\(\Sigma\)-comprou [TP João, T’comprou [VP t, tcomprou um carro vermelho] ]]]] BP

b’ *Comprou o João.

The aims of the paper:

a) The first aim of the paper is to present a slightly modified version of Holmberg’s IP/ ellipsis for MA in Finnish. In his analysis, the verb in Pol moves to C, and then PolP/IP is deleted.

(6) Q: Puhuu-ko Joni ranskaa?
   speaks-Q John French ‘Does John speak French?’
A: Puhuu.
   speaks.

(7) puhun+ C [fpol minä [fpol puhun [tp puhun [vp minä puhu ranskaa]]]]
In my cartographic approach of minimal answers, the inflected verb in Pol moves to F (Focus) in the left periphery (Rizzi 1997), and the Remnant IP moves to GroundP, where it is interpreted as the sentence presupposition, and then deleted at PF. We will see, with this analysis, that EP and BP both can license identical minimal answers despite the fact that EP is a prototypical null subject language and BP is not. The fact is that with IP-deletion, after the movement of the verb to T, the type of subject before deletion is not relevant. What counts here is V-movement to T and Remnant IP-ellipsis. This analysis also explains why BP, a variety that is on the way to lose the null subject, can exhibit an apparent context where the null variant seems to be categorical.

(8) a. [FocP querov [IP eu/pro [tV [comer bolo]]] Movement of verb to FocucP position
b. [GroundP[[IP eu/pro [tV [comer bolo]]][FocP querov [IP]]]] IP remnant movement toGroundP
c. [GroundP[[IP eu-tV [comer bolo]] [FocP querov [IP]]]] IP-ellipsis

b). The second aim is to analyze polar answers with more than just the verb.

b1. BP can have the polar item sim before the verb. Sim in preverbal position signals politeness or formal language. We propose that the derivation is identical to the simple Verbal response, with the additional merging of sim in ForceP.

(9) Sim, queror. yes, want. Yes I do.

(10) [ForceP [F SIM [GroundP [TP [TP]]] [FocP querov [TP]]]]

b2. In emphatic positive answers, the verb and the polarity item can also appear together, but with the latter occupying the post-verbal position (K&T 1992). Here, we propose that sim merges as the Focus head, and the remnant IP moves to GroundP, with the object optionally null, in both varieties and with the subject null in EP and overt in BP.

(11) Q: Você comprou o carro?

A: eu/pro comprei, sim. I/pro bought, yes
A': eu/pro não comprei, não. I/pro not bought, no

‘I certainly did.’
‘No, I really didn’t.’

(12) [GroundP [IP eu/pro comprei (o carro)] [FocP sim [TP]]]

b3. Subjects can be expressed marginally, in preverbal position, even without the polar expressions, in both varieties, in contrastive or emphatic contexts. In this case, if the subject is a pronoun, it has to be of the strong type, and in both varieties it has to be merged outside IP, as a contrastive Topic or a contrastive Focus.

(13) Q: Vocês querem bolo?

you-pl want-3PPL cake ‘Do you want some cake?’

A: EU quero, não sei se a Maria quer. I do; I don’t know whether Mary wants

‘I do; I don’t know whether Mary does too.’

(14) [GroundP [IP querov comer bolo] [FocE EU[Foc querov [IP]]]], não sei se......
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Between 1090 and 1527, in French, the percentage of fronted participles dropped from about 20% of the clauses with an auxiliary and a participle, to 0%.

(1) sil fiert en l’ elme, ki gemmet fut a or; 
struck him on the helm, that jewelled was with gold

Since the work of Maling (1990), participle fronting has been much discussed for Icelandic, as an instance of Stylistic Fronting, and has been attested in ancient Scandinavian and in Romance: Italian (Cardinaletti 2003), Sardinian (Egerland, 2011), Old Florentine (Franco 2012), Old Catalan (Fischer, 2010), Old Spanish (Fontana, 1993), Old French (Cardinaletti & Roberts, 1991/2002, Mathieu 2006). Previous studies have pointed to intralinguistic (Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund, 2009; Molnár, 2010) and crosslinguistic pragmatic and syntactic variation. For example, it has been argued that the fronted constituent is focussed in Romance, contrary to Icelandic (e.g. Egerland 2011). The stylistically fronted element may be preceded by a full subject in Italian (Cardinaletti, 2003), Old English & Old Catalan (Fischer 2010), while this is excluded in Scandinavian. The fronted participle tends to front as a head in Icelandic but as a phrase in Sardinian (Egerland, 2011). The position of the fronted participle is a matter of debate: whether it targets Spec,TP, or a head or specifier position within the left periphery: FinP (Hrafnbjargarson & Wiklund, 2009), ModP (Franco, 2012a,b), TopP+ (Mathieu, 2006), FocP (Hrafnbjargarson, 2004). We study the construction in Old and Middle French, concentrating on the following three aspects: the position of the participle in the clause, the pragmatic effect of fronting and the nature of the fronted constituent.

i) In main clauses, postverbal weak pronominal subjects are attested. Since pronominal subjects occupy the highest position in IP (cf. Vance, 1988), the participle in (2) is within the left periphery, checking the V2 head. Indeed, most of the examples are of type: “loué soit il” (blessed be he) which have volitive force. (Cf. also 5a, with a focus interpretation).

(2) Oit avons nous nombre dix manieres de pechiez de langue; 
Heard have we numbered ten manners of sin(ning) with tongue
(1279, SOMME-ROYAL-P,1,66.1796)

In embedded clauses, postverbal pronominal subjects are not attested even though definite nominal subjects are widely attested. Instead, until 1267 we find the order PronSubj-Participle-V (3a). As this word order also occurs with full subjects (3b) (see Fischer, 2010), it does not result from the fact that the subject would have cliticized on the complementizer (contra what Mathieu 2006, Plat Zack 1988, Cardinaletti & Roberts 2002 proposed for (3a)).

(3) a. la gravance que il fait avoit a l’ empeor ... 
the wrong that he did had to the emperor
(1279, CASSIDORUS-P,674.4619)

(3) b. Eüstaces mot n’ en savoit De ço que Dex sauvé avoit ses effanz … 
E. word not knew of the-fact that God saved had his children
(1212, EUSTACE-FISHER-R,31.370)

We argue that the subject checks a D feature in a position adjacent to Fin and that the verb checks a T feature in a lower head, the participle being scrambled between the two heads (cf. Cardinaletti & Roberts 2002, Labelle, 2007). After 1267, the PronSubj-Participle-V word order is replaced by Participle-PronSubj-V, with the pronominal subject adjacent to the verb: the D and T features are now checked on the same head. This word order is found only in subordinate clauses (except for one late example in verse, dating from 1370).

ii) In many cases, there is no pragmatic effect to participle fronting (4), but in other cases, the participle is focused (5). We discuss the data in reference to Frey (2006)’s view that pragmatically neutral participle fronting results from Formal Movement, while contrastive fronting is A’ movement.

(4) Bel sire reis, fait m’ avez un grant dun. 
Good Sire King, (you) made me have a great gift
(1100, ROLAND-V,70.840)
(5) a. ...avoit il recouree sa terre que Tholomers li voloit tolir, et tolue li eust il ... he recovered his land that T. wanted to take from him, and taken would-have he if...
(1225, QUESTE-P,113.2974 (2731-2734)

(5) b. Se fuït s' en est Marsilies, Remés i est sis uncles Marganices....
If fled has M. , stayed is his uncle M.
(1100, ROLAND-V,143.1937)

iii) We argue that there is evidence of V^0 movement when the participle is extracted out of a coordination; in (6a) the participle’s complement is stranded, and in (6b), the modifier:

(6) a. Si ne voloient qu' afolez Fust des Crestiens ou defoulez;
PRT did not want that hurt be from the Christians or trampled
(137X, PRISE-R,.3365)

(6) b. ...s' en ala veoir sa mere Et son mari, qui deshaitiez Estoit forment & mal traitiez.
...went see his mother and her husband who distressed was much & badly treated
(137X, PRISE-R,.4514)

VP fronting is also attested, notably when a complement immediately follows the participle. This word order is attested in Sardinian but is said to be impossible in Old Catalan.

(7) a. e lunges vait Ainz que [trovet nule rien] ait. (1120, BRENDAN-R,70.1085)
and long-time goes until [found any thing] had.

(7) b. ... furent [...] ruet jus li Hainnuier, et ceu [accompagniet avoecques euls] estoient.
... were [...] thrown down the H. and those who [accompanied with them] were
(137X, FROISSART-P,436.8913)

The fronted participle phrase has the OV_{part} word order twice as often as the V_{part} O word order illustrated in (7). VO, attested as early as 1120 (7a), becomes relatively more frequent during the 14th c. We argue that, in the OV_{part} order (apart from sentences with a verb final base, which do not result from participle fronting), the O has moved to the left of the participle, as this word order is also attested after the finite auxiliary.

We discuss the combinations of factors that lead to participle fronting, both diachronically and crosslinguistically, comparing French with Romance and Scandinavian languages.
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Low sentence structure and word order in French
Karen Lahousse / KU Leuven, Belgium

0. Intro. In this talk we will provide a new analysis for verb-subject (VS) word order in French (1a). We will first argue against Kayne and Pollock’s (2001) (K&P) ‘high’ analysis, in which the postverbal S is in a high left-peripheral position, and IP is moved pass it through remnant movement. We will then propose a new ‘low’ analysis.

(1) l’homme à qui a téléphoné ton ami
lit. The man to who have telephoned your friend (K&P 2001: 107)

1. The postverbal S is not in Rizzi’s (1997) left periphery. 1.1. From the fact that indefinites as quelqu’un appear neither in a left-dislocated (2a) nor in postverbal S position (2b), K&P conclude that postverbal Ss are in the same left-peripheral position as left-dislocated constituents.

(2) a. *Quelqu’un, il mangera ce gâteau.
   lit. Someone, he will eat that cake.
   b. *Quel gâteau a mangé quelqu’un?
   lit. Which cake has eaten someone?

We will however show that the ungrammaticality of (2b) does not reduce to that of (2a), but is due to an independent constrain on postverbal Ss in interrogatives. This is corroborated by the fact that such indefinites are attested in other contexts for VS, e.g. relatives (3), and that some types of constituents occur in postverbal S position (4), but not in a left-dislocated position (5).

(3) L’air que fredonnait quelqu’un m’a soudain rappelé mon enfance.
   lit. The tune that was humming a passer-by reminded me of my youth. (Kampers-Manhe 2004)

(4) ... quand s’affrontaient différentes milices, il n’y avait plus de loi ni d’ordre.
   lit. .. when clashed different militias, there not was no longer law nor order. (Le Monde)

(5) *Différentes milices, elles s’affrontaient… lit. Different militias, they clashed …

1.2. Since standard cases of VS (1a,3,4) do not have the contrastive/corrective intonation and interpretation typically associated with the left-peripheral focus position (Rizzi 1997, Belletti 2004), there is no reason to assume that VS involves a left-peripheral Focus position. 2. The verb phrase does not undergo remnant movement. The fact that the postverbal S in SI can be followed by other complements (6), is a further indication that no remnant movement of TP took place (see Belletti 2004 for similar arguments for Italian).

(6) a. le livre que veut conseiller mon professeur aux étudiants (Marandin 2001)
   lit. the book that wants to recommend my professor to the students
   b. Que dira Pierre à Micheline? (Korzen 1983)

3. Our proposal. We will argue that the postverbal S in French VS word order is low in the sentence structure: it is not in its original VP-internal position (which would also be incompatible with a cartographic approach), and not in the preverbal subject position, but in an IP-internal Focus or Topic position (Belletti 2004). Arguments: 3.1. Just as in Italian (Belletti 2001/2004, Cardinaletti 2001), the postverbal S follows low adverbs (Cinque 1999) (7), which is an indication of its IP-internal position [ex. to be read with neutral intonation]:

(7) la tâche qu’ont bien fait les étudiants *bien
   lit. the task that have well done the students well

3.2. The postverbal S did not move through one of the preverbal subject positions advocated for in Cardinaletti (2004) ( SpecSubjP - SpecEPPP - SpecAgrSP*). The fact that VS in French can never be constructed as the answer (A) to a question (Q) as in (8), shows that the “subject-of-predicate feature” has not been checked in preverbal S position (SpecSubj):

(8) Q: # Que sais-tu à propos des grosses araignées?
   ‘What do you know about big spiders?’
   A: En septembre apparaissent les grosses araignées. (Simon, Frantext corpus)
   lit. In September appear the big spiders.

Moreover, if postverbal Ss moved through the preverbal S position, then the checking of phi-features (presumably in SpecAgrP) should be the same as in SV. However, the S in VS can only be 3rd (but not 2nd) person singular or plural (9a), in contrast with the S in SV word order (9b):
3.3. It is well known that floating quantifiers *tous*, which occurs between the auxiliary and the past participle in SV word order (10a), cannot occur there in VS (10b) (Sportiche 1988, Déprez 1988/1990, Koopman & Sportiche 1991).

(10)  a.   \( \text{Quand sont venus Pierre et Paul?} \)  lit. When came Peter and Paul ?
     b.  \( * \text{Quand Pierre et Paul sont venus?} \)  lit. When Peter and Paul came ?

3.4. The interpretation of the postverbal subject and the distribution of VS in main clauses. 3.4.1. It is well-known that VS in French, except in cases of ‘elaborative VS’ (Marandin 2001) or ‘focus VS’ (Lahousse 2006), must be licensed by the presence of some type of preverbal element. We will first show that this element must either be (i) a spatio-temporal topic, as in locative inversion (8A), or a (ii) wh-element (11a) or preposed contrastive focus (12a).

(11)  a. \( \text{Quand sont venus Pierre et Paul?} \)  lit. When came Peter and Paul ?
     b. \( * \text{Quand Pierre et Paul sont venus?} \)  lit. When Peter and Paul came ?

3.4.2. On the basis of question-answer tests, we will show that the postverbal S in the (i)-contexts has a (non-contrastive) focus interpretation (13), whereas the postverbal S in the (ii)-contexts is not the focus of the sentence (14b) but part of the background of the sentence-initial focus (14a).

(13)  Q: - Qu'est-ce qui apparaît en septembre?  lit. What appears in September?
A: - En septembre apparaissent les grosses araignées.  (Simon, Frantext corpus)
     lit. In September appear the big spiders.
(14) [Question to be asked in the context in (12)]
     a. Q: - Comment écrivait Alexandre?  lit. How did Alexander write?
        A: - AINSI écrivait Alexandre.  lit. SO/IN THIS WAY wrote Alexander.
     b. Q: - Qui écrivait ainsi?  lit. Who wrote in this way?
        A: - * AINSI écrivait Alexandre.  lit. SO/IN THIS WAY wrote Alexander.

3.4.3. We will conclude from this that postverbal Ss in the (i)-contexts are in Belletti’s (2004) IP-internal Focus position, whereas those in the (ii)-contexts are in Belletti’s (2004) IP-internal Topic position.
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More than three decades ago, as noted by Koronkiewicz (2012), it was stated that pronouns are unable to be code-switched while DPs do code-switch (Gumperz 1975, Lipski 1978, among others). Jake (1994) differentiated ‘grammatical’ (English-like) subject pronouns from ‘lexical’ (French or Arabic) strong pronouns showing that it is only the former that cannot code-switch. More recently, Van Gelderen & MacSwan (2008) have provided a Minimalist account of how the categorial nature of the subject determines the viability of subject/verb switches by bilingual speakers so that switching between the DP subject and the verb in (1) is a grammatical option while switching between the subject pronoun and the verb as in (2) is ungrammatical.

(1) **That teacher** odia los exámenes
   (2) **She** odia los exámenes

Van Gerderen & MacSwan (2008) consider the switch in (2) to be ungrammatical because it violates the PH(phonological) F(form) Disjunction Theorem which rules out code-switching below X°. As shown in (1), lexical DPs check features in [Spec TP] while pronouns in (2) undergo D-to-T movement. In the latter case, the mixed-language complex head crashes at PF. However, in the case of strong pronouns (Cardinaletti & Starke 1999) such as the French or Moroccan Arabic strong pronouns in (3) and (4), Van Gerderen & MacSwan (2008) argue that the PF Disjunction Theorem would not be violated because they behave as DPs.

(3) **Moi** dxlt
    ![Diagram](image1.png)
    ([I\_French [went-in]\_Arabic ] (French/Moroccan Arabic)
(4a) **Nta** tu vas travailler
    ![Diagram](image2.png)
    ([you\_Arabic [you go work]\_French ] (French/Moroccan Arabic)
(4b) **Humaya** vergelijken de mentaliteit met de islam
    ![Diagram](image3.png)
    ([they\_Arabic [compare the mentality with the islam]\_Dutch ] (Dutch/Moroccan Arabic)

As for Spanish subject pronouns, and even though they have been considered to be strong (e.g. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1988; Kato 1999), English-Spanish bilinguals do not seem to code-switch freely between a Spanish subject pronoun and an English verb as in (5).

(5) **Ella** odia los exámenes
Koronkiewicz (2012), based on the different code-switching behavior attributed to standard, as in (5), versus non-standard subject position pronouns (prosodically stressed, coordinated or modified) as in (6), calls for a further refinement and expansion of Cardinaletti & Starke’s (1999) strong, weak and clitic pronominal systems.

(6) a. **ELLA** hates exams
(6) b. **Ella** y Marsias hate exams
(6) c. **La de sintaxis** hates exams

According to this distinction, we would expect the same code-switching differences between standard and non-standard position Spanish and English pronouns. Furthermore, since none of the proposals make any prediction with respect to potential differences between first, second and third person pronouns, we would also expect the same code-switching behavior for the three. In this paper, we discuss code-switching acceptability judgment data elicited from a group of twelve child 2L1 (simultaneous English-Spanish) bilinguals, a group of eighteen child L2 (subsequent Spanish L1-English L2) bilinguals and a group of adult L2 (subsequent Spanish L1-English L2) bilinguals. We show that: (i) there are significant differences between subject DPs and subject pronouns both in English and Spanish, (ii) there are significant differences between both English and Spanish third person standard position pronouns and first and second standard position pronouns; (iii) Spanish third person standard position pronouns significantly differ from their English counterparts with respect to code-switching; and (iv) Spanish third person standard position pronouns are closer to DPs than to their first and second person counterparts.

In order to account for those differences, we propose an agreement version of the so-called “analogical criterion” that has been shown to underlie code-switching preferences (Liceras et al. 2008) in the case of concord structures such as those in (7) and (8).

(7) **la** house
   fem. [casa, fem.]
(8) **la** book
   fem. [libro, masc.]

Liceras et al. (2008) have shown that simultaneous English-Spanish bilinguals and Spanish dominant bilinguals systematically reject clear-cut violations of the “analogical criterion” as in (8) where the Spanish feminine determiner occurs with an English noun whose corresponding Spanish translation is a masculine noun.

Thus, following Liceras et al.’s (2008), we argue that, as it is the case with concord structures, with third person standard position pronouns, Pesetsky & Torrego’s (2001) double feature valuation hypothesis leads native Spanish speakers and Spanish dominant bilinguals’ intuitions when judging code-switching structures. Namely, both English and Spanish third person standard position pronouns require the valuation of their agreement feature on the verb and the verb requires to value the nominative feature on the pronoun. However, while the Spanish pronoun can value its agreement feature on the English verb (it is morphologically marked with an –s), the English pronoun cannot value its nominative feature because the Spanish third person verb lacks any morphological marking, as shown in (9) and (10) respectively.

(9) **Ella** talk-S about syntax
(10) **She** habla-Ø de sintaxis

This implies that the need to value the agreement feature born by the Spanish pronoun (to abide by this version of the “analogical criterion”) supersedes the PF Disjunction Theorem.
“Toned-up” Spanish: Stress → pitch → tone(?) in Equatorial Guinea

John M. Lipski / The Pennsylvania State University

In Equatorial Guinea, the only Spanish-speaking nation in sub-Saharan Africa, Spanish is in contact with lexical tone languages of the Bantu family (Bubi, Fang, Ndowé, and others). The present study, based on field data collected in Equatorial Guinea, analyzes the prosodic system of Guinean Spanish in terms of the transition from a pitch-accent based metrical stress system to an emergent lexical tone system. In Spanish, lexical stress is determined metrically; vocalic duration and pitch accent are the primary acoustic correlates of lexical stress. In citation pronunciation, polysyllabic words always include a stress accent, but in connected speech relatively long expanses with no pitch peaks frequently occur. In lexical tone languages each syllable carries a phonologically specified tone and the tones persist in connected speech. Sequences of High tones may occur with little “smoothing out” or stress-clash avoidance such as occurs with successive pitch accents in Spanish, and lexically specified tones do not usually “spill over” into adjacent syllables, unlike the late peak-alignment of prenuclear pitch accents in many varieties of Spanish. Speakers of lexical tone languages who learn a stress/pitch-accent language normally perceive pitch accents as High tone, but when faced with phrase-level intonation, may have no default intonational templates. The acoustic cues of the homology PITCH/STRESS ACCENT = HIGH TONE are attenuated during connected speech and the only suprasegmental roadmap possessed by speakers of a lexical tone language may be an intuitive awareness of the stochastic distribution of tones in the native language. In the present study a corpus of naturalistic Equatorial Guinean Spanish produced by native speakers of Bubi and Fang (languages with High and Low lexical tones) was analyzed for the presence and distribution of pitch accents. The data were compared with exemplars of the same utterances produced by monolingual Spanish speakers from Madrid, the dialect zone that served as primary input for the formation of Guinean Spanish. In connected speech, Guinean Spanish presents early-aligned pitch accents on all lexically stressed syllables including functional elements. Even in fluent speech, each word is pronounced as a citation form and there is no avoidance of stress clashes or High tone spreading to posttonic syllables, as occurs, e.g. in varieties of English in contact with lexical tone languages (Nigeria, Singapore, Hong Kong, Malaysia). Moreover the fundamental frequency of atonic syllables is tightly constrained, suggesting consistent interpretation as a Low tone and not simply the absence of a pitch accent. The relative invariance of syllabic pitches in Guinean Spanish is more characteristic of lexical tone languages than of pitch accent/stress languages. The Madrid Spanish data show significantly fewer pitch accents per utterance, exhibit general late-peak alignment of prenuclear pitch accents, and show evidence of stress clash avoidance, all traits associated with pitch accent/stress languages. Although Guinean Spanish still maintains obligatoriness and culminativity (each lexical word has one and only one syllable marked for prominence, i.e. pitch accent), the relative invariance of the pitch accents in connected speech and the assignment of pitch accents to functional items not normally accented in other varieties of Spanish is consistent with the lexicalization of phonological tone. The retention of citation-like intonational patterns in spoken Guinean Spanish is attributed in part to the fact that for most Guineans Spanish was primarily acquired in school and church settings. In addition, corpora of spoken Bubi and Fang were analyzed for relative distributional probabilities of High and Low tones: the rate at which high pitch accents occur in Guinean Spanish is closer to the distribution of High tones in Fang and Bubi than to the distribution of pitch accents in Madrid Spanish, and statistical learning of probabilistic patterns in indigenous Guinean languages may contribute to the emergent status of Equatorial Guinean Spanish as a lexical tone language.
Example: *Entonces si eres pobre tienes un marido al menos* 'Then if you are poor at least you have a husband'

Equatorial Guinea

Madrid
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A fine-grained analysis of analytic causatives in Romance
Mihaela Adriana Marchis / Hamburg University

1. Introduction: This paper discusses the crosslinguistic variation of the analytic causatives hacer/faire/fare/fazer/mander “make” in Spanish, Italian, Romanian & Brazilian Portuguese. Kayne (1975) identified two types of restructuring causatives for French, e.g., faire a (FI) and faire par (FP) (cf. Kayne 1975, Huber 1980, Burkio 1986, Enzinger 2010 among others). Folli & Harley (2007) explain the distinction between Italian FI and FP causatives by assuming that fare in FP causatives is a lexical element while fare in FI causatives is a functional element. In line with Wurmbrand (2003), Folli & Harley (2007) and Balza (2012), Torrego (2010) among others, I argue, on the basis of well-known tests such as clitic climbing, negation, event modifiers, that the causative verb faire within a language and across Romance is ambiguous between functional and lexical. Moreover, this paper provides evidence for a non-homogenous (non-)restructuring of analytic causatives in Romance: these constructions are ambiguous between restructuring and non-restructuring while non-restructuring analytic causatives can be both raising/ECM and object control depending on the agentiveness of the subject. Hence, this paper shows that analytic causatives should be analyzed on a par with aspectual verbs since they are also ambiguous between raising and control in Greek and Romanian (cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999).

2. The analysis of analytic causatives in Romance: This paper shows that Romance analytic causatives involve different degrees of restructuring and non-restructuring: i. functional restructuring when the causative verb is a functional verb that restructures a small verbal complement: either vP in unergative FI causatives or VP with unaccusatives or FP causatives (cf. López 2001); ii. lexical restructuring when the causative verb is a lexical verb that subcategorizes a vP or VP complement but has a complete argument structure; iii. non-restructuring when the causative verb is a control or a raising/ECM and is part of a biclausal structure. Hence, it subcategorizes at least a TP.

2.1. Functional Restructuring: Analytic causatives involve funct. restructuring in Italian FI causatives but also in Spanish and Romanian when there are selectional restrictions neither on the causer (-animate) nor on the causee or when the causee is absent. The test with the eventive modifiers show that the structure is mono-eventive and, hence, monoclusal. The event modifiers cannot modify the causative verb but only the embedded lexical verb:

(1) El buen clima hace las plantas crecer cuatro veces más rápido. Spanish
The favorable climate makes plants grow four times quicker.
The sole interpretation is that the plants **grow four times** quicker.

(2) Maria gli fa lavare quattro volte la camicia. Italian
Maria them make wash **four times** the shirt.
Interpretation: ‘Maria made them wash the shirt four times’ (four washings not four makings)

2.2. Lexical Restructuring: The causative verb is a lexical verb that subcategorizes a vP or VP and has a complete argument structure. Note that unlike with FI, FP causatives in Italian & Spanish impose selectional (animacy/agentiveness) restrictions on the agent:

(3) La generosità fece donare la casa a/*da Gianni. Italian
The generosity made donate the house to/*by Gianni.

2.3. Raising & control non-restructuring: On the basis of negation and event modifier tests, all analytic FI causatives in Romanian, Br. Portuguese and loísta (with acc. clitics) and leísta Spanish variants (with dat. clitics) are non-restructuring (for Br. Portuguese Marchis 2012)

(4) Maria nu l-a facut pe Ion sa nu gateasca. Romanian
Maria not cl.acc-has made PE John subj not cook-3sg.
Maria no lo hizo no cocinar.  
Spanish

“Mary did not make him not cook.”

Negation can appear either on the matrix verb, or the embedded verb or on both verbs with different semantics. This shows that the embedded complement must be more than a bare VP. If NegP is present, then a TP must be present as well (cf. Haegeman 1995). Torrego (2010) illustrates that analytic causatives in loísta dialects (FI\textsubscript{left}) have an agentive restriction on the subject on a par with FP causatives (see (3)) while leísta causatives (FI\textsubscript{right}) with dative clitics in standard Spanish are grammatical with all types of subjects:

\[(5) \quad \begin{array}{l}
a. \quad *\text{la recesión ha hecho a la atleta} \quad \text{perder el trabajo. loísta Spanish} \\
\quad \text{The recession cl.acchas made to the athlete lose the job.} \\
b. \quad \text{la recesión ha hecho perder el trabajo a la atleta. standard Spanish} \\
\quad \text{The recession cl.dat. has made lose the job to the athlete.}
\end{array} \]

Interestingly, as Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese do not show the distinction between loísta and leísta causatives like Spanish, the ambiguity arises with FI\textsubscript{left} causatives:

\[(6) \quad \begin{array}{l}
a. \quad \text{la recesión ha hecho a la atleta} \quad \text{perder el trabajo. loísta Spanish} \\
\quad \text{The recession cl.acchas made to the athlete subj-cl.dat lose the job.} \\
b. \quad \text{Maria ha hecho p. pe Ion sa si dea demisia. control} \\
\quad \text{Mary intentionally cl.acc-has made PE.acc John subj-cl.dat quit.}
\end{array} \]

The agentivity of the subject is tested by the agent-oriented adverbs like in (6b). On the basis of this, I argue that we have to do with different analyses for leísta and loísta causatives and for (6a) and (6b) in Romanian: raising for leísta causatives in (5b) and ECM for nonagentive causatives in Romanian (6a) and control for loísta causatives and agentive causatives in Romanian (6b). In line with López (2001), I argue that the causative control verb assigns an (+affected) theta-role to its causee. The contrast between raising and control (cf. Landau 2004, 2007) should be visible also in case assignment: Raising:DP, DAT…..V…..[t,…..V…..FQ\textsubscript{DAT}] vs. Control: DP 1 NOM…..V…..[PRO]…..V…..FQ\textsubscript{DAT} (Landau 2007: 305). This distinction is visible in Spanish variants: control triggers structural case assignment like in Spanish loísta while raising like in leísta Spanish preserves the inherent case of the causee (that is assigned by the preposition a). Note that aspectual verbs are also ambiguous between raising and control in their agreement pattern (cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 1999).

All in all, restructuring causatives can be functional when they lack argument structure and subcategorize a bare VP/vP or lexical when they have argument structure. Non-restructuring causatives can be raising/ECM when they have just one argument: the caused event (see Romanian (6) for ECM the causee has acc. structural case) or control when they have three arguments the causer, the causee and the caused event (cf. Zubizarreta 1985, Alsina 1992 and Ippolito 2000).
The epistemic and the counterfactual interpretations of present perfect *pouvoir* in French

**Alda Mari / Institut Jean Nicod, CNRS/ENS/EHESS**

**Scope and aim** Existential modal *pouvoir* in the present perfect in French has an abilitative (1-a) and an epistemic interpretation (1-b). The abilitative reading can be associated with an actuality entailment (AE), (see Hacquard, 2006 and also Bhatt, 1999, for Hindi).

(1) a. Jean a pu déplacer la table, #mais il ne l’a pas fait.
   John Pres.Perf.can move the table, #but he not that has done

b. John a pu prendre le train (comme il a pu ne pas le prendre)
   John Pres.Perf.can take the train (as he Pres.Perf.can not it take)

While several theoreticians have considered these interpretations separately (e.g. Mari and Martin, 2007; Mari, 2010; Homer, 2011; Mari and Schweitzer, 2010; Martin, 2011, Piñón, 2011), the merit of Hacquard (2006, 2009, 2010) is to present a theory of the systematic ambiguity of the modal that, in her work, is solved as syntactic scope ambiguity, with the scopings PAST > MOD for the abilitative reading, and MOD > PAST for the epistemic reading. As firstly noted in Mari and Martin (2007), the major shortcoming of Hacquard’s theory is that it does not leave room for abilitative interpretations without actuality entailment (see also Homer, 2011).

(2) Ce robot a pu repasser les chemises à un stade bien précis de son développement, mais cette fonction n’a jamais été utilisée.
   The robot could have ironed skirts at a precise stage of its development, but this function has never been used. (Mari and Martin, 2007)

Our goal is to propose a semantic/pragmatic view of the systematic ambiguity, exploiting the aspectual and temporal makeup of the present perfect, which, unlike Hacquard (2006, 2009), we analyze as a perfect rather than an aorist (see Schaden, 2009). Our account builds on the common view that the present perfect introduces a result state whose running time is the utterance time \( t_u \) (e.g. Kamp and Reyle, 1993; de Swart, 1998). On the pragmatic side, we subscribe to the view that the present perfect is used inferentially, that is to say, that the past event is not presented per se but it is inferred from some less direct result state (Comrie, 1976; Schaden, 2009; Apotheloz and Nowakowska, 2010). Knowledge of the present result state plays a key role in the account.

With these ingredients in place, the paper also redesigns the spectrum of interpretations of *a pu*-sentences, distinguishing between epistemic and counterfactual interpretations. It thus sheds a new light on the previously unanswered question of the competition between the present perfect modal (see (2)) and the modal in the past conditional (see (3)).

(3) Ce robot aurait pu repasser les chemises à un stade bien précis de son développement, mais cette fonction n’a jamais été utilisée. *This robot could have ironed skirts at a precise stage of its development, but this function has never been used.*

**Proposal** Available theories of the present perfect consider it to be an operator over properties of events (e.g. de Swart, 2007; Schaden, 2009). In our account we treat the modal, aspectual and temporal operators as propositional and assume that they are interpreted in situ with the scoping \( \text{PRES} > \text{PERF} > \text{MOD} > p \), in all the available interpretations. We call \( p \) the prejacent, and distinguish between \( p \) and the result proposition \( q \). PERF applies on a modalized proposition and renders a modalized result proposition whose time of evaluation is \( t_u \). We relativize the accessibility relation to times, in the spirit of Condoravdi (2002). Informally, our semantic analysis of an *a pu*-sentence (e.g. *Jean a pu déplacer la voiture* / ‘John could move the car/might have moved the car’) states that in a world that was metaphysically accessible at a past time \( t’ < t_u \), the proposition \( p \) was true at \( t’ \) and the result proposition \( \diamond q \) is true in the base world \( w \) at \( t_u \) (the formal details will be provided in the extended version). Contextual information determines which interpretation among the epistemic, the abilitative with AE and the abilitative without AE is obtained. We use \( \diamond p(t’), \) meaning that \( p \) is true in a world accessible at \( t’ < t_u \). \( \diamond q(t_u) \) means that \( q \) is true at \( t_u \) in an accessible world. We also assume that there is a relation of logical equivalence between the prejacent and the result proposition: \( \diamond p(t’) \leftrightarrow \diamond q(t_u) \).
On the model theoretic side, we use a branching time framework (Thomason, 1984; Condoravdi, 2002), in which worlds are represented as metaphysical alternatives. Branching time represents the past as settled and the future as open. Any two worlds are identical until they branch. With PERF scoping over MOD, future possibilities are considered at t'. We note with Condoravdi (2002) that, when settledness is presupposed, the only available interpretation is epistemic. With Condoravdi (ibid.), we also assume that modals have a diversity condition, i.e. the modal base must contain p and \( \neg p \).

On the pragmatic side, considering the present perfect in its inferential use, the last ingredient of our explanation is knowledge: we argue that, in order to utter \( \diamond p(t') \), at the utterance time, the speaker has to have some knowledge relative to the result proposition \( \diamond q(t_u) \).

**Deriving the interpretations.** Contextual information at the utterance time determines whether, at \( t_u \), the speaker knows that \( q(t_u) \) or \( \neg q(t_u) \) (both compatible with \( \diamond q \) being true at \( t_u \)) or whether s/he just knows \( \diamond q(t_u) \). Note that, in all the cases discussed here, past and present settledness is presupposed at \( t_u \). (i) The epistemic interpretation of \( \diamond p(t') \) is straightforward when the speaker knows that \( \diamond q(t_u) \) at the utterance time: settledness is presupposed at \( t_u \), and in order to satisfy the diversity condition, the only available option is the epistemic interpretation (see Condoravdi, 2002). Note that if the speaker knows \( q \) at the utterance time the epistemic interpretation cannot be obtained. Consider a situation in which there is something white on the street, which looks like snow. The speaker can utter *Il a pu neiger cette nuit* (ok epistemic) / *It might have snowed last night* (the sentence is out if the speaker knows that there is snow on the street). (ii) When the speaker knows that \( q \) is true at the utterance time in the actual world, s/he also knows that \( p \) is true at a past time in the actual work. By using the modal (which is associated with a diversity condition), the speaker conveys a counterfactual interpretation: as for (1a), the speaker conveys that John has moved the table and that the actual world at \( t' < t_u \) could have continued in a way such that he did not move it (hence the effort flavor). (iii) When the speaker knows that \( \neg q \) is true at the utterance time, s/he also knows that \( \neg p \) is true at a past time. Opening past possibilities, the past modal conveys counterfactuality; e.g (2) more specifically conveys that the robot could have ironed skirts.

**Counterfactuals compete** This view allows us to consider the unexplored competition between the counterfactual uses of the modal in the present perfect and in the past conditional (and the imperfect). Two types of scenarios must be distinguished. *Type 1* (present knowledge and metaphysical past alternatives à la Condoravdi (2002)). Consider a situation in which John is playing chess. At a certain point during the game, it was possible for him to win. If the speaker knows that he did not win (i.e. \( \neg q(t_u) \) and hence \( \neg p(t') \)), but s/he wants to counterfactually convey that at \( t' \) the actual world could have continued in such a way that John won, s/he can employ either the modal in the present perfect or in the past conditional (the modal in the imperfect is also allowed).

(4)  
*À ce moment là, il aurait pu/a pu gagner (mais il a perdu l’occasion de la faire) !*  
*At that point he could have won (but he lost the occasion to do it) !*

*Type 2* (knowledge-only-based scenarios à la Abush (2012)). A tournament took place in which John did not participate. The speaker speculates on whether John would have won, if he had participated. In this scenario, only the past conditional can be used (the imperfect is not allowed).

(5)  
*Le connaissant, il aurait pu# a pu gagner ! / Knowing him, he could have won!*

We can make the hypothesis that the modal in the present perfect and in the past conditional compete in Type 1 scenario. However, in virtue of its wider use, the modal in the past conditional is preferred over the present perfect modal, as it is the more common way to express counterfactuality.

**Perspectives** In the talk, we consider the use of the modal in the imperfect in Type 1 scenarios, explain how it differs from that of the modal in the past conditional and thus why it survives in the competition.

1. Introduction. This paper focuses on past subjunctive conditionals (PSCs) in French. French PSCs have a conditionnel 2 in the consequent. It is often assumed that French (like Greek) requires imperfective aspect as a counterfactual (CF) marker in the antecedent (Iatridou 2000, Bjorkman & Halpert 2012). This should explain why we find in the antecedent of PSCs the plus que parfait, a double past combining an imperfective morphology to a first layer of past, cf. (1a). Non-imperfective past tenses, a.o. the present perfect, are supposed to be banned, as confirmed by (1b).

(1) Si on (a.) OK avait réfléchi. (b.) *a réfléchi, on n’a aurait pas signé.
    If we (a.) think-PQP (b.) think-PRST-PERF, we NEG sign-COND.2-NEG
    ‘If we had thought/ have thought about it, we wouldn’t have signed.’

We start from the observation that this empirical picture should be refined. We found many occurrences of conditionals with a conditionnel 2 in the consequent and a present perfect in the antecedent in corpora, cf. e.g. (2)-(3). Their context of use makes clear that they are not confined to a substandard variant of French, even if they are banished by some prescriptive grammars. Since conditionals like (2)-(3) mix the morphologies typical of PSCs and past indicative conditionals (PICs), we call them ‘swing’ PSCs.

(2) Si un missile sol-air a effectivement été utilisé, il aurait été tiré à partir d’un bateau
    If a missile ground-air indeed be-PRES.PFCT used, it be-COND.2 launched from a boat the
    at the coast of Long Island.
    ‘If a missile has indeed been used, it would have been launched from a boat off the Long Island coast’

(3) Si le chef a réellement tenus [c]es propos, il aurait commis un acte grave
    If the Chief held-PRES.PFCT really these comments, he commit-COND.2 a act serious
    ‘If the Chief really has made these comments, he would have committed a serious act’

2. Swing PSCs vs standard PSCs. A first defining property of swing PSCs si p, q is that they are systematically odd if p or ¬p follows from the context C (the set of worlds currently taken to be epistemically accessible by all participants): they require p to be undecided relative to C. This suffices to explain the problem of (1b), since there, C most probably entails either p or ¬p. Swing PSCs thus differ from standard PSCs, since the latter can be used if p is counterfactual in C. A second related property of swing PSCs is that they are typically used when p is contextually salient but not yet accepted or rejected — p is on the Table (Farkas & Bruce 2010). A sign of this is the frequent presence of anaphorical adverbials like effectivement/ vraiment ‘indeed/really’ in their antecedent, cf. (2)-(3). Asserting a swing PSC is then a way to address the question on the Table p. Interestingly, doing so through the assertion of a swing PSC projects a different set of future common grounds (projected set, ps; Farkas & Bruce 2010) than through the assertion of a standard PSC. The way we interpret A’s confirmation (6) of B’s reaction (5) illustrates the point. Through (5), B reacts to A’s proposal (4) to add p to the common ground.

(4) A. Le Boeing 747 a été détruit par un missile, je crois/‘The Boeing 747 was destroyed by a missile, I think’
(5) a. B. S’il avait été détruit par un missile, il aurait été lancé par l’US Navy!
    ‘If it had been destroyed through a missile, it would have been launched by the US Navy!’ (standard PSC)
    b. B. S’il a été détruit par un missile, il aurait été lancé par l’US Navy!
    ‘If it has been destroyed through a missile, it would have been launched by the US Navy!’ (swing PSC)

(6) A. Tu as raison/’You’re right.’

(5a) and (5b) have the same literal content p→q. They also both presuppose that q is false or at least implausible in the current context C1. But they differ through their implicated content. As an answer to (5a), (6) is easily understood as a confirmation to p→q but also to ¬p, because the rule of modus tollens is applied (ps = {C1 ∪ {p→q} ∪ {¬p}}). By contrast, as an answer to (5b), (6) cannot be interpreted that way. To begin with, the reaction (5b) to the proposal (4) neither amounts to rejecting p nor to accepting it. Rather, it invites to choose between (i) rejecting p and (ii) challenging the presupposition ¬q and accepting both p and q. The context state after a swing PSC is thus inquisitive wrt to p: its ps contains two future common grounds, namely ps = {C1 ∪ {p→q} ∪ {¬p}, C1 ∪ {p → q} ∪ {p} ∪ {q}}. However, A can
still react to (5b) through (6) in order to signal she accepts the imposed choice. She can then continue by signaling which future common ground she goes for, either through (i) You are right. The missile theory is after all very unlikely (A chooses \( \neg p \)), or (ii) You are right. After all it isn’t the first time that the Army is involved in such disasters (A goes for \( p \) and \( q \)). Note that (ii) cannot be used to assent to (5a).

3. Swing PSCs vs PICs. Swing PSCs also differ from PICs in three respects. 1. PICs can sometimes be used as a rhetorical device when \( p \) follows from \( C \) (It rained. If it rained, the match was cancelled, cf. e.g. Dancygier 1999); this is not possible with swing PSCs. 2. PICs à la Anderson 1951 (e.g. (7b)) are odd, because they are totally uninformative (von Fintel 1997). By contrast, ‘Andersonian’ swing PSCs are natural, as shown by the acceptability of (7a). 3. Except in Andersonian cases, swing PSCs tend to presuppose that the consequent \( q \) is false (or at least implausible) in \( C \). This is not the case with PICs.

(7) Si John a pris de l’arsenic, il (a.) aurait montré (b.) \# a montré exactement les symptômes qu’il a maintenant
If John has taken arsenic, he (a.) have-COND.2 (b.) have-PREST.PFCT exactly the symptoms that he has now

‘If John has taken arsenic, he would have shown/has shown exactly the symptoms that he has now’

4. Swing PSCs are subjunctive conditionals. Why should we analyse ‘swing PSCs’ as subjunctive rather than indicative conditionals, if (i) their morphology only partly matches the one of PSCs and (ii) they do not implicate that \( p \) is false? We endorse here the view according to which the difference between PSCs and PICs mainly lies in the kind of domain (\( D(w) \)) the conditional quantifies over. Following e.g. von Fintel 1997, we assume that the default pragmatic constraint on quantification over worlds performed by conditionals is that \( D(w) \) is entirely in \( C \). The indicative being unmarked, it does not signal anything against this constraint \( D(w) \subseteq C \). The subjunctive is marked and indicates a violation: SCs presuppose that \( D(w) \) is partly outside \( C \). This explains why standard PSCs are used when the antecedent \( p \) is taken to be CF, but also when \( D(w) \) needs to be widened for some other reason (e.g. if \( p \) and \( q \) follow from \( C \) but \( D(w) \) contains \( \neg q \)-worlds, as in Andersonian PSCs according to von Fintel’s 1997 analysis). The facts described in § 2 and 3 allow to conclude that swing PSCs are PSCs: their \( D(w) \) contains either CF/implausible \( q \) worlds (cf. e.g. (2)-(3) & (5b)), or CF/implausible \( \neg q \) worlds (cf. (7a)).

5. The role of the imperfective. Swing PSCs allow to better tease apart the contribution of aspect/tense morphology in the antecedent and the consequent of PSCs. Their properties point to the following conclusions. 1. The ‘subjunctivehood’ of French PSCs (that we equal with \( D(w) \subseteq C \)) depends on the conditionnel 2 morphology in the consequent (found in swing and standard PSCs), and not on the extra-layer of past in the antecedent (not present in swing PSCs). This is confirmed by the fact that PSCs cannot be obtained by combining a plus-que-parfait in the antecedent and a non-conditionnel indicative in the consequent (these sentences are either out, or force a temporal interpretation of the \( pgp \) and are PICs). 2. The ‘CF antecedent falsity’ of PSCs depends, in French, not only on the conditionnel 2, but also on the imperfective in the antecedent. Given that the conditionnel can be analysed as the morphological spell-out of the imperfective plus the future (Iatridou 2000), this suggests that imperfectivity in both clauses is necessary to signal CF antecedent falsity.

6. A case of agreement failure. In several treatments of PSCs (e.g. Ippolito 2003, Arregui 2004), the past tense morpheme in the main clause is used to go back to a time where the proposition could still be true. A way to implement this is to have the past tense outscoping the modal (NOW PAST(MOD (\( p \rightarrow q \))). Tense/aspect morphology in the antecedent is often analysed as a case of agreement with the morphology in the matrix clause (cf. e.g. von Fintel 1997, Arregui 2004, Anand & Hacquard 2009). Swing PSCs can then be conceived as a case where agreement fails to hold. We propose the idea that through this agreement failure, the speaker indicates that subjunctivehood is not obtained through the counterfactuality of \( p \), i.e. that it is not because \( p \) is CF that \( D(w) \) reaches outside of \( C \).
How a bilingual stores and activates lexical representations in their two languages has been a central interest in psycholinguistic studies of bilingualism. Two competing theories of bilingual lexical access have been put forth – the language-selective access theory and the language non-selective access theory. The former proposes that only the lexical items from the intended language are activated and available for selection during speech planning and comprehension (e.g., Costa, Santesteban, & Ivanova, 2006). The latter proposes that both languages receive activation and compete for production (e.g., Kroll, Bobb, & Wodniecka, 2006). Within the framework of the non-selective access theory, the ability to negotiate cross-linguistic competition may come from language cues that reliably signal the L1 or L2 in conjunction with an inhibitory control mechanism (e.g. Green, 1998). The purpose of this study is to investigate whether language-specific syntax – the syntactic positioning of a target word in a determiner phrase (DP) – can act as a language cue to modulate cross-linguistic activation in bilingual sentence comprehension and if competition for production is mediated by an inhibitory control mechanism.

The participants (n=23) in this study are Spanish native speakers with advanced English proficiency living in Argentina. To examine cross-linguistic activation the participants were presented English sentences containing DP’s that received genitive or dative case. In English, these structures have two acceptable positions; one which is linearly congruent with Spanish syntax (see examples 1 and 3) and one which is linearly incongruent (see examples 2 and 4).

1) Congruent Dative (canonical dative construction):  
   *The man gave some water to the [donkey] in the lot.*  
   (target: *burro*)

2) Incongruent Dative (dative double object construction):  
   *The worker in the street gave the [dog] a little space.*  
   (target: *perro*)

3) Congruent Genitive (of-genitive):  
   *The teacher drew the top of the [tree] with a marker.*  
   (target: *árbol*)

4) Incongruent Genitive (’s-genitive):  
   *The young girl wanted to paint the [chair]’s bottom bright green.*  
   (target: *silla*)

In task 1, the participants completed a cross-modal priming paradigm combined with a lexical decision task (figure 1) using SuperLab software (Cedrus Corp.; Haxby, Parasuraman, Lalonde and Abboud, 1993). After reading each stimuli sentence, the participants were presented a word that was either the Spanish translation-equivalent of the target word or a control word from either Spanish or English. The participants clicked “yes” or “no” to indicate if the word was a real Spanish word. The response times were recorded in milliseconds from the onset of the lexical decision task stimulus to the button press. Occasional “yes-no” comprehension questions were included to control for participants’ attention. In task 2, the participants performed the same activity as in task 1, except that they repeated the stimulus out loud prior to the lexical decision task. Again, response times were recorded in milliseconds from the onset of the lexical decision task.

The results (figure 2) of task 1 revealed that response times in the congruent conditions (of-genitive and canonical dative position) were significantly faster (*p < .02*) than response times in the incongruent conditions (’s-genitive and dative double object) lending evidence that linearly congruent syntax results in cross-linguistic activation and that language-specific syntax (linearly incongruent) can reduce such cross-linguistic activation. However, in task 2 where participants read the stimuli out loud, there were no significant differences between the response times in the congruent and incongruent conditions (*p > .05*). Such results suggest that highly activated translation-equivalents in Spanish (congruent condition) require more inhibition upon production in English than those which receive less activation initially (incongruent...
condition). This active inhibition involuntarily persists into the processing of the lexical decision task resulting in a delayed response time and a loss of a response time advantage over the less activated translation-equivalents as seen in task 1 when repetition was not required. These finding are in line with the asymmetrical language-switch costs reported by Meuter and Allport (1999) and with the notion of an inhibitory control mechanism.

The results from this study further support the language non-selective access theory and provide evidence that language-specific syntax can be a language cue that modulates cross-linguistic activation. Furthermore, they suggest that any remaining cross-linguistic competition is resolved by an inhibitory control mechanism during speech production. Taken together the results from this study refine current theories of cross-linguistic activation and provide a better understanding of the role of inhibition in bilingual language comprehension and production.
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Reduced parenthetical clauses in Portuguese - a comparative approach

Gabriela Matos / Universidade de Lisboa

1. Reduced Parenthetical Clauses (Schneider 2007), henceforth RPC, in Romance and non-romance languages present a specific structural configuration: they may exhibit a verb complement gap and display Subject-Verb Inversion, obligatorily or optionally depending on the language/language variety, as shown for quotation verbs in European and Brazilian Portuguese (=EP, BP) and in Dutch and English: EP patterns with Dutch in not allowing preverbal subjects (cf.(1)-(3)), BP behaves like English by accepting preverbal and post-verbal subjects (cf.(2)-(4)):

(1) a. *Esse autor, disse o repórter, escreveu um livro sobre esse assunto.
   ‘That author, the reporter said, wrote a book on that subject.’
   (EP)

   b. Esse autor, disse o repórter, escreveu um livro sobre esse assunto.
   that author, the reporter said, wrote a book on that subject.
   (EP)

(2) a. Você tá me ouvindo?, disse Kátia [e eu me senti flagrado].
   ‘Are you hearing me? said Kátia [and I felt trapped].’
   (Ventura 1998) (BP)

   b. O homem procura motivos de indignação para alimentar sua inveja, ele disse.
   ‘Man looks for motives of indignation to feed his envy, he said.’
   (Ventura 1998) (BP)

(3) a. “Ik heb een nieuwe baan,” vertelde Joop me gisteren.
   ‘I have a new job’ told Joop me yesterday
   (De Vries 2006) (Dutch)

   b. *“Ik heb een nieuwe baan,” Joop vertelde me gisteren.
   (De Vries 2006) (Dutch)

(4) a. “Don’t turn back!” warned Marcel.
   (Collins & Braningan 1997) (En)


The required V-S order in EP seems to indicate that there is a correlation between the object gap and V-Movement in this language; a similar claim has been made for Dutch, where RPCs have been related to the V2 phenomenon. In opposition, the alternation S-V/V-S in English and BP suggests that the object gap and V-Raising in RCPs are unrelated phenomena. Considering Portuguese, these word order patterns are problematic for both varieties: in EP the obligatory V-S order may hardly be conceived as V2 effect, given that in neutral declarative sentences SVO in main and embedded clauses typically occurs. As for BP, the problem arises of explaining how the V-S order produces acceptable results, considering that: V to C has been lost in wh-questions (e.g. Ribeiro 2001, Mioto & Kato 2005); V-S in declarative sentences is (almost) lost (Galves & Gibrail 2012), except with unaccusative verbs; and V movement out of vP targets a low functional category with aspectual content (Cyrino 2013).

2. Early analyses on RPC have presented two main hypotheses. The complement hypothesis claims that the parenthetical originates as a main clause, whose verb takes the host sentence as its complement; this complement is fronted in sentences like (4) (Ross 1973); then, an optional rule of parenthetical formation derives sentences like (5) (Emonds 1970, Ross 1973). Alternatively, the modifier hypothesis takes the host sentence as autonomous and assumes that the parenthetical is related to it as a modifier (Jackendoff 1972).

(5) Mary will, John said, see you tomorrow.

The complement hypothesis apparently directly accounts for the correlation between the parenthetical verb gap and the host sentence. Also, in languages like Dutch, it seems to argue for the V2 analysis. Yet, in the current framework, it does not easily account for the interpolated and floating nature the parenthetical, illustrated in (5) and (6). In addition, it faces with empirical problems, illustrated for Portuguese in (7): the host sentence may not exhibit an overt complementizer, as required in embedded finite sentences in this language, (7a); and the tense (mood) and person features of the host clause are not restricted by the parenthetical verb, as they would be in an indirect speech reporting clause, (7b):

(6) Eu vou (disse ele) comprar (disse ele) esse livro.
   I will (said he) buy (said he) that book

(7) a. Ele disse *(que) ia comprar esse livro. ≠ b. Ele disse que eu vou comprar esse livro.
   He said (that) (he) would buy that book  He said that I will buy that book.
Thus, current analyses mostly reject the complement hypothesis, despite of developing different proposals to deal with the correlation between the parenthetical and its host (e.g., Espinal 1991, Collins & Barningan 1997, Cover & Tiersh 2002, De Vries 2006).


\[ [\text{CP Op}]_j [C +\text{quote}][FocP JOE_4[Foc +Focus]_{TP} t_k [\text{dished} t_j]] \]

This analysis does not explain the obligatory V-S order in RPC in EP. To deal with this problem we could assume that EP is a residual V2 language, considering that representations akin to (8) have been proposed for RPCs in V2 languages (Cover & Tiersh 2002, De Vries 2006). Still, the motivation for this residual V2 effect in EP should be explained.

A possible outcome would be to adopt some version of Collins & Branigan’s (1997) analysis of quotative inversion. These authors claim that in English a quotative null operator is merged in Spec CP and binds a variable in complement position of the parenthetical. The V-S order arises when the DP subject remains in Spec of the verbal phrase and the main verb, in overt Syntax, moves to the most local functional category, according to them AgrO, (as shown by the ban of sentence negation and the position of VP adverbal modifiers in RCPs) to check the case of the Quotative operator. They explain the V-S-S-V patterns in terms of C features: only a C [+quote] with an uninterpretable V-feature may attract the main verb to a functional projection.

Extending this proposal to Spanish, Suñer (2000) claims that the Quotative operator always occurs in F(orce)P, a functional category that exhibits a [+focus] feature when the quote is fronted; the V-S order arises because an expletive pro is merged in Spec TP to check the EPP-features of T in Spanish, a Null Subject Language, or a null R-expression (a null definite description) is merged in Spec TP in English. Elaborating on these proposals, I will alternatively claim that a RPC with a C [+quote] selects for a Focus(P) with an underspecified N-feature. This captures the fact that in RPC the subject is interpreted as informational focus, a discursive property that seems to be related to the pragmatic reporting value of these parentheticals. In languages like English and BP, the informational focus feature is usually valued, during the derivation, by Agree with a DP-subject raised into Spec FocusP, as in (9a), thus resulting the S-V order (cf. (2b) and (4b)). Yet, as shown in (2a) and (4a), under the scope of a C [+quote], BP and English still allow, in the current (written) language, that the focus feature be valued at long distance by Agree with a DP-subject in Spec vP, provided that local V-raising to AspP has applied (cf. (9b)), producing the required discursive effects. This analysis captures the English data and is compatible with Cyrino’s evidence that the verb in BP raises to a low projection, bellow TP.

\[ [\text{CP Op}]_j [C +\text{quote}][[\text{FocP JOE}_4[\text{Foc +Focus}]_{\text{TP}} t_k [\text{dished} t_j]] \]

In contrast, in languages like EP (or Spanish), preverbal focus is restricted to contrastive focus, and informational focus occurs in post-verbal position, typically remaining in Spec vP (Costa 1998). Thus, in EP only the latter strategy is available, despite the fact that V-raising is not confined to the lower functional category above VP, and may move to T and C.

Perception of consonantal and vocalic contrasts in heritage and native Spanish speakers
Natalia Mazzaro / University of Texas at El Paso
Alejandro Cuza / Purdue University
Laura Colantoni / University of Toronto

Research shows a strong correlation between L2 native-like attainment and early age of onset of bilingualism (Abrahamsson & Hyltenstam, 2009; Flege et al., 2006). The argument is that after a certain age L2 learners are unable to fully acquire L2 speech patterns not present in their L1 due to cognitive impairments (Hyltenstam & Abrahamsson, 2003). However, recent research documents comparable patterns of morphosyntactic and phonetic divergence between near-native L2 learners and long-term immigrants undergoing L1 attrition (Hopp & Schmid, 2011; Major, 2009), casting doubts on maturational constraints in language learning. We expand on this previous research by examining the production and perception of vowels and consonants among Spanish heritage speakers (early bilinguals) and long-term Spanish immigrants (late bilinguals). Specifically, we tested the perception and production of Spanish voiceless and voiced stops in all five vocalic contexts and initial and medial positions in the word (1a-1c) and [e] vs. [i] and [o] vs. [u] (2) in stressed and unstressed syllables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Position</th>
<th>Medial Position</th>
<th>Stressed syllable</th>
<th>Unstressed syllable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. [g]iso vs. [k]iso (“stew” vs. “s/he wanted”)</td>
<td></td>
<td>b. pe[γ]ar vs. pe[k]ar (“to hit” vs. “to sin”)</td>
<td>b. d[o]rar vs. d[u]rar (“to tan” vs. “to last”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. [d]una vs. [t]una (“dune” vs. “prickly pear”)</td>
<td></td>
<td>c. me[ø]i vs. me[ti] (“I measured” vs. “I put”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If maturational approaches to final L2 attainment are correct, early bilinguals are expected to behave as long-term immigrants, since both acquired Spanish before puberty. If exposure to a second language affects perception, then Spanish heritage speakers exposed to English (L2) before puberty will have difficulties in the discrimination of Spanish native contrasts due to their reduced Spanish input and to their intense contact with English. In particular, it should prove difficult for these speakers to discriminate Spanish voiced and voiceless stops because they map into one English phonetic category (i.e. voiced stops); these participants are also expected to confuse mid-vowels (front-vowels in particular) because the Spanish [e] overlaps with the English [I] (Bradlow, 1995). On the other hand, long-term immigrants who acquired the L2 past puberty should behave closer to the attested monolingual patterns (MacKay et al., 2001).

A total of 14 participants took part in the study, which involved an AX discrimination task. Eight participants were Spanish heritage speakers; half of them were born and raised in the US and half immigrated before the age of 15 (mean age of arrival, 10; mean length of residence, 12). The remaining 6 participants were long-term immigrants from Mexico (mean age, 32; mean length of residence, 14). All participants were university educated or were enrolled at a major research university at time of testing.

An independent sample T-test comparing the number of perception errors by group (heritage speakers vs. long-term immigrants) indicates that heritage speakers outperformed long-term immigrants (M=28.4, SD=10.4 and M=36.5, SD=16.3, respectively), albeit the differences were not significant [t(7)= -1.08, p = 0.32]. These results indicate first that early exposure to the target language results in similar abilities to discriminate phonological contrasts. Yet, if specific contrasts are analyzed, evidence of attrition was observed in long-term immigrants, who found the discrimination between voiced and voiceless labial and coronal stops significantly more difficult than heritage speakers (Figure 1). The fact that long-term
immigrants found such contrasts more difficult to discriminate is puzzling. Finally, a comparison of the two groups of heritage speakers (those born in the US vs. those who arrived before puberty), revealed a negative correlation between age of onset of bilingualism and percentage of errors ($r=0.66$), which supports the idea of perceptual attrition in early bilinguals. These preliminary results will be further explored with more subjects.

**Figure 1:** Percentage of discrimination errors by contrast for heritage speakers and long-term immigrants

**References**
Major, R. C. (2009). Sociolinguistic Factors in Loss & Acquisition of Phonology. CUP
Going, going, gone? Devoicing of unstressed final vowels in São Paulo Portuguese

Ronald Beline Mendes / University of São Paulo
James A. Walker / York University, Toronto

A salient difference between spoken European Portuguese (EP) and Brazilian Portuguese (BP) is the phonetic realization of unstressed vowels (e.g. Mateus & d’Andrade 2000). Although neutralized in both varieties (though in different ways), devoicing and even deletion is common in EP (e.g. Silva 1998) and unreported in BP. However, our casual observation of native speakers in São Paulo suggests that vowel devoicing is on the rise.

This paper reports on a systematic examination of the variable occurrence and conditioning of word-final unstressed vowels in spoken Portuguese in the city of São Paulo, with data taken from a sample of sociolinguistic interviews with 24 men and women recorded in 2011 (Mendes & Oushiro 2012). From these interviews, we extracted a representative sample of tokens and coded them according to the voicing of the vowel and a series of linguistic and social factors: the vowel type ([i], [u], [a]), the preceding and following phonological context, the distance of the vowel from the preceding stressed syllable, and the sex, age-group and social class of the informant. In addition to analyzing a subsample of tokens acoustically using Praat (Boersma & Weenink 2012), we assess the relative contribution of the above factors to devoicing through a mixed-effects multiple regression model (Johnson 2009), with the individual speaker and lexical item as random effects.

Preliminary results indicate that devoicing is more frequent with [i] and [u] (the raised variants of /e/ and /o/, respectively) than with [a], and is favored with preceding voiceless consonants and following voiceless consonants or pauses. Devoicing also seems to be more common in the speech of men. Since these results parallel those obtained by Silva (1998) for EP, which also features vowel deletion, they raise the question of whether devoicing is the first step toward deletion. A more detailed examination of the distribution and conditioning of devoicing in apparent time will permit us to verify whether this is indeed a change in progress.
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Prosodic boundary effect on the syntactic parsing of French utterance fragments

Amandine Michelas / Université d’Aix-Marseille & Laboratoire Parole et Langage - CNRS
Mariapaola D’Imperio / Université d’Aix-Marseille & Laboratoire Parole et Langage - CNRS, Institut Universitaire de France

A growing number of studies have shown that prosodic boundaries are obvious candidates for constraining the syntactic parsing of spoken utterances. For French, recent studies have suggested that the placement of phonological phrase boundaries might be employed by adult listeners to resolve temporary syntactic ambiguities (Millote et al., 2007, 2008).

French represents an anomaly among Romance languages because accentuation and phrasal boundaries always coincide. Stress always falls on the last full syllable of a phrasal domain smaller than the Intonation Phrase (the Accentual Phrase, AP) and its location is not contrastive. However, the issue of the number of prosodic units below the Intonation Phrase is still controversial in French. While the AP is widely accepted, recent studies provide evidence for an additional level of phrasing, which is intermediate between the AP and the IP levels (D’Imperio & Michelas, 2010; Michelas, 2011). Specifically, while the AP right boundary is cued through a typical (L)H* final f0 rise on the last syllable of the phrase (Fig. 1a), the ip right boundary appears to be marked by a H-phrase accent responsible for blocking downstep of subsequent accents within the ip (Fig. 1b). Moreover, the right edge of an ip shows greater preboundary lengthening than AP right edges.

In the present study, we examined the influence of acoustic cues (tonal and duration cues) located at AP and ip boundaries in the syntactic parsing of spoken utterances. In a previous study (Michelas & D’Imperio, 2011), we used natural speech stimuli to test whether French listeners interpret an ip boundary as cueing a major syntactic break (Noun-Phrase/Verb-Phrase break, 1b) or a weaker syntactic break (Noun-Phrase internal Boundary, 1a).

1a. La nana[AP du sauna][AP d’Hélêna][AP devenait vraiment méchante.]
“La nana who managed Hélêna’s sauna became really nasty.”

1b. La nana[AP du sauna][AP/ip devenait vraiment méchante.]
“The girl who managed the sauna became really nasty.”

Participants gave more VP responses when an ip boundary was present in the stimuli relative to when an AP boundary was present showing that French listeners are able to differentiate prosodic cues at both AP and ip boundaries and exploit this difference to infer the morphosyntactic category of the upcoming syntactic phrase. However, since only natural stimuli were employed, we could not determine which specific cues intervene in the differential processing.

Hence, in this study we tested the specific contribution of tonal and duration cues of AP/ip boundaries. The acoustic cues located at the AP boundary of 20 NPs taken from our previous study were modified and resynthesized using PSOLA. We thus obtained a set of stimuli marked either by one type of cue (either tonal or duration cues) or by both indices (Table 1). Our prediction was that listeners would show greater values of PP-choice (minor break) when perceiving an AP boundary, even when cued by preboundary lengthening values alone. Likewise, we predicted that duration cues alone would help listeners identify an ip boundary, and hence show more VP choices for this level. The results confirmed the first prediction, in that participants gave more PP responses when an AP boundary was marked either by both cues or only by duration indices, (Fig. 3), while they did not confirm the second. Specifically, for an ip-boundary to be identified, the presence of both tonal and duration cues seems to be necessary. These results are line with previous studies (Delattre, 1966; Wenk & Wioland, 1982) suggesting that duration cues are more relevant than tonal cues in French prosodic boundaries marking. The findings have implication for current models of speech processing and provide a better understanding of the specific role of acoustic cues to prosodic edge marking in French.
Figures and Tables

Fig. 1: The two sequences La nana du sauna “The girl who managed the sauna” whose the last syllable is either associated to an AP (1a) or an ip (1b) boundary.

Fig. 2: Percentages of PP-responses and VP-responses for AP and ip-conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tonal cues</th>
<th>Duration cues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP-ton</td>
<td>H°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ip-ton</td>
<td>H°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-dur</td>
<td>Ambiguous tonal cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ip-dur</td>
<td>Ambiguous tonal cues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>H°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Six types of resynthesized stimuli obtained by modification of tonal and duration cues.
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The Italian locative \textit{lì} as a Topic head and the typology of Topics  
Marco Nicolis / Université du Quebec à Montreal

1. Background. Several analyses exist of structures in which a demonstrative co-occurs with a locative deictic adverb in Romance and Germanic (e.g. Questo N qui (proximal) Quel N lì (distal) in Italian and This here N, that there N in English; Bernstein (1997), Aboh (2004), Leu (2007) a.o.). While implementations differs greatly, all these approaches are based on two underlying assumptions: a. the locative adverbial qua 'reinforcer' is parasitic on the presence of the demonstrative b. the locative 'reinforcer' is DP-internal. This is illustrated by cases like (1), ungrammatical in the Dem-less version, under the relevant non-locative interpretation.

(1) a. Ho letto {*il/questo/quel} libro {qui/lì} b. I read {*the/this/that} {here/there} book
Italian however allows for structures where the locative adverb lì can surface without an associated demonstrative, even when it is clearly not interpreted spatially.

(2) Il tipo lì...il fidazato di Maria, l'ho alla fine conosciuto
The guy there...the boyfriend of Maria, I have finally met him'
The DP 'il tipo lì' refers to a specific referent which is assumed to be part of the shared encyclopedic knowledge of speaker and hearer, but which the speaker doesn't want to or can not identify using a rigid designator.

2. Proposals & analysis. I propose that the locative adverbial \textit{lì} in structures like (2) is not DP-internal: it clearly does not 'reinforce' a Dem, as there is no Dem in the structure, but it rather realizes the head of a Topic projection in the left periphery. Supporting evidence:

A. Dem-less structures like (2) are only grammatical when the relevant DP is left-dislocated (3a vs. 3c), contrary to Dem-Reinf DPs, which are grammatical in non-Top positions as well (e.g. object position (3d))

(3) a. [\textit{Top} libro [\textit{Top} lì]]... l'ho alla fine letto b. [\textit{Top} Quel libro lì [\textit{Top} Ø]] l'ho letto
   The book there...I have finally read it That book there, I have read it
c. *Alla fine ho letto il libro lì
d. Alla fine ho letto quel libro lì
   Finally I have read the book there Finally I have read that book there

B. While Dem-Reinforcer structures are grammatical with both a proximal (qui) and a distal (lì) reinforcer in all cases, Dem-less structures are only grammatical, in the desired interpretation, with the distal adverb lì. Under the present account this immediately accounted for: lì encodes a Top head in (4a), it is not a reinforcer/deictic element, thus no alternation with qui is expected.

(4) a. Il libro {*qui/lì} ... l'ho alla fine letto b. Ho letto {questo/quel} libro {qui/lì}
   the gook {here/there} I have finally read I read {this/that} book {here/there}

Crosslinguistic support for this analysis comes from Saramaccan, which encodes Top heads overtly in most cases. Aboh (2006: fn.8) shows that the Topic marker is overtly realized in this language as \textit{dè}, which is interestingly homophonous with the nominal locative adverb \textit{dè} 'there'. Moreover, much like in the Italian cases discussed above, it can be used as a DP-internal 'reinforcer'. In the latter case it alternates with the proximal locative aki ('here')(5a).
However, the Topic marker can only be realized by the distal locative marker \textit{dè} (5b) and not the proximal aki ('here'), exactly like in Italian (see (4a)).

(5) a. Dì múa bakúba aki/dè
   Det hand banana here/there
   'The bananas here/there'
b. Dì bakúba dè mi táki táa Amato bói en
   Det banana Top 1sg say that Amato cook 3sg
   'As for that banana, I said that Amato cooked it'

C. The facts in A and B suggest that there are two different classes of Topics in Italian; a class which allows recursive stacking (6a) (Rizzi (1997), Benincà (2001), Benincà and Poletto (2004), a.o.), and the type headed by 'lì' discussed above, which strongly disallows stacking (6b):
It is important to stress that 'li-Topic' cases like (2), (3a), (6b), etc. can not be analyzed as Hanging Topics, which also can not be stacked (Cinque (1990)); in fact, a 'li-topic' can follow a bona fide a Hanging Topic; the structure is grammatical as long as there is only one 'li-topic', and only one HT.

While this state of affairs is surprising under the assumptions that Topics are always recursive in Romance, this is a familiar situation in languages in which Topic heads are typically overtly realized. Aboh (2006) shows that topics in Gunbe are moved to the left periphery where the Top head is realized by the topic marker yà. Exactly like in the Italian cases in (7), Gunbe also bans topic recursion.

D. One last piece of evidence illustrating the difference between the two Topic classes concern their different ability to refer back to 'old information'. I propose that stackable Topics are sensitive to 'old information' already introduced in discourse, while 'li-Topics' are not; they are only sensitive to shared encyclopedic knowledge between speaker and hearer. Consider the following dialogue:

(28) A: Ho letto “La Morte a Venezia” e mi è molto piaciuto
    I read “Death in Venice” and I like it a lot
B': Quel libro di Mann li, non l'ho mai letto
    That book by Mann there, I have never read
B'': #Il libro di Mann li, non l'ho mai letto
    The book by Mann there, I have never read

A introduces the DP “La Morte a Venezia” in discourse, which thus becomes 'discourse old information'. The only natural reply to A is B': the topicalized DP in B’ can refer back to the DP “La morte a Venezia”; however the one in B” can not. Structures like (28B”) pick out a specific referent which is assumed to be shared knowledge between speaker and hearer. Such knowledge is 'encyclopedic' background knowledge, as opposed to knowledge already introduced in discourse, thus the ungrammaticality.
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Reverse psych verb constructions with and without clitic doubling in Peninsular Spanish  
Chiyo Nishida / University of Texas at Austin

1. Data. It is widely accepted that the Spanish reverse psych verbs like gustar ‘to appeal/like’ take an experiencer IO and a stimuli (theme) Subject, and that the unmarked word order is IO V Subject, as shown in (1a) (Cuervo 2003, Gutiérrez-Bravo 2007; inter alia). Also widely assumed in theoretical syntax literature is that the dative clitic is obligatory in this word order; thus, (1b) is ill-formed for the lack of a clitic.

(1) a. *A Pepe gustá el fútbol  
   to Pepe appeals the football  
   ‘Football appeals to Pepe/Pepe likes football.’

The two arguments can appear in the reversed order, as shown in (2); this sentence is felicitous as a response to: a) What about football? or b) Who does football appeal to? In either case, the Subject (football) assumes the pragmatic relation topic (Lambrecht 1994).

(2) El fútbol LE gusta a Pepe.  ‘Football appeals to Pepe.’

It has been largely overlooked in previous studies, but in sentences like (2), where the Subject is preverbal, the dative clitic is not obligatory, as shown in (3). (All examples hereafter were extracted from the Spanish Royal Academy’s online corpus, Corpus de Referencia de Español Actual – CREA), focusing on Peninsular Spanish data.

(3) Les decía, además, que el fútbol Ø gusta a los grandes tenores . . .’
   ‘He would tell them, besides, that football appeals to great tenors . . .’

Sentences like this are not restricted to journalistic language but broadly found across genres in the Peninsular Spanish database. The non clitic-doubled experiencer is particularly frequent in relative clauses, where the (subject) relative pronoun serves as the topic (Lambrecht 1994), as in (4).

(4) ... y el resultado es un guión que no Ø gusta a Hitchcock, ...
   ‘...and the result is a script that does not appeal to Hitchcock,…’

Moreover, both clitic-doubled (CLD) and non clitic-doubled (NCLD) variants are equally frequent in the corpus consulted, demonstrating syntactic variation, as shown in two similar sentences, (5)&(6).

(5) Josefa habla de él todo el tiempo, un tipo que LES gusta a las mujeres...
   ‘Josefa talks about him all the time, a guy who appeals to women…’
(6) …era un rubio que Ø gustaba a las chicas ...
   ‘...he was a blond man who appealed to girls …’

2. Research questions. Using corpus data, this paper seeks to answer five questions: A. Do all psych verbs show the variation at issue?; B. What is the syntactic status of the NCLD experiencer, assuming the CLD experience is an IO (or a dative)?; C. Do a CLD sentence and a NCLD sentence differ in meaning?; D. What are the distributional differences between the two variants?; and E. Why is the dative clitic obligatory in one word order and optional in another?

3. Data collection. We selected 6 psych verbs – gustar ‘to appeal’, importar ‘to matter’, interesar ‘to interest’, encantar ‘to delight’, sorprender ‘to surprise’, and asustar ‘to frighten’ and extracted from CREA all tokens of sentences with these verbs exhibiting the Subject V IO word order. We surveyed only the Peninsular Spanish data (due to its highest volume), collecting the total of 1,490 tokens.

4. Results. Among the six verbs selected, only gustar and importar exhibited equally frequent occurrences of two variants (about 250 tokens each), whereas the rest either strongly (interesar&encantar) or predominantly (sorprender&asustar) favored the NCLD variant. We predict the syntactic variation at issue is most eminent among psych verbs that cannot alternately be used as transitive eventive verbs.

With respect to Question B, focusing on gustar and importar, we postulate that the CLD and NCLD variants are two instantiations of the same syntactic argument IO (or the dative), rather than analyzing the former as the IO and the latter as the DO accompanied by a differential object marker (DOM). Evidence for this comes from passages like (7), where a NCLD variant is “pronominalized” as a dative clitic.
Also, similar syntactic variation already exists with the recipient dative of ditransitives, as in (8)&(9).

(8) El padre Michel LE entregó a Sole una pequeña campana de bronce.

‘Father Michel gave Sole a little bronze bell.’

(9) … a su vez, Ø entregó a Cortés un collar de caracoles,....

‘… in return, he gave a necklace of shells to Cortés’

Regarding Question C, we argue that the two variants do not differ in meaning. This is supported by (10) & (11), which appeared in the same newspaper article referring to the same event.

(10) La operación que no Ø gusta a nadie. ‘The operation that does not appeal to anyone.’

(11) La operación en Chechenia no LE gusta a nadie.

‘The operation in Chichnya does not appeal to anyone.’

For Question D, we examined the nominals used in both variants in terms of their referential properties since referential effects on argument realization have been widely reported in typological studies (cf. van Lier 2012). First, we found that non pronominal DPs (Pedro, mi hijo ‘my son’, etc.) are compatible with both variants, but pronominal ones are restricted to the CLD variant, (which in general is the case with all types of verbs in Spanish). Second, the NCLD variant may occur with various kinds of nominals not directly denoting animate entities: a) institutional/organizational terms (el gobierno ‘government’), b) locational terms referring to their institutional aspect (Moscú ‘Moscow’); c) abstract terms signifying groups of individuals (la propiedad ‘the property’ to mean owners); and d) inanimates not implying animacy (la fabula ‘the fable’). None of these occurs as a CLD variant. From these results, we conclude that pronominality and animacy are critical factors for the argument realization of the IO in reverse psych verb constructions that exhibit the subject V IO order.

Regarding Question E, the analysis of the dative clitic as the head of ApplicativeP (Cuervo 2003) or as an agreement marker (Gutiérrez-Bravo 2007) does not offer a solution. Alternatively, we postulate that the dative clitic is obligatory if the IO is preverbal (just like in all other cases of the left dislocated object), but it is optional if it is postverbal (just like in exx, 8 and 9).

Finally, the syntactic variation reported here appears to be more pervasive in the Peninsular Spanish, which corroborates the observation made by Dufter&Stark (2008) that the grammaticalization of dative clitic doubling in general is in a more advanced stage in the Latin American varieties.
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Direct object expression and its semantic properties in Catalan-Spanish bilingualism
Silvia Perpiñán / The University of Western Ontario

It has recently been debated whether adult second language (L2) learners can acquire semantic features encoded through inflectional morphology. Most studies on this particular area have shown that feature reassembly into functional morphology is, if not impossible (Hawkins & Chan, 1997), a common problematic area for adult L2 learners (Lardiere, 2008; Slabakova, 2008). The present study goes beyond the adult second language acquisition context and explores this issue in a language contact situation, in Catalan-Spanish early bilingualism.

Direct Object expression in Catalan differs from that of Spanish in several ways. In this study we will focus on two morphological differences: the Differential Object Marking (DOM) and the accusative clitics *el* vs. *ho*.

Catalan, unlike Spanish, does not present the ‘personal a’ or DOM (1a, 1b). DOM is a morphosyntactic element whose distribution in Spanish is determined by several semantic features (Leonetti, 2004; 2008); in particular it is obligatory with [+animate] and [+specific] objects (1b, 1c). However, there are exceptions to this rule and certain vagueness in the criteria that regulate the use of DOM, not only in Spanish but also in other languages with DOM (Aissen, 2003). Syntactically speaking, it is proposed that DOM objects project an additional higher functional projection outside the VP (Rodríguez-Mondoñedo, 2008; Torrego, 1998).

Furthermore, Catalan morphologically differentiates accusative masculine singular clitic forms (*el*, *l’*, -*lo*, *l*) from what has traditionally been called neuter clitic *ho*, used to refer to subordinate clauses or the unspecified pronouns *això* or *allò* (‘this’ or ‘that’). However, we believe the main difference between these two forms (*-l* vs. *ho*) is not one of gender as traditionally explained, but of definiteness or specificity, as its distribution in nominal predicates (2a, 2b) seem to indicate (Roca, 1992). Thus, the clitic *ho* is not available for definite masculine objects (2c). Crucially, this semantic distinction mapped into different morphological forms does not exist in Spanish since all those forms and functions map into the clitic *lo* in Spanish.

To sum up, in the first case, it is Spanish the language with an intricate semantic system that regulates the appearance of the DOM, a morphosyntactic feature inexistent in Catalan; whereas in the second case, it is Catalan the language with a more complex morphology linked to certain semantic properties. Given these differences between Catalan and Spanish, we wonder whether Spanish-dominant early bilinguals will be able to fully acquire new functional categories and their appropriate semantic distribution in L2 Catalan, at the same time that they will have to *delearn* the use of DOM.

Sixty bilingual speakers with different degrees of language preference as measured by an exhaustive linguistic background questionnaire, the reported language use and a self-rating test completed an acceptability judgment task (AJT) and an oral production task. The AJT tested DOM in sentences with and without the *a* personal, with definite and indefinite animate objects (4 variables, 2 grammatical, 2 ungrammatical, 5 tokens each). The AJT also tested the knowledge of accusative clitics in masculine singular objects, in grammatical sentences with the clitic *el/l’* (proclisis) and *’l/-lo* (enclisis), and in ungrammatical sentences with the clitic *ho* or with no clitic (4 variables, 2 grammatical, 2 ungrammatical, 5 tokens each). This makes a total of 40 sentences targeting direct object expression in a 120-items test. The oral production task elicited sentences with direct objects in those same contexts.

Results indicated that Catalan-Spanish bilinguals, regardless of their language dominance or geographical area (metropolitan area of Barcelona or interior provinces of Catalonia), equally accepted and produced sentences with or without DOM, in definite or indefinite objects, displaying probabilistic use of DOM in...
Catalan, as previously documented in Spanish Heritage Speakers (Montrul & Bowles, 2009). On the other hand, only Catalan-dominant speakers, but not Spanish-dominant speakers were able to correctly reject ungrammatical sentences with the clitic ho referring to definite masculine objects.

Overall, these results showed convergence of Catalan with Spanish with respect to the DOM feature (cfr. Zapata, Sánchez & Toribio, 2005); whereas on the other hand, they also showed some degree of incomplete acquisition of certain morphological forms, since the L2 Catalan speakers failed to fully reclassify or create a new functional category.

Examples:

1a. En Joan buscava (*a) la Maria ahir a la tarda. **Catalan**
    The Joan looked-for DOM the Maria yesterday in the evening
1b. Juan buscaba *(a) María ayer por la tarde. **Spanish**
    Juan looked-for DOM María yesterday in the evening
    ‘John looked for Mary yesterday evening’
1c. Juan buscaba una niña ayer por la tarde. **Spanish**
    Juan looked-for a girl yesterday in the evening
    ‘John looked for a girl yesterday evening’

2a. En Joan és forner. En Joan ho és. **Catalan**
    The Joan is baker. The Joan HO is.
    ‘Joan is a baker. Joan is so.’
2b. En Joan és el forner del poble. En Joan l’é. **Spanish**
    The Joan is the baker of the town. The Joan L is
    ‘Joan is the baker of the town. Joan is so.’
2c Qui va rebre el regal? *Ho va rebre el Joan. (Correct form: el)**
    Who got the present? HO got the Joan
    ‘Who got the present? Joan got it.’

References
Several Romance languages underwent a change reversing the internal order of clitic sequences. In Italian and French, for instance, clusters containing a 1/2p dative clitic nowadays exhibit the order dative > accusative, but in origin they were characterised by the opposite order: accusative > dative.

(1) a. Je le te commande (o.Fr., Foulet 1919:149)
b. Je te le commande (m.Fr.)

Descriptively, such languages evolve from a stage in which clitic pronouns display the same order of the corresponding arguments/adjuncts to a stage in which the order of the former is the mirror image – in Baker’s sense – of the order of the latter.

Arguably, the trigger of this change was the evolution from weak to clitic pronouns, which allowed clitics (namely, X°) to left-adjoin one to the other. Building on Kayne’s Linear Correspondence Axiom (Kayne 1994:19-21), I therefore argue that the evolution from (1a) to (1b) results from a change in the syntactic configuration of the cluster: in origin, clitic sequences were split (i.e. clitics occupy different, though adjacent, positions), while nowadays they are true clusters, i.e. a single complex head:

(2) a. [ le [ te (o.Fr., split)
b. te le [ … (m.Fr., cluster)

The evolution from (2a) to (2b) did not take place simultaneously in all the Romance varieties, but nowadays the mirror order is found in almost all the Romance varieties. With sequences of 3p clitics, things are a bit more complicated, as in modern Romance their ordering is subject to cross-linguistic variation and, moreover, their morphology is subject to puzzling alterations. In Ibero-Romance and modern Italian, for instance, these clusters exhibit the mirror order (hence, dative > accusative), but the resulting combination ends up being morphologically opaque. In general, the inflected form of the 3p dative clitic, e.g. Sp. le(s), is not accepted in cluster-initial position, where it is replaced by an invariable exponent (i.e. a clitic that does not exhibit agreement or case morphology):

(3) a. se/*le lo da ‘He/she gives it to him/her/them’ (Sp.)
c. glic/*le lo dà ‘ ‘ ‘ ‘ (It.)

French departs from the other Romance languages as clusters of 3p clitics are accusative > dative (they therefore retain the archaic order) and display no synchronic irregularity. Diachronically, however, it is worth noting that the 3sg dative clitic li turned to the modern exponent lui, which, in origin, was a strong form.

(4) a. Et cil le li dient ‘and they tell it to him’ (o.Fr)
b. Et ils le lui dient ‘ ‘ ‘ (m.Fr)

My talk addresses the following questions: i. why do 1/2p clitics (and the 3p reflexive clitic) change first, while 3p clitics tend to maintain the original order? ii. why are sequences of 3p clitics morphologically opaque (while 1/2p clitics are not)? iii. why does such opacity arise in languages like Italo- and Ibero-Romance, which display the mirror order, while it is not found in French? iv. why did the Fr. clitic li turn to lui?

First, the 3p dative clitic, unlike its 1/2p counterparts, is a bimorphemic clitic, i.e. it can be analysed as a root √l- followed by an agreement marker (cf. Kayne 2000). In light of this distinction, I argue that opacity
follows because true clusters are formed via a process of root incorporation targeting a subcomponent of the dative clitic, i.e. the root expressing Person features (\(\sqrt{\{P\}}\)). Once incorporated, \(\sqrt{\{P\}}\) can no longer trigger the insertion of \(l-\) (which must be followed by a proper agreement marker) and, as a last resort, a dummy clitic like \(bi\) or \(se\) is inserted, as shown in (5). 1/2p datives, on the contrary, are monomorphemic elements and, as such, they incorporate without giving rise to opacity effects.

Following the same analysis, I argue that, in French, clusters of 3p clitics have kept the archaic order because they are still split. In other words, while in the other romance languages the dative clitic becomes ‘syntactically deficient’ (in the sense of Cardinaletti and Starke 1999) and is therefore forced to incorporate onto the accusative one, in French it does not become a fully-fledged clitic and, consequently, it is expressed by a weak exponent (\(lui\)) in a split position. This amounts to say that modern French displays two types of clitic combinations: true clusters, where 1/2p dative clitics have incorporated onto the accusative one giving rise to the mirror order in (6a), and split sequences, in (6b), which have kept the archaic syntactic structure in which the dative pronoun stands in a separate position and is therefore spelled out as a weak pronoun (noticeably, the same conclusion is reached in the synchronic study of Laenzlinger 1993):

\[
\text{(5)} \quad \left[ \sqrt{\{P\}} \right] + D^o \left[ \sqrt{\{P\}} \right] \\
* l- \rightarrow \text{bi/se} \quad \text{lo}
\]

Moreover, the hypothesis of two different syntactic configurations can account for the morpho-phonology of enclitic combinations (Laenzlinger 1994, Rooryck 1992), which exhibit the following possible combinations (the standard ones are those in (7a) and (7b')):

\[
\text{(6)} \quad \begin{array}{ll}
\text{a.} & \text{me le} \quad \ldots \quad \text{(cluster)} \\
\text{b.} & \text{le [ lui} \quad \text{(split)}
\end{array}
\]

Moreover, the hypothesis of two different syntactic configurations can account for the morpho-phonology of enclitic combinations (Laenzlinger 1994, Rooryck 1992), which exhibit the following possible combinations (the standard ones are those in (7a) and (7b')):

\[
\text{(7)} \quad \begin{array}{ccc}
\text{a.} & \text{Parle-m’en!} & \text{a’.} & \text{Donne-me-le!} \\
\text{b.} & \text{Parle[z]-en-moi!} & \text{b’.} & \text{Donne-le-moi!} \\
\text{c.} & \text{Parle-moi[z]en!} & \text{c’.} & \text{Donne-moi-le!} \\
& \text{‘talk to me about it’} & & \text{‘give it to me’}
\end{array}
\]

I argue that the pattern in (7) follow from the co-existence of true clusters, (7a/a’), and split sequences, (the others). The difference between the split configurations may lie on the fact that in (7b/b’) the clitic \(en/le\) moves with the verb crossing the weak pronoun \(moi\), while in (7c/c’) the verb moves past the whole pronominal (split) sequence.
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Raising and hyper-raising across experiencer in Brazilian Portuguese: a vP phase evidence

Carolina Petersen / University of Maryland

**Aim:** Looking at Brazilian Portuguese’s pattern of (hyper-) raising an embedded subject over an experiencer DP, I’ll focus on the asymmetry seen with respect to finite versus and nonfinite complement clauses when the embedded subject moves to the matrix Spec-TP and crosses over the experiencer WH-trace. Based on phasehood (Chomsky 2001), I’ll show a step-by-step derivation of the finite and infinitive clauses can explain why infinitive subjects, but not finite ones, can raise over an experiencer-WH trace. This shows evidence in favor of successive cyclic movement through vP strong phase edge (Legate 2003 and Sauerland 2003).

**Theoretical Background:** Null subjects in indicative clauses in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) display all the diagnostics of obligatorily controlled PRO. Based on Hornstein (2001), Ferreira (2000, 2009) and Rodrigues (2004) analyze BP’s null subjects as traces (deleted copies) of A-movement. Assuming Chomsky’s (2000, 2001) Agree-based framework, Ferreira (2000, 2009) proposes finite Ts in BP are ambiguous. It can have either a complete or incomplete set of φ-features (cf. Nunes 2008). BP came to license not only finite control, but also hyper-raising constructions (in the sentence of Ura, 1994). With this in mind, we can directly compare raising and hyper-raising in experiencer intervention context.

**Analysis:** BP’s infinitive and indicative complement of raising verbs behave alike when the dative PP prevents the embedded subject from undergoing Move to matrix [Spec, TP], as we see in (1a)&(2a). By contrast, when the dative PP is extracted out of VP via cliticization, the blocking effect is no longer found, as in (1b) and (2b) (similar to Italian and French).

(1)

a. *Os alunos parecem ao professor estar cansados
   
   *Os alunos parecem ao professor que estão cansados.
   
   The students seem to be tired.
   
   ‘The students seem to the professor to be tired.’

b. Os alunos me parecem estar cansados.

   ‘The students seem to me to be tired.’

(2)

b. *Os alunos parecem ao professor que estão cansados.

   ‘The students seem to me to be tired.’

   ‘To whom does Peter seem to be a nice person?’

b. *A quem Pedro parece ser uma boa pessoa?
   
   ‘To whom does Peter seem to be a nice person?’

Those complements behave differently when the intervener is the experiencer WH-trace. Raising the embedded subject out of infinitival complements is acceptable (cf. (3a)). In contrast, hyper-raising of a subject of an embedded finite clause is not (cf. (3b)).

(3)

a. A quem Pedro parece ser uma boa pessoa?

   ‘To whom does Peter seem to be a nice person?’

b. *A quem Pedro parece que é uma boa pessoa?

   ‘To whom does Peter seem that is a nice person?’

I argue that despite the surface similarities, the derivations of (3a) and (3b) are quite distinct. Building on Chomsky’s (2001) PIC phasehood notion, the embedded C of infinitive clauses does not constitute a strong phase, while the finite embedded C in (3b) does. The embedded subject of the infinitive clause can thus move directly from embedded Spec-TP to the matrix Spec-TP without having to stop in any
intermediate landing side on its way there. On the other hand, the embedded subject of the finite clause does have to stop at embedded Spec-CP and matrix spec-vP to be able to reach [Spec,TP] where it checks EPP, Agrees and is Case marked by a φ-complete T. As the experience-WH phrase also has to stop at the matrix Spec-vP to move out to Spec-CP position, the movement of the subject to this intermediate position is blocked, causing an intervention effect observed by the marginality of (2). This analysis shows evidence that spec-vP of raising verbs is an obligatory landing site for movement out of phase domains (Centeno & Vicente 2008). In BP this position can only be filled by one element.

Consequences: Independent evidence supports this analysis. If the intervention effect above is due not to a particular WH-experiencer construction, then any WH-element that undergoes cyclic movement should be expected to stop in phase edges of embedded C and matrix v and block the hyper-raising. That prediction is borne out (cf. (4a)). As predicted by our analysis, (4a)’s raising parallel sentence is well-formed (4b), for the embedded C is a weak phase head and allows for Spec-TP to Spec-TP movement of the subject to conform to PIC:

(4) a. */??A quem Pedro parece que vai nos apresentar amanhã?
   to whom Peter seems that will us introduce tomorrow
   ‘Who does it seem that Peter will introduce us to tomorrow?’

b. A quem parece que Pedro vai nos apresentar amanhã?
   to whom seems that Peter will introduce us the new girlfriend of his tomorrow
   ‘Who does it seem that Peter will introduce us to tomorrow?’

Second, we look at WH-questions of other simple finite embedded complement clauses in BP. It is possible to attest similar effects in finite control complements, considering the assumption outlined here to explain how the hyper-raising blocking effect is caused by the WH-extraction, However we show below that those sentences are acceptable (Ferreira 2000, 2009).

(5) A quem Pedro disse que vai nos apresentar amanhã?
   to whom Peter said that will us introduce tomorrow
   ‘Who did Peter say that he is going to introduce us to tomorrow?’

Although these facts seem to be evidence against the account proposed here, I will show that once we investigate the derivational steps of the movement of the embedded subjects of (4a) and (5) all their way to matrix Spec-TP in respectively hyper-raising and finite control, we are able to explain this contrast. The crucial difference is that Pedro in (5) receives the external argument theta role of the matrix verb dizer (‘say’) in vP before it enters into Agree relations moves to Spec-TP to be Case marked. Therefore (5) doesn’t involve successive cyclic movement through phase edges, as (4b) does.

To conclude, I propose an analysis for an asymmetry between raising/hyper-raising in BP that shows evidence for successive cyclic movement via vP-edge in the computational system. Moreover, it can also account for independent finite control and hyper-raising distinctions in this language.
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French modals *falloir* and *devoir* and antecedent determination in Control clauses
Lisa Reed & Marc Authier / Pennsylvania State University

0. **Overview:** The goal of this paper is to shed new light on the meaning and structure of sentences containing the French modal verbs *devoir* and *falloir* and to explore some important implications such an analysis holds for our understanding of Control phenomena at large. Specifically, the principle in (1) is adopted from some recent work on the syntax of Control clauses (Reed, to appear) in order to build a theory of how the reference of PRO is determined -- the principle in (2), a principle clearly informed by the extensive literature on Control, but which is in no way a simple reformulation of it. This paper, therefore, argues against a strict interpretation of both semantically-based theories of Control (cf. Bach (1979), Chierchia (1984), Dowty (1985), Sag & Pollard (1991), Jackendoff & Culicover (2003) among others) and purely syntactic accounts, such as those that derive Control from syntactic movement (cf. Bowers (1973, 2008), Hornstein (1999, 2000), Takano (2010), among others).

(1) PRO is the “minimal” N, associated with neither Case nor agreement features in the syntactic component. Its featural make-up is simply [+N], [-expletive].

(2) By default, PRO must take as its antecedent a c-commanding implicit (see (3)) or explicit argument within the superordinate clausal domain that immediately dominates the clause in which it appears, with lexical semantic specifications ruling out competing potential antecedents. When the preceding structural conditions do not obtain, PRO receives a so-called ‘arbitrary’ interpretation.

(3) An implicit argument $\alpha$ c-commands $\beta$ if the lexeme of which $\alpha$ is an implicit argument c-commands $\beta$. Williams (1985: 303)

1. **Some Empirical Facts:** English *must* can be rendered into French in at least three different ways: as *devoir* + infinitive, *falloir* + infinitive, or *falloir* + subjunctive clause. The three can neither be syntactic nor semantic equivalents, however, since the following properties distinguish them. (Further data will be introduced in the talk.) Only *falloir* + infinitive (4b) disallows complement clauses in which the embedded predicate does not select for a thematic subject:

(4) a. *Il doit y avoir du savon dans toutes les toilettes publiques.*
   b. *Il faut y avoir du savon dans toutes les toilettes publiques.*
   c. *Il faut qu’il y ait du savon dans toutes les toilettes publiques.*
   ‘There must be soap in all public restrooms.’

Substitution of an embedded thematic predicate in the preceding contexts results in ill-formedness only in the case of *devoir* (5a):

(5) a. *Il doit faire attention où on marche ici.* (*on the relevant expletive reading of *il* ‘it’)
   b. *Il faut faire attention où on marche ici.*
   c. *Il faut qu’on fasse attention où on marche ici.*
   ‘You must pay attention when walking through here.’

On deontic readings, only *falloir* + subjunctive allows the subject of its complement clause to be inanimate (6c) or quasi-expletive (7c).

(6) a. *Pour crever ce genre de pneu, un clou doit le pénétrer.*
   b. *Pour crever ce genre de pneu, il faut le pénétrer.*
      (*on the relevant reading that something, not someone, must puncture it.)
   c. *Pour crever ce genre de pneu, il faut qu’un clou le pénètre.*
      ‘In order for this tire to go flat, a nail must puncture it.’

(7) a. *Pour attraper des truites dans cette rivière, il doit faire mauvais.*
   b. *Pour attraper des truites dans cette rivière, il faut faire mauvais.*
   c. *Pour attraper des truites dans cette rivière, il faut qu’il fasse mauvais.*
   ‘In order to be able to catch trout in this river, it must rain.’
Epistemic *devoir* is subject to neither of these restrictions cf. (6a) and (7a) versus (8a,b):

(8)  
       ‘Your tire’s flat. A *nail* must have punctured it.’  
   b. *Regardez ces gros nuages noirs sur le pic là-bas. Il *doit* y pleuvoir.*  
       ‘Look at all of those dark clouds hanging over that mountain. *It* must be raining there.’

Epistemic *devoir* (9) contrasts with deontic *devoir* (10) in that only epistemic *devoir* freely accepts idiomatic complement clauses:

(9) *Quand ils ne sont pas d’accord, ces deux-là, les plumes *doivent* voler.*  
    ‘When those two don’t agree, the fur must (epistemically) really fly.’

(10) *S’ils refusent notre offre, les plumes *devront* voler.*  
    ‘If they turn down our offer, then the fur (deontically) must fly.’

2. The Analysis: *Falloir* and *devoir* are hypothesized here to be associated with the entries below:

(11) a. *falloir*  = *falloir* + subjunctive  
     Meaning: *It deontically must be the case that* *p.*  
     c-selection:  
     s-selection:  
     b. *falloir*  = *falloir* + infinitive  
     Meaning: *It is deontically required of NP that* *p.*  
     c-selection:  
     s-selection:  

(12) a. *devoir* = epistemic *devoir* + infinitive  
     Meaning: *It epistemically must be the case that* *p.*  
     c-selection:  
     s-selection:  
     b. *devoir* = Raising (non-external-theta-role assigning) deontic *devoir* + infinitive  
     Meaning: *It deontically must be the case that* *p.*  
     c-selection:  
     s-selection:  
     c. *devoir* = Non-Raising (external-theta-role assigning) deontic *devoir* + infinitive  
     Meaning: *NP deontically must p.*  
     c-selection:  
     s-selection:  

The argument structures in (11)-(12) interact with the principles in (1)-(3) to yield the properties outlined in Section 1. Here is the partial sample permitted by space constraints:

- **Accounting for the contrast involving *devoir* (4a), *falloir* (4b), and *falloir* (4c):** Only *falloir* (11b) semantically selects for an indirect object NP that may (and, in (4b) does) remain syntactically implicit. This NP bears a deontic obligation with respect to the complement clause, resulting in a semantically deviant reading in which some individual is required to “be soap in all public restrooms.”

- **Accounting for the contrast involving *devoir* (5a), *falloir* (5b), and *falloir* (5c):** The embedded predicate is now thematic. In (5c), the external theta-role is assigned to the overt NP on ‘one.’ However, following Reed (to appear), in (5a,b), the Case and phi-featureless nature of infinitival T licenses only PRO – the only NP that can be assigned a thematic role without feature valuation. By the principle in (2), PRO must take as its antecedent the c-commanding NPs in the matrix clause. As *falloir* semantically selects for an (implicit) indirect object NP that bears a deontic obligation with respect to the complement clause, this argument serves as the antecedent of PRO. Grammaticality results. The reading of (5b) in which the matrix expletive subject serves as PRO’s antecedent is ruled out as semantically deviant, due to a clash between the two N’s [+/--expletive] features. This is the only reading associated with the ungrammatical example in (5a).

- **Accounting for the contrast involving *devoir* (6a) and (7a), *falloir* (6b) and (7b), and *falloir* (6c) and (7c):** In the ungrammatical examples, syntactic considerations license only PRO. As *devoir* and *falloir* select for an argument that bears a deontic obligation with respect to the complement clause, by the principle in (2), that NP must serve as the antecedent of PRO, resulting in deviant readings in which a nail is required to puncture a tire and the weather is obliged to rain.
Prepositionless home in some Northern Italian dialects: from N to Particle (to P)

Silvia Rossi / Università Ca’ Foscari Venezia

1. It is well-known that Modern English home obligatorily appears without the directional P to, while stative at is usually—though not obligatorily—present, becoming mandatory only in adjunct PPs (’I’m eating *(at) home’). A comparable phenomenon is found also in some Northern Italian dialects (NIDs) (Venetan, Penello 2003; Bellinzonese, Cattaneo 2009), in which casa “home/house” is not introduced by a P in locative adpositions (examples from the ASIt database http://asit.maldura.unipd.it/):

(1)

a. J’ vaghi cà (Borgomanero, NO)
   I go home
b. Go da portarlo casa (Treviso)
   I have to take it home ‘I have to take it home’

Similarly, Modern Greek allows null directional Ps with both home and some other few nominals, but only home is acceptable with a null stative P (cf. Terzi to appear).

2. The major syntactic accounts of these facts attribute the exceptional behaviour of home in locative adpositions to a silent directional P which incorporates into V and takes home as its complement in a fully-fledged DP. Alternatively, home is viewed as a “light noun” moving out of its DP to SpecPP thus making the edge of PP overt and allowing P to be null (see Terzi to appear for references and discussion). As for Romance casa, Longobardi (1997, 2001) analyses it as a “construct state” noun, which moves from N° to D°, and in NIDs, where null Ps are allowed, casa can further incorporate into a null P°, yielding the cases in (1). More recently, Terzi (to appear) accounts for the Modern Greek null spatial Ps in a Split-PP framework, proposing that spiti “home” is in fact an instantiation of the otherwise silent PLACE head, which moves for lexicalization requirements to the Specs of PPLoc/PPGoal (the projections encoding stativity and directionality in the fine-grained PP):

(2)

a. Pao (sto/sti) spiti/gimnastirio/sxolio/grafio/eklisia.
   I-go (se.the-neut/fem) home/gym/school/office/church
b. [VP V [PP Goal spiti/grafio Pgoal 0 [PLoc PLoc 0 [DP/NP spiti/grafio ]]]]

3. However, some NIDs exhibit clear evidence that prepositionless home does not always behave like any other proper spatial PP. Rather, in many dialects, home has the same distributional properties of particles (Prt), such as in/out and up/down. This is the case, for instance, in Borgomanrese, a Gallo-Italic variety of north-eastern Piedmont, which, as argued in Tortora (2002), has vP-oriented clitics surfacing as enclitics to finite verbs, past participles and to some “higher” adverbs of the functional hierarchy (Cinque 1999), like anymore and already. Enclisis however does not occur on lower adverbs like always and well. Interestingly, Borgomanerese exhibits verbal enclitics on directional Ps which look like Prts, suggesting that these are hosted in a specific and rather high projection in the functional domain of the clause (Tortora 2002: 746).

(3)

a. i porti denta-la vs. *i porti-la denti
   I take in=her (’I take her in’) I take=her in
b. Al pensa da pudì purtè viggù (ASIt; Borgomanero, NO)
   He thinks of can take away=him=it ‘He thinks he can take it away from him’

Crucially, verbal enclitics are found also on ca “home” (Tortora 2002: 746), clearly suggesting that home in Borgomanerese is hosted in the same structural projection of Prts:

(4)

i porti ca-tti vs. *i porta-ti ca.
I take home=you I take=you home
Further evidence of the particle-like behaviour of *home* in NIDs comes from the fact that in some Venetan varieties, *home*—just like the Prts *in*/*out* and *up*/*down*—can be modified by another PP (5a), but this PP has to follow the Prt otherwise the sentence becomes ungrammatical (examples from Gazzolo, VR):

(5) a.  
Vo/Sto casa in leto/sul divan (cf. Vo/Sto fora in giardin)  
I.go/I.stay home in bed/on.the sofa (cf. I.go/I.stay out in garden)

b. *Vo/Sto in leto/sul divan casa (cf. *Vo/Sto in giardin fora)

4. In the light of the split-PP hypothesis, I propose an alternative analysis of prepositionless *home* in NIDs, suggesting that it should be considered a modifier within the DPPlace hosting the Ground object of P, and not an instantiation of the null PLACE head. Specifically, adopting Cinque’s (2010) PP structure, I claim that *home* is hosted in AbsViewP, a projection introducing modifiers of the Ground which indicate how the Ground is to be located w.r.t. an absolute (geographical) viewpoint, i.e., *home* may provide a prototypical viewpoint for the speaker/linguistic community much like *north* or *inland*.

(6)  
\[\text{PPdir \ [PPstat AT \ [DPPlace \ [\ldots \text{AbsViewP home} \ [\ldots \text{AxPartP [NPplace Ground DP PLACE]}}\ldots\]}\]

Following Cinque (2010:9), Prts like *up*/*down* and *in*/*out* are hosted in RelViewP, a projection right under AbsViewP, forming together with it a field for viewpoint modifiers. Under the proposal in (6), P-less *home* in NIDs is structurally similar to, i.e. is in the same position of, locative adverbs like *out*/*in* and *up*/*down*. This claim is further supported by cross-linguistic evidence—together with the fact that P-less *home* is in complementary distribution with the typical RelViewP adverbs. As viewpoint modifiers in the higher portion of DPplace, *home* and *up*/*down*/*in*/*out* can remain inside their PP, thus forming fully-fledged adverb(ial)s or, in the case of (1), (3-5) they can move as weak adverbs, i.e., Prts, out of their PPs into a dedicated projection in the functional domain of the clause (cf. Koopman 2000 on Dutch Prts moving out of their PP).

5. As to why *home* can be hosted in AbsViewP, I suggest that this is a direct consequence of its being a “construct state” noun (Longobardi 1997, 2001): *home*—clearly originated as the Ground/DP object of P—can move as a bare element from *N°* to *D°*, thus entailing the presence of an overt/understood genitive argument. By virtue of this genitive argument, *home* becomes a perfect candidate for AxPartP, the lowest modifier projection of DPPlace directly above the Ground, which hosts lexical Ps indicating how the Ground is to be put in relation to the Theme (=the subject/object to be located). Once entered the modifier layer of the DPPlace, *home* can move further up to AbsViewP becoming an adverb/Prt, and in some cases, grammaticalises even more by moving up into the PP functional field (*PPStat/PPEnd*) to become a proper P, cf. French *chez*.
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Marsican Deixis and the Indexical Nature of Syntax
Mario Saltarelli / University of Southern California

1. The issues and the problem
Regarding the range of deictics, the philosophy of language (Kaplan 1989) proposes a context-of-utterance theory of demonstratives, while the syntactic phrase in which the deictic is uttered is not of concern. Generative grammars since Abney (1986), on the other hand, account for demonstratives in a syntactic DP hypothesis, in which the context-of-utterance (indexicality) has not played a crucial role for the theory of syntax (but cf. Baker 2008; Giorgi 2010). The general goal of this paper is a unification account of the philosopher’s ‘context’-semantics and the linguist’s syntactic ‘content’. The empirical goal is a descriptive account-by-derivation of Marsican ad-nominal and ad-verbal deictics in parallel domains.

2. The Marsican paradigm.
Marsican deixis encodes morpho-syntactically the three-term/three-value speaker-oriented system of Latin and Basque for adnominal and adverbial categories (cf. p. 2). Note the grammaticalization of Count, Gender and Number. Note also a unique, social gender driven, diglossia (p.2, 1c, i-ii.) This paper claims that the functional interpretation of the system is more precisely accounted for under a higher order intentional speech act purview, which encodes the Speaker>Hearer as an irreflexive indexical relation in time and space. This relation, we propose, accounts for the (*)agrammaticality of both ad-nominal and ad-verbal deictics:

(1)  a. lîgge ste/*’sse libbre ècche/*èsse/*lôche! (intended in concord with the Speaker)
    b. lîgge*ste/ss e libbre *ècche/èssë/*lôche! (intended in concord with the Hearer)
‘read this/that book here/there/(yonder’).

(2) interface:
    a. indexical +Speaker +Hearer -S,H (“proximal, distal”)
    b. morphosyntactic 1st Person 2nd Person 3rd Person
        quîste > quîsse quîse (Marsican P.)
        hic iste ille (Latin)
        hau hori hur (Basque)

3. Toward a unified indexical syntax of deixis.
It will be argued, first, that the internalized (i.e.,I-language) interface system of deixis (2) requires, as a conceptual necessity, access to indexical properties (2,a) for an adequate descriptive account of bare (Kaplan 1989) and complex (King 2001) demonstratives. Secondly, in a forward-oriented generative system (Chomsky 2001-2008), the externalized (i.e., E-language) computation of both ad-verbial (1a ‘VP-adjunct’) and ad-nominal (2,b NP ‘determiner’) deictics requires indexical access for an explanatory account.

A preliminary proposal toward a unified indexical syntax will be presented, which responds to studies in the philosophy of language (Kaplan 1989, Schlenker 2003) as well as the syntax of parallel domains (Liao&Vergnaud 2010).
## 4. The paradigm of Marsican spatial demonstratives

Pescasseroli (L’Aquila), western Abruzzo

(1) Form and function in adnominal and adverbial deictic phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinate</th>
<th>Count N (m.)</th>
<th>Count N (f.)</th>
<th>-Count N (m.)</th>
<th>Num</th>
<th>Adverb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Speaker</td>
<td><em>(qui)ste ['kwista] cane</em></td>
<td><em>(qué)sta['kwésta]mane</em></td>
<td><em>(quéste['kwéste]pane</em></td>
<td>Ecche</td>
<td>'here'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘this dog’</td>
<td>‘this hand’</td>
<td>‘this bread’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(qui)šche['kwifka]cane</em></td>
<td><em>(qué)šte['kwésta]mane</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘these dogs’</td>
<td>‘these hands’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Hearer</td>
<td><em>(qui)ssé['kwisa] cane</em></td>
<td><em>(qué)ssa['kwesa] mane</em></td>
<td><em>(quésse['kwessa]pane</em></td>
<td>èsse</td>
<td>‘there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘that dog’</td>
<td>‘that hand’</td>
<td>‘that bread’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(quišše ['kwıscala] cane</em></td>
<td><em>(quıšša ['kwıscala] mane</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘those dogs’</td>
<td>‘those hands’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)(i) -S,H</td>
<td><em>(quí'n ['kwısa] cane</em></td>
<td><em>(quéla ['kwela] mane</em></td>
<td><em>(quéle ['kwele] pane</em></td>
<td>lóche</td>
<td>‘there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘that dog’</td>
<td>‘that hand’</td>
<td>‘that bread’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)(ii) Diglossia</td>
<td><em>(quiła ['kwıła] cane</em></td>
<td><em>(quilà ['kwıła] mane</em></td>
<td><em>(quilà ['kwıła] pane</em></td>
<td>lóche</td>
<td>‘there’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘that dog’</td>
<td>‘that hand’</td>
<td>‘that bread’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>(quígle ['kwıłe] cane</em></td>
<td><em>(quıgle ['kwıłe] mane</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘those dogs’</td>
<td>‘those hands’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dèccueta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dèsta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-S,H</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dèllela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Convergence in feature mapping: Evidentiality, aspect and nominalizations in Quechua-Spanish bilinguals

Liliana Sánchez / Rutgers University

Reportative evidentiality (hearsay information) has emerged as part of the verbal paradigm of Spanish in contact with different Quechua languages. It is encoded as the pluperfect (Klee & Ocampo 1995, Escobar 1997, Sánchez 2004 inter alia) or as the present perfect (Escobar 1994). Grammatical encoding of reportative evidentiality on the verb coexists with the use of discourse-level particles such as dice (Escobar 1997, Sanchez 2004):

(1) Le había encontrado un pajarito amarillo, dice.
   “(She) found a yellow bird” (Hearsay information)

In (1) the pluperfect occurs in a sentence in which the event referred to may have taken place in the recent past and crucially this is an event for which the speaker has no direct evidence.

Morphological marking of reportative evidentiality is found in all varieties of Quechua where reportative evidentiality is marked on the subject with the suffix –s and in the reparative past tense morpheme -sqa:

(2) Pay-kuna-s taksa hamp’atu-ta qhawa-sqa-ku
   S/he-PL-REP/FOC medium frog-ACC look-PAST REP-PL
   “They looked at the medium sized frog” (Hearsay information, wide focus)

This indicates that some type of convergence in evidentiality, tense, aspect and mood features (E/TMA) is taking place in Spanish in contact with Quechua. Convergence in language contact contexts raises the issue of how do features come together to form larger structures (Adger and Svenonius 2009) that are associated with syncretic morphology (Giorgi and Pianesi 1996) in bilinguals. Language contact situations are especially relevant to understand this process since in them two feature systems coexist and allow for re-mapping of bundles of features onto morphology (Lefebvre 1988, Lardiere 1998, inter alia).

Cases such as (1) have been analyzed as evidence of convergence between Quechua and Spanish features in a matrix of functional features that includes, in addition to tense and aspect features, evidentiality features (Sanchez 2004). This matrix of features is mapped onto the syncretic Tense/Mood/Aspect (TMA) morphology of Spanish. Evidentiality in (1) is an uninterpretable feature in the C-domain that agrees with a complex syncretic T head:

(3) \[[CP \text{ Evid} \ldots [TP [VP \text{ había encontrado}]]]]

While this mechanism may account for the checking of the evidentiality features it does not provide evidence of how the mapping of features onto morphology takes place. Furthermore there is dialectal variation in the mapping. Adelaar and Musyken (2004) note that, reportative values are conveyed by the pluperfect (había sido ‘had been) in Southern Andean Spanish (Peru and Bolivia) and by the present perfect (ha sido ‘has been’) in Northern varieties (Ecuador). Additionally, while the morphological expression of reportative evidentiality has been extensively documented, the mapping onto Spanish morphology of its opposite value, attested evidentiality (first hand information), figures less prominently in the literature.

In this paper, I present a study that aims at answering the following questions about the emerging encoding of evidentiality, tense and aspect in Spanish in contact with Quechua:
a) How do discourse conditions affect the mapping of tense, aspect and evidentiality features onto Spanish TMA verbal morphology in bilingual speech?

b) Does contact with different dialects of Quechua generate differences in feature mapping onto Spanish morphology in bilingual speech?

In order to answer these questions, a study was conducted to elicit oral narratives from adult early Quechua-Spanish bilingual speakers from the Huánuco region, a community with low levels of formal instruction (N= 15, ages 24-69) and from adult early bilingual speakers (N= 15, ages 18-30) from the Cuzco region with high level of formal instruction (complete secondary education or college). The narratives were elicited in Quechua and in Spanish using a picture-based story telling task. It was hypothesized that contact with Quechua would result in similar patterns of crosslinguistic influence in Spanish that would show similar verb forms indicating attested evidentiality given the shared view of the sequence of pictures by the interviewer and the participant. In this talk I will report on the Spanish data only.

The data show that speakers of the Huánuco region made extensive use of present progressive forms in both languages. New periphrastic verbs forms in Spanish were found such as imminent progressives (4) and passives with estar+participle+ DO as in (5):

(4) El tortuga (es)tá queriendo caer del canoa
The turtle beASP want-PROG fall off the canoe
‘The turtle is about to fall off the canoe’

(5) El muchacho está cruzado su mano.
The boy is crossed his hand(s).
‘The boy has his hands crossed’

The Cuzco group, on the other hand shows low percentages of progressive forms and both imperfective and perfective forms in their Spanish narratives.

An independent samples mean test showed that the distribution of past forms among Cuzco Spanish speakers (22.3 avg) and Huanuco Spanish speakers (5.26 avg) was significantly different (p=0.002). There were also statistically significant differences in the distribution of present progressive forms between both groups (Cuzco, 1.37 avg; Huanuco 19.46 avg, p= 0.000). No significant evidence of hearsay particles such as dice or specific verbal forms for attested values were found for either group. While Huánuco Quechua speakers interpreted the task as a description and used the progressive forms as a way to convey shared information and estar+participle+ DO to convey a resultative interpretation, Cuzco speakers approached the task as a narration and used a wider range of past forms in Quechua and a wide range of past forms (perfective and imperfective) in Spanish. Structures (4) and (5) are indicative a description. In (5), the participle cruzado “crossed” is analyzed as a nominalization of the Quechua type that is the complement of an aspectual head. The resultative interpretation emerges from the interaction of the verb estar ‘to be+aspect’ and the nominalization.

These findings suggest that, while previous studies have established that contact with Quechua is an important factor in the mapping of Evidentiality, Tense and Aspect systems onto TMA morphology in contact varieties of Andean Spanish, changes in how discourse conditions are interpreted for the same task may yield different mapping results depending on the level of formal instruction of the speakers. These facts favor an analysis of online mapping of ETMA features onto bilingual Spanish morphology that is based on feature matrix formation according to discourse task.
Phonological vowel reduction is a process that affects the acoustic characteristics of unstressed vowels (Fourakis, 1991). Much of our current understanding of the phenomenon stems from the spectrographic analyses of Lindblom (1963) and Delattre (1969). Since then, there has been steady interest in considering phonological vowel reduction across languages (see, for example, Liljencrants & Lindblom, 1972; Daur, 1980; Flege & Bohn, 1989; van Bergen, 1993; Johnson & Martin, 2001). Recently, Crosswhite (2004) and Flemming (2005) have attempted to formalize our understanding of vowel reduction in theoretical terms by offering a phonetically-based phonological account. Crosswhite (2004) chooses to frame her analysis in an OT framework and views vowel reduction in terms of sonority; Flemming (2005)’s work is an extension of Liljencrants & Lindblom’s (1972) model of vowel inventory and incorporates aspects of the prosodic and segmental contexts of vowels.

Though vowel reduction is relatively common across many languages (Crosswhite, 1999), its existence (and use) is not fully understood with specific regard to Spanish. Whereas some researchers (Sebastián-Gallés et al, 1992) suggest vowel reduction in Spanish does not exist, others (Lipski, 1990) note that it does, but in only two varieties, namely in Northern and Central Mexican Spanish and Andean Spanish. Previous studies (Canellada & Zamora Vicente, 1960; Lope Blanch, 1963) have simply noted the phenomenon impressionistically. Delforge (2008) was the first to offer a spectrographic analysis specifically detailing unstressed vowel reduction in Andean Spanish. As such, we currently have very little understanding about this phenomenon in Spanish, beyond Delforge’s (2008) seminal study on Andean Spanish.

The current study is novel in three distinct ways. First, it builds on Delforge’s (2008) work by conducting a spectrographic analysis on empirical data for a previously untested variety of Spanish, namely Guatemalan Spanish. Second, it is the first to use laboratory data, as opposed to the conversational data found in Delforge’s (2008) study. Third, it is the first to test phonetically-based phonological models (i.e. those proposed by Crosswhite (2004) and Flemming (2005)) with empirical data for vowel reduction in Spanish.

With regard to experimental design, I analyze the acoustic properties of unstressed vowels from a corpus that includes twenty-five speakers from Guatemala City, Guatemala; unstressed vowels are analyzed spectrographically using Speech Analyzer 2.7. Participant recordings are in MPEG format at a sample rate of 22,050 Hz and sample size of 16-bit. Each participant read a paragraph containing a maximum of 605 tokens per participant. F1 and F2 frequencies were measured, which included measuring the distance between F1 and F2 for both stressed and unstressed vowels to test vowel centralization.

Preliminary data results suggest that unstressed vowel reduction in Guatemalan Spanish is similar to Andean Spanish in that reduction is more likely to occur with high vowels (i.e. /i/ and /u/) and much less likely to occur in back vowels (i.e. /a/). In addition, devoicing and elision, in the case of the back vowel, /a/, are evidenced, as well. In theoretical terms, preliminary data suggest that phonological vowel reduction in Guatemalan Spanish is best viewed as a ‘contrast-enhancing category’ (Crosswhite, 2004). That is, the process occurs in unstressed vowels to avoid ‘perceptually challenging vowel qualities’ (Crosswhite, 2004: 225) evident in the stressed vowel. The study concludes with discussion on Crosswhite’s (2004) claim that devoicing and elision are common traits of stress-timed languages and re-considers the ‘syllable-timed language’ categorization for Spanish.
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Language variation and language acquisition are necessary ingredients for language change. We know that variation that affects the realization of functional vocabulary items can lead to grammar competition and language change. But we also know that variation itself can be learned (Smith et al 2009) and sustained through many generations. In this paper we provide acquisition evidence that input variability can give rise to two different performance signatures, one consistent with grammar competition and the other consistent with varying processing costs. Although we can only speculate when language change will happen, we argue that one signature provides at least the necessary conditions, while the other does not.

**Acquisition background:** Miller and Schmitt 2009, 2011, 2012 (M&S) have argued that variability that causes ambiguity has an impact in acquisition (as predicted by Yang’s 2004 variational hypothesis). They showed that Mexican-Spanish-speaking children, who are exposed to variable realization of plural morphology, much earlier than Chilean-Spanish children, who are exposed to variable realization of plural morphology. Similar claims have been made by Castro & Ferrari Neto 2007: European Portuguese-speaking children, exposed to categorical input, performed better than Brazilian Portuguese-speaking children, a dialect with variable realization of number morphology. Although the sources of variation are different and the potential reliability of the forms is different (a low-level lenition process in ChS and a morpho-syntactic process in BrP), in both cases it is clear that variability affects the acquisition timeline.

**Question and hypotheses:** In this paper we depart from the assumption that variability can affect the acquisition of grammatical morphology, and we ask whether the BrP variability in the realization of number morphology have the same impact as it does in ChS. We hypothesize that variation can (i) lead children to entertain a non-adult grammar and show a systematic pattern of responses or (ii) lead children to be less efficient processors of grammatical morphology, causing a variable pattern of responses within an individual subject depending on the task.

**Linguistic background** Unlike Mexican Spanish, Chilean Spanish and Brazilian Portuguese have a variable realization of plural morphology (Table 1 provides numbers for dialects tested experimentally). In comparison with ChS, BrP rates of omission are slightly lower and the source of variation is different. While ChS variability is a consequence of a variable rule that weakens syllable-final /s/ which can be weakened to [h] or to Ø ((Miller 2007; Cepeda 1995), the variation in BrP results in [s] or Ø and is the consequence of a rule that targets agreement (Pereira & Scherre 1995, Koelling 2004). Importantly though, the overall distribution of the variation is fairly similar in both languages: determiners tend to show more number marking than nouns and the variation is sensitive to education and class distinctions.

**Experiments:** Mexican, Chilean and Brazilian working class (WC) children were tested using the same experiments (see Tables 1 & 3 for subjects). For the indefinites, an act-out experiment asked children to place uma/una NP (an NP) or umas/unas NP (some NPs) in a box (8 experimental items). For the definites, we replicate Munn et al 2005’s act-out experiment asking children to give the toy/toys next to the house to the experimenter (8 experimental items) in a scenario as in Figure 1. Importantly, while the indefinite experiment only requires the use of [s] to distinguish singular vs. plural, the definite determiner experiments are harder. For the definite singular interpretation to be felicitous children must impose an implicit restriction to the definite (as in the closest to the house), otherwise only the plural interpretation is felicitous (as there are 3 toys next to the house).

**Results and Discussion:** BrP and MexS speaking children can use plural morphology in indefinite NPs in contrast to ChS children whose answers are biased towards the singular interpretation (Table 2). Table 3 shows the distribution of subjects by response types. Most subjects either use or do not use number morphology. Very few have mixed-type responses. Tables 4 & 5 show the responses for the experiments with the definite determiner. The definite NPs experiment biased children towards the plural interpretation
(without the implicit restriction). The main error is treating the singular definite as a plural. In the singular definite, 50% of BrP children have mixed responses, sometimes answering with a singleton and sometimes with a plurality, unlike the Chilean children. The results suggest that the impact of variation in BrP children is milder and seems to cause more of a processing load when the task is more complex (definite singular) but there is no evidence that BrP children have a non-adult grammar at this point, since they have no problem with the indefinite plural. ChS children’ systematic responses in both experiments, on the other hand, show that children are still entertaining a non-adult grammar.

Table 1: % Distribution of plural morphology in the adult language

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Chilean Spanish (Miller 2007)</th>
<th>Brazilian Portuguese (Koelling 2004)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%Determiner</td>
<td>%Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[s,h]</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: % correct Indefinites in ChS & BrP in comparison to MexS-speaking children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>% Indefinite plural</th>
<th>% Indefinite singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MexWC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3;09-5;11</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChWC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4;01-6;01</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrWC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3;9-5;9</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Plural indefinites: distribution of subjects according to response types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%Subjects Singletons</th>
<th>%Subjects Pluralities</th>
<th>Mixed: Pl+Sg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MexWC</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChWC</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrWC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: % correct definites in ChS & BrP in comparison to MexS-speaking children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>%Definite plural</th>
<th>%Definite singular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MexWC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3;06-6;02</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChWC</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4;00-4;07</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrWC</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3;9-5;9</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: % Plural indefinites: distribution of subjects according to response types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Group</th>
<th>% Definite singular</th>
<th>% Definite plurals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sing</td>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Sg+Pl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MexC</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ChC</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BrC</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Give me the frog(s) next to the house
The alternation between present and absent subject personal pronouns in Spanish (e.g. *yo bailo ~ bailo*) has been so widely studied that Bayley et al. (2012) have recently called it the ‘showcase variable’ of Spanish sociolinguistics. Nevertheless, very few studies have examined this feature in the developing grammars of Spanish-speaking children. The wealth of information available regarding adult patterns of Spanish subject pronoun use make this an ideal feature for examining when and how children’s patterns of usage come to mirror those of adults.

A remarkable finding from variationist studies of Spanish-speaking adults’ use of subject pronouns is that, even though rates of pronoun use vary, patterns of usage are similar across dialects and settings (e.g. Cameron 1992, 1993; Flores-Ferrán 2002, Otheguy & Zentella 2012, Ortiz López 2010, Torres-Cacoullos & Travis 2010). In general, pronouns are expressed more often a) when referring to singular subjects (e.g. *yo ‘I’*) than plural ones (e.g. *nosotros ‘we’*), b) when the referent of two consecutive grammatical subjects is different (*switch-reference*) than when it is the same, c) with verbs in the imperfect tense than with verbs in the preterit, and d) with cognitive verbs like *creer* ‘to think’ than with other types of verbs. The patterns of adult pronoun use are probabilistic in nature, since either choice – the inclusion or the omission of the pronoun – is acceptable in the contexts studied.

The question that arises for researchers of language acquisition, then, is when and how children converge on this probabilistic component of language production. The current study investigates the variable use of subject pronouns in child Spanish by employing variationist sociolinguistic methodology, closely following Otheguy & Zentella (2012). Over 2,500 verbs were extracted from sociolinguistic interviews conducted with 24 monolingual Spanish-speaking children in Oaxaca, Mexico, ages six to eight years old (mean age 7;0). Comparisons of the children’s patterns and those found in studies of adults (Otheguy & Zentella 2012) revealed both differences and similarities. On the one hand, the children used far fewer pronouns than adults typically do. The children’s abundant subjectless verbs sometimes resulted in ambiguity in reference, corroborating findings in Shin & Cairns (2012). On the other hand, for the cases in which reference was unambiguous, children’s patterns of pronoun usage were strikingly similar to those of adults. For these cases, a multivariate analysis was performed using present versus absent subject pronouns as the dependent variable and the following four independent predictor variables: 1) Person/number of the verb; 2) Switch-reference; 3) Tense, mood, and aspect of the verb; and 4) Lexical semantics of the verb. All four predictor variables significantly predicted the children’s alternation between present and absent pronouns. Moreover, the predictor variables were ranked in exactly the same order for the children as they are for adults. In sum, the study shows that Spanish-speaking children use fewer subject pronouns than adults do, but when they do include pronouns, their patterns of usage resemble those of adults. Therefore, the findings in this study are suggestive of a conservative learning pattern, whereby children introduce new forms into their discourse in a constrained fashion (Boyd & Goldberg 2012, Tomasello 2003).
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French *wh* in situ

*Ur Shlonsky / Université de Genève*

*Wh* in situ in French is optional, (1), but barred from subject position (Koopman 1983). This is not easy to show, given the string vacuity of movement to the left periphery of a preverbal subject, but several empirical arguments are brought to bear on this point, among which the ungrammaticality of *quoi* in subject position and the distribution of the discourse particle *ça*, Cheng & Rooryck (2000), both of which are only possible in situ.

*Wh* in situ is grammatical in complement clauses, both finite, (3a), and non-finite, (4a) (contra e.g., Bošković (2000), Cheng & Rooryck (2000),) but not in indirect questions, (3b), (4b). This distributional pattern is not unique to French. It shows up in many unrelated languages which have optional, as opposed to obligatory *wh* in situ (Sabel (1998), Sabel & Zeller (2006).) My hypothesis is that these distributional restrictions are traceable to the fact that optional *wh* in situ (OWIS) involves movement of a minimal lexical item.

Evidence for movement comes from intervention effects, well-documented in e.g., Mathieu (1999) and Starke (2001). Since the *wh* phrase does not move overtly, the question arises as to what exactly does move. OWIS is blocked by c-commanding negation, a diagnostic for movement of non-arguments (Rizzi (1990)). Perhaps, then, the target of movement is the *wh* feature and not the phrase containing it. Feature movement in the sense of Chomsky (1995), Pesetsky (2000) is formally indistinguishable from Agree (Roberts (2010)), but it is useful to maintain the distinction between Agree and Move, be it only for the fact that they are subject to different locality restrictions. Suppose, then, that there is no feature movement but only movement of phrases and of lexical items (LIs). In OWIS, the target of movement is a LI composed of the *wh* feature (and, where *D*-linked *wh* is involved, whatever feature(s) characterize *D*-linkedness), plus a minimal set of features necessary for the identification of the *wh* expression as a LI (in the sense of Chomsky's work from 2002 onwards). The moved part of e.g., *qui* 'who' is [N (or D), WH, HUMAN] and that of *quel linguist* 'which linguist' is [WH, M, S], etc.

*Wh* in situ is barred from subject position by Criterial Freezing (CF) (Rizzi (2010), Rizzi & Shlonsky (2007)): An element which satisfies a Criterion (here, the Subject Criterion,) is frozen and cannot move further. Although sub-extraction from the subject position is perhaps marginally possible, Obenauer (1994) - on the condition that the moved sub-constituent is featurally-independent of the criterial subject feature - the minimal LI moved in *wh* in situ structures has both phi and categorial features in addition to [WH] and thus participates in the criterial relation. Hence, no movement is possible from subject position and a *wh* in situ is ruled out.

In indirect questions, *wh* is targeted by $\text{Foc}^0$ in the embedded left periphery. In its turn, $\text{Foc}^0$ is probed by interrogative Force (the technical implementation of which is fairly controversial.) Overly moved *wh* is a phrase which goes into Spec/Foc, satisfying the Wh-Criterion. $\text{Foc}^0$, the criterial probe, is unfettered and can be probed by $\text{Forceo}$. In situ *wh* however, involves movement of a LI, not a phrase, which incorporates to $\text{Foc}^0$, thus satisfying the Wh-Criterion. $\text{Foc}^0$ is a criterial probe which comes to *contain* the criterial goal. It thus becomes criterially-frozen. CF should, I believe, be strengthened from a ban on movement to a ban on probe-ability: It is as if CF sends the criterial goal to the interface right away, even if the (strong) phase is not complete, (although the consequences of that are only evaluated once the phase is complete.) *Wh* in situ in root clauses is possible because unselected $\text{Forceo}$ never actually reaches the interfaces, as only the complement of a phase head undergoes Transfer.

To conclude, *wh* in situ in OWIS languages involves *wh*-movement, although neither of a *wh*-phrase nor of a *wh* feature. This idea, coupled with an explicit implementation of CF, yields an explanation for the distribution of French *wh* in situ.
(1) a. Tu as vu qui?
   you have seen who

(2) a. Tu as fait quoi?
   you have done what?

(3) a. Tu penses que Jean a vu qui?
   you think that Jean has seen who

(4) a. Tu penses parler à qui?
   you intend to speak to whom?

   b. Quii, tu as vu t?
   who you have seen

   b. *Quoi flotte dans l'eau?
   what floats in the-water

   b. *Tu te demandes Jean a vu qui.
   you wonder Jean has seen who

   b. *Tu te demandes parler à qui.
   you wonder to speak to whom
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Gender agreement with animate nouns in French

Petra Sleeman / University of Amsterdam
Tabea Ihsane / University of Geneva

1. Aim: This paper focuses on gender agreement phenomena in French and examines contexts little discussed in the literature, where agreement takes place between an animate noun and various elements outside the strict DP (1-4). What we show is that in such examples gender agreement differs from gender agreement inside DP. Our proposal is that, in some cases, gender on the root can be overridden by a supplementary interpretable gender feature on n.

2. Background: Whereas in English there are no gender distinctions for the noun, in Romance masculine and feminine nouns can be distinguished, both for animate and inanimate nouns. Although for inanimate nouns gender is always arbitrary, for animate nouns grammatical gender does not always correspond to semantic gender, as illustrated by French: *la sentinelle* (f.) ‘the sentinel’ and *le médecin* (m.) ‘the doctor’, for example, can both refer to men and women. To account for the dual behavior of nouns (arbitrary or semantic gender), it has been proposed in recent literature (Kramer 2009; Atkinson 2012) that gender is not expressed in a single position within DP (e.g. on the root as in Alexiadou 2004 or on n as in Lowenstamm 2008) but in two positions: (i) on the root as an uninterpretable feature accounting for arbitrary/grammatical gender (*le magasin* (m.) ‘the shop’; *la sentinelle* (f.) ‘the sentinel’) and (ii) on the head of nP as an interpretable feature accounting for semantic gender (*une chatte* (f.) ‘a (female) cat’; *une enfant* (f.) ‘a (female) child’; *un enfant* (m.) ‘a (male) child’). Determiners and adjectives agree with the [+feminine] feature on n (*une chatte* (f.) *blanche* ‘a white cat’) or with the gender feature on the root (*un vieux magasin* (m.) ‘an old shop’, *la malheureuse sentinelle* (f.) ‘the poor sentinel’). In the case of a non-specified noun, like *un enfant* ‘a (male or female) child’, the determiner and the adjective agree with the root, which gets default masculine gender.

3. Data: This analysis seems to account nicely for the local agreement between D, adjectives, and noun in D-A-N or D-N-A configurations. In this paper, however, we scrutinize this approach to determine whether it also accounts for less local agreement, i.e. agreement between the noun (phrase) and a predicate or a pronoun outside the strict DP. To do so, we focus on animate nouns with an unspecified gender feature on n:

(1) *Le plus jeune /La plus jeune de mes chers enfants (j’ai deux fils et une fille) s’appelle Nina.*

‘The name of the youngest of my sweet children (I have two sons and a daughter) is N.’

(2) *De tous les mannequins, seul le plus jeune / seule la plus jeune – Mélanie – parle bien l’anglais.*

‘Among all the models, only the youngest one – Mélanie – speaks English well.’

(3) *Voilà mon ancien professeur de français. Elle/*Il s’appelle Mme Lagarde.*

‘Here is my former professor of French. Her name is Mrs Lagarde.’

(4) *Mon ancien professeur de français était toujours contente de mon travail. Elle vient de partir à la retraite.*

‘My former French teacher was always satisfied with my work. She just retired.’
What we observe is that when \( n \) is unspecified for semantic gender, the gender feature on the root can be overridden (1-2), must be overridden (3-4), or cannot be overridden (5).

4. Analysis: We propose an account for the data within a locality theory of agreement, according to which locality conditions on agreement may be more or less strict depending on the kind of agreement (Chomsky 1995, 2001, 2008, Rizzi 1990). Moscati & Rizzi (2011) test the hypothesis that locality ranking has a predictive power on the order of acquisition, in that a more local agreement process (D-A-N) is fully mastered earlier than less local agreement, such as S-V agreement or clitic – past participle agreement. We argue that locality also has predictive power in the case of agreement with animate nouns. Whereas subject-verb agreement and past participle agreement show that locality conditions may be more or less strict depending on the kind of agreement, on the basis of our data we show, on the other hand, that agreement may be more or less strict depending on the degree of locality and some features of the noun.

The analysis of agreement within the (French) DP put forth by Atkinson (2012) seems to be limited to local agreement within the strict DP: determiners/quantifiers/adjectives agree with the gender feature on the root or with the gender feature on \( n \). If agreement takes place with an element outside the strict DP, i.e. when it is less local, we claim that, in French, gender on the root can be overridden by a supplementary interpretable gender feature on \( n \) (1-4). One such less local relation is agreement in a partitive construction: in (1), agreement with the root of the non-specified noun with default masculine gender does not necessarily take place. This shows that Atkinson’s analysis only applies to the strict DP (mes chers enfants), but not to its expansion in the partitive construction. In (2), agreement with a constituent outside the complement of the partitive construction can take place. In other cases where agreement takes place with an element outside the (strict) DP and is thus less local, gender on the root must (3-4) or cannot (5) be overridden by an additional gender feature on \( n \).

5. Conclusion: Our data suggest that, besides locality, what plays a role in gender agreement is: (i) an uninterpretable feature on the root, which makes gender on an agreeing pronoun, as in (5), also uninterpretable, (ii) default gender on the root, which can be overridden by a supplementary interpretable gender feature on \( n \), at least for non-local agreement. Data such as the feminine variant of (1-2) and (3-4) suggest that with respect to agreement, not either \( n \) or the root takes part in the checking relation, as in Atkinson’s analysis, but that agreement can take place with both of them at the same time. We argue that this is possible, because of valuation and the interpretable/uninterpretable character of the gender feature (Pesetsky & Torrego 2007). A feature on the root is always valued, i.e. specified (masc or fem) or default masculine, and uninterpretable. Checking is local. A valued gender feature on \( n \) and the root enters a local agreement relation with D and A within the strict DP. However, a non-specified, interpretable gender feature on \( n \) (the root having a masculine default gender feature), can (1-2) or must (3-4) get a specific value, depending on the distance from the feature sharing constituent. The French data suggest thus that agreement can take place in a cyclic way.
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Some Notes on the Syntax of Imposter DPs in Two Romance Languages

Gabriela Soare / University of Geneva

English, like many other languages, has a class of expressions that while denoting the speaker or the addressee have the syntactic form of a standard 3rd person DP but crucially present alternations in pronominal phi-features which do not correlate with any truth conditional differences (see (1) taken from Collins & Postal 2012). In (1), the reflexive pronoun can either be 3PL, agreeing with the antecedent this reporter and his son, or 1PL. Labelling them (person) imposters, Collins & Postal (2012) (henceforth C&P) argue in favour of a syntactic analysis of the English imposters in (1), and of the cases in (2) showing similar behaviour.

C&P show that an imposter has a complex structure made up of an upper DP part (=shell) which is 3rd person and a subpart DP (=core) containing a covert 1st or 2nd person pronoun. The imposter complex DP is anteceded by AUTHOR (or ADDRESSSEE) in the left periphery of the clause (3) (see also Bianchi 2003, 2009 on person as logophoric centre; Sigurdsson 2004, a.o.). In C&P’s system, the reflexive can take its phi-feature values from the immediate antecedent (primary source), hence 3PL pronominal agreement, or from the ultimate antecedent of the reflexive, AUTHOR and this accounts for 1PL pronominal agreement.

This paper proposes an account of the behaviour of imposer DPs in Romanian and French which are a good testing ground given their rich verbal morphology. Adopting C&P’s idea that imposters DPs contain an embedded covert 1st/2nd person pronoun, we show that the latter is subject to some further conditions in Romanian and French. The paper thus investigates: (i) Singular, plural and coordinate imposters in the two languages. The hypothesis is that the rich verb agreement affects imposters as shown by the availability of two agreement patterns with plural and coordinate structures containing an imposter; (ii) It also considers the status of the subject of predicate nominals in French and Romanian as compared to (2). Plural imposters (4) in both languages only allow 3PL pronominal and verbal agreement. The ultimate antecedent, AUTHOR, a potential origin for phi-features for the verb and of the pronominal is unavailable. However, if the plural imposter is modified by the indexical here present, an ameliorating effect obtains (5). We argue that the imposter DP shell contains a PredP subpart (core) and that it is this subpart which contains the covert pronoun we in addition to the adjective (this covert pronoun is anteceded by AUTHOR in the left periphery). This is the first condition to which the covert pronoun is subject to in French and Romanian.

In coordinate structures with an imposter DP in Romanian (6-7a), 1PL verbal agreement is more readily available on condition the imposter gets topicalised across, for instance, an indexical adverb. We suggest that what moves to the left periphery is the shell part and that the core part (we) is represented by pro which has [1PL] phi-features, thus resulting in 1PL verb agreement. In French (7b), the subject containing an imposter can either fill the criterial subject position, above the ModP hosting the adverb, or or a lower position (see also Rizzi and Shlonsky 2007). In either position, the coordinate DP has AUTHOR (Plural) as an antecedent and thus verbal agreement is 1PL.

In configurations with a relative pronoun, Romanian (and French) show both 3rd person (8a) and 1st person verb agreement (8b). The DPs care and professor share a lexical basis in the sense of C&P, so professor is a source of care. Since pro is the subject of the predicate nominal professor, it is a source for anything that professor is a source for. Thus, pro is a source for care and the latter agrees with pro and is 1SG. Without fleshing out the details of an analysis of relative pronouns (Kayne 1994, Kayne 2008, Bianchi 1999, a.o.), the Rel can agree either with the predicate nominal or with the subject of the predicate nominal.
To sum up, the paper takes C&P’s analysis of English imposters and suggests further refinements, in particular, imposters are subject to two distinct conditions: availability of an indexical modifier (here present) in both French and Romanian and pro-Topicalisation in coordinate structures in Romanian (given the null subject property). In French, coordinate structure with an imposter behave more like English, except the overt character of verbal morphological agreement. Under these conditions, the imposter DP can then determine the more seemingly unexpected 1PL verbal (and pronominal) agreement.

(1) In this reply, the present authors (= the writers of the reply) attempt to defend ourselves/themselves.

(2) I am a teacher who takes care of myself/himself.

(3) a. AUTHOR the present authors attempt to defend ourselves/themselves.
   b. AUTHOR this reporter and his son are proud of ourselves/themselves.

(4) a. Les auteurs sont /*sommes fiers d’eux-mêmes/*de nous-mêmes.
   The authors are.3PL/are.1PL proud of themselves /of ourselves
   ‘The authors will be proud of themselves.’
   b. Autorii vor /*vom fi mandri de ei insisi /*noi înșiși.
   Authors.the will.3.PL/*will.1.PL be proud of themselves/ourselves
   ‘The authors will be proud of themselves.’

(5) a. Les auteurs ci-présents sommes fiers de nous-mêmes.
   The authors here present.M.PL are.1.PL proud of ourselves
   b. Autorii aici prezenți suntem mândri de noi înșișe.
   Authors.the here present.M.PL are.1.PL proud of ourselves

(6) a. Mâmica și bunica Sofia vor cumpăra pălării foarte curand.
   Mommy and grand-mother Sofia will.3.PL buy hats very soon.
   ‘Mommy and Grandmother Sofia will buy hats very soon.’
   b. „Mâmica și bunica Sofia vom cumpăra pălării foarte curand.
   Mommy and grand-mother Sofia will.1.PL buy hats very soon

(7) a. (?)Mâmica și bunica Sofia, foarte curand, vom cumpăra…
   Mommy and grand-mother Sofia very soon will.1.PL buy
   b. (?)Maman et grand-maman, (très bientôt), allons acheter…

(8) a. Sânt un profesor care a avut mereu grijă de el (însuși).
   Am a professor who has had always care of him (self)
   ‘I am a professor who has always taken care of him.’
   b. Sânt un profesor care am avut mereu grijă de mine (însumi).
   Am a professor who have.1SG had always care of me (self)
   ‘I am a professor who has always taken care of myself.’
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Diachronic syntax based on constituency and dependency annotated corpora:
Theoretical and methodological issues

Achim Stein / University of Stuttgart

This paper introduces a new, dependency-annotated corpus of Medieval French, the Syntactic Reference Corpus of Medieval French (SRCMF)\(^2\) and compares it to the Penn-style phrase structure annotated corpus Modéliser le changement: les voies du français (MCVF)\(^3\).

In the first part, I will introduce the SRCMF annotation model. In the second part, I will present a case study of constructions with information-structural (IS) properties like clefts and dislocations and will serve to discuss two more general and related problems:

1. How can we use corpus data to induce properties of historical stages of languages when ambiguities on several linguistic levels cannot be directly resolved?

2. What is the contribution of the corpus annotation model to this task? How can it reconcile the wish to be maximally expressive while being minimally interpretive?

Take a look at the following French cleft constructions (Prévost, 2009, 3):

(1) C’est Paul qui est tombé? Non, c’est Luc qui est tombé.

   is it Paul who has fallen? no it is Luc who has fallen.

(2) Qu’est-ce qui se passe? C’est Luc qui est tombé.

   what is it that REFL happens? it is Luc who has fallen.

Some authors capture the difference between (1) and (2) by distinguishing several types of clefts: cases like (1) have been called stressed-focus clefts, cases like (2) informative- presupposition clefts (for English classifications see e.g. Prince 1978; Collins 1991, for French Dufter 2008). The ambiguity resides in the IS status of Luc and pertains to different linguistic levels:

(3)

- Reference: the pronoun ce has the status of either an expletive or a demonstrative
- Semantics: the verb est is either a full copula verb or a grammaticalized IS-marker
- Information structure: the XP is either a predicative complement or IS-marked. If it has the latter status it is either a focus or a topic
- Syntax: the subordinate clause depends either on the XP or on the pronoun
- Prosody: the XP is either prosodically marked or not

Knowledge about the properties of Modern French can help to disambiguate these constructions: (1) it is a strict SVO language, (2) it has no sentence-initial focus position, (3) stress is syntactically constrained to the end of prosodic groups, (4) it shows neither null subjects nor Verb Second. For diachronic stages of French, this knowledge is not available because these properties have undergone a number of drastic changes, so that variation of all four of them was characteristic for the Old French period (OF: 842-ca.1320):

(4)

1. word order was changing from SOV to SVO;
2. OF still had a sentence-initial focus position;
3. OF still showed rather unconstrained word accent;
4. OF still had null subjects as well as Verb Second orders.

\(^2\) http://srcmf.org (Prévost and Stein, 2012)

\(^3\) http://www.voies.uottawa.ca/corpus_pg_fr.html (Martineau, 2009)
We also cast a glance on the better established Old English (OE) and Middle English Penn corpora (Taylor et al., 2003; Kroch and Taylor, 2000), where similar problems arise since from late OE on the change from SOV to SVO, the loss of null subjects and Verb Second resulted in new information-structural possibilities. The problem concerning clefts is almost analogous to Medieval French, since *(h)it* can be a personal or an expletive pronoun, the demonstrative *bat* can also introduce a cleft, *beon/ben* is either a full copula verb or a grammaticalized IS-marker etc.

It is obvious that in such a situation annotators of historical corpora face serious problems: in the case of clefts, syntactic annotation can either limit itself to syntactic structure (here: a predicative main clause with pronominal or null subject and a relative subordinate clause) or provide a functional interpretation by marking the same structure with a “cleft tag” (CP-CLF in the Penn annotation). The latter option, however, presents a historical datum (a structure) as if it were evidence for a given phenomenon (a cleft), and doing this is tantamount to stating that the multiple ambiguities in (3) were properly evaluated, not only in the immediate context, but also in the context of the language specific variations (4).

For reasons of time, previous corpus-based studies (e.g. Bouchard et al. 2010 and earlier papers) can only be considered marginally; the main interest is technical: we will show how the corpora MCVF and SRCMF handle the aforementioned problems and discuss them from the users’ and the annotators’ perspective.

In the final part, I will show that although the choice of the syntactic categories was motivated by linguistic considerations rather than by parsing efficiency, the SRCMF dependency model can be used successfully with state-of-the-art parsers like *mate* (Björkelund et al., 2010) for the automatic annotation of Old French texts.
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We make a quantitative argument that the evolution of the Spanish preposition *para*, exemplified in (1), involves ‘chunking’ of two frequently co-occurring earlier prepositions, *por* and *a*, and ensuing loss of compositionality. The corpus for the present study comprises 17 texts, beginning with *El cantar de mio Cid* (12th c.), and draws on two prose texts for each subsequent century, from the 16th onward one peninsular and one from New Spain/Mexico. For each century approximately 1,000 tokens of *por* and *para* were extracted, for a total of 8108.

(1) a. fueron-se *para* la ribera de la mar
   go.PFV.3PL-REFL to ART.DEF.F.SG shore of the sea

   b. *para* se - r
to REF. go-INF
‘they went to the shore to depart’ [14th c. Zifar, 89]

From the earliest texts we see variation between allative ‘to’ (1a) and purposive ‘for’ (1b) uses of *para*, but over time there is a decline of the former and a rise of the latter. In 12th – 14th century data, three verbs of directional motion—*ir(se)* ‘go’, *venir(se)* ‘come’, *tornar(se)* ‘return’—constitute 80% of all spatial instances of *para*, as in (1a). We further observe that middle- (or reflexive-) marked *irse* is somewhat (56:44 times) more frequent than unmarked *ir* (whereas with *por*, *irse* is far less frequent than *ir* (3:31)). The co-occurrence of *para* with se-marked motion verbs is consonant with allative use. It is apparently cross-linguistically common for allatives cooccurring with ‘go’ verbs to develop purposive meaning, sometimes going on to introduce verbal complements (Rice & Kabata 2007:459). After the 14th century, there is change in the distribution of *para* + NP across spatial (allative) and abstract (e.g., benefactive) uses such that the proportion of spatial uses drops from 40-50% in the early texts to no greater than 10% (while for *por*, spatial uses remain stable, constituting 10% to 30% of all *por* + NP tokens, indicating that the drop for *para* is not an artifact of genre, topic or some other extra-grammatical consideration).

After this decline of spatial *para* + NP uses, a second change is that the purposive infinitive construction becomes more associated with *para* over time. We register a reversal in the relative frequency of *por* and *para*, which are evenly distributed in [+ INFINITIVE] constructions until the 17th century, after which the rate of *para* increases, reaching 85% in the 20th century. Counting as purposives those instances in which the infinitival situation is posterior to that of the finite verb, as in (1b), we verify that the reversal in the rate of *para* relative to *por* includes purposive [+ INFINITIVE] constructions, even those in which the subject has a human referent (2).

(2) a. *querría quedarse por aliviar tu cuytado*
   ‘I would like to stay to alleviate your pain’
   [15th c., Celestina, 2.132]

   b. *quería vencerla, para no padecer tanto*
   ‘he wanted to defeat it [ambition], so as to not suffer so much’
   [19th c., Regenta, 2.22]

We can make a strong case that *para* arises from the combination of two separate prepositions, one of which was *a*, based on the semantic measure of compositionality of meaning, operationalized by the contexts of use of *para*. In spatial uses of *para* + NP, when we consider the proportions of prepositional objects that are persons, not places, we find that, in 13th-14th century texts, NPs with a human referent as the endpoint of motion, as in (3), are at 35%, but such uses disappear from the corpus after the 16th c. (Figure 1).
In this early [MOTION VERB + para + PERSON] construction, the human referent of the object appeared as a personal pronoun, proper noun, or definite full NP, and nearly always in singular number. From this we infer that the referent is specific and individuated, precisely the kind of referent we would expect the preposition a to occur with, in accordance with its use as a dative marker and progressively also as an accusative marker for direct objects referring to persons. This early [MOTION VERB + para + PERSON] construction indicates that the semantic contribution of the preposition a was still discernible in the new preposition, and thus greater compositionality in its beginnings. Subsequently, object NPs with a human referent as the endpoint of motion disappear with para, which indicates that a no longer makes an independent meaning contribution. This is a measure of loss of compositionality, as a is completely absorbed into the chunked preposition.

In summary, the evidence adduced for allative > purposive grammaticalization is first, the decline of spatial uses as a proportion of para tokens, which includes the disappearance of destinations that are persons, and second, the increasing rate of para relative to por within purposive infinitive constructions. The findings suit a view of reanalysis as the outcome of gradual loss of compositionality, which, in usage-based theory, is a consequence of the chunking, or fusion, of frequent strings (Bybee 2010:34).
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Coalescence and hybrid vowels in the realization of Spanish four-vocoid sequences containing a single non-high vowel

Gabriela Vokic / Southern Methodist University
Jorge Guitart / University at Buffalo, SUNY

This study analyzed native Spanish speakers’ production of sequences arising in syntax of four vocoids in which one was a non-high vowel and the other three were high vocoids, either vowels or glides. The purpose was to determine if it would be possible for all four vocoids to be placed in the same syllable when the realization does not violate the sonority principle. For instance consider the sentence Fui a Irak ‘I went to Irak’, which native Spanish phonologists anecdotally declare can be realized in two syllables. If the outcome were [fwja:rak], the quadriphthong [wjaj] would not violate the sonority principle. Cf. the triphthong [wja] in Fui allà ‘I went there’ in which the rhyme [aj] does not violate the sonority principle either.

Data were collected from ten native Spanish speakers of different varieties in a sound-proof booth using a digital recorder Marantz CDR 420 and a cardioid microphone Shure Beta 54. The participants read aloud stimuli sentences containing vocoid sequences /wiaj/, /wiai/, /juaj/, /wioj/, /juoj/, /wiej/ and /juej/ at three different speech rates (preset relatively normal, preset relatively rapid and maximum speed according to subject’s ability). Three out of four sets of recorded stimuli were incorporated into the analysis. A total of 240 tokens were analyzed for the preset relatively rapid condition and a total of 240 tokens for the maximum speed condition. Using Praat version 5.2.15., data were spectrographically analyzed by extracting the triphthong peak and measuring the F1 and F2 of the nucleus.

Results did not support the existence of cuadriphthongs in Spanish. Rather, in both recording conditions all four-vocoid sequences were phonetically realized as triphthongs whose structure was GVG (i.e. a nucleus flanked by glides). Moreover, the nucleus was invariably a hybrid vowel that combined features of both the non-high vowel and the high vowel that were adjacent at the underlying level. Results also showed that in most instances this hybrid nucleus was a vowel that is absent from the phonemic inventory of Spanish, i.e. schwa or a high front lax unrounded vowel. In general, these results are similar to those of Vokic and Guitart 2009, who found support for the principle that there can be no more than three vocoids in a syllable and noticed that in most cases of contact between two non-high vowels in four- and five-vocoid sequences the nucleus of the triphthong was a hybrid vowel manifesting features of both underlying vowels.
Stages of grammaticalization of the assertion structure in Spanish varieties
Maria Luisa Zubizarreta / University of Southern California

This paper examines the specificational pseudo-cleft (PCleft) in standard Spanish (StSp) and in spoken Peninsular Spanish (SPSp), as well as the focus copular structure (FocCop) in Caribbean Spanish (CSp), and argues that these reveal different stages of the grammaticalization of the bi-clausal Assertion Structure of the sentence (i.e the presupposition/assertion divide). A biclausal-qua-ellipsis analysis is shown to readily capture the grammatical properties and the historical connection between the P-cleft and the FocCop structure. It is furthermore suggested that “focusing via marked word ordering” in SSp is best analyzed as a case of reduplication of vPs-qua-ellipsis, and it is proposed that this case constitutes the ultimate grammaticalization of the AS, where the presupposition and assertion parts share the same T(ense), but branch out into two distinct vPs. The focused phrase is identified as the constituent in the asserted clause that is adjacent to the left-edge of the CP or vP phase at PF (Molnar & Winkler 2010).

Alongside PClefts introduced by a wh-phrase (as in English), StSp also has PClefts introduced by a relative pronoun, composed of a definite weak pronominal element plus the complementizer que. These can be analyzed as a structure with an operator-variable in the pre-copular clause (the presupposition) and a post-copular clause (the assertion). Forward ellipsis deletes all but the focused constituent in the assertion (Ross 1972, Schlenker 1998, 2003, Den Dikken et al. 2000).

(1) a. De la que te hablé fue de Maria. (StSp)

  of Fem.Sg. that (I) to you. spoke was of Maria.

  b. [CP [de la que], te hablé e,[ fué ] [CP te hablé de Maria]]

Of particular interest is the case of the neuter lo in (2a) bound to the complement of hacer, which cannot be anything else than an event-denoting DP; cf. (2b) and (2c). Thus, (2a) shows that in a PCleft, where the op-vbl relation is formed via movement, it is the semantic content (not the syntactic form) of the variable that must match that of the focus phrase.

(2) a. Lo que debes hacer es comprar un coche nuevo. (StSp)

  Neut.3Sg. that must.2PSg. do is buy a new car.

  ‘What you must do is buy a new car.’

  b. Debes hacer esto: comprar un coche nuevo.

  Must.2PSg do this: buy a new car.

  c. *Debes hacer comprar un coche nuevo.

  Must.2PSg. do buy a car new

PClefts in SPSp, first described by Fernandez-Soriano 2009, have the peculiarity that part of the assertion is elided in the post-copular rather than in the expected pre-copular part. This “ellipsis mismatch” so to speak, is particularly conspicuous in cases of idioms (3).

(3) Lo que no puedes meter es la pata hasta el punto de que te echen. (SPSp, F-S 2009)

  3PSg.Neut. (you) cannot put is your foot in it until (they) you-fire

  ‘What you cannot do is put your foot in it until you get fired.”

The difference between the two varieties can be described as follows. In StSp, the presuppositional variable is created before spell-out, while in SSp, it can be created after spell-out via LF ellipsis. More precisely, in SSp, both backward and forward deletion applies at LF (as in PF), opening up the possibility for an ellipsis mismatch between what is deleted at PF and what is deleted at LF. (The mismatch appears to be constrained to the V head and its associated functional categories, subject to similar constraints as noun head ellipsis).
(4) PF: [Lo, que [Neg no [TP puedes [vP meter la pata]]] es [[Neg no [TP puedes [vP meter la pata]]]]
LF: [Lo, que [Neg no [TP puedes [vP meter la pata]]] es [[Neg no [TP puedes [vP meter la pata]]]]

The FocCop, documented in different varieties of Venezuela (Sedano 1998, 1990, 2003, Bosque) and Colombia (Camacho 2006, Mendez-Vallejo 2009), has evolved from the pseudo-cleft. It lost the overt relative pronoun, bringing about a loss of the existential presupposition characteristic of definite pronouns; cf. (5a) vs. (5b).

(5) a. No comió fué nada. (CSp)
   neg. eat.3Sg.Past be.3Sg.Pret. potatoes
   ‘He did not eat anything’

b. *Lo que no comió fué nada. (StSp)

The loss of the overt relative pronoun leads to a major restructuring of the clause structure: the pre-copular part becomes the main clause. The post-copular part becomes a vP, sister to a reanalyzed copula with a defective T (temporally bound to the minimally c-commanding Tense); copula + vP is adjoined to matrix vP (Camacho 2006). This restructuring will be argued to account for the fact (among many others to be discussed) that the Neg in the pre-copular part can formally license the NPI in the post-copular part of the clause (5a).

In the FocCop structure, the op-variable structure is created at LF (as in SPSp PCleft), via (backward) deletion and null operator insertion. This accounts for the contrast between CSp (6) and StSp (2a): variables created via ellipsis at LF (unlike those created via overt movement) require both syntactic and semantic identity.

(6) * Debes hacer es comprar un coche nuevo. (CSp, compare with StSp (2a))
   Must.2S. do.inf is buy a car new

The FocCop structure in the Andean variety of Columbian Spanish (described by Mendez-Vallejo 2009) provides a further argument in favor of the ellipsis-based analysis. In this dialect, the “given” part of the VP may surface either in the pre-copular part (via PF forward deletion) or post-copular part (via PF backward deletion).

(7) Clara le trajo <a Armando> fué GALLETAS <a Armando> (CSp, Andean variety)
   Clara Dat Cl.bring. <to Armando> be.3Sg.Pret. cookies <to Armando>
   ‘It was cookies that Clara brought for Armando’

The case of “focusing via marked word ordering” in StSp (Zubizarreta 1998) represents the ultimate grammaticalization stage, with a reduplicated VP (8). This construction will be shown to be akin to the CSp FocCop, but crucially with no copula-bearing Tense.

(8) Me regaló un libro Maria ‘it was Maria who gave me a book’ (StSp)
   PF: [TP me regaló [vP Maria regal√ el libro]] [vP Maria regal√ el libro]]
   LF: [Opk [TP me regaló [Ev-T [vP DPk regal√ el libro]] [vP DPk Maria regal√ el libro]]]

To summarize, assuming an ellipsis-based analysis, the PCleft in SPSp (with an overt rel. pron but covert op-vbl formation), the FocCop in CSp (with no overt rel. pron. and covert op-vbl formation), and the “focusing via marked word-order” in StSp (with covert op-vbl formation and no copula) can be seen as different stages of an incremental grammaticalization of the bi-clausal Assertion Structure of the sentence.
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