Formal Linguistics and the Syntax of Spanish: Past, Present and Future[1]

Margarita Suñer
Cornell University

The organizers of the Symposium suggested the topic of this presentation. From the very beginning my main purpose was to discuss an example of how one works within formal linguistics, my area of specialization.

I must also make clear that I do not believe that there is an entity called the *syntax of Spanish*, but that rather there exists what we call *syntax* and that we apply its principles and hypotheses to different languages. The idea is that syntax is unique, *universal* according to Chomsky – the top guru of formal linguistics according to my estimate. To a large degree this concept is based on the acquisition of first languages, given that all children learn their language or languages that surround them quickly and without effort. Moreover, they all go through the same learning stages at roughly the same maturational time.

It is true that languages differ, but the main differences are lexical; the other ones turn out to be mainly superficial once we study any given phenomenon *comparatively* and *in depth*. An example of this is given later when I compare Spanish to the Germanic languages in Section 3.

The studies related to Spanish have contributed to a better understanding of many of the syntactic subareas. I divided the *Bibliography* into these subareas and within each of them, the works appear in strict chronological order. I must also point out that there have been several articles that give a panoramic view of studies concerning Spanish in the formal linguistic framework. Among them you can find those in (A):

A)   *Panoramic Studies on Formal Research*

1981   Contreras, Heles. Romance Syntax in the 70s. In H. Contreras & K. Klausenburger (eds.),
         Papers in Romance 3:26-40.
1989   Suñer, Margarita. Spanish Syntax and Semantics in the 80's: The Principles-and-Parameters
         Approach. *Hispania* 72: 832-847.
1993   Bosque, Ignacio. La gramática generativa y los estudios de sintaxis española. Breve estado
         de la cuestión. ALFAL X, Veracruz (inédito).
2000   Brucart, José Ma. 25 años de sintaxis española (1970-1995). En M. Bargalló Escrivá C.
         Garriga Escribano (eds.): *25 años de investigación de la lengua española*. Tarragona,
         Universitat Rovira i Virgili, 111-188.
2002   Brucart, José Ma. Los estudios de sintaxis en el generativismo: balance y perspectiva. *En
         Presente y futuro de la lingüística en España*, La Sociedad de Lingüística 30 años después,
         Actas del II Congreso de la Sociedad Española de Lingüística (Madrid, 2000), 21-51.

2006   Toribio, A. Jacqueline. The Revitalization of Spanish Linguistics. *Hispanic Issues On Line* 1.1: 133-136.

In what follows I briefly present the situation of formal linguistics as applied to Spanish and then discuss an example of how we work within the formal framework using the clitic systems, that is, the Spanish untressed pronouns.

1. The past

Chomskian grammar begins to have disciples towards the end of the 60s and the beginning of the 70s. Among them I can name Sol Saporta, Carlos Otero, Heles Contreras, James Harris, Mercedes Roldán, William Cressey and also Marisa Rivero, Marta Luján, Jorge Guitart, Susan Plann, Alberto Rivas and myself. In Spain one finds V. Sánchez Zavala, Violeta Demonte, Carlos Piera and Esther Torrego among others.

During the 80s there appear in the US Osvaldo Jaeggli, Karen Zagona, Héctor Campos, María Luisa Zubizarreta and Paula Kempchinsky. One of the gatherings that fostered the interest in formal linguistics was the meeting started in Florida in 1970, the *Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages* which this year celebrated its 37 anniversary. Because of the quality and quantity of the works presented, Spanish always occupies the main stage in this meeting. Many years later the *Hispanic Linguistics Symposium* and *The Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese as First and Second Languages* are established.

However, not everything was rosy. As with any science, the theory kept evolving because new facts showed it to be deficient in certain areas. Thus, from the *Aspects* model, we went to the *Theory of Government and Binding*, then to *Barriers* and from there to *Minimalism* in 1995. These frequent changes disappointed some and they decided to abandon the area of formal linguistics.

Among US universities that excelled in the first stage of formal linguistics are MIT, Georgetown, Indiana, USC, UCLA, UC Santa Cruz, and University of Washington in Seattle. Cornell joins the formal camp in the middle 70s. In Spain in the mid eighties we find the Universidad Autónoma de Madrid and the Fundación Ortega y Gasset (which sponsors the annual *Coloquium on Generative Grammar*), the Universitat Autònoma of Barcelona, and also the University of Deusto-Bilbao and that of the Basque Country. A large number of graduates of these Spanish universities obtain their PhDs from US universities and have a great impact when they return to Spain as professors of formal linguistics.

2. The present and the future

My evaluation is that Spanish departments in the US are in a great situation. The number of students ready to study Spanish as a second or foreign language continues to increase disproportionately when compared to other foreign languages. In part, this is due to immigration and the need to communicate with Spanish speakers in all spheres of society (medicine, law, commerce, construction, schools, radio, TV, etc.). The number of students studying linguistics in these departments does not compare favorably to the number studying literature, but it must be remembered that linguistic students take some classes in Linguistic Departments. Moreover, there are linguists who work with Spanish – although not necessarily exclusively – in General Linguistic departments (for example, Zubizarreta, Zagona, Contreras, Plann, Strozer, Rivero, among others).

Another consequence of the interest in formal linguistics can be gleaned from the explosion in the number of journals that have begun publication in this area. As an example see the non-exhaustive list in (B) of those which compose the top tier:

B) 1924   *Language* (LSA)
    1947   *Lingua* (Elsevier)
    1964   *Journal of Linguistics* (Cambridge)
    1970   *Linguistic Inquiry* (MIT).

1974	*Theoretical Linguistics* (Walter de Gruyter)
1977	*Linguistics and Philosophy* (Springer Netherlands)
1983	*Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* (Kluwer)
1983	*The Linguistic Review* (Walter de Gruyter)
1989	*Probus* (Mouton de Gruyter)
2001	*Syntax* (Blackwell Publishers)

If we stop to consider their starting publication dates we see that while I was a gradutae student, *Linguistic Inquiry* was founded and since then all the rest have emerged. To (B) one needs to add the publications emanating from Spanish departments and those that are published on the web.

On the web one also finds several corpus (see (C)):

C) *Corpus:*

- *Real Academia Española* (REA)
- *Univ. de Santiago de Compostela* (directed by Guillermo Rojo).
- *La Norma Culta de las principales ciudades de Latinoamérica y España* in disk and a portion of it in the CREA of the RAE
- www.corpusdelespanol.org (Mark Davies)
- Corpus Oral Centropeninsular
- Corpus Escrito del Español de Chile
- Corpus Escrito del Español de Argentina
             (The last three directed by F. Marcos-Marín and available on the web)

When a researcher uses these corpus for empirical data, s/he gets a more realistic and adequate vision of how a given language works regarding the phenomenon under study.

There are many good linguists in Spanish departments. Among them Almeida Jacqueline Toribio (Penn State), Luis López (U. of Illinois Chicago), Paula Kempchinsky (Iowa), Pascual Masullo (Pittsburg), Liliana Sánchez (Rutgers), Francisco Ordoñez (SUNY-Stony Brook), José Camacho (Rutgers), Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach (Ohio State), Marta Luján (TX-Austin), among others.

Another indication of the expansion of formal linguistics is the partial list in (D) of linguists hired by Spanish departments in the last few years, included 3 hired by the University of Illinois at Chicago, which even surprises me:

D)   Miguel Rodriguez-Mondoño: Indiana U. (syntax)
        Cristina Cuervo: U. of Toronto (syntax)
        Asier Alcázar: U. of Missouri (syntax and interfaces)
        Karlos Arregi: U. of Illinois Urbana-Champaign (syntax)
        Alejandro Cuza: U. of Illinois Chicago (acquisition of 2nd. languages and attrition) 2007
        Kay González-Vilbazo: U. of Illinois Chicago (code-switching from a formal point of view) 2006
        Kara Morgan-Short: U. of Illinois Chicago (acquisition of 2nd. languages from a neurolinguistic methodology) 2007

Hence, although it is difficult to predict the future with complete certainty, since my crystal ball gets a bit cloudy at times, I'm very optimistic because formal linguistic as applied to the Spanish language enjoys a privileged position in the US.

3. An example of formal comparative syntax as applied to Spanish

I'll be talking about clitics. For the most part, I concentrate on object clitics, mainly DO ones because they are the ones that differ the most in terms of both Clitic-systems and Clitic-doubling. All data are from Suñer 1988, 1989, 2000, and Suñer and Yépez 1988, and references therein.

3.1. Morphological Variation: Four Clitic-Systems

I limit myself to the following four dialects: *Normative Spanish, Madrid Spanish, Porteño and Colloquial Quiteño*. Hence, the comparison here is among dialects of the same language (Fernández-Ordoñez 1993, Klein-Andreu 1993, among many others).

By *Normative Spanish* I mean the idealized Spanish described by traditional grammarians as in (1):

1) *Normative Spanish*
     DO: la(s) (fem) / lo(s) (masc)   **IO**: le(s)

2) *Madrid Spanish* has two subvarieties
     a. *leísmo*:   **DO**: la(s) (fem) / le(s) (masc)   **IO**: le(s)
     b. *laísmo*:   **DO**: la(s) (fem) / le(s) (masc)   **IO**: le(s) (masc) / la(s) (fem)

3) *Porteño* (= etymological system)
     DO: la(s) (fem) / lo(s) (masc)   **IO**: le(s)

4) *Colloquial Quiteño*
     DO & **IO**:   le(s)

I'd like to suggest that the variation found in these four CL-systems is *morphological*. In other words, speakers of these dialects assign different features to the clitic morphemes. For example, the *laísta* dialect of Madrid marks both DOs and IOs for gender.

3.2. DO Clitic-doubling

The four dialects also respond differently to the possibility of doubling.
     Normative Spanish only allows doubling of DOs with personal pronouns (5).

5) <u>La</u> recordamos <u>a ella</u> con gran cariño.

This NS situation fosters the misconception that peninsular dialects do not permit DO-D. However, doubling is found in the *leísta* subvariety in the educated spoken corpus of Madrid provided the doubled DO is interpreted as *specific/identifiable* (in Suñer's 1988 terminology); see (6-7):

6a) No <u>le</u> he oído <u>a ese señor</u>.   Quilis et al 1985:101   *leísta dialect*
  b) El Señor <u>le</u> atrae <u>a uno</u>.

7a) <u>La</u> encuentro <u>a la tía</u>.
  b) . . . sí, pero no <u>la</u> voy a pisar <u>la Universidad</u>. (note the absence of *a*) *leísta dialect*

And doubling also occurs in the *laísta* dialect with IO's. See (8):

8a) <u>La</u> dejó sus libros <u>a su sobrina</u>.   Quilis et al 1985:101   *laísta dialect*
  b) <u>La</u> rogaron <u>a Juana</u> que no se incomodara.

Nevertheless, that speakers — whether *leístas* or *laístas* — "know" the differences between DOs and IOs is confirmed by the fact that IO doubling does not obey the specificity constraint (9a-b) that DOs must obey (9c), as made clear by adding a relative clause in the subjunctive mood to the respective object.

9a) <u>La</u> darán el premio <u>a una niña de 4 años que sepa (subj) dividir</u>.   *laísta*
  b) <u>Le</u> darán el premio <u>a un niño de 4 años que sepa (subj) dividir</u>.   *leísta*
  c) *<u>le</u> necesitan <u>a un cocinero que prepare (subj) sushi</u>.   *le* = DO

Porteño, the variety of Spanish spoken in the city of Buenos Aires and surrounding area, doubles a specific animate DO without any trouble, whether pronominal or not, as in (10).

10)   <u>La</u> vi a …

       (i) ella / la mujer / la gata [+spec +anim +def]

       (ii) una mujer que vendía empanadas [+spec +anim -def]

Moreover, although less frequent, the doubling of inanimates is possible, as in (11).

11a)   . . . <u>lo</u> vamos a empujar <u>al ómnibus</u>.   (recorded) [+spec -anim +def]
    b)   <u>Lo</u> quiero mucho <u>a este arbolito</u> porque me lo regaló mamá. (spont.) [+spec -anim +def]

As expected, no doubling occurs with non-specific DOs; see (12):

12)   (<u>*La</u>) buscaban <u>(a) una mujer</u> que vendiera (subj) globos.   [-spec -anim -def]

At first sight, **Colloquial Quiteño** — the Spanish dialect of Quito, Ecuador — appears to differ considerably from general Spanish so I outline some of its main characteristics as it concerns object CLs. All data are from Yépez 1986. The most salient trait of this dialect is that DO-CLs have been almost universally replaced by *le(s),* that is, by the etymological IO-CL forms. This replacement applies irrespective of the features of animacy and / or gender; see (13).

13a)   Tuve que salvar<u>le</u>. (*le = mi amiga*)
    b)   Ya <u>le</u> vendió.   (*le = el carro*)

Thus, it seems save to claim that QS has carried *leísmo* to conclusion.
     CLs used as DOs allow DO-D quite freely (see (14)), so even inanimates double with ease; as in (14c).

14a)   ... <u>le</u> conoció <u>a mamá.</u>   [+hum]
    b)   ... <u>les</u> calentara <u>a los pollitos</u>.   [+anim]
    c)   <u>Le</u> contrataré <u>al taxi</u>..   [-anim]

QS also avoids sequences of IO and DO CLs, so that instead of the generalized (15a), they use (15b) with the exact same meaning, and instead of (16a), (16b).

15a)   Dámelo.
    b)   Dame∅.

16a)   Bueno, yo <u>te lo</u> saco.
    b)   Bueno, yo <u>te</u> ∅ saco.   (∅ = *el vestido*)

This trait is not unknown in other varieties of Spanish where it happens sporadically and where, for the most part, it is circumscribed to Vs of knowledge and understanding (*decir, saber, preguntar*, etc; cf. Kany 1969, Keniston 1937), but Quiteño regularly omits the DO indiscriminately in the presence of an IO with all kinds of verbs. [2] Even more, DO CLs vanish when the referent of the DO is clear from the context as it happens in Left-dislocations in (17), or when the referent appears in the preceding sentence as in (18).

17a)   *Las elecciones* yo nunca ∅ entendí.
    b)   *La leche* ∅ vendían a $1.20.

---

[2]   In Yépez 1986 recorded corpus there is not a single example of cooccurring IO + DO CL in which one of them is not reflexively interpreted.

18a)   Me dejaban *el formulario* para que yo $\varnothing$ vea.
   b)   A mi mamá le quedó un poco mal cerrado *el armario* y logré abrir $\varnothing$

Moreover, IO CLs may work as DOs provided there is no ambiguity as to function; that is, provided there is no IO phrase in the same sentence, as in (14) above (*le conoció a mamá*). However, if there is an IO phrase, the CL unambiguously refers to the IO argument, and the DO automatically goes to $\varnothing$ or surfaces as a lexical DP, see (15b)-(16b) above and (19) below.

19a)   Al chofer <u>le</u> $\varnothing$ di.   ($\varnothing$ = *los papeles*)
   b)   Decidí ponerle los cuernos, y le $\varnothing$ puse.

Could the QS CL usage cause confusion? Certainly; to speakers of other dialects. I must confess that at times, I had no idea what María Yépez was saying or asking me. But Quiteños do not even perceive the possible confusions/ambiguities they create for others. This shows that they have a deep unconscious knowledge of grammatical relations. Validation for this comes from three argument verbs where *le(s)* always refers to the IO slot. Consider (20) where only one of the logically permitted interpretations of the sentence obtains, even though the other reading is the only one possible whenever the same verb is construed with subject and DO.

20a)   Ella no permitía que <u>le</u> $\varnothing$ toque.   ($\varnothing$ = *el pie*)
         (i) She did not allow that I touch her foot (lit: the foot of her).
        (ii) #She did not allow that I touch her.

   b) Capaz que le iba y <u>le</u> $\varnothing$ enseñaba.   *($\varnothing$ = la foto)*
           (i) Perhaps s/he would go (to him) and show it to him.
          (ii) #Perhaps s/he would go (to him) and show him.

To sum up, we have reviewed four Clitic-systems and and their possibilities for DO CL-doubling. Keep in mind that the morphological shape the CLs adopt in the dialects are a consequence of the diverse solutions different areas have given to the system inherited from Latin. However, the shape of the CLs is irrelevant to the doubling process. What *is important to the phenomena is the **features** of the element in argument position*; it must be *specific/identifiable*.

For comparison's sake, the results for DO-D are summarized as in (21) by a minimal system of features, an indication that this approach to dialectal variation holds some promise. (21) also illustrates a tendency towards simplification of the feature system by either suppressing or generalizing a feature.

21)   *DO-doubling*
   N. Spanish   + pron + spec + anim
   Porteño   + spec (+/(-) anim)
   Madridian   + spec (+ anim)
   Quiteño   + spec (+/- anim)

4. Comparison across languages: Spanish CL-D and Germanic Object-shift

My objective here is to show that Spanish CL-D is very much like what is known as *Object-shift* in the Germanic languages, a phenomenon intensively studied by Vikner 1990 & 1995, Thrainsson 1997 and Holmberg 1986, among others. Similarly to Spanish, Object-shift is semantically motivated in that it only occurs with *specific/identifiable DPs*. However, as we will see, the outwards look of this shared phenomenon is very different.

The main manifestation of Object-shift consists of non-contrastive pronouns obligatorily jumping leftwards over an adverb or the sentential negator as in (22) for German and (23) for Scandinavian:

22)   ... weil   ich <*sie*> selten   <**sie*>   streichle.   German
        ya-que yo *a ella* raramente <**a ella*> acaricio
        'ya que (yo) a ella raramente la acaricio'

23a)   Hann las   <*thaer*> ekki <**thaer*>.   Icelandic (Insular Scandinavian)
        él   leyó *las*   no   <**las*>
        '(El) no las leyó'
   b)   Anna läste <*den*> kanske inte <**den*>   Swedish (Mainland Scandinavian)
        A.   read   it   maybe never   it
        'Anna tal vez nunca las leyó'

I'd like to claim that Spanish has pronominal Object-shift, but it differs from Germanic in that it is expressed through CL-D. Recall that CL-D is obligatory with direct (24) and indirect object (25) pronouns across all dialects (as opposed to the variation found with non-pronominal objects):[3]

 24a)   ¿Cuándo *(te) nombraron a *ti*?
   b)   Y luego *(lo) miré a *él*.

 25a)   (Antes de permitir<u>nos</u> entrar,) *(nos) devolvió las entradas a <u>nosotras</u>.
   b)   *(<u>Les</u>) mandaron regalos a <u>ellos</u>.

But what explains the obligatoriness of pronominal CL-D? Spanish strong pronouns are definite and referential; hence, they are given contextually specified values and thus, act as definite descriptions. This means that strong pronouns cannot be interpreted existentially because they would violate Heim's (1982) *Novelty Condition* which requires that entities inside the VP be new to the discourse; consequently, the pronouns must move out of the VP. In essence, *the CL works as a scope marker for the interpretation of the pronouns* and the structure complies with Diesing's 1992 *Mapping Hypothesis* in the overt syntax.[4]

4.1. Strong pronominals and Object-shift in a crosslinguistic perspective

    My plan of action is the following: To start, I review the characteristics of strong pronouns in non-oblique positions. Then, I compare Spanish to the Germanic languages to show that the latter exemplify a more limited distribution of object shift.
    First, we already know that strong pronouns are definite and referential. They refer to entities already in the (linguistic or extralinguistic) discourse, so they are [+specific] defined as identifiable.
    Second, strong pronouns in subject, DO and IO positions are interpreted as [+human] (occasional counterexamples aside[5]) (Strozer 1976, and others since then). See (26a) for a pronoun in subject position. This fact contrasts with what happens in PPs, for example, where pronouns maybe [±human], as in (26b):

26a)   <u>Ella</u> √she[+hum]/#it me recuerda momentos gratos.

---

[3]   *Leísta* dialects show an exception to obligatory pronominal doubling already noticed by Perlmutter (1970): a 1st or 2nd person Acc clitic and a 3rd person Dat clitic cannot cooccur, so the Dat is instantiated by a non-doubled strong pronoun.
                Me recomendaron <u>a ellos</u>.
                Te presentaron <u>a ella</u>.
[4]   *The Mapping Hypothesis*:   (Diesing 1992)
            a. VP maps into the nuclear scope (the domain of existential closure)
            b. IP/TP maps into the restriction of an (implicit or explicit) operator
[5]   The one below is from Sampedro's novel (1995); relevant coreferent constituents appear underlined:
        En las noches de viento sur el viejo oye <u>*las campanas del Duomo*</u> *a pesar de la ventana cerrada. Acaso* <u>*ellas*</u> *ahora le despiertan, o quizás [...]* (Son:94)

b)   Luis cerró el portón y Lisa se acercó a <u>él</u>. (= Luis) / (= portón)

   Third, although it is generally thought that strong pronouns in Spanish are contrastive or focused, when one pays attention to the context, this is not necessarily true. One such context is provided by displacing a contrastively stressed constituent to the front of the sentence (indicated by capitals; only a single constituent per clause can be focus-fronted), so in (27a) the postverbal subject pronoun receives an almost flat intonation. And something very similar happens in the quotative inversion example in (27b):

27a)   ADELANTE gritaron <u>ellos</u>.
  b)   – ¿Necesita Ud algo más? – pregunta al fin <u>él</u>.

Coordination is another environment where these pronouns are not necessarily contrastive. In (28a) the subject pronoun is conjoined to a full DP and the normal sentential stress falls on *pronto* 'soon'. And the same happens when the conjunction is in object position; in (28b) the pronoun does not deserve contrastive stress, for the main stress is on the last constituent.

28a)   <u>Ella</u> y su madre regresarán pronto.
  b)   Se quedaron mirándo<u>nos</u> a <u>Rosa y a mí</u> por un rato largo.

But even strong non-conjoined, non-fronted object pronouns can be interpreted as non-contrastive. In (29), they materialize mainly for reasons of clarification and perhaps style, and not because of focus or contrast. As usual, all are CL-D:

29a)   Luego de la mudanza, <u>los</u> vemos a <u>ellos</u> pero menos seguido.
  b)   El marido la fundió por malos negocios y <u>la</u> arrastró a <u>ella</u> en su caída.

Quantified object pronouns must also be CL-D, see (30):

30a)   <u>Los</u> invitamos a <u>todos ellos</u>.
  b)   <u>Las</u> visitaron a <u>ellas dos</u>.

That strong pronouns are not necessarily focused does not mean that they can not be. In the two examples in (31) the pronouns are heavily stressed (in capitals). The interesting fact is, regardless of whether the use is contrastive (31a) or deictic (31b), they still require CL-doubling:

31a)   ¿Tú <u>me</u> reclamas a MÍ por tus pantalones?
  b)   Dí<u>se</u>lo a ÉL. (pointing to the person)

That Spanish uses CL-D to shift non-contrastive strong object pronouns should not come as a surprise, given the Spanish data in (24) and (25) and the Germanic in (23), which I repeat for ease of exposition:

23a)   Hann las   <*thaer*> ekki <**thaer*>.   Icelandic (Insular Scandinavian)
        él   leyó *las*   no   <**las*>
        '(El) no las leyó'
  b)   Anna läste <*den*> kanske inte <**den*>   Swedish (Mainland Scandinavian)
        A.   leyó   it   maybe never it
        'Anna tal vez nunca las leyó'

24a)   ¿Cuándo *(te) nombraron a <u>ti</u>?
  b)   Y luego lo miré a <u>él</u>.

25a)   (Antes de permitirnos entrar,) *(nos) devolvió las entradas a <u>nosotras</u>.
  b)   *(Les) mandaron regalos a <u>ellos</u>.

What is a bit more surprising from a crosslinguistic point of view is that Spanish also requires *obligatory* CL-D (i.e., shifting) of contrastive, conjoined and quantified strong pronouns.

To corroborate this unusualness, I now review some comparative data. I continue to use Icelandic for Insular Scandinavian[6] and Swedish as representative for Mainland Scandinavian. What we see in (32)-(37) is that Mainland Scandinavian does not allow the shifting of contrastive (33), conjoined (35) or quantified pronouns (37), and that Icelandic allows it but only optionally. Thus, the Scandinavian languages contrast with the obligatoriness of the shifting/CL-D in Spanish.

Contrastive contexts

32) Anna las <HANA> kannski ekki <HANA>   Icel.   (insular)
    A.   read   IT   maybe not   IT
    'A. perhaps did not read it.'

33) Anna läste <*DEN> kanske inte <DEN>   Swe.   (mainland)
    A.   read   IT   maybe never   IT

Conjoined pronouns

34) Anna sá <mig og phig> liklega ekki <mig og phig>   Icel.
    A. saw   me and you   probably not   me and you
    'A probably didn't see me and you.'

35) Anna såg <*mej och dej> förmodlingen inte <mej och dej>   Swe.
    A.   saw me and you   probably   not   me and you

Quantified pronouns

36) Anna sá <phá bátha> alls ekki <phá bátha>   Icel.
    A.   saw   them both   not at all   them both
    'A. did not see them both at all.'

37) Anna såg <*dem båda> förmodlingen inte <dem båda>   Swe.
    A.   saw   them both   probably   not   them both

No doubt the means used to achieve the shifting of the object plays a role in the contrast between Spanish and the other languages. The data suggest that it is more difficult to move the actual object when it has been made "heavy" through contrastive stress, conjunction or quantification. Instead, *CL-D achieves object shift without really moving the object itself since it uses the CL as a scope marker to show where the object is interpreted.*

To sum up, we have discussed two different instances of Object shift: Germanic shifting and Spanish CL-D. We have also taken note of their similarities and divergences.

4.2. Further confirmation for CL-D as Object-shift: CL-D doubling of DPs

Keeping in mind that CL-D of other than pronominal DOs in Spanish is dialectally constrained, supporting evidence for CL-D as object shift is found in the doubling of Accusative human DPs in Porteño.[7] In this dialect, CL-D of DOs is common, which is not to say that all definite DOs are doubled.

---

[6]   However, (insular) Faroese only allows the shifting of non-contrastive pronouns.
[7]   Human DOs are the ones doubled with the greatest ease. Animates double but less frequently (i), and even some inanimates occasionally double (ii):
        (i)   Juana <u>lo</u> quiere más a<u>l perrito</u> que a su marido.

Only those whose referents have previously been introduced in the (extra-) linguistic discourse are doubled; that is, *doubling occurs only when the referent is identifiable*. Hence, a novel referent is not doubled even if definite; but if it is mentioned again, it is, as in the examples in (38) where coreference is indicated through underlining. Observe that although the first mention may be done through the DO function, as in (38a-b), this is not necessarily the case; in (38c) it is first introduced as the object of a PP:

38a)   Ahora, según escuché, ha hecho ir a <u>un tal Martínez</u> [...]; yo presente
        <u>lo</u> tengo a<u>l tal Martínez</u> [...]   (Am: 259)

  b) – Llámame a <u>Doña María Josefa</u> – le ordena. Hace días que quiere ver<u>la</u>
        a <u>la cuñada del Restaurador</u>.   (Am: 63)

  c) Corrí hacia la esquina, en busca de<u>l agente</u> que había visto antes. No estaba. Tomé por la calle
        transversal, me parece que es Viamonte y llegué a la esquina de Reconquista. Allí <u>lo</u> veo <u>al</u>
        <u>agente</u>. – "Venga, venga", grité ...   (Ros: 119)

The universal doubling of strong pronouns in Spanish differs from the doubling in (38) with DPs in that pronouns by nature are never considered 'new'. On the other hand, even definite DPs can be conceived of as introducing novel information into the discourse; thus, they may or may not be doubled depending on their interpretation. As the examples in (38) show, even proper name referents are not necessarily considered as presupposed. This is clearly illustrated in the pair in (39) in the context of a gathering. In (39a), CL-D is inappropriate given that the situation specifies that *Luis* constitutes a completely novel referent. Contrariwise, doubling is perfect in (39b) when the person whom Luis was introduced to talks to a third party:

39a.   – Te (#<u>lo</u>) presento a <u>Luis</u>, un amigo de mi infancia.
  b.   – Sí, Mariana me <u>lo</u> acaba de presentar a <u>Luis</u>.

Further confirmation for the above comes from different quarters. First, *uno* 'one' may receive an indefinite interpretation, in which case it rejects CL-D, see (40a); but it may also be read as specific partitive as in (40b) or as generic as in (40c) (Suñer 1988). In the latter two cases, CL-D is permitted precisely because the referent is presupposed:

40a)   ¿Ya (#<u>lo</u>) consultaste a <u>uno</u>?
  b)   <u>La</u> examinamos a <u>una</u> de ellas.
  c)   Hoy en día <u>lo</u> contratan a <u>uno</u> sin garantías de trabajo permanente.

Something similar occurs with *ninguno* 'no one', an inherently partitive negative term in Spanish (as opposed to *nadie* which is not partitive); because of this, CL-doubling is permitted in appropriate contexts (keep in mind that doubling of any constituent but strong pronouns is "optional"):

41a)   Aunque no (<u>lo(s)</u>) consultaron a <u>ninguno de ellos,</u> tuvieron en cuenta sus proyectos.
  b)   No <u>nos</u> invitaron a <u>ninguno</u>.

Moreover, scope facts further support my hypothesis about the import of CL-D. In (42), we find CL-D of a quantified DO DP. This causes the quantified DO to have wider scope than the quantified subject. Note that the reverse interpretation of the quantifiers is totally impossible because a CL-D DO can only be understood as specific/presupposed (Hurtado 1984; Suñer 1988) and as such, it must be read outside the VP as in (42b) (Both orders of the quantifiers are possible when the DO is not doubled).

42a)   Todos los electores <u>los</u> eligieron a <u>algunos de los candidatos</u>.   Hurtado 1984
        'Every voter elected some of the candidates.'

      (ii) Yo <u>la</u> tenía prevista <u>esta muerte</u>.   (Ros.: 102)

b)   y, y a candidate, x, x a voter (x elected y)
        (i.e., every voter elected the *same* set of candidates)

When we again look for crosslinguistic evidence, we find that Icelandic permits the shifting of a lexical DO DP as in (43a), but only optionally, while Swedish, as expected, forbids such a move in (43b):

43a)   Jón las   <bókina> aldrei <bókina>   Icel.: optional
        J. read   book-the never book-the
        'J. never read the book.'
  b)   Anna läste <*boken> kanske inte   <boken>   Swe.: *
        A.   read   book-the maybe never book-the
        'A. perhaps never read the book.'

        We can speculate that the optional shifting correlates with whether the object is novel (non shifted alternative), or whether it has previously been introduced into the discourse (shifted alternative), in parallel to the Spanish examples in (38).
        Icelandic also behaves like Spanish with respect to the scope facts in (42). Consider (44) (from H.Thráinsson, p.c.): the universal quantifier in the unshifted version (44a) has wider scope than the numeral; it can be paraphrased as 'It holds of all the students that they rarely read three books.' But in the shifted version (44b), the quantifiers have the opposite scope: 'There are three books such that all the students rarely read them'; that is, the shifted object is interpreted as specific (the same three books):

44a)   Allir nemendurnir l'asu sjaldan <u>thrj'ar baekur.</u>   x = students, y = three books
        all   students-the read rarely three books
        'All the students rarely read three books.'
  b)   Allir nemendurnir l'asu <u>thrj'ar baekur</u> sjaldan.   y = three books, x = students
        all   students-the read three books rarely
        'All the students rarely read [the same] three books.'

Observe further, that in the German examples in (45) the shifting of a quantified object does interact with the scope of the adverb (examples from Diesing and & Jelinek 1995):

45a)   ... weil ich selten   <u>jedes Cello</u> spiele.   Diesing & Jelinek 1995
        since I   seldom every cello play
        'since I seldom play every cello.'   DO in scope of adverb
  b)   ... weil ich <u>jades Cello</u> selten   spiele.
        since I   every cello seldom play
        'since I play every cello (only) seldom.'   DO has wider scope than adverb

        In brief, Spanish, Icelandic and German do have object shift. Importantly, if we had circumscribed our research to just Spanish, we would have ended with a nice generalization about the language but *we would not have learned that CL-D has a first cousin in the Germanic languages called Object-shift. And we would not have learned either that the semantics of these two processes are identical even though the means used to convey this semantics looks radically different on the surface*. Hence, it becomes necessary to investigate languages comparatively so we may discover the deeper generalizations that are common between and among languages. Somebody might object that the comparative approach takes too much effort because one needs to go far beyond what is published about the syntax of Spanish. One needs to read widely across languages in what is being done in formal syntax. But I believe that the extra effort also produces greater rewards, and for me at least, that was enough to propel me forwards.

Minimal References

Chomsky, Noam.(1995). *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Diesing, Molly. (1992a). Bare Plurals and the Derivation of Logical Representations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 353-380.

_____. (1992b). *Indefinites*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

_____ & Eloise Jelinek. (1995). Distributing Arguments. *Natural Language Semantics* 3, 123-176.

Fernández-Ordoñez, Inés. (1993). Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo: Estado de la cuestión. In Olga Fernández-Soriano (ed.), *Los pronombres átonos*. Madrid: Taurus, 63-96.

Heim, Irene. (1982). *The Semantics of Definite and Indefinite Noun Phrases*. Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst dissertation.

Holmberg, Anders. (1986). *Word Order and Syntactic Features*. Stockholm.

Hurtado, Alfredo.(1984). Clitic chains. Simon Fraser unpublished ms.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo.(1982). *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.

_____ . (1986). Three Issues in the Theory of Clitics: Case, Doubled NPs, and Extraction. In Hagit Borer. (ed.), *Syntax and Semantics 19: The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics*. NY: Academic Press, 15-42.

Kany, C. E. (1969). *Sintaxis Hispanoamericana*. Madrid: Gredos

Keniston, Hayward. (1937). *Spanish Syntax List*. NY: Holt.

Klein-Andreu, Flora. (1993). Distintos sistemas de empleo de 'le', 'la', 'lo': Perspectiva sincrónica, diacrónica y sociolingüística. In Olga Fernández-Soriano (ed.), *Los pronombres átonos.* Madrid: Taurus, 337-354.

Perlmutter, David. (1970). Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 187-256.

Rivas, Alberto. (1977). *A Theory of Clitics*. MIT dissertation.

Strozer, Judith. (1976). *Clitics in Spanish*. UCLA dissertation.

Suñer, Margarita.(1988). The Role of Agreement in Clitic-Doubled Constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 391-434.

_____. (1989). Dialectal Variation and Clitic-Doubled Direct Objects. In Carl Kirshner and Janet DeCesaris (eds.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 377-395.

_____. (1992). Subject Clitics in the Northern Italian Vernaculars and the Matching Hypothesis. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 10, 641-672.

_____. (1994).Verb-movement and the Licensing of Argumental Wh-phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12, 335-372.

_____. (1997). Clitic-doubling of strong pronouns in Spanish: An instance of Object shift. In J.Franco, A. Landa and J. Martín (eds.), *Grammatical Analyses in Basque and Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

_____. (2000). Object-shift: Comparing a Romance Language to Germanic. *Probus* 12: 261-289.

_____ & María Yépez. (1988). *Null Definite Objects in Quiteño*. Linguistic Inquiry 19.3: 511-19.

Thráinsson, Höskuldur. (1997). Topics in Scandinavian Syntax. LSA Linguistics Institute handout, Cornell.

Vikner, Sten. (1990). *Verb Movement and the Licensing of NP Positions in the Germanic Languages*. Univ. of Genéve dissertation.

_____. (1995). *Verb Movement and Expletive Subjects in the Germanic Languages*. NY: Oxford Univ. Press.

Yépez, María. (1986). *Direct Object Clitics in Quiteño Spanish*. MA thesis, Cornell.

Data sources

Am :   De Miguel, Ma. Esther. 1997. *La amante del Restaurador*. Bs. Aires: Planeta Argentina.

Ros :   Denevi, Marco. 1964. *Rosaura a las diez*. NY: Scribner's Sons.

Son :   Sampedro, José L. 1995. *La sonrisa etrusca.* Madrid: Alfaguara.

Bibliography

Some Influential Books (*and two articles*)

1957   Chomsky, Noam. *Syntactic Structures*. The Hague: Mouton.

1965   Chomsky, N. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

1981   Chomsky, N. *Lectures on Government and Binding*, Dordrecht: Foris.

1986a   Chomsky, N. *Barriers*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

1986b   Chomsky, N. *Knowledge of Language*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

1990   Rizzi, L. *Relativized Minimality.* Cambridge: MIT Press.

1991   Koopman, Hilda & Dominique Sportiche. The position of subjects. *Lingua* 85, 211-258.

1992   Diesing, Molly. *Indefinites*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

1995   Chomsky, N. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
1997   Rizzi, Luigi. The Fine Structure of the Left-Periphery. *Elements of Grammar: Handbook of Generative Syntax*, ed. by L. Haegeman. Kluwer.
2007   López, Luis. *Locality and the Architecture of Syntactic Dependencies*. London: Palgrave-MacMillan. (A study on minimalist syntax which develops a novel analyses of quirky subjects in Icelandic and Spanish, indefinite SE in Spanish and different types of expletive constructions in English, French, German, Spanish, Italian and Icelandic).

Some (Relatively) Recent Grammars of Spanish

1987   Hernanz, María Lluisa and José M. Brucart. *La Sintaxis*, Barcelona: Ed. Crítica. (descriptive & formal)
1999   Bosque, Ignacio & Violeta Demonte. *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa.
2002   Zagona, Karen. *The Syntax of Spanish*. Cambridge Univ. Press.   (formal)
2007   King, Larry D. & Margarita Suñer. (1998, 2003 & 2007) *Gramática española: Análisis lingüístico y práctica*. McGraw-Hill. 3rd edition (revised).   (pedagogical / descriptive)

Morphology (lexical structure, predicate argument structure):

1985   Zubizarreta, Ma. Luisa. The Relation between Morphophonology and Morphosyntax: The Case of Romance Causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16.2, 247-289.
1987   Zubizarreta, Ma. Luisa. *Levels of Representation in the Lexicon and in the Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
1991   Bonet, Eulalia. *Morphology after Syntax*. MIT dissertation.
1992   Masullo, Pascual. *Incorporation and Case Theory in Spanish: A Crosslinguistic Perspective*.
1992   Varela, Soledad. *Fundamentos de morfología*. Madrid: Ed. Síntesis.
1995   Bonet, Eulalia. Feature Structure of Romance Clitics. *NLLT* 13, 607-647.
1995   Demonte, Violeta. Dative alternation in Spanish. *Probus* 7, 5-30.
1998   López, Luis. The Causee in Causative Constructions. *Proceedings of the 1st Symposium on Hispanic Linguistics*. Ohio State University.
1998   Harris, Jim. Spanish Imperatives: Syntax meets Morphology. *Journal of Linguistics* 34:27-52
2003   Cuervo, María Cristina. *Datives at Large*. MIT dissertation.
2003   Eguren, Luis. Evaluative Suffixation in Spanish and the Syntax of Derivational Processes. In J. Herschensohn et al. (eds.) *Features and Interfaces in Romance*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
2004   Rivero, María Luisa. Spanish Quirky Subjects, Person Restrictions, and the Person-Case Constraint. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35.3: 494-502.
2006   Nevins, Andrew. The Representation of Third Person and its Consequences for Person-Case Effects. To appear in *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*.
2006   Rivero, María Luisa. Oblique subjects and person restrictions in Spanish: A Morphological Approach. In *Agreement Restrictions*, ed. by R. D'Alessandro, S. Fischer, and G. Hrafnbjargarson. Berlin: De Gruyter
2007   Zubizarreta, Ma. Luisa & Eunjeong Oh. *On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Acquisition:

1986   Liceras, Juana. *Linguistic Theory and Second Language Acquisition*. Tübigen: Narr.
1994   Strozer, Judith. *Language Acquisition after Puberty*. Georgetown. University Press.
1997   Lleó, Conxita. *La adquisición de la fonología de la primera lengua y de las lenguas extranjeras*. Madrid: Visor.
1998   Liceras, Juana M. and Lourdes Díaz. On the Nature of the Relationship between Morphology and Syntax: Inflectional Typology, *f*-Features and Null/Overt Pronouns in Spanish Interlanguage. In *Morphology and its Interfaces in Second Language Knowledge*. Maria-Luise Beck (ed.), 307 ff.
2003   Borgonovo, Claudia. Mood and Focus. In *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2001*, Josep Quer, Jan Schroten, Mauro Scorretti, Petra Sleeman and Els Verheugd (eds.), 17–30.
2003   Montrul, S. and F. Ordóñez (eds.). *Linguistic Theory and Language Development in Hispanic Languages*. Selected Papers from the 5th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium and the 2001 Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese. Sommerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. (497 pages)
2003   Pérez-Leroux, Ana Teresa & Juana Muñoz Liceras (eds.). *The Acquisition of Spanish Morphosyntax: The L1/L2 Connection*. *Studies in Theoretical Psycholinguistics*, vol. 31, 272 p.

2004   Montrul, S. *The Acquisition of Spanish*: *Morphosyntactic Development in Monolingual and Bilingual L1 Acquisition and in Adult L2 Acquisition.* [Series on Language Acquisition and Language Disorders] Amsterdam: John Benjamins (pp. xv + 411).

2005   M. Cabrera & M. L. Zubizarreta. Are All L1 Grammatical Properties Simultaneously Transferred?: Lexical Causatives in L2 Spanish and L2 English.". *Proceedings of the 7th Generative Approaches to Second Language Acquisition Conference (Gasla 2004)*, Laurent Dekydtspotter et al.(eds.), Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 24-37.

2006   Borgonovo, Claudia, Joyce Bruhn de Garavito & Philippe Prévost. Is the semantics/syntax interface vulnerable in L2 acquisition?: Focus on mood distinctions clauses in L2 Spanish. In *The Acquisition of Syntax in Romance Languages,* Vincent Torrens & Linda Escobar (eds.), Amsterdam, John Benjamins. 353-369.

2006   Borgonovo, Claudia, Joyce Bruhn de Garavito, Pedro Guijarro-Fuentes, Philippe Prévost & Elena Valenzuela. Specificity in Spanish: The syntax/semantics interface in SLA. *EUROSLA Yearbook*, Susan H. Foster-Cohen, Marta Medved Krajnovic and Jelena Mihaljević Djigunović (eds.), 57–78.

Variation:

1986   Suñer, M. Lexical Subjects of Infinitives in Caribbean Spanish. In O. Jaeggli & C. Silva-Corvalán (eds), *Studies in Romance Linguistics*. Dordrecht: Foris, 189-203.

1989   Suñer, M. Dialectal Variation and Clitic-Doubled Direct Objects. In C. Kirschner & J. DeCesaris (eds.), *Studies in Romance Linguistics: Selected Proceedings from the LSRL XVII*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 377-395.

1993   Toribio, Almeida Jacqueline. *Parametric Variation in the Licensing of Nominals*. Cornell U. diss.

1995   Suñer, Margarita & Carmen Lizardi. Dialectal Variation in an Argumental/Non-argumental Asymmetry in Spanish. *Contemporary Research in Romance Linguistics*, ed. by J. Amastae, G. Goodall, M. Montalbetti, & M. Phinney, Amsterdam: Benjamins, 187-203.

1996   Toribio, Almeida Jacqueline. Dialectal Variation in the Licensing of Null Referential and Expletive Subjects. In *Aspects of Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance languages XXIV.* C. Parodi, Carlos Quicoli, Mario Saltarelli & Ma. Luisa Zubizarreta (eds.). Washington, DC: GUP.

2000   Toribio, A. J. Setting parametric limits on dialectal variation in Spanish. *Lingua* 110: 315-341.

2001   Olarrea, A. & F. Ordoñez-Lao. Subject Clitics in Caribbean Spanish and XP Pied-piping. In J. Herschensson & K. Zagona, (eds.), *Features and Interfaces, Current Issues in Linguistic Theory.* John Benjamins Press.

2003   Sánchez, Liliana. *Quechua-Spanish Bilingualism: Interference and Convergence in Functional Categories*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

2005   Fernández Soriano, Olga & Violeta Demonte. Features in Comp and syntactic variation. The case of "(de)queísmo" in Spanish. *Lingua* 115: 1063-1082.

2006   Ordoñez, Francisco & Antxon Olarrea. Microvariation in Caribbean/nonCaribbean Spanish Interrogatives. *Probus* 18: 59-96.

Syntax:

Adjectives:

1980   Luján, Marta. *Sintaxis y semántica del adjetivo*. Madrid: Cátedra.

1990   Bosque, I. Sobre el aspecto en los adjetivos y participios. In I. Bosque (ed.), *Tiempo y Aspecto en español*. Madrid: Cátedra, 177-214.

1996   Bosque, I. & Carme Picallo. Postnominal Adjectives in Spanish. *Journal of Linguistics* 32: 349-385.

1999   Demonte, Violeta. A minimal account of Spanish adjective position and interpretation. In J. Franco, A. Landa y J. Martín (eds.). *Grammatical Analyses in Basque and Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins: 45-75.

Verb movement:

1984   Torrego, Esther. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15,103-129.
        (first to show word order contrast between argument/adjunct wh-extraction and its implications)

1990   Lema, J. & Ma. Luisa Rivero. Types of verbal movement in Old Spanish: Modals, Futures and Perfects, *Probus* 3, 237-278.

1994.   Suñer, M. Verb-movement and the Licensing of Argumental Wh-phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 12. 335-372 (evidence that wh-phrases move to SpecCP but the V stays within IP).

1994   Benedicto, Elena. AGR, f-features and V-movement: Identifying *pro*. In E. Benedicto & J. Runner (eds), *Functional Projections,* UMOP 17, University of Massachusetts, Amherst

Clitics: (doubling/restructuring/causatives/etc.)

1974   Bordelois, Ivonne. *The Grammar of Spanish Causative Complements*. Ph.D. dissertation, MIT.

1976   Strozer, Judith. *Clitics in Spanish*, UCLA dissertation.

1977   Rivas, Alfredo. *A Theory of Clitics*. MIT dissertation.

1979   Contreras, Heles. Clause Reduction, the Saturation Constraint and Clitic Promotion in Spanish. *Linguistic Analysis* 5, 161-182.

1982   Jaeggli, Osvaldo. *Topics in Romance Syntax,* Foris, Dordrecht.

1984   Hurtado, Alfredo. Clitic chains. Simon Fraser Univ. unpublished ms.

1986   Yépez, María. Direct Object Clitics in Quiteño Spanish. Cornell M.A. thesis.

1986   Rivero, María Luisa. Parameters in the typology of clitics in Romance, and Old Spanish. *Language* 62: 774-807.

1988   Suñer, M. The Role of Agreement in Clitic-Doubled Constructions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 391-434 (develops the Matching Hypothesis: CL-D allowed only if CL & double match in features; explains asymmetries betw. DO & IO doubling in Spanish).

1993   Franco, Jon. *On Object Agreement in Spanish*. Los Angeles: USC dissertation.

1993   Fernández Soriano (ed.). *Los pronombres átonos*. Taurus Universitaria.

1995   Demonte, Violeta. Dative alternation in Spanish. *Probus* 7: 5-30 (claims that Span IO clitic-doubling is equivalent to Engl double object construction; IO CliticP between the two parts of VP; cf. Larson 88).

2000a   Suñer, M. Object-shift: Comparing a Romance Language to Germanic. *Probus* 12: 261-289.

2000b   Suñer, M. Clitic-doubling of Strong Pronouns in Spanish: An Instance of Object-shift. In Jon Franco, Alazne Landa, and Juan Martín (eds.), *Grammatical Analyses in Basque and Romance Linguistics*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 233-256

Wh-movement (ie, movement of interrogative and relative pronouns):

1980   Plann, Susan. *Relative Clause in Spanish without Overt Antecedents and Related Constructions.* Berkeley: Univ. of CA Press.

1982   Plann, Susan. Indirect Questions in Spanish. *L.I.* 13. 297- 312.

1984   Torrego, Esther. On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *L. I.* 15. 103-129.

1988   Escandell Vidal, M. Victoria. *La interrogación en español: semántica y pragmática*. Madrid: Univ. Complutense.

1991   Rivero, Ma. Luisa. *Las construcciones de relativo*. Taurus Universitaria.

1991   Suñer, M. Indirect Questions and the Structure of CP: Some Consequences. In H. Campos and F. Martínez-Gil (eds), *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, Washington, DC: GUP, 283-312.

1993   Suñer, M. About Indirect Questions and Semi-Questions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 16, 45-77.

1994   Suñer, M. Verb-movement and the Licensing of Argumental *Wh*-phrases in Spanish. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 335-372.

1994   Rivero, Ma. L. On indirect questions, commands and Spanish quotative *que*. *LI* 25: 547-554.

1998   Ordoñez, Francisco. Post-verbal Asymmetries in Spanish. *NLLT* 16: 313-346 (deals w/ VSO & VOS orders, where the 2nd obtains by scrambling the object to the left. Great parallelisms to Zubizarreta 1998).

1998   Suñer, M. Resumptive Restrictive Relative Clauses: A Crosslinguistic Perspective. *Language* 74: 335-364.

2000   Suñer, M. The syntax of direct quotes with special reference to Spanish and English. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*. 18: 525-578.

2005   Arregui, Karlos & Naiara Centeno. Determiner Sharing and Cyclicity in *Wh*-movement. Randall Gess and Edward Rubin (eds.), *Theoretical and Experimental Approaches to Romance Linguistics*. John Benjamins, Philadelphia.

2006   Ordoñez, Francisco & Antxon Olarrea. Microvariation in Caribbean/non-Caribbean Spanish Interrogatives. *Probus* 18: 59-96.

Topic/Focus/Subject:

1976   Contreras, Heles. *A Theory of Word Order with Special Reference to Spanish*. Amsterdam: North-Holland.

1980   Groos, Anneke & Reaneke Bok-Bonnema. The Structure of the Sentence in Spanish. In I. Bordelois, H. Contreras & K. Zagona (eds.), *Generative Studies in Spanish Syntax*. Foris: Dordrecht, 67-80

1982   Suñer, M. *Syntax and Semantics of Spanish Presentational Sentence-types*. Washington, DC: GUP.

1987   Hernanz, Maria Luisa and José Maria Brucart. *La sintaxis.* Barcelona: Editorial Crítica.

1990   Campos, Héctor & Mary Zampini. Focalization Strategies in Spanish. *Probus* 2: 47-64.

1990   Treviño, Esthela. *Non-Canonical Subjects in Spanish: Evidence from Causatives and Psych Verbs.* Univ. of Ottawa, unpublished manuscript.

1991   Contreras, Heles. On the Position of Subjects. In S. Rothstein (ed*.), Perspectives on Phrase Structure: Heads and Licensing*. (Syntax & Semantics 25). S. Diego, Academic Press: 63-79.

1997   Ordoñez, Francisco. *Word Order and Clause Structure in Spanish and Other Romance Languages.* The City University of New York dissertation.

1998   Benedicto, E., S. Tomioka & M. Romero (eds). *Proceedings of the UMass Workshop on Focus*. GLSA [Graduate Linguistics Student Association], University of Massachusetts, Amherst.

1998   Zubizarreta, Ma. Luisa. *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

1999   Bleam, Tonia. *Leísta Spanish and the Syntax of Clitic Doubling*. Univ. of Delaware dissertation.

1999   Fernández Soriano, Olga. Two Types of Impersonal Sentences in Spanish: Locative and Dative Subjects. *Syntax* 2: 101-140.

2001   Goodall, Grant. The EPP in Spanish. In *Objects and other Subjects,* William Davies & Stanley Dubinsky (eds.), Kluwer.

2003   Arregui, Karlos. Clitic Left Dislocation is Contrastive Topicalization. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium, U. Penn Working Papers in Linguistics* 9.1:31-44. Penn Linguistics Club, Philadelphia.

2003   Suñer, M. The Lexical Preverbal Subject in a Romance Null Subject Language: Where Art Thou? *A Romance Perspective in Language Knowledge and Use. (LSRL 31,* Chicago, April 2001). Rafael Nuñez-Cedeño, Luis López and Richard Cameron (eds). John Benjamins, 341-357.

2004   Rivero, Ma. Luisa. Spanish Quirky Subjects, Person Restrictions and the Person-Case Constraint. *LI* 35: 494-502.

2004   Casielles-Suárez, Eugenia. *The Syntax-Information Structure Interface*. Routledge.

2006   Suñer, M. Left Dislocations with and without Epithets. *Probus* 18.1:127-157.

Coordination:

1972   Fält, Gunnar. *Tres problemas de concordancia verbal en el español moderno*. Uppsala, Almqvist y Wiksell.

1987   Bosque, I. Constricciones morfológicas sobre la coordinación. *LEA* 9: 83-100.

1988   Goodall, Grant. *Parallel Structures in Syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. P.

1995   Sánchez López, Cristina. On the Distributive Reading of Coordinate Phrases. *Probus* 7.2:181-196.

1997   Camacho, José. *The Syntax of NP Coordination*. USC dissertation.

Negation:

1980   Bosque, Ignacio. *Sobre la negación*. Madrid: Cátedra.

1990   Laka, Itziar. *Negation in Syntax: On the Nature of Functional Categories and Projections*. MIT diss.

1995   Suñer. Negative Elements, Island Effects and Resumptive *no*. *The Linguistic Review* 12, 233-273.

1997   Zanuttini, Rafaella. *Negation and Clausal Structure: A Comparative Study of Romance Languages*, Oxford University Press.

Null arguments:

1982   Suñer, M. On Null Subjects. *Linguistic Analysis* 9.1: 55-78.

1988   Hernanz, Ma. L. En torno a los sujetos arbitrarios: La 2a. persona del singular. UAB.

1991   Campos, Héctor. Silent Objects and Subjects in Spanish. *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*. Héctor Campos & Fernando Martínez-Gil (eds.), Washington, D.C.: GUP.

2003   Franco, Jon & Alazne Landa. Null Objects Revisited. *A Romance Perspective in Language Knowledge and Use. (LSRL 31,* Chicago, April 2001), Rafael Nunez-Cedeño, Luis López and Richard Cameron (eds). John Benjamins, 341-357.

DP structure:

1995   Parodi, Claudia. On Case and Agreement in Spanish and English DPs. *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics Selected Papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, GUP (1994), 403-16.

1988   Eguren, Luis. *Sintaxis de la Frase Nominal: La Hipótesis de la Frase Determinante*. Univ. de Valladolid dissertation.

1989   Mallén, Enrique. *The internal Structure of Determiner Phrases*. Cornell Univ. dissertation.

1990   Eguren, Luis. La combinatoria de los determinantes. *Dicenda* 9: 1-25

1990   Leonetti, Mario. *El artículo y la referencia*. Madrid: Taurus.

1994   Parodi, Claudia. On Case and Agreement in Spanish and English DPs, *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, GUP, 403-16.

1995   Martín, J. *On the Syntactic Structure of Spanish DPs*. University of Southern California dissertation.

1996   Bosque, I. *El sustantivo sin determinación*. Madrid: Visor Libros.

1997   Roca, F. *La determinación y la modificación nominal en español*. UAB dissertation.

2001   Gutiérrez-Rexach, Javier & Enrique Mallén**.** NP Movement and Adjective Position in the DP Phases. In *Features and Interfaces in Romance*, Julia Herschensohn, Enrique Mallén and Karen Zagona (eds.), 107 ff.

2004   Eguren, L. y C. Sánchez. Contrast and Addition in Romance. A Case Study in Microvariation. En J. Auger *et al.* (eds.), *Contemporary Approaches to Romance Linguistics*, Amsterdam, John Benjamins, 159-176.

2006   Eguren, L. La capacidad explicativa de la Hipótesis de la Frase Determinante, *Revista Iberoamericana*, 17: 215-238.

Extraction from DP:

1987   Demonte, V. Rección y minimidad en el sintagma nominal. En V. Demonte y M. Fernández Lagunilla (eds.), *Sintaxis de la lenguas románicas*, Madrid, El Arquero, 252-290.

1988   Campos, Héctor. Extraction from NP in Spanish. *Romance Linguistics and Literature Review* 1: 1-32.

1994   Contreras, Heles. Sobre la extracción desde sintagmas de determinante. *Revista Argentina de Lingüística* 10: 23-50.

2005   Ticio, E. Locality and Antilocality in Spanish DPs, *Syntax*, 8.3: 229-286.

Tense/Aspect/Mood:

1980   King, Larry & M. Suñer. On the Notion of Stativity in Spanish and Portuguese. In: F.H. Nuessel, Jr. (ed). *Contemporary Studies in Romance Languages*. Bloomington, Indiana Univ. Linguistics Club, 183-201.

1981   Luján, Marta. The Spanish Copulas as Aspectual Indicators. *Lingua* 54:623-209.

1990a   Bosque, Ignacio (ed.). *Indicativo y subjuntivo*. Taurus Universitaria.

1990b   Bosque, Ignacio (ed.). *Tiempo y aspecto en español*. Madrid: Cátedra.

1990   Kempchinsky, Paula. Más sobre el efecto de referencia disjunta del subjuntivo. En Bosque 1990a: 234-258.

1995   Bosque, Ignacio & Esther Torrego. On Spanish *Haber* and Tense. *Langues at Grammaire* 1: 13-29 (Univ. de Paris 8).

1990   Suñer, M. El tiempo en las subordinadas. In I. Bosque (ed.), *Tiempo y aspecto en español*. Madrid: Cátedra. 77-105.

1992   Miguel, Elena de. *El aspecto en la sintaxis del español: Perfectividad e impersonalidad*. Madrid: Univ. Autónoma.

1994   Borgonovo, Claudia. *The Parametric Syntax of Gerunds*. Brandeis Univ. dissertation.

1994   Saltarelli, Mario. Voice in Latin and Romance: On the Representation of Lexical Subjects. In *Issues and Theory in Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XXIII.* Michael L. Mazzola (ed.). Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 445-478.

1996   Cipria, Alicia. The Interpretation of Tense in Spanish Complement Clauses. The Ohio State Univ. diss.

1998   Schmitt, Cristina. Lack of Iteration: Accusative clitic doubling, participial absolutes and *have* + agreeing participles. *Probus* 10: 243-300.

1999   Zagona, Karen. Voice and Aspect. In *Grammatical Analyses of Basque and Romance Linguistics*. Jon Franco, Alazne Landa, and Juan Martín (eds.). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 279-293.

1999   Zagona, K. Structural Case and Tense Construal. In *Formal Perspectives on Romance Linguistics*. J-Marc Authier, Barbara Bullock and Lisa Reed (eds.). Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 305-327.

2001   Quer, Josep. Interpretating Mood. *Probus* 13: 81-111.

2002   Zagona, K. Tenses and Anaphora: Is there a tense-specific theory of coreference? In: *Anaphora: An Overview*. Andrew Barss (ed.). Oxford, UK and Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

2004   Cipria, Alicia. The Inchoative Interpretation of the Imperfect. In *Contemporary Approaches to Romance Linguistics*, Julie Auger, J. Clancy Clements and Barbara Vance (eds.), 65–81.

2004   Kempchinsky, Paula. Romance SE as an Aspectual Element. In *Contemporary Approaches to Romance Linguistics*, Julie Auger, J. Clancy Clements & Barbara Vance (eds.), 239–256.

2004   Zagona, K. "Measuring out" complement clause tenses. *Probus* 16: 273-315.

Auxiliary verbs:

1980   King, Larry & M. Suñer. The Meaning of the Progressive in Spanish and Portuguese. *The Bilingual Review/La Revista Bilingüe*, 222-238.

1987   Suñer, M. *Haber* + Past participle. *Linguistic Inquiry* 18. 683-689.

1992   Zagona, K. Perfective *Haber* and the Theory of Tenses. In H. Campos & F. Martínez-Gil (eds.), *Current Studies in Spanish Linguistics*, Washington, DC: GUP.

19xx   Lema, José. Tiempo y Aspecto, correlatos sintácticos y semánticos: los auxiliares *ser* y *estar*. En J. A. Pascual (ed.), *Estudios lingüísticos de México y España*, Univ. de Salamanca.

Deletion:

1987   Brucart, José M. *La elisión en español.* Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

edited by Joseph Collentine, Maryellen García, Barbara Lafford, and Francisco Marcos Marín

Cascadilla Proceedings Project   Somerville, MA   2009

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Suñer, Margarita. 2009. Formal Linguistics and the Syntax of Spanish: Past, Present and Future. In *Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Joseph Collentine et al., 9-26. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Suñer, Margarita. 2009. Formal Linguistics and the Syntax of Spanish: Past, Present and Future. In *Selected Proceedings of the 11th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. Joseph Collentine et al., 9-26. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2199.