

SQUIB

A biclausal account of Clitic Left-Dislocations with epithets in Rioplatense Spanish

Bruno Estigarría

University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Department of Romance Studies, Dey Hall, Chapel Hill, US
estigarr@email.unc.edu

Clitic Left-Dislocations with Epithets in Rioplatense Spanish (CLLD+ep) are sentences with three apparently co-referential direct object constituents: a clitic-left-dislocated topic DP (DP-LD), a clitic (CL) and a post-verbal epithet (DP-ep). Previous studies have proposed that the DP-ep is licensed in-situ as Clitic Doubling and the DP-LD base-generated, or that the DP-ep and the DP-LD are licensed together in a predicative small clause doubled by the clitic. However, data where the DP-LD and the CL are singular but co-occur with a plural DP-ep cast doubt on previous analyses. Here, I explore an analysis of CLLD+ep as an underlyingly biclausal structure subject to deletions. The biclausal structure allows a plural epithet to refer to the plural restrictor set of a syntactically singular quantifier in a previous clause.

Keywords: ellipsis; agreement mismatches; quantifiers; Intersentential Anaphora; predication

1 Introduction

Clitic Left-Dislocations with Epithets in Rioplatense Spanish (CLLD+ep; 1) are transitive sentences with a clitic-left-dislocated topic DP (DP-LD), a clitic (CL) and a post-verbal epithet (DP-ep).¹

- (1) a. Suñer (2006: 129)
A Menem_{DP-LD}, nadie **lo**_{CL} votará **a ese estafador**
 A Menem.M.SG nobody CL.M.SG vote.FUT.3SG A that swindler
sinvergüenza_{DP-ep}
 shameless.M.SG
 ‘(Carlos) Menem, nobody will vote for that shameless swindler.’
- b. **A los políticos**_{DP-LD} **los**_{CL} odio **a los idiotas**_{DP-ep}.
 A the politicians.M.PL CL.M.PL hate.1SG A the idiots.M.PL
 ‘I hate politicians, those idiots.’

All three *components* are identifiable as direct objects. The object CL is accusative.² Both DPs appear with *a* iff they are animate (“personal *a*”, glossed *A*, an instance of Differential

¹ To avoid terminological confusion, I use the label *clitic-left-dislocat(ed/ion)* in keeping with Cinque (1990), Suñer (2006) and López (2009). The first DP in the construction studied here is not a hanging topic (see 2 below). Agreement features are glossed once for the whole DP. The English translations attempt to render aspects of the information structure of the Spanish examples, but no such equivalence is necessarily present regarding syntactic structure. All judgments are mine (Rioplatense native speaker) or those of the authors cited.

² In Rioplatense Spanish, clitics are accusative iff they are direct objects.

Object Marking, *DOM*).³ The three components apparently agree in phi-features and are co-referential, although this squib will challenge this generalization by presenting data with number mismatches between a plural epithet and a singular DP-LD and CL.

2 Previous analyses

Suñer (2006) introduced CLLD + ep to support base-generation of CLLD. Her licensing mechanism combined Clitic Left-Dislocation (CLLD) and Clitic Doubling (CLD). Noting that the DP-ep is within the scope of the Nuclear Stress Rule (therefore, in situ), she licensed the CL/DP-ep chain in a BigDP. The clitic's obligatoriness and the epithet's definiteness and *a*-marking follow directly from independent requirements of CLLD.

She also argued that DOM shows the DP-LD to be clitic-left-dislocated and not a hanging topic (*connectivity*, Cinque 1990). However, the DP-LD cannot arrive in the left periphery via movement, since its putative original position is occupied by the DP-ep. Hence, it is licensed via Long-Distance Agreement. Finally, since the in-situ position is bound by the DP-LD, only epithets, which can be bound by a c-commanding DP, can occur there, but not other R-expressions.

López (2009: 230) challenged this proposal. A major theoretical concern is that probes for Agree are usually heads with unvalued phi-features. Contrary to this, in CLLD + ep the DP-LD is an XP with valued phi-features. Empirically, López noted that the DP-ep is in a relation of predication with the DP-LD, not of coreference. Crucially, predication is generally assumed to be licensed in a local configuration, not via Long-Distance Agreement. Hence, he proposed instead to license both DPs locally in a clitic-doubled small clause. That way, Suñer's example (2a) below would be licensed via the underlying small clause in (2b), followed by leftward movement of the DP-LD.

- (2) a. Suñer (2006: 129)
 En el trabajo, **a su hermano** Mara me dijo que no
 in the work A his brother.M.SG Mara me tell.PST.3SG that no
lo aguantan **a ese tarugo**.
 CL.M.SG stand.3PL A that jackass.M.SG
 'Mara told me that they can't stand her idiot brother at work.'
- b. López (2009: 230)
 En el trabajo, Mara me dijo que no **lo** aguantan [_{sc}
 in the work Mara me tell.PST.3SG that no CL.M.SG stand.3PL
ese tarugo_{DP-ep} **su hermano**_{DP-LD}].
 that jackass.M.SG his brother.M.SG

Whereas this proposal successfully accounts for the predication relation and the agreement between the DPs, López recognized that special stipulations would need to be added to account for DOM of the DP-ep, since predicative DPs in Spanish copular and small clauses appear without *a*.⁴

³ I restrict the discussion to animates following Suñer and López, although inanimate DOs are also acceptable:

- (i) **La moto** **la** vendí **esa porquería**.
 The motorcycle.F.SG CL.F.SG sell.PST.1SG that junk.F.SG
 'I sold the motorcycle, that piece of junk.'

⁴ Moreover, indefinites can be predicates in small clauses, but they cannot occur in CLLD + ep, a fact not easily accommodated in López's account.

- (ii) **Lo** considero **un** genio.
 CL.M.SG consider.1SG a.M.SG genius.M.SG
 'I consider him a genius.'

3 Forced agreement mismatches in Clitic Left-Dislocations with epithets

Even though both accounts have merits, the data I present below are not easily accommodated by either proposal. Example (3) shows a DP-LD that is a negative indefinite quantifier, morphosyntactically singular. In this case, the CL agrees in the singular with the DP-LD. However, the DP-ep is plural, creating a number agreement mismatch between the components. Moreover, as (3b) and (3c) show, it is not possible for the CL to agree in the plural with the DP-ep, or for the DP-ep to be singular, thus agreeing across the board. That is, the number mismatch is obligatory.⁵

- (3) a. Estigarribia (2017: 22)
A ningún estudiante lo bocharon a los suertudos.
 A no.one student.M.SG CL.M.SG fail.PST.3PL A the lucky.M.PL
 ‘But no student was failed, the lucky dogs.’
- b. ***A ningún estudiante los bocharon a los suertudos.**
 A no.one student.M.SG CL.M.PL fail.PST.3PL A the lucky.M.PL
 (‘But no student was failed, the lucky dog(s).’)
- c. ***A ningún estudiante lo bocharon al suertudo.**
 A no.one student.M.SG CL.M.SG fail.PST.3PL A.the lucky.M.SG
 (‘But no student was failed, the lucky dog.’)

This datum is problematic for both Suñer’s and López’s accounts. First, it strongly argues against the idea that CLLD + ep is an instance of Clitic Doubling, since this construction does not allow number mismatches (4), casting doubt on Suñer’s mechanism for jointly licensing the CL and DP-ep.

- (4) ***Lo bocharon a los suertudos.**
 CL.M.SG fail.PST.3PL A the lucky.M.PL
 (‘They failed the lucky devils.’)

As for López’s proposal, number mismatches are generally impossible in copular sentences and small clauses (5).

- (5) a. Ningún estudiante es un suertudo /* unos suertudos.
 no.one student.M.SG be.3SG a lucky.M.SG some lucky.M.PL
 ‘No student is a lucky dog.’
- b. No considero a [_{sc} ningún estudiante un suertudo /* unos suertudos]
 no consider.1SG A no.one student.M.SG a lucky.M.SG some
 lucky.M.PL
 ‘I do not consider any student a lucky dog.’

- (iii) **A Pepe lo odio a *un idiota.**
 A Pepe.M.SG CL.M.SG hate.1SG A a.M.SG idiot.M.SG
 (‘I hate that idiot Pepe.’)

⁵ These cases were first presented in Estigarribia (2017). One may also find gender mismatches with *epicene* nouns in CLLD + ep (iv). However, these mismatches are not relevant here because lack of overt agreement is a property of epicene nouns independently of CLLD + ep (see, for example, a copular sentence such as (v)).

- (iv) **A mi jefe lo odio a esa víbora.**
 A my boss.M.SG CL.M.SG hate.1SG A that snake.F.SG
 ‘I hate my boss, that snake.’

- (v) **Mi jefe es una víbora.**
 my boss.M.SG be.3SG a snake.F.SG
 ‘My boss is a snake.’

Careful consideration of the semantics of the predication relation in CLLD + ep also argues against a small clause analysis. Note that in (3a) (repeated below for convenience) the DP-ep is not predicated of the overt (singular) DP-LD, but of the covert (plural) restriction set of the quantifier, ‘the students’ (that is, it is the students who are lucky, not ‘no student’ or ‘some student’).

- (3) a. **A ningún estudiante lo bocharon a los suertudos.**
 A no.one student.M.SG CL.M.SG fail.PST.3PL A the lucky.M.PL
 ‘But no student was failed, the lucky dogs.’

Trying to license (3a) with López’s mechanism is also problematic. The possibilities in (6) match the surface DPs, but their small clause is ungrammatical and would make *ningún estudiante* the subject of predication.

- (6) No lo/los bocharon *_{sc}[unos/los suertudos
 no CL.M.SG/CL.M.PL fail.PST.3PL some/the lucky.M.PL
 ningún estudiante]
 no.one student.M.SG
 (‘The students weren’t failed, the lucky bastards.’)

These mismatch data force us to continue looking for a viable licensing mechanism for CLLD + ep.

4 Agreement mismatches in Intersentential Anaphora

Notably, number mismatches like these are also found in Intersentential Anaphora. Such mismatches are familiar from studies of the reference of *they* across sentences in English (7a shows the pronoun *they*; 7b a plural epithet). Similar examples can be constructed for Spanish (8).

- (7) a. No professor was harmed in the making of this paper. **They** (= the professors) were well protected.
 b. No professor was harmed in the making of this paper. **The poor things** (= the professors) are so sensitive.
- (8) a. No bocharon a ningún estudiante. **pro*_{SG} Había
 no fail.PST.3PL A no.one student.M.SG have.PST.3SG
 estudiado mucho.
 studied much
 ‘They did not fail any student. *S/he had studied a lot.’
- b. No bocharon a ningún estudiante. *pro*_{PL} Habían
 no fail.PST.3PL A no.one student.M.SG have.PST.3PL
 estudiado mucho.
 studied much
 ‘They did not fail any student. They had studied a lot.’
- c. No bocharon a ningún estudiante. **pro*_{SG} Es un suertudo.
 no fail.PST.3PL A no.one student.M.SG be.3SG a lucky.M.SG
 ‘They did not fail any student. *He is lucky.’
- d. No bocharon a ningún estudiante. *pro*_{PL} Son unos suertudos.
 no fail.PST.3PL A no.one student.M.SG be.3PL some lucky.PL
 ‘They did not fail any student. They are lucky.’

The configuration of intersentential anaphoric relations allows a plural pronoun (or epithet) to refer to the plural (covert) restriction of a singular (overt) quantified antecedent. Note that in (7), not only do *they/the poor things* take a plural antecedent that is not itself overtly present in the preceding sentence, but also *were well protected/are so sensitive* are predicated of ‘professors’, that is, of the restriction of the quantified *no professor*. This reference to the restrictor set is often called *maximal set* anaphora (Nouwen 2003: 43), and is generally available in intersentential contexts, provided the restrictor set is guaranteed to be non-empty (that is, with strong determiners; see Nouwen 2003: 50). Likewise, both in (3a) and in (8) *habían estudiado mucho/suertudos* are predicated of ‘estudiantes’, the restriction of the quantified *ningún estudiante*. Therefore, the singular/plural mismatches occur similarly in Intersentential Anaphora and in CLLD + ep.

In light of these parallels, I propose that number mismatches can be explained if CLLD + ep is derived from a structure that is underlyingly biclausal, allowing for anaphoric relations where a subsequent plural epithet can refer to the plural maximal set (restriction) of the singular quantified antecedent. Biclausal structures have been assumed in analyses of dislocations (Ott 2014; Ott & de Vries 2016), ellipsis (Arregi 2010), emphatic replies (Poletto & Zanuttini 2013), and clefts (Zubizarreta 2014). The two underlying clauses involved are reformulations that support deletion of identical parts and phonological integration, thus deriving a CLLD + ep that is monoclausal on the surface.

5 Putting forward a biclausal solution

Let us assume for simplicity the CLLD + ep in (9a). The underlying structure in (9b) is composed of a CP1 with a VP that contains the DP-LD, and a CP2 with a VP that contains the DP-ep. In (9c), Clitic-Left Dislocation applies in CP1 for information-structural reasons (this is independently needed to obtain a CLLD sentence). In (9d), Bare Argument Ellipsis (or Gapping, more generally, since more than one constituent can remain; see (16) below) deletes the redundant *odio* in CP2, leaving the epithet as remnant.⁶

- (9) a. **A Pepe lo odio al idiota.**
 A Pepe CL.M.SG hate.1SG A.the idiot.M.SG
 ‘I hate that idiot Pepe.’
- b. [_{CP1} odio a Pepe_{DP-LDi}] [_{CP2} odio al idiota_{DP-epi}]
- c. [_{CP1} a Pepe_{DP-LDi} lo odio a Pepe_{DP-LDi}] [_{CP2} odio al idiota_{DP-epi}]
- d. [_{CP1} a Pepe_{DP-LDi} lo odio a Pepe_{DP-LDi}] [_{CP2} odio al idiota_{DP-epi}]

In the underlying structure in (9b), CP1 and CP2 are *reformulations* in the sense of Ott (2016), that is, the CP2 is fully redundant with the CP1 modulo the differing DPs. In this case, ellipsis allows a CP2 remnant to be integrated prosodically in the CP1. Hence, the reformulative character of CP2 allows the DP-ep to be within the scope of the Nuclear Stress Rule.

Because my proposal depends on the underlying structures being syntactically parallel, I assume that CLLD in CP1 is obtained by movement. Evidence in support of this is the fact that a lower quantified DP can bind DP-LDs (10) (see Villa-García 2019). Another supporting fact is that a prosodic boundary is not necessarily present after the DP-LD (Labastía 2018), which would otherwise suggest base-generation.⁷

⁶ For discussion of the issues involved in assuming Stripping/Gapping, see Johnson (2019).

⁷ I thank a reviewer for suggesting using these properties to provide support for a movement analysis. The same reviewer wonders whether the epithet can occur in a position other than the base-generated one. It can indeed, but it requires an intonational break after the DP-LD. I believe this to be a different derivation, with a hanging topic DP plus a CLLD’d epithet. Reasons of space preclude a more complete exposition of this point.

- (10) A su_i mujer todo marido_i la engaña a la muy
 A his wife every husband CL.F.SG cheat.on.3SG A the very
desgraciada.
 unfortunate.F.SG
 ‘Every husband cheats on his poor unfortunate wife.’

Let us see now how this proposal accounts for all known properties of CLLD + ep.

5.1 Morphosyntactic marking of CLLD+ep components

Further evidence for an analysis that assumes a biclausal structure followed by ellipsis is provided by case matching of the DP-ep, not predicted by López’s account. The biclausal structure in (9) correctly predicts that the DP-ep will be *a*-marked and have the morphosyntactic shape of an argumental DP, because the DP-ep is a local argument of the V in CP2. This strongly suggests that there must be additional covert clausal structure than can license the visible epithet.⁸

On the other hand, connectivity and agreement effects between the DP-LD and the CL follow directly from properties of “vanilla” Clitic Left-Dislocation in CP1.⁹ Note that, as a result, (a) Clitic Doubling is not a mechanism that licenses CLLD + ep or parts thereof (contra Suñer 2006), and thus (b) the CL must agree with the DP-LD but is theoretically free to disagree with the DP-ep. Crucially, so far nothing enforces agreement of the DP-ep with either of the other two components, a fact that will become immediately relevant in 5.3 below.

5.2 Predicational semantics

How the epithet enters a predication relation with the intended, but not always overt, subject of predication is not obvious in Suñer’s and López’s proposal. In the account advanced here no specific predication structure (small clause or other) is needed. Instead, the DP-ep enters in a predication simply because of how reference to entities works in chained discourse. Generally, subsequent reference to a given discourse participant *x* with a new referential expression with lexical content *P* is tantamount, semantically, to predicating *P(x)*. For example, the speaker of (11) below cannot really deny having called Pete ‘a son of a bitch’, or in (12), deny having called Pepe ‘an idiot’. A biclausal structure allows the predication *idiotista(Pepe)* to be established in the same way for (9) above.¹⁰

- (11) I hate Pete. The son of a bitch slept with my wife.

- (12) Lo odio a Pepe. No lo puedo ver al idiota.
 CL.M.SG hate.1SG A Pepe. no CL.M.SG can.1SG see A.the idiot.M.SG
 ‘I hate Pepe. I can’t stand the idiot.’

⁸ Similar arguments for biclausality are made in Arregi (2010), for example.

⁹ See Rizzi (1997) for an explanation of why the CL is obligatory in CLLD.

¹⁰ In a similar vein, Ott (2014; 2016) argues that coreference between anchor and restrictive nominal appositive, and in left-dislocations, is obtained from discourse coherence. I agree. The CP2 cannot explicitly encode the predication relation, as in (vi) below, because if (vi) was the underlying structure, it is unclear how the DP-ep would end up spelled out as (viii) due to the morphosyntactic mismatch in definiteness (the same problem afflicts López’s analysis).

(vi) [_{CP1} Odio a Pepe] [_{CP2} Pepe es un idiota]

(vii) [_{CP1} A Pepe lo odio] [_{CP2} Un idiota es-Pepe] > *A Pepe lo odio un idiota.

(viii) A Pepe lo odio al idiota.

Notably, the predication *idiota(Pepe)* is not-at-issue (see Estigarribia 2017): it is not part of the main assertion and is typically not amenable to direct rejection. This is expected if the predication is established in the absence of an intraclausal syntactic predicational structure (although this is not the only way not-at-issue content can arise).

5.3 Number agreement mismatches

Finally, the key datum in this squib is forced number agreement mismatches between singular DP-LD and CL on one hand, and plural DP-ep on the other. As we saw above, plural pronouns in Intersentential Anaphora can refer to the *reference set* of a previous quantifier (13a) or to its restriction or *maximal set* (13b). Consequently, I identify (3a) (repeated here for convenience) as an instance of *maximal set anaphora* (*maximal* because it refers to the whole restrictor set).

- (13) Nouwen (2003: 43)
- a. Few MPs attended the meeting. **They** decided not to discuss anything important.
 - b. Few MPs attended the meeting. But **they** all attended the drinks afterwards.
- (3) a. **A ningún estudiante lo bocharon a los suertudos.**
 A no.one student.M.SG CL.M.SG fail.PST.3PL A the lucky.M.PL
 ‘No student was failed, the lucky dogs.’

I propose that (3a) is licensed biclausally as in (14).

- (14) a. [_{CP1} no bocharon a **ningún estudiante**_{DP-LD-i}] [_{CP2} no bocharon a los **suertudos**_{DP-ep-i}]
- b. [_{CP1} a **ningún estudiante**_i ~~no~~ lo bocharon *t*_i] [_{CP2} ~~no bocharon a los suertudos~~_i]

In (14b), the topical object DP in CP1 is fronted to check information structure features: the DP-LD thus surfaces case-marked as in its base position and agrees with the clitic.¹¹ Redundant material in CP2 is then deleted. Prosodic integration is possible as mentioned above as a consequence of the reformulative character of CP2.¹²

Going back to the beginning of this squib, Suñer claimed the epithet to be in-situ on prosodic grounds. In support of the DP-ep’s being in-situ, Estigarribia (2014; 2017) shows that this constituent also precedes secondary predicates (15a), VP-internal adverbials (15b), and is licensed in ECM contexts (15c).

- (15) a. **A mi vecina yo no la considero a esa yegua una amiga.**
 A my neighbor.F.SG I no CL.F.SG consider.1SG A that mare.F.SG a friend.F.SG
 ‘My neighbor, I don’t consider that bitch a friend.’
- b. **A Mara la atropellaron a la pobre a propósito.**
 A Mara.F.SG CL.F.SG run.over.PST.3PL A the poor.F.SG on purpose
 ‘They ran Mara over on purpose, the poor sod.’

¹¹ For this step, note that Spanish preverbal n-words are incompatible with negation (see Sánchez López 1999), hence *no* cannot appear overtly.

¹² A reviewer wonders what excludes structures with Focus Fronting + epithet. This is ruled out either because the DP-LD and the DP-ep differ in information structure status and are therefore in non-reformulative clauses, or they have the same focal status and cannot be integrated in a single clause.

- c. **A los alumnos los deajo a los tarambanas**
 A the students.M.PL CL.M.PL leave.1SG A the scatterbrains.M.PL
 copiarse.
 to.copy
 ‘The students, I let those scatterbrains copy off of someone else.’

This behavior is predicted in this analysis. For example, occurrence of the DP-ep before a secondary predicate is derived by ellipsis targeting redundant material both in CP2 and CP1 (that is, backward clausal ellipsis, see Ott 2014), yielding the derivation in (16).¹³ This way, the DP2 shows in-situ behavior while belonging to a separate clause underlyingly.

- (16) a. [_{CP1} considero a Mara_i una genia] [_{CP2} considero a esa loca linda_i una genia]
 b. [_{CP1} a Mara_i la considero t_i una genia] [_{CP2} considero a esa loca linda_i una genia]
 (CLLD) + (Forward ellipsis in CP2) + (Backward ellipsis in CP1)
 c. **A Mara la considero a esa loca linda una**
 A Mara.F.SG CL.F.SG consider.1SG A that crazy cutie.F.SG a
 genia.
 genius.F.SG
 ‘I consider Mara, that crazy cutie, a genius.’

The DP-ep can also occur after a secondary predicate. In this case, backward clausal ellipsis is not applied, but forward ellipsis of the secondary predicate in CP2 (17).

- (17) a. [_{CP1} considero a Mara_i una genia] [_{CP2} considero a esa loca linda_i una genia]
 b. [_{CP1} a Mara_i la considero t_i una genia] [_{CP2} considero a esa loca linda_i una genia]
 c. **A Mara la considero una genia a esa loca**
 A Mara.F.SG CL.F.SG consider.1SG a genius.F.SG A that crazy
linda.
 cutie.F.SG
 ‘I consider Mara, that crazy cutie, a genius.’

Ningún is not the only quantifier that allows the DP-ep to refer to its restriction. The DP-LD quantifier in (18) is *pocos* ‘few’. There is no number mismatch because the reference set for the quantifier is plural, making the clitic plural as well, independently of the plurality of the DP-ep (indices added to clarify this).

- (18) **A pocos corruptos_i los_i condenan a los hijos de puta_i.**
 A few corrupt.PL CL.M.PL sentence.3PL A the sons of bitch.M.PL
 ‘Few corrupt politicians are sentenced, the bastards (= all corrupt politicians).’

In order to derive (18), surface *pocos* ‘few’ must be *many* plus VP negation underlyingly, as argued for in Greer (2014a; b). This explains why the pattern in (19) is only possible when *pocos* has the proportional reading ‘few of the corrupt (politicians) are sentenced’, which is equivalent to *many* + NOT VP, and not when it has the “reverse” reading ‘few of the sentenced people are corrupt (politicians)’, which is not equivalent to *many* + NOT VP.

¹³ As Ott (2014: 278) notes, “backward clausal ellipsis [...] is a general possibility, as shown for example by backward sluicing”.

- (19) a. [_{CP1} no condenan **a muchos corruptos**]_i [_{CP2} no condenan **a los hijos de puta**]_i
 b. [_{CP1} **a muchos corruptos**_i no los condenan *t_i*] [_{CP2} ~~no condenan a los hijos de puta~~]_i
 c. [_{CP1} **a pocos corruptos**_i los condenan *t_i*] [_{CP2} ~~no condenan a los hijos de puta~~]_i (*many + NOT VP > few*)

6 Conclusion and further work

To summarize, a biclausal analysis accounts for the morphological shape of all the components, their surface positions, and the way the DP-ep finds a subject of predication in either the reference or the restrictor set of the DP-LD. Key components of this proposal are that CLLD is derived by movement in CP1, that both forward and backward ellipsis must be allowed to apply, and that the CP2 epithet must be allowed to integrate prosodically into the CP1. Yet, a couple of observations suggest the link between Intersentential Anaphora and CLLD + ep is not unproblematic.

First, since Intersentential Anaphora involving non-epithet DPs is acceptable (20a), we should expect non-epithet DPs to occur in CLLD + ep (20b), contrary to fact.¹⁴

- (20) a. No voté **a Méndez**. No voté **al peor presidente que tuvimos**.
 no vote.PST.1SG A Méndez no vote.PST.1SG A.the worst president.M.SG that have.PST.1PL
 ‘I didn’t vote for Méndez. I didn’t vote for the worst president we’ve had.’
- b. *A Méndez no lo voté **al peor presidente que tuvimos**.
 A Méndez no CL.M.SG vote.PST.1SG A.the worst president.M.SG that have.PST.1PL
 (‘I didn’t vote for Méndez, the worst president that we’ve had.’)¹⁵

One possibility worth exploring is to follow Suñer in exploiting Condition C of classical Binding Theory. For that, we need to assume that in CLLD + ep there is, in fact, some mechanism that syntactically integrates the DP-ep into the CP1, and that this full syntactic integration is responsible for this restriction. Biclausal analyses of fragment answers and sluicing (Merchant 2004), split questions, and right- and left-dislocations (Arregi 2010; Ott 2014; Ott & de Vries 2016) yield structures where the remnants of ellipsis are not fully integrated in the host clause. Contrary to this, CLLD + ep is monoclausal on the surface. Allowing full syntactic integration of the DP-ep would make it subject to Condition C, thus preventing R-expressions from occurring. This would require making the deletion site in CP1 available for this kind of “extreme” merging. For example, this could be a kind of *external remerge* à la de Vries (2012). But, prima facie, it looks like this solution risks overgenerating in a different way, since now all traces of movement could in principle be vacated to allow remergings.

¹⁴ Note that the weight/length of the DP-ep is not an issue:

- (ix) A Méndez no lo voté **al hijo de una caravana de diez mil putas**.
 A Méndez no CL.M.SG vote.PST.1SG A.the son of a caravan of ten thousand whores.M.SG
 ‘I didn’t vote for Méndez, the son of a caravan of a thousand whores.’

¹⁵ A reviewer mentions that (20b) does not sound too bad. If so, then that is even better for the biclausal account, since the intersentential version is OK.

Another possibility is that in (20) there is no real predication relation between the DP-LD *a Méndez* ‘Méndez’ and the DP-ep *al peor presidente que tuvimos* ‘the worst president we’ve had’. The latter being an R-expression, it is freer to find a referent than are anaphoric expressions like pronouns or epithets. It could be that there is a strong pragmatic preference to interpret R-expressions as referentially disjoint, and that this interferes with a hearer’s ability to appropriately parse (20b) to avoid a valency violation. This would mean that (20b) is indeed grammatical, but extremely dispreferred for audience-design/parsing reasons. Experimental evidence could presumably be brought to bear on this issue.

Another issue is raised by the behavior of *cada* ‘each’.¹⁶ It allows expected mismatches intersententially (21), but apparently not in CLLD + ep (22).

(21) Premiaron a cada estudiante. *pro*_{PL} Son unos suertudos.
give.award.PST.3PL A each student.SG be.3PL some lucky.M.PL
‘They gave awards to each student. They are lucky.’

(22) *A cada estudiante lo premiaron a los suertudos.
A each student.SG CL.M.SG give.award.PST.3PL A the lucky.M.PL
‘(Each student was given a prize, the lucky dogs.)’

First, note that a singular epithet is disallowed, which is consistent with the ungrammaticality of examples involving *ningún* + singular epithet, and consistent with the Intersentential Anaphora patterns.

(23) *A cada estudiante lo premiaron al suertudo.
A each student.SG CL.M.SG give.award.PST.3PL A.the lucky.M.SG
‘(Each student was given a prize, the lucky dog.)’

Now, I think the reason that (22) also sounds unacceptable is because of the complicated expectations set up by the semantics of *cada*. It is known that, unlike *todo(s)* ‘every’, *cada* ‘each’ seems to require distributivity, and a focus on individuals (e.g. Vendler 1967; Tunstall 1998).

(24) a. Tenés que hablar con cada estudiante.
have.2SG that to.talk with each student.SG
‘You have to talk with each student.’ (one by one but not all together)

b. Habló con casi todos los estudiantes. / *casi cada
talk.PST.3SG with almost all the student.M.PL almost each
estudiante.
student.SG
‘S/he talked to almost every/*each student.’

Cada, then, requires an interpretation at the level of events predicated of single individuals. Example (22) is odd because one does not expect a predication about the whole set if you use *cada*. Something is needed that reflects the distributivity of *cada*. Note that if one adds the postverbal subject *sus padres*, which “satisfies” the distributivity of *cada*, in my opinion acceptability improves:

(25) ?A cada estudiante_i lo premiaron sus_i padres a los
A each student.SG CL.M.SG give.award.PST.3PL his parents A the
suertudos.
lucky.M.PL
‘Each student was given a prize by their (own) parents, the lucky dogs.’

¹⁶ As a reviewer notes.

Therefore, I believe the issue in (22) is how to satisfy the expectations that the use of *cada* sets up. This is not a problem in Intersentential Anaphora because the first sentence's interpretation is unproblematically distributive, and the quantifier *cada* still introduces its restriction set as a possible antecedent for future reference.

To resolve the issues raised in this squib satisfactorily, it is crucial to determine experimentally, in future work, the range of grammatical quantifier/DP-ep combinations and their degree of acceptability. This will help narrow down the possible analyses of Romance Clitic Left-Dislocations. Moreover, if the analysis presented here is correct, it can have important consequences for recent proposals about “unconventional” merging operations, and more generally for the infrastructure of the syntax-semantics interface.

Abbreviations

The abbreviations used follow the Leipzig glossing rules at <https://www.eva.mpg.de/lingua/resources/glossing-rules.php> (accessed 14 November 2019).

1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person, A = personal *a* (differential marking of animate specific direct objects), CL = clitic, CLD = Clitic Doubling, CLLD+ep = Clitic Left-Dislocation(s) with epithet(s), DO = direct object, DOM = Differential Object Marking, DP-LD = Clitic Left-Dislocated DP, DP-ep = post-verbal epithet, ECM = Exceptional Case Marking, F = feminine, FUT = future, M = masculine, NOM = nominative, PL = plural, PST = past, SG = singular

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Luis López, Liliana Sánchez, Andrés Saab, and Pablo Zdrojewski for discussion of some of these issues. The published manuscript does not necessarily reflect their views. The author thanks Dennis Ott as well for sharing some of his unpublished manuscripts.

Competing Interests

The author has no competing interests to declare.

References

- Arregi, Karlos. 2010. Ellipsis in split questions. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 28(3). 539–592. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-010-9097-x>
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1990. *Types of A-bar Dependencies*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- de Vries, Mark. 2012. Unconventional mergers. In Myriam Uribe-Etxebarria & Vidal Valmala (eds.), *Ways of Structure Building*, 143–166. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199644933.003.0007>
- Estigarribia, Bruno. 2014. La estructura informacional en la triplicación con clíticos del español rioplatense. *Signo y Seña: Revista del Instituto de Lingüística* 25. 105–132.
- Estigarribia, Bruno. 2017. The semantics of Spanish Clitic Left Dislocations with epithets. *Probus* 29(2). 287–321. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/probus-2017-0002>
- Greer, Kristen. 2014a. *A General Theory of Quantification*. Davis, CA: University of California, Davis dissertation.
- Greer, Kristen. 2014b. Extensionality in natural language quantification: The case of *many* and *few*. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 37(4). 315–351. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-014-9157-5>
- Johnson, Kyle. 2019. Gapping and Stripping. In Jeroen van Craenenbroeck & Tanja Temmerman (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ellipsis*, 562–604. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780198712398.013.24>
- Labastía, Leopoldo Omar. 2018. *Entonación y estructura informativa en el español rioplatense*. Madrid: Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia dissertation.

- López, Luis. 2009. *A derivational syntax for information structure*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199557400.001.0001>
- Merchant, Jason. 2004. Fragments and ellipsis. *Linguistics & Philosophy* 27(6). 661–738. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-005-7378-3>
- Nouwen, Rick. 2003. *Plural Pronominal Anaphora in Context: Dynamic Aspects of Quantification*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Ott, Dennis. 2014. An Ellipsis Approach to Contrastive Left-Dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45(2). 269–303. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1162/LING_a_00155
- Ott, Dennis. 2016. Ellipsis in appositives. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 1(1). 34. 1–46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.37>
- Ott, Dennis & Mark de Vries. 2016. Right-dislocation as deletion. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 34(2). 641–690. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-015-9307-7>
- Poletto, Cecilia & Raffaella Zanuttini. 2013. Emphasis as reduplication: Evidence from *sì che/no che* sentences. *Lingua* 128. 124–141. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2012.10.016>
- Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of the left periphery. In Liliane Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of Grammar*, 281–337. Dordrecht: Kluwer. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7
- Sánchez López, Cristina. 1999. La negación. In Ignacio Bosque & Violeta Demonte (eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, vol. 2, 2561–2634. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Suñer, Margarita. 2006. Left dislocations with and without epithets. *Probus* 18(1). 127–158. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/PROBUS.2006.005>
- Tunstall, Susanne Lynn. 1998. *The Interpretation of Quantifiers: Semantics and Processing*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Amherst dissertation.
- Vendler, Zeno. 1962. Each and Every, Any and All. *Mind*, 71(282). 145–160. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LXXI.282.145>
- Villa-García, Julio. 2019. Re complementation in English and Spanish: Delineating the CP space. *Glossa: A Journal of General Linguistics* 4(1). 56. 1–44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.845>
- Zubizarreta, María Luisa. 2014. On the grammaticalization of the Assertion Structure: A view from Spanish. In Andreas Dufter & Álvaro S. Octavio de Toledo y Huerta (eds.), *Left Sentence Peripheries in Spanish: Diachronic, Variationist, and Comparative Perspectives (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today)*, 253–282. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/la.214.14zub>

How to cite this article: Estigarribia, Bruno. 2020. A biclausal account of Clitic Left-Dislocations with epithets in Rioplatense Spanish. *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 5(1): 33.1–12. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.1008>

Submitted: 24 May 2019

Accepted: 04 November 2019

Published: 24 March 2020

Copyright: © 2020 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC-BY 4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. See <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.



Glossa: a journal of general linguistics is a peer-reviewed open access journal published by Ubiquity Press.

OPEN ACCESS