Abstract
This article examines the post- and preverbal clitic alternations (traditionally, enclisis and proclisis) found in Western Iberian Romance languages (WI), that is in Galician, European Portuguese and Asturian. These clitic alternations have been traditionally analyzed assuming clitics in these languages are phonologically enclitic – that is, as clitics requiring a phonological host to their left. Alternatively, other analyses have capitalized on a syntactically triggered verb-movement past the clitic to a projection in the left-periphery, blocked under certain conditions. Summarizing part of the research developed in Fernández Rubiera (2009), this article presents new data from different varieties of Asturian where postverbal clitics can also be found in the finite embedded context, a clitic pattern that speakers of Galician and European Portuguese report as marginal or ungrammatical. Empirical evidence from these varieties of Asturian supports an analysis of post- and preverbal clitic alternations in terms of syntactic movement to Finitenessº (cf. Rizzi 1997, 2004) either as an instance of A’-movement or by Xº-movement of a closer head to this left-peripheral projection. In turn, this analysis can be naturally extended to explain the different interpretations that post- and preverbal clitics give rise to in the finite embedded contexts in which both options are grammatical for speakers of what I call Conservative Asturian (CAst). Finally, I briefly show how the analysis proposed predicts crosslinguistic variation within WI in the finite embedded context, which I claim to be ultimately related to differences in the complementizer system in the languages under study.
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1. POST- AND PREVERBAL CLITICS IN WESTERN IBERIAN ROMANCE LANGUAGES

1.1. Clitic alternations in the matrix context in Western Iberian Romance languages

One of the properties that distinguishes Western Iberian Romance languages from other Romance varieties is that sometimes the clitic appears postverbally and sometimes preverbally in the matrix context, as it is shown in (1) and (2) respectively. The examples in (1) show that clitics appear obligatorily in postverbal position in verb initial contexts in Asturian (Ast), Galician (Gal) and European Portuguese (EP), while those in (2) show that the negative marker forces a preverbal order of the clitic in these languages.

(1) a. Téo\-les tayaes \[\ast \text{Les teo}\]  
   have\textsubscript{1sg}-them\textsubscript{cl} cut  
   “I have them (my hands) cut”  
   [Álvarez, Llames]
   
   b. Contou\-mo todo \[\ast \text{Mo contou}\]  
   told\textsubscript{1sg}-me\textsubscript{cl}-it\textsubscript{cl} everything  
   “S/he told me everything”  
   [Álvarez et al. (1986: 183)]
   
   c. Estudara\-o a fundo \[\ast \text{O estudara}\]  
   had-studied\textsubscript{3sg}-it\textsubscript{cl} to depth  
   “S/he had studied it in depth”  
   [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 165)]

(2) a. Nun me mancó \[\ast \text{mancó-me}\]  
   not me\textsubscript{1sg} hurt\textsubscript{3sg}  
   “S/he didn’t hurt me”  
   [Orton, Mayordomu]
   
   b. Non \textbf{cho} dícia por iso \[\ast \text{dícía-cho}\]  
   not you\textsubscript{1sg} said\textsubscript{1sg} for that  
   “I didn’t say it to you for that (reason)”  
   [Álvarez et al. (1986: 185)]
   
   c. Tu não \textbf{lhe} telefonaste hoje? \[\ast \text{telefonaste-lhe}\]  
   you not him\textsubscript{1sg} phoned\textsubscript{3sg} today  
   “You didn’t call him today?”  
   [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 167)]

In turn, assuming the CP projection comprises an articulated set of functional projections – i.e., a left-periphery approach to the CP, which include TopicP and FocusP as argued in Rizzi (1997), we observe the following. A Topic, clearly identified by the presence of an obligatory resumptive clitic coindexed with the dislocated direct object and by its falling intonation, triggers obligatorily a postverbal clitic pattern. On the other hand, a Focus, identified by the ungrammaticality of a resumptive clitic coindexed with the dislocated constituent, by its raising intonation (as it is customary, I indicate this particular intonation with capitals), and for encoding contrastive information, triggers a preverbal clitic pattern. This is shown in (3) and (4).

---

1 Clitics are in bold here and in subsequent examples for the readers’ convenience. I indicate in brackets here and elsewhere the source of the examples in Asturian, with the author’s last-name and the name of the play where it can be found. See the Asturian corpus-bibliography for details.
Forceº, Finitenessº and the placement of clitics

(3) a. Esoi sábes\_lo\_ per leer\_les cartes
That you know\_it\_CL for read\_INF the cards
“That, you know it from reading the (tarot) cards”  
(González, Comedies)

b. iso\_ publicáron\_o\_ os críticos insidiosos
that published\_it\_CL the critics\_insidious
“That, the insidious critics published it”  
(CORGA (2008))

c. issoi digo-\_vo-lo\_ eu
that say\_youCL\_CL I
“That, I say it to you”  
(O Corpus do Portugués (2007))

(4) a. YO MESMA\_me\_la\_ repito\_ un cientu\_vegas
I\_self\_POC\_me\_CL I repeat\_one hundred times
“I myself repeat it to myself one hundred times”  
[de Pablo, Memoria]

b. e NO SEU TRABALLO\_o\_ prenderon
and in-the his\_job\_FOCUS\_him\_CL caught\_PL
“And it was in his job that they caught him”  
[Álvarez et al. (1986: 184)]

c. OS TRÊS HOMENS\_se\_sentaram à\_ mesa
the three\_men\_POC\_rfl\_CL sat\_atPL at-the table
“It was the three men who sat at the table”  
[Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 166)]

Summarizing, post- and preverbal clitics arise uniformly in the same matrix contexts in Western Iberian Romance languages: postverbal clitics arise obligatorily in verb initial contexts and after a Topic, while preverbal clitics appear after the negative marker and after a Focus constituent. Interestingly, similar clitic placement alternations can also be found in the finite embedded context in Asturian, but not in Galician or European Portuguese, as I show next.

1.2. Clitic alternations in the finite embedded context in two varieties of Asturian

In all varieties of Asturian, the presence of a Topic or a Focus in finite embedded contexts as those in (5)–(6) gives rise to the same effects on clitic placement as in matrix environments. In short, a preverbal Topic subject\(^2\) triggers obligatorily a postverbal clitic pattern, as shown in (5) – cf. (3), while only a preverbal clitic pattern is grammatical with a Focus subject, as in (6) – cf. (4).

(5) Repítote\_[que yo dexé\_lo\_ aquel diecisiete\_de mayu]\_ [*lo dexé]\_ Ast
repeat\_3SG-you\_CL\_it\_CL that I\_left\_3SG-IND\_it\_CL that\_seventeenth\_of\_May
“I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth”  
[de Pablo, Memoria]

(6) Repítote\_[que YO\_lo\_ dexé\_ aquel diecisiete\_de mayu]\_ (, non él)\_ [*dexe\_lo]\_ Ast
repeat\_3SG-you\_CL\_it\_CL\_that\_seventeenth\_of\_May
“I repeat to you that I (, and not him) left it that May seventeenth”

\(^2\) It is generally assumed since the seminal work of Contreras (1978) that non-focalized preverbal subjects in the so-called pro-drop languages appear in a left-peripheral Topic position. See the discussion in sections 3 and 4 below.
Moreover, speakers of a variety of Asturian which I refer to as Conservative Asturian (CAst) report data as that in (7) where the clitic may optionally appear postverbally in the finite embedded clause. In CAst, whenever a clitic appears postverbally in a finite embedded context like the one in (7a), the embedded sentence has a special interpretation\(^3\), what I call a [+conviction] interpretation. This is an interpretation that marks the content of the embedded clause as part of the belief state of the matrix predicate’s subject in the case at point, but it can also be that of the speaker. On the other hand, no such interpretation is available if the clitic appears preverbally as in (7b), so the embedded clause has what I call a [-conviction] interpretation.

(7) a. Digo [qu’ayúdame] \\
    say\(_{1\text{SG}}\) that-help\(_{\text{SG-IND}}\)-me\(_{\text{CL}}\) CAst

b. Digo [que me ayuda] \\
    say\(_{1\text{SG}}\) that me\(_{\text{CL}}\) help\(_{\text{SG-IND}}\) “I say that s/he helps me out” [From Viejo (2008)]

Crosslinguistically, speakers of other varieties of Asturian, Galician and European Portuguese report the postverbal clitic pattern in (7a) as ungrammatical. Going one step further, speakers of Galician and European Portuguese accept only the preverbal clitic pattern not just in (7), but also under the presence of a preverbal Topic subject as that in (5), reporting the postverbal clitic pattern as either marginal or downright ungrammatical. This is shown in (8) and (9).

(8) Xulia dixo [que Mon o dixera] \\
    Xulia said\(_{3\text{SG}}\) that Mon it\(_{1\text{CL}}\) had-said\(_{\text{SG-IND}}\) “Xulia said that Mon had said it” Gal

(9) O Pedro disse [que o Paulo o dissera] \\
    the Pedro said\(_{3\text{SG}}\) that the Paulo it\(_{1\text{CL}}\) had-said\(_{\text{SG-IND}}\) “Pedro said that Paulo had said it” EP

Summarizing, while clitics may optionally surface postverbally in finite embedded contexts as that in (7) in Conservative Asturian in the absence of left-peripheral material, speakers of other varieties of Asturian as well as those of Galician and European Portuguese reject the postverbal clitic pattern in (7a). In turn, while the presence of a Topic in an embedded clause as that in (5) forces a postverbal order of the clitic in all varieties of Asturian, speakers of Galician and European Portuguese report this clitic pattern as either marginal or ungrammatical – see (8)-(9).

This article tackles both the similarities in clitic placement in the matrix context as well as the noted crosslinguistic variation in the finite embedded one in Western Iberian. Following the analysis proposed in Fernández Rubiera (2009), I claim that post- and preverbal clitic alternations in this group of languages arise as a result of Fin(iteness)\(^5\) (cf. Rizzi 1997) being a phase-head (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2008) which observes the condition stated in (10).

(10) In Western Iberian, Fin\(^{\text{g}}\) is a phase-head with an edge condition which triggers and ensures the displacement of an element\(^4\)

---

\(^3\) Some of these interpretation differences are reported in Viejo (2008).

\(^4\) Following Chomsky 2008, this edge condition I propose for Fin\(^{\text{g}}\) could be considered as an Internal Merge requirement of this phase-head.
But before I present the analysis I propose, I briefly discuss two main approaches to clitic placement alternations in Western Iberian, showing how they fall short at explaining the clitic patterns we find in the finite embedded context in this group of languages.

2. Previous approaches to clitic alternations in Western Iberian Romance languages

2.1. Phonological approaches to clitic alternations

Following a long philological tradition contending that unstressed elements cannot stand in absolute initial position, phonological approaches account for post- and preverbal clitic alternations as those in Western Iberian by saying that clitics in these languages are enclitic elements that must have a phonological host to their left. For instance, Barbosa (1995, 2000) proposes a PF-filter as that in (11) below to account for these clitic alternations.

(11) *[IntP cllitc V…], where IntP = Intonational Phrase [From Barbosa (1995, 2000)]

Under this line of analysis, the clitics in (1) and (3) above arise postverbally because there is no element to the left of the clitic – see (1), or because there is a Topic element that creates its own Intonational Phrase – see (3), which leaves the clitic as the first element in its Intonational Phrase and thus triggers the PF-filter in (11), explaining the postverbal clitic pattern we find. In turn, clitics arise preverbally in (2) and (4) because both the negative marker and also Focus constituents are analyzed as part of the same Intonational Phrase as that of the clitics, rendering the PF-filter in (11) inert. However, this analysis does not predict the clitic alternations we find in (7), repeated below.

(12) a. Digo [qu'ayúdame] say1SG that-help3 SG-IND-meCL
b. Digo [que me ayuda] say1SG that meCL help3SG-IND
“I say that s/he helps me out” [From Viejo (2008)]

Thus, notice that we find a postverbal clitic in (12a) in spite of the fact that que “that” could serve as phonological support (as in (12b)), and also in spite of the fact that this element would arguably be part of the same Intonational Phrase as that of the clitics. This suggests that there must be other constraints in question. Another line of analysis similar to the one I will propose relates clitic alternations in Western Iberian to the properties of a left-peripheral projection, which I review next.

2.2. Left-peripheral approaches to clitic alternations

Differently from phonological approaches to clitic alternations (see 2.1 above), left-peripheral approaches argue that clitic alternations as those observed in Western Iberian Romance languages do not arise as a result of a PF-filter triggered by the clitics, but rather as the result of verb-movement targeting a head in the left-periphery in this group of languages. One such analysis is presented and discussed in Raposo and Uriagereka (2005), who propose a clausal structure for Western Iberian as that shown in (13).

(13) [Cº Cº [IP Pº [+φ] [IP …]]]
Following previous work of their own (cf. Uriagereka 1995a, 1995b and Raposo 2000), Raposo and Uriagereka (2005) claim that post- and preverbal clitic alternations in Western Iberian arise as a side-effect of the interaction between clitics and the feature-composition of a left-peripheral Fº projection that they propose. Under this analysis, postverbal clitics are the result of (i) the presence of morphological [+φ] -features in Western Iberian in a left-peripheral projection that they label Fº – cf. (13), which also hosts the clitics in this group of languages, and of (ii) verb-movement triggered by Fº as last-resort to provide an element for the clitic elements in this projection to fuse to. Thus, verb-movement to Fº is triggered as last-resort in verb initial contexts, as in (1), and also under the presence of a Topic constituent, as in (3), because the clitics in Fº require an adjacent host to fuse to, which explains the postverbal clitic pattern observed.

Turning to preverbal clitics, Raposo and Uriagereka (2005) account for this clitic pattern assuming that an adjacent element satisfies the fusion condition of the clitics in Fº. Under their analysis, both the negative marker and Focus constituents target the FP projection they propose, and are thus suitable elements for the clitics in Fº to fuse to, which accounts for the preverbal clitic pattern we find in (2) and (4) above. However, if clitics move to Fº in Western Iberian Romance languages as Raposo and Uriagereka (2005) propose, and if the lexical Cº can be a host for the clitic elements in Fº to fuse to, the preverbal pattern in (7b) above follows, but the postverbal clitic pattern in (7a) is predicted ungrammatical, contrary to fact.

Leaving this discussion here, I next lay out my assumptions and I present the analysis that I will argue for to account for the post- and preverbal clitic alternations we find in Western Iberian Romance languages.

3. CLITICS AND THE ROLE OF FINITENO IN DERIVING POST- AND PREVERBAL CLITICS IN WESTERN IBERIAN

In this section, I discuss two assumptions and I lay out the analysis I propose to account for clitic placement alternations in Western Iberian. The first assumption relates to clitics in Western Iberian. Following Franco (1991, 1994, 2000), I analyze clitics in these languages as agreement affixes which, following Murphy-Armstrong (1987) and Sportiche (1996), are merged in the phrase marker in an extended projection of the TP-domain which I label CliticP. With this, I assume that clitics appear preverbally in Western Iberian, with postverbal clitics being the result of an independently triggered verb-movement operation to a projection higher than the one hosting the clitics.

The second assumption relates to preverbal subjects and [Spec, TP]. In line with Barbosa (1995) and Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998), I assume that the verbal head in Western Iberian bears nominal features that check Tº’s [EPP]. Therefore, I analyze preverbal subjects as either A’-moved (i.e., Focus) or base-generated (i.e., Topic) elements.

Finally, I contend that post- and preverbal clitic alternations in this group of languages are connected to the phase property of Finitenessº (Finº) proposed in (14).

(14) In Western Iberian, Finº is a phase-head with an edge condition which triggers and ensures the displacement of an element

With (14), I contend that the edge condition of Finº can be satisfied either by an element undergoing A’-movement to the left-periphery passing through [Spec, FinP], or by the closest head in the structure moving to Finº. Thus, the syntactic structure that I am arguing for is as

---

5 I take the lack of interpolation in Asturian to show the Xº status of these elements – with interpolation in regression in the other Western Iberian Romance languages. Further arguments and evidence for this analysis are given in Fernández Rubiera (2009).
shown in (15), with the parentheses indicating that those projections are only present when needed in the structure (cf. Rizzi 1997, 2004 for discussion).

(15) ForceP
    (TopicP)
    (FocusP)
    FinitenessP
    Finº      CliticP
    Cliticº   TP
          ...

Given the edge condition of Finitenessº (Finº) in (14), together with the clause structure proposed in (15), I show next how the post- and preverbal clitic alternations we find in the matrix context in Western Iberian can be uniformly explained.

4. POST- AND PREVERBAL CLITICS IN THE MATRIX CONTEXT IN WESTERN IBERIAN AND THE EDGE CONDITION OF FINITENESSº

On the analysis I propose, a postverbal clitic pattern obtains if there is no A'-movement, and also if there is no closer head to Finº than the verb in Tº. Under those circumstances, the verb moves to Finº to satisfy this phase head’s edge condition (see (14)). Let me illustrate the analysis proposed with the data discussed in section 1 above. Recall that clitics occur postverbally in Western Iberian in verb initial contexts as those in (1), repeated below for convenience.

    have¬[ºth]em¬[ºcut]
    “I have them (my hands) cut” [Álvarez, Llames]

    told¬[ºme¬[ºlt]¬all] everything
    “S/he told me everything” [Álvarez et al. (1986: 183)]

    ad-studied¬[ºlt]¬the depth
    “S/he had studied it in depth” [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 165)]

With the analysis I propose, the postverbal clitic pattern we find in (16a) is analyzed as in (17). As argued in section 3, I assume that the verb in Western Iberian checks Tº’s [EPP] when it moves to Tº, as in (17a). Next, the clitic is merged in CliticP, followed by merge of Finº, as in (17b). As discussed in (14), I am assuming that Finº is a phase-head with an edge condition. It is this condition, I argue, that triggers verb-movement of Tº to Finº picking up the clitic(s) in Cliticº on its way up as in (17c).
Another matrix context where a postverbal clitic pattern can be also found in Western Iberian is after a Topic constituent – cf. (3), repeated below.

(18) a. Esoi sábes lo i        per lleer les cartes ["lo sabes"] Ast

That know_it for readINF the cards

"That, you know it from reading the (tarot) cards" [González, Comedies]

b. isoi  publicáron  o  i       os  c r í  ticos insidiosos ["o publicaron"] Gal

that published_ins-itcl the critics insidious

"That, the insidious critics published it" [CORGA (2008)]

c. issoi digo-vo-lo i              eu                       ["vo-lo digo"] EP

that say_youCL.PL-itCL I

"That, I say it to you" [O Corpus do Português (2007)]

The postverbal clitic pattern we find with a preverbal Topic in (18) is explained under my analysis as follows. Under the assumption that Topics are base-generated in a Topic position in the left-periphery (following Barbosa 1995, 2000, Raposo 2000, and references cited therein), and therefore do not involve A’-movement, Finº must satisfy its edge condition by attracting the closest available element in the structure, namely the verb in Tº. This results in the following derivation for (18a).

(19) a. [TP sabes [+D, +V] Tº [+V, EPP] [\{vº (pro) \{sabes pro ... per lleer les cartes\}]\]

b. [Finº \{\[lo sabes\] Tº [vº (pro) \{sabes pro ...\}]\}

c. [Finº teoles Finº \{\[lo sabes\] teo \{sabes pro ...\}]\]

d. [L(ld)D \{eso[+Top] \{\[lo sabes\] \[T' teyles\] \{sabes pro ...\}]}\]

"That, you know it from reading the (tarot) cards"

Preverbal clitics on the other hand, are predicted to arise under the presence of A’-movement or a closer head to Finº than Tº, as they satisfy the edge condition of Finº proposed in (14). Under the assumption that Focus involves A’-movement, consider (4), repeated below for convenience.

(20) a. YO MESMA me la repito un cientu vegaes ["repitomela"] Ast

I self_itcl repeat one hundred times

"I myself repeat it to myself one hundred times" [de Pablo, Memoria]

---

6 In line with those approaches to clitics as agreement-morphemes (cf. Franco 1991, Murphy-Armstrong 1987 and Spor tiche 1996), I assume object-pro fills the object slot of the predicate sabes "you know", as in (17a). As for subject-pro, I do not commit to whether it is necessary as argued in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998, so I put it in parentheses here and in subsequent derivations.

7 Arguments for the base-generated nature of Topics in Western Iberian are given in Fernández Rubiera (2009), where I refer the reader for evidence and discussion.
b. e NO SEU TRABALLO o prenderon [*prenderon-no] Gal
and in-the his job [*focus] him$_{CL}$ caught$_{PL}$
"And it was in his job that they caught him"
[Álvarez et al. (1986: 184)]
c. OS TRÊS HOMENS se sentaram à mesa [*sentáram-se] EP
the three men [*focus] at-the table
"It was the three men who sat at the table"

Being instances of A’-movement, the focalized elements in (20) above must move to the
left-periphery in order to check their criterial [+Focus] features (cf. Rizzi 2004), satisfying the
edge condition of the Finº phase-head on their way to a criterial Focus position. This accounts
for the preverbal clitic pattern observed as shown in the derivation below.

(21) a. [v$_{Finº}$ yo mesma$_{Focal}$ [v$_{Fin}$ repito$_{VP}$ pro pro]]
     Focº [+Focus] repito pro pro
b. [CliticP me la [v$_{Finº}$ repito Tº [v$_{Fin}$ yo mesma$_{Focal}$ repito]]]
     Focº [+Focus] repito

c. [Finº CliticP me la [v$_{Finº}$ repito Tº [v$_{Fin}$ yo mesma$_{Focal}$ repito]]]
     Focº [+Focus] repito

d. [Finº, yo mesma$_{Focal}$ [Finº CliticP me la [v$_{Finº}$ repito Tº [v$_{Fin}$ yo mesma$_{Focal}$ repito]]]]
     Focº [+Focus] repito

e. [Finº, yo mesma$_{Focal}$ [Finº, CliticP me la [v$_{Finº}$ repito Tº [v$_{Fin}$ yo mesma$_{Focal}$ repito]]]]
     Focº [+Focus] repito

"I myself repeat it to myself one hundred times"

In turn, a preverbal clitic pattern after the negative marker in Western Iberian is also predicted by my analysis. Consider (2), repeated below.

(22) a. Nun me mancó [*mancó-me] Ast
     not me$_{cl}$ hurt$_{SG}$
     "S/he didn’t hurt me"
     [Orton, Mayordomu]
b. Non cho dicía por iso [*dicía-cho] Gal
     not you$_{cl}$ it$_{cl}$ said$_{SG}$ for that
     "I didn’t say it to you for that (reason)"
     [Álvarez et al. (1986: 185)]
     you not him$_{cl}$ phoned$_{SG}$ today
     "You didn’t call him today?"
     [Vázquez Cuesta and Mendes da Luz (1971: 167)]

Following Zanuttini’s 1991, 1997 proposal for different Romance languages, I assume that the negative marker in Western Iberian is licensed in a NegP projection that takes Tº as its complement, as in (23):

(23) [Finº Negº [CliticP [clitic(s) [TP Tº …]]]]

This allows me to analyze the preverbal clitic patterns in (22) as in (24).

(24) a. [CliticP me [TP mancó Tº [TP (pro) [mancó …]]]]
    Focº [+Focus] mancó
b. [Finº, Negº nun [Negº [CliticP me [TP mancó Tº …]]]]
     Focº [+Focus] mancó

c. [Finº, nun Focº, Negº nun [Negº [CliticP me [TP mancó Tº …]]]]
     Focº [+Focus] mancó

"S/he didn’t hurt me"

---

As shown, I assume two object pros (i.e., those related to the Indirect and the Direct objects) satisfy the predicate’s subcategorization; cf. footnote 6.
Summarizing, I have shown in this section that post- and preverbal clitic alternations in Western Iberian can be accounted for assuming Rizzi’s 1997 Finiteness is a phase with an edge condition in this group of languages – cf. (14). In short, a preverbal clitic pattern arises as a result of A’-movement passing through [Spec, FinP] on its way to a left-peripheral projection, which satisfies Finº’s edge condition. Alternatively a head higher than Tº can move to Finº. In the absence of A’-movement or a closer head, the verb in Tº adjoins to Cliticº (thus obtaining the postverbal clitic order observed) to finally move to Finº, thus satisfying the edge condition of this phase head. Furthermore, the analysis proposed predicts the different clitic patterns that we find in the finite embedded context in different varieties of Asturian, to which I turn next.

5. CLITIC ALTERNATIONS IN FINITE EMBEDDED CONTEXTS IN ASTURIAN

I showed in 1.2 above that postverbal clitics show up obligatorily in Asturian after a Topic constituent in finite embedded clauses as that in (5), repeated in (25).

(25) Repítote [que yo dexélo aquel diecisiete de mayu] [*lo dexé] Ast
repeat₁SG-youCL that I left₁SG-IND-itCL that seventeenth of May
"I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth" [de Pablo, Memoria]

A Focus on the other hand, obligatorily triggers a preverbal clitic pattern in the same embedded context – cf. (6), repeated below.

(26) Repítote [que YO lo dexé aquel diecisiete de mayu] (, non él) [*dexélo] Ast
repeat₁SG-you that I left₁SG-IND-itCL that seventeenth of May
"I repeat to you that I (, and not him) left it that May seventeenth"

Moreover, speakers of a variety of Asturian that I call Conservative Asturian (CAs) report that both post- and preverbal clitics are grammatical in finite embedded contexts as that in (7) – cf. (27). Furthermore, the different clitic patterns observed in this finite embedded context are also reported to differ in interpretation.

(27) a. Digo [qu’ayúdame] CAs
say₁SG-IND-help₁SG-IND-meCL
b. Digo [que me ayuda]  
say₁SG-IND-helpmeCL₁SG-IND
"I say that s/he helps me out" [From Viejo (2008)]

In this section, I first illustrate the interpretation differences that clitic alternations as those in (27) are subject to for speakers of CAs. Next, I relate the different interpretations to selection properties of the matrix predicate, arguing that this predicate may select for Forceº or Finº, and that each choice correlates with a different complementizer. Finally, I show how the selection properties of the matrix predicate, the different complementizers and the analysis of clitic placement in Western Iberian I propose accounts not only for the different clitic patterns we find in this environment in Asturian, but also for the different interpretations that speakers report.
5.1. Pragmatic “conviction” and post- and preverbal clitic alternations in Conservative Asturian

A post- and a preverbal clitic pattern in those subordinate clauses where both options are available for speakers of Conservative Asturian\(^9\) (cf. (27)) relates to a subtle but systematic interpretation difference. Briefly put, postverbal clitics in the finite embedded environment give rise to a pragmatic “conviction” interpretation of the content of the embedded clause attributed to the matrix predicate’s subject, which I formalize as [+conviction]. Interestingly, this [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation is absent when a preverbal clitic arises in the same embedded CP (e.g., the pragmatic interpretation found in those instances is [-conviction]). In order to illustrate these different interpretations, consider the following context and (28):

[Two people are discussing whether the new employee actually helps them at work or he is just a lazy soul; one of them says...]

(28) a. Digo [qu’ayúda me] \(\text{CAst}\)

\[\text{say}_{\text{SG-IND}}\text{that-help}_{\text{SG-IND}}\text{me}_{\text{CL}}\]

b. Digo [que me ayuda]

\[\text{say}_{\text{SG-IND}}\text{that}_{\text{CL}}\text{help}_{\text{SG-IND}}\]

“I say that s/he helps me out” [From Viejo (2008)]

If a speaker utters (28a), it must be the case that either a previous speaker asserted or implied that the new employee is lazy, or that s/he considers the topic of discussion pointless. (28a) attributes to the matrix predicate’s subject, who is also the speaker in this case, a pragmatic “conviction” (e.g., [+conviction]) ensuring that the new employee truly helps him, leaving no room to think otherwise. However, if (28b) is uttered, the matrix predicate’s subject is reported to only state what s/he thinks, without attributing any kind of “conviction” (e.g., [-conviction]) as to whether the new employee helps.

Evidence for these interpretations differences comes from (29). As shown, if a contradiction regarding the matrix subject’s “conviction” is present in the discourse, as the one in the fragments in brackets in (29), the postverbal clitic pattern in (29a) is ruled out. But the preverbal clitic pattern in (29b) is pragmatically adequate. I take this to show that the preverbal clitic pattern does not encode a “conviction” of the content in the embedded clause (e.g., it encodes a [-conviction] interpretation).

(29) a. Digo qu’ ‘ayúda [anque nun toi enfotáu del too] \(\text{CAst}\)

\[\text{say}_{\text{SG-IND}}\text{that-help}_{\text{SG-IND}}\text{me}_{\text{CL}}\text{ though not am convinced of-the all}\]

b. Digo que me ayuda [anque nun toi enfotáu del too]

\[\text{say}_{\text{SG-IND}}\text{that}_{\text{CL}}\text{ help}_{\text{SG-IND}}\text{ though not am convinced of-the all}\]

“I say that s/he helps me, although I am not totally convinced (that s/he does (help me))”

In the next section, I show how the different [+conviction] interpretations are related to the matrix predicate selecting Force\(^\circ\) or Fin\(^\circ\), which I contend correlates with the presence (or absence) of assertive illocutionary Force.

\(^9\) I use the term “Conservative” is used to refer to this variety of Asturian where postverbal clitics are available in finite embedded contexts, as opposed to other varieties of this language where postverbal clitics are ungrammatical. Although this dialectal split has not been tackled in traditional grammars, postverbal clitics in finite embedded contexts in the absence of left-peripheral material have been already reported in D’Andrés (1993), a constructions that some speakers of Asturian reject. I am not aware of any factor (geographical, age-related, education, or other) that may be relevant for this dialectal split, which is an issue I leave open for future research. I would like to thank the members from the Seminariu de Filoloxía Asturiana (Universidade d’Uviéu) for the discussion of these constructions.
5.2. Pragmatic “conviction”, illocutionary Force and the complementizer system of Conservative Asturian

Data as that in (28) show that the different clitic patterns in finite embedded clauses where no left-peripheral material appears correlate with different “conviction” interpretations. This, I argue, follows from the selection properties of the matrix predicate. Thus, for a matrix predicate like *digo* “I say” in (28), I claim that it may select for two types of complements as shown below.

(30) Selection of Forceº and Finº and [±conviction]

Assertive predicates (cf. Bosque 1990) such as *dicir* “to say” can select two types of CPs:

a. Forceº > assertive illocutionary Force, giving rise to pragmatic [+conviction]
b. Finº > absence of illocutionary Force, giving rise to pragmatic [-conviction]

Building on ideas developed in Demonte and Fernández Soriano’s (2005, 2007, 2009) analysis of the complementizer system in Spanish, I claim that the selection properties proposed in (30) correspond in Conservative Asturian to two different but homophonous *que* “that” complementizers, namely a *que1* “that1” in Forceº, and a *que2* “that2” in Finº. I argue that these different complementizers reflect the presence or absence of assertive illocutionary Force, which in turn explains the different [±conviction] pragmatic interpretations as shown in (31).

(31) The complementizer system in Conservative Asturian

As I show next, entertaining this idea of different complementizers being mapped in different projections in the left-periphery predicts both the clitic patterns we find in the finite embedded context in Conservative Asturian, as well as the different interpretations that speakers report.

5.3. Accounting for clitic placement alternations in the finite embedded context in different varieties of Asturian

The different clitic patterns we find in Conservative Asturian are predicted by the analysis I propose as follows. First, we predict that if the matrix predicate selects Forceº, mapped as *que1* “that1” and giving rise to assertive illocutionary Force and a [+conviction] interpretation, the Finº-phase head triggers Tº-to-Finº movement in the absence of A’-movement or a closer head to satisfy its edge condition (cf. (14)), as a result of which the clitic appears in a postverbal position. For illustration, consider (32), which receives the analysis in (33).
(32) Digo [qu’ayúdame] [pero nun toi seguru] CAst
say$_{SG}$ that-help$_{SG-IND}$ me$_{CL}$
“I say that s/he helps me out, but I am not sure (that s/he helps me)”

(33) Digo … + Forceº > assertive illocutionary Force and [+conviction] interpretation
say$_{SG}$
\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. } [\text{TP ayuda Tº } [\text{vº (pro)} [\text{vº ayuda } \ldots]]]
\text{b. } [\text{Fin’ Finº [CliticP me [TP ayuda Tº [\text{vº (pro)} [\text{vº ayuda } \ldots]]]]]}
\text{c. } [\text{Fin’ que’ Finº [CliticP me [TP ayuda Tº …]]}]
\text{d. } [\text{que’ Force’ Finº [CliticP me [TP ayuda Tº …]]}]
\end{array}\]
“I say that s/he helps me”

Second, this analysis also predicts that if the matrix predicate selects Finº, mapped as que2 “that2”, not encoding illocutionary Force and thus, giving rise to a [-conviction] interpretation, the edge condition of the Finº-phase head proposed in (14) is satisfied by merge of the que2 complementizer, as a result of which the clitic appears exclusively in a preverbal position. With this analysis, the preverbal clitics pattern in (34) is derived as in (35).

(34) Digo [que me ayuda] [pero nun toi seguru] CAst
say$_{SG}$ that me$_{CL}$ help$_{SG-IND}$
“I say that s/he helps me out, but I am not sure (that s/he helps me)”

(35) Digo … + Finº > absence of illocutionary Force and [-conviction] interpretation
say$_{SG}$
\[\begin{array}{l}
\text{a. } [\text{TP ayuda Tº } [\text{vº (pro)} [\text{vº ayuda } \ldots]]]
\text{b. } [\text{Fin’ Finº [CliticP me [TP ayuda Tº [\text{vº (pro)} [\text{vº ayuda } \ldots]]]]]}
\text{c. } [\text{que’ Finº [CliticP me [TP ayuda Tº …]]}]
\end{array}\]
“I say that s/he helps me”

Turning now to those finite embedded environments in which left-peripheral material appears, the different clitic patterns we observe in all varieties of Asturian also follow. Consider first the effect of a preverbal Topic subject as in (36) (cf. (5)), which triggers obligatorily a postverbal clitic pattern.

(36) Repítote [que yo dexélo aquel diecisiete de mayu] [lo dexé] Ast
repeat$_{SG}$ you$_{SG}$ that I left$_{SG-IND}$-it$_{SG}$ that seventeenth of May
“I repeat to you that I left it that May seventeenth” [de Pablo, Memoria]

Repetir “to repeat”, a verb of saying, may select for Forceº or Finº (cf. (30)). Selection of Forceº mapped as que’ “that!” is compatible with left-peripheral material in the embedded clause, and we predict assertive illocutionary Force and a [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation. That this is indeed the case is confirmed by the inadequacy of the fragment pero nun toi seguru “but I am not sure”. The postverbal order of the clitic also follows from the edge condition of Finº proposed in (14), which in the absence of A’s-movement or a closer head triggers Tº-to-Finº, thus deriving the postverbal clitic pattern as shown in the derivation below.
Consider next the effect of a preverbal Focus element in the embedded clause as in (38).

(38) repítote que YO lo dexé aquel diecisiete de mayu (, non él) [dexélo] Ast
“\(I\) repeat to you that I (, and not him) left it that May seventeenth”

Selection of Force\(^{°}\) is compatible with a Focus constituent. Thus, que “that” is merged in Force\(^{°}\) and we predict assertive illocutionary Force and therefore, a \([+\text{conviction}]\) interpretation, confirmed by the inadequacy of the fragment pero nun toi seguru “but I am not sure”. The preverbal order of the clitic also follows: the Focus constituent, being an instance of A’-movement, passes through [Spec, FinP] before it reaches a criterial Focus position in the left-periphery, licensing Fin\(^{°}\)’s edge condition and accounting for the preverbal clitic pattern we find. The details are shown below.

(39) repítote ... + Force\(^{°}\) > assertive illocutionary Force and \([+\text{conviction}]\) interpretation
repeat\(_{\text{asc}}\) you\(_{\text{CL}}\)

a. \([vP dexé\{\text{\(Y\)o}\}, vº dexé} pro ... aquel diecisiete de mayu]]\)

b. \([vP Fin\{\text{\(Y\)o}\}, lo \{\text{\(Y\)o} dexé\{\text{\(Y\)o}\}, vº dexé pro} ... ]]\)

c. \([vP loso\{\text{\(Y\)o}\}, \text{lo} \{\text{\(Y\)o} dexé\{\text{\(Y\)o}\}, vº dexé} Tº ... ]]\)

d. \([\text{\(Y\)o} que/\(Y\)o}, \text{Fin\{\(Y\)o}, Finº, \text{lo} \{\text{\(Y\)o}, \text{lo} \{\text{\(Y\)o} dexé\{\text{\(Y\)o}\}, vº dexé pro} ... ]]\)

“\(I\) repeat to you that I (, and not him) left it that May seventeenth”

After laying out how the analysis proposed accounts for the clitic placement alternations we find in the finite embedded context in different varieties of Asturian, I turn next to the crosslinguistic variation that this context is subject to in the other Western Iberian varieties. I will show how crosslinguistic variation can be attributed to differences in the complementizer systems within Western Iberian.

6. CROSSLINGUISTIC VARIATION IN THE FINITE EMBEDDED ENVIRONMENT IN WESTERN IBERIAN

I have shown that Conservative Asturian may optionally exhibit a postverbal clitic pattern in a finite embedded clause as that in (27) in the absence of left-peripheral material. However, speakers of other varieties of Asturian, as well as those of Galician and European Portuguese,
reject this clitic pattern and report that only the preverbal clitic is grammatical to them as shown in (40) – cf. (27).

(40) Digo [*qu’ayudame] / [que me ayuda] Ast/Gal/EP 
saySG that-helpSG-IND-mecl that meCL helpSG-IND 
“I say that s/he helps me out”

Going one step further, speakers of Galician and European Portuguese accept only the preverbal clitic pattern not just in (40), but also after a Topic constituent as shown in (41) and (42) respectively – cf. (25).

(41) Xulia dixo [que Mon o dixera] [?? dixerao] Gal 
Xulia saidSG that Mon itCL had-saidSG-IND 
“Xulia said that Mon had said it”

(42) O Pedro disse [que o Paulo o dissera] [??/* dissera-o] EP 
the Pedro saidSG that the Paulo itCL had-saidSG-IND 
“Pedro said that Paulo had said it”

This section touches briefly on this crosslinguistic variation, showing how the analysis I propose can also explain the crosslinguistic variation we find in the finite embedded context in Western Iberian.

### 6.1. Crosslinguistic variation in Western Iberian (I): The Forceº/Finitº system in the absence of left-peripheral material

As noted, for a sentence like (43), speakers of other varieties of Asturian different from Conservative Asturian, as well as those of Galician and European Portuguese, report that only the preverbal clitic pattern is grammatical.

(43) Digo [*qu’ayudame] / [que me ayuda] Ast/Gal/EP 
saySG that-helpSG-IND-mecl that meCL helpSG-IND 
“I say that s/he helps me out”

Given the proposal I have developed, I take this to be an indication that the edge-condition of Finitº is already satisfied and that there is no longer a need for Tº-to-Finº verb-movement to satisfy (14). I would like to propose that what satisfies the edge condition of Finitº in these contexts is in fact a complementizer. There are two options to capture these facts. One is que2, as in Conservative Asturian. I will discuss this option later. The other option is that Finitº is filled by a hybrid complementizer que1/que2; semantically, like que1, the complementizer que1/que2 encodes assertive illocutionary Force and gives rise to a [+conviction] reading, but syntactically, like que2, que1/que2 appears in Finitº. In particular, I would like to propose that que1/que2 appears in Finitº and correlates with a collapse of Forceº to Finitº in the absence of peripheral material in these Western Iberian varieties (cf. Rizzi 2004 for the opposite claim, namely Finitº collapsing to Forceº).

Thus, when no left-peripheral material is found in other varieties of Asturian, as well as in Galician and European Portuguese, digo “I say” can either select Finitº, which is headed by que2 or Forceº, which collapses to Finitº and hosts a hybrid complementizer que1/que2. In both instances, no movement is necessary to satisfy the edge condition of Finitº stated in (14) and we correctly predict that we exclusively find clitics in preverbal position, cf. for example the
ungrammaticality of the postverbal clitic pattern in (43). The two alternatives are shown in the tree structures below:

\[ (44) \]
\[
\text{Digo} \ldots
\]
\[
\text{say}_{\text{sg}}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(a) } & + \text{Force}^o > \text{assertive illocutionary Force and [+conviction]} \\
& \text{FinP/ForceP} \\
& \text{Fin}^o/\text{Force}^o \quad \text{CliticP} \\
& \text{que}/\text{que}^2 \quad \text{TP} \\
& \text{me} \quad \ldots \\
& \text{ayuda}
\end{align*}
\]
\[*I say that s/he helps me out*

\[(b) \]  
\[
+ \text{Fin}^o > \text{absence of illocutionary Force and [-conviction]}
\]
\[
\begin{align*}
& \text{FinP} \\
& \text{Fin}^o \quad \text{CliticP} \\
& \text{que}^2 \quad \text{TP} \\
& \text{me} \quad \ldots \\
& \text{ayuda}
\end{align*}
\]

Turning now to the semantic properties of the derivations above, notice that unlike speakers of Conservative Asturian, who clearly indicate assertive illocutionary Force (giving rise to pragmatic [+conviction]) or its absence (and thus, [-conviction]) through the clitic placement in (28), the moment que/que enters the complementizer system and occupies Fin\(^o\), clitics are found exclusively in preverbal position and word order no longer reveals if a [+conviction] or [-conviction] interpretation is intended. In other words, we expect that strings like that in (43) are ambiguous; that is to say, (43) has an interpretation in which the fragment pero nun toi seguru "but I am not sure" is pragmatically odd (i.e., a [+conviction] interpretation), and also an interpretation in which the same fragment is pragmatically adequate (i.e., a [-conviction] interpretation). The speakers I consulted confirm that this ambiguity does indeed arise in a sentence like (43).

But crosslinguistic variation in Western Iberian also appears under the presence of left-peripheral material such as a Topic in the embedded clause, which I tackle next.

### 6.2. Crosslinguistic variation in Western Iberian (II): The Force\(^o\)/Fin\(^o\) system with left-peripheral material

While the presence of a preverbal Topic subject in an embedded clause as that in (25) triggers obligatorily a postverbal clitic pattern in all varieties of Asturian, speakers of Galician and European Portuguese reject this clitic pattern and report that only a preverbal one is grammatical as shown in (45)-(46) below.

\[(45) \]  
\[
Xulia dixo \ [\text{que Mon o } \text{dixera}] \\
Xulia said that Mon it\(_{cl}\) had-said\(_{sg}\) \text{IND} \\
"Xulia said that Mon had said it"
\]
I hypothesize that this crosslinguistic variation also relates to the complementizer system. Briefly put, I relate the unavailability of postverbal clitics in Galician and European Portuguese in embedded contexts as those in (45)-(46) to the presence of a complementizer in Finº even when there is one in Forceº. Under the analysis proposed, Forceº and que “that 1” may cooccur with an instance of que2 “that 2” hosted in Finº which may be overt or covert. If this analysis is on the right track, we predict that if the que2 complementizer in Finº is overtly realized, recomplementation patterns must be available in Galician and in European Portuguese, and this is indeed what is found. Consider the following example in European Portuguese from Barbosa (2000: 59, (107b)), with the complementizers in bold for the reader’s convenience:

(47) Acho [que amanhã que vai] have, meeting
      think that tomorrow (that) there will be a meeting

In turn, this analysis predicts that if the que2 in Finº is covert, no recomplementation appears. Furthermore, we also predict no postverbal clitics, as the proposed Finº’s edge condition is satisfied by merge of an overt or silent que2 “that 2”12, which explains the preverbal clitic pattern that speakers report after a Topic in (45)-(46), thus derived as shown below.

(48) (a) Galician: Dixo + Forceº > assertive illocutionary Force and [+conviction]

---

11 In turn, this analysis also predicts that recomplementation should be unattested in Asturian, which is confirmed by both the data I found in Eslema (2008) and in my personal corpus, as well as by the speakers I consulted.

12 An anonymous reviewer raises two questions. First, what prevents a covert instance of the que2 complementizer from satisfying the proposed edge-condition of Finº (cf. (14)) in root environments. I hypothesize that (overt or covert) complementizers are only licensed when selected by a higher predicate, thus unavailable in root (e.g., unselected) environments. The second and related question is that if a silent que2 can satisfy (14), we would expect to find embedded contexts headed by covert complementizers, contrary to fact. In this case, I tentatively suggest that silent complementizers only occur when a pronounced complementizer is present in the structure, which in turn would account for a silent que/ and a que2 overtly realized in some varieties of Spanish (cf. Fernández Rubiera 2009, chapter 4).
A further prediction of my analysis is that if Forceº and que1 “that!” is selected by the matrix predicate in (45) and (46), the embedded clauses must encode assertive illocutionary Force and thus have a [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation. The speakers I consulted find the fragment “but s/he’s not sure” pragmatically inadequate, which indeed confirms that assertive illocutionary Force is encoded and thus, a [+conviction] pragmatic interpretation.

7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this article, I have dealt with the post- and preverbal clitic alternations we find in Western Iberian Romance languages (WI). I have showed that while we find the same clitic alternations in WI in the matrix context, differently from Galician and European Portuguese, pre- and also postverbal clitics can be found in the finite embedded context in different varieties of Asturian. The pre- and essentially, the postverbal clitic patterns attested in Asturian are neither predicted nor accounted for under previous analyses and accounts of clitic placement alternations in WI.

I have argued that Finitenessº (Finº) (cf. Rizzi 1997, 2004) in the left-periphery is a phase-head (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2008) with what I call an edge condition in Western Iberian. This edge condition requires that an element must move to Finº, a condition that can be satisfied either by an element undergoing A’-movement to the left-periphery of the clause, or by the closest available head in the structure. I have shown that the different ways in which this edge condition is satisfied can easily explain the pre- and postverbal clitic alternations we find in matrix contexts in WI.

I have also shown that this analysis predicts the availability of postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context. I have illustrated this clitic pattern with data from a variety of Asturian that I have called Conservative Asturian (CAst). Furthermore, I have also shown that the post- and preverbal clitic alternations in embedded CPs that have no left-peripheral material are subject to interpretation differences. I defined these interpretations in terms of (presence or absence of) assertive illocutionary Force which gives rise to different pragmatic “conviction” interpretations, and I have argued that the pre- and postverbal clitic patterns we find in these finite embedded contexts follow from the selection properties of the matrix predicate, and also from the complementizer system in CAst. I have contended that CAst has two complementizers namely, que1 and que2 which head Forceº and Finº respectively, and that the position of these complementizers in the clausal architecture can also explain the different pragmatic “conviction” interpretations we find in the finite em-
bedded context in CAst. Moreover, the different clitic patterns we find also follow: que₁ in Force₀ is compatible with postverbal clitics, which arise in the absence of A'-movement or a closer head to Fin₀ than T₀, triggering verb movement to satisfy the proposed edge condition of this phase head and explaining the postverbal clitic pattern we observe, while que₂ exhibits exclusively a preverbal clitic pattern as the edge condition of Fin₀ is licensed by merge of que₂.

Finally, I have argued that the crosslinguistic differences we find in the finite embedded context in Western Iberian can also be explained under the analysis I propose. I have claimed that this variation can be reduced to differences in the complementizer system in these languages. I proposed that Force₀ collapses to Fin₀ in the absence of left-peripheral material in the embedded clause, in which case Fin₀ hosts a hybrid complementizer that I have called a que₁/que₂ complementizer. If a Topic is present in the embedded clause, I have argued that the matrix predicate selects Force₀ and que₁ in Galician and European Portuguese too, but selection of Force₀ always coexists with another complementizer in Fin₀, which may be pronounced as a recombination pattern or not. I have claimed that the presence of this complementizer in Fin₀ licenses the proposed edge-condition of Fin₀ and explains the unavailability of postverbal clitics in the finite embedded context in Galician and in European Portuguese.
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