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Abstract

The typical assumption in a pro-drop language like Spanish is that covert as well as overt subjects occupy a preverbal position at Spell Out in which their case and agreement properties are satisfied. This paper presents evidence against such a claim. On the one hand, we show that pre-verbal overt subjects pattern with left dislocated DOs and IOs in a wide range of syntactic contexts: ellipsis, extraction of quantifiers and interpretation of pre-verbal quantifiers. In these same contexts, sentences with a silent subject differ from sentences with overt ones. We conclude that overt pre-verbal subjects are necessarily left dislocated.

In order to account for the left dislocated nature of overt subjects, we propose to eliminate AgrS as a functional projection. Instead we take the idea that subject agreement should be considered a clitic (Taraldsen, 1992), and the relation between the agreement and subject to be one of clitic doubling. Evidence in favor of this claim comes from striking parallelisms between standard clitic doubling constructions and agreement-subject constructions. Specifically, both cases pattern similarly in relation to the determination of binding in certain cases of mismatches in person between the doubling DP and the clitic. Since we take agreement to be a clitic that absorbs theta role and case, movement of the doubling DP subject to a preverbal position cannot be driven by agreement or case reasons. Instead, movement of the subject to a pre-verbal position is driven by discourse considerations as is typical in left dislocations. © 1999 Published by Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved
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1. Introduction

It has been assumed that in Romance preverbal subjects as in (1) occupy a functional position Spec IP, in which case and Agreement are satisfied (Rizzi, 1990; Motapanyane, 1991; Cardinaletti, 1996; Belletti, 1990). On the other hand, preverbal objects in (2) and (3) are taken to occupy a more external position corresponding to that of a topic.

(1) Juan le dio las llaves a Pedro.
   Juan cl gave the keys to Pedro.

(2) Las llaves se las dio Juan a Pedro.
   The keys cl-cl gave Juan to Pedro.

(3) A Pedro le dio Juan las llaves.
   To Pedro cl gave Juan the keys.

Thus, sentences with pre-verbal subjects receive the analysis in (4) in which subjects are in Spec IP, while pre-verbal DOs and IOs receive a different analysis as in (5). Here, the IP projection is always present either occupied by pro as indicated in (5a) or by a lexical DP subject as indicated in (5b).

(4) \[\text{IP Juan le dio las llaves}\]
(5) a. XPDO/IO \[\text{IP proV (subject)}\]
   Las llaves / a Pedro \[\text{pro le dio (Juan)}\]
   The keys / to Pedro \[\text{cl gave Juan}\]

   b. XPDO/IO \[\text{IO subject V}\]
   Las llaves / a Pedro Juan le dio.
   The keys / to Pedro Juan cl gave.

The standard analysis therefore leads to a dual characterization depending on whether preverbal subjects or pre-verbal objects are involved. The evidence to be introduced in this article challenges this dual analysis in two important ways. On the one hand, the assumption that there is a null pro in Spec IP with a pre-verbal DO or IO in (5a) conflicts with some facts of ellipsis and extraction of quantificational elements (e.g. negative quantifiers and wh-expressions). The conclusion that pro cannot be postulated in the pre-verbal subject position leads naturally, in turn, to the elimination of the idea that there is a pre-verbal Spec position exclusively for subjects altogether. The second kind of evidence in favor of our hypothesis comes from the fact that overt preverbal subjects share certain important similarities with preverbal DOs and IOs regarding constraints on quantificational interpretation. These similarities call for a uniform analysis for all pre-verbal arguments.

These admittedly radical reconceptualizations require certain fundamental theoretical changes. In this article we propose the elimination of Spec IP as a position

---

1 Given an articulated theory of inflectional projections such as Pollock (1989), this IP projection exclusive for subjects is denominated AgrS. See Belletti (1990). In most of the paper we will continue using the term IP except when the denomination AgrS becomes relevant.
exclusively for subjects. Instead, we analyse pre-verbal DO's, IOs, and subjects as occupying the same topic position as in (6):

(6) \( \text{[Top}_{\text{p}}\text{XP(subject/DO/IO)} \text{ Top]} V \)

Also, as a consequence of this analysis, the theoretical status of preverbal arguments must be revised. With regard to subjects, the main question to be addressed is how case and Agr properties are satisfied. In view of the fact that subjects may appear in other positions, as examples in (7) and (8) illustrate, we also sketch an alternative characterization of the so-called pro-drop instances like those in (9).

(7) Le dio las llaves tu hermano.
   Cl gave the keys your brother
   ‘Your brother gave him/her the keys’

(8) Le dio tu hermano las llaves.
   Cl gave your brother the keys

(9) Le entregó las llaves a Pedro.
   Cl gave the keys to Pedro.

The paper is organized as follows. In the second section, we describe the empirical data that support the conclusion that preverbal overt subjects and objects have the same syntactic distribution. Given such evidence, we reconsider the theoretical status of preverbal subjects in Section 3 and revise some of the alternatives proposed in the literature by other researchers. In Section 4 we reject the idea that there is an inflectional projection called AgrS in which case and agreement are satisfied for subjects in a preverbal position. Instead, we adopt Taraldsen’s (1992) position that agreement, specifically person agreement, should be considered a clitic and argument of the verb. Evidence that Agr is a clitic is given by the striking similarities between the relation of doubling XP and a clitic, on the one hand, and agreements and subjects, on the other, with respect to certain mismatches in person specification. Evidence that Agr is an argument is given by the fact that it is crucial for the computation of A binding in these cases of mismatches.

2. Empirical evidence

2.1. Ellipsis

Spanish exhibits ellipsis phenomena which differ in several ways from English VP ellipsis. Brucart (1987) shows that certain discourse polarity particles such as sí (‘yes’), no (‘not’), también (‘too’), and tampoco (‘neither’) license ellipsis. The elements that can stand as remnants of this kind of ellipsis include not only preverbal subjects as in (10), but also preverbal direct and indirect objects, as in (11) and (12).²

² The elided material is indicated in bold face enclosed in square brackets.
El le dio unos libros a Pía y Pepe también [le dio unos libros a Pía]
He cl gave some books to Pía and Pepe too [cl-gave some books to Pía]

Unos libros le dio a Pía y unos cuadros también [le dio a Pía]
Some books cl gave-3ps to Pía and some paintings too [cl-gave-3ps to Pía]

A Pía le dio unos libros y a Sara también [le dio unos libros]
To Pía cl gave-3ps some books and to Sara too [cl-gave-3ps some books]

Furthermore, all the remnants of this type of ellipsis can be easily subordinated, as shown in (13) and (14):

Juan le dio unos libros a Pía y me parece que Pepe también [le dio unos libros a Pía] Juan cl gave some books to Pía and cl seems that Pepe too [cl gave some books to Pía]

A Pía le dio unos libros y me parece que a Sara también [le dio unos libros]
To Pía cl gave-3ps some books and it cl seems that to Sara too [cl-gave-3ps some books]

The possibility of subordinating these remnants indicates that ellipsis of this sort involves a copy of the inflectional projection that follows the discourse polarity items. Thus, an analysis involving the movement of the correlate, for example, as proposed in Reinhart (1992) for bare argument ellipsis, or in Larson (1990) for cases of gapping, is immediately excluded since those two types of constructions do not allow subordination of the remnant.

The parallelism between DO, IO, and subject remnants remains even in those cases in which ellipsis is licensed in island contexts. Examples include extraposed clauses such as (15) and (16) – instances of a weak island context – and relative clauses – strong islands – as in (17) and (18):

Maria no sabe ruso pero es posible que Luis sí [sepo ruso] (Brucart, 1987)
Maria not knows Russian but it is possible that Luis yes [knows Russian]
‘Maria doesn’t know Russian, but it is possible that Luis does’

A ti te admitirán en Harvard pero es probable que a tu amiga no [la admitirán en Harvard]
To you cl will admit in Harvard but it is probable that to your friend not [cl will admit in Harvard]
‘You will be admitted to Harvard, but it is probable that your friend will not’

Luis no sabe traducir pero yo conozco a una alumna que sí [sabe traducir]
Luis not knows to translate but I know a student that yes [knows to translate]
‘Luis doesn’t know how to translate, but I know a student who does’

Hay gente a la que le puedes decir bromas y hay gente a la que no [le puedes decir bromas]
There is people to whom cl can tell jokes and there is people to whom not [cl can tell jokes]
‘There are people who you can tell jokes to, and there are people who you cannot’

Under the dual hypothesis represented in (5), in which preverbal subjects occupy a more internal position than preverbal DOs and IOs, it would not be easy to capture the parallelism shown by all remnants in the former examples. From that perspective, two different types of remnants must be postulated, as shown in (19). Thus, there would be a one-constituent remnant with preverbal subjects, the subject itself (19a), and a two-constituent remnant for preverbal objects and pro (19b).3

(19) a. [SU no/tambiéntampoco/sí]
b. [DO/IO [pro no/tambiéntampoco/sí]

Assuming an analysis such as (19b), we would make the prediction that it could be possible to substitute pro in Spec IP, for an overt subject. Nevertheless, (20b) below, which could be derived from (20a) by assuming that the projection in bold is subject to ellipsis, shows that this prediction is incorrect. It is clear that remnants containing a preverbal DO do not admit a preverbal overt subject.

(20) a. A ti la policía te va a detener, pero Pedro el juez no la va a detener.
To you the police cl will detain, but to Pedro the judge not cl will detain
b. *A ti la policía te va a detener, pero a Pedro el juez no.
To you the police cl will detain, but to Pedro the judge not

Additional cases with other discourse polarity items like también, as in (21), confirm this fact.4

---

3 This is especially clear for the case of the polarity item ‘no’. Observe that overt subjects obligatorily precede ‘no’ as shown in the contrast in (i) and (ii). Therefore if pro has the same distribution as an overt subject, it will always have to appear pre-verbally with the polarity item ‘no’ with all DO and IO remnants.

(i) *No Juan vino.
   not Juan came.
(ii) Juan no vino
   Juan not came

4 As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, the following example appears possible for some speakers of Spanish. None seem natural to either of the authors, speakers of Peninsular and Mexican Spanish.

(i) Unos libros Juan le dio a Pedro y unos cuadros Pablo también.
   Some books John cl-gave to Peter and some paintings Pablo too.
   Observe that this example does not involve a clitic for the DO ‘unos libros’. It could be that some speakers are taking these sentences as examples of hanging topics (see Cinque, 1990), and not left dislocations. To make sure that we have genuine left dislocation, we should look at examples with a clitic and with embedding in the second conjunct as in (ii). Examples like (ii) are definitively worse:

(ii) Algunos de estos libros, Juan se los dio a Pedro, y me parece que algunos de estos cuadros, Pablo también.
   Some of these books, John cl-cl gave to Peter, and it seems to me that some of those pictures, Pablo did too.
(21) a. *A María, los niños le dieron un libro y a Pía, Pedro también.
   To María, the kids cl gave a book and to Pía, Pedro too.

   b. *A María, Juan le dio un libro y me han dicho que a Tomás, Tito también.
   To María, Juan cl gave a book and cl have told that to Tomás, Tito too

Therefore, we must conclude that at least the assumption that pro and overt sub-
jects have the same distribution is untenable. By the same token, the behavior of all
cases presented thus far, can be better accounted for if overt preverbal subjects, DOs,
and IOs occupy the same syntactic position. From this perspective, all of the exam-
pies (10)–(18), represent instances of one constituent remnant, unlike (20b), (21a),
and (21b) which constitute cases of two constituent remnants.

Interestingly, examples such as these fall into the same category as those studied
by Williams (1977) and Sag (1976) where a more external XP bind into the elided
material predicated of a subject. Some examples include the following:

(22) *What did Harry take a picture of? *What did Bill? (from Sag, 1976)
(23) *John, who Bill saw, and who Bob did too. (from Williams, 1977)

The degraded nature of the two constituent remnants can be explained, in part, by
the fact that no predication or binding relation from an external element can be
established into an elided constituent. Williams and Sag have accounted for these
cases by a condition of identity of predication on the copied material.

2.2. Quantifier extraction

2.2.1. Negative quantifiers

In Spanish, negative quantifiers can appear in preverbal position. Example (24)
shows a subject negative quantifier, and (25) and (26) show a DO and an IO nega-
tive quantifier respectively.

(24) Nadie le debe la renta a María.
    Nobody (S) owe-3ps the rent to María

(25) Nada le debe Juan a sus amigos.
    Nothing (DO) cl owe-3ps Juan (S) to his friends (IO)

(26) A nadie le debe Juan la renta.
    To nobody (IO) cl owe-2ps Juan (S) the rent.

(iii) A algunos de los espías, la CIA los va a detener, pero creo que a algunos de los colaboradores,
el FBI no.
    Some of the spies, the CIA is going to arrest, and some of the collaborators, the FBI is going to
too.

The reason hanging topics do not produce any violation to some speakers is that these cases do not
involve any binding at the site of ellipsis. See the end of this section for the explanation of why binding
into the ellipsis is crucial for this sort of violation.
Following the hypothesis illustrated in (5), it could be argued that while a subject negative quantifier surfaces in Spec IP, DO and IO ones arise in a more peripheral position; a position likely to be identified as a focus site. \(^5\) If this is correct, the representation of (25) and (26) is that in (27) and (28):

(27) A nadie [IP pro (le) debe (Juan) la renta]
(28) Nada [IP pro le debe (Juan) a sus amigos]

Again, from this analysis we may infer that pro may be substituted by an overt subject without inducing a deviant outcome. Yet, this is plainly wrong as sentences like (29) and (30) demonstrate.

(29) *Nada Juan le debe a sus amigos.
    Nothing (DO) Juan (S) cl owe-3ps to his friends
(30) *A nadie Juan le debe la renta.
    To nobody (IO) Juan (S) cl owe-3ps the rent

A similar contrast is observed in contexts with non negative quantifiers:

(31) a. *?A cualquiera tu madre pone contento.
    To anybody (DO) your mother (S) make-3ps happy
   b. A cualquiera pones contento.
    To anybody (IO) make-2ps happy
(32) a. *?A todo el mundo la prensa ha aceptado
    To everybody (IO) the press (S) have-3ps accepted
   b. A todo el mundo ha aceptado la prensa.
    To everybody have-3ps accepted the press

Contrary to what we assumed in describing (27) and (28), Laka (1990) contends that the contrast between (24)–(26) and (29)–(30), shows that the verb has to move above Spec IP so that a Spec-head relationship with the negative quantifier can be established. Nonetheless, certain types of evidence lead us to question the appropriateness of such an approach. For example, Spanish, unlike Italian and French, allows frequency adverbs to precede the verb in declarative clauses, as it is shown in (33):

(33) Juan siempre me engaña.
    Juan always cl cheat-3ps

If, in fact, the verb moves higher up in contexts with preverbal negative quantifiers, we would expect frequency adverbs to follow the verb in these contexts. Examples (34)–(35) indicate that such an expectation is not met; a preverbal nega-

---

\(^5\) As we will see later on, it is not necessary for pre-verbal IO with doubling to be focused when they appear preverbally (see footnote 16). However, this point is irrelevant for the main point of this section.
tive quantifier and a negative preverbal frequency adverb render a grammatical outcome:6

(34) Nadie nunca te vio tan triste
Nobody ever cl saw-3ps so sad
‘Nobody ever saw you so sad’

(35) A nadie nunca le das las gracias.
To nobody ever say-2ps thank you
‘You never say thank you to anybody’

(36) A nadie ya saludas por las mananas.
To nobody you greet in the morning.

In addition, the verb movement approach is incompatible with the idea that Romance clitics cannot be head-adjoined to the verb or to the inflectional projection where the verb is located, as proposed in Kayne (1994).7 If clitics always precede the verb, and they are not adjoined to it, there is no possibility in which a Spec-head relation could obtain between the verb and the pre-verbal negative quantifier in (37).

(37) A nadie le debe la renta.
To nobody owe-3ps the rent.
To nobody, he owes the rent.

If, as we argue, the verb movement hypothesis is not viable, some other mechanism must be at play in order to explain the apparent blocking effect exerted by a preverbal over subject, DOs, IOs, in cases (29) and (30), in contrast with cases like (24)–(26). Observe that the contrast is especially problematic if pro occupies the same structural position of overt subject as proposed in (5).

The conclusion we draw from the preceding evidence is that the position preverbal subjects surface in is not exclusive to subjects. But that position is parallel to a typical left dislocation. In fact, the ungrammaticality of (29) and (30), repeated below as (38a, b), can be explained in terms of the intervening effect of the left dislocated material in between.

6 One anonymous reviewer suggests that Quantifier Absorption might explain examples (34) to (36). It is generally considered that Quantifier Absorption does not involve syntactic reanalysis of the two quantifiers as a unit before Spell Out. Quantifier Absorption is believed to take place at LF. Observe that if quantifier Absorption leads to reanalysis, we might predict that French or Italian might have sentences parallel to (34) and (35) even though in these languages adverbs do not precede the verb. However, this prediction is not fulfilled.

(i) *Personne jamais a mangé
Nobody ever has eaten

7 An empirical consequence of not having clitics adjoined to the verb in the CL-V order is that it naturally leads to an explanation of the alternation CL-V and V-CL in terms of verb movement (see Ordóñez, 1997: Ch. 4). That verb movement motivates the CL-V or V-CL alternations is shown by the fact that the morphology of the verb is crucial in determining one or the other order (i.e: imperatives, infinitives with V-CL versus finite CL-V in Spanish). If the alternation were not related to verb movement, we might expect both possibilities in the same language or across languages.
(38) a. *A nadie [Juan [le debe la renta.
b. *Nadie [a Juan [le debe la renta..

We take the subject Juan in (38a), and the IO a Juan in (38b) to be in an A' position. Thus, movement of the negative quantifier produces a blocking effect when it moves over.8 This situation does not arise in cases (25) and (26), since under our view, no intruding material, overt or covert, intervenes when the negative quantifier is pre-posed.9

2.2.2. Extraction of wh-elements

Some data concerning the distribution of wh-elements also seem to support the conclusion that overt subjects do not have the same distribution as non overt ones. The obligatory inversion exhibited in contexts like (39) has led some linguists to conclude that either the subject cannot occupy Spec IP because the wh-trace already occupies that position (e.g. Lema, 1989; Goodall, 1991), or that V must move to a higher position (higher than IP), to C, to enter into a checking relation (Rizzi, 1991).

(39) a. *¿Qué Pedro compró en el mercado?
What Pedro bought in the market?
b. *¿A quién Susana le dio el paraguas?
To whom Susana cl gave the umbrella?

Nevertheless, the contrasts offered by examples in (40a) versus (40b), (42a) versus (41b), and (42a) versus (42b) below, show that an obligatory inversion effect is not always forced.

(40) a. ¿Qué tipo de literatura Octavio Paz nos sugiere que debamos leer?
What type of literature Octavio Paz cl suggests that we should read?
b. *¿Qué Octavio Paz nos sugiere que debemos leer?
What Octavio Paz cl suggests that we should read?

(41) a. ¿Qué tipo de libros a nosostros nos sugiere Paz que debemos leer?
What type of books to us cl suggests Paz that we should read?
b. *Qué a nosotros nos sugiere Paz que debemos leer?
What to us cl suggests Paz that we should read?

8 The data is also problematic for the proposition that pro has a different distribution from overt subject in pre-verbal position (see Cardinaletti, 1996). Thus, we should still explain why pro should not have blocking effects. Against the idea that pro is post-verbal, see also Cardinaletti (1996).

9 One might wonder why this intervening effect should occur with the preposing negative quantifiers or wh-quantifier (see next section), but does not occur with left dislocated XP's (i.e. we can have multiple dislocations as in (20a)). The answer must be that bare negative quantifiers and wh-quantifiers involve agreement of a special sort. Thus, it has been proposed that wh-elements enter into wh-agreement (Rizzi, 1991; Chung and Georgopoulos, 1988). For the extension of this idea to negative quantifiers (Laka, 1990; Haegeman and Zanuttini, 1991). Sporiche has pointed out that this agreement is satisfied at LF by the verb in French, while it is satisfied before Spell Out in English. If we extend the proposal for Spanish (see Ordóñez, 1997: Ch. 4), we obtain that the movement of the verb at LF in Spanish is blocked by the intervention of the dislocated subject.
(42) a. A ver, ¿de qué manera a ti te podían criticar tus enemigos?
See, in what way to you could criticize your enemies?
See, in what way could your enemies criticize you
b. *A ver, ¿cómo a ti te podían criticar tus enemigos?
See, how to you could criticize your enemies?
See, how could your enemies criticize you.

What we observe is that the inversion effect vanishes when the wh-constituent is a complex one, such as *Qué tipo de literatura*, (*what type of literature*), and *De qué manera*, (*in what way*), but it surfaces when faced with a bare wh-constituent like *qué* (*what*), or *cómo*, (*how*). Interestingly, when inversion is not required, subjects, D0s, and IOs pattern equally with respect to the possibility of appearing between the verb and the Wh-element as shown in (41b) and (42b).

Interestingly, another context where no obligatory inversion is required, even when a bare wh- is involved, is found in Spanish in cases of long wh-extraction.

(43) a. *Qué te dijo Martina que el abogado no le había dado a tiempo?*  
What cl said Martina that the lawyer not cl had given on time?  
What did Martina say that the lawyer had not given her on time?
b. *Qué dijiste que tus padres te iban a regalar?*  
What you said that your parents were going to give you  
What did you say that your parents were going to give you?

(44) a. *¿A quién te dijo Martina que el citatorio ya se lo habían dado?*  
To whom cl said Martina that the subpoena already cl they had given?  
Who did Martina say that they have given the subpoena?
b. *Qué pensabas que a ti te iban a regalar?*  
What you said that for you they were going to give?  
What did you say that they were going to give?

In the examples in (43), the wh-element has been extracted over a subordinate preverbal subject, and in (44) it has been extracted over a preverbal object. What we must conclude from these data is that the obligatory inversion effects must crucially depend on the syntactic nature of the moved wh-element. In structures involving long wh-extraction where the wh-element appears adjacent to the embedded preverbal argument, be it a subject or an object, no such restriction applies. Given the complexity of the data, it is hard to maintain the idea that V moves to C or that Spec IP might be occupied by the trace of the moved wh-element in interrogatives in Spanish.

In fact, we think these data point to the opposite conclusion, that wh-elements do not move through the specifier of IP, and that V does not move to C. This point has been independently made for Spanish by Suñer (1994) and Ordóñez (1997). For
instance, Suñer (1994) shows that frequency adverbs may appear between the wh-element and verb, contrary to what one might expect if the verb is in C:\11

\begin{align}
(45) \quad & \text{¿Con quién nunca piensas tú hablar? (from Suñer, 1994)} \\
& \text{With who never think-2ps you to speak} \\
& \text{Who don’t you ever think to speak to} \\
(46) \quad & \text{¿A quién siempre le dices tus secretos?} \\
& \text{to whom always cl-say-2ps your secrets.} \\
& \text{Who do you always tell your secrets} \\
\end{align}

If the conclusion that V-to-C is not adequate for the inversion effect in Spanish, it is not clear why pro should have a different behavior than overt subjects given the hypothesis illustrated in (5). Thus, we seem to run into the same paradox for the cases of questions as we did for negative quantifiers as the contrast in (47) shows:\12

\begin{align}
(47) \quad a. \quad & \text{*¿Qué Pedro compró en el mercado?} \\
& \text{What Pedro bought-3p.s in the market.} \\
\quad b. \quad & \text{¿Qué pro compró en el mercado?} \\
& \text{What pro bought in the market.} \\
\end{align}

Again, from a different perspective in which the subject in (47a) is left dislocated in an A’ position, we might explain the contrast in terms of the intervening effect of a dislocated subject as we did with the previous section. Crucially, we would assume that no element intervenes in (47b).\13

In conclusion, the internal structure of wh-questions in Spanish also leads to unexpected asymmetries - as in (47) - if pro and preverbal overt subjects have the same distribution. We have seen that when no inversion is required, preverbal DO, IO, and subjects can appear between the wh-element or and the verb as in (40a)-(41a) and

---

11 See also the same point with quantifiers in the previous section.
12 We have not discussed yet the structure of the parallel sentence (i):
   
   (i) \text{¿Qué compró Pedro en el mercado?} \\
   \text{what bought Pedro in the market} \\
   One might propose the following structure for pro:
   
   (ii) \text{¿Qué compró pro en el mercado?} \\
   \text{what bought pro in the market} \\
   As we have mentioned in the text, Ordoñez (1997) and Suñer (1994) argue against the idea that the order is obtained by verb movement. Thus the structure for pro might be (iii) with a pro expletive in Spec IP:
   
   (iii) \text{¿Qué pro compró [vp pro en el mercado?} \\
   \text{A basic problem with this structure is that pro in spec VP is too far from AGRS in order to be identified for features of person and number. Rizzi’s (1986) identification or ‘pro’ requires it to be in a Spec-Head relation with an agreement head. For arguments against the existence of post-verbal ‘pro’, see Cardinaletti (1996).} \\
   
13 One might wonder how examples (40a) can be allowed. In Ordoñez (1997) it was proposed that these more complex cases are parallel to the more complex negative quantifiers studied by Rizzi (1997). His proposal is that these complex negative quantifiers are left dislocated. Thus, the answer is that these complex wh-elements are not really in Spec CP.
If more structure is involved with pre-verbal DO and IO than with pre-verbal subject, as proposed in (5), one might expect some contrasts depending on whether subjects or DO and IO intervene.

2.3. The scope of quantifiers in pre-verbal position

In the previous section the kind of evidence introduced pointed against the idea that there is more structure with a pre-verbal DO or IO than with a pre-verbal subject. We have also shown that, given the postulation of subject pro, overt subjects and pro must have a different distribution. These two conclusions indicate that the standard hypothesis represented in (5) is inadequate. In this section we provide more evidence for the uniform hypothesis showing that the restrictions on quantificational interpretation of pre-verbal DOs and IOs is parallel to that of preverbal subjects.

The special properties of subject quantifiers in pre-verbal position have been taken as evidence for the appearance of these elements in Spec IP, a non properly governed position. For example, Rizzi (1982), following Kayne (1984), reports that elements like nessuno cannot be licensed as NPI by a negation in the matrix clause (wide scope interpretation) when they appear in the pre-verbal subject position of a finite embedded clause. This element can only be licensed as an NPI with respect to the matrix negation when it appears post-verbally as shown in the following contrast:

(48) Non credo che sia arrestato nessuno.
    I do not think that will be arrested nobody
    I do not think that anybody will be arrested
(49) Non credo che nessuno sia arrestato.
    I do not think that nobody will be arrested
    *I do not think that anybody will be arrested.

Rizzi (1982) gives an explanation for this contrast in terms of the ECP. He assumes that there is movement of the NPI to target the licensing negation at LF. Consequently, the movement of the pre-verbal subject Nessuno at LF would not be possible in (49) because Spec IP is not a properly governed position. However, the movement would be perfectly licensed from the post-verbal position in (48) where the NPI nessuno is governed by the inflection.14

---

14 The adaptation of the nessuno facts into Spanish is rather controversial. Not all speakers reject the wide scope interpretation in (i). For those speakers there is no contrast between (i) and (ii).
(i) No creo que nadie llegó.
    I don't think that nobody came
(ii) No creo que llegó nadie.
    I think that came nobody.

Interestingly, the speakers that do not allow wide scope interpretation for (i), do not allow it either for other pre-verbal IO negative elements. For those speakers, wide scope interpretation is easier with the a) cases than with the b) cases in (iii) and (iv) respectively.
Jaeggli (1987) adopts this hypothesis for Spanish and observes that the same contrast holds in the distribution of wh-elements in situ. Compare (50) with (51):

\[(50) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & *\text{¿Qué dijiste que quién compró el otro día?} \\
& \text{What did you say that who (S) bought the other day.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{¿Qué dijiste que compró quién el otro día?} \\
& \text{Who did you say that bought who (S) the other day}
\end{align*}\]

\[(51) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & *\text{¿Quién piensa que quién (S) lo ganó?} \\
& \text{Who thinks that who won it} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Quién piensa que lo ganó quién (S)?} \\
& \text{Who thinks that won it who}
\end{align*}\]

The contrast between (50) and (51) is parallel to that shown for Italian: the subject wh-element cannot appear in the Spec IP. Jaeggli (1987) suggests that the ungrammaticality of (50a) and (51a) has to be related to the inability of the subject wh-word to move at LF from a non-properly governed position like Spec IP. However, similar contrasts hold for other pre-verbal wh-elements like IOs or DOs. Observe the following contrasts when the IO is pre-verbal or post-verbal as in (52a,b). As shown in (52c), a non-wh-IO can appear pre-verbally in the embedded clause, minimally contrasting with (52b).

\[(52) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{¿Quién cree que le va a dar eso a quién?} \\
& \text{Who do you think will give that to whom} \\
\text{b. } & *\text{¿Quién cree que a quién le va a dar eso?} \\
& \text{Who do you think that to whom will give that} \\
\text{c. } & \text{¿Quién cree que a ti te va a dar eso?} \\
& \text{Who do you think that to you will give this}
\end{align*}\]

We believe that the explanation provided for the pairs (50) to (51) should be the same as the one given for (52) with preverbal IOs. Thus, an explanation in terms of the ECP and the crucial idea that Spec IP is a non properly governed position falls short of giving a complete understanding of the entire paradigm.

By contrast, Uribe-etxebarria (1992) provides the basis for such a uniform explanation. She observes that the interpretation of pre-verbal universal quantifier subjects

\[(iii) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{no creo que le gustó a nadie.} \\
& \text{I do not think that cl-liked to nobody} \\
& \text{I do not think that anybody liked it.} \\
\text{b. } & \text{no creo que a nadie le gustó.} \\
& \text{I do not think that to nobody cl-liked} \\
& \text{I do not think that anybody liked it}
\end{align*}\]

\[(iv) \begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{no creo que se lo enviase a nadie.} \\
& \text{I do not think that cl-cl sent to nobody} \\
& \text{I do not think that they sent it to anybody} \\
\text{b. } & \text{no creo que a nadie se lo enviase} \\
& \text{I do not think that to nobody cl-cl sent} \\
& \text{I do not think that they sent it to anybody}
\end{align*}\]
is more restricted than that of post-verbal subjects universal quantifiers in Spanish. For example, pre-verbal subject quantifiers in an embedded clause cannot take wide scope over an extracted wh-object. Thus, in (53) the reading in which cada senador loves a different person is not possible. The most salient reading is the one in which cada senador loves the same person (narrow scope of the universal quantifier).

(53) ¿A quién dices que cada senador amaba?
Who did you say that every senator loved?

However, when the subject quantifier is in a post-verbal position, the ambiguity reappears. Sentence (54) can have both a wide scope and a narrow scope reading.

(54) ¿A quién dices que amaba cada senador?
Who did you say that loved every senator
‘Who did you say that every senator loved’

However, English significantly differs from Spanish. May (1985) claims that a pre-verbal quantifier can take wide scope over an extracted wh-element:

(55) What do you think everyone bought? (from May, 1985)

From this contrast, it can be concluded that the nature of the position occupied by the subject in Spanish has to be characterized in a rather different way from English.¹⁵

Uribe-Etxebarria (1992) proposes that the mismatches can be understood if subjects are in an A’ position in Spanish.¹⁶ She makes the interesting parallel between

¹⁵ The conclusion is based on evidence of quantified subjects and their constraints on interpretation. I am assuming with May (1985) that the universal quantifier ‘everyone’ has the same distribution of non quantified in Spanish and English. Thus, my conclusion extends to non quantified elements.

¹⁶ The idea that pre-verbal subjects like pre-verbal DOS and IOs are dislocated in an A’ position is usually challenged by the following contrast from Rizzi (1986b):

(i) *Nessuno, l’ho visto.
Nobody, I have seen him.

(ii) Nessuno è venuto
Nobody came

Rizzi (1986b) takes (i) to show that Negative quantifiers cannot be left dislocated in an A’ position. Thus if subjects are in an A’ position in (ii) it is hard to understand the contrast in grammaticality between the two examples. We take this contrast just to mean that object negative quantifiers are incompatible with the accusative clitic. Thus, the contrast in (i) and (ii) is reminiscent of the ban on the doubling of object negative quantifiers with accusative clitic, (See Dobrovie Sorin (1990) for Rumanian and Suñer (1988) for Rio-platense Spanish). Observe that an IO negative quantifier in pre-verbal position, which requires doubling in all dialects of Spanish, behaves similarly to a pre-verbal subject negative quantifier. For instance, it does not need to be emphatic in order to appear pre-verbally as shown in the parallelism between (iii) and (iv).

(iii) Dicen que a nadie le tienes miedo.
they said that to nobody you fear
They said that you don’t fear anybody.
this position and the topicalization position of English. For example, a wide scope interpretation of a topicalized quantifier in English is not possible as shown in the contrast in interpretation between (56a) and (56b). Similarly, no wh-element seems to be allowed when it is topicalized as in shown by the ungrammaticality of (57b).

(56) a. Someone thinks that every problem, Mary solved. (from Lasnik and Uriagereka, 1988: 156
b. Someone thinks that Mary solved every problem

(57) a. Who thinks that I like who?
b. *Who thinks that who, I like

Therefore, this type of approach leads to the treatment of pre-verbal subjects as having the same quantificational constraints of a topic like element. This is feasible if the preverbal DOs and IOs, on the one hand, and pre-verbal subjects, on the other, are characterized in the same fashion.

The conclusion we reach is that no further movement is licensed when a quantifier has been already moved to an A' peripheral position before Spell Out. Epstein (1992) gives a theoretical implementation on this ban in terms of economy of derivation. For a quantifier in a topic position to have wide scope, it is necessary to move further at LF in a second step. This derivation in two steps is blocked by a derivation in one step where the quantifier and wh-element are not moved to the topic position before Spell Out, but are moved in one swoop at LF from a post-verbal position.17

In conclusion, it has been shown that pre-verbal subject quantifiers in Spanish behave in many cases in a parallel fashion to pre-verbal object quantifiers as shown by the parallelisms in the contrasts with subject wh-questions in (50) and (51) and the preverbal IO as in (52). It has also been shown that they differ from pre-verbal subjects in English with respect to wide scope interpretation of a quantifier. This cross-linguistic difference confirms our suspicions concerning the idea that the preverbal subject occupies the Spec IP in Spanish.

3. Dislocated subjects: Previous accounts

If, as we have been showing, preverbal subjects parallel with preverbal objects in their behavior, we have to give an answer as to what prevents subjects from appearing in Spec IP. We will see that the answer is crucially related to a broad question of what allows Spanish to have the V S O as well as the V O S orders.

---

17 For an alternative in terms of unambiguous binding, see Müller and Sternefeld (1993).
There are two lines of inquiry that give an answer to these questions. In this section we review them and point out some of their shortcomings. We propose a solution which in some respects combines some important conclusions from these two approaches.

3.1. VSO approaches

One type of answer to the question posed above is the idea that case and Agr are satisfied post-verbally, and therefore movement to a pre-verbal position is triggered by discourse reasons as in any left dislocation. This kind of approach has been proposed by Contreras (1991) and Zubizarreta (1994).

Contreras (1991), for example, suggests that economy principles prevent IP from projecting a specifier position. In his analysis, subjects in Spanish are assigned case and Agr under c-command by Inflection, which is taken to be lexical and, as such, is able to L-mark a postverbal (c-commanded) subject. Given this perspective, there is no justification for the projection of a specifier position of IP. Preverbal subjects are generated as adjuncts, and case and Agr are presumably assigned postverbally to a null pro when no overt subject appears.

Similarly, Zubizarreta (1994), with a richer assumption of inflectional projections, proposed that subjects are assigned case and Agr prior to the movement of the verb to the highest inflectional projection. The highest Spec of the projection where the verb ends up is a position related to what she calls 'neutral topics' and movement of the subject to that position is purely optional.

In important respects, these approaches claim that Spanish is the mirror image of English. While in English, subject NPs satisfy their agreement and case properties in
a Spec position in which the verb ends up at Spell Out, in Spanish subject NPs satisfy these properties in Spec positions previous to the final target movement of the verb at Spell Out. In this respect, Spanish is thought to share important similarities with V SO languages like Irish or Arabic. However, there are many aspects of Spanish that do not seem to fit into this perspective. From a discursive point of view, the V SO order is not the most neutral one as is the case in languages like Irish or Arabic. From a syntactic point of view, there seem to exist quite important differences between standard V SO languages and Spanish. For instance, it is typical of this type of language for there to exist an adjacency requirement between the verb and the subject that follows. However, such constraints do not seem to apply in a language like Spanish, which, for example, also allows the V O S order.18

(60) Ayer compró el libro Juan.
Yesterday bought the book Juan.

3.2. Poly§synthetic approaches

Another type of approach claims that Spanish is polysynthetic with respect to the distribution of subjects. This seems to be corroborated by the existence of a rich inflectional paradigm, the possibility of pro-drop, and the different possible positions of the subject (free word order).

This intuition has been put to work in different ways by various linguists (see Jelinek, 1984). Baker (1995), in his study of polysynthetic languages claims that lexical DP arguments are always associated with pro. In his view, pro’s are the real argument and lexical DPs are adjoined to a more peripheral position as in (61). This proposal is adopted by Barbosa (1996) in her study of the distribution of pre-verbal subjects in European Portuguese. A pro would be in a Spec IP position, while pre-verbal subjects are always left dislocated or adjoined.

\[(61)\]

\[
\text{Top} \\
\quad \text{DP}_{j} \quad \text{IP} \\
\quad \quad \text{proj} \quad \text{I} \\
\quad \quad \quad \text{VP}
\]

There are two important questions that arise from adopting this proposal: (1) Why could a lexical DP not occupy the argumental position? (2) What kind of syntactic relation is established between pro and the corresponding lexical DP?

Question 1 is related to the fact that pro and lexical DPs do not seem to have the same distribution as we have shown in section 2. The idea that lexical subjects and

18 A detailed explanation of the syntactic differences between Spanish and V SO languages goes well beyond the scope of this paper.
pro must have different distribution has been also argued by Rigau (1988) for Catalan and Cardinaletti (1996) for Italian (see also Bonet, 1988; Solà, 1992). For example, Rigau shows that in Catalan the behavior of pro parallels that of clitics and not that of strong pronouns. She proposes that pro appears in Spec IP, and a strong pronoun appears adjoined to IP. A similar intuition is found in Cardinaletti who suggests that in Italian the behavior of pro runs on a par with some lexical pronouns but not with others. Italian seems to have strong pronouns like *lui* ('he') and *loro* ('they') and weak pronouns like *egli* ('he'), and *esso* ('it'), and pro seemingly behaves like weak pronouns. Cardinaletti's conclusion is that pro must move to the specifier of a functional projection Agr2, whereas lexical subjects may only appear in the specifier of a higher Agr1. If these arguments are correct, they would build a strong case against considering that lexical DP's and pro exhibit the same distributional properties.

The question not yet answered by all these approaches is why pro and a lexical subject must have a different distribution. Baker (1995) proposes an answer based on the idea that rich inflections absorbs case:

\[(62) \text{An agreement morpheme adjoined to a head X receives that head's case at S-structure/PF. (From Baker, 1995: 86)}\]

Thus, the reason why lexical DPs cannot occupy the argumental position is due to the lack of case. This reasoning however, crucially implies that pro does not have case previous to Spell Out. Therefore, the case filter has to be formulated as a condition on S-structure that applies only to lexical XPs:

\[(63) \text{The Case Filter} \]

\[\ast \text{NP without case if NP has phonetic features and is in an argument position.}\]

However, a formulation of the case filter in these terms is dubious given the visibility condition, which requires XP to be in a case position in order to be visible for theta role assignment (see Lasnik and Uriagereka, 1988; Lasnik and Chomsky, 1995). On the other hand, Rizzi (1982: Ch. 4, 1986a) has also shown that pro is licensed only if it is in the context of assignment of case. This is especially crucial for the instances of pro in the so called Aux-to-Comp constructions in which Rizzi argues that expletive pro is licensed by the auxiliary in C, which exceptionally assigns nominative case to it:

\[(64) \text{Ritengo esser pro nevicato anche sotto I mille metri.} \]

\[\text{I believed [to have snowed even below 1000 meters]}\]

Following these reasonings, new premises need to be added to case theory. One must assume that even if pro does not get morphological case at PF because it is absorbed by the agreement, it must still receive it at LF. Thus Baker (1995) adopts a conjoined theory of the case filter that applies to lexical XP at PF and applies to pro at LF. In this way, agreements are deleted at LF and case is assigned to pro at that level. Notice, that it is still difficult to understand how the lexical DP associated with
pro gets its morphologic case before Spell Out, given that case has been absorbed by the corresponding agreement. This issue is particularly problematic if the DP and pro form a chain as is claimed by Baker (1995) (see below) given connectedness.

The second question that a polysynthesis type approach has to confront is how to define the syntactic relation established between pro and a lexical DP. It is obvious that the relation cannot be pure binding since that would obviously lead to a principle B violation since pro would be bound by the lexical DP related to it:

(65) **Juan, pro, vino.**

Baker assumes that the XP and pro are connected by a chain of the type proposed for CLLD by Cinque. This kind of chain, however, has a rather special status. It is not derived by movement, but it is computed representationally. There must be a matching of indexes between the adjoined XP elements and pro. Baker (1995) formulates the chain condition in the following way:

(66) **The chain condition**

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{X and Y may constitute a chain only if:} \\
\text{(i) X c-commands Y.} \\
\text{(ii) X and Y are co-indexed.} \\
\text{(iii) There is no barrier containing Y but not X} \\
\text{(iv) X and Y are not distinct in morphosyntactic features (i.e. category, person, number, gender, case, etc..)}
\end{align*} \]

As the chain condition is formulated, it leaves open the possibility that the two elements involved could be either a pronominal and a lexical XP or two lexical XPs with the same index. As we mentioned earlier, binding play no role in the computation of this kind of chain. However, as proposed by Baker, the only two elements involved in this kind of chain are a lexical XP in an adjoined position and a empty pronominal in the argument position. It remains unclear why the existence of this special kind of chain (lexical XP, pro) relies on the already stipulated property that pro can only occupy argumental positions. Thus, Baker (1995) proposes the adjunct licensing condition below:

(67) **The adjunct Licensing Condition** (from Baker, 1995)

An argument-type phrase XP generated in adjoined position is licensed if and only if it forms a chain with a unique null pronominal in an argument position.

In conclusion, we have seen that there are two possible alternatives to account for why pre-verbal subjects are dislocated. The first type of approach relies on the

---

19 If it were derived by movement, there would be no reason for the existence of pro in argumental position in the first place. The chain has to be always computed representationally.

20 The nature of the algorithm that determines how this matching of indexes takes place is not explicitly discussed by Cinque (1990) nor by Baker (1995).
idea that subjects satisfy case and Agr before the verb moves to a higher inflectional projection in a similar fashion as has been described for V SO languages. This proposal encounters problems in that Spanish does not seem to fit very well into the class of verb initial languages from either a discursive point of view nor a syntactic point of view. The second alternative, adopts the idea that Spanish shares the property of being a polysynthetic language with respect to the syntactic distribution of subjects. In this respect, Baker's proposal, which requires pro's to be in the argumental position and any other XP to be adjoined, seems promising. However, if we adopt this hypothesis we have to make non obvious assumption like adopting a conjoined formulation of the case filter. Even in this case, it is unclear how an adjoined lexical DP receives case. We saw that the chain relation between the dislocated XP and pro had a special status. The chain is not the product of movement but takes place by a mechanism of co-indexing. Finally, it is unclear why the existence of this special type of chain is contingent on the fact that an empty pronominal is in an argumental position.

4. Person agreement as a clitic

We agree with the intuition that the reason preverbal subjects behave like preverbal DOs and IOs is related to the fact that the language allows free variation with respect to the position of the subject, and it has to be also related to the possibility of pro-drop. In this respect we group Spanish with the polysynthetic languages. However, the way in which we derive these properties is different from Baker's polysynthesis parameter. Instead, we adopt the proposal made by Taraldsen (1992) that agreement is a clitic and as such, it not only absorbs case, but it also receives theta role assigned to the subject (see Taraldsen, 1992).21

The idea that Agr is an argument of the verb seems confirmed by how binding is crucially determined by it. Hurtado (n.d.), Jelinek (1984), Olarrea (1994) and Torregro (1996) notice that Spanish allows certain plural DPs to agree with 1p. 2 p. as well as with 3p. in the plural verbal paradigm in (68a) and (68b):

(68) a. Los estudiantes tenemos mala memoria. 
   The students have-1pp bad memory.

b. Los estudiantes tenéis mala memoria
   The students have-2pp bad memory.

c. Los estudiantes tienen mala memoria.
   The students have-3pp bad memory.

21 Our theory differs from Taraldsen in several respects. For us agreement does not head an independent functional projection, but it is a pure argument which enters into Spec-head agreement with a doubling XP.
Crucially, there is a change in patterns with respect to binding depending on whether the plural DP is associated or not with such agreeing elements. For instance, a plural DP object such as los estudiantes, not associated with any agreement or clitic, cannot be co-indexed with either the 1pp pronoun in the adjunct clause in either (69a) and (69b). The DP ‘los estudiantes’ takes the default 3pp pronoun or agreement feature as shown in (70):

(69) a. *Acusaron [a los estudiantes], después de que se peleasen con nosotros.
   They accused [the students], after they fought with us.
   b. *Hablaron de [los estudiantes], después de que se peleasen con nosotros.
   They talked about [the students], after they fought with us.

(70) a. Acusaron [a los estudiantes], después de que se peleasen con ellos.
   They accused [the students], after they fought with them.
   b. Hablaron de [los estudiantes], después de que se peleasen con ellos.
   They talked about the students, after they fought with them.

These facts show that a plural DP binds a 3pp pronoun or agreement by default. However, Olarrea (1994) points out that when the plural DP is associated with 1 or 2 pp subject agreement, the binding effects are the opposite. The plural DP associated with lpp subject agreement can only be bound with lpp in the adjunct clause as in (71 b), but not with a 3pp as in (71a).

(71) a. *(Los estudiantes), salimos de la reunión después de que los acusaran.
   The students, leave-lp. pl. the meeting after they accused them.
   b. [Los estudiantes], salimos de la reunión después de que nos acusaran.
   The students, leave-lp. pl the meeting after they accused us.

Therefore, the examples above point to the conclusion that the appearance of agreement on the verb is crucial in evaluating what the possible antecedent for a pronoun is. This could only be shown in a language that allows different agreement possibilities for the same DP as shown above. When the DP appears not to be associated with any agreement element, it can only bind a default 3p. pronoun. When the DP is associated with an agreement morpheme it can only bind a pronoun whose person specification matches the agreement associated with the DP binder.22

The same kind of paradigm can be observed in the domain of standard clitic doubling. A non doubled DP cannot be the binder of a 1pp or 2 pp pronoun in an adjunct clause. It can only be co-indexed with a 3pp pronoun in (70a). However, when the DP is doubled by a lpp pronoun, the judgments reverse, and co-indexing can only take place with a 1pp pronoun. We obtain the following minimal pair in (72), which parallels the case we have seen for the case of the subject agreement paradigm in (71).

---
22 The conclusion is rather puzzling for those theories that claim that pro and subject DPs might have partially the same distribution (e.g. Chomsky, 1982; Rizzi, 1986a). From that perspective, it is harder to express how the different agreement changes affect the binding possibilities of these DP's.
(72) a. *Acusaron [a los estudiantes], después de que hablasen de nosotros.
   They accused [the students], after they talked about us.

b. Nos acusaron [a los estudiantes], después de que hablasen de nosotros.
   cl-1p. pl accused [the students], after they talked about us.

The facts point to the same conclusion with respect to the paradigm of clitic doubling. The presence of the clitic crucially determines the coreference possibilities of the DP associated with it. All these data raise two questions: (1) How can we express the parallelism between clitic doubling and subject agreement with respect to their coreference patterns? and (2) How can we integrate a DP and Agr or clitic to explain that both are crucial in determining coreference with any other pronoun in the sentence?

We might start answering the first question by taking seriously the idea that person agreement is a clitic. The facts discussed above not only showed that there was a parallelism between clitic doubling and agreement; but also that agreement was crucial in the determination of A-binding. Such a result leads us to think that person agreement itself should be considered an argument. We propose that the relation between the Agr and the DP is the same kind of relation established between a DP and a clitic as we saw above: they are both instances of 'clitic doubling'.23 In doing so, we adopt a specific proposal about clitic doubling made by Torrego (in progress). Torrego has proposed that the clitics (and in our proposal Agr) head a DP in the spirit of Postal (1974).24 This DP is also integrated by the doubling DP, which merges with the head to form what we can call a big DP.25

(73) Doubling DP cl agr Doubling DP cl acc/dat

23 There is an obvious question to be answered. If person agreement is a clitic, why should it be obligatory present on the verb. We think that part of the answer has to be encoded in the parameter that determines polysynthesis with respect to the subject argument. See Jelinek (1984) and the discussion below.

24 Observe that we are proposing that person agreement is a clitic. We continue to assume that number and gender are radically different: they are incapable of bearing any theta-role. Therefore, this approach does not eliminate the possibility of thinking of gender and number as inflectional projections and that Spec-Head can be obtained in these cases. However, see Chomsky (1995) for an elimination of the number and gender agreement as an inflectional projection altogether.

25 The analysis is not exactly the ones proposed in Torrego or Uriagereka (1995). They propose that there is a complement pro of the D. Observe, that given antisymmetry, which we assume, the Cl agreement projects an intermediate X to which the DP attaches in order to be a specifier.
The virtue of this proposal is that it integrates the relation between the doubling element and the clitic (or Agr) into a core notion such as Spec-head relation. In this way the big DP would inherit the phi-features of the both elements that integrate it: the clitic and the DP that doubles it. The Big DP occupies the corresponding subject argumental position for cl Agr, as the DO doubled element occupies the corresponding argument position for object clitic.

In this way, we obtain a way to express why agreement is crucial in the determination of the binding possibilities when associated with plural DPs in Spanish. The clitic Agr will be the head of the Big DP and therefore it will determine the person specification on the index of the big DP, which is the one which enters in the computation for binding purposes. The Big DP will be only able to be co-indexed with another element that shares the same person specification already determined by the agreement clitic as the paradigm in (71) showed. When the DP is not doubled by any clitic, no person specification is explicit in the reference of the DP. The DP would only be able to be co-indexed with a 3 person by default as shown in the contrast in (69) and (70).

As we mentioned before, the agreement in features between the doubled DP and the clitic agreement is resolved internal to the big DP, which is in an argumental position in D-structure. Since the clitic is the head of the DP, it will be also the element to absorb the nominative case from the tense specification, which will be transmitted by Spec-head to the doubled DP. Tense assigns its case to the big DP by being in a very local relation with the upper Spec of the VP in which the subject argument is situated.

---

26 Sportiche also claims that the relation of the doubling DP and the clitic is one of Spec-head at LF. Earlier theories of doubling treated the relation of the doubled and the clitic as one of representational chain Jaeggli (1982), Borer (1984). Baker’s proposals follow the second way of reasoning in dealing with the problem of polysynthesis. Some of the problems with that second type of approach have been pointed out in the previous section.

27 For proposals that nominative case is assigned in this configuration see Koopmand and Sportiche (1991) and Kitagawa (1986). We could also consider the possibility that nominative case on the tense can be discharged by incorporating tense to the clitic agreement in a later stage of the derivation. In either case the case would be transmitted to the doubled DP which originated in the big DP in Spec VP.
The clitic agreement would move to a functional projection external to T as has been proposed for any kinds of clitics. For example, Uriagereka (1995) proposes an F-position unrelated to tense in which clitics adjoin in Galician and Portuguese. Here we will adopt the proposals made by Uriagereka (1995) in this respect and assume that agreement clitics like other clitics in tensed clauses adjoin to an abstract functional head F (see also Taraldisen, 1992). We propose that F contains strong N and V features. The F-projection attracts the clitic agreement, which by adjunction to F, will erase the strong feature in N. Subsequent to the adjunction of the agreement clitic to the abstract functional head we call F, the verb with tense would adjoin to it, and erase the strong V feature on F.

(75) 

---

28 From our perspective, person agreement is not a functional projection in the language, contrary to tense. See Chomsky (1995) and Rouveret (1991) for discussion of the special status of Agr in the collection of inflectional projections.

29 The reasons that drive Kayne to adjoin clitics to F are two: in the first place the clitic was able to adjoin to head with features as tense and the verb subsequently adjoined to tense, a case of multiple adjunction to the same head would obtain and that would be incompatible with the antisymmetry proposal. Secondly, if the verb adjoined to the clitic, already adjoined to tense, the sequence V+CL+Tense would be obtained. Kayne rejects that kind of proposal because pronouns never appear within words. By treating person agreement as a pronominal clitic, we therefore have a formal explanation of why the sequence Verb-agreement-tense is not a sequence attested in the Spanish verbal paradigm. Observe that such a conclusion is not immediately available if agreement is treated as a functional projection as in Pollock (1989) and Belletti (1990).

30 Observe that the idea that verbs move beyond T and adjoin to the clitic has been already proposed for other cases of enclisis with imperatives and infinitives as proposed by Kayne (1994), and Benincà and Cinque (1993).

31 As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer one might wonder why this F projection does not have an specifier. I will follow Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1996) and Bemamoun (to appear) and propose that the EPP is satisfied in Spanish by Head movement and not by Spec-Head agreement. See Uriagereka (forthcoming) for a proposal in terms of feature movement. Uriagereka also proposes the elimination of 'pro' in favor of feature checking. Observe that the existence of projection without specifier is not anomalous as pointed out by Kayne (1994: fn. 4): "On the other hand, it is worth noting that certain phrases, such as PP, DP and NP typically display no specifier (or adjoined phrase) and that if Agr (S) could bear a theta-role while still being a pure head of AgrP, then a verb could have a subject without having a specifier". In this paper, we are proposing exactly this last scenario.
Now that we have laid out our hypothesis, we can revisit some of the major conclusions with respect to the empirical data discussed in section 2. The data showed, on the one hand, that preverbal subjects and pre-verbal objects have a similar syntactic behavior, and, on the other, that the distribution of lexical subjects seems to differ from the distribution of pro.

With respect to the first issue, we take the position that the clitic is the only element that can satisfy θ-role assignment and case for the subject argument. Thus, we follow the line of thought established by Jelinek (1984) that in some languages the real arguments are the agreement, which she also takes to be clitics. This defining property is encoded in the parameter which distinguishes non polysynthetic languages from polysynthetic ones. As mentioned before, there are good reasons to think that Spanish can be classified in the first group with respect to the subject argument. Thus, we start to understand why Spanish does not pattern like a canonical S V O (English) or V S O (Irish and Arabic) as implied by Contreras (1991) and Zubizarreta’s (1994) approach.

From our perspective the DP is the doubling element of a clitic argument, and it is completely optional. Its presence or absence is immaterial to the discharge of the theta role or the assignment of nominative case to subjects. Lexical DPs are licensed by being in a Spec-head relation with the clitic agreement inside the big DP, and they inherit all their properties in that way. The doubling DP plays no role in the satisfaction of the formal conditions of the clause. It is licensed by purely discourse and prosodic considerations. Thus, when it appears post-verbally we assumed that it has moved to different projections associated with focus.

We are assuming that there is no inflectional projection Agr and that verbs in Spanish move beyond T in order to incorporate to the subject clitic agreement. So any movement of the doubling DP SU past the V+T+Clagr must be driven by considerations of semantic-discourse interpretation such as is typical for the case of left dislocations of DOs and IOs. Thus, we are able to understand why pre-verbal subjects and pre-verbal DOs and IOs behave in the same fashion. Parallel to the analysis of pre-verbal subjects, DOs and IOs are also associated with a clitic, which in the same fashion is responsible for the satisfaction of case and theta role assignment.

Our data also showed that sentences with silent subjects pattern differently from sentences in which a pre-verbal overt subject appears. Given the postulation of pro as a subject argument, the conclusion was that pro must have a different distribution from overt subjects. However, from our perspective there is never any pro argument in the Spec of an inflectional projection. The subject argument is always the agreement clitic that appears enclitic on the verb. Obviously, sentences with a preposed

---

32 Baker (1995) encodes the parameter in a different fashion, he proposes that arguments in these languages have to be co-indexed to a morpheme (see Baker’s Morphological Visibility Condition (Baker, 1995: 17), even though the morpheme is not the real argument.

33 See Ordóñez (1977) for justification of the existence of these kinds of projections in post-verbal position in Spanish.

34 Thus, our perspective leads us to think that CLLD of DO and IO are instances of clitic doubling as has been suggested by Kayne (1994).
doubling DP subject differ from sentences in which no doubled DP is preposed, just as sentences with a dislocated object differ from sentences in which the object is not left dislocated. Specifically, the preposing adds a new layer of structure in pre-verbal position: a topic phrase. In this sense, we adopt Rizzi's (1997) proposals that left dislocated elements must involve a topic head as in (76a). When no preposing takes place, no Top P appears preverbally as in (76b):

(76) a. Top P[SUp/DO/IO Top] V+T+Clagr, [[t, t',
    b. V+T+Cl agr, [VP DP t, ...

Finally, our proposal compares in interesting ways with Baker's polysynthesis proposal. Baker proposes that three important elements are involved in explaining the property of polysynthesis: pro, lexical DPs, and agreement. The element pro is licensed by being in Spec-head with agreement, while the lexical DP is licensed by being in a chain relation with pro. Thus, the polysynthesis parameter relies on the important idea that rich agreement absorbs case. This leaves pro being the only possible element to appear in argumental position given the assumption that pro does not require case. Thus, case is the factor that explains the different distribution of lexical XPs and pro's.

From our perspective there are two elements involved in explaining polysynthesis: the Agr itself and the doubling DP. The parameter in question also involves the special properties of agreement. Agreement morphemes not only absorb case, but they can also bear a θ-role and are, therefore, the real argument of the verb. This fact can be expressed if agreement is thought to be a pronominal clitic. The question of the different distribution of Agr and lexical DP is understood since they have different X’ status: the Agr is a head and must end up in a head position by Spell Out, while the lexical DP is a maximal projection and must always be in a specifier position. Since there is no pro licensed by any inflectional projection, the question of the different distribution does not arise.

(79) XP
   Spec
   DP
   Clagr

Finally, in the Polysynthesis hypothesis the lexical DP is licensed by being co-indexed to pro given the postulation of a chain with the following properties:

(a) X c-command Y (from Baker, 1995)
(b) X and y are co-indexed
(c) There is no barrier containing Y but not X

Also, a condition should be added that postulates that lexical DP can only be licensed by being co-indexed to a pro (see the adjunct condition above).
Given Torrego’s account of clitic doubling, the DP is licensed by being in a Spec-head relation with the agreement clitic as shown above. Thus conditions (a)-(c) of the chain condition in the polysynthesis parameter reduce to the standard notion of Spec-head agreement under our doubling hypothesis. On the other hand, we assume doubling can only take place when two elements with the same referential index differ in X’ status: one is a head and the other element is an XP in Spec. Therefore, an XP will be only able to related to a referential head element, in our case a clitic pronoun.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have shown that there is no exclusive position for pre-verbal subjects in finite clauses in Spanish. Evidence against such a position was drawn from data on ellipsis, extraction of quantifiers, wh-questions, and finally the restrictions on quantifier interpretation in this position. The facts either showed that we could not assume the existence of pro in pre-verbal position or that there were striking similarities between pre-verbal subjects, DOs, and IOs with respect to quantificational interpretation. Thus, the standard hypothesis in (5) was rejected.

To solve these puzzles, we have proposed the elimination of AgrS as a functional projection. Rather, we have proposed that person agreement should be considered an argument of the verb. Thus, we adopted the position that AgrS is a clitic, which absorbs theta role and case (see Jelinek, 1984; Taraldsen, 1992). Independent evidence for such a position comes from the similarities between clitic doubling constructions and agreement. We saw that person agreement, like a clitic in doubling construction, crucially determines the binding possibilities. This could be shown in those cases in which different person agreements can be associated with the same plural DP. It also leads to the proposal that the relation between DP and agreement is one of clitic doubling.

As a consequence of this analysis, we eliminate the notion that pro is an argument of the verb in favor of thinking that person agreement is the real argument. Thus the empirical argument that pro seems to show a different distribution from overt DP reduces to the fact that a clitic has a different distribution from a DP. Under Torrego’s analysis of doubling, we can accommodate the different distribution of both elements since one of them is a head (the clitic agreement) and the other is an XP.
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