SYNTACTIC AND SEMANTIC PROPERTIES OF NULL *VS.* OVERT SUBJECTS: EVIDENCE FROM COLOMBIAN SPANISH

Kryzzya Gómez
LLING-UMR 6310, CNRS/
Univeristy of Nantes, France
Kryzzgomez09@gmail.com

According to the standard theory (Chomsky 1981, 1982; Rizzi 1982, 1986; and Lasnik & Uriagereka 1988, Miller 2002 and references therein), overt nominative subjects and referentially null subjects of the *pro*-type are licensed by finite INFL/T, while PRO is licensed in the absence of finite INFL/T. There are three descriptive claims underlying this type of approach:

i. No overt (nominative) subjects in infinitives.
ii. No overt controlees.
iii. No null referentially free subjects (pro) in infinitives.

Counter-evidence for these claims has been already observed in different languages including romance languages (see Rigau 1995, Mensching 2000, Barbosa 2009, Szabolcsi 2009, Livitz 2011, Gómez 2017). Focusing on (Andean) Spanish, this work shows the following:

- Preverbal overt and null subjects in infinitival adjunct clauses in Colombian Spanish (CS) exemplify three systematic patterns of exceptions to the standard generalizations on infinitives/control in (i-iii).
- Overt PRO subjects cannot be characterized as either Obligatory Control (OC) or Non-Obligatory Control (NOC) (cf. Hornstein 1999, Sichel 2010, Landau 2013).
- The properties of Overt/Null PRO can be better captured by the Anaphor generalizations in (1):

(1) The Anaphor Generalizations:

i. Both null and overt anaphors need to be syntactically bound.

ii. Overt anaphors *can* be semantically bound, null anaphors *must* be semantically bound.

(2) María$_{\mathbf{i}}$ dejó de trabajar [sin [Rosa$_{\mathbf{k}}$/ ella$_{\mathbf{i/k}}$/ *pro*$_{\mathbf{i/k}}$] decir nada]. ***Sin*-infinitives**
Maria stopped of to.work without Rosa/ she/ *pro* to.say nothing *overt subject alternating with pro*
'Maria stopped working without (Rosa/her) saying anything.'

(3) Juan$_{\mathbf{i}}$ sería feliz [al [José$_{\mathbf{k}}$/ él$_{\mathbf{i/k}}$/ PRO$_{\mathbf{i/*k}}$] dejar la casa]. ***Al*-infinitives**
Juan be-$_{COND}$ happy in.the José/ él / PRO to.leave the house *overt subject alternating with PRO*
'Juan would be happy when he left/ leaving the house.

(4) Juan$_{\mathbf{i}}$ se fue [para [él$_{\mathbf{i/*k}}$/PRO$_{\mathbf{i/*k}}$/*María] estar feliz]. ***Para*-infinitives**
Juan $_{CLIT\ 3p}$.left for him / PRO/ María to.be happy '*OVERT PRO' alternating with PRO*
'Juan left in order for him to be happy.'

This classification is based on a set of tests distinguishing the OC vs. NOC in English (cf. Hornstein 1999) and confirmed by 36 native speakers' judgments obtained with an experimental protocol (Gómez in progress).

(5) Distribution of Null subjects *vs.* Overt PRO

	English infinitival clauses		***Sin*-infinitives**	***Al*-infinitives and *Para*-infinitives**	***Para*-infinitives**
test	**NS**	**NS**	**NS**	**NS**	**Overt PRO**
Non-obligatory C-command	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Long distance antecedent	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Sloppy reading under ellipsis	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Strict reading under ellipsis	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO
Coreference reading under the focus particle test	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES
BV reading under the focus particle test	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	OC	**NOC**	**NOC**	**OC**	Neither OC nor NOC

Seeking to provide an empirical and theoretical characterization of null subjects of CS non-finite adjunct clauses, we start by adopting Duguine's (2013) analysis of pro-drop in which (just like in Japanese-type languages; Saito 2007, Takahashi 2014), null subjects in Spanish are analyzed not in terms of the primitive *pro*, but arise via DP-ellipsis. Duguine posits an Identity Condition (The Condition on Parallelism) in order

to recover the interpretative properties of ellipsis sites (cf. Fox 2000). This proposal explains the availability of the strict and sloppy reading in ***sin***-infinitives, in terms of Referential Parallelism and Structural Parallelism respectively:

(6) a. María$_i$ dejó de trabajar [sin [su$_i$ jefe]$_j$ decirle nada (a ella$_i$)].
'Maria stopped working without her boss saying nothing to her.
b. Y Rosa$_k$ también dejó de trabajar [sin **[ø]** decirle nada (a ella$_k$)].
'And Rosa also stopped working without (him) saying nothing to her.'

(7) Y Rosa$_k$ también dejó de trabajar [sin [su$_i$ jefe]$_j$] decirle nada (a ella$_k$)]. →Strict reading

The strict reading (7) is obtained via the Referential Parallelism Condition because the interpretative values of the NS in (6b) are recovered from its antecedent [su$_i$ jefe]$_j$.

(8) Y Rosa$_k$ también dejó de trabajar [sin [su$_k$ jefe]$_z$] decirle nada (a ella$_k$)]. →Sloppy reading

The sloppy reading in (8) is obtained via the Structural Parallelism Condition since *Rosa$_k$* can bind locally the possessive pronoun *su$_k$* in the complex elided DP [su$_k$ jefe]$_z$. just like *María$_i$* binds the corresponding pronoun in the antecedent clause.

Turning to ***para***-infinitives, we see from table (5) that Overt and Null PRO both exhibit unexpected interpretative asymmetries as stated in (9):

(9) Overt *vs.* Null PRO paradox:
i. Null PRO and Overt PRO yield conflicting results with respect to the focus particle test -- but not with respect to the ellipsis test. Why?
ii. Ellipsis & focus particle tests yield conflicting results for overt PRO -- but not for null PRO. Why?

We take these asymmetries to reflect the Anaphor Generalizations in (1), as shown in (10) -(13).

Ellipsis test:

Overt & Null PRO MUST be syntactically bound

(10) Juan$_i$ se fue [para **[él]$_{i/*k/*j}$** /[Ø]$_{i/*k/*j}$ estar feliz] y María$_k$ también.
Juan$_i$ se fue para **[él]$_{i/*k/*j}$** /[Ø]$_{i/*k/*j}$ estar feliz y María$_k$ también se fue para **[ella]$_{k/*i/*j}$** estar feliz. ***Sloppy Reading***√
*Juan$_i$ se fue para **[él]$_{i/*k/*j}$** /[Ø]$_{i/*k/*j}$ estar feliz] y María$_k$ también se fue para **[él]$_i$** estar feliz. ***Strict Reading X***

Focus particle test:

Null PRO MUST be semantically bound

(11) a**. Sólo** María$_i$ hizo trampa para [Ø]$_i$ ganar el primer lugar.
b. ✓No, Daniela (Maria's best friend) also cheated in order for herself to win.
c. ✓No, Daniela (λy(y cheated for y to win)) ***BVA*** √
d.*Rosetta (λy(y cheated for her to win)) (her= María)) ***Coreference X***

Overt PRO CAN be semantically bound

(12) a. **Sólo** María$_i$ hizo trampa para **[ella]$_{i/*j}$** ganar el primer lugar.
b. ✓No, Daniela(λy(y cheated for y to win)) ***BVA*** √
c. ✓No, Rosetta (λy(y cheated for her to win)) (her= María)) ***Coreference*** √

Overt & Null PRO MUST be syntactically bound

(13) **Sólo** María$_i$ hizo trampa para [Ø]$_{i/*j}$**/ella$_{i/*j}$** ganar el primer lugar

The anaphor generalization in (1(i)) straightforwardly explains why Null and Overt PRO pattern alike on the ellipsis test: c-command holds in each of the conjuncts under the sloppy reading, but not between the matrix antecedent and the infinitival subject in the second conjunct under the strict reading (10).The anaphor generalization in (1(ii)) straightforwardly explains why Overt and Null PRO pattern differently with respect to the focus particle test: only BVA is available for Null PRO since it must be semantically bound, accounting for why (11(a)) can be denied under the BVA reading in (11(c)). In contrast, both coreference and BVA are available for the Overt PRO (12) since the latter can but need not be semantically bound, thus explaining why (12) can be denied either on both the BVA reading (12(b)) and the coreference reading in (12(c)). Crucially, however, the reference of overt PRO cannot be left free altogether since as an anaphor it must be syntactically bound (13).

To conclude, the study of subjects in adjunct non-finite clauses in CS has important implications for the understanding of the distribution and interpretation of Overt *vs.* Null. Unlike traditional contexts (finite or complement clauses), adjunct infinitives and in particular, ***para***-infinitives provide unexpected evidence for novel asymmetries in the interpretative properties of Overt *vs.* Null PRO. We close by discussing a micro syntactic variation between the European and the Latin American varieties of Spanish with respect to the distribution of (null) subjects in adjunct infinitives.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Duguine, M., 2013 "Null arguments and linguistic variation: a minimalist analysis of pro-drop". PhD Dissertation University of the Basque country (UPV/EHU) Université de Nantes.

Landau, I., 2013. *Control in Generative Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Livitz, I., 2012, "Incorporating PRO: a defective goal analysis", NYU WPL 3:95-119.

Piera, C.. 1987, "Sobre la estructura de las cláusulas de infinitivo", Sintaxis de las lenguas románicas, V. Demonte y M. Fernández Lagunilla (eds.), Madrid: Arquero: 148-166.

Rigau, G., 1995,"The properties of the temporal infinitive constructions in Catalan and Spanish", *Probus* 7:279-301.

Takahashi, D., 2007, "Argument ellipsis from a cross-linguistic perspective: An interim report", Handout, GLOW in Asia VI, Chinese University of Hong Kong, December 2007.