Introduction

Main data: Spanish clitic left-dislocation (CLLD) in (1) and accusative clitic doubling (ACD) in (2), and null referential objects (NROs) as in Rioplatense (3).  

(1) Los libros_i los_i compré ayer.  
the books them I-bought yesterday
‘I bought the books yesterday.’

(2) Juan la_i abrazó (a ella)_i / % (a María)_i  
Juan her he-hugged DOM she DOM María
‘Juan hugged her / María.’

(3) a. Queremos el postre_i.  
we-want the dessert
‘We want the dessert.’

b. Ya traigo pro_i.  
now I-bring it
‘I’m bringing it now.’

Patterns:
1. CLLD appears historically prior to ACD. Why should this be the case if both involve a clitic albeit in different positions?
2. Standard Modern Spanish (ModS) disallows NROs while Rioplatense Spanish allows them.

Main claim: CLLD, ACD, and NROs become available diachronically as a result of the grammaticalization of object clitics; i.e., the Object Agreement Cycle (OAC).  

---

1 Email: MMaddox@southeast.edu; website: www.matthewmaddox.org
2 Data in (3) from Schwenter (2006).
3 See Maddox (2019) for more discussion and analysis of the OAC, object movement, and object clitic constructions.
Analysis: I extend Holmberg’s (2005, 2010) and Holmberg et al’s (2009) D-in-T analysis of null subjects to null objects. I propose that the D-feature that licenses NROs on \( v \) is there due to the Object Agreement Cycle.

- The OAC is comprised of three stages. At stage (a), CLLD involves a dislocated topic with a coreferential DP resumptive pronoun.
- At stage (b), CLLD is movement of the DP object clitic to Spec,\( v \) followed by m-merger as in Harizanov (2014).
- At stage (c), the clitic in CLLD is a \( v \)-head with a D-feature and either \textit{pro} or a lexical object can be in complement position; i.e., renewal.

Proposal: Synchronic m-merger is diachronic reanalysis. The DP clitic is reanalyzed as a complex D-\( v \) head which is how the D-feature ends up on \( v \).

- Once a language has D-in-\( v \), NROs are licensed. First, D is realized as a clitic. “Simplex cliticization” (4) involves an NRO at stage (c) but not stage (b).

\[(4)\] Juan lo leyó. \[\rightarrow\] Stage (b): \[TP T [_{vP} l_0 v [_{VP} leyó <lo>]]\] Stage (c): \[TP T [_{vP} l_0i [_{VP} leyó pro_i]]\]

‘Juan read it.’

Prediction: A language with clitic-less NROs will have developed unrestricted ACD first.

Goal: To account for the distribution of CLLD, ACD, and NROs diachronically and synchronically throughout Romance.

Presentation format:

Section 1 – Background on grammaticalization, the Object Agreement Cycle, and the licensing of null arguments.
Section 2 – Distribution of CLLD, ACD, and null objects.
Section 3 – Analysis of CLLD, ACD, and NROs based in part on Harizanov (2014) and Kramer (2014).
Section 4 – Consequences and cross-linguistic patterns
Section 5 – Conclusion
1. Background

1.1 Language change and grammaticalization (Gelderden 2011)

1.1.1 Background

- Change is motivated by principles of economy.

(5) Head Preference Principle (HPP):
   Be a head rather than a phrase.

- Examples of reanalysis due to the HPP: demonstrative pronoun *that* > complementizer, adverb > aspect marker, pronoun > agreement, etc.

- “Linguistic cycles” -- change is cyclic because once an element is reanalyzed as a head or features on a head, a new element can merge and restart the cycle.

(6) a. jep ne dis (Old French)
    b. je ne dis pas ("Standard" Modern French)
    c. je dis pas (Colloquial Modern French)

1.1.2 Diagnostics

- Different elements may be at different stages in the cycle depending on their categorial status; i.e., head or XP.


Phonological reduction

(7) \[ S \quad P \quad \text{(Hindi/Urdu)} \]
    1 mē ham
    2 tum aap
    3 woo woo

---

\(^4\) Data in this section are from van Gelderen (2011) and references therein.
Coordination

(8) **mē or merii behn doono dili mēy rehtee hē.** ‘I and my sister both Delhi in living are’

‘My sister and I are both living in Delhi.’

Modification

(9) a. **ham log**
‘We people’

b. **aap log**
‘You people.’

Separation from verb

(10) a. **Mē kahaanii likhtii hū.**
I.Nom story writing am
‘I am writing a story.’

b. **Woo aadmii kahaanii likhtaa hē.**
that man.Nom story writing is
‘That man is writing a story.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Head</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phonological reduction</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Modification</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Separation from verb</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Summary of van Gelderen’s (2011) Diagnostics

- What looks like a full pronoun can be an XP or an X, but if it still has interpretable φ-features it is a pronoun that receives a theta-role.
  - Agreement is always a head but may still have interpretable φ-features or it may have uninterpretable φ-features, as in polysynthetic languages.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Theta-role</th>
<th>XP or X</th>
<th>Fixed Position</th>
<th>iφ</th>
<th>Language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full pronoun</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>XP</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Hindi/Urdu, Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head pro-</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>French, (English)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polysynthetic</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Navajo, Old English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hind/Urdu, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Pronouns vs. Agreement (van Gelderen 2011:40)

1.1.3 *Object Agreement Cycle*

Object Agreement Cycle (OAC): Object pronouns become object agreement.

(11) zri-x-t **umcic.**  
    saw-I-OBJ the-cat  
    ‘I saw the cat.’

- Object agreement morphology is absent from Latin to most varieties of modern Romance. Object clitics are currently undergoing this cycle. The OAC is comprised of three stages:

Stage (a) – Urdu, Hindi

Object pronoun = DP [iφ, uAsp]  
ν [uφ, iAsp]  

\[ TP \]
\[ T \]
\[ vP \]
\[ v \]
\[ VP \]
\[ V \]
\[ DP \]

---

5 From van Gelderen (2011) and references therein.
Stage (b) – Modern English, Arabic

Object pronoun/clitic = DP/D [iφ, uAsp]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\nuP \\
\downarrow v' \\
\downarrow D + v \\
\downarrow VP \\
\downarrow V \\
\downarrow DP \\
\end{array} \]

Stage (c) – Kambera, Southern Slavic

Object clitic = v [uφ, iAsp]
\[ \begin{array}{c}
\nuP \\
\downarrow v \\
\downarrow VP \\
\downarrow V \\
\downarrow DP/pro \\
\end{array} \]

- On van Gelderen’s (2011) analysis, accusative clitic doubling (ACD) only becomes possible at stage (c) since the complement position is now open.

1.2 Object Agreement Cycle and Accusative Clitic Doubling in Spanish

Maddox (2019) – builds on van Gelderen’s (2011) discussion of the OAC in Spanish with additional patterns of omission in VP conjuncts and accusative clitic doubling to determine the status of the OAC from Latin to Spanish.6

(12) a. (*La\textsubscript{i}) vimos la casa\textsubscript{i} de María. ("standard" Modern Spanish)
   ‘We saw María’s house.’
   b. *(Lo\textsubscript{i}) vimos a él\textsubscript{i}.
      ‘We saw him.’
   c. Pedro (*lo\textsubscript{i}) vio a Juan\textsubscript{i}.
      ‘Pedro saw Juan.’
   d. ¿A quién\textsubscript{i} (*lo\textsubscript{i}) viste?
      DOM whom him you-saw
      ‘Whom did you see?’

---

6 Data in (56) and (57) from van Gelderen (2011:102ff) and references therein.
(13) a. Pedro lo_i vio a Juan_i.   
   Pedro him saw DOM Juan  
   ‘Pedro saw Juan.’

   b. De repente la_i vio a Grimanesa...  
   of sudden her saw DOM Grimanesa  
   ‘Suddenly s/he saw Grimanesa...’

   c. Lo_i trae un chiquihuite_i.  
   it he-brings a basket  
   ‘He brings a basket.’

   d. ¿A quién_i le_i viste?  
   DOM whom him you-saw  
   ‘Whom did you see?’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stages of the OAC from Latin to Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stage (a): Latin/Old Spanish; object pronoun = full DP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage (b): “standard” Modern Spanish; object pronoun = DP/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage (c): Rioplatense Spanish; object pronoun = v</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- ACD occurs at both stage (b) and (c). At stage (b) it is restricted to pronominal objects while at stage (c) it is not. Maddox (2019) proposes that ACD at either stage is derivationally distinct.

  - Following Harizanov (2014) and Kramer (2014), ACD at stage (b) involves movement of the full DP object to Spec,v followed by m-merger.\(^7\)

(14) ACD at Stage (b)

Step 1 $\rightarrow$ Object DP merges and Agrees with $v$. 

\[ \text{vP} \]
\[ \text{v'} \]
\[ V_{[\text{esp},\text{iCase},\text{EPP}]} \]
\[ V \]
\[ \text{DP}_{[\text{iop},\text{uCase}]} \]

---

\(^7\) See full discussion in Maddox (2019:98ff).
Step 2 → V moves to v; Object DP moves to Spec,v.

Step 3 → M-merger between object DP and v.

(15) ACD/Agreement at stage (c); clitic = v-head
1.3 Licensing null arguments

1.3.1 Holmberg (2005, 2010)

(16) Juan\textsubscript{i} compró el libro. Luego, pro\textsubscript{i} leyó el libro en el tren.
Juan bought the book later he read the book on the train.
‘Juan bought the book. Later, he read it on the train.’

• “In the spirit of” Longobardi (1994), a D-feature in T licenses null subjects.
  o Null subject is a deficient φP with unvalued D-feature.
  o In null subject languages, T has a valued D-feature. D-in-T values the φP’s D-feature resulting in a definite, referential interpretation.
  o To derive a non-referential, generic null subject, languages with D-in-T have to resort to other mechanisms such as impersonal reflexives.

1.3.2 Holmberg et al (2009)

• D-feature is T is unvalued. D-feature is valued by overt subject or, following Frascarelli (2007), the D-feature is valued by a null Aboutness topic base-generated in the left periphery.
  o Every clause has a topic.
  o Valuing of the D-feature on the φP results in copying of the referential index of the topic.
  o The φP incorporates into T following Roberts (2010). EPP is satisfied by the topic.

2. Distributional patterns of CLLD, ACD, and null objects

2.1 Clitic left dislocation

(17) Las flores\textsubscript{i} las\textsubscript{i} compré ayer.
The flowers them I-bought yesterday
‘The flowers, I bought them yesterday.’
• CLLD occurs in the earliest documents:

(18) [La tierra del Rey Alfonso] i esta noche la podemos quitar.  
(Old Spanish) 
the land of-the king Alfonso this night it we-can leave
‘Tonight we can leave King Alfonso’s land.’

(19) [vuestras mannas] i bien las sabemos.  
(Old Spanish) 
your abilities well them we-know
‘We know your abilities well.’

• CLLD can occur with epithets in Rioplatense Spanish (from Suñer 2006):

(20) [A mi mejor amiga] i, la vi [a esa loca linda] i el jueves.  
DOM my best friend her I-saw DOM that crazy beautiful the Thursday
‘I saw my best friend, that crazy beautiful girl, on Thursday.’

(21) [A Menem] i, nadie lo i votará [a ese estafador sinvergüenza] i .  
DOM Menem no-one him will-vote DOM that swindler shameless
‘Menem, no one will vote for that shameless swindler.’

2.2 Accusative clitic doubling

• In “standard” ModS ACD is obligatory with pronominal objects; i.e., “restricted” ACD.

   o Data in Section 1.1.4 above show that in Rioplatense and other non-
   standard varieties, ACD is much less restricted, suggesting these varieties
   are at stage (c) of the OAC.

(22) Juan lo i vio a él i / *a Miguel i / *al carro i .  
Juan him saw DOM he DOM Miguel DOM-the car
‘Juan saw him / Miguel / the car.’

• In OldS, ACD of pronominal objects starts in the 15th century but is not the
   majority pattern until the 16th century (Gabriel & Rinke 2010). Most examples
   of ACD in early OldS are likely clitic right dislocation instead (Eberenz 2000).

---

8 Anonymous, El Cid, l. 423; c. 1207
9 Anonymous, Razones d’Amor, l. 175; c. 1205
(23) e mataronlo a él e a uno de los que yvan con él.\textsuperscript{10} and they-killed-him DOM he and DOM one of those that went with he ‘And they killed him and one of those that went with him.’

(24) y después lo prendieron a él, como diremos…\textsuperscript{11} and afterwards him they-captured DOM he as we-will-tell ‘And afterwards they captured him, as we will tell…’

(25) y ella muy bien veía a él.\textsuperscript{12} and she very well saw DOM he ‘And she saw him very well.’

2.3 Null objects\textsuperscript{13}

• ModS allows null objects that are non-specific or non-referential (26). Specific/referential null objects may occur in the presence of a direct object clitic (27).

(26) Fui a la tienda a comprar café pero no pro tenían. I-went to the store to buy coffee but not it they-had ‘I went to the store to buy coffee but they did not have it.’

(27) Fui a la tienda a comprar el periódico pero no lo / *pro tenían. I-went to the store to buy the newspaper but not it it they-had ‘I went to the store to buy the newspaper but they did not have it.’

• Null non-referential objects also occur in ModS in the context of a conversation with two interlocutors:

(28) a. ¿Compraste pan / el libro? ‘Did you buy bread / the book?’
   b. Sí, compré pro / *pro. ‘Yes, I bought it.’

\textsuperscript{10} Anonymous, \textit{Crónica de Juan II de Castilla}, para. 201; 1406-1411
\textsuperscript{11} Pedro Cieza de León, \textit{Las guerras civiles peruanas}, para. 577; c. 1553-1584
\textsuperscript{12} Anonymous, \textit{Libro del conde Partinuplés}, para. 91; c. 1500
\textsuperscript{13} Data in this section are adapted from Schwenter (2006).
• Non-standard varieties of Spanish pattern differently since they allow null referential objects (NROs). These include varieties spoken in northwest Argentina, Bolivia, Ecuador (Quito), Peru, Uruguay, Paraguay, and Rioplatense Spanish (Schwenter 2006:28).

(29)  a. Queremos el postre.
we-want  the dessert
‘We want the dessert.’

  b. Ya traigo proi,.
now I-bring it
‘I’m bringing it now.’

• Schwenter, following Masullo (2003), notes that these NROs are only allowed when “the referent can be anaphorically recovered from the immediate context of the utterance.” This suggests a connection with information structure.

2.4 Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Old Spanish</th>
<th>“Standard” Modern Spanish</th>
<th>Rioplatense Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clitic-left dislocation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓ (epithets disallowed)</td>
<td>✓ (epithets allowed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusative clitic doubling</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓ (restricted)</td>
<td>✓ (unrestricted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Null referential objects</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Diachronic and synchronic variation in Spanish

3. Analysis: OAC $\rightarrow$ D-in-$\nu$

3.1 Background

• Distributional patterns seen in Section 2 are tied to the stages of the OAC.

(30) Stages of the Object Agreement Cycle (REVISED)
  o Stage (a): pronoun is a full DP that merges as complement and can undergo subsequent movement.
  o Stage (b): pronoun merges as DP; moves to $\nu$ as D-head.
In ACD, the pronoun moves to Spec, v as DP; m-merger with v results in realization of upper copy as a D-clitic; high and low copy are spelled out.

- Stage (c): clitic/pronoun is reanalyzed as features of v; pro or lexical complement can merge to renew cycle.

- At stage (b), ACD involves object movement. At stage (c), ACD is true agreement between v (spelled-out as the clitic) and a verbal complement.

Proposal: In the history of Spanish, stages of the OAC are represented as below. CLLD, ACD, and NROs become available at different stages.

- Stage (a) → Old Spanish
- Stage (b) → “standard” Modern Spanish
- Stage (c) → Rioplatense and other non-standard varieties

3.2 Analysis of CLLD

3.2.1 CLLD in Modern Spanish - (clitic = DP/D)

- Extension of Harizanov’s (2014:1072) analysis of CLLD in Bulgarian

  - DP object merges as complement and moves to Spec, v. Movement of object to CP is not possible because m-merger creates a complex D-v head, after which the resulting head (spelled out as a clitic) is not accessible for further movement.

  - A’-probe searches for a goal and the only one available is the copy of the DP object in argument position since it has no access to the copy in Spec, v, a complex head. The original copy moves to CP. Only the c-commanding copy in the left periphery is pronounced due to chain reduction as in Nunes (2004).
(31) [Las flores], las, compré ayer. -- ‘The flowers, I bought them yesterday.’

Step 1 → Object DP merges and Agrees with v.

```
  vP
    v'    
       v
         v[up, iCase, EPP]
      VP
        V    DP[up, uCase]
```

Step 2 → V moves to v; object DP moves to Spec,v.

```
  vP
    DP v'
       v
          v
          v[up]
      VP
        V    V    <DP>
```

Step 3 → M-merger between object DP and v yield D-v complex head.

```
  vP
    v
      v
      v[up]
  VP
    V    V    <DP>
```

Step 4 → Lower original copy of object DP moves to Spec,C.

In CLLD there are three copies of the object involved. In ACD there are only two. In both cases there is m-merger with $v$, resulting in the presence of the clitic.

3.2.2 CLLD in Old Spanish - (clitic = DP)

“CLLD” in OldS is actually a base-generated topic with a resumptive pronoun. In putative CLLD structures, the clitic merges as complement where it checks Case and receives its theta-role. It also values the φ-features on $v$.

- Object movement in OldS is triggered by an optional EPP-feature on $v$ (Mensching 2012, Maddox 2019). This feature is also at work in OldS CLLD; i.e., the object clitic moves to Spec,$v$. The dislocated topic is base-generated in the left-periphery.
(32) vuestras mannas, bien las, sabemos.\textsuperscript{14} -- ‘We know your abilities well.’

\begin{center}
\begin{dependency}
  \begin{deptext}
    vuestras mannas\textsubscript{i} & bien las, sabemos.
  \end{deptext}
  \begin{deplabels}
    \DepNode{c}{C'} \DepNode{t}{TP} \DepNode{v}{vP} \DepNode{v'}{v}
  \end{deplabels}
  \begin{deprels}
    \DepEdge{c}{v}
    \DepEdge{t}{c}
    \DepEdge{v}{v'}
    \DepEdge{v'}{v}
  \end{deprels}
\end{dependency}
\end{center}

- OldS “CLLD” is derivationally distinct from ModS CLLD because the OldS object “clitic” is just a resumptive full DP pronoun.
  - This makes sense since Latin also had topicalization with resumptive pronouns (Bortolussi 2017). The same strategy was used in both Latin and OldS since both languages were at stage (a) of the OAC.

3.2.3 \textit{CLLD in Rioplatense (clitic = v)}

- Rioplatense is at stage (c) of the OAC, where the clitic is the spell-out of \textit{v}. Complement position is open for a lexical object or \textit{pro}, which is what happens in unrestricted ACD. This is essentially the same for CLLD.
  - The topic is base-generated, the clitic is the realization of \textit{v}, and the epithet merges as complement. In ModS CLLD there is movement of the original copy of the object to Spec,C. In Rioplatense CLLD, there is no object movement.

\textsuperscript{14} Anonymous, \textit{Razones d’Amor}, l. 175; c. 1205
(33) A mi mejor amiga, la vi a esa loca linda el jueves.
‘I saw my best friend, that crazy beautiful girl, on Thursday.’

3.3 Analysis of ACD (revisited)\textsuperscript{15}

- ModS exhibits restricted ACD and it is at stage (b) of the OAC. The DP object merges as complement and then moves to Spec,\(v\). After m-merger with \(v\) the higher copy is pronounced as a D-clitic. M-merger is the synchronic equivalent of diachronic reanalysis.
  - Stage (b) ACD serves as Primary Linguistic Data to language learners, who reanalyze the complex head formed by the D-clitic and \(v\) as object agreement (stage c).

- ACD in Rioplatense is different. There is no object movement and the clitic is the realization of the \(v\)-head and the doubled object is in argument position; i.e., object agreement.

- OldS represents stage (a) since it lacks ACD. The object pronoun can undergo movement to Spec,\(v\) and possibly higher, but it is not targeted for m-merger.

\textsuperscript{15} See Section 1.1.4 above for details. See also (Maddox 2019:69ff).
3.4 Analysis of Null Objects

• NROs are allowed in Rioplatense and they are disallowed in OldS and ModS.

Proposal: The distributional patterns of NROs in Spanish are to be expected given how the OAC works; i.e., null objects are a by-product of the reanalysis of object clitics. NROs in Rioplatense are licensed by a D-feature in v.

• Extension of Holmberg et al (2009) to null objects.

  o Ingredients required for a null argument: 1) a D-feature on a functional head (T for subjects), 2) incorporation of a φP, and 3) a base-generated topic.

(34)  a. Tengo un calmante para dormir.16 (Rioplatense Spanish)
     I have a sedative to sleep
     ‘I have a sedative in order to sleep.’
   b. No tomes pro. Te va a hacer mal.
     not take it you it goes to make ill
     ‘Don’t take it. It will make you ill.’

  o There is an unvalued D-feature on v. A φP merges as complement and v probes the φP to have its unvalued φ-features valued. The φP has its Case feature valued by v.
     ▪ The φP is a defective probe since v’s features are a superset of the φP’s; i.e. v has the unvalued D-feature which the φP lacks. Since the φP is defective it incorporates into v, chain reduction applies and the φP is unpronounced.
     ▪ D-feature on v is valued by a null topic introduced into the discourse by the interlocutor.

(35)  \[ TP \quad T \quad [NegP \quad no \quad [L-TopP \quad un \quad calmante, \quad [vP \quad v \quad [VP \quad tomes \quad \phi_P]]]]

    \begin{align*}
    v & \rightarrow \quad \{D:\__ , \phi:\__, \text{Case:Acc}\} \\
    \phi P & \rightarrow \quad \{\phi:2S, \text{Case:__}\} \\
    \text{un \ calmante} & \rightarrow \quad \{D:i\}
    \end{align*}

16 These data are from Schwenter (2006:28).
3.5 CLLD, ACD, NROs and the stages of the OAC

- Each construction becomes available at a different stage of the OAC as a result of the categorial status of the clitic.
  
  o In OldS and ModS CLLD, there is no D-feature in v. The clitic is either a full DP or a DP that moves to Spec,v and undergoes m-merger with v (DP/D-v). The only D-feature involved is on the clitic itself. In ModS ACD the clitic undergoes m-merger with v, which feeds reanalysis.
  
  o Once the clitic is fully reanalyzed as v (stage c), NROs become possible, as in Rioplatense, because v now has a D-feature.
    
    ▪ As is expected in grammaticalization cycles, the agreement morphology (the clitic) will eventually disappear. The overt realization of the D-feature is no longer expressed, but there is still a D-feature on v.

(36)  Stage (a): clitic = DP; only CLLD allowed
      Stage (b): clitic = DP/D-v; CLLD and ACD allowed
      Stage (c): clitic = v; CLLD + epithets, ACD, and NROs allowed

4. Consequences and Cross-linguistics Patterns

- Accounting for the distribution of CLLD, ACD, and NROs in Romance.
  
  o In Spanish, CLLD appears before ACD because OldS CLLD is actually a topic with a resumptive DP pronoun, which is generally available in all languages with DP pronouns, like English: That guy, I hate him. ModS CLLD looks like OldS “CLLD,” but they are derivationally distinct.

Prediction: If a language allows NROs it will have developed (unrestricted) ACD first.

- NROs arise after ACD because it is in ACD where m-merger of D and v takes place. Since NROs are licensed by D-in-v, there must be an operation whereby D is associated with v. On my analysis this is m-merger.

---

4.1 Spanish variation

- Different synchronic and diachronic varieties represent different stages of the OAC. The constructions that occur in these varieties also correlate with stages of the OAC.

(37) OldS $\rightarrow$ Stage (a): clitic = DP; only CLLD
ModS $\rightarrow$ Stage (b): clitic = DP/D-v; CLLD and ACD
Rioplatense $\rightarrow$ Stage (c): clitic = v; CLLD + epithets, ACD, and NROs

4.2 French and Italian

- Both languages have CLLD but lack ACD and NROs.\(^{18}\) Given my prediction, French and Italian should also be at an earlier stage of the OAC. Evidence that this is the case comes from patterns of clitic omission in VP conjuncts.\(^{19}\)

(38) a. lo$_i$ mató y Ø$_i$ despedaçó…\(^{20}\) (Old Spanish)
   b. lo$_i$ mató y *(lo$_i$) despedazó.\(^{20}\) (Modern Spanish)
   ‘It killed him and tore him apart…’

(39) Paul l’a insulté e Ø$_i$ mis à la porte.\(^{21}\) (French)
   Paul him.Aux insulted and him threw to the door
   ‘Paul insulted him and threw him out the door.’

(40) L$_i$’ho baciato e Ø$_i$ abbracciato.\(^{22}\) (Italian)
   him-I-have kissed and him hugged
   ‘I kissed him and hugged him.’

\(^{18}\) Italian and French, like ModS, do allow generic or indefinite null objects.
\(^{19}\) This diagnostic adopted from Culbertson (2010).
\(^{20}\) Pedro Mejía, *Silva de varia lección*, para. 264; c. 1540-1550
\(^{21}\) Adapted from Kayne (1975:95).
\(^{22}\) Adapted from Luraghi (1997).
4.3 Variation in Portuguese: a possible confound

4.3.1 Brazilian Portuguese

- Brazilian Portuguese (BP) has CLLD (41), though the clitic tends to be replaced by a full pronoun. ACD was lost in the 19th century (Castilho 2005), but still occurs optionally in some non-standard varieties (42), but only in the 1st and 2nd person (Machado-Rocha & Ramos 2016). NROs are allowed (43).

(41) A minha amiga_i , eu a_i / elai vi na quinta.\textsuperscript{23}
the my friend I her/her saw on-the farm
‘My friend, I saw her on the farm.’

(42) a. Ele me_i ajuda eu_i .\textsuperscript{24}
‘He helps me.’

b. Eu te_i ajudo você_i .
‘I help you.’

(43) O João comprou [um livro novo]_i . Ontem ele trouxe Ø_i à aula.\textsuperscript{25}
the Juan bought a book new yesterday he brought it to class
‘Juan bought a new book. Yesterday he brought it to class.’

- BP is the most advanced variety of Romance discussed here. ACD was lost, for the most part, and object clitics are being lost as well. What evidence is there for unrestricted ACD in older BP?

4.3.2 European Portuguese

- European Portuguese (EP) has CLLD (44). EP has obligatory ACD with pronominal objects (45) and “some quantifiers” (Dubert & Galves 2016). Like BP, NROs are allowed, as in (46) in the context of discussing a new computer.

\textsuperscript{23}I thank Janayna Carvalho for these data via personal communication.
\textsuperscript{24}Adapted from Machado-Rocha & Ramos (2016).
\textsuperscript{25}Adapted from Schwenter (2006).
(44) A sopa_i comeu-a_i O Paulo.\textsuperscript{26} 
the soup ate-it the Paul
‘Paul ate the soup.’

(45) Vi-os a eles / a todos / **aos meninos.\textsuperscript{27} 
I-saw-them DOM them DOM them DOM-the boys
‘I saw them / all of them / the boys.’

(46) A Joana viu Ø na TV ontem.\textsuperscript{28} 
the Joana saw it on-the TV yesterday
‘Joana saw it/him/her/them on TV yesterday.’

- These patterns suggest EP is far advanced with respect to the OAC, given my hypothesis. However, additional evidence suggests it is at an early stage as seen in the following data from Luis & Kaiser (2016).

(47) Apenas a minha mãe me ajudou e (me) incentivou. 
only the my mother me helped and me encouraged
‘Only my mother helped me and encouraged me.’

(48) Se me não engano…
if me not mistake
‘If I am not mistaken.’

Problem: Given my hypothesis, EP should not have NROs since ACD is still restricted. It should pattern like Rioplatense ACD if NROs are licensed.

5. Conclusion

5.1 Summary

i. Different varieties of Spanish are at different stages of the OAC. OldS = stage (a), ModS = stage (b), Rioplatense and other non-standard varieties = stage (c).

\textsuperscript{26} Adapted from Farren (2016).
\textsuperscript{27} Adapted from Dubert & Galves (2016:434)
\textsuperscript{28} Originally from Raposo (1986); cited in Cyrino & Matos (2016).
ii. CLLD, ACD, and NROs become available as the OAC progresses. The derivation of CLLD and ACD will vary depending on the stage of the OAC. NROs become available last.

iii. NROs are licensed in Rioplatense Spanish via a D-feature in $v$. This D-feature is there due to reanalysis of the D-clitic as the $v$-head.

\[(49)\] OldS, French, Italian $\Rightarrow$ Stage (a): clitic = DP; only CLLD

“standard” ModS $\Rightarrow$ Stage (b): clitic = DP/D-$v$; CLLD and ACD

Rioplatense Spanish $\Rightarrow$ Stage (c): clitic = $v$; CLLD + epithets, ACD, NROs

5.2 Next steps

- Investigate patterns of
  - ACD with quantifiers:
    - On van Gelderen’s (2011) account, if the clitic can double a quantifier, it has reached the final stage of grammaticalization.
    - Jaeggli (1981)
    - Tsakali (2008) - Obligatory in Rioplatense; optional in ModS.
    - What about other varieties of Romance?

- Need to look into analyses of null objects in BP (Cyrino 1997) and EP (Raposo 1986). Different authors propose different analyses. Are NROs in BP and EP really like Rioplatense?

- Latin has also been shown to have allowed NROs (Luraghi 1997, 2004). Latin lacked object clitics, so how does it fit into this picture?
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