### Contrast and the (Non-) Occurrence of Subject Pronouns

## Patricia Matos Amaral and Scott A. Schwenter The Ohio State University

#### 1. Introduction

One of the main communicative functions of subject personal pronouns (SPPs) in Spanish and European Portuguese (as well as other "pro"-drop languages) is to mark "contrast". This function is recognized by nearly all grammars of these languages (e.g. Alarcos Llorach 1994; Butt & Benjamin 2000; Gili Gaya 1943; Cunha & Cintra 1987), and has been succinctly summarized recently by Luján: "[E]I uso explícito de un pronombre personal tónico en posiciones donde su omisión es normal obedece a razones de contraste o énfasis" (1999: 1277). However, neither these works nor more specialized studies tend to be explicit about the OBLIGATORINESS OR OPTIONALITY of SPPs in contrastive contexts. Must SPPs appear in contrastive contexts or are they merely a POTENTIAL feature of such contexts? As a result of this inexplicitness, there is no consensus on the issue, and several different positions regarding the (non-) occurrence of contrastive SPPs can be found in the literature.

On the one hand, there exists a number of studies where contrastive contexts (or a subset thereof) are considered to be obligatory contexts for subject pronouns. Examples of this approach in the study of Spanish can be found in Silva-Corvalán (1982, 1994, 2001, 2003), Cameron (1992, 1995, 1997), Bayley & Pease-Álvarez (1997), and Solomon (1999). The common bond that unites these studies is that they are all carried out within a variationist (socio)linguistic framework in the Labovian tradition (cf. Labov 1972). In this tradition, an important methodological step that serves as a necessary precursor to quantitative analysis is the identification of the so-called "envelope of variation", i.e. all and only those contexts in which a given instance of variation could be possible (as determined by the researcher). Those contexts in which no variation is possible, e.g., where a subject pronoun is either obligatorily present or absent, are left out of the envelope of variation—and therefore out of the analysis. Contrastive contexts (to be defined below) are one context that, in this strand of variationist work, is to be left outside the envelope of variation.

Somewhat surprising to us, however, is the fact that there also exists a substantial number of studies where contrastive contexts (or a subset thereof) are NOT considered to be obligatory contexts for subject pronouns. As a result, the analysis of SPP expression/omission includes contrastive contexts with others. Among these studies we have found, for Spanish, Bentivoglio (1987[1980]), Enríquez (1984), Montes (1986), and, for written Brazilian Portuguese, Paredes Silva (1993). Finally, it is also possible to find a few other studies where the status of contrastive contexts vis-à-vis subject realization is left undetermined (e.g. Morales 1986, 1997), i.e. where no explicit statement about the inclusion or exclusion of contrastive contexts in the (quantitative) analysis of SPP usage has been made.

As a whole, we take these radically different approaches to contrastive contexts to reflect the fact that there is actually no clear consensus regarding the obligatoriness and/or optionality of SPPs in such contexts. Clearly, however, in the Anglo-American variationist tradition represented by a series of

<sup>\*</sup>We are grateful to the audience at HLS7 for helpful comments on the oral presentation of this paper. Thanks go out as well to Richard Cameron, Assela Reig, Susana Rodríguez Rosique, Rena Torres Cacoullos, and finally to the participants at the CUNY *Pronombristas* workshop (February 2002), who commented on an earlier version of this work (Schwenter 2002).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Translation: 'The explicit use of a tonic personal pronoun in positions where its omission is normal is due to reasons of contrast or emphasis'.

<sup>© 2005</sup> Patrícia Matos Amaral and Scott A. Schwenter. Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium, ed. David Eddington, 116-127. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

studies by eminent researchers such as Silva-Corvalán and Cameron, SPPs are considered obligatory in such contexts. Therefore, SPPs in contrastive contexts constitute what are now commonly known as "don't count" cases for quantitative analysis, insofar as no variation between an overt SPP and a null pronoun is considered to be possible in these contexts.

The goal of this paper is to analyze in more detail, and from a decidedly pragmatic perspective, the question of SPPs in contrastive contexts. The approach to be used here is primarily qualitative, not quantitative, in orientation, and as such may not seem to be wholly relevant to quantitative work such as that exemplified by the studies cited above. We would argue, however, that it is in fact very relevant, inasmuch as determining the "envelope of variation" for SPP presence/absence (or for other morphosyntactic variables) is very much a qualitative venture that depends crucially on subtle pragmatic judgments of felicity or lack thereof depending on the linguistic context in which a given token appears. This should not imply, however, that the following will be a strictly "armchair" study of SPPs; below, we will present data from naturally-occurring corpora of Spanish and European Portuguese (EP)<sup>2</sup> to support our claims to a fuller extent.

In brief, what we intend to demonstrate is that the occurrence of overt SPPs in contrastive (and other) contexts is not necessarily obligatory. Other linguistic devices (e.g. adverbials of various sorts) can also be employed, instead of SPPs, to help carry out the referential function normally ascribed to SPPs. We will provide a preliminary taxonomy of such devices in §3 below. These devices, in combination with the appropriate verb forms, have the capability of effecting reference to subject referents indirectly via a process of metonymic inference. Before moving on to this taxonomy, however, in the next section we will first establish the non-obligatoriness of SPPs in contrastive contexts.

#### 2. The non-obligatory nature of SPPs in contrastive contexts

When considering the use/non-use of SPPs in contrastive contexts, there has typically been a linear focus on adjacent clauses/sentences/utterances, whether explicitly conjoined or not, which are necessarily SWITCH IN REFERENCE with respect to their subjects (Cameron 1992, 1995). Switch reference essentially means that the subject X of a given sentence/utterance S1 is not the same as the subject (Y) of a following sentence/utterance S2. In a nutshell, then, all examples of contrastive contexts are also examples of switch reference, but not vice versa. There are no examples of contrast in the literature where continuity of subject reference is found across sentences/utterances, i.e. where X is constant across S1 and S2. Contrastive contexts therefore represent a (presumably small) subset of cases of switch reference.

Among this group of contrastive contexts, there are examples cited in the literature where SPPs are clearly obligatorily overt, and as a result must be considered "don't count" cases for variationist analysis. For example, no variation between overt and null subject appears possible in (1), where the subject pronoun *nosotros* 'we' in A's second utterance is obligatory. Without the pronoun, the sentence would be unacceptable in this discourse context. Following standard practice in the variationist literature on SPPs, we have indicated the unacceptability of the null subject option with a star. Note however that it is not necessarily ungrammaticality that is at issue here, but rather pragmatic infelicity: the null subject sentence  $\mathcal{O}$  lo tenemos el viernes '(We) have it on Friday' is perfectly grammatical in any dialect of Spanish as an isolated sentence, but in the context of (1) it is not, since it is in contrast with the last sentential subject vosotros 'you (pl.)':

(1) (From Esgueva and Cantarero 1981: 309; cited in Cameron 1997: 34):

Inf. A: ¿Vosotros [lo] tenéis el lunes?

'You guys have [it] on Monday?'

<sup>2</sup>Our claims do not carry over to Brazilian Portuguese, since overt expression of pronominal subjects in this language is much more frequent than in Portugal, and seemingly on the way to becoming obligatory. See Kato & Negrão (2000) for more information on the situation in Brazilian Portuguese.

Inf. B: El lunes. Un día, un día estratégico, además.
'Monday. A day, a strategic day, besides.'
Inf. A: Bueno, (nosotros / \*Ø) lo tenemos el viernes.
'OK, we have it on Friday.'

Why are SPPs—in (1), *nosotros*—considered obligatorily overt in such contexts? The standard answer to this question in the variationist literature on SPPs has been that there is some kind of contrast between what is predicated of the (necessarily switch reference) subjects (*vosotros* vs. *nosotros*), and that this predicated material "in contrast belong[s] to the same semantic field" (Silva-Corvalán 1982: 114). The material contrasted in this way in (1) are the days of the week *lunes* 'Monday' and *viernes* 'Friday'.

Along with this characterization of what constitutes a contrastive context, it is important to point out that there is an accompanying guiding assumption which is normally left unstated: the contrast between subjects in contrastive contexts in Spanish (or European Portuguese) cannot be expressed by the inflectional verbal morphology only. As noted by Haverkate for Spanish (1976: 1196): "el sujeto realizado únicamente por la desinencia verbal nunca encierra información contrastiva" ('the subject marked only by the verbal inflection never carries contrastive information'). Therefore, as a result, it is assumed that the SPP must be overtly realized in order to express the contrastive information that cannot be conveyed by the (suffixal) verbal inflection.

Thus, in an example like (1) above, the contrasting content basically boils down to what is represented in pseudo-algebraic form in (2):

(2) x tener <u>el lunes</u> y tener <u>el viernes</u> x≠y, <u>el lunes</u> ≠ <u>el viernes</u>

The impetus for the present study is that the supposed obligatory nature of SPPs in contexts like that of (1) has not, to the best of our knowledge, been questioned in the literature. In the rest of this paper we aim to challenge this assumption.

Now, while it is true that the removal of *nosotros* in (1) would result in oddity, what has NOT been noticed previously is that the obligatoriness of the SPP in an example like (1) above fades away when other, non-pronominal, material (e.g. an adverbial) which can indirectly express the contrast between one subject and another is inserted into the sentence. Compare (1) with a modified version of this same example in (3), where a null subject (indicated by  $\emptyset$ ) could occur instead of the SPP (the slash between the overt SPP *nosotros* and the null subject indicates that either is possible):

(3) Inf. A: ¿Vosotros [lo] tenéis el lunes? 'You (PL) have [it] on Monday?'

Inf. B: El lunes. Un día, un día estratégico, además.

'Monday. A day, a strategic day, besides.'

Inf. A: Bueno, <u>aquí</u> (Nosotros / Ø) lo tenemos el viernes.

'OK, in our case we have it on Friday.'

The contrast in (3) between what is said by A and B does not necessarily have to be expressed through overt SPPs that are switch in reference. The locative adverb *aqui* 'here', in conjunction with the first-person plural morphology on the verb, is sufficient to license the contrasting predications made by A and B. The SPP could also occur in (3) in combination with *aqui*, but the relevant point is that the SPP is not obligatory once the adverb is inserted. In other words, the adverb appears to have the capacity to express the contrastive interpretation that would otherwise require the presence of the SPP.

It would seem that the possibility of a null subject in examples like (3) would be sufficient to contradict the claim that SPPs are obligatory in contrastive contexts. However, in a recent article, Silva-Corvalán (2003: 853) has been critical of these kinds of counterexamples (which were first presented in Schwenter [2002]): "estos ejemplos no constituyen excepciones a la regla de "la doble oposición" (i.e. sujeto y predicado), pues el sujeto no es el foco de contraste y por tanto su expresión

deja de ser obligada. El foco de contraste es claramente el adverbio o la frase adverbial". Silva-Corvalán provides (4) as another example (2003: 854):

(4) Ellos hablan inglés en la casa, pero <u>en la nuestra</u> (**Nosotros** / **Ø**) hablamos español. 'They speak English at home, but at our house we speak Spanish.'

Thus, for Silva-Corvalán, the optionality of the SPP *nosotros* in (4) stems from the fact that the "focus of contrast" is the adverbials (or their implicated content): *en su casa* 'in their house' and *en la nuestra* 'in our house'; the subjects, therefore, are not the "focus of contrast" in this example. However, if this analysis is correct, the prediction that follows would be that ANY case of contrast between adverbials will license a null subject. That this prediction is incorrect can be easily demonstrated by another, similar, example where different adverbials constitute the focus of contrast:

(4') Nosotros siempre hablamos inglés, pero en ocasiones (Ellos / \*Ø) hablan español. 'We always speak English, but on occasions they speak Spanish.'

In keeping with Silva-Corvalán's position, (4') should be acceptable with either an overt SPP or a null subject, as a result of the focal contrast holding between the temporal adverbials *siempre* 'always' and *en ocasiones* 'on occasions'. But this sentence is clearly ungrammatical without the SPP *ellos* 'they' or a 3pl. lexical NP subject.

So, the obvious question is this: why is (4') unacceptable with a null subject, but the null subject in (4) is fine? We believe the answer to be fairly obvious: because the adverbial *en la nuestra* 'in our [house]' in example (4) can be construed as referring, albeit indirectly via a metonymic inference (cf. Nunberg 1995; Ward 2003), to the referent of the subject of the sentence in which this adverbial appears, namely *nosotros* 'we'. The morphology of the verb indicates the subject referent (i.e. first-person plural) and the referent of the possessor in the adverbial phrase can be associated with that subject referent, thereby providing a tonic constituent to index the subject referent, in addition to the atonic verbal person/number inflection. By contrast, in (4') no such associative inferencing process can be realized, since the temporal adverbial *en ocasiones* 'on occasions' cannot under any circumstance be interpreted as indirectly referring to the referent of the subject of the verb *hablan* 'they speak'.

More crucially, to claim that "el adverbio o la frase adverbial" ('the adverb or the adverbial phrase') is the focus of contrast in examples like (4) or (4') leads to the notion that contrast is construed directly between competing linguistic forms or constituents. But contrast as a pragmatic category is not interpreted in this way; rather, it is interpreted between the DISCOURSE REFERENTS that such forms or constituents refer to, whether more directly in the discourse model (as in the case of pronouns) or more indirectly (as in the case of some adverbials). Once this understanding of "focus of contrast" is made the relevant one, differences between otherwise similar examples like (4) and (4') can be accounted for straightforwardly.

Modifications similar to those carried out on (4) above can be made to other so-called "don't count" examples in the literature, i.e. examples where it is assumed that the SPP must be expressed to preserve grammaticality/felicity. For instance, (5) is Bayley & Pease-Álvarez' (1997: 356) example of a "contrastive context" where the pronoun is assumed to be obligatorily overt:

(5) Cindy toma café con leche pero yo / \*Ø prefiero café negro. 'Cindy drinks coffee with milk but I prefer black coffee.'

Indeed, (5) would be infelicitous without the SPP yo 'I', due to the contrasting predications and switch-reference subjects. But notice how the option of a null subject in (5) becomes fully acceptable once a potentially contrastive adverbial like *por mi parte* 'in my case' is added to (5):

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Translation: 'These examples do not constitute exceptions to the "double opposition" (i.e. subject and predicate) rule, since the subject is not the focus of contrast and therefore its overt expression is no longer obligatory. The focus of contrast is clearly the adverb or the adverbial phrase.'

(5') Cindy toma café con leche, pero <u>por mi parte</u> (yo / Ø) prefiero café negro. 'Cindy drinks coffee with milk but in my case I prefer black coffee.'

In both (4) and (5'), the lexical content of the adverbials indirectly expresses the identity of the subject, via the possessive determiners *nuestra* 'our' and *mi* 'my'. The person/number features of these forms are associated with the first-person verb morphology of the following verb in order to achieve the intended reference. But notice that, as already shown by example (3) above, there is no restriction such that only adverbials which are overtly morphologically-marked for person/number can carry out indirect subject reference (example modified from Cameron 1992):

- (6a) Ella siempre quiere ir al cine. Yo / \*Ø preferiría estar en casa. 'She always wants to go to the movies. I would prefer to stay home.'
- (6b) Ella siempre quiere ir al cine. <u>Honestamente</u>, (yo / Ø) preferiría estar en casa. 'She always wants to go to the movies. Honestly, I would prefer to stay home.

Why would the null subject option be possible in (6b), which only differs from (6a) by virtue of the adverb *honestamente* 'honestly'? Because this adverb, in this syntactic position (but not necessarily in others), must be identified as indexing specifically the viewpoint of the speaker. The subject of *preferiria* 'I would prefer' is first-person singular., i.e. coreferential with the speaker in (6b), and therefore the adverb is compatible with the corresponding person/number features of the subject referent. Thus, it seems that all is actually required is an adverbial which can be identified, via indirect reference, with the referent of the subject of the second clause. Corroborating evidence for this analysis is that *honestamente* cannot co-occur with a null subject in the following example:

(7) Ella siempre quiere ir al cine. <u>Honestamente</u>, (ellos / \*Ø) preferirían estar en casa. 'She always wants to go to the movies. Honestly, they would prefer to stay at home.

In (7), the third person plural subject referent of *preferirian* in the second sentence CANNOT be coreferential with the (referent of the) speaker, which is first-person singular. As a result an appropriate SPP such as *ellos* (or a third person plural lexical subject) must be overtly expressed.

In the next section, we present an initial taxonomy of adverbials that can be used to carry out this kind of indirect reference to subjects without the need for overt SPPs.

#### 3. Forms licensing indirect reference to subjects

An initial classification of linguistic devices in Spanish and EP onto which a contrastive subject interpretation can be mapped are presented below in the order "closest in form" (e.g. an expression that includes an oblique form related to the subject pronoun, such as *nuestro* 'our' ~ *nosotros* 'we') to "furthest in form" (e.g. a locative adverbial) with respect to other expressions, such as SPPs, for the referent in question. Some of these devices exhibit distributional restrictions, as we show below. In the naturally-occurring corpus examples we present below, the <u>underlined</u> form is the one that appeared in the original version.

#### 3.1 Topic-introducing adverbials

There is a subset of topic-introducing adverbials that overtly introduces a contrastive topic. The adverbial constructions that make up this class have a variable slot, e.g. Span. *en cuanto a X*, EP *quanto a X* 'As for X', where X is the slot for an oblique pronoun that can be marked for first, second, or third person, as well as for singular or plural. (8) and (9) are examples of these adverbial constructions with first-person plural, for Spanish and EP, respectively. In these cases the adverbials cannot co-occur with the subject pronouns (e.g. \*En cuanto a nosotros, nosotros... 'As for us, we...'),

since there appears to be a ban on the repetition of a pronoun when it first occurs as an oblique, then immediately follows as an SPP:

(8) "Detrás de la noción de generalista se oculta una noción de empobrecimiento de competencias, en una especie de magma informal que algunos proponen bajo la expresión de "¡sabemos hacerlo todo!". En cuanto a nosotros, / Nosotros / \*Ø queremos ser multiespecialistas en cierto número de técnicas bien definidas, que nuestros clientes quieren utilizar para conseguir la transformación de su modelo, con el fin de entrar con buen pie en la nueva economía".

[http://www.umanis.com/es/presse/default.asp]

'Behind the notion of a generalist there is hidden a notion of lessened competence, in a kind of informal magma that some propose with the expression "we know how to do it all!". As for us, we want to be multispecialists en a certain number of well-defined techniques, which our clients want to use to achieve the transformation of their model, with the goal of entering into the new economy on solid footing.'

(9) Os meus pais gostam de ir para a praia no verão. Quanto a nós, / Nós / \*Ø preferimos a montanha.

'My parents enjoy going to the beach in summer. As for us, we prefer the mountain.'

Notice that the occurrence of a contrastive device such as an adversative conjunction does not license the contrast between referents. As a result, in (10b) E.P. mas 'but' must co-occur either with the overt subject pronoun eu 'I' or with the adverbial por mim 'as for me':

- (10a) O João não quer dar aulas de manhã cedo. **Por mim**, / **Eu** / \*Ø dou aulas a qualquer hora. 'João doesn't want to teach early in the morning. As for me, Ø teach at any time.'
- (10b) O João não quer dar aulas de manhã cedo, mas **eu / por mim / \*Ø** dou aulas a qualquer hora. 'João doesn't want to teach early in the morning, but as for me, / I / \*Ø teach at any time.'

The variable slot of the adverbial constructions of this class may also be filled by a possessive determiner that indexes the subject referent. Of course, in order for the null subject to co-occur with the adverbial, the determiner must be compatible with the person/number morphological marking of the verb form, as shown in (11). Note that in (11), and all the examples to follow, unlike (8), the combination of the adverbial and the subject pronoun is also felicitous, i.e. one can say, *Por mi parte, yo prefiero ir a la montaña*, since the two forms (adverbial and subject pronoun) are not mutually exclusive:

(11) Mis padres veranean en la playa. **Por mi parte**, / Yo / \*Ø prefiero ir a la montaña. 'My parents spend the summer in the beach. As for me, Ø prefer to go to the mountain.

#### 3.2 Stance ("Speaker-oriented") adverbs

This class of sentence adverbs, made famous in the work of Jackendoff (1972; cf. also Powell 1992), can occur only with first-person interpretation, singular or plural (with one exception to be seen just below). These adverbs must appear in a left-peripheral position, where they are interpreted as expressing the speaker's (or speakers') attitude and/or orientation towards what they are saying (i.e. a metalinguistic function). When possible, below we provide an example with the stance adverb and the manner adverb to illustrate the contrast: in the former case, no SPP is necessary, in the latter, an SPP is required.

The adverbs *pessoalmente/personalmente* 'personally' can only refer to a first-person singular referent, and therefore are only permissible when the speaker and the referent of the subject are identical. Therefore, the Portuguese example in (12a) below is perfectly acceptable, while in (12b) the

use of the stance adverb makes the sentence ungrammatical, because the subject of the verb *adoramos* is first-person plural, not singular. The same can be said for Spanish, as exemplified in (13):

- (12a) A Ana adora ver filmes policiais. **Pessoalmente**, / **Eu** / \*Ø adoro filmes de terror. 'Ana loves cop movies. Personally, I love horror movies.'
- (12b) A Ana e o marido adoram ver filmes policiais. \*Pessoalmente, / Nós / \*Ø adoramos filmes de terror.
  - 'Ana and her husband love cop movies. We love horror movies.'
- "Además, el patinaje es como muchos deportes, que dependen de como se te dé el día, pueden salirte las cosas bien o no. **Personalmente** / **Yo** / \*Ø estoy contento porque había saltos que me costaba introducirlos, pero he luchado que es lo importante". (cf. \*Personalmente, estamos contentos...)

[http://www.patinaje.org/campespana/campesp2000/campespana00.html]

'Besides, skating is like many sports, which depend on how you are that day, things can come out well or not. <u>Personally</u>, I'm happy because there were jumps that were hard for me, but I've kept fighting and that's what's important.'

When *pessoalmente* is used as a manner adverb (meaning 'in person'), the SPP is obligatory, as exemplified in (14a). When used as a stance adverb, as in (14b), it points to the speaker, effecting the switch in reference and thus allowing the null subject option. (14c) shows that both uses may co-occur in the same sentence, and as predicted the stance adverb licenses the null subject:

- (14a) Toda a gente conhece o Director do Departamento. **Eu / \*Ø** nunca falei com ele **pessoalmente**. (*Manner adverb*)
  - 'Everybody knows the Department Chair. I've never spoken with him personally.'
- (14b) Toda a gente conhece o Director do Departamento. **Pessoalmente**, / **Eu** / \*Ø nunca falei com ele. (*Stance adverb*)
  - 'Everybody knows the Department Chair. Personally, I've never spoken with him.'
- (14c) Toda a gente conhece o Director do Departamento. **Pessoalmente**, / **Eu** / \*Ø nunca falei com ele **pessoalmente**. (Co-occurring stance and manner adverbs)

  'Every body knows the Department Chair Personally. L'ye nover engles with him personally.

'Everybody knows the Department Chair. Personally, I've never spoken with him personally.'

There are a number of tests that allow us to distinguish between the manner adverb and the stance adverb, such as the syntactic position of the adverb:

- (15a) Todos os alunos deram a sua opinião. Eu falei **sinceramente**.
  - 'All the students gave their opinion. I spoke sincerely.'
- (15b) Todos os alunos deram a sua opinião. Sinceramente, / Eu / \*Ø não falei.
  - 'All the students gave their opinion. Sincerely, I didn't speak.'

The manner adverb is generally clause-final, as in (15a), while the stance adverb occurs at the beginning of the clause, as in (15b). As the example makes clear, the stance adverb licenses the occurrence of the null subject but may also occur in combination with the overt SPP, which is the case for all the stance adverbs in the contrastive contexts that we have been considering. As stated above, the use of the stance adverb is restricted to first person; therefore, unlike (15b), examples (15c) and (15d), which have third person subjects, are ungrammatical:

- (15c) Todos os alunos deram a sua opinião. \*Sinceramente, o João não falou.
  - 'All the students gave their opinion. Sincerely, João didn't speak.'
- (15d) Todos os alunos deram a sua opinião. \*Sinceramente, Ø não falou. 'All the students gave their opinion. Sincerely, João didn't speak.'

Another test to distinguish the two classes of adverb is that the manner adverb, unlike the stance adverb, may occur in cleft constructions, as in (15e) vs (15f):<sup>4</sup>

- (15e) Foi **sinceramente** que o João falou.
  - 'It was sincerely that João spoke.'
- (15f) \*Foi sinceramente que falei.
  - 'It was sincerely that I spoke.'

The manner adverb can also occur within the scope of negation, unlike the stance adverb, as shown in (15g) vs (15h):

- (15g) O João não falou sinceramente.
  - 'João didn't speak sincerely.'
- (15h) \*Não sinceramente, falei.
  - 'Not sincerely I spoke.'

Just like *sinceramente*, the Spanish stance adverb *honestamente* 'honestly' may also occur with both first-person singular and plural interpretation, as shown by (16) and (17):

(16) "Reinaldo Laddaga: -A mí me interesó la cifra de Diana Aisenberg: 200 y pico. Es una cifra curiosa, porque obviamente es una cifra lo suficientemente grande como para que no sea un grupo de amigos, pero al mismo tiempo lo suficientemente pequeña como para que dificilmente pensemos en nuestra idea de espacio público. Honestamente / Yo /\*Ø prefiero desplazar la figura de espacio público porque tengo la impresión de que en nuestro imaginario qué cosa es un espacio público está enormemente restringido, porque está capturado en determinadas figuras del espacio público: la plaza, el aula, la sala de conferencia, estas que son formaciones históricas del espacio público."

[http://www.proyectotrama.org/00/TEXTOS/REDES/debates/dladdaga.htm]

'Reinaldo Laddaga: -I found interesting Diana Aisenberg's figure: 200 and some. It's a strange figure, because obviously it is a figure that is large enough to not be a group of friends, but at the same time small enough so that it's difficult for us to think about our idea of public space. Honestly, I prefer to displace the image of public space because I have the impression that in our imagination what a public space is is enormously restricted, because it's captured in specific images of public spaces: the plaza, the classroom, the conference room, images that are historical formations of public space.'

(17) Los amigos de Ana siempre llegan tarde a las fiestas. **Honestamente**, / Nosotros / \*Ø preferimos llegar temprano.

'Ana's friends always arrive late at parties. Honestly, we prefer to arrive early.'

Beside the simplex adverbs just presented, there also exist phrasal stance adverbials that can index the subject referent indirectly, as shown in (18) for EP and in (19) for Spanish. These complex adverbials meet the same compatibility requirements as the other adverbials in this class:

- (18a) Todas as revistas de beleza aconselham cremes de limpeza. **Para dizer a verdade**, / **Eu** / \*Ø prefiro o sabonete tradicional.
  - 'All the beauty magazines recommend cleansing cremes. To tell the truth, I prefer normal soap.'

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup>Of course, (14f) is acceptable if the adverb is understood as the manner adverb, i.e. meaning 'with sincerity, in a sincere manner'.

- (18b) Todas as revistas de beleza aconselham cremes de limpeza. **Para dizer a verdade**, / Nós / \*Ø preferimos o sabonete tradicional.
  - 'All the beauty magazines recommend cleansing cremes. To tell the truth, we prefer normal soap.'
- (19a) Todas las revistas de belleza aconsejan cremas de limpieza, pero, **la verdad**, / **Yo** / \*Ø prefiero el jabón tradicional.
  - 'All the beauty magazines recommend cleansing cremes, but, the truth, I prefer normal soap.'
- (19b) Todas las revistas de belleza aconsejan cremas de limpieza, pero, **la verdad,** / N**osotras** / \*Ø preferimos el jabón tradicional.
  - 'All the beauty magazines recommend cleansing cremes, but, the truth, we prefer normal soap.'

However, these adverbials, like the univerbal stance adverbs above, must occur in combination with an SPP if the verbal subject is not first person. Thus, an example like (19') is unacceptable in the absence of the SPP *ella* 'she', since the viewpoint vouching for "the truth" conveyed by the epistemic adverb must be that of the speaker, who clearly cannot be co-referential with the third-person singular *prefiere* 'she prefers':

- (19') Todas las revistas de belleza aconsejan cremas de limpieza, pero, **la verdad, ella/\*Ø** prefiere el jabón tradicional.
  - 'All the beauty magazines recommend cleansing cremes, but, the truth, she prefers normal soap.'

#### 3.3 Locative adverbials

Locative adverbs/adverbials such as *alli*, *aqui*, *en casa*, *em Lisboa*, *por Albuquerque*, etc. can also be used to carry out indirect reference to the subject referent, in lieu of (or in conjunction with) an SPP. The locative meaning requires that the subject referent in question be locatable at the place specified by the adverbial, which in some cases may be very schematic. Again, these forms may occur with first, second and third person subject referents, both in singular and plural.

In (20), the use of the locative adverb that conveys the deictic center of the speaker licenses the null subject option, since the verb form is also marked for first person (in this case plural), while in (21a) the adverb indirectly refers to the interlocutor(s):

- (20) Tu compras sapatos todas as estações. **Aqui / Nós / \*Ø** compramos só uma vez por ano. 'You buy shoes every season. Here we buy them only once per year.'
- (21a) Nosotros siempre estamos lavando el coche. **Allí** no lo laváis/lavas nunca. 'We are always washing our car. There you don't wash it ever.'
- (21b) Nosotros siempre estamos lavando el coche. **Vosotros** no lo laváis nunca. 'We are always washing our car. You (pl.) don't wash it ever.'
- (21c) Nosotros siempre estamos lavando el coche. **Tú** no lo lavas nunca. 'We are always washing out car. You (sg.) don't wash it ever.'
- (21d) Nosotros siempre estamos lavando el coche. \*Ø no lo laváis/lavas nunca.

Interestingly, locative adverbials occurring with null subjects may signal a switch in the subject referent in contrastive contexts even if the verb forms are morphologically marked for the **same** person and number. In (22), the subject referent of *eles gostam* 'they like' (where "they" = "the foreigners"), is different from the subject referent of  $t\hat{e}m$  'they have' (where "they" = "the people who work in the tourism industry"), even though both verb forms are marked for third person plural. However, the null subject in the latter case is acceptable because the identification of the subject is done indirectly through a metonymic inference triggered by the locative adverbial aqui 'here'. Notice that, although

there is a locative meaning intended for this adverb (viz. "here in Portugal" or "here in this region of Portugal"), the interpretation of *aqui* is more obviously linked to the attitudinal locus of the people who work in the tourism industry:

(22) A: Olhe e eles gostam da comida portuguesa, em geral?

X: Gostam, mas muitas vezes <u>aqui</u> têm a mania que é, que é a única, a única, o mal que leva a indústria hoteleira, que eu também já trabalhei na culinária muitos anos, e sei muito bem fazer comida, é que é o seguinte: o estrangeiro vem à procura de comida portuguesa, não vem à procura de servirmos os estrangeiros com comidas...com molhos lá ao modo deles, ...

[CRPC, 41]

'A: Look, do they [=foreigners] like the Portuguese food, in general?

X: Yes they [=foreigners] do, but very often <a href="here">here</a> [they = the people who work in the tourism industry] think that it is, that it is the only one, the only one, the problem with the tourism industry, I have also worked in the food industry for many years, and I know how to cook very well, and the problem is the following: foreigners come [here] because they want to try the Portuguese food, they are not expecting us to serve food...with sauces in the style they're used to,'

Although the linguistic devices presented in this section are clearly the "furthest in form" with respect to the pronominal representation of the referent, they effect reference indirectly in pretty much the same way as the other devices considered. Note, however, that if we compare all the forms presented in the current section, the interpretation of the locative adverbials seems to be the least predictable (i.e. the most context-dependent and flexible in reference) with regard to the identification of the subject referent: a locative adverbial like *en/em Ohio* 'in Ohio', for instance, can in principle refer to any subject referent in the appropriate context, provided the necessary combination with the appropriate verb form and syntactic placement.

#### 4. Conclusion

Much variationist work on SPPs in Spanish and Portuguese has shown that it is undeniable that there exist examples of obligatory SPPs in contrastive contexts. However, it does not follow from this observation that contrastive contexts specifically require overt SPPs. Indeed, as we have demonstrated, SPPs represent only one (admittedly frequent) means for the explicit marking of switch reference subjects. There are other devices available besides SPPs, such as the contrastive adverbial forms that we have presented above, which are fully capable of expressing contrast between the subject referents of two adjacent clauses/sentences/utterances. Thus, it is inaccurate to say that SPPs are obligatory in contrastive contexts. All that is needed is the presence of some overt expression that can effect REFERENCE, albeit indirectly, to the discourse referent of the sentential subject when this expression is interpreted in the context of the person/number verbal morphology. It appears clear, furthermore, that this expression must be one that can carry tonic stress; if not, there would be no way to explain why it is that verbal inflections alone are not capable of conveying contrast in Spanish and EP (cf. Haverkate 1976).

The kind of indirect reference seen throughout this paper is carried out through a rather unremarkable process of metonymic inferencing, leading to an association between the semantic/pragmatic content of the adverbial expression and the referent of the subject of the verb in question. The interpretative content of the adverbial must be compatible with the subject referent that is overtly indexed by the verbal morphology. When it is not compatible in this way, an overt SPP must be employed in order to signal the intended contrastive interpretation in explicit fashion, thereby avoiding infelicity.

For future research on this topic, an issue of utmost interest is the syntactic parallelism found among the adverbials presented in §3 above. All three classes occur—and possibly, MUST occur—in a left-peripheral position, outside the slot normally associated with the SPP. Thus, if the adverbial and

the SPP BOTH occur in a given sentence/utterance, the adverbial always comes first. Different answers as to why this configuration should be the case would issue from, e.g., pragmatics versus syntax, but it appears that only an approach which combines both pragmatic and syntactic insights will be able to arrive at a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena involved. Further investigation is also needed on the distributional patterns of the three classes of adverbs, since it is clear that they are not interchangeable, and indeed in some cases they are in complementary distribution. Obviously, a resolution to this issue will require taking into account the interpretational differences between the different adverb-types, since it is clearly not the case that a locative adverb like Spanish aquí means the same thing as a stance adverb like honestamente, despite the fact that both can be used, under differing circumstances, to indirectly index the referent of the sentential subject in a contrastive context.

#### References

Alarcos Llorach, Emilio. 1994. Gramática de la lengua española. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Butt, John, and Carmen Benjamin. 2000. A new reference grammar of modern Spanish. 3rd ed. Lincolnwood, IL: McGraw-Hill.

Bayley, Robert, and Lucinda Pease-Álvarez. 1997. Null pronoun variation in Mexican-descent children's narrative discourse. *Language Variation and Change* 9.349-71.

Bentivoglio, Paola. 1987[1980]. Los sujetos pronominales de primera persona en el habla de Caracas. Caracas: Universidad Central de Venezuela.

Cameron, Richard. 1992. Pronominal and null subject variation in Spanish. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Cameron, Richard. 1995. The scope and limits of switch reference as a constraint on pronominal subject expression. *Hispanic Linguistics* 6/7.1-27.

Cameron, Richard. 1997. Accessibility theory in a variable syntax of Spanish. Journal of Pragmatics 28.29-67.

Cunha, Celso, and Lindley Cintra. 1987. Nova Gramática do Português Contemporâneo. Lisboa: Edições Sá da Costa.

Enríquez, Emilia V. 1984. El pronombre personal sujeto en la lengua española hablada en Madrid. Madrid: CSIC.

Esgueva, Manuel, and Margarita Cantarero. 1981. El habla de la ciudad de Madrid: materials para su estudio. Madrid: CSIC.

Gili Gaya, Samuel. 1943. Curso superior de sintaxis española. Barcelona: Biblograf.

Haverkate, Henk. 1976. Estructura y función del sujeto en el español moderno. *Actas du XIII*<sup>e</sup> Congrès International de Linguistique et Philologie Romanes, I, 1191-1197. Quebec: Université Laval.

Jackendoff, Ray. 1972. Semantic interpretation in generative grammar. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kato, Mary Aizawa, and Esmeralda Vailati Negrão. 2000. *Brazilian Portuguese and the null subject parameter*. Frankfurt: Vervuert.

Labov, William. 1972. Sociolinguistic patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Luján, Marta. 1999. Expresión y omisión del pronombre personal. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, ed. by Ignacio Bosque and Violeta Demonte, vol. I, 1275-1315. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.

Montes, Rosa Graciela. 1986. Factores discursivos en el análisis de los pronombres personales sujetos en español. Morphé 1.45-71.

Morales, Amparo. 1986. *Gramáticas en contacto: análisis sintácticos sobre el español de Puerto Rico*. Madrid: Editorial Playor.

Morales, Amparo. 1997. La hipótesis functional y la aparición de sujeto no nominal: el español de Puerto Rico. *Hispania* 80.153-65.

Nascimento, Maria F. B. (coord.). 2001. *Português Falado. Documentos Autênticos*. Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa e Instituto Camões. (PF)

Nascimento, M. F. B. et al. 1987. Português Fundamental. Vol. II. Métodos e Documentos, tomo 1, Inquérito de Frequência. Lisboa: Instituto Nacional de Investigação Científica e Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa. (electronic version of Corpus de Referência do Português Contemporâneo, Sub-corpus oral espontâneo accessible online at http://www.clul.ul.pt/sectores/corpus\_oral\_pf\_publicado.zip) (CRPC)

- Nunberg, Geoffrey. 1995. Transfers of meaning. Journal of Semantics 12.109-33.
- Paredes Silva, Vera Lúcia. 1993. Subject omission and functional compensation: evidence from written Brazilian Portuguese. *Language Variation and Change* 5.35-49.
- Powell, Mava Jo. 1992. The systematic development of correlated interpersonal and metalinguistic uses in stance adverbs. *Cognitive Linguistics* 3.75-110.
- Schwenter, Scott A. 2002. The notion of contrast in the study of Spanish subject personal pronouns. Paper given at the Workshop on Subject Pronoun Expression in Spanish, CUNY Graduate Center.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1982. Subject expression and placement in Mexican-American Spanish. *Spanish in the United States: sociolinguistic aspects*, ed. by Jon Amastae and Lucía Elías-Olivares, 93-120. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 1994. Language contact and change: Spanish in Los Angeles. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 2001. *Sociolingüística y pragmática del español*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 2003. Otra mirada a la expresión del sujeto como variable sintáctica. *Lengua, variación y contexto: Estudios dedicados a Humberto López Morales*, ed. by Francisco Moreno Fernández et al., 849-60. Madrid: Arco/Libros.
- Solomon, Julie. 1999. Phonological and syntactic variation in the Spanish of Valladolid, Yucatán. PhD dissertation, Stanford University.
- Ward, Gregory. 2003. Deferred equatives. Ms., Northwestern University.

# Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium

## edited by David Eddington

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2005

#### Copyright information

Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium © 2005 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 1-57473-403-2 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper. Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

#### **Ordering information**

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press. To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, e-mail: sales@cascadilla.com

#### Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Amaral, Patrícia Matos and Scott A. Schwenter. 2005. Contrast and the (Non-) Occurrence of Subject Pronouns. In *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. David Eddington, 116-127. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

or:

Amaral, Patrícia Matos and Scott A. Schwenter. 2005. Contrast and the (Non-) Occurrence of Subject Pronouns. In *Selected Proceedings of the 7th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium*, ed. David Eddington, 116-127. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #1092.