SUPERLATIVE QP "HYPER-RAISING" IN DIALECTAL SPANISH: THE ROLE OF DORMANT EDGE FEATURES[1]

Luis Sáez

Universidad Complutense de Madrid

ABSTRACT. In this paper I deal with a particular relative-clause superlative construction attested in Spanish dialects like Canariense (Bosque & Brucart 1991) and Puerto Rican (Rohena-Madrazo 2007), among others. In this construction the superlative quantifier raises to the left of the complementizer of the relative clause. However, as observed by Bosque & Brucart (1991), only object quantifiers can move in this way; subject quantifiers cannot. I account for this assymmetry by assuming Bianchi's (2000) raising analysis for relative clauses, Kandybowicz's (2009) theory on edge features and Pesetsky & Torrego's (2001) proposal on Tense-to-Comp movement (among other assumptions). Object-quantifier movement correlates with Tense-to-Comp movement, which activates an edge feature for objects and allows them to escape the phasal minimal domain undergoing Transfer. This is not possible for subject-quantifier movement. I also propose that the determiner introducing a relative clause bears an uninterpretable [Superlative] feature with clitic-like properties. This feature forces the determiner to post-syntactically cliticize to the superlative quantifier degree word, a process which requires linear adjacency. This accounts for certain restrictions on this sort of superlative quantifier raising already pointed out by Bosque & Brucart (1991). The proposal (similar to the one in Rohena-Madrazo 2007) that [Superlative] may also be in Force in these dialects (if selected for Force by the determiner) explains a more restrictive (and widespread) variant of this construction.

Keywords:. superlatives; relative clauses; phases; dormant edge features

RESUMEN. En este trabajo abordo una construcción superlativa de cláusula relativa registrada en dialectos españoles como el canario (Bosque y Brucart 1991) y el puertorriqueño (Rohena-Madrazo 2007), entre otros. En esta construcción, el cuantificador superlativo asciende hasta la izquierda del complementante de la relativa. Sin embargo, como se señala en Bosque y Brucart (1991), solo los objetos cuantificadores (no los sujetos) pueden moverse de este modo. Explico esta asimetría asumiendo la propuesta de Bianchi (2000) de un análisis de ascenso para las cláusulas relativas, así como la teoría de Kandybowicz (2009) sobre los rasgos de borde-fase y la de Pesetsky y Torrego (2001) sobre el movimiento de Tiempo a Comp (entre otras asunciones). Los objetos cuantificadores coexisten con un movimiento de Tiempo a Comp que activa un rasgo de borde-fase para los objetos; ello permite a estos escapar del mínimo dominio de fase sometido a Transferencia. Esto no es posible para los sujetos cuantificadores. Propongo además que el determinante que introduce la relativa alberga un rasgo no interpretable [Superlativo] con propiedad de clítico. Este rasgo hace que el determinante, post-sintáctcamente, se cliticice al cuantificador superlativo, proceso que requiere contigüidad fonológica entre el determinante y el cuantificador superlativo. Ello explica ciertas restricciones en este ascenso del cuantificador superlativo ya señaladas en Bosque y Brucart (1991). La posibilidad de posicionamiento de este rasgo en Fuerza, localización

similar a la propuesta en Rohena-Madrazo (2007) pero aquí atribuida a selección por parte del determinante, explica una variante de esta contrucción más restrictiva pero más común.

Palabras clave: superlativas; cláusulas relativas; fases; rasgos-borde latentes

1. Introduction

The non-standard superlative construction illustrated in (1) is attested in Spanish dialects like Canariense (Bosque & Brucart 1991; "B&B") or Puerto Rican (Rohena-Madrazo 2007; "R-M"), among others:

(1)   [$_{RC}$ El   **más   países**   que   visitó] es   Luis.
        the.masc.sg   most   countries   that   visited is   Luis
        "The one who visited the most countries is Luis."

(1) only differs from (2) (its General-Spanish alternative) by the fact that the Superlative Quantifier Phrase ("SQP") *más países* (in bold type in (1)/(2)) precedes the complementizer *que* of the relative clause ("RC", between brackets in (1)/(2)):

(2)   [$_{RC}$ El que   **más   países**   visitó] es   Luis.

B&B and R-M argue that SQP in (1)/(2) raises to the RC Left Periphery ("LP"). R-M assumes:
   a) Rizzi's (1997) LP cartography in (3) (which substitutes for the traditional CP):

(3)   [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{TocP}$ [$_{FocP}$ [$_{FinP}$ [$_{TP}$ ...]]]]]

   b) Bianchi 's (1999)/(2000) and Kayne's (1994) configuration for RCs, a sort of "raising analysis" where an external Det (here called "Dext") selects a relative:

(4)   [$_{DextP}$ [$_{ForceP'}$ [$_{TocP}$ [$_{FocP}$ [$_{FinP}$ [$_{TP}$ ...]]]]]]

R-M proposes the structure (5a) for the RC in (2), and (5b) for the RC in (1). The null RC head ("RCH"), which I represent as a null "pro" (a DP), moves from its Spec-T argument position to Spec-Dext (as said, this is an RC "raising analysis"),[2] which leaves Spec-Force free as a landing site for the SQP extra movement (here called "SQP

---

[2]   The fact that a *pro* raises to Spec-Dext in (5) must not lead to conclude that these constructions are free relatives (as suggested by one of *Borealis* reviewers), since what raises in (6) is a PP with a non-null nominal. Moreover, as will be noted below (see section 3, example (29) with structure in (30); see also footnote 6), free relatives require an approach unrelated to the relative clauses dealt with in this paper.

As for superlative relative clauses with *wh*-pronouns like *quien* 'who', illustrated by the string between brackets in (i) and mentioned by one of the *Borealis* reviewers, I will have nothing to say because (as also observed by the reviewer) they are opaque as regards the position of SQP in LP. The reason is that Force must remain null in these clauses for independent reasons (note the asterisks in (i)).

(i)   [Quien (*que) más   países   (*que) visitó] fue   Luis.
          who   the   most   countries   that   visited   was   Luis
          "The one who visited the most countires was Luis."

However, I fully agree with the reviewer in the observation that future findings concerning these clauses must have a direct impact on the establishment of the boundaries of SQPHR.

Hiper-Raising"; "SQPHR", in bold type in (5)). (5a) lacks this extra step: SQP remains in Spec-Foc (*que* is standardly considered to be in Force).

(5) a. [DextP pro_j [Dext' el
[ForceP [Force' que [FocP [SQP **más países**]_i [Foc' [TP t_j visitó t_i]]]]]]]

b. [DextP pro_j [Dext' el
[ForceP [SQP **más países**]_i [Force' que [FocP t_i [Foc' [TP t_j visitó t_i]]]]]]]

R-M claims the extra step in (5b) is triggered by a strong [+superlative] feature on Force. (6a) is an SQPHR with an overt PP RCH (where, under Bianchi's (1999)/Kayne's (1994) framework, the DP complement of P raises to Spec-PP); R-M proposes the structure in (6b) for the RC in (6a):

(6) a. María es [la niña con la más que hablo].
María is the:F girl with the:F (most) that I.speak
"María is the girl I speak with (the most)."

b. [DP [PP [DP la [NP niña]]_k [P' con t_k]]_j [D' la [ForceP [SQP más]_i
[Force' que [TP hablo t_j t_i]]]]]] (Puerto Rican; R-M : ex. (103))

However, B&B observe SQPHR raises three particular questions to be addressed:
a) a subject cannot undergo SQPHR:

(7) [El (*más chicos) **q**ue (**más chicos**) visitaron] es Italia.
the.masc.sg most boys that visited is Italy
"The one that most boys visited is Italy."

b) a PP cannot undergo SQPHR:

(8) [El (*en **más países**) que (**en más países**) vivió] es Luis
the.masc.sg in most countries that lived is Luis
"The one who lived in most countries is Luis."

c) RCH cannot be a non-null DP; (1)/(2) contrast with (9), which has an overt RCH *chico* 'boy':

(9) [El chico (*más países) que (más países) visitó] es Luis.
"The boy who visited the most countries is Luis."

Section 2 addresses these facts. Section 2.1 introduces some Minimalist assumptions, among them Chomsy's (2000, 2001, 2008) Phase Theory and Kandybowicz's (2009) proposal that phase heads bear a "dormant" edge feature that can only be "activated" through Agree. Pesetsky & Torrego's (2001) proposal for T-to-C movement will be crucial too. In section 2.2 I propose that Dext in SQPHR has an uninterpretable [Superlative] feature with an EPP property which needs to probe the interpretable [Superlative] feature in the SQP Deg, so SQP must raise to Spec-Force in order to be accessible for probing. A dormant edge feature can be activated in Force (which is necessary for SQP raising to Spec-Force) only if T-to-C movement (Agree in Force) ensues, which allows to explain the contrast (7)/(1) after having assumed Pesetsky &Torrego's proposal for T-to-C movement: in (7) SQP is a subject, thus blocking T-to-

C movement; in (1) SQP is an object, thus allowing T-to-C-movement and, as a result, the activation of the edge feature in Force.

In section 2.3 I focus on the morphological properties of Dext in SQPHR. I claim that, as a morphological manifestation of the uninterpretable [Superlative] feature it bears, Dext must post-syntactically cliticize to the SQP Deg. This requires linear adjacency between Dext and Deg, which correctly rules out the ungrammatical SQPHR cases illustrated in (8)/(9).

In section 3 it is shown how this clitic-like [Superlative] feature may account for a more widespread variant of SQPHR in dialectal Spanish. A possible explanation of the hybrid behaviour of Dext concerning definiteness is also suggested in this section: Dext bears an uninterpretable [definite] feature with an EPP property, which triggers RHC raising to its Spec and provides the linear adjacency between Dext and Deg necessary for SQPHR. Section 4 concludes the paper.

2. Theoretical proposals for the problems observed by Bosque & Brucart (1991)

2.1. Minimalist assumptions.

I assume Chomsky's (2000, 2001, 2008) "Phase Theory". If computational efficiency is to be assumed for well designed language systems (in conformance with the "Strong Minimalist Thesis"; "SMT"), it is reasonable to also assume that grammatical objects are progressively built in stages. At each stage, rather than a whole "lexical array" (the total set of lexical terms taking part in the derivation of a full grammatical object), it is only a subset of it (a lexical sub-array called "phase") that is in "active memory" for syntactic operations to proceed (this reduces the computational burden). Phases are delimited by "phase heads" ("PHs": v and C, according to Chomsky (2008)), which, in turn, are defined morphologically as those heads bringing "uninterpretable" features ("uFs": EPP, phi) for internal merge ("i-merge"). As a non-PH like T also triggers i-merge (English subjects, for instance, must move from Spec-v to Spec-T due to an EPP related to phi), Chomsky proposes T "inherits" EPP/phi from Force. In this way, "Inheritance" preserves the definition of PHs as the bearers of uFs. Chomsky also proposes the existence of uFs called "Edge Features" ("EFs"), which are carried by all lexical items in the lexical sub-array in order to motivate their external merge ("e-merge") as well as cases of i-merge necessary for long-distance movement. As soon as uFs are e-merged, they must be checked/valued either by e-merge of a lexical item or Agree/i-merge for phi/EPP. It is Transfer that finally deletes the checked/valued uFS at the moment it sends the phase to the phonological and semantic interfaces for interpretation (as the uFs disappear, Full Interpretation is complied with). The structure transferred is no longer visible for further computation.

However, a phase cannot undergo Transfer in its entirety: PH and its Spec (the "phase edge") must remain visible for ongoing computation (iterability of Merge) and long-distance movement to be possible; under SMT guidelines, this naturally justifies the "Phase Impenetrability Condition" ("PIC"; Chomsky 2000):

(10)   In phase a with head H, the domain of H is not accessible to operations outside
         a; only H and its edge are accessible to such operations.

According to (10), the wh-object *what* in (11a) can only move to the main Spec-C if it has previously moved to the embedded Spec-C/v and main Spec-v, otherwise it would get trapped in the respective domains of embedded C/v and main v (embedded TP/VP and main VP) undergoing Transfer and, thus, becoming invisible for further

computation. Embedded C/v and main v freely provide EFs allowing *what* to escape their domains (see the much simplified configuration in (11b), where "+" indicates EF has been checked).

(11)   a.   What did you say that John bought?

         b.   [$_{CP}$ what$_i$ [$_{C'}$ [$_{C\text{-}[EF+]}$ did$_j$] [$_{TP}$ you [$_{T'}$ t$_j$

                [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [$_{v'}$ $v_{[EF+]}$-say$_m$ [$_{VP}$ t$_m$

                [$_{CP}$ t$_i$ [$_C$ that$_{[EF+]}$ [$_{TP}$ .John T

                [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [$_{v'}$ $v_{[EF+]}$ -bougth$_n$ [$_{VP}$ t$_n$ t$_i$]]]]]]]]]]]]

Kandybowicz (2009) ("K") proposes Chomsky's (2008) Inheritance is unnecessary for a proper definition of PHs: both PHs and non-PHs (like T) may lexically bear uFs; the difference between them relies on the different properties of their EFs. EFs in PHs are "dormant", while EFs in non-PHs are always active. A dormant EF can only be activated through an Agree operation taking place in PH. K obtains evidence for his proposal from Nupe. In this language, an object can only escape the v-domain VP if V (actually a root) raises to v after being probed by an uF [V] ("[uV]"; actually an [uRoot]) with an EPP property and located in v. In (12a), V-to-v raising (triggered by Agree) activates a dormant EF in v, which allows the object to raise to Spec-v. Instead, in (non-unaccussative) perfect-tense cases, where no V-to-v raising is possible in Nupe (see K (2009) for details),[3] objects cannot be extracted (see (12b)).

(12)   a.   Kè   Musa à   pa   ___   o?   (Future TP)

                what Musa FUT pound   FOC

                'What will Musa pound?'   (K 2009: ex. [3c])

         b.   *Kè Musa á   pa   ___   o?   (Perfect TP)

                what Musa PRF pound   FOC

                'What has Musa pounded?'   (K 2009: ex. [3d])

K's (2009) proposal will be crucial for mine, as Pesetsky & Torrego's (2001) one ("P&T") will be. P&T propose Spanish C has an uF [T] ("[uT]") with an EPP property. [uT] probes an interpretable [T] ("[iT]") in T. When wh-objects move, [uT] (due to its EPP property) triggers T-to-C movement (actually, [V-v-T]-to-C movement as [V-v] moves to T in Spanish). This explains Spanish V-subject ((13)) and English *do*-subject ((14)) word orders ("+" in (13)/(14) indicates an uF has been valued/checked);

(13)   a.   ¿Qué compró   Juan?

                what boutht   Juan

                "What did John buy?"

         b.   [$_{CP}$ [$_{DP}$ qué]$_i$ [$_{C'}$ [$_C$ [$_T$ [$_v$ [$_V$ compró]$_k$-$v_{[uV+,EPP+]}$] $_m$-T$_{[iT]}$]$_j$-C$_{[uT+,EPP+]}$]

                [$_{TP}$ Juan [$_{T'}$ t$_j$ [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [$_{v'}$ t$_m$ [$_{VP}$ t$_k$ t$_i$]]]]]]]

(14)   a.   What did John buy?

         b.   [$_{CP}$ what$_i$ [$_{C'}$[$_C$[$_T$ did$_{[iT]}$]$_j$-C$_{[uT+,EPP+]}$]

                [$_{TP}$ John [$_{T'}$ t$_j$ [$_{vP}$ t$_i$ [$_{v'}$ [$_v$ [$_V$ buy]$_k$-$v_{[uV+,EPP+]}$] [$_{VP}$ t$_k$ t$_i$]]]]]]]

---

[3] The relevant difference between (12a) and (12b) is that the future particle *à* in (12a) is in T°, while the perfect particle *á* in (12b) is the exponent of a head lower than T° (it is the reduced form of a light verb in v). K offers several empirical arguments supporting the different base-generation position of the two particles.

Wh-subjects do not trigger T-to-C movement (see (15a)) as their uF [Case] (which is closer to C than T is) is actually an [uT] (valued as nominative by [iT] in T) and checks [uT] in C on its way to Spec-C (see (15b)).

(15) a. ¿Quién   compró   eso?
          who   bought   that
          "Who bought that?"
      b. [CP [DP quién[uT+:nominative] i [C' C [uT+,EPP+]-[EF+]
          [TP t i [T' [T [v [V compró]k -v [uV+,EPP+]] m -T[iT]]
          [vP [v' t m [VP t k eso]]]]]]]

P&T do not assume a cartographic approach to C; I will. Roberts (2012) addresses the distribution of EFs under a cartographic approach to C, and proposes that different heads in LP ("a distributed PH C") may be specified with an EF (thus, Force, Foc or Fin may bear an EF). In conformance with K's proposal for PHs, I will assume that only Force bears a dormant EF. I will also assume that both Force and Fin may bear an [uT] (as LP is a distributed PH C).

2.2. A proposal for the subject/object asymmetry in SQPHR
Under the above premises, the syntactic computation of (2) proceeds as follows:
a) Spanish [V-*v*]-to-T movement always activates the EFs in *v*, so any object can escape VP and remain visible for further computation after Transfer of VP.
b) Top°/Foc° bear an [uTop/uFoc] with an EPP property, [uTop/uFoc] are valued by probing a topic/focus XP/YP with an [iTop/iFoc], namely pro/*más países*. I assume RCHs pass through Spec-Top on the way to Spec-Force (Bianchi 1999). I also crucially assume object-focus movement to Spec-FocP (like object-wh movement) correlates with T-to-C movement in Spanish (Torrego 1984), as evidenced by the mandatory V-subject word order in (16) (where *manzanas* 'apples' bears [iFoc] and raises to Spec-Foc):

(16) MANZANAS (*María)   comprará   (María),   no   peras.
      apples.topic María   will.buy   María   not   pears
      "It is apples that María will buy, not pears."

By contrast, RCHs do not trigger T-to-C movement as they are topics; this is shown in (17), where both subject-V and V-subject word orders are possible (the latter one due to the fact that the subject may optionally stay in Spec-*v* in Spanish):

(17) Los   países   que   (el chico) visitó (el   chico)
      the   countries   that   the boy   visited the   boy
      "The countries that the boy visited"

c) XP/YP raise to Spec-Top/Spec-Foc and check the EPP in Top°/Foc°.
d) RCH (*pro*) moves to Spec-Force *via* an EF in Force activated by an [uRel(ative)] in Force with an EPP property ("[uRel-EPP]"). Recall that K links the activation of a dormant EF to an instance of Agree in PH. uFs like [uRel] or [uQ] (the interrogative-F triggering wh-movement) are in Force, and bear an EPP property; they probe a relative/wh XP which, forced by the EPP, must move to Spec-Force. As said, this activates the dormant EF in Force. The system correctly rules out sentences like (18),

where *what* has raised to the Spec of an embedded Force lacking [uQ-EPP] (thus lacking an Agree operation), which impedes the activation of its dormant EF:

(18)   *Who thinks what Mary bought?

This formalizes Chomsky's (2001) suggestion that (18) is ruled out because a PH is assigned an "EPP"-F only if that has an effect on outcome (in our terms, only if a dormant EF in Force is activated in some way). Long-distance *what*-movement like the one in (19) does not pose any problem either, as there is an Agree operation in the embedded Force activating a dormant EF for *what*: according to P&T, an [uT] in this Force (=C in their terms) is checked by *that* (an auxiliary with an [iT] raising to C, according to P&T), thus the dormant EF in this Force is activated for *what* by this Agree operation, so *what* may escape the embedded TP.

(19)   What do you think that Mary bought?

e) Dext is e-merged and the domain of Force (TopP) undergoes Transfer. Finally, RCH locally moves from Spec-Force to Spec-Dext (a last step R-M proposes but does not motivate; for a justification of this movement, see section 3).

As a result, the structure for (2) should be (20), rather than (5a) (basically, identical steps hold for the PP RCH chain in (6a), where a further movement of the DP complement of P *con* to Spec-PP also takes place; see below for justification of this extra step):

(20) $[_{DextP} [_{DP} pro_{[uRel+]//[iTop]}]_j$ $[_{Dext'} el$
         $[_{ForceP} t_j$ $[_{Force'} que_{[EF+]-[iRel,EPP+]}$
         $[_{TocP} t_j$ $[_{Top'} Top_{[uTop+,EPP+]}$
         $[_{FocP} [_{SQP} más países]_{[iFoc]} _i$ $[_{Foc'} Foc_{[uFoc+,EPP+]}$
         $[_{FinP} [_{Fin'} [_{Fin} [_T [_v [_V visitó]_k -v_{[uV+,EPP+]}]_m -T_{[iT]}]_n -Fin_{[uT+,EPP+]}]_n$
         $[_{TP} t_j t_n t_i]]]]]]]]]]]$

As for SQPHR, I claim there is an [uSup(erlative)] in Dext which, in order to get valued, probes an [iSup] in the Deg of SQP.[4] SQP must be available in Spec-Force, as FocP becomes invisible by Transfer once Force is e-merged. Then, a dormant EF in Force must be activated for SQP to raise to Spec-Force. In (7) this is not possible as SQP is a subject and, according to P&T, subject movement does not trigger T-to-C movement (in our terms, T-to-Force movement). Therefore, we have the same ungrammatical result as in Nupe with object extraction from perfect *v*Ps (recall (12b)). In (1) the EF in Force is activated as SQP is an object and objects trigger T-to-C movement according to P&T. The configurations for (7) and (1) are (21a) (with the problematic EF in bold type) and (21b) (with the crucially activated EF and its related

---

4   A *Borealis* reviewer poses the question what exactly is the nature of [Sup]. As for [uSup], I propose (see below) it is a formal clitic-like feature similar to phi-features; so, like other agreement features, it is not semantically interpreted. In order to get deleted (and thus comply with Full Interpretation), it has to get valued by a local superlative Deg. It is particularly related to Dext due to the well-known mutual connection between the definiteness of Dext and the superlative Deg (**the/*a man who wrote the large*st** *prime number*), but only arises in SQPHR constructions due to a lexical particularity of Dext in the dialects at issue (a micro-parameter). *As* for [iSup], it does not need to syntactically enter into a "checking relation" as it is interpretable (and present in every superlative Deg).

Agree in bold type; notice I am assuming multiple Specs are always available, so simultaneous RCH/SQP raising to Spec-Force poses no problem):

(21) a. [DextP pro[uRel+]/[iTop] i   [Dext' el
        [ForceP ti [ForceP [SQP más chicos][iFoc]/[uT+:nominative] j
                                                [Force' que[EF+]-[iRel,EPP+]///**dormant-[EF]**
        [TopP ti   **(illicit movement)**   [Top'   Top[uTop+,EPP+]
        [FocP tj   [Foc'   Foc[uFoc+,EPP+]
        [FinP tj   [Fin'   Fin [uT+,EPP+]   [TP tj visitaron ti]]]]]]]]]]]
    b. [DextP pro[uRel+]/[iTop] j   [Dext' el
        [ForceP ti   [ForceP [SQP más países][iFoc] i
                            [Force' que[EF+]-[iRel,EPP+]///**[EF+]-[uT+,EPP+]–**
                            [T [v [V visitó] k -v [uV+,EPP+]] m -T[iT]] n
        [TopP tj   [Top'   Top[uTop+,EPP+]
        [FocP ti   [Foc'   Foc[uFoc+,EPP+] [FinP [Fin'[TP tj   tn   ti]]]]]]]]]]]]

That T raises all the way to Force in SQPHR with SQP objects (yielding a *que*+T complex and activating the dormant EF in Force in (21b))[5] is supported by the fact that no SQPHR data is attested lacking contiguity between Force and V, as illustrated in (22) (I assume R-M's (2007) proposal that, with multiple SQPs, the one immediately following *que* is a topic located in Spec-Top):

(22) El   [SQP (***mejor trabajo**)] que [SQP **en   menos tiempo**]
    the.masc.sg   best job   that   in   less   time
    [SQP (**mejor   trabajo**)]ha   hecho es Luis
          best job   has   done   is Luis
    "The one who has done the best job in the least time is Luis."
                                                        (Canariense;B&B)

Wh-islands in Spanish support the account just offered for the contrast (7)/(1). The contrast (23a/b) was observed by Torrego (1984):

(23) a. ¿Quién sabes   qué   compró?
        who   you.know   what   bought
        "Who is the person such that you know what he bought?"
    b. *¿Qué sabes   quién compró?
        what you.know   who   bought

According to the above premises, this contrast would be explained in the following way:

a) In (23b) the wh-subject *quién* moves to the embedded Spec-Force probed by an [uQ-EPP] in Force, an Agree relation which activates an EF in Force for *quién*. Wh-subject movement, according to P&T, blocks T-to-Force movement as the [uT-EPP] in

---

[5] A *Borealis* reviewer poses the question why object movement correlates to T-to-Fin in (20) but to T-to-Force in (21b). I assumed in section 2.1 that both Force and Fin may bear an [uT] (as LP is a "distributed PH C"; Roberts 2012). Actually, T-to-Force might also take place in non-SQPHR cases if in the grammatical variant of (2) *el que visitó más países*, with the focus phrase following the verb, T is interpreted as having raised to Force optionally. As to why T-to-Force is mandatory in SQPHR cases, I have not yet an independently justified answer at the moment, but it is most probably related to the mandatory movement of the focus phrase to Spec-Force.

Force has been already checked by the [uT] (valued as nominative Case by [iT] in T°) of the wh-subject on its way to Spec-Force. This means that no second EF in Force may be activated for the wh-object. As a consequence, the wh-object cannot move to Spec-Force in order to further raise to the main Spec-Force (it gets trapped in the transferred embedded TP).

b) In (23a), the wh-object moves to the embedded Spec-Force probed by an [uQ-EPP] in Force activating an EF for the wh-object to escape the embedded TP. Wh-object movement, according to P&T, correlates with T-to-Force movement as the [uT-EPP] in Force must be checked by [iT] in T°. As a result, there is a second Agree relation in embedded Force activating a second EF for the wh-subject to move to the embedded Spec-Force and raise to the main Spec-*v* and main Spec-C

2.3. The role of the clitic-like properties of Dext

As shown in the preceding section, the contrast (7)/(1) can be explained as resulting from a T-to-C movement contrast correlating with a subject/object movement contrast in Spanish (if P&T's (2001) proposal for T-to-C movement in Spanish and K's (2009) "dormant"-EFs proposal are assumed). As for the ungrammaticality of SQPHR in (8) and (9), I claim it results from post-syntactic reasons.

I propose the SQPHR Dext, due to its bearing an [uSup], must cliticize to a Deg (rather like pronominal clitics must cliticize to a V). I also claim that this cliticization requires post-syntactic linear adjacency between Dext and Deg, so no phrase with phonological features may intervene between Dext and Deg (I assume Halle & Marantz's (1993) Distributed Morphology framework). In (9), though, the overt N *chico* intervenes between the Dext *el* and the Deg *más*. The same happens in (8): the P *en* intervenes between Dext and Deg.

Recall that, in this paper, I am assuming R-M's (2007) proposal that RCHs eventually reach Spec-Dext (see the structures (5b)/(6b) for (1)/(6a)). Then, one might wonder why the RCH of the SQPHR in (9) (*chico*) remains in Spec-Force (see (24)):

(24)   [DextP [Dext' el [ForceP [NP chico]j [ForceP [SQP más países]i
         [Force' que+visitók [FinP [TP tj tk ti]]]]]]]

In order to explain why RCH must stay in Spec-Force, I assume Bianchi's (2000) proposal that non-PP RCHs are not bare NPs, but are full DPs, which avoids difficulties arisen with Kayne's (1994) analysis (for instance, according to (24), the subject of *visitó* is a bare NP *chico*, but singular bare NPs cannot be subjects in Spanish; see Borsley (1997) for further problems arisen with Kayne's analysis). More concretely, Bianchi claims the RCH DP is headed by a null relative D (here called "Drel") which, in order to be licensed, must unify its features with the ones of Dext through incorporation. Importantly for us, incorporation can only take place when the Drel remains in the complement domain of Dext (Spec-Force) so it can be c-commanded by Dext. Syntactic unification (incorporation) of Drel and Dext features motivates that, post-syntactically, only one article is late-inserted. For instance, in (25b), the (much simplified) configuration of a regular RC like (25a), only one article *el* (in bold type) is inserted after unification of Dext-Drel:

(25)   a.   El   chico   que   cantaba
                the   boy   that   sang
                "The boy who sang"

b.   [DectP Dext:**el** [ForceP [DP Drel [NP chico]]ⱼ [ForceP que [FinP [TP tⱼ cantaba]]]]]]

(unification/incorporation)

(26) offers the actual (much simplified) configuration of the SQPHR in (9): Drel must remain in Spec-Force in order to be c-commanded by Dext for proper incorporation into Dext:

(26)   [DP Dext:**el** [ForceP [DP Drel [NP chico]]ⱼ

[ForceP [SQP más países]ᵢ [Force' que+visitóₖ   [TP tⱼ tₖ tᵢ]]]]

(unification/incorporation)

As a result, if overt RCH DPs must always stay in Spec-Force in order to provide their Drel with a c-command configuration for incorporation, they will always block Dext-to-Deg cliticization.

The incorporation requirement does not hold for RCH PPs, since, in these cases, Drel is overt (see (6)) and does not incorporate into Dext, so PP may unproblematically raise to Spec-Dext. As a consequence, no problem arises here for Dext-to-Deg cliticization.

3. Further issues

Throughout this paper I have been assuming R-M's proposal that RCHs raise to Spec-Dext in superlative RCs (see (5) and (6b), which derive the attested word orders). A rationale for RCH raising to Spec-Dext can be obtained from the particular properties of superlative Ds. Szabolcsi (1986) observes that, although always spelled-out by a definite article ((27)), superlative Ds behave as indefinites, as shown by the contrast between (28b) and (28c) regarding wh-extraction.

(27)   I bought the/*a most expensive car.
(28)   a.   Who did you take a picture of?
         b.   *Who did you take the/every picture of?
         c.   Who did you take the best picture of?

I propose these facts can be explained if superlative Ds bear an [uDef(inite)-EPP] (not an [iDef]), so they behave like indefinites (they do not trigger definiteness effects). [uDef-EPP] must be valued by probing an XP with an [iDef], as evidenced by the late-inserted definite article superlative Ds must host. In non-RC superlatives like (28) this XP is most probably a *pro*. In superlative RCs this XP is RCH (a full DP, according to Bianchi (2000) for non-PP RCH cases) locally located in Spec-Force. Given the EPP property of [uDef-EPP], RCH must raise to Spec-Dext. This justifies the structures in (5) with *pro*-movement. In the non-SQPHR option of (9), incorporation of Drel into Dext is enough for EPP satisfaction. [uDef]-valuation also explains the DP complement of P in (6) raises to Spec-PP in order to be accessible for probing by Dext, as PP is a phase (see Raposo (2018) and Ticio (2009) for support).

Non-superlative Ds (including Dexts of non-superlative RCs) behave as real definites (see (28b)). Here, D/Dext bears an [iDef] which triggers definiteness effects.

Superlative examples like (29a) seem to pose a problem for the configuration (6b) R-M offers for (6a). If (29a) had the configuration in (29b), where the RCH is the PP *con la persona* (raised to Spec-Dext), then three problems would arise: a) the DP complement of P does not raise to Spec-P, so [uDef-EPP] in Dext cannot probe it in order to get valued; b) unexpectedly, Dext must remain null; c) there cannot be SQPHR (as shown by the asterisk in the leftmost *más*):

(29)   a.   [Con   la   persona (*más) que   (más) hablo] es
                with   the:F   person (most) that   most   I.speak is
                (con) Luis
                (with) Luis
                "The person I speak with the most is Luis." (R-M: ex. [115])

       b.   [$_{DP}$ [$_{PP}$ [$_{P'}$ con [$_{DP}$ la [$_{NP}$ persona]]]]$_j$
             [$_{D'}$ D [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{SQP}$ más]$_i$ [$_{Force'}$ que [$_{TP}$ hablo t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]]

I propose (as already entertained by R-M) (29b) is not the right configuration for (29a). (29a) is a construction different than the one at issue in this paper. I claim the RC between brackets in (29a) is a free relative, that is, a bare ForceP with no Dext (and, therefore, with no SQPHR available as there is no Dext bearing an [uSup]/[uDef-EPP]); a tentative configuration is presented in (30).[6]

(30)   [$_{ForceP}$ [$_{PP}$ con [$_{DP}$ la [$_{NP}$ persona]]]$_j$ [$_{Force'}$ que [$_{TopP}$ t$_j$ [$_{Top'}$ [$_{FocP}$ [$_{SQP}$ más]$_i$
        [$_{Foc'}$[$_{FinP}$ [$_{TP}$ pro hablo t$_j$ t$_i$]]]]]]]]]

That (29a) is a headless/free relative is evidenced by the possible repetition of the P *con* before *Luis*, which is impossible in the relatives addressed in this paper, as illustrated in (31):

(31)   (*Con) María es [la   niña con   la   (más) que   (más) hablo].
        with   María is the:F girl with   the:F (most) that   (most) I.speak
        "María is the girl I speak with the most."

To conclude this section, I must take into account the relevant fact that there are SQPHR dialects (the majority of them, according to B&B) that reject examples like (1), with a complex SQP, and only accept examples like (32), with just a Deg word *más/menos* preceding *que*:

(32)   Ese   libro   es   el   más   que   me   gusta.
        that   book   is   the   most   that   to.me likes
        "That is the book I like the most."

                                                 (B&B: ex. [53a])

I propose these dialects have a Dext which does not bear an [uSup] by itself, but selects one for its complement head Force. This feature must post-syntactically cliticize to a Deg, which requires linear adjacency between a Deg raised to Spec-Force and [uSup] in Force (no phrase with phonological features may intervene between Deg and [uSup] in Force). This is not possible in (1) (where *países* intervenes between *más* and [u]Sup in Force) but it is in (32) as it is just a bare SQP *más* that raises to Spec-Force. Then, it is reasonable to conclude that the Dext-to-Deg cliticization proposed above for cases like (1) actually translates into a [uSup]-to-Deg cliticization requirement: Dext

---

[6]   The configuration in (30), a bare ForceP (CP) crucially not dominated by a DP (with a *pro*), aligns with proposals like Rooryck's (1994), where free relatives (actually a misnomer) and indirect *wh*-clauses are structurally identical.

    One of the *Borealis* reviewers comes to a similar conclusion.

becomes a proclitic of Degº in (1), while the complementizer *que* becomes an enclitic of Degº in (32).

4. Summary

In this paper I have dealt with a particular superlative relative-clause construction attested in certain Spanish dialects. In this construction the superlative quantifier unexpectedly raises to the left of the complementizer of the relative clause. However, only object quantifiers can move in this way; subject quantifiers cannot. I have explained this asymmetry by assuming Bianchi's (2000) raising analysis for relative clauses, Kandybowicz's (2009) theory on edge features and Pesetsky & Torrego's (2001) proposal on T-to-C movement. Object-quantifier movement correlates with T-to-C movement, which activates an edge feature for the objects and allows them to escape the phasal minimal domain undergoing Transfer. This is not possible when subject quantifiers move.

I have also proposed that Dext bears an uninterpretable [Superlative] feature with clitic-like properties.and an EPP property forcing the RCH to raise to its Spec (except when the RCH is a non-null DP). This feature forces Dext to post-syntactically cliticize to the superlative quantifier (Degº), which requires linear adjacency. This accounts for certain restrictions on SQPHR already observed by Bosque and Brucart (1991). The location of this clitic-like feature in Force, as a result of selection by Dext, may also explain a more restrictive SQPHR variant attested in the majority of SQPHR Spanish dialects.

Luis Sáez
luissaez@filol.ucm.es
Departamento de Lengua Española
y Teoría de la Literatura
Facultad de Filología
Edificio D, despacho 360
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
Avda. Complutense s/n
28040 Madrid,
España

References

Bianchi, V. (1999). *Consequences of Antisymmetry: Headed Relative Clauses*. Berlin, de Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110803372

Bianchi, V. (2000). The raising analysis of relative clauses: a reply to Borsley. *Linguistic Inquiry* 31, pp 123-140. https://doi.org/10.1162/002438900554316

Borsley. R. (1997). Relative Clauses and the Theory of Phrase Structure. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28, pp. 629-647.

Bosque, I. & J. M. Brucart (1991). *QP-Raising in Spanish superlatives*, Ms. Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Chomsky, N. (2000). Minimalist Inquiries: The Framework, in R. Martin et al. (eds.), *Step by Step. Essays on Minimalist Syntax in Honor of Howard Lasnik*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 89-155.

Chomsky, N. (2001). Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 1-52.

Chomsky, N. (2008). On Phases. In R. Freidin et al (eds.) *Foundational Issues in Linguistic Theory*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, pp. 133-166. https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262062787.003.0007

Halle, M. & A. Marantz (1993). Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In K. Hale et al. (eds) *The View from Building 20*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press. pp. 111-176.

Kandybowicz, Jason (2009). Embracing edges: syntactic and phono-syntactic edge sensitivity in Nupe. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 27, pp 305-344. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-009-9064-6

Kayne, R. (1994). *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press.

Pesetsky, D. & E. Torrego (2001). T-to-C movement: causes and consequences. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.) *Ken Hale: A Life in Language*. Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, pp. 355-426.

Raposo, E. (2018). Nominal ellipsis and prepositional modifiers in Portuguese: A phase-theoretic approach. *Probus* 30-2, pp. 277-303. https://doi.org/10.1515/probus-2018-0004

Rizzi, L. (1997). The fine structure of the left periphery. In L. Haegeman (ed.), *Elements of grammar*. Dordrecht, Kluwer, pp. 281-337. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-5420-8_7

Roberts, I. (2012). Phases, head movement and second-position effects. In Á. Gallego (ed.), *Phases. Developing the Framework*. Berlin, Gruyter, pp. 385-441. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110264104.385

Rohena-Madrazo, M. (2007). *Superlative Movement in Puerto Rican Spanish and General Spanish*. New York University Working Papers in Linguistics.

Rooryck, J. (1994). Generalized transformations and the *wh*-cycle: free relatives as bare Wh-CPs, In C. Jan-Wouter Zwart (ed.) *Minimalism and Kayne's Antisymmetry Hypothesis*. Groninger Arbeiten zur Germanistischen Linguistik 37, pp. 195-208.

Szabolcsi (1986). Comparative Superlatives. In N. Fukui et al (eds.) *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics*, pp.245-266.

Ticio, E. (2009). *Locality Domains in the Spanish Determiner Phrase*. Berlin, Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-90-481-3398-7

Torrego, E. (1984). On Inversion in Spanish and some of its effects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15-1, pp. 103-129.