

0. **Intro:** As illustrated in (1), Asturian – a western Iberian Romance language – exhibits enclitic/proclitic alternations (alternatively, post- and preverbal clitics), similarly to Galician and European Portuguese, but differently from Spanish, Catalan, Italian, etc.

- These alternations have been at the core of much debate in the generative literature, and analyses proposed to explain these patterns have ranged from purely phonological accounts to syntactic ones. However, there is one aspect that has not been much discussed in the literature and that distinguishes Asturian from Galician and European Portuguese, namely similar clitic placement alternations in the embedded environment. Relevant examples are shown in (2).

- The enclitic patterns we observe in (2) correlate with a [+epistemic] interpretation of the content in the embedded clause, interpretation that can be anchored to the matrix predicate subject (i.e., *Xulia*) as in (2a), or anchored to the speaker as in (2b).

(3) a. [Force° [... [Fin° ...]] b. Enclisis: [Force° [Fin° verb + clitic] ...]
2. **Semantic anchoring:** The [+epistemic] interpretation of the content in the embedded clause in (2a) is anchored to the matrix predicate subject. Cancelling the [+epistemic] interpretation for the matrix predicate subject as in (4a) is infelicitous, which contrast sharply with the adequacy of the fragment when related to the speaker, as in (4b).

- (4) a. #Pero Xulia sabe que ye mentira que lu toparon ahí. [+epistemic>subject]
but Xulia knows that is lie that him_{CL.ACC} found_{3PL} there
'#But Xulia knows that it is not true that they found him there.'
- b. Pero yo sé que ye mentira que lu toparon ahí. [-epistemic>speaker]
but I know that is lie that him_{CL.ACC} found_{3PL} there
'But I know that it is not true that they found him there.'

On the other hand, the [+epistemic] interpretation of the content of the embedded clause in (2b) is anchored to the speaker, not to the main clause subject. Consider the following fragments,

- (5) a. Pero Ana diz que nun-y lo mandó Pin. [-epistemic>subject]
 but Ana says that not-her_{CL.DAT}-it_{CL.ACC} ordered_{3PL} Pin
 ‘But Ana says that Pin did not tell her to.’
 b. #Pero yo digo que nun-y lo mandó Pin. [+epistemic>speaker]
 but I say that not-her_{CL.DAT}-it_{CL.ACC} ordered_{3PL} Pin
 ‘But I know that it is not true that they found him there.’

This semantic anchoring (Uriagereka’s intuition about “point of view”) which can be attributed to the matrix subject or to the speaker also follows from the analysis proposed. In short, predicates like that in (2a) are argued to select a [+epistemic] complement, interpretation that is then anchored to the external theta-role by virtue of the selection configuration, accounting for (4). In cases as that in (2b), as the selection of a [+epistemic] complement is not mediated by a predicate, the [+epistemic] interpretation can only be anchored to the speaker, accounting for (5).

3. **Further evidence:** With multiple embedding, some relevant examples in (6), the [epistemic] encoding (i.e., Uriagereka’s “point of view”) and its anchoring are also predicted by the analysis entertained. In (6a), *Xulio* is anchored to the [+epistemic] content in the embedded clause, but the main predicate’s subject *Ana* is not, as shown in (7). Turning to (6b), it is not the speaker that the [+epistemic] content in the embedded clauses is anchored to (vs.. (2b)), but rather the matrix predicate subject, as illustrated in (8).

- (6) a. Ana diz que Xulio creyía [que atopáranlu nel chigre].
 Ana says that Xulio believed_{3SG} that had.found_{3PL}-him_{CL.ACC} in-the bar
 ‘Ana says that Xulio believed that they had found him at the bar.’
 b. Xicu diz que Ana trai les bebidas [porque mandó-ylo Pin].
 Xicu says that Ana brings the drinks because ordered-her_{CL.DAT}-it_{CL.ACC} Pin
 ‘Xicu says that Ana is bringing the drinks because Pin ordered her to.’
 (7) a. Pero Ana sabe que ye mentira que lu toparon ahí. [-epistemic]
 but Ana knows that is lie that him_{CL.ACC} found_{3PL} there
 ‘But Ana knows that it is not true that they found him there.’
 b. #Pero Xulio sabe que ye mentira que lu toparon ahí. [+epistemic]
 but Xulio knows that is lie that him_{CL.ACC} found_{3PL} there
 ‘#But Xulio knows that it is not true that they found him there.’
 (8) a. Pero yo sé que ye mentira que-y lo mandó Pin. [-epistemic>speaker]
 but I know that is lie that-her_{CL} it_{CL} ordered_{3SG} Pin
 ‘But I (speaker) know that it is not true that Pin ordered her to.’
 b. #Pero Xicu sabe que ye mentira que-y lo mandó Pin. [+epistemic>subject]
 but Xicu knows that is lie that-her_{CL} it_{CL} ordered_{3SG} Pin
 ‘#But Xicu knows that it is not true that Pin ordered her to.’

If semantic anchoring follows from selection properties, in the absence of a mediating predicate that may select a [+epistemic] content with an external theta-role to attribute it to, the speaker receives the [+epistemic] anchoring, which follows naturally from the analysis proposed.

REFERENCES: Demonte, V., & Fernández-Soriano, O. 2009. “Force and Finiteness in the Spanish complementizer system”. *Probus* 21, 23-49// Fernández-Rubiera, F. J. 2009. *Clitics at the edge: Clitic placement in western Iberian Romance languages*. Ph.D. dissertation, Georgetown University.
 /Fernández-Rubiera, F. J. 2013. “Clisis revisited: Root and embedded contexts in western Iberian”. In *Challenging clitics*, 55-86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins // Fernández-Rubiera, F. J. 2015. “CP-complements to assertive predicates: Their syntax and interpretation”. *Revista internacional de lingüística iberoamericana* 26:2. 187-202.// Rizzi, L. 1997. “The fine structure of the left periphery”. In *Elements of Grammar*, 281-337. Dordrecht: Kluwer // Uriagereka, J. 1995. “Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 26:1, 79-123.