

Putting objects in order:

Asymmetrical relations in Spanish and Portuguese ditransitives

Paola Cépeda (Stony Brook University) and Sonia Cyrino (Universidade Estadual de Campinas)

Introduction Spanish, European Portuguese (EP) and Brazilian Portuguese (BP) allow two possible linear orders for the direct (DO) and indirect object (IO) in ditransitives: DO>IO and IO>DO, shown in (1) and (2) for Spanish and EP, respectively (the same applies to BP). The goal of this paper is twofold. First, as initially suggested by Kayne (1984) for French and Romance in general, we argue in favor of the absence of a Double Object Construction (DOC) in Spanish, EP and BP. Second, we provide evidence to argue that DO>IO and IO>DO are derivationally related (an assumption in Demonte (1995)), IO>DO being the result of an informational structure operation. By providing a unified analysis, this paper aims to contribute to a better understanding of ditransitives in Romance, which have not yet been thoroughly analyzed in a comparative approach.

- | | |
|--|--|
| (1) a. <u>Spanish DO>IO</u>
Pedro (le) dio [_{DO} un libro] [_{IO} a María]
Pedro CL gave a book to María
'Pedro gave a book to María' | b. <u>Spanish IO>DO</u>
Pedro (le) dio [_{IO} a María] [_{DO} un libro]
Pedro CL gave to María a book
'Pedro gave a book to María' |
| (2) a. <u>EP DO>IO</u>
O Pedro deu [_{DO} um livro] [_{IO} à Maria]
the Pedro gave a book to.the Maria
'Pedro gave a book to Maria' | b. <u>EP IO>DO</u>
O Pedro deu [_{IO} à Maria] [_{DO} um livro]
the Pedro gave to.the Maria a book
'Pedro gave a book to Maria' |

There is no DOC in Spanish, EP and BP Following Kayne's (1984) proposal, we claim there is no DOC in Spanish, EP and BP. There is evidence that shows that the arguments supporting a DOC approach for these languages (defended by Demonte 1995, Cuervo 2003, Torres-Morais & Salles 2010, a.o.) are neither semantically nor structurally conclusive.

First, according to Demonte (1995) and Blears (2003), when the IO-doubling clitic appears in Spanish, the sentence resembles an English DOC, as opposed to the clitic-less ditransitive, which would correspond to a PP-dative. However, the presence or absence of clitics in Spanish does not say anything about the structural position of DO or IO. The same c-commanding effects arise with or without the concomitant clitic (also noted by Pineda 2013). Just to mention a few examples of counterevidence for a DOC structure, the animacy of the IO has been contended (e.g. by Pineda 2013); the possession entailment (Oehrle 1976) is only a (cancelable) implicature; and binding effects do not change in relation with the presence or absence of the clitic (against Blears 2003).

Second, the absence of IO-passivization in Spanish, EP and BP has been overlooked, as if it did not offer any insights for these languages. However, it can be used as an important diagnostic for DOCs: if IO-passivization is not possible, then we need to assume that IO is not occupying any object position (Larson 2013), even though its linear order may suggest differently. In English, DOCs are able to passivize the IO (3a); however, this is not possible in the EP version of the English sentence (3b), and the same can be said for BP and Spanish (note, again, that the presence of clitics in Spanish does not change the grammaticality of the sentence (3c)):

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| (3) a. <u>English</u>
Pedro was given the book. | b. <u>EP</u>
*O Pedro foi dado o livro. | c. <u>Spanish</u>
*Pedro <i>le</i> fue dado el libro. |
|--|--|--|

Given these facts, we conclude that there is no strong semantic or structural evidence for a DOC in Spanish, EP or BP.

DO>IO and IO>DO are derivationally related in Spanish, EP and BP While some have argued for two independent structures to account for DO>IO and IO>DO (Brito 2014, a.o.), we propose that these linear orders are derivationally related (in the sense of Demonte 1995, a.o.). Give-idioms have been used as an argument for DOCs in Spanish, EP and BP (e.g. Blears 2003). However, as Larson (2013) points out, the so-called *idiomatic reading* is in fact compositional since the objects always receive specific meanings. Examples in (4) show that Spanish *dar lata a alguien* 'give someone a hard time' (4a) is not idiomatic since *lata* can refer either to a tin can or, crucially, to a tedious, annoying situation (4b). The same can be said for BP (and EP), as shown in (5a-b) (*dar canja a alguém* 'make things easy'; *canja* lit. 'chicken broth').

- (4) Spanish a. Pedro (le) está dando lata a María.
Pedro CL is giving annoyance to Maria
 ‘Pedro is giving Maria a hard time.’ b. ¡Esto es una lata!
This is one annoyance
 ‘This is annoying!’
- (5) BP a. Pedro está dando canja pra Maria.
Pedro is giving ease to Maria
 ‘Pedro is making things easy for Maria.’ b. Isto é uma canja!
This is a ease
 ‘This is easy!’

Since the *idiomatic readings* are really compositional, DO and the verb do not necessarily form a constituent in ditransitive structures. Larson shows that the syntactic composition follows the Thematic Hierarchy ([AG] > [TH] > [GL] > [LOC] >...). DO is thus generated necessarily higher than IO, so DO>IO is the base order. Consequently, the order IO>DO can only be explained in derivational terms (as in Demonte 1995). We support this claim with two arguments for Spanish, EP and BP.

Argument # 1. Scope effects Quantificational objects show different scope relations depending on their order: $DO_{\exists}>IO_{\forall}$ is scopally ambiguous (6a), but $IO_{\exists}>DO_{\forall}$ is not (6b): the scope has frozen. Since scope freezing occurs when a quantifier raises over another to a c-commanding position as a result of a single instance of movement (Antonyuk 2015), the difference of interpretations suggests that the basic order is DO>IO (as proposed in Larson 2013) and that, in (6b), IO has moved over DO. These effects are also found in EP and Spanish (regardless of the presence/absence of a clitic).

- (6) a. BP $DO_{\exists}>IO_{\forall}$
 Pedro deu [do um livro] [io para todos os parentes]
Pedro gave a book to every the relatives
 ‘Pedro gave a book to every relative.’ b. BP $IO_{\exists}>DO_{\forall}$
 Pedro deu [io para um parente] [do todos os livros]
Pedro gave to a relative every the books
 ‘Pedro gave a relative every book.’

Argument # 2. Informational differences In clear relation with the scope effects pointed out above, there are informational differences between the two orders. DO>IO is the informational unmarked configuration, since it is the default order for answering a general question such as ‘what happened?’ (7a). In contrast, IO>DO is the derived configuration, where IO has moved over DO. This movement is triggered whenever DO encodes new information as the answer to the question ‘what?’ and, consequently, must appear in final position (7b). This is also the case when the DO is heavy (Beavers & Nishida 2010). Therefore, we propose that the IO>DO order is motivated by informational structure in the verbal domain.

- (7) a. BP $DO>IO$
 Q: **O que aconteceu?**
the what happened
 ‘What happened?’
 A: O Pedro deu [do um livro] [io para o Paulo].
the Pedro gave a book to the Paulo
 ‘Pedro gave a book to Paulo.’ b. BP $IO>DO$
O que o Pedro deu para o Paulo?
the what the Pedro gave to the Paulo
 ‘What did Pedro give to Paulo?’
 O Pedro deu [io para o Paulo] [do um livro].
the Pedro gave to the Paulo a book
 ‘Pedro gave Paulo a book.’

To explain the informational motivation for the IO>DO order, we assume Belletti’s (2004) claim that the verb phrase is endowed with a fully-fledged periphery of discourse related structural positions, in parallel with the high left periphery. With Miotto (2003) and Quarezemin (2005), we propose that the low periphery minimally contains [TopP [FocP [vP]]]. So in the BP answer (7b), [io para o Paulo] is conveying given information and is located in the low left periphery TopP; in contrast, [do um livro], encoding new information, appears in the low left periphery FocP.

Conclusions We have shown that the evidence supporting a DOC approach is not conclusive either semantically or structurally. So we conclude that there are no DOCs in these three languages. The orders DO>IO and IO>DO are indeed derivationally related as suggested by scope effects and informational relations. Our comparative approach unifies the analysis of ditransitives in Spanish, EP and BP.

References Antonyuk, S. (2015) Quantifier Scopepe and Scope Freezing in Russian. || Beavers, J. & C. Nishida (2010). The Spanish Dative Alternation Revisited. || Belletti, A. (2004) Aspects of the Low IP Area. || Bleam, T. (2003) Properties of DOC in Spanish. || Brito, A. M. (2014) As construções ditransitivas revisitadas || Cuervo, M.C. (2003) *Datives at Large*. || Demonte, V. (1995) Dative Alternation in Spanish. || Kayne, R.S. (1984) Connectedness and Binary Branching. || Larson, R.K. (2013) On Shell Structure. || Miotto, C. (2003) Focalização e quantificação. || Oerhle, R. (1976) The Grammatical Status of the English Dative Alternation. || Pineda, A. (2013) DOCs in Spanish (and Catalan) revisited. || Quarezemin, S. (2005) Focalização do Sujeito no Português Brasileiro. || Torres Morais, M. A. & Salles, H.M.L. (2010) Parametric change in the grammatical encoding of indirect objects in BP.