

CONSTRAINTS ON V-IO-DO AND V-S-DO IN ROMANCE IOs AS "VP
SUBJECTS": A LABELING THEORY APPROACH

Katerina Thomopoulou and Ángel J. Gallego

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

1. PROPOSAL: We claim that the limited availability on V-IO-DO in Romance (Ormazabal & Romero 2013 and references therein) should be paralleled with that of V-Subj-DO (Gallego 2013, Ordóñez 2007). We argue that the facts follow from a general principle that requires that only one of the elements establishes a AGREE / MOVE (=IM) dependency with v^* . We phrase the solution in terms of Chomsky's (2013, 2015) Labeling Theory (LT), which we adjust to exclude exocentric {XP,YP} structures. The connection between the constraints on V-Subj-DO and multiple object construction is not new (cf. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2007): what *is* new is the connection between the behavior of IO and Subj in V-[IO-DO] and V-[Subj-DO] respectively, which we attribute to the possibility to generate V-DO-Subj through object shift (Ordóñez 1998, Gallego 2013).

2. THE PROBLEM: It has been reported that V-Subj-DO sentences are restricted in Romance (Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2001; 2007, and references therein), and it seems that the languages allowing V-Subj-DO are those that generate V-DO-Subj through "object shift" (Ordóñez 1998, Gallego 2013), as binding effects indicate:

- (1) Recogió cada coche su propietaria (2) Recogió la alumna su coche (Spanish)
picked-up every car its owner picked-up the student her car
'Its owner picked up each car' 'The student picked up her car'

Similarly, both V-DO-IO and V-IO-DO sentences have been shown to be subject to non-trivial constraints, regulated by phenomena like DOM, clitic doubling, NP heaviness, or the strong pronoun status of the relevant arguments (Anagnostopoulou 2003, Lopez 2012, Ormazabal & Romero 2007). Just like V-Subj-DO, V-IO-DO is degraded in Catalan, Italian, and French (only allowed under conditions like NP heaviness; Fournier 2010, Beavers & Nishida 2010, Blears 2003):

- (3) */?Vaig recomanar a la Maria els teus estudiants (Catalan)
AUX-1.sg recommend to the Maria the your students
'I recommended your students to Maria'
(4) ??Ho raccomandato a Giovanni il mio amico (Italian)
have-1.sg recommend to Giovanni the your friend
'I recommended my friend to Giovanni'
(5) */?J'ai recommandé à Pierre Jean (French)
I-1.sg recommended to Pierre Jean
'I recommended Jean to Pierre'

The same deviance is NOT found in Spanish and Romanian:

- (6) He recomendado a María a tus estudiantes (Spanish)
have-1.sg recommended to Maria the your students
'Have recommended your students to Maria'
(7) I l-am recomandat Mariei pe Ion (Romanian)
i-cl.DAT I-cl.ACC recommended Mary-DAT ACC John
'I recommended John to Mary'

It is well-known that having a 'too crowded' VP is problematic, but the specific *connection between IO and Subjects* (would-be "specifiers" in X-bar terms) has not been established so far. Making such correlation makes sense if we consider the similarities between those dependents: IOs and Subjects can be doubled (in the case of subjects, by verb agreement), IO and Subject doubling is compatible with negative quantifiers, IOs and Subjects are typically analyzed as specifiers of sorts, IO and Subjects display island effects, IOs and Subjects fail to affect the lexical aspect of verbs, IOs and Subjects occupy the first position in clitic clusters with DOs, and so

CONSTRAINTS ON V-IO-DO AND V-S-DO IN ROMANCE IOs AS "VP
SUBJECTS": A LABELING THEORY APPROACH

on. Given these empirical correlations, trying to establish a correlation between V-[IO-DO] and V-[**Subj**-DO] makes sense.

3. (SOME) SOLUTIONS SO FAR: We don't know of accounts tackling the symmetry between V-IO-S and V-Subj-DO, but we do know of proposals that try to explain the problems that V-DO-IO / V-IO-DO pose. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou (2007) propose a *Multiple Case Condition* (MCC), which states that VP cannot contain more than one argument with an undeleted Case feature. The MCC is interestingly compatible with Ormazabal & Romero's (2007) *Object Agreement Constraint* (OAC), which amounts to saying that v* can only establish one AGREE dependency. Although (8) might indeed tackle both MOCs and V-Subj-DO, we ultimately believe the problem is not entirely Case-dependent. If it were, it is not clear why, say, V-Subj-DO is ruled out in Catalan, whereas V-Subj-IO is okay, as (8) shows:

- (8) Es van lliurar els treballs a les professores (Catalan)
 SE AUX-3.pl deliver the works to the teachers
 'The works were delivered to the teachers'

What an example like (8) reveals, if nothing else, is that the problem is not about licensing the subject in a [V --- Object] context. This is the reason why we would like to pursue an alternative analysis.

4. AN ALTERNATIVE: The intuition behind all the proposals we just referred to is that, in {H, {XP, YP}} configurations, only XP or YP must engage in a syntactic dependency of the AGREE or IM with H (the Probe, Case assigner, etc.). Our proposal aligns with that intuition (which we take to be correct), but capitalizes on the problems shared by V-Subj-DO and V-IO-DO, and the DOM-deploying nature of this languages in which V-IO-DO is not degraded: Spanish and Romanian. If we are correct, it is the special v*-DO dependency that rescues the relevant structures by making use of an AGREE dependency that can manifest itself as a clitic (or not; cf. Ordóñez & Roca 2019) that allows the IO to be sandwiched between V and DO. Since such a dependency is not present in other Romance languages, we expect V-IO-DO to be ruled out. To be specific, we start with the, rather conventional, base configuration in (9). From (9), DOM triggers AGREE (v*, DO), followed by "object shift" (pied-piping) to Spec-v*, and then the IO is also raised to an outer Spec-v*, as we see in (11), largely for semantic/pragmatic issues (so that DO becomes the narrow focus).

- (9) [Subj v* [IO [V DO]] (10) [IO [DO [t_{Subj} v* [t_{IO} [V t_{DO}]]]]]

In (10), IO and DO are in the same domain (the v*P edge), which should create a problem, for reasons discussed in Moro (2008) and Chomsky (2013, 2015). Following Epstein et al. (2016), we assume that IM (DO, v*) gives rise to a countercyclic H-XP dependency that creates a doubly picked structure that forces the application of Transfer. With Uriagereka (1999) and Obata (2010), we further assume that Transfer removes material (in particular, both DO and VP, given the double pick) from the syntactic workspace, so that only v and the IO (and, higher up, the Subject) are left, as indicated in (11):

- (11) [IO [t_{Subj} [v* DO] [t_{IO} [V t_{DO}]]]] (before T) → [IO v*] (after T)

5. ADVANTAGES, PREDICTIONS: Our proposal has both empirical and theoretical consequences. On the empirical side, if our account is on track, we expect for V-IO-DO to be licensed if some process removes DO or OI of the VP. We have claimed that Spanish and Romanian, due to their DOM-licensing nature, remove the DO by Transfer. What if the relevant language does not have such a device? We argue that it should resort to processes like clitic right/left topicalization or emarginazione. On the theoretical side, our proposal assumes that there are no exocentric {XP, YP} structures (*pace* Chomsky 2013, 2015). Therefore, what seem to be specifiers are actually countercyclic complements, giving rise to a multiple (double picked) configuration, an option barred by X-bar Theory. The proposal could be carried over to multiple wh-movement, if only one element is Q-attracted (all others are focus-attracted; Bošković 1999). Multiple topicalization is not relevant, which follows from Ott's (2014) multiclausal (+ellipsis) analysis.

CONSTRAINTS ON V-IO-DO AND V-S-DO IN ROMANCE IOs AS "VP SUBJECTS": A LABELING THEORY APPROACH

5. CONCLUSION: This paper has offered an analysis of V-IO-DO sequences, which we have compared to V-Subj-DO, assuming that both Subj and IOs are “subjects” in the relevant, Spec-based, sense. We have put forward an account that capitalizes on the possibility for certain languages to deploy DOM (thus IM (DO,v*)) and give rise to a countercyclic configuration that triggers Transfer and ends up giving an endocentric {v*,IO} configuration.

REFERENCES (SEL.): **Anagnostopoulou, E. 2003.** Strong and weak person restrictions. A feature checking analysis. In Lorie Heggie & Francisco Ordóñez (eds.), *Clitic and affix combinations: Theoretical perspectives*, 199–235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **Alexiadou, A., and E. Anagnostopoulou. 2007.** The subject-in-situ generalization revisited. In *Interfaces + recursion = language? Chomsky’s minimalism and the view from syntax-semantics*, eds. Uli Sauerland and Hans-Martin Gärtner, 31–59. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. **Bleam, T. 2003.** Properties of double object construction in Spanish. In Rafael Núñez-Cedeño, Luis López & Richard Cameron (eds.), *A Romance perspective on language knowledge and use: Selected papers from the 31st Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL)*, 233–252. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **Bošković, Ž. 1999.** “On multiple feature-checking: Multiple wh-fronting and multiple head-movement”. In *Working Minimalism*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press. **Chomsky, N. 2013.** Problems of Projection. *Lingua*. 130. 33–49. **2015.** Problems of Projection: Extensions. In E. Di Domenico, C. Hamann & S. Matteini (eds.), *Structures, Strategies and Beyond*, 1-16. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **Epstein, S.D., H. Kitahara & T.D. Seely. 2016.** Phase Cancellation by External Pair-Merge of Heads. *The Linguistic Review* 33: 87-102. **Fournier, D. 2010.** La structure du prédicat verbal: Une étude de la construction à double objet en français. University of Toronto. (Doctoral dissertation). **Gallego, Á.J. 2013.** Object shift in Romance. *Nat Lang Linguist Theory* 31, 409–45. **Moro A. 2008.** *The Boundaries of Babel*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. **López, L. 2012.** Indefinite objects. Scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. **Obata, M. 2010.** Root, Successive-Cyclic and Feature-Splitting Internal Merge: Implications for Feature-Inheritance and Transfer. PhD dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. **Ormazábal, J. & J. Romero. 2013.** Object clitics, agreement and dialectal variation. *Probus* 25. 301–344. **Ordóñez, F. 1998.** Post-verbal asymmetries in Spanish. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 16. 313–346. **2007.** Cartography of postverbal subjects in Spanish and Catalan. In Sergio Baauw, Frank AC Drijkoningen & Manuela Pinto (eds.), *Romance languages and Morpho-syntactic Variation in Romance v 435 linguistic theory 2005: Selected papers from ‘Going Romance’, Utrecht, 8–10 December 2005*, 259–280. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **Ordóñez, F. & Francesc R. 2015.** Differential Object Marking (DOM) and clitic subspecification in Catalanian Spanish. Ms. Stony Brook University/Universitat de Girona. [final version in Gallego 2019]. **Ott, D. 2014.** An Ellipsis Approach to Contrastive Left-dislocation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 45: 269-303. **Uriagereka, J. 1999.** Multiple Spell-Out. In S. Epstein & N. Hornstein (eds.), *Working Minimalism*, 251-282. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.