CONSTRAINTS ON V-IO-DO AND V-S-DO IN ROMANCE AND GREEK

1. PROPOSAL: We claim that the limited availability of 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 Richard's (2010) Distinctness, and Torrego's (2002) P/D functional projection which we adjust to exclude {α, α} 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 (c.f. Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2001; 2007), and it seems that the languages allowing V-Subj-DO are those that generate V-DO-Subj through "object shift" (Ordóñez 1998, Gallego 2013). 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, Bleam 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, Romanian and Greek:

(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 l-cl.ACC recommended   Mary-DAT   ACC   John
         'I recommended John to Mary'

(8) (a) Sistisa   sti   Maria   ton   Yani.   (Greek)
         recommended-1.sg   to-the-ACC Maria-ACC the-ACC John-ACC
     (b) Sistisa   tis   Marias   ton   Yani.
         recommended-1.sg   the-GEN   Maria   the-ACC   John-ACC
         '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 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 (2001, 2007) put forth their Subject in-situ Generalization (SisG), claiming that vP can contain no more than one argument with an unchecked Case feature. Similarly, Baker & Collins's (2006) *Multiple Case Condition* (MCC), 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 (9) 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 (9) shows:

(9) 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 (9) 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 Clitic doubling-deploying nature of these languages in which V-IO-DO is not degraded: Spanish, Romanian, and Greek. What we are suggesting is that D/P provides a way to undo/break the <α, α> configuration (or not; cf. Torrego 2002) that allows the IO to be sandwiched between V and DO. To be specific, we start with the, rather conventional configurations in (10) for Italian and Catalan and (11) for Spanish, Romanian and Greek. We assume that V-DO-IO (which is not problematic) requires VP fronting or object shift. In this case though, V-IO-DO is ruled out because the VP must move. In the case of Spanish, Romanian and Greek, object shift is optional, thanks to Torrego's (2002) D/P.

(10) [Subj v* [IO   [V DO]]]   (11) [Subj v* [IO [D/P [V DO]]]]

Assuming that both IO and DO are DPs as in (12) and (13) we believe an account in terms of Richards' (2010) Distinctness is more promising. D/P provides a way to break the symmetry between Subj and DO after verb movement.

(12) [DP_{Subj} v* [DP_{IO} [V DP_{Obj}]]]   (13) [DP_{Subj} v* [DP_{IO} [D/P [V DP_{Obj}]]]]

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 in the presence of an extra functional projection. We have claimed that Spanish,

Romanian, and Greek due to Clitic Doubling-licensing, do have this projection for "distinctness" reason. What if the relevant language shows "distinctness" effects? As discussed by Romero (2019), Spanish rejects (14):

(14) *Envié al   niño al   médico (Spanish)
      sent   DOM-the boy to-the doctor
      'I sent the kid to the doctor'

We argue that either DOM goes away or the key solution is found in the presence of a dative clitic that is inserted.

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 that languages allowing both sentences are similar in having the projection Torrego (2002) argued for.

REFERENCES: Alexiadou, A., & Anagnostopoulou, E. 2001. The subject-in-situ generalization and the role of case in driving computations. Linguistic inquiry, 32(2), 193-231. **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. **Anagnostopoulou, E. 2003**. Strong and weak person restrictions. A feature checking analysis. In clitic and afx combinations: Theoretical Perspectives, L. Heggie & F. Ordóñez (eds.), 199– 235. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **Baker, M., & C. Collins. 2006.** Linkers and the Internal Structure of vP. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. 24. **Beavers, J., & Nishida, C. 2010.** The Spanish dative alternation revisited. **Belletti, A. 2001.** 'Inversion' as focalization. In Subject inversion in Romance and the theory of universal grammar, eds. Aafke Hulk and Jean-Yves Pollock, 60–90. Oxford: Oxford University Press. **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. **Fournier, D. 2010.** La structure du prédicat verbal: Une étude de la construction à double objet en français. Université de Toronto. (Doctoral dissertation). **Gallego, Á.J. 2013.** Object shift in Romance. Nat Lang Linguist Theory 31, 409–45. **López, L. 2012.** Indefinite objects. Scrambling, choice functions, and differential marking. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. **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. **Ormazabal, J. & J. Romero, 2007.** The Object Agreement Constraint. Natural Language and Linguistic Theory. 25. 315-347. **2013.** Object clitics, agreement and dialectal variation. Probus 25. 301–344. **Richards, N. 2010.** Uttering trees (Vol. 56). Cambridge MA: MIT Press. **Torrego, E. 2002.** Aspect in the prepositional system of Romance.