

Subextraction through doubled datives and beyond

1. The intriguing problem: On the basis of new empirical evidence, Jiménez-Fernández (2016) has challenged the accepted consensus that subextraction from Differential Object Marking (DOM) (1) and argument dative objects (2) in Spanish yields ungrammatical results (Torrego 1998, Gallego & Uriagereka 2007, Ordóñez & Roca in press, among others). As the grammaticality in sentence in (1) and (2) shows, there are good reasons to call such a consensus into question:

- (1) ¿De qué edificio han aterrorizado [a algunos vecinos t] con amenazas?
of what building have.they scared to some neighbors with threats
'Of what building do you say they have scared some neighbors with threats?'
(2) ¿De qué curso les entregaron los exámenes [a varios estudiantes t]?
of what year him.dat gave.they the exams to several students
'Of what year did they give the exams to several students?'

The puzzle then involves accounting for the sharp contrast between (1-2) and examples such as (3-4), where extraction from DOM-/dative-marked objects is clearly banned:

- (3) *¿[CP De quién_i has visitado [a muchos amigos t_i]]?
of whom have.you visited to many friends
'Who have you visited many friends of?'
(4) *¿[CP De quién_i le diste los libros [a los padres t_i]]?
of whom him.dat gave.you the books to the parents
'Who did you give the books to the parents of?'
[Ordóñez & Roca (in press, ex. 77b); Gallego & Uriagereka (2007)]

The puzzle is even more intriguing when the role of the dative clitic is taken into account. Specifically, if the clitic is absent, the output of subextraction is much worse, as illustrated in (5) in contrast with (6) where the clitic is present, which is acceptable:

- (5) *¿De qué curso dijiste que entregaron los exámenes [a varios estudiantes t]?
of what year you.said that gave.they the exams to several students
(6) ¿De qué curso dijiste que les entregaron los exámenes [a varios estudiantes t]?
of what year you.said that cl gave.they the exams to several students
'Of what year did you say they gave the exams to several students?'

2. The analysis: The contrast between (1-2) and (3-4) runs against assimilating doubled dative (alongside DOM) objects with PPs, which are always islands for extraction. For this reason, Jiménez-Fernández (2016) assumes a K(ase)P analysis for DOM and doubled dative objects in line with Zdrojewski (2008), López (2012) and Ormazabal & Romero (2013), among others. If KP, as opposed to PPs, are transparent for extraction, sentences like (1-2) are accounted for since KP is endowed with an Edge Feature which permits movement across KP.

The question remains as to how to account for the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (3). Following Haegeman *et al*'s (2014) approach to the Subject Condition, Jiménez-Fernández proposes that island effects in objects introduced by *a* in Spanish are multifactorial. Among the several conditions that affect the possibility of subextraction the following ones are especially relevant to explain the opposition in (1-2) and (3-4):

- (7) a. the *Freezing Principle* (A moved constituent is frozen for extraction)
b. the *Specificity Condition* (Specific nominals are opaque domains for extraction)
c. the *D-linking Condition* (Extraction is ameliorated when the extractee is D-linked).

Thus, in the sentences in (1-2), unlike (3-4), both the properties of the extractee and the properties of the DOM/dative object makes extraction possible.

The opposition between KP and PP can also account for the mitigation of island effects in doubled dative constructions. In current research on the structure of DPs in Dative Clitic Constructions, there has been an explosion of proposals suggesting that the preposition *a* present in

both accusative and dative objects is not a true P in Spanish, but a morphological marker (Demonte 1995; Cuervo 2003; Ormazabal & Romero 2013; Pineda 2013, a.o.). In a different line, Ordóñez (1998), Ordóñez & Roca (in press), this *a* is a real preposition probing for a goal in the syntax. Assuming Riemsdijk's (1978 and subseq. work) distinction between lexical and functional prepositions, we claim that, as far as doubled dative constructions is concerned, when the clitic is present the *a*-DP is a KP but when the clitic is absent the *a*-DP is a PP. If this proposal is correct, we predict that doubled dative *a*-DPs are transparent, whereas non-doubled *a*-DPs are opaque as any other lexical PP. The prediction is borne out in light of data in (5-6). With the clitic the *a*-DP *a varios estudiantes* is a KP and hence subextraction is allowed (as long as other violations are avoided). On the other hand, the *a*-DP in the non-clitic version is a PP, and as such induces island effects (Boeckx 2003).

Two crucial consequences follow from this approach to subextraction, namely, (i) doubled argument datives are not PPs, and (ii) datives are not necessarily *ex situ* constituents (or, at least, datives do not necessarily move to frozen positions; see Chomsky 2008), contra Demonte (1995), Cuervo (2003), Rodríguez-Mondoñedo (2007), Zdrojewski (2008), a.o.).

3. The reverse of the puzzle: Rioplatense Spanish has some particular properties that make it ideal for testing the multifactorial approach to subextraction from DOM objects. Specifically, this variety has an extended accusative doubling system. Both third person indefinite and definite lexical DPs can be doubled by an accusative clitic (Suñer 1988, Zdrojewski 2008, Di Tullio & Zdrojewski among many others). Let's focus only on indefinite doubling:

- (8) *Juan (los) vio a tres vecinos míos.* Indefinite doubling
 J. (CL.acc) saw to three neighbors mine
 'Juan saw three neighbors of mine.'

Subextraction from doubled indefinite DOM DPs is clearly disfavored unlike what we have observed with doubled datives ((9) involves wh-movement; (10) instantiates focus fronting):

- (9) *¿De qué división (*?los) desaprobaron a tres estudiantes?*
 of which class (Cl.pl.acc) failed to three students
 (10) *De la división de JUAN (??los) desaprobaron a tres estudiantes.*
 of the class of J. (Cl.pl.acc) failed DOM three students

We contend that the problem vanishes if (i) all DOM objects are KPs (*pace* Ordóñez & Roca) and (ii) indefinite doubling is the surface reflex of right dislocation of the indefinite KP. If this is correct, subextraction from doubled indefinite DOMs produces a violation of Freezing, and the ungrammaticality of (9-10) is predicted by our system. In summary, Rioplatense Spanish provides new evidence for the hypothesis that there is no ban for extraction from DOM objects *per se*; islandhood is the surface reflex of independent conditions that give rise to different degrees of grammaticality effects.

Selected References: Di Tullio, Á. & P. Zdrojewski, P. 2008. Notas sobre el doblado de clíticos en el español rioplatense: asimetrías entre objetos humanos y no humanos, *Filología* XXXVIII, 13-44. Gallego, Á. & J. Uriagereka. 2007. Conditions on sub-extraction. In L. Eguren and O. Fernández-Soriano (eds.), *Coreference, Modality, and Focus*. 45–70. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. Haegeman, L., Á. L. Jiménez-Fernández & A. Radford. 2014. Deconstructing the Subject Condition in terms of cumulative constraint violation. *The Linguistic Review* 31(1): 73–150. Jiménez-Fernández, Á. 2016. Extraction from dative and accusative DPs in psych verbs: a multifactorial approach, paper delivered at II GETEGRA International Workshop: Nominals, Recife. Ordóñez, F. & F. Roca. In press. Differential Object Marking (DOM) and clitic subspecification in Catalanian Spanish. In Á. Gallego (ed.), *The Syntactic Variation of Spanish Dialects*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. Ormazabal, J. & J. Romero. 2013. Differential object marking, case and agreement, *Borealis* 2 (2): 221-239. Pineda, A. 2013. Double object constructions in Spanish (and Catalan) revisited. In S. Baauw, F. Drijkoningen, L. Meroni & M. Pinto (eds.), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 2011*. 193–216. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Riemsdijk, H.C. van. 1978. *A case study in syntactic markedness: the binding nature of prepositional phrases*. Lisse: The Peter de Ridder Press. Suñer, M. 1988. The Role of Agreement in Clitic Doubled Constructions. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 6: 391-434.