

# O DESENVOLVIMENTO DA MARCAÇÃO DIFERENCIAL DE PRONOMES NO PORTUGUÊS E SUA RELAÇÃO COM AS ESCALAS HIERÁRQUICAS

Aline Jéssica Pires (Universidade Estadual de Campinas)

**Palavras-chave:** Marcação Diferencial de Objeto, Pronome Pleno, Preposição A, Português antigo.

## Resumo:

A Marcação Diferencial de Objeto (MDO) consiste na marcação morfológica do objeto direto; no português, o fenômeno ocorre pelo uso da preposição A diante do objeto direto (Pires 2020) (ver 1.). Nos estudos sobre o tema, comumente, as escalas hierárquicas da animacidade (humano>animado>inanimado) e da definitude (1p>2p>3p>nome próprio>DP definido>DP não-específico) são utilizadas para descrever o fenômeno em diferentes línguas (Aissen 2003, entre outros). Ainda de acordo com essas escalas, o primeiro estágio de desenvolvimento da MDO seriam pronomes de 1p e 2p e posteriormente a 3p seria marcada. Entretanto, dados do catalão e romeno antigos violam a previsão das escalas, pois os casos de MDO com 3p são mais frequentes que os de 1p e 2p (Irimia e Pineda 2019). As formas pronominais podem ser distinguidas pelo traço [pessoa] que indica animacidade: enquanto a 3p é [-pessoa], 1p e 2p são [+pessoa] (Cyrino 2018). Considerando a violação encontrada em outras línguas românicas, este trabalho investiga, no português dos séculos XVI ao XIX, as ocorrências da MDO com pronomes plenos, assim como a adequação de escalas hierárquicas para a descrição dessas ocorrências. Para a análise, foram coletados dados do Corpus Histórico do Português Tycho Brahe (Galves, Andrade e Faria 2017) e do Corpus Post Scriptum (CLUL 2014). Os estudos anteriores sobre essa violação não distinguiram os casos de MDO (ver 2.) dos de redobro de clítico (ver 3.), fenômeno em que um clítico coocorre com um pronome pleno em posição de argumento e forma um constituinte descontínuo. Esses fenômenos não são comumente distinguidos, pois o redobro é classificado como um subgrupo da MDO, já que, nas línguas românicas, é requerido que o clítico coocorra com um objeto preposicionado (Leonetti 2008). Os dados analisados neste trabalho revelaram que, para o português, a separação dos casos de redobro de clítico dos de MDO é relevante, pois há resultados diferentes quando são excluídos os casos de redobro. Em um cenário em que MDO e redobro de clítico são contabilizados juntos, 1p e reflexivos são os mais frequentemente marcados nos séculos XVII (36% e 25%, respectivamente) e XVIII (28% e 47%, respectivamente); no século XVI, há mais casos de 3p (38%), enquanto no XIX há apenas um caso de reflexivo marcado e os pronomes de 1p são os mais frequentemente marcados (43%). Já no cenário em que são analisados apenas casos de MDO e são excluídos os de redobro, nos séculos XVI ao XVIII, há a diminuição dos casos de 1p e de reflexivos, assim como o aumento dos de 3p; no século XIX, foram encontrados apenas dois casos de pronomes plenos marcados, um de 1p e o outro de 3p. A 2p, por sua vez, em nenhum século dos dois cenários, foi a mais frequentemente marcada. A separação dos casos dos dois fenômenos revelou que 1p e 2p, que ocupam as posições mais altas das escalas, ocorrem majoritariamente com redobro e não com MDO, o que pode indicar que em estágios anteriores a MDO estava vinculada à animacidade de objetos que não tinham este traço pressuposto. Desse modo, marcar 1p e 2p seria redundante, pois nessas formas pronominais a animacidade já está pressuposta, o que não se verifica na 3p, por isso a necessidade da MDO nesse contexto para indicar animacidade.

1. a. Os religiosos amam a Deus. b. A mulher agradeceu (a)o médico.
2. a. [O Arcebispo aconselhava que os prelados] curassem primeiro a si mesmos (Séc. XVI). b. Estes dois Capitães [...] o inquietavam, e excitavam a ele (Séc. XVII).
3. a. isto consola-me a mim (Séc. XVIII). b. se te eu cheiro a ti, flor (Séc. XIX).

**Referências:**

- Aissen, Judith. 2003. “Differential object marking: Iconicity vs. economy.” *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 21, no. 3: 435-483.
- CLUL. 2014. *P.S. Post Scriptum. Arquivo Digital de Escrita Quotidiana em Portugal e Espanha na Época Moderna*. <http://ps.clul.ul.pt>.
- Cyrino, Sonia. 2018. “Animacidade na sintaxe: uma abordagem formal.” *Revista da Anpoll* 1, no. 46: 222-238.
- Galves, Charlotte, Aroldo Leal de Andrade e Pablo Faria. 2017. *Tycho Brahe Parsed Corpus of Historical Portuguese*. <http://www.tycho.iel.unicamp.br/~tycho/corpus/texts/psd.zip>.
- Irimia, Monica Alexandrina e Anna Pineda. 2019. “Differential object marking and Scales: Insights from diachrony.” *Proceedings of the Linguistic Society of America* 4, no. 1: 1-15.
- Leonetti, Manuel. 2008. “Specificity in clitic doubling and in differential object marking.” *Probus* 20, no. 1: 33-66.
- Pires, Aline Jéssica. 2020. “A influência da gramática espanhola na Marcação Diferencial de Objeto no português diacrônico.” *Cadernos De Linguística* 1, no. 2: 01-20. <https://doi.org/10.25189/2675-4916.2020.v1.n2.id168>.

## WORD ORDER AND INFORMATION STRUCTURE IN ‘WHY’-INTERROGATIVES IN ROMANCE LANGUAGES

Svenja Schmid, Anja Weingart, Carmen Widera, Georg A. Kaiser (Universität Konstanz)

**Key words:** Word order, information structure, ‘why’-interrogatives

**Abstract:**

In this paper, we want to present a case study on word order in ‘why’-interrogatives in Romance languages, investigating the effect of information structure on word order. All Romance languages, with the exception of colloquial French and Brazilian Portuguese, generally require VS order in *wh*-interrogatives (see (1)-(3)) (Calabrese 1982, Torrego 1984, Mioto & Lobo 2016). However, in interrogatives introduced by ‘why’, most Romance languages also allow SV order (see (4)-(5) for Italian and Spanish) (Rizzi 2001, Suñer 1994). The aim of the study is to investigate language-internal as well as cross-linguistic factors of word order variation in these constructions.

To this end, we conducted two empirical studies on Italian and Spanish. In a study of parallel corpora (based on contemporary translations of the Bible and Sherlock Holmes detective novels), we compared the frequency of the patterns ‘why’SV and ‘why’VS, as well as the distribution of subjects marked by [ $\pm$ Focus] (Krifka 2008) and [ $\pm$ Given] (Heidinger 2018) in the two languages. Due to the small number of subjects marked by [+Focus] and [-Given], we conducted a forced-choice study in order to gain a deeper understanding of the impact of the information structural categories focus ([+Foc] vs. [-Foc]) and givenness ([+Given] vs. [-Given]) on word order in ‘why’-interrogatives. Both studies reveal a clear difference between the two languages: while Italian clearly prefers SV order, the opposite is observed in Spanish, where VS order is clearly preferred (see Table 1). Furthermore, the results of the forced-choice experiment indicate that focus has an impact on word order in Italian ‘why’-interrogatives, whereas in Spanish, word order is not determined by any information structural category. We show that ‘why’-interrogatives in Italian and Spanish differ in two ways. First, non-focal subjects occur in preverbal position in Italian, while they occupy the postverbal position in Spanish. Second, Italian exhibits a lower degree of optionality with respect to word order patterns. We assume that this limitation is related to a higher number of word order constraints in Italian with respect to postverbal subjects. This difference between Italian and Spanish is especially apparent in constructions with transitive verbs. While Spanish allows both word order patterns VSO and VOS, Italian lacks VSO. Belletti (2004) provides two possible explanations for this difference. First, Spanish has either a further subject position located higher in the structure than postverbal subjects in Italian, or it exhibits an additional option for case marking which does not exist in Italian.

Given these results, we conducted a study on European Portuguese based on the same translations of the Bible and Sherlock Holmes. The first results for the Bible translations prove not only the existence of SV order, but also show that VS order is significantly more frequent in ‘why’-interrogatives (see Table 2). This suggests that European Portuguese behaves similarly to Spanish in the sense that unfocused subjects occur in a postverbal position in ‘why’-interrogatives.

### Examples:

- |     |    |                              |     |     |                               |
|-----|----|------------------------------|-----|-----|-------------------------------|
| (1) | a. | Che cosa ha letto Maria?     | (2) | a.  | <i>¿Qué</i> ha leído María?   |
|     | b. | *Che cosa Maria ha letto?    |     | b.' | * <i>¿Qué</i> María ha leído? |
| (3) | a. | O que leu Maria?             | (4) | a.  | Perché balla Maria?           |
|     | b. | *O que Maria leu?            |     | b.  | Perché María balla?           |
| (5) | a. | <i>¿Por qué</i> baila Maria? |     |     |                               |
|     | b. | <i>¿Por qué</i> María baila? |     |     |                               |

	‘why’(x)VS	‘why’(x)SV	total
Italian ( <i>perché</i> )	18 21.7%	65 78.3%	83 100%
Spanish ( <i>por qué</i> )	92 78.6%	25 21.4%	117 100%

Table 1: Word order ‘why’VS and ‘why’SV in the Bible and Sherlock Holmes corpus .

	‘why’(x)VS	‘why’(x)SV	total
European Portuguese ( <i>por que</i> )	44 88%	6 12%	50 100%

Table 2: Word order ‘por que’VS and ‘por que’SV in the Bible corpus.

### References:

- Belletti, A. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In: L. Rizzi (ed.). *The Structure of CP and IP. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures*. Volume 2. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 16-51.
- Calabrese, Andrea. 1998. "Some remarks on the Latin case system and its development in Romance." In *Theoretical Analyses on Romance Languages. Selected Papers from the 26th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL XXVI)*, Mexico City, 28-30 March 1996., edited by J. Lema and E. Treviño, 71-126. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Heidinger, Steffen. 2018. *Sekundäre Prädikation und Informationsstruktur. Fokus und Informationsstatus bei spanischen Depiktiven*. Berlin: Peter Lang.
- Krifka, Manfred. 2008. "Basic notions of information structure." *Acta Linguistica Hungarica* 55: 243-276.
- Mioto, Carlos, and Maria Lobo. 2016. "Wh-movement: interrogatives, relatives and clefts." In *The Handbook of Portuguese Linguistics*, edited by W.L. Wetzel, J. Costa and S. Menuzzi, 275-293. Chichester: Wiley & Sons.

- Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. "On the position 'Int(errogative)' in the left periphery of the clause." In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax*. Essays offered to Lorenzo Renzi, edited by G. Cinque and G. Salvi, 287-296. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Suñer, Margarita. 1994. "V-movement and the licensing of argumental wh-phrases in Spanish." *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 12: 335-372.
- Torrego, Esther. 1984. "On inversion in Spanish and some of its effects." *Linguistic Inquiry* 115: 103-129.

## WHEN HISTORY EXPLAINS TODAY'S COMPLEX PATTERNS: RUSSIAN NULL SUBJECTS WITH INDIVIDUAL REFERENCE

Nerea Madariaga (University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU)

*Key words:* Modern Russian, Old Russian, Referential Null Subjects, Null Topics, adaptive reanalysis.

*Abstract:* Referential Null Subjects (RNS) in Modern Russian are highly restricted while, at the same time, display different patterns, as compared to so-called consistent NS-languages. I will show here that a mixed synchronic – diachronic account is the most adequate type of account for the complex distribution of RNSs in Modern Russian.

Modern Russian, a partial NS-language, displays heterogeneous patterns of RNSs. A NS, i.e. a minimal  $\phi P$  (Holmberg 2005, Roberts & Holmberg 2010), matches its unvalued  $\phi$ -features with a finite T, but still needs to get a referential index in order to be correctly interpreted. Given that T lacks an unvalued D-feature (Holmberg et al 2009), and the language lacks V-to-T movement (Bailyn 2012), this referential index can only be transmitted by D-linking in one of the following configurations:

- a) familiar/given topical subjects, whenever a logophoric/situational/contextual Edge-topic feature is easily accessible at C (following Sigurðsson's 2011, Tsedryk 2015); example (1).
- b) root NSs in a topic chain, licensed by a null operator in the C-layer, which shares its features, including the referential index, with every link of the chain (following Holmberg et al 2009, Frascarelli 2018); example (2). Unlike familiar topics, a topic chain must be headed by an overt (sentential) topic, acting as an antecedent for subsequent NSs, with no other D-equipped element mediating between them.
- c) embedded coreferent NSs, bound by a c-commanding antecedent, in similar conditions in finite and non-finite contexts (following Livitz 2014, Landau 2015); example (3).

Old Russian, a consistent NS-language, displayed a homogeneous pattern of subject drop. NSs were regularly licensed in the domain of a T whose unvalued D-feature was valued by a null Topic at [Spec,CP], while focused or contrastive subjects had to be realized as overt. In regular conditions, every non-emphatic subject had to be dropped as far as it could be interpreted as any kind of topic (Eckhoff & Meyer 2011); example (4). In Old Russian, T was endowed with an unvalued D-feature, and the inflected V-T, from its high position in the structure, “mediated” in referential index transmission from a null Topic / operator at CP to the  $\phi P$  (NS), at the same time as T valued its own D-feature.

Thus, Russian RNSs transited from a homogeneous pattern of RNS licensing into a three-part distribution, as represented in table (5). The various patterns available in Modern Russian follow straightforwardly from the loss of consistent pro-drop in the language, described by Meyer (2011). I argue that, after Russian lost V-to-T movement, T became unable to mediate in copying the D-feature that referential NSs needed from the element sitting at CP (i.e. T was reanalysed as lacking an unvalued D-feature). This new configuration forced pronominal referential subjects to be realized overtly.

However, NSs with an individual reference were still available in the learners' linguistic input because (i) change spreads through communities of speakers in a progressive way, and (ii) infinitive clauses still produced “referential” gaps in the place of subjects in infinitive clauses (PRO). I will show that NSs in Modern Russian arose by adaptive reanalysis of residual NSs inherited from the previous system:

- a) NSs in root contexts were reinterpreted either as familiar/given topics (1) or as successive instances of a sentential topic (2), whenever their reference could be linked directly to the right topic feature;
- b) NSs in embedded contexts (finite and non-finite) were subsumed under PRO's “control” requirements, most importantly, the need of a local c-command antecedent (3), extending the Old Russian instances of control, which had been so far available only in a few infinitive constructions.

Today's Russian RNSs can be viewed as “survivors” that adapted to new linguistic conditions in the best way they could, resulting in heterogeneous, albeit restricted patterns, as compared to older stages of the language.

## Examples and tables

- (1) Privet! Xorošo, čto (vy) prišli! (example of a logophoric topic)  
 hi well that you.NOM came.PL  
 ‘Hi! So good that you came!’
- (2) Ja<sub>i</sub> tol’ko čto videl Svetu<sub>j</sub>. (*Ona<sub>j</sub>*) skazala mne<sub>i</sub>, čto naš  
 I just saw Sveta.ACC she.NOM said.F me.DAT that our  
 dom uže prodan. (From Tsedryk 2015)  
 house already sold  
 ‘I’ve just seen Sveta. (She) told me that our house had already been sold.’
- (3) Vrači skazal, čto e<sub>i</sub> primet bol’nyx<sub>j</sub>.  
 doctor said that will see.M sick people.ACC  
 ‘The doctor said that he will receive the patients.’
- (4) I viděvše že Grěcě ubojašaja (...). I ustavi Olegъj  
 and seeing part Greeks feared and stopped.3SG Oleg.NOM  
 boik. I e<sub>i</sub> vynesoša emu<sub>j</sub> brašna i vino<sub>m</sub> i  
 soldiers and brought.3PL him food and wine and  
 e<sub>j</sub> ne prija ego<sub>m</sub>, e<sub>m</sub> bě bo ustroeno s otovoju.  
 not took.3SG it was part prepared with poison  
 ‘When they saw that, the Greeks became afraid (and asked Oleg to stop the war). Oleg stopped his soldiers. And [the Greeks] brought him food and wine, and [Oleg] did not drink it, because [the wine] was poisoned.’ [Laur. Chr., 15]

Old Russian	>	Modern Russian
[CP Topic <sub>i</sub> C [TP φP <sub>i</sub> T <sub>D<sub>i</sub></sub> [VP V...]]]		[CP Op <sub>[+edge]</sub> C [TP φP <sub>i</sub> T...]]] (G-Topics, logophorics)
		[DP <sub>i</sub> ... [ShiftP Op <sub>[+aboutness]</sub> [TP φP <sub>i</sub> T...]]]] (topic chains)
		[DP <sub>i</sub> ... [CP Op <sub>i</sub> C [TP φP <sub>i</sub> T...]]]] (embedded RNSs)

## References

- Bailyn, John. 2012. *The Syntax of Russian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Frascarelli, Mara. 2018. The interpretation of pro in consistent and partial null subject languages: A comparative interface analysis. In J. Casalicchio & F. Cognola (eds.), *Null Subjects in Generative Grammar. A synchronic and diachronic perspective*, 211–239. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Holmberg, Anders. 2005. Is there a little pro? Evidence from Finnish. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36. 533–564.
- Holmberg, Anders, Aarti Nayudu & Michelle Sheehan. 2009. Three partial null-subject languages: a comparison of Brazilian Portuguese, Finnish and Marathi. *Studia Linguistica* 63. 59–97.
- Landau, Idan. 2015. *A Two-Tiered Theory of Control*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Livitz, Inna. 2014. Deriving silence through internal reference: focus on pronouns. PhD diss. NYU.
- Meyer, Roland. 2011. *The history of Null Subjects in East Slavonic. A corpus based diachronic investigation*. Habilitation Thesis, University of Regensburg.
- Roberts, Ian & Anders Holmberg. 2010. Introduction: Parameters in Minimalist Theory. In T. Biberauer, A. Holmberg, M. Sheehan & I. Roberts, *Parametric Variation. Null Subjects in Minimalist Theory*, 1–57. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sigurðsson, Ármann Halldór. 2011. Conditions on argument pro-drop. *Linguistic Inquiry* 42. 267–304.
- Tsedryk, Egor. 2015. Deriving null pronouns: A unified analysis of subject drop in Russian. In M. Szajbel-Keck, R. Burns & D. Kavitskaya (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 23: The first Berkeley meeting*, 342–361. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications.