

## Dative Microvariation in Portuguese

This talk aims to describe and analyze tendencies of microvariation in dative structures with core and non-core dative verbs in five varieties of Portuguese (European, Brazilian, Santomean, Angolan, and Mozambican Portuguese) based mainly on data from spoken corpora.

Based on Rappaport-Hovav & Levin's (2008) distinction between core dative verbs and non-core dative verbs, we will show that both European and Brazilian Portuguese use ditransitive prepositional constructions (DPCs). However, while in the European Portuguese both Recipients [ $\pm$ ANIM], selected by core dative verbs, and Goals [+ANIM], selected by non-core dative verbs, are introduced by the functional preposition *a* 'to' and cliticize as dative *lhe* (1), in Brazilian Portuguese, dative objects are introduced by the non-functional preposition *para* 'to/ toward' and pronominalize as strong pronouns (2), irrespective of the verb type (cf. Torres Morais & Berlinck 2007; Torres Morais & Lima Salles 2010). African varieties, on the other hand, exhibit a range of alternative strategies. Santomean Portuguese, a young L1 variety, historically in contact with the Creole of Santome, exhibits dative alternation between double object constructions (DOCs) and DPCs with both *a* or *para* (1a; 2a vs. 3), Recipients mainly cliticize as *lhe* (3), and dative passives are not attested (Gonçalves 2016). Nativizing Angolan and Mozambican varieties, despite being both in contact with Bantu languages, exhibit different dative strategies: while Angolan Portuguese use a DPC introduced by *em* 'in', which, surprisingly, cliticizes as *lhe* (4) (e.g. Cabral 2005; Chavagne 2005), Mozambican Portuguese makes frequent use of DOCs (3), dative passives (5) and Recipients also cliticize as *lhe* (e.g. Gonçalves 1990, 2002, 2010).

It has been argued that Romance languages, in particular Spanish and Portuguese, exhibit dative alternation between DOCs and DPCs related to the presence of dative clitics (e.g. Demonte 1995 for Spanish) or to different word order patterns (Torres Morais & Lima-Salles 2010 for BP). Moreover, several recent approaches to DOCs assume that these structures project an applicative head (e.g. Pylkkänen 2002; Torres Morais & Lima-Salles 2010; Pineda 2016). We argue against the extension of this hypothesis to dative constructions in Romance languages on the following grounds. First, Pylkkänen (2002/2008) claims that low applicatives relate two arguments and involve a transfer relation, which means they always co-occur with non-stative verbs; however, in languages for which low applicatives have been proposed (English, Spanish, Portuguese), non-argument datives (i) do not always involve transfer (6a), (ii) co-occur with non-stative unaccusative verbs (6b), and (iii) co-occur with stative verbs (6c). Second, dative constructions in these languages are substantially different from applicative constructions found in Bantu languages, which do not only come in a variety of types (causative, dative, locative, etc.) but also exhibit specific verbal extensions associated to different thematic roles. The Ganda dative *-er/-ir* extension in (7a-c), for instance, introduces beneficiaries, locations and instruments. As such, these applicatives closely parallel oblique arguments in other languages (Larson 2014) and contrast with the structure of Bantu core dative verbs, in particular prototypical 'to give', which yield non-derived/applied datives (7d).

Similarly to Ormazabal & Romero (2010), we adopt a version of the classical Larsonian VP-shell analysis to derive ditransitive constructions. However, to account for the observed microvariation, we will argue that in the varieties of Portuguese, and, more generally, in Romance languages, the IO, instead of the DO, projects in [Spec,VP], whereas the DO moves to [Spec, $\nu$ P] to check Case. The dative head is spelled out as *a*, *para*, and *em* European, Santomean and Angolan Portuguese. On the other hand, in some Portuguese varieties, namely Santomean and Mozambican Portuguese, as in Germanic languages, the DO checks structural Case *in situ* and [Spec, $\nu$ P] is available for the IO, which accounts for the presence of DOCs (and dative

passives). Brazilian Portuguese differs from European and African varieties of Portuguese, since Recipients are PPs and not DPs.

### Examples

- (1) a. O João deu um livro *ao* amigo. / O João deu-*lhe* um livro.  
John gave a book to his friend. / John gave him a book.  
b. O João enviou/atirou um livro *ao* amigo. / O João enviou/atirou-*lhe* um livro.  
John send/threw a book to his friend / John send/threw him a book.
- (2) a. O João deu um livro *para* o amigo. / O João deu um livro *para* ele.  
b. O João enviou/atirou um livro *para* o amigo. / O João enviou/atirou um livro *para* ele.
- (3) O João deu *o* amigo um livro. / O João deu-*lhe* um livro.
- (4) O João deu um livro *no* amigo. / O João deu-*lhe* um livro.
- (5) O amigo foi dado um livro (pelo João).
- (6) a. Mary baked him a cake for her birthday. (Boneh & Nash 2009)  
b. Nasceram os dentes ao bebé. (Miguel, Gonçalves & Duarte 2011)  
were.born the teeth to.the baby  
c. Juan le respecta las opiniones a María. (Pujalte 2010)  
Juan cl.dat respects the opinions to María
- (7) a. a=kol-er-a *abaami babiri* (Ganda, Schadeberg 2003:74)  
3SG=work-DAT-FV masters two ‘he works for two masters’  
b. kol-er-a *wano* (ibidem)  
work-DAT-FV here ‘work here!’  
c. a=tambul-ir-a *ku-pikipiki* (ibidem)  
3SG=travel-DAT-FV LOC-motorcycle ‘he travels by motorcycle’  
d. Mamani a-nyik-ile n’wana pawa (Changana, P. Gonçalves 2010)  
1.mommy SC-give-PST 1.child 5.bread  
‘Mommy gave the child (some) bread.’

### Selected references

- Demonte, V. 1995. Dative alternation in Spanish. *Probus* 7, 5-30.
- Miguel, M., Gonçalves, A. & Duarte, I. 2011. Dativos não argumentais em português. In A. Costa *et al.* (orgs.), *Textos Seleccionados, XXVI Encontro da APL*. Lisboa: APL, 388-400.
- Gonçalves, P. 2010. *A génese do português de Moçambique*. Lisboa: Imprensa Nacional/Casa da Moeda.
- Gonçalves, R. 2016. *Construções ditransitivas no português de São Tomé*. PhD Dissertation: Universidade de Lisboa.
- Larson, R. 2014. *On Shell Structure*. New York/London: Routledge.
- Ormazabal, J. & J. Romero 2010. The derivation of dative alternations. In Duguine, M. *et al.* (eds.). *Argument structure and syntactic relations from a crosslinguistic perspective*, 203-232. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pineda, A. 2016. *Les fronteres de la (in)transitivitat: estudi dels aplicatius en llengües romàniques i basc*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Mòn Juïc.
- Pylkkänen, L. 2002/2008. *Introducing Arguments*. PhD Dissertation, Cambridge: MIT.
- Rappaport-Hovav, M. & B. Levin. 2008. The English dative alternation: the case for verb sensitivity. *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 129-167.
- Torres Morais, M. A. & H. M. Lima-Salles. 2010. Parametric change in the grammatical encoding of indirect objects in Brazilian Portuguese, *Probus* 22 (2), 181-209.