Double pronominalization and clitic doubling in Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese and Colloquial Standard Brazilian Portuguese

Heloisa M. M Lima Salles
University of Brasília
hsalles@unb.br

Maria Aparecida Torres Morais
University of São Paulo
torres.mariacida@gmail.com

Abstract

In this study, we propose a comparative analysis of the ditransitive constructions in Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese (DBP) and Colloquial Standard Brazilian Portuguese (BP), taking into consideration the phenomenon named Double Pronominalization, in which both the *theme* and the *goal* arguments are realized as clitics or full pronouns, with consequences for the occurrence of a type of Person Case Constraint as well as a specific case of clitic doubling. In the comparative scenario, we show that the DBP instantiates a particular type of Double Object Construction (DOC), in which the grammatical licensing of the *goal* argument has similarities with the English DOC. Further we consider that both the dialectal and the standard varieties display the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC), in which the *goal* argument is

introduced by the preposition *para* ('to'). In this paper we propose that these innovative properties can be accounted for if we consider the theory of *low* and *high applicative*, as expressed in Pylkännen's (2008) typology. Following Pancheva & Zubizarreta (2018), we also assume that the applicative head bears an interpretable person feature entering an agreement relation with the argument introduced in the specifier position of the applicative domain (cf. also Torres Morais & Salles 2010, 2016, 2019). Finally, we claim that the loss of third person dative clitics in BP undermine the feature make-up of the *low applicative* head, excluding clitic cluster and clitic doubling formation (of the EP type). Consequently, two strategies arise in the licensing of the *goal* argument in ditransitive structures: (i) under structural Case, in a *low* applicative head, as found in DBP; (ii) as an oblique phrase, introduced by the preposition *para* ('to'). However, first and second clitics *me* and *te* remain, implying that the BP pronominal system expresses a monovalent value for the feature [participant]. We propose that they are licensed in a *high applicative* structure bearing an interpretable person feature, under an agreement relation with the inherent interpretable person feature, which corresponds to first (speaker) and second person (addressee) (cf. Torres Morais & Salles, 2022).

Keywords: dative argument clitic doubling, double pronominalization, preposition.

1. Introduction

In this study, we propose an analysis of ditransitive constructions in Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese (DBP) and Colloquial Standard Brazilian Portuguese (henceforth, BP) taking into consideration double pronominalization, in which both the *theme* and the *goal* arguments are pronominalized, with consequences for the occurrence of a type of Person Case Constraint. We further discuss a type of clitic doubling in Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese (DBP), which involves first and second person clitics.

Primarily we focus on DBP ditransitives, in which the grammatical licensing of the *goal* argument is found in a type of Double Object Construction (DOC), as illustrated in (1a-b).[1]

(1)   (from Rezende &Pádua 2004: 49; 196)
       a. ua muié mandô <u>pidi</u> el'-ø   um remédio
          a woman made.3SG ask.INF 3M-SG.ACC a medicine
       'a woman made someone ask her a medicine'

       b. teve   que dá   água ele-ø   primeiro
          had.3SG that give.INF water 3M-SG.ACC first
          'he had to give him water'

       In addition to DOC, DBP displays the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC), in which the *goal* argument is introduced by the preposition *para* ('to'), which

---

is also found in BP, thus implying an alignment with benefactives and other oblique phrases, as illustrated in (2a-b).[2]

(2)   (from Rezende &Pádua 2004: 184; 140)
         a. vô   mostrá   pa senhora um negocim
            go.PRS.1SG show.INF to madam   one small-thing
            'I will show something to madam'

         b. eli-s   dava   cachaça... dava   rapadura p'ra ele-s
            3M-PL give.IPRF.3PL spirit...   give.IPRF.3PL sweet   to   3M-PL.OBL.
            'they used to give spirit... give sugar-cane-sweet sweet to them'
            (data

In previous analyses, these facts have been attributed to the radical changes in the pronominal system of BP (both dialectal and colloquial standard), which involve the loss of third person dative and accusative clitics, namely *lhe(s)* and *o(s), a(s)*, respectively, and the rise of the (full) forms *você(s),* for second person, and *ele(s), ela(s)*, for third person, in different grammatical functions.

Assuming that DOC (as found in DBP) is a correlate of English DOC, we follow previous analyses proposing that it is licensed in an Applicative structure (Pylkännen 2002, 2008, for English; Torres Morais & Salles 2010, for DBP). We also consider the fact that (only) first and second person clitics *me* and *te* are found in both DBP and BP pronominal system. We further assume, following Torres Morais & Salles (2022), that the facts about the split system of clitics in BP point to a change from a bivalent to a monovalent value with respect to the feature [participant], which allows for the unification of the syntactic and semantic properties of the dative clitic as a *high applicative* head.

A related fact is that in double pronominalization, first and second person clitics (*me/ te*) are used either as accusative or dative arguments, along with the full pronoun (*ele(s); ela(s)*), or the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC), as illustrated in (3) and (4), respectively. Interestingly, the example in (3) corresponds to the one involving a clitic cluster in European Portuguese, as illustrated in (3'). In turn, the one in (4) has a direct correlate in EP, as it involves an oblique phrase (although the relevant preposition in EP is *a*, which occurs as a *repair* structure, given that clustering is blocked by the Person Case Constraint (PCC)). In BP the oblique configuration is uniformly found, as clitic clusters cannot be formed.

(3)   Maria me$_{GOAL}$=apresentou   ele-ø.
         Maria 1SG.DAT=introduced.3SG 3M.SG.ACC
         'Maria introduced him to me.'

(4)   Maria me=apresentou   para ele$_{GOAL}$.
         Maria 1SG.ACC=introduced.3SG to   3M.SG.OBL
         'Maria introduced me to him.'

(3')   Maria m-o-ø=apresentou.
        Maria 1SG.DAT-3M-SG.ACC=introduced.3SG
        'Maria introduced him to me.'

(4')   Maria me=apresentou   a ele-ø   [*me lhe].
        Maria 1SG.ACC=introduced.3SG to 3M-SG.OBL   [1SG.CL 3SG.CL]
        'Maria introduced me to him.'

Another related fact is that DBP displays a type of clitic doubling, involving first and second person clitics, as illustrated in (5), thus confirming their productivity:

(5)   (from Machado Rocha 2016: 23)
        deixa   eu   te=perguntá ocê   um negócio
        let. IMP.3SG I   2SG=ask.INF you.ACC a   thing
        'let me ask you something'

Assuming the split character of the pronominal system, we will propose that first and second person clitics in both BP and DBP are licensed in an Applicative projection by an interpretable Person feature. This configuration is taken to impose the restrictions on clitic clustering (thus implying that a type of PCC is at stake), further providing the grammatical conditions for the rise of clitic doubling in DBP. In the absence of third person (dative) clitic pronouns (as well as third person (accusative) pronouns), the dative argument is uniformly licensed as an oblique phrase.

The study is developed as follows, in section 2, we firstly present the facts about the innovative pronominal realization of the goal argument in ditransitive structures in Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese (DBP) and Colloquial Standard Brazilian Portuguese (BP), considering the facts about double pronominalization and clitic doubling, which display innovative strategies. In section 3, we provide a brief review of previous analyses of ditransitive constructions in EP, in terms of Pylkännen's (2008) applicative typology, in which the interpretable person feature on the applicative head is at stake. Given this approach, we provide an account of double pronominalization as found in DBP and BP, in which a type of PCC arises. We further discuss clitic doubling in DBP. In section 4, we present the final considerations.

2. Pronominalization in ditransitive constructions in DBP and BP

In this section, we look at the innovative facts concerning pronominalization of ditransitive constructions in DBP and BP in detail. In section 2.1, we present a brief note on the dialect spoken in the Central region, in which DOC is found. In the following section, we present the properties of DOC in DBP (in a contrastive perspective to English DOC), further considering the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC), found in both DBP and BP. Given this, we discuss the facts about double pronominalization in DBP and Colloquial and Standard BP, in which clitic clusters are absent. Instead, the PDC configuration is uniformly found, thus differing from EP, in which this configuration only occurs as a *repair* strategy, that is, as an alternative to the restrictions on clitic clusters imposed by the PCC.

2.1 DBP in the Brazilian territory

In the present study, Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese is a designation for the language spoken in the rural area of the Central region of Brazil, which is delimited by Goiás and Minas Gerais states, as well as part of Bahia state, given their identification regarding the occurrence of the so-called Double Object Construction, and related properties of the pronominal system. Accordingly, this designation is not intended to refer to a dialect as defined in the scope of the dialectology discipline, which takes into consideration lexical-phonological variables that are not relevant for the present study. In this respect, we refer the reader to ALINGO (*Atlas Linguístico de Goiás*), in which relevant information of dialects from Goiás is provided (cf. Milani 2016).

Following previous studies, the occurrence of the above-mentioned Double Object Construction, and its related pronominal system allows for a distinction from other dialects of BP, including the Colloquial Standard variety, henceforth designated as BP. DOC in DBP has been widely investigated in the literature, from different theoretical perspectives (see Ramos 1992; Scher 1996; Salles 1997, 2016; Nascimento 2007, 2009; Torres Morais & Salles 2010; Ramos & Salles 2016; Rocha 2017; Pereira 2019; Salles & Torres Morais 2020; among others, regarding the occurrence of DOC in Minas and Goiás dialects).[3]

We shall not go into the related social and historical facts that took place during the colonial period, particularly in the 17th and 18th centuries, giving rise to language contact between the language spoken by the colonizers, namely Portuguese, and the languages of the originary people (mostly from the Macro-Jê stock), who were confined under the so-called 'aldeamento' (tribalizing) policy, as well as of the African people (mostly from the Bantu family), who were brought to the region as slaves (on the facts about the occupation of the central region, see Chaim 1974; Chaul 1997; Brasil 1980, among others).

At this point we will focus on the analysis of the properties characterizing DOC in DBP (in a comparative perspective with English).

2.2 A type of Double Object Construction (DOC) in DBP in variation with the Prepositional Ditransitive Construction (PDC)

As mentioned above, Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese (DBP) has a type of DOC which alternates with the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC), in which the *goal*

---

[3]   It should be noted that a similar type of DOC is also attested in dialects spoken in Bahia state (located in the Northeastern region), as pointed out in Lucchesi & Mello, 2006; Barros 2018, Barros & Calindro 2023, among others (cf. (i)). According to these analyses, the occurrence of DOC is due to language contact between Portuguese, spoken by the colonizers, and languages from the Bantu stock, spoken by the Africans brough to Brazil as slaves, during the colonial period (on the socio-historical facts, see, among many others, Mattos e Silva 2004).

(i)   Deu o japonês 20 mil
        'He gave the Japanese guy 20 thousand [reais].' (from Lucchesi & Melo 2006: 442).

argument is introduced by the preposition para ('to'), and its reduced forms *pra/ pa*, as illustrated in (1) and (2), above, as well as in (6) and (7), below, respectively.[4]

Double Object Construction ((e-g) from Nascimento 2009: 46-7)

(6)   a. eu té... dava   ele-ø   café
       I even... give.3SG.IPRF 3M-[SG].ACC coffee
      'I even used to give him coffee (…)'

    b. deus ajudô   qu-ele deu   nóis   um fejão
       god helped.3SG that-he gave.3SG 1PL.ACC a bean
      'God helped [to the extent] that he gave us some beans'
      (data in (a) and (b) from Pereira, 2019: 171)

    c. feiz   a chá... e   deu   el-a-ø
       made.3SG a tea... and gave.3SG 3F-[SG].ACC
      'she made tea... and gave [it] to her'

    d. mandô pidi   el'-ø   um remédio
       made.3SG ask.INF 3M.[SG].ACC one remedy
      'he made someone ask him a remedy'
      ((a-d), from Pereira 2019: 161, 171)

    e. aí, pidi   o caboco o poso   lá
       then ask.PRF.1SG. the guy   the shelter there
      'then I asked the guy a shelter there'

    f. eu vô   ensiná   ocê os remédio
       I go.PRS.1SG teach.INF you the remedies
      'I will teach you the medicines (…)'

    g. pergunta ele-ø   alguma coisa...
       ask.IMP.2SG. 3M.[SG].ACC something
      'ask him something'

---

[4]   As pointed out in Nascimento (2007, 2009), the preposition *a* ('to') is attested in the rural varieties spoken in Goiás. Adopting the Labovian framework, the author provides a detailed analysis of the distribution of the variants expressing the dative argument, showing that the preposition *para* ('to') is the preferred variant, as opposed to *a*, and the null variant (which corresponds to the type of double accusative construction). In particular, the preposition *a* is restricted to contexts in which the *goal* argument is a divinity, as illustrated in (i) – for this reason we take the use of *a* in these contexts to be formulaic, implying that *para* ('to') is the innovative lexical variant.
    (i)   A gente   pede muito *a* Deus (...)
          the-people ask a-lot to God   'we strongly ask God [for mercy]'

(7)   *Prepositional Ditransitive Construction* ((d-g) from Rezende & Pádua 2004:
        67, 86, 178)
        a. aí   ele deu   um café   *pra* ele
           then he gave.3SG one coffee to him
           'then he gave a [cup of] coffee to him'

        b. aí   eu falo   *pr'o-s*   meu-s   minino
           then I   say. PRS.1SG. to-the.M-PL my.M-PL boy
           'then I say to my children...'

        c. tem   esse murão   que eu tô falano   *pr'*ocê-is...
           have.3SG this big-wall that I   am speaking to-you-PL
           'there is this big wall that I am mentioning to you'
           ((a-c), from Nascimento 2009: 46-7)

        d. só   o-que ele respondeu   *pra* mim foi isso
           only what he answered.3SG to   me   was this
           'what he answered to me was this'

         e. vendeu   el-a-ø   *pra* mim
            sell.PRF.3SG 3F-SG.ACC to   me
            'he sold it to me'

         f. falei   pra ele-ø   que num lavasse   cum limão
            say.PRF.1SG to 3M.SG.OBL that not   wash. SUBJ.3SG with lemon
            'I said to him that he should not wash it with lemon'

         g. ela sempre contava   esses causo *pra* nóis
            she always tell.IPRF.3SG these stories to   1PL.OBL
            'she would always tell these stories to us'

        The use of the preposition *para* ('to') allows for an alignment with benefactive
constructions, as illustrated in (8a-c). In this respect, DBP differs from English, as the
preposition introducing the benefactive construction is *for*, which is not the same as
the one introducing the *goal* argument in ditransitive constructions (cf. *he cooled the*
*milk **for** the child/ he gave the milk **to** the child*) – we shall return to this matter.

(8)   (from Rezende & Pádua 2004: 118, 190)
        a. tô   caçan'   quem   troca dinhero   *pra* mim
           am.1SG searching someone change money   to   me
           'I am looking for someone to change money for me'

        b. ...cê tava   fazen' macumba *pra* mim
              you were doing macumba to   me
              'you were doing 'macumba' [=African ritual] on me'

c. vai   isfriá o   leite *pra* el-a-ø
   go.IMP.2SG. cool   the milk to   3F-SG.OBL
   'go to cool the milk for her'

The structural properties of DOC in DBP have been examined in various studies, in terms of Barss and Lasnik's (1986) analysis of English DOC, pointing to a similar behavior (see Scher 1996; Salles 1997, 2016; Torres Morais & Salles 2010; Ramos & Salles 2017; Rocha 2017, among others). Given that asymmetric c-command is required for a pronoun to relate to a quantified NP (QNP) as variable, it is possible to show that the first object asymmetrically c-commands the second object in DOC from DBP, as the binding relation holds in (9a), but not in (9b), exactly as in the DOC examples from English (cf. (10a), as opposed to (10b)).[5]

(9)   a. Pedro mostrou cada pai$_i$ seu$_i$ filho.
           Pedro showed each father$_i$ his$_i$ son

        b. *Pedro mostrou seu$_i$ pai   cada filho$_i$.
            Pedro showed his$_i$ father each son$_i$

(10)   (from Barss & Lasnik, 1986: 348)
        a. I denied each worker$_i$ his$_i$ paycheck.
        b. *I denied its$_i$ owner each paycheck$_i$.

As expected, the same structural conditions apply to the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC), as the binding relation holds in (11a), but not in (11b), implying that the quantified NP in the first position asymmetrically c-commands the pronoun in the complement position of the preposition, but not conversely.

(11)   a. Pedro mostrou cada filho$_i$ para seu$_i$ pai.
           Pedro showed each son$_i$ to   his$_i$ father
        b. *Pedro mostrou seu$_i$ filho para cada pai$_i$.

Recall that ditransitive predicates also occur in the *theme-goal* word order in DBP, the *goal* argument occurring without the preposition, as illustrated in (1b), repeated in (12a), below, including the examples in (12b) and (12c), thus differing from English, in which only the *goal-theme* word order is allowed (**Mary gave a book John*).

(12)   ((b-c) from Ramos & Salles 2017: 134/145)
        a. ... teve   que dá   água ele-Ø primeiro
           had.3SG that give.INF water 3M.SG first
           'he had to give him water'

---

[5]   The examples in (9), (11) and (13) concerning quantifier binding are adapted from Ramos & Salles (2017), the judgements being provided by a native speaker of the DBP.

     b.   Maria Lixande, vai   dá   mão el-a-Ø
         Maria Lixande, go.IMP give.INF hánd 3F-SG
         'Maria Lixande, go to give her a hand'

     c.   ê-s   ficava   dano consei nóis
         3M-PL remain.IPRF giving advise 1PL
         'they would remain giving us advise'

Regarding the binding relations, it is noted that the structure in the *theme-goal* word order, without the preposition, patterns like the one with the preposition, as illustrated in (13a), as opposed to (13b), with examples adapted from Ramos & Salles (2017): while the binding relation between the QNP and the pronoun holds in (13a), it does not in (13b), implying that the QNP asymmetrically c-commands the pronoun in the former, but not in the latter.

(13)   a. Pedro mostrou cada filho$_i$ seu pai$_{GOAL}$.
        Pedro showed each son$_i$ his$_i$ father

        b. *Pedro mostrou seu filho cada pai$_{GOAL}$.
         Pedro showed his$_i$ son each father$_i$

A relevant property of DOC in DBP is that, differently from English DOC, passivization affecting the goal DP is not possible with verbs of transference, such as *dar* ('to give'), *entregar* ('to hand') (cf. 14a). Crucially, passivization is possible with verbs of saying, as illustrated in (14b), suggesting that it is lexically restricted.

(14)   a. *João foi dado um livro.
        João was given a   book

      b. João foi ensinado o caminho.
       João was taught   the address

We thus assume that passivization of the *goal* argument is not a conclusive test for determining its accusative status. We thus retain the view that DBP has a type of DOC.[6]

    Another fact concerning DOC in DBP is that it is not found with benefactive arguments (cf. (15a)), differently from English, which allows it in the transfer of possession interpretation (cf. (15b)).[7]

---

[6]   The restriction on passivization may be seen as a challenge for the analysis of the *goal* argument as bearing structural Case in the DOC type from DBP (as pointed out by two anonymous reviewers). Given the contrastive facts in (14a) and (14b), we leave this matter open, referring the reader to Ramos & Salles (2017), for a more detailed discussion on the role of verb class in passivization.

[7]   The occurrence/ absence of benefactives in the DOC configuration can be analysed in terms of a requirement on a distinctive licensing of the non-argumental *benefactive*, as opposed to the *goal* argument of a ditransitive predicate, namely that at least one of them be assigned a non-ambiguous configuration. In English, the configuration with the preposition *for* is exclusive of the non-argumental *benefactive* (*bake a cake for X*), as opposed to DOC, in

(15)   a. *Maria fez   ele-s   um bolo.
            Maria made 3M-PL.ACC a   cake

        b. Maria baked them a cake.

        Now, turning to first and second person clitics, it is possible to show that they are productively found in DBP (cf. (16a-c)).

(16)   (from Pereira 2019: 184)
        a. eu caí aqui... *me*=dá   a mão
           I   fell here...1SG.DAT=give.IMP.2SG a hand
          'I fell here... give me a hand'

         b. Aí   ele *me*=vendeu   o violão
            then he 1SG.DAT=sold.3SG the guitar
            'then he sold me the guitar'

         c. eu vô   *te*=metê ferro
            I   go.PRS.1SG 2SG=put   chain
            'I will put a chain on you'

        Colloquial Standard BP, in turn, does not display the type of DOC as found in DBP. The *goal* argument is consistently realized in the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC), as illustrated in (2)) (cf. Salles 1997; Berlinck 2001; Figueiredo e Silva 2007; Armelin 2011; Calindro 2015, 2020; Salles & Torres Morais 2020).
        As already mentioned, the innovative licensing of the *goal* argument in DBP and BP interacts with the (innovative) pronominal system. These properties are summarized in the topics and tables 1 and 2, below (cf. Galves 2001, and reference therein).
✓   a pronominal split regarding the distribution of clitics: (only) first and second person clitic pronouns, *me* and *te*, are found – as a corollary, the third person full pronouns *ele(s)/ ela(s)* substitutes for the third person clitics *lhe(s)/ o(s); a(s)* in the direct object position and in the complement of the preposition;
✓   the honorific pronoun *você(s)* (as found in EP) occurs as a second person pronoun both in BP and DBP (also found in subject position, triggering third person singular inflection), alternating with the second person clitic *te*;
✓   the collective DP *a gente* ('the people') includes the speaker, thus occurring as a first-person plural expression (triggering third person singular inflection, in subject position), alternating with the first person plural pronoun *nós*;
✓   the strong/ full pronominal series is found in the complement position of the directional preposition *para* ('to') encoding the *goal* argument in ditransitive and monotransitive (para *mim/ você(s)/ nós/ a gente/ ele(s)/ ela(s)*).

---

which both the non-argumental *benefactive* and the *goal* argument are found (*to bake X a cake/ to give X a cake*). In DBP, DOC is exclusive of the *goal* argument (*dar X um bolo*), while both the *goal* argument and the non-argumental *benefactive* are found in the prepositional configuration with *para* ('to') (*dar um para X/ fazer um bolo para X*) (cf. Salles 1997).

DBP and BP's pronominal systems are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. The crucial difference between DBP and BP is that the former, but not the latter, uses full pronouns without the preposition in the realization of the *goal* argument (giving rise to DOC).[8]

Table 1: DBP pronominal system: clitics, full pronouns and obliques in the realization of the indirect object

	Clitic	Full Pronoun		Oblique
1	Me	(eu)	Para	Mim
2	Te	Você		Você
3	---	Ele/ele		Ele/ela
1	---	Nó(i)s/ A gente		Nó(i)s/ a gente
2	---	Vocês		Você(s)
3	---	Ele(s)/ela(s)		Ele(s)/ Ela(s)

Table 2: BP pronominal system: clitics, full pronouns and obliques in the realization of the indirect object

	Clitic	Full Pronoun		Oblique
1	Me	---	Para	Mim
2	Te	---		Você
3	---	---		Ele/ela
1	---	---		A gente/ nós
2	---	---		Você(s)
3	---	---		Ele(s)/ Ela(s)

---

[8] Another contrastive property is that the (third person) dative clitic *lhe* may occur as a second person pronoun in (standard) BP, but not in DBP, which can be analyzed in relation to the occurrence of the (third person) honorific pronoun *o/a senhor(a)*. As such, it is found in both monotransitive and ditransitive predicates. We shall not consider this case, as it does not affect the present discussion.

Given these facts, we now turn to double pronominalization, found with ditransitive predicates in both DBP and BP, further considering a type of clitic doubling, found in DBP.

2.3 Double pronominalization in DBP and BP

As mentioned in the previous section, third person clitics (whether dative (*lhe(s)*) or accusative (*o(s)*; *a(s)*) are not found in BP and DBP. A direct consequence is that clitic clusters of the EP type (cf. section 3.1, below) cannot be formed, as contrastively illustrated in (17):

(17)   a. m-o/a-(s);   no=lo/a-(s)
           1SG.DAT-3M/F-SG-(PL).ACC; 1PL.DAT=3M/F-SG-(PL).ACC
         b. t-o/a-(s);   vo=lo/a-(s)
           2SG.DAT-3M/F-SG-(PL).ACC; 2PL.DAT=3M/F-SG-(PL).ACC
         c. lh-o/a-(s)
           3SG.DAT-3M/F-SG-(PL). ACC   [PB*/PE^{OK}]

As already mentioned, first and second person clitics (*me*; *te*) are productively found in both DPB and BP. Accordingly, double pronominalization is found in two configurations given that the *goal* argument is realized either as the (dative) clitic pronoun or as full pronoun introduced by the lexical preposition, as illustrated in (18a) and (18b), respectively. If the clitic is the direct object, the *goal* argument is obligatorily realized as a full pronoun introduced by the lexical preposition, as illustrated in (18c), as opposed to (18d).

(18)   a. Inácio me$_{GOAL}$=apresentou   el-a-ø.
           Inácio 1SG.DAT=introduced.3SG 3F-SG.ACC
           'Inácio introduced her to me.'

         b. Inácio apresentou   el-a-ø   pra mim$_{GOAL}$.
           Inácio introduced.3SG 3F-SG.ACC to   me
           'Inácio introduced her to me.'

         c. Inácio me$_{ACC}$ =apresentou   para el-a-ø.
           Inácio 1SG.ACC=introduced.3SG to   3F-SG.ACC
           'Inácio me apresentou para ela'

         d. *Inácio me$_{ACC}$=apresentou   el-a-ø$_{GOAL}$.
           Inácio 1SG.ACC=introduced.3SG 3F-SG.ACC

Moreover, first and second person clitics (*me/te*) never cluster (**me te/ *te me*), thus being sensitive to the so-called Strong Person Case Constraint (PCC), as originally defined by Bonet (1994, 1995), exactly as in EP – we will return to the EP facts in section 3.1. Hence, in double pronominalization the pronominal clitic is either the direct object (DO) or the indirect object (IO). If it is the DO, the *goal* argument is (obligatorily) realized as a full pronoun introduced by the lexical preposition *para* ('to') (cf. (19a-b), as opposed to (19c)). If it is the IO, the direct object must be realized

by a full pronoun, which is crucially the second person full form *você* (first- and second-person full pronouns *eu* and *tu* being marked forms) (cf. 19d-f).

(19) a. Inácio te=apresentou   para mim [*te me].
         Inácio 2SG.ACC=introduced.3SG to   me
         'Inácio introduced you to me.'

      b. Inácio me=apresentou   para você [*me te].
         Inácio 1SG.ACC=introduced.3SG to   you.OBL
         'Inácio introduced me to you.'

      c. *Inácio me=apresentou   você-ØGOAL.
          Inácio 1SG.ACC=introduced.3SG 2SG.ACC

      d. Inácio me=apresentou   você.
         Inácio 1SG.DAT=introduced.3SG 2SG.ACC
         'Inácio introduced you to me.'

      e. Inácio me=apresentou   tu.
         Inácio 1SG.DAT=introduced.3SG 2SG.ACC
         'Inácio introduced you to me.'

      f. Inácio te=apresentou   eu.
         Inácio 2SG.DAT=introduced.3SG 1SG.ACC
         'Inácio introduced me to you.'

If the two arguments in ditransitive structures are third person (corresponding to *lho(s)/lha(s)*), the *goal* argument only occurs as an oblique pronoun in a configuration introduced by the lexical preposition. An independent restriction does not allow the realization of the (third person) *goal* argument as a full pronoun, as illustrated by the contrast in (20a) and (20b) (cf. Nascimento, 2009: 59).

(20) a. João apresentou   ela-ø   pra ele-ø.
         João introduced.3SG 3F-SG.ACC to   3M-SG.OBL
         'João introduced her to him.'

      b. *João apresentou   ele-øGOAL ela-ø.
          João introduced.3SG 3M-SG.ACC 3F-SG.ACC

At this point, we can formulate the following generalization related to the *goal* argument in double pronominalization: the *goal* argument can be realized either as an oblique pronoun (introduced by the lexical preposition *para* ('to')), or as a first and second person (dative) clitic *(me/ te)* in both DPB and BP.[9]

---

[9]   Pancheva & Zubizarreta (2018) present a very detailed typology and a formal analysis of PCC effects, mainly in Romance Languages. Based on Perlmutter (1971:21) and Bonet (1991:179), the authors documented that some speakers of Spanish and some speakers of Catalan accept a variety of PCC named Ultra-Strong PCC (Nevins, 2007), which ranks first person higher than second person in that it allows the second person but not the first person to

Before we turn to the formal analysis for the above-mentioned facts, we would like to examine the occurrence of a type of clitic doubling in DBP, in which first and second person clitics are productively found.

2. 4 Clitic Doubling in DBP

As already mentioned, another feature concerning the pronominal realization of the goal argument is that a type of clitic doubling is found in DBP – a fact that has been originally noted in data from Minas dialect, also affecting direct objects (cf. Diniz 2007; Machado Rocha 2016; Machado Rocha & Ramos 2016), as illustrated in (21a-b) and (22a-b), respectively.

Ditransitive predicates
(21)   a. eu to te=falano   pra você
            I am 2SG.ACC=talking to you
            'I am talking to you'

        b. deixa eu te=perguntá ocê um negócio
           let   I 2s=ask.INF you a   thing
          'Let me ask you something'
          (data from Machado Rocha 2016, p. 23)

Monotransitive predicates (from Projeto Minerês, cited in Machado Rocha 2016: 23, 91)
(22)   a. eu vou   te=jogá   ocê no   fogo.
            I go.PRS.1SG 2SG=throw you in-the fire
            'I will throw you in the fire'

        b. pode   intrá   qu'eu te=ajudo   ocê
           can.2SG come-in that-I 2SG=help.PRS.1SG you.ACC
           'You can come in and I help you'

        c. começo   a me=xingá   eu
           started.3SG to 1s=tell-bad-names 1SG.ACC

---

be the direct argument in double object construction. For Spanish speakers who have this variety of PCC grammar, two participant clitics can co-occur without ambiguity, even though they do not show a distinction between dative and accusative case. As the example (i) shows, the first-person clitic (*me*) must be understood as the indirect object.

(i)   Él te=me=recomendó   (a mí).
         he 2SG=1SG=recommended.3SG (to me)
         'He recommended you to me.', not:
         'He recommended me to you.'   (Pancheva & Zubizarreta, 2018:1295)

Also, the authors considered the fact that Spanish is a language with Strong PCC grammar, as it is well documented in the current literature. Consequently, for such speakers, this example is not acceptable.

Given the above-mentioned split in the pronominal system of DBP (as well as in BP), clitic doubling is restricted to first and second person, as third person clitics are not found in DBP. As noted in Pereira (2019), clitic doubling in DBP should be taken as additional evidence for the productivity of first and second person clitics in this dialect, along with the facts concerning double pronominalization, as presented in the previous section.

As noted in Machado Rocha's (2016: 88) analysis, a relevant property of clitic doubling in DBP is that in the former the doubled DP occurs without the preposition in both ditransitive and monotransitive predicates (cf. (21b) and (27a-c), above) – although the preposition *para* may be found with ditransitive predicates as well (21a). Machado Rocha points out that the role of the preposition is crucial in the analysis of the doubling clitic in DBP as agreement markers. We will return to this matter (cf. section 3.4).

In section 3 we will establish the theoretical assumptions for the present analysis.

3. A formal analysis for ditransitive constructions in Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese and Colloquial Standard BP

In this section, we will advance an analysis of the *goal* argument (indirect object) in BP and DBP in which it is syntactically expressed as either an applied or an oblique argument. In section 3.1, we will discuss the (*high*) applicative analysis of indirect objects in European Portuguese (EP) and the PCC effects, in which the role of the interpretable Person feature on the applicative head is at stake. In section 3.2, we discuss the corresponding facts in BP and DBP, considering double pronominalization. In section 3.3, we use this framework, taking into consideration clitic doubling in DBP.

3.1 The Applicative analysis of indirect objects in European Portuguese and the PCC effects

A well-known fact regarding ditransitive predicates European Portuguese (EP) is that the indirect object (IO) is a distinct structural class, morphologically identified by a dative morphological marker. As a full DP, it is preceded by the dative-morpheme *a* (*a*-DP), and as a pronominal argument, it is realized by the series of dative clitics.

As noted in Torres Morais (2006, 2007), the mutual implication between the dative marker *a* and the dative clitic is expressed under clitic doubling, in which not only the dative clitic is obligatory in the presence of the full (pronominal) DP (cf. (23a)), but also the dative marker *a* is obligatory, the lexical preposition being disallowed (cf. (23b)):

(23) a. Dei=*(lhe-ø)   o livro a   ele-ø.
         gave=3SG=3SG.DAT the book to.DAT 3SG.OBL
         'I gave him the book.'

      b. Dei=lhe-ø   o   livro (*para) ele-ø.
         gave=3SG.DAT the book to   3SG.OBL

In Raposo's (1998) analysis of clitic doubling in EP, the dative clitic and the

full DP are projected in a kind of Complex DP. Accordingly, the full paradigm of clitics in EP can be expressed in a DP complex, as shown in Table 3, in a comparative perspective with BP and DBP, in which the DP complex is unavailable, as displayed in Table 1 and Table 2).

Table 3: The EP pronominal system realizing the indirect object

	Dative Clitic	Full Pronoun	Oblique
1	[Me ... [*a*-mim]]	---	*a/para mim
2	[Te... [*a*-ti]]	---	*a/para ti
3	[Lhe.. [*a*-ele/a]]	---	*a/para ele/ela
1	[Nos…[*a*-nós]]	---	*a/para nós
2	[Vos… [*a*-vós]]	---	*a/para vós
3	[Lhe(s)…[*a*-eles/as]]	---	*a/para eles/elas

Another remarkable aspect is the pervasive distribution of dative objects in EP, which is referred in traditional grammars as well as in modern descriptive ones (cf. Mateus *et al.* 2003; Raposo *et al.* 2013). It is found with activity verbs, including directional dynamic verbs of transference, creation verbs and non-directional dynamic verbs. It also appears with stative verbs. In all these contexts, the *goal* argument conveys different meanings, including *recipient, source, benefactive, possessor*, with respect to another argument, which is mostly the *theme* argument.

Based on Pylkkänen's (2008) theory of *low* and *high applicatives*, Torres Morais (2007) proposes that the morphological expression of the dative argument and the variety of meanings in EP ditransitive structures derive from the different positions in which the applicative head is licensed in the clause structure. In Pylkkänen's typology, the *high applicative* head denotes a relation between an event and one individual, while the *low applicative* head denotes a relation between two individuals. The DOC/ applicative analysis is also proposed in Cuervo (2003, 2020), for Spanish; Diaconescu & Rivero 2007, for Romanian; Fournier (2010), for French; Pineda (2013, 2020), for Spanish and Catalan, just to mention a few studies in the same line of research on Romance languages. Accordingly, the applied argument is syntactically and semantically licensed in the projection of a *low applicative* head. Also, it is possible to assume three subtypes of *low applicatives* in EP: *recipient* (TO-applicative), *source* (FROM-Appl) and *possessor* (AT-Appl), as originally proposed in Cuervo, for Spanish (2003).

We further assume, following Torres Morais and Salles (2010, 2016, 2019), that the upper *v* head has uninterpretable *phi*-features that act as a Probe and enters an *Agree* relation with the (interpretable) *phi*-features of the DP$_{THEME}$ (cf. Chomsky 1995, 2001). In turn, the applicative head bears an interpretable Person feature which enters an agreement relation with the inherently marked dative argument in the Applicative

domain. The derivation of (24a) involving a *low applicative* head (Appl TO) is illustrated in (24b).

(24)   a. O Pedro deu=lhe   o colar   (a el-a-ø).
            the P.   gave=3SG.DAT the necklace to 3F-SG.OBL
            'Peter gave her the necklace.'

        b.   [*v*P *v* [VP V [ApplP [[lhe] a-ela]] [Appl [DP o colar]]]]]

        Moreover, EP provides evidence for the two types of applicative heads, namely the *low applicative* and the *high applicative*. As contrastively shown in (25a-b), an ambiguous interpretation arises in (25a), as either a possessive or a benefactive interpretation is possible, but not in (25b), in which only the benefactive interpretation arises, as the predicate denotes that the argument benefits from the fact that the event was performed (not from being the *goal* of the transference).

(25)   a. (adapted from Berlinck, 1996: 135)
            Descasquei=lhe-ø   a laranja.   (poss/ben)
            peel.PRS.1SG=3SG.DAT the orange
            'I peeled his orange'/ 'I peeled the orange for him.'

        b. (adapted from Berlinck, 1996: 136)
            Descasquei=lhe   uma laranja.   (*poss/ben)
            peeled.1SG=3SG.DAT an   orange
            'I peeled him an orange.'

In (25a), the possessive interpretation arises from the interaction between the definite interpretation of the DP *a laranja* (the orange) (as required in external possession) and the occurrence of the goal argument as a dative clitic, confirming their licensing as a *high applicative*. In turn, the realization of the *theme* argument as an indefinite DP, as in (25b), excludes the possessive interpretation, implying that only the *high applicative* is active.

        Another related property is that clitic clusters are formed in EP under the Person Case Constraint (PCC), which is originally formulated in Bonet (1994, 1995) in the statement in (26) (see also Perlmutter 1971, Kayne 1975, on the PCC in French).

(26)   If DAT then ACC-3rd   (Bonet 1994)

        In fact, EP manifests the *Strong PCC* type, only allowing the combinations involving a dative clitic and a third person accusative clitic, while excluding the realization of the *goal* argument in the prepositional phrase, as illustrated in (27a/a'-c/c'):

(27)   a. A Maria não   m-o-ø=apresentou.
            the Maria not 1SG.DAT-3M.SG.ACC=introduced.3SG
            'Maria did not introduce him to me.'

a'. *A Maria   não   o-ø=apresentou   a mim.
    the Maria not   3M-SG.ACC=introduced.3SG   to me

b. A Maria   não t-o-ø=apresentou.
   the Maria not 2SG.DAT-3M.SG.ACC=introduced.3SG

b'. *A Maria não o-ø=apresentou   a ti.
    the Maria not 3M.SG.ACC=introduced.3SG to you

c. A   Maria   não lh-o-ø=apresentou.
   the Maria not 3SG.DAT-3M.SG.ACC=introduced.3SG

c'. *A Maria não o-ø apresentou   a ela.
    the Maria not 3M.SG.ACC=introduced.3SG to her

As can be inferred from (27), the PCC rules out the possibility of clitic clusters formed with a dative clitic (whether first, second or third person) and a first- and second-person accusative clitic – *me te*; *te me*; *lhe me*; *lhe te*. Given this, as a repair strategy, double pronominalization is expressed in a mixed structure, which is formed with the accusative clitic and the full pronoun introduced by the lexical preposition *a* ('to') (cf. 28a-d).[10]

(28)   a. O   João apresentou=me   a ti.
          the João introduced.3s=1SG.ACC to you.OBL
          'John did not introduce me to you.'

       b. O   João apresentou=te   a mim.
          the João introduced.3s=2SG.ACC to me
          'John did not introduce you to me.'

       c. O   João apresentou=me   a ela.
          the João introduced.3SG=1SG.ACC to her
          'John did not introduce me to her.'

       d. O   João apresentou=te   a ela.
          the João introduced.3SG=2SG.ACC to her
          'John did not introduce you to her.'

---

[10] An analysis assuming the distinction between the true dative and the structure in which the full pronoun is introduced by the lexical preposition *a* ('to') is proposed in Sheehan's (2020) discussion of the contrastive facts in (ia-b). According to Sheehan (2020), clitic doubling (which is taken to involve the true dative marker) excludes differential object marking (DOM), this fact showing that the PCC is not restricted to clitic cluster formation.
(i)   a. Enviaron *(a) Mateo/ tu   hijo a los doctores.
            sent.3PL *(a) Mateo/ your son to the doctors
         b. Les=enviaron   (*a) Mateo/ tu   hijo a los doctores.
            3PL.DAT=sent.3PL (*to) Mateo/ your son a the doctors
            'They have sent Mateo/ your son to the doctors.'
            (from Ormazabal & Romero, 2013: 224, cited in Sheehan 2020: 150)

We take the occurrence of the oblique pronoun in this particular context as a piece of evidence for the grammatical status of *a* as a lexical preposition, not as a dative marker (cf. (28a-d)). This is confirmed by the ungrammaticality of the construction with the full pronoun as a counterpart to clitic clusters. That is, where clusters are formed, the occurrence of the *goal* argument as a full pronoun introduced by the lexical preposition is excluded, as illustrated in (27a'-d'), above.

According to Pancheva & Zubizarreta's (2018) analysis of PCC, the interpretable Person-feature is also responsible for the person restrictions in clitic cluster formation. The authors assume a person feature specification that expresses the asymmetry between first, second, on a side, and third person, on the other side, in terms of the binary specification of the feature [participant]. First and second person are distinguished by the [author] feature. They also adopt the distinction proximate/ obviative. The notion of proximity, particularly, is related to the speech situation, applying to first, second and third person. The difference is that first and second person arguments are inherently proximate, while the third person is marked [+/- proximate] only in the presence of another third person argument. The system proposed by the authors for the feature make-up of the Person feature on the applicative head is presented in (29):

(29)   (Pancheva & Zubizarreta, 2018: 9)
      a. 1P: [+proximate], [+participant], [+author]
      b. 2P: [+proximate], [+participant], [-author]
      c. 3P proximate: [+proximate], [-participant], [-author]
      d. 3P obviative: [-proximate], [-participant], [-author]

The authors further suggest that [+proximate] is the default value for PCC grammars. Thus, in the grammar that instantiates the default option, the indirect object clitic introduced by the applicative head has no person restriction. This is the case of the Strong PCC in EP grammar. However, more marked values for the interpretable person feature on the applicative head, such as [+participant] and [+ author], are instantiated in other varieties of PCC grammars.

In what follows, we will discuss the facts concerning double pronominalization as well clitic doubling constructions in DBP and BP, in terms of the role of the (interpretable) person feature on the applicative head.

3.2 Going back to DBP and BP: the structural properties

In this subsection, we would like to assume that DOC in DBP is a *high applicative*, in which the applicative head excludes the interpretable person feature. We also show that the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC) is uniformly found in both DBP and BP. Next, we will consider the implications of these analyses for double pronominalization and clitic doubling, as found in these varieties.

The crucial fact about DOC in DBP, as illustrated in (30a), is that, differently from EP, the interpretable person feature is absent in the feature make-up of the applicative head. In the absence of the interpretable person feature, structural/ accusative Case is activated, and the interpretable *phi*-features of the *goal* argument in the specifier position of the *low applicative* head enter an *Agree* relation with the uninterpretable *phi*-features of the *v* head. In turn, the uninterpretable *phi*-features of

the *low applicative* head enter an Agree relation with the interpretable *phi*-features of the DP argument in its complement position, giving rise to a type of English DOC, as illustrated in the derivation in (30b) (cf. Torres Morais & Salles 2010).

(30)   a. deu   el-a-ø   chá
           gave.3SG 3F-SG.ACC tea
           'she gave her tea'

        b. [vP *v* [vP deu [ApplP [DP elaACC] [Appl [DP cháACC]]]]]

The same configuration applies to the *theme-goal* word order, as the possession relation between two individuals is found (cf. (1b)), as proposed in Ramos & Salles (2017). The occurrence of the double accusative is thus a crucial property expressing the microparametric variation in DBP, as opposed to EP.

    Regarding the prepositional ditransitive construction, found in both DBP and BP (PDC) (cf. section 2.2), we propose, in the spirit of previous analyses (cf. Kayne 1984; Hale & Keyser 1993; Pesetsky 1995; Salles 1997; Harley 2002; Manzini & Franco 2016, among others), that the *goal* argument is introduced by a lexical preposition, namely *para* ('to'), which occurs in the complement position of V, as illustrated in (31a-b), with data from DBP:

(31)   a.   Ele dava   comida pa/po's caboco.
              he give.IPRF.3SG food   to-the   guys
              'He gave food to the guys.'

        b.   [vP dava [vP *v* [vP [DP comida]ACC [V [PP pa [DP os cabocos]]]]]]

    Recall that PDC is also found in EP, as a repair strategy in double pronominalization, given the effects of PCC, as illustrated in (28a) (cf. section 3.1), repeated in (32), below.

(32)   O João apresentou=me   a tiGOAL.
        the João introduced.3SG=1SG.ACC to you.OBL
        'John introduced you to me.'

    We conclude that these facts should be taken as evidence for the distinction between clitic doubling and the so-called true dative, which is licensed in the applicative projection, on the one hand, and in PDC, on the other hand.[11] In turn, in

---

[11]   See Pineda (2020), for a unified analysis of ditransitive constructions in Spanish (and other Romance languages) in terms of the applicative analysis (thus excluding a contrastive analysis involving the Prepositional Ditransitive Construction (PDC)). Brito (2008) in turn does not assume the applicative analysis, pointing out that ditransitive predicates in EP are projected in a prepositional configuration. In spite of the advantages of the uniform analysis, we will retain the distinction as a way to account for the above-mentioned morphosyntactic properties involving dative marking and the syntax of prepositions in EP, which support the distinctive status of datives and obliques.

BP and in DBP, PDC introduced by *para* ('to') is uniformly used. A related fact is the occurrence of first and second person clitics in both BP and in DBP, which allows for the above-mentioned (specific) facts about double pronominalization in both BP and in DBP, as well as the type of clitic doubling found in DBP.

Torres Morais & Salles (2022) have addressed the implications of the presence of first and second person clitics in BP (*me/te*), showing their pervasive distribution in dynamic and stative ditransitive predicates, in monotransitive predicates, inergative and unaccusative, including psychological verbs, and in predicates displaying ethical datives. In their analysis, they propose that the system of pronominal clitics in BP expresses a monovalent value with respect to the feature [participant], as only first and second person clitics are found, third person clitics being absent. They claim that the fact that first and second person clitics are marked as event participants allows for their unified occurrence in the specifier of the *high applicative* in BP, which is also consistent with the requirement that the argument in the *high applicative* enters a relation with the whole event. In this position, first and second person clitics are licensed under an agreement relation with the interpretable person feature on the *high applicative* head.

Under this approach, it is possible to account for double pronominalization, as well as to the type of PCC found in DBP and BP. A relevant point is that a difference arises regarding the structural licensing of the pronominal clitic.

If the clitic realizes the direct object (DO), as in (19b), repeated in (33a), it enters an Agree relation with the *v* head, being marked for structural Case, while the *goal* argument is licensed by the lexical preposition *para* ('to') (cf. (33b)).

(33)   a. Inácio me=apresentou   para você.
            Inácio 1SG.ACC=introduced.3SG to   you

         b. ... [$_{vP}$ *v* [$_{ApplP}$ [me$_{ACC}$] [Appl [$_{vP}$ V [$_{PP}$ para [$_{DP}$ você]]]]]]

If the clitic realizes the *goal* argument, as in (19d), repeated in (34a), it is inherently licensed as a dative argument (under the thematic relation with the verb). In turn the DO, which is realized as a full pronoun, enters an *Agree* relation with the *v* head, being licensed under structural Case (cf. (34b)).

(34)   a. Inácio me=apresentou   você.
            Inácio 1SG.DAT=introduced.3SG you.ACC

         b. [$_{vP}$ *v* [$_{ApplP}$ [me$_{DAT}$] [Appl [$_{vP}$ V [$_{DP}$ você]]]]]

In the following subsection, we will discuss clitic doubling in DBP, which involves different structural and licensing properties as compared to clitic doubling in EP.

3.3 Clitic doubling in DBP

As mentioned above, DBP, and more restrictively BP, displays a type of clitic doubling, in which the doubled DP is introduced by the preposition *para* ('to'), not the dative marker *a*, as illustrated in (21a), from DBP, repeated in (35a), below. Moreover,

in DBP, the doubled DP may occur without a preposition, as illustrated in (21b), repeated as (35b), below.

(35)   a. eu to   *te*=falano   pra você
           I   am 2SG.DAT=speaking   to   you
           'I am talking to you'

        b. deixa eu *te*=perguntá   ocê   um negócio
           let   I   2SG.DAT=ask.INF you.ACC a   thing
           'let me ask you something'
        (adapted from Machado Rocha 2016: 23)

    In Machado Rocha's (2016) analysis, the absence of the preposition in (35b), above, provides support for the analysis of clitics in DBP as agreement markers. As such, they dispense with Case, while the full pronoun in the object position is licensed by the (little) *v* head in the VP shell projection. As pointed out by the author, "if clitics *me* and *te* were to receive case from *v*, there would be no source of Case to be assigned to the doubled DPs, unless they were always introduced by a preposition".[12]

    Galves (2020) notes that additional support for Machado Rocha's (2016) analysis could be the fact that this construction is also found in other dialects of BP, in relation to the innovative use of the second person clitic *te*. In Galves' analysis, an innovative property of the clitic *te* in BP is that it is deprived of the feature [familiarity], as confirmed by the example in (36), in which the clitic is doubled by the honorific DP *a Senhora* ('Madam').

(36)   Eu te=dou   esse livro para a Senhora
        I   2SG.DAT=give this book to   the Madam
        'I give this book to you [Madam]'
        (adapted from Galves 2020: 30)

    As already mentioned, Torres Morais & Salles (2022) provide an analysis for the presence of first and second person clitics in BP (as opposed to the absence of third person clitics), in which it is proposed that the system of clitics in BP displays a monovalent value for the feature [participant], which allows for their uniform occurrence as specifiers of a *high applicative* head. This property further interacts with the requirement that in this position the clitic enters a relation with the event (cf. section 3.2).

    Following Torres Morais & Salles (2022), we propose that the clitics *me* and *te* in clitic doubling in DBP are licensed as a *high applicative* as well. However, differently from the contexts in which first and second person are not doubled (cf. (16)), they occur as the spell out of the *phi*-features on the high Applicative head, given their non-argumental status in clitic doubling. In this respect, we follow Cuervo's (2003) analysis of ethical datives, which is crucially based the fact they are non-argumental, as well as on their occurrence in predicates with unergative verbs as well

---

[12]   In the original: "Se os clíticos *me* e *te* recebessem caso de *v*, não haveria uma fonte atribuidora de Caso para os DPs redobrados, a menos que eles fossem sempre preposicionados." (Machado Rocha 2016: 88)

as in configurations displaying a dative argument (involving a *high applicative* or an affected dative). Regarding the doubling DP, we propose that it is licensed either by the lexical preposition *para* ('to'), or in the DOC configuration, by the *v* head in the *v*-VP structure. In turn, in the former, the DO is structurally licensed by *v* (under *Agree*), while in the latter, it is licensed internally to the DOC configuration (see section 3.3), as shown in (37a) and (37b), respectively.[13]

(37)   a. eu tô [$_{vP}$ ... *v* [$_{ApplP}$ te [$_{VP}$ falano [$_{PP}$ pra [$_{DP}$ você]]]]]

         b. deixa eu [$_{vP}$ *v* [$_{ApplP}$ te [$_{VP}$ perguntar [$_{ApplP}$ ocê [$_{Appl'}$ [$_{DP}$ um negócio]]]]]]

The idea of analyzing first and second person clitics in clitic doubling in DBP as the spell out of the high Applicative head, due to their non-argumental status, finds a correlate in Machado Rocha (2016) and Machado Rocha and Ramos' (2016) proposal of analyzing them as agreement markers. In present terms, first and second person clitics have two different syntactic expressions, occurring either in the specifier position of the *high applicative* projection, due to their argumental status in constructions without clitic doubling, or as proforms lexicalizing the *high applicative* head, due to their non-argumental status in clitic doubling constructions.

4. Final considerations

In this study, we have shown that ditransitive constructions in DBP and BP display innovative properties in the grammatical encoding of the indirect object¸ as compared to EP, which can be analyzed in terms of microparametric variation (cf. Roberts 2007; Biberauer & Roberts, 2017). We have proposed that the relevant property distinguishing them is the absence of the interpretable person feature on the *high applicative* head in both DBP and BP, implying the loss of the true dative category, and its related phenomena, namely clitic doubling and clitic clusters (of the EP type). In the absence of the interpretable person feature on the applicative head, the prepositional ditransitive construction (PDC) is uniformly found, thus implying an alignment with benefactive constructions. It was further argued that the absence of the interpretable person feature on the applicative head gave rise to a type of DOC in DBP, in which the *goal* argument is licensed structurally under an *Agree* relation with the upper *v* head. As a related fact, we have also discussed the occurrence of a type of clitic doubling in DBP (restrictively found in BP). Considering that only first and second person clitics are involved in these varieties of Portuguese, implying the monovalent expression of the feature [participant] on the clitic system, it was proposed that these pronouns are the spell out of a *high applicative* head, working as proforms grammaticalizing the universal expression of the interpretable person feature in the grammatical system.

---

[13]   As expected, in the (restrictive) instantiation of clitic doubling in BP, the doubling DP is only introduced by the preposition *para* ('to'), given that DOC is not found in this variety.

List of abbreviations

SG: singular

PL: plural

F: feminine

M: masculine

ACC: accusative

DAT: dative

INF: infinitive

IMP: imperative

IPRF: imperfective

OBL: oblique

PRS: present

PRF: perfective

References

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2001. Two classes of direct object verbs – the role of zero morphology. In M. Vostendrop, & E. Anagnostopoulou (eds). *Progress in Grammar. Articles at the 20th Anniversary of the Comparison of Grammatical Models Group in Tilburg*, 1-27. http://www.meertens.nl/books/progressingrammar

Armelim, Paula R. G. 2011. *Sentenças bitransitivas do português do Brasil revisitadas à luz da Teoria dos núcleos aplicativos*. M.A. Dissertation, Universidade de São Paulo. https://doi.org/10.11606/D.8.2011.tde-04052011-142215

Barros, Isis J. 2018. *As preposições introdutórias de dative em verbos ditransitivos dinâmicos no português rural da Bahia: evidências do contato entre línguas*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidade Federal da Bahia.

Barros, Isis J. & Calindro, Ana R. 2023. Double Object Constructions in Afro-Brazilian Portuguese: contact-driven L2 learning and Maximizing Minimal Means. In Alice Corr & Norma Schifano (eds.), *Special issue of Isogloss. Open Journal of Romance Linguistics* 9(2)/4: 1-26. https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/isogloss.202

Barss, Andrew & Lasnik, Howard. 1986. A note on Anaphora and Double Objects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 347-354.

Berlinck, Rosane. A. 1996. The Portuguese Dative. In W. Van Belle & W. Van Langendonck (eds.), *The Dative. Descriptive Studies*, 119-151. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Berlinck, Rosane A. 2001. Complementos Preposicionados: Variação e Mudança no Português Brasileiro. *Letras* 56: 159-175.

Biberauer, Theresa, & Roberts, Ian G. Parameter setting. In A. Ledgeway & I. Roberts (eds.), *The handbook of historical syntax. Types and mechanisms of syntactic change*, 134-162. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bonet, Eulalia. 1994. The person-case constraint: A morphological approach. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 22. The Morphology-Syntax Connection*: 33-52.

Bonet, Eulália. 1995. *Morphology after syntax: Pronominal clitics in Romance languages*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Brasil, Americano. 1980. *Pela história de Goiás*. Goiânia: Editora Universidade Federal de Goiás.

Brito, Ana Maria. 2008. Grammar variation in the expression of verb arguments: the case of the Portuguese Indirect Object. *Phrasis, Studies in Language and Literature* 49 (2): 31-58.

Calindro, Ana. 2015. *Introduzindo argumentos: Uma proposta* para *as sentenças ditransitivas do português brasileiro*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidade de São Paulo. https://doi.org/10.11606/t.8.2016.tde-01032016/154938

Calindro, Ana 2020. Ditransitive constructions: What sets Brazilian Portuguese apart from other Romance languages? In A. Pineda, & J. Mateo (eds.), *Dative constructions in Romance and beyond* 75-95. Berlin: Language Science Press. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.37765535

Chaim, Marivone M. 1974. *Aldeamentos indígenas na capitania de Goiás: sua importância na política de povoamento (1789-1811)*. Goiânia: Editora Oriente.

Chaul, Nars Nagib F. 1997. *Caminhos de Goiás: da construção da decadência aos limites da modernidade*. Goiânia: Editora Universidade Federal de Goiás.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In M. Kenstowicz (ed.), *K. Hale: A Life in Language* 1-52. Cambridge: MA: MIT Press.

Cuervo, Maria Cristina. 2003. *Datives at Large*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute

of Technology.

Cuervo, Maria Cristina. 2010. Against ditransitivity. *Probus* 22: 151-180.

Cuervo, Maria Cristina. 2020. Datives as applicatives. In A. Pineda, & J. Mateo (eds.), *Dative constructions in Romance and beyond* (*Open Generative Syntax 7*) 1-42. Berlin: Language Science Press.

Cyrino, Sonia. 1997. *O objeto nulo no português brasileiro. Um estudo sintático-diacrônico*. Londrina: Editora Universidade Estadual de Londrina.

Diaconescu, Constanta R. & Rivero, Maria Luisa. 2007. An applicative analysis of Double Object Constructions in Romanian. *Probus* 19 (2): 171-195.

Diniz, Carolina R. 2007. *Eu te amo você. O redobro de pronomes clíticos sob uma abordagem minimalista*. M. A. dissertation. Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais.

Figueiredo-Silva, Maria Cristina. 2007. A perda do marcador dativo e algumas das suas consequências. In A. T. de Castilho, M. A. Torres Morais, R. V. Lopes, & S. Cyrino. *Descrição, história e aquisição do português brasileiro*, 85-110. São Paulo: Fapesp, Campinas: Pontes Editores.

Fournier, Daniel. 2010. *La structure du prédicat verbal: Une étude de la construction à double object en français*. Ph.D. thesis, University of Toronto.

Galves, Charlotte. 2001. *Ensaios sobre as Gramáticas do Português*. Campinas: Editora da Unicamp.

Galves, Charlotte 2020. Mudança sintática no português brasileiro. *Cuadernos de la Alfal*, 12 (2): 17-43.

Gomes, Christina. A. 1996. *Aquisição e perda de preposição no português do Brasil*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro.

Gomes, Christina. A. 2003. Variação e mudança na expressão do dativo no português brasileiro. In M. C. Paiva, & M. E. Duarte (eds.). *Mudança Linguística em Tempo Real*, 81–96. Rio de Janeiro: FAPERJ/Contra Capa.

Hale, Keneth & Keyser, Samuel J. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In K. Hale, & S. Keyser J. (eds.). *The View from Building 20*, 53-109. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harley, Heidi. 2002. Possession and the double object construction. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2 (1): 31–70. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.2.03clu

Kato, Mary A. 1999. Strong and Weak Pronominals in the Null Subject Parameter. *Probus* 11: 1-37.

Kayne, Richard. 1975. *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Kayne, Richard. 1984. *Connectedness and Binary Branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.

Lucchesi, Dante, & Mello, Camilla M. 2009. A alternância dativa. In A. Baxter, D. Lucchesi, & I. Ribeiro (eds.) *O Português Afro-brasileiro*, 427-53. Salvador: Editora Universidade Federal da Bahia.
https://doi.org/10.7476/9788523208752

Machado Rocha, Ricardo. 2016. *O redobro de clítico no Português Brasileiro Dialetal*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais.

Machado Rocha, Ricardo, & Ramos, Jânia M. 2016. Clitic doubling and pure agreement person features. *Revista Estudos da Linguagem* 24 (2): 378-416.

Manzini, Maria Rita, & Franco, Ludovico. 2016. Goal and DOM datives. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory*, 34: 197-240.
Mateus, Maria Helena M., Brito, A. M., Duarte, I., & Hub, I. 1985. *Gramática da língua portuguesa*. Lisboa: Caminho.

Mattos e Silva, Rosa Virgínia. 2004. *Ensaios* para *uma Sócio-história do Português Brasileiro*. São Paulo, Parábola.

Milani, Sebastião Elias. 2016. As contribuições do ALINGO para a descrição da língua brasileira. *Web-Revista Sociodialeto* 6: 106-121.

Nascimento, André. 2007. *A variação na expressão do dativo em variedades linguísticas rurais goianas*. M. A. dissertation, Universidade Federal de Goiás.

Nascimento, André. 2009. Variação e mudança na expressão do dativo em comunidades rurais goianas e suas relações com as origens do português brasileiro. *Domínios de lingu@gem* 3 (2): 33-74.

Nevins, Andrew. 2007. The representation of third person and its consequences for Person-Case effects. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 273-313.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-006-9017-2

Ormazabal, Javier, & Romero, Juan. 2007. The object agreement constraint. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25: 315-347.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-006-9010-9

Pancheva, Roumyana, & Zubizarreta, Maria Luiza. 2018. The Person Case Constraint: the syntactic encoding of perspective. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 36 (1): 1291-1337.
https://doi.org/10.1007/s11049-017-9395-7

Pereira, Manoel B. 2019. *Predicados bitransitivos do português dialetal do Brasil Central (PBC). Construções de objeto duplo e de redobro do clítico*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidade de Brasília.

Perlmutter, David. 1971. *Deep and surface structure constraints in syntax*. New York: Rinehart and Winston Inc.

Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero syntax: Experiencers and cascades*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pineda, Anna. 2013. Double Object Constructions and dative/ accusative alternations in Spanish and Catalan: a unified account. *Borealis*: *An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics* 2: 57-115.

Pineda, Anna 2020. From dative to accusative. An ongoing syntactic change in Romance. *Probus* 32 (1): 129-173.

Pylkkänen, Liina 2002. *Introducing Arguments*. Ph.D. thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
Pylkkänen, Liina. 2008. *Introducing arguments*. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Ramos, Jania. 1992. *Marcação sintática e mudança sintática no português*. Ph.D. thesis, Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

Ramos, Jânia. 2010. *Corpus do dialeto mineiro: textos orais; textos escritos dos séculos XVIII, XIX e XX*. Belo Horizonte: UFMG/ FAPEMIG/ CNPq. Núcleo de Pesquisa em Variação Linguística.

Ramos, Jânia & Salles, Heloisa M. L. 2017. In E. Pilati *et al*. (eds.) *Novos olhares* para *a gramática do português brasileiro*, 131-150. São Paulo: Pontes.

Raposo, Eduardo. 1998. Some observations on the pronominal system of Portuguese. *Catalan Working Papers in Linguistics* 6: 59-93.

Raposo, Eduardo *et al.* 2013. *Gramática do português*, volume 2. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.

Rezende, Tânia; Pádua, Hosamis R. de. 2004. *Projeto Estudo da Fala de Goiás. Corpora linguísticos. Fala rural goiana*. Letras/ Universidade Federal de Goiás.

Roberts, Ian. 2007. *Diachronic Syntax*. Cambridge: Oxford University Press.

Rocha, Bárbara G. 2017. *Applicatives in Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese.* M. A. dissertation, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais.

Salles, Heloisa M. L. 1997. *Prepositions and the Syntax of Complementation*. Ph.D. thesis. University of Wales.

Salles, Heloisa M. L. 2016. The syntax of (ditransitive) predicates of transference in Dialectal Brazilian Portuguese. *Quaderni di Linguistica e Studi Orientali* 2: 79-96.

Salles, Heloisa M. L., & Torres Morais, Maria Aparecida. 2020. Estrutura argumental no português brasileiro: perdas e alinhamentos inovadores nos sistemas pronominal e preposicional. *Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 12 (2): 467-490.

Scher, Ana Paula. 1996. *As construções com dois complementos no inglês e no português do Brasil*. M. A. dissertation, Universidade Estadual de Campinas.

Sheehan, Michelle. 2020. The Romance Person Case Constraint is not about clitic clusters. In A. Pineda, & J. Mateu (eds.). *Dative constructions in Romance and beyond*, 143-171. Berlin: Language Science Press.
DOI 10.5281/zenodo.3776543

Torres Morais, Maria Aparecida. 2006. Um cenário para o núcleo aplicativo no português europeu. *Abralin* 5: 239-266.
Torres Morais, Maria Aparecida. 2007. *Dativos*. Tese de Livre Docência, Universidade de São Paulo.

Torres Morais, Maria Aparecida, & Salles, Heloisa M. L. 2010. Parametric change in the grammatical encoding of indirect objects in Brazilian Portuguese. *Probus* 22: 181-209.

Torres Morais, Maria Aparecida, & Salles, Heloisa M. L. 2016. The external possessor construction in European Portuguese and Brazilian Portuguese. In M. Kato, & F. Ordoñez (eds.). *The morphosyntax of Portuguese and Spanish in Latin America*, 204-235. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Torres Morais, Maria Aparecida & Salles, Heloisa M. L. 2019. *Possessivos de 3ª pessoa na História do Português Brasileiro*. In C. Galves, M. Kato & I. Roberts (eds.) *Português Brasileiro. Uma Segunda Viagem Diacrônica,* 174-201. Campinas: Editora da UNICAMP.

Torres Morais, Maria Aparecida, & Salles, Heloisa M. L. 2022. Resistência do dativo de 1ª pessoa na batalha (quase) perdida dos clíticos pronominais do português brasileiro. *Revista Estudos Linguísticos* 30 (4): 1621-1657.
DOI: 10.17851/2237-2083.30.4.1621-1657