Spanish allows its post-verbal subjects to appear in the VSO and VOS configurations. It has been generally assumed that the second order is generated by the adjunction of the subject to the right (Rizzi 1982, Torrego 1984, and Suen 1984). This paper explores an alternative to this traditional view in which this order is generated by the scrambling of the objects to the left. Empirical support in favor of this hypothesis comes from certain syntactic asymmetries between VSO and VOS. Some of these asymmetries reflect the fact that the object c-commands the subject in the VOS order but not in the VSO order. In other cases, the asymmetries show that certain types of objects cannot move to the left to produce the VOS order. This is the result predicted by the constrained nature of scrambling. Specifically, there is a parallel between these alternations in Spanish and the same ones observed in scrambling languages (e.g., German or Korean) with SOV and OSV alternations. Finally, this hypothesis supports the line of research put forward by Kayne (1994) for word order in UG, according to which right adjunction is not possible.

0. Introduction:

The VSO and VOS Orders in Spanish

Spanish is generally considered an SVO language which nevertheless allows its subjects to appear post-verbally either before or after objects. The VSO order is attested in questions as well as in declaratives (1) and (2):

1. ¿A quién le prestó Juan el diccionario?
   to whom el-lent  Juan the dictionary
   Who did Juan lend the dictionary to?

2. Espero que te devuelva Juan el libro.
   I hope that el-you-return Juan the book
   I hope Juan returns the book to you.

In view of some proposals about verb movement (Edmonds 1978, Pollock 1989) and the VP internal subject hypothesis (Koopman and Sportiche

* For discussion of different parts of this article at earlier stages I would like to thank A. Cardinaletti, J. Costa, E. Herburger, M. L. Hernanz, C. Picallo, G. Rigau, F. Roca, E. Trevisan, X. Villalba. I would also especially like to thank E. Torrego for her written comments and the four anonymous NLLT reviewers for helping me improve this study. Special thanks are also due to Juan Uringeréka and Richard Kayne for their help and encouragement.

1991), the VSO order is derived by moving the verb past the base-generated position of the subject in Spec VP. Suñer (1994), in fact, gives independent arguments to think that verbs in Spanish always move to the highest inflectional projection of the verb (FP1), and the subject stays in situ. This analysis seems unproblematic and is accepted here:

\[(3)\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{FP1} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{FP2}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{F1'} \\
\text{V}\text{t}_1 \\
\text{F2'} \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{compró} \\
\text{F2} \\
\text{VP}
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{S} \\
\text{Juan} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{O} \\
\text{t}_1 \\
\text{el diccionario}
\end{array}
\]

The VOS order is also attested in questions and declaratives:

1 The VSO and VOS orders differ with respect to their interaction with focus. Zubizarreta (1995) points out that VSO order can be associated with two different focus structures depending on which element gets the main sentence stress. If the subject receives the main sentence stress, the focus could be the object or the subject and the object together, as in (i). If the subject receives main sentence stress, the object gets downstressed, and the subject can be the only focus, as in (ii). This later focus structure is more marked than the former. I indicate main sentence stress in bold and possible focus is underlined:

(i) ¿A quién le prestó Juan el diccionario?
(ii) ¿A quién le prestó Juan el diccionario?

In the VOS order, the subject receives main sentence stress, and it can be the only focus of the sentence.

(iii) ¿A quién le prestó el diccionario Juan?

See also Webolshuch (1992, p. 165, fn. 2), who points out that, for German, the parallel OS(V) order is possible only when the S is heavily focused.
(4) ¿A quién le prestó el diccionario Juan?
    *to whom cl-lent the dictionary Juan*
    Who did Juan lend the dictionary to?

(5) Espero que te devuelva el libro Juan.
    *I hope that cl-you-return the book Juan*
    I hope that Juan returns the book to you.

Suer (1994) and Torregro (1984) follow Rizzi’s (1982) analysis of subject inversion in Italian and propose that the VOS order is obtained by having the subject right-adjoint to the VP as in (6). This arrangement could be a base-generated adjunction or an adjunction produced by some sort of rightward movement, such as extraposition.

(6) The Right Adjunction Hypothesis

```
   F'P2
    ↑  
   Spec  F2'
    ↑  
    F2  VP
     ↑  
     VP  S
     ↑  
     Spec  V'
      ↑  
      V  O
```

The proposal made here departs from this view by claiming that this order is created by movement of the object to the Spec of a higher inflectional projection. The landing site for this movement of the object

---

7 While the proliferation of functional projections in recent years, there are various possible landing sites for these right adjunctions. Despite all these new options, many linguists have continued to assume in recent years either adjacency to the right of the VP or a specifier to the right: Suer (1994) for Spanish, Rizzi (1990) for Italian, Motapanyane (1991) for Romanian, and Solà (1992) and Bonet (1988) for Catalan. The choice of right adjacency to the VP or to any other higher functional projection does not change substantially the arguments against it in the following pages.
would be lower than the final position of the verb, but to the left of the base position of the subject. This movement is essentially scrambling of an object to the left:³

(7) The Scrambling Hypothesis

\[
\begin{array}{c}
F P 1 \\
\text{Spec} \quad F \quad F^1 \\
\text{F} \quad F P 2 \\
\text{Spec} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{O} \\
el \ \text{dicionario} \\
F 2 \\
\text{Spec} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{S} \quad S u a n \\
V \quad t_i \\
\text{compró} \\
\end{array}
\]

The two hypotheses differ crucially in the hierarchical representation of the VOS order. In the Right Adjunction Hypothesis, the subject adjoined to the VP c-commands the object in its base-generated position. The Scrambling Hypothesis posits, on the contrary, that the scrambled object in Spec of FP2 c-commands the subject in Spec of VP.⁴ Thus, with the

³ Throughout the paper I adopt Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetry proposal for word order. Under his proposal, the distinction between adjunction to a maximal projection and a specifier of a maximal projection collapses. I do not think that we can consider scrambling as movement to Spec AgrO for case reasons, as it is not only DPs but other PP objects that are subject to scrambling. Instead, I will adopt the idea by Saito (1992) and Frank, Lee and Rambow (1992) that this type of short distance scrambling is non-operator non-A movement. See Corver and Riemsdijk (1994) for ongoing debate on the status of scrambling with respect to the A-A' dichotomy.

⁴ As pointed out by a reviewer, there is a third possible way to obtain the VOS order, one in which the object is scrambled to the left and the subject is right-adjointed to the VP. Observe that under this alternative the object c-commands the subject, which is nevertheless right-adjointed:

(i) \[ [F P 1 \text{object}, [VP [VP t_i, t_i] \text{subject}]] \]

However, simple economy considerations block the possibility of this derivation. Given that
Right Adjunction Hypothesis there are no hierarchical differences between the VOS and VSO orders. In both orders the subject c-commands the object. The only differences lie in the linear ordering of the object and subject, and so there should be no syntactic asymmetries in hierarchical terms. From a scrambling perspective, on the other hand, the orderings are asymmetrical; the subject c-commands the object in the VSO order while the object c-commands the subject in VOS order. Therefore, the Scrambling Hypothesis can accommodate the syntactic asymmetries shown in subsequent sections. Interestingly, the asymmetries between the orders of subjects and objects in post-verbal positions are similar to equivalent cases in the pre-verbal positions in languages such as German, Hindi, and Korean, where a scrambling analysis is widely assumed. The differences between Spanish on the one hand, and Korean, German, and Hindi on the other, can be reduced to a difference in the syntax of verb movement. Verbs move to the highest inflectional projection before Spell-Out in Spanish but not in German, Hindi, or Korean. Finally, from the perspective of the Scrambling Hypothesis, we expect to find the same type of constraints on the elements that can undergo this type of movement as have been found in the literature on scrambling.

The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 1 covers the asymmetries between these two orderings with respect to binding (quantifier binding in 1.1 and principle C effects in 1.2) and certain reconstruction effects with subject binders also found in other scrambling languages (section 1.3). Section 2 examines asymmetries in the distribution of post-verbal wh-words in situ. Section 3 looks at how the interpretation of indefinite objects is affected by the scrambling of these elements to the left. Section 4 consists of a discussion of scrambling of the Indirect Object (IO), which has effects on the appearance of dative clitic doubling. In the conclusion, we discuss how these facts support Kayne’s (1994) antisymmetry proposal.
1. Binding

1.1. Quantifier Binding

The first asymmetry is found in the domain of quantifier binding. It is a standard claim in the literature about anaphora that in order to have a pronoun interpreted as a variable bound by a quantifier, the pronoun must be in the c-command domain of that quantifier (Reinhart 1983, p. 122, among others). This condition is violated in the example in (8), where the subject possessive pronoun is to be understood as coreferent with the object quantifier:

(8)a. *Su amigo le regaló un libro [a cada niño],
    his friend cl-bought a book [for each boy]
    para su cumpleaños,
    for his birthday

b. *Su madre le presentó (a) [cada niño], al director
    his mother cl-introduced [each boy] (DO) to the director (IO)

As expected, the same fact holds with the post-verbal subjects when they precede the object quantifier, as in (9):

(9)a. *¿Qué le regaló su amigo [a cada niño],
    what cl-bought [his friend] (S) [for each boy] (IO)
    para su cumpleaños?
    for his birthday
    What did his friend buy for each boy for his birthday?

b. *Este libro se lo regaló su amigo [a cada niño],
    this book cl-gave [his friend] (S) [for each boy] (IO)
    This book, his friend gave it for each boy.

c. *¿A quién le presentó su madre (a) [cada niño]?
    to whom cl-introduced his mother (S) each boy (DO)
    Who did his mother introduce each boy to?

d. *Aquí presentó su madre (a) [cada niño],
    here introduced his mother (S) each boy (DO)
    Here, his mother introduced each boy.
In the analysis of the VSO order represented in (3), the possessive pronoun in the subject in Spec of VP is not c-commanded by the object, and therefore pronominal binding cannot be established.\(^5\)

However, when the object quantifier precedes the subject, the bound interpretation becomes available in all examples.

\[(10)\]
\[
\text{a. } \text{¿Qué le regaló [a cada niño], su amigo?} \\
\quad \text{what cl-bought [for each boy] (IO) [his friend] (S)} \\
\quad \text{para su cumpleaños? for his birthday}
\]
\[
\text{b. Este libro se lo regaló [a cada niño], su amigo.} \\
\quad \text{this book cl-gave [for each boy] (IO) [his friend] (S)}
\]
\[
\text{c. ¿A quién le presentó (a) [cada niño], su madre?} \\
\quad \text{to whom cl-introduced [each boy] (DO) his mother (S)}
\]
\[
\text{d. Aquí presentó (a) [cada niño], su madre?} \\
\quad \text{here introduced [each boy] (DO) his mother (S)}
\]

The right adjunction analysis of the VOS, as represented in (11), is incapable of rendering an easy account of these examples in (10). Under this structural analysis, the subject right-joined to the VP would not be c-commanded by the object quantifier, just as in the VSO order.

\(^5\) As discussed in footnote 1, there are two prosodic structures associated with the VSO order, a more neutral one in which the object receives the main sentence stress and a marked one in which the subject receives main sentence stress. While there seems to be a consensus that WCO clearly obtains under the more neutral structure, an anonymous reviewer claims that all the cases of WCO improve under the more marked focus structure in which the subject receives main sentence stress, as in (1). There was no agreement in this respect between the speakers I consulted. Some examples seem to get better but they are not judged to be as fully acceptable as the ones in (10).

\[(1) \quad \text{¿Aqui presento SU MADRE [a cada niño].} \]

Observe that the same speakers that allow the marked (1) also tend to allow (ii):

\[(ii) \quad \text{¿SU MADRE presentó [a cada niño].} \]

The problem suggests that certain discourse factors may override the condition on WCO for some speakers. See Zubizarreta (1995) for an account in terms of binding and discourse.
(11) The Right Adjunction Hypothesis

```
(0) Spec F2' F2 V P
    |       |   |
    V P S  su amigo
    |       |   |
    Spec V' [a cada niño]
    |   |
    V O
```

Under the scrambling proposal, on the other hand, the examples are analyzed as in (12). The object quantifier (O or DQ) in the Spec of FP2 c-commands the subject in Spec VP and quantifier binding can be established. Scrambling creates a new binding possibility which was not available in either the SVO or the VSO orders.

(12) The Scrambling Hypothesis

```
(0) Spec F1' F1 F2 FP2
    |       |   |
    V P Q [a cada niño]
    |       |   |
    Spec E2' F2 V P
    |       |   |
    V S su amigo
    |   |
    V' ti
```

Parallel asymmetries with respect to the possibilities of pronominal

---

6 I assume, in agreement with Frank, Lee, and Rambow (1992), the view that binding theory is a constraint on non-operator positions.
binding between the object-quantifier binder and subject bindee have been found in German, Korean, and Hindi. These languages differ from Spanish in that the alternations occur in pre-verbal position. The overt or covert possessives in the (a) cases of (13)–(15) cannot be bound because, with their subject-object quantifier order, the c-command condition is not met. However, in the (b) cases, with the order object quantifier-subject, binding can be established:

**German** (Frank, Lee and Rambow 1992)

(13)a. "Ich glaube, daß [sein, Vater] jedem, das Bild gezeigt hat

I think that [his father] (S) everyone-(IO) the picture shown has

I think that his father has shown everyone the picture.

b. Ich glaube, daß [jedem,] [sein, Vater] das Bild gezeigt hat

everyone (IO) [his father] (S) the picture shown has

**Korean** (Frank, Lee, and Rambow 1992)

(14)a. "[pro, apecil]-ka mwukwu-eykeyn-na pro-GEN father (S) everyone-DAT-UQ (IO)
yongton-ul cwunta money-ACC (DO) gives

His father gives everyone money.

b. [mwukwu-eykeyn-na] [pro, apecil]-ka yongton-ul every-DAT-UQ (IO) pro-GEN father (S) money-ACC (DO) cwunta
gives

**Hindi** (Mahajan 1992)

(15)a. *[unkii, bahin] sab-ko, pyaar kartii thii their sister (S) everyone (DO) love do-imp-f be-pst-f

Their sister loved everyone.

b. [sab-ko,] [unkii, bahin] pyarr kartii thii everyone (DO) their sister (S) love do-imp-f be-pst-f
In these languages, all the (b) cases are analyzed as cases of scrambling of the object quantifier to the left past the position of the subject.

1.2. Principle C Effects

Similar symmetries with respect to scrambling are found in the domain of principle C of the binding theory. In (16) the referential expression *Eva* embedded in the subject position can be coindexed with the IO pronoun *a ella* without triggering any violation of principle C, since there is no c-command. These same facts hold in post-verbal position with the order VSO, as in (17). However, with the VOS order, this co-indexing yields an ungrammatical result (18).\(^7\)

\(^7\) DO and IO strong pronouns must be doubled in Peninsular Spanish. Doubling of DOs with lexical elements is impossible in all varieties of Spanish except Rio Platense, which allows doubling of [−animate] [+specific] DP Objects (Jaeggli 1982). In contrast, doubling of IO is permitted in all varieties, and it is never restricted by specificity. In the text I have assumed that what counts for binding purposes is the doubled XP, not the clitic. For example, the presence or absence of the clitic does not obviate a WCO configuration as shown in (i) and (ii):

(i)  *El juez no le contará la de su amigo a nadie.*
    *the judge neg cl-IO tell-fut of his friend to no one*
    The judge won’t tell about his friend to no one.

(ii) *Eli juez no contará la de su amigo a nadie.*
    *the judge neg cl-IO tell-fut of his friend to no one*
    The judge won’t tell about his friend to anyone.

The presence or absence of the clitic also does not destroy a pronominal binding configuration, so the two sentences are equally grammatical.

(iii) *El profesor devolverá [cada libro] a su propietario.*
    *The professor will return [each book] to its owner*

(iv) *El profesor le devolverá [cada libro] a su propietario.*
    *The professor cl-will return [each book] to its owner*

Finally the grammaticality of (17a) shows that the clitic doubling the XP cannot count for binding with respect to Principle C effects (see also Varela 1988). In this respect Spanish seem to behave differently from Greek, in which the presence of the clitic is crucial for the determination of binding, as shown by Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1996).

\(^8\) It is important to distinguish the case in (18) from one where there is a pause between the IO and the subject as in (i). With right dislocation of the subject binding can be established:

(i) *¿Qué le compraron a ella, los hermanos de Eva?*
    *What cl-bought for her (IO) Eva’s brothers (S)*
Spanish

(16) Los hermanos de Eva, le compraron el libro a ella,
Eva's brothers (S) bought the book for her (IO)

(17)a. ¿Qué le compraron los hermanos de Eva, a ella?
what cl bought Eva's brothers (S) for her (IO)
What did Eva's brothers buy for her?
b. El libro, se lo compraron los hermanos de Eva, a ella,
the book cl-bought Eva's brothers (S) for her (IO)
The book, Eva's brothers bought for her.

(18)a. *¿Qué le compraron a ella, los hermanos de Eva,?
What cl-bought for her (IO) Eva's brothers (S)

b. *El libro, se lo compraron a ella, los hermanos de Eva,
The book cl-bought for her (IO) Eva's brothers (S)

From a scrambling perspective, the ungrammaticality of (18) with the VOS order is explained since the IO has been proposed to a c-commanding position with respect to the following subject, and consequently it is able to trigger a principle C effect.²

Parallel contrasts to the ones found in (16)–(18) are reported in German and Korean. I just report here the German examples given by Frank, Lee, and Rambow (1992):

(19)a. daß [die Brüder vom Hans] ihm, das Bild gezeigt
that the brothers of Hans (S) him (IO) the picture shown
haben
have
that the brothers of Hans have shown him the picture

² The deviance of (18) cannot be an effect of backward anaphora. Backward anaphora is perfectly possible with the VOS order as in (i).

(i) ¿Qué le compraron a su hijo, los directores?  
What cl-bought for his son (IO) the directors (S)
What did the directors buy for his son?
1.3. Reconstruction Effects

The parallelism between Spanish and the languages where a scrambling analysis is assumed holds even for cases where this type of movement shows reconstruction effects. If the relationship between binder and bindlee is reversed – so that subject is a quantifier binder and the object contains the possessive pronoun – no asymmetry is established; i.e., binding is possible with both orderings, as can be seen in (20) and (21):

(20)a. ¿Qué le regaló [cada niño], a su amigo?
    what cl-bought each boy (S) for his friend (IO)

b. ¿Qué le regaló a su amigo [cada niño]?
    what cl-bought for his friend (IO) each boy (S)

(21)a. Aquí besó [cada niña], a su amiga
    here kissed [each girl] (S) [her friend] (DO)

b. Aquí besó [a su amiga] [cada niña],
    here kissed [her friend] (DO) [each girl] (S)

A similar lack of asymmetry is found in equivalent cases in German and Korean:

(22)a. Ich glaube, daß jeder, [seinem Vater] die Bilder
    I think that everyone (S) his father (IO) the picture
    gezeigt hat.
    shown has
    I think that everyone has shown his father the pictures

b. Ich glaube, daß [seinem Vater] jeder, die Bilder
    his father (IO) everyone (S) the pictures
    gezeigt hat.
    shown has

Korean (Frank, Lee and Rambow 1992)
(23a. [Nwukwuna-ka], [pro, chinkwu]-eykey komin-ul
everyone (S) pro-GEN friend (IO) problem ACC (DO)
theleohnhunta.
tell
Everyone tells his friend problems.

b. [pro, chinkwu]-eykey [nwukwuna-ka], komin-ul
pro-GEN friend (IO) everyone (S) problem ACC (DO)
theleohnhunta.
tell

Reconstruction effects are also found with anaphors: the subject binds the object anaphor — de si mismus (about themselves) — whether it precedes or follows the subject binder. The same effects are found in Hindi with reciprocals; the scrambling of the object reciprocal does not destroy the anaphoric relations, as shown in (25).

**Spanish**
(24a. ¿Cuándo habló [tu hermana], [de sí misma],?
When talked your sister (S) about herself.

b. ¿Cuándo habló [de sí misma], [tu hermana],?
When talked about herself your sister (S).

**Hindi** (Mahajan 1992)
(25a. [raam Or siitaa] ek duusre-ko pasand Karte hEn
[Ram and Sita], (S) each other, (DO) like
Ram and Sita like each other.

b. ek duusre-ko [raam Or siitaa] pasand Karte hEn
each other, (DO) [Ram and Sita], (S) like

Under the Scrambling Hypothesis all the cases that do not show asymmetry are accommodated in terms of reconstruction. This in itself is an important reason for thinking that the VSO and VOS orders are mediated by the creation of a chain of the movement of the object to the left. In Chomsky's (1993) understanding of reconstruction as an option left by the copy and deletion theory of movement, these cases of reconstruction would appear as in (26). The tail of Chain j, the chain formed by the
scrambled object, has been deleted at PF.\footnote{The deleted material is printed in bold face, here and below.} Observe that the c-command requirement is established between the subject quantifier and the tail of the chain formed by the scrambled object.

(26) Aquí besó [a su, amigal] [cada niña], [a su, amigal].

Nevertheless, in sections 1.1 and 1.2 the relevant configuration for the computation of bound anaphora and principle C was the c-commanding relationship between the head of the scrambling chain and the subject. Thus, no reconstruction effects were obtained. The examples are repeated here as (27) and (28).

(27) Este libro se lo regaló [a cada niño], su, amigo [a cada niño].

(28) "¿Qué le compraron a ella, los hermanos de Eva, a ella?"

Therefore there is a need to explain why reconstruction effects are obtained only in some cases.\footnote{I leave aside the question of reconstruction effects with respect to A-movement.} To do so, I will adopt a derivational approach for the computation of pronominal binding and principle C effects. Under this approach, any point in the derivation at which the relevant relation of c-command is obtained will trigger pronominal binding and principle C effects.

Note that the idea that principle C has to be computed derivationally is not new; it has already been proposed by Lebeaux (1988) and Heycock (1995). Given this approach, in (28), the indirect object a ella enters into c-command with los hermanos de Eva when it is scrambled. At that point, principle C is triggered, rendering the sentence ungrammatical. Thus, no reconstruction effects are obtained.

Similarly, Santorini and Lee (1994) have proposed a condition on the bound interpretation of pronouns that is also derivational in essence. According to their condition, binding between a quantifier and a pronoun obtains anytime a quantifier or a link of a chain of a quantifier c-commands a pronoun or a link of a chain containing a pronoun.\footnote{Given that binding has to be understood as restrictions on non-operator elements, we automatically exclude the possibility of a Wh in Spec CP binding into a pronoun in subject position. Thus, the WCO effects are still maintained in the examples with interrogatives.} From that perspective, reconstruction effects depend on whether the relevant c-command relation is obtained at an intermediate stage in the derivation or at the final stage. Thus, pronominal binding for the scrambling of quantifiers can be satisfied at a later stage in the derivation as we saw in (27), (10b)–(10d). Specifically, c-command is obtained between the head of the chain...
and the subject. On the other hand, in examples (20b), (21b), and (26),
the c-command relationship was already established at the starting point
of the derivation, when the pronoun of the object was c-commanded by
the subject quantifier.\textsuperscript{13} Further movement of the object containing the
bound pronoun is irrelevant since the condition on bound anaphora has
already been satisfied. To conclude, from a derivational perspective, the
variation between examples \textit{without} reconstruction (as in sections 1.1 and
1.2) and examples with reconstruction (as in section 1.3) reduces to a
single difference: the stage in the derivation at which binding conditions
are satisfied.\textsuperscript{14}

In conclusion, we observe striking parallelisms with respect to binding
possibilities when the object precedes the subject in post-verbal position
in Spanish and the equivalent in pre-verbal position in German, Korcan,
and Hindi. For the latter cases a rule is widely assumed that prepenses
the object over the subject to a higher position. It is natural and empirically
plausible to extend this analysis to Spanish.

2. \textit{Post-verbal Wh-Elements}

Another asymmetry between the VSO and VOS orderings in Spanish is
found in the relative distribution of post-verbal wh-elements. The post-
verbal wh-subject must precede the post-verbal wh-object, as can be shown
by the contrasts in (29) and (30):

\textit{Post-verbal Subject and Object wh-elements}

\begin{align*}
(29)a. & \quad \text{¿Qué le compró quién a quién?}^{15} \\
& \quad \text{what cl-bought who (S) for whom (IO)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(29)b. & \quad \text{¿Qué le compró a quién quién?} \\
& \quad \text{what cl-bought for whom (IO) who (S)}
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{13} Santorini and Lee's (1994) formulation is more complex than what I have expressed in
the main text. Their principle requires that the satisfaction of the pronominal binding be
done in a certain domain defined by the existence of a subject Agreement (what they call a
binding domain). In this domain, which they call an argument domain, all theta roles are
satisfied. See Santorini and Lee (1994) for a more explicit formulation of their principle.

\textsuperscript{14} As pointed out to me by Marcel Den Dikken, the derivational approach to Principle C
and quantifier binding should guarantee that in the VOS order, movement of the subject at
LF to check case and agreement features in AgrS would not destroy the binding already
obtained before spell-out. This movement of the subject at LF would be thought of in terms

\textsuperscript{15} For all these examples we abstract away from the echo interpretation.
(30)a. ¿Qué dijo quién de quién?
   what said who (S) about who (O)

   b. ¿Qué dijo de quién quién?
   what said about who (O) who (S)

The same contrast holds with the respective ordering of post-verbal wh-DOs and wh-IOs in (31):

(31)a. ¿Quién le compró qué a quién?
   Who cl-bought what to whom

   b. ¿Quién le compró a quién qué?
   who cl-bought to whom what

Under the scrambling proposal, the ungrammatical post-verbal sequences of wh-elements are the result of scrambling the wh-object to the left of the wh-subject in the examples (29b)–(30b), and moving the wh-IO to the left of the wh-DO in (31b).

The distribution of the post-verbal wh-elements in the (b) configurations seems analogous to a standard case of a superiority condition violation, where a wh-element has been moved, crossing overtly over another hierarchically superior c-commanding wh-element. However, it is difficult for a superiority approach to reconcile the ungrammaticality of the (b) cases with the fact that such a “superiority effect” does not arise between a wh-word in Spec CP and a post-verbal wh-word (Jaeggli 1982). An object-wh can be in CP, crossing over a hierarchically superior subject, as in (32b).

(32)a. ¿Quién compró qué?
   Who bought what

   b. ¿Qué compró quién?
   What bought who

It is thus worth considering that the ungrammaticality of (29b)–(31b) may not be reducible to the superiority phenomenon, but to some constraint on the scrambling of wh-elements in situ. It has been noticed for German that wh-phrases, unlike non wh-elements, resist scrambling (Fancock 1990, Müller and Sternewald 1995).

16. Hindi and Korean do allow scrambling of wh-words. See Müller and Sternewald (1995) for a possible parametrical explanation for the differences between these languages.
with the contrast between (33b), with scrambling of the wh-object was and (33c), with scrambling of the NP das Auto:

(33)a. Wie hat der Fritz was repariert?
how has Fritz what fixed?
(Müller and Sternefeld 1995)
How has Fritz repaired what?

b. *Wie hat der Fritz repariert?
how has what Fritz fixed?

(33)c. Wie hat das Auto der Fritz repariert?
how has the car Fritz fixed?

More examples, similar to the German ones, which show the ban on scrambling wh-XPs in Spanish are given in (34), which contrasts with (35):

(34)a. ¿Quién regaló estas flores para quién?
who bought these flowers for who

b. ¿Qué dijo comprarle Luis diariamente a quién?
what said to buy Luis everyday to whom

(35)a. *¿Quién regaló para quién estas flores?17
who cl-bought for who these flowers
Who told whom what happened?

b. *¿Qué dijo comprarle a quién Luis diariamente?
What said to buy to whom Luis everyday

In order to cope with this ban on the scrambling of wh-words in situ, Müller and Sternefeld (1993) propose that the grammar should distinguish between different types of A’ movement (scrambling, wh movement, and topicalization) in terms of their landing site.18 They show empirical evidence that these different processes obey different locality conditions.

---

17 This order is felicitous with a right dislocation of the NP that follows, as in (i). This is why the cases, involving more than one wh-word in situ (29)–(31b) in post-verbal position are clearer, since a right dislocation of a wh-word in situ is completely impossible.

(i) ¿Quién regaló para quién # estas flores?
who cl-bought for who # these flowers.

18 There are two landing sites for the cases discussed: Spec of a functional projection for scrambled elements, and Spec of CP for wh-movement. We leave topicalization aside.
even in the same language, and that the grammar should have a principle of Unambiguous Binding that avoids any interaction between them. This principle would keep one type of \(\lambda\) movement (scrambling) from feeding another type of movement (wh-movement).\(^{19}\)

(36) **PRINCIPLE OF UNAMBIGUOUS BINDING**

a variable that is alpha-bound must be beta-free in the domain of the domain of the head of the chain (where alpha and beta refer to different types of positions)

(Müller and Sternefeld 1993)

In the ungrammatical cases (29b)–(31b), the wh-word IO *a quién* has been moved to Spec of FP2, the landing site for scrambled elements, by Spell-Out. At LF *a quién* would have to move to Spec CP in order to yield an operator-variable configuration. However, at this point there is a violation of the principle of unambiguous binding at LF. The original trace of *a quién* in the VP shell is simultaneously linked to the trace in the scrambling site Spec of FP2 (\(\ast\)) and the wh-word adjoined to CP at LF.

---

\(^{19}\) If we assume wh-elements to be indefinites, it is tempting to think that the ban on the scrambling of wh-elements is due to the ban on scrambling of non-specific indefinites, as predicted by the mapping hypothesis of Diesing (1992). However, the idea is problematic for the following reason. On the one hand, Heim (1987), who assumed that wh-elements are decomposed into an operator and an indefinite or existential component, states that the existential component is always semantically interpreted in its base position. Thus, at LF the indefinite part would always be interpreted inside the VP domain in all the cases of scrambling, rendering the mapping hypothesis irrelevant. On the other hand, we still might predict that we would be able to find cases in which the scrambling of a wh-word would be good under a certain specific interpretation. See Heim (1987) for specific interpretation of sentences containing a single wh-element. However, such sentences are judged ungrammatical. Finally, the restriction on specificity for scrambled indefinites does not go in tandem with the restriction on scrambling of wh-words, as shown by Hindi, which allows scrambling of wh-elements (Malajkan 1992), but restricts scrambling of indefinites to the ones with a specific interpretation (Malaika 1991).
This principle has the additional advantage of explaining why Spanish has WCO effects with wh-words in Spec CP as in (38):

(38)a. ¿A quién vio su madre?
   to whom (DO) saw his mother (S)
   Who did his mother see?

b. \[ _{V_P} [A \text{ quién}_i] [_{V_P} \text{ vio} [_{F_P^2} t_i [_{V_P} \text{ su} \text{ madre} [t_i]]]] \]

In section 1.1, I showed that scrambling of a direct or indirect object can override WCO effects (example (10b)). If overt wh-movement in Spanish uses this intermediate scrambling position as an escape hatch toward its final landing site in Spec CP, as represented in (37), there should be no WCO effects. In the first movement to Spec FP2 the wh-
word *a quien* would command the subject in Spec VP, *en madre*, and binding could be established with the possessive pronoun. For the unambiguous binding approach, this could not be a possibility since scrambling can never feed wh-movement.

In sum, there is good reason to think that the restricted distribution of post-verbal wh-words in situ in Spanish is due to some ban on the scrambling of these elements. This fact was already noticed for German by Fanselow (1990), Müller and Sternefeld (1995). It is possible to adopt Müller and Sternefeld’s approach of unambiguous binding which supplies a theoretical way to deal with the problem. Moreover, the unambiguous binding condition seems to be independently motivated in Spanish in order to explain the existence of WCO effects with overt wh extraction.20

3. Interpretation of Indefinites

The objective of this section is to support the claim that the order VOS is obtained by scrambling of the object to the left, by discussing the interpretive effects of scrambling.

As has been pointed out recently in the literature, scrambling has effects on the specificity and related scopal properties of indefinites which are moved. For example, Kural (1992) shows that scrambling can affect the scopal possibilities of the different quantifiers in Turkish. In (39a), the subject quantifier ‘three’ is naturally understood as taking wide scope over the IO ‘every car’. However, in the sentence (39b), where the IO is scrambled, the judgments are reversed, and it is naturally understood with a wide scope interpretation for the IO:

(39)a. [Üç kişi] [her arabayla] binmiş (Turkish, Kural 1992)

*three person (S) every car (dat) get in pst-agr*

Three persons got in every car.

b. [Her arabayla] [üç kişi] binmiş

*every car (dat) three person (S) get-in-pst-agr.*

Three persons got in every car.

---

20 The ban of scrambling of wh-words in situ could be looked upon in an economy approach, as in Epstein (1992). Under this view, movement of the wh-word from the scrambled position would be blocked by a more economical derivation in which the wh-element in its basic position moves in one sweep to Spec CP at LF. See Müller and Sternefeld (1995) for comparison between both approaches and discussion of the advantages of unambiguous binding versus the economy approach.
Similarly, an example of the restriction of scrambling to specific indefinites is pointed out by Diesing (1992) for German. A subject indefinite inside the VP is naturally interpreted as nonspecific (nonpresuppositional in Diesing’s (1992) terminology). If the subject is scrambled (i.e. when it appears to the left of the sentential adverb ‘indeed’), the interpretation obtained is specific (in her terms presuppositional). Example (40a) just asserts the existence of two cellists in a hotel nonspecifically. In (40b) the two cellists are already presupposed in the discourse:

(40)a. . . . Weil ja doch zwei Cellisten in diesem Hotel (Diesing 1992)
   Since indeed two cellists in this hotel
   have-taken-rooms

b. . . . Weil zwei Cellisten ja doch in diesem Hotel
   Since two cellists indeed in this hotel
   have-taken-rooms

Given these asymmetries in the scopal and specific interpretation of indefinites, it is predicted that, following the scrambling hypothesis, similar effects should be found in Spanish. In fact, the asymmetry can be clearly seen in cases where the subject is a universal quantifier and the object is an indefinite. Examples (41) with the order VS (universal quantifier) O (indefinite) are ambiguous. The indefinite can be interpreted as specific, a reading that we can express as having an existential quantifier taking scope over the universal, as in (42a) (which corresponds to example (41c)). Another natural reading is the one where the indefinite is not specific, which we represent as the universal having scope over the existential (42b).21

(41)a. ¿Qué le regalaron todos los estudiantes a un profesor?
   what cl-gave all the students (S) to a professor (IO)

---

21 There is actually a third reading in which the indefinite has narrow scope and nevertheless is understood as notionally or pragmatically specific. This reading arises when the indefinite refers to different individuals out of an already presupposed set. For example, in (41b) that reading would be obtained when we know the spies involved in the discourse and know that each agent informed one spy about something – i.e. a distributional reading. For a discussion of this narrow reading of a specific indefinite see Diesing (1992), and for a general non-scopal approach to the interpretation of specific indefinites see Enc (1991).
b. ¿De qué informó cada agente a un espía?
   *What informed each agent (S) to a spy (DO)*
   *What did each agent inform a spy about?*

c. Estos libros, se los dieron todos los estudiantes a
   *These books, cl-cl-gave all the students (S) to a professor (IO)*
   *a professor (IO)*

(42)a. $\forall y \forall x (\text{student}(x) \land \text{professor}(y))(\text{give-a-book}(x, y))$

b. $\forall x \forall y (\text{student}(x) \land \text{professor}(y))(\text{give-a-book}(x, y))$

However, the previous ambiguity disappears when the object with the indefinite precedes the subject (43). These examples force the specific reading of the indefinite (see also footnote 21):

(43)a. ¿Qué le regalaron a un profesor todos los
   *what cl-gave to a professor (IO) all the students (S)*

b. ¿De qué informó a un espía cada agente?
   *What informed to a spy (DO) each agent (S)*

c. Estos libros, se los dieron a un profesor todos los
   *These books, cl-cl-gave to a professor (IO) all the students (S)*

This same contrast is also found with an indefinite IO and a universal quantifier DO. Sentence (44a), with the order V DO IO, is also ambiguous between the two readings. However, the V IO DO order in (44b) forces the reading where the indefinite IO takes scope over the universal quantifier in the object. This similarity in the alternation DO IO with the alternation S IO suggests a uniform treatment of the two cases:

(44)a. Los profesores le dieron cada libro a un estudiante.
   *Professors cl-gave every book (DO) to a student (IO)*

b. Los profesores le dieron a un estudiante cada libro.
   *Professors cl-gave to a student (IO) every book (DO)*
The restriction on specificity of XPs for certain orderings is further attested with inherently non-specific XPs. Such an example can be found with the postposed determiner cualquiera. The prediction that these NPs should not appear in the scrambled orders V IO DO and V IO S is confirmed by the contrasts in (45) and (46):

(45)a. El director le pasará este manuscrito
   The director cl-will give this manuscript (DO)
   a una secretaria cualquiera,
   to secretary whichever (IO)

b. El libro de matemáticas, se lo dará el profesor a un
   The book, el-will give the teacher (S) to a
   estudiante cualquiera
   student whichever (IO)

(46)a. ¿El director le pasará a una secretaria cualquiera este
   The director cl-will give to a secretary whichever (IO) this
   manuscrito.
   manuscript (DO)

b. ¿El libro, se lo dará a un estudiante cualquiera el
   The book, cl-will give to a student whichever (IO) the
   profesor.
   teacher (S)

---

22 An anonymous reviewer pointed out to me that the constraints on the examples in (46) might be related to focus. Presumably, the postposing of the determiner cualquiera makes the DP more emphatic. Parallel effects are found with the postposing of the demonstrative este with specific DPs as in (i).

(i) Este niño.
    This boy.

(ii) El niño és éste
     The boy this.

If focus, and not specificity, were the only factor to explain the marginality of (46), it might be expected that examples involving the scrambling of el niño ser might be as marginal as the ones involving una secretaria cualquiera. However, these examples seem to improve, as in (iii). This again suggests that specificity, and not only focus, is the crucial factor in explaining the marginality of the previous examples involving postposed cualquiera.

(iii) El director le pasará al niño éste el libro de matemáticas.
     The director cl-will give to the boy this the book of mathematics.
The examples with the V IO S / V IO DO orders, in (46), contrast with those in (47). The examples in (47) force the specific reading for the IO by introducing a partitive in the sequence with the indefinite determiner cualquiera:25

(47)a. El director le pasará a cualquiera de estas secretarias

_The director will give to any of these secretaries_ (IO)

el manuscrito.

_the manuscript_ (DO).

b. El libro, se lo dará a cualquiera de estos estudiantes el

_The book, he will give to any of these students_ (IO) the

profesor.

_professor_ (S).

The common assumption concerning the restriction on specificity in indefinites in scrambling constructions has been that the indefinite, in moving out of its basic syntactic position, loses its non-specific interpretation. In Diesing's view, for example, this restriction on interpretability for scrambled indefinites could be explained under the mapping hypothesis. Diesing postulates that trees in LF are mapped into logical representations where material inside and outside the VP correspond to different kinds of quantification. The material remaining in the VP maps into the nuclear scope of the quantification. In this domain all non-specific readings of indefinites are obtained by existential closure.26 The material outside the VP maps into the restriction clause of the quantification. All quantificational elements, including indefinites with a specific reading,25 must appear outside of the VP at LF to be able to map into the restrictor.26

One of the empirical facts that this hypothesis tries to accommodate is that indefinites already taken outside the VP domain at Spell-Out can only have a specific reading. This is what, in fact, we have seen in

---

25 See Eng (1991) for a proposal that relates specificity to partitivity.

24 Diesing (1992), following and modifying ideas by Heim (1982) and Kamp (1981), supposes that indefinites with non-specific readings introduce a free variable which is bound by an implicit existential operator in the nuclear scope.

25 Diesing assumes that indefinites with a specific reading are quantificational elements which undergo QR. Indefinites that are in the VP, as in examples (41), QR under the specific reading.

26 For the cases in which the indefinite is in the VP and nevertheless has a [+specific] interpretation, we assume that at LF the formal features of the specific DP move out of the VP.
the scrambling examples for German (40b) and for Spanish as well (43, 44b).27

In sum, in Spanish the specific reading is forced for the object in the VOS order but not the VSO order. This is obtained under the standard assumption that scrambling is only possible if the scrambled element has a specific interpretation. The effects in Spanish thus match those found in other languages, in which a scrambling analysis is widely accepted. Again, this corroborates the idea that the first order is obtained from the second by scrambling of the object to the left.

4. DOUBLING WITH INDIRECT OBJECTS

The final asymmetry with respect to the VSO/VOS alternation can be found in the domain of clitic doubling. Spanish allows clitic doubling with indirect objects. Some full NP indirect objects are optionally doubled in the configuration V DO IO:

**DO IO Order**

(48)a. El director (les) entregó las notas a unos
    the director (S) dat-cl-gave the grades (DO) to some
    estudiantes.
    students (IO)

b. El director (le) dio un libro a María.
    the director (S) dat cl gave a book (DO) to María (IO)

Hernanz and Brucart (1987, p. 267) observe that doubling of the indirect

---

27 Another well-known explanation for the restriction on specificity has been given by De Hoop (1992). She divides indefinites into strong (presuppositional) and weak (non-presuppositional), which are assigned two different types of cases (weak and strong). Weak case can only be assigned in an NP's deep structure position (inside the VP), while strong case is freer. Thus, scrambling is limited to strong indefinites. Reinhart (1995) postulates that the restrictions on the specificity of indefinites derive from the fact that the scrambled element is downtressed and therefore already presupposed in the context under normal circumstances. This downtressing is a consequence of the rule of assignment of sentential stress. Following Cinque (1993), she proposes that sentential stress is assigned to the most embedded element in the structure. In scrambling constructions the downtressed element is the one that precedes the VP that has sentential stress (see footnote 1 for the VOS order in Spanish). Consequently, Reinhart's proposal has to assume that the scrambled indefinites are in a hierarchically more prominent position than the focus element that follows. This fits very nicely with our proposal that the object c-commands the subject in the VOS order.
object in these situations becomes necessary when the order of the objects is reversed.\textsuperscript{26} The examples in (49) are deviant without the clitic:\textsuperscript{29}

\textbf{IO DO Order}

(49)a. El director *(le) entregó a los estudiantes las notas.

the director (S) dat-el-gave to the students (IO) the grades (DO)

b. El director *(le) dio a María un libro.

the director (S) dat-el-gave to María (IO) a book (DO)

We find that doubling is also required in the V IO S order, but not in the V S IO order:

\textbf{S IO Order}

(50)a. Ésta es la asignatura que (les) enseñaba el profesor a diversos estudiantes.

this is the subject that taught the professor (S) to some students (IO)

b. Ésta es la señal que (les) hizo el alcalde a varios hombres.

this is the sign that made the mayor (S) to some men (IO)

\textbf{IO S Order}

(51)a. Ésta es la asignatura que *(le) enseña a varios

this is the subject that teaches to some

\textsuperscript{26} Zubizarreta (1995) mentions the same intuition (Chapter 3, p. 21).

\textsuperscript{29} There is some dialectal variation with respect to the different possibilities of clitic doubling in Spanish. In some dialects the clitics are almost always required, in which case the discussion of this section does not reflect the grammar of those speakers. For those dialects in which the clitic is optional, special attention should be paid to intonation. The judgments reported in (49) have to be read with sentence stress on the final object, the structure that corresponds to the intonational properties of scrambling, as in (i). The intonation with right dislocation of the DO, as in (ii), is not relevant for the discussion.

(i)a. El director les entregó a los estudiantes las notas.

(ii)a. El director entregó a los estudiantes las notas.
alumnos el profesor.

students (IO) the professor (S)

b. Esta es la señal que *(les) hizo a varios hombres el
this is the sign that dat-cl-made to some men (IO) the
alcalde.

mayor (S)

These contrasts are clearly problematic for the right-adjunction
hypothesis. Under that proposal there should be no contrast for the dative
arguments in the V DO IO / V IO DO and V S IO / V IO S orders with
respect to clitic doubling, since the dative is in situ in both. With the
scrambling proposal, however, there is no incompatibility. Scrambling
therefore must be triggering the clitic doubling, but there still is a need
to account for these facts. To do so, it is helpful to employ Torrego's
(1992) hypothesis that clitics head their own DP projection. In the case
of doubling, the doubled XP is realized in the Spec of the DP where it
enters into Spec head agreement with the elitic D counterpart. This DP
would be embedded in the lower Larsonian VP shell. Example (52)
corresponds to (18a) with the overt elitic dative before Spell-Out:

30 Again, these cases should not be confused with the ones where we have the same structure
but there is a right dislocation of the final subject.
31 I will put aside DOs, which do not admit doubling in general. From our perspective, they
cannot be subsumed under the representation in (52).
32 This matching is responsible for the identification of a pro when there is no overt counter-
part as in (1):

(i) les entregó las notas pro

The matching does not involve the feature ε specific. It has been shown by Suárez (1988)
that indirect object clitics can double non-specific DPs. See example (50), in which the
indefinite can be read as non-specific when it is doubled.
33 The overt D elitic moves by Spell Out to some functional projection (Kayne 1994).
34 I adopt a Larsonian structure since it is in consonance with the asymmetry proposal
by Kayne (1994). My analysis is perfectly compatible with other analyses for double objects.
As a natural extension of the DP hypothesis for clitics, we also have cases where the D heading the DP is an empty category. This case corresponds to the counterpart of (52) with no overt clitic:\footnote{Contrary to overt Ds, we assume that empty Ds do not cliticize overtly. If we think that cliticization before Spell-Out is motivated by the need for a clitic to be checked in an inflectional projection, empty Ds are excluded because they do not have phi-features to be checked.}
In general, DPs headed by an empty D have a more restrictive distribution than lexically realized ones. Romance DPs headed by an empty head are not permitted in preverbal position.\textsuperscript{36} They are only allowed in a head-object relation with the verb as seen by the contrasts in (54) with a passive and (55) with an unaccusative verb:\textsuperscript{37}

(54)a. **[Ø Petroleo] fue encontrado.
   oil (S) was found

b. Fue encontrado [Ø petroleo] (example from Bosque 1990)
   was found oil (S)

(55)a. ??Aquí [Ø turistas] llegan de todas partes.
   here tourists (S) come from everywhere

b. Aquí llegan [Ø turistas] de todas partes
   here arrive tourists from everywhere

Longobardi (1994) proposes that the appearance of the empty determiner is constrained by a lexical government requirement. As has been pointed out several times in the literature (Chomsky 1981, Rizzi 1982, among others), this requirement is not met in the pre-verbal position in (54)–(55). Following this idea, I propose the following principle for the licensing of Ω:\textsuperscript{38}

(56) A DP headed by Ø must be contained in the projection of the head which assigns a theta role to it.\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{36} Only cases of focalization in pre-verbal position seem to allow such empty determiners (Contreras 1985).

\textsuperscript{37} There are interpretive differences between the empty Ds in the cases of elitic doubling in (53) and the empty elitic Ds in DPs in (54). In this paper, we are just concerned about the syntactic distribution of these empty elements, which seems constrained by the same syntactic principles. Another element which has a similar syntactic pattern is the empty complementizer.

\textsuperscript{38} As Stowell (1981) has proposed empty complementizers are constrained by lexical government.

\textsuperscript{39} Being theta-marked by its governor plays an important role for the licensing of Ω. Empty determiners are not possible for subjects of small clauses as pointed out by Contreras (1985) and Longobardi (1994). In these cases, the verb in the matrix clause does not assign a theta role to the Spec position of the small clause. From this fact, it is concluded that lexical government is not enough to explain the distribution of empty Ds.

(i) *Consideravo studenti intelligenti (from Longobardi 1994)
   considered students intelligent

We could alternatively reformulate (56) in terms of Θ-government, in the sense of Chomsky (1986).
This requirement is met in (54b) and (55b), with the only argument in the object, position, but not when it is moved to the pre-verbal position, in (54a) and (55a). In example (53) with a dative DP, $\emptyset$ is also included in the projection of the $V$, which is responsible for the assignment of the goal theta role to the whole dative DP. However, this configuration is destroyed when the DP IO is scrambled to the left to Spec FP2. Scrambled XPs ends up in a non-thematically selected projections. This has been taken to be a crucial point in the explanation for the constraint on extraction out of scrambled XPs German (Dingging 1992, Grewendoff and Sabel 1994). In (57), which represents sentence (49a), the dative DP is in the specifier of FP2, which is not thematically selected by $V$. Consequently the empty determiner in representation (57) is excluded by principle (56).  

(57)

Another instance of the requirement in (56) comes from the distribution of generic bare plural IOs. As pointed out by Fernández Soriano (1989)

(56') $\emptyset$ must be $\Theta$-governed.

$\Theta$-government: $\alpha$ $\Theta$-governs $\beta$ iff $\alpha$ is a zero-level category that $\Theta$-marks $\beta$, and $\alpha$, $\beta$ are sisters (Chomsky 1990).

(57) $\Theta$-government is not met in (57) either. $V$ and the dative DP in Spec FP2 are not sisters in the strict sense.
and Jaeggli (1982), these elements are incompatible with an overt dative clitic. They are only possible with the empty D counterpart.41

(58)a. No (*les) des tus llaves a personas desconocidas.
   don't cl- give your keys to strangers

b. Luis no (*les) envía sus cartas a niños indefensos.
   Luis not cl- send his letters to defenseless children

Consequently42 these datives would not be able to scrambled to the left, as shown below:43

(59)a. *No das a personas desconocidas tus llaves.
   don't give to strangers your keys

b. *Luis no envía a niños indefensos sus cartas.
   Luis not send to defenseless children his letters

In conclusion, we have seen that empty and overt Ds in a dative XP alternate when these elements are in situ. The conditions which license empty Ds are destroyed once the DP is scrambled to a higher inflectional projection. As also argued for German (Diesing 1992 and Grewendorf and Sabel 1994), scrambled XPs end up in non-thematically selected positions.

5. Conclusion

In this paper I have shown certain asymmetries between objects and subjects in the VOS and VSO orders in Spanish. The asymmetries in quantifier binding and principle C effects between the two orders were explained by having the hierarchical relation between subjects and objects reversed, implying that objects c-command subjects only in the VOS order.

---

41 I have no reason for why bare plural IOs are impossible with the overt clitic. Presumably, the same factors that make the presence of a determiner incompatible with the generic interpretation for plural DPs in languages like English may also explain the incompatibility of the doubling clitic with the IO generic bare plural in Spanish.
42 The question arises as to what happens with DO bare plurals since, contrary to IO bare plurals, these elements are perfectly grammatical in the VOS order. In order to understand this contrast I will assume that DO bare DPs and the verb must be reanalyzed. Such a reanalysis would not be possible with an IO because of the presence of the dative marker.
43 It is interesting to point out that while reanalysis of DO and V is widely attested, this seems not to be true for IO and V. For example, idiom chunks frequently consist of a verb and a direct object, they rarely if ever consist of a verb and an indirect object.
47 Generics and specie indefinite are both classed as "presuppositional" in Diesing's sense. They both map into the restrictor. Therefore the mapping hypothesis as stated in Diesing (1992) cannot be an explanation for the marginality of (59a, b).
This relation could only be obtained by moving the object to the left to some higher inflectional projection and having the subject stay in the VP. The ban on wh-objects in situ in the VOS order was reduced to a ban on scrambling wh-in-situ. The obligatory specific interpretation of the indefinite object in VOS order was seen as a consequence of the effects of scrambling on indefinites. Finally, the impossibility of having an empty counterpart of the dative clitic in the V IO S order was reduced to the fact that the conditions for licensing this empty category are not met in the landing site for scrambled XPs. In every case support for a scrambling account is found.

This conclusion implies that the alternations between the S O and O S orders found in verb-final languages like Korean, Hindi, and German needs to be extended to languages where this alternation is obtained postverbally, such as Spanish. In principle, there is little reason why the same basic alternation should have two different analyses in UG (scrambling of the object to the left in verb-final languages and adjunction of the subject to the right in non-verb-final languages). From the particular perspective of Spanish, it has also been shown that this analysis is empirically superior to the alternative right-adjunction hypothesis.

Finally, our analysis, contrary to the tree inversion hypothesis, confirms the line of research put forward by Kayne (1994), which derives linear order from hierarchical structure. This is done by what he calls the "Linear Correspondence Axiom" (LCA) which maps asymmetric c-command into linear precedence. Since the mapping is done into linear precedence, no right-adjunction is allowed in syntactic trees.

Under the scrambling proposal, the subject asymmetrically c-commands the object in the representation in (3) and the object c-commands the subject in the representation in (7). The LCA thus correctly yields the two orderings VSO and VOS. However, the Right Adjunction Hypothesis, represented in (6), is incompatible with such a reduction of linear ordering from hierarchical relations. In this theory, the subject asymmetrically c-commands the object in both of the two linear orderings VSO and VOS. It is then a logical result to eliminate right adjunction of subjects from UG, in favor of an independently established phenomenon of scrambling.
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