

Abstract

In Spanish ditransitive sentences in which a dative and an accusative complement co-occur, the dative can or cannot be doubled by a pronominal clitic. This paper shows that this double realization is not a case of free variation but instead correlates with systematic syntactic and semantic properties very similar to those exhibited by the two members of the English Dative Alternation. The basic form of the two ditransitive sentences is discussed. It is argued that Spanish sentences with dative clitic doubling have a uniform basic syntactic configuration in which the indirect object is higher than the direct object and the clitic projects a Dative Clitic Phrase. This analysis makes it possible to illuminate order and binding effects in ditransitive structures. Properties of possessor datives are also derived.

-
1. Preliminary versions of this paper have been presented in seminars held during the first semester of 1993 at USC, Georgetown University (Washington D.C.), UCLA and the University of Texas (Austin), as well as at the *First Workshop on Spanish Grammar* at the Università di Venezia. I wish to thank the participants of these events for their useful comments. I would like to give special thanks to María-Luisa Zubizarreta. Without her invaluable help this paper could not have reached its final form. Olga Fernández Soriano also made very useful observations. The subtle and intelligent questions of an anonymous *Probus*' reviewer undoubtedly contributed to making the paper more explicit. Any errors or misunderstandings are my own. I am deeply indebted to Jean Grugel and Thomas Ferguson for revising the English.

The research behind this work has been supported in part by the DGICYT Project PB90-0181 as well as by a grant from this same institution which partly supported my stay at USC as a visiting scholar in the Department of Linguistics (93-010 Programa de Movilidad Temporal de personal funcionario Docente e Investigador).

1. Introduction

In this article I will deal with the Spanish transitive sentences in which a dative pronominal clitic co-occurs with a full dative noun phrase introduced by *a* 'to'. I will provide a unified account for sentences with the familiar Goal Indirect Object datives, as in (1a), sentences with Benefactive "augmented" datives (cf. Jackendoff 1990), as in (1b), and those with "Interest" datives such as the ones in (1c) and (1d).² I will refer to all these datives as "affected" second objects:³

- (1) a. *Le entregué las llaves al conserje.*
CL.3SG⁴ I+gave the keys to-the janitor
'I gave the keys to the janitor.'
- b. *Le cociné el pollo a Mario.*
CL.3SG I+cooked the chicken to Mario
'I cooked the chicken for Mario.'
- c. *Le limpié las manchas a la camisa.*
CL.3SG I+cleaned-off the stains to the shirt
'I cleaned the stains off (of) the shirt.'
- d. *Le fregué las manchas al tablero.*
CL.3SG wiped-off the stains to-the table-top
'I wiped the stains out of the table-top.'

2. Sentences with Goal datives are usually headed by TRANSFERENCE PREDICATES similar to *vender* 'to sell', *regalar* 'to give away', *enviar* 'to send', *mandar* 'to send', *entregar* 'to hand in/over', *devolver* 'to return', *traer* 'to bring', *llevar* 'to take', *donar* 'to donate', *confiar* 'to trust', *aportar* 'to contribute', *enseñar* 'to teach', *mostrar* 'to show', *recomendar* 'to recommend', etc. Benefactive datives appear with CREATION AND CHANGE OF STATE VERBS like *preparar* 'to prepare', *guisar* 'to cook', *cocinar* 'to cook', *comer* 'to eat', *hacer* 'to make', *pintar* 'to paint', *dibujar* 'to draw', *copiar* 'to copy', *adornar* 'to decorate', *coser* 'to sew', *lavar* 'to wash', *afeitar* 'to shave', *arreglar* 'to fix', *reparar* 'to mend', etc. Interest datives show up in sentences with REMOVAL OR CONTACT VERBS as *quitar* 'take away', *limpiar* 'clean off', *fregar* 'wipe off/ scrub off', *añadir* 'to add', *pegar* 'to stick', *poner* 'to put', etc.
3. I am using the notion of "affected" dative in a larger sense than Authier and Reed (1992) who deal only with the non-lexical datives in French, namely those usually corresponding to the cases in (1b), (1c) and (1d). For the sake of the argument, I am leaving out here "possessor raising" or "sympathetic" dative constructions such as *Le ensucié el delantal a María* 'I stained María's apron' or *Le duele la cabeza a Juan* 'Juan has a headache'. I will come back to these constructions in section 3.4. See Masullo (1992) for another uniform treatment of dative constructions.
4. Through this specification I refer to the regular third person Spanish dative clitic which, unlike accusative forms, is unmarked for gender. My discussion deals only with third person indirect object pronouns since only in this case does the alternance presence versus absence of clitics hold. In first and second person dative constructions the clitic is unavoidable given that clitics are obligatory when the "double" is a pronominal: *Te entregaron (a ti) a tus enemigos* versus **(Te) entregaron a ti a tus enemigos* 'They hand you over to your enemies'.

Central to my analysis of these constructions is the assertion that there is Dative Alternation in Spanish. More accurately, it will be shown that Spanish sentences with dative clitic doubling, as those in (1), share the syntactic properties of double object constructions in languages such as English. The corresponding sentences without the clitic, the ones in (2), show the properties of regular V+NP+PP ditransitive sentences:

- (2) a. *Entregué las llaves al conserje.*
'I gave the keys to the janitor.'
- b. *Cociné el pollo para Mario.*
'I cooked the chicken for Mario.'
- c. *Limpié las manchas de la camisa.*
'I cleaned the stains from the shirt.'
- d. *Fregué las manchas del tablero.*
'I wiped the stains out of the table-top'.⁵

In section 2 I will illustrate the main lines along which this syntactic similarity runs. Asymmetries between accusative and dative objects in given syntactic contexts will be exhibited. In section 3 I will provide an analysis for the affected dative constructions. I will contend that, in sentences such as those in (1), the clitic is the head of a DCIP⁶ [Dative Clitic Phrase] at the top of a Chomskian-Larsonian VP-shell type structure. The associated "double" of this clitic (the Goal/Benefactive/Source [*a* NP]) is licensed in the Specifier of this DCIP. Order constraints between direct objects and indirect objects, binding and weak cross-over effects, scope facts and properties of inalienable constructions will follow from the existence of this configuration, independently motivated, moreover, in accounting for asymmetries between direct objects and indirect objects.

Exploring this field of affected datives may lead to a better understanding of certain hypotheses about the nature and status of VP. In fact, what my analysis may ultimately show is the crosslinguistic pervasiveness of the "single complement hypothesis" (Larson 1988), as well as the fact that differences between languages are mostly due to the specific content and articulation of functional categories.

5. The fact that *a* 'to' is the Goal preposition in Spanish could lead us to the misleading conclusion that the dative clitic is optional in Goal structures (see [1a], which alternates with [2a]) while obligatory in Benefactive and Interest structures (in [1b], [1c] and [1d] the clitic is forceful). My supposition will be that the clitic *le* is obligatory in all structures with a given "affected" interpretation, co-occurring in these cases with an *a* which is a mark of dative Case (cf. section 3.3.3 below). Under this premise the *a* of all examples in (1) is simply homophonous with the Goal preposition in (2a).
6. By DCIP I refer to a constituent similar to that of Marantz's (1990) "Benefactive phrase", Koizumi's (1993) Ω Phrase or Brugger and Poletto's (1993) AgrIO .

2. On certain parallelisms between Spanish and English and the dative alternation

In many languages, verbal predicates appearing at S-structure with a set of two complements give rise to an alternation in the projection of their argument structure. Well known cases include those of English and the Germanic languages where a verb such as *give* can project its arguments either in a [V NP₁ P + NP₂] structure or in a [V NP₂ NP₁] sequence. In certain languages (German and Dutch, for instance, see the examples in [3]), NP₂ takes the dative Case. In English, this NP has the accusative Case, and this is also the Case of the second object (the direct object of the corresponding [V NP P + NP] structure, (see [4]):

- (3) a. *Jan gaf Marie/haar het boek.* Dutch
 b. *Hans gab Marie/ihr das Buch.* German
 Jan gave Marie/her(DAT) the book
- (4) a. *John gave* [NP₁ *a book*] [NP₂ *to Mary/her*].
 b. *John gave* [NP₂ *Mary/her*(ACC)] [NP₁ *a book*].

It has also been observed that in certain languages this alternation appears in the morphology. In Chichewa, for instance, a structure of the type [V NP P + NP] correlates thematically with others in which a complex verb adds an applicative suffix. Baker (1988) describes this structure as a case of preposition incorporation:

- (5) a. *Mbidzi zi-na-perek-a msampha kwa nkhandwe.*
 zebras SP-PAST-hand-ASP trap to fox
 'The zebras handed the trap to the fox.'
 b. *Mbidzi zi-na-perek-er-a nkhandwe msampha.*
 zebras SP-PAST-hand-to-ASP the-fox the-trap

It is a common observation that Romance languages differ from Germanic ones in that they lack the double object construction. Beginning with Kayne (1984), this gap has been attributed to the fact that the preposition *a* 'to' assigns the oblique Case in the Romance languages, while in English and similar languages it assigns the structural Case. These languages would not have an applicative morphology either. Rather than having affix-like prepositions, they would instead have Ps which behave as full roots (Baker 1988: 231).

In fact, what is found in Romance languages is only the [V NP P + NP] structure. In the subset of these languages which admits clitic doubling, a dative clitic can co-occur with the full lexical *a* + NP constituent (as shown in [6]) (recall also note 5). In a non-clitic doubling language, such as French, a distribution of transitive verbs between lexical-dative taking verbs and non-lexical-dative taking verbs is found (as in [7a] and [7b], respectively):

- (6) *Juan (le) dio el libro a María.*
 Juan CL.3SG gave the book to María
- (7) a. *Je lui donne le livre / Je donne le livre à Marie*
 I CL.3SG give the book I gave the book to Marie
 'I gave Marie the book.'
 b. *Je lui ai trouvé un emploi / ??J'ai trouvé un emploi à*
 I CL.3SG have found a job I-have found a job to
Théophile.
 Théophile
 'I have found Théophile a job.'

After the comprehensive revision of the topic by Larson (1988) and its subsequent extension by other authors (mainly Jackendoff 1990; Aoun and Li 1989; and Speas 1990), the dative alternation has to be interpreted, in my view, as the possibility of computing two syntactic configurations (two partially similar VP-shells) derivationally related either in the syntax or in the lexicon. This derivational relationship is crucial in order to safeguard the Uniformity of Theta-role Assignment Hypothesis (UTAH) of Baker (1988). Accepting this to be so, it is reasonable to assume that the dative alternation is something more than an emergence of the Case properties of the preposition associated with the second internal argument of certain subclasses of ditransitive verbs. In fact, the mere existence of such a duplex of configurations in Universal Grammar predicts a series of syntactic and semantic properties which reflect significant aspects of active causative verbal phrases.

What we will see in the following subsection is precisely that Spanish sentences exhibit a cluster of contrastive syntactic properties which also define the dative alternation structures in languages apparently different in this regard. Furthermore, I want to suggest that these contrasts are strictly related to the presence or absence of the dative clitic. I will briefly outline these contrasts.

Asymmetries in sentences with dative complements

C/command asymmetries. A cornerstone of the discussion about English double object constructions lies in the observation (made by Barss and Lasnik 1986) that in the two structures in (4) there are c-command asymmetries between NP₁ and NP₂. In (4a) NP₁ would c-command NP₂; in (4b) NP₂ would c-command NP₁ as can be observed through reflexivization, binding of pronouns, superiority and many other well known effects. Observe the paradigm in (8):

- (8) Reflexivization
 a. *I showed/presented* [NP₁ *Mary*] *to* [NP₂ *herself*].
 **I showed/presented herself to Mary.*
 b. *I showed* [NP₂ *Mary*] [NP₁ *herself*].
 **I showed herself Mary.*

