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1. Introduction.

In this study, 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. I will consider as a uniform set that which is constituted by 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 "sympatheticus" datives (generally corresponding to a Source argument) like the one in (1c). I will refer to all these datives as "affected" second objects:

(1) a. Le entregué las llaves al conserje.
   I gave the keys to the janitor.

1. Preliminary versions of this paper have been presented in seminars held during the first semester of 1993 at the universities of USC, Georgetown (Washington D.C.), UCLA and Texas (Austin) as well as at the First Workshop on Spanish Grammar at the Università di Venezia. I wish to thank the participants in all these events for useful comments. Special thanks are due to M. Luisa Zubizarreta, Olga Fernández Soriano. Errors or misunderstandings are all my own.

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

2. Sentences with Goal datives are usually headed by transference predicates similar to vender 'to sell', regular 'to give away', mandar 'to send', entregar 'to hand', 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 do', 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. Sympatheticus datives show up in sentences with removal or contact verbs as: quitar 'to take away', limpiar 'to clean', fregar 'to wash off / scrub off', atadura '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 consider as such only French non-lexical datives, namely those usually corresponding to the cases in (1b) and (1c).

4. Through this specification I refer to the regular third person Spanish dative clitic which, differing in this sense from accusative forms, is unmarked for gender. My discussion deals with third person indirect object pronouns but it can be extended to dative pronouns of other persons.
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b. Le cociné el pollo a Mario.
C13s I-cooked the chicken to Mario
'I cooked the chicken for Mario'.
c. Le llimpié/fergué las manchas a la camisa.
C13s I-wiped off the stains from the shirt
'I wiped the stains off of the shirt'.

Central to my analysis of these constructions will be the assertion that Spanish has the dative alternation or, more strictly, that Spanish sentences with dative clitic doubling share the syntactic and semantic properties of English or German double object constructions. I will first show the main lines along which this syntactic similarity runs, and asymmetries between accusative and dative objects in given syntactic contexts will be shown. Secondly, I will illustrate the lexical-semantic features that distinguish the sentences with affected readings in (1) from the corresponding sentences without dative clitics, such as those in (2):

(2) a. Entregué las llaves al concierge.
'I gave the keys to the concierge'.
b. Cociné el pollo para Mario.
'I cooked the chicken for Mario'.
c. Llimpié / fregué las manchas de la camisa.
'I wiped the stains from the shirt'.

Also suggested in this section is that in the Spanish grammar the dative alternation is satisfied in the lexicon, where two constructions are derivationally related.

In the third part of this paper I will provide an analysis for the affected dative constructions. I would like to prove that, in constructions like those in (1), the clitic is the head of a BP at the top of a Chomskian-Larsonian VP-shell type structure. The associated "double" of this clitic (the Goal/Benefactive/Source ([NP]) is licensed either in the Specifier of this BP or as an adjunct to V (as is the dethematized object of the Larsonian derived layered VP). Order constraints between direct objects and indirect objects, binding and WCO effects, scope facts or impossibility of passivization would follow from the existence of this configuration, independently needed, moreover, to account for asymmetries between direct objects and indirect objects. Looking more tentatively to this material, I will suggest that this BP is a functional category that expresses the final point of the event described by the verb sentence.

Exploring this field of affected datives may lead us to a better understanding of certain hypothesis about the nature and status of VP. In fact, what our analysis ultimately might show is the crosslinguistic pervasiveness of the "single complement hypothesis" (Larson (1988)) just as those differences among languages are always due to the specific content and way of articulation of functional categories.

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

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

(3) a. Dutch: Jan gaf Marie/haar dochter het boek.
'Jan gave Marie/her the book'.
b. German: Hans gab Marie/ihre Tochter das buch.


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

(5) a. Mbidzi zi-na perek-a mma pha kwa nkhandwe
zebras P-PAST-hand-ASP trap to fox
'The zebras handed the trap to the fox.'

It is a common observation that Romance languages differ from Germanic ones in that they lack the double object construction. Since Kayne (1984) this gap has been attributed to the fact that the preposition a/le would assign oblique Case in the Romance languages, while it would assign structural Case in English and similar languages. These languages would not have either applicative morphology due to the fact that they do not have affix-like prepositions but just Ps which behave as full roots. (cf. Baker, op. cit.: 231).

Actually, what we have in the Romance area is only the [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)). In a non-clitic doubling language like 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 C13s gave the book to María

(7a) a. Je lui donne le livre / Je donne le livre à Marie.
I give the book to Marie
b. Je lui ai trouvé un emploi / J'ai trouvé un emploi à Théophile.
I have found a job / I have found a job for Théophile

After the comprehensive revision of the topic by Larson (1988) and its subsequent extension by many other authors (mainly Jackendoff (1990), Aoun and Li (1989))...
and Speas (1990)) the dative alternation has to be understood, in my opinion, as the possibility of having access to two syntactic configurations (two partially similar VP shells) derivationally related either in the syntax or in the lexicon. This derivational relation is crucial in order to safeguard the UTAH. In this sense, it is reasonable to think 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, since the mere existence of such a duplex of configurations predicts a series of syntactic and semantic properties from which different behaviors of the VP constituents would follow.

What I would like to show now is precisely that Spanish sentences exhibit a cluster of syntactic and semantic contrasting properties which also define the dative alternation structures. I also want to suggest that these contrasts are strictly related to the presence or absence of the dative clitic. I will go briefly through these contrasts now since I will be qualifying them in a precise way in the following sections of this article.

2.1. Asymmetries in sentences with dative complements.

Command asymmetries. A cornerstone of the discussion about English double object construction lies in the observation (due to 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 [NP1Mary] to [NP2herself].
   * I showed / presented herself to Mary.
b. I showed Mary herself.
   * I showed herself Mary.

Bound pronouns
a. I gave / sent every check to its owner.
   ?I gave / sent his paycheck to every worker.
b. I gave every worker his paycheck.
I gave his owner every paycheck.

These asymmetries indicate that the position of these NPs is not the same in the two choices of the dative alternation.

I want to point out that in Spanish there are also asymmetries similar to the ones just mentioned although their existence does seem to be related—at least at first glance— not only to the different syntactic position of each of the lexical arguments, but also to the presence or absence of the dative clitic. 6 The contrasting pairs in (9)-(10), where the (a) and (b) cases show the sentences without clitics and the (a') and (b') those with the dative clitic, will be extensively qualified in the third part of this work. At this point the important thing is to notice that the following contrasts are very clear and nearly parallel the English facts:

(9) Reflexivization
a. El tratamiento psicoanalítico reintegró a María[DO] a sí misma[IO]. the psychoanalytic therapy gave back Mary to herself.
b. * El tratamiento psicoanalítico devolvió (a) a sí misma[DO] a María[IO].
   the psychoanalytic therapy gave back herself to Maria

a'. * El tratamiento psicoanalítico le devolvió a María[DO] a la estima de sí misma.
   the psychoanalytic therapy CI3S gave back to Mary to her self-esteem
b'. El tratamiento psicoanalítico le devolvió la estima de sí misma[DO] a María[IO].
   the psychoanalytic therapy CI3S gave back her self-esteem to Maria

(10) Bound pronouns
a. * La profesora entregó su dibujo a cada niño. 7
   'The teacher gave his/her drawing to each child'.
b. La profesora entregó cada dibujo a su autor.
   'The teacher gave each drawing to its author'.

a'. * La profesora le pasó su limpio dibujo a cada niño.
   the teacher-F CL3S gave back his drawing to each child
b'. La profesora le pasó a limpio dibujo a su autor.
   the teacher-F CI3S gave back each drawing to its author

(9) shows that IO anaphors are possible in sentences without the dative clitic, but not in the other context; similarly, DO anaphors appear in ditransitive sentences with dative clitics, but not in those without. (10a) indicates that the distributive reading and the binding of the pronoun are not possible when such a pronoun is in the DO, though this reading is found when the pronoun is in the PP, (10b). When the clitic is present, the bound pronoun can be in the DO, (10a), although the contrast with the other distribution of the pronoun and the quantifier is not as straightforward as in the preceding case. We will clarify this last fact at greater length after introducing our analysis.

Passivization. A regular observation in the literature about double object constructions is that there are constraints on the passivization of the double object. The generalization concerning English is that in structures such as (4b) it is possible to passivize both NP1 and NP2 depending on the lexical nature of the verb. More strictly, verbs of the give type belong to the passivization class, while verbs of the fix class do not passivize:

(11) a. Mary was given the book.
b. (?) The book was given Mary.

6. As far as I know, Uriagereka (1988) was the first author to point out similar asymmetries for clitic structures in Galician.

7. The * means only that the bound reading of the pronoun is not obtained.
(12) a. *Mary was fixed the sandwich.
b. *The sandwich was fixed Mary.

There is a considerable dialectal variation regarding (11b) —namely, the structure where the Theme object passivizes (also common is the observation that the sentence improves when the Goal is a pronominal: *The book was uniform, Gennan paradigm in that it does not accept passivization in the class of verbs accepting only the passivization of the Theme. It also belongs to the unmarked state (aside from the change of location encoded in (18a) and (18b), we can then think that the structural position for an affected argument is already structurally occupied and there is no room for the dative. A similar generalization to the one suggested for the (17) cases.

Before proceeding to give a syntactic account of these parallellisms I want to go briefly into the lexical-conceptual characteristics of the Spanish sentences with affected datives.

2.2. A lexical-conceptual alternation.

The proposal I want to argue for in this subsection is that the presence of the affected datives makes explicit a change in the status of the event described by the verb. This proposal is summarized in (19):

governed preposition: pensar / pensar en 'think/think of' or soñar / soñar con 'dream/dream with'. Actually, in these alternates the proposition acts as a 'type shifting' element (Pustejovsky (1992)) that turns a process predicate in an accomplishment one. 8. Observe now that the presence of the dative clitic is only possible in the VPs of this series lacking the preposition (see (16)). In contrast, the presence of the clitic makes grammatical the prepositional structures, as in (17):

b. Su asesor le pensó una buena réplica al presidente.
c. Su asesor pensó una buena réplica para el presidente.

(17) a. Juan (*le) soñó con un viaje a su hija.
b. Su asesor (*le) pensó en una buena réplica al presidente.
c. Su asesor pensó en una buena réplica para el presidente.

Conjecturally at this moment, I would also like to relate the facts in (17) to the constraints on clitic augmentation or clitic doubling found in sentences with the locative alternation:

(18) a. Luis cargó margaritas en el camión.
b. Luis cargó el camión con margaritas.
c. Luis cargó (a María) el camión con margaritas.
d. Luis C3SS loaded (for María) margaritas in the truck.
e. *Luis le cargó (a María) el camión con margaritas.
f. *Luis C3SS loaded (for María) the truck with daisies.

If we assume (as in Rappaport and Levin (1988)), that sentences with the locution argument (18a) and (18b) encode an added change of state (aside from the change of location encoded in (18a) and (18b)), we can then think that the structural position for an affected argument is already structurally occupied and there is no room for the dative. A similar generalization to the one suggested for the (17) cases.

If we assume (as in Koopman (1991)), that the particle phrase is a sister PP of the main verb, and we accept also a layered VP structure (Larson (1988)) as a correct configuration for the double object structures, we can phrase the contrast descriptively saying that in (14a) and (15a) the verb has moved alone from the inner part of the VP shell leaving the particle and the demoted Theme in situ. In (14b) the verb could have had the possibility of reanalyzing with the governed particle, leaving them then together over a higher goal. Now, this leaves unexplained the fact that the sequence V+Prt in double object constructions is generally considered marginal. Moreover, this last fact leads one to think that the particle is more related to the licensing of the Goal than to the root verb.

Identical structures do not exist in Spanish, although there are transitive structures apt to accept an augmented Benefactive which can be compared with (14) and (15). I want to refer to a small subclass of Spanish verbs with an (apparently) optional
In ditransitive sentences alternating a [NP PP] and a [Cl a NP NP] structure for the double complement the dative -when present- is interpreted as affected, in the sense that it is taken either as the possessor or as an intrinsic part of the Theme argument. This affected interpretation follows from the fact that sentences with dative clitics (different from those without them) express the highest degree of culmination or completeness of the event described by the predicate.

(20) illustrates straightforwardly the first statement of (19). In (20) the structures with clitics range from marginality to ungrammaticality when the goal cannot be understood as possessor either for general knowledge reasons (the tablecloth appears to be a part of the table not the dishes) or because the possible possessor lacks reference or is an abstract possessor:

(20) a. Le puse el mantel a la mesa.
   CL3S I+put the tablecloth to the table
   'I put the tablecloth on the table.'
   a'. *Le puse los platos a la mesa.
      CL3S I+put the dishes to the table
   b. Le regalé un libro a cada uno de los asistentes.
      CL3S I+gave-away a book to each one of the attendants
   b'. (??Le) regalé un libro al auditorio / a la biblioteca.
      CL3S I+gave-away a book to the audience / to the library

Oehrle (1975) points out some similar interpretations in English for the alternation between the IO constructions with to and the double object variant. This linguist says that only (21b), the construction with dative shift, implies that Mary learned Russian:

(21) a. John taught Russian to Mary.
    b. John taught Mary Russian.

Note the similar contrast in (22), which makes one realize that even though the notion of beneficiary goal is implicit in both cases, the construction with the clitic has an interpretation in which the beneficiary seems to participate more in the transformation of what is created or obtained:

(22) a. Mi madre le hizo un vestido a María, ?? que le
       my mother CL3S made a dress for María, which CL3S
dio a mi hermana Pepa.
       (my mother)-give to my sister Pepa
   b. Mi madre hizo un vestido para María, que le
       my mother made a dress for María, which CL3S
dio a mi hermana Pepa.
       (my mother)-give to my sister Pepa

With similar reasoning, Jayasselan (1988) points out that the continuation of the English sentence (23a) -similar, in my consideration, to (22a)- is a contradiction, as that structure actually implies that John's wife kept the kimono, as (22a) implies that the final destination of the dress was María:

(23) a. John bought his wife a kimono, # but finally got it to his mistress.
    b. John bought a kimono for his wife, but finally got it to his mistress.

In summary, (22a) and (23a) convey a presupposition of the existence of the beneficiary, which is not necessarily the case in the corresponding (b) sentences (cf. Speas (1990): 84). This is the reason why the above mentioned possible continuations sound strange. Similar reasons could explain why not all transitive sentences of creation and preparation that accept a Benefactive with para have the corresponding form with a dative clitic:

(24) a. Barenboim ejecutó las "Variaciones Diabelli" para los madrileños.
    Barenboim played the "Variations Diabelli" for the people-of-Madrid.
    a'. * Barenboim les ejecutó las "Variaciones Diabelli" a los madrileños.
    Barenboim CL3P played the Variations Diabelli to the people-of-Madrid.
    b. * Espert representó a Genet para el público del Festival.
    Espert performed to Genet for the public of-the Festival.
    b'. * Espert (le) representó a Genet al público del Festival.
    Espert CL3S performed to Genet to-the public of-the Festival

Parallel to (24) is the fact, illustrated in (25), that not all sentences with Benefactive Datives accept the counterpart with para:

(25) a. Le coloque cortinas al salón.
    CL3S I+put curtains to+the living room
    a'. * Coloque cortinas para el salón.
         I+put curtains for the living room
    b. * I+put cortinas in the living room.

As I have anticipated in (19), a natural conjecture following from the preceding data is that the structures with dative clitics, contrary to those without them, express the highest degree of culmination or completeness of the process described by the predicate and, therefore, of the relation between the Theme (the object of the movement or the change of state) and the Goal, Beneficiary or Source. It is not a question of the action not being finished in the constructions without the clitic, but what is being asserted here is that the interpretation of these facts in the context of a theory of subevents allows us to understand the pronominal construction as another way of conceiving the organization of the internal temporal subevents of the predicate given an identical argument structure.

Two additional pieces of evidence can be adduced in favour of the evocative interpretation just sketched. Let us look first at the fact that adverbs of duration are less natural in structures with a pronominal:

(26) a. Juan le escribió una carta a su novia (?? durante cinco horas).
    Juan CL3S wrote a letter to his fiancée (for five hours)
    b. Juan escribió una carta a su novia durante cinco horas.
    'Juan wrote a letter to his fiancée (for five hours).

Some other interesting evidence comes from data concerning the scope of the adverb casi/almost. In sentences with accomplishment verbs, this element can refer
to the process as such or the end of the event. Thus, the ambiguity of *John almost opened the door*, which may mean either that the agent did not even touch the door or that he left itajar, that he almost did not reach the end of the opening action. In structures such as (27) one finds the same ambiguity (Juan did not even start the letter or he left it half-written) but what is happening here is that those readings correspond, respectively, to the structure with and without the clitic. (27a) -the structure without the pronominal clitic- seems to refer only to the core of continuation towards the culmination of the act of writing the letter, which is a very anomalous structure without the pronominal clitic. (27b) -the structure with the pronominal clitic- seems to refer to the completion of the writing action, which is a very anomalous reading of the sentence, once a given 'licensee' lands in the specifier of [XCAUSE[Y to be at STATE]] (for Z).

Find additional insights regarding the syntax of the construction. It can be thought, for instance, that in the (a) cases casi modifies the Tense of the clause, while in the (b) ones it modifies the accomplisment. If casi is an adjunct to VP, there has to be something in the structure which avoids the advert to establish the correct relation with the Tense and which forces it to remain anchored in the inner part of the structure. Final support for the thesis that the presence of the clitic conveys the accomplishment of a meaning of completion comes from contrasts like those in (29) and (30). (29) and (30) show the impossibility of the clitic when an activity (or a non-construcative accomplishment) verb co-occurs with indefinite plurals. The presence of this kind of NPs voids the completion reading; in those cases the change of state of an object associated with an inherent endpoint of the event cannot be construed (observe also that this result is independent of the tense of the main verb);

(31) will project onto the syntactic structures without clitics, as those in (2); (32) will link the sentences with dative clitics similar to those in (1). In a more articulated theory of projection, it would be necessary to specify precisely how the initial statement of the pairs (32) projects onto the D-structure configurations. One possibility is to think that the initial statements of (32a) and (b) give rise to a maximal projection with a head bearing a [+final] feature. This feature would license the culmination reading of the sentence, once a given 'licensee' lands in the specifier

9. I owe this observation to Anna di Stefano.

10. With constructive accomplishments the data appear to be different. La maestra les dijo que los niños nada decir es bastante acceptable in my opinion.

11. Cf. Demonte (1993b) for more details on this matter.
position of the constituent headed by the affected object.

3. The syntax of transitive sentences with affected dative.

3.1. The background.

Up to this point it appears that we have enough empirical justification to think that Spanish does have an alternation similar to the one exhibited by English in the well known structures of (4). As I have already noted, Larson (1988) has articulated a well known analysis for the English Dative alternation supported by the idea that in a sentence like that of (4a) the indirect object is in fact "an inner object" forming a constituent (a small predicate send to Mary) with the verb that excludes the surface direct object... "in this structure", Larson says, "the indirect object is in the structural domain of the direct object NP, but not conversely" (Larson, op. cit. 339).

In his account, structures like those in (4b), the double object construction 'strictu sensu', derive from (4a) through a process akin to passivization. (33) and (34) illustrate the two cases of the derivation on the dative alternation:

(33) (op. cit. 342-343)  
```
Spec

V
```

(34) (op. cit. 353)  
```
Spec

V
```

Larson’s explanation is based on two well-designed theoretical pillars. The first is that Case marking --the visibility condition on NPs—is the key in assigning positions and the subsequent placement of the constituents. There is an empty verb in (33), then, because this element has to Case-mark twice and besides must do it in two ways: the FP constituent will receive first inherent case from the preposition to, under government by send (or by the verb send through the Case-marking preposition to) 12; once the verb has moved (through head to head movement), it will mark the ‘subject’ of the complex verbal phrase with structural case. The second pillar --indispensable to preserve the hypothesis that "the same thematic roles must be assigned to the same syntactic positions" (Baker’s UTAH. (1988))-- is that any variant with this same basic form can only be a derivational result of the one just described. Thus, for this linguist, the double object structure (4b) derives from (4a) through a process akin to passivization. The verb, as it occurs in passive constructions, ‘absorbs’ the Case, this time the inherent Case, and to disappears as a result; the subject position dematizes and is now free as a landing site for the movement of Mary. On the other hand, the basic subject a letter undergoes a lexical process of "demotion". That is why it appears now as an adjunct to V, in the same way as the agent in passive constructions are adjuncts of V. This is the structural representation in (34).

The analysis is both persuasive and refined: the Uniformity of Theta-assignment Hypothesis [UTAH] is left intact and it gives due account of c-command asymmetries in both kinds of ditransitive structures. It has some problems, though, and one of them, pointed out by Aoun and Li (1989) and Speas (1990), is that it does not seem to take into account the 'restriction on possession'. However, there are ways to solve this problem. One of them is that adopted by Aoun and Li, which postulates a derivational relation in which the double object construction is the basic structure: such a structure has an empty verb of possession and is the base for the construction with to. Nevertheless, this proposal sacrifices the previously safeguarded uniformity hypothesis as far as it eliminates the possession verb in the derivational process. Another proposal is that of Speas (also held by Jackendoff (1990), which emphasizes the role of the lexicon: (4a) and (4b) would have two partly similar and lexically related Lexical Conceptual Structures, to each of which would correspond one of the two basic syntactic structures already seen. As I have anticipated in § 2.2.1 I will take here this last approach regarding the Spanish data.

3.2. The structure of ditransitive sentences without dative clitics.

Taking the previous background as a point of departure, I want to claim first that Spanish sentences with two internal arguments without a dative clitic have a basic representation similar to that in (35), where the direct object asymmetrically c-commands the indirect object. As in all standard analyses, I also assume that DP2 receives inherent case from the preposition (under government by the main verb). Once the verb moves up to the empty verb position it will assign structural objective Case to DP1, the "subject" of the complex verbal phrase.

12. To be more precise, according to Larson (1988) "...in a VP like send a letter to Mary to represent case marking" (op. cit. 369). It implies that even though the verb assigns theta-role, as does the preposition, to the indirect object argument, the verb alone cannot assign Case to it and does it through an independent case marker: to. Although Larson does not say explicitly that the verb assigns Inherent Case, that is implied in his statement about the preposition being just a "marker" and that "absorption" implies that it is absent (op. cit. 352) (see also p. 362). In any case, absorption is possible because the verb and the preposition "assign thematic role redundantly".
constructions without dative passives like (37):

(37) El premio Nobel fue concedido a Cela.

From this configuration, then, the way reflexive anaphors are found in Spanish constructions without dative clitic (36=9a,b):

(36) a. El tratamiento psicoanalitico reintegro a Maria[DO] a si misma[IO].

b. * El tratamiento psicoanalitico devolvió a si misma[DO] a Maria[IO].

c. El tratamiento psicoanalitico therapy gave back Mary to herself

d. * El tratamiento psicoanalitico therapy gave back herself to Marfa

(37) El premio Nobel fue concedido a Cela.

as well as the binding of pronouns in (38), similar to (10a,b):

(38) a. * La directora entregó su premio a cada ganador.

b. La directora entregó cada premio a su ganador.

or WCE like those in (39) are easily derived:

(39) a. ¿Qué destinatarios mandaste tus cheques?

b. ¿Qué cheques mandaste a tus destinatarios?

From this configuration it follows also that only in (38b) and (39b) can we obtain the distributive reading.

3.3. The BPhrase and the structure of VP.

The second and central assumption of this work is that all the structures with affected dative clitic are base generated in a configuration akin to that in (40) where the clitic is the head of a BP [see note 5] occupying the higher position of a VP-shell type structure. This configuration departs slightly from that of Larson in that the Theme argument is the sister of the main verb and the adjunct position in V can be now occupied by the the PP double of the clitic. To be more precise, I would like to suggest that in a representation such as that in (40) the Goal / Benefactive / Source indirect object can choose first to appear in the SPEC of the BP, a position to which it might have moved from its base position higher than the Theme in the VP (I will come back to this question in 3.3.4). As a second option, this indirect object can be an adjunt to V forming a chain with a pro indirect object in the Spec of BP:

I want to remark in advance that the analysis I am proposing does not appear to be compatible with the VP-internal subject hypothesis. The reason is simply that given a structure like (40) with the possible addition of an AGRoP it would not be possible for the subject to move out of the VP. Generally, movement is not allowed to skip two specifier positions of successive heads. However, I will not enter here into the alternatives to the standard internal subject hypothesis. I refer the reader to Koizumi (1993) and his hypothesis on the “Split VP” which allows subjects to be generated lower than AGRoP but not within the VP as in the standard proposal.

Given (40), now, there are many questions which need to be answered. Here is a subset of those possible: (i) What independent empirical evidence do we have that the Goal or Benefactive lexical dative can appear in both positions ?; (ii) Is it base generated in the [Spec, BP] or does it get there by movement ?; (iii) What implications does this analysis have for the matters of case assignment ?; (iv) How does this representation explain the constraints on passivization ?

Order constraints, WCO effects and scope of adverbs data will be brought out to answer these questions.

3.3.1. Some constituent-order effects.

Even if it is accepted that Spanish is a free word order language, the existence of constraints on the arrangement of the constituents of the sentences has to be acknowledged. In Goal structures, where the clitic can be absent, the unmarked order is V DO IO. The order V DO IO ranges from being felt as stylistically marked to having an ungrammatical flavor. What the speakers said is that in this second case the structure "asks for the clitic": 13

13. I refer to Demonte (1993a) for an explanation of the facts of scrambling of the IO over the DO.
(41) a. Di el libro a María. / Entregué las llaves al dueño.
   'I gave the book to María', / 'I delivered the keys to the landlord'.

   (a'), (b') and (c') it would be placed in the Spec of BP, the two possibilities
   the bound pronoun in the DO we find, in sentences with
datives, fragile judgements and not strong differences in grammatical judgements
in sentences from the adjoined to
clichés.

   Both of the pair of structures in (41) are perfectly normal when the clitic is
present:

(42) a. Le di el libro a María.

   (a') Le di a María el libro.
   b'. Le entregué al dueño las llaves.
   c. Luisa le cocinó un pavo relleno a los invitados.
       Luisa CL3P cooked a turkey stuffed to the visitors
       'Luisa cooked the visitors a stuffed turkey'.
   c'. Luisa les cocinó un invitados un pavo relleno.
       Luisa CL3P cooked to the visitors a stuffed turkey
We can think, then, that in the (a) (b)
There-is, though, another analytical possibility
My interpretation of the preceding facts is that the pronoun can be bound in
(43) a. (?) La secretaria le mandó su cheque a cada empleado.
   the secretary CL3S sent his check to each worker
   La secretaria le mandó a cada empleado su cheque.
   the secretary CL3S sent to each worker his check
   (44) a. (?) Le arreglé su coche a cada corredor.
   CL3S fixed his car to each racer
   Le arreglé a cada corredor su coche.
   CL3S fixed to each racer his car
   My interpretation of the preceding facts is that the pronoun can be bound in any of
the two orders since the quantified NP c-command the direct object NP both
from the adjoined to V' position and from the Spec of the BP. It is interesting to note
that the sentences in which the distributive reading is more difficult to get are those
with Goal Indirect object in which the bound pronoun is in the DO. Does it mean that
sentences like (43a) can be processed as having a structure like (35)? This would
have an uninteresting consequence for a uniform approach to the nature of dative
clites.

   These, though, another analytical possibility 14 which would take on the

responsibility for the differences in grammaticality judgements to the nature of the
adjunct constituent. In fact, it may be thought that the adjunct IO (at least in the
structures in which we find the "augmented" benefactive) is a nominal element, akin
to a secondary predication. In that case the binding from the adjoined position will be
straightforward. In other words, if the IO is a PP in (43) and an NP in (44) the
contrast between the two structures will follow without any further stipulation.
Now when the quantified NP is the direct object the contrasts are stronger and the
judgements about the two classes of verbs are to a certain extent reversed (recall also
the observation about the paradigm in (10)):

(45) a. (?) La secretaria le mandó cada recibió a su solicitante.
   the secretary CL3S sent each bill to its applicant
   b. (?) La secretaria le mandó a su solicitante cada recibió.
   the secretary CL3S sent to its applicant each bill

(46) a. (?) La fotógrafa le retrató cada niño a su madre.
   the photographer CL3S photographed each kid to his mother
   b. (?) La fotógrafa le retrató a su madre cada niño.
   the photographer CL3S photographed each kid to his mother

(47) a. Le arreglé cada coche a su dueño.
   CL3S fixed each car to its owner
   Le arreglé a su dueño cada coche.
   CL3S fixed to each owner his car

   A qualification is in order, namely, that the (a) cases of (45), (46) and (47)
are problematic facts for the analysis (40) since it would be difficult to assert that the
DO can c-command the adjoined IO. Now, if you test in other structures the
appearance of bound pronouns with other quantifiers the preceding pattern changes
in a significant way. Observe the facts in (48):

(48) a. Las madres no les transmitieron ningún mensaje a sus hijos.
   'The mothers did not transmit any message to their sons'.
   Las maestras no les dibujaron ningún mapa a sus alumnos.
   'The teachers did not draw any map for their pupils'.

   These sentences can only mean: (i) that there was no message at all (one single
message) transmitted, (ii) that there was not map at all drawn. Nningún, then, does
not bind the pronoun in the final constituent, otherwise we would have a distributed
reading as in the cada cases. The implication of these judgements is that the
problematic sentences (45a), (46a) y (47a) show the intervention of another factor,
very possibly the fact that each is a quantifier which sends to get wide scope.
In addition, the b cases of the paradigm (45) to (47) also show that the IO in the
Spec of BP cannot be bound by the quantifier in the direct object. Both, the a and b
facts are consistent with the hypothesis that QPs adjoin to VP (cf. May (1985)).
Now, if this is the case and the distributed reading is not possible in (45b), (46b) and
(47b), it implies that the IO is necessarily higher in the configuration. A fine-grained
analysis of this data, then, appears to provide positive evidence for our proposal.
At this point, I would like to present additional data which might help to make the
question of the role of the adjunct IO in c-command relations more precise. Observe
that when we left-dislocate the IO with a bound pronoun the results are bad,
independently of the judgments regarding the source sentences, look at (49) and (50):

(49) a. *A suj solicitante, la secretaria le mandó cada recibir.
   b. *A suj dueño, Juan le dio cada cheque.

(50) a. *A suj madre, la fotógrafa le retrató cada niño.
   b. *A suj dueño, le arregló cada coche.

Since the judgments regarding the sources are not uniform, one could expect differences in CLLD structures. In other words, given our previous analysis (49) is unexpected (since binding of the pronoun was possible in the source sentence) while (50) is expected, since binding was not allowed. Now, a general explanation for the preceding facts could consist in relating them to the LD of other adjuncts. Observe that in the following pair of passive sentences we do not get the bound reading when the by-phrase is fronted. The whole set of facts could imply then that we cannot reconstruct a relation between an adjunct to V and the inner VP complement when this element is LD:

(51) a. ?Fue diseñado cada vestido por suj modelo.  
   b. Cada vestido fue diseñado por suj modelo.
   c. *Por suj modelo fue diseñado cada vestido.

The way CLLD proceeds when we LD isolate the quantified IO over the DO with the bound pronoun appears to add partial positive evidence for the conjecture regarding reconstruction of adjuncts. Observe that we cannot violate WCO when we extract the IO of goal sentences, as in (52), similarly to the impossibility of fronting a quantified by-phrase, (53):

(52) a. *A cada empleado, la secretaria le dio suj cheque.
   b. *A cada alumno, la maestra le dio suj mapa.
   c. *Por suj mapa, le regaló cada chaqueta.

(53) a. ?Fue diseñada suj casa por cada arquitecto.
   b. Cada arquitecto diseñó suj casa.

15. Notice that this sentence cannot be considered totally equivalent to (46b) since cada vestido is a subject and can appear higher than the by-phrase.

3.3.3. Co-reference effects in inverted subject structures.
A problematic evidence for my proposal comes from the binding of the pronoun in structures with inverted subject. If the inverted subject is adjoined to VP we will not expect co-reference in affected dative structures with inverted subjects since the clitic, according to the analysis in (40), will c-command the subject (and there will be, then, a Principle C violation). (55) shows the typical pattern of goal sentences with inverted subjects; disjoint reference is forceful in (55b) implying that the clitic c-commands the inverted subject:

(55) a. La madre de Luisa le regaló la chaqueta.
   b. *Le regaló la chaqueta la madre de Luisa.

In the set of Benefactive affected dative structures the (co/disjoint) reference judgements are not as strict as in the previous case. The generalization could be the following:

(56) In benefactive/source dative constructions with inverted subjects the stronger the inalienable possession reading, the stronger the disjoint reference effect.

(57) a. Le preparó la merienda la madre de Juan.
   b. % Le arregló el coche el mecánico de Juan.
   c. *Le operó la nariz el marido de Luisa.
   d. *Le lavó la cara la maestra de José.

C13S washed the face the teacher of José

In (57a) most speakers accept a co-reference reading. In (57b) judgments range
from considerable doubt to unacceptability of co-reference. In (57c) and (57d) disjoint reference is reported as forceful. 17 Let us pay attention to the fact that (57a) and (57b) show an alienable possession relation between the dative and the DO, while in (57c) and (57d) the direct object is inalienable possessed.

It has been extensively argued (cf. Vergnaud & Zubizarreta (1992) as well as Brugger (1993)) that the definite DO determiner in unalienable possession constructions is an expletive determiner --without denotational content-- since it does not need to satisfy a Predication relation with the clitic.

Observe now the sentences in (59):

(59) a. *Les quitó a las blusas completamente las manchas.
b. (?) Les quitó las manchas completamente a las blusas.
c. (?) Les quitó completamente a las blusas las manchas.
d. Les quitó completamente las manchas a las blusas.

The grammatical (59a) and (59d) as well as the ungrammatical (59c) would be straightforward realizations of the base sentences, given our analysis. The dubious (59b) could indicate that there is no AGRoP which the DO can rise up to.

Our second paradigm is the one formed by ditransitive sentences with a VP adverb. Assuming that an adverb is licensed by adjoining to the maximal projection of its licenser, VP adverbs would adjoin to VP, as in (60):

(60) a. *Le entregó secretamente a Juan los papeles.
b. Le entregó a Juan secretamente los papeles.
c. Le entregó los papeles secretamente a Juan.
d. Le entregó secretamente los papeles a Juan.

Interestingly, the only grammatical order is that in which the adverb precedes an IO preceding itself a DO. (61a) indicates, then, that a "proposed" IO is always higher than the Verb Phrase. It has also to be noted that (61c) (which should be compared to (51b)) leads to the conclusion that the DO also moves out of the VP, perhaps to a phrase located between the BP and the lexical VP.

3.4. Passives in ditransitive sentences.

From the analysis that I have proposed for the structures with affected dative goals and augmented benefactives I want also deduce the constraints on passivization in structures with two internal arguments. Now, before going into the implementation of the analysis I would like to organize the data in a comparative perspective.

Regarding passives of the two alternative projections of the dative alternation, Czeplicki (1980) gave the following summary of the English data, where the four tested dialects come from a set of six linguists and where it is a common judgement (Oehrle (1976); Larson (1988)) that the (c) sentence of (62) can be considered well
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formed only if the IO is a pronominal:

(62) a. The book was given Mary. ok ok ok ok
    b. Mary was given the book. ok ok ok ok
    c. The book was given Mary/her. ok ok ok *

(63) a. The book was bought for Mary. ok ok ok ok
    b. Mary was bought the book. * ? * ok ok
    c. The book was bought Mary/her. * * ok *

The generalization appears to be that English passivizes both the Theme and the Goal in Goal dative structures and has strong constraints for the passivization of any of the arguments in the augmented Benefactive structure (recall also (11) and (12) above).

In Dutch and German, even if these languages allow two VP-internal NPs, only passivization of the Theme DO is possible. It has to be noted that in those languages the IOs are assigned dative Case (the data come from Haegeman (1985)):

(64) Dutch
   a. *Marie/zieuw het boek gegeven. Mario/she was the book given
      Marie/zieuw was het boek gegeven. the book was Marie/her given
   b. Het boek werd Marie/haar gegeven. the book was Marie/her given

(65) German
   a. *Maria/Sie wurde das Buch gegeben. Marie/she was the book given
      Marie/Sie war das Buch gegeben. the book was Marie/her given
   b. Das Buch wurde Maria/ihr gegeben. the book was Maria/ ihr given

Spanish is like German and Dutch in allowing only passivization of the Theme, similar to them it shows overtly Dative Case on the IO. Moreover, a rule for Spanish appears to be that only Goal ditransitive structures admit passivization, Benefactive dative sentences precludes passives (this is illustrated in (66)):

(66) a. El premio Nobel (le) fue concedido a Cela el año pasado. 'The Nobel prize was awarded to Cela last year'.
    b. El coche le fue arreglado a Juan anteayer. 'The car was fixed (for) Juan the day before yesterday'.

What is also true for Spanish is that speakers show a considerable idiosyncratic variation. Preparan, for instance, a creation verb with an augmented benefactive, is not totally out in passives: La cena le fue preparada al presidente 'Dinner was prepared (for) the president', while enseñar, that has a Goal IO, is quite unacceptable in a similar construction: *El ruso le fue enseñado a María por un profesor muy bueno 'Russian was taught to Mary by a very good teacher'.

To account for this complex set of data, my first assumption will be that passivization absorbs structural accusative (with no qualification up to this point regarding whether this is assigned through Spec-head agreement or through government by the verb). Accusative is by default the structural verbal Case. From this presupposition, it follows that in Spanish passive sentences (as well as in German and Dutch) the only NPs needing to move in order to be case marked will be the Theme ones. It also follows the possibility of (62b), the English sentence where the Goal passivizes, since in English both objects receive Accusative case.

My second assumption is that (40) (repeated below as (67)) is the only structure available for sentences with an affected IO, either Spanish sentences with dative clitic or Germanic double object structures:

(67) V P a-DP b-BP Cl VP V DP

I also want to consider the generalization regarding English, namely, that sentences like A book was given John/ihim are much better when the IO is a pronominal, as the unmarked case for the passivization of a Theme in a double object configuration akin to (67). The intuition underlying this fact is that if the upper DP in the VP shell can be felt as much closer to the verb (and perhaps as reanalyzed with it being a clitic like element), then the movement of the inner DP becomes possible.

With these assumptions in mind, the following analysis could be taken into consideration. The whole lack of passivization in sentences with the structure in (67) (English (65) and Spanish (66b)) results as a violation of relativized minimality. Recall that we have assumed that in such structures the Spec of the BP phrase is occupied by the IO. If this assumption is correct, the inner DP will not have an escape hatch through which to go up to the AgrSP to acquire Nominative Case. This would be an explanation in terms of shortest movement: the Theme has skipped a position it could have reached by a shorter movement had this position not been filled. Phrasing this explanation in other terms, we can say that NP-movement of the inner DP will give rise to an ECP violation since an A constituent will cross over an A specifier.

An important additional question is how in certain cases do we obtain passives of the Theme in double object structures (impossible in Spanish (66b), possible in German/Dutch (64b, 65b) and possible in English (62b) with qualifications). To handle this issue we could suggest two possibilities, maybe inextricably related: (a) perhaps certain languages do not have the functional BP projection, (b) perhaps the impossibility of the movement is due to the fact that the Spec of the functional part is not occupied by a constituent, the opposite situation to the one entertained for the Spanish Case. If the first possibility is tenable, we can think that this kind of representation allows incorporation of the head of the higher BP into the V. As a consequence the domain of the verb will be extended and the object Theme will have its way opened to go up to obtain nominative Case: the object can now rise because it had become the object of the complex V+N after incorporation. In other words, when the higher DP (or its head) incorporates into the verb there is no barrier impeding the government of the trace of the inner DP since Goal incorporation enlarges the domain of the chain.
A non-interesting consequence is that this analysis says that this incorporation is forceful in German, Dutch and Spanish Goal ditransitive structures, while it appears to be optional in English. A tentative line of account can be conceived, though. In English, incorporation appears to be be possible only when the IO is an element of the argument structure of the verb, benefactives are not incorporated. We might suppose that the same happens in Spanish. However, German and Dutch are still problematic. It may be important to keep in mind, regarding Dutch and German, an observation due to Haegeman as to the passives of double objects in the former language.

In this paper I have presented some evidence arguing in favour of the two following claims: (a) There exists in Spanish a lexical-conceptual alternation in sentences with and without: a dative and a benefactive. This way, (64b) would not be problematic anymore since it might be derived from (68). We will not be forced to assume, then, that Dutch has obligatory incorporation.
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