Object Clitics and Agreement*

Javier Ormazabal & Juan Romero

U. of the Basque Country/HiTT & U. de Extremadura/HiTT

April, 2010

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is twofold. We first argue that syntactic, morphological and semantic properties of object clitics in Spanish support a "mixed" analysis where 3rd person DO clitics, *lo(s)/la(s),* are best analyzed as determiners, and all the rest are agreement markers. Second, we analyze some important theoretical consequences of this split; it is argued that once we leave Determiner-like 3rd person DO clitics aside, all other clitics constitute a single agreement system that does not discriminate between Direct Objects and Indirect Objects, neither morphologically nor in the syntax, a conclusion supported by different kinds of evidence. First, the behavior of the object Case/animacy marker *a* shows (i) that inanimate and animate objects are subject to different syntactic requirements, especially in *se* constructions; and (ii) that only one argument may appear overtly marked by *a*. Furthermore, microdialectal variation receives a straightforward explanation within this model. Northern *leísta* dialects exhibit a complete Case/agreement paradigm, including 3rd person animate object agreement, while other dialects, including Standard Spanish and Standard *leísta* dialects show a gap in 3rd person of the agreement paradigm, but resort to different morphosyntactic strategies to represent phonetically null 3rd person objects.

1. Introduction

In the syntactic analysis of Romance clitics two have been the main hypotheses within the generative tradition since Kayne's (1975) original discussion of the topic. The *movement hypothesis* (Kayne 1975, 1991, Rizzi 1986, among others) analyzes clitics as pronominal elements generated in their argumental position within VP and moved to the verbal or inflectional projection. The *base-generated hypothesis* (Strozer 1976, Aoun 1981, Jaeggli 1982, etc.) in its modern version argues that Romance clitics are agreement markers attached to inflectional heads (Borer 1984, Saltarelli 1987, Suñer 1988, Fernández Soriano 1989**,** Franco 1993, Sportiche 1993, Anderson 2005, among others).

Both hypotheses share the underlying assumption that object clitics form a uniform class with respect to the issues at stake. More recently, an alternative, "mixed", analysis

has arisen that postulates a different division of work among clitics and suggests that Romance clitics are not as uniform a class as we would expect even within the same language. In particular, the idea is that 3rd person Direct Object (DO) cliticization in Spanish constitutes a genuine case of Determiner movement, but other DO clitics and Indirect Object (IO) clitics are of a very different nature, most probably agreement-like elements. In section 2, heavily based on work by Roca (1996), we argue that syntactic, morphological and semantic differences between 3rd person DO clitics, *lo(s)/la(s),* and IO clitic *le(s)* support the "mixed" analysis. Specifically, it is shown that the behavior of 3rd person object clitics is better understood as an instance of determiner movement. In section 3 we extend the analysis to the entire paradigm, including 1st and 2nd person object clitics, and conclude that contrary to 3rd person DO clitics, in Spanish all Indirect Object clitics as well as 1st and 2nd person Direct Object clitics are agreement markers.[1]

This conclusion allows us to unify the DO and IO paradigms to levels beyond what works on the topic have proposed so far: as we argue in sections 4 and 5, once we draw apart Determiner-like 3rd person DO clitics, all other clitics constitute a single agreement system, which does not discriminate between Direct Objects and Indirect Objects, neither morphologically nor in the syntax.[2] In order to achieve these results, in section 4 we first extend our analysis to *leísta* dialects and show that 3rd person animate DO clitics *le(s)* in these dialects also behave together with all other agreement clitics rather than their closest inanimate *lo(s)/la(s)* version. These dialects fill up the gap in the paradigm corresponding to 3rd person DO agreement. We also deal with well-known cases of optional clitic doubling and show that in fact this apparent optionality reflects two different underlying structures. This conclusion is strongly reinforced by the behavior of the animacy/Case marker *a*, which cannot be assigned to the DO in the presence of a dative clitic. In section 5 we reconsider the entire paradigm and argue that DO and IO agreement constitute a single agreement paradigm. Finally, in section 6 we consider some interesting consequences of our analysis involving microdialectal variation. Our accommodation of

---

[1]We leave aside the clitic *se* in all its uses. However, it has to be noted that there are two cases where *se* clearly satisfies an object role. First, when it works as a DO/IO reflexive. In this function, it behaves as a base generated clitic. The other case involves Spurious *se*, for which there is no single reason to suppose that its use is syntactically relevant.

[2]From a diachronic point of view, that 1st and 2nd person objective clitics have the same origin is a well-known fact (see footnote 13 below). However, our analysis makes a much stronger claim, both because it extends far beyond the etymological contexts and includes 3rd person clitic *le*, which is of a very different origin, and because it also extends to the syntactic behavior of these elements. See Bleam (2000) for a similar proposal from a rather different perspective.

Standard *leísta* dialects, where animate DO clitic *les* show apparent "mixed" properties of Determiners and agreement markers, uncovers interesting extensions of the analysis throughout the paper.

2. The Determiner nature of third person Direct Object clitic.

In this section we argue that 3rd person DO clitics *lo(s)/la(s)* do not belong to the same grammatical clitic paradigm than the rest of the clitics. To achieve this goal, we first show that 3rd person DO clitics contrast with IO ones in a number of syntactic contexts (section 2.1). Various authors account for this difference arguing that the 3rd DO clitic is in fact a determiner. We then show, following Roca 1992, that both obligatory DO clitic doubling (section 2.2), and 3rd person DO clitic interpretation (section 2.3) strongly reinforce this hypothesis. To finish, morphological differences between DO and IO clitics (section 2.4) also support the same conclusion.

2.1. Clitic Doubling : differences between Direct and Indirect Objects

The classical argument against clitic movement presented by defenders of the base-generated/agreement hypothesis has always been clitic doubling. Consider the example in (1).[3]

(1)   Les recomendé   un libro a los estudiantes
        3pIO recommended.I a book to the students
        'I reccomended a book to the students'

The presence of the full DP *los estudiantes* ('the students') in the argument position makes that position in principle unavailable as the source for the clitic, a fact that defenders of the agreement hypothesis take as evidence that the clitic is base-generated somewhere in the inflectional element to which it appears attached.

Yet, if this argument goes through, the agreement analysis does not extend to 3rd person DO clitics in Spanish. 3rd person DO and IO clitics present a radically different

---

[3] The following abbreviations are used in the glosses: 1, 2, 3 = first, second, third person respectively; s = singular; p/pl = plural, f = feminine, m = masculine, a = animate, df = default, IO = Indirect Object, DO = Direct Object, RFL = reflexive.
     Subjects are glossed by their corresponding English pronoun, and the animacy/Case marker *a* that appears with animate specific indirect objects in Spanish has been left untranslated and is represented by the small capital A.

behavior in Standard Spanish. IO clitic doubling does not seem to be particularly restricted with respect to the properties of the argument; thus, the clitic can optionally double definite DPs (1), indefinite ones (2a), bare NPs (2b), interrogative pronouns (2c), negative indefinite pronouns (2d), or quantified expressions of different sorts (2e) (see Roca 1996):

(2)   a.   (Les) compré un libro a unos amigos
              (3pIO) bought.I a book to some friends
              'I bought some friends a book'

        b.   (Le)   mencioné este asunto a gente de la universidad
              (3sIO) mentioned.I this issue to people from the university
              'I mentioned this issue to people at the university"

        c.   ¿A quién (le)   has   vendido la casa?
              To whom (3sIO) have.you sold the house?
              'Who did you sell the house to?'

        d.   No   (le) dijimos   nada   a nadie
              Not (3sIO) told.we nothing to nobody
              'We did not tell anything to anybody'

        e.   (Les) pagamos las deudas a todos/algunos/muchos acreedores
              (3pIO) paid.we the debts to all / some / many creditors
              'We paid our debts to all/some/many creditors'

In contrast, in standard Spanish except for examples to be discussed in section 2.2, 3rd person DO clitics can never be doubled, as the examples in (3) illustrate.

(3)   a.   (*La) vimos   la casa   (cf. (1))
              3fDO saw.we the house
              'We saw the house'

        b.   (*Las) compramos unas cervezas   (cf. (2a))
              3fpDO bought.we some beers
              'We bought some beers'

        c.   (*La) visité (a) gente de la universidad   (cf. (2b))
               3fDO visited.I A people from the university
              'I visited people from the University'

        d.   ¿Qué libros (*los)   has   comprado?   (cf. (2c))
               What books 3mpDO have.you bought
              'What books did you buy ?'

        e.   No (*lo) vimos a nadie   (cf. (2d))
              Not 3mDO saw.we A nobody
              'We saw nobody'

        f.   (*Los) vimos   a algunos/muchos   (cf. (2e))
              3mpDO saw.we A some / many
              'We saw some/many'

On the basis of this difference, various authors (see specially Uriagereka 1988, 1995; Roca 1992, 1996; Torrego 1998, Bleam 2000, Ormazabal & Romero 2002, 2004 and references cited there) have argued that Spanish clitics *lo(s)/la(s)* belong to the category Determiner. From these authors' perspective, the cliticization of 3rd person DOs in Spanish is a process of movement of a head belonging to the category Det, a case of Det-incorporation from the complement position. As a consequence, the option of doubling is in general terms discarded with these elements.

2.2. Third Person Object Clitic Doubling

In contrast with the general situation described in section 2, there are three contexts where DO clitic doubling is not only possible, but in fact obligatory: Clitic Left Dislocation (4a), universal quantifier *todo* (4b), and strong pronouns (4c).

(4)   a.   La   casa todavía no *(la)   he   visto
              The house still   not 3fsDO have.I seen
              'The house, I haven't seen it yet'

        b.   Ayer   *(los) vimos   a todos
              yesterday 3mpDO saw.we A all
              'We saw them all yesterday'

        c.   *(La) vimos   a ella
              3fsDO saw.we A her
              'We saw HER'

Among these contexts, the obligatoriness of clitic doubling in left dislocated configurations such as (4a) has generally been attributed to the non-argumental status of the doubled element. There is general agreement in the literature that the dislocated DP on the left is base-generated in that position and, consequently, the clitic --or *pro*, according to some analyses-- occupies the argument position. Some authors observe that this could explain not only why these contexts exceptionally allow DO clitic doubling, but also why clitic doubling is obligatory in this configuration.

Regarding the other two contexts, in section 2.2.1 we extend Roca's argument and argue that it occurs with the universal quantifier due to the fact that this item requires a definite determiner, and in section 2.2.2. we show that it coappears with strong pronouns in general because strong pronouns are not inserted in verb-related argument position, possibly due to its focus nature.

2.2.1. Quantifiers

The obligatoriness of the clitic in (4b) constitutes a particularly interesting case, because it presents very strong indirect evidence in favor of the Determiner source of 3rd person DO clitics, as observed by Roca (1996). To begin with, the construction corresponds to a floating quantifier structure, where the Determiner clitic moves leaving behind the quantifier. Roca observes that this conclusion is supported by the fact that only the universal quantifier allows complements headed by the definite determiner, i.e. constructions of the type in (5), which suggests a possible source for this construction.

(5)   [Quantifier [Det NP]]

While clitic doubling is obligatory when the floated element is the universal quantifier, the quantifiers in (6) never allow the clitic:

(6)   (*Los)   vimos   algunos/bastantes/suficientes/muchos
        3mpDO saw.we   some / quite   / enough   / a lot
        'We saw (*them) some/quite/enough/a lot'

As expected, this difference correlates with the fact that the universal quantifier relates with phrases headed by the definite determiner, while the other quantifiers, including the existential one, do not (7).

(7)   a.   Vimos todos *(los) libros
                Saw.we all   the books
                'We saw all the books'

        b.   Vimos algunos/bastantes/suficientes/muchos (*los) libros
                saw.we some / quite   / enough / a lot   the books
                'We saw some/quite a lot/enough/a lot of books'

Given this, the correlation between quantifiers allowing DP complements and those allowing DO clitics strongly supports the movement hypothesis in general and, in particular, the hypothesis of the incorporation of the determiner.

2.2.2. Strong Pronouns

As for contexts like (4c), repeated in (8), Uriagereka (1995, 1997) and Bleam (2000) on the one hand, and Rigau (1988) and Roca (1996) on the other present two alternative proposals for the exceptionality of clitic doubling with strong pronouns.

(8)　　*(La)　vimos　a ella
　　　　3fsDO saw.we A her
　　　　'We saw HER'

Roca (1992, 1996), based on Rigau (1988), argues that strong pronouns are not in argument position, in which case the real argument would be, once again, the clitic. Many are the arguments that support this claim: a) to begin with, strong pronouns can never function as resumptive pronouns. The ungrammatical (9b), where the strong pronoun *a él* ('to him') functions as a resumptive element in the relative clause, minimally contrasts with (9a), where the clitic is the resumptive element [examples in Spanish, adapted from Rigau's 1988 original example in Catalan]:

(9)　　a.　　Éste es el crío　al　que dicen　que　**le**　han　　regalado un caballo
　　　　　　This is the lad　to.the that say.they that 3sIO have.they **offered**　a　horse
　　　　　　'This is the guy to whom they say they gave a horse (to him) as a present'

　　　　b.　　*Éste es el crío　al　que　dicen　que (le)　han　　regalado un caballo **a él**
　　　　　　This is　the lad　to.the that say.they that 3sIO have.they **offered**　a　horse to him
　　　　　　'This is the guy to whom they say they gave a horse (to him) as a present'

b) Unlike clitics (10a), strong pronouns cannot refer to a dislocated element [idem]:

(10)　　a.　　A Pedro **le**　　han　　regalado un caballo
　　　　　　To Pedro 3sIO have.they offered　a　horse
　　　　　　'To Pedro, they gave him a horse as a present'

　　　　b.　　*A Pedro (le)　　han　　regalado un caballo **a él**
　　　　　　To　Pedro 3sIO have.they offered　a　horse　to him
　　　　　　'To Pedro, they gave him a horse as a present'

c) Unlike 3rd person DO clitics or subject *pro*, strong pronouns cannot function as variables bound by a quantifier, the so-called Motalbetti effects [see Rigau 1988, for Catalan and Fernández Soriano 1993, for Spanish]:

(11)　　a.　　Todos mis amigos$_i$ saben que　　los$_{i/j}$　　apreciamos
　　　　　　All　　my friends$_i$　know that 3mpDO$_{i/j}$　like.we
　　　　　　'All my friends know that we estimate them (my friends or somebody else)'

　　　　b.　　Todos mis amigos$_i$ saben que　　los$_{*i/j}$　　apreciamos a ellos$_{*i/j}$
　　　　　　All　　my friends$_i$　know that 3mpDO$_{*i/j}$　like.we　　A they$_{*i/j}$
　　　　　　'All my friends know that we estimate them (my friends or somebody else)'

　　　　c.　　Todos mis amigos$_i$ saben que *pro*$_{i/j}$　　van　　a perder
　　　　　　All　　my friends$_i$　know that *pro*$_{i/j}$ will.they to lose
　　　　　　'All my friends know that they (my friends or somebody else) will lose'

　　　　d.　　Todos mis amigos$_i$ saben que ellos$_{*i/i}$　　van　　　a perder
　　　　　　All　　my friends$_i$　know that they$_{*i/j}$ will.they to lose

7

'All my friends know that they (somebody else) will lose'

Montalbetti effects disappear when the strong pronoun is within a PP, where it may be interpreted as a bound variable (Montalbetti 1984, Rigau 1988):

(12)   Nadie$_i$ desea que el director hable   con él$_{i/j}$
        Nobody desires that the director speak.he with him$_{i/j}$
        'Nobody wants the director to speak with him'

d) A strong pronoun in an extraposed adverbial phrase cannot corefer with the subject of the main clause, again contrasting with the behavior of *pro* and 3rd person DO clitics (Luján 1984 ; Fernández Soriano 1999):

(13)   a.   Cada vez que *pro$_{i/j}$* pierde, Ana$_i$ se   enfada
              Each time that   loses, Ana herself annoys
              'Each time she (Ana or somebody else) looses, Ana gets annoyed'

        b.   Cada vez que ella$_{j/*i}$ pierde, Ana$_i$ se   enfada
              Each time that she   loses, Ana herself annoys
              'Each time she (somebody else) looses, Ana gets annoyed'

(14)   a.   Si   la$_{i/j}$ invitan, Ana$_i$ buscará   una excusa
              If 3fsDO$_{i/j}$ invite.they, Ana$_i$ will.look-for.she an excuse
              'If they invite her (Ana or somebody else), Ana will look for an excuse'

        b.   Si   la   invitan   a ella$_{j/*i}$, Ana$_i$ pondrá   una excusa
              If 3fsDO$_{i/j}$ invite.they A her$_{j/*i}$, Ana$_i$ will.look-for.she an excuse
              'If they invite her (somebody else), Ana will look for an excuse'

e) To the previous arguments we can add an argument --adapted from Bresnan & Mchombo's (1987; p. 768) discussion of pronouns and agreement--, which also distinguishes between clitics and strong pronouns. As the contrast in (15) illustrates, clitic pronouns *lo(s)/la(s)* may be anaphorically linked to an antecedent in the discourse, while strong pronouns cannot:

(15)   a.   La hiena se comió al león. Después   de habérselo   zampado,...
              The hyena ate.she the lion. After   have.INF.3msDO wolfed,..
              'The hyena ate the lion. After she wolfed it...'

        b.   *La hiena se comió al león. Después   de haberselo   zampado a él,
              The hyena   ate   the lion. After   have.INF.3msDO wolfed   A him,..
              'The hyena ate the lion. After she wolfed it'

Once again, these effects disappear when the strong pronoun is within a PP, in which case it can be anaphorically linked to the potential discourse antecedent:

(16)   La   hiena   vio   al león. Después de hablar con él,...
        The hyena saw.she the lion. After   have.INF with him...
        'The hyena saw the lion. After having spoken with him...'

All the previous arguments support the idea that strong pronouns cannot be inserted in argumental positions, and consequently account for the exceptionality –and obligatoriness-- of 3rd person OD clitic doubling just in these contexts.

2.3. The Interpretation of third person DO clitics

One of Suñer's (1988) contributions to the analysis of clitic doubling is her observation that, in addition to the distributional restrictions discussed in the previous subsection, 3rd person DO clitics, unlike IO ones, are also semantically restricted to [+specific] arguments (Suñer 1988, Uriagereka 1992):

(17)   Lo   he   visto en la playa   (√the car /≠ a car)
        3smDO have.I seen on the beach
        'I saw it on the beach (√the car   /≠ a car)'

The interpretation of the clitic with universal quantifiers discussed in the previous subsection is completely coherent with this conclusion:

(18)   (Los)   vimos todos   [=4b]
         3mpDO saw.we all
         'We saw them all'

Additional work (see especially Roca 1996) have extended this observation and have shown that although in some contexts non-specific interpretations are also possible, their range of interpretations corresponds exactly to the semantic interpretation of Direct Object DPs headed by the definite determiner in the same contexts, thus confirming the determiner nature of the 3rd person DO clitic. Thus, although the object clitic cannot generally associate to a bare NP interpreted as non-specific (19b), this is possible when the bare NP has a *type* interpretation, as in (20) (Roca 1992, 1996).

(19)   a.   No tengo dinero
                No have.I money
                'I do not have money'

        b.   *Dinero, no   lo   tengo
                Money, not 3smDO have.I
                'Money, I do not have it'

  c. Dinero, no tengo
     Money, not have.I
     'Money, I do not have any'

(20) [Jugadores como Maradona] no los veremos más
   Players like Maradona not 3mpDO will.see.we more
   'Players like Maradona, we will not see them any more'

But, as Roca observes, a full DP in object position headed by the definite determiner also allows a type interpretation:

(21) En París venden el mismo coche más caro que en Bayona
   In Paris, sell.they the same car more expensive than in Bayonne
   'The same car, they sell it more expensive in Paris than in Bayonne'

   Similarly, Roca also observes that the DO clitic may double a dislocated DP headed by the indefinite determiner *un(a)* ('a [masc./fem.])', but only when this argument is interpreted as generic (22a), never as a regular indefinite (22b):

(22) a. Una corbata, no me la   pondría   ni borracho
     A tie, not 1sRFL 3sfDO would.put-on.I not-even drunk
     'A tie, I would not dress it not even if I was drunk'

  b. *Una corbata, me la   puse   ayer
     A   tie, 1sRFL 3sfDO put-on.I yesterday
     'A tie, I dressed it yesterday'

Again, DPs headed by a definite article may be interpreted as generic, as the examples in (23)-(24) illustrate:

(23) a. The potato was first cultivated in South America

  b. The lion is a predatory cat

(24) a. La vaca come hierba
     The cow eats grass
     'Cows eat grass'

  b. Los políticos usan la corbata para parecer respetables
     The politicians use the tie to appear respectable
     'The politicians dress a tie to appear respectable'

   Summarizing, the evidence presented so far shows that the range of interpretations available for the 3rd person object clitic fully coincides with those found with the definite determiner.

2.4. The Morphology of 3rd person DO clitics and determiners: gender marking.

An important respect in which Spanish DO clitics pair together with determiners and differ from IO clitics is their morphological shape: as examples in (25) show, IO clitics are indifferent with regard to the distinction between feminine and masculine and are marked morphologically only for number:

(25) a. **Le**   di el libro a María/a Juan
          3sIO gave the book to María/to Juan
          'I gave Mary/John the book'

     b. **Les** di   el libro a mis hermanas/ hermanos
          3pIO gave the book to my.pl sisters   / brothers
          'I gave my sisters/brothers the book'

In contrast, as can be seen from the examples throughout the paper, DO clitics present a richer morphological paradigm where, in addition to number, gender is also marked, a property they share with determiners. In fact, abstracting away from the difference in the masculine singular (a historical accident related to stress), as shown in Table 1 the forms are exactly the same for both the clitic and the determiner paradigms:

Table 1. Determiners and Object Clitics				
	Masculine		Feminine	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
Determiner	el	los	la	Las
Clitic	lo	los	la	Las

From a historical point of view, the fact that the two paradigms coincide is not at all surprising, since they share the same demonstrative origin; however, the fact that the IO forms, which also share the same diachronic origin (see fn. 13 below), have dissociated strongly suggests that they passed the cliticization stage and became agreement morphemes, a rather common process in many languages of the world.

2.5. Conclusion

From the discussion in this section we can conclude that 3rd person DO clitics in Spanish show properties that pair them with determiners and set them apart from their IO

counterparts. The syntactic, semantic and morphological properties shared by DO clitics and determiners support an analysis of these clitics as definite determiners along the lines first proposed by Postal (1966) for other pronouns.[4] In consequence, the evidence presented so far strongly supports a movement approach to 3rd person object clitics. At least two possible approaches are conceivable to motivate determiner cliticization in these contexts. It could be the case that 3rd person DO movement is an instance of Determiner incorporation governed by the same general principles that govern incorporation in general. Alternatively, it could be that when the determiner has no phonetic NP as its complement, this element must move, due to its lack of stress, in search of an appropriate phonetic host (see, for instance, Kayne 1992 or Uriagereka 1995). At this point, we do not see any direct syntactic effect related to this cliticization, and consequently we would favor a PF head movement approach. However, for the purposes of this paper, nothing important in what follows hinges on that choice.

3. Completing the Paradigm: most clitics are not determiners

As discussed in the previous section, we can divide Spanish clitics into two different groups based on their different behavior with respect to a variety of properties. The first group includes 3rd person direct object clitics, which we have categorized as determiners attached to the verb. In this section we show that the second group comprises the rest of the object clitics, including 1st and 2nd person DO clitics. We also argue that clitics in this group are better understood as agreement markers.

3.1. The Indirect Object

In the previous section we have already shown that 3rd person IO clitics differ systematically in their properties from DO ones: (i) the distribution of 3rd person IO clitic doubling is much wider than the corresponding DO clitics; in fact, it is rather similar to subject agreement. (ii) the morphological information of IO clitics is also closer to subject agreement than to DO clitics, pronouns and determiners. (iii) The behavior of IO clitics differ from DO ones also with regard to floating quantifiers in all respects. First, unlike DO clitic doubling, IO clitic doubling is not obligatory with universal quantifiers, but rather it

---

[4]See Elbourne (2001) and references therein for an updated version of Postal's hypothesis.

follows the general conditions that govern dative clitic doubling. Second, as we have seen (section 2.2.1), DO clitics double only quantifiers that combine with the definite determiners, while IO clitics, like subject agreement markers (26b) combine with any type of quantifier (26a).

(26)   a.   (Les)   pagamos las deudas a todos los/algunos/muchos acreedores
              (3pIO) payed.we the debts to all the / some / many   creditors
              'We payed our debts to all/some of/many of our creditors'

        b.   Todos los/ Algunos / Muchos acreedores   cobraron   las deudas
              All   the/ Some / A lot   creditors   got-paid.they the debts
              Every/ Some / Most creditors were paid their debts

Finally, concerning their interpretation, IO clitics do not show the same restrictions we have seen for DO clitics. Thus, as (27) illustrates, IO clitics are wholly compatible with non-specific readings.

(27)   Con esta venta, le   pagamos las deudas a un acreedor

        With this sale, 3sIO pay.we the debts to a creditor

        'With this sale, we paid the debt to a creditor'

As in the case of subject agreement, nonspecific readings are possible with agreeing arguments but movement is barred. So, in the same way the internal argument cannot raise to subject position when it is nonspecific (28b), the IO cannot precede the DO (29b).[5]

(28)   a.   llegaron   (los) trenes
              arrived.they the   trains

        b.   *(los) trenes llegaron
                the trains arrived.they
              'the trains arrived' 'there arrived trains'

(29)   a.   le   pagamos las deudas a una/la acreedora
              3sIO payed.we the debts   to a / the creditor
              'We paid our debts to a/the creditor'

        b.   le   pagamos a *una/la   acreedora las deudas
              3sIO payed.we to *a/the creditor-fem the debts

---

[5]As argued in Romero (1997) and Ormazabal & Romero (2007), the inversion of the arguments is not the main characteristic of dative shift, but a by-product of P incorporation. On the other hand, Peterson (2007) shows that there are many cases, specially with locatives, where argument inversion do not take place in applicative constructions.

The main objection against the clitic-as-agreement analysis of IO clitics is the alleged optionality of the dative clitic, illustrated by the minimal pair in (30):

(30)   a.   Juan envió un libro a María
            John sent.he a book to Mary
            "John sent a book to Mary"

        b.   Juan le   envió   un libro a María
            John 3sIO sent.he a book to Mary
            "John sent Mary a book"

According to researchers opposing the agreement analysis, dative clitics do not behave in that respect like genuine agreement markers –e.g., subject agreement in Spanish--, which are obligatory (see Franco 1993, chapter 2 for discussion). However, many authors (see Uriagereka 1988; Demonte 1995; Romero 1997; Ormazabal & Romero 1998; 2007; Anagnastopoulou 2002; among others) have extensively argued that the two examples in (30) correspond to two very different constructions that show very different syntactic and semantic properties depending on whether the dative clitic is present or not. In particular, the Dative Clitic Construction is subject to many of the syntactic restrictions DOCs are: they are subject to the same c-commanding asymmetries discussed in Barss & Lasnik 1988, and to the same semantic restrictions such as the possession restriction exemplified in (31) (Demonte 1991, Romero 1997).

(31)   a.   *Yo le   envié un libro a Nueva York
             I 3sIO sent.I a book to New York
            'I sent New York a book'

        b.   Yo envié un libro a Nueva York
             I   sent.I a book to New York
            'I sent a book to New York'

If correct, the apparent optionality of IO agreement is just the product of two superficially very similar constructions: one of them involves Prepositional Phrases and never triggers agreement and the other one is a particular case of object shift and triggers obligatory agreement, manifested in Spanish as clitic doubling (see Ormazabal & Romero 2007, 2010 and references therein for a complete description of this alternation).

3.2. The other persons: first and second vs. third person DO

1st and 2nd person DO clitics behave together with IO clitics; in particular, they do not show any restriction on the type of argument they can double. Contextually, it is more difficult to find nonspecific interpretations for 1st and 2nd person argument than for 3rd

person ones; yet, when this difficulty is controlled for, 1st and 2nd DO clitic doubling shows the same lack of restrictions as IO ones and may appear in non-specific and quantificational contexts where definite DPs would never appear (32)-(33).[6]

(32) a.   Os   veré   a los que vayáis pronto
               2pDO will.see.I A the that go.you early
               'I will see those of you who arrive early'

        b.   Os   controlan a gente de la universidad
               2pDO control.they A people from the university
               'They control you people from the university'

        c.   Os   he encontrado a vosotros
               2pDO have.I   found   A you.pl
               'I found YOU'

        d.   ¿A quiénes/ cuántos   nos han elegido para el puesto?
                A who.pl/how many 1pDO have selected for the position
               'Who/how many (of us) did they chose for the position?'

        e.   No   os   encontramos a nadie/ninguno
               Not 2pDO found.we A nobody/none
               'We found none of you'

        f.   Os   veré   a todos/algunos/muchos en el examen
               2pDO will.see.I A all / some / many in the exam
               'I will see all /some/many of you at the exam'

(33) a.   Nos   mandarán   a algunos a resolver el problema
               1pDO will.send.they A some to solve the problem
               'They will send some of us to solve the problem'

        b.   Si queréis,   os   llevo a algunos/unos cuantos a-l pueblo
               If want.you, 2pDO bring.I A some / a.pl many to.the town
               'If you guys want, I wll give some of you a ride to town'

Following the same logic proposed for 3rd person DO and IO clitics, 1st and 2nd person DO clitics should be treated together with all IO clitics as belonging to the agreement group.

---

[6]Consider the following context: a university professor who is talking to her students tells them that from that time on she has no intention whatsoever to grade their exam anymore but rather every year she will organize a lottery and...:
(i)   Os   aprobaré   a algunos (en modo y número completamente aleatorios)
         2pDO will.let-pass.I A some in manner and number completely   aleatory
         'I will let you some pass (in a manner and number completely aleatory)'
(ii)   Algunos (en modo y número completamente aleatorios) aprobaréis
         Some.pl (in manner and number completely   aleatory) will.pass.you
         'Some of you (in a manner and number completely aleatory) will pass'
         The result of doubling the quantifier 'some' has exactly the same grammatical status as when the quantifier is in subject position and is 'doubled' by a 2nd person agreement marker.

3.3. The Object Agreement Constraint

The *me-lui* constraint is a restriction originally observed by Perlmutter (1971) in Spanish and French but attested in the grammar of numerous languages consisting in a general gap in the combination of possible clitic clusters; basically, this constraint distinguishes between 3rd person and 1st/2nd person DO clitics in ditransitive structures. While 3rd person DO clitics are compatible with the presence of an IO clitic in the same cluster (34), 1st and 2nd DO clitics can never cooccur with an argumental dative clitic (35).

(34) a. Pedro te   lo   envía   [Spanish]
          Pedro 2sIO 3sDO send.he
          'Pedro sends it to you'

      b. Pedro me   lo   envía
          Pedro 1sIO 3sDO send.he
          'Pedro sends it/him to me'

(35) a. *Pedro te   me   envía
          Pedro 2sIO 1sDO send.he
          'Pedro sends me to you'

      b. *Pedro te   le   envía
          Pedro 2sDO 3sIO send.he
          'Peter sends you to him'

Bonet (1991) links this constraint to a similar restriction systematically applying in rich agreement languages, and Ormazabal & Romero (1998, 2007) and Anagnastopoulou (2002), among others, extensively argue that it is a syntactic restriction related to the structural properties of ditransitive constructions when both DO and IO arguments enter into agreement/structural Case relations (see section 4 below).[7] Once again, the important observation is that all DO-IO clitic combinations are banned except when the DO clitic is 3rd person *lo(s)/la(s)*, which indicates that the last ones are external to the clitic agreement system altogether.

3.4. Conclusion so far

Evidence from a variety of sources supports a division between Determiner-type clitics and Agreement-type ones along the following lines: 3rd person DO clitics and Determiners belong to the same category. Cliticization in this case amounts to Determiner

---

[7] Extensive literature on the topic in recent years.

movement, either in the syntax or in the morphological component (movement hypothesis; in particular Kayne's (1991) or Uriagereka's (1995) proposals):

Table 2: Spanish DO Determiner and Pronominal System			
	Masculine animate	Masculine inanimate	Feminine
Strong pronouns	él/ellos	---	ella/ellas
Clitics	lo/los	lo/los	la/las
Determiners	el/lo	lo/los	la/las

All other object clitics, including 1st and 2nd DO clitics and the entire IO series, are agreement markers base-generated in the verbal or inflectional head (base-generated hypothesis):

Table 3: Spanish Object Agreement System				
	DO Agreement clitics		IO Agreement clitics	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
1st person	me	nos	me	Nos
2nd person	te	os	te	Os
3rd person	---	---	le	Les

4. Multiple Agreement in Spanish

In this section we concentrate on two properties of the system as considered so far. The most obvious property is that there is a gap in the paradigm in that 3rd person Direct Objects are the only arguments that do not maintain agreement with the verbal system. However, as will be argued next, the situation is slightly more complex and some *leísta* dialects of Spanish do actually show 3rd person DO agreement under certain circumstances (section 4.1), providing us with the necessary information to fill up the gap in the agreement paradigm.

Our main goal in this and the next sections is not only to establish that we are dealing with a genuine, well-behaved, agreement system; but this state of affairs also allows us to go one step further and propose a single agreement paradigm --and, consequently, a single agreement relation/position—for DO and IO arguments, a conclusion that has important theoretical consequences.

17

4.1. Third Person DO and leísta Dialects: À la recherce de l'accord perdu

If the results in the previous section are correct, languages like Spanish show a multiple agreement pattern, quite close to the system of well established multiple agreement languages such as Quechua, Georgian or Basque, as extensively argued in some previous works (see Franco 1993 and Ormazabal & Romero 1998, among others). The following table reflects the three-way agreement system we postulate for Spanish:[8]

Table 4: Spanish Agreement System					
	DO Agreement clitics		IO Agreement clitics		Subject Agreement	
	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural
1st person	me	nos	me	nos	-o	-mos
2nd person	te	os	te	os	-s	-is
3rd person	---	---	le	les	--	-n

From a purely morphological point of view, a very simple comparison of the three systems quickly reveals an almost complete similarity between the DO and the IO agreement system, while the subject agreement seems to go in a different direction. This is confirmed by other properties of the two groups such as the position each occupies with respect to the verbal root, etc. But the table also reveals an interesting division in the 3rd person of DO and IO agreements: there seems to be a gap in the paradigm in that 3rd person Direct Objects are the only arguments that are excluded from the agreement relation with the verbal system. The lack of agreement with 3rd person DOs is not in any way a particularity of the Spanish clitic-system, which pairs together in that respect with many well-established agreement systems where this person, both subject and object, is usually represented as a ∅-morpheme. What is more remarkable from the point of view of the agreement system –although in no way specific of the paradigm we are dealing with here—is the fact that this is the only case where IO and DO agreement split, the former being manifested morphologically by the clitic *le* and the latter being null.

---

[8] The subject agreement paradigm is more complex than suggested in the text. The paradigm in the table corresponds to the present tense of the first conjugation, and what often appears as the 3rd person agreement marker corresponds to the thematic vowel.

But the situation is a bit more complex; in fact, that conclusion clearly holds in standard Spanish, but not in what are called *leísta* dialects spoken in the North of Spain. The characteristic property of these dialects is that the distinction is more subtle, being made in the 3rd person DO system between animate and inanimate objects. When the object is not marked for animacy, these dialects follow the standard *lo(s)/la(s)* clitic system; when it is animate, they make use of the clitic *le*, the same as the one in the dative paradigm:[9]

(36)   a.   Lo   vi
            3sDO saw.I
            'I saw it

       b.   Le   vi
            3saDO saw.I
            'I saw him/her'

Clearly, this cannot be considered just a morphological choice, since its consequences expand through the entire system: [+animate] DO clitics behave exactly like other agreement clitics, radically contrasting with the other 3rd person DO clitic *lo(s)/la(s)*. Regarding its form, 3rd person animate object *le(s)* in these dialects belong to the same paradigm as the agreement clitics. Furthermore, in contrast to Standard Spanish, these dialects do not discriminate between masculine and feminine OD forms. In addition, in the Northern dialects under discussion, DO 3rd person animate *le*-clitics can be doubled in the same contexts IO or 1st and 2nd person DO clitics can (Franco 1993, Franco & Mejías-Bikandi 1999). Moreover, contrary to what has been said in the literature (see especially Bleam 2000), DO [+animate] clitics in Northern *leísta* dialects do not show the same interpretive restrictions as *lo(s)/la(s)*, yielding the following minimal pair:[10]

---

[9]The term *leísmo* covers a wide range of phenomena in the crossroad of Case, animacy, person and number of internal argument representation. In some *leísta* dialects, the clitic forms *le* (singular) and *les* (plural) are used for all masculine 3rd person forms of direct and for indirect objects, and therefore they do not make any distinction i animate/inanimate, or accusative/dative objects. In other areas the use of clitics *lo* and *le* clearly distinguishes into inanimate and animate objects. These areas can furthermore be splitted between those that allow clitic doubling, and those that do not, and in some other intricate ways. For the ease of exposition, we first deal with Northern *leísta* dialects, which allow doubling, and leave the details and the discussion of Standard *leísta* dialects until section 6. See also Landa (1995), Fernández-Ordóñez (1999), Bleam (2000) and references there for an extensive description of these dialectal differences and their theoretical consequences.

[10] Camacho (1993) [apud Roca 1996] observes that in some dialects where *leísmo* is optional and either *le* or *lo* clitics are allowed for animate DOs, minimal pairs of the type in (i) show up:

(i)   a.   Pedro no   le   vio   a nadie

(37) a.   Pedro no   le   vio   a nadie
              Pedro not 3saDO saw.he A nobody
              'Pedro saw nobody'

     b.   *Pedro no   lo   vio   nada
               Pedro not 3smDO saw.he nothing
              'Peter saw nothing'

Similarly, this contrast can be extended to quantified and indefinite expressions of all sorts; consider, for instance, the example in (38):

(38) a.   Les   llevé   a algunos jóvenes   al   pueblo
              3paDO carry.I A some   youngsters to-the town
              'I gave some young people a ride to the town'

     b.   (*Los)   llevé algunos libros al   pueblo
              3pmDO carry.I some   books to-the town
              'I brought some books to the town'

Thus, in these dialects nominal phrases may double animate clitic *le(s)*, but never inanimate ones *lo(s)/la(s).* In other words, as expected *lo(s)/la(s)* clitics in these dialects have the same properties as in standard Spanish, but *le(s)* behaves together with IO *le(s)* and 1st/2nd clitics in general, as the comparison of (38) with the paradigm in (2) and (3) of section 2.1 immediately shows.

There is another interesting respect in which DO clitics *le(s)* and *lo(s)/la(s)* differ in *leísta* dialects: when combined with other agreement clitics, animate 3rd person DO clitic *le(s)* shows *me-lui* effects, as illustrated in (39) from Ormazabal & Romero (1998; 2007):

(39) a.   Le   llevé   a tu   hijo a casa
              3saDO brought.I A your son to home
              'I brought your son home'

     b.   Te   (*le)   llevé   (a) tu   hijo a casa
              2sIO 3saDO brought.I (A) your son to home
              'I brought you your son home'

Interestingly, to avoid *me-lui* effects, *leísta* Spanish makes use of an alternative strategy: the use of the Determiner-like clitic *lo* referring to the animate object. It is

---

              Pedro not 3saDO saw.he A nobody
              'Peter saw nobody'

     b.   *Pedro no   lo   vio   a nadie
               Pedro not 3smDO saw.he A nobody
              'Peter saw nobody'

important to note that this is one of the very few contexts where the use of the non-agreement clitic to refer to animates sounds completely natural for many *leísta* speakers, not having any normative connotation:

(40)　Te　　lo　　　llevé　　a casa
　　　2sIO　3smDO brought.I　to home
　　　'I brought you **it/him** (home)'

But the choice of the clitic *lo* is more than just a morphological strategy to avoid the *me-lui* combinations; it comes together with the syntactic consequences associated to this choice: clitic doubling is again impossible and, consequently, the argument cannot appear overtly as (41) shows.

(41)　*Te　　lo　　　llevé　　(a) tu　hijo a casa
　　　 2sIO　3smDO　brought.I　(A) your　son　to home
　　　'I brought you your son home'

　　　Moreover, the construction gets restricted once again to contexts where the interpretation is compatible with the determiner-like clitic *lo*, following our discussion in section 2; thus, (42a-b), where only one agreement clitic appears, are compatible with a indefinite interpretation of the Direct object *a unos estudiantes* ('some students') as expected in the agreement system; (42c) is a *me-lui* context and consequently (42d), the alternative strategy with *lo* is perfectly grammatical. However, unlike (42a), which primes an indefinite interpretation of *unos estudiantes* ('some students'), the only possible interpretation of (42d) is the one where the clitic refers to a very specific group of students:

(42)　a.　　Les　　has　　traído　a unos estudiantes desde la universidad
　　　　　3paDO　have.you brought　A a.pl　students　from　the university
　　　　　'You gave some students a ride from the university'

　　　b.　　Nos　　has　　traído　a　unos　estudiantes desde la universidad
　　　　　1pIO　have.you brought　a.pl some　students　from the university
　　　　　'You brought us, some students, from the university'

　　　c.　　*Nos　les　　has　　traído
　　　　　 1pIO 3paDO have.you brought

　　　d.　　Nos　　los　　has　　traído
　　　　　1pIO 3pmDO have.you brought
　　　　　'You brought them to me' (only specific group)

Once again, this contrast strongly supports our claim that while *le* is an agreement marker *lo(s)/la(s)* are uniformly determiner-like clitics, even in those restricted contexts where they refer to animate objects in Northern *leísta* dialects.

4.2. Case and agreement

A property of Spanish distinguishing it from other Romance languages is the appearance of a marker *a* introducing animate specific DOs. The nature of this element has been the center of much debate in the Romance literature. What is interesting for our discussion is the interaction of this animacy marker with dative clitics, as we discuss next.

In general contexts, the animacy marker *a* obligatorily precedes animate specific objects in all dialects, as the contrast in (43a-c) illustrates. Both animacy and specificity are thus required for the marker to appear: (43a) shows the impossibility of the animacy marker with non-animate objects; the example in (43b) shows that non-specific animate objects do not allow *a*-insertion. And animate specific ones require it obligatorily (43c):

(43) a. He   visto (*a) el libro
          Have.I seen   A   the book
          'I saw the book'

      b. He   visto *(a)l   niño
          Have.I seen A-the child
          'I saw the boy'

      c. He   visto (*a) niños
          Have.I seen   A children
          'I saw some children'

In addition, the presence of the animacy marker is independent of whether that object may be doubled by an agreement clitic or not, as shown by the fact that it must appear in both (43b), where no clitic doubling appears, and in contexts like (44), where the animate specific object is doubled by a clitic: (44a) corresponds to Northern *leísta* dialects, where animate object clitic doubling is in most cases obligatory (see section 4.1), and (44b) is a context of clitic doubling in all dialects, as discussed in section 2.1:

(44) a. Le   he visto *(a)l niño   (*Northern* leísta *dialect*)
          3saDO have.I seen A.the child
          'I saw the boy'

      b. Os   veré   a todos en el exámen
          2pDO will.see.I A all   in the exam
          'I will see you all at the exam'

22

Interestingly, the only context where animate specific DOs cannot appear preceded by the animacy marker *a* is when combined with a doubled IO, as in (45b):

(45)   a.   llevé *(a) la niña al   doctor
               Took.I   A the girl to.the doctor

        b.   le   llevé (*a) la niña al   doctor
               3sIO took.I A   the girl A.the doctor
               'I took the girl to the doctor'

The contrast between (45a) and (45b) shows that the relation between the verb and the direct object changes completely in the presence of the dative clitic. Let us then assume that the animacy marker is interpreted as a case marker (see, for instance, López 2008); in that case, a strong parallelism can be established between dative constructions in Spanish and Double Object or applicative Constructions. In the case of Spanish, when there is no dative clitic, specific animate objects receive accusative Case, morphologically marked by means of the marker *a*. When the dative is present, the animate object does not receive accusative Case and the animacy marker disappears accordingly. This conclusion is supported by the behavior of animate objects in so-called *se*-constructions. These constructions share with regular passives the property that the external argument is dropped and the internal argument raises to subject position triggering agreement with the verb (46) (see Mendikoetxea 1999 and references there).

(46)   a.   se   llevaron (los) regalos   al   doctor
               SE$_{arb}$ take.they the presents to.the doctor
               'The presents were brought to the doctor'

        b.   *se   llevó (los) regalos   al   doctor
               SE$_{arb}$ take.it the presents to.the doctor

Curiously, complements headed by the animacy marker are frozen in this construction and unable to raise to subject position (47a). The only option available in this case is marking the verb with a default 3rd person singular neuter agreement (47b). In contrast, nonspecific animates (47c), which are not *a*-case marked, must raise to subject position, like other objects which are not *a*-marked, and check nominative Case there.

(47)   a.   *se   llevaron (a) los niños   al   doctor
               SE$_{arb}$ take.3pl A the children to.the doctor

        b.   se   llevó a los niños   al   doctor

SE$_{arb}$ take.df A the children to.the doctor
'The children were taken to the doctor'

 c. se llevaron unos niños al doctor
   SE$_{arb}$ take.3pl some children to.the doctor
   'Some children were taken to the doctor'

 d. *se llevó unos niños al doctor
   SE$_{arb}$ take.df some children to.the doctor

Considering this, let us come back to the paradigm in (45), where the presence of the dative clitic blocks *a*-insertion on the animate specific DO. If, as the preceding paradigm supports, the animacy marker *a* is in fact a Case-marker, in these contexts the animate specific DO does not receive structural Case from the verb. We expect then that it will be free to raise to subject position and check nominative case (48a), and neuter agreement should not be available (48b). This prediction is borne out:

(48) a. se le llevaron los niños al doctor
    SE$_{arb}$ 3sIO took.pl the children A.the doctor

  b. *se le llevó los niños al doctor
    SE$_{arb}$ 3sIO took.sg the children to.the doctor
    'The kids were taken to the doctor'

We thus can conclude that Case marking in Spanish tears apart specific animate direct objects and indirect objects from nonspecific animate and inanimate direct objects. We will return to this issue in section 6.

5. A Single Agreement Paradigm: unifying DO and IO Agreement

 As a result of the discussion in sections 3 and 4, a clear picture emerges concerning DO and IO agreement in Spanish where the two paradigms merge in a single one:[11]

---

[11]From a historical and a morphological point of view, this is nothing particularly new in what concerns 1st and 2nd person clitics. It is well known that in these cases the two series, the IO and the DO ones, have the same origin. In the evolution from Latin to Romance, together with the process of simplification of the declension system, there is a process of especialization in the distribution of personal pronouns; in the case of Spanish, 1st and 2nd person accusative pronouns yield the objective clitic paradigm and the dative ones become strong pronouns. Thus the origin of both Direct and Indirect Object clitics in Spanish is the accusative pronounof Latin (i.e. Lat. *me* (Acc.)> Sp. *me* (DO/IO) , Lat. *te* > Sp. *te*, Lat. *nos* > Sp. *nos*, Lat. *vos* > Sp. *os*); on the other hand, the dative pronouns in Latin derive in the strong pronoun series in Spanish (Lat. *mihi* (Dat.)> Sp. *mí* (DO/IO), Lat. *tibi* > Sp. *tí*, etc.). However, all 3rd person pronouns –strong and weak- derive from Latin demonstratives; in this case, however, Spanish maintained the Latin Accusative/Dative distinction **References**

Table 5: Spanish Single Agreement Clitic System (DO and IO)		
	Singular	Plural
1st person	me	Nos
2nd person	te	Os
3rd person	le	Les

Given the conclusions in this paper, there is some sense in which the long standing view in the Spanish clitic literature that treats *le* of *leísta* dialects as a dative clitic (see XX) may be observationally correct. However, if the argumentation is correct its agreement properties are nothing exclusive to the *le* clitic in *leísta* dialects but general to the entire set of agreement clitics —in particular to 1st and 2nd person clitics *me, te* (sg.), *nos, os* (pl.)— and the unification of the two *le* clitics is just a particular case.

Obviously, this system only deals with verbal *agreement* relations. When no syntactic agreement holds, no agreement clitic appears in the verbal complex, as expected. There are two cases that interest us particularly: on the one hand, IOs in a PP-construction headed by prepositional heads such as *a* ('to')*, en* ('in', 'on')*, de* ('from'), and maybe others. On the other, 3rd person DOs in the contexts discussed in this paper, i.e., non-specific or inanimate.

Given that, the novelty of the system we propose is twofold and has far reaching theoretical consequences. One side of our proposal concerns the elements that show verbal agreement: as observed, we argue that there is a single Case/agreement system holding for DO and IO arguments; in its most radical, but coherent, formulation, our claim is that there is a single agreement relation holding for DO and IO arguments or, more generally, for all internal arguments agreeing with the verbal complex. In fact, we have argued elsewhere (see Ormazabal & Romero 2002, 2007) that the *me-lui* constraint and its extensions, the Object Agreement Constraint, come down to a conflict arising when two arguments compete for the only available agreement slot. This constraint extends to a larger range of constructions that typologically have received different names in the literature but that share many properties and, we claim, the same underlying structural configuration; among them, Dative Constructions, Double Object Constructions, Dative Clitic Constructions and Applicative constructions. In this sense, the paradigm in table 5 can be considered the

mirror image in the dative system of the Double Object Construction, where the two internal arguments have been traditionally argued to receive accusative case.

The second consequence of our proposal is related to the internal arguments that do not agree with the verb. This agreement system makes the exceptional behavior of some syntactic elements, such as 3rd person DO, even more evident. The impossibility of 3rd person DO agreement for inanimates or non-specifics is not just a question of morphological marking, as both language-internal and crosslinguistic analysis shows. From a morphological point of view, if there is a single-agreement paradigm, it would be highly difficult to understand why 3rd person DO agreement could be as eccentric as to choose not to show up morphologically when it has a morphological mark assigned in the paradigm, namely *le*. From the syntactic point of view, its singular behavior across languages with respect to the *me-lui/Object Agreement* constraint clearly supports the same conclusion that some 3rd person direct objects are not competing for the Case position. Furthermore, it is a well-known fact from languages where there is a productive set of incorporation processes that Noun Incorporation is almost exclusively restricted to inanimate objects (Mithun 1984, Baker 1988, 1996, Ormazabal & Romero 2007, among others). This constitutes independent evidence that inanimates do not enter into the same Case/agreement licensing conditions animate objects do.

6. Micro-parametric Variation

6.1. The problem: a different leísta dialect

The picture presented so far suggests a situation where each clitic belongs to a given group and, consequently, behaves in a coherent way with regard to the tests that characterize the group it belongs to . Thus, if the clitic corresponds to an incorporated determiner, we would expect that it behaves in a unified way with regard to the different tests; similarly, if the clitic is of the agreement type, it is also expected to have a given behavior with regards to each and every test. However, [+animate] 3rd person DO clitic show "mixed" properties in Central Peninsular *leísta* dialects [henceforth "Standard *leísta* dialects].

These dialects share some properties with the Northern *leísta* dialect in that they make a morpohological distinction between animate and inanimate 3rd person masculine

DO clitics in a systematic way (49a-b) and show *person-case* and, more generally, Object Agreement Constraint effects ((50; see Ormazabal & Romero 2007):

(49)   a.   El libro   lo   vi
                The book 3smDO saw.I
                'I saw the book'

          b.   Al   niño   le   vi
                A.the child 3smaDO saw.I
                'I saw the child'

(50)   a.   le   envié a la alcaldesa
                3smaDO sent.I to the mayor
                'I sent him to the mayor'

          b. * se   le   envié
                3IO 3smaDO sent.I
                'I sent him to her'

However, some other properties are closer to the Standard dialect and make them look more like determiners than like agreement markers. To begin with, unlike in Northern *leísta* dialects they show a gender distinction in the DO system, discriminating between animate masculine clitic *le* and feminine *la*:

(51)   a.   Al   niño   le   vi
                A.the child.m 3smaDO saw.I
                'I saw the boy'

          b.   A la niña   la   vi
                A the child-f 3sfDO saw.I
                'I saw the girl'

In addition, the interpretation of the animate clitic *le* shows the interpretive restrictions observed for *lo*, which makes it close to the interpretation of definite determiners. To take an example, it cannot corefer with an indefinite DP, as the contrast in (52) illustrates:

(52)   a.   *A un amigo   le   vi   ayer
                 A a friend 3smaDO saw.I yesterday
                'I saw a friend yesterday'

          b.   a mi amigo   le   vi   ayer
                A my friend 3smaDO saw.I yesterday
                'I saw my friend yestarday'

Moreover, the 3rd person [+animate] clitic *le/la* do not allows doubling, except in those contexts discussed in section 2, where the inanimate clitic *lo* also allows it, that is, exclusively with quantifier *todos/todas* ('every'), left dislocated elements and strong

pronouns. Thus, animate object clitics in these languages behave like inanimate objects in (3) and unlike animate objects of Northern *leísta* dialects in (37)-(38) above:

(53) a. *la vi a la niña
          3sfDO saw.I A the girl
          'I saw the girl'

      b. *le   vi   al   niño
          3smaDO saw.I A.the boy
          'I saw the boy'

For the sake of clarity, we present these properties in the following table, focusing on the divergences Standard *leísta* dialects show with respect to Northern *leísta* dialect on the one hand and Standard Spanish on the other:

Table 6: Parametric differences					
	*A*do			DO	
	MSC	FEM	DOUBLING	MSC	FEM
Northern *Leísta*	Le		√	lo	la
Standard *Leísta*	Le	la	*	lo	la
Standard Spanish	Lo				

6.2. The Standard leísta dialect explained

As shown in table 6, the Standard leísta dialect patterns with Northern *leísta* in choosing the *le* form for animate DOs (*a*DOs), but with Standard Spanish in disallowing doubling, and restricting the use of *le* to masculine animate objects. Given that mixture, our basic strategy will be to argue that *le* in Standard *leísta* dialects sides with the Determiner clitics and to reanalyze slightly our assumptions about the explanation of the OAC effects so that the difference between animate *le* and inanimate *lo* is accommodated. Our proposal is then that *le* is the determiner head-moved to the verb used in those contexts where overt NPs appear preceded by the object marker *a*. As a determiner head, it will behave together with object clitics *lo/la* with respect to doubling and the semantic properties associated to determiners. As the cliticized determiner head

of an animate, specific and Case-marked DP, it will share some properties with the syntactic configuration of agreement *le* in Northern *leísta* dialects, especially its sensibility to the *me-lui* and its extensions, the Object Agreement Constraint (OAC).

6.2.1. Where do *le* mixed properties come from?

If we adopt Torrego's (1999) hypothesis, *pro* is composed of a Determiner head plus a null nominal head. Our hypothesis is that in the morphology of the Standard *leísta* dialect a morphological difference is made when the null nominal head is [+animate], resorting to a clitic with the same morpho-phonological form as the dative:

(54)   a.   [Det N$_{[msc]}$] $\rightarrow$ *lo*

     b.   [Det N$_{[animate][msc]}$] $\rightarrow$ *le*

If our hypothesis is correct, we predict both animate and inanimate clitics of the Standard *leísta* dialect to act like Standard Spanish with regard to all the properties related to cliticizing determiners. This accounts for the paradigms concerning gender specification (51), semantic interpretation (52), and lack of doubling (53).

On the other hand, according to (54b) *le* has the same syntactic specifications *a* insertion has, namely, it must be animate and specific. As a matter of fact, there is interesting evidence showing that this correlation has a deep syntactic motivation that goes beyond a pure morphological codification of animacy. Consider the following sentences:

(55)   a.   Pedro   busca (*a) un secretario que   hable   inglés
               Pedro looks.for A   a   secretary that speaks.SUBJUNCTIVE English
               'Pedro is looking for an English speaking secretary'

     b.   Pedro   busca *(a) un secretario que   habla   inglés
               Pedro looks.for A   a   secretary that speaks.INDICATIVE English
               'Pedro is looking for a secretary who speaks English'

The contrast in (55) builds on the well observed fact that the use of a subjunctive form in the relative clause (55a) correlates with a non specific reading for the object, while indicative mood correlates with a specific one (55b). In consequence, in spite of being animate, the object in (55a) cannot appear preceded by the preposition *a*. With this contrast in mind, consider now the following sentences:

(56)   a.   Pedro   lo   busca
                 Pedro 3smDO looks-for.he
                 'Pedro looks for someone (who speaks English)'

        b.   Pedro   le   busca
                 Pedro 3smaDO looks-for.he
                 'Pedro looks for him'

Our proposal predicts that the choice of the clitic will determine the specificity interpretation of the object just like the absence/presence of *a* determines the choice of subjunctive or indicative in the relative clause, a prediction that is borne out: sentences in (56a) and (56b) convey the referential interpretation of (55a) and (55b) respectively. Once shown that the clitic *le* and *a*-insertion share the same conditions in Standard leísta dialects, we can extend our analysis to account also for OAC effects in (50) in a natural way.

.

6.2.2. OAC in Standard *leísta* dialects

       The Standard *leísta* dialect seems to behave like the Northern *leísta* dialect in that it precludes *le* in the presence of a dative clitic (Romero 1997):

(57)   a.   le   envié a la alcaldesa
                 3smaDO sent.I to the mayor
                 'I sent him to the mayor'

        b.   *se   le   envié
                 3IO 3smaDO sent.I
                 'I sent him to her'

At a first glance, this fact could constitute a problem for our analysis, given that in spite of its surface similarity, the clitic *le* is of a very different nature in both dialects: an agreement head in Northern dialects and an incorporated determiner in Standard *leísta* dialects. However, a unified explanation is possible that leans on our observation that in both dialects the presence of the clitic *le* crucially correlates with the distribution of *a*-insertion. Remember that in section 4.2 we observed that *a* insertion is blocked in the presence of a dative clitic, as shown in example (45) repeated here as (58).

(58)   a.   enviaron *(a) los niños   a la doctora
                 sent.they   A the children to the doctor
                 'They sent the children to the doctor'

    b.   le   enviaron (*a) los niños   a la doctora
            3IO sent.they   A the children to the doctor
            'They sent the children to the doctor'

Given this fact, the explanation of OAC effects is straightforward. Since the animacy marker *a* is in fact a morphological manifestation of Case with animate objects, OAC effects arise in both dialects as a consequence of the failure of the verb to assign Case to the object.

Interestingly, there is one important respect in which Northern and Standard leísta dialects differ, indirectly supporting our claim that *le* in these dialect is not the same object. In order to avoid OAC effects each dialect resorts to a different repair strategy. As discussed in section 4, Northern dialects resort to the determiner clitic *lo* (59). However, as grammaticality judgments in (59)-(60) illustrate, this alternative strategy has an unnatural flavor in Standard leísta dialects (60a). In fact, in a clear contrast with speakers of Northern dialects, speakers of these dialects strongly prefer not to double the dative (60b) in this context, it being the only context where an IO strong pronoun can appear non doubled.

(59)   a.   se   lo   envié   *Northern dialects*
             3IO 3sDO sent.I
             'I sent him to her'

       b.   *le   envié a ella
             3smaDO sent.I to her
             'I sent him to her'

(60)   a.   ^{??}se   lo   envié   *Standard leísta*
             3IO 3smDO sent.I
             'I sent him to her'
       b.   le   envié a ella
             3smaDO sent.I to her
             'I sent him to her'

A difference between the two dialects that would account for this contrast is that in the Standard *leísta* dialect the repair strategy in (60a) neutralizes the [±animate] distinction within the determiner clitic system. Consequently, the unnatural character of this strategy in Standard *leísmo* can be attributed to the fact that there is a morphological mismatch between the argument's actual clitic realization (*lo*, unspecified for animacy) and its interpretation as animate. This mismatch does not appear in the Northern *leísta* dialect, where no issue of determiner clitic choice arises, but rather there is a shift from

a syntactic device involving the agreement system to a morphological one involving cliticization of a determiner head.[12]

7. Concluding Remarks

The distribution of object clitics raises interesting questions concerning both the historical evolution of the clitic system in different languages of the Romance family and the theoretical analysis of Case and agreement. Concerning the second issue, this article is part of a broader project the authors have been conducting during the last years where we explore how a single agreement system that does not distinguish DO and IO arguments works within current theoretical assumptions; in particular, we explore the consequences of such a system for the theory of Case and agreement in a broad set of typologically different languages. If our analysis of Spanish object clitics and the intricacies of dialectal variation we propose in this paper are on the right track, we are led to an asymmetric theory of agreement where agreement is restricted to a certain set of objects and argumental DPs behave differently from one each other depending on their syntactic person, specificity and animacy feature specifications. In particular, third person objects in languages like English or Spanish do not qualify as candidates to raise to object agreement positions, in the lines of Ormazabal & Romero (1998, 2007, 2010). This view goes against the generally assumed uniformity of the Case and agreement system. In our view, this is just an unmotivated residue of the Principles & Parameters model often resorted to but more often ignored, not only in incorporation contexts (see

---

[12] In fact, a similar effect also appears in the Standard dialect, where, somehow surprisingly, (i) is also reported as unnatural (Fernández-Ordoñez 1999), despite the fact that this dialect does not make a morphological difference between animate and inanimate objects:

(i) a.   envió a los niños   al   médico
           sent.he A the children to.the doctor
           'He sent the children to the doctor'

     b.   Los   envió al   médico
           3mpDO sent-he to.the doctor
           'He sent them to the doctor'

     c.   [??]Se los envió al médico

This contrast suggests that *lo* in Standard Spanish is the morphological form of the two different syntactic objects in (54), in which case the difference between Standard Spanish and Standard *leísta* dialects reduces to a question of morphological marking in the determiner system.

Baker's 1988 account in terms of the Visibility Condition), but also in complex predicate formation, and even in regular transitive constructions. Thus, that objects in, say, English do not check accusative case has lately become a common place in the literature. For instance, Bošković (2002, 2007) suggests that they receive inherent case and do not have to move to the object agreement position in either regular transitive constructions or DOCs. In the context of a more general discussion of Case and agreement, in Ormazabal & Romero (in progress) we extensively argue that Bošković's "inherent case" approach is the wrong interpretation of the facts both empirically and theoretically. The discussion of Spanish object clitics in this paper constitutes another piece of evidence in the same direction.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES.

Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2002). *The Syntax of Ditransitives: evidence from clitics*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Anderson, Stephen R (2005). *Aspects of the Theory of Clitics*, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Aoun, Joseph (1981). On Government, Case marking and Clitic Placement. Manuscript, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Baker, Mark (1988). *Incorporation Theory. A theory of grammatical function changing.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark (1996). *The Polysynthesis Parameter.* Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

Barss, Andrew & Howard Lasnik (1986). A Note on Anaphora and Double Objects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17: 347-353.

Bleam, Tonia M (2000). *Leísta Spanish and the Syntax of Clitic Doubling*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Delaware.

Bonet, Eulalia (1991). *Morphology after Syntax: Pronominal Clitics in Romance.* Unpublished PhD dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge (Massachusetts).

Borer, Hagit (1984). *Parametric Syntax: case studies in Semitic and Romance languages.* Dordrecht: Foris Pub.

Bošković, Ž. 2002. A-movement and the EPP. *Syntax* 5: 167-218.

Bošković, Ž. 2007. On the Locality and Motivation of Move and Agree: An Even More Minimal Theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 38: 589-644.

Bresnan, J. & M. Mochambo (1987). Topic, Pronoun, and Agreement in Chichewa. *Language* 63: 741-782.

Camacho, José (1993). Posición de los clíticos, morfología y modularidad", talk presented at the *3rd Colloquium of Generative Grammar*, San Lorenzo del Escorial, Madrid.

Demonte, Violeta (1995). Dative Alternation in Spanish. *Probus* 7.1: 5-30.

Elbourne, Paul (2001). E-Type Anaphora as NP Deletion. *Natural Language Semantics* 9: 241-288

Fernández-Ordoñez, (1999). Leísmo, laísmo y loísmo. In I. Bosque & Violeta Demonte, eds., *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, vol. I, Madrid: Espasa, 1317-1398.

Fernández Soriano, Olga (1989). *Rección y ligamiento en español. Aspectos de parámetro del sujeto nulo*. Unpublished PhD. Dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid.

Fernández Soriano, Olga (1993). *Los pronombres átonos*, Madrid: Taurus.

Franco, Jon (1993). *On Object Agreement in Spanish*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, USC, Los Angeles.

Franco, Jon & Errapel Mejías-Bikandi (1999). The Presuppositionality Condition on Spanish Clitic Doubling", in M. Authier, Barbara Bullock & Lisa Reed (eds.), *Formal Perspectives on Romance Linguistics*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 107-120.

Jaeggli, Osvaldo (1986). Three issues in the theory of clitics: Case, doubled NPs, and extraction. In H. Borer, ed., *The Syntax of Pronominal Clitics* (*Syntax & Semantics* 19). Orlando, Academic Press, 15-42.

Kayne, Richard (1975). *French Syntax*. Cambridge, MIT Press.

Kayne, Richard (1991). Romance clitics, verb movement, and pro. *Linguistic Inquiry* 22.4 : 647-686.

Landa, Alazne (1995). *Conditions on Null Objects in Basque Spanish and Their Relation to* Leísmo *and Clitic Doubling*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, USC, Los Angeles.

López, Luis (2008). *Locality and the Architecture of Syntactic Dependencies*, Palgrave Macmillan.

Luján, Marta (1984).

Mendikoetxea 1999). Construcciones con *se*: Medias, pasivas e impersonales. In I. Bosque & Violeta Demonte, eds., *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*, vol. II, Madrid, Espasa, 1631-1722.

Mithum, Marianne (1984). On the Nature of Noun Incorporation. *Language* 62: 32-37.

Montalbetti, Mario (1984). *After Binding. On the interpretation of pronouns*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge (Massachusetts).

Ormazabal, Javier & Juan Romero (1998). On the syntactic nature of the *me-lui* and the Person-Case Constraint. *Anuario del Seminario Julio de Urquijo* XXXII-2, pp. 415-434.

_____ (2002). Agreement Restrictions. Manuscript, University of the Basque Country and University of Alcalá de Henares

_____ (2007). The Object Agreement Constraint, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 25.2: 315-347.

_____ (2010). The Derivation of Dative Alternations. To appear in M. Duguine, S. Huidobro & N. Madariaga, eds. *Argument Structure and Syntactic Relations from a Crosslinguistic Perspective*, John Benjamis, Amsterdam-Philadelphia.

Perlmutter, David (1971). *Deep and Surface Structure Constraints in Syntax*. New York: Rinehart & Winston Inc.

Peterson, (2007). *Applicative Constructions.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Postal, Paul (1966). On the so-called pronouns in English. In F. Dineen, ed. *Report of the 17th Annual Round Table Meeting on Languages and Linguistics*, Georgetown University, Washington D.C., 201-224.

Rigau, Gemma (1988). Strong Pronouns. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19.3: 503-511.

Rizzi, Luigi (1986). Null objects in Italian and the Theory of *pro*. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17.3: 501-557.

Roca, Francesc (1992). On the Licensing of Pronominal Clitics: the properties of object clitics in Spanish and Catalan. Unpublished manuscript, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.

Roca, Francesc (1996). Morfemas objetivos y determinantes: los clíticos del español. *Verba* 23: 83-119.

Romero, Juan (1997). *Construcciones de doble objeto y gramática universal*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, Madrid.

Saltarelli, Mario (1987). The Acquisition of Agreement. In W. Bahner et al, eds. *Proceedings of the Fourteenth International Congress of Linguistics*, Akademie-Verlag Berlin, 810-815.

Sportiche, Dominique (1993). Clitic Constructions. Unpublished manuscript, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles (California).

Strozer, J (1976). *Clitics in Spanish.* Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles (California).

Suñer, Margarita (1988). The Role of Agreement in Clitic-Doubled Constructions, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6: 391-434.

Torrego, Esther (1998). *The Dependencies of Objects*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Uriagereka, Juan (1988). *On Government*. Unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Connecticut.

_____ (1995). Aspects of the syntax of clitic placement in Western Romance. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 26.1: 79-124.

_____ (1997). Formal and Substantive Elegance in the Minimalist Program. In Chris Wilder, Hans-Martin Gärtner & Manfred Bierwisch, eds. *The Role of Economy Principles in Linguistic Theory*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 170-204.

Javier Ormazabal
Hizkuntzalaritza eta Euskal Ikasketak Saila
Filologia, Geografia eta Historia Fakultatea
Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea
Unibertsitateen Ibilbidea 5, 01006 Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain
javier.ormazabal@ehu.es

Juan Romero
Departamento de Filología Hispánica
Universidad de Extremadura
Avenida de la Universidad s/n
10071 Cáceres, Spain
juan.romero@uah.es