

**Romance languages do not have double objects:
evidence from European Portuguese and Spanish**

Rita Gonçalves¹

Centro de Linguística da Universidade de Lisboa (Portugal)

ritamgg@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper focuses on the dative expression in Romance languages, particularly on European Portuguese (EP) and Spanish. Many authors have proposed that clitic(-doubling) constructions and nonclitic(-doubling) constructions in these languages exhibit the same properties of both English double object construction (DOC) and ditransitive prepositional construction (DPC) (e.g. Masullo 1992, Demonte 1994, 1995, Romero 1997, Cuervo 2003, Morais 2006, 2012). Others, such as Pineda (2013), argue that the only available strategy in Romance to express the dative is the DOC. We will argue against these two proposals, showing that the same arguments presented in the literature, which aim to prove the occurrence of DOC in Romance languages, namely, binding asymmetries, passivization, clitic-doubling as well as lexical-semantic constraints, can instead be used as arguments to support that EP and Spanish only exhibit a DPC. In addition, we will refuse analyses of the dative as an applied argument, such those following Pykkänen (2002). Furthermore, we will propose that, if some comparison can be established between Romance and English dative strategies, this should be based on the distinction between a DPC introduced by a functional preposition and a DPC introduced by a directional preposition. In fact, DPC from EP is similar to the one that occurs in English with core dative verbs, such as *give*: in both languages, the preposition *a/to* acts as a Case marker (e.g. Larson 1988; Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008).

Keywords: dative argument, double object construction, ditransitive prepositional construction, European Portuguese, Spanish, functional and directional prepositions.

Contents

0. Introduction. 1. Binding (a)symmetries. 2. Passivization. 3. Clitic-doubling. 4. (Lack of) successful transfer. 5. The syntax of EP DPC. 6. Final remarks.

0.Introduction

Traditionally, it is assumed that Romance languages lack a double object construction (DOC), since verbs cannot assign structural Case to more than one NP (e.g. Kayne 1984, Baker 1988). However, several authors have claimed the opposite for Spanish (e.g. Masullo 1992, Demonte 1994, 1995, Romero 1997,

¹ Funded by doctoral grant BD/73839/2010 of the Foundation for Science and Technology.

Cuervo 2003), as well for Portuguese (Morais 2006, 2012)². These authors attempt to show that these languages display the same dative alternation exhibited by English (cf. (1)). In particular, they propose that while sentences such in (2.a) and (3.a) are ditransitive prepositional constructions (DPCs), parallel to (1.a), sentences with clitic(-doubling), as those in (2.b) and (3.b), are DOCs, parallel to (1.b).

- (1) a) John gave a book to Mary.
b) John gave Mary a book.
- (2) a) O João deu um livro *ao Pedro*.
'John gave a book to Peter.'
b) O João deu-*lhe* um livro (a ele).
'John gave him a book.'
c) O João deu *ao Pedro* o livro que comprou na semana passada.
'John gave Peter the book he bought last week.'
- (3) a) Juan dio el libro *a Pedro*.
'John gave a book to Peter.'
b) Juan *le* dio el libro *a Pedro*.
'John gave a book to Peter.'

Morais (2006) also proposed that the occurrence of the indirect object (IO) adjacent to the verb and on left of the direct object (DO), in EP, is also a DOC (cf. (2.c)). In fact, the unmarked order in Portuguese and Spanish (and Romance languages in general) is V DO IO (e.g. Belletti & Shlonsky 1995). However, when informational structure is involved, such as in (2.c), the order is typically inverted, which is V IO DO. According to Duarte (2003) for EP, and Pineda (2013) for Spanish, this order is related to both heaviness effects and informational structure. In addition, these authors argued that this does not affect the base syntactic structure³.

Brito (2010), for EP, as well as Pineda (2013), for Spanish, argued against the proposal that Romance languages exhibit dative alternation between DOC and DPC. Pineda (2013), in particular, referred to this proposal as a forced attempt to compare the strategies employed by these languages with English dative alternation. However, despite the fact that both authors criticize the previous proposals to dative argument analyses, their counter-proposals are different. Only Pineda (2013: 201), following Pylkkänen (2002), considered the dative as an applied argument and proposed that "all constructions expressing a transfer of possession (successful or not, with a completely affected Goal or not) in Spanish,

² See also Diaconescu & Rivero (2007) and Fournier (2010) for a similar approach in Romanian and French.

³ Brito (2014, 2015) proposed a different approach. According to this author, there are two base-generated word orders in EP. However, we will not adopt neither discuss this proposal here.

Catalan and French (and probably Italian) are DOC”. On the other hand, Brito (2008: 149) argued that EP datives involving a Low Applicative Head should only be used if non-argumental datives are considered. Nevertheless, this proposal does not find much empirical support, neither in EP nor in other Romance languages, e.g. as shown by Miguel *et al.* (2011).

As a result, we will propose that the only available strategy in these languages to express the dative is indeed a DPC. We will show that the same arguments presented in the literature to claim the opposite can instead support our proposal. In addition, we will state that, despite the typological distinctions between English and Romance languages in their Case systems (e.g. Baker 1988), some correlations can still be established between them.

We will start from a discussion about the alleged asymmetry between the IO and the DO in Spanish with respect to binding of anaphors and possessives. We will also make some reference to EP behavior in this respect (section 1). In section 2, we will show how Romance fails on the main diagnosis to identify a DOC language. Both Spanish and EP lack dative passives. Next, we will argue that classifying a clitic(-doubling) construction as a DOC will have other consequences both in Spanish and EP (section 3). To conclude our argument against the alleged dative alternation in Romance languages, we will also discuss some lexical and semantic constraints typically—but improperly—attributed to DOC. Finally, in section 5, we will present our proposal: EP and Spanish only exhibit DPC. In particular, we will show that to some extent, DPC from EP is “similar” to the one that occurs in English with core dative verbs, such as *give*. In both these languages, the preposition *a/to* acts as a Case marker (e.g. Larson 1988; Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008).

1. Binding (a)symmetries

The asymmetries in the behavior of the two objects in the DOC and DPC, as discussed by Barss & Lasnik (1986) and Larson (1988), show that the first NP c-commands the second. Therefore, when anaphors are involved, while the Indirect Object (IO) c-commands the Direct Object (DO) in the DOC (cf. (4)), the DO c-commands the IO in the DPC (cf. (5)). The same occurs with quantifier-pronoun binding (see (6-7) ungrammaticality contrasts)⁴.

- (4) a) I showed [Mary_{IO}] [herself_{DO}].
b) *I showed [herself_{IO}] [Mary_{DO}]. (Larson 1988: 336-338)
- (5) a) I showed [Mary_{DO}] [to herself_{IO}].
b) *I showed [herself_{DO}] [to Mary_{IO}]. (*Ibidem*)
- (6) a) I gave [every worker_{IO}] [his_i paycheck_{DO}].

⁴ Cf. Barss & Lasnik (1986) and Larson (1988) for other contexts in which there is asymmetric c-command relationship between IO and DO in English dative alternation.

b) *I gave [its_i owner_{IO}] [every paycheck_i DO]. (*Ibidem*)

(7) a) I gave [every check_i DO] [to its_i owner_{OI}].

b) ?I gave [his_i paycheck_{DO}] [to every worker_i IO]. (*Ibidem*)

These asymmetries show that the two NPs do not occupy the same position in the DOC and DPC. Bearing these grammaticality contrasts in mind, Demonte (1995) tried to show that Spanish clitic-doubling and non-doubling ditransitive constructions exhibit the same behavior⁵. Nevertheless, she asserted that “these asymmetries are not only related to the different syntactic position of each lexical argument, but also to the presence or absence of the dative clitic”. The grammaticality contrasts below seem to indicate that “indirect object anaphors are possible in sentences without the dative clitic, but not in the alternative context; similarly, direct object anaphors appear in ditransitive sentences with dative clitics, but not in those without them” (Demonte 1995: 10-11) (cf. (8-9)).

(8) a) El tratamiento le devolvió [la estima de sí misma DO] [a María IO]. (cf. (4.a))
‘The therapy gave María the esteem of herself back.’

b) *El tratamiento le devolvió [a María DO] [a la estima de sí misma IO]. (cf. (4.b))
‘The therapy gave the esteem of herself María back.’ (Demonte 1995: 10-11)

(9) a) El tratamiento devolvió [a María DO] [a sí misma IO]. (cf. (5.a))
‘The therapy gave María back to herself.’

b) *El tratamiento devolvió [a sí misma DO] [a María IO]. (cf. (5.b))
‘The therapy gave herself back to María.’ (*Ibidem*)

However, Pineda (2013) noted that these ungrammaticality contrasts are not related to binding phenomena but with the fact that two different types of anaphor were used (cf. *la estima de sí misma* in (8) vs. *a sí misma* in (9)). In fact, according to this author, if *a sí misma* is used, (8.a) is ungrammatical (cf. (10.a)). Also when the anaphor in (9.b) is changed to *la estima de sí misma*, the sentence becomes grammatical (cf. (10.b)).

(10) a) *El tratamiento le devolvió [a sí misma DO] [a María IO]. (cf. (4.a))
‘The therapy gave María herself back.’

b) El tratamiento devolvió [la estima de sí misma DO] [a María IO]. (cf. (5.b))
‘The therapy gave the esteem of herself back to Maria.’ (Pineda 2013: 190)

⁵ See also Cuervo (2003), for a similar proposal.

Demonte (1995: 11) observed that “the contrast with the other pronoun-quantifier distribution is not as straightforward as [alleged it is] in the preceding case”. The author did not judge (11.b) ungrammatical, as (12.b), but only less acceptable than (11.a). However, Pineda (2013) concludes that, not only (11.b) is clearly acceptable if it is used with the same verb of (12) (cf. (13)), but also (12.b) is grammatical in a distributive reading.

- (11) a) La profesora le pasó a limpio [su_i dibujo DO] [a cada niño IO]_i. (cf. (6.a))
‘The teacher cleaned each child his drawing up.’
b) ?La profesora le pasó a limpio [cada dibujo DO]_i [a su_i autor IO]. (cf. (6.b))
‘The teacher cleaned its author each drawing up.’ (Demonte 1995: 10-11)
- (12) a) La profesora entregó [cada dibujo DO]_i [a su_i autor IO]. (cf. (7.a))
‘The teacher gave each drawing to its author.’
b) *La profesora entregó [su_i dibujo DO] [a cada niño IO]_i. (cf. (7.b))
‘The teacher gave his/her drawing to each author.’ (*Ibidem*)
- (13) La profesora le entregó [cada dibujo DO]_i [a su_i autor IO]. (cf. (6.b))
‘The teacher gave each drawing to its author.’ (Pineda 2013: 200)

Therefore, these examples show the irrelevant role played by the clitic in the grammaticality or ungrammaticality of the sentences. In addition, the pairs presented by Demonte (1995) and discussed by Pineda (2013) appear incomplete. These authors did not discuss the (im)possibility of the IO being adjacent to the verb. In fact, according to Bleam (2003), the unique asymmetry that occurs in the alleged DOC in Spanish is observed in the order V IO DO, in which the IO c-commands the DO (cf. (14)).

- (14) a) El editor le envió [a cada autor IO]_i [su_i libro DO].
‘The editor sent his book to each author.’
b) *El editor le envió [a su_i autor IO] [cada libro DO]_i.
‘The editor sent each book to his author.’ (Bleam 2003: 237-238)

In conclusion, the assumed asymmetries shared by Spanish clitic-doubling constructions and English DOC are constrained by the anaphora in use (Demonte 1995) or by the unmarked word order (Bleam 2003). As pointed out by Pineda (2013: 188), there is bidirectional c-command (or, in other words, binding symmetries) in Spanish, as well as in Italian and French (e.g. Giorgi & Longobardi 1991; Harley 2002) (cf. (15-16)).

- (15) a) Una lunga terapia psicoanalitica ha restituito [se stessa_i]_{DO} [a Maria_i]_{IO}. (cf. (5.a))
 ‘A long psychoanalytic therapy restored herself to Maria.’
 b) Una lunga terapia psicoanalitica ha restituito [Maria_i]_{DO} [a se stessa_i]_{IO}. (cf. (5.b))
 ‘A long psychoanalytic therapy restored Maria to herself.’ (Giorgi & Longobardi 1991: 42)
- (16) a) Jean a présenté [chaque institutrice _{DO}]_i [à ses_i élèves _{IO}]. (cf. (7.a))
 ‘Jean introduced every teacher to her students.’
 b) Marie a donné [son_i crayon _{DO}] [à chaque garçon _{IO}]_i. (cf. (7.b))
 ‘Marie gave his pencil to every boy.’ (Harley 2002: 62)

The same holds for EP. There does not seem to be an asymmetric relationship between the IO and the DO, neither in the distribution of anaphors (cf. (17-18)) nor in the bounded possessive pronouns. Both examples in (19-20) are grammatical in a distributive reading and both (17-18) and (19-20) are synonymous independent of the word order.

- (17) a) O tratamento devolveu [à Maria _{IO}]_i [a estima de si_i mesma _{DO}]. (cf. (4.a))
 ‘The therapy gave the esteem of herself back to Maria.’
 b) O tratamento devolveu [à estima de si_i mesma _{IO}] [a Maria _{DO}]_i. (cf. (4.b))
 ‘The therapy gave Maria back to the esteem of herself.’
- (18) a) O tratamento devolveu [a estima de si_i mesma _{DO}] [à Maria _{IO}]_i. (cf. (5.a))
 ‘The therapy gave the esteem of herself back to Maria.’
 b) O tratamento devolveu [a Maria _{DO}]_i [à estima de si_i mesma _{IO}]. (cf. (5.b))
 ‘The therapy gave Maria back to the esteem of herself.’
- (19) a) Entreguei [a cada autor _{IO}]_i [o seu_i livro _{DO}]. (cf. (6.a))
 ‘I gave his book to each author.’
 b) Entreguei [ao seu_i autor _{IO}] [cada livro _{DO}]_i. (cf. (6.b))
 ‘I gave each book to its author.’
- (20) a) Entreguei [cada livro _{DO}]_i [ao seu_i autor _{IO}]. (cf. (7.a))
 ‘I gave each book to its author.’
 b) Entreguei [o seu_i livro _{DO}] [a cada autor _{IO}]_i. (cf. (7.b))
 ‘I gave his book to each author.’

In spite of the review of the data presented so far, we admit that the (a)symmetries in the c-command relation are not sufficient to prove or refute the existence of DOC in Romance languages. As a result, in the next section, we will discuss the (im)possibility of both IO and DO becoming the subject of passives in Spanish and EP. In fact, one of the main diagnoses to prove the occurrence of DOC in a language is the occurrence of dative passives.

2. Passivization

Baker (1988: 174-186) distinguished between true DOC languages, such as Kinyarwanda, in which both NPs show identical behavior, *i.e.* can cliticize on the verb and become the subject of passives, and partial DOC languages, such as Chimwiini and English, in which only the Goal argument can do so. Therefore, DOC languages could exhibit true/symmetric passives or partial/asymmetric passives (e.g. Bresnan & Moshi 1990; Wollford 1993). However, not every DOC language exhibits dative passives. In fact, according to Anagnostopoulou (2003, 2005) there is a subtype of partial DOC languages, such as Modern Greek, in which neither the Goal argument nor the Theme argument of a DOC could become the subject of a passive. In this section, we will discuss the extent of the relationship between passives and the alleged DOC in Romance languages.

Going back again to Demonte (1995), the author asserted that English is a true DOC language, admitting both dative and accusative passives. However, in this language, while the former is grammatical (cf. (21.b)), the latter is ungrammatical unless derived from the DPC (cf. (21.c) vs. (22.b))⁶. On the other hand, Spanish, EP (and Romance languages in general) lack dative passives, only exhibiting accusative passives derived from the DPC (cf. (23) vs. (24))⁷.

- (21) a) John gave Mary a book.
b) Mary was given a book.
c) *A book was given Mary.

- (22) a) John gave a book to Mary.
b) A book was given to Mary.

⁶ According to Demonte (1995: 11), “there is a considerable dialectal variation regarding (...) the structure where the Theme object passivizes” (cf. (20.b)). She pointed out that this variation depends “on the lexical nature of the verb”. However, we are following Baker (1988), among others, according to whom English belong to a partial DOC language with no symmetric passives.

⁷ However, there are some exceptions to this rule. These exceptions are limited to such verbs as *pagar* ‘pay’ and *responder* ‘answer’. In these cases, the IO may become the subject of the passive and there is no DO (Duarte 2013: 435-436).

- (i) Os operários foram pagos pela administração.
‘The workers were paid by the administration.’
(ii) Os pedidos de isenção não foram respondidos a tempo pelos serviços.
‘The requests for exemption were not returned on time by the services.’

- (23) a) *Pedro fue dado el libro (por Juan).
'Pedro was given a book (by Juan).'
- b) *Pedro foi dado um livro (pelo João).
'Pedro was given a book (by João).'

- (24) a) El libro fue dado a Pedro (por Juan).
'The book was given to Pedro (by Juan).'
- b) O livro foi dado ao Pedro (pelo João).
'The book was given to Pedro (by João).'

In addition, although one could suggest that these languages exhibit a similar behavior to Modern Greek (e.g. Anagnostopoulou 2003, 2005), Spanish sentences like (25) and EP sentences like (26) show that accusative passives are acceptable independently of the presence/absence of the clitic, *i.e.* they are acceptable even with the alleged DOC. Moreover, as far as we know, there are no DOC languages that lack dative passives and exhibit accusative passives.

- (25) El premio Nobel (le) fue concedido a Cela el año pasado.
'The Nobel prize was awarded to Cela last year.' (Demonte 1995: 12)

- (26) a) O livro foi-lhe (a ele) dado na semana passada.
'The book was given to him last week.'
- b) O livro foi dado ao Pedro na semana passada.
'The book was given to Pedro last week.'

As a result, the absence of dative passives in Spanish and EP can be considered a strong argument to refute the existence of DOC in Romance languages. This was already noted by Brito (2010). In the next section, we will show that the occurrence of clitic-doubling—the so called DOC in Romance languages—can be considered a counter argument to DOC.

3. Clitic-doubling

Among Romance languages, the occurrence of clitic-doubling is not a generalized property. In fact, while Spanish and EP allow clitic-doubling, French and Italian do not (cf. (27)).

- (27) a) Jean (*lui) a donné des bonbons à Marie.
'Jean gave a candy to Marie.'
- b) Lina (*gli) ha dato una caramella a Giovanni.

‘Lina gave a candy to Giovanni.’ (Jaeggli 1982: 13)

In addition, within the Romance languages that exhibit clitic-doubling there is some variation. In peninsular Spanish, the dative clitic can be doubled by both pronouns and nouns (cf. (28.a-b)), while the accusative clitic can only be doubled by a pronoun (cf. (28.c-d)). In EP, both accusative and dative clitics exhibit the same behavior; clitic-doubling only involves a pronoun or a bare quantifier (cf. (29))^{8 9}.

- (28) a) *Le entregue la carta a él.*
‘I gave him the letter.’
b) *Miguelito le regaló un caramelo a Mafalda.*
‘Miguelito gave a candy to Mafalda.’
c) *Lo vi a él.*
‘I saw him.’
d) *Lo vimos a Guille.* (*Peninsular Spanish/[✓]River Plate Spanish)
‘We saw Guille.’ (Jaeggli 1982: 12-14)
- (29) a) *Encontrámo-las a elas/a todas* na feira do livro.
‘We found *them/all* in the book market.’
b) **Encontrámo-las às raparigas* na feira do livro.
‘We found them in the book market.’
c) *Os professores ofereceram-lhes gelados a eles/a todos* no dia da criança.
‘The teachers gave *them/all* ice-creams on Children’s Day.’
d) **Os professores ofereceram-lhe gelados ao João.*
‘The teachers gave him ice-creams.’ (Mateus *et al.* 2003: 832)

Moreover, as pointed out by Jaeggli (1982: 14), in other varieties of Spanish, namely those spoken in River Plate area of South America, “animate specific direct objects may (and preferable are) clitic doubled”. Therefore, unlike Peninsular Spanish, sentences such as (28.d) are grammatical.

Kayne (1975) noticed that clitic-doubling only occurs when the doubled object NP is preceded by a preposition. Since the clitic absorbs the verb’s feature Case, an extra Case assigner is required to allow the NP to escape the Case filter. This led Jaeggli (1982) to highlight that the difference between Romance

⁸ If literally translated into English, the examples (28-29) would become redundant.

⁹ EP examples, such as in (29.c) with a pronoun (e.g. *a eles*), are different from examples such as in (i). While the former is a clitic-doubling construction, the latter is a strategy used in EP colloquial language to avoid the clitic (Brito 2008: 34). In addition, there is no contrastive reading (inherent to EP clitic-doubling constructions) in any of the examples below.

- (i) *O João deu o livro a ela.*
(ii) *O João deu-lhe o livro.*
‘John gave her a book.’

languages (Spanish vs. EP), as well as this difference between Spanish varieties (River Plate Spanish vs. Peninsular Spanish), stems from the status of the preposition *a* that occurs in the clitic-doubling. While in Spanish the preposition *a* can assign Case to the NP in clitic-doubling constructions, in EP (as well as in French and Italian), it cannot¹⁰.

Hence, the grammaticality of utterances with accusative clitic doubling in River Plate Spanish creates an additional problem for the Spanish DOC proposal. If we consider that the occurrence of sentences with dative clitic-doubling, along with sentences without clitics, are parallel to dative alternation, how can we explain that sentences with accusative clitic-doubling also coexist with sentences without clitics? The possibility of doubling the clitic cannot be analyzed as a phenomenon of alternation in Spanish.

Moving on to EP, if we classify sentences with dative clitic(-doubling) as DOCs, as well as sentences without the clitic as DPC, as proposed by Morais (2006), we have to assume that this language exhibits two different prepositions, or at least a preposition with a different status, occurring in the dative argument: (i) a defective preposition with the role of Case assigner, in contexts with the marked word order V IO DO, being the IO a clitic or a NP; and (ii) a true preposition, in contexts with the unmarked word order V DO IO¹¹. However, different empirical arguments have been presented to support the analysis that EP dative does not involve a preposition but rather a dative Case marker, such as (e.g. Duarte 1987; Gonçalves 1990; Morais & Berlinck 2007; Brito 2008):

- the dative clitic *lhe/lhes* does not replace true PPs, even introduced by *a* (cf. (30-31));

(30) a) Pensei muito *neles*.

b) *Pensei-*lhes* muito.

‘I thought about them a lot.’ (Duarte 1987: 166)

(31) a) Eles assistiram *ao espetáculo*.

b) *Eles assistiram-*lhe*.

‘They attend it.’ (Gonçalves 1990: 104)

- while the IO can control PRO, a true PP cannot (cf. (32));

¹⁰ Suñer (1988) argued against this Kayne/Jaeggli generalization, based on the fact that in River Plate Spanish clitic doubling of DO [-ANIM] is possible despite the absence of *a*. According to this author, *a* is not a Case marker but rather a marker of animacy (see also Belloro 2007). The same analysis does not hold for EP clitic doubling occurrences; the presence of *a* is always required, irrespectively the animacy of the DO/IO.

¹¹ According to Morais (2006) and Morais & Lima-Salles (2010) EP presents variation between a DPC which involves a ‘true’ preposition (*a* or *para*) and a DOC which involves the dative Case marker *a* (or a clitic *lhe/lhes*). In the first case, *a* and *para* encode the same meaning, *i.e.* the same directional/locative information. In the latter, *a* is no longer a lexical item, but only a functional one.

- (32) a) Permitiram *ao João*_i PRO_i apresentar o trabalho mais tarde.
 ‘They allowed John to present his assignment later.’
 b) * Combinei *com o João*_i PRO*_i_j ir ao cinema.
 ‘I arranged with John to go to the cinema.’ (Duarte 1987: 166)

➤ the impossibility of clitic-doubling using the preposition *para* shows that only clitics and NPs can form a syntactic chain (cf. (33));

- (33) a) Dei-*lhe* o livro *a ela*.
 b) * Dei-*lhe*_i o livro *para ela*_i.
 ‘I gave her a book.’ (Morais 2006: 258)

➤ the coordination of dative arguments require the presence of *a* in each coordinate member (cf. (34.a)) (e.g. Duarte 1987). However, this ungrammaticality is reduced when plural or singular bare nouns are involved (cf. Brito 2008), as in (34.b-c).

- (34) a) O João deu livros *ao Pedro e *(a)o Luís*.
 ‘I gave books to Pedro and Luís.’
 b) O diretor deu as boas-vindas *a professores e (a) alunos*.
 ‘The director gave the welcome to teacher and students.’
 c) Os examinadores deram mais importância *a Camões e (a) Pessoa*.
 ‘The examiners gave more importance to Camões and Pessoa.’

As a result, we must conclude that the IO in EP is always a NP; the preposition *a* acts as a Case marker. On the other hand, the application of the coordination test to Spanish shows that in this language, as opposed to EP, the IO is a PP, irrespective of the presence/absence of the clitic (cf. (34-35))¹² (Jaeggli 1982: 32). Hence, there seems to be substantial evidence that while in Spanish the lexical element introducing the dative is a preposition, in EP it is a Case marker.

- (35) a) (Les) dieron (los) caramelos *a María y Pedro*.
 ‘They gave candies to Mary and Peter.’
 b) (Les) dieron (los) caramelos *a niños y niñas*.
 ‘They gave candies to boys and girls.’

¹² Both (35.a-b) are also grammatical in Spanish with the preposition *a* in each coordinate member.

To sum up, we can conclude, in opposition to proposals by Demonte (1995) and Morais (2006), that the IO in Spanish is always a PP, whereas in EP it is always a NP. This distinction between Romance languages explains the grammaticality contrasts on clitic-doubling between these languages, on the one hand, and between Spanish varieties, on the other, in the sense of Kayne/Jaeggli. Only languages/varieties in which the IO is a PP can exhibit the property of clitic-doubling with nouns. Therefore, there seems to be additional evidence not to classify Romance languages as DOC languages. In the following section, we will present an additional argument against the dative alternation in EP and Spanish.

4. (Lack of) successful transfer

Several authors have associated the English dative alternation with two events: *cause to have* and *cause to go to*. According to this semantic distinction, while the DOC expresses caused possession, the DPC encodes caused motion (e.g. Green 1974; Oehrle 1977; Pinker 1989; Jackendoff 1990; Krifka 1999, 2003; Harley 2003). Specifically, for these authors, while the DOC implies that the Theme has been transferred to the Goal with success, the DPC only entails a change of Theme location and it does not imply successful transfer. Therefore, in the examples below only (36.a) entail that the students learned French.

- (36) a) Beth taught the students French.
b) Beth taught French to the students. (Krifka 1999: 4)

This led Demonte (1994: 78) to propose that the same lexical-semantic differences are observed in Spanish dependent on the presence or the absence of the clitic, *i.e.* according to this author, “sentences with dative clitics (different from those without them) express the highest degree of culmination or completeness of the event described by the predicate”. Therefore, “in Goal structures where the clitic can be absent, the unmarked order is V DO IO. The order V IO DO ranges from being felt as stylistically marked to having an ungrammatical flavor (...). In the second case the structure ‘ask for the clitic’ ” (Demonte 1995: 20).

Therefore, one of the arguments presented by Demonte (1994, 1995) in favour of the proposal that sentences with clitic doubling are semantically different from sentences without clitic doubling is that adverbs of duration are less natural in the alleged DOC (cf. (37.a) *vs.* (37.b)). However, typically these adverbs do not co-occur with telic predicates irrespectively of the presence/absence of the clitic. As a result, we would expect both sentences to be ungrammatical¹³.

¹³ One of the anonymous reviewers pointed out that the ungrammatical contrast presented by Demonte (1994) could be related to the possibility of interpreting “una carta a su novia” as a DO. In that case, without the presence of an affected argument, the co-occurrence of a *escribir*-type verb with an adverbial of duration would be (more) acceptable. The reviewer also suggested that (39.b) would become unnatural in spite of the absence of the clitic with an inverted word order (V IO DO) (cf. (39.a) *vs.* (i)). This fact confirms that the apparent aspectual restriction exhibited in (39) is not (only) related to the presence/absence of the clitic. Moreover, the possibility of combining an adverb of duration with a telic predicate seems to be restricted to the verb *escribir* ‘write’.

- (37) a) Juan le escribió una carta a su novia (?? durante cinco horas).
 b) Juan escribió una carta a su novia (durante cinco horas). (Demonte 1994: 80)

Besides this, Demonte (1994) argued that sentences as in (38.b) are ungrammatical “since the Goal or Location cannot be classified as a possessor either for general knowledge reasons (the tablecloth appears to be a part of the table whereas the dishes are not) or because the potential possessor either lacks reference or is abstract”.

- (38) a) Le puse el mantel a la mesa.
 b) *Le puse los platos a la mesa. (Demonte 1995: 12)

However, this grammaticality contrast is not (only) dependent on the dative alternation. Romero & Moreno Quibén (2001), *apud* Ormazabal & Romero (2010a: 11) observed that, “in spite of the absence of any structural or morphological change on the sentence, [examples such as (39)] (...) may only receive an integral interpretation”.

- (39) Juan puso los guisantes en lata. (Ormazabal & Romero 2010a: 11)

Hence, none of the examples presented by (Demonte 1994: 78-79) to interpret the IO as an affected argument “in the sense that it is taken [to be] either as the possessor or as an intrinsic part of the Theme argument” can be seen as evidence of a lexical-semantic difference between the DPC and the (alleged) DOC. (37) does not confirm the successful transfer, nor does (38) show an integral relation between the IO and DO.

For EP, Brito (2010: 104) noticed that “the dative clitic doubling is rare and independent of the IO position”. Besides this, word order did not change the meaning. Sentences such as (40-41) are synonymous.

- (40) a) A Maria deu-lhe um livro a ele.
 b) A Maria deu-lhe a ele um livro.
 ‘Mary gave him a book.’

- (41) a) A Maria deu um livro ao Pedro.
 b) A Maria deu ao Pedro um livro.
 ‘Mary gave Pedro a book.’

Rappaport-Hovav & Levin (2008: 146-148) presented three strong arguments against two different meanings associated with DOC and DPC in English. In our view, the same could be used to show that a clitic(-doubled) or a full NP do not have different meanings in both EP and Spanish. Therefore a distinction between them based on lexical-semantic constraints cannot be established. First of all, since verbs such as *read* and *write* lexicalize activities, they do not entail caused possession. As a result, successful transfer is not entailed in either variant and can be denied in the English DOC and DPC (cf. (42)). The same holds for EP constructions with an IO full NP or clitic(-doubling), irrespective the word order (cf. (43)).

- (42) a) I wrote Blair a letter, but I tore it up before I sent it.
 b) I wrote a letter to Blair, but I tore it up before I sent it. (Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008: 148)

- (43) a) O João escreveu uma carta à namorada, mas rasgou-a antes de a enviar.
 b) O João escreveu à namorada uma carta, mas rasgou-a antes de a enviar.
 ‘João wrote his girlfriend a letter, but he tore it up before he sent it.’
 c) O João escreveu-lhe uma carta (a ela), mas rasgou-a antes de a enviar.
 d) O João escreveu-lhe (a ela) uma carta, mas rasgou-a antes de a enviar.
 ‘João wrote her a letter, but he tore it up before he sent it.’

On the other hand, with verbs such as *give* that lexicalize caused possession, the successful transfer cannot be denied neither in the DOC nor in the DPC (e.g. Oehrle 1976; Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008) (cf. (44)). From their nature, these cases always entail successful transfer.

- (44) a) #My aunt gave/lent/loaned my brother some money for new skis, but he never got it.
 b) #My aunt gave/lent/loaned some money to my brother for new skis, but he never got it.
 (Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008: 146)

Again, the same holds for EP (and Spanish). Sentences such as (45) are ungrammatical or, at least, very unacceptable, since the second clause contradicts the first. In addition, once again, there is no relation between the presence and absence of the clitic in the grammaticality judgments.

- (45) a) #A minha tia deu/emprestou dinheiro ao meu irmão para uns patins novos, mas ele nunca o obteve/recebeu.
 ‘My aunt gave/lent my brother some money for new skis, but he never got it.’
 b) #A minha tia deu/emprestou-lhe dinheiro (a ele) para uns patins novos, mas ele nunca o obteve/recebeu.
 ‘My aunt gave/lent him some money for new skis, but he never got it.’

Finally, to accept that the DOC and the DPC have different meanings would mean that successful transfer is implied in all DOCs, independently of the verb. However, this is not the case of verbs such as *promise* or *offer*, as we can see in the examples below (cf. (46-47)).

- (46) a) Max offered the victims help, but they refused his offer.
b) Sarah promised Catherine her old car, but then gave it to her son instead. (Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008: 146)
- (47) a) O João ofereceu um gelado às crianças mas elas recusaram.
b) O João ofereceu às crianças um gelado mas elas recusaram.
'John gave the kids an ice-cream but they refused it.'
c) O João ofereceu-lhes um gelado (a elas) mas elas recusaram.
d) O João ofereceu-lhes (a elas) um gelado mas elas recusaram.
'John gave them an ice-cream but they refused it.'

To sum up, the (lack of) successful transfer is not related to the presence/absence of the clitic, in the case of EP and Spanish, nor is it related to the event expressed in both the DOC (*cause to have*) and the DPC (*cause to go to*), in the case of English. Instead, it is related to the (a)telicity expressed by the verb that selects the IO: “the meaning inherent in the verb plays a critical role in determining the availability of this inference. (...) When successful transfer is entailed by a verb, the entailment appears in both the *to* and double object variants, while when a verb lacks this entailment, it is absent from both variants” (Rappaport-Hovav and Levin 2008: 146). This leads us to refute the proposal that the alleged dative alternation in Romance languages is based on lexical-semantic restrictions.

5. The syntax of EP DPC

In the previous sections, we have argued against the existence of DOC in EP and Spanish. As a result, we are also refuting the proposals that the dative is an applied argument (Morais 2006, 2012 for EP; Pineda 2013, for Spanish). Alternatively, we are following the classic analysis of ditransitive constructions, such as the one proposed by Larson (1988)¹⁴. In the shell structure proposed by Larson (1988: 335-336) a derivational approach is conceived. Specifically, “a simple dative like *John sent a letter to Mary* (...) involve[s] an underlying clause-like VP whose “subject” is *a letter* and whose “object” is *(to) Mary*”¹⁵. This is also reflected in the analysis of Brito (2010: 106-109) for the EP DPC dative expression (cf. (48)). As

¹⁴ This is also the analysis Demonte (1995) and Morais (2006) adopt to derive the DPC, which they assume to be a variant of the dative alternation in Spanish and EP.

¹⁵ On the other hand, “double objects can be (...) produced by applying the familiar operations responsible for passive sentences within VP. The former indirect object (*Mary*) becomes a derived VP “subject”, and the former direct object (*a letter*) assumes adjunct status within V’ ” (Larson 1988: 335-336).

mentioned by the author: “the IO constituent (...) is projected in the specifier position of the lower VP (...) and the DO as a complement of V. (...) In order to explain the marked order V IO DO, we must propose that the IO is scrambled out the VP over the DO”. On the other hand, in the case of clitic constructions, “*lhe*, as an argument of the verb, may be also projected as the specifier of the VP and (...), due to its clitic nature, it is obligatory moved to V”.

(48) [vP [NP *O João*] [v' [v *deu*] [VP [NP *um livro*] [V' [V ~~deu~~] [PP *ao pai*]]]]

Furthermore, we would like to propose that the EP dative expression is a DPC somewhat similar to English. According to Pineda (2013: 201), “proposing a Romance [D]PC structure for ditransitives parallel to the English *to*-construction turns out to be an *ad-hoc* solution, usually chosen as a result of the tendency in linguistics to continuously mirror phenomena seen in English.” However, as we will see, the DPC from Romance languages has more in common with English DPC than its DOC.

Larson (1988: 370) stated that the occurrence of a subset of verbs in both variants of dative alternation (DOC and DPC), in contrast with another that can only occur in one of them (DPC), can be explained by Case-marking requirements. According to this author, when both V and P must independently assign the same thematic role —Goal— the semantic contribution of the latter is redundant and therefore can be ‘reduced’. However, when there is some thematic information associated with the directional preposition *to*, this is not possible. In this case, since the verb only assigns the Beneficiary role to its IO, the reduction of *to* to Case-marking would result in an unrecoverable loss of thematic information associated with the preposition¹⁶. The main conclusion is therefore that English has two different prepositions introducing the dative. This distinction between a *to*-directional preposition and a *to*-functional preposition is the core ingredient to establish a correlation between Romance and English DPC. As we have seen before, empirical arguments show that the IO in EP is a NP and not a PP: *a* is a Case marker rather than a contentful preposition (cf. (30-34)).

Although he discussed these Case-marking requirements, Larson (1988) did not identify the verbs that can occur in both DOC and DPC and the verbs that can only occur in the DPC. Several other authors have tried to do so, based on the association of the events *cause to have* and *cause to go to* with the two variants of dative alternation. In fact, the primary motivation in relating the DPC to a caused motion is the use of the preposition *to*, which suggests that the argument introduced by *to* is the goal of a possessional path. The problem is that several verbs that do not entail a path can also occur in the DPC, namely the most common dative verb *give* (cf. (1), repeated in (20.a) and (21.a)). Based on this assumption, Rappaport-Hovav & Levin (2008) proposed a different approach to the English dative alternation based on the semantic meaning of the verbs. They analyze *give*-type verbs differently from *throw* and *send*-type verbs; while the former have a caused possession meaning, the latter have both caused motion and caused

¹⁶ On the other hand, double object formation represents a case of unaccusativity: “the relevant verbs are incompatible with any potential thematically Case assigner and hence force their third argument to undergo movement” (Larson 1988: 374-375).

possession meaning. As a result, *give*-type verbs —which they referred to as ‘core dative verbs’— may occur in both variants of dative alternation; in this case, *to* is reduced to Case-marking. In contrast, *throw* and *send*-type verbs — labeled ‘noncore dative verbs’— involve a path and, therefore, can only occur in the DPC; in this case, *to* is a true preposition with a directional meaning (Rappaport-Hovav & Levin 2008: 134)¹⁷.

We therefore argue that the DPC from EP is “similar” to the one that occurs in English with core dative verbs: in both languages, the preposition is reduced to a Case marker. However, while in English this occurs with a subset of verbs due to the redundant contribution of the preposition *to*, in EP the presence of the dative Case marker *a* is always required, since the only Case feature available in EP verbs to be assigned is the accusative. In fact, EP three-argument verbs, such as *dar* ‘give’, lack the property to assign Case to more than one NP. In addition, two-argument verbs, which are apparently able to assign Case to its internal argument, like *telefonar* ‘to telephone’, require the Case marker to assign the dative (cf. (49)).

- (49) a) O João deu um livro *(a)o Pedro/ O João deu *(a)o Pedro um livro.
‘John gave a book to Pedro.’
b) A rapariga telefonou *(a) um amigo.
‘The girl called a friend.’

As pointed out by Gonçalves (2002: 336), “in EP [the] preposition *a* is required not only as a Case assigner of an extra NP in VP but also as the dative Case marker of IO arguments.” Hence, the EP subcategorization frame of ditransitive dative verbs, as in English core dative verbs, is always V NP *a/to*-NP, in spite of looking like a V NP PP, due to the occurrence of the ‘preposition’ *a/to*.

6. Final remarks

We have argued against the existence of DOC in EP and Spanish. Specifically, after thorough analysis, we have shown that the same data presented so far to support the view that these languages exhibit DOC can, instead, be used to show that the only strategy available in these languages to express the dative is the DPC. Furthermore, we have seen that the DPC from Romance languages has more in common with English DPC than with its DOC. Hence, if any comparison can be established between Romance and English dative strategies, it should consider the distinction between DPCs introduced by functional prepositions and DPCs introduced by directional prepositions. As we have seen, EP DPC is similar to the one that occurs in English with core dative verbs: in both languages the preposition introducing the IO is reduced to Case marker. We have not discussed to what extent Spanish DPC is similar to English nor even the possibility of the occurrence of ‘noncore dative verbs’, such as *throw* and *send*, with directional

¹⁷ See Rappaport-Hovav & Levin (2008) for an extended argumentation in favour of two distinct classes of dative verbs, as well as Levinson (2005) for the distinction between *to*-directional and *to*-functional prepositions.

prepositions in the Romance languages under discussion. In these cases, they select an Oblique rather than an IO (e.g. Ormazabal & Romero 2010b). This topic will require further research.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank to Inês Duarte and Tjerk Hagemeijer for their insightful comments to this work as well as to the reviewers for their careful reading and valuable suggestions. I am also grateful to Rosabel Cachero for their assistance with the Spanish examples, and to Natasha Fabri for their English review.

References

- Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2003): *The Syntax of Ditransitives: Evidence from Clitics*. Berlin/New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anagnostopoulou, Elena (2005): “Cross-linguistic and cross-categorical variation of datives”, in Melita Stavrou / Arhonto Terzi (eds.), *Advances in Greek Generative Syntax*. John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia, 61-126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.76.05ana>
- Baker, Mark (1988): *Incorporation: A Theory of Grammatical Function Changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Barss, Andrew / Howard Lasnik (1986): “A note on anaphora and double objects”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 347-354. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-94-009-2542-7_8
- Belletti, Adriana / Ur Shlonsky (1995): “The order of verbal complements: a comparative study”, *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13, 489-526.
- Belloro, Valeria A. (2007): *Spanish Clitic Doubling: a Study of the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface*. Phd. Diss., State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Bleam, Tonia (2003): “Properties of the double object construction in Spanish”, in Rafael Núñez-Cedeño, Luis López & Richard Cameron (eds.), *A Romance perspective on language knowledge and use*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 233-252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/cilt.238.19ble>
- Bresnan, Joan / Lioba Moshi (1990): “Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax”, *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 147-185.
- Brito, Ana Maria (2008): “Grammar variation in the expression of verb arguments: the case of the Portuguese Indirect Object”, *Phrasis* 2, 31-58.
- Brito, Ana Maria (2010): “Do European Portuguese and Spanish have the double object construction?”, *EGG5. V Encuentro de Gramática Generativa*. Neuquén: EDUCO, Editorial Universitaria del Comahue, 81-114.
- Brito, Ana Maria (2014): “As construções ditransitivas revisitadas – alternância dativa em PE?”, in António Moreno *et al.* (eds). *Textos Seleccionados: XXIX Encontro Nacional da APL*. Coimbra: APL, 103-119.

- Brito, Ana Maria (2015): "Two base generated structures for ditransitives in European Portuguese", in António Simões *et al.* (eds). *Linguística, informática e tradução: mundos que se cruzam*, Oslo *Studies in Language* 7 (1), 337-357.
- Cuervo, María Cristina (2003): *Datives at large*. PhD Diss., MIT.
- Demonte, Violeta (1994): "Datives in Spanish", *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics* 4 (1), 71-96.
- Demonte, Violeta (1995): "Dative alternation in Spanish", *Probus* 7, 5-30. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/prbs.1995.7.1.5>
- Diaconescu, Constanta Rodica / María Luisa Rivero (2007): "An applicative analysis of double object constructions in Romanian", *Probus* 19 (2), 209-233. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/probus.2007.007>.
- Duarte, Inês (1987): *A construção de topicalização na gramática do português: regência, ligação e condições sobre movimento*. PhD. Diss, Universidade de Lisboa.
- Duarte, Inês (2003): "Relações gramaticais, esquemas relacionais e ordem de palavras", in Maria Helena Mira Mateus *et al.* (eds.), *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Caminho, 275-321.
- Duarte, Inês (2013): "Construções ativas, passivas, incoativas e médicas", in Eduardo B. Paiva Raposo *et al.* (eds.), *Gramática do Português*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian, 429-458.
- Fournier, David H. (2010): *La structure du prédicat verbal: une étude de la construction à double objet en français*. PhD Diss, University of Toronto.
- Giorgi, Alessandra / Giuseppe Longobardi (1991): *The syntax of noun phrases: configuration, parameters and empty categories*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gonçalves, Perpétua (1990): *A construção de uma gramática do português de Moçambique: Aspectos da estrutura argumental dos verbos*. PhD Diss. Universidade de Lisboa.
- Gonçalves, Perpétua (2002): "The role of ambiguity in second language change: the case of Mozambique African Portuguese", *Second Language Research* 18 (4), 325-347. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/0267658302sr209oa>.
- Green, Georgia M. (1974). *Semantics and Syntactic Regularity*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Harley, Heidi. (2002): "Possession and the double object construction", *Linguistic Variation Yearbook* 2, 31-70. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/livy.2.04har>.
- Jackendoff, Ray S. (1990): *Semantic structures*. Cambridge/MA: MIT Press.
- Jaeggli, Osvaldo (1982): *Topics in Romance Syntax*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Kayne, Richard (1975): *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Kayne, Richard (1984): *Connectedness and binary branching*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Krifka, Manfred (1999): "Manner in dative alternation", in Sonya Bird *et al.* (eds.), *WCCFL 18. Proceedings of the 18th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press, 260-271.
- Krifka, Manfred (2004): "Semantic and pragmatic conditions for the dative alternation", *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics* 4, 1-32.

- Larson, Richard (1988): "On the double object construction", *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335-391.
- Levinson, Lisa (2005): "'To' in two places in dative alternation", in Sudha Arunachalam *et al.* (eds). *The 28th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 155-168.
- Masullo, P. J. (1992). *Incorporation and case theory in Spanish: a cross-linguistic perspective*. Diss, University of Washington.
- Mateus, Maria Helena Mira *et al.* (2003): *Gramática da Língua Portuguesa*. Lisboa: Caminho.
- Miguel, Matilde / Anabela Gonçalves / Inês Duarte (2011): "Dativos não argumentais em português" in Armada Costa / Pilar Barbosa / Isabel Falé (orgs.), *Textos Seleccionados, XXVI Encontro da Associação Portuguesa de Linguística*. Lisboa: APL, 388-400.
- Morais, Maria Aparecida / Heloisa Maria Lima-Salles (2010): "Parametric change in the grammatical encoding of indirect objects in Brazilian Portuguese", *Probus* 22 (2), 181-209. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1515/prbs.2010.007>.
- Morais, Maria Aparecida / Rosane Berlinck (2007): "Eu disse pra ele ou disse-lhe a ele: a expressão do dativo nas variedades brasileira e europeia do português", in Ataliba Castilho *et al.* (eds.), *Descrição, história e aquisição do português brasileiro*. Campinas/SP: Pontes/FAPESP, 61-74.
- Morais, Maria Aparecida (2006): "Argumentos dativos: um cenário para o núcleo aplicativo no português europeu", *ABRALIN* 5 (1-2), 239-266.
- Morais, Maria Aparecida (2012): "Sentenças bitransitivas e objeto indireto no português brasileiro", *Linha de Água* 25 (2), 25-50.
- Oehrle, Richard (1977): "Review of Georgia M. Green: Semantics and syntactic regularity", *Language* 53, 198-208.
- Ormazabal, Javier / Juan Romero (2010a): "The derivation of dative alternations", in Maia Duguine / Susana Huidobro / Nerea Madariaga (eds), *Argument Structure and Syntactic Relations from a Crosslinguistic Perspective*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1075/la.158.13orm>.
- Ormazabal, Javier / Juan Romero (2010b): "Ditransitive Predicates, Argument Structure and Selectional Properties of Vs and Ps". *Minimalist and Interfaces, IV Workshop "Sintaxe Gerativa do Português Brasileiro na Entrada do Século XXI"*. Universidade de São Paulo. Unpublished presentation.
- Pineda, Anna (2013): "Romance double object constructions and transitivity alternations", in Enrico Boone / Martin Kohlberger / Maartje Schulp (eds.), *Proceedings of ConSOLE XX*. Leiden: Universitet Leiden, 185-211.
- Pinker, Steven (1989): *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge/MA: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina (2002). *Introducing Arguments*. PhD Diss, MIT: Cambridge.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka / Beth Levin (2008): "The English dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity". *Journal of Linguistics* 44, 129-167. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/s0022226707004975>.

- Romero, Juan (1997): *Construcciones de doble objeto y gramática universal*. Diss, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Suñer, Margarita (1988): “The Role of Agreement in Clitic-Doubled constructions”, *Natural language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 391-434. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/bf00133904>.
- Wollford, Ellen (1993): “Animacy hierarchy effects on object agreement”, in Paul Kotey (ed), *New Dimensions in African Linguistics and Languages*. Florida: Africa World Press, 203-216.