

A-movement and clitic doubling in Rioplatense Spanish

Mercedes Pujalte (UBA-UNGS-UNAHUR)

Andrés Saab (CONICET-UBA)

Goals: In this talk, we first describe the distribution of dative clitic doubling in Rioplatense Spanish (1a) that, as I well-known, is much less restricted than the distribution of accusative clitic doubling (1b) and, then, explore certain interactions between both types of doubling that shed new light on the syntax of objects:

- (1) a. Le entregué el libro a María.
CL.dat.3sg gave the book to M.
'I gave the book to María.'
- b. La vi a María.
CL.acc.fem.3sg saw DOM M.
'I saw María.'

Dative doubling and A-movement: We show that dative doubling is almost mandatory for any type of indirect object (IO). We propose then an analysis in terms of A-movement, according to which doubling is the surface reflex of an A-dependency between the phase head ν and the DP that values dative. In this respect, dative doubling behaves like accusative doubling, which is also a reflex of A-movement to the ν edge, as already show by Di Tullio *et al* (in press). Among other relevant diagnostics, Di Tullio *et al* argues that presence of A-movement in accusative doubling can be detected by the particular distribution of Weak Crossover effects (WCO). This distribution is replicated in exactly the same way when it comes to dative doubling. First, as shown in (2), dative doubling repairs WCO in regular *wh/focus* extraction (both sentences in (2) are degraded without doubling in those dialects/idiolects that accept non-doubling variants):

- (2) a. ¿A quién_i le entregó la nota su_i profesor?
to who CL.dat.3sg gave the grade his professor
- b. A MARÍA_i le entregó la nota su_i profesor.
to M. CL.dat.3sg gave the grade his professor

Second, this repair is sensitive to the position of the possessive phrase (see Ishii 2006 for English): Whenever the possessive phrase that is crossed by the A'-operator is not in the same clause the result is degraded:

- (3) a. *¿A quién_i cree su_i madre que le entregó el libro Juan?
b. ¿A quién_i cree Juan que su_i madre le entregó el libro?
- (4) a. *¿AMARÍA_i cree su_i madre que le entregó el libro Juan.
b. A MARÍA_i cree Juan que su_i madre le entregó el libro.

Crucially, this particular distribution is not attested in other constructions that also repair WCO (see Di Tullio *et al* for a discussion on clitic left dislocation). The key for understanding the pattern in (2)-(4) is the type of movement involved in each case. WCO arises whenever an operator crosses the possessive DP. Crucially, A-movement doesn't involve any Operator-variable chain. Then, whenever the IO crosses the subject DP through A-movement, absence of WCO is predicted. This is the situation that obtains in (2), (3b) and (4b). In the sentences in (3a) and (4a), the IO crosses the DP in the main clause through A'-movement giving rise thus to WCO.

In sum, dative doubling, like accusative doubling, involves A-movement to the first ν P edge. Now, given the broad extension of dative doubling in Rioplatense Spanish, we conjecture that the motivation for A-movement to the ν P edge is different IOs and DOs. For the latter, Di Tullio *et al* provide evidence in favor of the hypothesis that clitic doubling is the result of an optional person feature on accusative DPs. Our conjecture is that IOs are forced to move for a property on the ν head and not on the IO itself. Our conjecture is that such a feature is purely selectional feature (a D feature or an EPP feature, depending on certain assumptions about the motivation for A-movement).

On the ban on double doubling: Regardless the particular implementation, both IOs and DOs are in competition for exactly the same position, Spec, ν P. This makes a couple of important predictions. First, given that dative doubling is mandatory in Rioplatense Spanish, IOs always win. This explains why we cannot double doublings like those in (1a), a hitherto observation in the literature.

- (5) a. *A Juan, *se la* presenté a María.
b. A Juan, *le* presenté a María.

The contrast in (5) is straightforwardly captured under our analysis. Here is why. In (5a) the IO requires A-movement before topicalization. For this reason, mandatory A-movement of the IO blocks A-movement for the DO. The sentence in (5b) is grammatical just because the DO doesn't A-move to the ν P edge.

The second important prediction is that topicalizing the DO should give grammatical results, given that accusative clitic doubling (i.e., A-movement) is optional; i.e., the DO can be topicalized without being subject to A-movement to Spec, ν P. This prediction is borne out. Notice that the final result is opposite to what we observe in (5): absence of dative doubling is ungrammatical in colloquial (oral) Rioplatense Spanish:

- (6) a. A María, *se la* presenté a Juan.
b. *?A María, *la* presenté a Juan. (better in formal register)

Importantly, the contrast between (5) and (6) cannot be accounted in terms of other well-known restrictions involving *a*-marked DPs. Concretely, distinctiveness in the sense of Richards (2010) (i.e., the ban for two category identical DPs to be linearized within the same phase) cannot be the cause of the ungrammatical results in (5a) and (6b): the two *a*-DP are in different phases and, consequently, distinctiveness is respected. Evidently, the grammatical counterparts in (5b) and (6a) also precludes any explanation in terms of Richards' condition.

We'll also show that no animacy restriction (Ormazabal & Romero 2007, 2013) is behind our basic minimal pairs. Pairs like (7), in which we obtain the same results as in (5) and animacy is not at issue, allow us to reject alternative analyses along these lines:

- (7) a. *A instituciones prestigiosas, solo se lo recomiendo a Juan.
b. A instituciones prestigiosas, solo les recomiendo a Juan.