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Abstract

The paper provides a functional, usage-based analysis of the genesis and diffusion of the object clitic doubling in Spanish, which is seen as an agreement phenomenon, and hence as a working example of grammaticalization. It has been claimed that doubling arises from the so-called topic-shift construction (Givón 1976), but historical and contemporary data support an alternative proposal that pays more attention to frequency effects and takes into account the often neglected high proportion of clitic-only objects in discourse. Our analysis suggests a strong correlation between being an object encoded frequently by means of a clitic/affix and developing agreement, which points to the accessibility of the discourse referents as the main factor in determining the grammatical form of direct and indirect objects in Spanish.

1. Introduction

The examples below show various possible encodings of direct (1a-c) and indirect (2a-c) objects in Spanish:

1 We are indebted to the editors of the volume and to two anonymous referees for useful comments on a previous version of this paper. This research has been funded by the Spanish Ministry of Science and FEDER funds (grants HUM2006-05776 and FFI2010-17417) and The Spanish Ministry of Education (AP 2006-02002).

2 The particular constructions represented by these examples are not evenly spread in current Spanish; i.e. the pattern of (1c) is used mostly in the Río de la Plata variety and the
(1a) […] y de pronto abri-ó los ojos […]
   And of sudden open-PST.3SG the eyes
   ‘And suddenly he opened his eyes’ (SONRISA: 91, 31)

(1b) […] y poco después lo-s-invit-ó
   And few after 3M.ACC-PL-invite-PST.3SG al Park a almorzar
to.the Park to lunch
   ‘And shortly after he invited them to the Park for lunch’
   (HISTORIAS: 14, 30)

(1c) Me-fui al baño
   REFL.1SG-go[PST.1SG] to.the bathroom para acompañar-la a la Dilia
   for accompany-INF.3F.ACC.SG to the Dilia
   ‘I went to the bathroom to accompany Dilia’ (GLENDA: 147, 8)

(2a) El banco […] liquida-ba los correspondientes intereses
   The bank pay.off-PST[3SG] the respective interests a los clientes
to the clients
   ‘The bank paid off the clients’ interest’ (2VOZ: 28, 1, 2, 2)

(2b) le-gusta mucho la medicina
   3SG.DAT-like[PRES.3SG] much the medicine
   ‘He likes medicine very much’ (SEVILLA: 82, 15)

Indirect object encoding in (2a) is nowadays more common in written texts than in spoken discourse.

3 Complete references for the cited texts are provided in appendix 2.
(2c) A mí sí me-gusta la cocina mucho

to me yes 1SG.DAT-like[PRES.3SG] the cooking much

‘I like cooking very much’ (MADRID: 382, 31)4

In the (a) series, the object is an independent syntactic constituent, in this case a nominal (1a) or prepositional (2a) phrase. In (b), objects are encoded only by a person marker, one that has commonly been referred to as a ‘clitic’ or ‘unstressed personal pronoun’. In (c), the same object is encoded by both a clitic and a full-fledged constituent. Traditional grammar regarded those doubled objects exemplified in (c) as redundant or pleonastic constructions, but this view has been criticized by Rothe (1966), Heger (1966), and Llorente and Mondéjar (1974), who set out some structural arguments to consider the examples in (c) as cases of an “objective conjugation” in Spanish, though the seeds of this analysis can be traced back to the work of Lenz (1920: 82) and Tesnière (1959). Along the same line, more recently it has been convincingly argued that this type of construction must be viewed as an agreement phenomenon (cf. Bossong 1980; García-Miguel 1991; Franco 2000). According to these studies, constructions such as (1c) and (2c) do not contain two objects, one of them pleonastic; rather, the object expressed by a strong pronoun or a lexical constituent has a copy of some of its features (person, number, gender, case) attached to the verb, although this attachment is reflected in writing only in some cases (cf. 1c).

A widely accepted explanation for the origin of agreement from pronouns is that provided by Givón (1976), according to which the so-called Topic-Shift (henceforth TS) construction set up the context that allows the

---

4 There is no formal distinction between accusative and dative in first and second person clitics. However, for the sake of simplicity, in the glosses we will maintain the parallel with third person forms, which do mark this difference (1b vs. 2b). In spite of their nature, affixes not always are written together with the verb stem they attach to. Only those that occur after the verb stem are spelt as one word.
pronominal element to be reanalyzed as an agreement affix, as will be shown in section 3. However, diachronic data suggest a path of emergence of the object agreement that does not support the TS hypothesis (see section 4), hence the necessity of examining a comprehensive corpus of Spanish texts, which we will do in section 5. The consideration of extensive discourse data of the relevant constructions requires an alternative analysis. While previous studies (e.g. Poston 1953; Barrenechea & Orechia 1970; Silva-Corvalán 1984; Rini 1991; Becerra Bascuñana 2006) have focused on lexical and strong pronominal objects, accompanied or not by co-indexed clitics, as in (1a) vs. (1c) and (2a) vs. (2c)–, there are some works that take a more inclusive view on the data, such as Weissenrieder (1995) and Dufter & Stark (2008). A short survey of these proposals will be given in section 5.1. Next, section 5.2. will provide detailed information on the sample we have used in our study. In section 5.3., besides full-fledged constituents, our analysis will pay attention to those very frequent cases in which objects are represented only by a clitic, as in (1b) and (2b), and accordingly we will put forward a new hypothesis for the origin and spread of object agreement in Spanish (Section 6). In the final section we will summarize the advantages of this proposal, which relates the discourse-pragmatic function of the constructions to phonological, morphological and syntactic properties of the linguistic units involved in this process of grammaticalization leading to object agreement.

2. The status of so-called clitics in Spanish

Before addressing the question of the origin of object agreement, it is useful to justify the assigning of affix status to those elements in bold type in (1b) and (2b) from contemporary Spanish, since these are generally considered to be clitics in the literature. The morphological status of such forms nowadays is not the same as in initial stages of the language. In this respect, we agree with Enrique-Arias (2003), who maintains that, in contemporary Spanish,
they are verbal inflections. Taking into account a number of previous works (Greenberg 1954; Carstairs-McCarthy 1981; Anderson 1982; Zwicky & Pullum 1983; Bybee 1985; Hopper & Traugott 1993; Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca 1994), Enrique-Arias suggested a set of properties that define the prototype of inflectional expressions. The so-called ‘clitics’ of Spanish comply with almost every feature proposed:

a) Inflectional expressions appear obligatorily in their relevant structural position. With pronominal and preverbal definite objects, object affixes (‘clitics’) are obligatory in contemporary Spanish.

\[(3a) \text{ lo-vieron } a \text{ él} \]
3SG.ACC-see-PAST3PL to he
‘they saw him’

\[(3b) *\text{vieron } a \text{ él} \]
see-PAST3PL to him
‘they saw him’

The fact that obligatoriness does not spread to every context cannot be taken as evidence against the existence of object agreement, since, as Enrique-Arias notices, constraints in agreement like the ones displayed by in Spanish are attested in other languages (cf. also Siewierska 2004: Ch. 4).

b) Inflectional expressions have grammatical meanings (gender, case) and do not fill any NP slot (they are not in complementary distribution with co-referential NPs). This is the case with the so-called object clitics of Spanish: they have the meanings of person, gender, number and case (though not all

---

5 The examples are taken from Enrique-Arias (2003).
the members of the paradigm exhibit these meanings), and they are not in complementary distribution with object NPs.

c) Spanish object affixes appear fused with the verb, and, following the criteria that define the inflectional expression prototype as proposed by Enrique-Arias, inflections are bound. As unstressed object pronouns became verbal affixes it is no longer possible to insert other elements in between them and the verb. Rivero (1986: 775) and Rini (1992: 133ff) observe that “interpolation” was common in Old Spanish, as it is shown in (4), where the indefinite stressed pronoun algo ‘something’ is placed between the clitic te ‘you’ and the verb tomar ‘take’. Such a distribution has disappeared in Present-day Spanish:

(4)  por alguna parte dél [tu reino]  te=entra-rá
     for some part of it  2SG.DAT=enter-FUT[3SG]

     alguno para te=algo  toma-r
     someone to 2SG.DAT=something take-INF

     ‘in some part of it [your kingdom] someone will enter to take something from you’ (Amadís)

d) Spanish object affixes only attach to the verb, so they exhibit strong selectional restrictions for their hosts.

---

According to Enrique-Arias (2003: 73) the loss of some or all the grammatical meanings encoded by clitics reflects “a process towards a higher degree of semantic generalization of the grammatical marker”. This phenomenon can be observed in an example like (i), taken from Enrique Arias (ibid.): the dative clitic le, that does not make gender distinctions, in some instances also loses the number distinctions (le vs. les). Moreover, and again according to Enrique Arias, the distinction of case is also lost, since the verb temer takes an accusative object:

(i)  Juan le-teme a las brujas
     Juan 3SG-M-ACC-fears to the witches
     ‘Juan is scared of witches’
e) While clitics tend to be affected by discourse features, the expression of inflectional affixes is influenced by features of the host word. In contemporary Spanish, the distribution of object affixes is determined by the form of the verbal stem they are attached to: with imperatives and non-finite forms, they are in final position, with finite forms in initial position. This was not the case in Old Spanish: object clitics were subject to a number of restrictions depending on discourse or syntactic features (e.g. they never appeared at the beginning of the sentence; the presence of an indefinite pronoun in the clause conditioned their position, etc.).

d) Inflectional affixes exhibit morphological idiosyncrasies. This criterion proposed by Carstairs-McCarthy (1981) and Zwicky & Pullum (1983) is questioned in Enrique-Arias (2003), as it is not a necessary condition to establish the inflectional status for agreement markers. Inflectional affixes are less likely to develop morphological idiosyncrasies in their combination with the verbal stem than other inflections (tense or mood), which tend to undergo a higher degree of fusion with the verb. However, Enrique-Arias identifies some phonic readjustments that take place in combinations of verb plus object affix:

(5) \( \text{va}-\text{mos} + \text{nos} \rightarrow \text{vámonos} \)
    go[PRES]-1PL + 1PL.REFL \rightarrow ‘let’s go’

(6) \( \text{venid} + \text{os} \rightarrow \text{veníos} \)
    come[IMP]2PL + 2PL.REFL \rightarrow ‘come’

In (5) and (6) the endings \(-s\) and \(-d\) disappear when personal reflexive affixes are added to the verb.

Another phenomenon mentioned by Enrique-Arias as an argument supporting the analysis of these elements as clitics is attested in non-
standard dialects: the verbal person affix that marks subject agreement—or encodes the referent of the subject—occasionally appears separated from the verb by what is traditionally considered a clitic (It has to be noted that in these dialects, there is no distinction between second and third person plural).

\[(7) \quad sient-e-se-n\]
\[
\text{sit-IMP-REFL-2PL} \\
\text{‘sit down’}
\]

This further supports the contention that, in Spanish, the elements considered clitics should be analyzed as affixes. This is moreover in keeping with a criterion put forward by Zwicky & Pullum (1983: 504) to distinguish both categories according to which “[c]litics can attach to material already containing clitics, but affixes cannot”.

3. TS hypothesis

The most widely accepted explanation for the origin of agreement from pronouns is that proposed by Givón (1976), according to which the TS construction is the context that allows the pronominal element to be reanalyzed as an agreement affix. Givón maintains that agreement has its origin in the TS construction, a device for re-introducing into the discourse an entity that has not been referred to in the immediately preceding context, as illustrated in the following example:

\[(8) \quad \text{Context: Once there was a wizard. He was very wise, rich, and was married to a beautiful witch. They had two sons. The first was tall and brooding, he spent his days in the forest hunting snails, and his mother was afraid of him. The second was short and vivacious, a bit crazy but always game.}\]
AP [anaphoric pronominalization]: ?He lived in Africa.

TS [topic-shift]: \textit{Now the wizard}, he lived in Africa (Givón 1976: 153)

In such a context, if the speaker goes on to mention \textit{the wizard} again, given that several referring expressions that might serve as antecedent to an anaphoric element have occurred in the interim, anaphoric pronominalization becomes too weak a resource, and the speaker must resort to a stronger referring mechanism, i.e. the TS construction. In this construction, the topic is coded by a NP which is detached from the core clause by a pause, and, within the clause, the topic is referred to again by an anaphoric pronoun.

However, the TS construction in fact seems to be too strong as a referring expression in contexts such as that illustrated by (9):

(9) “Context: Once there was a wizard.

AP: He lived in Africa.

TS: ?\textit{Now the wizard}, he lived in Africa” (Givón 1976: 153).

In (9), the anaphoric pronoun \textit{He} is sufficient for the act of reference to be successful. Yet, according to Givón (1976: 153-156), under certain conditions —he mentions the “heavy communicative stress” of Pidgins and Creoles—, the TS pattern may be over-used, appearing in contexts such as (9), where, in principle, it would not be likely to appear. If this is the case, the TS construction may be interpreted as unmarked by speakers: the topic-referring NP is no longer seen as an extra--clausal constituent and is reanalysed as an argument of the predicate, so the erstwhile anaphoric pronoun is reinterpreted as an agreement marker.

Following Givón (1976), the TS theory has been used to account for the origin and extent of object agreement in several languages. Some well-

As for Spanish, Silva-Corvalán (1984) presents a study based on historical and contemporary data that she claims “support Givón’s (1976) proposal that grammatical agreement arises from topic-verb agreement” (Silva-Corvalán 1984: 556; emphasis original). The author relates the use and diffusion of object agreement (or clitic doubling) to the “degree of topicality of the object noun phrase” (Silva-Corvalán 1984: 555), conceiving of topicality as a gradual and compositional property made up of features such as animacy and definiteness, and also of formal features such as preverbal order, which Silva-Corvalán identifies as “topic position” (Silva-Corvalán 1984: 555).

One problematic point in Silva-Corvalán’s account, and in the literature dealing with object topicalization in Spanish, is that two partially different structures are lumped together as ‘topicalized objects’, ‘objects in topic position’, etc. The former is made up by a detached noun phrase, without prepositions marking its functional or semantic relation with the verb, and a clause; the latter is a clause with a fronted object marked as such and non-detached. The former resembles the TS construction as described by Givón the most. In practice, however, preverbal, definite, and human objects, such as A María in (10), are equated with detached referential expressions such as Los mancebos de la çibdat in (11), which are seldom found in the texts, as noted by Riiho (1988), in spite of their differences.7

7 “El objeto dativo repetido lleva normalmente la preposición a, como marca de su función. En algunos casos, sin embargo, aparece al principio de la oración, como una especie de tópico general, que se comenta luego, y sin presentar ninguna señal externa de su papel.” (Riiho 1988:39; emphasis added).

“the repeated dative object usually takes the preposition a as an index of its function. In certain cases, however, it appears at the beginning of the sentence, like a sort of general topic, which is then talked about and does not show any external marking of its role”.

---

Draft version

(10) A María le-dio un libro
   To María 3SG.DAT-give[PST.3SG] a book
   ‘To Mary gave (her) a book’ (Silva-Corvalán 1984: 555)

(11) Los mancebos de la cibdat, tanto
    The boys from the city so.much
    les=plaze de la beldat
    3PL.DAT=please[PRES.3SG] of the beauty
    ‘As for the boys of the city, they are very pleased with beauty’
    (Egipciaca 172; cited in Riiho 1988: 40)

The principal problem of Silva-Corvalán's study in connection with the TS hypothesis is that it does not deal with the TS construction as a motivation for the origin of object agreement, but with formal manifestations of topicality and their relation with object agreement. Thus, though her data seem to confirm that preverbal position, animacy, and definiteness of the objects are relevant factors in accounting for the extent of the object agreement, her analysis does not offer new insights into the relation of object agreement and the construction discussed.

4. Shortcomings of TS hypothesis

In spite of some positive evidence, accounting for the origin of object agreement in Spanish by means of the TS hypothesis poses certain problems and leaves several questions unsolved.

Some studies suggest that there is a relation between constructions that seem to fit Givón’s description of the TS construction and the presence of an anaphoric element retrieving the reference of a topicalized NP:
There is […] some evidence which would indicate that, when a strongly stressed object or indirect object precedes the verb, it is followed by a pause, after which a new breath-group follows an unstressed personal pronoun then becomes necessary in order to link the isolated object with the main clause (Keniston 1937: 83-84)

It appears, however, that in Old Spanish the unstressed pronoun alluded to here by Keniston was in fact used to refer anaphorically or cataphorically to any constituent detached from the clause, regardless of the topicality of that constituent. That is why Riiho (1988) finds that the most frequent context for the doubling of postverbal direct objects in his corpus is one in which a subordinate clause is detached from the main clause:

El caso típico de la duplicación de un objeto directo pospuesto al verbo lo constituye el uso del pronombre neutro para anticipar cualquier clase de frase subordinada, después de un adverbio, (p. ej. bien, ya mucho, assí), una locución adverbiaf fija (p. ej. por tu boca, con uuestro conseio, en buen ora), un complemento circunstancial o una conjunción. (Riiho 1988: 35)

[The typical case of doubling of a postverbal object concerns the use of the neuter pronoun to anticipate any kind of subordinated clause after an adverb (e. g. bien, ya mucho, assí), a fixed adverbial phrase (e. g. por tu boca, con uuestro conseio, en buen ora), an adjunct or a conjunction]

(12) Ca todos  lo=saben  que
    For all.M.PL 3SG.M.ACC=know[PRES]3PL  that
In view of this, one might think that this is a case of right dislocation and that the construction could have served as the source construction for the agreement of post-verbal objects. However, the construction mentioned by Riiho above does not seem very productive in contemporary Spanish. Moreover, in the corpus used by Riiho, this construction was only attested with direct objects (cf. Riiho 1988: 136), but in many dialects of contemporary Spanish direct-object agreement is restricted to pre-verbal distribution, and in dialects with post-verbal DO agreement, it is associated with definite and highly animated objects, not with clausal ones. All this suggests that this type of construction with postverbal doubled objects has had little influence in the contemporary pattern of object agreement in Spanish.

Another argument that can be adduced in favour of the TS hypothesis as explanation for the rise of object agreement in Spanish is the fact that fronted or topicalized objects usually trigger object agreement (as noted in Silva-Corvalán 1984; Riiho 1988: 45; Company 2006: 540). However, the topicalized object construction occurs too infrequently in the language to be considered as the source of Spanish object agreement. Givón himself maintains that there must be an “over-use” of the TS construction in order to reanalyze this construction as a basic one and to interpret the topic as an argument agreeing with the verb instead of a topicalized element retrieved by an anaphoric pronoun. But such an “over-use” has never been attested in Spanish (cf. table 1 below).

Finally, the TS hypothesis cannot account for the unequal spread of agreement across the different types of objects in Spanish: in Present-day Spanish, the agreement among Indirect Objects (henceforth IO) reaches
percentages of more than a 90% in some genres irrespective of their distribution, while, among Direct Objects (henceforth DO), it takes place almost only with preverbal objects (with the exception of Argentinian Spanish). In turn, with stressed personal pronouns functioning as objects, verbal agreement is obligatory.

5. A new approach to discourse data

5.1. A note on previous literature

Most of the previous research on object agreement in Spanish has focused on full-fledged objects (with a comparison to without clitic agreement) and has disregarded the occurrences of object clitics on their own in the analyses. As far as we know, in the body of literature on clitic doubling only two pieces of research have based their analyses on the various types of object expressions found in the selected discourse samples, i.e., non-clitic (NP and stressed pronoun), non-clitic+clitic (NP/stressed pronoun + clitic), and clitic in isolation. These are Weissenrieder (1995) and Dufter & Stark (2008). Although the aim of these papers, the selection of data and the conclusions drawn are different from each other, and are also different from ours, Weissenrieder’s and Dufter & Stark’s proposals are worth a short reference/review here, for the sake of comparison with the data and the analysis that will put forward in the next sections.

First of all, it should be pointed out that both articles focus on very restricted sets of constructions. Weissenrieder limits her research to 3rd person indirect objects, whereas Dufter & Stark analyze just the expression of “the indirect objects of a small set of highly frequent verbs” (Dufter & Stark 2008: 114), which are *dar* ‘give’, *decir* ‘say, *parecer* ‘seem’, *gustar*, *Argentinian Spanish has developed the agreement with animate (and even inanimate) and definite postposed DO, and indeed with specific and given inanimate DO. For a recent functional analysis based on Buenos Aires’ conversational data, see Belloro (2007).
encantar ‘please’. Dufter & Stark’s paper has a contrastive and diachronic bias, so they also provide data from Italian and they take a closer look at the historical evolution of “preverbal pronominal indirect object doubling” in Spanish (Dufter & Stark 2008: 120). As for our proposal, every occurrence of both direct and indirect objects in the sample has been accounted for (see section 5.2, below).

The size and characteristics of the samples used in the two papers is also fairly reduced when compared to ours, since Weissenrieder relies on a sole novel from the Argentinian writer Manuel Puig, and Dufter & Stark base their analysis on a sample of contemporary spoken Spanish of approximately 300,000 words, and also on some very selective searches in the Corpus del español of Mark Davies.

Both papers give us new insights into the phenomenon of object agreement, but also both leave some problems unsolved. Weissenrieder summarizes the main lines of research taken in the past, points out the shortcomings of analyses limited to the sentence level, and argues for adopting a discourse perspective. Her proposal relates verbal agreement to the topical character of the discourse entities encoded as subject, indirect object and direct object, though only empirical data on the indirect object are given in the article. The main drawback of this view lies in the elusiveness of the notion of ‘topicality’, which Weissenrieder relates to such heterogeneous properties as the NP characteristics (animacy and definiteness), the syntactic function (S>IO>DO) and also the “form” of the constituent (“noun phrase” vs. “pronominal phrase” vs. “agreement particle”).

As for Dufter & Stark’s (2008) paper, it provides us with some interesting suggestions based on corpus data, for instance, the existence of a correlation between clitic doubling and lexically-driven thematic roles (e.g., experiencer of parecer, gustar, encantar). Nevertheless, their analysis presents a serious shortcoming, since it is based on an peculiar interpretation
of what “clitic doubling” is. In the view of Dufter & Stark, in constructions like *a mí non me pesa* ‘It does not grieve me’ (c. 1140, *Cantar de Mio Cid*; quoted in Dufter & Stark 2008: 117), the element considered as “doubled” is the clitic *me*. As a consequence of this analysis, they calculate “the percentage of clitic-doubled *a mí* (or *a mi*) among all occurrences of *me*” (Dufter & Stark 2008: 121-122; see also Table 6 p. 121). And as the proportion of this doubling does not grow over time, they conclude that there are no arguments to see the effects of a grammaticalization process in this construction. Nevertheless, the usual view of the clitic doubling as grammaticalization is just the opposite, as this view is based on the gradual increasing over time of agreeing clitics when a stressed nominal or pronominal object is present in the clause. In other words, whereas the usual path of grammaticalization of the object agreement is

(13)  *A mí plaze*  >  *A mí me=plaze*  
To me please[PRES.3SG]  >  To me 1SG.DAT=please[PRES.3SG]  
‘It pleases to me’  ‘It pleases to me’

(14)  *Die-ro-n el libro a María*  
Give-PST-3PL the book to María  
‘they gave the book to Mary’  
>  *Le-die-ro-n el libro a María*  
>  3SG-DAT-give-PST-3PL the book to María  
‘they gave the book to Mary’;

in Dufter & Stark's analysis, however, the grammaticalization is supposed to follow a very different course:

(15)  *Me=plaze*  >  *A mí me=plaze*  
1SG.DAT=please[PRES.3SG]  >  To me 1SG.DAT=please[PRES.3SG]
‘It pleases to me’  ‘It pleases to me’

Adopting such a view on the phenomenon of clitic doubling, quantitative historical data cannot give any evidence of change along centuries. Dufter & Stark (2008: 121) do not notice that the “unexpected” results arise from a unsound approach to the data. Starting from erroneous premises, they finally come to an inadequate conclusion:

Therefore, it does not appear justified to consider spoken varieties of Spanish or Italian to be further advanced towards the grammaticalization of object clitics into agreement markers. With respect to linguistic factors influencing the likelihood of double indirect pronouns, the evolution of Spanish does not provide evidence for any change at all. In particular, we failed to find a marked increase in clitic-doubling for the most frequent type of pronominal indirect objects (Dufter & Stark 2008: 127)

5.2. The data

The sample we use here contains roughly 1,936,000 words. It comprises texts ranging from the 12th to the 17th century. It is at the beginning of 17th century that the grammaticalization process by means of which pronominal clitics became affixes is more or less consolidated (cf. Rini 1991: 282; Enrique-Arias 2003). In addition, we have added data extracted from

---

9 It would be as expecting a grow of the use of subject (stressed) pronouns yo ‘I’ and tú ‘you’ as a proof of the grammatical character of the subject agreement, when it goes without discussion that subject agreement is fully grammaticalized in Spanish no matter a subject pronoun appears or not in particular clauses.

10 “Given the claim that indirect object clitic-doubling has been undergoing a process of grammaticalization in Modern Spanish, one might expect the proportion of clitic-doubled a mí to grow over time. However, the data from the Corpus del español show precisely the opposite development” (Dufter and Stark 2008: 121)

11 A complete relation of the texts for 13th-17th centuries is provided in appendix 1.
corpora of Present-day Spanish in order to get a more complete perspective of this process.  

The non-contemporary texts are all prose with one exception (Cantar de mio Cid) and the majority of them are narratives. There are two instances of doctrinal prose (Corbacho and Las Moradas), two are dialogues, after the Latin comoedia humanistica (La Celestina and La Dorotea), and there is an instance of legal texts (Andalusian documents). The contemporary ones include the texts of the ARTHUS corpus (made up of newspapers, literary prose and transcriptions of oral productions) and three spontaneous conversations from Briz and Val.Es.Co (2002).

We have analysed direct and indirect objects and divided them into three different categories:

i. We use the label clitic for unstressed personal forms like me, te, se, lo, le, etc. For the sake of economy and ease of comparison, in table 1 below, we apply this term to those forms even in periods when they should be considered verbal affixes.

ii. Under the term non-clitic we group all those objects encoded by forms other than those described in i. and without doubling or verbal agreement. This group encompasses a wide range of units: relative pronouns, stressed pronouns, bare nouns, noun phrases, complement clauses and relative clauses.

iii. The third category comprises those objects encoded by a clitic/affix plus a non-clitic unit.

---

12 Although in the case pronominal objects the conditions of agreement are practically the same in the present and in the 17th century (agreement is obligatory here), in other contexts there have been changes: for instance, the agreement of indirect objects has undergone an increase, so much so that in contemporary Spanish conversation indirect objects without verbal agreement are virtually non-existent.

13 The label ‘non-clitic’ is not entirely accurate, since some unstressed units like the relative pronoun que are covered by it.
For centuries 13th and 14th we had access to a database made previous to this study by researchers of the Spanish Department of the University of Santiago de Compostela. This part of the sample comprises ca. 345,000 tokens. From the 15th century onwards, we have collected data from excerpts of three different texts per century, each excerpt made up of ca. 10,000 tokens (i.e. 30,000 tokens per century).

The Present-day data include 1,470,046 words in total, of which 21,041 tokens correspond to conversation and 1,449,005 tokens are from ARTHUS, a heterogeneous corpus made up of texts published between 1980 and 1991. Syntactic and semantic features for each clause in ARTHUS (158,954 in total) are recorded in a complex database (BDS/ADESSE).

Table 1 summarizes the analysis of the whole sample, providing an overview of the encoding of the objects across centuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IO</th>
<th>DO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clitic</td>
<td>Non-clitic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th cent.</td>
<td>1044 (72.1%)</td>
<td>336 (23.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th cent.</td>
<td>1738 (75.9%)</td>
<td>519 (22.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th cent.</td>
<td>302 (64.5%)</td>
<td>154 (32.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th cent.</td>
<td>579 (82%)</td>
<td>112 (15.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th cent.</td>
<td>466 (75.4%)</td>
<td>106 (15.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th cent.</td>
<td>BDS 9727 (78.6%)</td>
<td>1085 (8.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conv.</td>
<td>361 (88.5%)</td>
<td>2 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Object encoding across centuries

For further information, the reader is referred to [http://www.bds.usc.es/](http://www.bds.usc.es/) and [http://adesse.uvigo.es/](http://adesse.uvigo.es/).
These results are quite consistent across centuries and genres: indirect objects overwhelmingly tend to be encoded by clitics/affixes, while direct objects are their mirror image in this respect. They are mostly encoded by means of a non-clitic unit. Finally, the doubled/agreeing objects, which include all the exemplars of TS construction, but not only, are consistently a minority of cases.

5.3. The analysis

Some earlier studies (Poston 1953, Fish 1968, Barrenechea & Orecchia 1970, Silva-Corvalán 1984 or García-Miguel & Vázquez Rozas 1994, among others) have supported their findings with discourse data. Yet the way in which data in such studies have been used is, to our mind, a skewed one: only the contrast between non-doubled and doubled NP objects is addressed and a considerable set of objects is neglected, that is, those encoded by means of a clitic or object affix alone. In contrast, if we consider the whole range of possible encodings, this overview can shed considerably more light on the issue in question and can also serve to avoid the shortcomings of the TS hypothesis.

Figures 1 and 2 present the data displayed in table 1 regarding the encoding of direct and indirect objects in Spanish:

![Figure 1: Coding devices for IO across time](image-url)
From the first texts of the sample, it can be seen that objects are encoded according to patterns that are recurrent over time and across the different genres represented in our sample.

In the first place, and as already pointed out with respect to the TS hypothesis, doubled objects are a marginal object encoding, although in contemporary Spanish a considerable increase of agreeing IO’s is attested. Secondly, there is a clear split between IO and DO what concerns preferred categories: IO’s exhibit a tendency to be encoded by clitics alone, whereas DO’s tend to be encoded by more complex constituents. In addition, the data suggest a strong correlation between an object which is encoded frequently by means of a clitic/affix and developing agreement. Thus, in Present-day Spanish, the agreement of non-clitic IO’s oscillates between 59% of the cases in a multi-genre corpus and 95,7% in conversation, while DO’s agreement is quite restricted in most of its dialects.

What is the meaning of the different linguistic encodings an object can receive and why do these encodings seem to follow a pattern that can be verified across different periods and discourse genres?

With regard to the first question, it is generally agreed upon in the literature that a relation exists between the accessibility that a referent has
for speakers and the linguistic encoding that this referent requires (cf. Givón 1983, 1992; Ariel 1990): broadly, the more accessible a referent is, the less semantic and phonic content is required for its linguistic expression. This relation has been empirically tested in the cited works.

In the light of this, we can draw the conclusion that objects encoded by means of a clitic are highly accessible to the hearer, since a clitic has a minimum semantic content (person and, not always, gender and number features) and quite a weak phonic structure (clitics are unstressed monosyllabic units). The following examples illustrate this point.

(16) [...] pero muchas veces acontece que los que tenían méritamente granjeada y alcanzada gran fama por sus escritos, en dándolos a la estampa la perdieron del todo [...] (Quijote, 2nd part, ch. 3)
‘but many times it happens that those who have conquered and merited fame by means of their writings, they lost it completely by having them printed’

(17) pero la Santa Escritura, que no puede faltar un átomo en la verdad, nos muestra que los hubo [gigantes], contándonos la historia de aquel filisteazo de Golías (Quijote, 2nd part, ch. 1)
‘but the Holy Scriptures, which cannot lie, show us that there were some [giants], telling us the story of Goliath, that big philistine’

In (16), the object affix los ‘them’ refers to a highly accessible entity, since it has been mentioned in the previous clause (the NP sus escritos ‘their writings’). By contrast, the NP la estampa ‘the printing’ encodes a referent that has not been mentioned before, hence its more complex encoding. In (17), we again have a noun phrase encoding a newly introduced referent (la historia de aquel filisteazo de Golías ‘the story of Goliath, that big philistine’), while the first person affix (-nos ‘us’) is used
to encode the speech act participants (SAP; here writer and reader). In this case, it is the fact of being prominent elements of the communicative situation that licenses a high accessibility encoding. The examples differ, however, in the syntactic function each form is associated with: in (16) the clitic is the DO and the NP the IO, whereas example (17) illustrates the opposite situation.

Following this argument, and with the data presented above in mind, we can conclude that, in Spanish, IO’s in general are more accessible than DO’s, since the latter are encoded mostly by units which are semantically and phonically more elaborated than clitics —so that (16) above exemplifies an exceptional context, while (17) is the default case. This leads us to our second question, the existence of regular encoding patterns for different syntactic functions.

Du Bois (2003a, b) has put forward a hypothesis according to which O arguments are preferred loci for introducing referents which constitute new information or, in the terms we have been used up until now, whose accessibility is low, while A arguments exhibit more restrictions in this regard. The letters A and O refer to agent-like and patient-like arguments, respectively, which, in nominative languages, usually correspond to the subject and object of a transitive clause. This preference for the distribution of referents according to their accessibility has received the name of Preferred Argument Structure (PAS). There is an amount of work that has proved the cross-linguistic validity of the predictions made by Du Bois (see Du Bois, Kumpf and Ashby 2003 and references therein), that he himself extends to ditransitive clauses (cf. Du Bois 2003b: 42 and further).

In the case of Spanish a similar patterning of informational distribution can be proposed for IO’s and DO’s, the latter being preferred loci for low-accessibility referents.

---

15 There is a third category, S arguments, which stands for the arguments of intransitive predicates.
Examples (16) and (17) above illustrate two different sources of high accessibility: recency of mention and salience in the communicative situation. In the case of IO, these two contextual properties can be related to a pragmatico-semantic feature recurrently associated with this semantic function: its high animacy. Like A arguments, IO’s overwhelmingly tend to be highly animated and human, as the data in table 2, extracted from BDS show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animate</th>
<th>Inanimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object affix</td>
<td>9503 81,21%</td>
<td>224 27,76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object affix + NP</td>
<td>1404 12,15%</td>
<td>150 18,59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>652 5,64%</td>
<td>433 53,65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11559</td>
<td>807</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:** Frequencies and percentages of animate vs. inanimate IO’s (data BDS)

DO objects, on the other side, typically show lower animacy (table 3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Animate</th>
<th>Inanimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Object affix</td>
<td>8027 65,87%</td>
<td>5306 10,35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object affix + NP</td>
<td>429 3,52%</td>
<td>576 1,12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>3731 30,61%</td>
<td>45400 88,53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12187</td>
<td>51282</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3:** Frequencies and percentages of animate vs. inanimate DO’s (data BDS)

The ultimate reason behind the link between high animacy/humanness and IO’s can be found in the semantic roles encoded by this syntactic function (i.e. experiencer, recipient). DO’s, on the other hand,
semantically tend to be themes or patients, which favour an interpretation in which they are viewed as entities with a low degree of animacy. Since it is generally acknowledged that human discourse deals mostly with human referents (cf. Hawkinson & Hyman 1974; Givón 1983; Dahl and Fraurud 1996; Dahl 1997; 2000; 2008; Thompson & Hopper 2001: 53), i.e. its topics are frequently human referents, it is plausible that in Spanish, the syntactic function IO encodes highly continuous or prominent topics, by virtue of its association with human and highly animated referents.16

Thus, a parallel can be drawn between the semantic and pragmatic properties related to each syntactic function and the differences in agreement advancement: figure 3 illustrates the advancement of agreement with IO across centuries, whereas figure 4 illustrates how agreement with DO is similarly restricted in Old Spanish and in 20th century.

![Figure 3: Advancement of IO agreement across centuries](image)

---

16 Likewise, the tables above suggest a strong association between minimal linguistic encodings (affixes) and a high degree of animacy.
So far, we have dealt with the differences between IO’s and DO’s in terms of their respective agreement patterns are concerned. However, stressed personal pronouns exhibit peculiar patterns irrespective of being IO’s or DO’s. When an independent personal pronoun occurs as an object (a mí, a ti, a ella, and so on) it always agrees with the verb. This state of affairs has remained the same since around the end of 16th century. It is plausible to assume that when speakers make use of person markers (clitics/affixes or independent/stressed personal pronouns), the intended referent possesses a high degree of accessibility. Most of the times they would use simply an unstressed form (an affix in Present-day Spanish; a clitic before the grammaticalization of these units into affixes was completed). Only under certain circumstances (e. g., in order to convey a contrastive meaning), would they employ independent/stressed personal pronouns.\(^\text{17}\) But these circumstances arise sporadically, hence the data in Table 4, showing that

\(^{17}\) That is the pragmatic function that Rini (1991) attributes to the use of a stressed personal pronoun.
SAP’s are encoded by an affix at a proportion of approximately nine to one:\(^{18}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Affix</th>
<th>Affix + pers. pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>6749 (91.7%)</td>
<td>559 (8.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>3505 (95%)</td>
<td>173 (5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Frequencies and percentages of syntactic encoding of 1st and 2nd pers. SG. objects (data from BDS)

The situation depicted in this table is easily projectable on preceding stages of Spanish and very similar to that of indirect objects: highly accessible referents are preferably encoded by attenuated forms.

The frequent clitic encoding seems to have been crucial for the development of agreement both in IO’s and in independent/stressed pronominal objects. As for the latter, from the first Spanish texts, stressed personal pronouns doubled by clitics are attested. Melis & Flores (2005), studying the diachrony of agreement in IO’s, point out that, until the 17\(^{th}\) century, clitic doubling seems to be favoured by objects occurring in preverbal position. From then on agreement is associated with the object being a personal pronoun, irrespective of its distribution.

6. Discussion

The data we have discussed so far show that the types of objects that, because of their high accessibility, exhibit a tendency (diachronically and synchronically) to be encoded by a clitic or an affix, are those that have developed agreement.

\(^{18}\) Speech Act Participants, that is, speakers and hearers, which are almost only encoding by means of 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) person forms (clitics, affixes or pronouns).
The different object agreement types in contemporary Spanish can be regarded as a case of fixation of highly frequent patterns. Clitics were the preferred form to encode objects in contexts where their referents were highly accessible. In such contexts, they have undergone a morphologization process through which they have become verbal affixes. This evolution was favoured because of the scant phonetic substance of clitics (related also to the high accessibility of their referents) and the fact that they must attach to other words. That they have become fixed as verbal morphemes suggests that the verb+clitic combination was more frequent than other possible ones. In fact, other combinations attested in earlier stages of Spanish have disappeared.

On the other hand, at a certain point of the language’s history the complementary distribution of clitics and full-fledged objects was lost. But this process is relatively independent of the morphologization of clitics into affixes; while the co-occurrence of clitics and full object phrases is attested in the earliest documents of Spanish, clitics do not exhibit the features that classify them as verbal affixes at least until the 17th century (cf. Rini 1990).

The non-complementary distribution between stressed pronouns and clitics before the latter had reached morpheme status could lead again to the vexed question of whether the doubled object construction was a redundant one before the 17th century. Probably there was no such redundancy, since clitics and stressed pronouns fulfilled different informative functions. The following contemporary examples may perhaps serve to illustrate this point.

(18) [...] digo no no/ yo/ lo-pag-o yo que / la dueña soy yo [...] 
I 3M.SG.ACC-pay[PRES]-1SG I

‘I say: “no, no. I pay it myself because I am the owner”’

(VALESCO: S.65.A.1; 493)
These constructions are not felt to be ungrammatical, either by grammarians or speakers of the language (Fernández Soriano 1999: 1237 and further). An account of these constructions according to the principles of generative grammar would describe the postverbal pronouns here as emphatic and non-argumental. Leaving aside the question of the (non-) argumental status of these pronouns, the occurrence of two constituents marked for the same syntactic function in the same clause does not constitute a problem, as they have two different values, topic and focus, which indeed provides a functional basis for doubling. In any case, speakers usually manage to combine the topical, informative, semantic and syntactic values within the same constituent, and therefore structures with two co-referential full-fledged constituents performing the same syntactic function are not very frequent.

Doubling of syntactic constituents is in fact possible under certain constraints. Presumably, informative requirements played a role in the co-occurrence of clitics and stressed pronouns (Academia 1973 and Rini 1991, among others, have noticed the contrastive character of doubled pronominal objects), but other kinds of contexts call for the presence of a stressed object as well. Rini (1991) points out that in Old Spanish this doubling used to happen in environments where objects were either modified or part of a coordinated construction. As clitics cannot be coordinated or be modified, a stressed, full-fledged constituent was needed.

In addition to this, there is reason to think that clitics and syntactic constituents were not felt by speakers to be elements filling the same

---

19 Only the fragments in bold of (18) and in italics of (19) are glossed.
syntactic slot, even before clitics had fulfilled their morphologization path. From the initial stages of Spanish, stressed pronouns and some clitics were already split into two different series –*me* vs. *a mí*, *te* vs. *a ti*, etc.–, so that the phonological differences between the two did not consist simply of a stress contrast. Moreover, clitics and other object constituents did not have the same syntactic freedom (e.g. clitics could not constitute utterances on their own, they could not be modified, they could not be coordinated, etc.), and the factors that affected the distribution of clitics and other objects were different (the distribution of clitics depended on features such as the polarity of the clause, the presence of indefinites and so on). Hence, a paradigmatic relation between clitics and full-fledged objects was not felt, which facilitate their co-occurrence in the same clause. Both of these facts, the morphologization of clitics and the loss of complementary distribution with syntactic objects, have contributed to a reanalysis of the doubled object construction as an agreement relation.

The hypothesis presented here avoids the problem of the lack of a documented over-use of the TS construction, and also solves a question that would otherwise remain unanswered, viz. that of the unequal spread of agreement across different types of objects. This is the result of the automatization of different encoding patterns related to different properties of object referents.

The fact that an over-use of the TS construction cannot be attested is hardly surprising: the scant use of TS constructions is a consequence of its discourse function. TS is defined by Givón as a conversational device to re-introduce an inactive topic. TS is hence related to a kind of discontinuity in discourse, but discourse topics, usually human, remain continuous over long stretches and are referred to by grammatical markers such as agreement and clitics, associated with their high accessibility. The TS hypothesis, though, is based on a syntactic pattern hardly found in texts.
Furthermore, the evidence in favour of the relation between topicality and object agreement can also serve as support for the hypothesis suggested here. High topicality has much to do with high accessibility. It has been noted that discourse is mostly about human referents: these are more continuous, hence more topical, and, at the same time, more easily accessible to speakers.

7. Conclusion

The object agreement patterns of contemporary Spanish can be viewed as the result of a morphologization process due to the recurrence of certain constructions associated with certain referential properties of their arguments. Clitics have been reanalyzed as verbal affixes as a result of their scant phonetic substance and their frequent attachment to verbs with highly accessible objects. At the same time, and to a certain extent independently of the fixation of clitics into affixes, the complementary distribution between affixes/clitics and phrasal or clausal objects disappeared.

This view has some advantages over the most widely accepted hypothesis explaining the emergence of agreement, i.e. the TS hypothesis. Whereas the TS hypothesis may provide a good account for the occurrence of clitics in clauses with topicalized arguments, since it postulates an overuse in order to reanalyze clitics as agreement affixes, it fails to explain the morphologization of clitics in Spanish, because in Spanish such an over-use has never been attested. According to the alternative hypothesis proposed here, the frequent recurrence of the complex clitic+verb is enough for the reanalysis to take place. This is supported by the fact that those objects which, due to their semantic and informational properties, tend to be encoded overwhelmingly by clitics, are those that tend to develop agreement. Furthermore, our hypothesis explains why, in Spanish, object agreement is restricted to certain types of objects.
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Appendix 2: Complete references of the sources of contemporary examples

From the Archivo de Textos Hispánicos de la Universidad de Santiago de Compostela (Arthus):
2VOZ: La Voz de Galicia (22/11/1991)

Conversational discourse: