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1. Introduction

It is well known that in many Romance languages, the accusative and dative reflexive and reciprocal clitic pronouns have the same form. This is illustrated in (1) and (2) by Spanish reflexive and reciprocal se respectively.

(1) a. Juan se mandó un regalo.  
   Juan se$_{DAT}$ sent a gift  
   “Juan sent himself a gift.”

b. Juan se vio en el espejo.  
   Juan se$_{ACC}$ saw in the mirror  
   “Juan saw himself in the mirror.”

(2) a. Juan y María se mandaron un regalo (el uno al otro)  
   Juan and María se$_{DAT}$ sent a gift (the one to the other)  
   “Juan and María sent each other a gift.”

b. Juan y María se vieron en el espejo.  
   Juan and Mary se$_{ACC}$ saw in the mirror  
   “Juan saw himself in the mirror.”

If both dative and accusative have the same form, one can raise the following question: Why is se in (1a) and (2a) taken to be dative. There appear to be essentially three reasons: one morphological, one interpretational and one theoretical. First, when the non-reflexive/reciprocal argument corresponding to se arises, it is overtly dative, as illustrated in (3).

(3) Juan le mandó un regalo.  
   Juan le$_{DAT}$ sent a gift  
   “Juan sent him/her a gift.”

Second, se in (1a) and (2a) is interpreted in the same way as the overtly dative forms in (3). Thus, se in (1a) and (2a) are interpreted as goals, just like le in (3a).

Third, since Chomsky (1981) it has been assumed that only one abstract Nominative or Accusative case can be assigned, and once assigned to an argument, no others can receive it. Now, we know that un regalo “a gift” in (1a) receives accusative, since its corresponding pronominal clitic is lo, as illustrated in (4a) and it becomes subject in passive, as illustrated in (4b). Since, another argument already receives accusative, se must receive some other case: dative.

(4) a. Juan se lo mandó a sí mismo.  
   Juan se$_{DAT}$ it$_{ACC}$ sent to self same  
   “Juan sent it to himself.”

b. El regalo fue mandado  
   The gift was sent  
   “The gift was sent.”

Given these considerations, it is not unreasonable to treat se in (1a) and (2a) (henceforth I(ndirect) O(bject) se) as a dative argument receiving dative case. If we draw this conclusion,
however, we are faced immediately with a challenge, as noted by Kayne (1975): while IOse is ungrammatical in passive, illustrated in (5), dative le is not, illustrated in (6). 1

(5) a. El profesor (*se) ha sido presentado (a sí mismo). The professor IOse has been presented (to self same)
“The professor was introduced to himself.”

b. Juan y María (*se) han sido presentados (el uno al otro).
Juan and María IOse have been presented (the one to the other)
“Juan and María have been introduced to each other”.

(6) a. El profesor le ha sido presentado (a María)
The professor leDAT has been presented (to Mary)
“The professor has been introduced to María.”

b. Juan y María le han sido presentados (a Julia).
Juan and María leDAT have been presented (to Julia)
“Juan and María have been introduced to Julia.”

This contrast raises a problem for the conclusion that IOse is dative, since, as we see in (6), overly dative arguments are perfectly grammatical.

The main goal of this paper is to offer an explanation of the ungrammaticality of IOse in passive in Spanish. The main claim is that IOse is accusative, not dative. And thus, the reason it cannot appear in passive is because accusative is not available in passive.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we briefly review previous accounts of the ungrammaticality of IOse in the passive. We will see, as pointed out by Dobrovie-Sorin (2006), how each of these previous accounts all face at least one important empirical challenge: Romanian IOse can occur in the passive. As we will see, moreover, Romanian does show an overt morphological distinction between dative and accusative reflexive and reciprocals. In section 3, I argue that a certain dialect of Spanish laísta show indirect object accusative overtly. In section 4, I offer a technical analysis of indirect object accusative. I claim that Multiple Agree (see Ura, Hiraiwa among others) with little v can account for the facts. We will see that a Multiple Agree account makes interesting (non-)intervention predictions between IOse and other (dative) clitics. Section 5, recaps and discusses one potential extension of this approach.

2. Previous Accounts

Before discussing previous accounts directly, note that as Burzio (1986) observed, IOse is not only ungrammatical in the passive, but also in raising verbs/copulas and unaccusatives, illustrated in (7) and (8) below.

---

1 Not all datives are grammatical. As Demonte (1995:12) observes, when the dative corresponds to benefactive or interest datives, passivation is not good. She notes *La casa le fue pintada a Juan anteayer “The house was painted for Juan the day before yesterday.” and *La mancha le fue frotada a la camisa. “The stain was scrubbed out of the shirt.” It appears that the dative is fine when an argument of the verb.

2 A felicitous context here might be one where the professor has a clone that he meets for the first time.
There are three properties of these classes of predicates: 1. There is no external argument; 2. The subject is derived, giving rise to chain; and 3. There is no accusative case available. As we will see, previous accounts have targeted the first two of these properties. In this paper, I explore the consequences of the third property.

2.1 Previous accounts and an empirical challenge

Kayne (1975), Burzio (1986), and Pesetsky (1995) claim that the presence of IOse is licensed by an external argument. Rizzi (1986) claims that IOse intervenes between the raised subject and its empty category, thus giving rise to a chain formation problem.

As Dobrovie-Sorin (2006:132) points out, each of these accounts faces one serious empirical problem: Romanian IOse can appear in passive and with copula verbs.

3 Note that with an adjective like fiel, the patterns are different: i. Su mujer le es fiel (a Juan). “John’s wife is faithful to him.” ii. Juan y su mujer se son fieles. “John and his wife are faithful to each other.” iii. Juan se es fiel a sí mismo. “John is faithful to himself.” It is not clear why there should be this difference in behavior.

4 There are several unaccusative verbs that can take se: irse “go”, volverse “return”, bajarse “go down”, subirse “go up”, caerse “fall” etc. One possibility is that these ses are comparable to so-called inchoative se, which appears when no external argument is present and the internal argument becomes subject: Juan rompió la radio. “Juan broke the radio.” La radio se rompió. “The radio broke.” An alternative is that these unaccusatives can still assign accusative case, and, we do in fact have IOse here.

5 Glosses from Dobrovie-Sorin with the change to “IOse” by J.E.MacDonald.
An important difference between Romanian and Spanish, French and Itlian, is that it (morphologically) differentiates dative reflexive/reciprocal clitics from accusative reflexive/reciprocal clitics. Accusative se is illustrated in (9a) (from Dumitrescu 1990:424) and dative îşi is illustrated in (9b) (from Dobrovie-Sorin 2006:130).

(9) a.  S-a întristat la față. b. Ion ș-a trimis cărți postale
    DOse-has saddened the face    John IOse-has sent    postcards
    “His/Her face became sad.”    “John sent himself postcards.”/7

Romanian reflexive and reciprocals are dative and they are fine in passives. In Spanish overt datives—le—are also possible in passives.8 I will assume, then, that Spanish IOse is accusative, and not dative. This would explain its inability to appear in passive, since no accusative is available in passive.

3. Laïsta dialects illustrate overt IO accusative

In Laïsta dialects of northwest Spain, indirect object clitics that are animate and feminine surface with a form that is homophonous with feminine direct object clitics (Gutierrez Ordóñez 1999, Romero to appear, Fernandez Ordóñez 1994, 1999) as illustrated in (10a).

(10)a.  La escribió un poema a Inés.  [Gutierrez Ordóñez 1999:1870]
    IOla wrote a poem to Inés
    “S/he wrote Inés a poem.”

b.  El regalo le/*la fue enviado.
    The gift  IOle/*IOla was sent
    “The gift was sent to her.”

As observed by Gutierrez Ordóñez (1999:1870), IOla cannot appear in passive. Tellingly, IOla is overt accusative morphology, suggesting that IOla is in fact accusative. In fact, Romero (to appear) argues explicitly that IOla is accusative, noting that IOla cannot appear with unaccusatives (11) either or replace datives in copular constructions (12).9

6 Dumitrescu (1990) only supplies a translation is Spanish: Se ha entristecido en la cara, literally “Self has saddened in the face”. Glosses and translation by J.E.MacDonald.
7 Translation is J.E.MacDonald
8 Note also Slovenian, like many other Slavic languages, has dative si and accusative se. Observe: dative IOse can appear in passive.
9 Data in (11) to (12) from Romero (to appear). Glosses changed slightly for coherency with the other glosses in the paper and translations added by author.
(11a) La carta le/*la llegó tarde  b. La piedra le/*la cayó encima
the letter IOle/I0la arrived late  the stone IOle/I0la fell on
“The letter arrived to her late.”  “The stone fell on her.”

c. La pregunta le/*la resultó extrana
the question IOle/I0la resulted strange
“The question sounded strange to her.”

(12a) Le/*la es fácil resolver esos problemas  b. Le/*la parecía estúpido
IOHer/I0la is easy solve those problems  IOHer/I0la seemed stupid
“It is easy for her to solve those problems.”  “He looked stupid to her.”

Based on these daya, I conclude that IOla is accusative, as is IOse. Moreover, I would like to suggest that so-called (transitive) aspectual se, examples of which are illustrated in (13), is also accusative.

(13a) Juan se bebió la cerveza.  b. Pablo se leyó el libro.
Juan IOse asp drank the beer  Pablo IOse asp read the book
“Juan drank up the beer.”  “Pablo read the book.”

As illustrated in (14), as expected, aspectual se is ungrammatical in the passive.

(14a) La cerveza (*se) fue bebida  b. El libro (*se) fue leído.
the beer IOse asp was drunk  The book IOse asp was read
“The beer was drunk up.”  “The book was read.”

Although there could be a semantic issue in the passive,\(^\text{10}\) which very well could explain the ungrammaticality in (14), I would still like to suggest that aspectual se is also accusative. See Appendix 3 and footnote 10.

The final question to address here is how does IOse get accusative, if there is already an direct object that receives accusative. Case checking, as in Chomsky (1981), would rule out an account of these facts, in as much as checking takes place under government, and only one NP can be governed by the same case checking head. Thus, only one abstract Case can be assigned to one nominal. I address this question in the next section.

4. A Multiple Agree Account

4.1 Multiple Agree: One probe, multiple goals

\(^{10}\) It is possible that the problem with these passives is a semantic one, since the derived subject would bind se, and what the interpretation would be is not clear. Note, nevertheless, the contrast with the passive-se: La cerveza se bebió. “The beer was drunk.” Here se arguably does not contribute any semantics; it just absorbs accusative and agent-theta role. What this entails is that aspectual se does contribute some semantics, some of which I discuss below. In Romanian, parallel cases are also out: *Și-a mâncat mărul. “IOse has eaten apple.” While this could rule out the passives above, it does not inform us about the intervention effects discussed below.
Hiraiwa (2001,2005) (see also Anagnostopoulou 2005; Boeckx 2008; Chomsky 2004; Nevins 2007 a.o.) proposes a theory of Multiple Agree couched within a probe-goal theory of Chomsky (2000, 2001), whereby a single head can probe two distinct goals. With respect to goals, the operation Agree is not inherently constrained. It is constrained, however, by the Phase Impenetrability Condition (PIC) which limits it to Phases. Additionally, a Probe can only see Matching features (types, not values) and value active goals. Finally, Hiraiwa (2001:71) also proposes the following (derivational) constraint on intervention:

\[ (15) \quad \text{The Defective Intervention Constraint (DIC) (derivationally revised):} \]
A syntactic operation AGREE must obey a strict locality condition. AGREE \((\alpha, \gamma)\) is prohibited if there is a closer matching goal that is already inactive at the point of the derivation where the probe is merged; thus the DIC is restricted to a case where a probe for \(\gamma\) and a probe for intervening \(\beta\) are derivationally distinct.

In essence, since Agree takes place simultaneously\(^{11}\) a goal has to already be inactive (i.e. have no unvalued features) at the point in the derivation where the probe is merged. I assume that IO\(se\) is accusative due to a multiple Agree relation with \(v\).

Moreover, I assume the following structures for aspectual \(se\) in (16a) (from MacDonald 2004, 2006)\(^{12}\) and double object constructions (DOC) in (16b) (following Cuervo 2003).

\[ (16)a. \quad \ldots vP \]
\[ \quad v \]
\[ \quad VP \]
\[ \quad V' \]
\[ \quad DP \]
\[ \quad una cerveza \]
\[ \quad V \]
\[ \quad PP \]
\[ \quad V \]
\[ \quad se_{Asp} \]

\[ (16)b. \quad \ldots vP \]
\[ \quad v \]
\[ \quad VP \]
\[ \quad V \]
\[ \quad LApplP \]
\[ \quad DP \]
\[ \quad a si mismo \]
\[ \quad LAppl \]
\[ \quad IOse \]
\[ \quad DP \]
\[ \quad una carta \]

Assuming these structures and the DIC, we can generate predictions about potential interveners. As illustrated in (17), \(XP_1\) is structurally higher than \(v\) and therefore should not intervene, because it is not c-command by \(v\). Additionally, \(XP_2\) which is embedded within a DP

\(^{11}\) Principle of simultaneity: Apply operations simultaneously in parallel at probe level (Hiraiwa 2005: 38).

\(^{12}\) An alternative account is a high applicative à la Cuervo (i.e. what she calls an affected experiencer, used differently in Bosse et al. to appear) where these two clitics compete for the same applicative head. For a concrete instantiation see Armstrong (2011:232-233 and references therein). There are three immediate complications for such an approach. 1. Benefactives and aspectual \(se\) pattern differently in several ways, one relating to the inability of benefactive clitics to induce a telic interpretation, another being \(se\)’s inability to double which is not the case for benefactives. 2. We cannot capture the requirement that a direct object is obligatorily present with aspectual \(se\) (nor is it clear how the on/with interpretation arises). 3. This class of approach relies on telicity being the factor that imposes a restriction on non-bare nouns. Yet, aspectual \(se\) does not always give rise to a telic predicate, although the non-bare noun restriction holds; moreover, it is not clear that the non-bare noun restriction results directly from telicity anyway. See Appendix 2 for more details.
should also not intervene, since it would not c-command IOse. XP2 is the only XP that meets the structural conditions of the DIC, and should count as an intervener.

Non-interveners

In the next section, I test these predictions, taking ethical datives, or Bosse et al.’s (to appear) affect experiencers, as an instance of XP1, high applicatives à la Pylkkänen (2008) as an instance of XP2, and DP internal alienable possessors as an instance of XP3.

4.2 Non-intervention: ethical datives

As illustrated in (18), the presence of an ethical datives does not give rise to an ungrammatical sentence, whether with aspectual se (18a) or with a DOC (18b).

(18)a. Mi hijo se me bebió una botella de tequila.
   My son IOse me\text{\textsubscript{Ethical}} drank a bottle of tequila
   “My son drank a bottle of tequila on me.”

b. El editor se me leyó el poema en publico.
   The editor IOse me\text{\textsubscript{Ethical}} read the poem in public
   “The editor read the poem on me in public.”

Bosse et al. (to appear) call these elements affected experiencers. And note that they can appear either below \(v\) or above \(v\). One indication that they are above \(v\) is that the source of experience can be the subject. In Spanish, the subject can be the source of the experience, as indicated by an example of ethical dative in a statement typical of a parent in (19).

(19)Mi hijo no me come.
   My son no me\text{\textsubscript{Ethical}} eats
   “My son doesn’t eat on me.”

Consequently, I conclude that ethical datives are above \(v\) and are simply too high to intervene.
4.3 Intervention: High Applicative à la Pylkkänen

In Pylkkänen (2008:13), the position below v but above the lexical verb (or root) corresponds to a high applicative (HAppl). A high applied argument bears a relation with the event itself, and can be interpreted as *benefiting from the event by not doing it him/herself*. Observe in (20) that this interpretation is available in Spanish.

(20a) Yo te bebo la cerveza.13
I youHAppl drink the beer
“I will drink the beer for you.”

(20b) Yo te leo el poema.
I youHAppl read the poem
“I will read the poem for you.”

c. Yo te envío el regalo a María.14
I youHAppl send the gift to María
“I will send the gift to María for you (i.e. instead of you).”

d. Juan te escribió una carta de recomendación.
Juan youHAppl write a letter of recommendation
“Juan wrote a letter of recommendation for you (i.e. instead of you).”

Crucially, this high applicative interpretation is not available with aspectual se (21) or with IOse in the DOC (22).

(21a) Pedro se (*te) bebió la/mi cerveza.15
Pedro IOse youHAppl drank the/my beer
“Pedro drank up the/my beer for you (i.e. instead of you).”

(21b) Juan se (*te) leyó el/mi poema.
Juan IOse youHAppl read the/my poem
“Juan read the/my poem for you (i.e. instead of you).”

---

13 Note that it is not exactly clear, why, assuming that the HAppl merges higher than VP the complement of which is the direct object, HAppl does not block v from valuing accusative on the direct object in simple transitives (as well as ditransitive). This question arises under Agree, multiple or not. One possibility is that HAppl is not so high and is actually lower than the direct object, yet still takes the VP as a complement.

14 Low applicative benefactives (i.e. intended recipients) are out with the DOC because it is impossible to apply an applicative to a subject (Cuervo 2003) or there is a semantic issue (Pylkkänen 2008).

15 An alternative explanation for the ungrammaticality of (21) and (22) is that they violate the P(erson) C(asem) C(onstraint), whereby the combination of 2ndIO and 3rdIO here is no good, due to their both entering into verbal agreement (Ormazabal & Romero 2007), possibly checking a (person or animacy) feature on v (Anagnostopoulou 2005). Bonet (1991:197) has shown that benefactives are subject to the PCC, just like indirect objects. Thus, if Agree with v by two elements underlies the PCC constraint, then we would have to conclude that both Agree with v, and thus there could be a PCC violation here, since we know that reflexives are not exempt from PCC constraints (Anagnostopoulou 2005, Kayne 1975, Bonet 1991). The crucial test case is the following, which for some speakers is grammatical: (i) *Te me presentas* “You present yourself to me.”, indicative of the weak version of PCC (see Bonet 1991), where a 2ndDO reflexive and 1stIO avoids a PCC violation. So, if the examples in (23) are out due to the PCC, we would expect that a sentence like (ii) *Te me bebiste su cerveza*. “You drank up his beer for me.” should be grammatical for those speakers that allow (i). The speakers who allow (i) find (ii) ungrammatical, suggesting the PCC alone cannot account for (23).
(22)a. Pablo se (*te) envió un regalo de cumpleaños (a sí mismo).
      Pablo IOse youAppl sent a gift of birthday (to self same)
      “Pablo sent himself a birthday gift for you (i.e. instead of you).”

b. Juan se (*te) escribió una carta de recomendación (a sí mismo).
      Juan IOse youAppl wrote a letter of recommendation (to self same)
      “Juan wrote himself a letter of recommendation for you (i.e. instead of you).”

Given the unavailability of the high applicative with these IOse, I conclude that there is an intervention effect here.

4.3 Non-intervention: DP internal alienable possessors

Observe that while an alienable possessor interpretation is available with aspectual se, illustrated in (23), it is not available with IOse in the DOC, illustrated in (24).

(23)a. Juan se te bebió la/*mi cerveza.
      Juan IOse youAPOS drank the/my beer
      “Juan drank up your beer.”

b. María se te leyó el/*mi poema.
      María IOse youAPOS read the/my beer
      “María read your poem.”

(24) Juan (*se) te envió el regalo de cumpleaños.16
      Juan IOse youAPOS sent the gift of birthday
      “Juan sent (himself) your birthday present.”

I take the contrast between the construction with aspectual se and the DOC to arise from their different underlying structures. With respect to aspectual se, I assume that the null P that introduces se forms a complex predicate with the verb and together assign a compositional theta-role to the direct object. This contrasts starkly with the applicative account of the DOC. On that account, the direct object is not semantically related to the verb (Cuervo 2003; Pylkkänen 2008:14). The lack of theta-relation with the verb is the source of the contrasts with respect to the alienable possessors.17 Essentially, a constituent must be theta-marked for the possessor to move out.

One might claims that something similar is arguably happening with small clauses, which also do not allow dative alienable possessor extraction.18

(25)a. Considero [muy interesante ese cuento de Borjes].19

16 This is not a semantic issue since a DP internal alienable possessor is perfectly felicitous in this context in DOC:
   (i) Juan se envió tu regalo de cumpleaños (a sí mismo).
      “John sent himself your birthday gift.”

17 This appeals to GB formulation of islands (see Chomsky’s L-marking), which is no longer a viable technical solution since it relies on government. Nevertheless, being theta-marked by the verb appears to be the source of the contrast.

18 Although Pylkkänen (2008:45) provides the following example: La profesora le consideró la respuesta válida.
   “The professor considered his/her answer valid.” It is not clear to me that this is a case of alienable possession.

19 With respect to complements of perception verbs, such as ver “see” or oír “hear”, the patterns are not as clear: (i) Juan oyó una canción de Paco de Lucía. “Juan heard a song of Paco de Lucía.” (ii) Juan le oyó una canción. “John heard his song”. Additionally, wh-movement gives mixed results: Grammatical with aspectual se (e.g. ¿De quién te
Consider very interesting that story of Borjes
“I consider Borjes’s story very interesting.”

b. *Le; considero [muy interesante ese cuento ti].
   IOAPOS consider very interesting that story
   “I consider his story very interesting.”

These facts arguably follow if alienable possessors move from DP internal positions (see, for instance, Landau 1999, and Alexiadou et al. 2007 for references). Consider evidence that these alienable possessors are derived DP internally. In (26a) le can be interpreted as a possessor or an agent/creator. In (26b) the same interpretations are available for the DP internal possessor su.

(26)a. Le compré un libro.
IOhim bought a book
“I bought a book.”

b. Compré su libro.
bought his book
“I bought his book.”

In contrast, when both le and su are present, as in (27a), le can only be interpreted as possessor and su as agent/creator. Likewise, when the agent/creator is expressed explicitly DP internally, as in (27b), le can only be interpreted as a possessor.

(27)a. Le compré su libro.
IOhim bought his book
“I bought his book.”

b. Le compré el libro de Borjes.
IOhim bought the book of Borjes

These interpretive effects are often thought to be due to a hierarchical difference between possessors and agents/creators, where possessors are structural higher than agent/creators (Alexiadou et al. 2007, Ticio 2005). I also follow Alexiadou et al. (2007) and Ticio (2005) in assuming that DP internal possessors must pass through a DP internal left-peripheral position to escape the DP. I claim that le can only be interpreted as possessor in the presence of su, because as a possessor, it is higher than any other DP internal phrase and can freely move out. In contrast, it su is a possessor, and le is an agent/creator, since the agent/creator is structurally lower than the possessor, the possessor will block movement of le. Thus, in the presence of both le and su, as in (27a), le will be interpreted as possessor, if su is interpreted as agent/creator.

We find similar patterns with wh-movement as well. So observe in (28a) that de quién can be interpreted as asking about the possessor of the book or the agent/creator. Yet, in the presence of su, as in (28b), de quién can only be interpreted as possessor.

(28)a. ¿De quién compraste [el libro <de quién> ]?
of who bought the book <of who>

bebiste una cerveza?; Ungrammatical with DOC (e.g. *¿De quién te enviaste un regalo (a ti mismo); Grammatical with Small Clause ¿De quién consideras interesante ese cuento?). This is not entirely expected, since clitic movement appears not to be allowed from adjuncts, as illustrated by data from Bosque & Gutiérrez-Rexach (2008):

(iii) a. Acabaron eligiendo a José.
   Acabaron eligiéndole.
b. Le acabaron eligiendo.
   *¿A quién acabaron eligiendo?

(iv) a. Sonreían mirando a José.
   Sonreían mirándole.
b. Le sonreían mirando.
   *¿A quien sonreían mirando?

See Ticio (2005) for argument extraction facts that support a DP internal analysis of possessors.

20
“Whose book did you buy?”

b. ¿De quién compraste [su libro <de quién> ]?
   of who bought his book <of who>

Thus, I assume that dative clitic alienable possessors in Spanish are generated DP internally and move to a clitic position outside the DP. They are available with aspecual se because the direct object is theta-marked by the verb (and null P). Since, the alienable possessor moves from a position within the DP to a clitic position, which is higher than v, it never c-commands aspectual se, so it does not intervene. In contrast, dative clitic alienable possessors in the DOC construction are ungrammatical because they move from within a DP that is not theta-marked by the verb.

Conclusion

1. The claim: IOse, laísta IOla and aspecual se are accusative due to Multiple Agree with v.
2. The consequence: IOse, laísta IOla and aspecual se cannot appear in passive.
3. (Non-)intervention: i. Ethical datives do not intervene. 
   ii. High Applicative benefactives intervene.
   iii. Alienable possessors do not intervene.

One assumption of this approach is that these dative clitic alienable possessors receive dative case DP internally (Szabolcsi 1983; cf. Landau 1999), since they are not stopping off in any projection to receive case outside of the DP, before moving to the clitic position. If it is the case that alienable possessors are dative, and as claimed here, IOse is accusative, then we might be able to explain the following contrasts in Spanish in which only inalienable possession allows reflexives, alienable possession does not (see Gutierrez Ordóñez 1999:1900), illustrated in (29a) and (29b) respectively .

(29a) María se cortó el brazo. b. María (*se) destrozó el coche
“Mary cut her arm.” “María destroyed her car.”

Now contrast (29b) with (30). The overtly dative le can represent the alienable possessor in (30), while the IOse in (29b) cannot.

(30) María le destrozó el coche.
“María destroyed his/her car.”

Observe moreover, in Laísta dialects of Spanish, IOla can only be interpreted as an inalienable possessor, as illustrated in (31a), but not an alienable possessor, as illustrated in (31b).

21 Data also consistent with this approach are dative possessors of a subject: El ordenador no me funciona “My computer doesn’t work.” (Based on data from Vann 1994:495). If a dative needed to move to XP in (25) for dative case, these examples should be ungrammatical in Spanish, since the external argument is merged above XP.
(31)a. **La cortaron el brazo.**
    Her cut the arm
    “They cut her arm.”

b. * **María tenía varios coches a la venta y yo la compré el coche gris.**
    María had several cars to the sale and I *la* bought the car grey
    “Maria had several cars for sale and I bought her grey car.”

If alienable possessors are dative, we can explain these facts, under the assumption that Spanish IO*se* and Laísta IO*la* are accusative. Moreover, this explanation extends to Romanian, a language with overtly dative reflexives. Observe, as expected under this story, that Romanin IO*se* can be interpreted as an alienable possessor.

(45)a. **Și-a trădat patria.**
    *se*-has betray homeland
    “S/he has betrayed his homeland.”

b. **Ion ș-a sărutat nevasta**
    Ion *se*-has kissed wife
    “Ion has kissed his wife.”

Crucially, these facts fall out if IO*se* and IO*la* are accusative.
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