Cinzia Campanini & Florian Schäfer (Universität Stuttgart)

Optional *Se*-Constructions in Romance: Syntactic Encoding of Conceptual Information

(i) In 'Optional SE Constructions' (**OSCs**) found in Italian (1a), French (1b) and Spanish, a transitive verb is optionally enriched with a reflexive dative clitic. We argue that OSCs recur to a low applicative phrase to explicitly express information that is otherwise left implicit at the level of the verb's lexical-conceptual structure.

(ii) Morpho-syntactic properties of OSCs: The optional clitic must agree in φ-features with the subject (2a-b) and cannot be replaced by a disjoint clitic or a full DP (3a-b). This property makes OSCs similar to inherently reflexive verbs. Furthermore, the reflexive clitic in OSCs triggers *be*-auxiliary selection and participle agreement with the subject (4a-b). The latter two properties set OSCs on a par with cases of semantic binding between the subject and a Θ-marked direct or indirect object clitic, e.g. (5a-b).

(iii) The class of verbs entering is restricted to ingestive/consumption verbs (Arce 1989, Nishida 1994, Zagona 1996), described in the typological literature as encoding "the semantic feature of taking something into the body or mind (literally or figuratively)" (Masica 1976, Næss 2007): predicates of physical consumption (*eat*, *drink,* etc., cf. (1-2)), and "psychological consumption verbs" (Zagona 1996, cf. *read*, *watch*; 4b). Furthermore, some activity verbs taking cognate objects enter OSCs (6a-b). All the above verbs are Non-Core Transitive Verbs (Levin 1999), i.e. their objects can easily be left out (7). In OCSs, however, the very same verbs obey a strict object restriction (8). Core Transitive Verbs like *break* or *open* never enter OSCs, though they can combine with 'affected dative' clitics (cf. Cuervo 2003). Stative verbs (*know, hate*) and achievements (*recognize*) are also excluded from OSCs. Spanish *saber* ('know') enters OSCs iff it is re-interpreted as a dynamic event (Zagona 1996). Some unaccusatives seem to enter OSCs, but we will show this is a different phenomenon.

(iv) The interpretation of OSCs: Inserting the reflexive clitic does not change the truth-conditions of the clause (Nishida 1994, Boneh & Nash 2009); therefore, OSCs differ from prototypical (high or low) applicatives. Several authors have argued that the insertion of the reflexive has an aspectual effect in that it shifts the event type expressed by the verb from an activity to a delimited situation or culminating/telic transition (Nishida 1994, Zagona 1996, De Miguel & Lagunilla 2000). Finally, some authors report a pragmatic flavour in OSCs concerning the subject's attitude towards the event (volitional involvement or affectedness (D'Introno et al. 2007), or "enjoyment and easy-goingness" (Boneh & Nash 2009)).

(v) Analysis: We avoid stipulating a (further) reflexive element in Romance peculiar to OSCs, as has been assumed in earlier approaches which analyze the *se/si* under discussion as a verbal head (Folli & Harley 2005) or an aspectual/telic operator (Zagona 1996, De Miguel & Lagunilla 2000). Similarly, a high applicative analysis (Boneh & Nash 2009) has to stipulate inherent reflexivity, the verb class and transitivity restriction. Instead, we treat the reflexive clitic as an ordinary anaphor bound by the subject; this relates the agreement between the subject and the reflexive (2), *be*-selection and participle agreement (4b) to other, unequivocal cases of anaphoric clitic binding in Romance. Specifically, we propose that OSCs have the bi-eventive structure in (9b) which is built from (9a) by addition of a low applicative phrase. (9a), without a reflexive, denotes an activity, but (9b) is a bi-eventive accomplishment in which the reflexive clitic is introduced in the specifier of a low applicative, i.e. a headthat relates an entity to another entity and expresses a possessive HAVE-relation between the two (Pylkkänen 2002, Cuervo 2003, Beck & Johnson 2004). Thus, (9b) has roughly the interpretation in (9c); we propose to interpret the possessive relation as one of *inalienable* possession (part-whole relation). The structure in (9b) relates the verb-class restriction to inherent reflexivity in the following way. Recall that consumption verbs are at the heart of OSCs; Nishida (1994) characterizes them as "incorporative verbs which have the general meaning 'taking something into oneself'". This "incorporative" semantics is part of the very concept of consumption verbs and does not need to be structurally encoded (cf. (9a)). In (9b), however, this meaning aspect is structurally encoded by a low applicative. In any case, it is a conceptual necessity of consumption events that the agent and the possessor/incorporator are identical; if we choose to express the possessor overtly, this must be bound to the agent. Such a necessity never arises with non-consumption verbs. Under a high applicative analysis of OSCs, it would not even arise with consumption verbs, as the individual affected by a consumption event is not necessarily the same as the agent of the event. Since the applicative in (9b) overtly expresses information that is already part of the concept denoted by the verb in (9a), we predict no difference in the truth-conditions between (9a) and (9b); but overtly expressing implicit information can lead to the pragmatic effects reported for OSCs (cf. (iv)). The addition of the low applicative shifts a mono-eventive to a bi-eventive structure. This explains the aspectual effect noted for OSCs (shift to a culminating/telic transition). Finally, the structure in (9b) explains the object restriction on OSCs; only if the theme-DP of the verb is realized can a low applicative enter the structure. Further syntactic data support the claim that OSCs involve low applicatives, e.g. embedding below French *faire*-causatives: while high applicatives are excluded (10a), OSCs (10b) and clear low applicatives (10c) are licensed (pace Boneh & Nash 2009). We suggest that the complement of *faire* is too small to host high applicatives.

(vi) Expanding possession: The possessive relation in (9b) is interpreted as 'incorporation', i.e. *inalienable possession* with literal consumption verbs. For psychological consumption verbs (4b), we propose that the agent incorporates a *mental representation* (*John watches REFL the movie -> By watching, John causes himself to have (a mental representation of) the movie*). For examples like (6a-b) we extend our concept of possession. If "*someone runs REFL a marathon*", (s)he *has* the marathon on his/her personal list of athletic achievements.

Cinzia Campanini & Florian Schäfer (Universität Stuttgart)

(1) a. *Gianni (si)   mangia una mela.*　　　　b. *Jean (se)   fume   une cigarette.*
　　　 John (REFL) eats   an apple   (Italian)　　 John (REFL) smokes a cigarette   (French)

(2) a. *Lui$_i$ (si$_i$)   beve una birra.*　　　b. *Tu$_i$ (ti$_i$)   bevi una birra.*
　　　 He REFL.DAT drinks a beer   (Italian)　　 You (you(rself). DAT) drink a beer   (Italian)

(3) a. **Lisa gli   mangia una mela.*　　　　b. **Lisa mangia una mela a suo papà.*
　　　 Lisa him.DAT eats   an apple　　　　　　 Lisa eats   an apple to her dad.DAT

(4) a. *Lisa **ha** guardat**o**   un film.*　　 b. *Lisa si   è guardat**a**   un film.*
　　　 Lisa has watched. MAS.SG. a movie　　　 Lisa REFL is watched.FEM.SG. a movie

(5) a. *Lisa gli   **ha** dat**o** un consiglio.*　　 b. *Lisa si   è dat**a**   un consiglio.*
　　　 Lisa him.DAT has given an advice　　　　　 Lisa REFL.DAT is given.FEM.SG. an advice
　　　 'Lisa has given him advice'　　　　　　　 'Lisa has given advice to herself'   (Italian)

(6) a. *(Lui) si   è ballato un tango*　　　　 b. *Il s'   est couru un marathon.*
　　　 He   REFL is danced a tango . (Italian)　 He REFL is run   a marathon   (French)

 (7) a. *Gianni mangia (una mela).*　　　　　 b. *Gianni ha ballato (un tango).*
　　　 John   eats   (an apple)　　　　　　 John   has danced (a tango)

(8) a. *Gianni si   mangia *(una mela).*　　　 b. *Gianni si   è ballato *(un tango).*
　　　 John   REFL eats   (an apple)　　　　 John   REFL is danced (a tango)   (Italian)

(9) a. [$_{VoiceP}$ John *Voice* [$_{VP}$ eats the apple]]

　　 b. [$_{VoiceP}$ John$_i$ *Voice* [$_{VP}$ eats [$_{ApplP}$ REFL$_i$ *Appl* the apple]]]

　　 c. John$_i$ causes, by eating, that he$_i$ (inalienably) possesses/has the apple.

(10) a. **Elle a   fait   [me/**se**$_i$ peindre la porte à **Paul**$_i$].*   ('She made Paul paint the
　　　　 She has made me/REFL paint   the door to Paul   door for me/himself')

　　 b. *Elle a   fait   [**se**$_i$ fumer un cigare **à Paul**$_i$].*
　　　　 She has made REFL smoke a cigar   to Paul   ('She made Paul smoke a cigar')

　　 c. *Elle a   fait   [me donner un cadeau à Paul].*
　　　　 She has made me give   a present to Paul   ('She made Paul give a present to me')

References

Arce, M. (1989). *Semantic structure and syntactic function: the case of Spanish SE*. Unpublished PhD dissertation. University of Colorado, Boudler.

Beck, S. and Johnson, K. (2004). 'Double Objects Again'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35(1): 97-124.

Boneh, N. & Nash, L. (2009). 'A higher applicative: evidence from French'. *Proceedings of IATL 25*.

Cuervo, C. (2003). *Datives at Large*. PhD Dissertation. MIT

De Miguel, E. & Lagunilla Fernández, M. (2000). 'El operador aspectual *se*'. *Revista Española de Lingüística* .

D'Introno, F., González, V. and Rivas, J. (2007). 'Aspectos sintácticos y semánticos del pronombre *se*'. *Boletín de Lingüística* XIX-28.

Folli, R. & Harley, H. (2005). 'Flavours of v: Consuming Results in Italian and English'. *Aspectual Enquiries*, Kempchinsky, P. and Slabakova, R. (eds.), pp. 95-120. Dordrecht:Springer.

Levin, B. (1999). 'Objecthood: An Event Structure Perspective'. *Proceedings of CLS 35, volume 1: The Main Session,* Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, pp. 223-247.

Masica, C. P. (1976). *Defining a Linguistic Area: South Asia*. Chicago University Press.

Næss, A. (2007). *Prototypical Transitivity*. John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam.

Nishida, C. (1994). 'The Spanish reflexive clitic *se* as an aspectual class marker'. *Linguistics 32, 3*. 425-458.

Pylkkänen, L. (2002). *Introducing Arguments.* PhD Dissertation. MIT.

Zagona, K. (1996). 'Compositionality of Aspect: Evidence from Spanish Aspectual *Se*'. In *Aspects of Romance Linguistics: Selected Papers from the Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages XXIV,* 475-488. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.