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ABSTRACT

The unaccusativity hypothesis (Burzio 1986; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995; Perlmutter 1978) posits that intransitive verbs may be divided into two broad classes: unaccusatives, whose sole argument is an internal argument and unergatives, whose sole argument is an external argument. In this dissertation I explore the idea that there is a similar, though less obvious, division among different types of transitive verbs using Spanish as the primary object language. The idea that transitivity is not a uniform phenomenon has been explored in many approaches to grammar (Cuervo 2003; Dixon & Aikenvald 2000; Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002; Hopper & Thompson 1980; Levin 1999; Marantz 1997, 2005). The main objective of this dissertation is to contribute in a meaningful way to the idea that there are different types of transitive verbs by (i) outlining a series of diagnostic tests in Spanish for separating certain types of transitive verbs into two broad classes that I label ‘class 1’ and ‘class 2’ and (ii) providing an analysis for why class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs have the properties that they do in this language. I limit the study principally to sets of verbs that have usually been characterized according to lexical semantic notions like ‘change of state’ (such as romper = break; my ‘class 1’) and ‘activity’ (such as leer = read; my ‘class 2’). It is argued that the simplest generalization that captures the properties of these verbs is one that mirrors, to a large extent, the unaccusative – unergative distinction: class 1 verbs require an internal argument and may optionally omit their external argument whereas class 2 verbs require an external argument and may optionally omit their internal argument. I present a
formal analysis of class 1 and class 2 verbs based on this generalization, claiming that it has positive consequences for understanding transitivity alternations, the interpretation and modification of participles and various uses of the reflexive (se) clitic paradigm in Spanish. Finally, I propose that class 1 verbs form a continuum that includes unaccusative verbs while class 2 verbs form a continuum that includes unergative verbs.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The unaccusativity hypothesis (Burzio 1986; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995; Perlmutter 1978; Rosen 1984, among many others) proposes that intransitive verbs be divided into two broad classes that are defined by a particular set of syntactic properties and lexical semantic characteristics that may vary from language to language. The idea that transitive verbs may also fall into classes based on clusters of syntactic properties and lexical semantic characteristics has also been explored in both generative and functional-typological approaches to grammar (Croft 1991; Cuervo 2003; Dixon & Aikenvald 2000; Hopper & Thompson 1980; Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002; Levin 1999; Marantz 1997, 2005; Mateu 2002; Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998; Ramchand 2008; Zubizarreta & Oh 2007, among others). In this introduction I discuss the relationship between the unaccusative – unergative distinction in intransitive verbs to a similar distinction that can made within the seemingly uniform notion of “the transitive verb” and then outline how this idea may be applied to Spanish.

Perhaps the most intriguing idea associated with the unaccusativity hypothesis is that it actually casts intransitivity in terms of the basic external – internal argument distinction that normally characterizes transitive relations: the single argument of an intransitive verb is either an underlying object (unaccusative) or an underlying subject (unergative). In section 1.1 I review some of the principal diagnostics that have been used to separate unaccusative from unergative verbs in Spanish. In the sections that follow 1.1, I discuss how the unaccusative – unergative distinction has been tied to different kinds of transitive relations in the literature. The main point of departure for the works discussed is that there are at least two types of transitive verbs that are
unique in that they may also be used as intransitives (= they are alternating verbs). One type of transitive verb has intransitive uses in which the sole argument is an internal argument (like unaccusatives) while the other has intransitive uses in which the sole argument is an external argument (like unergatives).

In section 1.2 I discuss two influential proposals (Chierchia 2004 and Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002) that claim that unaccusative and unergative verbs are actually derived from different types of transitive bases. One type of transitive base provides the input to an operation that eliminates the external argument, yielding unaccusatives (Chierchia 2004), while another type of transitive base provides the input to an operation that eliminates the internal argument, yielding unergatives (Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002). The point of the section is to introduce the concept of different types of transitivity in its most radical and abstract form. In sections 1.3 and 1.4, I review work on English and Yucatec Maya that provides further evidence for making the distinction between the two kinds of transitive bases that is discussed more abstractly in section 1.2. The point of these sections is to provide additional empirical support for the idea that there are at least two kinds of transitive relations that mirror to some extent the unaccusative–unergative distinction in intransitive verbs.

In section 1.5 I assess the various ways in which these two classes of transitive verbs have been characterized in the literature, highlighting the fact that relatively little is known about how to diagnose different types of transitivity and this generally has given rise to a particular way of capturing the differences between types of transitive verbs based on intuitive meaning paraphrases. The problem with using these paraphrases as the motivating source of the difference between distinct types of transitive verbs is that they are not formed upon any solid empirical
base for many languages, but taken for granted as the main reason why transitive verbs exhibit different types of syntactic and semantic behavior.

Finally in section 1.6, I outline the basic objectives of this dissertation, which are (i) to demonstrate what the empirical basis is for dividing transitive verbs into two classes in Spanish and (ii) to propose an analysis based on that empirical base for those two classes of Spanish transitive verbs. Within section 1.6, a brief description of the subsequent chapters of the dissertation is provided.

1.1 The Unaccusative – Unergative Distinction in Spanish

One of the most important findings of modern linguistic research is that intransitivity is not a uniform phenomenon. The fact that all intransitive verbs take one argument, or involve a single participant, actually belies a division between types of intransitive verbs that is manifested in both their formal syntactic properties and often in their lexical semantic characteristics. In a series of now classic works Burzio (1986), Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995), Perlmutter (1978) and Rosen (1984) argued, using a spectrum of data from many languages, that there are two broad classes of intransitive verbs: unaccusative and unergative verbs. Unaccusative verbs are generally characterized as taking a single argument that is an “internal argument”, the equivalent of an object of a transitive verb, whereas unergative verbs are generally characterized as taking a single argument that is an “external argument”, the equivalent of a subject of a transitive verb.

Perlmutter (1978) first offered the hypothesis in order to explain why only some intransitive verbs have impersonal passives in Dutch (unergatives). Work by Burzio (1986) and Rosen (1984) then offered a number of diagnostics for the proposed distinction from Italian,
mainly auxiliary selection (unaccusatives = *essere*; unergatives = *avere*) and *ne* cliticization (unaccusatives only). In their monumental work on unaccusativity, Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) added further diagnostics from English, citing the object restriction on resultative predicates as something that picks out unaccusative and transitive verbs while ‘unselected’ resultative complements (*one’s way* and the fake reflexive)

\[1\]

represent a phenomenon that isolates unergative verbs because they require the lack of an underlying object. These authors also cite the causative – inchoative alternation as a phenomenon that isolates unaccusative verbs to the exclusion of unergatives. In addition to the causative – inchoative alternation, other grammatical phenomena from English that have been cited as isolating unaccusative verbs to the exclusion of unergatives include locative inversion

\[2\] and *there*-insertion (Hale & Keyser 2002).

Along with these syntactic properties, there are many lexical semantic correlations across languages between verbs that behave syntactically as unaccusatives and those that behave as unergatives, which was first noted by Perlmutter (1978) in his original list of unaccusative and unergative verbs. Unaccusative verbs have been largely characterized as denoting “changes” of state, position or location that hold of their sole argument. These changes may be internally caused or externally caused (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995) but are largely thought to lack any

---

\[1\] Examples of these types of resultative complements are shown for the unergative verb *bark*.

(i) a. The dog barked *its way into the house.*
   b. The dog barked *itself tired.*

\[2\] See Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995, chapter 6) for a detailed discussion about what this diagnostic actually shows in English. It does not pick out just unaccusative verbs.
kind of agentivity. Unergative verbs, on the other hand, have been largely characterized as
denoting “activities” that are performed or “done” by an agent.\(^3^4\)

In order to exemplify the kind of diagnostics used to show the difference between
unaccusative and unergative verbs I will draw from Spanish (since it is the main object language
of this work). There have been many studies on Spanish that show that the difference between
unaccusative and unergative verbs is important to theoretical approaches to intransitivity, to
processing and to acquisition (Campos 1999; Bever & Sanz 1997; Mendikoetxea 1999a; Montrul
2004; Torrego 1989). There are two major tests used to show that the sole argument of an
unaccusative verb functions like the object of a transitive verb: (i) absolute participial clauses
(Campos 1999) and (ii) the licensing of bare plurals in post-verbal position (Torrego 1989). If we
start with the sentences in (1), it appears that the grammatical subjects in all three are the same
and we might expect them to pattern together with respect to any given grammatical
phenomenon that isolates subjects.

(1)     a. Los invitados llegaron.
         The guests arrived
         “The guests arrived”

         b. Los empleados trabajaron.
         The employees worked
         “The employees worked”

\(^3^\)There are many other variations on this broad distinction in terms of “change” versus “activity.” Some authors
characterize unaccusatives in terms of ‘result states’, linking them with the notion telicity while unergatives are
‘processes’ that are atelic (Dowty 1991; Van Valin 1990; see also Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Everaert 2004 for
a variety approaches and discussion of these facts). The distinction between ‘result’ and ‘manner’ has also been used
to characterize the difference between unaccusatives (result-denoting, scalar change) and unergatives (manner-
denoting, non-scalar change) (Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2010).

\(^4^\)More recent work on the unaccusative – unergative distinction has revealed a host of nuances that show that neither
the syntactic diagnostics nor the lexical semantic correlates apply uniformly to some types of intransitive verbs. That
is, many verb classes show mixed behavior, supporting the idea that there are subclasses of unaccusative and
unergative verbs (Kural 2002).
c. Los estudiantes entregaron las composiciones.
   The students turned in the compositions
   ‘The students turned the compositions in’

However, there are many tests that show that the subjects of the two intransitive verbs in (1a) and (1b) are different. The first indication of this is that only the subject of (1a) can be the argument of a participle that functions as the main predicate of an absolute clause.

(2)   a. Llegados los invitados, empezó la fiesta.
      Arrived the guests, began the party
      ‘Once the guests arrived, the party began’

      b. *Trabajados los empleados, el jefe se fue.
         Worked the employees, the boss left
         Intended: ‘Once the employees had finished working, the boss left’

In transitive constructions, only the object may be the argument of a participle that functions as the main predicate in an absolute clause, as we see in (3).

(3)   a. Una vez entregadas las composiciones, el semestre va a terminar.
      Once turned in the compositions, the semester will end
      ‘Once the compositions are turned in, the semester will end’

      b. *Entregados los estudiantes las composiciones, el semestre va a terminar.
         Turned in the students the compositions, the semester will end
         Intended: ‘Once the students were turned in the books, the semester will end’

This supports treating the sole argument of llegar like an object of a transitive verb and the sole argument of trabajar like a subject of a transitive verb. The second reason to believe that the
subjects of (1a) and (1b) are different is that the subject of llegar may appear as a bare plural in post-verbal position but the subject of trabajar may not.\(^5\)

(4) a. Llegan invitados (cuando hay una fiesta).
   ‘Guests arrive (whenever there is a party)’

   b. *Trabajan empleados (cuando hay buenos sueldos).
   ‘Employees work (whenever there are good salaries)’

Only the object of a transitive verb may appear as a bare plural in post-verbal position while subjects of transitive verbs may not. This is shown in (5), where the object of the transitive verb entregar (turn in) may be a bare plural in post-verbal position (= composiciones) but the subject may not (= estudiantes).

(5) a. Los estudiantes entregan composiciones (cuando llega el final del semestre)
   ‘Students turn in compositions (at the end of each semester)’

   b. *Entregan estudiantes las composiciones (cuando llega el final del semestre)
   ‘Students turn in compositions (at the end of each semester)’

---

\(^5\)Note that it is possible to have bare plural subjects if there is a locative phrase, contrastive focus or some other modifier on the subject (Bleam 2007; Masullo 1992; Suñer 1982; Torrego 1989).

(i) En esta mina trabajan niños.
   ‘Kids work in this mine’

(ii) Trabajan MUJERES (no hombres) en este sitio.
   ‘WOMEN (not men) work in this place’

In the cited works, the general intuition is that certain kinds of modification allow a bare plural to appear in the post-verbal position of an unergative verb, but that this modification is not necessary for licensing a bare plural subject when the verb is unaccusative. Whatever the correct explanation of this phenomenon is, it draws on the distinction between the two types of intransitive verbs that is currently under discussion.
This further supports treating los invitados (the guests) in (1a) as an underlying object while los empleados (the employees) in (1b) is generated in the same position in which subjects of transitive verbs appear. Other tests that have been offered as further support for the distinction include extraction and restrictions on impersonal SE (Cinque 1988; Campos 1999; Mendikoetxea 2002). It is only possible to extract out of the sole argument of unaccusative verbs like llegar (arrive) but not out of the sole argument of unergative verbs like trabajar (work), as noted in Campos (1999: 1567).

(6) a. Llegaron todos los jugadores del Madrid a la fiesta (pero los del Barça no)
    Arrived all the guests of Madrid to the party (but those of Barça didn’t)
    ‘All of the Madrid players arrived at the party, but Barcelona’s players didn’t’

    b. ¿[De qué equipo] i llegaron todos los jugadores ___i a la fiesta?
    Of what team arrived all the players to the party
    ‘Which team’s players all arrived at the party?’

(7) a. Trabajaron todos los jugadores del Barça en un evento de UNICEF pero los del Madrid no
    Worked all the players of Barça in an event of UNICEF (but those of Madrid didn’t)
    ‘All of Barcelona’s players worked at a UNICEF event, but Madrid’s players didn’t’

    b. *¿[De qué equipo] i trabajaron todos los jugadores ____ en un evento de UNICEF?
    Of what team worked all the players in an event of UNICEF
    Intended: ‘Which team’s players all worked at a UNICEF event?’

In transitive constructions, extraction is only possible out of the object of the verb and not the subject as shown in (8).

(8) a. Los estudiantes de literatura entregaron las composiciones sobre El Quijote.
    The students of literature turned-in the compositions about El Quijote
    ‘The literature students turned in the compositions about Don Quijote’

    b. ¿[Sobre qué libro] i entregaron los estudiantes de literatura las composiciones ____i?
    About what book turned-in the students of literature the compositions?
    ‘What book did the literature students turn in a composition about?’
c. *¿De qué asignatura entregaron los estudiantes __i las composiciones sobre *El Quijote? Of what subject turned-in the students the compositions about *El Quijote? Intended: *[What subject]i did the students majoring in ___i turn in compositions about *Don Quijote?

The data in (8) show that extraction is only possible out of objects, which are generated in complement position, but not out of subjects, which are generated in specifier position (Kayne 1984). If the sole argument of unaccusative verbs is a complement (an underlying object) while the sole argument of unergative verbs is in a specifier (an underlying subject), then the asymmetry in (6b) and (7b) can be straightforwardly accounted for. Finally, impersonal SE has also been noted to resist the past preterit tense for unaccusative verbs but not for unergative verbs as shown in (9) and (10) (Cinque 1988; Campos 1999; De Miguel 1992; Mendikoetxea 2002).

(9) a. Se llega temprano al aeropuerto actualmente. SE arrives early to the airport these days ‘One generally arrives early at the airport these days’

b. ??Se llegó temprano al aeropuerto ayer. SE arrived early to the airport yesterday Intended: ‘Somebody (some people) arrived early to the airport yesterday’

(10) a. Se trabaja duro todos los días (en esta oficina). SE work hard all the days (in this office) ‘One works hard everyday’

b. Se trabajó duro ayer (en esta oficina). SE worked hard yesterday (in this office) ‘Somebody (some people) worked hard yesterday’ (= Hard work was done yesterday)

Transitive verbs pattern exactly like unergatives in admitting both present habitual tense as well as past preterit tense with impersonal SE constructions as shown in (11).
(11) a. Se entrega la composición al final del semestre (en esta clase).
   SE turn-in the composition at the end of the semester
   ‘One turns in the composition at the end of the semester’

   b. Se entregó la composición ayer.
   SE turned-in the composition yesterday
   ‘One (someone) turned in the composition yesterday’

There is no agreed upon analysis for why unaccusative verbs do not allow impersonal SE sentences in the past preterit tense while unergative verbs do (see Mendikoetxea 2002 for discussion). The main generalization that has come out of this data is that there are two kinds of interpretations associated with ‘arbitrary’ or ‘indefinite’ subjects (Cinque 1988): generic interpretations (preferred if verb tense is associated with habitualness) and existential interpretations (preferred if verb tense is associated with temporal boundedness). The generalization is that if impersonal SE is linked to an internal argument position (an object), it may not license the existential interpretation associated with the indefinite subject, whereas if it is linked to an external argument position (a subject), it may license the existential interpretation. The generic interpretation of indefinite subjects appears as a default of sorts that is available for any argument position to which impersonal SE is linked.\(^6\)

While the majority of the syntactic tests used to demonstrate the difference between unaccusative and unergative verbs are designed to pick out internal over external arguments, there is also evidence from derivational morphology that the sole argument of unergative verbs

\(^6\)The semantic nuances of the impersonal SE construction are reviewed in detail by Mendikoetxea (2002). Another way we might explain the data is by harkening back to Perlmutter’s (1978) original observation regarding unaccusativity in Dutch: only unergatives allow impersonal passives. Campos (1989) has noted that there is an impersonal passive use of SE in Spanish. It could very well be that the in the past preterit tense, it is the impersonal passive reading that is forced on the structure (see the translation in (10b)), which is only compatible with unergative verbs. An impersonal passive analysis has been offered for similar constructions in Romanian by Dobrovie-Sorin (1998).
tends to be an agent while the sole argument of unaccusative verbs is not. The nominalizer –dor (and allomorphs) generally derives agents from verbs as does the present participle –nte.\(^7\)

Interestingly, virtually no unaccusative verb is capable of combining with either of these morphemes while most unergative verbs are. The following examples are from Campos (1999: 1567).

(12)  Unaccusative Verbs
   a. ir → *idor (intended: ‘goer’)
   b. morir → *moridor (intended: ‘dier’)
   c. llegar → *llegador (intended: ‘arriver’)

(13)  Unergative Verbs
   a. trabajar → trabajador (worker)
   b. correr → corredor (runner)
   c. gesticular → gesticulador (gesticulator)

(14)  Transitive Verbs
   a. pintar → pintor (painter)
   b. leer → lector (reader)
   c. escribir → escritor (writer)

\(^7\)I say generally here because it is well known that –dor (and allomorphs) actually derives three types of words from verbs in Spanish (Santiago Lacuesta & Bustos Gisbert 1999: 4533-4534) and many more in English (Lieber 2004: 17): (i) agents (most common), (ii) instruments and (iii) locations (least common)

(i)  Agent: escritor (writer)
     Instrument: lavadora (washer; washing machine)
     Location: comedora (dining room)

There are also some adjectival uses of –dor words, including salidor (= a person who goes out a lot) and sentador (= becoming, as in something that looks ‘becoming’ or ‘flattering’ on someone) that are derived from underlying unaccusative verbs. The point made by the authors who have cited –dor and –nte morphology as a diagnostic for unergatives (Bever & Sanz 1997; Campos 1999) is that it is a strong tendency for those particular morphemes to target unergative verbs when the result of attaching them to the verb stem is interpreted as an agent.
Bever & Sanz (1997: 75-76) note that the non-productive present participle morphology ending in \(-nte\), which can derive nouns or agent-oriented adjectives, cannot occur with unaccusative verbs but can occur with unergatives.

(15) Unaccusative Verbs⁸
    a. morir → *muriente (intended: ‘dying/dier’)
    b. llegar → *llegante (intended: ‘arriving/arriver’)

(16) Unergative Verbs
    a. cantar → cantante (singing/singer)
    b. hablar → hablante (speaker)

(17) Transitive Verbs
    a. estudiar → estudiante (student)
    b. oír → oyente (hearer)

This asymmetry is expected if the sole argument of unaccusative verbs is like the object of a transitive verb while the sole argument of an unergative is like the subject of a transitive verb. The reasoning behind this is that subjects are prototypical agents while objects are not.

In every language for which the unaccusative – unergative distinction has been studied, similar kinds of language-specific diagnostics have been developed in order to clearly show what the differences between the two verb classes are. Once these diagnostics are developed, we may start looking for what the lexical semantic correlates of the unaccusative – unergative distinction are in a given language. In Spanish, the verbs that can be arguments of absolute participles, license bare plurals in post-verbal position and resist agent nominalization are the same verbs that are usually classified as non-agentive “changes” of state, position or location whereas the

---

⁸Though these words do not appear in any dictionary, they may be accepted by some speakers with the meaning ‘those dying’ or ‘those arriving,’ which preserves the original present participle meaning.
verbs that exhibit the opposite pattern with respect to these three tests are the same verbs that are usually classified as agentive “activities.”

As mentioned throughout this section, the most widely accepted explanation for these facts (in Spanish and other languages) is that the sole argument of unaccusatives and unergatives is generated in a different syntactic position: it is generated inside the VP for unaccusatives and outside the VP for unergatives. Assuming that subjects are generated in the specifier of a head that takes VP as its complement (v, Pred or Voice – Bowers 1993; Chomsky 1995; Kratzer 1996), the difference between unaccusatives and unergatives may be represented as follows, ignoring issues pertaining to case, agreement and tense.

(18) Possible Representation of Unaccusative and Unergative Verbs

a. Unaccusative Verbs:
   \textit{llegar} (= arrive), \textit{crecer} (= grow)

b. Unergative Verbs:
   \textit{trabajar} (= work), \textit{correr} (= run)

‘Llegó María’

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (VP) {VP}
  \node (V) [below of=VP] {V}
  \node (DP) [left of=V] {DP}
  \node (María) [below of=DP] {María}
  \node (llegó) [above of=V, xshift=-2cm] {llegó}
  \draw (llegó) -- (DP);
  \end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

‘María trabajó’

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
  \node (vP) {vP}
  \node (DP) [below of=vP] {DP}
  \node (María) [below of=DP] {María}
  \node (v) [right of=DP] {v}
  \node (VP) [below of=v, xshift=2cm] {VP}
  \node (trabajó) [below of=VP, xshift=-2cm] {trabajó}
  \draw (trabajó) -- (v);
  \draw (v) -- (VP);
  \end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

The structures in (18) cast the unaccusative – unergative distinction in terms of a basic transitive relation, one member of the internal – external argument pair that typifies a transitive relation being absent in each case. In the next section, I briefly discuss two important ideas regarding
how these two different types of intransitivity might be related to different types of transitive relations.

### 1.2 The Unaccusative – Unergative Distinction: Its Relation to Transitivity

While the tests outlined above are generally applied to verbs that are “stable” intransitives, there are many intransitive verbs that can either surface as intransitive or transitive verbs. For example, some intransitive verbs have transitive uses in which the stable argument in the alternation is interpreted as the *theme* in each variant.

(19) **Causative – Inchoative Alternation (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 79)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pat broke <em>the window</em></td>
<td><em>The window</em> broke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antonia opened <em>the door</em></td>
<td><em>The door</em> opened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracy sank <em>the ship</em></td>
<td><em>The ship</em> sank</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other intransitive verbs seem to be related to more basic transitive constructions in which the object may be omitted in certain contexts; the *agent* is thus the “stable” argument in these cases.

(20) **Unspecified Object Alternation (Levin 1993: 33)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>John</em> ate a sandwich</td>
<td><em>John</em> ate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mary</em> read a book</td>
<td><em>Mary</em> read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bob</em> swept the floor</td>
<td><em>Bob</em> swept</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These examples serve to highlight the two different ways in which the *unaccusative – unergative* distinction is related to transitivity. The data in (19) appear to indicate that some unaccusative verbs may also be used transitively in which case they will take an external argument interpreted as the *causer* of the change denoted by the verb. An intransitive verb like *the window broke*
behaves like an unaccusative while its transitive variant *Pat broke the window* is interpreted as an instance of caused change. On the other hand, the alternation that we see in (20) appears to show that some unergative verbs may be used transitively in which case they take an internal argument that is interpreted as the *patient* of the activity that is done by the agent. An intransitive verb like *Bob swept* behaves like an unergative verb while its transitive variant *Bob swept the floor* is interpreted as a sweeping event that happens to a particular type of surface area (i.e. – it is not necessarily a caused change).\(^9\)

Capturing the patterns in (19) and (20) has been the subject of much recent research in syntax and lexical semantics (for example, Hale & Keyser 2002; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995). The main question that these proposals seek to answer is how to formalize the intuitive relationship between the transitive – intransitive pairs in (19) and (20).\(^10\) Searching for an answer to this puzzle necessarily involves establishing a link between different kinds intransitivity (unaccusative and unergative) and transitive relations. Some questions that immediately arise are the following: (i) are there two classes of transitive verbs that mimic the two broad classes of intransitive verbs that we have seen thus far? If so, (ii) what is the formal relation between

---

\(^9\)Note that a verb like *sweep* may be interpreted as a caused change, but this generally requires a particular type of patient: an incremental theme (Dowty 1991; Tenny 1994). The sentence in (i) is interpreted as caused change: it is telic and it entails a result state expressible as (ii).

(i) Bob swept the entire house in two hours.
(ii) The entire house is swept.

The same is not true of a sentence like *Bob swept the floor*, which may be interpreted as a caused change (if the *entire* floor is what is salient) or an activity that has no natural endpoint and entails no particular type of change that happens to the *floor*.

\(^10\)Note: on the neo-constructionist view of grammar (Borer 2005; Marantz 1997, 2005) such variability is simply part of how the structure building operations of the grammar interact with the conceptual content of roots since roots have no argument structures.
different types of intransitivity and different types of transitivity? Two proposals stand out in this regard: Chierchia (2004) has proposed that unaccusative verbs are actually derived from a more basic transitive relation through a special type of reflexivization operation and Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) have proposed that all unergative verbs are underlying transitives.

Chierchia (2004) has claimed that unaccusativity is the result of a special kind of reflexivization operation that applies to a causative transitive relation that is part of the denotation of all unaccusative verbs. The proposal is quite radical (and abstract) in nature and requires some explanation. The main point of departure for this idea are verbs such as Italian *affondare* (= to sink), which, like its English counterpart, can be either transitive or unaccusative as shown in (21).

(21)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Gianni ha affondato la barca.} \\
\text{Gianni sank the boat}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b. La barca è affondata.} \\
\text{The ship sank}
\end{align*}

For Chierchia (2004), the meaning a verb like *affondare* is transitive as shown in (22), adapted from Chierchia (2004: 37, ex (28b)).

(22)  
\[
[[\text{affondare}]]_{TV} = \lambda x \lambda y \exists P(\text{CAUSE}(P(y), \alpha(x)))
\]
\begin{align*}
P &= \text{some action} \\
\alpha &= \text{some suitable result of a sinking action (being under water)}
\end{align*}

The denotation in (22) says that some argument \( y \) does something that causes a *sinking* and that as a result another argument \( x \) ends up in a state that is typical of something that has been sunk (i.e., it is under water). This is meant to represent a sentence like (21a), where \( y = \text{Gianni} \) and \( x = \text{la barca} \). The question is how the sentence in (21b) is related to (21a). Chierchia (2004) proposes
that it is the output of a special type of reflexivization operation $R$, shown in (23) (adapted from Chierchia 2004: 37, ex (29)).

(23)  
   a. $\text{affondare}_{TV} = R([[\text{affondare}_{TV}]]) \rightarrow \lambda x \exists P[\text{CAUSE}(P(x), \alpha(x))]$

   b. $R([[\text{affondare}_{TV}]])(\text{the boat}) = \text{a property of the boat causes the boat to sink}$

The result of $R$ taking a causative transitive verb as its input is that we interpret the result as a kind of static reflexive that Chierchia summarizes in the following way.

I am essentially proposing to interpret *the boat sank* as something like *the boat sank itself*. But this is not quite right, of course. What we actually want is to interpret *the boat sank* as: some property of the boat (or some state the boat is in) causes it to go down. That is, with unaccusatives the causing factor must be understood not as an action, but statively. When we say ‘the boat sank itself’ we are imputing to the boat the capacity of performing an action; we are anthropomorphizing it. But for the boat to sink, it suffices that the boat has or comes to have a property that causes its sinking.

The reflexive character I am attributing to unaccusatives is of a special, static nature … We can define a reflexive operator that has this stativity requirement built in. Or we can assume that the $\text{CAUSE}$ operator (implicitly present in the structure of *sink*) is neutral as to what type of property is involved (i.e. whether it is an action or a state). It is then the (in)animacy of the subject that triggers an implicature as to whether the causing factor involves an action or a state. (Chierchia 2004: 37-38).

This particular view makes the most sense for verbs like Italian *affondare* and English *sink*, which may be transitive or unaccusative. However, Chierchia (2004) argues that it can also be extended to account for unaccusative verbs like *arrivare* (= arrive) and *crescere* (= grow), which do not have transitive uses in Italian. He cites unstable valence as one of the main arguments in favor of extending the special reflexivization analysis to all unaccusatives. For example, the verb *crescere* (= grow) is intransitive in standard Italian but may be used transitively in many Italian dialects. If the verb is derived from an underlying transitive source, the fact that it surfaces as a transitive verb in some dialects would have a straightforward explanation. For verbs that seem
less amenable to unstable valency such as *arrivare* (= arrive), a more speculative suggestion is offered, which is summarized by Levin & Rappaport Hovav as follows.

Chierchia points out that an unaccusative verb that lacks a paired transitive causative use is exceptional on the causative analysis and would be expected to acquire such a use because it derives from a causative predicate and is thus basically dyadic. Chierchia suggests that an unaccusative verb like *come*, for example, which lacks a causative use, is related to a causative verb meaning something like *bring*, but that this causative verb either is not lexicalized or is marked as being lexicalized by a verb that is not related to the intransitive verb morphologically. (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 87)

On this view, verbs that do not alternate are essentially classified as lexical accidents: *llegar* (arrive) does not alternate in Spanish or English because the causative variant of the verb is expressed by a different stem, *traer* (bring). Admittedly, this view requires a significant amount of abstraction in order to establish the relevant relationship between unaccusatives and transitives. The main point of bringing it up here is that it forces us to consider the idea that

---

11The claim here is not that *traer* (= bring) means the exact same thing as *hacer llegar* (= to make someone arrive). Note that Chierchia is careful in this regard claiming that it means something like ‘bring’, and it may be so abstract such that it is not lexicalized in the language. Periphrastic causatives are possible for any verb so long as the subject of the embedded verb can be ‘manipulated’ in an appropriate way by the subject of the causative verb *hacer* (= make). Lexical causatives, on the other hand, are restricted to unaccusative verbs. The lexical causative form of a verb may possess some idiosyncratic nuances that a periphrastic causative built from the same verb does not. We see this phenomenon in Yucatec Maya and Japanese, languages that possess different types of morphemes that mark periphrastic and lexical causatives (Miyagawa 2010; Shibatani 1976).

An additional complicating factor that is not directly addressed in this particular work concerns languages in which a transitive verb is derived from an unaccusative verb through so-called ‘causative’ morphology. The *come/arrive – bring* relation alluded to above is expressed through the same verb root in Yucatec Maya, but instead of a special reflexivization operation that applies to causative transitive verb, it appears that a transitive verb is derived from an underlying unaccusative through the addition of transitivizing, ‘causative’, morphology.

(i) Unaccusative Transitive
taal (= come) taa-s (= bring)
u’ul (= arrive/return) u’ul(l)-s (= bring)

Perhaps the most conservative conclusion is that different languages may treat verb stems or roots as basically transitive or intransitive and depending on what a particular stem is classified as, the language will have some mechanism to derive either a transitive or intransitive verb from whatever is ‘basic’ in the language. Alternatively, roots or stems could be thought of as lacking any kind of specification with respect to their arguments and the morphology with which they combine will determine whether they will be transitive or intransitive (see Schäfer 2009 for an overview).
certain kinds of transitive verbs are intimately related to unaccusative verbs. In Chierchia’s view, all verbs that denote a caused change represent a type of transitive relation that is the possible input for a rule that gives rise to unaccusative verbs through the elimination of the external argument of that relation.

Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) make a similarly bold claim for unergative verbs, proposing that all unergatives have an underlying object but that we simply don’t pronounce that object most of the time because it incorporates into a verbal head. First, it should be noted that work by other researchers has largely concurred with the idea that unergatives are nothing more than transitive verbs even if the precise representations of how to capture this may differ (Mateu 2002; Zubizarreta & Oh 2007). Adopting something like it provides a way of explaining why so many verbs that we think of as fundamentally unergative can actually take (non-cognate) objects. The following Spanish examples, *toser* (= cough) and *trabajar* (= work), both unergative verbs according to the tests presented in section 1.1, may be used transitively.

(24) a. Ese rico tose monedas de oro.
   That rich guy coughs coins of gold
   ‘That rich guy coughs up golden coins’

   b. Trabajaron estos ensayos muy bien.
   They worked those essays very well
   ‘The worked (on) those essays well’

Furthermore, unergative motion verbs such as *run*, *walk* and *swim* all take objects that denote a distance related to the particular motion verb in question as noted in Mendikoetxea (1999a) and Zubizarreta & Oh (2007).

   The athletes ran some 100 meters
   ‘The athletes ran 100 meters’
b. Juan nadó varios largos.
    Juan swam some laps
    'Juan swam some laps'

Data like these provide the basis for the hypothesis that all unergative verbs are actually transitive, which is what Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) argue in favor of. The reason that verbs such as *laugh* and *cough* appear to be intransitive is because the object (the abstract nominal element *laugh* or *cough*) has incorporated into a light verb that means something similar to *do*.\textsuperscript{12} The sentences in (26) have the abstract syntactic representation in (27) (adapted from the work of Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002).

\begin{enumerate}
\item a. Mary laughed
\item b. John coughed.
\end{enumerate}

\begin{equation}
(26)\begin{align*}
(27)
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) argue that there are two main areas of support for this particular idea. The first comes from the tendency for there to be synonymous paraphrases of many

\textsuperscript{12}What should be noted here is that this proposal requires an similar amount of abstraction as we saw in Chierchia’s. When Hale & Keyser talk about 'nouns’, they are talking about abstract entity-denoting heads that do not project a specifier or complement position. In addition, when they discuss the expression of light verbs meaning something like *do*, they do not mean that all possible light verbs must surface as English *do*. Rather, *do* is used more as lexical semantic primitive than anything else, similar to how it is used in Dowty (1979) and in work by Cuervo (2003) and Harley (2005). The range of light verbs that can morphologically spell out his particular lexical semantic primitive ultimately depend on the nominal complement. They include verbs such as *do, give* and *let out* among others.
unergative verbs (in both English and Spanish) in which a light verb like *do* gets inflected for tense and agreement and the main conceptual content of the VP is realized by a noun as we see in (28) and (29).

(28)  
   a. work \(\approx\) do work  
   b. shout \(\approx\) give (a) shout

(29)  
   a. trabajar \(\approx\) hacer trabajo  
   b. gritar \(\approx\) dar (un) grito

These types of paraphrases are complemented by the fact that in some languages like Basque unergative verbs are compound expressions, consisting of a light verb that translates to *do* (or something similar) and a noun.

(30)  
   **BASQUE** (from Hale & Keyser 2002: 117)  
   \[
   \begin{array}{ll}
   \text{nedar} & \text{(cry, N)} \\
   \text{eztl} & \text{(cough, N)} \\
   \text{barre} & \text{(laugh, N)} \\
   \end{array}
   \begin{array}{l}
   \text{egin (do, V)} \\
   \text{egin (do, V)} \\
   \text{egin (do, V)} \\
   \end{array}
   \begin{array}{l}
   \text{nedar egin = ‘to cry’} \\
   \text{eztl egin = ‘to cough’} \\
   \text{barre egin = ‘to laugh’} \\
   \end{array}
   \]

If the representation in (27) is on the right track, the complex predicates in (28) – (30) could be thought of as variations of (27) in which each head, V and N, is spelled out by a different phonological index. A second area of support for this idea comes from a phenomenon known as ‘cognate’ objects. It has been noted that many unergative verbs permit the expression of an object that is identical in form to the main verb.\(^{13}\)

(31)  
   a. Mary laughed an evil laugh / John coughed a horrible-sounding cough  
   b. llorar el llanto de un niño / reír la risa de un tonto (Mendikoetxea 1999a: 1621)

\(^{13}\)Cognate objects may also appear with some unaccusative verbs as in *die a horrible death* and *fall a terrible fall*. It has been argued in Nakajiima (2006) and Pereltsvaig (2000) that these cognate objects constitute a distinct type of phenomenon and should be treated as adverbial in nature while cognate objects of unergative verbs are true objects. More on this will be presented in chapter 6.
If unergative verbs are derived from underlying nouns, this phenomenon has a straightforward explanation. Hale & Keyser (2002) argue that the cognate objects in (31) can be understood as a copy of the phonological index of the verb that is left in the complement N and is spelled out for reasons that have to do with stranding of modifiers (note that an adjective or post-nominal modifier is usually required for the sentence to sound natural) among other factors (see Haugen 2009 for a review).

Like Chierchia’s (2004) analysis of unaccusative verbs, the analysis of unergatives proposed by Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) posits that the latter are actually underlying transitive verbs that are derived through a lexico-syntactic operation (= conflation), whereby the internal argument is incorporated into a light verb, which eventually is spelled out as the main verb. Like Chierchia’s analysis of unaccusativity, the author’s propose that there is an intimate connection between certain types of transitive verbs and unergative verbs. Those transitive verbs that denote activities (abstractly represented as the DO light verb) may surface as unergative verbs if conflation applies to them.

In this section we have seen that there is an intimate relation between unaccusative verbs and transitive verbs that denote ‘caused changes’ and unergative verbs and transitive verbs that denote ‘activities.’ The work of Chierchia (2004) and Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) argues that both unaccusative and unergative verbs are actually transitive relations at a certain level of abstraction and that a set of rules targeting ‘causative’ transitive verbs gives rise to unaccusatives while a separate set of rules that apply to ‘activity’ transitive verbs gives rise to unergatives. If we compare this approach to the more descriptive section 1.1, we seem to be at a crossroads. The overall conclusion from section 1.1 was that there are simply different types of intransitive verbs
that may be listed as unaccusative (i.e. – they are lexically specified to take an internal argument) or unergative (i.e. – they are lexically specified to take an external argument). The conclusion from the works presented in this section is that unaccusative and unergative verbs are actually the product of grammatical rules that apply to different types of transitive verbs. In the next sections we will examine in more detail just what those types of transitive verbs are and what the evidence is for their existence in languages like English and Yucatec Maya. We then move on to the primary objectives of this dissertation, which are to motivate and propose an analysis for those two broad classes of transitive verbs in Spanish and explore their relation to the unaccusative – unergative distinction.

1.3 Core Transitive Verbs and Non-Core Transitive Verbs (Levin 1999)

Some of the most important work on different types of transitivity (and verb classes in general) in English has been carried out by Levin (1999), Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) and Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998, 2010). In this section I briefly review their work on transitivity types and how it relates to what we saw in section 1.1 and 1.2. In these works, the authors isolate two types of transitive verbs in English based on two major criteria: (i) transitivity alternations and (ii) resultative secondary predication.¹⁴

¹⁴A third diagnostic used is out- prefixation, but this seems to just be a variation of the unexpressed object alternation. Out- requires that a verb drop its object and only Non-Core Transitive Verbs (NCTV = (32b)) may do so.

(i) a. ??John out-broke Mary
   b. Mary out-swept John

Apart from out- prefixation, other kinds of prefixes have also been key in determining differences between transitive verbs in English (Hale & Keyser 2000 on up and re-; Marantz 2007, 2009 on re-)
(32) a. Core Transitive Verbs (CTV): break, open, dry, harden, melt, clear
    b. Non-Core Transitive Verbs (NCTV): sweep, dance, eat, wash, kick, build

The first criterion used to separate CTV from NCTV is the transitivity alternation that most typically applies to them. CTV may exhibit the causative-inchoative alternation whereby the internal argument (affected object that undergoes a change = the object of the transitive verb) is the stable one in the alternation whereas NCTV may exhibit the unexpressed object alternation whereby the external argument (the entity that initiates the action expressed by the verb) is the stable one in the alternation. These two alternations, in neutral contexts, are generally mutually exclusive.

(33) CTV: Causative – Inchoative Alternation
    a. John broke the vase. Transitive
    b. The vase broke. Inchoative
    c. *John broke. Unexpressed Object

(34) NCTV: Unexpressed Object Alternation
    a. Mary swept the floor. Transitive
    b. *The floor swept. Inchoative
    c. Mary swept. Unexpressed Object

The second criterion used to separate CTV from NCTV is the type of resultative secondary predication admitted by verbs from each class. English permits a wide range of resultative predicational types. Of these types, CTV admit a limited number of particles, PPs and APs that appear to modify a result that is entailed by the verbs themselves. In these constructions the CTV is generally interpreted as a kind of result that is further specified by the resultative predication. NCTV admit a wide array of unselected small clause complements that specify results that are only peripherally linked to the main verb. In these cases, the verb specifies a manner that is not
intimately linked to the result specified by the small clause predicate (see Beavers 2010; Mateu 2000, 2010; Washio 1997 for more details).

(35)  
CTV
   a. John broke the vase open.  AP related to breaking
   b. *John broke the dishes off the table.  PP small clause
   c. *John broke the dishes valueless.  AP small clause
   d. *John broke his way into the room.  One’s way construction
   e. *John broke himself tired.  Fake Reflexive construction

(36)  
NCTV
   a. Mary swept the floor clean.  AP related to sweeping
   b. Mary swept the crumbs off the table.  PP small clause
   c. Mary swept the leaves into a corner.  PP small clause
   d. Mary swept her way into the room.  One’s way construction
   e. Mary swept herself tired.  Fake Reflexive construction

In order to capture these differences Levin (1999) proposes that the two kinds of action verbs are associated with different event structures through canonical realization rules, which provide the semantic underpinning of the different syntactic behavior that is observed between the two classes of verbs. The main difference can be seen with respect to how each type of transitive verb licenses its object.

(37)  
CTV\textsuperscript{15}
   \[ [ [ x \text{ACT}] \text{CAUSE} [\text{BECOME} [ y \text{<STATE> } ] ] ] \]
         |                  |         |
     Subj      Obj    Verb

(38)  
NCTV
   \[ [ [ x \text{ACT}\text{<MANNER>} y ] ] \]
         |                  |
     Subj    Verb    Obj

\textsuperscript{15}For convenience, I am eliminating the level of representation that Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) call argument structure in addition to the linking rules that match the arguments at argument structure with syntactic positions.
Event structure representations are meant to bring out shared properties among classes of verbs through primitive predicates such as ACT and CAUSE. Verbs themselves are realized by phonological strings that are inserted into “constant” slots represented by brackets <…>). The constants contain certain idiosyncratic properties that we associate with individual verbs based on the concepts they name and the conventions associated with those concepts. Arguments are represented by variables (x, y, ...) and receive roles based on their position in the event structure representation.

CTV are the product of inserting a state-denoting constant into an event structure that specifies a caused change. Thus, the verb ends up specifying the result of a caused change. The event structure licenses two syntactic arguments: the subject of the change (y), which is linked to the internal argument position in syntax, and the subject of the causing subevent ACT (x), which is linked to the external argument position in syntax. NCTV are the product of inserting a manner-denoting constant into an event structure that specifies a simple action that entails no caused change. This event structure licenses one syntactic argument: the subject of ACT that performs or does the simple action (x), which is linked to the external argument position in syntax. Some manner constants license an additional participant because of the conventions associated with the actions they name. The constant <sweep> for instance is generally done to a surface. This extra participant that is not part of the event structure is underlined in the representation in (38) in order to indicate that it is not the subject of a caused change and is instead licensed by the constant itself.

The causative-inchoative alternation that affects CTV is a product of the caused change semantics associated with the event structure of these verbs. The inchoative variant essentially
preserves the right half of the event structure, eliminating the ACT subevent (and perhaps the CAUSE, though see work by Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer 2006; Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2009; Chierchia 2004; Koontz-Garboden 2009; Levin 2009; Pylkkänen 2008; Schäfer 2009 for different viewpoints). In Levin’s (1999) view it is the fact that the internal argument in these cases is a “structure participant” (the subject of a caused change) that gives it stability in the alternation. This, she argues, explains a strong correlation for objects of these verbs to be marked with accusative case in languages with rich case morphology and also why it is relatively easy to assign these objects a “patient” or “affected participant” role in the event. The unexpressed object alternation, on the other hand, is a product of the object in these cases being a “constant participant.” These objects are licensed not by the more stable structural properties of event structure but by the more idiosyncratic conventions associated with the constant. The stable argument in NCTV is the actor (or initiator) of the simple action denoted by the verb. This, according to Levin (1999), explains why objects in these verbs (i) can often be left unexpressed, (ii) often defy simple classification with one thematic label and (iii) are often morphologically expressed in variety of ways in languages with rich case morphology, which include accusative, oblique or as PPs.

The difference that we see with respect to resultative predicational types can be attributed to the canonical realization rules in (37) and (38) and a combinatory principle that Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) propose for generating multiple and complex verb meanings.

(39) **Template Augmentation:** Event structure templates may be freely augmented up to other possible templates in the basic inventory of event structure templates (RH&L 1998: 111)
If we take resultative predicational constructions to denote caused changes that come about by an action that is distinct from the result of the change, we see why NCTV appear to be freer to associate with different kinds of resultative predicational constructions than do CTV. NCTV have simple event structures that can embed a caused change whereas CTV have complex event structures that cannot embed a caused change that is distinct from the one they already specify. 

\[(40) \quad \text{a. } [ [ x \text{ ACT}] \text{ CAUSE } [ \text{BECOME } [ y \text{ <BROKEN> } ] ] ] \]
\[\begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
\text{CAUSE } [ \text{BECOME } [ y \text{ <...> } ] ] \\
\end{array}\]

\[\text{b. } [ [ x \text{ ACT}] <\text{Sweep}> ] \]
\[\begin{array}{c}
\uparrow \\
\text{CAUSE } [ \text{BECOME } [ y \text{ <...> } ] ] \\
\end{array}\]

The conclusion from this body of work is that the difference between CTV and NCTV is due to a semantic distinction between verbs that specify caused change and those that specify a simple activity. CTV license their object as the “subject of a caused change”, making it a stable structure participant whereas NCTV license their object as a constant participant, making it an unstable participant in the verbal construction. The relative stability of the object in CTV explains why these may alternate with (or give rise to) unaccusative verbs while the relative stability of the subject in NCTV explains why these may alternate with (or give rise to) unergative verbs.\[16\]

\[\text{The reason for which the external argument may be eliminated in CTV is outlined in more detail in Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995, chapter 3). The elimination of the external argument is related to whether or not the constant specifies anything about the causing event that gives rise to the change that it lexicalizes. Verbs that are less specific about who or what their external argument is (agent, instrument or inanimate causer) are the ones that participate in the causative inchoative alternation. The unexpressed object alternation is also determined by a set of restrictions but, curiously, these seem to be the opposite of those that enable the causative-inchoative alternation. An unexpressed object of a verb like eat, read or sweep is one that is the most prototypical of the verb (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995: 109). Rather than underspecify its object, these verbs seem to naturally be very specific about what their most prototypical objects are. The main difference that is highlighted in the series of works by Levin & Rappaport Hovav is that both subjects and objects of CTV and NCTV behave in different ways and these can be studied independently of one another (see Tsunoda 1985 as well). For more on the different kinds of “underspecification” associated with subjects and object see chapter 3, section 3.4.}\]
in simple terms, CTV require an object and may omit their subject whereas NCTV require a subject and may omit their object. The distinction that is made by Levin (1999) overlaps with the types of transitive verbs that are proposed to be the underlying source of unaccusatives in Chierchia (2004) (= CTV) and unergatives in Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) (= NCTV). What is important about Levin’s (1999) study is that she provides independent diagnostics for English to determine whether a particular verb belongs to the class of stems that may surface as either a transitive or an unaccusative verb or to a separate class of stems that may surface as either a transitive or an unergative verb.

Thus far we have seen that there is good evidence for distinguishing between at least two types of transitive verbs in English and that these two types are closely related to different types of intransitive verbs: some of Levin’s CTV may surface as unaccusative verbs (Chierchia 2004) and Levin’s NCTV may surface as unergative verbs (Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002). For the remainder of this chapter and the remainder of the dissertation I will refer to what Levin (1999) calls CTV as *class 1 transitive verbs* and what she calls NCTV as *class 2 transitive verbs*. The main questions that will guide us through the rest of this work are the following ones: (i) does this distinction among transitive verbs exist in other languages, mainly Spanish and, if so, (ii) how is it best represented? Before providing a roadmap of the main chapters of the dissertation, some additional morphological evidence for positing the existence of class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs from Yucatec Maya will be briefly presented in order to give the idea some cross-linguistic perspective and a broader empirical base.
1.4 Transitivity Markers in Yucatec Maya

Yucatec Maya verb morphology and the semantics that conditions it has been the object of an important number of studies (Bohnemeyer 2004; Briceño Chel 2006; Bricker, Po’ot Yah & Dzul de Po’ot 1998; Lehmann 1993; Lucy 1994; Krämer & Wunderlich 1999). Transitive verbs fall into four broad morphological classes: (i) those that take aspectual and modal inflection directly on the roots, (ii) roots that are marked with an –s (and allomorphs) before taking aspectual and modal inflection, (iii) roots that are marked with a –t (and allomorphs) before taking aspectual and modal inflection (iv) roots that are marked with –kVnt (various allomorphs) before taking aspectual and modal inflection. These are outlined in table 1.1.17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stems</th>
<th>Morphological Marker</th>
<th>Class Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k’ay (sing)</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>‘Root’ Transitive Verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xok (read)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kach (break)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>je’ (open)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kíim (die)</td>
<td>-s</td>
<td>‘Causative’ Transitive Verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>síij (be born)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(from unaccusative verbs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lúub (fall)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wen (fall asleep/sleep)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>óok’ot (dance)</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>‘Applicative’ Transitive Verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mís (sweep)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(from a variety of stems)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meen (do/make)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jan(al) (eat)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polok (fat)</td>
<td>-kint/-kunt/-kins/-kuns (varies)</td>
<td>‘Causative’ Transitive Verbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>síis (cold)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(from adjectives and positionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kul (sit)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chil (lie down)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We will focus primarily on the major pattern that characterizes the –s versus –t distinction in the language. In the examples that follow, I limit myself to completive aspect, which governs an

---

17See Bricker, Po’ot Yah & Dzul de Po’ot (1998: 333-343) for a complete range of allomorphs of all of the types of transitive verbs in Yucatec Maya.
ergative-absolutive case marking pattern on bound pronominal clitics. Transitive verbs contain a preverbal completive aspect marker $T-$ to which an ergative morpheme (labeled set $A$) that marks the grammatical subject is cliticized while intransitive verbs lack a preverbal aspect marker.\footnote{Some researches represent this as a pre-stem aspiration “j” or “h” for root or inactive intransitive verbs (Bohnemeyer 2002, 2004; Briceño Chel 2006).} In addition to a preverbal aspect marker, all stems take status suffixes, which mark a combination of transitivity, aspectual and modal values. The morphology of the status suffix is determined by the preverbal aspect marker and it is also the attachment site for absolutive morphemes (labeled set $B$) that mark the O argument of transitive verbs and the S argument of intransitive verbs in completive aspect. The status suffixes of all verbs in completive aspect are generally variations of the morpheme $–aj$ though root or inactive intransitive verbs take no status suffix at all. I represent this as a null morpheme, $–Ø$. The $–s$ and $–t$ morphemes that mark transitivity are labeled in the glosses as $–S$ and $–T$ respectively and they attach directly to the root before the status suffix to which the absolutive pronominal clitic (set $B$) attaches.

Let us first look at some of the patterns associated with $–s$. The $–s$ suffix has been called "causative" in the literature. It is added primarily to stems that denote a change of state or location and its presence adds a “causer” to the change denoted by the intransitive verb.

(41) a. Kíim-$Ø$-o’ob
die-STATUS-3p.B
‘They died’

b. T-in kíin-$s$-aj-o’ob
ASP.COMP-1s.A die-S-STATUS-3p.B
‘I killed them’
c. Other verbs like *kūm* (= die) – *kūn*-s (= kill)

||
| láub (= fall) | láub-s (= fell) |
| aj (= wake up) | aj-s (= wake someone up) |
| wen (= fall asleep) | ween-s (= put to sleep) |
| sīįj (= be born) | sīįj-s (= give birth) |
| pīik’ (= clear) | pīik’-s (= clear) |

The –t suffix, on the other hand, has been called an “applicative” in the literature. It is added to a variety of stems that, in the absence of the –t, are used primarily as unergative activity verbs or nouns. When –t is present it generally signals the addition of an affected object, the patient of the activity (Krämer & Wunderlich 1999 for a similar generalization; Bohnemeyer 2004 for a some counterexamples and a different view). The stems in (42c) may all be used as unergative verbs in the absence of –t and take –t in order to mark the presence of an internal (affected) argument.

(42)  

a. Meyaj-naj-en

work-STATUS-1s.B

‘I worked’

b. T-in meyaj-t-aj-Ø in kool

ASP.COMP-1s.A work-T-STATUS-3s.B my milpa

‘I worked my milpa (= corn field)”

c. Other verbs like *meyaj* (= work) – *meyaj*-t (= to work in/on something).19

||
| mūis (= broom/sweep) | mūis-t (= sweep a surface/a place) |
| janal (= food/eat) | jaan-t (= eat something) |
| ts’īib (= writing) | ts’īib-t (= write something) |
| meen (= deed) | meen-t (= do/make something) |
| óok’ot (= dance) | óok’o-st (= dance a particular kind of dance) |

---

19The stem from which the verb *eat* (= janal) is derived is disputed in the literature. Some claim that it is derived from *jan-* while others claim that *janal* is the stem that functions as both the noun ‘food’ and the intransitive verb ‘eat’ and that this is reduced in the transitive form when –t is suffixed to it. There is variation with respect to how the verb is conjugated as an intransitive in completive aspect, some using *jan-* as the stem and treating it as an “root”or “inactive” intransitive whereas others use *janal* as the stem and treat it as a “derived” or “active” intransitive (see data in Briceño Chel 2006: 21 and also Bohnemeyer 2004 and Bricker, Po’ot Yah & Dzul de Po’ot 1998 for discussion).
The basic pattern that can be observed in (41) – (42) is that \(-s\) marks class 1 transitive verbs (their internal argument is “stable”) while \(-t\) marks class 2 transitive verbs (their external argument is “stable”). While in English the difference between the two verbs is illustrated through a series of syntactic diagnostics, in Yucatec Maya it is overtly marked by morphology for a fairly well defined class of stems.\(^{20}\)

What is even more striking is that Hale & Keyser (2002) have observed essentially the same pattern that we see in (41) and (42) across a spectrum of languages of the Americas including Navajo, Tohono O’odham, Hopi, Miskitu and Ulwa. In these languages, there tends to be one type of transitive verb that is marked with a morpheme whose function is similar to that of \(-s\) in that it derives transitive verbs from underlying unaccusative verbs or adjectives while another type of transitive verb is marked with a morpheme whose function is similar to that of \(-t\)

\(^{20}\)Some motion verbs such as roll show the opposite pattern (Bohnemeyer 2004): \(-t\) marks the presence of an external argument rather than an internal argument.

(i) Motion verbs that exhibit an unexpected pattern with respect to their transitivity marker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Transitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>balak’ (x rolls)</td>
<td>balak’-t (y rolls x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chį̀k (x shakes)</td>
<td>chį̀k-t (y shakes x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jútuy (x stirs)</td>
<td>jútuy-t (y stirs x)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>peek (y moves)</td>
<td>peek-s (y moves x)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bohnemeyer (2004) claims that data like these render the search for some kind of thematic or lexical semantic correlate to \(-s\) and \(-t\) meaningless: the morphemes are not sensitive to the addition of any type of argument nor are they sensitive to any lexical semantic notions such as lexical aspect and external versus internal causation. However, some of the verbs that Bohnemeyer (2004) cites are labeled anti-passives in Bricker, Po’ot Yah & Dzul de Po’ot (1998). That is, a stem like jútuy (stir) would mean y stirs and jútuy-t would mean y stirs x. The exceptions to the overall pattern are motion verbs, which seems to say something more about motion verbs than about the pattern. Bohnemeyer (2004) also notes that verbs of sound emission pattern (i.e. buzz) in a way that we would not expect based on the \(-s\) and \(-t\) patterns presented here. Motion verbs and verbs of sound emission are notoriously fickle with respect to unaccusative and unergative diagnostics and sometimes exhibit mixed behavior depending on the syntactic context (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995; Rosen 1984).
in that it derives transitive verbs from underlying unergative verbs or nouns. The morphological data from languages like Yucatec Maya add further support to the intuition that there are transitive verbs that treat one of their arguments in a special way with respect to their other argument. Some transitive verbs require a theme (an internal argument) and are marked when an external argument is added to them. Other transitive verbs require an agent (an external argument) and are marked when an internal argument is added to them.

1.5 Assessment of Transitivity Types

As we saw in section 1.1, for intransitive verbs, there is a clear set of diagnostics for determining class membership in many languages and those diagnostics usually give us an indication as to how to represent the sole argument of an intransitive verb: as an internal or an external argument. On the other hand, the idea that there are two classes of transitive verbs that are directly related to the unaccusative – unergative distinction made within the realm of intransitive verbs is widely accepted, and seems intuitively appealing given what we saw in sections 1.2 – 1.4, but there is little agreement with respect to (i) diagnosing whether a particular verb belongs to one class or another and (ii) how to represent the distinction between different types of transitive verbs.

This tendency is a defining facet of the Hale & Keyser’s (1993, 2002) theory of argument structure (see also Mateu 2002). Class 1 verbs are either derived from an underlying root or an underlying abstract adjective (A head) whereas class 2 verbs are all derived from incorporation of nominal complements into a light verb (N head). This has been a very influential idea, and I adopt it in other work (Armstrong 2011a). However, it is truly only a tendency that class 1 verbs are related to adjectives while class 2 verbs are related to nouns, however we choose to define these notions. I will adopt a more conservative approach here that does commit to the existence of an underlying (abstract) adjective or (abstract) noun in every class 1 or class 2 verb.

As discussed in Dixon & Aikhenvald (2000), languages vary as to whether they have markers that make intransitive stems transitive or vice versa. That is, there are languages for which a particular stem S may be basically transitive or intransitive. In the languages for which S is basically transitive, there are often morphemes used to derive intransitive verbs from it. On the other hand, in the languages for which S is basically intransitive, there are often morphemes used to derive transitive verbs from it. The latter case is what we have seen with –s and –t marking in Yucatec Maya.
Within generative approaches to the kinds of differences that we saw in section 1.2 – 1.4 there are two types of analyses that stand out: (i) lexical semantic analyses (Levin 1999; Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998) and (ii) structural analyses (Cuervo 2003; Folli & Harley 2005; Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002; Harley 2005; Marantz 1997, 2005; Mateu 2002; Ramchand 2008; Zubizarreta & Oh 2007).

We already saw the lexical semantic analysis in section 1.3. The basic tenets of this analysis are (i) different object licensing mechanism and (ii) different subject licensing mechanism. The object of class 1 transitive verbs is the subject of a caused change whereas the object of class 2 transitive verbs is the complement of a constant (stem or root). The difference between the objects of these verbs correlates with a different event structure assigned to the lexical representation of each of the verbs: class 1 verbs are causative whereas class 2 verbs are non-causative. Note that the external arguments of each of the verbs is licensed by the same primitive predicate \textit{ACT}, the main distinction between the two being that in class 1 verbs there is no inherent manner component that is lexicalized by the constant whereas the constants of class 2 verbs lexicalize an inherent manner component. Almost all of the structural approaches mentioned in the previous paragraph are nearly identical to Levin (1999) in terms of the basic lexical semantics of the two verb types. The main difference between them is that they localize Levin’s (1999) primitive predicates in the syntax or derive them in terms of structural relations.

If we abstract away from differences between the individual systems, the basic generalizations that come out of the structural approaches are that (i) differences between objects are structural differences and (ii) differences between subjects are interpretative differences. Class 1 verbs have objects that are licensed in the specifier of a VP (or a category-neutral small
clause) while class 2 verbs have objects that are licensed as complements of V (or complements of a category-neutral root). This is meant to capture the “stability” of the internal argument of class 1 verbs. The differences between the subjects in each case are due to different flavors of \( v \): \( v_{\text{CAUSE}} \) (or some equivalent) licenses the external argument of class 1 verbs whereas \( v_{\text{DO}} \) (or some equivalent) licenses the external argument of class 2 verbs. This is meant to capture the inherent manner component of class 2 verbs. A generic structural version of Levin (1999) is shown in (43).

(43) Types of Transitive Verbs: Structural Approach

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Class 1} & \quad \text{b. Class 2} \\
& \quad vP \\
& \quad DP_{\text{Subj}} \quad v' \\
& \quad v_{\text{CAUSE}} \quad VP \\
& \quad DP_{\text{Obj}} \quad V' \\
& \quad V \quad \text{Root} \\
& \quad \text{Root} \quad v_{\text{DO}} \quad VP \\
& \quad \text{DP}_{\text{Obj}} \quad V \\
\end{align*}
\]

The primitive predicates that Levin (1999) uses to distinguish the two verb classes are derived structurally in this approach. Class 1 verbs are derived from roots that are embedded under a verbalizing structure as a complement of V. They take an argument in a specifier and this relation is interpreted as “change” or “become” where the root specifies some state or position that is result of the change. Variations of what we see in (43a), which is taken from Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002), include small clauses in which the verb root is the predicate of a small clause whose subject is the internal argument (Harley 2005; Marantz 1997). The causal relation
between the external argument and the change denoted by the VP is to be read off of the \( v - VP \) structural relation while the subscript \textit{cause} is meant to indicate that there is no requirement that the external argument need to act in a particular \textit{manner}. The lack of a manner component in this particular \( v \) corresponds to a lack of a thematic specificity of the external argument: it may be an agent or any kind of inanimate causer capable of initiating whatever the concept expressed by the verb is (Folli & Harley 2005, 2007; Harley 1995). Class 2 verbs are derived by compounding a root directly with a complement-taking V. Variations of what we see in (43b) have the root take the complement directly (Cuervo 2003; Marantz 2005). There is no structural relation in (43b) that corresponds to the notion of change, so the \( \text{DP}_{\text{Obj}} \) is interpreted according to the conceptual nature of the root. Finally, the causal link between the external argument and the VP is again read off of the \( v - VP \) structural relation while the subscript \textit{DO} indicates that the external argument must be capable of acting in the manner specified by the root, which generally means it must be an agent (Folli & Harley 2005, 2007; Harley 1995).

The conclusion that both of these approaches lead us to is that transitive verbs that require an internal argument (and may omit the external argument) can be paraphrased as “\( x \) causes \( y \) to become VERB-ED” whereas transitive verbs that require an external argument (and may omit the internal argument) can be paraphrased as “\( x \) acts (in a certain VERB-Y way) upon \( y \).” The existence of these sub-lexical predicates like \textit{ACT}, \textit{CAUSE} and \textit{BECOME} into which verbs are decomposed has given rise to a successful vein of literature on the syntax and semantics of argument and event structure. For lexicalists like Levin and Rappaport Hovav, the primitive predicates of the event schema provide the inputs to lexical rules. Since class 1 verbs and class 2 verbs contain different event schemas they will inevitably be the inputs to different types of rules.
and this is what explains their distinct types of behavior. For non-lexicalists, the primitive predicates are the heads that license the arguments of a given verb. Since class 1 and class 2 verbs are composed of different types of primitive predicates, their arguments are licensed in different ways and this is the source of their distinct behavior. Since I will focus on the syntax of the class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs in what follows it is important to consider proposals like those of (43) carefully.

In spite of the success that syntactically decomposing verbs has had in recent years, it is still a controversial approach the lexicon – syntax interface (Fodor 1970, 1981, 1998; Fodor & Lepore 1998, 1999). While decomposition of sub-lexical predicates and thematic separation has been shown to be necessary for interpretative reasons (Herburger 2000; Parsons 1990; Pietroski 2006; Schein 1993, 2002), it is not clear that fully decomposing all sub-lexical and thematic relations predicates in the syntax as is done in some neo-constructionist approaches to grammar (Borer 2005) actually gets us anything that cannot be handled by assuming a complex and a fully-decomposed semantics. In addition, the tense and aspect of the verbs in question seem to influence how the paraphrasing works. For example, does ‘John washed the car’ mean ‘John caused the car to become washed’ (a caused change) or ‘John did a washing to the car that was completed’ (a completed activity)? Likewise, does ‘John is breaking the window’ mean ‘John is causing the window to become broken’ (a caused change in process) or ‘John is doing a breaking to the window’ (an activity)? It seems as though we are writing aspeectual differences into the

---

23The ‘all’ is italicized here mainly because the separation of the external argument from the VP is a somewhat standard assumption in current minimalist syntax (Bowers 1993; Chomsky 1995; Kratzer 1996; Marantz 1984). The decomposition of a verb into numerous heads that represent primitive predicates as well as the separation of the object from the verb (Borer 2005) is not as widely accepted.
meanings of these verbs (or into their thematic structural core) that are largely determined by aspectual operators (or the referential properties of the arguments themselves) rather than by lexical semantics alone.\textsuperscript{24} Thus, it is adequate to ask whether we actually need it to explain the difference between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs or whether this can be explained using a more traditional approach.

If we look back at the data from English and Yucatec Maya, the simplest generalization seems to be the following one: class 1 transitive verbs require an internal argument and may omit the external argument while class 2 verbs require an external argument and may omit the internal argument. It could very well be that the event structure representations from Levin (1999) or the syntactic decomposition we see in (43) are the source of this difference, but it would be wrong to assume that this is so without independent evidence for precisely the kind structural relations that supposedly exist in (43a) but are lacking in (43b). For example, if we were to begin studying a language for which we have few diagnostics for the class 1 – class 2 distinction, it seems more appropriate to look for the diagnostics that show that the two kinds of verbs are indeed different from one another in some meaningful grammatical way before assuming that they have different

\textsuperscript{24}Most of the work in lexical semantics and the structural approaches to event and argument structure works under the assumption that event and argument structure are separate from both lexical aspect (telicity) and grammatical aspect (perfectivity/progressive). However, there is still no consensus as to whether event structure plays a direct role in determining lexical aspect and also how both lexical and grammatical aspect interact with one another and with event structure in order to produce the different kinds of aspectual interpretations that we see for different verb types (Dowty 1979; MacDonald 2008; Ramchand 2008; Smith 1991; Thompson 2006; Zubizarreta & Oh 2007).

An alternative is that the lexical decomposition of a verb determines its compatibility with certain aspectual environments. This would mean that the telic \textit{John broke the glass} and the imperfective \textit{John is breaking the window} would actually correspond to different structures: \textit{John broke the glass} to something like (43a) and \textit{John is breaking the window} to something like (43b).

For simplicity’s sake I will assume that telicity and grammatical aspect are different notions. Telicity is determined by the nature of the verb’s internal arguments and grammatical aspect is determined by the aspectual and tense morphology on the verb. Apart from this, transitive verbs do not have any inherent aspectual-like meaning representations written into their lexical semantic representations or into their core $vP$ structure.
lexical semantic representations or are inserted into different kinds of vPs that ultimately determine their syntactic properties.

It is with this in mind that I turn to the data from Spanish that will form the core of this dissertation. Spanish is a language that has been given little attention with respect to different types of transitive verbs. There are two main sets of questions that guide the present investigation.

- Does Spanish show a distinction between different kinds of transitive verbs similar to English and Yucatec Maya, and if so, what are the diagnostics that we can use to demonstrate that such a difference exists?

- Based on the properties that characterize different types of transitive verbs in Spanish, what is the most appropriate analysis of them?

In chapter 2 I provide an affirmative answer to the first question by showing that there are seven properties that distinguish class 1 transitive verbs from class 2 transitive verbs. In chapter 3 I outline the basic analysis that enables us to capture why class 1 verbs may be unaccusative (in addition to being transitive) and why class 2 verbs may be unergative (in addition to being transitive). In chapters 4 and 5 I investigate two areas of Spanish grammar that receive attractive explanations based on the proposal made in chapter 3: meaning and modification of participles (chapter 4) and different uses of the reflexive (SE) clitic paradigm (chapter 5). Finally, in chapter 6 I offer an overall conclusion of how class 1 and class 2 transitivity relate to the unaccusative – unergative distinction and outline some areas of future research. The final section of this

---

25Cuervo (2003, 2010) is an exception. She develops a model of the structure and interpretation of dative arguments in Spanish that relies crucially on the structural distinction between different types of transitive verbs that we see in (31).
introductory chapter contains a brief outline of the main points that will be made in the subsequent chapters.

1.6 “Roadmap” of Dissertation

The point of departure for the first objective of the dissertation is the hypothesis that there are two classes of transitive verbs that can be separated according to whether they require an internal argument (and may omit the external argument = class 1) or whether they require an external argument (and may omit the internal argument = class 2). I first show that this generalization captures the main properties that distinguish the two verb classes in chapter 2 and then propose an analysis for these properties in chapter 3. In chapters 4 and 5 some positive consequences of the proposal are examined that are not directly related to capturing phenomena related to the argument structure alternations that characterize each verb class. Chapter 4 examines the meaning and modification of participles of class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs and chapter 5 examines various uses of the reflexive clitic paradigm and how these can be explained in terms of the class 1 versus class 2 distinction. Finally, in chapter 6, a brief conclusion is offered in which the class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs are linked to the unaccusative – unergative distinction made between intransitive verbs.

1.6.1 Brief Description of Chapter 2: Diagnostics and Generalizations

In chapter 2 I outline a set of seven diagnostics that show that these two types of verbs exist in Spanish and behave differently in grammatically interesting ways. In section 2.1 I look at the distribution of inchoative SE, a use of the reflexive clitic that marks the unaccusative variant of the causative – inchoative alternation in Spanish. Not surprisingly, only class 1 verbs admit
inchoative SE. In sections 2.2 and 2.3 I look at two consequences of the fact that only class 1 verbs have inchoatives: (i) they may behave like unaccusatives when embedded under *hacer* in periphrastic causatives and (ii) they have unintentional causer datives. In section 2.4, I investigate the meaning and modification of adjectival participles that are derived from class 1 and class 2 verbs. I show that the adjectival participles of class 1 verbs are ambiguous between readings that require an implicit agent and ones that do not. Class 2 verbs, on the other hand, give rise to adjectival participles that either take an agent as their argument or require an implicit agent. Since only class 1 verbs can take an internal argument in the absence of an external argument, this asymmetry has a possible explanation. In section 2.5 I show that object omission (or unspecified objects, Levin 1993: 33) is only possible with a subset of class 2 verbs but not with class 1 verbs. This is what we would expect on the view that class 1 verbs require an internal argument whereas class 2 verbs require an external argument. In section 2.6 I present data that shows that the morphological marking of lexical aspect with the reflexive clitic SE is actually sensitive to the difference between class 1 and class 2 verbs. Finally, in section 2.7 we see that class 2 verbs generally impose an agent requirement on their external argument whereas class 1 verbs do not. The latter freely admit agents, instruments and inanimate causers as external arguments. At the end of the chapter, in section 2.8, a brief review of the properties is presented and the main generalizations regarding class 1 and class 2 verbs are summarized. A table of the properties that we will see in chapter 2 is shown below.
Table 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Class 1 Transitive Verbs</th>
<th>Class 2 Transitive Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hacer</em> causatives without embedded subjects (multiple interpretations?)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional Causer Datives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles: modifiers <em>bien</em> and <em>muy</em> – multiple interpretations (event and degree)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Omission</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE &amp; Telicity: does aspectually-sensitive use of SE require an external argument?</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic role of external argument (Agent only?)</td>
<td>×</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.6.2 Brief Description of Chapter 3: Analysis of Class 1 versus Class 2 Transitivity

In chapter 3 I outline the main tenets of the framework that is employed to capture the differences between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs, focusing on how to capture the basic transitivity alternations that characterize each verb class and the nature of the thematic roles that may be assigned to the ‘omissible’ arguments of both class 1 and class 2 verbs. I begin with a brief discussion regarding the GB-style projectionist view of argument structure in which a theta grid is used to tell the syntax what to do versus the more radical neo-constructionist models in which roots are separated from the structure building operations that create argument structures. After this brief discussion, I opt for a more traditional “theta grid” – style approach to class 1 versus class 2 transitivity, arguing that it provides the clearest and simplest explanation of the facts outlined in chapter 2. On this view, transitive verbs are built from stems that contain formal
features that indicate what the syntactic requirements of the verb are. A generic transitive verb would have a D feature indicating that an internal argument must be a DP and is interpreted as a theme and a v feature indicating that the verb must take a v that introduces an appropriate thematic role based on what is specified by the verb, say an agent.

(44) Generic Transitive Verb: STEM\(\langle v:AG, D:TH \rangle\)

These features must be satisfied by having the appropriate syntactic objects in the appropriate positions once the vP phase is built (Chomsky 2000, 2001, 2008; Legate 2003). If not, the derivation crashes. For transitive verbs, this means that both a DP must be present in the complement V position and a v\(_{AG}\) in the position that immediately dominates VP. I propose what makes class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs different from the hypothetical generic transitive verb is that one of these features is marked in a way that allows a set of rules to apply to each verb class that mutually excludes one from the other. Class 1 verbs are built from stems that have the following set of formal features: D:TH and v:EFF. The D feature requires these verbs to take a DP internal argument and assign it a theme role. The v feature requires that there be a v that introduces an EFFECTOR thematic role to the external argument, a macro-role used to capture the idea that the external argument of class 1 verbs may be an agent, instrument or inanimate causer (Koontz-Garboden 2009; Van Valin & Wilkins 1996). Class 2 transitive verbs are built from stems that have following features: D:TH and v:AG. The D feature requires these verbs to take a DP internal argument and assign it a theme role while the v feature requires that there be a v immediately dominating the VP that introduces an AGENT role. The main claim is that the v:EFF
feature of class 1 verbs is marked with a set of parentheses whereas the D:TH feature of class 2 verbs is marked with a set of parentheses as in (45).

(45)  
   a. Class 1 Transitive Verbs: STEM_{<v:EFF,D:TH>}: “break” = romp_{<v:EFF,D:TH>}
   b. Class 2 Transitive Verbs: STEM_{<v:AG,(D:TH)>}: “read” = le_{<v:AG,(D:TH)>}

I argue that, while appealing, the parentheses in (45) do not mean ‘complete optionality.’ On the contrary, they signal that the particular formal feature on the stem may be satisfied by an expletive element that is not a \( v_{\text{EFF}} \) (class 1) or a DP theme (class 2). In the case of class 1 verbs, an expletive \( v \) may merge with the VP. This \( v \) introduces no thematic relation nor does it introduce an argument. I suggest that the parentheses around \( v_{\text{EFF}} \) allow this feature to be satisfied by an expletive element that does not introduce the external thematic role normally required by the verb. The consequence of this expletive \( v \) merging with a class 1 verb is an inchoative. The parentheses around D:TH in class 2 verbs indicate that this particular feature may be satisfied by a phonologically empty N head that simply fills the position of an internal argument. The consequence of this expletive N merging with a class 2 verb is the unspecified object intransitive, where a class 2 verb is used like an intransitive verb superficially but is interpreted as having some kind of prototypical object. In section 3.3 I discuss the thematic roles associated with the omissible argument in each of the alternations that define both class 1 and class 2 verbs. Finally in sections 3.4 and 3.5 I extend the framework to capture the ambiguity associated with class 1 verbs when embedded under \textit{hacer} without an overt subject and also unintentional causer datives.
1.6.3 Brief Description of Chapter 4: Class 1 and Class 2 Participles

In chapter 4 I extend this account to class 1 and class 2 participles. The overall claim of this chapter is that different grammatical objects with participial morphology (verbs and adjectives) have different kinds of interpretations that can be understood in terms of the class 1 versus class 2 distinction made in this dissertation. In section 4.1 I look at verbal and adjectival passives. These are uses of participles that contain a single argument that is usually interpreted as a theme as well as an implicit agent that is not realized syntactically. Both class 1 and class 2 verbs productively give rise to verbal and adjectival passives because there is nothing about these syntactic environments that is incompatible with either the set of formal and interpretational features of class 1 or class 2 verbs.

In section 4.2 I look at simple adjectives that contain participial morphology as well as “truncated participles” such as seco = dry. These adjectives are property-denoting expressions that do not contain an implicit agent. I present data that shows that this particular type of adjectival predicate as marked by participial morphology is generally only available for class 1 verbs but not class 2 verbs. I then propose that these uses of participles are derived from stems with a different set of formal and interpretational features from those that give rise to verbs. Instead of requiring a type of v and an internal argument, these stems require a degree argument (Deg) and an external theme argument (D:TH). It is argued that this particular feature specification is most likely historically derived from a verbal use of the stem that involves the gradual loss of the external argument (subject acting as ‘agent’ or ‘causer’) feature. Since only class 1 verbs can omit the external argument, it makes sense that only they would have developed this particular type of adjective from participial morphology.
In section 4.3 I look at pseudo-resultative constructions that involve an adjective that is root identical to the main verb and that emphatically specifies the result state denoted by that verb. I show that class 1 verbs systematically have two types of pseudo-resultatives while class 2 verbs do not. This difference is explained in terms of the fact that only class 1 verbs are able to give rise to adjectival passives and simple gradable adjectives. In section 4.4 I discuss the different types of interpretations associated with adverbial modifiers bien (lit. well) and muy (lit. very). The range of interpretations that they have with class 1 adjectives is distinct from the range of interpretations that they have with class 2 adjectives. This difference is traced back to the different kinds of feature specifications that class 1 and class 2 stems can have.

1.6.4 Brief Description of Chapter 5: Uses of Inherent SE

In chapter 5 I turn to uses of what is labeled ‘inherent SE’, a range of uses of the reflexive clitic paradigm that are (i) paradigmatic (inflect for the full range of person and number) and (ii) non-doubling (they cannot be doubled by a strong anaphoric pronoun, sí mismo). I claim that these uses of SE reflect the intrinsic differences between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs. I first provide a general discussion about what constitutes a use of ‘inherent SE.’ The term is meant to refer to a cluster of uses of the reflexive clitic paradigm that are not impersonal (including passives and middles) nor true reflexives of the –self type where there is a relation in which the same entity is interpreted as both the external argument and an internal argument (direct or indirect object). The overall hypothesis is that uses of inherent SE represent different kinds of morphological realizations of v or Appl (a high applicative), positions from which it may impose restrictions on the (i) aspectual interpretation of the VP, (ii) on the external
argument or (iii) on the ability to assign accusative case. Thus, inherent SE may come in three forms (some have more than one of the effects enumerated below): (i) aspectually sensitive uses of SE mark telicity, (ii) thematically sensitive uses of SE may signal the elimination of an external argument or impose a certain type of restriction on the external argument and finally (iii) case sensitive uses of SE simply absorb accusative case.

In sections 5.1 and 5.2 I outline some of my assumptions regarding the role of \( v \) in the aspectual interpretation of the VP and also in the valuation or checking of accusative case. With the relevant additions to the core \( vP \) in place, in sections 5.3 and 5.4 I turn to analyzing the different kinds of inherent SE that appear with class 1 verbs (section 5.3) and class 2 verbs (section 5.4). Class 1 verbs have one type of inherent SE that marks the absence of an external argument while simultaneously selecting a telic VP complement. This is inchoative SE and I argue that it is the morphological realization of \( v \). Class 1 verbs also have another type of inherent SE that requires a culminating event and an agent. The main contribution of this SE is to add a conventional implicature to the agent role such that the agent performs the event wholeheartedly (with a heightened sense of effort or involvement). This is wholehearted telic SE and I argue that it is the morphological realization of an Appl head. Class 2 verbs have three kinds of inherent SE. Like class 1 verbs they also take wholehearted telic SE but there are various subtypes of class 2 verbs that can be divided according to whether wholehearted telic SE adds the agent-oriented conventional implicature or not. It is argued that for some class 2 verbs, verbs of consumption, wholehearted telic SE has been reanalyzed from an Appl head to \( v \) head that introduces an agent and selects a culminating event as its complement. The grammaticalized form of wholehearted telic SE is called transitive aspectual SE. A second type of inherent SE that
class 2 verbs may take is unselected subject SE, which marks a mismatch between the agent requirement that is specified by class 2 stems and the argument that is actually added by $v$ (an inanimate causer). This particular use of SE is only available for consumption verbs. It is argued, following Folli & Harley (2005), that this particular SE is the realization of a $v$ that introduces an argument not specified by the stem. Specifically, it spells out the presence of $v_{\text{EFF}}$ for consumption verbs, which are specified for $v:\text{AG}$. Finally, a third type of inherent SE that we see with class 2 stems is one that marks pronominal verbs that either take no internal argument or take a prepositional internal argument. It is argued that this particular SE is the realization of a $v$ that introduces an agent per the requirement of class 2 stems but lacks the capacity to assign accusative case. The conclusion of the chapter is that that class 1 versus class 2 distinction and how this determines what kinds of $v$ a particular verb stem may combine with provides a useful tool for understanding these apparently idiosyncratic uses of SE that have been a major problem both descriptively and theoretically in Hispanic linguistics.

1.6.5 Brief Description of Chapter 6: Class 1 and Class 2 Continuums

In chapter 6 I offer a general summary of the major points that were made in chapters 2 – 5. I then outline the hypothesis that class 1 verbs form a continuum with unaccusative verbs while class 2 verbs form a continuum with unergative verbs. These two continuums are defined by different kinds of non-alternating and alternating stems whose stable core is either the internal argument (class 1) or the external argument (class 2). I then discuss various areas of future research and some open questions and puzzles.
Chapter 2: Two Classes of Transitive Verbs – Diagnostics and Generalizations from Spanish

As we saw in chapter 1, a variety of different kinds of evidence for dividing large groups of transitive verbs into two classes has been uncovered in English and other languages such as Yucatec Maya. The types of transitive verbs that have been isolated in those languages were labeled class 1 (require an internal argument) and class 2 (require an external argument) respectively. The Spanish equivalents of many of the class 1 and class 2 verbs from English and Yucatec Maya that we saw in chapter 1 are shown in (1).

(1)  
   a. Class 1: romper (break), cerrar (close), congelar (freeze), llenar (fill), vaciar (empty), secar (dry), abrir (open), derretir (melt), quemar (burn), hundir (sink)  
   b. Class 2: comer (eat), bailar (dance), leer (read), fumar (smoke), escribir (write), cantar (sing), barrer (sweep), pintar (paint), lavar (wash), estudiar (study)

When presented with the task of proposing a lexical semantic or syntactic representation for these verbs in Spanish we could simply adhere to the intuitive meaning paraphrases that are used to understand the basic conceptual difference between the them: class 1 verbs are ‘change of state’ and class 2 verbs are ‘activities.’ Thus, class 1 verbs mean something like ‘x cause y to become VERB-ed’ and class 2 verbs mean something like ‘x act in a VERB-y way upon y’ and these determine the event structure representation of the verb or the syntactic frame in which it may be inserted (see section 1.5). However, a more careful way of distinguishing between the two verb types involves describing which properties of Spanish grammar make separating (1a) from (1b) necessary; that is, why is this separation grammatically relevant. Since Spanish lacks constructions such as resultative predicational structures, a test that has proved useful for
separating the two verb types in English (see section 1.3) and has no transitivity markers like Yucatec Maya (see section 1.4), we need to look for other properties of Spanish that are sensitive to the class 1 versus class 2 transitivity distinction in order to find out both if and in what way the distinction is grammatically relevant.

In this chapter I show that there are seven properties in Spanish that are sensitive to the class 1 versus class 2 distinction, many of which have been investigated independently in other works but none of which have been presented as a part of a cluster of properties that defines a particular class of transitive verbs. First, only class 1 verbs admit inchoative SE, which we will see in section 2.1. Second, only class 1 verbs can have an ambiguous interpretation when embedded as infinitives without an overt subject under hacer, which we will see in section 2.2. Third, as we will see in section 2.3, only class 1 verbs admit unintentional causer datives while class 2 verbs do not. Fourth, only the participles of class 1 verbs yield ambiguous event-oriented and degree readings when modified by bien (lit. well) and muy (lit. very), which we will see in section 2.4. Fifth, only class 2 verbs may omit their objects, which we will see section 2.5. Sixth, only class 2 verbs admit transitive aspectual SE, which we will see in section 2.6. Finally, only class 2 verbs impose a selectional restriction on their subjects, mainly that it be an agent, a property we will see in section 2.7.

I propose that these seven properties that differentially affect class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs are all related to one fundamental difference between those verbs: class 1 verbs always require an internal argument but may optionally omit their external argument and class 2 verbs always require an external argument but may optionally omit their internal argument. This generalization is spelled out in (2) and will be repeated in section 2.8, in which the seven
diagnostics that can be used to test whether or not a transitive verb is class 1 or class 2 are summarized.

(2) **CLASS 1 – CLASS 2 TRANSITIVITY GENERALIZATION (SPANISH)**

a. Class 1 transitive verbs must have an *internal argument* and need not have an *external argument*

b. Class 2 transitive verbs must have an *external argument* and need not have an *internal argument*

2.1 **Inchoative SE**

The first property that divides class 1 from class 2 transitive verbs is inchoative SE. This a particular use of the reflexive clitic paradigm that eliminates an external argument in addition to any implicit agentivity from a transitive verb. The many meanings associated with reflexive clitics in Romance languages necessitate a brief discussion with respect to how to isolate inchoative SE from other uses, mainly impersonal (including passive and middle) and reflexive. Two examples of impersonal SE sentences are shown in (3). These can be translated into English as either active impersonals or passive impersonals but there is no difference between the two readings in Spanish.

(3) **IMPERSONAL SE**

a. Se hundió el barco. (Class 1)  
   SE.3s sank the boat  
   ‘The boat was sunk (by someone)’ or ‘Someone sank the boat’

b. Se barrió el suelo. (Class 2)  
   SE.3s swept the floor  
   ‘The floor was swept (by someone)’ or ‘Someone swept the floor’
A variation of the reading in (3) is also possible in present tense. This is the so-called “middle” reading (Mendikoetxea 1999b; Sánchez 2002). The most salient interpretation of the sentences in (4) is that the objects in each case have a property that is associated with an agentive form of the verb: the boat is *sinkable* (easy for someone to sink) and the floor is *sweepable* (easy for someone to sweep).

(4) IMPERSONAL SE (MIDDLE READING)

a. Este barco se hunde con facilidad. 
   This boat SE.3s sinks with ease
   ‘This boat sinks easily’

b. Este suelo se barre con facilidad. 
   This floor SE.3s sweeps with ease
   ‘This floor sweeps easily’

These impersonal uses of SE are defined by three properties: (i) they never appear in 1st or 2nd person (the form ‘*se*’ is the only possible one), (ii) they cannot be doubled by a pronominal anaphor and (iii) they contain implicit agentivity. These properties are illustrated below for example (3a).

(5) IMPERSONAL SE: PROPERTIES

   SE.1s sank
   Intended Reading: ‘I was sunk (by someone)’ *or* ‘Someone sunk me’

b. El barco se hundió (*a sí mismo).
   The boat SE.3s sank (*itself)
   Intended Reading: ‘The boat was sunk (by someone)’ *or* ‘Someone sunk the boat’

c. El barco se hundió deliberadamente
   The boat SE.3s sank deliberately
   ‘The boat was sunk deliberately (by someone)’ *or* ‘Someone deliberately sunk the boat’
Since impersonal uses of SE may appear with both class 1 and class 2 verbs, they will not be further explored here. A second use of the reflexive clitic paradigm is to mark true (semantic) reflexivity in which the subject is equivalent to an internal argument (a direct or indirect object). Two reflexive sentences are shown in (6).

(6) **REFLEXIVE SE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Juan se quemó.</th>
<th>(Class 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juan SE.3s burned</td>
<td>‘Juan burned himself’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Juan se lavó.</td>
<td>(Class 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juan SE.3s washed</td>
<td>‘Juan washed (himself)’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The clitic in reflexive sentences like (6) is defined by two properties: (i) they inflect for the full range of person and number and (ii) they can be doubled by a pronominal anaphor (= a sí mismo). In the absence of the pronominal double, some verbs assign a “non-volitional” role to the subject whereas in the presence of the pronominal double, agentivity is obligatory for all verbs. The verb quemar (6a) is representative of a verb that may assign a non-volitional role to its subject in the absence of a pronominal anaphor whereas lavar (6b) is representative of a verb whose subject is always volitional regardless of whether or not the pronominal anaphor is present. This is shown in (7) and (8) below. The true reflexive use of the SE clitic paradigm does not discriminate with respect to the transitive verbs with which it can appear, so it will not concern us either.26

---

26Note that we do see a reading for quemar (burn) that does not exist for lavar (wash): the non-volitional subject reading. Though this reading applies only to a limited set of verbs (possible only quemar – burn and romper – break when the objects of these verbs are body parts of the subject), it is yet another difference between the two verb classes that is related to agentivity (Maldonado 1999). Class 1 verbs can have subjects that are not agents whereas
(7) **Different Interpretations of Reflexive SE: Class 1**

a. Me quemé.
   SE.1s burned
   ‘I burned myself’

b. Juan se quemó.
   Juan SE.3s burned
   (i) Juan got burned (he accidentally burned himself)
   (ii) Juan burned himself on purpose

c. Juan se quemó a sí mismo.
   Juan SE.3s burn acc himself
   (i) *Juan got burned (he accidentally burned himself)
   (ii) Juan burned himself on purpose

(8) **Different Interpretations of Reflexive SE: Class 2**

a. Me lavé.
   SE.1s wash
   ‘I washed (myself)’

b. Juan se lavó.
   Juan SE.3s wash
   (i) *Juan got washed (he accidentally washed himself)
   (ii) Juan washed himself on purpose

c. Juan se lavó a sí mismo.
   Juan SE.3s wash acc himself
   (i) *Juan got washed (he accidentally washed himself)
   (ii) Juan washed himself on purpose

Now let us look at inchoative SE. The main function of inchoative SE is to indicate that the relevant event happens ‘by itself’, without the presence of an external causer, which is the typical role assigned to the subject of the verb. As we see in (9) and (10), inchoative SE can only appear with class 1 verbs.

---

class 2 verbs generally require their subjects to be agents. Since this phenomenon is relatively limited in scope, I leave it for future research.
(9) **INCHOATIVE SE: CLASS 1**

   a. Se hundió el barco.
       SE.3s sank the boat
       Intended reading (impersonal readings also possible): ‘The boat sank’

   b. Se quemó la casa.
       SE.3s burned the house
       Intended reading (impersonal readings also possible): ‘The house burned down’

(10) **INCHOATIVE SE: CLASS 2 (IMPOSSIBLE)**

   a. *Se barrió el suelo.
       SE.3s swept the floor
       Intended reading: ‘The floor swept’

   b. *Se lavó la camisa.
       SE.3s washed the shirt
       Intended reading: ‘The shirt washed’

The properties that characterize inchoative uses of SE are the following: (i) it may inflect for the full range of person and number, (ii) it allows expansion by the non-volitional anaphoric expression *por sí solo* (= by itself), yielding an interpretation that can best be described as “on its own” or “without an external cause”, (iii) it prohibits doubling by a pronominal anaphor and (iv) it contains no implicit agentivity. These are illustrated for example (9a) below.

(11) a. Me hundí.
       SE.1s sank
       ‘I sank’

   b. El barco se hundió por sí solo.
       The boat SE.3s sank by itself
       ‘The boat sank by itself’ (= The boat sank ‘by itself’, without an external cause)

---

27The readings associated with impersonal SE that are shown in (3) and (4) are possible here. The inchoative reading, however, is not possible. The English translations are equally unacceptable.
c. El barco se hundió (*a sí mismo)
The boat *sank (ACC itself)
Intended reading: ‘The boat sank’

d. El barco se hundió (*deliberadamente)
The boat *sank (deliberately)
Intended reading: ‘The boat sank deliberately’

There are two analyses of the inchoative. One view claims that SE marks the absence of an agent and of a cause (Pylkkänen 2008). The other view claims that SE takes an externally caused event and makes it into an internally caused event where a property of the internal argument (= theme) is what is understood as being responsible in some way for the event’s happening (Chierchia 2004; Koontz-Garboden 2009 – see section 1.2 or a brief explanation of this idea). On the latter analysis, the inchoative is a special kind of reflexivization operation that requires lack of agentivity, which is only permitted by some verbs. Regardless of what the correct view is for Spanish, inchoative SE is a property that clearly distinguishes class 1 transitive verbs from class 2 transitive verbs.

In this section we have seen that inchoative SE is both morpho-syntactically and semantically distinct from impersonal and reflexive uses of SE. In the presence of inchoative SE the relevant event is perceived as happening ‘by itself’, without the intervention of an external causer. Thus, inchoative SE marks the elimination of the external argument of the verb. Since class 1 verbs are the only verbs that admit inchoative SE, the simplest way to capture this distinguishing property of class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs is by stating that class 1 verbs may omit their external argument (i.e. they are compatible with what inchoative SE does) while class 2 verbs may not (i.e. – they are incompatible with what inchoative SE does).
2.2 *Hacer* Causatives (without an overt embedded subject)

Periphrastic causatives have received a lot of attention in Romance languages and continue to generate important studies (Aissen 1979; Burzio 1986; Folli & Harley 2007; Goodall 1987; Hernanz 1999; Kayne 1975; Torrego 2010; Zubizarreta 1985). Much attention has been focused on the different structures associated with what Kayne (1975) calls the *faire-infinitif* (FI) and the *faire-par* (FP) constructions. Each of these involves an infinitival VP embedded under the Romance equivalent of *make* (= *faire* (FR), *hacer* (SP), *fare* (IT), etc.). In the FI construction, the embedded subject receives accusative or dative case, which is marked with *a* in Spanish. An example of this is shown in (12).

(12) María le hizo arreglar el carro a Juan.
    María DAT.3s made fix.INF the car DAT Juan
    ‘María made Juan fix the car’

In the FP construction the subject of the embedded verb is marked with the equivalent of the preposition *by* (French = *par*; Italian = *da*). Though widely attested and studied in French and Italian (Burzio 1986; Kayne 1975; Folli & Harley 2007), the FP construction is more limited in Spanish. For example, the sentence in (13) sounds odd in many dialects of Spanish, though not in French or Italian.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{28}\)There is a lot of variation with respect to the FP construction in Spanish. The following examples come from Hernanz (1999) and Torrego (2010). Some dialects may accept the FP construction when the object is not a clitic while others only have the FP construction when the object of the embedded infinitive is (i) animate or (ii) animate and a clitic.

Hernanz (1999: 2252): either *a* or *por* is possible
(i) Hicieron analizar el plasma *{a/por}* un especialista
(ii) Han hecho escriturar el piso *{a/por}* un notario
(iii) Hacía barrer los patios *{a/por}* los alumnos [Treviño 1994: 57]
An additional periphrastic causative construction that has received less attention than the FI and FP constructions is one where there is no overt embedded subject, but simply an embedded infinitive and an object, as in (14).

(14) María hizo arreglar el carro.
    María made fix.INF the car
    ‘María had the car fixed’

For a transitive verb like *arreglar (= fix), the most salient interpretation of (14) is that someone besides María fixed the car. That is, the verb *arreglar contains an implicit agent and María asked that person to fix the car. A second characteristic of (14) is that the object may be substituted by a clitic that may be enclitic on the embedded verb or proclitic on *hacer as in (15).

(15) a. María hizo arreglar-lo.
    María made fix.INF-it
    ‘María had it fixed’

   b. María lo hizo arreglar.
    María it made fix.INF
    ‘María had it fixed’

---

Hernanz (1999: 2252-2253): only *por is possible
(i) La cantante se hizo maquillar {*a/por} la peluquera. (subj of *hacer = obj of embedded infinitive)
(ii) Esta profesora se hace respetar {*a/por} los alumnos (animate obj)
(iii) Hicieron examinar a Julia {*a/por} un médico (animate obj)
(iv) Hicieron procesar al acusado {*a/por} el juez

Torrego (2010: 458)
(i) *María ha hecho pintar la casa por su ayudante (non-clitic obj)
(ii) La hicieron examinar por un buen médico (animate obj)
(iii) *La hicieron arreglar por un profesional (inanimate obj)
Let us briefly compare the examples in (14) and (15) with periphrastic causatives that have embedded unaccusative infinitives. Note that (16) looks superficially identical to (14) but is interpreted in a different way.

(16) El jardinero hizo florecer las plantas del jardín.
The gardener made flower-INF the plants of.the garden
‘The gardener caused the plants in the garden to flower’

In (16) el jardinero (= the gardener) does not get someone else to cause the plants to flower, rather he himself is interpreted as the initiator of the flowering process. The main function of the periphrastic causatives for unaccusative verbs is to add an external cause and the subject of the matrix causative predicate is interpreted as the initiator of a causal chain that leads to the embedded event happening. The embedded subject of florecer (= flower), las plantas del jardín (= the plants in the garden) may be substituted with an object clitic, but its position is restricted to being proclitic on hacer.

The gardener made flower-INF-them
‘The gardener caused them to flower’

b. El jardinero las hizo florecer.
The gardener them made flower-INF
‘The gardener caused them to flower’

It is with the interpretations that we see for (14) and (16) in mind that I turn to another distinguishing property between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs that is related to class 1 verbs having inchoatives and class 2 verbs not having them. In periphrastic causatives that have no overt embedded subject, class 1 verbs are ambiguous between the interpretation associated with transitive verbs (14) and the one associated with unaccusative verbs (16). Class 2 transitive verbs
are never ambiguous: they only have the interpretation associated with transitive verbs in (14).

Let us look at two examples.  

\[(18) \text{Hice cerrar la puerta.} \quad \text{(Class 1)} \]
I made close.INF the door
(i) I had the door closed
(ii) I caused the door to close

\[(19) \text{Hice barrer la casa.} \quad \text{(Class 2)} \]
I made sweep.INF the house
(i) I had the house swept
(ii) *I caused the house to get swept

Let us first focus on the two readings of sentence (18). It can either have a reading in which I have someone else close the door (= (i)) or one in which I do something that indirectly causes the

\[\text{There is some controversy associated with these examples. For example, Sánchez (2002: 90) cites the following examples as ungrammatical, reflecting similar judgments presented for French in Zribi-Hertz (1987: 42).} \]

(i) El viento cerró la ventana.
(ii) *El viento hizo cerrar(se) la ventana.

The discussion in this work does not mention that the sentences in (i) and (ii) might both be grammatical if they mean different things. The difference is between direct and indirect causation (Bittner 1999). The second sentence is not ungrammatical on an indirect causation reading. Verbs that can only be caused externally by indirect causation (many unaccusatives like florecer) obligatorily show the pattern with hacer and cannot be made into a simple causative transitive verb.

\[\text{Zubizarreta (1985) contains some examples in which reflexive and inchoative se appear on the embedded infinitive in a causative construction and other examples in which the presence of se is judged to make the sentence ungrammatical. For the most part, all the sentences cited in that work are acceptable with or without se. The judgments do not constitute a clear pattern. The data in this work and in others supports a rule of se deletion under hacer.} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inchoative se</th>
<th>Reflexive se</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(i) El viento hizo disipar(se) las nubes</td>
<td>(i) A Juan lo hicimos afeitar(se)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) El viento hizo dispersar(se) las hojas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) El viento hizo apagar(se) la vela.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, Kempchinsky (2004) contains examples in which inchoative se may be embedded under hacer optionally. There is simply variability with respect to whether a speaker will accept the embedded infinitive sentence with se or without it, which is shown below by the parentheses. This is the view that is supported by the data here. The following examples are from Kempchinsky (2004, ex. 16).

(i) El viento hizo romper(se) los cristales
(ii) El ruido hizo despertar(se) al niño.
door to close (= (ii)). It would be more felicitous to say (18) on the second reading, (ii), if I pushed a chair that ran into the door and caused it to close. Perhaps it was not my intention to close the door but I did cause it to close. The clitic facts that that we saw in (15) and (17) correlate with the highlighted interpretations.

(20) Example (18), Reading (i) (= I had someone else close the door)

a. La puerta, hice cerrar-la
   The door  I made close-INF-it
   ‘As for the door, I had it closed’

b. La puerta, la hice cerrar
   The door  it I made close-INF
   ‘As for the door, I had it closed’

(21) Example (18), Reading (ii) (= I caused the door to close)

a. *La puerta, hice cerrar-la
   The door, I made close-INF-it
   Intended reading: ‘As for the door, I caused it to close

b. La puerta, la hice cerrar
   The door  it I made close-INF
   ‘As for the door, I caused it to close’

The data in (20) and (21) show that if a class 1 verb such as cerrar is interpreted as a transitive like arreglar (see example (14)), the direct object may cliticize to the embedded infinitive or climb to the higher auxiliary verb. On the other hand, if cerrar is interpreted as an intransitive, it behaves like an unaccusative verb such as florecer (see example (16)), since the clitic can only appear in the higher position, enclitic on the auxiliary verb. The next question we might ask is why the intransitive embedded cerrar in (21) lacks inchoative SE, which was shown to be a marker of the absence of an external argument of class 1 verbs in section 2.1. In colloquial language, it is possible for inchoative SE to appear on the embedded verb for reading (ii). In this
case, the clitic must be proclitic on *hacer*, which is precisely what we would expect since an inchoative has the same interpretation as an unaccusative verb when embedded under *hacer*.

(22)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Intended reading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. <em>La puerta, hice cerrar-se-la</em></td>
<td>The door, I made close-SE.3s-it</td>
<td>‘As for the door, I caused it to close’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. La puerta la hice cerrar-se</td>
<td>The door it I made close-SE.3s</td>
<td>‘As for the door, I caused it to close’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one question that arises with respect to (21) and (22) is why the inchoative variant of the class 1 verb is optionally marked with SE when embedded under *hacer*. We saw in section 2.1 that the inchoative variants of class 1 transitive verbs are obligatorily marked SE when they are matrix verbs. The absence of SE can be understood in terms of a more general restriction that is imposed by *hacer* on the expression of a range of SE types (reflexives and inchoative markers) in the embedded infinitival clause. Hernanz (1999: 2254), following an observation in Bello (1847: §1104) notes that reflexive, inchoative and ‘pronominal verb’ SE can be deleted when the verb is embedded as an infinitive under *hacer*. The following examples show that both reflexive SE and the pronominal use of SE can be deleted under *hacer*.

(23)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sentence</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>‘As for the door, I caused it to close’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. María hizo bañar(se) a los niños.</td>
<td>María made bathe(se-refl) ACC the kids</td>
<td>‘María made the kids bathe’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. El cura hizo arrepentir(se) al ladrón.</td>
<td>The priest made repent(se-pron) ACC the thief</td>
<td>‘The priest made the thief repent’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30‘Pronominal verb’ SE is the traditional term that refers to a use of SE (a reflexive ‘pronoun’) that appears obligatorily with a certain set of Spanish verbs that are not obviously reflexive. These verbs simply cannot be used without SE. The closest thing we have in English to this type of marking are particle verbs. An analysis of some pronominal verbs will be presented in chapter 5, sections 5.3 and 5.4. See Cano Aguilar (1999), Otero (1999) and Sánchez (2002) for more details.
Outside of the embedding context of (23), neither *bañar* nor *arrepentir* can be used as a reflexive verb or pronominal verb without SE.

(24) a. Los niños *(se) bañaron.
    The kids (SE.3s) bathed
    ‘The kids bathed’

b. El ladrón *(se) arrepintió.
    The thief (SE.3s) repented
    ‘The thief repented’

The simplest analysis of these facts is that there is a preference to omit SE in infinitives embedded under *hacer*. Thus, the reason why inchoative SE optionally appears for the second reading in which *cerrar* is interpreted as an inchoative in (18) is because it has been omitted according to the preference for SE omission under *hacer*.

Let us turn now to class 2 verbs as exemplified in (19). All class 2 verbs have the reading associated with transitive verbs whereby the embedded infinitive is interpreted as having an implicit agent that is distinct from the subject of the periphrastic causative. The second reading, in which the subject of *hacer* is interpreted as the indirect causer of the event denoted by the embedded verb, is systematically absent with all class 2 verbs. The observed difference is fully expected based on what we saw in section 2.1. The external argument of class 1 verbs may be omitted whereas the external argument of class 2 verbs may not. This essentially means that whenever a class 2 transitive verb has an object, it must also have an implicit agent if one isn’t overtly realized. This explains why there is only one reading available in (19). Let us briefly look at the clitic facts, which serve to corroborate this observation.
(25)  a. La casa, hice barrer-la
      The house, I made sweep-INF-it
      ‘As for the house, I had it swept’

      b. La casa, la hice barrer
      The house, it I made sweep-INF
      ‘As for the house, I had it swept’

There is no possible interpretation whereby I am interpreted as the indirect causer of the
sweeping event. This is shown in (26).

(26)  a. *La casa, la hice barrer
      The house, it I made sweep-INF
      Intended reading: ‘As for the house, I had it swept’

      b. *La casa, la hice barrer-se
      The house, it I made sweep-INF
      Intended reading: ‘As for the house, I had it swept’

A final note on these constructions is in order here, which concerns a lack of full productivity
with the full range of class 2 verbs. We have used barrer (= sweep) as a our primary test case
thus far; however, not all class 2 can appear in the relevant causative construction, at least not in
pragmatically neutral contexts. Take the following examples with comer (= eat) and bailar (=
dance).

(27)  a. ??Hice comer el plato de espinacas.
      I made eat-INF the plate of spinach
      Intended reading: ‘I had the plate of spinach eaten’

      b. ??Hice bailar un tango.
      I made dance-INF a tango
      Intended reading: ‘I had a tango danced’
Unlike *barrer* (= sweep), both of these verbs require an embedded subject in order to sound natural as we see in (28).

(28)  

a. *Le* hice **comer el plato de espinacas** a **Juan**  
**DAT.III** I made **eat.INF** the **plate of spinach** **DAT Juan**  
‘I made Juan eat the plate of spinach’

b. *Le* hice **bailar un tango** a **la pareja**.  
**DAT.III** I made **dance.INF** a **tango** **DAT the couple**  
‘I made the couple dance a tango’

Does the fact that some class 2 verbs may not appear embedded under *hacer* without an overt subject undermine this particular structure as a diagnostic for separating class 1 and class 2 verbs? I don’t think it does. As can be seen in the examples used thus far, there is generally a contextual requirement that the embedded verb denote some kind of ‘chore’ in order for it to appear without an overt subject. Verbs such as *cerrar* (= close) and *barrer* (= sweep) can be thought of as things that we might get someone else to do for us. Verbs such *comer* (= eat) and *bailar* (= dance), on the other hand, are not generally thought of as things we get someone else to do for us. If we factor out this pragmatic constraint and look only at the verbs that appear felicitously in this particular causative construction, there is a clear difference between class 1 and class 2 verbs. An explanation for the fact that some verbs do not appear in the construction at all will be left open for future research, but it seems to me that it is related to something external to the grammar itself: the pragmatic associations that we make for certain verbs.

The data presented in this section corroborates the conclusion of section 2.1: only class 1 transitive verbs are capable of omitting their external argument whereas class 2 verbs are not capable of doing so. This explains why only class 1 verbs may be interpreted like either
transitive verbs or unaccusative verbs when embedded under *hacer*. Class 2 verbs, on the other hand, can only be interpreted as transitive verbs when embedded *hacer*. In the next section we will see how the ability to form inchoatives correlates with a class of dative arguments that are unique to class 1 transitive verbs and not possible with class 2 transitive verbs.

**2.3 Unintentional Causer Datives**

Yet another consequence of the fact that class 1 verbs may give rise to inchoatives while class 2 verbs may not can be seen with respect to a unique kind of dative argument that only exists in class 1 verbs: the unintentional causer dative. These datives only occur with inchoatives and rather than add a possessor or an affected entity, they add what is understood to be an “accidental” agent or causer argument (Cuervo 2003; Fernández Soriano 1999).

(29) a. A Juan se le rompió la radio.
   DAT Juan SE.3s DAT.3s broke the radio
   ‘Juan (accidentally) broke the radio’

   b. A Juan se le quemó la cena.
   DAT Juan SE.3s DAT.3s burned the dinner
   ‘Juan (accidentally) burned the dinner’

Though class 2 verbs may take a wide range of dative arguments including possessor datives, affected experiencers and ‘ethical’ datives (= interested speech participants), their inability to give rise to inchoatives means that they do not have unintentional causer datives. This is shown in (30).

---

31 Note that this is not the only interpretation that may be assigned to these datives (Cuervo 2003). There are also readings associated with possession and affectedness in each of these cases. However, possessor and affected experiencer datives are available for both class 1 and class 2 verbs, thus they do not function as a clear diagnostic for distinguishing between the two verb types.
The data in (29) and (30) further corroborate what we have seen in sections 2.1 and 2.2: only for class 1 verbs is the external argument capable of being omitted. In this case, it has been shown that in the inchoative form of the verb, a ‘quirky’-type subject may be added but it is interpreted as an unintentional causer. Thus, it appears that this interpretation requires that the particular verb in question be able to dissociate from any kind of external causation initiated by an argument with an *agent* role, which is something that class 2 verbs cannot do. We will see in the next section how this inability to dissociate from agentivity plays a vital role in determining the nature of de-verbal adjectives with participial morphology that are derived from class 1 and class 2 verbs.

---

There is a reading in which *se* is interpreted as impersonal *se* (see section 2.1) and a *Juan* as a possessor or an affected experiencer. It would mean something like ‘Juan’s house was painted’ or ‘The house was painted on/for Juan.’ What is crucial here is that there is no unintentional causer reading, precisely because there is no inchoative for these verbs.
2.4 Meaning and Modification of Participles of Class 1 and Class 2 Verbs

Past participles are notoriously difficult grammatical forms for both syntactic and semantic reasons. From a syntactic point of view they have fuzzy grammatical category membership that fluctuates in a nuanced way between what appear to be verbs on the one hand and adjectives on the other (Bosque 1990, 1999; Dubinsky & Simango 1996; Embick 2004; Levin & Rappaport 1986; Koontz-Garboden 2010; Kratzer 2000; Parsons 1990; Rainer 1999; Wasow 1977). From a semantic point of view, all past participles appear to refer to a type of state. Some of those states may be thought of as a consequence or result of the action that is named by the source verb. For example broken may refer to the consequence or result of a breaking event. However, the same participles may also refer to states that simply indicate the present state of something without implying that that state is the consequence or result of an action named by its source verb. For example a cracked window may simply describe a characteristic of the window without implying that a cracking event actually occurred (it could have been built that way, for example). In languages like English and Spanish, the syntactic and semantic complexities of past participles conspire to yield as many as four different functions: (i) perfective aspect in active sentences, (ii) verbal passive, (iii) adjectival passive and (iv) a simple attributive/predicative adjective. These are shown in (31).

(31)  

a. Juan ha cerrado la puerta  
Juan has closed the door  
‘Juan has closed the door’  

b. La puerta fue cerrada por Juan  
The door was closed by Juan  
‘The was closed by Juan’
c. La puerta quedó cuidadosamente cerrada 
   The door remained carefully closed
   ‘The door remained carefully closed’

   d. una puerta cerrada 
   a door closed
   ‘a closed door’

In this section, we will focus primarily on the adjectival uses of participles in (31c) and (31d). The term adjectival passive is from Wasow’s (1977) seminal study on them. Subsequent research has labeled them resultative participles (Embick 2004), resultatives (Jackson 2005) and result state uses of de-verbal adjectives (Koontz-Garboden 2010). Adjectival passives share with verbal passives the following property: they contain an implicit external argument (agent or some external initiator) and an event that is marked as a ‘culminating event’ by passive morphology (ed and allomorphs). They differ in that verbal passives have the distribution of verbs and adjectival passives have the distribution of adjectives and are attributed or predicated of the internal argument (theme or patient) of the source verb. Thus, in a sentence like (31c), the meaning of cerrada (= closed) entails that there was a prior event of closing by someone that gave rise to the state of the door that it names (= being closed). This is why this particular adjective may be modified by an agent-oriented adverb such as cuidadosamente (= carefully).

Simple adjectives, on the other hand, are property-denoting expressions that do not contain an implicit agent or a culminating event. These have been called statives (Dubinsky & Simango 1996), simple states (Embick 2004) and derived statives (Koontz-Garboden 2010). The sentence in (31d) is illustrative of a simple adjectival use of a participle. In this case, the door may have been built closed and thus has never actually been closed by anyone. As a
consequence, these simple adjectives do not take agent-oriented modifiers like adjectival passives and, according to some researchers (Embick 2004; Dubinsky & Simango 1996), do not entail any prior event of closing (though see Koontz-Garboden 2010 for an alternative analysis). They are similar in meaning to simple adjectives that are not derived from verbal sources such as rojo (= red).

The point of this section is to show that these two adjectival uses of participles give us an interesting window into what information is required by the source verb from which they are derived. Class 1 verbs all have adjectival passives, which are attributed or predicated of the internal argument of the source verb and have an implicit agent that is characteristic of passives. In addition, all class 1 verbs provide an input for the derivation of simple adjectives (participles or ‘truncated’ participles) that are property-denoting expressions attributed or predicated of the internal argument of the source verb that lack an implicit agent. Like class 1 verbs, class 2 verbs also have adjectival passives; however, they appear to systematically lack simple adjectives that may be attributed or predicated of the internal argument of the source verbs in the absence of an implicit agent. Given what we saw in sections 2.1 – 2.3 this apparent gap is no coincidence. It stems from the fact that in class 1 verbs the external argument (agent in these cases) may be omitted while in class 2 verbs, the external argument may not be omitted. The point of this section is thus to explore the idea that the argument structure requirements of both class 1 and

---

33 Koontz-Garboden (2010) has argued that all deverbal adjectives with past participial morphology (-ed, -en, etc.) contain an implicit event but that resultatives are characterized by a temporal event while derived statives are characterized by a spatial one.

34 The term ‘truncated’ participle comes from the Hispanic grammatical tradition. It is applied to adjectives like lleno (full) and seco (dry), which were used as participles in Old Spanish (Bosque 1990, 1999) and have since become simple attributive/predicative adjectives. They are ‘truncated’ because they appear to be missing the morphological marker of the participle (-ado, -ido): llenado – filled versus lleno – full. The same phenomenon exists in English (see Dubinsky & Simango 1996; Embick 2004; Parsons 1990). More on this will be detailed below.
class 2 verbs carry over to some adjectival forms that are derived from the two classes of verbs. Let us review the evidence in favor of this idea.

One group of class 1 transitive verbs yields participles that are three ways ambiguous: they may be interpreted as verbal passives, adjectival passives or simple adjectives. These are shown in table 2.1.

Table 2.1 Ambiguous Participles of Class 1 Transitive Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Verbal or Adjectival Passive</th>
<th>Simple Adjective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>romper (to break)</td>
<td>roto (broken)</td>
<td>roto (broken)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congelar (to freeze)</td>
<td>congelado (frozen)</td>
<td>congelado (frozen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>derretir (to melt)</td>
<td>derretido (melted)</td>
<td>derretido (melted/molten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cerrar (to close)</td>
<td>cerrado (closed)</td>
<td>cerrado (closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abrir (to open)</td>
<td>abierto (opened)</td>
<td>abierto (open)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quemar (to burn)</td>
<td>quemado (burned)</td>
<td>quemado (burnt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hundir (to sink)</td>
<td>hundido (sunk)</td>
<td>hundido (sunken)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two questions that immediately arise with respect to the participial forms in table 2.1: (i) how do we tell them apart and (ii) how do we determine what the simple adjectives mean in relation to the source verb? Fortunately, Spanish provides us with a way of answering both of these questions due to the nature of the modifiers bien (lit. well) and muy (lit. very). Though these two modifiers literally translate to ‘well’, a manner modifier, and ‘very’, a degree modifier, respectively, they each have two homophonous meanings that are very useful for distinguishing between adjectival passives on the one hand and simple adjectives on the other. Let us briefly review the characteristics of each meaning of bien and muy.

The prototypical meaning that most speakers would assign to the word bien is ‘well’, a manner adverb. Let us call this bienM for ‘manner.’ As a manner modifier bienM may modify participial forms that have an implicit manner component. Having an implicit manner component
is tantamount to saying that the predicate has an implicit agent since only agents are capable of acting in ways required by manner adverbs.

(32) a. una lección bien\textsubscript{M} estudiada (Adjectival Passive)
    a lesson well studied
    ‘a well studied lesson’

    b. una lección estudiada bien\textsubscript{M} (Verbal Passive)
    a lesson studied well
    ‘a lesson (that was) studied well’

The interpretation of (32a) is equivalent to (32b). The main difference is that the participle in (32a) is an adjectival passive since only adjectives admit \textit{bien} in the pre-nuclear position while (32b) is a verbal passive since verbs only admit \textit{bien} in the post-nuclear position (see Bosque 1999: 284 for more details).\textsuperscript{35} Another important characteristic of bien\textsubscript{M} is that it may be intensified by a degree intensifier such as \textit{muy} (very), \textit{super} (super) or \textit{re} (≈ super).

(33) a. una lección \{muy/super/re-\} bien\textsubscript{M} estudiada (Adjectival Passive)
    a lesson very/super/super well studied
    ‘a very well studied lesson’

    b. una lección estudiada \{muy/super/re-\} bien\textsubscript{M} (Verbal Passive)
    a lesson studied very/super/super well
    ‘a lesson (that was) studied very well’

\textsuperscript{35}Spanish verbs do not admit \textit{bien} in the pre-nuclear position, but they admit other adverbs there. Compare the following examples.

(i) a. *Juan \textbf{bien} hace la tarea.
    b. Juan hace \textbf{bien} la tarea.
    b. Juan hace la tarea \textbf{bien}.

(ii) a. Juan \textbf{siempre} hace la tarea.
    b. Juan hace \textbf{siempre} la tarea.
    c. Juan hace la tarea \textbf{siempre}. 
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This is not the only *bien* in the Spanish language though. There is another *bien* that functions as a colloquial degree modifier, meaning ‘very’ or ‘really.’ Let us call this *bien_{D}* for ‘degree.’ As a degree modifier *bien_{D}* may modify adjectives that denote a gradable property. Unlike *bien_{M}* it may never appear in the post-nuclear position, which is impossible for adjectival modifiers.

(34)  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
  a. & un hombre *bien_{D}* alto  
  & a man really tall  
  & ‘a really tall man’  \\
  b. & *un hombre alto *bien_{D}*  
  & a man tall really  
  & Intended: ‘a really tall man’  
\end{tabular}

Since *bien_{D}* is itself a degree modifier, it may not be further intensified by a different degree modifier.\(^{36}\)

(35)  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
  a. & un hombre {*muy/super/re} *bien_{D}* alto  
  & a man very/super/super really tall  
  & Intended: ‘a very really tall man’  
\end{tabular}

Now that we have shown that *bien* has two meanings in Spanish, *bien_{M}* (= well) and *bien_{D}* (= really or very), let us move on to the modifier *muy*. The prototypical meaning that most speakers would assign to *muy* is ‘very’, a degree modifier. Let us call this *muy_{D}* for ‘degree.’ As a degree modifier *muy_{D}* may modify adjectives that denote gradable properties in the pre-nuclear position.

(36)  
\begin{tabular}{ll}
  a. & un hombre *muy_{D}* alto.  
  & a man very tall  
  & ‘a very tall man’  
\end{tabular}

\(^{36}\)Kennedy & McNally (2005: 370) note a general restriction on recursion of degree modifiers. Essentially, it is only possible to repeat a degree modifier in reduplication constructions such as *very very surprised* (compare with *very quite surprised*). The same restriction also holds for Spanish but the way of intensifying a degree modifier differs according to which degree modifier we are talking about. It is possible to say *muy muy alto*, where *muy* (= very) is repeated. However, it is not possible to say *bien bien alto*, rather the presence of *pero* (= but) is required between the two instances of *bien* in such constructions: *bien pero bien alto*. I will not comment further on this here, leaving this subtle but interesting difference between the degree words *muy* (= very) and *bien* (= really) aside for future research.
b. *un hombre alto muy$_D$
   a man tall very

   Intended: ‘a man tall very’

However, this is not the only muy in the Spanish lexicon. There is another muy that modifies adjectives that contain an implicit event or agent and functions as an adverbial quantifier whose meaning translates roughly to ‘often.’ Let us call this muy$_F$ for ‘frequency.’ As an adverbial quantifier muy$_F$ may modify adjectival passives (which we already know contain an implicit event and agent) in the pre-nuclear position. Its meaning is similar to what the adverbial quantifier mucho (= a lot) yields for verbal passives. The main difference between these two modifiers is that muy$_F$ only modifies adjectives in the pre-nuclear position whereas mucho only modifies verbs in the post-nuclear position.

(37) a. un museo muy$_F$ visitado
    a museum often visited
    ‘an often visited museum’

   b. un museo visitado (*muy$_F$/mucho
    a museum visited often / often
    ‘a museum (that has been) visited often/a lot’

Now, we have seen that in addition to containing two bien’s (bien$_M$ and bien$_D$), Spanish also contains two muy’s, muy$_D$ (= very) and muy$_F$ (= often). In order to be modified by bien$_M$ (= well) and muy$_D$ (= often), a participial adjective must contain an implicit agent and event that gives rise to the state denoted by the adjective. In order to be modified by bien$_D$ (= really) and muy$_D$ (= very), a participial adjective must refer to a simple, gradable state that lacks an implicit agent and event that gives rise to the state denoted by that adjective. Taking what we have seen with respect to bien and muy into consideration let us observe the possible interpretations that these
two modifiers yield with class 1 participles. In order to put the following phrases in context, imagine that we are members of a farming community that must burn forest in order to plant. The burning is cyclic such that the same areas of forest are burned and allowed to grow again after planting and then may be burned again. Thus, burning in this context requires a particular amount of skill on the farmer’s part and may also occur various times on the same patch of land (over a long period of time). In such a context, both (38a) and (38b) are clearly ambiguous.

(38)  a. un terreno bien$_{M/D}$ quemado  
       a plot well/really burned/burnt  
       (i) bien$_{M} =$ a field that was skillfully burned (by an experienced farmer)  
       (ii) bien$_{D} =$ a field that is really burnt (to a high degree)  

 b. un terreno muy$_{F/D}$ quemado  
       a plot often/very burned/burnt  
       (i) muy$_{F} =$ a field that is often burned (many people burn it to plant there)  
       (ii) muy$_{D} =$ a field that is very burnt (to a high degree)  

In the case of (38a), reading (i) may be paraphrased as (39a) and admits degree intensifiers as in (39b). Reading (ii) does not permit such a paraphrase nor does it permit further degree intensifiers.

(39)  a. un terreno quemado bien$_{M/D}^{*}$  
       a plot burned well/*really  
       ‘a field (that was) burned well’  

 b. un terreno muy bien$_{M/D}^{*}$ quemado  
       a plot very well/*really burned  
       ‘a very well burned field’  

In the case of (38b), reading (i) may be paraphrased as (40) but no such paraphrase exists for reading (ii).
The data in (38) – (40) show that class 1 transitive verbs may give rise to participles that function as adjectival passives or simple adjectives that denote gradable properties attributed or predicated of the internal argument (= theme) of the verbs from which they are derived. For example, un terreno in all of the examples in (38) is the theme of the source verb quemar (burn) and encodes an implicit event of burning and an agent in the first readings while simply indicating the state of the field without necessarily implying the presence a prior event or an agent in the second readings. Further corroboration of this observation comes from a second group of class 1 transitive verbs that actually show a morphological distinction between their verbal/adjectival passive form and the simple adjective that may be derived from the source verb. Let us look at a few of these verbs in table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Verb</th>
<th>Verbal or Adjectival Passive</th>
<th>Simple Adjectival Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>secar (to dry)</td>
<td>secado (dried)</td>
<td>seco (dry)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>llenar (to fill)</td>
<td>llenado (filled)</td>
<td>lleno (full)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vaciar (to empty)</td>
<td>vaciado (emptied)</td>
<td>vacío (empty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>limpiar (to clean)</td>
<td>limpiado (cleaned)</td>
<td>limpio (clean)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sujetar (to fasten)</td>
<td>sujetado (fastened)</td>
<td>sujeto (fastened)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>juntar (to join)</td>
<td>juntado (joined)</td>
<td>junto (together)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despertar (to awaken)</td>
<td>despertado (awakened)</td>
<td>despierto (awake)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first question that the reader might ask is why the adjectives in the right hand column are called ‘participles.’ The answer is that some of them were participles in Old Spanish (Bosque 1999: 279) and the same derivational process from participle to a ‘truncated’ adjectival form in English (dried – dry) has also been noted by Parsons (1990). In modern Spanish (and English),
however, they are all used as simple adjectives. Within this group of class 1 verbs, there is no
ambiguity with respect to *bien* and *muy* modification. Agent and event oriented readings are only
possible with the full participial form (the verbal or adjectival passive) whereas degree readings
are only possible with the truncated form (the simple adjective).

(41)  a. un plato *bienM/D* secado
     a plate well/*really dried
     ‘a well dried plate’

     b. un plato bien*M/D seco
     a plate *well/really dry
     ‘a really dry plate’

The predictions are precisely what we expect given what we saw in (38) – (40). The adjectival
passive use of *secado* in (41a) may be paraphrased as the verbal passive in (42a), in which case
the position of *bien* is post-nuclear. Further corroboration that this is the manner use of *bien*
that is targeting the implicit agentivity of the adjectival passive comes from the fact that *bien* in
(41a) may be modified by degree intensifiers as in (42b).

(42)  a. un plato secado bien*M/D*
     a plate dried well/*really
     ‘a plate (that was) dried well’

     b. un plato muy/super/re *bienM/D secado*
     a plate very/super/super well/*really dried
     ‘a very well dried plate’

The truncated participle, on the other hand, is a simple adjective, and can only be modified by
*bienD*. Thus, it does not permit *bien* to appear in the post-nuclear position nor does *bien* permit
additional degree intensification as seen in (43).
(43)  a. *un plato seco bien_D
    a plate dry really
    Intended: ‘a really dry plate’

    b. *un plato muy/super/re bien_D seco
    a plate very/super/super really dry
    Intended ‘a very really dry plate’

The modification facts with muy also follow the expected pattern. The frequentative reading is the only one possible for the full participle (verbal or adjectival passive) and the degree reading is the only one possible for the truncated participle (simple adjective).

(44)  a. un plato muy_F/D secado (porque se moja tanto)\(^{37}\)
    a plate often/*very dried (because it gets wet so much)
    ‘an often dried plate’

    b. un plato muy_F/D seco
    a plate often/very dry
    ‘a very dry plate’

Only (44a) is equivalent to a paraphrase in which mucho is used in the post-nuclear position while (44b) cannot appear in such a construction.

(45)  a. un plato secado mucho (porque se moja tanto)\(^{38}\)
    a plate dried often/a lot (because it gets wet so much)
    ‘a plate (that has been) dried often/a lot’

---

\(^{37}\)Another possible reading that exists for some adjectival passives is one in which the progress of the event (drying in this case) is measured in terms of the surface area of the object that has been ‘covered.’ Thus, some verbs may permit an additional reading for a sentence like (44a) where un plato muy secado would mean something like ‘a plate the majority of whose surface has been dried.’ Some speakers accept a reading like this for limpiado (cleaned) but it seems more limited.

\(^{38}\)Sentences like (44a) are not as frequent as (45a); however, they are not ungrammatical and are readily understood by all speakers. Examples like (44a) are cited as unacceptable in Bosque (1999: 298) but they are only unacceptable if the intended reading is a degree reading. On the event-oriented reading they are not unacceptable. The main reason why Bosque (1999) cites them as unacceptable is that speakers also have the option of using the verbal form of the participle and modifying it with mucho in order to express the same meaning. So, it is also possible to say un plato secado mucho (= a plate (that is) dried a lot). Perhaps the frequency of muy as a degree modifier creates a tendency to avoid its use as an adverbial quantifier.
b. *un plato seco mucho
   a plate dry often/a lot
   Intended: ‘a plate (that has been) dry often’

The data in (41) – (45) add further support to the observation that class 1 transitive verbs, when combined with participial morphology, in addition to the completely productive adjectival passive, also yield simple adjectival forms.

Taking this into consideration we see that there is a clear link between the ability of class 1 verbs to omit their external argument (what we saw in sections 2.1 – 2.3) and an ability to systematically yield derivative adjectival forms that lack any kind of implicit agent: simple adjectives. Some class 1 verbs have simple adjectives that are morphologically identical to adjectival passives such as congelar – congelado (freeze – frozen) while others have simple adjectives that are morphologically distinct from the adjectival passive such as secar – secado – seco (dry – dried – dry). We already saw that class 2 verbs cannot omit their external argument, so if there is a correlation between being able to omit the external argument and yielding a derived adjectival form that lacks an implicit agent, we would not expect to see the same kind of systematic derivational relation between class 2 verbs and derivative adjectival forms that lack any kind of implicit agent (simple adjectives). In the discussion that follows, we will see that this expected correlation is borne out.

In some works on participles, passives and statives across languages it seems to be assumed that all verbs give rise to participles that may function as verbal and adjectival passives in addition to simple adjectives. Let us assume for the time being that like class 1 verbs, all class 2 verbs are three ways ambiguous when it comes to their participles (here, as we did above, we
are ignoring the use of participles as markers of perfective aspect in active sentences with the auxiliary verb *haber* = to have).

Table 2.3 Ambiguous Participles of Class 2 Transitive Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Verbal or Adjectival Passive</th>
<th>Simple Adjectival Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>barrer</td>
<td>barrido (swept)</td>
<td>barrido (swept)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavar</td>
<td>lavado (washed)</td>
<td>lavado (washed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comer</td>
<td>comido (eaten)</td>
<td>comido (eaten)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomar</td>
<td>tomado (drunk)</td>
<td>tomado (drunk)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fumar</td>
<td>fumado (smoked)</td>
<td>fumado (smoked)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leer</td>
<td>leído (read)</td>
<td>leído (read)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>escribir</td>
<td>escrito (written)</td>
<td>escrito (written)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cantar</td>
<td>cantado (sung)</td>
<td>cantado (sung)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bailar</td>
<td>bailado (danced)</td>
<td>bailado (danced)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pintar</td>
<td>pintado (painted)</td>
<td>pintado (painted)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we saw above, there are two questions that we face when confronted with the kind of ambiguity exhibited by participles: (i) how do we tell the verbal and adjectival passives apart from the simple adjectival form and (ii) how do we determine what the simple adjectival forms mean in relation to the source verb? In the case of class 1 verbs *bien* and *muy* provided a way to answer both questions. Agent and event oriented readings of *bien* and *muy* pick out the verbal and adjectival passive forms over the simple adjectival form. Furthermore, the fact that degree readings are systematically available with the simple adjectival forms for those verbs shows what their relation to the source verb is: a gradable property that is attributed or predicated of the internal argument (= theme) of the source verb. For all of the participles in table 2.3, there is no ambiguity exhibited when modified by *bien* or *muy*, as can be seen in (46).

(46) a. una casa muy / bien barrida
    (i) a house often / well swept (Agent/Event-Oriented Readings)
    (ii) ?? a house very / really swept (Degree Readings)

81
b. una pizza muy_{F} bien_{M} comida^{39}
   (i) a pizza often / well eaten (Agent/Event-Oriented Readings)
   (ii) a pizza very / really eaten (Degree Readings)

c. un trabajo muy_{F} bien_{M} escrito
   (i) a work often / well written (Agent/Event-Oriented Readings)
   (ii) a work very / really written (Degree Readings)

d. una canción muy_{F} bien_{M} cantada
   (i) a song often / well sung (Agent/Event-Oriented Readings)
   (ii) a song very / really sung (Degree Readings)

The data in (46) show that there is no interpretation of the participle such that it is a simple
gradable adjective that is attributed or predicated of the theme of class 2 verbs. This already
clearly separates this particular set of class 2 verbs from class 1 verbs. The question then
becomes whether the past participles of class 2 verbs have simple adjectival forms at all. That is,
is there an adjectival use of any of the participles in table 2.3 that is distinct from an adjectival
passive? The answer is affirmative, but the relation of those adjectives to the source verb is not
as systematic and predictable as the one we see for class 1 verbs. A subset of class 2 transitive
verbs that involve consumption and internalization (such as leer = read) have simple adjectival
forms that generally require the presence of a modifier like bien or muy but they do not denote a
gradable property that is attributed or predicated of the theme of their source verb. In fact, it is
precisely the opposite relation that we see: the adjective is actually attributed of the agent of the
source verb in the following examples.^{40}

---

^{39}In (35b) there is an extra reading associated with muy (very) that was mentioned above in fn. 9 above. For some verbs there is an event-oriented reading that is associated with amount of surface area covered understood in terms of an amount of the direct object. This is the extra event-oriented reading that exists for comer. That is, una pizza muy comida could be one that is order and consumed often by customers at a particular restaurant or it might be a pizza the majority of whose surface area has been eaten (by someone). Crucially this reading also requires a prior event and is not the degree reading that is associated with simple gradable adjectives.

^{40}English actually shows a similar pattern (see Bresnan 1995 for details).
Based on what we have been outlining thus far, this shouldn’t come as a surprise. These verbs require an agent and may optionally appear without a theme, thus it make sense that only a subset of class 2 transitive verbs and no class 1 transitive verbs have the kind of adjectival uses of participles that we see in (47). The animate arguments of the class 1 adjectival passives in (48) can never be interpreted as agents in the way that those of (47) are.

Other class 2 verbs may have what appear to be simple adjectival uses but, for the most part, it is impossible to separate these from adjectival passives.

41This is somewhat synonymous with ‘un animal bien alimentado’ (= a well fed animal). However, this phrase implies that an owner takes care of the animal by providing it with the proper and adequate amount food. The phrase in (47a) simply indicates that the animal has eaten a lot.
The adjective in (49) must have an implicit agent and grammatically encode a prior event. It is not a gradable property that holds of the theme of the source verb, thus there is simply no evidence that many class 2 verbs actually have a simple adjectival form that is different from an adjectival passive. We might also draw on the observation that few class 2 verbs may be the source of simple adjectives in the ‘truncated’ form that we saw in table 2.2 above in order to further support the idea that class 2 verbs do not have simple adjectival uses of participles. However, there are some class 2 verbs that do appear to have simple adjectives in the ‘truncated’ form such as pinto (= painted, colored) from pintar (= to paint), a verb that behaves like a class 2 verb according to each of the diagnostics presented above. Some examples are shown in (50).

(50) a. un caballo pinto
    a horse painted
    ‘a pinto horse’

b. judías pintas
    beans painted
    ‘pinto beans’

(Bosque 1990)

Obviously, the use of the word pinto in each case does not entail that a painting event happened resulting in the coloration of the horse or bean. In these cases pinto means ‘a particular type of color pattern.’ As noted in Bosque (1990, 1999), truncated participles were much more common in Old Spanish and they clearly contained implicit events, thus functioning like verbal and adjectival passives. The following examples are from Bosque (1990, ex. 3).

(51) a. fueron las paredes llenas de sangre [General Estoria]
    were the walls filled with blood
    ‘the walls were filled with blood’
b. Fue suelto de la cárcel [Guzmán de Alfarache]
He was released from the jail
‘He was released from jail’

As Bosque discusses, the context of each of these sentences, in addition to the use of ser (= the auxiliary used in verbal passives), shows that the truncated participles are referring to events of filling and releasing and not simply indicating the state that the theme of the source verb is in. The data from Bosque show that the use of truncated participles was generalized to many verbs in Old Spanish, class 1 and class 2. What is interesting is that only class 1 verbs maintain productive uses of them in Modern Spanish. The fact that some class 2 verbs have associated adjectives such as pinto is simply a historical accident. Most speakers would find it difficult to use pinto outside of the two examples in (51) because it has essentially formed lexical units with those particular nouns (caballo and judía). To sum up, even the existence of truncated participles that function as simple adjectives does not provide convincing evidence that class 2 verbs can productively derive simple adjectives that require the absence of an implicit event and agent.

If we compare what we have seen for class 1 verbs to what we have seen for class 2 verbs, it is clear that the conclusions of sections 2.1 – 2.3 are reinforced. Class 1 verbs do not require an external argument thus they can give rise to derived forms that lack an agent. This is why these verbs, when they take participial morphology, systematically give rise to adjectival forms that lack any kind of implicit agent. The main generalization that has been made here is that the ability of a verb to omit the external argument correlates with the ability of that same verb to give rise to a simple adjective with participial morphology that only requires an internal argument, generally a theme in the cases we have seen (class 1). Verbs that can never omit the external argument do not give rise to simple adjectives that only require a theme. This is due to
the fact that the source verb requires an implicit event and agent (the external argument cannot be omitted). We saw that if class 2 verbs have a simple adjectival form with participial morphology, it is related to the source verb in an idiosyncratic way. It may take the agent of the source verb as its argument as in _una mujer muy leída_ (= a well read woman) or it may simply be a historical accident as in _pinto_ (= lit. ‘painted’), which has lost any real association with the verb ‘pintar.’

One final data set that further corroborates the ideas that we have seen in this section are secondary predicational constructions that involve participles that are “root-identical” to the main verb. Spanish, like all Romance languages, lack resultative constructions in which an adjectival predicate expresses a result that is lexically distinct from the means or manner component expressed by the main verb as in _John hammered the metal flat_. Instead of constructions like this one, Spanish does allow constructions in which a result is specified by a participle that is built from the same root as the main verb so long as _bien_ modifies the participle (see Armstrong 2010b, 2011a; Bosque 1990; Demonte 1991; Demonte & Masullo 1999 for more details). What is interesting about these constructions is that _bien_ can be interpreted as either _bien_M or _bien_D. In spite of the possibility of either type of _bien_ being able to appear in these constructions, only class 1 verbs show the ambiguity we would expect from such a possibility while class 2 verbs do not. This is illustrated below. In (52) we see that either the manner or degree reading is possible for the first group of class 1 verbs that make no morphological distinction between adjectival passives and simple adjectives.

---

42The reasons for which Romance languages do not have resultative constructions like this will not be treated here. There is an ample literature on this subject (Mateu 2000, 2002, 2010; Snyder 1995; Talmy 1985; Washio 1997).
In (53) we see that the second group of class 1 verbs, which distinguishes morphologically between the two kinds of adjectives, permits the resultative constructions with both types
(adjectival passives and truncated participles). The readings in each case are precisely what we would expect given what was presented above. The full participial form is interpreted as ‘manner’ while the truncated participial form is interpreted as ‘degree.’

Finally, we see that class 2 verbs only ever permit one unambiguous resultative construction, which follows straightforwardly from their inability to yield simple adjectival forms that lack any kind of implicit agent.

The data we have seen in this section provide even stronger evidence in favor of the preliminary conclusions we reached in sections 2.1 – 2.3. Class 1 verbs do not need an external argument, which explains why they routinely appear as inchoatives. This also explains why, when combined with participial morphology, they systematically give rise simple adjectives that are
only require a theme and lack any kind of implicit agent. Class 2 verbs, on the other hand, must have an external argument. This is why they never appear as inchoatives. This also explains why class 2 verbs, when combined with participial morphology, do not give rise to simple adjectival forms that lack an implicit agent. They generally only have adjectival passives and when they do have simple adjectival forms these are idiosyncratically related to the source verb, either requiring some kind of agentivity or take on a meaning such as that of pinto that is no longer derivationally related to the original source verb.

2.5 Object Omission

In the previous four sections we saw a cluster of phenomena that show that class 1 verbs may omit their external argument (which has been an agent in most of the examples we have seen) while class 2 verbs may not. A natural question is if the inverse holds. Do class 2 verbs always require the presence of their external argument while allowing their internal argument to be omitted? A preliminary answer to this question is affirmative: only class 2 verbs can omit their internal arguments in ‘neutral’ declarative contexts.

There are various kinds of object omission in Spanish so it is instructive to review what type of object omission is of interest here. Let us first mention a kind of object omission that we are not interested in: indefinite object drop. Campos (1986) shows that indefinite object drop is a phenomenon in Spanish whereby an indefinite object of a transitive verb may be omitted in the context of an answer to a question or any similar context in which the object is pragmatically
recoverable.\footnote{In addition to indefinite object drop in interrogative contexts, imperatives and certain habitual and progressive contexts are amenable to object omission mainly because the object is recoverable in the context. Campos (1999: 1528) cites a few imperatives from Cano Aguilar (1981) in which the object is omitted but is clearly recoverable through deixis.} As shown in (55) and (56), this phenomenon does not pick out any particular class of transitive verbs; rather, it applies to any transitive verb with an indefinite object that is used in the appropriate context.

(55)  a. ¿Derretiste hielo?
You melted ice
‘Did you melt ice?’

   b. Sí, derretí.
Yes, I melted
‘Yes, I melted (ice)’

(56)  a. ¿Escribiste cartas?
You wrote letters?
‘Did you write letters?’

   b. Sí, escribí.
Yes, I wrote
‘Yes, I wrote (letters)’

More relevant to our investigation is that in neutral declarative sentences that might be conceived of as the answer to the question ¿qué pasó? (= what happened) or ¿qué hiciste? (= what did you

\footnote{In addition to indefinite object drop in interrogative contexts, imperatives and certain habitual and progressive contexts are amenable to object omission mainly because the object is recoverable in the context. Campos (1999: 1528) cites a few imperatives from Cano Aguilar (1981) in which the object is omitted but is clearly recoverable through deixis.}
only class 2 verbs can omit their objects while class 1 verbs systematically resist such omission as shown in (57) and (58).

(57)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. *Ale rompió a las siete.  
      \hspace{1cm} \text{Class 1} 
    \hspace{1cm} \text{Ale broke at seven} 
    \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Ale broke at seven o’clock’} 
  
  \item b. *Juan vació toda la tarde.  
    \hspace{1cm} \text{Juan emptied all afternoon} 
    \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Juan emptied all afternoon’} 
\end{itemize}

(58)  
\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Ale comió a las siete.  
    \hspace{1cm} \text{Ale ate at seven} 
    \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Ale ate at seven o’clock’} 
  
  \item b. Juan leyó toda la tarde.  
    \hspace{1cm} \text{Juan read all afternoon} 
    \hspace{1cm} \text{‘Juan read all afternoon’} 
\end{itemize}

Most approaches to the difference we see between (57) and (58) claim that some verbs are capable of licensing an implicit object by virtue of their meaning. These verbs are called ‘transitivos absolutos’ in traditional grammars (Campos 1999: 1527-1528; see Levin 1993: 33 for a similar discussion for English). Another way of looking at the difference between (57) and (58) is that the verbs in (58) are actually grammatically intransitive and have no implicit theme. The reason we tend to associate an implicit theme with them is because the real-world mechanics of the actions they denote are impossible to conceptualize without a theme. For example, it is possible for the grammar of Spanish to generate the intransitive verb *comer* (eat) but it is

\footnote{The following list is provided by Campos (1999: 1528), which essentially picks out class 2 transitive verbs.}

(i) Mental or Physical Perception: *comprender* (understand), *mirar* (look), *oír* (listen), *ver* (see)
(ii) Consumption Verbs: *comer* (eat), *cenar* (dine), *desayunar* (eat breakfast)
(iii) Intellectual Activities: *leer* (read), *escribir* (write)
(iv) Performance Verbs: *bailar* (dance), *cantar* (sing)
impossible for speakers to conceptualize that verb as intransitive because there is no real-world counterpart of an eating that doesn’t involve anything being eaten. Regardless of what the correct explanation for the difference is, these data clearly show the complementary pattern of what we saw in sections 2.1 – 2.3. Class 1 verbs permit the omission of their external argument but not their internal argument; on the other hand, class 2 verbs permit the omission of the internal argument but not their external argument.

2.6 Aspect, SE and the Class 1 – Class 2 Transitivity Distinction

In addition to being a marker of a range of impersonal sentences, a marker of true reflexive relations as in John hit himself and an inchoative marker (as we saw in section 2.1), the SE clitic may also appear with transitive verbs, imposing a variety of different effects on the subject of that transitive relation and on the aspectual interpretation of the verb phrase (Basilico 2010; De Cuyper 2006; De Miguel & Fernández Lagunilla 2000; MacDonald 2004; Nishida 1994; Sanz 2000; Zagona 1996). There are two types of transitive SE constructions that I believe bring out an additional, though more subtle difference between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs: (i) a weak dative pronoun that requires agentive transitive verbs, which is shown in (59a), and (ii) a verbal morpheme that obligatorily marks telicity for a subset of class 2 transitive verbs (verbs of consumption), which is shown in (59b).

(59) a. Juan (se) lavó todos los platos.
    Juan (SE.3s) washed all the dishes
    ‘Juan wholeheartedly washed all the dishes’

    b. María *(se) comió todo el pan.
    María (SE.3s) ate all the bread
    ‘María ate up all the bread’
Throughout this section I will call the SE in (59a) wholehearted telic SE because it requires the verb it combines with to be telic and also adds the idea that the event is performed in a wholehearted way by the subject. I will call the SE in (59b) transitive aspectual SE since it requires that the verb it combines with be both transitive and telic but does not add the notion of wholeheartedness to the subject. What is of particular interest to us is that while wholehearted telic SE is able to combine with a range of both class 1 and class 2 verbs, transitive aspectual SE is limited to only a subset of class 2 verbs: verbs of consumption. The question is why this should be the case. That is, why is there an aspectually-sensitive use of SE that picks out only a subset of class 2 verbs but not class 1 verbs? In this section I argue that the reason for which transitive aspectual SE only exists in class 2 transitive verbs is because the aspectually-sensitive use of SE in class 1 verbs is actually the inchoative SE we saw in section 2.1 (Basilico 2010; Sanz 2000).

The point of this section is to show that there is a use of SE that is a marker of telicity that reflects the inherent difference between class 1 and class 2 verbs. When it marks class 1 verbs as telic, it also marks that there is no external argument (= inchoative SE). When it marks telicity in class 2 verbs as telic, it requires that the verb be transitive (have both a subject and an object). Due to the often confusing nature of the different uses of SE, this section is longer than the previous ones. We will start with a brief discussion of telicity in transitive verbs. Then we will move on to the role that aspectually-sensitive SE plays with different types of transitive verbs. Finally, I will discuss how the distribution of transitive aspectual SE is relevant for the class 1 versus class 2 transitivity distinction, comparing it with inchoative SE.

---

I will not attempt to answer the question why inchoative SE has the two functions it has for class 1 verbs (eliminating the external argument and marking telicity). This is beyond the scope of what I am doing here.
2.6.1 Telicity in Transitive Verbs

Telicity in many transitive verbs depends on a combination of tense, aspect and the referential properties of the verb’s internal arguments (Dowty 1979; Krifka 1989, 1992; Vendler 1967; Verkuyl 1972, 1993). For the most part, the nature of telicity has been investigated in past tense situations that can be measured by temporal bounds in the form of time frames introduced by the prepositions *in* or *for*. A telic verb phrase is one that contains an inherent endpoint that delimits the verb phrase. When adding a temporal bound to such a verb phrase, the end of the time frame corresponds to the inherent endpoint of the event and this is what *in* is sensitive to. An atelic verb phrase is one that contains either a series of bounded events that iterate indefinitely or one long event that extends indefinitely, thus they are not delimited. When adding a temporal bound to such a verb phrase, the end of the time frame does not correspond to any inherent endpoint associated with the event. The lack of sensitivity to an inherent endpoint is what triggers a verb phrase’s compatibility with *for*.

Objects that denote ‘specific quantities’ (Verkuyl 1972) or that have ‘quantized reference’ (Krifka 1989) give rise to telic readings for many transitive verbs whereas the absence of a specific quantity or quantized referenced gives rise to an atelic reading. For many class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs in Spanish, this is the sole determining factor for whether or not a

---

46There is currently a lot of interest in precisely what the interpretation of bare plurals with a time span introduced by *for* actually mean. Traditionally these are taken to be unbounded events that can receive a temporal bound in the form of a *for* phrase. However, it has been argued in Depraetere (1995), MacDonald (2008), Ramchand (2008), Zagona (2004) and Zubizarreta & Oh (2007) that these are actually iterative bounded events that receive a ‘sequence of similar events’ reading in the presence of the *for* phrase (MacDonald 2008). These observations seem to be correct and it means that we have to refine the notions of telic and atelic in such a way as they get at the distinction between bounded and unbounded, particularly those kinds of events that are instantaneous and iterative (achievements and semelfactives), which have traditionally been the toughest predicates to analyze in terms of telicity or atelicity. For cases in (60) and (61) this means the following: *en x time* targets a unified event and temporal bound whereas *durante x time* introduces a temporal bound to an event that may iterates indefinitely or to one that has no bound and may extend indefinitely like *run*. 93
particular verb phrase will be telic or atelic. This is shown for both class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs in (60) and (61).

(60) **CLASS 1**

a. El mesero llenó vasos *en/durante* tres horas.
   The waiter filled glasses *in/for* three hours
   ‘The waiter filled glasses for three hours’

b. El mesero llenó todos los vasos *en/durante* tres horas.
   The waiter filled all the glasses *in/for* three hours
   ‘The waiter filled all the glasses in three hours’

c. El mesero llenó un vaso *en/durante* 30 segundos.
   The waiter filled a glass *in/for* 30 seconds.
   ‘The waiter filled a glass in 30 seconds’

(61) **CLASS 2**

a. El artista pintó murales *en/durante* un día.
   The artist painted murals *in/for* a day
   ‘The artist painted murals for a day’

b. El artista pintó todo el mural *en/durante* un día.
   The artist painted all the mural *in/for* a day
   ‘The artist painted the whole mural in a day’

c. El artista pintó un mural *en/durante* un día.
   The artist painted a mural *in/for* a day
   ‘The artist painted a mural in a day’

The next step is defining the precise function that aspectually-sensitive uses of SE have in different types of transitive verbs. This is done in the next section.
2.6.2 Class 1 Verbs: Wholehearted telic SE

Class 1 transitive verbs may take wholehearted telic SE. The first property of wholehearted telic SE is that it is *optional* and its presence adds the idea that the subject performs the event denoted by the verb ‘wholeheartedly’ (= with effort, involvement). This is can seen in the English translation of the sentence in (62).

(62)  El mesero (se) llenó todos los vasos del restaurante
The waiter (SE.3s) filled all the glasses of the restaurant
‘The waiter wholeheartedly filled all the glasses in the restaurant’

Because SE adds the idea of *whoheartedness*, it is infelicitous in contexts where the subject is forced to perform an action or performs an action unwillingly or half-heartedly. This can be seen in the examples in (63).

(63)  a. El jefe del restaurante obligó al mesero a llenar(#se) todos los vasos.
The boss of the restaurant made ACC. the waiter to fill(SE.3s) all the glasses
Intended: ‘The boss forced the waiter to wholeheartedly fill all the glasses’

b. (#Me) cerré todas las puertas de la casa con desgano/sin mayor interés.
(SE.1s) I closed all the doors of the house half-heartedly
Intended: I wholeheartedly closed all the doors in the house half-heartedly

As its name indicates, wholehearted telic SE requires that the verb it combines with be telic. As a consequence, it is only compatible with the objects that can license temporal frames headed by *en* but not those headed by *durante*. This can be seen in (64).

(64)  a. El mesero (??se) llenó vasos *en/durante tres horas.
The waiter (SE.3s) filled glasses *in/for three hours
‘The waiter filled glasses for three hours’

b. El mesero (se) llenó todos los vasos en/*durante tres horas.
The waiter (SE.3s) filled all the glasses in/for three hours
‘The waiter wholeheartedly filled all the glasses in three hours’
The next property of wholehearted telic SE is that it cannot be doubled by the strong pronoun anaphor, *a sí mismo* (= self), a property it shares with inchoative SE (see section 2.1). This is shown in (65).

(65)   El mesero se llenó todos los vasos (*a sí mismo)  
       The waiter SE.3s filled all the glasses (DAT.3s,himself)  
       ‘The waiter whole-heartedly filled all the glasses’

A final property of wholehearted telic SE is that it has a limited co-occurrence with other dative clitics. Specifically, it blocks the presence of non-reflexive third person datives as can be seen in (66a). It may occur with first and second person ‘ethical’ datives as we see in (66b). Finally, three clitic clusters are not possible with wholehearted telic SE as can be seen in (66c).

(66)   a. ??El mesero se le llenó todos los vasos al jefe  
       The waiter SE.3s DAT.3s filled all the glasses DAT.3.s, the boss  
       ‘The waiter whole-heartedly filled all the glasses for the boss’

   b. El mesero se me llenó todos los vasos  
       The waiter SE.3s DAT.1s filled all the glasses  
       ‘The waiter whole-heartedly filled all the glasses for me’

   c. *El mesero se me le llenó todos los vasos al jefe  
       The waiter SE.3s DAT.1s DAT.3s filled all the glasses DAT.3s, the boss  
       ‘The waiter whole-heartedly filled all the glasses for the boss (and I was interested in this)’

The properties of wholehearted telic SE are summarized in table 2.4. Wholehearted telic SE may appear with any class 1 verb when provided with an appropriate context. In the next section we will look at the behavior of class 2 verbs in transitive SE constructions.
Table 2.4: Properties of Wholehearted telic SE (Class 1 Verbs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 1 Verbs</th>
<th>Optional?</th>
<th>Adds “wholeheartedness”?</th>
<th>Telicity?</th>
<th>Doubling?</th>
<th>Co-occur w/ 3rd person datives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class 1 (all)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6.3 Class 2 Verbs: Wholehearted Telic SE and Transitive Aspectual SE

Unlike class 1 verbs, class 2 verbs may be divided into various subtypes according to their behavior in transitive SE constructions. These subtypes are based on whether the verb combines with wholehearted telic SE or with transitive aspectual SE. The subtypes are outlined below.

The first subtype of class 2 verbs are activity verbs such as *lavar* (= wash), *barrer* (= sweep) and *pintar* (= paint, in the non-creation sense). This subtype of class 2 verbs behaves exactly like class 1 verbs in that they take wholehearted telic SE but not transitive aspectual SE. The properties that sentences containing SE have are the same as the ones we saw above for class 1 verbs. First, SE is optional and its presence adds the idea that the subject performs the event denoted by the verb ‘wholeheartedly’ (= with effort, involvement). This is shown in (67).

(67)  Juan (se) barrió toda la casa  
       Juan (SE.3s) swept all the house  
       ‘Juan wholeheartedly swept the whole house’

As we saw in examples (63) above, with this particular subtype of class 2 verbs, SE is infelicitous in contexts where the subject is forced to perform an action or performs an action unwillingly or half-heartedly. This is shown in (68).

(68)  a. El jefe del restaurante obligó al mesero a barrer(#se) todo el piso.  
       The boss of the restaurant made ACC. the waiter to sweep(SE.3s) all the floor  
       Intended: ‘The boss forced the waiter to wholeheartedly sweep the whole floor’
b. (#Me) lavé todos los platos de la casa con desgano/sin mayor interés.
(SE.1s) I washed all the doors of the house half-heartedly
Intended: I wholeheartedly washed all the dishes in the house half-heartedly

The presence of SE is only compatible with a verb phrase that is telic and thus only a temporal frame headed by en is possible when SE is present as we can see in (69).

(69) a. María (??se) pintó casas *en/durante tres horas.
   María (SE.3s) painted houses *in/for three hours
   Intended: ‘María wholeheartedly painted houses for three hours’

   b. María (se) pintó toda la casa en/*durante tres horas.
   María (SE.3s) painted all the house in/for three hours
   ‘María wholeheartedly painted the whole house in three hours’

Doubling of SE by a strong pronominal anaphor is impossible as is the case with class 1 verbs. This is shown in (70).

(70) Me lavé todos los platos (*a mí mismo)
   SE.1s I washed all the dishes (DAT myself)
   ‘I wholeheartedly washed all the dishes’

Finally, when SE appears with this particular subtype of class 2 verbs, it imposes restrictions on the presence of other dative clitics. Mainly, third person datives appear to be blocked by SE (71a) whereas first and second person ‘ethical’ datives may co-occur with SE (71b). Three clitic clusters are ungrammatical, just we saw above for class 1 verbs (71c).

(71) a. ??Juan se le barrió toda la casa a María
   Juan SE.3s DAT.3s swept all the house DAT María
   Intended: ‘Juan wholeheartedly swept María’s house’

   b. Juan se me barrió toda la casa
   Juan SE.3s DAT.1s swept all the house
   ‘Juan wholeheartedly swept the whole house for me’
(72)  a. Tongolele se       bailó una rumba inolvidable
    Tongolele SE.3s danced a rumba unforgettable
    ‘Tongolele danced an unforgettable rumba (with all her might) (Maldonado 2008)

    b. Me     he      pintado un cuadro impresionante / que te cagas
    SE.1s I have painted a painting impressive / that you shit
    ‘I made a painting that will blow you away’ (adapted from Sanz 2000)

    c. Juan se       cocinó una paella deliciosa para sus invitados.
    Juan SE.3s cooked a paella delicious for his guests
    ‘Juan cooked up a paella for his guests’ (adapted from Sanz 2000: 61)

In the absence of the modifiers inolvidable (72a), impresionante (72b) or deliciosa (72c) the sentence sound like they are missing something to most speakers. The reason why we see this particular property appear with these verbs is most likely due to an interaction between the
notion of *wholeheartedness* that SE adds and the meaning of the verbs themselves. When someone puts all of their effort into performing or creating some entity, there is a strong likelihood that the performed or created object will be of high quality. I will call this particular sub-type of verbs, class 2, subtype 2.

A third subtype of class 2 verbs is comprised of verbs of learning and ‘internalization’ such as *leer (= read), aprender (= learn), saber (= know/learn), conocer (= know/learn), ver (= see), estudiar (= study)*. Verbs of learning are like activity and creation/performance verbs in the following ways: (i) SE is optional, (ii) SE requires telicity, (iii) it is non-doubling and (iv) it blocks the expression of third person dative clitics. Where these verbs differ from their other class 2 counterparts is with respect to the idea of *wholeheartedness*. As can be seen in (73), SE may appear on a verb of learning that is embedded in context where the subject has been forced to do something against his or her will.

(73) a. El maestro obligó a los alumnos a aprender(se) todos los poemas del libro.  
    The teacher made the waiter to learn(SE.3s) all the poems of the book  
    ‘The teacher forced the students to learn all the poems in the book by heart’

    b. Me obligaron a leer(me) esos libros horribles para la clase de literatura.  
    They forced to read(SE.1s) those books horrible for the class of literature  
    ‘They forced me to read those horrible books in Literature’

With these particular verbs, SE can also appear with modifiers that require that the event be done *halfheartedly* as shown in (74).

(74) Juan se leyó la mitad del libro sin mayor interés y lo dejó de leer.  
    Juan SE.3s read the half of the book half-heartedly and it stopped reading  
    ‘Juan read half of the book half-heartedly and then stopped reading it’
I will call these verbs class 2, subtype 3. The final sub-type of class 2 verbs is comprised by verbs of consumption such as *comer* (= eat), *beber* (= drink), *tomar* (= eat/drink) and *fumar* (= smoke). These verbs behave differently in many ways from class 1 verbs and all of the other sub-types of class 2 verbs in transitive SE constructions. The first property that separates them from all the other verbs we have seen thus far is that SE is not optional. As we saw in the previous examples, SE is impossible when the object of the verb is incapable of licensing a temporal frame headed by *en*. In (75), since *pan* (= bread) can only license a temporal frame headed by *durante*, SE is ungrammatical.

(75)  
a. Comí pan *en/durante media hora.
   I ate bread in/for half hour
   ‘I ate bread for half an hour’

   b. (*Me) comí pan
   (SE.1s) I ate bread
   ‘I ate bread’

Let us look now at objects of consumption verbs that only license a temporal frame headed by *en* as in (76a) and (76b), assuming that consumption verbs behave just like the other verbs we have seen thus far.

(76)  
a. Pablo comió un trozo de pan *en/*/durante cinco minutos.
   Pablo ate a piece of bread in/ for five minutes
   ‘Pablo ate a piece of bread in five minutes’

   b. Tomé todo el vino *en/*/durante una hora.
   I drank all the wine in/for an hour
   ‘I drank all the wine in an hour’

Since *un trozo de pan* (76a) and *todo el vino* (76b) are quantized themes, they provide a salient endpoint for the consumption event, thus making it telic and only compatible with terminal
temporal frames. If consumption verbs were like all of the other verbs we have seen thus far, then sentences like (76) would be the ones with which SE could optionally combine. What is interesting is that for most speakers, those sentences are degraded in the absence of SE as we can see in (77).

(77) a. Pablo *(se) comió un trozo de pan en cinco minutos.
    Pablo SE.3s ate a piece of bread in five minutes
    ‘Pablo ate a piece of bread in five minutes’

    b. *{(Me) tomé todo el vino en una hora.
       (SE.1s) I drank all the wine in an hour
       ‘I drank all the wine in an hour’

These data demonstrate that instead of appearing optionally in contexts that are already telic, consumption verbs actually require SE when they have telic interpretations. This is perhaps the defining property of this particular verb class and it has a ripple effect in that it affects how transitive SE constructions of consumption verbs pattern with respect to all of the other properties we have seen for the previous verb classes.

Like class 2, subtype 3 verbs (verbs of learning), SE is felicitous even when a consumption verb is embedded in context where the subject is forced to consume something unwillingly or half-heartedly. This is shown in (78).

(78) a. María obligó a Pedro a fumar-se un puro entero.
    María forced ACC Pedro to smoke-SE.3s a cigar entire
    ‘María forced Pedro to smoke an entire cigar’

---

47For all speakers I have talked to, regardless of dialect, the presence of se in a sentence like (77a), where there is a quantized theme and terminal temporal frame headed by en, is obligatory. There is some variation with respect to sentences like (77b). For some speakers, se is obligatory and for others, it is todo that appears to license the terminal temporal frame. That is, since todo already forces telicity by virtue of its quantificational properties, se is optional. I am grateful to María Cristina Cuervo for pointing this out to me.
b. Context: Juan is a whiskey drinker and doesn’t like beer, but it is all that’s available …
   Juan se tomó una cerveza con desgano/sin mayor interés
   Juan SE.3s drank a beer half-heartedly
   ‘Juan drank up a beer half-heartedly’

The data in (78) show that there is no notion of *wholeheartedness* added by SE when it appears with consumption verbs. Like all of the other uses of SE we have seen in this section, the SE that appears with transitive consumption verbs is non-doubling. The final property that separates the SE we see in consumption verbs from all of the ones we have seen previously is that it can co-occur with any other dative clitic (Strozer 1976, 1978). Strozer (1978) observed that SE may co-occur with other third person datives, something that is not possible for the other verb classes.  

(79)  
  a. Pepe se le comió la manzana al niño.  
      Pepe SE.3s DAT.3s ate the apple DAT.the kid  
      Possible Interpretations (all perfect):  
      (i) Pepe ate up the kid’s apple (Possessor)  
      (ii) Pepe ate up the apple for/on the kid (Affected Exp)  

There is some variability if the direct object is interpreted as an inalienable part of the third person non-reflexive dative as shown by the following examples.

(i)  El canario macho se les comió las plumas a los hijos.  
    The canary male SE.3s DAT.3p ate the feathers DAT the sons  
    ‘The male canary ate up the chick’s feathers’  
    (se = transitive aspectual se; les = possessor dative, inalienable possession)  
    (http://www.todoexpertos.com/categorias/familiarelaciones/mascotas/respuestas/146566/canario-come-plumas)  

(ii)  
   a. El zombi le comió el brazo al hombre.  
       The zombie DAT.3s ate the arm DAT.the man  
       ‘The zombie ate the man’s arm off’  

   b. El brazo de este pobre, se lo comió el zombi  
       The arm of that poor guy, SE.3s it ate the zombie  
       ‘That poor guy’s arm, the zombie ate it up’  

   c. ??El zombi se le comió el brazo al hombre.  
       The zombie SE.3s DAT.3s eat.3s.PRET the arm DAT.the man  
       ‘The zombie ate up the man’s arm (*off)’  
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b. Ella se le tomó el café a Pepe.
She SE.3s DAT.3s drank the coffee DAT Pepe
Possible Interpretations (all perfect):
(i) She drank up Pepe’s coffee (Possessor)
(ii) She drank up the coffee for/on Pepe (Affected Exp)

The same author also observed that three clitic clusters are possible for consumption verbs.

Again, these same kinds of sentences are not possible with other types of verbs we have seen thus far.

(80) a. Pepe se me le comió la manzana al niño.
Pepe SE.3s DAT.1s DAT.3s ate the apple DAT the kid
Possible Interpretations (all perfect):
(i) Pepe ate up the kid’s apple (and I have a vested interest in this)
(ii) Pepe ate up the apple for/on the kid (and I have a vested interest in this)

b. Ella se te le tomó el café a Pepe.
She SE.3s DAT.2s DAT.3s drank the coffee DAT Pepe
Possible Interpretations (all perfect):
(i) She drank up Pepe’s coffee (and you have a vested interest in this)
(ii) She drank up the coffee for/on Pepe (and you have a vested interest in this)

Because of the unique properties of transitive SE constructions in consumption verbs among, I will call consumption verbs class 2, subtype 4. A summary of each of the subtypes of class 2 verbs according to how they behave in transitive SE constructions is provided in table 2.5.

Table 2.5: Transitive SE Constructions in Class 2 Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 2 Verbs</th>
<th>Optional?</th>
<th>Adds “whole-heartedness”?</th>
<th>Telicity?</th>
<th>Doubling?</th>
<th>Co-occur w/ 3rd person datives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subtype 1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lavar, barrer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subtype 2</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cantar, cocinar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

49The most natural interpretation of the speaker’s interest in this event is that it is the speaker’s child who owned the apple that Pepe ate or was affected by Pepe’s eating the apple.
The main difference between class 1 and class 2 verbs is that the latter show what is essentially a gradient type behavior with respect to transitive SE constructions while the former do not. Class 1 verbs can only appear with wholehearted telic SE while class 2 verbs may be defined as either taking wholehearted telic SE (subtypes 1 and 2) or transitive aspectual SE (subtypes 3 and 4). Using table 2.5 as our base, the relation between these two types of transitive SE constructions can be understood in the following way: transitive aspectual SE is a ‘bleached’ version of wholehearted telic SE that functions primarily as a telicity marker without adding anything extra such as ‘wholeheartedness.’ What I would like to highlight here is that transitive aspectual SE is an aspectually-sensitive use of SE that has developed only for a sub-type of class 2 verbs (verbs of consumption) but not for class 1 verbs. The question we must answer is how this particular difference between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs fits into the picture we have painted of these two verb classes thus far. This is what we will do in the next section.

### 2.6.4 Inchoative SE and Transitive Aspectual SE

The question that arose in the previous section is why transitive aspectual SE is only available for a subset of class 2 transitive verbs but never class 1 transitive verbs. Suppose that we assume that among the many functions of SE, including impersonal, reflexive and inchoative, which we have already seen in section 2.1, that another one is simply a verbal morpheme that marks aspectually telic verb phrases and that this may combine with either class 1 or class 2 verbs so
long as the VP is telic. Such an assumption seems plausible given SE’s sensitivity to aspect that we have witnessed in the previous sections. Since telicity is dependent on the internal arguments of the verb (MacDonald 2006, 2008; Travis 2000, 2010), this would mean that class 1 verbs could be marked by this hypothetical generalized telic SE without taking an external argument since these verbs can omit their external arguments. Likewise, the presence of this generalized telic SE with class 2 verbs would force them to take a particular type of internal argument, a quantized theme. However, since class 2 verbs can never omit their external argument, the presence of this SE would force these particular verbs to be transitive. I argue that this hypothetical scenario is actually what we have in Spanish. Specifically, inchoative SE not only serves as a marker of the absence of an external argument in class 1 verbs, it also is a marker of telicity. Inchoative SE’s counterpart for class 2 verbs is transitive aspectual SE. Since class 2 verbs can never omit their external argument, the effect of transitive aspectual SE is to mark the VP as telic. Thus, the way SE marks telicity in both class 1 and class 2 verbs is intimately related to whether or not the external argument can be omitted (class 1) or not (class 2).

We have already seen the aspectual effects of transitive aspectual SE in section 2.6.3. What we have yet to see are the aspectual effects of inchoative SE. The main evidence that inchoative SE, in addition to marking the absence of an external argument, also forces the VP to be telic comes from the following data.

(81)  **INCHOATIVE SE (CLASS 1)**

a. Se rompieron *(los) vasos.  
SE.3s broke (the) glasses
Intended: ‘Glasses broke’  
(Fernández Soriano 1999: 99)
b. Se derritió *(la) manteca.  
SE.3s melted (the) butter  
Intended: ‘Butter melted’

(Masullo 1992: 272)

If we compare the examples in (81) to (82), we see that both contain a SE that imposes a similar kind of restriction on the internal arguments of the verbs it appears with: both prohibit bare nouns in the internal argument position.

(82) **Transitive Aspectual SE (Class 2)**

a. Juan se tomó *(los) vasos de vino.
Juan SE.3s drank (the) glasses of wine
Intended: Juan drank up glasses of wine

b. Me comí *(el) pan
SE.1s I ate (the) bread
Intended: ‘I ate up bread’

Furthermore, both sets of sentences can only license temporal frames introduced by *en* but not by *durante*. This is shown in (83).

(83) a. Se rompieron los vasos en/*durante 10 minutos.
SE.3s broke the glasses in/*for 10 minutes
‘The glasses broke in 10 minutes’

b. Se derritió la manteca en/*durante 10 minutos.
SE.3s melted the butter in/*for 10 minutes
‘The butter melted in 10 minutes’

c. Juan se tomó los vasos de vino en/*durante 10 minutos.
Juan SE.3s drank the glasses of wine in/*for 10 minutes
‘Juan drank up the glasses of wine in 10 minutes’

d. Me comí el pan en/*durante 10 minutos.
SE.1s I ate the bread in/*for 10 minutes
‘I ate the bread up in 10 minutes’
The next question to ask is how we know for sure that the SE in (81) is inchoative SE. That is, how do we know it is not an impersonal (which includes passives and middles) use of SE? I have simply indicated that the inchoative is the intended reading in the translation and this particular reading is what blocks the presence of the bare nouns. We need more evidence that this is actually the case. As we saw in section 2.1, only inchoative SE is able to take the oblique anaphoric expression *por sí solo*, indicating that an action happens ‘without an external cause’, something that distinguishes it from impersonal readings of SE. When *por sí solo* is added to the sentences, the bare plurals are ungrammatical as shown in (84).

(84) a. Se rompieron *(los) vasos por sí solos.
   SE.3s broke *(the) glasses by themselves
   Intended: ‘Glasses broke by themselves’

It should be noted that there are cases in which an inchoative can take a bare plural object but never a bare singular object. The cases in which the inchoative may take a bare plural generally require some type of preverbal topic such as a locative (see chapter 1, p. 5, fn. 5 for a similar restriction for the licensing of bare plurals in the post-verbal position of unergative verbs – I will not comment on the possible relation between these two here). Compare the following sentences.

(i) a. ??Se rompen vasos por sí solos.
   SE.3s break glasses by themselves

   b. En este restaurante se rompen vasos por sí solos.
   In this restaurant SE.3s break glasses by themselves

(ii) a. *Se derrite manteca por sí sola.
    SE.3s melts butter by itself

   b. *En este lugar sin sombra se derrite manteca por sí sola.
    In this place without shade SE.3s melts butter by itself

What is interesting here is that the idea that *se* is sensitive to aspect can be maintained if we adopt Dapraetare (1995) and MacDonald’s (2008) idea that bare plurals can license telic readings that *iterate* while bare singulars can never license telic readings. On this view bare singulars can function like quantized themes that are conceived of as represented many indeterminate numbers of the objects they refer to. Thus, it is possible to conceive of a sentence like (ib) as a series of similar iterations of glass-breaking events (see Ramchand 2008 and Zubizarreta & Oh 2007 for similar discussions). Bare singulars, such as *manteca (= butter)*, on the other hand, are incapable of licensing such an interpretation. If inchoative SE requires the VP it combines with to be telic, then we expect bare plurals to be able to occur in some contexts where a sequence of similar events (MacDonald 2008) interpretation is possible, but it should never admit bare singulars. This is precisely what we see.
b. Se derritió *(la) manteca por sí sola.
SE.3s melted (the) butter by itself
Intended: ‘Butter melted by itself’

Furthermore, in contexts where it is clear that SE is interpreted as an impersonal marker, such as those where a purpose clause headed by para is added to the verb phrase, the restriction on bare nouns does not hold.

(85) a. Se rompieron vasos toda la noche sólo para hacer ruido.
SE.3s broke glasses all the night just to make noise
‘Glasses were broken all night long just to make noise’

b. Se derritió manteca esta mañana para poder hacer los pasteles en la tarde.
SE.3s melted butter this morning to be able to make the cakes in the afternoon.
‘Butter was melted (by someone) in order to make the cakes this afternoon’

The data in (81) – (85) support treating inchoative SE as an aspectual marker (in addition to a marker of the absence of an external argument) on par with transitive aspectual SE. These two properties of inchoative SE limit its distribution to only class 1 verbs since these are the only verbs that can simultaneously be telic while lacking an external argument. 51

51 An additional piece of data that is often cited in favor of this particular view is the following putative contrast, which is originally attributed to Bruhn de Garavito (2002) and cited in Basilico (2010) and Kempchisky (2004), is shown below.

(i) a. Esa madera *(se) quemó durante más de una hora.
   That wood (SE.3s) was on fire for more than an hour

b. Esa madera *(se) quemó en menos de una hora.
   That wood (SE.3s) burned up in less than an hour

Following claims by Folli (2002) for Italian, the authors claim that the verb quemar (= burn) may be intransitive and be marked either with or without se. When it lacks se it is atelic and means something like ‘be on fire’ while when it is marked by se it is telic and means something like ‘burn up.’ They argue that data like these support linking inchoative se to telicity. The problem with this argument is that the putative atelic intransitive verb quemar doesn’t exist in Spanish (though it may in Italian). No speaker I have spoken to accepts sentence (ia), rather, they substitute quemar for the verb arder (= to be on fire). I thank Héctor Campos and María Cristina Cuervo for pointing this out to me.
We are now in a position to link the aspectual effects that SE has on particular verb phrases with the class 1 versus class 2 transitivity distinction. One type of aspectually sensitive use of SE, wholehearted telic SE, requires that the verb phrase be telic (= a particular type of internal argument is required) and that it have an agent to which the notion wholeheartedness may be attributed. The requirements of wholehearted telic SE may be fulfilled by either class 1 or class 2 transitive verbs, so it does not represent a way of distinguishing between them. However, there are purely aspectual uses of SE that only require the VP with which they occur to be telic. It was argued here that inchoative SE is this purely aspectual use of SE for class 1 verbs and that transitive aspectual SE is this purely aspectual use for class 2 verbs. Inchoative SE imposes a telic requirement on the VP while simultaneously marking the absence of an external argument, a combination of effects that are only compatible with class 1 verbs. Transitive aspectual SE, on the other hand, imposes a telic restriction on the VP while simultaneously requiring the presence of an external argument. I have suggested here, and will further argue in chapter 5, that the reason for this set of requirements stems from the grammaticalization of wholehearted telic SE with class 2 verbs to a telicity marker. Since wholehearted telic SE requires an agent, it makes sense that it would appear more naturally and frequently with class 2 verbs. Frequent use of wholehearted telic SE with some subclasses of the most common class 2 verbs (verbs of consumption) has lead to a loss of the notion of wholeheartedness, and what is left is a telicity marker. In this section we have seen that the way in which SE marks telicity creates a split between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs that can be understood using the same generalization that has served us so well through this chapter: class 1 verbs require an internal
argument and may omit their external argument whereas class 2 verbs require an external argument and may omit their internal argument.

### 2.7 Thematic Roles of Arguments

The final difference between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs concerns the range of possible thematic roles that can be typically assigned to their external and internal arguments. Let us start with external arguments. What is the precise nature of the external argument of each verb class; for example, does it always have to be an *agent* or can it be conceived of more along the lines of an *external causer*\(^{52}\), which includes *agents, instruments* and *inanimate causers* such as forces of nature? Class 1 verbs generally allow a range of external arguments that include *agents (AG)*, *instruments (INSTR)* and *inanimate causers (IC)* whereas class 2 verbs generally restrict their external arguments to *agents*. This is shown in (86) and (87).

\begin{equation}
(86) \text{ CLASS 1 VERBS: TYPES OF EXTERNAL ARGUMENTS}
\end{equation}

\begin{itemize}
\item[a.] \{Juan\(_{AG}\) /esa piedra\(_{INSTR}\)/el sismo\(_{IC}\}\} \text{ rompió la ventana.}
\hspace{1cm} \text{Juan /that rock /the earthquake broke the window}
\hspace{1cm} \text{‘Juan/the rock/the earthquake broke the window’}
\item[b.] \{María\(_{AG}\)/esa llave\(_{INSTR}\)/el viento\(_{IC}\}\} \text{ cerró la puerta.}
\hspace{1cm} \text{María /that key / the wind closed the door}
\hspace{1cm} \text{‘María/the key/the wind closed the door’}
\end{itemize}

\(^{52}\text{The idea of external causer is meant to encompass all the possible entities that initiate the relevant causal chain that leads to whatever event the verb refers to happening. This macro-role has been named ‘effector’ (Van Valin & Wilkins 1996), ‘originator’ (Borer 2005; Mateu 2002) and ‘initiator’ (Ramchand 2008). For these authors, the external argument of any verb gets one of these underspecified roles. The nature of the argument itself, whether it is animate or inanimate, for example, will ultimately determine whether it is an agent or something else. This is similar to Dowty’s (1991) approach to thematic roles, where a role such as agent is determined ultimately by the number of proto-agent entailments that a particular argument has. The difference is that all of this localized to an external argument position, whereas in Dowty’s system there is no direct correlation between structural positions and thematic roles.}\)
(87) **CLASS 2 VERBS: TYPES OF EXTERNAL ARGUMENTS**

a. \{Juan\_{\text{AG}}/\#{\text{esca}}\_{\text{INSTR}}/\#{\text{el viento}}\_{\text{IC}}\} barrió el suelo.

Juan /that broom /the wind swept the floor

‘Juan /#that broom /#the wind swept the floor’

b. \{María\_{\text{AG}}/\#{\text{pluma}}\_{\text{INSTR}}/\#{\text{el café}}\_{\text{IC}}\} escribió el artículo.

María /that pen /the coffee wrote the article

‘María /#that pen /#the coffee wrote the article’

As noted in Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) for English and Mendikoextea (1999a) for Spanish, there is a correlation between verbs for which the external argument can be omitted (our class 1 verbs) and a larger possible range of thematic roles that can be assigned to the external arguments of those same verbs (when they are present). This is what we see in (86). The reverse correlation also holds. That is, for verbs that can never omit the external argument, such as class 2 verbs, there seems to be a more rigid requirement on the thematic role that that argument is assigned. In the case of class 2 verbs, the external argument is generally an agent. This is what we see in (87).\(^{53}\)

What is interesting is that this particular correlation that has been noted mainly by Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) extends even further in some Romance languages, including Spanish and Italian. It has been noted in Folli & Harley (2005) and Moreira & Butt (1996) that when some consumption verbs are used metaphorically, they mark the fact that the external argument

\(^{53}\)The underspecified subject of many class 1 verbs has been cited as the main reason for which they can omit the external argument. Inchoatives are simply another type of unspecified external cause (that might be simply a reflexive if Chierchia 2004 and Koontz-Garboden 2009 are correct). Curiously, this is precisely the opposite kind of reasoning that has been applied to unspecified objects for class 2 verbs (object omission). In these cases, it is the highly specific nature of the internal argument that appears to be the trigger of its omission. Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 109-110) observe this and cite it as a reason not to think the two types of omissions are linked. The two processes may not follow from the same lexical semantic triggers but this does not take away from the main generalization that one type of verb may systematically omit its external argument while another type of verb may systematically eliminate its internal argument. Appeals to the conceptual nature of different kinds of events, while useful, seems to obscure this more basic fact about the two kinds of verbs.
is not an agent with the reflexive clitic, thus constituting yet another use of SE distinct from any of the ones we have seen thus far (examples from Basilico 2010; De Cuyper 2006; Moreira & Butt 1996).

(88)  a. El mar *(se) come la playa
     The sea (SE) eats the beach
     ‘The sea eats the beach away’

     b. Esta cama *(se) come toda la habitación
     This bed (SE) eats all the room
     ‘This bed eats up the entire room’

     c. El orín *(se) come el hierro
     The rust (SE) eats the iron
     ‘Rust eats at iron’

     d. El sol *(se) come la pintura
     The sun (SE) eats the paint
     ‘The sun eats away at the paint’

     e. El sol *(se) ha bebido el lago
     The sun (SE) has drunk the lake
     ‘The sun drank up the lake’

     f. La noche *(se) tragó a los viajeros.
     The night (SE) swallowed the travelers
     ‘The night swallowed up the travelers’

The examples in (88) are either ungrammatical in the absence of SE or highly anomalous. Some of the fundamental properties of these constructions are that it is most productive with verbs of consumption like the ones we see in (88). Outside of this subtype of class 2 verbs, it is not common as shown by the following examples.

(89)  a. La máquina *(se) lee todos los exámenes (para corregirlos).
     The machine (SE.3s) reads all the exams (to correct them)
     ‘The machine reads all the exams (to correct them)’
b. Las estrellas (*se) bailan una danza cósmica.

The stars (SE.3s) dance a dance cosmic
‘The stars dance a cosmic dance’

This particular use of SE appears to pick out precisely those class 2 verbs that have transitive aspectual SE and mark the fact that their subject is not the typical agent role that class 2 verbs normally assign to the external argument. Because of these characteristics I will tentatively call this particular SE unselected subject SE. The function of this particular SE is often carried out by particles in Germanic languages such as Dutch and English (De Cuyper 2006; Folli & Harley 2005).

Since class 1 verbs do not appear to impose any kinds of restriction on the specific role that the external argument receives, we wouldn’t expect there to be a similar type of marking for them. The following examples corroborate this idea. There is no special marking for inanimate causers when they appear with class 1 verbs.

\[54\text{The same verbs that tend to mark ‘unselected subjects’ with SE also tend to form idiomatic expressions in which the subject is animate but does not receive an ‘agent’ interpretation in the sense we would expect from a verb of consumption. In some of the phrases below, the subject receives an experiencer or non-volitional ‘doer’ role from the verb-object combination.}\]

(i)  
- a. comerase un gol – to miss a goal (Arg) [lit. to eat-SE a goal]
- b. comerase/fumarse una reunión – to miss/skip a meeting [lit. to eat/smoke-SE a meeting]
- c. comerase las des/las comas – to leave off “de”/commas [lit. to eat-SE the d’s/the commas]
- d. comerase los espacios – to cover spaces (i.e. – soccer player) [lit. to eat-SE the spaces]
- e. comerase los calcetines – to have your socks stuffed into your shoes [lit. to eat-SE the socks]
- f. comerase un insulto – to get insulted (without deserving it) [lit. to eat-SE an insult]
- g. beberse la fortuna – to rapidly spend the fortune [lit. to drink-SE the fortune]
- h. fumarse la quincena – to blow (wastefully) the paycheck [lit. to smoke-SE the paycheck]
- i. merendarse a un rival – to destroy a rival (sports) [lit. to snack-SE a rival]
- j. tragarse una mentira – to believe a lie [lit. to swallow-SE a lie]
- k. tragarse una situación – to suck up a (bad) situation [lit. to swallow-SE a situation]
- l. tragarse un farol – to run into a lamppost [lit. to swallow-SE a lamppost]
- m. tragarse un semáforo – to go through a light [lit. to swallow-SE a traffic light]
(89) **CLASS 1 VERBS: NO ‘UNSELECTED SUBJECT’ SE**\(^{55}\)

a. El sismo (*se) rompió la ventana.
   The earthquake (SE.3s) broke the window

b. El viento (*se) cerró la puerta.
   The wind (SE.3s) closed the door

c. El huracán (*se) hundió el barco.
   The hurricane (SE.3s) sunk the boat

These particular uses of SE add further support to the correlation between a verb’s capability of omitting its external argument and having a wider range of possible thematic roles that may be assigned to the external argument when it is present. We have seen that class 1 verbs, the same verbs that may optionally omit their external argument, are the ones that permit *agents*, *instruments* and *inanimate causers* to be their external argument. These verbs also lack any kind of special marking when they take inanimate causers as their external arguments. On the other hand, verbs that require an external argument seem to impose a more rigid restriction on what that external argument can be. We have seen that class 2 verbs generally only take *agents* as external arguments. In addition, consumption verbs, the same subtype of class 2 verbs that have transitive aspectual SE (see section 2.6.3), may take *inanimate causers* as external arguments as long as they are marked with the SE clitic, which in constructions like (88), appears to be marking the fact that the external argument has a thematic role that is distinct from the one the verb normally assigns to that position.

\(^{55}\)The only interpretation these particular sentences have is one in which *se* is interpreted as wholehearted telic SE. This essentially gives them a very strange feel such that the inanimate causers in each case are imbued with some kind of human quality and that they are thought to put a great deal of effort in performing the respective actions identified by the verbs.
Let us now turn briefly to internal arguments. Class 1 verbs take *patients* or *themes*. *Patients* are understood as the entity that are acted upon while *themes* which are understood as the entity that undergoes a change of state, position or location (Gruber 1965; Jackendoff 1990; Marantz 2005). For many class 1 verbs, both of these definitions apply equally to the internal argument. For example, the object of *romper* (= break), when the verb is transitive, is both acted upon and undergoes a change of state. Class 2 verbs may also take *patients* or *themes*. When we ‘sweep a floor’, a floor could be conceived of as the patient whereas when we ‘make a cake’, a *cake* is called the effected theme (Dowty 1991), it undergoes a change in terms of extent, from not existing to existing. This brief discussion is illustrative of how difficult it is define the thematic roles of internal arguments. Since internal arguments often receive an idiosyncratic role from the verb itself (Marantz 1984), it would makes little sense to attempt to delimit the entire range of different type of *themes* and *patients* as we might end up with just a list of verbs. A more interesting thing to look at is if there is a correlation between the omissibility of the internal argument and a larger possible range of thematic roles. Throughout this work I will refer to the internal arguments of both class 1 and class 2 verbs as *themes*, being more specific about the precise characteristics of those themes when necessary.

What we saw above is that there is a correlation between a broader range of possible thematic roles in the external argument and the possible omission of that external argument. This is what is known as underspecificity of thematic roles. Curiously, this is precisely the opposite kind of reasoning that has been applied to unspecified objects for class 2 verbs (object omission). In these cases, it is the highly specific nature of the internal argument that appears to be the trigger of its omission. Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995: 109-110) observe this and cite it as a
reason not to think the two types of omissions are linked. We will go into more detail on this point in the next chapter.

In this section we have seen that there is a correlation between the fact that the external argument of class 1 verbs may be omitted and a broader possible range of thematic roles that may be assigned to that particular argument position. Class 2 verbs, which must have an external argument, generally impose a requirement that that argument be an agent. Some class 2 verbs have special morphological marker that indicates that the subject of the verb is not an agent. Finally, we saw that there is no comparable correlation between a broad range of possible thematic roles assigned to the internal argument position of class 2 verbs and the fact that these can be omitted.

2.8 Summary

We started this chapter by posing the question whether there is any evidence from Spanish for making the distinction between different kinds transitive verbs that has been made in other languages. It was shown that there is ample evidence for dividing a substantial set of transitive verbs into two classes labeled class 1 and class 2. These seven properties are presented in a table format below in table 2.6.
Table 2.6 Properties of Class 1 and Class 2 Transitive Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Class 1 Transitive Verbs</th>
<th>Class 2 Transitive Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hacer</em> causatives without embedded subjects (multiple interpretations?)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional Causer Datives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles: modifiers <em>bien</em> and <em>muy</em> – multiple interpretations (event and degree)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Omission</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE &amp; Telicity: does aspectually-sensitive use of SE require an external argument?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic role of external argument (Agent only?)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only class 1 verbs can optionally omit their external argument, which explains why only they are capable of (i) taking inchoative SE, (ii) being interpreted as inchoatives when embedded under *hacer* without an overt subject and (iii) why they admit unintentional causer datives. Furthermore, only the participles of class 1 verbs systematically yield simple adjectives, which require the absence of an implicit agent. Class 2 verbs, on the other hand, only give rise to adjectival passive or simple adjectival forms that require the presence of an implicit agent. A fact that separates class 2 verbs from class 1 verbs is that only they can omit their objects. These two sets of facts suggest that class 2 require an external argument but that the internal argument may be optionally omitted. This idea is corroborated if we look at purely aspectual uses of SE. In class 1 verbs, aspectual uses of SE simultaneously mark the absence of the external argument (= inchoative SE) while for class 2 verbs they require the presence of an external argument (= aspectual SE).
transitive aspectual SE). Finally, we saw that there is a correlation between the range of possible thematic roles that may be assigned to the external argument of class 1 verbs and the omission of that argument. The external arguments of class 1 verbs may be agents, instruments or inanimate *causers* while the external arguments of class 2 verbs are generally *agents*.

The simplest way to understand why these properties are the way they are is through the following generalization, which repeated from (2) at the beginning of the chapter.

\[ \text{(90) Class 1 – Class 2 Transitivity Generalization (Spanish)} \]

a. Class 1 transitive verbs must have an *internal argument* and need not have an *external argument*

b. Class 2 transitive verbs must have an *external argument* and need not have an *internal argument*

In the next chapters I outline an implementation of this generalization that provides us with a way of explaining the main properties that we have seen in this chapter. In chapter 3 I outline a system that is capable of providing an explanation for transitivity alternations and apply it to *inchoatives* (and the other related constructions that require inchoatives such as periphrastic causatives in 2.2 and unintentional causer datives we saw in 2.3), *object omission* and how the ‘specificity’ of thematic roles might be related to these two kinds of alternations. In chapter 4 I focus on participles, outlining an explanation for why class 1 verbs have both adjectival passives and simple adjectives but class 2 verbs do not productively yield simple adjectives. Finally, in section 5 I treat the entire range of SE constructions we have seen here including inchoative SE, wholehearted telic SE, transitive aspectual SE and unselected subject SE. I follow work by Folli & Harley (2005), Sanz (2000), Zubizarreta (1987) and Zagona (1996) in assuming that SE in all
of these constructions is a verbal morpheme that has particular effect on the VP that is related to whether the verb is class 1 or class 2. I then extend this analysis to cover a class of verbs that are obligatorily marked by SE: pronominal verbs. In the final chapter I integrate the ideas outlined here into a combined theory of (in)transitivity where class 1 forms a continuum that comprises unaccusatives and transitive verbs and class 2 forms a continuum that comprises unergative and transitive verbs.
Chapter 3: Analysis of Class 1 and Class 2 Transitive Verbs in Spanish

In chapter 2 we saw that there are seven properties that separate class 1 transitive verbs from class 2 transitive verbs. It was proposed that the main generalization that underlies these properties is the idea that one of the elements of the basic transitive relation is “optional” in each class. Class 1 transitive verbs require an internal argument, which is usually a THEME, may but omit the external argument, which may be an AGENT, INSTRUMENT or INANIMATE CAUSER, whereas class 2 transitive verbs require an external argument, which is always an AGENT, but may omit the internal argument, which is usually a THEME or a PATIENT. In this chapter a formal analysis of how to explain the basic transitivity alternations that characterize each verb class is outlined. The conclusions of this chapter are then used as the basis through which to explain the generalizations regarding participles of class 1 and class 2 verbs we saw in section 2.4 (this is done in chapter 4) and a variety of uses of the reflexive (SE) clitic paradigm in Spanish, some of which have received almost no attention in the theoretical literature (this is done in chapter 5).

In section 3.1 I outline the tools of the analysis with which the basic alternations that characterize each verb class may be explained (causative – inchoative and object omission). The main proposal is that all verbs are built from stems that maximally contain two formal:interpretational feature pairs that specify the grammatical category of their arguments and how they are interpreted such as $v:\text{AG}$ and $D:\text{TH}$, where $v:\text{AG}$ indicates that the verb is only compatible with a $v$ that introduces an agent and it requires a DP in its complement position that is interpreted as the theme. These features represent interface conditions that are used to evaluate
the compatibility of a stem with a particular syntactic structure, doing work similar to what “theta grids” do in GB-style analyses of argument structure (Stowell 1981; Williams 1980, 1981). The main goal of the chapter is to propose a way to capture the fact that one of the arguments of both class 1 and class 2 verbs can be omitted. I claim that each of these verbs is special because one of its formal:interpretational feature pairs is marked with a set of parentheses. This mark serves as an indication that an expletive element may be merged in the marked position, yielding a superficially intransitive verb.

In section 3.2 I argue that the basic alternations that affect each type of verb follow straightforwardly from this proposal. Class 1 verbs must minimally have a DP in their complement position that is interpreted as the theme but they have a marked v feature indicating that v may introduce an external argument or simply merge as a semantically empty expletive. I argue that inchoative SE is the morphological realization of the expletive v that introduces no external argument. Class 2 verbs must minimally have a v that introduces an agent but need not have a DP in their complement position that is interpreted as the theme. Object omission is thus a phenomenon that we would expect for a stem with this type of feature specification. I argue that object omission is possible because of the marked D:TH feature on class 2 stems and that it involves the merge of a null N in the complement position that incorporates into the verb.

In section 3.3 I discuss the nature of the thematic roles associated with external and internal argument positions in more detail. The external argument of class 1 verbs may assume a variety of thematic roles that ultimately depend on the internal properties of the argument itself (whether it has volition, whether it can be used as an instrument, etc.). Because of this variety of thematic roles, I opt to change the name of the external argument that is introduced by v in class
1 verbs to EFFECTOR following Koontz-Garboden (2009) and Van Valin & Wilkins (1996). This change allows us to account for the correlation between the underspecified nature of the external argument and the capacity to omit the external argument that has been noted in Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) for English and Mendikoetxea (1999a) for Spanish. There is no counterpart to underspecification and the ability to omit the object in class 2 verbs.

In sections 3.4 and 3.5 I discuss how this analysis is able to capture the facts regarding ambiguity in periphrastic causatives and the ability to have unintentional causer datives. Both of these phenomena require the absence of an external argument. Since only class 1 verbs can take an expletive v that does not introduce an external argument role, they are the only verbs that can be ambiguous in hacer causatives and take unintentional causer datives. Finally, in section 3.6 a summary of the chapter is presented.

3.1 Basic Elements

Before outlining my proposal for capturing the difference between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs it is worth mentioning how alternating verbs like those of class 1 and class 2 that form the main object of inquiry here have been treated in different approaches to argument structure. Projectionist approaches to argument structure like the GB model (Stowell 1981; Williams 1981) list the thematic information in the verb’s lexical entry and that information essentially tells the syntax what to do (it tells the head how to “project”). In order to account for alternating verbs, mechanisms such as absorption of case or thematic roles are used in order to explain the intuitive connection between causatives and inchoatives and transitives and unexpressed object variants. In both cases, the transitive verb is ‘basic’ in some sense and one of its arguments gets absorbed
by some syntactic mechanism. An alternative to this is to actually list different variants of verbs in the lexicon and propose lexical redundancy rules that capture the intuitive connection between the different variants (Jackendoff 1976). The main question that arises if we adopt this kind of model is why we have such well defined asymmetric patterns with respect to which argument will be omitted and why there are clusters of other grammatical properties that follow from this asymmetry. Why would case or thematic absorption systematically target one type of argument (the external argument) for one class of transitive verbs (class 1) and another type of argument (the internal argument) for another class of transitive verbs (class 2)? This is where event structure is proposed to play a vital role and it is why the work of Levin (1999), Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) and Rappaport Hovav (1998) has been so influential. They have structured lexical entries in such a way as to reflect different types of verbs according to how arguments are licensed within those structured lexical entries. The work of Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) and others such as Mateu (2002), Ramchand (2008) and Zubizarreta & Oh (2007) has also had a similar important influence as these authors have incorporated aspects of event structure into lexical-syntactic representations for verbs. Structural differences between distinct kinds of transitive verbs are used to predict which argument will be omitted in alternations.

On the other hand, many recent approaches to argument structure that can be broadly understood as part of the minimalist program (MP) have completely abandoned the notion of listed thematic roles and structured lexical entries. Neo-constructionist views of grammar claim that the syntax generates possible argument structures and the roots that give verbs their names can be freely inserted into those structures (Borer 2005; Marantz 1997). On the most extreme view of the neo-constructionist approach to argument structure (Borer 2005), ‘verbs’ as we know
them do not specify anything about their arguments; everything is derived in the syntax. This view is meant to explain why there are so many different types of alternations across languages: in principle, any root may be inserted into any argument structure configuration that can be generated by the syntax. However, as all researchers that have accepted some form of the neo-constructionist view admit, not all verbs may appear in all of the argument structure configurations that the syntax can generate in any language. There is thus a problem of over-generation if we adopt the most extreme view. In order to get out of this pickle, many researchers working in neo-constructionist models have recurred to the conceptual content of the root as a determining factor for its compatibility with certain syntactic configurations (Borer 2005; Harley 2005), some have used semantic types to classify stems and thus limit their insertion possibilities (Levinson 2010) and others have used event or thematic-oriented features in order to limit the insertion possibilities of a root (Harley & Noyer 2000; Ramchand 2008; Travis 2010b). To the skeptic, the introduction of conceptual content, types and/or features into the roots that limit their insertion possibilities is simply a sneaky way of acknowledging that the “theta-grids” that form such an important part of GB are unavoidable. These ideas could easily be recast as “the features of the root project on to the syntax”, which is precisely what these theories want to avoid.

There is clearly something intuitive and also something unappealing about both approaches. On the one hand, alternations are quite common and they also can be broken down

---

56 The overall hypothesis for this entire body of work assumes that event structure and argument structure associated with a particular verb is acquired by a child through a filtering process. Children basically assume by default that verbs have no argument structure at all and then through the syntactic contexts in which they hear verbs in the primary linguistic data, the syntactic contexts in which a verb most prototypically occurs are narrowed down (Borer 2005; Gleitman 1990; Potts 2008) and this is what “theta grids” in the traditional sense actually represent. The aim of the idea is meant to account for why some verbs occur so freely in different types of argument structure configurations and alternations whereas others do not.
into patterns that seem to militate against simply listing them in one way or another. On the other hand, alternations are not “free”, no matter how much the neo-constructionist literature attempts to find new examples of roots that can appear anywhere in the grammar, there seem to be too many roots across languages that only appear in a limited number of syntactic constructions. This is why I believe that the most measured approach to explaining the primary differences between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs in Spanish is by using certain facets from both types of proposals.

We might assume that there is a purely structural facet to argument structure as has been argued in Baker (1988), Chomsky (1995), Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002), Kratzer (1996), Larson (1988), Marantz (1984) and Williams (1980, 1981), some of whose work draws heavily from the decomposed logical forms of event semanticists such as Davidson (1967), Lombard (1985), Parsons (1990), Pietroski (2006) and Schein (1993), attempting to integrate their ideas into the syntax. The minimalist version of the main ideas from these works is that the basic transitive relation may be defined in terms of how each of the arguments of those relations is licensed. The external argument (DP₁) is licensed in the specifier of v whereas the internal argument is a complement of V (DP₂).

(1)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP₁} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{v} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP₂}
\end{array}
\]

Syntactically, the notions of subject and object correspond to the external and internal argument positions in (1), respectively. More importantly, these positions have been argued to align with
the interpretations of each argument in the relation (Baker 1988 – UTAH; Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002 – configurational thematic roles). DP₁ is abstractly interpreted as the effector (Van Valin & Wilkins 1996), initiator (Ramchand 2008) or the originator (Borer 2005; Mateu 2002) of an action, since it is actually the argument of a predicate that is introduced externally to the VP (it could be agent, instrument, etc., depending on what the verb requires). DP₂ is interpreted as the entity that is acted upon and/or undergoes some type of change that is specified by the meaning of the verb (= patient or theme). Assume that this particular structure and variations of it such as passives, unaccusatives and unergatives can be generated independently of verbal stems that are inserted as V by free merge. It is then up to the verb itself, in combination with v, to determine both what syntactic positions must be projected and also how those particular positions are specifically interpreted within the general abstract limits imposed by the structure itself on the possible meanings of the vP. Let us go through some scenarios.

A verb that has both of these structural positions occupied by arguments is a transitive verb while a verb that has only one of the positions occupied by an argument is an intransitive verb. We know, however, that not all verbs can appear in all possible configurations. In order to limit the possible structural configurations in which a particular stem may appear, I propose that

---

57 Obviously, verbs that do not denote ‘actions’ of the type we are studying here sometimes show patterns that cannot be as easily accounted for, experiencer – theme verbs such as frighten and fear being the prototypical ones (Grimshaw 1990; Pesetsky 1995).

58 This structural definition of thematic relations also explains why a particular verb may associate with at most three arguments in Hale & Keyser’s (1993, 2002) view: VP may have a comp and a spec and v may have a spec. For the most part I will not be dealing with multiple internal arguments here. Note that there are many different ways of accounting for this apparent restriction apart from the particular view advocated in Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002). Pylkkänen (2008), for example, accounts for double object constructions and other additional arguments by arguing that V may take an applicative complement in which a possessive relation between two individuals is the internal argument of the verb (see Cuervo 2003, 2010 and Pylkkänen 2008, among others for details).
there is combination of selectional and interpretational features on the V head itself and on v which are inherited from the stem. The selectional features are shown in (2) and (3).

(2)  
   a. \( \text{STEM}_{<v,D>} \) (Transitive)  
   b. \( \text{STEM}_{<D>} \) (Unaccusative)  
   c. \( \text{STEM}_{<v>} \) (Unergative)

(3)  
   a. \( v_{<D,V>} \) (Transitive or Unergative)  
   b. \( v_{<V>} \) (Unaccusative)

There are three types of relevant syntactic features: \( v \), V and D. Stems are inserted as V’s and may contain \( v \) and D features. First let us look at (2). The D feature says that the complement position of V must have a DP. Once a DP merges in that position, the D feature is satisfied and the VP level is projected. This feature is shared by both transitive and unaccusative verbs but unergative verbs lack it. The \( v \) feature cannot be satisfied within the VP; it percolates up the VP level. What the \( v \) feature is meant to capture is not an inverse selectional relation whereby a VP selects \( v \) and projects when the two merge. As introducers of the predicate that links the external argument to a particular VP, \( v \) heads must select a VP and project their label. What the \( v \) feature on VP does is determine if the VP is compatible with \( v \) (i.e. – if the stem requires an external argument). Once an appropriate \( v \) merges with VP, the \( v \) feature on VP is satisfied. The external argument then merges according to what \( v \) itself requires. In addition to requiring VPs as their complements, \( v \)’s may differ according to whether they require a DP in their specifier or not. Transitive and unergative \( v \)’s have this feature whereas unaccusatives do not. The three

---

59 This idea comes from Kratzer (1996). She proposes that the predicate introduced by \( v \) (her Voice) is linked to the event denoted by the VP through an operation called event identification. She claims that “event identification is only defined if the two predicates have compatible Aktionsarten.” (Kratzer 1996: 122). So, for example, an ‘action’ predicate such as wash the clothes will only be compatible with an AGENT predicate introduced by event identification. A stative predicate such own the dog is only compatible with a HOLDER predicate introduced by event identification. This compatibility requirement between what is denoted by the VP and what is introduced by \( v \) is what the \( v \) feature on the stem is meant to capture here.
relevant structural configurations understood purely in terms of syntactic features are shown in (4).

(4)

a. Transitive Verb  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{v}_{\text{D,V}} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{STEM}_{\langle \text{D,V} \rangle}
\end{array}
\]

b. Unaccusative Verb  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{STEM}_{\langle \text{D} \rangle}
\end{array}
\]

c. Unergative Verb  
\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP} \\
\text{v}_{\text{D,V}} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{STEM}_{\langle \text{V} \rangle}
\end{array}
\]

The structures in (4) say nothing about how each of the arguments is interpreted. We must provide some way of capturing UTAH and similar intuitions about how thematic roles align with particular structural positions. Let us start with the selectional features on verb stems and integrate thematic roles.\(^60\)

(5)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. STEM}_{\langle \text{v:AG, D:TH} \rangle} \\
\text{c. STEM}_{\langle \text{D:TH} \rangle} \\
\text{d. STEM}_{\langle \text{v:AG} \rangle}
\end{align*}
\]

Even though we know that not all external arguments are *agents* per se and not all internal arguments are *themes*, we can assume for the sake of presentation in this section that they are the most typical roles associated with external and internal arguments respectively à la Dowty’s

---

\(^{60}\)The idea the thematic roles are syntactic features that are sensitive to the interpretable-uninterpretable and valued-unvalued distinction that characterizes all features in the MP is developed in great detail by Hornstein (1999) and Larson (2010). In this work, I assume that the features on stems represent interface conditions that ensure the information in the stem is compatible with the syntactic structure in which it appears. This is more akin to what those working in neo-constructionist models would say the “conceptual content” of the stem that limits insertion possibilities is.
(1991) proto-agent and proto-patient roles. The DP that merges to satisfy the D feature of a transitive or unaccusative verb will be interpreted as the theme of the verb, which is indicated by D:TH. The v that merges with VP must be compatible with whatever the v feature on the VP says about the verb’s external argument. So, v:AG on the verb stem means that the v that merges with the VP must introduce an AGENT predicate, which is eventually saturated by whatever v takes in its specifier. Some possible ‘flavors’ of v (term from Folli & Harley 2005) are shown in (6).

(6)  
(a) $v_{AG,D:AG,V}$  (Active Transitive – agent external argument)  
(b) $v_{AG,V}$  (Passive – there is a semantic agent but no syntactic agent)  

In (6a), we have a $v_{AG}$, where the subscript AG specifies the type of predicate that $v$ introduces. This means that the external argument, which is indicated by the D feature in $v$’s selectional features will be interpreted as an agent, which is indicated by the D:AG notation in (6a). In (6b), we have a $v_{AG}$ that has no D feature. This means that $v$ will introduce an AGENT predicate but that the role will not be assigned to an argument in $v$’s specifier because this $v$ cannot take a specifier. This is a passive $v$. Ignoring passives for now, let us exemplify these ideas with the three sentences below.

(7)  
(a) Juan tocó la mesa.  (Transitive)  
    Juan touched the table  
(b) Juan llegó.  (Unaccusative)  
    Juan arrived  
(c) Juan trabajó.  (Unergative)  
    Juan worked  

---

61Section 3.5 we will discuss the other roles such as instrument, inanimate causer and patient (see chapter2, section 2.7) that can be assigned to each of the positions and how to accommodate it into the present framework.
In each case, the merging of the verb phrase is driven by selection and interpretational features are what determine how each of the positions filled by arguments is interpreted. For the transitive verb phrase in (7a), the stem *toc-* has both a *v*:AG feature and a D:TH feature. This set of selectional features percolates up to V. The D feature is satisfied by merging a DP, *la mesa*, in complement position. The consequence of satisfying the D feature is that it gets checked (crossed out here) and it determines how the particular argument that satisfies it is interpreted, as a theme in this case. This is signaled by the subscripted TH on the DP itself. The *v*:AG feature then percolates up to VP. This determines the compatibility with different types of *v*. When merging *v* and VP, there is a bi-directional checking relation. First, *v* selects VP, which satisfies its V feature. Second, the VP must be compatible with the *v* it is selected by. In this case *v*\textsubscript{AG} selects a VP with a *v*:AG feature, so we have compatibility. The D:AG feature of *v*\textsubscript{AG} then percolates up to the *v*′ level and is satisfied by merging the DP, *Juan*, in the specifier position of *v*P. The AG subscript on this DP signals that *Juan* is interpreted as the agent. The mechanism is no different for the unaccusative verb *llegar* (= arrive) and the unergative verb *trabajar* (= work). The main difference is that the stem *lleg-* only has a D:TH feature. This prohibits it from combining with a
v since no v will be compatible with it. The stem trabaj-, on the other hand, only has a v:AG feature. Thus, this feature will percolate up to VP and determine what type of v may merge with the VP. The feature specification and checking mechanisms for these two verbs are shown in (8b) and (8c) respectively.\textsuperscript{62}

It is largely assumed within the MP framework that the \textit{v}P defines a domain of structure building operations at which the created syntactic object is sent to the interfaces to ‘check’ various phonological and interpretative facets of the structure: a phase (Chomsky 2001, 2008; Legate 2003).\textsuperscript{63} Intuitively the \textit{v}P phase is believed to define the event and argument structure associated with a particular verb while higher phases (TP or CP) may be thought to define the temporal and propositional anchoring of the sentence. On the view that has been outlined above, all of the features on the stem and on \textit{v} must be checked once the \textit{v}P phase is reached. If a feature is not checked by the \textit{v}P phase, then the derivation fails to converge and we are left with an ungrammatical syntactic object.

Based on what we saw in chapter 2, class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs essentially represent two types of “middle ground”, one between (8a) and (8b) and another between (8a) and (8c) above. In an ideal world, the best way to account for this is to claim that the feature specification of class 1 transitive verbs contains an obligatory D:TH and an \textit{optional} v:AG

\textsuperscript{62}Note: I have labeled the D feature of \textit{llegar} as D:TH because the sole argument of this verb undergoes a change of location, which falls within Gruber’s (1965) original definition of theme. The same could be said of directional verbs such as \textit{ir} (= go), \textit{venir} (= come), \textit{salir} (= leave), \textit{subir} (= go up) and \textit{bajar} (= go down). However, the sole argument of this entire class of motion verbs also has agent entailments. The arguments are animate and may also require some kind of volition in order to perform these particular actions. A careful representation of the D feature of these verbs might call the role an AG-TH composite, whereby the sole argument is both the initiator and the theme. The issue is a complicated one and it deserves its own study where it is the central focus, which is something I cannot do here. I thank Elena Herburger for bringing this to my attention.

\textsuperscript{63}There is no consensus as to which phrase markers define phases nor is there a precise understanding of what is supposed to happen at each putative phase boundary (see Matushansky 2005 for a discussion).
feature while the feature specification of class 2 verbs contains an obligatory \( v:AG \) and an *optional* \( D:TH \). Optionality is represented as parentheses in (9).

(9)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. STEM}_{v:AG,(D:TH)} & \quad \text{(Class 1 Transitive Verb)} \\
\text{b. STEM}_{v:AG,D:TH} & \quad \text{(Class 2 Transitive Verb)}
\end{align*}

The consequences of making this particular move appear to be quite appealing. Note that we are assuming that \textsc{merge} may generate any of the structures in (8) and the features on the stem determine compatibility with any of them at the interfaces. What (9a) says is that class 1 stems must *minimally* have a DP in their complement position that is interpreted as the *theme*. They also may have an agent but this is not necessary. Since \textsc{merge} is free to create structure (8a) or structure (8b), both of them will be compatible with any stem that has the feature specification in (9a). What (9b) says is precisely the opposite of (9a). Class 2 stems must *minimally* have a \( v_{AG} \). They also may have a DP that is interpreted as the *theme* but this is not necessary, and given that \textsc{merge} is free to create either (8a) or (8c), both of these structures will be compatible with any stem that has the feature specification in (9b).

In order to investigate what the consequences of the ideas outlined above are for class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs let us repeat the representative lists of class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs from chapter 2.

(10)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Class 1: } & \text{romper (break), cerrar (close), congelar (freeze), llenar (fill), vaciar (empty), secar (dry), abrir (open), derretir (melt), quemar (burn), hundir (sink)} \\
\text{b. Class 2: } & \text{comer (eat), bailar (dance), leer (read), fumar (smoke), escribir (write), cantar (sing), barrer (sweep), pintar (paint), lavar (wash), estudiar (study)}
\end{align*}

Any stem from (10a) will be able to occur in two of the structures in (8) that can be generated by \textsc{merge}: transitive or unaccusative. Abstracting away from many important details of chapter 2,
this would mean that class 1 transitive verbs such as *romper* (= break) could either be a transitive or an unaccusative verb as shown in (11). Obviously, we are glossing over many important facets of the intransitive variants of class 1 verbs such as the role of SE in the inchoative. These will be treated in a later section where we will attempt to refine this somewhat coarse vision of the two verb types.

(11) \( \text{romp-}^{<v:AG,D:TH>} \) (break)

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{a. Transitive} & \quad \text{b. Unaccusative} \\
\text{VP} & \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{DP}_{AG} & \quad \text{V} \\
\quad v & \quad \text{DP}_{TH} \\
\quad v' & \quad \text{V} \\
\quad \text{VP} & \quad \text{DP}_{TH} \\
\quad \text{V} & \quad \text{V} \\
\quad \text{DP}_{TH} & \quad \text{DP}_{TH} \\
\quad \text{romp-}^{<v:AG,D:TH>} & \quad \text{romp-}^{<v:AG,D:TH>}
\end{align*} \]

If we abstract away from the details of object omission, the tentative conclusion would be that any stem from \((10b)\), class 2 verbs, will be able to occur in two of the structures that can be generated by \textsc{merge}: transitive or unergative. This is shown in (12).
(12)  \( le_{v:AG,(D:TH)} \) (read)

a. Transitive

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP}_{AG} \quad v' \\
\quad v_{AG} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad V \quad \text{DP}_{TH} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{le}_{v:AG,(D:TH)} \\
\end{array}
\]

b. Unergative

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{DP}_{AG} \quad v' \\
\quad v_{AG} \quad \text{VP} \\
\quad \quad V \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{le}_{v:AG,(D:TH)} \\
\end{array}
\]

We could then revise the interface condition that is imposed by the feature specification of stems on the syntactic structures where they appear to accommodate class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs in the following way.

(13)  INTERFACE CONDITION ON ARGUMENT STRUCTURE:
The syntax must satisfy the minimal requirements of the selectional and thematic feature specification of a stem at the vP phase

For an obligatorily transitive or intransitive verb, (13) ensures that structural positions in the syntax in which the arguments appear match the feature specification on the stem and that those arguments are interpreted accordingly. There is no difference between a minimal and maximal feature specification for these verbs. For class 1 and class 2 verbs, however, this means that any syntactic structure in which a class 1 stem appears, the D feature of the stem must be satisfied and the argument that satisfies the D feature will be interpreted as a theme. On the other hand, any syntactic structure in which a class 2 stem appears, the v feature must be satisfied and the argument that eventually satisfies the D feature of v will be interpreted as an agent. These are the
minimal requirements of the selectional and thematic feature specification of each class. What separates class 1 and class 2 verbs from obligatorily transitive and intransitive verbs is that they also have maximal feature specifications that may be satisfied by a transitive structure. That is, either type of verb stem is also compatible with a structure in which both the \( v \) and D features are satisfied by arguments in the complement V and specifier of \( v \) positions respectively.

In the sections that follow we will see that this very simple view of the difference between class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs can account for the basic alternations that characterize each verb class but that we need to refine certain notions such as the ‘optionality’ of arguments in order to account for the full range of phenomena that we saw in chapter 2. In section 3.2 I treat the inchoative alternates of class 1 verbs and object omission alternates of class 2 verbs. In section 3.3 I examine how the different types of thematic roles that correspond to omitted subjects and omitted objects may be integrated into the present framework. In section 3.4 I look at periphrastic causatives and why only some class 1 verbs may be interpreted ambiguously in these constructions but class 2 verbs may not. Finally, in section 3.5 I discuss how unintentional causer datives fit into the present framework.

3.2 Basic Alternations: Inchoative SE and Object Omission

The most obvious property that follows from class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs each having an optional selectional and thematic feature are the alternations that we saw in chapter 2 (sections 2.1 and 2.5): class 1 verbs have inchoative variants that are marked by SE in which only an internal argument, theme, is present and class 2 verbs have unergative variants that are not morphologically marked whose sole argument is an external argument, an agent. As we saw in
chapter 2, each alternation is mutually exclusive in that only class 1 verbs have inchoative variants marked by SE and only class 2 verbs can omit their objects.

(14) **INCHOATIVES**

a. La comida se congeló (por sí sola)  
The food SE.3s froze (by itself)  
‘The food froze (by itself)’

b. *El libro se leyó (por sí solo)  
The book SE.3s read (by itself)  
Intended: ‘The book read (by itself)’

(15) **OBJECT OMISSION**

a. ¿Qué hiciste ayer? – Congelé *(comida) toda la tarde.  (*Class 1)  
What did you do yesterday I froze (food) all afternoon

b. ¿Qué hiciste ayer? – Leí toda la tarde.  (Class 2)  
What did you do yesterday I read all afternoon

Ignoring the function of SE in (14) for the time being, we can explain this asymmetry by appealing to the condition in (13). The sentences in (14) represent structures that can satisfy the *minimal feature specification* for class 1 verbs but not for class 2 verbs. The structural representation of the sentences in (14a) and (14b) is shown in (16).

(16) **Inchoatives: an idealized representation of (14)**

a. Class 1 (14a)

```
  VP
   \  /  
  V   DP_TH
     \  /  
    congel-<v:AG,D:TH> la comida
```

b. *Class 2 (14b)

```
  VP
   \  /  
  V   DP_TH
     \  /  
    le-<v:AG,D:TH> el libro
```
In (16a), the minimal thematic feature specification is satisfied since the external argument (= agent) is optional. In (16b) the minimal thematic feature specification is not satisfied since the internal argument (= theme) is optional but the external argument (= agent) is obligatory. Since there is no agent generated by the syntax in (16b), the condition in (13) is not satisfied and the structure is uninterpretable. We have precisely the opposite problem in (15). In this case the minimal feature specification of (15a) is not satisfied by the syntactic structure but that of (15b) is.

(17) Object Omission: an ideal representation of (15)

a. *Class 1 (15a) 

```
  vP
  △AG
  pro.1s
  vAG
  vp
  | V
  | congel-<v:AG,D:TH>
```

b. Class 2 (15b) 

```
  vP
  △AG
  pro.1s
  vAG
  vp
  | V
  | le-<v:AG,D:TH>
```

In the following sections we will take a more in-depth look at both inchoatives and object omission, discussing how to best represent the fact that one argument in each case appears to be optional.

3.2.1 Inchoative SE

We have not said anything about the role of SE in the inchoative of class 1 verbs. This has received ample attention in the literature on inchoatives that are marked with reflexive morphology across languages (Alexiadou 2010; Chierchia 2004; Kempchinsky 2004; Levin &
Rappaport Hovav 1995; Koontz-Garboden 2009; Mendikoetxea 1999a; Pylkkänen 2008; Schäfer 2009, among others). In her richly detailed description of Spanish inchoatives, Mendikoetxea (1999a) observes that SE is generally a mark of an inchoative form of a verb that is externally caused and transitive, following work by Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995). Inchoative-like verbs that are not marked with SE are usually internally caused and can only be intransitive (unaccusatives). These strictly intransitive verbs, like florecer (blossom) and enrojecer (blush), have periphrastic transitive forms in which an external argument is introduced as the subject of a light verb, usually hacer (make) (see Mendikoetxea 1999a and Sánchez 2002 for more details).

There are a few verbs that demonstrate a transitive alternation that is almost identical to the causative-inchoative except for the fact that se does not mark the intransitive variant. The prototypical verb that follows this pattern is hervir (boil).

(i) a. Juan hirvió el agua.
   Juan boiled the water

b. El agua (*se) hirvió.
   The water (SE) boiled

Other verbs that show a pattern like hervir include particular uses of verbs such as aumentar (increase), subir (raise) and many de-adjectival verbs such as engordar (= fatten/get fat) and ensanchar (= widen). As noted in Sánchez (2002: 89), these verbs are called ‘neutral’ or ‘diathesis neutral’ verbs because they are capable of appearing as transitive or unaccusative verbs in the absence of any kind of grammatical marking. They constitute a smaller portion of verbs that are able to omit their external argument. Sánchez (2002) reviews survey work in which 25 of 300 alternating verbs had unaccusative variants that were not marked with se). There is little evidence that the intransitive variants of these verbs are actually inchoatives though. As we saw in section 2.6.4, and will see again in section 5.1, inchoative se forces the VP it combines with to have a telic reading. Alternating verbs like hervir and aumentar are not necessarily interpreted as telic when they are intransitive. In fact, they license the durative temporal frames headed by durante more naturally than ones headed by en, which is the exact opposite of what we see with inchoatives.

(ii) a. El agua hirvió ?en/durante 10 minutos
   The water boiled in/for 10 minutes

b. Los precios aumentaron ?en/durante 3 meses.
   The prices increased in/for 3 months

These particular verbs most likely comprise a sub-type of class 1 verbs that I will not have space to treat here. One of the main objectives here is to uncover what the properties of the one type of class 1 transitive verbs are and then use the diagnostics to investigate other types of transitive verbs to see where they fit into the classification. This is outlined in chapter 6.
The descriptive observations in Mendikoetxea (1999a) strongly indicate that inchoative SE is a marker of an unaccusative use of a verb that is treated as “underlyingly” transitive by the grammar of Spanish. This is the basic intuition that is explored in Chierchia (2004) for similar data from Italian, Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) for English and Koontz-Garboden (2009) for Spanish and other languages. Both Chierchia (2004) and Koontz-Garboden (2009) propose that the inchoative is the output of a special type of reflexivization operation on a particular type of causative transitive relation (see section 1.2 for a discussion of this idea as it applies to unaccusativity more generally) while Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) propose that inchoatives are the product of the elimination of the external argument along with any type of predicate (such as agent) that may link the external argument to event denoted by the verb. This semantic analysis of inchoatives has been complemented by morpho-syntactic analyses of the same kinds of sentences by Alexiadou (2010), Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer (2006), Embick (1998) and Schäfer (2007), among others whose general conclusion is that the reflexive morphology that marks inchoative sentences in many languages represents the realization of “non-thematic voice.” Simplifying these analyses greatly, the basic idea is that there is a v (or Voice) head present in inchoatives that does not license an external argument or introduce any kind of thematic relation at all. In some languages this head is spelled out in a particular way, reflexive morphology being one of the most common.65

Taking these ideas into consideration we might assume that there are at least three kinds of v heads in Spanish that are marked for whether or not they introduce an AGENT in addition to

---

65For an excellent discussion of how to reconcile the reflexivization analysis of inchoatives (or ‘anti-causatives’) with the different kinds of morphological expressions that these types of intransitive forms have across languages see Koontz-Garboden (2009: 125-132).
their selectional and interpretational features. An active transitive verb is one that introduces an 
AGENT predicate and discharges that particular role to the argument that is required in its 
specifier (due to its D feature). The combination of introducing a thematic role and discharging it 
is what makes the v active. These are the v’s that are capable of assigning accusative case. A 
passive transitive verb is one that introduces a role that cannot be discharged to the specifier of 
the vP position. Thus, what characterizes these particular v’s is the introduction of an AGENT 
predicate but the absence of a selectional feature that forces the merge of an external argument. 
This is why passives have implicit agents and can be modified by the by-phrase that introduces 
the agent. Since these particular v’s do not discharge a role to their specifier, they cannot assign 
accusative case (following Burzio’s generalization). There is one additional type of v: one that 
introduces no thematic relation at all and acts mainly as an expletive for the external argument 
position within the vP phase. This v would simply have a selectional V feature but lack a D 
feature in addition to lacking any kind of subscript indicating that it introduces a thematic role. 
Obviously, this v would not have any case-assigning ability (it discharges no role to its specifier), 
or would it have any kind of implicit agentivity that could be modified by something like by-
phrase or any other kind of agent-oriented modifier. Let us assume that this v is what is 
morphologically realized by inchoative SE.

\[(18) \quad \begin{align*} 
& a. \, v_{AG<D:AG,V>} \quad \text{(Active Transitive Verb)} \\
& b. \, v_{AG<V>} \quad \text{(Passive Transitive Verb)} \\
& c. \, v_{<V>} \quad \text{(Inchoative Variant of a Transitive Verb)} 
\end{align*} \]

The sentence in (14a) would thus have a structural representation like that of (19).
(19) Sentence (14a) = la comida se congeló

Making this step has a number of positive consequences. As we saw in chapter 2, what differentiates inchoative SE from impersonal and true reflexive uses of SE (section 2.1) is that (i) it has no implicit agentivity and (ii) it is non-doubling. In (19), these two characteristics are the only possibility in the presence of SE: (i) it realizes a non-agentive verbal head and (ii) it is simply part of the verb’s morphology (it is not an argument) and thus we would never expect a full pronominal double of it. The morphological shape of SE (as me, te, se, nos, os, se) is determined by an agreement relation between the v head and the grammatical subject. Note that this is not the same as the case-motivated agreement that exists between v and the object, assuming that v takes the place of AgrO (Chomsky 1995). It is important to separate the two notions because if we were to posit that SE was an agreement clitic related to accusative case, its morphological shape would always match that of the internal argument and be contingent on accusative case valuation. This is clearly wrong in the case of (19) because there is no accusative case valuation and, as we will see in detail in chapter 5, clearly wrong for a host of other uses of SE that share the same morpho-syntactic profile as inchoative SE (I call them all uses of ‘inherent SE’). In order to account for this fact, I claim that there are various morphological realizations of v in Spanish that are upward-agreeing (Baker 2008) and not contingent on case valuation. They agree either with the DP in spec vP or, in the absence of such a position (as is the
case with inchoative SE), they agree with the phi-features features on T. Thus, inchoative SE, along with other uses of inherent SE, functions like (grammatical) subject agreement morphology and should not be considered a morphological realization of the uninterpretable phi-features on v that come as a result of the valuation of accusative case, as accusative clitics have been argued to be in works like Franco (1991, 2000). We will see much more of this in chapter 5.

A further positive consequence of (19) can be observed if we return to Mendikoetxea’s (1999a) generalizations about verbs that are marked with SE in the inchoative and verbs that are not.

(20)  a. *(Se) rompió la ventana (por sí sola)  
     (SE.3s) broke the window by itself  
     ‘The window broke’
  
  b. (*Se) creció el árbol.  
     (SE.3s) grew the tree  
     ‘The tree grew’

If we were a learner of Spanish, the presence of SE in (20a) would give us the following information about the verb romper: “romper is externally caused and the verb in this sentence may be used as a transitive verb.” The impossibility of SE in (20b) would give us the following information: “crecer is an internally caused verb and this sentence can only be intransitive; there is no transitive use of crecer in the absence of a light verb.” On the present analysis, this fact can be accounted for given the way that selectional and thematic feature specifications of stems interact with the syntactic structures in which those stems may be inserted.

(21)  a. romp-<(v:AG),D:TH>  
  b. crec-<(D:TH>
The presence of SE is essentially giving the learner a cue that for romper there is a position in which an AGENT may appear, there just isn’t one here now as that position is filled by an “expletive-like” element, SE. This information can then be used to deduce that the stem has an optional v:AG feature. The absence of SE in a verb like crecer is an indication that there is no position in which an AGENT can be merged for this verb, which can be used to deduce that this stem has no v feature at all. This is shown in (22).

(22) Inchoatives versus (Strictly) Unaccusatives – representation of (20a) and (20b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inchoatives: vP is there</th>
<th>Unaccusatives: vP is not there</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>se</td>
<td>DP_{TH}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>romp_{&lt;(v:AG),D:TH&gt;}</td>
<td>crec_{&lt;D:TH&gt;} el árbol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

la ventana

So it seems that what was painted as an optional argument when setting up the framework is not entirely optional because it requires an expletive-like element in the position where the thematic role of the external argument is normally introduced. Thus, we need to revise what the parentheses around v:AG actually mean. Instead of meaning that v is optional, they mean that v_{AG} is optional and that any type of v may merge with the VP. This is spelled out below in (23), where the difference between class 1 transitive and unaccusatives is highlighted.

---

An important note is in order here. There is set of unaccusative verbs that do take inchoative SE. These include morir-se (die-SE), caer-se (fall-SE) and salir-se (leave-SE) to name just a few. In the last chapter, chapter 6, I treat these verbs as part of class 1 continuum that includes both unaccusative, inchoatives and transitive verbs.
In this section we have argued that inchoatives are like unaccusatives in that they take an internal argument. However, they differ from unaccusatives in that they have a special type of expletive \(v\) that is morphologically realized by SE. We argued that this particular \(v\) (and the SE that realizes it) takes instructions from the selectional and thematic feature specification on class 1 stems. The parentheses around \(v:\text{AG}\) does not mean that \(v\) is optional, but that \(v_{\text{AG}}\) (the \(v\) introduces an agent predicate) is optional. If it does not merge, another type of \(v\) must merge in its place, one that does not introduce any kind of role that can be assigned to an external argument. In section 5.3 we will continue the discussion of inchoative SE, highlighting a further aspectual effect that it has on the VP, mainly that of forcing a telic reading (see chapter 2, section 2.6.4 for a detailed discussion). In this sense inchoative SE is similar to other ‘inherent’ uses of SE that do not function as impersonals or true reflexives. For now let us briefly discuss the nature of object omission in class 2 transitive verbs.

### 3.2.2 Object Omission

It was noted in section 2.5 that there is some controversy as to how to best characterize object omission. When we say a sentence like (15b), *leí toda la tarde* (= *I read all afternoon*), are we saying ‘I read (something) all afternoon’ or just ‘I read all afternoon’? Campos (1999) and Levin (1993) concur that for both Spanish and English sentence (15b) means something like ‘I read (something) all afternoon.’ Verbs that allow object omission (mainly, class 2 transitive verbs)
may omit their internal argument if that argument is understood as the most prototypical thing that functions as the internal argument of the verb in question.

(24)  a. María (ya) comió.
María (already) ate

b. Juan (ya) barrió.
Juan (already) swept

The reason we can leave the internal argument out in (24a) is because it is recoverable as ‘food item’ since that is the most typical thing that functions as the object of *comer* (eat). Likewise, in (24b), we can leave out the internal argument because it is recoverable as ‘a surface’, the most typical thing that functions as the object of *barrer* (sweep). The sentences in (24a) and (24b) are thus treated as a special kind of indefinite object drop that is enabled by the conceptual content of many class 2 transitive verbs. This idea seems very intuitive and makes sense of the data, but consider the class 1 transitive verb *vaciar* (empty). It is a fair question to ask how many things one can possibly empty – a drawer, a closet, etc. All of these things could be grouped under the concept ‘containers.’ This seems to me the same kind of mental process that a hearer might go through when hearing the sentence in (24b). *Barrer* means ‘sweep.’ There are many possible things that can be swept – a floor, a sidewalk, an entry, etc. but all fit under the concept of ‘surfaces.’ Thus, I accept (24b) because I know that a surface was swept. Why can’t the same mechanism be employed to accommodate (25)?

(25)  *Juan (ya) vació*
Juan (already) emptied

*Intended: Juan (already) emptied*
I would like to argue that the reason only certain class 2 transitive verbs are able to omit their object in the neutral contexts that are of interest to us here (i.e. answers to the question ‘What did you do?) is due to the difference in the feature specification on class 1 and class 2 verbs. Let us take a look at the stems that give rise *comer* (= eat) and *vaciar* (= empty).

(26)  

a. *com*-\(<v:AG, (D:TH)\>  
b. *vaci*-\<(v:AG), D:TH\>

In section 3.2.1 it was argued that the parentheses around *v:AG* for class 1 verbs actually indicate that *v*\_\_AG\_ is optional, not that *v* is optional all together. Thus there is an external argument of sorts in inchoative verbs (an ‘expletive’ *v* that is realized by SE). The question is if a similar thing is happening with object omission. That is, do the parentheses around D:TH on the stem in (24a) indicate that the complement position of this verb is optional all together or do they indicate that there exists a particular rule that is sensitive to those parentheses and can effectively eliminate the internal argument of the verb? On the first view, the representation of a sentence like (24a) would not involve an object position at all, making the verb an unergative.

(27)  

Object Omission: Possible Representation of (24a)
In order to explain why we interpret some kind of prototypical object in the case of (27), we may appeal to the conceptual content of the stem itself. Even though the grammar may generate an *eating* event with no theme, it is simply impossible for us to conceptualize such an event without a *theme* and this is why we interpret a prototypical object in these cases. On the second view, class 2 verbs would always be transitive and they would have to satisfy the D:TH feature in some way even though this is not grammatically marked by any special morpheme like SE. One possible way of representing this to say the internal argument position is occupied by a phonologically empty N head. This is not a *pro*; rather, it is a syntactic head that is capable of satisfying the optional D:TH of class 2 verbs. It is essentially an expletive for the D feature. This is shown in (28).

(28) Object Omission: Possible Representation of (26a)

Following work by Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) we could think of the N merging as an obligatory incorporating element since it lacks any kind of phonological index. Thus after

---

67 This particular proposal differs from that of Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) in that I am not claiming that the verb originates as an abstract nominal element and that the incorporation of this nominal element into a light verb meaning something like *do* (see chapter 1, section 1.2) is what gives the verb its name. I am claiming the opposite here: the null element is the noun and the head that has a phonological index is the verb. I find this a more intuitive and appealing way of accounting for the fact that the surface intransitive *eat* means *eat something* rather than *do an eating* just as *sweep* means *sweep something* rather than *do a sweep*. Though evidence from languages like Basque suggest that this may be the right move for some unergative verbs, the DO+N idea does not accurately capture how
merging as the complement of the V head and satisfying its D:TH feature, it incorporates into V, getting a phonological index from the verb stem. The result of that incorporation is a complex verb as shown in (29).

(29)

This empty N can only be interpreted as a default object that is intimately related to prototypicality since it has no phonological index and no referential properties. This is precisely the reason why we seem to interpret an object when there isn’t one expressed, not even as a null pro. Taking what we saw in the previous section as our precedent we could say that the parentheses around D:TH are what enable this particular mechanism to apply to a given verb. So, a verb like vaciar (= empty) is not a licit input to this rule since it must have a full DP satisfy its D feature. Just as (v:AG) signifies the optionality of a particular type of v for class 1 verbs, so (D:TH) signifies the optionality of a particular type of internal argument for class 2 verbs. Now let us briefly compare the intransitive use of class 2 verbs to unergative verbs. On this particular view, there is an underlying difference that is obscured at the superficial level. Take following sentences.

class 2 verbs that appear in object omission constructions are interpreted. If we take the opposite tack and say that there is a null nominal element that is interpreted as the most prototypical object of the class 2 verb in question, we have a more accurate representation, in my view, of the interpretation of these verbs.
The stems that give rise to each of these verbs would have following feature specifications, respectively, which would correspond to the underlying structural difference in (32).

(31)  
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{barr-<v:AG,(D:TH)>} \\
\text{b. } & \text{trabaj-<v:AG>} 
\end{align*}
\]

(32) Representation of (30)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. Omitted Objects: N is there} & \quad \text{b. Unergatives: N is not there} \\
\end{align*}
\]

The second view that has been outlined here allows us to maintain the idea that class 2 verbs are fundamentally transitive but that the parentheses around the D:TH selectional and thematic features signal that these verbs may optionally take a DP as their internal argument. They may also take an expletive-like internal argument that I have represented as a phonological empty N that incorporates into V and is interpreted based on the conceptual nature of the verb itself. This not only explains why we seem to interpret an object in these cases but it also gives us a way to
link the ‘optionality’ of the internal argument of class 2 verbs to the ‘optionality’ of the external argument of class 1 verbs. We can redefine what the parentheses around D:TH in the following way.

(33)  
   a. \( \langle v:AG, (D:TH) \rangle \) = “DP is optional, but N must merge; \( v:AG \) is obligatory”
   b. \( \langle v:AG \rangle \) = “no internal argument merges; \( v:AG \) is obligatory”

We have argued that like the \( (v:AG) \) that marks class 1 verbs as potential inchoatives, the \( (D:TH) \) feature marks class 2 verbs as verbs that can undergo object omission. In the last part of this section, I would like to review how object omission is different from indefinite object drop and how this can be reflected in the structural representation of each of these phenomena. First, note that indefinite object drop, as it is defined in the literature (for example, Campos 1986), requires a context in which the omitted object of a particular verb can be linked to a contextually salient indefinite noun. Crucially, this does not discriminate between class 1 and class 2 verbs: either can appear when the object is recoverable. In the following example, a class 2 and a class 1 verb could be used and both could be understood as taking an indefinite object (= plates).

(34)  
   Context: They gave me 100 plates to wash and dry
   a. Lavé toda la mañana.  
      I washed all morning  
      (Class 2)
   b. Sequé toda la tarde.  
      I dried all afternoon  
      (Class 1)

If this context is replaced by one in which the sentences are the answer to the question \( qué hiciste ayer? \) (= what did you do yesterday), only the class 2 verb sounds natural.
In (35a), we interpret the object as *a washable surface or material*, the most prototypical object of the verb *lavar*. This is available because of the fact that the stem *lav-* has the feature (D:TH) while the stem *sec-* does not. Another difference between indefinite object drop and object omission is that the former has its own set of restrictions that apply to individual verbs that cut across the class 1 and class 2 distinction. That is, there are certain contexts in which some verbs admit indefinite object drop but others (both class 1 and class 2 verbs) do not. The follow question contexts are typical ones for eliciting indefinite object drop sentences. Note that some verbs can be used as answers to the questions and have the interpretation whereby the object mentioned in the question is interpreted as its internal argument, as we see in (34), whereas other verbs, when they appear in almost identical contexts, may not, as shown (36) and (37).68

68I am grateful to Héctor Campos for pointing out these particular data to me and for suggesting that I clarify the difference between ‘object omission’ and ‘indefinite object drop.’
Indefinite object drop has its own set of restrictions that do no isolate class 1 or class 2 verbs, thus it is not a relevant test for us. Object omission, as I have defined it here, does isolate class 2 verbs and thus does constitute a relevant test for us. Returning to the distinction between (34) and (35), I propose that the following structural representation is what captures the difference between indefinite object drop on the one hand and object omission on the other. In the indefinite object sentences, there is a null *pro in the object position as shown in (39).

(39)  Indefinite Object Drop: Representation of (34)

a. Class 1 Verbs = (34b)  b. Class 2 Verbs = (34a)

In the in the object omission sentence there is no null *pro in the object position. The expletive-like N merges there. Since this is only possible if a verb has a (D:TH) feature, it will only be
possible for class 2 verbs. This is explains why it ungrammatical with the class 1 verb. This is shown in (40).

(40) Object Omission: Representation of (33)\textsuperscript{69}

\begin{align*}
a. \quad \text{\*Class 1 Verbs} &= (33b) \\
&\quad \text{DP}_{AG} \quad v' \\
&\quad \text{pro.1s} \quad v_{AG} \quad \text{VP} \\
&\quad \text{V} \quad \text{N} \\
&\quad \text{sec-} <\langle v; AG, D: TH \rangle > \quad \{ \} \\

b. \quad \text{Class 2 Verbs} &= (33a) \\
&\quad \text{DP}_{AG} \quad v' \\
&\quad \text{pro.1s} \quad v_{AG} \quad \text{VP} \\
&\quad \text{V} \quad \text{N} \\
&\quad \text{lav-} <\langle v; AG, D: TH \rangle > \quad \{ \} \\
\end{align*}

In this section we have seen that object omission can be characterized in a similar way as inchoatives. They are the product of a particular rule that targets only class 2 verbs and not class 1 verbs. With this, we have been able to maintain the idea that class 1 and class 2 verbs are always underlying transitives, and thus distinct from unaccusatives and unergatives when they appear as superficial intransitives. We have also been able to sharpen (albeit only slightly) what

\textsuperscript{69}A possible avenue to explore to corroborate this idea has been suggested to me by Héctor Campos, but unfortunately I haven’t had the time to explore it with the necessary detail prior to completion of this thesis. The relevant contexts are ones in which a question that is normally the trigger for object drop is presented such as (i).

(i) Conoces a la chica que comió castañas?  
Do you know ACC the girl that ate chestnuts?

(ii) a. Sí, conozco a la chica que comió (castañas)  
(Falling contour – object drop)  
b. Sí, conozco a la chica que comió  
(Rising contour – object omission)

The hypothesis is that there may be a difference in intonation between answering with a sentence where the object is recoverable as the one in the question (a pro is there) and one in which there is no such recoverable object (= my expletive N is there). The presence of two distinct null elements in each of the different kinds of objectless sentences would be an interesting way of further showing that they are different and that what is in the complement position in each case may have an effect on the pitch that the stressed vowel of the verb receives. Since this requires a substantial amount of investigation and empirical measurements, I will leave it for future research.
the notion optionality means when we are talking about optional arguments. For both the omitted external argument in inchoatives and the omitted internal argument of object omission constructions the optionality of the omitted argument in each case is actually marked with an expletive-like element that fills its place. It is a v in inchoatives that marks the absence of an external argument and an N in object omission constructions that marks the absence of an internal argument.

3.3 Thematic Roles

In section 2.7 of the previous chapter it was observed that there are certain correlations between the number of thematic roles that can be assigned to a particular argument position and whether the argument that occupies that position can be omitted. Let us start with the external arguments of class 1 verbs. Class 1 verbs may admit agents (AG), instruments (INSTR) and inanimate causers (IC) as subjects but class 2 verbs generally impose an agent restriction on their subjects. Some representative examples are shown in (41) and (42).

(41)  a. \{Juan_{AG}/esa piedra_{INSTR}/el sismo_{IC}\} rompió la ventana.
      Juan  / that rock  / the earthquake broke the window
      ‘Juan/the rock/the earthquake broke the window’

      b. \{María_{AG}/esa llave_{INSTR}/el viento_{IC}\} cerró la puerta.
      María  / that key  / the wind closed the door
      ‘María/the key/the wind closed the door’

(42)  a. \{Juan_{AG}/#esa escoba_{INSTR}/#el viento_{IC}\} barrió el suelo.
      Juan  / #the broom  / the wind swept the floor
      ‘Juan / #the broom / #the wind swept the floor’

      b. \{María_{AG}/#esa pluma_{INSTR}/#el café_{IC}\} escribió el artículo.
      María  / #the pen  / the coffee wrote the article
      ‘María / #the pen / #the coffee wrote the article’
This pattern has been noted in many works on argument structure (for example, Folli & Harley 2005, 2007; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995). The source of this distinction is largely attributed to the idea that class 1 verbs denote caused changes (or results) and thus typically associate with a flavor of $\nu (= \nu_{\text{cause}})$ that does not require an argument capable of acting in any particular manner. Class 2 verbs on the other hand denote activities that contain an inherent manner component that requires an animate agent in order to be properly interpreted. Folli & Harley (2005, 2007) claim that this requirement is due to the fact that class 2 verbs typically associate with a flavor of $\nu (= \nu_{\text{do}})$ that requires the presence of some argument capable of acting in the way specified by the verb (= an agent).

We have yet to explicitly mention this variability in thematic roles in the system that we have been developing thus far. The first issue to address is the fact that the interpretational feature we have used thus far to indicate how the external argument is interpreted may be too specific. For example, the specification on a stem such as 

\[
\text{\textit{romp-}<(\nu:\text{AG}; D:\text{TH})>}
\]

If we look at (41), the question of whether $\nu_{\text{AG}}$ is what is required by this stem arises. The external argument does not have to be an agent. Many researchers have advocated an underspecified macro-role for external arguments which we might call \textsc{effector} (following Van Valin & Wilkins 1996), \textsc{initiator} (following Ramchand 2008) or \textsc{originator} (following Borer 2005 or Mateu 2002). These roles are meant to comprise all those entities that cause the event denoted by the verb to come about, but their precise interpretation depends on a variety of factors.
including internal characteristics of the argument itself (i.e. animacy, volition) and the range of possible external arguments that a particular verb can take (or lack thereof). What has been noted in works such as Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995) and Koontz-Garboden (2009) is that the possibility of taking a macro-role such as effector as its external argument strongly correlates with capacity to omit that argument. I propose that the parentheses around the v feature on class 1 verbs correlate with the presence of an EFF (for effector) interpretational feature on v. Thus, the feature specification on the stems romp- (= break) and cerr- (= close) respectively is shown in (44).

(44)  

a. romp-<\(v:EFF\); D:TH>  
b. cerr-<\(v:EFF\); D:TH>

Making this change allows us to accommodate the range thematic roles that can possibly appear with class 1 verbs. The argument receives an EFFECTOR role and its precise interpretation (agent, instrument or inanimate causer) is determined by the internal characteristics of the argument itself. The claim regarding what the parentheses around the v feature mean does not change. It still means that merging a v that introduces the EFFECTOR role is optional but that there must always be a v in the structure, the expletive-like v that doesn’t introduce the EFFECTOR role being morphologically realized by the inchoative. In this way we are able to capture the correlation between the possibility of omitting the external argument and the broader range of thematic roles that may be assigned to that particular position for class 1 verbs.

If we look at class 2 verbs, there is nothing to change here. These verbs require that the external argument be an agent and this correlates with the fact this argument cannot be omitted.
This can be captured by the fact that there are no parentheses around the $v$ feature on class 2 verbs as shown in (45).

(45)  
   a. $barr_{\langle v; AG; \{D; TH\} \rangle}$  
   b. $escrib_{\langle v; AG; \{D; TH\} \rangle}$

Now there is a question with respect to whether or not the inverse holds. Is there a comparable broader range of thematic roles that can be assigned to the internal arguments that can be omitted from class 2 verbs? Based on the discussion of object omission that we have seen in both chapter 2 (section 2.7) and in section 3.2.2 above it does not appear so. As mentioned previously, when the internal argument is omitted from class 2 verbs, it does not license us to infer that there is a range of possible arguments that that particular verb can take. On the contrary, it seems to lead to the conclusion only that for that particular use of the class 2 verb the object in question must be understood as the most prototypical one that combines with that verb. This is shown in (46) and (47).

(46)  
   a. *Juan rompió  
       Juan broke  
       Intended: ‘Juan broke’
   
   b. *María cerró  
       María closed  
       Intended: ‘María closed’

(47)  
   a. Juan barrió  
       Juan swept  
       ‘Juan swept (the floor of some place)’
   
   b. María escribió  
       María wrote  
       ‘María wrote (a piece of writing)’
The available evidence suggests that object omission is a fundamentally different phenomenon than that of the omission of the external argument in inchoatives and we captured as such in the previous section. The fact that class 2 verbs have their D feature marked with parentheses is what enables an expletive N to merge in place of a full DP in the internal argument position of these verbs. The incorporation of this element into the verb gives rise to the surface intransitives that we see in (47). Since class 1 verbs lack this special marking on their \( v \) feature, the same mechanism cannot apply to those verbs, as we see in (46). However, there is no correlation between the possibility of merging this expletive N and some macro-theme role that characterizes the internal arguments of class 2 verbs to the exclusion of class 1 verbs. Thus, we have no reason to mark the interpretational feature as anything besides \( \text{TH} \) for \textit{theme}.

3.4 \textit{Hacer} Causatives (without an overt embedded subject)

It was shown in the previous chapter (in section 2.2) that there are at least two kinds of infinitives that can embed under \textit{hacer} (make) that have no overt subjects: transitive verbs (= have an implicit agent) as in (48a) and unaccusative verbs (= no implicit agent) as in (48b).

(48) \hspace{1cm} a. María hizo arreglar el carro.
    María made fix-INF the car
    ‘María had the car fixed’

    b. El jardinero hizo florecer las plantas del jardín.
    The gardener made flower-INF the plants of the garden
    ‘The gardener caused the plants in the garden to flower’

For a transitive verb like \textit{arreglar} (= fix), an implicit agent carries out the action denoted by the infinitive at the request of the subject of \textit{hacer}. In (48a) \textit{someone} fixed the car at María’s request.

Unaccusative verbs have causative readings where the subject of \textit{hacer} is interpreted as the
indirect causer of the event denoted by the unaccusative infinitive. In (48b) the gardener did something that (indirectly) caused the plants to flower (he added fertilizer, etc.) We also saw that some class 1 verbs are ambiguous between the two readings when embedded under hacer as shown in (49) but that no class 2 verbs are as can be seen in (50).

(49) Hice cerrar la puerta.
I made close.INF the door
(i) I had the door closed
(ii) I caused the door to close

(50) Hice barrer la casa.
I made sweep.INF the house
(i) I had the house swept
(ii) *I caused the house to get swept

The ambiguity in (49) and the lack of ambiguity in (50) follows straightforwardly from the analysis presented in the previous sections. When there is no overt subject, let us assume that this may mean a number of things. First, it could mean that there is a subject that is simply not realized and thus there is a v capable of assigning case. Second, it could mean that there is a passive v on the embedded verb that introduces a thematic role that may be assigned to the external argument but has no specifier to which that role may be discharged. Third, it could mean there is an expletive v (the one present in inchoatives) that introduces no role associated with a subject at all. For the interpretations that involve an implicit agent, only the null subject and passive options are possible while for the interpretations that involve indirect causation readings, only the inchoative or no v at all options are possible. Let us start with class 1 verbs and attempt to explain why they are ambiguous in these particular constructions. I propose that the following structures are the ones that apply to embedded infinitives in each of the readings in (49).
(51) Class 1: Possible structures for the embedded infinitive in (49)

a. Transitive

b. Inchoative

These two structures are then embedded under hacer yielding the structures we see in (52). As we saw in chapter 2, there is a tendency to delete inchoative SE when it is embedded under hacer. This is indicated by the parentheses around SE in (52b).

(52) Class 1: representation of the two readings in (49)
Because of the feature specification on class 1 stems, they are compatible with either embedded structure. First, these structures give us the correct interpretation for each of the readings associated with class 1 verbs. In (52a), there is a null external argument in the embedded vP that receives the EFFECTOR role assigned by v. In this particular case, I suggest that the reason that speakers interpret the arbitrary PRO as an agent is because when a transitive verb is embedded under hacer, the subject of the transitive verb is usually interpreted as an entity that can be persuaded or coerced to do something. Since this is impossible if the EFFECTOR is an instrument or an inanimate causer, we always infer that there is an agent in the types of constructions like (49), reading (i). The same could be said of the English causative verbs make and have. In (52b) there is no external argument at all, nor is there a role that could give us any indication that there is an implicit agent in these cases. This corresponds to the reading whereby the subject of hacer is indirectly responsible for causing the action denoted by the embedded infinitive. If we re-visit the clitic climbing facts associated with the two readings I believe that these structures explain the difference that we saw between clitic climbing in the two structures in chapter 2. The relevant data is shown in (53).

(53) Reading (52a)

a. La puerta, hice cerrar-la
   The door I made close-INF-it
   ‘As for the door, I had it closed’

b. La puerta, la hice cerrar
   The door it I made close-INF
   ‘As for the door, I had it closed’
(54) Reading (52b)

a. *La puerta, hice cerrar-la
   The door, I made close-INF-it
   Intended reading: ‘As for the door, I caused it to close

b. La puerta, la hice cerrar
   The door it I made close-INF
   ‘As for the door, I caused it to close’

The question is why can the clitic either stay within the embedded infinitive or climb on reading (52a) where there is a PRO in the embedded subject position whereas it cannot on the indirect causer reading (it must climb). If we look at the structure in (52a), we see that there are two possible positions that can value accusative case on the embedded object: the higher $v$ and the lower $v_{\langle D,EFF,V \rangle}$. A reasonable assumption would be that the lower object gets its case valued from the lower $v$ and that hacer plays a role in licensing the case of embedded subject. In this scenario, the clitic may either stay put or climb. On the other hand, if we look at structure (52b), there is only one possible way that the embedded object can get case: from the higher $v$. Thus, it appears that if case is valued by the higher $vP$, headed by hacer, then climbing is obligatory. This makes sense if we assume that accusative clitics have been tightly linked to the valuation of case, and may be headed down a path toward becoming something like object agreement markers (Franco 1991, 2000). In conclusion, the clitic climbing facts associated with each of the interpretations in (51) provide further evidence for structures in (52).71

70Going into the case frames associated with periphrastic causatives would take us too far adrift here. There is still a lot of work to do in order to sort out the variation in case (and any accompanying variation in interpretation) and also variation in the position of embedded subjects. In the case of transitive verbs like these ones, we might assume that $\text{PRO}_{\text{ARB}}$ is associated with dative case just like the embedded subjects of transitive verbs in the FI construction. For a detailed treatment of how to reconcile this type of dative with applicatives see Torrego (2010).

71I believe this possible explanation of the clitic climbing facts makes the $\text{PRO}_{\text{ARB}}$ analysis preferable to one in which the embedded $v$ is treated as a passive that cannot value accusative case.
We now need to comment on the absence of SE in the embedded inchoative construction in (54). As we saw in chapter 2, there is a tendency to delete not just inchoative SE but other types of SE as well under *hacer*. I propose the following generalization in order to capture this fact.

(55) SE-Deletion under *hacer*: the SE clitic may be deleted on infinitives in periphrastic causatives under *hacer*.

The next issue to discuss is why the class 2 verbs that may appear in this same construction have only one interpretation. The answer is straightforward given what we saw in the previous sections. The following structures would be the representations of the two readings of embedded infinitives under *hacer* for class 2 verbs, assuming that both are available.

(56) Class 1: representation of the non-ambiguity of (50)

---

Note that it appears to be *hacer* more than any other verb that triggers the deletion. As noted in Hernanz (1999: 2255), perception verbs do not trigger deletion in superficially similar constructions.

(i) a. Vio {*sentar/sentarse} a las damas.
    b. Oyeron {*estremecer/estremecerse} a los niños
We know, however, that only the reading in (56a) is available. This is because the feature specification on class 2 verbs requires a \( v_{AG} \). Since there is no \( v_{AG} \) in the embedded \( vP \) in (56b), the structure is ungrammatical. The prediction that is made here is that the clitic facts for class 2 verbs should match those of the reading in (52a) of class 1 verbs. That is, the clitic should be able to appear in the embedded post-verbal position, enclitic on the main verb or climb to the higher \( vP \) and be enclitic on \( hacer \). This is precisely what we saw in chapter 2. The relevant data is repeated below.

(57)  
   a. La casa, hice barrer-la  
        The house, I made sweep-INF-it  
        ‘As for the house, I had it swept’  

   b. La casa, la hice barrer  
        The house, it I made sweep-INF  
        ‘As for the house, I had it swept’  

In this section we have seen that the system outlined in sections 3.2 and 3.3 may be extended straightforwardly to account for the ambiguity that characterizes the interpretation of the class 1 verbs that appear as embedded infinitives and the lack of ambiguity that characterizes class 2 verbs that can appear in the same construction. It was argued here that this differences stems from the feature specification on each verb class. Since the \( hacer \) construction can take either transitive or inchoatives complements and only class 1 verbs can appear as both transitives and inchoatives, then only these verbs are ambiguous.

### 3.5 Unintentional Causer Datives

In section 2.3 of chapter 2 we saw that only class 1 verbs are capable of taking unintentional causer datives. The relevant distinction is shown in (58) and (59).
(58)  
a. A Juan se le rompió la radio.  
   DAT Juan SE.3s DAT.3s broke the radio  
   ‘Juan (accidentally) broke the radio’

   b. A Juan se le quemó la cena.  
   DAT Juan SE.3s DAT.3s burned the dinner  
   ‘Juan (accidentally) burned the dinner’

(59)  
   a. *A María se le leyó el libro.  
       DAT María SE.3s DAT.3s read the book  
       Intended: ‘María (accidently) read the book’

   b. *A María se le barrió la casa.  
       DAT María SE.3s DAT.3s swept the house  
       Intended: ‘María (accidentally) swept the house’

The main generalization about unintentional causer datives is that they are only possible with inchoatives as we can see in the data in (58) and (59) (see Cuervo 2003 and Fernández Soriano 1999 for more details). Since only class 1 verbs are compatible with inchoatives, only they may have unintentional causer datives. This essentially amounts to a further corroboration of the fact that only the external argument of class 1 verbs can be omitted. Let us briefly sketch out a hypothesis for how to structurally represent unintentional causer datives, closely following Cuervo’s (2003) analysis of them.

We may hypothesize that unintentional causer datives are built on top of inchoatives, following Cuervo (2003: 158): the dative argument and clitic are merged as an applicative (ApplP) above an inchoative vP. The basic structure of applicatives in Spanish (following Cuervo 2003) is shown in (60). The head is realized by a dative clitic and the dative argument is

---

73As noted in chapter 2, there is always a reading for these sentences in which the dative argument is interpreted as a possessor or affected experiencer. In the case of (59), there is a possible reading in which se is interpreted as impersonal se and María by be either an affected experiencer (59a) or a possessor (59b). The translation of the possible reading in (59b) would be ‘Someone swept María’s house (for her).’ Note that these readings are available for any transitive verb and thus they do not help us to distinguish between class 1 and class 2 transitives.
merged in the specifier of the Appl and receives inherent dative case from the Appl head, which is realized by the dative case marker \( a \).

(60) Structure of Datives in Spanish (Cuervo 2003, 2010)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{ApplP} \\
\text{a-DP} & \text{Appl'} \\
\text{Appl} & \text{XP} \\
\text{Clitic (= le)}
\end{array}
\]

In an example like (58a), the argument introduced in the spec of Appl may be interpreted as an unintentional causer because the verb is an inchoative, lacking any agentivity. On the other hand, an example like (59b) may not be interpreted as an unintentional causer because it is incompatible with an inchoative structure. The result is an overall incompatibility between what the verb requires and what this particular applicative interpretation requires. There is simply no way that a verb that encodes agentivity as part of its meaning may take a dative argument that essentially “re-introduces” an implicit agent as an unintentional causer of the action.
As mentioned above, these particular dative arguments simply corroborate the fact that class 1 verbs are capable of eliminating their agents while class 2 verbs are not. They represent one possibility in a wide range of added participants in inchoative constructions that indicate that these forms allow for the presence of a causer but never an agent, which is what distinguishes them from passives. Other types of added participants in inchoatives include the anaphoric por sí solo (by itself) (62a) as well as inanimate causers introduced as oblique expressions (62b).

(62)  a. La comida se quemó por sí sola.
     The food SE.3s burned by itself
     ‘The food burned by itself’ (= spontaneously)

74 The ordering of the clitics as se le is done post-syntactically by the morphological component of the grammar, where morphological rules such as local dislocation (Embick & Noyer 2006) would apply to the terminal nodes of the syntactic object, inverting the order. Alternatively, we could think the order subject to templatic ordering restrictions that are done in a post-syntactic morphological component of the grammar (Bonet 1995; Perlmutter 1971). I will not commit to either view here.

75 For a detailed discussion of these facts in a variety of languages, I refer the reader to Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou & Schäfer (2006); Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2009; Chierchia (2004); Koontz-Garboden (2009); Levin (2009); Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1995); Mendikoetxea (1999a), Pylkkänen (2008) and Schäfer (2007).
b. La ropa se secó con el sol.
The clothing SE.3s dried with the sun
‘The clothing dried in the sun’

On the other hand, any kind of agentive expressions such as by-phrases or instruments (which must be controlled by an agent) are unacceptable with inchoatives.

(63) a. *La cubeta se llenó de agua por Juan.
The bucket SE.3s filled-up of water by Juan
Intended: ‘The bucket filled up with water by Juan’

b. *La radio se rompió con un martillo.\(^{76}\)
The radio SE.3s broke with a hammer
Intended: ‘The radio broke with a hammer’

Now that we have sketched out the basics of the framework, let us summarize this chapter and move on to the other empirical domains that were introduced in chapter 2: participles and different uses of the reflexive (SE) clitic paradigm.

### 3.6 Summary

In this chapter we have argued that class 1 and class 2 transitive verbs are unique among transitive verbs in that one of the elements of the basic external and internal argument relation that defines the notion of transitivity is marked with a set of parentheses. As shown in (64).

(64) a. Class 1: STEM\(_{(v:EFF),D:TH}^<(\ )\)>
b. Class 2: STEM\(_{<v:AG,(D:TH)}>\)>

In section 3.1, when we discussed how syntactic positions are related to thematic relations, we first entertained the idea that the parentheses in (63) are indicators of complete optionality. However, we refined this idea in section 3.2, showing that what the parentheses actually mean is that the position associated with the formal feature:thematic relation pair that is in parentheses is

\(^{76}\)The impersonal reading of SE is grammatical because it contains an implicit agent.
optional but that this syntactic position must always be filled. For class 1 verbs, the \((v:\text{EFF})\) feature means that a \(v\) that introduces an \text{EFFECTOR} role to its external argument is what happens when the verb is transitive; however, another possibility is that an expletive \(v\) that introduces no thematic role and projects no specifier may merge as a filler for this particular position. It was argued that inchoative \text{SE} is the morphological realization of this \(v\). It was then argued that for class 2 verbs the \((D:\text{TH})\) feature means that any class 2 verbs takes a DP in the internal argument position when it is a transitive verb; however, these verbs may also take an expletive like element in the internal argument position. I loosely followed ideas by Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) (though not the details of their analysis) by suggesting that this particular expletive element is an N. Since this N lacks a phonological index, it must incorporate into the class 2 verb in question. The result is a superficially intransitive verb that is interpreted as having an implicit internal argument of the most prototypical type generally taken by whatever the class 2 verb is. For example, if the verb is \(\text{comer} (=\text{eat})\), the implicit internal argument is taken to be \(\text{comida} (=\text{food})\).

In section 3.3 we incorporated the idea that there is a correlation between a broader range of thematic roles associated with the external argument position of class 1 verbs that can be omitted. In order to capture this correlation, in addition to being able to more accurately capture the thematic roles that are assigned to the external argument position of class 1 verbs, we modified the role that \(v\) introduces from \text{agent} to \text{effector}. This notion comes from work by Van Valin & Wilkins (1996) and Koontz-Garboden (2009) and is meant to encompass roles such as \text{agent}, \text{instrument} and \text{inanimate causer} with a macro-role whose precise interpretation is determined by the inherent properties of the argument itself. We saw that there is no comparable
correlation for object omission and so no modifications to the basic D:TH feature were made. In sections 3.4 and 3.5 we extended the framework outlined in sections 3.2 and 3.3 to cover two constructions that are sensitive to whether a particular verb admits an inchoative or not. Ambiguity under *hacer* and having unintentional causer datives are contingent on a verb’s having an inchoative. Since only class 1 verbs have inchoatives, only they (i) exhibit ambiguity when embedded as infinitives under *hacer* and (ii) take unintentional causer datives.

In the next chapters we will use the framework outlined above to explore the meaning and modification of participles (chapter 4) and then extend it to cover five different uses of the reflexive clitic **SE** that extend well beyond the inchoative we have seen here (chapter 5).
Chapter 4: Class 1 and Class 2 Participles

In section 2.4 of chapter 2 we observed that both class 1 and class 2 verbs give rise to participles that have multiple interpretations. On the one hand, there are verbal or adjectival passives, which are different kinds of passive forms of their respective transitive sources and on the other hand there are simple adjectival forms (sometimes called ‘lexicalized’ adjectives, cf. Rainer (1999)), which are property-denoting expressions that describe a state usually loosely associated with a consequence or result of the action described by the verb that they share a name with. Crucially, these simple adjectives do not entail that there is a prior event or an implicit external argument that causes the state they describe. For example, *a cracked window* does not necessarily entail that there was a *cracking* event that was caused by someone or something that ultimately resulted in the state that it describes, ‘being cracked.’ These adjectives are not generally thought to be derived from verbs like participles are (see Dubinsky & Simango 1996; Embick 2004 and Koontz-Garboden 2010 for different views of this idea).

In this chapter, following work by Alexiadou (2010), Bosque (1990), Embick (2004), Koontz-Garboden (2010) and Kratzer (2000), I argue that verbal and adjectival passives have complex internal structures that are always derived from a verbal source. If we assume that these represent phases in which the phonological and interpretive features of the structure that has been built from the verbal head must be checked or satisfied (as outlined in section 3.1), then we would expect that the same conditions imposed by the formal and interpretational feature specifications on what kind of vP’s a given stem may appear in will also apply to the different kinds of participles that may be derived from a given stem. Thus, any participial form derived
from a class 1 stem must satisfy the \(<(v:EFF), D:TH>\) feature specification of that stem and any participial form derived from a class 2 stem must minimally satisfy the \(<v:AG; (D:TH)>\) feature specification of that stem. I discuss a wide range of different verbal and adjectival passives from both class 1 and class 2 verbs that represent various ways of satisfying these different feature specifications in section 4.1.

Simple adjectives, on the other hand, are not built with stems that contain the same set of feature specifications as verbs and verbal and adjectival passives. The stems that simple adjectives are derived from contain a D:TH feature that indicates that there is a sole DP argument of the adjective that is interpreted as the theme and is located in an external position; the precise position depends on whether the adjective is used as an attributive or predicative adjective. They also contain a Deg feature, which indicates that they must take a degree argument. Thus, there is no temporal change or any kind of effector or agent involved in the eventualities described by these predicates. Simple adjectives may have the same form as participles or appear as truncated participles. The most striking fact about simple adjectives is that they are, with few exceptions, only possible with class 1 verbs. I suggest that this is due to the fact that class 1 verbs as well as verbal and adjectival passives can take an expletive subject and that they typically denote results. Thus, it makes sense that the stems of these verbs may take on a meaning that does not grammatically encode an event of the same type named by the verb they share a name with. For example, broken may simple refer to a state of ‘being broken’ without grammatically encoding a breaking event (Koontz-Garboden 2010; Parsons 1990). Class 2 verbs on the other hand always require some type of manner of acting, thus they tend not to develop meanings that do not encode the idea of manner. Apparent exceptions to this generally involve highly unproductive
uses of participles that have lexicalized a particular meaning that is not directly related to the verb that they share a name with. Different kinds of simple adjectives are treated in section 4.2.

In section 4.3 I provide a brief explanation for a type of resultative construction in Spanish whereby the result specified by a main verb is expressed by a participial form of that same verb. It is argued that certain ambiguities that arise in this construction for class 1 verbs but not for class 2 verbs may be explained in a straightforward way based on the proposal presented in sections 4.1 and 4.2 for adjectival passives and simple adjectives. In section 4.4 a brief summary of the different uses of bien and muy (see chapter 2, section 2.4) is presented. The main aim of this section is to outline a way of exploring a unified analysis of the different uses of bien and muy, taking a combination of the class 1 and class 2 verb distinction and ideas about possible measurable dimensions in Kennedy and McNally (2005) as its point of departure. Finally, in section 4.5 a summary of the main points made in this chapter is provided and an introduction to the next chapter in which we will treat a variety of uses of the reflexive clitic paradigm in terms of the class 1 versus class 2 distinction that has been outlined thus far.

4.1 Verbal and Adjectival Passives

Let us first treat the regular and predictable cases of verbal and adjectival passives for class 1 and class 2 verbs. These forms are characterized as having an implicit agent and they grammatically encode a culminating event. In section 2.4 tests with bien and muy were used to isolate verbal and adjectival passives from each other and from simple adjectival forms (which we will see in section 4.2). We saw that the main characteristics of both verbal and adjectival passives with respect to modification by bien and muy are (i) they may be modified by bien_M (well) in pre-
nuclear (adjectival passive) or post-nuclear (verbal passive) position without a change in meaning but not by bien$_D$ (really or very) and (ii) they may be modified by muy$_F$ (often) in pre-nuclear position (adjectival passive) and by mucho (a lot) in post-nuclear position (verbal passives), which are essentially synonymous, but not by muy$_D$ (very). These are shown for class 1 and class 2 verbs in (1) and (2).

1. **CLASS 1**

   a. un plato bien$_M^*$$_D$ secado
      a plate well/*really dried
      ‘a well dried plate’

   b. un plato secado bien$_M^*$$_D$
      a plate dried well/*really
      ‘a plate (that was) dried well’

   c. un plato muy$_F^*$$_D$ secado
      a plate often/*very dried
      ‘an often dried plate’

   d. un plato secado mucho
      a plate dried often/a lot
      ‘a plate (that has been) dried often/a lot’

2. **CLASS 2**

   a. una balada bien$_M^*$$_D$ cantada
      a ballad well/*really sung
      ‘a well sung ballad’

   b. una balada cantada bien$_M^*$$_D$
      a ballad sung well/*really
      ‘a ballad (that was) sung well’

   c. una balada muy$_F^*$$_D$ cantada
      a ballad often/*very sung
      ‘an often sung ballad’
In addition to these tests, it is also possible to modify both adjectival and verbal passives with agent-oriented adverbs like *cuidadosamente* (carefully) and *alegremente* (happily). If they appear in pre-nuclear position, we have an adjectival passive while in post-nuclear position we have a verbal passive.

(3)  

a. un plato cuidadosamente\(^{77}\) secado  
   a plate carefully dried  
   ‘a carefully dried plate’

b. un plato secado cuidadosamente  
   a plate dried carefully  
   ‘a plate (that has been) dried carefully’

(4)  

a. una balada alegremente cantada  
   a ballad happily sung  
   ‘a happily sung ballad’

b. una balada cantada alegremente  
   a ballad sung happily  
   ‘a ballad (that has been) sung happily’

The simplest view of adjectival and verbal passives would be that they have a different categorizing head and a ‘passive’ label.

---

\(^{77}\)As mentioned in chapter 2, this test only works for some adverbs such as *bien* and the agent oriented adverbs in (3) and (4). Note that *cuidadosamente* can never appear before a verb; it must appear post-verbally.

(i)  

a. ??Juan cuidadosamente cerró la puerta.
   b. Juan cerró cuidadosamente la puerta.
   c. Juan cerró la puerta cuidadosamente.
(5) Preliminary Representation of Adjectival and Verbal Passives

a. Adjectival Passive

(b. Verbal Passive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
<th>Class 1</th>
<th>Class 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP_PASS</td>
<td>AP_PASS</td>
<td>VP_PASS</td>
<td>VP_PASS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We are setting a few complicating factors aside here. First, I have not separated agreement morphology from participial morphology in the structural representations. Participial morphology is more precisely –d, –t or –ch (all different historical evolutions of Latin –tum). Second I have opted to leave the theme within the complex structure of the participles themselves. Note that technically the AP is actually attributed to or predicated of what ultimately functions as the internal argument of the verbal structure that forms part of the complex internal structure of both kinds of words. One way to account for this would be to posit that a PRO is present in the internal argument position of the most deeply embedded V and that is controlled by whatever the AP is attributed or predicated of. Another way would be to claim that the argument inside participle exports because there is no head that can value case inside the AP or VP\textsubscript{PART}. I will assume that there is a PRO inside the structure that is controlled by whatever the AP is attributed or predicated of.

We are setting a few complicating factors aside here. First, I have not separated agreement morphology from participial morphology in the structural representations. Participial morphology is more precisely –d, –t or –ch (all different historical evolutions of Latin –tum). Second I have opted to leave the theme within the complex structure of the participles themselves. Note that technically the AP is actually attributed to or predicated of what ultimately functions as the internal argument of the verbal structure that forms part of the complex internal structure of both kinds of words. One way to account for this would be to posit that a PRO is present in the internal argument position of the most deeply embedded V and that is controlled by whatever the AP is attributed or predicated of. Another way would be to claim that the argument inside participle exports because there is no head that can value case inside the AP or VP\textsubscript{PART}. I will assume that there is a PRO inside the structure that is controlled by whatever the AP is attributed or predicated of.
Adjectival passives have a PRO theme that is controlled by whatever argument the adjective is attributed or predicated of; for example, *un plato* = a plate in (1a) and *una balada* = a ballad in (2a). They also have a $v_{AG<V>}$, which satisfies the $v$ feature on the stem. Verbal passives have an internal argument that receives nominative case due to the inability of $v_{AG<V>}$ to value accusative
case. Thus, these structures too are able to satisfy both the D feature and the ν feature on both class 1 and class 2 stems.

The modification facts we see in (1) – (4) follow straightforwardly for both adjectival and verbal passives. I assume that all of the modifiers in (1) – (4) adjoin to either AP (left) or VP_{AUX} (right) and that their interpretation is simply based on what the internal structure of AP and VP_{AUX} is. Bien_{M} (well) is perfectly fine as a modifier adjoined to the left of AP or the right of VP_{AUX} because there is manner component present within the complex internal structure of both of these phrases. Muy_{F} (often) and mucho (a lot) are also perfectly fine as modifiers of AP and VP_{AUX}, respectively, since there is an event encoded in the internal structure of both AP and VP_{AUX}. Finally, cuidadosamente (carefully) and alegremente (happily) are perfectly fine as

\[ \text{Note that I am not assuming that modifiers need to attach directly to some abstract head that encodes precisely the semantic notion that the modifiers ‘need’ in order to be interpreted (Bosque & Masullo 1996; Cinque 1999; Gumiel, Nieto & Pérez 1999, among many others). On this view, for example, a manner modifier like bien, in order to be interpreted as a manner modifier, needs to attach to whatever head in the syntax is responsible for introducing a manner component into the structure. However, it is not clear the syntactic position alone is what dictates how a particular modifier may be interpreted. In Spanish, modifiers that can be ambiguous are ambiguous regardless of their position in the syntax. Take the following example, where mucho could have a ‘quantity of tank’ reading or a ‘quantity of times’ reading.}

\( \text{(i) Juan llena mucho el tanque.} \)
\( \begin{align*}
\text{Juan fills} & \quad \text{a lot} \quad \text{the tank} \\
\text{(i) Juan fills the tank frequently} \\
\text{(ii) Juan fills the tank up to the top}
\end{align*} \)

\( \text{(i) Juan llena el tanque mucho.} \)
\( \begin{align*}
\text{Juan fills} & \quad \text{the tank} \quad \text{a lot} \\
\text{(i) Juan fills the tank frequently} \\
\text{(ii) Juan fills the tank up to the top}
\end{align*} \)

Note that either reading is possible regardless of where mucho is. The ambiguity is simply derived from what llenar means rather than where mucho may attach to ‘llenar’ if it is decomposed into two subcomponents that indicate CAUSE and RESULT. If the interpretations of mucho were actually dependent on syntactic position, then we might have evidence for supporting the ‘attach a modifier to whatever it modifies in the syntax’ view (von Stechow 1996).}
modifiers of either phrase marker because each of them have an implicit agent. The positions of modifiers for each form are shown in (8) and (9).

(8)  Class 1: Representation of Modification of Adjectival and Verbal Passives ((1) & (3))

a. Adjectival Passive

b. Verbal Passive

---

80I assume that the sentences in (3b) and (4b) are reduced relative clauses in which the auxiliary verb ser is not pronounced. Thus, they can be paraphrased as in (i).

(i)    a. un plato (que fue) secado cuidadosamente  
       a  plate (that was) dried  carefully  

       b. una balada (que fue) cantada alegremente  
       a  ballad (that was) sung  happily
In this section we have drawn from a variety of important proposals on participles and proposed that verbal and adjectival passives are productive and regular across the class 1 versus class 2 division of transitive verbs precisely because these structures do not give rise to any clashes with the formal and interpretational feature specifications on the stems of class 1 or class 2 verbs.

A second type of adjectival participle that is not a ‘passive’ can be seen for class 2 verbs. These participles have an implicit, unspecified object and the argument of the adjective is interpreted as an agent. These are shown in (10), repeated from chapter 2.

(10) a. un animal bien comido
    an animal really eaten
    ‘an animal that has eaten a lot’

b. un hombre bien tomado
    a man really drunk
    ‘a really drunk man’ (a man who has drank a lot)
c. un chico muy fumado
   a kid very smoked
   ‘a very high kid’ (a kid who has smoked a lot)

d. una mujer muy leída
   a woman often read
   ‘a well-read woman’ (a woman who has read a lot)

These particular types of adjectives are rare when compared to the more regular and productive ones that take themes as their argument and have implicit agents, but they exist in Spanish as we see in (10) and also in English as has been noted by Bresnan (1995: 13). Some examples are shown in (11).

(11)  a. a well-prepared teacher  (= a teacher who has prepared well)
      b. a confessed killer  (= a killer who has confessed)
      c. a recanted Chomskyan  (= a Chomskyan who has recanted)
      d. a practiced liar  (= a liar who has practiced)
      e. an un-built architect  (= an architect who has not built [buildings])

These types of constructions, though not as productive as the previous ones we have seen, are still predicted to be possible in the framework outlined here. However, because these examples have an omitted object, we predict that they should only be possible with class 2 verbs. This is precisely what we see as there are no examples like (12) that involve an adjectival participle whose sole argument is interpreted as an agent (or an EFFECTOR more generally) for class 1 verbs.

(12)  #un delincuente bienD roto
      a delinquent really broken
      Intended: a delinquent who has broken (things) a lot’
I propose that the examples like (10) are adjectival ‘anti-passives’ that involve an expletive N in the internal argument position of the embedded \(vP\). Since only class 2 verbs permit this particular type of expletive internal argument, only they will have these types of adjectival ‘anti-passives.’

(13)  Class 2: Representation of Adjectival ‘Anti-passives’

a. Class 2: (10d) 

b. *Class 1: (12)

In these cases, the argument of the adjective is represented as a PRO in the position of the external argument of the embedded \(vP\). The internal argument is occupied by the phonologically empty expletive N that triggers an interpretation such that the resulting adjective has an object that is the most prototypical one associated with the source verb (see chapter 3, section 3.2.2 for more details). Since this particular rule cannot apply to class 1 verbs because of their feature specification, it follows that this type of adjective is not available for class 1 verbs. This particular proposal thus successfully explains why these adjectival anti-passives are only available for class 2 verbs.\(^{81}\)

\(^{81}\)Note: it does not explain why these are generally restricted though. They are not available for all class 2 verbs. The fact that they occur primarily with verbs of consumption in Spanish is yet another special property of these types of
Finally, I believe it also allows us to account for how the modifiers *bien* and *muy* are interpreted in these with these particular adjectives. Note that in (10), the adjectives are not interpreted as manner or frequency modifiers as in adjectival and verbal passives. Rather, they quantify over an implicit amount of object. For example, in (10b), the presence of *bien* signals that the man has had a lot to drink. If that object is present as the expletive N, triggering the inference that there is a prototypical object there, it would make sense that *bien* and *muy* might quantify over this object. I propose that the position of the quantifiers is the same as in the previous examples; it is an adjectival modifier. However, because these adjectives have a different type of internal structure than adjectival passives, both *bien* and *muy* can be interpreted differently (see section 4.4 for more on the multiple interpretations associated with *bien* and *muy*, which are sometimes idiosyncratic)

(14) Class 2: Representation of Adjectival ‘Anti-passives’: *bien* and *muy*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Class 2: (10b): bien</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdvP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bien</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_{AG&lt;:AG,V&gt;}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomo_{&lt;:AG&lt;:D:TH&gt;}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Class 2: (10d): muy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AdvP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v_{AG&lt;:AG,V&gt;}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leo_{&lt;:AG&lt;:D:TH&gt;}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

verbs that separate them from other class 2 verbs. An explanation for the limited number of verbs that appear as adjectival anti-passives will be left for future research.

184
In this section we have seen that participles that function as verbal and adjectival passives may be built from either class 1 or class 2 stems because the verbal structure that forms the core of these participles satisfies the formal and interpretational features associated with either stem. We have also seen that there are a limited set of participles that function more like adjectival anti-passives containing an omitted object and an argument that is interpreted as the subject. Since the verbal core from which adjective is built is only possible with class 2 verbs. In the next section we will look at simple adjectives.

4.2 Participles as Simple Adjectives: Differences between Class 1 and Class 2 Verbs

In addition to verbal and adjectival passives (and adjectival anti-passives), we also saw in chapter 2 (section 2.4) that participial morphology may give rise to simple adjectival forms. Simple adjectives have the following properties: (i) no implicit agent (or any kind of EFFECTOR) and (ii) denote properties that require a theme as their argument. In addition to having participial morphology, some of those simple adjectival forms are truncated participles (participles without the –d, –t or –ch that marks regular and irregular participial forms). Because of these properties, these adjectives are all modifiable with bien_D (really) and muy_D (very) but do not permit bien_M (well) or muy_F (often). The two relevant morphological patterns are shown in (15) and (16).

(15) PARTICIPLES (AMBIGUOUS)

a. una carne bien_M/D congelada
   a meat well/really frozen
   'a well/really frozen (piece of) meat'
b. una carne muyF/D congelada
   a meat often/very frozen
   ‘an often/very frozen (piece of) meat’

(16) ‘TRUNCATED’ PARTICIPLES (NOT AMBIGUOUS)

a. un plato bienM/D seco
   a plate *well/really dry
   ‘a really dry plate’

b. un plato muyF/D seco
   a plate often/very dry
   ‘a very dry plate’

What is of interest here is that only class 1 verbs appear to have these particular kinds of participles and truncated participles. Class 2 participles, on the other hand, do not productively give rise to the interpretations associated with simple adjectives nor do they have truncated participles outside of a few non-productive fossilized forms. The examples in (17) show that there are no simple adjective-like interpretations associated with class 2 verbs.

(17) CLASS 2 VERBS: NO SIMPLE ADJECTIVES

a. un libro escrito en inglés
   a book written in English
   ‘a book written in English’ (someone wrote it)

b. una casa pintada de rojo
   a house painted of red
   ‘a house painted red’ (someone painted it)

As we saw in chapter 2, there are some class 2 verbs that have truncated participles that are interpreted as simple adjectives such as pinto (= colored).

(18) a. un caballo pinto
    a horse painted
    ‘a pinto horse’
However, these uses of class 2 truncated participles are generally limited to certain phrases like the ones in (18) and cannot be used productively outside of these limited set phrases. We need to answer two questions about simple adjectives: (i) what is their internal structure? and (ii) why are these interpretations only productive with class 1 verbs?

In order to answer the first question, we must capture the fact that simple adjectives have no implicit agent, no event of change, a theme argument and a degree argument that can be modified by either $\text{bien}_D$ or $\text{muy}_D$. I propose that simple adjectives are built from stems that have a distinct formal and interpretational feature specification with respect to the arguments than do verbs. They require a degree argument and a DP argument that is interpreted as a theme, which is represented as follows.

\[
(19) \quad \text{STEM}_{<\text{D:TH, Deg}>}
\]

The stems are inserted under A heads that carry the relevant adjectival morphology according to what the stem is. That morphology may be either participial (-$d$, -$t$, -$ch$) or null. The latter is the source of truncated participles. For example, if the stem is $\text{congel}-_{<\text{D:TH, Deg}>}$, it will get participial morphology whereas a stem like $\text{sec}-_{<\text{D:TH, Deg}>}$ will get null adjectival morphology. I am thus assuming that participial morphology is synchretic and may be realized as an Asp head (Embick 2004) or simply be a type of adjectival morphology. The internal structure of the simple adjectives in (15) and (16) is shown in (20).
Simple Adjectives

a. Participial Morphology (15)

“congelada”

b. Truncated Participles (16)

“seco”

The degree argument required by the stem is introduced by the Deg head. The theme argument is always external and may occupy different positions depending on whether the adjective is used attributively or predicatively. The degree modifiers bien and muy modify the DegP (for slightly different versions of this idea see Baker 2003; Corver 1997; Demonte 2010; Kennedy 1999; Kennedy & McNally 2005; Piñón 2005). Their position is shown in (21).

Degree Modification

a. Participial Morphology

“bien/muy congelada”

b. Truncated Participles

“bien/muy seco”
Now that we have proposed a structure for simple adjectives, we are in a position to answer the question why class 2 verbs (with few exceptions) do not have them. What we have proposed is that simple adjectives require that a particular stem be ambiguous. When class 1 stems are inserted as V, they require an EFFECTOR external argument and THEME internal argument. On the other hand, when they are inserted as adjectives, they require a DEG argument and an external THEME argument. I propose that class 2 verbs are not ambiguous in this way. That is, class 2 stems do not have uses as adjectives with the feature specification requiring a DEG argument and an external THEME argument. Based on what we have seen thus far, this claim is not just a random stipulation. It follows from the fact that class 2 stems always require an external agent argument. Since the simple adjectival uses we have looked at in this section require precisely the opposite, the gap has an explanation related to other phenomena that affect class 2 stems such as lack of inchoatives and object omission.

Finally, we can treat simple adjectives such as *pinto* as accidents of history more than anything. As we saw in chapter 2, truncated participles were productively used as verbal passives in Old Spanish. The examples from chapter 2 (originally from work by Bosque 1990, 1999) are repeated below.

(22) a. fueron las paredes llenas de sangre [General Estoria]
   were the walls filled with blood
   ‘the walls were filled with blood’

   b. Fue suelto de la cárcel [Guzmán de Alfarache]
   He was released from the jail
   ‘He was released from jail’
There is a process of historical change that has affected truncated participles. They have lost the deverbal nature that characterized their earlier use. Once the stems are no longer inserted as verbs, they develop the purely adjectival use that has a different feature specification than the original deverbal use. This is shown below for the stem *llen-* (= fill).

\[(23)\quad llen-\langle v:EFF,D:TH\rangle \rightarrow llen-\langle D:TH,Deg\rangle\]

This process can be boiled down to a gradual elimination of the external argument requirement and of the event of change that results in a particular kind of state. Thus, it makes sense that class 1 verbs would be the most amenable to this process since, as verbs, they are able to fill the external argument role with an expletive. In order to explain adjectives like *pinto*, we can simply say that this process happened to the original deverbal use of the truncated participle, but was restricted to a limited set of nouns like *horses* and *beans*. The reason it did not happen more generally for class 2 stems is because the feature specification on the original deverbal use of the adjective requires the presence of an external argument.\(^{82}\)

---

\(^{82}\)There are two different ideas with respect to the direction of the ‘derivational’ relation referred to here. The traditional view is that the adjectives come from a verbal source. Participles that are used as adjectival passives may get lexicalized as adjectives that do not contain any of the information that a passive verb contains. The participle *congelado* (frozen) in both Spanish and English is derived from the verb *congelar* (freeze). The simple adjective *congelado* (frozen) is a use of the participle that develops from the adjectival passive use of the participle. A second view is that the verb *congelar* (freeze) is actually derived from an underlying adjective, the simple adjectival form *congelado* (Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002; Zubizarreta & Oh 2007). Parsons (1990: 252-253) wonders whether the two derivational processes may happen simultaneously and “reinforce one another.” That is, once a simple adjectival use of a participle gets lexicalized, that simple adjective may be interpreted as a subcomponent of a causative (and inchoative) verb.

There is little known about how this process might happen historically. In Spanish, the data presented in Bosque (1990, 1999) appear to indicate that participles get lexicalized as simple adjectives, but there is no indication that those same adjectives also become the source of causative verbs, at least that I know of. In this work, I have assumed that participial forms are derived from verbs and not vice versa. However, more research needs to be done to understand what the derivational relation between simple adjectival participles (including truncated participles) and class 1 verbs is.
4.3 Resultative Constructions (Pseudo Resultatives)

A final piece of corroborating evidence for the account sketched out above comes from the colloquial resultative-like constructions that Spanish allows when bien modifies a participle or truncated participle that is built from the same stem as the main verbs (Armstrong 2010b, 2011a; Bosque 1990; Demonte 1991; Demonte & Masullo 1999) and specifies the result of an action caused by the main verb. In chapter 2, we saw that class 1 verbs are ambiguous between manner and degree readings in these constructions whereas class 2 verbs only have manner readings.

(24)  a. Congelé la carne bien\textsubscript{M/D} congelada.
    I froze the meat well/really frozen
    (i) I froze the meat well (lit. I froze it well frozen) [Manner]
    (ii) I froze the meat to a high degree (lit. I froze it very frozen) [Degree]

    b. Juan barrió el suelo bien\textsubscript{M/D} barrido.
    Juan sweep.3s.PRET the floor well/really swept
    (i) Juan swept the floor well (lit. He swept it well swept) [Manner]
    (ii) *Juan swept the floor to high a degree (lit. He swept it very swept) *[Degree]

Following work by Bowers (2001), Demonte (1991) and Legendre (1997) we might assume that the [bien – Adj] constituent is adjoined to VP as PredP. The main difference is that the internal structure of main predicate of that PredP may either be an AP (an adjectival passive as in section 4.1) or a simple gradable adjective, a DegP (as in section 4.2). The subject of the predicate in each case is a PRO that is controlled by the internal argument of the main verb. The difference between class 1 and class 2 verbs is that class 1 permits the main predicate to be either an adjectival passive that is modified by bien\textsubscript{M} or a simple gradable adjective that is modified by bien\textsubscript{D}. Class 2 verbs, on the other hand, only permit a reading in which an adjectival passive is modified by bien\textsubscript{M}. This difference follows from the fact that class 2 stems may not give rise to a
simple gradable adjective that has a measureable dimension that can be modified by bienD. A representation of the sentences in (24) is shown in (25) – (28).

(25) Representation of the ambiguity in (24a)

a. Manner = Reading (i) Complement of Pred is AP (adjectival passive)

b. Degree = Reading (ii) Complement of Pred is DegP

(26) Representation of Internal Structure of PredP in (25)

a. Manner Reading (25a)

b. Degree Reading (25b)
These differences that we see between class 1 and class 2 verbs in the pseudo-resultative construction are accounted for straightforwardly on the view that the resultative predicate itself may either be an adjectival passive or a simple gradable adjective. As shown in (25) – (28), since
class 1 verbs can give rise to either simple gradable adjectives or adjectival passives, it is possible for either bien_D (really) or bien_M (well) to modify the participle. Class 2 participles, on the other hand, do not have stems capable of giving rise to simple gradable adjectives and are only modifiable by bien_M (well), thus they lack the ambiguity.

Since this construction has barely been touched in the literature, it is worth briefly going over some of its syntactic characteristics in addition to the basic semantic properties of it that we see in (24) – (28). The first issue concerns the control relation between the theme and the PRO in the PredP. Since the theme does not c-command the PRO from the position it occupies in (25) and (27) we might assume that it has to move to vP in order to do so. It has been argued independently that objects in Spanish may move to vP in some circumstances (see Cuervo 2003 for details about how to derive DO – IO word order in low applicatives) and I assume that this context represents another in which object moves to a higher position. Evidence from in favor of applying this idea to the pseudo-resultative constructions in (24) comes from data like (29) (Héctor Campos, p.c.).

(29) Juan pegó las estampillas, bien_M/D pegadas a sí mismas.
    Juan stuck the stamps really/well stuck to themselves
    (i) Juan did the sticking well (with care) [Manner]
    (ii) The stamps are very stuck to one another [Degree]

The sentence in (29) can be interpreted as either a manner or degree modifier as pegar (stick) is a class 1 verb. What is noteworthy is that regardless of how bien is interpreted, the resultative predicate contains an anaphor embedded inside of it, a sí mismas (= to themselves), which is bound by the theme. This shows that the theme must be in a position that c-commands the entire pseudo-resultative predicate. I suggest that that position is an extra specifier of vP (Chomsky 1995) as shown in (30).
From the higher position in (30), the theme c-commands the pseudo-resultative predicate and may bind the anaphor in the PredP. Another important characteristic of pseudo-resultative constructions is the relation of the pseudo-resultative predicate to focus.

As noted in Demonte (1991) and Demonte & Masullo (1999) the main communicative function of pseudo-resultatives is to emphasize a result that is entailed by the main verb by pronouncing a participle that is root-identical to that verb. Thus, the pseudo-resultative predicate is what receives nuclear stress as it is the element of the sentence in focus. Specifically, it always falls on the modifier bien.

(31) a. María llenó la cisterna BIÉN\textsubscript{M} llenadita.
    María filled the cistern WELL\textsubscript{M} filled\textsubscript{DIM}
    ‘María filled the cistern well filled’

\footnote{There are many alternatives to this approach, which is a bit clumsy because the structural relation needed to get the control and c-command facts is actually derived through movement. One is that the verb and pseudo-resultative actually form a complex predicate that takes an argument in the specifier of VP (Armstrong 2011a), a position from which the theme is structurally higher than the pseudo-resultative predicate. Another is that m-command is the relevant notion and that so long as the PredP is adjoined to VP, the theme may control a PRO within it or bind an anaphor within it. A further possibility is that the phi features that get valued on v (those of the theme) through accusative case checking are what control and bind into the PredP. Since this is not directly related to the class 1 versus class 2 distinction, I will leave it aside for now.}
b. María secó la ropa BIÉN seca.
   María dried the clothing REALLY dry
   ‘María dried the clothing really dry’

As focalized constituents, pseudo-resultative predicates may appear in “peripheral” positions above the VP, both right (between vP and TP, Belletti 2005) and left (between TP and CP, Rizzi 1997). Peripheral positions are specifiers to which topicalized or focalized constituents may move.

(32)  a. María secó bien seca la ropa
   María dried really dry the clothes
   ‘María dried the clothes really dry’

b. Bien seca secó María la ropa
   really dry dried María the clothes
   ‘Really dry (was the degree to which) María dried the clothes’

c. La ropa, bien seca la secó María.
   The clothes, really dry ACC.SG.F dried María
   ‘As for the clothes, really dry (was the degree to which) María dried them’

(33)  a. Pedro lavó bien lavado el carro.
   Pedro washed well washed the car
   ‘Pedro washed the car well washed’

b. Bien lavado lavó Pedro el carro.
   Well washed washed Pedro the car
   ‘Well (was how) Pedro washed the car’

c. El carro, bien lavado lo lavó Pedro.
   The car, well washed ACC.3s washed Pedro
   ‘As for the car, well (was how) Pedro washed it’

The word order in (32a) and (33a) may be derived by movement of the pseudo-resultative to a focus position in the right periphery (between vP and TP). This means that it will be below the final positions of the subject and verb but higher than the object, which can only move as far as vP. The word orders in (32b/c) and (33b/c) are derived by movement of the pseudo-resultative.
predicate to a focus position the left periphery (between TP and CP). In (32b) and (33b), the object remains within the vP, while in (32c) and (33c), the object is in a left peripheral topic position, explaining why it is prosodically dislocated from the sentence and is doubled by the clitic.\textsuperscript{84}

In this section we have taken a brief look at pseudo-resultative constructions whereby a pseudo-resultative predicate that obligatorily contains the modifier bien and a participle that is built from the same stem as the main verb functions as a VP modifier. The ambiguity that arises in pseudo-resultative constructions for class 1 verbs follows naturally from the two types of adjectives that can be derived from class 1 verbs: adjectival passives may be modified by bien\textsubscript{M} (well) while simple gradable adjective may be modified by bien\textsubscript{D} (really). The lack of ambiguity in class 2 verbs is due to the fact that their participles only permit modification by bien\textsubscript{M} (well) due to the requirement that the agent feature on class 2 stems be satisfied by the syntactic environment in which they appear. We then briefly reviewed some of the syntactic properties of pseudo-resultsatives, showing that the present analysis provides a possible explanation for those properties in addition to accounting for interpretative asymmetries that derive from the class 1 versus class 2 distinction.

4.4 Gradability and the Class 1 versus Class 2 Distinction

In sections 4.1 and 4.2 we have proposed to account for the variety of interpretations associated with the adverbs bien and muy by claiming that each of these adverbs are actually two

\textsuperscript{84}The existence of left and right periphery position is somewhat controversial as not all languages have specific syntactic position for topicalized and focalized constituents (Costa 2010). There are alternatives to this particular view that would require a re-working of the basic system that is beyond the scope of this work as it is not directly related to the class 1 versus class 2 distinction.
homophonous lexical items. *Bien* may be either a manner modifier or a degree modifier. As a manner modifier it requires the existence of a manner component (i.e. – something capable of being carried out by an agent) of the adjective it modifies while as a degree modifier it simply intensifies the degree to which the property it specifies holds of the theme argument. We also saw that *muy* may be either a modifier of frequency (a quantificational adverb), meaning roughly *often* or one of degree. As a modifier of frequency it requires that there be a temporal event component in the adjective it modifies whereas when it functions as a degree modifier, like *bien*, it intensifies the degree to which some property holds of its argument. In addition, we also saw that with some adjectives such as *leído* (= read), *tomado* (= drunk), both *bien* and *muy* appear to function as quantifiers over an implicit object. Does this mean that we have to keep listing every meaning of *bien* and *muy* separately or is there a way to account for all of their uses in more unified way? The main objective of this section is not to propose a unified account of these meanings but to simply highlight how the class 1 and class 2 distinction, coupled with important work on gradability by Kennedy & McNally (2005), may be an important step toward a unified account of the different uses of these two adverbs.

The three principal uses of *bien* and *muy* that we have seen thus far are outlined in (34) – (36). What unifies all the uses is that both of the adverbs intensify some measurable dimension associated with the adjective that they modify.

(34)  

a. **Intensifies a “goodness” scale**

    una camisa *bien* secada  
    a shirt well dried  
    ‘a well dried shirt’ (= dried with a high degree of skill)
b. **Intensifies a number of agents or number of times scale**

un libro *muy* leído
a book often read
‘a well read book’ / ‘an oft-read book’
(= a book that is read by many people or many times)

(35)  

a. **Intensifies a degree argument of the adjective: an empty-ness scale**

una habitación *bien* vacía.
a room *really* empty
‘a really empty room’ (= a high degree of EMPTY-ness)

b. **Intensifies a degree argument of the adjective: an frozen-ness scale**

una carne *muy* congelada.
a meat *very* frozen
‘a very frozen (piece of) meat’ (= a high degree of FROZEN-ness)

(36)  

a. **Intensifies an implicit amount of ‘unspecified thing that is drunk’**

un hombre *bien* tomado
a man *really* drunk
‘a very drunk man’ (= a man who has drunk *a lot*)

b. **Intensifies an implicit amount of ‘unspecified thing that is read’**

una mujer *muy* leída
a woman *very* read
‘a well-read woman’ (= a woman who has read *a lot*)

Thus, the key to understanding how *bien* and *muy* will be interpreted is to understand the internal structure of the adjective that they modify. In their seminal paper on gradability and degree modification Kennedy & McNally (2005) argue that degree expressions such as *very, much* and *well* have a distribution in English that depend on a number of factors including the scale structure of the gradable adjective with which they combine, whether the standard degree associated with an adjective is determined contextually or without reference to context, the
relation of a given adjective to an event denoted by a related verb and also the nature of the argument to which the adjective applies. In order to briefly illustrate one point made in the paper that is relevant to the current discussion, take (37) and (38).

(37)  a. My hands are very dry
      b. The restaurant is very empty tonight

(38)  a. a much admired statesman
      b. a much talked about program

In (37), the meaning of very raises the typical standard with which we measure the dryness of hands or the emptiness of a particular restaurant. (37a) means that there is far less moisture than usual on my hands and (37b) means that there are far less people than usual in the restaurant. The interpretation of much in (38a) and (38b) has a wider range of possibilities. For example, (38a) could mean that ‘a lot of people admire the statesman’ or that ‘he has been admired for a long time.’ Likewise, (38b) could mean that the program has been talked about many times, by many people or for an extended amount of time. Kennedy & McNally (2005) explain this variety of readings in the following terms:

Specifically, any of the various aspects of verb meaning that support measurement (temporal extent, number of occurrences, number of participants, intensity, etc.) can be used to fix the dimensional parameter of the derived adjective’s scale. We may assume that any particular adjectival form (needed, admired, etc.) is compatible with several dimensions, one of which must be settled upon in a context of utterance. (K&M 2005: 364)

Leaving aside some of the details of Kennedy & McNally’s (2005) analysis, I believe that we can assume that degree modifiers are basically quantifiers over certain measurable dimensions of the meaning of a given predicate. In (37a), this dimension can be understood in terms of degrees of dryness (relative to hands) while (37b) it is understood as degrees of emptiness (relative to
restaurants), which essentially means number of people. In (38a) and (38b), the participles contain “verbal” and “aspectual” information regarding events, event participants and times and these each may provide the measurable dimension over which *much* quantifies.

Switching back to the Spanish data that concern us here, we can understand the data in (34) – (36) in terms of the measurable dimensions associated with class 1 and class 2 stems. For adjectives derived from class 1 stems, we have measurable dimensions that can be construed in terms of *goodness* (= manner), times (= frequency) and a degree argument associated with an adjective derived from a class 1 stem (= STEM-ness). For class 2 verbs, the possible measurable dimensions associated with adjectives include *goodness* (= manner), times (= frequency) and quantity of an implicit object. Thus, the differences that we see between class 1 and class 2 stems can be understood in terms of the measurable dimensions that arise from the different formal and interpretational features on these two distinct classes of stems. Further research is necessary to come up with a proper formalization of this idea, but the work of Kennedy & McNally (2005) has already paved the way for such work to be done.

4.5 Summary

In this chapter we shifted gears and took a detailed look at the participles of class 1 and class 2 verbs. The general conclusion of the chapter is that the same conditions that are imposed on the possible vPs in which a class 1 or class 2 stem may be inserted also apply to adjectival forms that are derived from class 1 and class 2 stems. In section 4.1 we saw that both types of verbs have verbal and adjectival passives. Since these forms are both derived from passive vPs, there is no clash with the formal and interpretational feature specification of either type of stem. In section
4.2 we investigated simple adjectival forms. It was argued that the reason for which class 1 verbs give rise to adjectives that take a theme argument and lack any kind of agentivity is precisely because they have stems with formal and interpretational features that require a degree argument and a theme argument, while class 2 stems (with some exceptions) cannot be used in this particular way. In section 4.3 further evidence for this distinction was presented from pseudo-resultative constructions. Only class 1 verbs exhibit ambiguity in pseudo-resultatives while class 2 verbs do not. The reason for this followed naturally from what we saw in sections 4.1 and 4.2: only class 1 verbs are the source of adjectival passives that can be modified by $bien_M$ (well) and simple gradable adjectives that can be modified by $bien_D$ (really). Class 2 verbs only have participles that contain an implicit agent and thus can only be modified by $bien_M$. Finally, in section 4.4 I outlined a possible way to understand the different interpretations of $bien$ and $muy$ as degree intensifiers of contextually relevant scales associated with some component of the adjective they modify, following Kennedy & McNally (2005). It was suggested that the differences we see between class 1 and class 2 adjectives is due to the different kinds of contextually salient measurable dimensions that can be made available by the formal and interpretational features on each type of stem.

In the next chapter, a proposal is outlined for five different uses of inherent SE, which are uses of the reflexive clitic paradigm that formally and semantically contrast with impersonal and true reflexive uses of clitics and are generally ill-understood because many researchers treat them as “arguments.” Following Zubizarreta (1987) and Folli & Harley (2005), I explore the hypothesis that inherent SE is a morphological realization of different kinds of $v$. As a verbal morpheme, it may have effects on the aspectral interpretation of a VP, on the thematic relation
of the subject to the VP and also on the availability of accusative case. My main claim is that the reason there appear to be so many different kinds of inherent SE follows naturally from the system outlined here: many of the effects of SE are derived from whether a stem is class 1 or class 2 and how these stems have different kind of requirements regarding what v can be.
Chapter 5: Uses of ‘Inherent SE’

The main objective of this chapter is to employ the system outlined in chapter 3 in order to account for five different uses of the reflexive clitic paradigm in Spanish (= me, te, se, nos, os, se) that all fall under the label ‘inherent SE.’ The reflexive clitic paradigm in all Romance languages is interesting and problematic because in addition to marking true reflexive relations in which the external argument is interpreted as the same entity as an internal argument (a direct or indirect object), the clitics are also used in a variety of impersonal sentences as we saw in section 2.1 in addition to appearing in a number of other apparently idiosyncratic constructions that are difficult to characterize both morphosyntactically and semantically, some of which we saw in section 2.6 when the aspectual character of the clitic was discussed. The panorama of SE constructions contains at least the following ones, which are repeated from chapter 2 (see De Cuyper 2006; Maldonado 1999; Moreira & Butt 1996; Otero 1999; Sánchez 2002 for more in depth discussions).^85

1. **Reflexive: External Argument and Internal Argument Required**

   a. Juan se quemó a sí mismo.
   
   Juan SE.3s burned ACC himself
   
   (i) *Juan got burned (he accidentally burned himself)
   
   (ii) Juan burned himself on purpose

   b. Juan se quemó.
   
   Juan SE.3s burned
   
   (i) Juan got burned (he accidentally burned himself)
   
   (ii) Juan burned himself on purpose

^85The Romance languages are not the only ones in which reflexive morphology exhibits an almost uncontrollable degree of syncretism. Lidz (1996, 2001) has shown in a variety of works that Kannada, a language of Southern India, assigns a similar range of functions to reflexive morphology that the Romance languages assign to the se clitic paradigm.
(2) IMPERSONAL (PASSIVE): IMPLICIT EXTERNAL ARGUMENT

a. El barco se hundió deliberadamente
   The boat sank deliberately
   ‘The boat was sunk deliberately (by someone)’ or ‘Someone deliberately sunk the boat’

b. Se barrió el suelo para recibir a los invitados
   The floor was swept to receive the guests
   ‘The floor was swept (by someone)’ or ‘Someone swept the floor’

(3) IMPERSONAL (MIDDLE): IMPLICIT EXTERNAL ARGUMENT

a. Este barco se hunde con facilidad.
   This boat sinks with ease
   ‘This boat sinks easily’ (= It’s easy for someone to sink)

b. Este suelo se barre con facilidad.
   This floor sweeps with ease
   ‘This floor sweeps easily’ (= It’s easy for someone to sweep)

(4) INCHOATIVE: NO EXTERNAL ARGUMENT

a. Se hundió el barco.
   The boat sank
   Intended reading (impersonal readings also possible): ‘The boat sank’

b. Se quemó la casa.
   The house burned down
   Intended reading (impersonal readings also possible): ‘The house burned down’

(5) WHOLEHEARTED-TELIC SE: REQUIRES AGENT + TELICITY

a. El mesero se llenó todos los vasos del restaurante
   The waiter filled all the glasses in the restaurant
   ‘The waiter wholeheartedly filled all the glasses in the restaurant’

b. Juan se cocinó una paella deliciosa para sus invitados.
   Juan cooked up a paella for his guests
   ‘Juan cooked up a paella for his guests’ (adapted from Sanz 2000: 61)
Transitive Aspectual SE: Requires Agent + Telicity

a. Pablo se comió un trozo de pan
   Pablo SE.3s ate a piece of bread
   ‘Pablo ate a piece of bread’

b. Me tomé todo el vino
   SE.1s I drank all the wine
   ‘I drank all the wine’

Unselected Subject SE

a. Esta cama se come toda la habitación
   This bed SE.3s eats all the room
   ‘This bed eats up the entire room’ (De Cuyper 2006)

b. El sol se ha bebido el lago
   The sun SE.3s has drunk the lake
   ‘The sun drank up the lake’ (Basilico 2010)

In this chapter I will focus on the uses of SE that we see in (4) – (7). At first blush these uses appear to encompass such a wide range of functions as to resist a unified treatment. However, they do share two formal properties that separate them from reflexive and impersonal uses. Uses of SE are often defined in terms of (i) doubling by the a sí mismo anaphor and (ii) paradigmaticity, that is, whether or not they inflect for the full range of person and number (Otero 1999; Sánchez 2002). Reflexive uses of SE are both doubling and paradigmatic since the strong anaphor a sí mismo may double them and they can appear in the full range of person and number as shown in (8).

Unselected Subject SE

(8) a. Me quemé a mí mismo.
    SE.1s I burned ACC myself
    ‘I burned myself on purpose’

b. Juan se quemó a sí mismo.
   Juan SE.3s burned ACC himself
   ‘Juan burned himself on purpose’
Impersonal uses of SE are non-doubling and non-paradigmatic since they can never be doubled by the strong anaphor *a sí mismo* and they only ever appear as ‘*se*.’ This is shown in (9), where the context for the examples is that some unnamed agent performs a sinking.

(9)  

a. El barco **se** hundió deliberadamente  
   The boat **SE.3s sank** deliberately  
   ‘The boat was sunk deliberately (by someone)’ or ‘Someone deliberately sunk the boat’

b. El barco **se** hundió (**a sí mismo**).  
   The boat **SE.3s sank** (**ACC itself**)  
   Intended Reading: ‘The boat was sunk (by someone)’ or ‘Someone sunk the boat’

c. **Me** hundí.  
   SE.1s sank  
   Intended Reading: ‘I was sunk (by someone)’ or ‘Someone sunk me’

The other uses of SE in (4) – (7) are all non-doubling and paradigmatic. This means that they can never be doubled by a strong pronominal anaphor and that they inflect for the full range of person and number of the clitic paradigm. This is shown below for inchoative SE and transitive aspectual SE. The context for the set of sentences in (10) is that there is simply a sinking event with no implicit causer or agent, which is marked by *por sí solo* in (10a).

(10)  

a. El barco **se** hundió **por sí solo**.  
   The boat **SE.3s sank** by itself  
   ‘The boat sank by itself’ (= The boat sank ‘by itself’, without an external cause)

b. El barco **se** hundió (**a sí mismo**)  
   The boat **SE.3s sank** (**ACC itself**)  
   Intended reading: ‘The boat sunk’

c. **Me** hundí.  
   SE.1s sank  
   ‘I sank’
(11)  a. Pablo **se** comió un trozo de pan
    Pablo **SE.3s** ate a piece of bread
    ‘Pablo ate a piece of bread’

    b. Pablo **se** comió un trozo de pan (**a sí mismo**)
    Pablo **SE.3s** ate a piece of bread **DAT** himself
    ‘Pablo ate a piece of bread’

    c. Me comí un trozo de pan
    **SE.1s** I ate a piece of bread
    ‘I ate a piece of bread’

The following table summarizes the properties of the different types of SE constructions in (1) – (7) according to whether they are doubling and according to whether they are paradigmatic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of SE Construction</th>
<th>Doubling</th>
<th>Paradigmatic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reflexive SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonal SE</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative SE</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholehearted Telic SE</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitive Aspectual SE</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselected Subject SE</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What at first blush seems to be a strange medley of uses of SE, mainly those of (4) – (7), share the formal properties of being non-doubling and paradigmatic. This distinguishes them from reflexive SE, which is doubling and paradigmatic and impersonal uses of SE, which are non-

86The question of paradigmaticity for unselected subject SE is probably not relevant. This is due to the fact that this particular type of construction is only possible in the third person. If the external argument is first or second person, it will be interpreted as an agent.
doubling and non-paradigmatic. I will call uses of SE that fit the formal profile of being non-doubling and paradigmatic, ‘inherent SE.‘ The objective of this chapter is to propose a formal analysis for the four uses of inherent SE that we see in (4) – (7) in addition to one more: the SE of ‘pronominal verbs.’ Pronominal verbs are verbs that obligatorily receive the morphological mark of SE. Like other uses of inherent SE, they are non-doubling and paradigmatic. One example is shown in (12) for the pronominal verb *jactar-se* (= to brag/to boast).

(12)  a. David se jacta de su fortuna.  
    David SE.3s boasts about his fortune  
    ‘David boasts about his fortune’

    b. David se jacta de su fortuna (*a sí mismo)  
    David SE.3s boasts about his fortune (*ACC himself)  
    ‘David boasts about his fortune’

    c. Me jacto de mi fortuna.  
    SE.1s I boast about my fortune  
    ‘I boast about my fortune’

One might ask how this particular objective is related to the class 1 versus class 2 transitive verb distinction. What is striking about uses of inherent SE is that they generally isolate either class 1 or class 2 verbs but not both. That is, unlike the more productive reflexive and impersonal uses of SE, each type of inherent SE is only productive within a particular class of verbs. For example, inchoative SE can only appear with class 1 verbs whereas transitive aspectual SE only appears with class 2 verbs. Thus, we need a way to capture (i) the formal properties of inherent SE in a way that unifies the different uses and, at the same time, find (ii) a way to explain why these different functions are only productive within very specific sets of verb classes.

---

87 This term is used here to refer to the idea that SE is part of the verb’s inflectional morphology. Why and how it agrees with the grammatical subject is discussed in this chapter.
I explore an answer to this puzzle in three main steps. I start with some assumptions about telicity. As we saw in chapter 2 (section 2.6), there are various uses of SE that are sensitive to the lexical aspect of the VP in question. Thus, we need to clearly outline how telicity is represented syntactically in order to be able to make a proposal about what inherent SE does. This is the main topic of section 5.1. I follow work in the syntactic (Kempchinsky 2004; MacDonald 2006, 2008; Travis 2000, 2010) and semantic (Parsons 1990) literature in assuming that telic events culminate while atelic events do not and that this culmination is represented by the presence of an aspectual head between VP and v. The difference between telic and atelic events syntactically is the presence (telic) or absence (atelic) of this Asp head (Borer 2005), which corresponds to the presence of a culmination or its absence (Parsons 1990). Also included within this first step is an explanation of the dissociating the phi-features on v from accusative clitics in Spanish. This is done in section 5.2.

In section 5.3 I explore the different kinds of inherent SE that appear with class 1 verbs. I argue that there are only two kinds of inherent SE. One is the morphological realization of a particular set of features on v, mainly the expletive \( v_{<\text{Asp}>} \), which selects an AspP as its complement and introduces no external argument. This is essentially an updated version of the proposal for inchoative SE made in chapter 3. The main difference here is that, in order to capture the fact that inchoatives are always telic, I change the selectional properties of the v head it realizes from V to Asp. I also extend this analysis to cover one class of pronominal verbs that behaves exactly like inchoatives. The other type of inherent SE is a weak dative that is represented by applicative head, Appl, that merges between AspP and v. This particular Appl head merges with an AspP (thus forcing a telic reading) and also adds a conventional implicature
that requires the presence of an agent in the specifier of \( v \). The overall effect of this Appl head is an agentive event that is telic. This Appl head is wholehearted telic SE (see section 2.6).

In section 5.4 I explore the different kinds of inherent SE that appear with class 2 verbs. I argue that these uses of SE are formally identical to the ones we see in section 5.3 for class 1 verbs: SE can either be the morphological realization of \( v \) or an Appl head that merges between \( v \) and VP. I start by exploring the relation between wholehearted telic SE and transitive aspectual SE. I argue that wholehearted telic SE and transitive aspectual SE can be understood as different historical stages of aspectually sensitive clitics that have grammaticalized to different degrees within different subtypes of class 2 verbs, consumption verbs being the class in which wholehearted telic SE has fully grammaticalized to transitive aspectual SE. Formally, this change is marked by the disappearance of the Appl head and the use of SE to mark a \( v \) head with the features \( v_{<D:AG, Asp>} \). I then look at unselected subject SE, arguing that it is the realization of a mismatch between what the stem calls for and what \( v \) actually introduces. The mismatch may be represented in the following way: \( \text{STEM}_{v:AG, (D:TH)} - v_{\text{EFF}} \). Thus, SE spells out the presence of a \( v_{\text{EFF}} \) where a \( v_{AG} \) is called for by the stem. The presence of SE mends this particular mismatch, allowing the derivation to converge at the LF interface. This only happens with a handful of stems that are limited to verbs of consumption. Finally, I look at pronominal verbs whose sole argument is an external argument. I argue that in these cases, SE is the realization of a \( v \) that is not capable of valuing accusative case.

The overall conclusion that can be drawn from sections 5.3 and 5.4 is that inherent SE is a morphological realization of \( v \); it is a piece of verbal morphology. The reason why there are different types of inherent SEs that correspond to the class 1 versus class 2 distinction is because
the two verb classes are compatible with different types of \( v \). This conclusion provides further support for treating SE as a verbal morpheme, as outlined in work by Basilico (2010), Cuervo (2003), Folli & Harley (2005), Nishida (1994), Zagona (1996) and Zubizarreta (1987).

5.1 Assumptions about Telicity

It has been extensively argued from both syntactic and semantic points of view that telicity is a derived notion that is not assigned to individual verbs or to verb classes. Instead it depends on the meaning of the verb itself, the referential properties of the internal arguments of a verb and in some cases on contextual factors (Beavers 2008; Borer 2005; Jackendoff 1996; Hay, Kennedy & Levin 1999; Kennedy & Levin 2008; Krifka 1989, 1992; MacDonald 2006, 2008; Schein 2002; Tenny 1994; Travis 2000, 2010; Verkuyl 1993; Zubizarreta & Oh 2007). For example, the transitive form of either a class 1 or a class 2 can be telic or atelic depending on the referential properties of the object.

(13) a. Juan rompió \{un vaso en cinco minutos\} / \{vasos durante cinco minutos\}
    Juan broke \{a glass in five minutes\} / \{glass for five minutes\}
    ‘Juan broke \{a glass in five minutes\}/\{glass for five minutes\}

    b. Ana leyó \{una revista en media hora\} / \{revistas durante media hora\}.
    Ana read a magazine in half hour / magazines for half hour
    ‘Ana read \{a magazine in half an hour\}/\{magazines for half an hour\}

The main point I would like to make here is that telicity is not directly tied to the class 1 versus class 2 transitivity distinction, following nearly all of the work cited above. There are so many approaches to describing telicity that it would impossible to review the advantages and disadvantages of them in a short space. I will assume an approach to telicity drawing mainly from the semantic work in Parsons (1990) and Pustejovsky (1991) and the syntactic approaches

There are two interesting ideas in the literature that I believe can be condensed into a single proposal for our purposes. First, Parsons (1990) has claimed that all events culminate, which he represents as CUL and this is what distinguishes them from states, which HOLD. The atelicity of activities is because they contain a HOLD predicate rather than CUL. Like Parsons, Pustejovsky (1991) claims that the notion culmination is what characterizes telic events with respect to atelic ones. Telic events are those that contain a culminating transition as part of their lexical semantic representation. Second, a series of syntactic proposals have linked telicity to an aspectual projection between the VP and v. Borer (2005) has claimed that telicity results from the presence of an aspectual projection in the syntax while atelicity is the absence of that projection. MacDonald (2006, 2008) and Travis (2000, 2010) have both argued, using data from a variety of languages, that telicity and atelicity are encoded in an aspectual projection between v and VP, which is distinct from grammatical aspect (i.e. perfective, progressive), a higher grammatical operator. Combining elements from each of these proposals opens the possibility of exploring the idea that telicity is the result of a culminate predicate (Parsons 1990; Pustejovsky 1991) that is added by an aspectual head, Asp, that merges between the VP and v (Borer 2005; MacDonald 2006, 2008; Travis 2000, 2010). Atelicity is the absence of that Asp head and thus the absence of the culminate predicate. This is represented in (14).
One reason why this approach is attractive is because it provides a way of accounting for the intuition expressed by many researchers that telic events have something that atelic events lack (Depraetere 1995; MacDonald 2006, 2008; Ramchand 2008; Zubizarreta & Oh 2007; Zagona 2004), mainly event boundedness. Essentially, telic events are bounded in their referring to an event and may also be bounded with respect to the temporal reference interval they pick out, whereas atelic events may only be bounded with respect to the temporal reference interval they refer to (as was discussed in chapter 2, section 2.6). This is what explains the distribution of in and for phrases that introduce time spans in languages that are sensitive to the distinction. Time spans introduced by in (or its equivalent) measure the time from the start to the culmination of an event, thus they require Asp. On the other hand, time spans introduced by for (or its equivalent) measure the temporal reference interval of an event, thus they do not require Asp. In the most typical contexts, the time span introduced by in that measures the period from the beginning to the culmination of a telic event also refers to the temporal reference interval. This explains why telic events prefer time spans introduced by in but may admit a time span introduced by for in certain contexts. The reason is because in and for are different kinds of modifiers that attach at different parts of the structure. On the other hand, the lack of a culminate predicate in atelic
events explains why the presence of a time span introduced by in is simply incoherent: there is no Asp in these cases.

(15)  a. Juana limpió la casa en /?durante una hora.
     Juana cleaned the house in /?for an hour
     ‘Juana cleaned the house in/?for an hour’

     b. Juana limpió *en / durante una hora.
     Juana cleaned *in / for      an hour
     ‘Juana cleaned *in/for an hour’

Furthermore, as noted in Depraetere (1995), MacDonald (2008), Zubizarreta & Oh (2007) and Zagona (2004), there are some cases in which both an in phrase and a for phrase may appear in the same sentence. These sentences generally involve an event that may be conceived of as occurring iteratively in “culminating chunks.” The sentence in (16) is adapted from Zubizarreta & Oh (2007: 27, ex. 76). Imagine that we are talking about a deceased friend Juan, who worked as a professional framer.

(16)  Juan enmarcó cuadros en una hora durante toda su vida.
     Juan frame.3s.PRET pictures in an hour for      all      his life
     ‘John framed pictures in an hour for his whole life’

In this case, en una hora (= in an hour) specifies the time span from the start to the culmination of each picture-framing, whereas durante toda su vida (= for his whole life) specifies the temporal reference interval in which the culminating framing events occurred iteratively. MacDonald (2006, 2008) has argued that this shows that bare plurals in object position may contribute to a telic reading for a verb so long as it has an iterative-culminating-chunk reading, a reading he labels SSE (= sequence-of-similar-events).
Assuming that an aspectual head is present when events have telic interpretations and absent when they are interpreted as atelic, the class 1 versus class 2 transitivity distinction is now slightly more complex as we can see in (17) and (18).

(17) Class 1 Verbs: Telic or Atelic Interpretations

a. Telic

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{v_{EFF}} \\
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP_{TH}} \\
\text{STEM_{<v_{EFF},D:TH>}}
\end{array}
\]

b. Atelic

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{v_{EFF}} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP_{TH}} \\
\text{STEM_{<v_{EFF},D:TH>}}
\end{array}
\]

(18) Class 2 Verbs: Telic or Atelic Interpretations

a. Telic

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP_AG} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{v_{AG}} \\
\text{AspP} \\
\text{Asp} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP_{TH}} \\
\text{STEM_{<v_{AG},D:TH>}}
\end{array}
\]

b. Atelic

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{DP_AG} \\
\text{vP} \\
\text{v'} \\
\text{v_{AG}} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{DP_{TH}} \\
\text{STEM_{<v_{AG},D:TH>}}
\end{array}
\]
5.2 Assumptions about Clitics and Accusative Case

A second area that will become important in order to account for the different kinds of inherent SE is accusative case. What could be considered the “standard” minimalist treatment of accusative case is that outlined in Chomsky (1995, 2000, 2001). On this account, accusative case is valued by an active $v$ (a $v$ that takes the external argument of the verb in its specifier), which has a valued case feature (= ACC) and an unvalued set of phi features. The first goal in its c-command domain that has a set of valued phi features is the object. The valuation of accusative case is essentially a “feature swap”: the $v$ gets phi features and the object gets a case feature.\(^{88}\) This idea represents an elimination of the AgrO projection above VP that was previously thought to check accusative case and also be the locus of object agreement morphology in languages that have it such as Basque (Franco 1991, 2000). The main question that this particular system has provoked for Spanish is whether $v$ is the locus of direct object clitics (Franco 1991, 2000; Sportiche 1996). That is, when the “feature swap” happens between $v$ and the object, is the reflex of that swap the appearance of a clitic that agrees in phi-features with the object? Clitic doubling in Spanish has been used as an argument in favor of such an approach (Franco 1991, 2000; Sportiche 1996). The fact that doubling does not happen all the time in all dialects is due to the fact that the agreement is with *pro* in the object position. Another approach to Spanish clitics maintains the classic base-generation approach (Kayne 1975; Strozer 1976), claiming that doubling is the product of the clitic being generated within a big DP (Torrego 1995; Uriagereka

\(^{88}\)I am leaving aside feature interpretability here. To be more technically precise, the features on $v$ are case: valued as ACC, uninterpretable and phi: unvalued, uninterpretable while the features on the goal are case: unvalued, uninterpretable and phi: valued, interpretable. Feature interpretability is invoked as a way of accounting for sets of features that can enter into multiple agreement relations and thus do not appear to be rendered inert once they are checked (Chomsky 1995, 2000, 2001).
The clitic itself represents a D head that takes a pro NP as its complement and may be doubled by a full DP in an extra specifier position. In this system, accusative case is assigned to the entire big DP explaining why both the clitic and the full DP double (if it is there) have the same case and phi features. In both approaches, the clitics are assumed to move to higher clausal positions and attach to the verbal head.

I will assume that v is not the locus of direct object clitics in this particular work, adopting the big DP hypothesis with respect to direct object clitics. Thus, for both class 1 and class 2 verbs the assignment of accusative case by an active v is done in the same way.

(19)  a. ¿Y la puerta? La cerré. (Class 1)
      ‘What about the door? It.ACC.FEM.SG I closed
      ‘I closed it’

      b. ¿Y el carro? Lo lavamos. (Class 2)
      ‘What about the car? It.ACC.MASC.SG we washed
      ‘We washed it’

The representation of the big DP in the object position of both (19a) and (19b) is shown in (20).

---


90It is possible that in obligatory clitic doubling constructions such as right and left-dislocated clitic doubling, the nature of the doubling is different. I will not comment on this here as it is a completely separate issue and has nothing to do with the class 1 versus class 2 distinction and its interaction with inherent SE, which is the primary objective of this chapter.

---
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The question is how this value is assigned. How do these clitics get accusative case? This is shown in (21). The internal structure of the DP object has been simplified somewhat in order to illustrate this point.

Dative clitic doubling is done in a similar fashion within an applicative head (Appl), following Cuervo (2003, 2010), as we saw in chapter 3, section 3.5. The main point here is that \( v \) is not taken to be the position for direct object clitics in Spanish even though it contains a set of
unvalued, uninterpretable phi features that cause it to probe in search of a DP with a set of valued, interpretable phi features. This does not mean, however, that $v$ cannot be the position for other types of clitics or verbal morphemes that have effects on the aspectual interpretation, thematic relations and ability to assign accusative case as has been suggested in Basilico (2010) and Folli & Harley (2005). I will explore this idea in more detail in sections 5.3 and 5.4.

A final note is in order on the apparent link between accusative case and telicity. Though it is not clear that accusative case should be the locus of telicity (Kratzer 2004 argues for such a link; MacDonald 2006 argues against it), it certainly appears plausible that quantized objects (= objects that refer to specific quantities) interact with the aspectual projection in ways that non-quantized objects (= objects that do not refer to specific quantities) do not, precisely because the former need to enter into an agreement relation with $v$, which is higher than Asp, in order to check or value case (Kempchinsky 2004; Travis 2010).91

5.3 Inherent SE in Class 1 Verbs

Now that we have outlined our assumptions regarding aspectual interpretation and accusative case valuation, we are in a better position to make a formal proposal that explains both the morpho-syntactic and interpretational properties of inherent SE. Let us start with class 1 verbs. The main claim is that inherent SE may either spell out $v$ or realize an Appl head that merges between $v$ and AspP. This is shown below in (22).

---

91See MacDonald (2006) and Travis (2010) for a detailed discussion of the idea that accusative case and telicity are tightly linked but separate notions.
Inherent SE: Class 1 Verbs

a. Realizes \( v \)

b. Realizes Appl

In section 5.3.1, I argue that inchoatives and class 1 pronominal verbs are best represented as (22a), where SE spells out the \( v \) head that fills this position in the absence of an external argument with these particular verbs. In section 5.3.2 I argue that wholehearted telic SE is best represented as a weak dative (an applicative head that introduces no argument) as in (22b).

5.3.1 SE as \( v \): Inchoatives and Pronominal Verbs

We have already seen inchoatives in many other parts of this dissertation (sections 2.1, 2.6 and 3.1). In section 2.1 the fact that inchoative SE marks the absence of an external argument (explicit or implicit) was discussed and a proposal was made in section 3.1 regarding this fact. That proposal was that inchoative SE realizes an expletive-\( v \) that introduces no external argument (it has no specifier) and does not introduce an external argument predicate. The conclusion from chapter 3 is shown in (23).
(23) a. Se rompió la ventana
    SE.3s broke the window
    ‘The window broke’

    b. $vP$
        $v_{<v>}$ $VP$
            $se$ $V$ $DP$
                $romp-\langle v:EFF\rangle,D:TH\rangle$ $la$ ventana

The type of $v$ that is morphologically realized by SE is one that has no external argument requirement. It only takes an internal argument. In section 2.6 we saw inchoative SE also has an aspectual effect. This is the characteristic of inchoatives that we have yet to incorporate into the analysis in (23b). The relevant data from chapter 2 is repeated below (see chapter 2, section 2.6.4 for more details). The main piece of evidence that inchoative SE has an aspectual effect comes from the fact that bare nouns in the internal argument position, which as we saw in section 5.1 above license atelic interpretations, are banned in the presence of inchoative SE.

(24) a. Se rompieron *(los) vasos.  
    SE.3s broke *(the) glasses
    Intended: ‘Glasses broke’

    b. Se derritió *(la) manteca.  
    SE.3s melted *(the) butter
    Intended: ‘Butter melted’

In order to capture this fact we must somehow signal that whenever the particular $v$ that is realized by inchoative SE is present, the Asp head that marks an event as telic must also be present. I claim that this can be done by changing the feature on $v$ from $V$ to $V$-$Asp$. This is meant to capture the fact that the complement of $v$ must still be an event (a VP), but that the
event it takes as a complement must culminate. The result of making this move is that inchoative SE will appear only on those instances of \( v \) that must take a culminating event as their complement and at the same time introduce no new predicate that is saturated by an external argument.

(25)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\mid \\
\text{v}^{<V-Asp>} \\
\mid \\
se \quad \text{Asp} \\
\mid \\
\text{VP} \\
\mid \\
V \\
\mid \\
\text{DP} \\
\mid \\
\text{romp}^{<(v:EFF),D:TH>} \\
\text{los vasos}
\end{array}
\]

The presence of Asp forces a particular kind of complement to be present: only those events that culminate are licit complements of Asp. These means that a quantized theme must be present in the internal argument position in order for the derivation to converge.\(^{92}\) Let us exemplify this using the grammatical and ungrammatical versions of (24b).

---

\(^{92}\)For some speakers the bare plural \textit{vasos} is also possible in the presence of inchoative \textit{se}. We saw in section 2.6.4 and in section 5.1 that bare plurals can give rise to iterative culminating events whereas bare singular nouns cannot. This is why inchoative \textit{se} is never possible with bare singulars like \textit{manteca}.
(26) Representation of the Grammatical and Ungrammatical forms of (24b)

a. Grammatical (quantized theme)  

\[ \text{vP} \]  
\[ \text{v}_{<V,\text{Asp}>} \]  
\[ \text{AspP} \]  
\[ \text{se} \]  
\[ \text{Asp} \]  
\[ \text{VP} \]  
\[ \text{derrit-}_{<v:EFF,D:TH>} \text{ la manteca} \]

b. Ungrammatical (no quantized theme)  

\[ \text{vP} \]  
\[ \text{v}_{<V,\text{Asp}>} \]  
\[ *\text{AspP} \]  
\[ \text{se} \]  
\[ \text{Asp} \]  
\[ \text{VP} \]  
\[ \text{derrit-}_{<v:EFF,D:TH>} \text{ manteca} \]

In (26a) the quantized theme la manteca (= the butter) is what makes the VP potentially telic since it is semantically compatible with Asp. The addition of a culminate predicate by Asp is what enables the presence of modifiers such as in x time. Once Asp merges, the event satisfies the selectional properties of inchoative SE. In (26b), Asp cannot merge because it is semantically incompatible with the VP. This VP is not potentially telic because its object does not have the referential properties necessary for a telic interpretation. If Asp cannot merge, the selectional properties of the v that SE realizes cannot be satisfied.\(^9\)

\(^9\)In many cases, it is the object itself that appears to wholly determine whether an event is telic or atelic. If one set of object require Asp and another set can never occur with Asp, we do we need Asp at all? There are some cases in which the object itself can potentially determine either kind of reading. These include bare plurals which were mentioned in section 5.1 in addition to the object of degree achievement verbs such as *lengthen* (Borer 2005; Hay, Kennedy & Levin 1999; among many others)

(i)  

a. The workers lengthened the road in one day.  

b. The workers lengthened the road for one day.

These different readings are due to presence of Asp in (ia) and its absence in (ib). There are various cases in Spanish where a single object can give rise to either a telic or atelic reading as we can see in (ii).

(ii)  

a. Pedro leyó el libro en 3 horas.  

b. Pedro leyó el libro durante 3 horas.
I suggest that the same analysis may be applied to a group of intransitive verbs that are obligatorily marked with SE and whose sole argument is an internal one (Otero 1999). One example is shown in (27) for the verb *acatarrar-se* (= get a cold).

\[(27)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{*María acatarró a Pablo.} \\
& \quad \text{María got-a-cold ACC Pablo} \\
& \quad \text{Intended: María gave Pablo a cold}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Pablo *(se) acatarró.} \quad \text{Pablo (SE.3s) got-a-cold} \\
& \quad \text{‘Pablo got a cold’}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{c.} & \quad \text{una persona muy acatarrada} \\
& \quad \text{a person very with-cold} \\
& \quad \text{‘a very sick person’ (lit. a person very with cold)}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{d.} & \quad \text{??Pablo se acatarró para no ir a la escuela.}^{94} \quad \text{Pablo SE.3s got-a-cold to not got to the school} \\
& \quad \text{Intended: ‘Pablo got a cold to not go to school’}
\end{align*}
\]

Unlike class 1 transitive verbs, these verbs never appear as transitives (27a). As shown in (27b), they are ungrammatical in the absence of SE. The data in (27c) and (27d) show that the sole argument is interpreted as a theme rather than an agent or an effector. Other verbs that behave like *acatarrar-se* are shown in (28).

\[(28)\] **Pronominal Verbs (Class 1):** *acalambrarse* (cramp up), *afiebrarse* (get a fever), *ensimisimarse* (get lost in thought)

---

In other cases, where some objects can only give rise to one reading or the other, it forces the concomitant presence or absence of Asp. Another way to handle this type of ambiguity would be to say that there are slightly different structures associated with each reading. On the telic reading, the object could be licensed in an internal specifier position while on the atelic reading, it is the complement of a verb or root (see Cuervo 2003, Marantz 2005 for details).

\[^{94}\text{Note this would be possible in the rare case that someone willingly contracted a cold in some way. The nature of this particular verb and others like it resists such an interpretation though.}\]
To my knowledge, there has been no formal proposal regarding what SE is doing with these particular verbs. I claim that they are obligatory inchoatives whose stems contain a \( \nu \) feature that does not specify the presence of any type of external argument. The morphological realization of the expletive-like \( \nu \) that they require is SE. This is shown below for *acatarrar-se* (get a cold).

The main difference between these pronominal verbs and inchoatives is that the former cannot be used transitively. Like inchoatives, though, they also have a telic aspectual interpretation that is associated with a resultant state that holds of the sole argument of the verb. For example *Pablo being with cold* marks the natural endpoint of the event denoted by the verb *acatarrar-se*. Another characteristic that they share with inchoatives is that they require the presence of a \( \nu \) whose main function is to mark the absence of an external argument and any type of predicate that could indicate that an internal argument is implicit.

We have seen thus far that it is indeed possible to capture the interpretative characteristics of inchoative SE and one class of pronominal verbs by claiming that SE is the realization of a particular type of \( \nu \). The first question that might come to the reader’s mind is: isn’t SE a pronoun and not a verbal morpheme? This is the type of question that proposals such as those made by Folli & Harley (2005) and Zubizarreta (1987) have had to contend with as both have
claimed that SE can simply be a verbal morpheme and not a pronoun. The main reason why I believe that such an approach is attractive is because it can easily explain the morpho-syntactic properties of inherent SE that were discussed at the beginning of the chapter: (i) it is non-doubling and (ii) it is paradigmatic.

Non-doubling can be captured straightforwardly. I assume that doubling is only possible for clitics that are actually pronouns; that is, doubling is the appearance of double in a specifier of a big DP of which the clitic is the D head (see example (20) above). Since on the view outlined here SE is not the realization of a D head, we would not expect a pronominal anaphor to double it. This characteristic of inherent SE clearly separates it from other clitic pronouns in Spanish, which all are associated with some kind of doubling constructions where the referential properties of the clitic are made clear. The second question pertains to the fact that inherent SE appears to have phi-features: it always agrees with the grammatical subject. This characteristic is something that seems to make it more pronoun-like. We need to find a way to explain why SE agrees.

Until now we have claimed that some v’s, mainly $v_{<V-Asp>}$, are spelled out by SE. Thus, it is the formal and interpretational feature specification on v that determines whether or not SE will appear there or not. However, the superficial form of this spell out depends on what the grammatical subject of the clause is. This is shown in (30). In the (30a), it is spelled out as SE and in (30b) it is spelled out as me.

(30) a. Se rompió la ventana.  
    SE.3s broke the window  
    ‘The window broke’
b. Me acatarré.
SE.1s I got-a-cold
‘I got a cold’

In order to capture this very important fact, I propose that we attach unvalued person and number features to those v’s that have to be spelled out. For example, we know that v<\text{V-Asp}> must be spelled out. The form of this spell out operation is determined once the unvalued person and number features on this particular v are valued.

(31) Representation of (30a) and (30b)

In (31), the bracketed sets of phi-features function as an indicator that this particular head must be spelled out at the PF interface. How does the head get the relevant features? Remember that this particular feature valuation must be distinct from accusative case valuation since SE is not in any way associated with the valuation of accusative case or any other case for that matter. I propose that the valuation of these features is done by upward probing (Baker 2008). The v head searches upward in order to value these features. The first option will always be whatever argument is in spec vP. In the absence of an external argument, the second option will be
whatever values the phi-features of T, mainly the argument that receives nominative case. This is what we have in the examples in (30): \( v \) probes upward and the first set of phi-features it finds will be those of the internal argument (\textit{la ventana} and \textit{pro.1s} respectively), since these arguments are the ones that value the phi-features on T and receive nominative case. Note that in Spanish, movement of the internal argument to T to value nominative case is optional but the features of that argument will always appear in T, thus upward agreement can be maintained even in the case of a sentence like (30a) where the argument with which SE agrees is post-verbal.

5.3.2 SE as Appl: Wholehearted Telic SE

As we saw in chapter 2, class 1 transitive verbs may take another type of inherent SE called wholehearted telic SE, a type of inherent SE that requires that the verb phrase it combines with be both telic and have an agent. The data from chapter 2 is repeated below. Wholehearted telic SE is named the way it is because its presence is entirely optional and when it is present it adds the idea that the subject performs the action denoted by the verb with a great deal of effort and involvement. This is shown in (32) where the English translation \textit{wholeheartedly} corresponds to what the clitic adds.

(32) El mesero (se) llenó todos los vasos del restaurante
    The waiter (SE.3s) filled all the glasses of the restaurant
    ‘The waiter (wholeheartedly) filled all the glasses in the restaurant’

The second component of this particular clitic’s name indicates that it requires the verb phrase with which it combines be telic. This is shown in (33).

(33) a. El mesero (??se) llenó vasos *en/durante tres horas.
    The waiter (SE.3s) filled glasses *in/for three hours
    ‘The waiter filled glasses for three hours’
b. El mesero (se) llenó todos los vasos en/durante tres horas.
The waiter (SE.3s) filled all the glasses in/for three hours
‘The waiter wholeheartedly filled all the glasses in three hours’

Like the other uses of inherent SE that we saw in section 5.3.1, it is non-doubling in that it does not permit the strong anaphor a sí mismo to ‘double’ it.

(34) El mesero se llenó todos los vasos (*a sí mismo)
The waiter SE.3s filled all the glass (DAT himself)
‘The waiter whole-heartedly filled all the glasses’

Based on these data alone one possible way of explaining what wholehearted telic SE does is by proposing that it spells out a different v head, mainly one that requires an AspP as its complement in addition to adding a particular type of ‘wholehearted’ agent as the external argument. This possibility is shown in (35) where the ‘wholeheartedness’ is indicated with the WhH superscript on vAG.

(35)

```
(35)  vP
    /\  v'
   /  \  AspP
  /    \  Asp
 /      \ VP
|        |
V        DP

el mesero   vAG

WhH

P:?,N?

AspP

<Asp,D:TH,D:AG,V

llen-<(v,EFF),D:TH> todos los vasos
```

The v in (35) has a V feature that requires a culminating event. It also introduces a special kind of agent that is subscripted with WhH for wholehearted. This set of features on v is marked with unvalued person and number features that probe upward, agreeing with the external argument in
person and number. This approach appears to be attractive because it would allow us to maintain
that all types of inherent SE are simply morphological realizations of different types of v. There
is one piece of data that provides some problems for such an analysis. As we saw in chapter 2,
wholehearted telic SE cannot co-occur with other third person datives and is also impossible in
three-clitic clusters. These data are repeated below in (36).

(36) a. ??El mesero se le llenó todos los vasos al jefe
   The waiter SE.3s DAT.3s filled all the glasses DAT.the boss
   ‘The waiter wholeheartedly filled all the glasses for the boss’

   b. El mesero se me llenó todos los vasos
   The waiter SE.3s DAT.1s filled all the glasses
   ‘The waiter wholeheartedly filled all the glasses for me’

   c. *El mesero se me le llenó todos los vasos al jefe
   The waiter SE.3s DAT.1s DAT.3s filled all the glasses DAT.the boss
   ‘The waiter wholeheartedly filled all the glasses for the boss (and I was interested in this)’

Virtually any of the various possible analyses of applicatives (Boneh & Nash 2010; Bruening
2010; Cuervo 2003, 2010; Pylkkänen 2008) would not predict this particular type of distribution
if SE in each of these cases were the morphological realization of v. For example, the applied
argument that is represented by the clitic le and the dative marked argument al jefe (= DAT.the
boss) has been proposed to occupy a position above the VP. Using what was already presented
about applicatives in Spanish in chapter 3, section 3.5 (following Cuervo’s 2003 model), the
sentence in (36a) would have the following representation.
The word order would be derived by movement of the DP object over ApplP to the vP layer for case checking. There is nothing that would morpho-syntactically prevent this sentence from converging. The next question is if there is something semantically strange about endowing the subject with a greater amount of effort or involvement in the action that he/she is performing and the presence of a beneficiary, the boss, in this case. There does not seem to be anything anomalous about this particular scenario, especially since almost the exact same reading is possible if the beneficiary is a first person clitic (an ethical dative) as we see in (36b). The ungrammatical sentence in (36c) further corroborates the idea that it is the presence of the third person dative clitic that introduces a beneficiary that appears to be in complementary distribution with wholehearted telic SE.

In order to account for these facts, I propose that wholehearted telic SE is an applicative head that occupies the same position as the beneficiary le ... al jefe, above AspP and below v. In
fact, such a proposal is nothing new and is currently being explored in different guises by many researchers working on a wide array of languages that have similar phenomena (Armstrong 2010a, 2011b; Armstrong & Hutchinson 2009; Boneh & Nash 2010; Bosse, Bruening & Yamada 2010; Campanini & Schäfer 2011). This is shown in (38).

(38)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{DP} \\
  el \text{ mesero} \\
  \text{V} \\
  \text{vP} \\
  \text{v}' \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
  \text{ApplP} \\
  \text{Appl} \\
  \text{AspP} \\
  \text{Asp} \\
  \text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{llen-}\langle (v, \text{EFF}), D: \text{TH}\rangle \text{ todos los vasos}
\]

The next step is to discuss why there is a dual effect on both the aspectual interpretation of the VP and on the subject. Intuitively, the position of the Appl head is what gives it this unique ability to impose a telic restriction on its complement and also impose a compatibility requirement with the \text{v} that takes it as a complement. I claim that these two effects be formally represented as in (39).

(39)  \text{Appl}_{\text{WhH} < V-\text{Asp}>}

The type of event that Appl combines with must culminate, which is represented by a formal V-Asp feature on Appl. The notion of \textit{wholeheartedness} that is introduced by Appl is signaled by
subscripting the Appl head with WhH for wholeheartedness. This imposes a compatibility restriction on the \( v \) that can combine with ApplP: only \( v_{AG} \) can be felicitously used in the presence of Appl\textsubscript{WhH} since only agents can perform an event ‘wholeheartedly.’

Since all high applicative heads take an event as their complement (Pylkkänen 2008), this is not what makes this particular Appl special among other types of high applicatives. What makes it unique is that instead of adding an argument (40a) to the event it takes as a complement, it adds a conventional implicature\(^95\) to the effect that the event be performed wholeheartedly (40b).

\[(40)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{[[Appl}_{\text{BEN}}]] = \lambda f_{<s,t>}. \lambda x. f(e) \land \text{BEN}(e, x) \\
\text{b. } & \text{[[Appl}_{\text{WhH}}]] = \lambda f_{<s,t>}. \lambda e. f(e) : \text{PERFORMED-WHOLEHEARTEDLY}(e)
\end{align*}
\]

Compare the denotation of a high applicative that introduces a beneficiary, from Pylkkänen (2008), to what wholehearted telic SE does. I will follow Bosse, Bruening & Yamada (2010) in assuming that conventional implicatures are introduced after a colon, which separates the assertive content of the sentence from anything that is added as a conventional implicature.\(^96\)

By adding this conventional implicature, Appl\textsubscript{WhH} forces the presence of an agent since only an agent can perform an event wholeheartedly. We could view the presence of Appl\textsubscript{WhH} as imposing a particular restriction on the range of possible \( v \)’s that can normally merge with class 1 verbs. We have seen that the feature specification of class 1 stems permits \( v_{EFF} \) to merge, where EFFECTOR is interpreted as an agent, instrument or causer depending on the internal properties of

\(^95\)For more on the conventional implicature associated with these weak datives see Armstrong (2010a, 2011b) and Horn (2008).

\(^96\)For more on conventional implicatures in general see Grice (1975), Horn (2008, 2010) and Potts (2005, 2007).
the external argument itself, or merge of an expletive $v$ that introduces no role and projects no specifier for an external argument to merge. When $\text{Appl}_{\text{WhH}}$ is present it forces the presence of an agent since this is the only predicate that is compatible with the conventional implicature it adds. This is shown in (41).

(41)

One last point is in order regarding the morphological shape of $\text{Appl}_{\text{WhH}}$. Like uses of inherent SE that realize different types of $v$, the spell out of $\text{Appl}_{\text{WhH}}$ is contingent upon what is higher in the structure. Since $\text{Appl}_{\text{WhH}}$ forces the presence of an external argument, we can simply say that it agrees with whatever is in spec $vP$ through an upward agreement mechanism similar to the one that was outlined for the uses of inherent SE in section 5.3.1. This is also similar to the mechanism by which that the dative clitic that realizes applicative heads gets its features: it agrees upwards with whatever is in its specifier (see chapter 3, section 3.5 and Cuervo 2003 for details).
We have made a few significant changes to the original idea in (35) of claiming that wholehearted telic SE is just another morphological realization of $v$. Let us now evaluate the structure in (42) against the facts we have seen regarding wholehearted telic SE.

The non-doubling of wholehearted telic SE can be explained by the fact that it is not a pronoun that represents any argument. Instead, it spells out a head that introduces a conventional implicature that only makes sense if there is an agent introduced by $v$. The presence of wholehearted telic SE indicates that the agent is engaged in performing the event described by the verb in a very ‘involved’ way. The fact that it is a reflexive clitic that is paradigmatic is explained by the same mechanism we saw in section 5.3.1. The Appl head that introduces the above-mentioned implicature contains unvalued person and number features that are valued by whatever argument merges in the spec $vP$. Thus, we don’t lose the ability to explain the basic formal properties of inherent SE by claiming that wholehearted telic SE is an Appl head. What we gain is a possible way to explain the distributional facts with other dative clitics. Since
Appl\textsubscript{WhH} occupies the same position that other high applicatives that introduce beneficiaries are merged in, the fact that these two clitics are incompatible with one another is explained.

The one fact that we have not yet accounted for is why first and second person “ethical” dative clitics are compatible with wholehearted telic SE. This is repeated below in (43).

(43) El mesero se me llenó todos los vasos
The waiter SE.3s DAT.1s filled all the glasses
‘The waiter wholeheartedly filled all the glasses for me’

Some researchers such as Boneh & Nash (2010) have proposed that first and second person clitics that have more of a discourse function than adding a participant to the event itself and are actually merged above the predicational core represented by the vP. If we adopt this particular view, the clitics in (43) do not occupy the same position and thus it would not be predicted that they would be in complementary distribution. The position of me is higher than that of se. This is shown in (44).

(44) 

```
ApplP
   /\         
  Appl       vP
    |         /\        
  me       DP       v'
      /\     /\      
 el mesero v\textsubscript{AG} ApplP
          |         |
 Appl\textsubscript{WhH}<V-Asp> AspP
        |         |
 [P:?\,N:?] Asp   VP
       |         |
   V       DP
     llen-\langle v,EFF\rangle,D:TH> todos los vasos
```
The \textit{se me} clitic ordering in this case is derived through post-syntactic mechanisms that re-order terminal nodes before they are pronounced. This concludes the second type of inherent SE that can be found with class 1 verbs. We now have solid base upon which to propose an analysis for the types of inherent SE that appear with class 2 verbs and then discuss the relevance of the class 1 versus class 2 distinction for understanding the uses of inherent SE.

5.4 Inherent SE in Class 2 Verbs

The basic claim about inherent SE with class 2 verbs is no different from what we saw in the previous section. I propose that it can either be the morphological realization of $v$ or of $\text{Appl}_{\text{whH}}$. This is shown in (45).

(45) Inherent SE: Class 2 Verbs

\begin{enumerate}
  \item Realizes $v$
  \begin{center}
    \begin{tikzpicture}
      \node (vP) at (0,0) {$vP$};
      \node (DP_AG) at (-2,-2) {$\text{DP}_{\text{AG}}$};
      \node (v_AG) at (-4,-4) {$v_{\text{AG}}$};
      \node (Asp) at (-6,-6) {$\text{Asp}$};
      \node (VP) at (-8,-8) {$\text{VP}$};
      \node (V) at (-10,-10) {$V$};
      \node (DP_TH) at (-12,-12) {$\text{DP}_{\text{TH}}$};
      \node (se) at (-14,-14) {$\text{se}$};
      \draw (vP) -- (DP_AG);
      \draw (DP_AG) -- (v_AG);
      \draw (v_AG) -- (Asp);
      \draw (Asp) -- (VP);
      \draw (VP) -- (V);
      \draw (V) -- (DP_TH);
      \draw (DP_TH) -- (se);
      \draw (se) -- (V);
      \node at (-15,-15) {$\text{STEM}_{v_{\text{AG}},(D:\text{TH})}$};
    \end{tikzpicture}
  \end{center}

  \item Realizes $\text{Appl}$
  \begin{center}
    \begin{tikzpicture}
      \node (vP) at (0,0) {$vP$};
      \node (DP) at (-2,-2) {$\text{DP}$};
      \node (v_AG) at (-4,-4) {$v_{\text{AG}}$};
      \node (ApplIP) at (-6,-6) {$\text{Appl}_{\text{whH}}$};
      \node (Asp) at (-8,-8) {$\text{Asp}$};
      \node (VP) at (-10,-10) {$\text{VP}$};
      \node (V) at (-12,-12) {$V$};
      \node (DP_TH) at (-14,-14) {$\text{DP}_{\text{TH}}$};
      \node (se) at (-16,-16) {$\text{se}$};
      \draw (vP) -- (DP);
      \draw (DP) -- (v_AG);
      \draw (v_AG) -- (ApplIP);
      \draw (ApplIP) -- (Asp);
      \draw (Asp) -- (VP);
      \draw (VP) -- (V);
      \draw (V) -- (DP_TH);
      \draw (DP_TH) -- (se);
      \draw (se) -- (V);
      \node at (-17,-17) {$\text{STEM}_{v_{\text{eff}},D:\text{TH}}$};
    \end{tikzpicture}
  \end{center}
\end{enumerate}
Claiming that inherent SE realizes the same syntactic positions in class 1 and class 2 verbs however does not mean that it will have the same effect for each verb class. Since the two verb classes are compatible with different kinds of \( v \), we actually predict that inherent SE should have a different set of effects for class 2 verbs than it does for class 1 verbs. This is precisely what we will see in this section. In section 5.4.1 I discuss the fact that wholehearted telic SE has grammaticalized to varying degrees with class 2 verbs and has become a marker of telicity for one subtype of class 2 verbs, those of consumption. I argue that this process can be represented formally by claiming that the Appl head realized by wholehearted telic SE simply gets reanalyzed as a \( v \) and no longer adds the wholehearted implicature. Note that we do not see a comparable continuum of grammaticalization of wholehearted telic SE with class 1 verbs. In section 5.4.2 I discuss a second use of inherent SE that is unique to the consumption subtype of class 2 verbs: that which marks an ‘unselected’ subject. Finally, in section 5.4.3 I discuss a second set of pronominal verbs in which SE can be thought of as a \( v \) that introduces an agent but lacks the ability to assign accusative case (an antipassive).

5.4.1 SE as an Appl – \( v \) Continuum: Wholehearted Telic SE and Transitive Aspectual SE

In chapter 2 we saw that wholehearted telic SE does not have the same set of properties for all class 2 verbs as it does for class 1 verbs. In this section I argue that wholehearted telic SE has become an aspect marker for some subtypes of class 2 verbs. Formally, this change is proposed to be represented as a shift from realizing an Appl head to a \( v \) head. I propose that SE starts out as wholehearted telic SE. The implicature added by Appl then gets bleached. Since the only function of a bleached Appl\(_{WhH} \) head is to force the VP to be telic, the presence of SE then gets
reanalyzed as a morphological realization of a \( v \) that selects a culminating VP. These three stages of the grammaticalization of wholehearted telic SE to transitive aspectual SE are represented by the role SE plays with different subtypes of class 2 verbs. Activity, creation and performance verbs take wholehearted telic SE. These are no different from class 1 verbs. Verbs of learning and internalization take a semantically bleached Appl\(_{WhH} \) that doesn’t add any implicature but forces the interpretation of the VP to be telic. It maintains the optional character of wholehearted telic SE, thus it doesn’t obligatorily mark telic events. Finally, consumption verbs have a fully grammaticalized version of wholehearted telic SE. This use of inherent SE obligatorily marks consumption events that are telic and adds no *wholehearted* implicature. It is argued that this SE, called transitive aspectual SE, is a realization of \( v \) for a certain set of consumption verbs when these verbs are telic.

Let us look at the first sub-type of class 2 verbs, which include activity verbs such as *lavar* (= wash), *barrer* (= sweep) and *pintar* (= paint, in the non-creation sense), creation verbs such as *cocinar* (= cook), *preparar* (= prepare), *pintar* (= to make a painting, the creation sense) and performance verbs such as *bailar* (= dance) and *cantar* (= sing). These verbs all take wholehearted telic SE. Thus, when SE is present, they have essentially the same properties as the class 1 verbs we saw in section 5.3.2. Some of these are reviewed briefly below. This data can also be found in chapter 2, section 2.6.3.

First, SE is optional and its presence adds the idea that the subject performs the event denoted by the verb ‘wholeheartedly’ (= with effort, involvement). This is shown in (46).

\[
\text{(46) } \begin{align*}
\text{Juan (se) } & \text{ barrió toda la casa} \\
\text{Juan (SE.3s) } & \text{ swept all the house} \\
& \text{‘Juan wholeheartedly swept the whole house’}
\end{align*}
\]
The presence of SE is only compatible with a verb phrase that is telic and thus only a temporal frame headed by *en* is possible when SE is present as we can see in (47).

(47) a. María (?se) pintó casas *en/durante tres horas.
    María (SE.3s) painted houses *in/for three hours
    Intended: ‘María *wholeheartedly* painted houses for three hours’

b. María (se) pintó toda la casa en/*durante tres horas.
    María (SE.3s) painted all the house *in/for three hours
    ‘María *wholeheartedly* painted the whole house in three hours’

Doubling of SE by a strong pronominal anaphor is impossible as is the case with class 1 verbs. This is shown in (48).

(48) Me lavé todos los platos (*a mí mismo)
    SE.1s I washed all the dishes (DAT myself)
    ‘I *wholeheartedly* washed all the dishes’

Finally, when SE appears with this particular subtype of class 2 verbs, it imposes restrictions on the presence of other dative clitics. Mainly, third person datives are blocked by SE (49a) whereas first and second person ‘ethical’ datives may co-occur with SE (49b). Three clitic clusters are ungrammatical, just as we saw above for class 1 verbs (49c).

(49) a. ??Juan se le barrió toda la casa a María
    Juan SE.3s DAT.3s swept all the house DAT María
    Intended: ‘Juan *wholeheartedly* swept María’s house’

b. Juan se me barred toda la casa
    Juan SE.3s DAT.1s swept all the house
    ‘Juan *wholeheartedly* swept the whole house for me’

c. *Juan se me le barrió toda la casa a María
    Juan SE.3s DAT.1s DAT.3s swept all the house DAT María
    Intended: ‘Juan *wholeheartedly* swept María’s entire house (and I was interested in this)
Creation and performance verbs share the fundamental properties of the transitive SE sentences we have already seen for class 1 verbs and activity verbs: SE is not obligatory, adds the idea of wholeheartedness, requires telicity, is non-doubling and blocks the presence of some dative clitics. The one difference is that SE sounds more natural with this particular verb class when the created object is modified either by an adjectival modifier or relative clause that highlights the quality of the created or performed entity. Let us take a look at the following examples.

(50) a. Tongolele se bailó una rumba *inolvidable*
    Tongolele SE.3s danced a rumba unforgettable
    ‘Tongolele danced an unforgettable rumba (with all her might) (Maldonado 2008)

    b. Me he pintado un cuadro *impressante / que te cagas*
    SE.1s I have painted a painting impressive / that you shit
    ‘I made a painting that will blow you away’ (adapted from Sanz 2000)

    c. Juan se cocinó una paella *deliciosa* para sus invitados.
    Juan SE.3s cooked a paella delicious for his guests
    ‘Juan cooked up a paella for his guests’ (adapted from Sanz 2000: 61)

In the absence of the modifiers *inolvidable* (50a), *impressante* (50b) or *deliciosa* (50c) the sentences sound like they are missing something to most speakers.⁹⁷ The reason why we see this

---

⁹⁷ Most speakers wanted to put a modifier in the object position that highlighted the quality of the created entity. The presence of these modifiers may be obviated by intonation. That is, if a special kind of emphatic stress is placed on the object that serves to highlight the singular nature of that object, the presence of a modifier may not be necessary. This also separates wholehearted telic se from transitive aspectual se since this type of intonation is not triggered by transitive aspectual se as far as I can tell. The examples in (32a) and (32b) may be uttered with pure intonation in the following ways.

(i)  a. Tongolele se bailó UNA RÚMBA (≈ one of those rumbas that you’ll never forget) (32a)
     b. Me he pintado UN CUÁDRO (≈ a really amazing one) (32b)

The same effect can be gained when the object is preceded by a stressed definite article that carries the same kind of emphatic meaning that it does in English. In the absence of this special intonation, these sentences are unacceptable.

(ii) a. Ella se bailó LA rumba (= the one you’ll never forget)
    b. Me he pintado EL cuadro (= a really good one)
particular property appear with these verbs is most likely due to an interaction between the notion of *wholeheartedness* that SE adds and the meaning of the verbs themselves. When someone puts all of their effort into performing or creating something, there is a strong likelihood that the performed or created object will be of high quality. I propose that these verbs all have wholehearted telic SE and that it realizes the same Appl head in the same structural position that it realizes with class 1 verbs.

(51)  Representation of (48)

This allows us to explain all of the properties that wholehearted telic SE constructions of class 1 and class 2 verbs share without having to add anything new. The only new piece of data to explain is that when wholehearted telic SE is present with creation verbs, intended possessors

Finally, the need for this kind of modification and intonation is only necessary if the properties of the object itself are not ‘formidable.’ Objects of impressive quantity are also acceptable without the necessity of further modification.

(iii)  Tongolele  se  bailó  20 rumbas.
      Tongelele  SE.3s danced 20 rumbas

I am indebted to María Cristina Cuervo for calling the examples in (ii) and (iii) to my attention.
cannot be expressed as datives but may be expressed as oblique arguments marked by the preposition *para* (= for). This is shown in (52).

(52) a. ??Juan se les cocinó una paella a sus invitados.
    Juan SE.3s DAT.3p cooked a paella DAT his guests
   ‘Juan cooked up a paella for his guests’

   b. Juan se cocinó una paella para sus invitados.
    Juan SE.3s cooked a paella for his guests
   ‘Juan cooked up a paella for his guests’ (Sanz 2000: 61)

In the case of (52b), the reason why the benefactive prepositional argument can occur with *ApplWh* is because it is generated within the complement of VP as a relational small clause (FP) whose subject is the direct object (Cuervo 2003). Since the PP does not occupy the Appl position in which *ApplWh* merges, the sentence is grammatical. If the benefactive argument were expressed as a dative, it would compete for the same position with *ApplWh*.

---

98María Cristina Cuervo (p.c.) accepts the following example in which there is a wholehearted telic *se*, an ethical dative (*me*) and a recipient dative (*les*).

(i) Te me les cocinaste todo.
    SE.2s DAT.1s DAT.3p cooked all
   ‘You whipped it all up for them (and I was interested in this happening)

Héctor Campos (p.c.) also cites the following examples of class 2 verbs with three-clitic clusters.

(ii) a. Juana se me les cocinó una paella de miedo.
    Juana SE.3s DAT.1s DAT.3p cooked a paella of fear
   ‘Juana whipped them up a very tasty paella for me’

   b. Juana se me les bailó un tango de miedo.
    Juana SE.3s DAT.1s DAT.3p danced a tango of fear
   ‘Juan danced a beautiful tango for them (and I was interested in this happening)’

The same examples are not accepted by other informants, who prefer not to have recipient datives with SE. However, the variation here is part of what I am trying to capture by arguing that when SE appears in transitive constructions with class 2 verbs it can be an Appl head in which case it interferes with other datives and cannot appear in three-clitic clusters or it can be a verbal morpheme, a *v* that does not block the presence of any other dative and can occur in three-clitic clusters.
A second sub-type of class 2 verbs is comprised of verbs of learning and ‘internalization’ such as leer (= read), aprender (= learn), saber (= know/learn), conocer (= know/learn), ver (= see), estudiar (= study). Verbs of learning are like activity and creation/performance verbs in the following ways: (i) SE is optional, (ii) SE requires telicity, (iii) it is non-doubling and (iv) it blocks the expression of third person dative clitics. Where these verbs differ from their other class 2 counterparts is with respect to the idea of wholeheartedness. As can be seen in (54), SE may appear on a verb of learning that is embedded in a context where the subject has been forced to do something against his or her will.

(54) a. El maestro obligó a los alumnos a aprender(se) todos los poemas del libro.
   The teacher made ACC the waiter to learn(SE.3s) all the poems of.the book
   ‘The teacher forced the students to learn all the poems in the book by heart’
b. Me obligaron a leer(me) esos libros horribles para la clase de literatura.

ACC.1s they forced to read(SE.1s) those books horrible for the class of literature

‘They forced me to read those horrible books in Literature’

With these particular verbs, SE can also appear with modifiers that require that the event be done

*halfheartedly* as shown in (55).

(55) Juan se leyó la mitad del libro sin mayor interés y lo dejó de leer.

Juan SE.3s read the half of the book half-heartedly and it stopped reading

‘Juan read half of the book half-heartedly and then stopped reading it’

For this verb class, I propose that SE is the realization of an ApplWhH head that has been semantically bleached and thus acts as a morphologically realized identity function that takes a culminating event and returns that same culminating event. The bleaching is represented by outlining the subscript on the Appl head (the weird-looking font we see in (56)).

(56) \( [[\text{Appl}_{\text{WhH}}]] = \lambda f_{ss1s}. \lambda e. f(e) \)

The subtle difference between verbs of learning and other class two verbs is because of this bleaching.

(57) Juan se leyó el libro.

Juan SE.3s read the book

‘Juan read the entire book’
The structure in (58) is meant to capture the fact that this particular use of SE is optional but has almost no effect that cannot be generated independently of its presence. A situation like this would seem ripe for some kind of reanalysis whereby SE comes to be a marker of the structure that it selects when it is optionally present. This is what I claim has happened for consumption verbs.

The final sub-type of class 2 verbs is comprised by verbs of consumption such as *comer* (= eat), *beber* (= drink), *tomar* (= eat/drink) and *fumar* (= smoke). These verbs behave differently in many ways from class 1 verbs and all of the other sub-types of class 2 verbs in transitive SE constructions. As we saw in chapter 2, the first property that separates them from all the other verbs we have seen thus far is that SE is not optional. First, as we saw in the

---

99The verbs that must have se in order to be interpreted as telic are *comer* (eat), *tomar* (drink), *beber* (drink), *fumar* (smoke), *tragar* (swallow). It is important to note that it is not a mark of ‘consumption’ as verbs like *consumir* (consume) and *engullir* (gulp) do not obligatorily take SE. Thus, it is not the conceptual notion of consumption that is important in building a proposal for these uses of SE. It is consumption and usage frequency that seem to be important since it is only the most common consumption verbs that have developed this particular use of SE.
previous examples, SE is impossible when the object of the verb is incapable of licensing a
temporal frame headed by *en*. In (59), since *pan* (= bread) can only license a temporal frame
headed by *durante*, SE is ungrammatical.

(59)  a. Comí pan *en/durante media hora.
   I ate bread in/for half hour
   ‘I ate bread for half an hour’

   b. (*Me) comí pan
      (SE.1s) I ate bread
      ‘I ate bread’

Let us look now at objects of consumption verbs that only license a temporal frame headed by *en*
as in (60a) and (60b), assuming that consumption verbs behave just like the other verbs we have
seen thus far.

(61)  a. Pablo comió un trozo de pan *en/*durante cinco minutos.
   Pablo ate a piece of bread in/ for five minutes
   ‘Pablo ate a piece of bread in five minutes’

   b. Tomé todo el vino *en/*durante una hora.
      I drank all the wine in/for an hour
      ‘I drank all the wine in an hour’

Since *un trozo de pan* (61a) and *todo el vino* (61b) are quantized themes, they provide a salient
endpoint for the consumption event, thus making it telic and only compatible with terminal
temporal frames. If consumption verbs were like all of the other verbs we have seen thus far,
then sentences like (61) would be the ones with which SE could optionally combine. What is
interesting is that for most speakers, those sentences are degraded in the absence of SE as we can
see in (62).
These data demonstrate that instead of appearing optionally in contexts that are already telic, consumption verbs actually require SE when they have telic interpretations. As we saw with verbs of learning and internalization, SE is felicitous even when a consumption verb is embedded in a context where the subject is forced to consume something unwillingly or half- heartedly. This is shown in (63).

The data in (63) show that there is no notion of wholeheartedness added by SE when it appears with consumption verbs. Like all of the other uses of SE we have seen in this section, the SE that appears with transitive consumption verbs is non-doubling. The final property that separates the SE we see in consumption verbs from all of the ones we have seen previously is that it can co- occur with any other dative clitic (Strozer 1976, 1978). Strozer (1978) observed that SE may co- occur with other third person datives, something that is not possible for the other verb classes. 100

---

100There is some variability if the direct object is interpreted as an inalienable part of the third person non-reflexive dative as shown by the following examples.
(64) a. Pepe se le comió la manzana al niño.
Pepe SE.3s DAT.3s ate the apple DAT.the kid
Possible Interpretations (all perfect):
(i) Pepe ate up the kid’s apple (Possessor)
(ii) Pepe ate up the apple for/on the kid (Affected Exp)

b. Ella se le tomó el café a Pepe.
She SE.3s DAT.3s drank the coffee DAT Pepe
Possible Interpretations (all perfect):
(i) She drank up Pepe’s coffee (Possessor)
(ii) She drank up the coffee for/on Pepe (Affected Exp)

The same author also observed that three clitic clusters are possible for consumption verbs.
Again, these same kinds of sentences are not possible with other types of verbs we have seen thus far.

(65) a. Pepe se me le comió la manzana al niño.
Pepe SE.3s DAT.1s DAT.3s ate the apple DAT.the kid
Possible Interpretations (all perfect):
(i) Pepe ate up the kid’s apple (and I have a vested interest in this)\(^{101}\)
(ii) Pepe ate up the apple for/on the kid (and I have a vested interest in this)

\(^{101}\)The most natural interpretation of the speaker’s interest in this event is that it is the speaker’s child who owned the apple that Pepe ate or was affected by Pepe’s eating the apple.

(i) El canario macho se les comió las plumas a los hijos.
The canary male SE.3s DAT.3p ate the feathers DAT the sons
‘The male canary ate up the chick’s feathers’
(se = transitive aspectual se; les = possessor dative, inalienable possession)
(http://www.todoexpertos.com/categorias/familiarelaciones/mascotas/respuestas/146566/canario-come-plumas)

(ii) a. El zombi le comió el brazo al hombre.
The zombie DAT.3s ate the arm DAT.the man
‘The zombie ate the man’s arm off’

b. El brazo de este pobre, se lo comió el zombi.
The arm of that poor guy, SE.3s it ate the zombie
‘That poor guy’s arm, the zombie ate it up’

c. ??El zombi se le comió el brazo al hombre.
The zombie SE.3s DAT.3s eat.3s.PRET the arm DAT.the man
‘The zombie ate up the man’s arm (*off)’
b. Ella se te le tomó el café a Pepe.
She SE.3s DAT.2s DAT.3s drank the coffee DAT Pepe
Possible Interpretations (all perfect):
(i) She drank up Pepe’s coffee (and you have a vested interest in this)
(ii) She drank up the coffee for/on Pepe (and you have a vested interest in this)

In order to capture these facts, I claim that instead of wholehearted telic SE, the SE we see with these verbs is actually a realization of a $v$ that selects culminating events with this particular group of class 2 consumption verbs. The sentences in (66) are represented in (67).

(66)  a. Pablo (*se) comió pan.
   Pablo (SE.3s) ate bread
   ‘Pablo ate bread’

   b. Pablo *(se) comió el pan.
   Pablo (SE.3s) ate the bread
   ‘Pablo ate the bread up’

(67)  Atelic and Telic Interpretations of Consumption Verbs: Representation of (66a) and (66b)

a. Atelic (66a)

b. Telic (66b)

The mechanism by which SE gets its phi-features is the same one that applies to inchoatives and class 1 pronominal verbs. As in those cases, the $v$ that must be spelled out for these consumption verbs looks upward for its phi-features and gets them from the argument that is in spec $vP$. With
this proposal we capture the fact that SE obligatorily marks telicity for consumption verbs. We have thus proposed to treat wholehearted telic SE and transitive aspectual SE as different points in a continuum of grammaticalization whereby the Appl head that is realized by wholehearted telic SE becomes the realization of a $v$ that requires a culminating event as its complement. This explains why SE is obligatory in telic events for *these specific stems* and also why it can co-occur with third person datives and in three-clitic clusters. Since it does not spell out an Appl head between $v$ and Asp, that position can be occupied by a distinct dative element.

### 5.4.1.1 Evaluation of Proposal

The proposal that has been outlined in sections 5.3.2 and 5.4.1 has many positive consequences that enable to sort out some of the observations made in previous works. Before going into these data, I would like to address one question regarding the proposal that SE realizes $v$. We already mentioned above that doing so allows us to capture the fact that SE in this case is not an argument but a part of a verb’s morphology (Folli & Harley 2005; Zubizarreta 1987). However, this does not rule out the possibility that SE realizes Asp. All of the examples that we have seen thus far have involved telic interpretations. The question is why not say that SE realizes Asp instead of $v$ in the case of inchoatives, pronominal verbs and transitive aspectual SE? If this were the case, we would miss the generalization that SE not only has an aspectual effect on the VP but also marks whether or not an external argument is present. Note that SE is only obligatory in class 1 verbs when it marks telicity and the absence of the external argument. It is never obligatory when a class 1 verb is transitive.
The same sensitivity to voice can also be seen in the consumption verbs that take transitive aspectual SE. Note that aspect is not the only thing that SE marks; it also requires that the verb be active. Thus, it isn’t like the English aspectual particle *up, which can appear in a passive. This is shown in (69).

(69)  

   a. El pastel *(se) fue comido por Juan.  
       The cake SE.3s was eaten by Juan  
       Intended: ‘The cake was eaten up by Juan’

   b. Juan *(se) comió el pastel.  
       Juan SE.3s ate the cake  
       ‘Juan ate up the cake’

These data support treating SE as an aspectually-sensitive use of ν rather than as a morphological realization of the Asp head itself.

The proposal that there are various shades of inherent SE that appear with transitive verbs enables us to sort out some of the data that has been presented in previous research on the subject. There have been various data disputes in the literature on transitive uses of inherent SE and I argue that all of these stem from the erroneous idea that all of these uses of inherent SE are exactly the same. The controversy starts with the following examples. In her paper on the aspectual use of SE with motion and consumption verbs, Zagona (1996) claims that *lavar is
ungrammatical with inherent SE. However, subsequent work by Sanz (2000) and MacDonald (2004) cites lavar as a verb on par with consumption verb in its ability to take aspectually-sensitive SE.

(70) a. Pepe se lavó todos los platos de la cena en una hora.
    ‘Pepe washed all the dishes from dinner in an hour’ (Sanz 2000: 58)
    Pepe SE.3s washed all the dishes of the dinner in an hour.

b. Me lavé el carro.
    ‘I washed my car’ (MacDonald 2004)
    SE.1s I washed the car

This dispute can be remedied if we clearly separate wholehearted telic SE, an Appl head, from transitive aspectual SE, a v. Lavar (= wash) is a verb that takes wholehearted telic SE while comer (= eat) and other consumption verbs take transitive aspectual SE. Thus, Zagona (1996) is correct in claiming that the SE that appears with lavar is ungrammatical if it is assumed to be the same SE that appears with consumption verbs. Sanz (2000) and MacDonald (2004) are both correct in their claim that inherent SE appears with lavar, but this SE is distinct from the one that appears with comer and other consumption verbs.

In some research, the term aspectual SE (Nishida 1994) is used as a cover term for the transitive uses of inherent SE. Its frequency with consumption verbs has often led to the idea that it cannot appear with change of state verbs. De Miguel & Fernández Lagunilla (2000) and Otero (1999) cite the following examples as counter evidence to this claim.

(71) a. Me abrí dos latas en medio segundo.
    ‘I opened two cans in half a second’ (De Miguel & Fernández Lagunilla 2000: 23)
    SE.1s I opened two cans in half second
b. El submarino se hundió dos acorazados enemigos.
   The submarine SE.3s sank two battleships enemy
   ‘The submarine sank two enemy battleships’ (Otero 1999: 1478)

First of all, it is unclear whether either of these examples is widely acceptable as an aspectually sensitive use of SE. The sentence in (71a) could just as easily be interpreted as a benefactive dative and (71b) is extremely odd, requiring a very peculiar context to be acceptable. For argument’s sake, let us assume that these examples are widely accepted as wholehearted telic SE. On this view, we can maintain that both the SE that appears with consumption verbs and the SE that appears with the class 1 verbs in (71) are grammatical and have similar effects on the VPs they combine with but are not the same SE. A further controversy pertains to the co-occurrence of inherent SE with other dative clitics. It is often assumed that SE adds some kind of “benefactive” meaning to the subject and that this should block the presence of a benefactive dative that is distinct from the subject. De Miguel & Fernández Lagunilla (2000) cite (72b) as a counter example to this idea since there is dative clitic, me, appears with inherent SE.

(72)  a. Me abrí dos latas en medio segundo.
       SE.1s I opened two cans in half second
       ‘I opened up two cans in half a second’

   b. Mi hijo es muy habilidoso, se me abre dos latas en medio segundo.
      My son is very talented, SE.3s DAT.1s opens two cans in half second
      ‘My son is very talented, he can open me up two cans in a half a second’

The example in (72b) is exactly like the one we saw in (43), where there is one ethical dative, which merges above VP and another Appl of which wholehearted telic SE is the morphological realization.
The data on inherent SE is more complicated than it has been made out to be. The proposal made in sections 5.3.2 and 5.4.1 is able to capture both the unifying formal properties of the clitic in addition to the subtle differences between what SE does in different verb classes.

### 5.4.1.2 Wholehearted Telic SE: Appearance in other Languages

Throughout sections 5.3.2 and 5.4.1 we have seen that the differences between transitive aspectual SE and wholehearted telic SE are sometimes difficult to tease apart. In order to account for these subtle differences we have proposed that these two types of inherent SE are essentially part of a the same type of continuum, where SE could either realize an Appl head that adds a wholehearted conventional implicature or realize a \( v \) that requires its event complement to culminate. It was suggested throughout section 5.4.1 that there is a directionality of grammatical change associated with this continuum whereby a weak dative element that introduces no argument becomes a part of a verb’s morphological make-up over time: Appl gets reanalyzed as the head that is adjacent to it, \( v \). It is beyond the scope of this chapter to provide an in depth historical study of these uses of SE. However, I would like to present a set of cross-linguistic and historical data that lend support to the general idea.

One question that comes up with respect to the idea presented in sections 5.3.2 and 5.4.1 is if this is a plausible analysis for what appears to be a clitic “pronoun.” Are imposing aspectual restrictions on a verb phrase and adding a conventional implicature to the subject something that clitics usually do? Don’t they normally just stand in for arguments of a verb? A brief look at some of the functions of reflexive “pronominal” clitics in other languages shows that this idea is
on the right track and there is really no reason to assume that all clitics are necessarily ‘pronouns’ in the traditional sense.

The first indication of this comes from the American English personal dative construction (Christian 1991; Conroy 2007; Cournane 2010; Green 1974; Horn 2008, 2010; Hutchinson & Armstrong 2009; Webelhuth & Dannenberg 2006). This is a salient feature of many varieties of non-standard American English and it involves the presence of an ‘extra’ weak pronoun in the dative-shift position that obligatorily agrees with the subject. Some representative examples from the literature are shown in (73).

(73)  
a. I’m gonna write me a letter to my cousin. (Christian 1991: 16, ex. 10)  
b. I whittled me a stick. (Conroy 2007: 68, ex. 14)  
c. Bill played him a lullaby. (Green 1974: 191)

The characteristics of the underlined pronouns in (73) are remarkably similar to transitive aspectual SE and wholehearted telic SE at the superficial level.102 Like these two uses of SE in Spanish, personal datives are weak pronouns; that is, they don’t admit –self morphology, a counterpart to non-doubling in Spanish.103

(74)  
Intended Readings: those of (74)  
a. *I’m gonna write myself a letter to my cousin.  
b. *I whittled myself a stick.  
c. *Bill played himself a lullaby.

102 They aren’t the same as noted Franco & Huidobro (2010) and Sanz (2000), but these works barely even scratch the surface of the personal dative literature. Actually, I find that the uses of se in Spanish are more similar to the personal dative construction than they are different.

103 There probably is some variation among dialects as well as predicates in this sense. Some speakers might accept either of the following with almost no difference in meaning. This may be because there is no double object benefactive for consumption verbs with which the personal dative could be confused.

(i)  
a. I smoked me a cigarette.  
b. I smoked myself a cigarette.
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Second, they can appear with other goal and benefactive arguments as shown in (73a) but never with another dative-shifted pronoun, just like wholehearted telic SE. Third, they do not introduce a new argument that is related to the direct object through possession or related to the event through the general notion of “affectedness.” Rather, they have been described as introducing a sense ‘effort’, ‘involvement’ and ‘satisfaction of the intentions or desires’ of the grammatical subject. Horn (2008, 2010) has made a good case that what is added by the presence of these pronouns is a conventional implicature. Fourth, they require the presence of an object, which is a defining characteristic of both transitive aspectual SE and wholehearted telic SE. There are no unergative verbs that take personal datives in the absence of an object. The main difference between the personal dative construction and both transitive aspectual SE and wholehearted telic SE is that there does not appear to be an aspectual restriction imposed on the verb phrase by the pronoun.

The second indication comes from the functions of reflexive clitics in other Romance languages. French has been studied in detail by Boneh & Nash (2010). The following examples are what they label “co-referential datives” (Boneh & Nash 2010: 7-8).

(75)  
a. Jeanne s’ est fumé un narguilé  
     Jeanne SE.3s smoked a narghile  
     ‘Jeanne smoked her a narghile’

b. Je me suis maté un film avec ma copine.  
   I SE.1s watched a film with my girlfriend  
   ‘I watched me a movie with my girlfriend’

---

104 What is interesting is that the types of objects in personal datives are limited to those that have weak determiners in the sense of Milsark (1977) and Diesing (1992) but that these constructions appear to systematically ban bare nouns. This might lead us to think that a telic restriction is being imposed by these pronouns just as we saw with transitive aspectual SE and wholehearted telic SE but there is no evidence that these constructions are sensitive to telicity.
c. Je me suis cassé quelques bagnoles de riche (quel kif!)
I SE.1s broke a few cars of rich people (what fun!)
'I went and smashed me some rich folks’ cars (that was fun!)

The way the authors characterize this particular use of the reflexive clitic is as follows: “co-referential datives express how the subject, primarily agentive, experiences the event in question, implicating that the subject experiences enjoyment and easy-goingness. This effect depends on the volitional involvement of the agent in the event (Boneh & Nash 2010: 8).” This is essentially what we have argued for in the case of wholehearted telic SE in Spanish but not for transitive aspectual SE. The main difference between Spanish and French is that there is no evidence in French that co-referential datives induce a telic interpretation of the verb phrase. They do require an object though, as there are no unergative verbs that can appear with co-referential datives in French. This makes them more like personal datives in non-standard English than like transitive aspectual SE or wholehearted telic SE (see Armstrong 2011; Boneh & Nash 2010; Campanini & Schäfer 2011; Horn 2008; Hutchinson & Armstrong 2009; Sanz 2000 for more details on the cross-linguistic data within Romance languages and non-standard English).

Finally, the most interesting cases that have been cited in the literature come from Modern Hebrew. These represent what might be considered the opposite end of the spectrum from Spanish. In Hebrew, there are some non-doubling reflexive datives that implicate the idea of (i) carefree-ness and (ii) impose an atelic restriction on the verb phrases that they appear with.

(76) a. Rani šavar lo xalonot le-hana’ato (Borer & Grodzinsky 1986: 186, ex 27c)
Rani broke to-him windows for-his-pleasure
‘Rani broke windows for pleasure’

---

105 Boneh & Nash (2010) cite the work of De Miguel & Fernández Lagunilla (2000) on Spanish, claiming that while sentences with *comerse* and *se manger* are superficially similar in both languages, the telicizing effect of *se* in Spanish is not present in French.
b. ha-po’alim, ’avdu lahem;
   the-workers worked to-them
   ‘The workers worked leisurely’

Borer & Grodzinsky (1986: 187) claim that the underlined pronouns in “behave as modalic operators, giving a clear imperfective flavor to the predicates with which they are associated.” Where Spanish has clitics that introduce the idea of ‘effort’ and ‘involvement’ while imposing a telic restriction on the verb phrases with which they combine, Hebrew adds an idea ‘carefreeness’ and imposes an atelic restriction on the verb phrases with which they combine. Note that unlike any of the languages we have seen thus far, reflexive datives in Hebrew may occur with unergative verbs as in (76b). We might think of the personal dative of American English and coreferential datives as somewhere in between Spanish and Hebrew. They still seem to impose an object restriction on the verbs they combine with, but add a notion closer to ‘enjoyment’ than ‘effort.’ The correlation between the nature of the conventional implicature added by these weak pronominal elements and their relation to telicity is that if their conventional implicature is related more to ‘effort’ or ‘involvement’, they impose a telic restriction on the verb phrase (Spanish) whereas if their conventional implicature is related more to ‘carefreeness’ and ‘enjoyment’, they impose an atelic restriction on the verb phrase. Non-standard English and French seem to be somewhere between these two poles. The main point of introducing these data is to show that there are a number of languages that have weak pronoun-like elements that have similar functions to wholehearted telic SE, thus this is not a type of Appl that has been introduced for the sole purpose of explaining Spanish data.
5.4.1.3 Wholehearted Telic SE: History

Let us now turn to the idea that wholehearted telic SE may become a part of a verb’s morphological make-up. Based on the Spanish data we saw in sections 5.3.2 and 5.4.1 there are two questions that arise: (i) do the subtly different types of transitive SE’s that apply to different subtypes of class 2 verbs represent stages of grammaticalization in the shift from Appl to v? and (ii) why do these different stages only exist for class 2 verbs but not class 1 verbs? My hypothesis is that the continuum of wholehearted telic SE and transitive aspectual SE constructions discussed in section 5.4.1 do represent stages in a grammaticalization process. I further hypothesize that this grammaticalization process is triggered by a combination of formal and conceptual information that can be used to explain why it only has applied to class 2 verbs and more specifically why it has further divided class 2 verbs into subtypes; that is, why there are stages that have affected different types of class 2 verbs based on their conceptual rather than formal content.

The data that lends preliminary support to this hypothesis is that in the historical record the oldest examples that we find of inherent SE in transitive sentences are all consumption verbs, mainly comer (eat), beber (drink) and tomar (drink). Some examples can be found as earlier as the 13th century in the texts of Alfonso X, El Sabio. The following ones are from the 16th century.

(77) a. Acuérdome, que después de haber comido la ración del pupilaje de Gálvez, [me comí seis pasteles de a ocho] en una pastelería excellentísima que había en el desafiadero. ‘I ate-SE six eight-peso cakes’
Vida del escudero Marcos de Obregón, Espinel, Vicente. (1587)

b. Orfeo Yo no te vi; que estabas escondido debajo de una higuera. Fabio Si yo fuera, dejaría el pie más limpio y más pulido, y [los higos más sucios me comiera]: mira que no soy yo, suéltame un poco. ‘The dirtiest figs I would eat-SE’
El marido más firme, Vega, Lope de. (1598)
(78) 
a. A cada bocado, [nos bebíamos una copita de aquel vino destilado]
‘We would drink-SE a glass of that distilled wine’
_Primer viaje alrededor del mundo_, Pigafetta, Antonio. (1507)

b. Después beberé, hermanos, porque [cuando me tomo del vino, desconciértome mucho]
y quizá si me emborracho, caerme aquí sobre vosotros, por el mucho desconcierto que tengo en bebello.
‘When I drink-SE wine, I lose myself’
_Relación de ceremonias y ritos y población y gobernación de los indios de la provincia de Michoacán_ (16th Century)

The second earliest group of verbs that appear with a use of transitive SE includes verbs of
learning like _leer_ (= read), _aprender_ (= learn) and _saber_ (= know). These can be found as early
as the 15th century but become more numerous in the 18th and 19th century. Some examples are
shown in (79).

(79) 
a. Macanaz fue uno de los más entusiastas admiradores del benedictino gallego: al haber
a las manos con agradabilísima sorpresa el primer tomo de sus obras, [se lo leyó en una
sola noche]; según se fueron publicando los otros gozó el mismo intelectual deleite
‘He read-SE it all in one night’
_Historia del reinado de Carlos III en España_, Ferrer del Río, Antonio (1843)

b. Así que [me aprendí el libro de memoria], se lo vendí á un baratillero de Granada que
pasó por aquí.
‘I learned-SE the book by heart’
_La Alpujarra: sesenta leguas á caballo precedidas de seis en diligencia_, Alarcón,
Pedro Antonio de (1862)

c. Y [como eso se lo sabe la Trini de memoria], como es naturá, le estará dando a usté
tormento la mar de veces al día.
‘Because that stuff la Trini knows-SE it by heart’
_Lo mejor de los dados_, Reyes, Arturo. (1888)

The other types of class 2 verbs and class 1 verbs appear to be more a modern phenomena and
they do not appear in the electronic historical records I have consulted (CORDE (the historical
database of the RAE) and Mark Davies’ _Corpus del español_) any earlier than the 20th century.
We can thus ask if it is coincidence that the three subtly different types of inherent SE that appear in transitive sentences have started to appear at different points in the historical record. Mainly, the verbs that have transitive aspectual SE (consumption verbs) are the ones for which these SE constructions have been used for the longest amount of time. The verbs that have a bleached version of wholehearted telic SE (learning verbs) are the ones for which these SE constructions appear after those of consumption verbs. Finally, the verbs that have wholehearted telic SE have not appeared earlier than the 20th century as far as I can tell. I propose that this is no coincidence and that it is indicative of a process whereby wholehearted telic SE no longer morphologically spells out an Appl head and simply becomes part of a verb’s morphology when that particular verb has a telic interpretation. This is shown schematically in (80).

(80) Historical Development of Transitive Aspectual SE

The stages of the reanalysis of the ApplWH head as v are described in table 5.2.
Table 5.2 Wholehearted Telic SE – Transitive Aspectual SE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage 1 – Wholehearted Telic SE</th>
<th>Stage 2 – “Bleached” Wholehearted Telic SE</th>
<th>Stage 3 – Transitive Aspectual SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE realizes an optional Appl head that requires a culminating event as its complement and introduces a subject-oriented implicature</td>
<td>SE realizes an optional Appl head that requires a culminating event as its complement but fails to introduce a subject-oriented implicature</td>
<td>SE realizes a particular v head that requires a culminating event as its complement – it is obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE is infelicitous in contexts that require lack of effort or interest on the part of the subject</td>
<td>SE is felicitous in contexts that require lack of effort or interest on the part of the subject</td>
<td>SE is felicitous in contexts that require lack of effort or interest on the part of the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE blocks the presence of other third person datives that encode notions such as benefaction, malefaction and possession</td>
<td>SE blocks the presence of other third person datives that encode notions such as benefaction, malefaction and possession</td>
<td>SE does not block the presence of other third person datives that encode notions such as benefaction, malefaction and possession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEMS: class 1 stems like romper, hundir, llenar; class 2 stems like barrer, preparar, bailar</td>
<td>STEMS: class 2 stems that denote events learning or internalization like leer, aprender and saber</td>
<td>STEMS: class 2 stems that denote events of consumption like comer, beber, tomar and fumar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance in historical record: Modern</td>
<td>Appearance in historical record: 15th – 19th century</td>
<td>Appearance in historical record: 13th – 16th century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This hypothesis is testable and falsifiable since the characteristics of each stage have been outlined and can be searched for in the historical record. Testing this hypothesis is something that is left for future investigation. The next question that we can address is why this process has selected (i) only class 2 verbs and (ii) has differentially affected distinct subtypes of class 2 verbs.

Let us start with the question of why the grammaticalization continuum only exists for class 2 verbs. An intuitive way of thinking about it is to propose that the grammaticalization of wholehearted telic SE is more likely for those verbs whose formal and conceptual properties can
more easily ‘absorb’ the main contributions of the Appl head that wholehearted telic SE realizes. 

Appl$_{\text{WH}}$ has two requirements: (i) its complement must be a culminating event (an AspP) and (ii) the $v$ selecting it must introduce an agent argument. Let us focus on the second requirement.

Note that the $v$ that selects class 1 VPs introduces an effector argument while the $v$ that selects class 2 VPs introduces an agent argument per the specifications on class 1 and class 2 stems. Because class 2 verbs meet the requirement imposed by Appl$_{\text{WH}}$ that there be an agent independently of whether or not this head is present, it makes sense that this class of verbs would be the most likely to absorb the semantic contribution of Appl$_{\text{WH}}$. For class 1 verbs, on the other hand, Appl$_{\text{WH}}$ is actually adding something that is not independently required by the $v$-$V$ complex: it is requiring the presence of external argument role that is not introduced by default for these verbs.

The next question to address is why consumption verbs and verbs of learning are special among class 2 verbs in that they are the only subtypes of class 2 verbs for which the grammaticalization of wholehearted telic SE to transitive aspectual SE has happened. That is, the fact that class 2 verbs require an agent argument does not seem to be the only factor contributing to the reanalysis of wholehearted telic SE as transitive aspectual SE. Studies on telicity have treated these verbs as their own special class of verbs that are often called incremental theme verbs or verbs of measuring out (Dowty 1991; Jackendoff 1996; Krifka 1989, 1992; Ramchand 2008; Tenny 1994). The names are meant to capture the idea that the extent of the object of the verb functions as a measuring stick of the progress of the event. Take the following sentence as an example.
The extent of the *six cakes* can be used as a way to intuitively understand the temporal progress of the eating event. Once the *six cakes* are gone, the event is over. The fewer the number of cakes, the less time transpires between the event initiation and termination. The same idea applies to any other event of literal consumption and verbs of internalization such as *leer* (= read). Other verbs could be conceptualized in the same way but it is the notion of the *extent* or *existence* of the object in the case of consumption that makes them the clearest examples of measuring out. In addition, the subject can be thought of as the entity that metaphorically moves through the object as the event progresses in the case of these verbs (Beavers 2010).

I propose that wholehearted telic SE appears first with these types of verbs and marks the idea that the event is one of *indulgence* for the subject or one in which the subject’s positive disposition or hyper involvement in the event led to it terminating in a time frame that is faster than what we would expect based on the nature of the object. This would explain the early tendencies for the objects of consumption verbs marked by SE to be things such as desserts, alcoholic beverages and whole animals. It would also explain the tendency to use colloquial phrases that function as temporal “compressors” such as *de una sentada* (= in one sitting), *en un santiamén* (= in the blink of an eye), marking the fact that the consumption event terminated in a time far less than we might expect based on the properties of the object that measure out the event. This can be seen both in historical examples and modern ones.
a. En Granada hay un convento y más de mil monjas dentro, con hábito colorado, [cien me como de un bocado].
   ‘I’ll eat-SE 100 in one bite’
   *Genio e ingenio del pueblo andaluz*, Caballero, Fernán. (1836)

b. Ah, pero ya están disponibles los 5 capítulos, me los estoy bajando todos, si me gusta
   el primero [me la veo de una sentada]
   ‘I’ll watch-SE it (= the whole series) in one sitting’
   http://www.ultimonivel.net/foro/index.php?topic=12158.0 (Modern)

The frequent use of SE in these contexts could simply be reanalyzed by the learner as a marker
of telicity. Once the idea that SE is contributing something to the disposition of the subject is
reinterpreted as a simple marker of telicity, then we would expect to see SE in cases that do not
involve any kind of indulgence or hyper involvement on the subject’s part. This is why we see
SE in “ordinary” telic situations with consumption verbs in modern Spanish.

We have argued in this section that there is ample evidence from other languages that
wholehearted telic SE is more than just a strange Appl head that can only be found in Spanish.
We then presented some preliminary evidence in favor of the idea that there is an historical
relation between wholehearted telic SE and transitive aspectual SE, offering the hypothesis that
the formal and conceptual properties of consumption verbs can most easily absorb the
contributions made by wholehearted telic SE. These verbs are thus the ones for which the change
from wholehearted telic SE to transitive aspectual SE has happened.

5.4.2 SE as “mismatched” v: Unselected Subjects

Another use of inherent SE that has received some important attention recently in Folli & Harley
(2005) is what we might call ‘unselected subject’ SE. The main function of this use of SE, as
argued in Folli & Harley (2005), is to mark that a particular verb takes a subject whose thematic
role is different from the one that is specified in the verb stem itself. Their data is from Italian and English, but for the most part the arguments transfer to Spanish. All of the examples involve consumption verbs that have inanimate causer subjects rather than agents. The following examples are taken from Basilico (2010), De Cuyper (2006) and Moreira & Butt (1996) (repeated from chapter 2).

(83)  

a. El mar *(se) come la playa  
The sea (SE.3s) eats the beach  
‘The sea eats the beach away’

b. Esta cama *(se) come toda la habitación  
This bed (SE.3s) eats all the room  
‘This bed eats up the entire room’

c. El orín *(se) come el hierro  
The rust (SE.3s) eats the iron  
‘Rust eats at iron’

d. El sol *(se) come la pintura  
The sun (SE.3s) eats the paint  
‘The sun eats away at the paint’

e. El sol *(se) ha bebido el lago  
The sun (SE.3s) has drunk the lake  
‘The sun drank up the lake’

What is interesting about this phenomenon in light of what has been argued thus far in this work is that it picks out precisely the subset of class 2 verbs that also appear with transitive aspectual SE: consumption verbs. No class 1 verbs show a similar phenomenon nor does any other subset of class 2 verbs. There are thus two questions that we want to answer in this section, which

---

106 The extensive study of Moreira & Butt (1996) has a few examples of inanimate subject with consumption verbs do not require se and this is also highlighted in De Cuyper (2006). I have not found a speaker that did not require SE for all of the contexts isolated by Folli & Harley (2005).
mirror the ones explored in section 5.4.1: (i) why does unselected subject SE only pick out only class 2 verbs and (ii) why does it pick out precisely those verbs that also admit transitive aspectual SE (consumption verbs)?

The first question has a relatively straightforward answer given the system we have been developing here. Unselected subject SE only marks that there is a mismatch of the following type: the stem selects an AGENT and a $v_{\text{EFF}}$ merges with that stem. It does not mark the reverse scenario in which a stem selects an EFFECTOR and a $v_{\text{AG}}$ merges with that stem. Since only class 2 verbs select AGENT and could contain a mismatch in the presence of $v_{\text{EFF}}$, it is only for these verbs that we would expect unselected subject SE to appear.

(84)  

a. El mar *(se) come la playa.  
   The sea (SE.3s) eats the beach  
   ‘The sea eats the beach away’

b. El viento *(se) rompió la ventana.  
   The wind (SE.3s) broke the window  
   ‘The wind broke the window’

The representation of the sentences in (84) is shown in (85).

(85)  

a. Representation of (84a)  

b. Representation of (84b)
In (85a), we see that $v_{EFF}$ must be spelled out when there is a mismatch between it and what percolates up from the stem. In (85b), we see that there is no mismatch for class 1 verbs so $v$ is not spelled out. Though it might be tempting to link unselected subject SE with transitive aspectual SE because both are uses of inherent SE that pick out roughly the same sets of verbs, it is not clear that this is an attractive move. For example, it is far from clear that SE in (83) is marking telicity in the same way that it does in the examples that we saw in section 5.4.1. The most common examples of unselected subject SE, as can be seen in (83), are understood as generic facts about certain forces of nature. I don’t see how any of the examples in (83) could be interpreted as telic or even if they have any kind of aspectual value at all. The simplest analysis of them is to assume that there is no Asp present in those examples and that SE marks the presence of an inanimate causer when these are merged with consumption verbs.

The second question is slightly more difficult to answer but it appears to have a ready explanation given what we have seen thus far in the chapter. First, we have to note that this is a relatively isolated phenomenon. For example, the appearance of unselected subject SE with any class 2 verb does not mean that any subject may appear for that verb. Even poets would struggle to accept the following sentences with SE, mainly because the only interpretation available for them is that of wholehearted telic SE, which essentially has the effect of personifying the inanimate causers by endowing them with a sense of ‘effort’ or ‘involvement’ in the action that they are ‘performing.’

(86) a. Las tormentas (*se) lavan la ciudad.
   The storms (SE.3s) washes the city
   ‘The storms wash the city’
b. Las estrellas (*se) bailan una danza cósmica.
The stars (SE.3s) danced a dance cosmic
'The stars danced a cosmic dance'

c. El viento (*se) pinta el cielo con formaciones de hojas voladores
The wind (SE.3s) painted the sky with formations of leaves flying
'The wind painted the sky with flying-leaf formations'

These data show that we must be clear that SE realizes only the mismatch between v:AG on the stem and \( v_{\text{EFF}} \) for consumption verbs. This is precisely what Folli & Harley (2005) claimed for Italian and English as well. This brings up the curious issue of why consumption verbs seem to be so special among other class 2 verbs when we look at uses of inherent SE. One possibility is that the frequent appearance of SE with consumption verbs and the grammaticalization that has occurred due to this frequent appearance has led to a situation where it realizes various types of \( v \), not just one that selects a culminating event. Unselected subject SE represents an additional stage in the spread of SE as the realization of the morphological make-up of consumption verbs.

Another possible way that we might understand these two uses of SE is as a morphological indication that this subtype of class 2 verbs may behave, in some sense, like class 1 verbs.\(^{107}\) We have seen that two of the defining characteristics of class 1 verbs are (i) use of inherent SE as an aspectually-sensitive morpheme (inchoatives) and (ii) the capacity to take inanimate causer subjects.

(87) **CLASS 1 VERB: romper**

a. Se rompió el vaso.
SE.3s broke the glass
'The glass broke'

---

\(^{107}\) I thank Cristina Cuervo for pointing out the similarities between inchoative *se* and transitive aspectual *se* and linking them with inanimate causer data.
b. El ruido rompió el vaso.
The noise broke the glass
‘The noise broke the glass’

When inherent SE marks consumption verbs, it is precisely these two functions that it has: (i) transitive aspectual SE is an aspectually-sensitive morpheme and (ii) unselected subject SE gives consumption verb stem the capacity to take an inanimate causer subject.

(88)  **CLASS 2 VERB: comer**

a. Ana se comió una galleta.
Ana SE.3s ate a cookie
‘Ana ate a cookie’

b. El mar se come la playa.
The sea SE.3s eat the beach
‘The sea ate the beach away’

Does this mean that when SE realizes v it indicates to the hearer that a class 2 verb is being used as a class 1 verb? Not entirely. Note that there is still a strong requirement that an external argument be present when the class 2 stem is used. That is, there is no inchoative for *comer*. Thus, the aspectually-sensitive use of inherent SE is still keyed to the requirements of class 1 and class 2 stems. I leave the intriguing possibilities that follow from this idea for future investigation.

**5.4.3 SE as “anti-passive” v: Class 2 Pronominal Verbs**

The final use of inherent SE that will be treated in this chapter concerns a second class of pronominal verbs. In section 5.3.2 we saw one class of pronominal verbs whose sole argument functioned as the theme of the verb. They were treated as a special type of obligatory inchoative. The examples from that section are repeated below.
(89)  a. *María acatarró a Pablo.
    María got-a-cold ACC Pablo
    Intended: ‘María gave Pablo a cold’

    b. Pablo *(se) acatarró.
    Pablo (SE.3s) got-a-cold
    ‘Pablo got a cold’

    c. una persona muy acatarrada
    a person very with-cold
    ‘a very sick person’ (lit. a person very with cold)

    d. ??Pablo se acatarró para no ir a la escuela.
    Pablo SE.3s got-a-cold to not got to the school
    Intended: ‘Pablo got a cold to not go to school’

There is a second type of pronominal verb whose sole argument functions like an agent rather
than a theme. Like the pronominal verbs from section 5.3.2, they cannot be used transitively and
they require the presence of SE. However, unlike these verbs, their sole argument cannot be the
argument of an adjectival passive and this argument can control into a purpose clause headed by
para.

(90)  a. *Ana contoneó una salsa.
    Ana swung-her-hips a salsa
    Intended: Ana hip-swung a salsa

    b. Ana *(se) contoneó.
    Ana (SE.3s) swung-her-hips-around
    ‘Ana swung her hips around’

    c. *una persona muy contoneada
    a person very with-contonea
    Intended: ‘a very swung-hips-around person’

    d. Ana se contoneó para impresionar a todos en el antro.
    Ana SE.3s swung-her-hips to impress everyone at the club
    ‘Ana swung her hips around to impress everyone at the club’
These verbs have received very little attention in the literature (Bogard 2006; Cano Aguilar 1999; Masullo 1992; Otero 1999; Sánchez 2002). As noted in Otero (1999) and Sánchez (2002), there is a tendency to simply say that all pronominal verbs are inchoatives (or unaccusatives) that lack a transitive counterpart but that this idea does not hold much water. Only verbs like *acatarrar-se* appear to be inchoatives while verbs like *contonear-se* do not.\(^{108}\) Some of these verbs are listed in (91).

(91) **Pronominal Verbs (Class 2):** *rebelarse* (rebel), *vanagloriarse* (boast/brag), *jactarse* (boast/brag), *quejarse* (complain)

I propose that for these particular verbs SE realizes a type of \(v\) that introduces an *agent* but lacks the ability to assign accusative case: \(v_{AG[-ACC]}\). The first kind of stem that may combine with this particular type of \(v\) is a verb like *contonearse*, which never takes any type of object. It has the feature specification of an unergative verb and it obligatorily combines with \(v_{AG[-ACC]}\). This is shown in (92).

\(^{108}\)Pronominal verbs themselves may be further divided up based on their prepositional complements (Cano Aguilar 1999) and also on the semantic type of their argument (agent, experiencer, theme). This is a notoriously difficult class of verbs that appears to not be unified by any particular easy-to-define property. Part of the motivation of this section is simply provide an analysis in terms of the class 1 versus class 2 distinction that has been made thus far.
A second type of verb that takes this particular v are verbs like *quejarse* (= to complain) and *jactarse* (= to brag). These verbs may take themes but because the v they combine with cannot assign accusative case, they must be marked with a preposition, *de*.  

\[(93)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. Me } & \text{ quejé de la clase.} \\
& \text{SE.1s I complained of the class} \\
& \text{‘I complained about the class’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. Juan se } & \text{jacta de su dinero.} \\
& \text{Juan SE.3s brags of his money} \\
& \text{‘Juan brags about his money’}
\end{align*}\]

\[109\] The anti-passive idea has been studied in a limited number of works, including Basilico (2010), Bogard (2006) and Masullo (1992). It is generally applied to transitive verbs with experiencer subjects that may express their internal arguments as oblique in the presence of *se*.

\[(i)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. Me } & \text{ olvidé de la clase} \\
& \text{SE.1s I forgot of the class} \\
& \text{‘I forgot about the class’}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{b. Juan se } & \text{lamenta de su mala suerte.} \\
& \text{Juan SE.3s brags of his bad luck} \\
& \text{‘Juan brags about his money’}
\end{align*}\]

There are two things worth mentioning about the Spanish anti-passive idea. First, this construction is very limited. Spanish does not have a productive anti-passive whereby any external argument can be suppressed and expressed as an oblique. This phenomenon is limited to a handful of verbs (I have seen only 3 or 4 cited in the work on it). It seems to be a sub-area of pronominal verbs as are the “alternations” that involve a transitive variant and oblique argument variant in which the verb is obligatorily marked by SE. In these cases, the verbs basically have different meanings and there is no alternation involved. This is also a sub-area of pronominal verbs.

\[(ii)\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{despedir – to fire} & \text{ despedirse de – to say goodbye} \\
\text{acordar – to agree} & \text{ acordarse de – to remember} \\
\text{empeñar – to pawn} & \text{ empeñarse en – to insist on} \\
\text{deshacer – to take apart} & \text{ deshacerse de – to get rid of}
\end{align*}\]

A second issue is that the presence of an oblique argument does not seem to uniformly pick out the class 2 pronominal verbs. There are various verbs that appear to behave more like class 1 pronominal verbs but may also take a prepositional argument. These include *arrepentirse de* (= to repent of) and *enterarse de* (= to find out about). The basic conclusion here is that the oblique arguments of pronominal verbs need a study of their own as does the entire class of pronominal verbs in Spanish.
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Some researchers have labeled these particular constructions ‘anti-passives’ (Bogard 2006; Basilico 2010; Masullo 1992). They are like anti-passives in that SE appears to be syntactically suppressing an object and forcing it to be realized with oblique case. However, calling them anti-passives does not seem completely right because these verbs are, for the most part, obligatorily pronominal and can only take oblique internal arguments. In languages that actually have anti-passives, the mechanism is productive, taking a transitive verb as its input and yields an unergative verb. Since the Spanish data presented here do not represent a productive phenomenon, I have put the label “anti-passive” in quotations. They are better understood as a subtype of class 2 verbs whose \( \nu \) cannot assign accusative case. What SE marks in this case is the inverse of Burzio’s generalization: the verb licenses an external argument but cannot assign accusative case.

\[\text{representation of (93a)}\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{\text{DP}_{\text{AG}}} \\
\text{\text{pro.1s}} \\
\text{v_{\text{AG}}[-\text{ACC}]} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{\text{[P:?,N:?]}} \\
\text{V} \\
\text{\text{PP}^{110}} \\
\text{\text{quej-<v_{\text{AG}}(P:TH)>}} \\
\text{P} \\
\text{\text{DP}} \\
\text{\text{de}} \\
\text{\text{la clase}}
\end{array}
\]

\[\text{110 Alternatively, this could be called a KP for “case phrase” where de is inserted as the case marker due to the lack of availability of accusative case.}\]
5.5 Summary

We began this chapter by introducing a term, ‘inherent SE’, and explaining how different uses of inherent SE actually are sensitive to the class 1 versus class 2 distinction that we motivated in chapters 2, 3 and 4. First, we defined inherent SE morphosyntactically as those uses of the reflexive clitic paradigm that inflect for the full range of person and number and cannot be doubled by a strong anaphoric pronoun *a sí mismo*. We then saw that there are three areas that inherent SE is sensitive to: aspect, thematic relations and case. It was argued that all uses of inherent SE are morphological realizations of either *v* or Appl and that the features of the stem will ultimately determine what the precise effects of SE are.

Class 1 verbs have inchoative SE, which realizes an expletive *v* that requires a culminating event as its complement. Class 1 verbs also take wholeheated telic SE, which realizes an ApplWhH head that requires a culminating event as its complement and adds a conventional implicature to the event that forces the introduction of an AGENT argument in order to be felicitous. These types of inherent SE are described in table 5.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Head it spells out</th>
<th>Stem it occurs with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative SE</td>
<td><em>v</em><em>\text{&lt;V-Asp&gt;</em>}</td>
<td>\text{STEM}_{&lt;\text{v:EFF}, \text{D:TH}&gt;}: romper (break), quemar (burn), secar (dry), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative SE (pronoun verbs)</td>
<td><em>v</em><em>\text{&lt;V-Asp&gt;</em>}</td>
<td>\text{STEM}_{&lt;\text{p, D:TH}&gt;}: acatarrarse (get a cold), ensimismarse (get lost in thought), etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholehearted Telic SE</td>
<td>ApplWhH\text{&lt;V-Asp&gt;_}</td>
<td>Any class 1 stem so long as it can take an agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Class 2 verbs have a wider range of inherent SE types, but this is coupled with limited productivity of these types of inherent SE within different sub-types of class 2 verbs. We saw in section 5.4.1 that wholehearted telic SE exists in a continuum with transitive aspectual SE. It was hypothesized in that section that wholehearted telic SE has been reanalyzed as a marker of telicity for some class 2 verbs, mainly verbs of consumption. In section 5.4.2 we saw that consumption verbs also admit a particular use of inherent SE that marks a mismatch between what the stem specifies with respect to the external argument and what the external argument actually is. SE appears when these verbs take inanimate causer subjects instead of agents. Finally we saw that for a class of pronominal verbs, SE marks a particular type of \( \nu \) that introduces an external agent argument but lacks the ability to assign accusative case. These uses of inherent SE are described in table 5.4.

Table 5.4 Inherent SE – Class 2 Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Head it spells out</th>
<th>Stem it occurs with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wholehearted telic SE – Transitive aspectual SE continuum</td>
<td>Appl(<em>{WhH}) (\rightarrow) (V</em>{AG}(D:AG, V-Asp))</td>
<td>(STEM_{\nu:AG,(D:TH)}&gt;: Appl_{WhH} lavar (wash), barrer (sweep))&lt;br&gt;(STEM_{\nu:AG,(D:TH)}&gt;: Appl_{WhH} leer (read), aprender (learn))&lt;br&gt;(STEM_{\nu:AG,(D:TH)}&gt;: V_{AG}(D:AG, V-Asp))&lt;br&gt;comer (eat), beber (drink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unselected Subject SE</td>
<td>(V_{EFF}(D:EFF,V))</td>
<td>(STEM_{\nu:AG,(D:TH)}&gt;: V_{AG}(D:AG, V-Asp))&lt;br&gt;comer (eat), beber (drink)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pronominal Verb SE (agentive, no accusative case)</td>
<td>(V_{AG(\neg ACC)}(D:AG, V))</td>
<td>(STEM_{\nu:AG}&gt;: contonearse (sway hips))&lt;br&gt;(STEM_{\nu:AG, P:TH}&gt;: quejarse (complain), jactarse (brag))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The different uses of inherent SE depend largely on what the features of v are. Class 1 verbs can combine with a v that introduces no external argument or one that does introduce an external argument. Thus, there is an inherent SE for both types of these structures with which class 1 verbs are compatible. Class 2 verbs can only combine with a v that introduces an external argument. We have seen that the range of uses of inherent SE for class 2 verbs spell out different feature combinations of the types of licit v’s that can combine with class 2 verbs. This chapter has used the class 1 versus class 2 distinction to outline a typology of inherent SE constructions that explains how they are united by certain morphosyntactic characteristics and also how they are divided by certain semantic characteristics. Since these uses of SE have been a major problem for both descriptive and theoretical research in Hispanic linguistics, I take this as a sign of the usefulness of the class 1 versus class 2 distinction as it has been motivated in the previous chapters of this work.
Chapter 6: The Class 1 and Class 2 Continuums

Let us briefly review what we have seen in the first five chapters and provide some closure to the main points before mentioning a few more general hypotheses regarding the class 1 versus class 2 distinction as well as some areas for further exploration. In chapter 1, the importance of the unaccusativity hypothesis as a milestone of grammatical investigation was highlighted and it was suggested that a distinction similar to the unaccusative – unergative one that underlies superficially identical intransitive verbs may also exist among a certain set of “alternating” transitive verbs. It was hypothesized that one class of alternating transitive verbs, class 1, are like unaccusatives in that they may omit their external argument but never their internal argument. Another class of alternating transitive verbs, class 2, are like unergative verbs in that they may omit their internal argument but never their external argument. Ideas like this have been amply explored in languages that have rich morphological marking of transitivity (like Yucatec Maya, section 1.4 and many other non-European languages – see Dixon & Aikhenvald 2000 for details) but have not received too much attention in European languages outside of English (Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002; Levin 1999). The motivating force behind the study that followed was dictated by a common generative axiom, which could stated as “what we see in one language exists covertly in another.” I took this as a valid reason to explore the idea that different kinds of alternating transitive verbs exist in Spanish, a language that has received almost no attention in this regard. The goal was to uncover some grammatical properties of the language for which we had little knowledge or no explanation and that could be derived from assuming that there are
different kinds of alternating transitive verbs in this language. This is precisely what I hope to have shown in chapters 2 – 5.

In chapter 2 I outlined a set of diagnostics that allow us to clearly distinguish two kinds of alternating transitive verbs in Spanish. Those properties are repeated in the summary table from chapter 2 below as table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Properties of Class 1 and Class 2 Transitive Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Class 1 Transitive Verbs</th>
<th>Class 2 Transitive Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inchoative SE</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hacer</em> causatives without embedded subjects (multiple interpretations?)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unintentional Causer Datives</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participles: modifiers <em>bien</em> and <em>muy</em> – multiple interpretations (event and degree)?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object Omission</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE &amp; Telicity: does aspectually-sensitive use of SE require an external argument?</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thematic role of external argument (Agent only?)</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was argued that the properties in table 6.1 could be explained under a single broad generalization. In very basic terms, class 1 verbs always require the presence of an internal argument and can, in some circumstances, appear without an external argument. Class 2 verbs, on the other hand, always require the presence of an external argument can, in some circumstances, appear without an internal argument.

In chapter 3 we formalized this generalization in terms of the formal and interpretative features that appear on the stems that are inserted as V’s and give rise to class 1 and class 2
verbs. Class 1 verbs take a DP complement that is interpreted as a theme, which we represented as the formal:interpretative pair D:TH. They also contain information regarding the types of \( v \) that they are compatible with. The label \((v:\text{EFF})\) was intended as a way of capturing the fact that the external argument could be given an underspecified role called effector, which encompasses a range of external arguments including agents, instruments and inanimate causers. The parentheses around \( v:\text{EFF} \) were meant to capture the idea that these verbs always require a \( v \), but that the \( v \) position can be semantically empty. That is, it can be filled with an expletive. The expletive \( v \) that can appear with class 1 verbs is morphologically realized by the reflexive clitic paradigm, which gives inchoatives their morphological signature in Spanish. Class 2 verbs also take a DP complement but, unlike class 1 verbs, this complement can be syntactically absent. In order to capture this we represented this particular formal:interpretative pair as \((D:TH)\). The parentheses in this case are meant to capture the fact that the internal argument position of these verbs may be filled by an expletive \( N \) that incorporates into the verb and gives rise to the interpretation that there is an implicit, prototypical object. Class 2 verbs also specify what type of \( v \) they are compatible with. The label \( v:\text{AG} \) was meant to capture the fact that these verbs require a \( v \) that introduces an agent predicate that is saturated by whatever the external argument is. The lack of parentheses around \( v:\text{AG} \) indicates that it cannot be filled with an expletive element. We then used this system to explain why class 1 verbs have inchoatives and related constructions (ambiguity under causatives and unintentional causer datives) while class 2 verbs appear in object omission constructions.

In chapter 4 I argued that the system proposed in chapter 3 provides a straightforward way of accounting for some of the asymmetries that we see with respect to the participles of both
class 1 and class 2 verbs. The main generalization that was highlighted in the chapter was that the condition imposed on verbal syntax by the feature specifications on stems also applies to adjectival forms derived from class 1 and class 2 verbs. Adjectives derived from class 1 verbs always take a theme argument. There are two kinds of adjectives that are built from class 1 stems: (i) adjectival passives are de-verbal adjectives that contain an implicit event and agent and (ii) simple adjectives are property-denoting expressions that take a degree argument and a theme. Adjectives derived from class 2 verbs either have an implicit agent or take an agent argument as required by the verbal stem from which they are derived. Unlike class 1 verbs, class 2 stems do not productively have simple adjectives that take a degree argument and a theme. It was argued that this is due to the fact that these stems generally require the presence of an agent. Finally, in chapter 5 I argued that the model introduced in chapter 3 provided an intuitive way of capturing various uses of inherent SE, perhaps one of the most difficult aspects of Spanish grammar. The overall proposal is that inherent SE can be understood as a use of the reflexive clitic paradigm that is the morphological realization of a kind of applicative (Appl) or as a morphological realization of different flavors of v per the requirements of certain stems. The main point of this chapter was to show that inherent SE is far from a random idiosyncratic morpheme that has some vague reflexive-like meaning attached to it. It was shown that the types of inherent SE constructions out there can be clearly understood in terms of how class 1 and class 2 verbs interact with the v head that licenses the external argument.

In the remaining sections of this chapter I offer some concluding remarks taking into consideration what we have seen in chapters 1 – 5. In section 6.1 I discuss class 1 verbs in terms of a continuum that includes unaccusative verbs and discuss some areas of future research
associated with this superclass of intransitive and transitive verbs. In section 6.2 I discuss class 2 verbs in terms of a continuum that includes unergative verbs and discuss some areas of future research associated with this superclass of intransitive and transitive verbs. Finally, in section 6.3 I discuss some open questions and theoretical puzzles that arise as a consequence of what we have seen here.

6.1 Class 1 as a Continuum

Throughout this work we have focused mainly on alternating transitive verbs and compared them with intransitive verbs. Alternating class 1 verbs permit their external argument to be omitted, and thus have an intransitive variant whose sole argument is an internal argument, like an unaccusative verb. In (1) – (3) we see a class 1 transitive verbs (1), the intransitive alternates of class 1 transitive verbs (2) and unaccusative verbs (3).

(1)  a. El niño rompió la ventana.
     The child broke the window
     ‘The child broke the window’

     b. Los piratas hundieron el barco.
     The pirates sank the boat
     ‘The pirates sank the boat’

(2)  a. La ventana se rompió
     The window SE.3s broke
     ‘The window broke’

     b. El barco se hundió.
     The boat SE.3s sank
     ‘The boat sank’

(3)  a. El niño nació.
     The child was born
     ‘The child was born’
The structures for (1) – (3) are shown in (4).

(4) Representation of Class 1 Transitives/Intransitives and Unaccusatives

a. Class 1 Transitives (1b)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{Los piratas v}^\text{EFF} \quad \text{VP} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{hund}^\text{(v:EFF,D:TH)} \quad \text{el barco}
\end{array}
\]

b. Class 1 Intransitives (2b)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{vP} \\
\text{v} \quad \text{AspP} \\
\text{se} \quad \text{Asp} \\
\text{VP} \\
\text{hund}^\text{(v:EFF,D:TH)} \quad \text{el barco}
\end{array}
\]

c. Unaccusatives (3b)  

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{VP} \\
\text{V} \quad \text{DP} \\
\text{lleg}^\text{(D:TH)} \quad \text{el barco}
\end{array}
\]

Clearly, there appears to be a structural link between class 1 verbs and unaccusatives. I would like to propose that class 1 transitive verbs and unaccusatives form a superclass of stems that can be thought of as a continuum that is defined by different formal:interpretational feature pairs that are found on stems that all share the obligatory D:TH feature. Where stems differ within this continuum is how they specify their compatibility with the presence of an external argument or an expletive v. I claim that the following range of stems is what minimally defines this continuum.
At one end of the continuum we have non-alternating verbs. These may be unaccusatives like \textit{llegar} (= arrive) that can never be transitive and pronominal verbs like \textit{ensimismarse} (= get lost in thought) that can never be transitive and require the presence of an expletive \textit{v}. There are then two kinds of alternating verbs. The first is one that we have not mentioned in this dissertation but one for which is there is ample evidence. Some stems in Spanish can be either unaccusatives like \textit{llegar} (= arrive) or inchoatives like \textit{romper-se} (= break) or \textit{hundir-se} (= sink). The verb \textit{morir} (= die) is one such example. In (5), we see that \textit{morir} can be used as an unaccusative (5a) or as an inchoative (5b) in which case it takes inchoative SE and must be interpreted as a telic event.

\begin{equation}
\begin{align}
\text{(5a)} & \quad \text{Murieron soldados (en esa guerra).} \\
& \quad \text{Died soldiers (in that war)} \\
& \quad \text{‘Soldiers died (in that war)'} \\
\text{(5b)} & \quad \text{Se murieron *(dos) soldados del escuadrón.} \\
& \quad \text{SE.3s died (two) soldiers of the squadron} \\
& \quad \text{‘Two soldiers in the squadron died’}
\end{align}
\end{equation}

Other stems like \textit{morir} (= die) include \textit{caer} (= fall) and \textit{ir} (= go). For these stems, I propose that they have a expletive \textit{v} feature in parentheses that tells the syntax that they are compatible with the expletive \textit{v} that merges with inchoatives and pronominal verbs even though this is not necessary for these stems to converge at the interfaces. Finally, the second type of alternating verb is the one that has been our main focus thus far: those stems that require an internal
argument and also an expletive v or one that introduces an EFFECTOR role to the external argument.

The idea of a superclass that comprises both unaccusatives and class 1 verbs opens a slew of new areas to explore since it allows us to use this model and apply to other types of verbs such as de-adjectival changes of state like *engordar* (= fatten) and *aclarar* (= clear), positional verbs like *sentarse* (= sit down) and *acostarse* (= lie down), verbs of directed motion like *ir* (= go), *venir* (= come) and *subir* (= go up/ascend) and verbs that alternate between unaccusatives and transitives like *hervir* (= boil). We have not looked at any of these types of verbs here and this is one area of future research that seems to be quite promising. Let us briefly look at some of the areas that could be explored. First, consider de-adjectival verbs like *engordar* (= get fat/fatten). These verbs may all be used intransitively, their sole argument being an internal argument.

(6) El cochino engordó.  
The pig fattened  
‘The pig got fat’

If this were the only use of a verb like *engordar* we would classify it as an unaccusative like *llegar*. However, there is a range of variation across dialects with respect to how *engordar* can be used. For some speakers, it may be used transitively as in (7a) while for others such a reading can only be obtained through periphrastic causativization as in (7b).

(7)  
a. El campesino engordó al cochino.  
The farmer fattened ACC the pig  
‘The farmer fattened up the pig’

b. El campesino hizo engordar al cochino.  
The farmer made fatten_INF ACC the pig  
‘The farmer fattened up the pig’
Even more interesting is that for some speakers the verb may be used as an inchoative when the argument is a human as shown in (8).

(8)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. El cochino \(\text{se}\) engordó.  
\text{The pig SE.3s fattened}  
\text{‘The pig got fat’}
\item b. Mi papá \text{se} engordó  
\text{The pig SE.3s fattened}  
\text{‘My dad got fat’}
\end{enumerate}

The full range of possible structures that we see in (4) can all appear with the same de-adjectival verb. What needs to be done is to investigate the variation associated with these different uses of verbs like *engordar* and also to figure out why the presence of a human argument enables the presence of the inchoative in examples like (8b) for some speakers.

Positional verbs such as *sentar(se)* (= sit) and *acostar(se)* (= lie down) constitute another understudied class of verbs that fit nicely into the class 1 continuum. Many of them are characterized by an inchoative-like use (9a) and a transitive use (9b).

(9)  
\begin{enumerate}
\item a. María \text{se} sentó.  
\text{María SE.3s sat-down}  
\text{‘María sat down’}
\item b. Juan sentó a María.  
\text{Juan sat-down ACC María}  
\text{‘Juan seated María/sat María down’}
\end{enumerate}

These verbs have a complicating factor though. Note that in the inchoative-like use in (9a), María is an internal argument and she undergoes a change of position. However, there is also an animacy requirement that is imposed on this argument by the meaning of the verb itself and this gives us a sense that María is not an ordinary *theme* but rather a *theme* that has participated in
bringing about the change of position that has affected her. We need to take the special nature of
the theme of these verbs into account when integrating these verbs into the class 1 continuum.

Verbs of directed motion like *ir* (= go), *venir* (= come), *salir* (= leave), *subir* (= go up) and
*bajar* (= go down) also show a number of interesting alternations that fit into the class 1
continuum as it is represented in table 6.2. Some of these verbs may be used as either
unaccusatives or inchoatives as we see in (10).

(10) a. Tere subió al techo.
  Tere went-up to the roof
  ‘Tere went up to the roof’

  b. Tere se subió al techo.
  Tere SE.3s went-up to the roof
  ‘Tere went up to the roof’

These verbs are much more challenging because the difference between the unaccusative and the
inchoative is not always readily translatable into English. Most research on these verbs has
associated the presence of SE with a source of motion (De Cuyper 2006; De Miguel &
Fernández Lagunilla 2000; Masullo 1992; Sánchez 2002) and linked its presence to telicity.
What is clear is that since telicity for verbs of directed motion involves bounded spatial paths, we
will need to come up with an explanation for role of SE that takes this into account. An
additional factor that must be considered here is that sometimes the internal argument of these
verbs (= the theme of the change of location) also has some agentive qualities due to the fact that
this argument is generally animate and has volition. There is still very little known about how
these particular alternations should be accounted for.

Finally, there is series of verbs like *hervir* (= boil) (see fn. 63 on p. 139 for more details)
including *aumentar* (= increase) and other de-adjectival change of state verbs that appear to
alternate between unaccusatives and transitives. The main difference between these verbs and the others mentioned above is the intransitive variant doesn’t carry a special marker like SE.

(11) a. Ana hirvió el agua.
    Ana boiled the water
    ‘Ana boiled the water’

    b. El agua hirvió.
    The water boiled
    ‘The water boiled’

These verbs must be classified differently than class 1 verbs since they do not have inchoatives. That said, their intransitive forms clearly situate them within the class 1 continuum. More work is needed to identify what the properties of these verbs are and how to best characterize their alternations.

What I would like to highlight is these types of alternations are all expected within the possible types of the class 1 continuum. The objective for future research is thus to try to get an idea of what types of alternations characterize a broader range of verbs and then find out what it is about these alternations that might make them unique but more importantly how they are all part of a superclass of alternating verbs that can be broadly defined as class 1 verbs, or verbs that always require an internal argument.

6.2 Class 2 as a Continuum

We have characterized class 2 verbs as exhibiting the opposite behavior of class 1 verbs with respect to the external – internal argument distinction that defines basic transitive relations. Instead of requiring an internal argument and optionally permitting the omission of the external argument, class 2 verbs require an external argument and optionally permit the omission of their
internal argument. Thus, they can be thought of transitive verbs that have intransitives alternates that are like unergatives. In (12) – (14) we see class 2 transitive verbs (12), intransitive variants of class 2 transitive verbs (13) and unergative verbs (14).

(12) a. Juan comió pan.
    Juan ate bread
    ‘Juan ate bread’

    b. María leyó el libro.
    María read the book
    ‘María read the book’

(13) a. Juan comió (toda la tarde)
    Juan ate (all the afternoon)
    ‘Juan ate (all afternoon)’

    b. María leyó (toda la tarde)
    María read all the afternoon)
    ‘María read (all afternoon)’

(14) a. Juan nadó
    Juan swam
    ‘Juan swam’

    b. María trabajó
    María worked
    ‘María worked’

(15) Representation of Class 2 Transitives/Intransitives and Unergatives

a. Class 2 Transitives (12b)       b. Class 2 Intransitives (13b)       c. Unergatives (14b)
The link between class 2 transitive verbs and unergatives seems as intuitive as the one between class 1 transitive verbs and unaccusatives. I propose that there is a second continuum of verbs that comprises the class 2 stems we have seen and unergatives. This superclass of verbs revolves around the stable formal:interpretational pair \( v:AG \). All of these verbs require the presence of a particular type of \( v \) that introduces an AGENT predicate that is saturated by the external argument. The differences between verbs in the continuum can be found in how they specify information regarding their internal argument.

### Table 6.3 Class 2 – Continuum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-alternating Verbs</th>
<th>Alternating Verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \text{STEM}_{v:AG} )</td>
<td>( \text{STEM}_{v:AG,(D:TH)} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{STEM}_{v:AG,(P:TH)} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At one end of the spectrum we have unergative verbs like \( \text{trabajar} (= \text{work}) \) and \( \text{nadar} (= \text{swim}) \) that only require an external argument. At the other end we have class 2 transitive verbs that may take a DP internal argument and pronominal verbs that take prepositional internal arguments like \( \text{quejarse} (= \text{complain}) \), which we saw in section 5.4.3. There are many areas of future research that will help further our understanding of the class 2 continuum. Some of them are outlined in this section.

The first involves investigating the idea the all unergative verbs are underlying transitives (Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002). This would essentially mean that the class 2 continuum would be comprised entirely of alternating transitive verbs that take different kinds of internal arguments. On this view, verbs that appear to be intransitive like \( \text{trabajar} (= \text{work}) \) and \( \text{nadar} (= \text{swim}) \) are
thought to have implicit internal arguments. There is ample preliminary evidence for exploring this idea. Note that both of these unergative verbs may take internal arguments as shown in (16).

(16)  
a. Trabajaste este ensayo muy bien.  
You worked this essay very well  
‘You put a lot of work into this essay’

b. Nadamos tres largos.  
We swam three laps  
‘We swam three laps’

In fact, nearly any unergative can be used transitively in the right context as shown in the following example.

(17) Ese rico tose monedas de oro.  
That rich guy coughs coins of gold  
‘That rich guy coughs up golden coins’

The work that needs to be done is to investigate classes of verbs so as to determine what kinds of objects they can take. For example, manner of motion verbs like caminar (= walk), correr (= run), cojear (= limp) and nadar (= swim) all take distances as objects. Other class 2 verbs take objects that can only be understood based on the meaning of the verb itself such as jugar (= play).

(18) Jugamos un partido de fútbol.  
We played a game of soccer  
‘We played a game of soccer’

Other verbs appear to take objects that are nominal cognates of the verb itself such as reír – risa (laugh) and llorar – llanto (cry). Some of these examples are shown in (19).
(19) Unergative Verbs (Spanish)

a. Juan rió una risa malvada.
   Juan laughed an laugh evil
   ‘Juan laughed an evil laugh’ (= He laughed in an evil way)

b. Juan lloró el llanto de un niño
   (Mendikoetxea 1999: 1621)
   Juan cried the cry of a child
   ‘Juan cried a child’s cry’ (= He cried like a child)

Finally, other class 2 verbs like reír (= laugh), in addition to taking a cognate object, may also take a prepositional object in the presence of SE. This is shown in (20).

(20) Me reí de Juan.
    SE.1s I laughed at Juan
    ‘I laughed at Juan’

Thus, a verb like reír can appear in all of the possible constructions within the class 2 continuum. A brief comment is in order with respect to the cognate objects mentioned above. It is often assumed following Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) that cognate objects represent a phenomenon that only applies to unergative verbs (our class 2). However, it has been shown in a variety of works (for example, Perel'tsvaig 1999; Nakajima 2006) that all cognate object phenomena cannot simply be accounted for by saying there is a root-identical noun in the internal argument position of the verb. First, both unergative verbs and unaccusative verbs take cognate objects in many languages, including English and Spanish.

(21) Unaccusative Verbs (English, see Nakajima 2006)

a. John fell a short fall (from the tree).
b. Poe died an agonizing death.
(22) **Unaccusative Verbs** (Spanish, see Campos 1999)

a. El clavidista cayó una caída elegante (desde la quebrada)
   The diver fell a fall elegant (from the cliff)
   ‘The diver fell a graceful fall’

b. Antonio murió en el hospital una muerte piadosa.
   Antonio died in the hospital a death compassionate
   ‘Antonio died a compassionate death in the hospital’

It has been shown in Mendikoetxea (1999a) that none of these objects passivize while Pereltsvaig (1999) has shown that in Russian the accusative case that these cognate objects receive is adverbial case rather than structural case. In my view, the main function of cognate objects in both unergative and unaccusatives is to act as a morphosyntactic crutch for an adjective (or other nominal modifier) that functions like an adverb. Note that without such a modifier, none of the sentences sound very natural. Thus, the best explanation of sentences like (21) and (22) in Spanish is that the adjectives (or prepositional phrases) need to modify the verb but cannot in the absence of a noun. The role of the cognate noun is to support the modifier morphosyntactically. These adjectives represent an alternative to using adverbs to modify the verb. The view of cognate objects espoused in Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002), though very attractive for some verbs, is probably not the best characterization of all cognate object phenomena and of *all* unergative verbs.

A second area of future research would involve sharpening the notion of *AGENT* that has been associated with the external argument of class 2 verbs. We saw that class 1 verbs admit a range of external arguments and for this reason we proposed, following Koontz-Garboden (2009) and Van Valin & Wilkins (1996), that the *v* with which these verbs combine introduces an underspecified *EFFECCTOR* rather than an agent. There are verbs from the class 2 continuum that
have external arguments that are not volitional agents. These include unergative verbs that
describe some bodily processes such as estornudar (= sneeze), roncar (= snore) and toser (=
cough).

(23) Estornudé tres veces.
I sneezed three times
‘I sneezed three times’

The sentence in (23) has an involuntary source rather than an agent. We have not explicitly
attempted to capture the nature of these external arguments and integrate them into our proposal
for class 2 verbs.

6.3 Additional Open Questions and Puzzles

In this section I will explore some open questions that do not have a very clear cut path to a
definitive answer. The first question concerns the possibility that some stems can exist in both
the class 1 and class 2 continua. We already explored the idea that inherent SE may be
marking such a shift when it appears with consumption verbs in chapter 5. One verb that appears
to be a candidate for the simultaneous existence in both continua is dormir (= sleep). In
Spanish, this verb can mean either put/fall asleep or simply sleep. When it means put/fall asleep
it functions like a class 1 verb: it has both a transitive and an inchoative and when it means sleep
it is an unergative that can take an internal argument in some circumstances.

(24) Dormir as CLASS 1

a. Dormí al niño.
I put-to-sleep ACC.the child
‘I put the child to sleep’

111 The reflexive transitive dormirse as in ‘Me dormí a mí mismo’ (= I put myself to sleep ≈ ‘I hypnotized myself’) is
also included here (Strozer 1976).
b. Se durmió el niño.
   SE.3s fell-asleep the child
   ‘The child fell asleep’

(25) *Dormir* as **CLASS 2**

a. Dormí toda la tarde.
   I slept all the afternoon
   ‘I slept all afternoon’

b. Dormí una siesta muy larga.
   I slept a nap very long
   ‘I took a very long nap’

The reason this question is interesting is because it allows us to see both the flexibility of verb meaning but also the limits of that flexibility. As far as I know, there are few verbs like *dormir* in Spanish that are flexible enough to be able to appear in both the class 1 and class 2 continuums. Most verbs are flexible within the limits of the continuum they are in based on their feature specification. If we find more and more verbs like *dormir*, then we would gain support for a more radical neo-constructionist view of argument structure like that of Borer (2005). However, if we find that verbs are flexible only within the continuum in which they exist, a more conservative view of the specification of the number and nature of arguments, where limits are imposed on how many types of syntactic constructions a given stem may appear in, would seem to be the more attractive view.

A second area pertains to how exhaustive these two continuums are. We have limited ourselves to a handful of clearly alternating ‘action’ verbs in this dissertation. We have also mentioned other classes of verbs in sections 6.1 and 6.2 that might easily be accommodated within one of the two continuums that have been proposed here. What about obligatorily transitive verbs or verbs that denote states or psychological experiences? Do these verbs also fall
within one of the two continuums or do they form separate classes that have their own properties that militate against including them in the class 1 continuum or the class 2 continuum? For example, take a verb like *matar* (= kill). This verb is obligatorily transitive, so we have no alternations to use as evidence for including it one continuum or the other. One popular view is that *matar* is a class 1 verb and that its intransitive use is blocked by the existence of *morir* (= die). We can actually see the relation between the two verbs in passives. For some speakers there is a strong preference to avoid the passive *ser matado* (= ‘be killed’) and use the participle of *morir* (= *ser muerto*, lit. ‘be dead’) instead, as shown in (26).

(26) Un fugitivo fue muerto a tiros en la puerta de su casa.
A fugitive was dead by shots in the door of his house
‘A fugitive was shot to death at his doorstep’ (= was killed)

In other cases, however, the evidence is not so clear. Take verbs of impact like *patear* (= kick), *tocar* (= touch) and *golpear* (= hit). These verbs are also obligatorily transitive but it is less clear where they belong in the continuum. These verbs are classified as class 2 verbs because they require agents. I have not outlined diagnostics for these types of verbs in Spanish that would allow us to clearly assign them to one continuum or another. This is something that must be investigated in more detail in the future.

Finally, we have not mentioned transitive verbs that describe states, both physical and psychological, like *amar* (= love), *contener* (= contener) and *saber/conocer* (= know). We briefly mentioned the equivalents of ‘know’ in Spanish in chapter 5 when discussing uses of inherent SE, but the main question is whether all stative verbs are class 2 verbs or whether there exists the same type of separation between two types of continuums within these verbs as well. Again,
without a set of clear diagnostics that would allow us to support treating stative verbs as members of one continuum or another or as a completely separate class of verbs, I cannot say one way or the other what the answer to this question is. The objective for future research would be to come up with a similar set of diagnostics like the ones we saw in chapter 2 and use these as the base upon which to answer this question.

I will end this dissertation in a similar place to where it started. We saw at the beginning of chapter 1 that both unaccusatives and unergatives have been treated as underlying transitive relations by Chierchia (2004) and Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002) respectively. These views propose that surface intransitivity results from a grammatical mechanism applying to a transitive relation and effectively eliminating its external argument or its internal argument. If the external argument is eliminated, we get an unaccusative whereas if the internal argument is eliminated we get an unergative. In this dissertation I have looked at two kinds of alternating verbs and concluded something similar to each of these views for these particular verbs. That is, class 1 transitive verbs are transitive relations that are marked as acceptable inputs to a syntactic operation that effectively eliminates their external argument (an expletive v may merge with them). Class 2 verbs are transitive relations that are marked as acceptable inputs to a syntactic operation that effectively eliminates their internal argument (an expletive N may merge as their complement).

In this chapter we have established a link between class 1 verbs and unaccusatives by placing both of them within a continuum in which alternations are possible around an internal argument core. Some stems can only appear in an unaccusative structure, while others may appear as unaccusatives or inchoatives and others may appear as inchoatives or transitives. The
idea of a class 1 continuum thus distances itself from the proposal that all unaccusatives (and inchoatives for that matter) are derived from an underlying transitive relation as Chierchia (2004) has proposed. On the other hand, I have also proposed that the alternating class 2 verbs treated in this dissertation form a natural relation with unergative verbs and that these are part of separate continuum. What unites the verbs in this continuum is a stable external argument and a variable internal argument. We saw that the nature of the verbs in class 2 continuum appears to support Hale & Keyser’s (1993, 2002) analysis of unergatives since nearly all verbs in this continuum can take some kind of internal argument. The conclusion that the class 2 continuum is simply a pool of transitive verbs that take different kinds of objects appears very plausible. The question is why does the view that all unaccusatives and inchoatives are underlying transitives appear far more difficult to uphold?\footnote{I thank María Cristina Cuervo for commenting on this important aspect of the proposal.} The question can be rephrased as “why is it harder to add external arguments to verbs that don’t normally have them than it is to add internal arguments to verbs that don’t normally have them?”

I believe the answer to this question lies in the fundamental asymmetry between external and internal arguments that has formed such an important part of both semantic and syntactic studies of the verb phrase (Davidson 1967; Kratzer 1996; Marantz 1984; Parsons 1990). By separating the external argument from the verb syntactically, we have a possible answer as to why the class 1 continuum cannot be characterized as a bunch of transitive verbs that can surface as transitives or intransitives. The variation among class 1 verbs can be understood in terms of the different kinds of $v$ that these stems are compatible with. Some of them are incompatible with $v$ while some only take an expletive $v$ while others take a $v$ that introduces an external argument.
predicate. The lack of syntactic separation between internal arguments and the verb means that this argument is licensed in a different way. For class 2 verbs, the internal arguments are licensed as complements and thus they are often at the mercy of the verb itself as far as interpretation goes. This might explain why we see so much variability with respect to the omission of these arguments and the forms they take (see Levin 1999 for more on this). Thus, the differences between the class 1 and class 2 continuums are ultimately reflections of the different ways in which external and internal argument are licensed within the core vP.

I will end here in hopes that what has been presented in the preceding chapters will be of use to those working on argument structure in Spanish and other languages and that further research can be done in order to strengthen or re-work the hypotheses that appear in this work.
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