

Argument Structure and Argument Realization

Víctor Acedo-Matellán, Jaume Mateu, and Anna Pineda

16.1 Introduction

Argument structure can be defined from a semantic or a syntactic perspective. On the semantic side, argument structure is a representation of the central semantic participants in the eventuality (event or state) expressed by the (verbal) predicate.¹ On the syntactic side, argument structure is a hierarchical representation of the arguments required by the predicate that determines how they are expressed in the syntax.

There are currently two different theoretical approaches to argument structure: the projectionist one, which is typically adopted in lexicalist frameworks (see Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2005 and Wechsler 2015, among others), and the constructivist/neo-constructionist one, which is assumed in non-lexicalist frameworks (see Borer 2005 and Acedo-Matellán 2016, among others). According to the former perspective, the syntax of argument structure is claimed to be projected from the lexical meaning of the (verbal) predicate. According to the latter perspective, by contrast, argument structure is provided with a configurational/syntactic meaning that is independent from the conceptual contribution of the lexical (verbal) root and is constructed outside the lexicon.

In the paradigmatic projectionist proposal put forward by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995), two levels of lexical representation are postulated: event structure and argument structure. The former is a lexical-semantic level that provides a structural semantic decomposition of lexical meaning (e.g., see (1a) for the lexical-semantic structure of the verb *break*, which can be read as *the action of x causes y to become broken*), whereas the latter is a

¹ For reasons of space, in this chapter we will basically deal with what is known as *verbal* argument structure (for a recent overview, see Marantz 2013).

lexical-syntactic level that encodes the number of arguments selected by a predicate and the hierarchy that can be established among them (e.g., compare the external argument *x* and the internal argument *y* in (1b)). *x* will then be projected in syntax as a DP subject external to the verbal phrase, while *y* will be projected internally to it as a DP object.

- (1) a. [[X ACT] CAUSE [Y BECOME <BROKEN>]]
 b. *x* <*y*>

In projectionist frameworks argument structure alternations have been claimed to affect event structure via morphosemantic operations and/or argument structure via morphosyntactic operations. For example, according to Sadler and Spencer's (2001) lexicalist framework, the active-passive alternation in (2), which is analysed in (3), only affects the lexical-syntactic level of argument structure, i.e., (1b). In (3b), the suppression of the external argument is notated by means of parentheses: (*x*). The suppressed external argument can be expressed in the syntax with an adjunct PP (*per en Marc* 'by Marc').

(2) **Catalan**

- a. En Marc va trencar el vas.
 DET Marc AUX.PST.3SG break.INF the glass
 'Marc broke the glass.'
- b. El vas va ser trencat (per en Marc).
 DET glass AUX.PST.3SG be.INF broken (by DET Marc)
 'The glass was broken (by Marc).'

- (3) a. [[X ACT] CAUSE [Y BECOME <BROKEN>]] : event structure
x <*y*> : argument structure
 En Marc va trencar el vas
 Subject Object : syntax
- b. [[X ACT] CAUSE [Y BECOME <BROKEN>]] : event structure
 (*x*) <*y*> : argument structure
 El vas va ser trencat (per en Marc)
 Subject Oblique : syntax

On the other hand, in the Minimalist Program the formation of argument structures and argument structure alternations should be treated entirely within the syntax proper (i.e., outside the lexicon) via the same Merge and Move operations which construct any syntactic constituent (see Harley 2011 for an overview of some minimalist approaches to argument structure). As a result, the notion of 'mapping' from lexicon to syntax or the 'linking' of arguments used in projectionist accounts of argument realization has no meaning in this second approach; instead the mere syntax of argument structure narrows down possible semantic interpretations of predicates and arguments. For example, proponents of minimalist neo-constructionist approaches claim that the structural meaning in (1a) that

corresponds to (2a) can be read off a syntactic configuration such as that depicted in (4). The dynamic light verb (cf. Chomsky's 1995 causative little *v*) subcategorizes for a Small Clause (SC) whose inner predicate is the result state *TRENCAT* 'broken' and its internal subject is *el vas* 'the glass'. The idiosyncratic or encyclopaedic meaning is provided by the root $\sqrt{\text{TRENC-}}$, which is incorporated into the null light verb providing it with phonological content (see Hale and Keyser 1993).²

(4) [VoiceP Marc [_{VP} V_{DO} [_{SC} *el vas* $\sqrt{\text{TRENC-}}$]]]

In some current syntactic approaches to argument structure the alleged primitive predicate *CAUSE* in (1a) has been claimed to be read off a syntactic configuration where an activity verb selects a Small Clause (e.g., Zubizarreta and Oh 2007; Cuervo 2015). The external argument *Marc* is argued to be introduced by an upper functional head called *Voice* (Kratzer 1996; Harley 2013). Following Marantz (2013), the set of argument-introducing heads can be divided into *Voice* and so-called applicative heads (see Section 16.4), on the one hand, and prepositional heads, on the other. The *Voice* and applicative heads place the added argument syntactically above the phrase to which they add an argument. In contrast, prepositions add an argument below the phrase to which they attach (e.g., see Svenonius 2007). Finally, as for the passive alternant in (2b), in a non-lexicalist proposal such as that put forward by Embick (2004), the syntactic formation of the eventive passive involves an additional functional phrase *Asp(ectual)P* just above an agentive *VoiceP* (see Embick 2004 for details).

In Section 16.2 we deal with the well-known distinction among intransitive verbal predicates (unaccusatives vs unergatives) in the context of Romance linguistics. In Section 16.3 we offer a review of the crucial role of the Romance clitic *se* in argument structure and argument realization. Section 16.4 provides an overview of datives in various Romance languages. In Section 16.5 we show why these languages have a prominent place in the huge literature on the so-called lexicalization patterns. Section 16.6 contains some concluding remarks.

16.2 Unaccusativity and Unergativity

One of the most important hypotheses formulated in the syntactic literature on argument structure is the so-called *Unaccusative Hypothesis*, initially formulated by Perlmutter (1978) in the Relational Grammar framework and later developed by Burzio (1981; 1986) in the Government and

² See also Mateu (2002), Mateu and Espinal (2007), Ramchand (2008), and Acedo-Matellán and Mateu (2014), among others, for the important distinction between syntactically relevant structural/compositional meaning and syntactically irrelevant conceptual/idiosyncratic meaning.

Binding framework (cf. also Section 17.4.2). According to this hypothesis, intransitive verbs (or clauses; see Perlmutter 1978) can be classified into two classes on the basis of the status of their argument: the argument of *unergatives* is just like the subject of transitives, whereas the argument of *unaccusatives* is more like an object in important respects, though it may look like a subject on the surface. Two different D(eep)-structure configurations are attributed to them by Burzio (1981; 1986): unergative verbs such as It. *telefonare* ‘phone’, *lavorare* ‘work’, *dormire* ‘sleep’, etc. occur in the syntactic frame in (5a), while unaccusative verbs such as It. *arrivare* ‘arrive’, *uscire* ‘go out’, *morire* ‘die’, etc. enter into the configuration in (5b), where [_{NP} e] expresses an empty NP subject. An important single split is represented in (5): unergatives have an external argument (i.e., the NP is *external* to VP), while unaccusatives have their argument internal to VP.

- (5) a. [_{NP} [_{VP} V]]
 b. [[_{NP} e] [_{VP} V NP]]

Perlmutter (1978) and Burzio (1981; 1986) argue that the grammatical behaviour of unaccusative verbs/clauses, which can be diagnosed by means of morphosyntactic tests such as BE-selection (cf. also Sections 4.3.1, 18.3, 21.2.2.2) or *ne*-cliticization in Italian (see below for other ‘unaccusativity diagnostics’), can be explained in a uniform way by postulating an underlying structure in which their surface subject originates in an internal argument position (see 5b). Burzio argues that the pattern of auxiliary selection in Italian is parallel to that of the distribution of *ne*-cliticization, and that it reflects the different D-structure configurations of unaccusative verbs (see 5b) vs unergative ones (see 5a). Unaccusative verbs select the auxiliary *essere* ‘be’, while non-unaccusatives (i.e., both unergatives and transitives) select the auxiliary *avere* ‘have’. Burzio (1986: 30) points out that ‘*ne*-cliticization is possible with respect to all and only direct objects’ and defines unaccusative verbs as those verbs whose subject can be replaced by the direct object clitic *ne*. Two related facts are then accounted for: first, the contrast between unergatives (e.g., *telefonare* ‘phone’) in (6a) and unaccusatives (e.g., *arrivare* ‘arrive’) in (6b) (note that Burzio renamed Perlmutter’s unaccusatives as ‘ergatives’) and, in addition, the parallelism between the unaccusative subject in (6b) and the transitive object in (6c). As expected, *ne*-cliticization fails if the pronominalized NP is in subject position (see, e.g., 6d and 6e). Finally, as pointed out by Perlmutter, it seems more convenient to use ‘unaccusative’ as applied to structures (or clauses) rather than to verbs; for example, the passive construction can also be analysed as unaccusative (cf. 6f and 6b).³

³ Related to *ne*-cliticization in Italian, French, and Catalan, another test that has been put forward as an unaccusative diagnostic in Spanish (see Treviño 2003) is that the partitive phrase *de todo* ‘of everything’ can only occur as subject of unaccusatives (i.a) and object of transitives (i.b). In contrast, unergatives do not admit it (i.c).

(6) Italian

- a. **Ne hanno telefonato tre.
 PART= have.3PL phone.PTCP three
 (cf. Hanno telefonato tre ragazze)
 have.3PL phone.PTCP three girls)
 'Three of them have phoned.'
- b. Ne sono arrivate tre.
 PART= are.3PL arrive.PTCP.FPL three
 (cf. Sono arrivate tre ragazze)
 are.3PL arrive.PTCP.FPL three girls)
 'Three of them have arrived.'
- c. Ne hanno comprato tre.
 PART= have.3PL buy.PTCP three
 (cf. Hanno comprato tre macchine)
 have.3PL buy.PTCP three cars)
 'They have bought three of them.'
- d. **Tre ne sono arrivate.
 three PART= are.3PL arrive.PTCP.FPL
 'Three of them have arrived.'
- e. **Tre ne hanno {comprato due macchine / telefonato}.
 three PART= have.3PL buy.PTCP two cars phone.PTCP
 'Three of them have {bought two cars/telephoned}.'
- f. Ne saranno comprate molte (di macchine).
 PART= be.FUT.3PL buy.PTCP.FPL many (of cars)
 'Many of them will be bought.'

Burzio (1986: 55f.) formulates the following rule in (7) for *essere* 'be' assignment:

- (7) The auxiliary will be realized as *essere* when a binding relation exists between the subject and a nominal contiguous to the verb (where 'a nominal contiguous to the verb' is a nominal which is either part of the verb morphology, i.e., a clitic, or a direct object).

Despite its important merits, Burzio's syntactic account based on distributional arguments and binding principles has been said to be problematic due to some shortcomings (see, for example, Centineo 1996 for a critical review). For example, consider the relevant data in (8b) and (8d), taken from

Spanish

- (i) a. {Llega / cae / queda / muere...} de todo.
 arrives falls remains dies of everything
- b. {Compra / mata / construye...} de todo.
 buys kills builds of everything
- c. **{Duerme / brilla / suena...} de todo.
 sleeps shines rings of everything

Lonzi (1985) and revisited by Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 276f., ex. 106–07). These data have been claimed to be counterexamples to Burzio's (1986) claim that ergative (i.e., unaccusative) verbs are the only monadic verbs that admit *ne*-cliticization of their argument. Following Lonzi (1985), Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 275) point out that a variety of verbs that take the auxiliary *avere* 'have' do permit *ne*-cliticization, but only when they are found in a simple tense; *ne*-cliticization is not possible when these verbs are found in a complex tense in which the auxiliary is expressed. Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995: 277) conclude that 'phenomena said to involve "surface unaccusativity" [...] are not unaccusative diagnostics strictly speaking, but rather to a large extent receive their explanation from discourse considerations'.

(8) **Italian**

- a. **Di ragazze, *ne* hanno lavorato molte nelle fabbriche di Shanghai.
of girls, PART=have.3PL work.PTCP many in.the factories of Shanghai
- b. Di ragazze, *ne* lavorano molte nelle fabbriche di Shanghai.
of girls PART=work.3PL many in.the factories of Shanghai
'There are many girls working in the factories of Shanghai.'
- c. **Di ragazzi, *ne* hanno russato molti nel corridoio del treno.
of boys PART=have.3PL snore.PTCP many in.the corridor of.the train.
- d. Di ragazzi, *ne* russavano molti nel corridoio del treno.
of boys, PART=snored.3PL many in.the corridor of.the train
'There were many boys snoring in the corridor of the train.'

One could claim that Levin and Rappaport Hovav's (1995) remark on Italian only holds for imperfective tenses, since these can be regarded as the most appropriate for expressing habitual activities. However, the following triplet from Centineo (1996: 230f. n. 6) shows that this is not the case, since in the synthetic preterite these alleged unergative verbs are also compatible with *ne*-cliticization; see (9c).

(9) **Italian**

- a. Ce *ne* nuota tanta di gente, in quella piscina.
there= PART= swims much of people in that pool
'Lots of people swim in that swimming pool.'
- b. ??Ce *ne* ha nuotato molta di gente in quella piscina.
there= PART= has swum much of people in that pool
- c. Ce *ne* nuotò molta di gente in quella piscina.
there= PART= swam much of people in that pool
'Lots of people swam in that swimming pool.'

Note that the ungrammaticality of (8a, 8c) and (9b) is actually predicted by Burzio's (1986) correlation between *ne*-cliticization and unaccusativity. Indeed, there is some evidence that points to the fact that the constructions in (8) and (9) are unaccusative. *Avere* would not then be the expected auxiliary

in (9b) if the Italian existential construction in (9) turns out to be unaccusative. In this sense Centineo's (1996: 231 n. 6) remark can also be said to be relevant: 'it must also be added that some of the native speakers consulted about these data attempted to use *essere* as the auxiliary for <(9b)>.' Still, if one assumes that the construction in (9) is unaccusative, one wonders why *essere*-selection is not possible. This requires further research.

Furthermore, as pointed out by Rigau (1997), Catalan also offers evidence for the unaccusative status of existential constructions like (8b) and (8d). A well-known generalization in Romance is that bare NP plurals cannot be postverbal subjects of unergative verbs in free inversion contexts (e.g., see 10b) and are only possible as postverbal subjects of unaccusatives (e.g., Cat. *Venen nois* lit. 'come boys (= there come some boys)') or as direct objects of transitive verbs (e.g., Cat. *Les drogues maten nois* 'Drugs kill boys'). Given this, the existential construction in (10c) should be unaccusative. As expected, the postverbal bare subject in (10c) is pronominalized by partitive *ne*; see (10d).

(10) **Catalan**

- a. Els nois canten.
the boys sing.3PL
- b. **Canten nois.
sing.3PL boys
- c. (En aquesta coral) hi canten nois.
in this choir LOC= sing.3PL boys
'There are boys singing (in this choir).'
- d. (En aquesta coral), (de nois) n'hi canten molts.
in this choir of boys PART=LOC= sing.3PL many.
'There are many boys singing (in this choir).'

Rigau (1997) and Mateu (2015) argue that in existential constructions like (10c) or (10d) the obligatory locative marker *hi* 'there' can be analysed as a quirky subject (see also Torrego 1989; Masullo 1992a; and Fernández Soriano 1999 for related locative and dative constructions in Spanish). However, things turn out to be more complex. For example, Italian examples like the ones in (11), taken from Maling, Calabrese, and Sprouse (1994), do not involve any surface locative element. These authors point out that (11a) is possible only on a very specific reading, namely, many people are calling in one specific place relevant to the speaker. A similar comment could be said to be appropriate for (11b). Alternatively, temporal phrases like *la domenica* 'on Sunday' in (11a) or *domani* 'tomorrow' in (11b) can be claimed to play an important role as well. The relevant conclusion seems to be that a spatio-temporal element is compulsory in the syntactic structure in order to license these existential constructions.

(11) **Italian**

- a. Ne telefonano molti, di tifosi, la domenica!
 PART= phone.3PL many of fans on Sunday
 'Lots of fans ring on Sundays!'
- b. Domani ne parleranno molti.
 tomorrow PART= will.speak.3PL many
 'Tomorrow many of them will be speaking.'

As pointed out by Rigau (1997; 2005) and Mateu and Rigau (2002), a clearer piece of evidence for the unaccusativity of the existential constructions in (10c) and (10d) can be found in some north-western varieties of Catalan where there is no agreement between the indefinite argument *nois* 'boys' and the verb (cf. also Section 26.4.3); see (12b). Indeed, the lack of agreement in (12b) would be unexpected if the bare plural NP were the subject/external argument of an unergative verb/construction (cf. the unaccusativity of the example in 13b).

(12) **North-western Catalan**

- a. Els nois canten.
 the boys sing.3PL
- b. (En aquesta coral) hi canta nois.
 in this choir LOC= sings boys
- c. (En aquesta coral), (de nois) n'hi canta molts.
 in this choir of boys PART=LOC= sings many

- (13) a. Venen nois. (CCat.)
 come.3PL boys
- b. Ve nois. (NWCat.)
 come3SG boys

Drawing on Hale and Keyser's (1993) configurational theory of argument structure, Mateu and Rigau (2002) claim that the syntactic analysis of the agentive unergative structure in (12a) is the one depicted in (14a), whereas that of the existential unaccusative structure in (12b) is the one shown in (14b).

- (14) a. $[_{VP} \text{ Els nois } [_{V_{DO}} \sqrt{\text{CANT}}]]$
 b. $[_{VP} \sqrt{\text{CANT-V}_{BE}} [_{PP} \text{ hi } [_{P_{CCR}} \text{ nois}]]]$

Following Hale and Keyser (1993), the formation of unergative verbs can be argued to involve incorporation of a nominal (or a simple root, e.g., $\sqrt{\text{CANT}}$'s[on]g'), which occupies the complement position in (14a), into an agentive null light verb (v_{DO}). The formation of the unaccusative argument structure in (14b) is quite different, since a null light verb v_{BE} subcategorizes for a Small Clause-like PP as complement. The preposition that expresses a Central Coincidence Relation (P_{CCR}) in (14b), which can be claimed to be crucial when dealing with possessive relations (see Hale and Keyser 2002: ch. 7 and Real-Puigdollers 2013, among others), is conceived of as a

birelational element that relates a possessor (*hi* ‘there’) with a possessee (*nois* ‘boys’).⁴ The same sort of element has been argued to be involved in impersonal existential constructions with HAVE such as Fr. *il y a*, Sp. *hay*, and Cat. *hi ha* ‘there is’ (see Rigau 1997, among many others, for the proposal that HAVE = BE + P). The main difference between these constructions and (14b) is that the latter involves an additional conflation of the root $\sqrt{\text{CANT-}}$ with the null light verb. For two prominent SC-based analyses of existential constructions, see Hoekstra and Mulder (1990) and Moro (1997), among others.

It is important to point out that, besides syntactic accounts, there are also semantic approaches to unaccusativity. For example, a very influential approach is that pioneered by Antonella Sorace and her colleagues, who take systematic linguistic variation to suggest that unaccusativity is determined by a semantic notion whose components are organized along a (proto)typicality scale ranging from core to periphery. Sorace (2000; 2004) argues that a more nuanced descriptive approach than a simple two-way split (unaccusative vs unergative) is needed in order to account for the attested variation. In particular, she shows that in Italian some intransitive verbs (e.g., telic change of location verbs like *arrivare* ‘arrive’ or agentive process verbs like *lavorare* ‘work’) select an auxiliary more categorically than other verbs (e.g., atelic change of state verbs like *fiorire* ‘blossom’ or continuation of state verbs like *durare* ‘last’). The former are called ‘core’ verbs, while the latter are called ‘non-core’ verbs. To account for these facts, Sorace puts forward the A(uxiliary) S(election) H(ierarchy) in (15; cf. also Section 4.3.1). According to her, verbs at the BE end of the ASH are core unaccusatives and express telic change, whereas verbs at the HAVE end are core unergatives and express agentive activity in which the subject is unaffected. In contrast, intermediate verbs between the two extremes incorporate telicity and agentivity to lesser degrees, and tend to have a less specified (basically stative) event structure. Furthermore, core verbs are claimed to be those on which native grammaticality judgements are maximally consistent, and are acquired early by both first and second language learners. In contrast, intermediate verbs are shown to be subject to cross-linguistic differences and exhibit gradient auxiliary selection preferences.

- (15) Auxiliary Selection Hierarchy (ASH)
- | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| CHANGE OF LOCATION | selects BE | least variation |
| CHANGE OF STATE | | |
| CONTINUATION OF A PRE-EXISTING STATE | | |
| EXISTENCE OF STATE | | |
| UNCONTROLLED PROCESS | | |
| CONTROLLED PROCESS (MOTIONAL) | | |
| CONTROLLED PROCESS (NON-MOTIONAL) | selects HAVE | least variation |

⁴ See Rigau (1997; 2005) for the claim that the locative clitic *hi* ‘there’ acts as an impersonalizer in (14b).

Sorace claims that the cross-linguistic variation found, for example, between Italian and French depends on the location of the relevant cut-off point along the ASH in (15). In particular, the main cut-off point in Italian can be claimed to be drawn just below the lexical-semantic class expressing ‘existence of state’ (e.g., It. *esistere* ‘exist’ selects BE), whereas the main cut-off point in French can be drawn further up in the scale in (15) (e.g., Fr. *exister* ‘exist’ selects HAVE).

Sorace’s work on the ASH has influenced other accounts such as the O(ptimality) T(theory) proposals by Legendre and Sorace (2003) and Legendre (2007). These OT accounts are especially valuable since the authors try to argue for a unified analysis of the morphosyntactic ingredients (e.g., the reflexive clitic) and the semantic factors (e.g., telicity, stativity, or control) involved in auxiliary selection in French. In order to deal with systematic BE-selection in reflexive constructions the authors posit a constraint against linking morphosyntactic reflexives as unergatives. This crucially outranks all the semantic constraints, ensuring that reflexives will always select BE, no matter what their semantics. Despite their descriptive merits, the formal limits on the semantic ingredients involved in auxiliary selection are not provided by Sorace (2000; 2004).⁵ See Loporcaro (2015) for a recent criticism of semantic approaches to auxiliary selection such as those put forward by Sorace (2000; 2004) and Aranovich (2003).

Finally, besides the two important unaccusativity diagnostics reviewed above (auxiliary selection and *ne*-cliticization), it should be noted that there are other tests that have also been claimed to be relevant when distinguishing unaccusatives from unergatives. For example, unaccusatives can enter into absolute participle constructions, whereas unergatives cannot (see, for example, Legendre 1989; cf. 16a and 16b). The well-formedness of (16a) and (16c) shows a parallelism between the subject of unaccusatives and the direct object of transitives: *el dictador* ‘the dictator’ is the internal argument in (16a) and (16c), but not in (16b), where it is the external argument.⁶

⁵ Sorace (2000: 861) is aware of this non-trivial problem, noting that ‘there are some important questions that I do not attempt to address. First, the reader will not find an explanation of why particular semantic components are more crucial to the selection of particular auxiliaries than others.’ For an attempt to solve this problem, see Mateu (2002; 2009), who claims that meaning components like the ones in (15) are relevant precisely because these notions can be filtered into the abstract *relational* semantics associated with the unergative and unaccusative syntactic argument structures as they are understood in Hale and Keyser’s (2002) proposal of I(exical)-syntax.

⁶ See also De Miguel (1992) for the claim that a further aspectual restriction is relevant in Spanish: only telic unaccusative verbs (e.g., *llegar* ‘arrive’, *desaparecer* ‘disappear’) can enter into these participial constructions, whereas atelic unaccusative verbs (e.g., *existir* ‘exist’, *permanecer* ‘remain’) cannot: cf. Sp. *Una vez [desaparecidos/*existidos] los dinosaurios, ...* ‘Once the dinosaurs disappeared/existed, ...’

(16) Spanish

- a. Una vez muerto el dictador, ya hubo más libertad.
 one time die.PTCP the dictator, already existed more freedom
 ‘Once the dictator was dead, there was already more freedom.’
- b. **Una vez hablado el dictador, no hubo más libertad.
 one time speak.PTCP the dictator, not existed more freedom
- c. Una vez depuesto el dictador, ya hubo más libertad.
 one time oust.PTCP the dictator, already existed more freedom
 ‘Once the dictator was ousted, there was already more freedom.’

To conclude this section, it is worth pointing out that an important theoretical debate revolves around whether unaccusativity (and argument structure, in general; see Section 16.1) is a property of verbs, as argued by proponents of projectionism, or rather of constructions/structures, as argued by proponents of neoconstructionism/constructivism (see Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2005; Marantz 2013; Mateu 2014; Acedo-Matellán 2016: ch. 2), for relevant discussion of these two theories of the lexicon–syntax interface).

16.3 The Clitic *se*

In this section we deal with the clitic *se*, concentrating on its use in alternations: the transitive–unaccusative alternation usually called *causative alternation*, the transitive–transitive or intransitive–intransitive alternations (*telic* or *aspectual se*), and, very briefly, the object/oblique alternation (*antipassive se*).

In Romance languages, the anticausative counterpart in the causative alternation often features the clitic *se*, as in (17). This change of state unaccusative variant alternates with the transitive counterpart, as in (18):

- (17) La copa de vi s’ ha trencat. (Cat.)
 the glass of wine *se* has break.PTCP
 ‘The wine glass has broken.’
- (18) Un convidat ha trencat la copa de vi. (Cat.)
 a guest has break.PTCP the glass of wine
 ‘A guest has broken the wine glass.’

The theoretical relevance of the morphological marking of anticausatives has been and still is a widely discussed topic in Romance linguistics. Several notions have been claimed to be involved in the presence or absence of *se*, such as low/high spontaneity (a notion that has also been connected to a verb’s *causalness*, in the sense that verbs with a relatively low spontaneity

are more likely to be used as causatives, and less likely as anticausatives), external/internal causation, or telicity.⁷ As a matter of fact, in the examples above one can see that the verb ‘break’ denotes a telic event which has a low degree of spontaneity, since in order for something to break an external force is needed (external causation); therefore its anticausative use is somehow less expected and Romance languages tend to mark it, as in (17). At the same time, Cat. *trencar* ‘break’ has a high degree of causalness, and thus its causative use is not marked in (18) – on the contrary, the prediction is that Romance verbs with a poor degree of causalness, such as ‘grow’, which designates an atelic, generally internally-caused event and thus expectedly used as intransitive (19), will be marked when used causatively, as shown by its embedding under ‘make’ in (20).

- (19) Les plantes han crescut. (Cat.)
 the plants have grow.PTCP
 ‘The plants have grown.’

- (20) El sol fa créixer les plantes. (Cat.)
 the sun makes grow.INF the plants
 ‘The sun makes the plants grow.’

All in all, it seems that, even if some cross-linguistic tendencies exist and languages normally use the marked and unmarked variants according to certain semantic distinctions, SE does not have the same semantic effect on all verbs, as many differences and mismatches across and within languages still remain. The Romance family is not an exception to this. For example, Balearic Catalan dispenses with the clitic with some verbs (21b), which do need the clitic in other dialects (21a). Similar variation is found in Spanish (22), either dialectal or idiolectal, depending on the case. Finally, variation is also found in French, apparently linked to slightly different meanings, as shown in (23):

- (21) a. Ella s’ ha engreixat més que tu. (Cat.)
 she SE has fatten.PTCP more than you
 ‘She has put on more weight than you.’
 b. Ella ha engreixat més que tu. (Bal. Cat.)
 she has fatten.PTCP more than you
 ‘She has put on more weight than you.’

⁷ See Abrines (2016), Fontich (2021) for Catalan; Mendikoetxea (1999) for Spanish; Labelle (1992), Labelle and Doron (2010), Doron and Labelle (2011) for French; Folli (2002; 2014) for Italian; and Haspelmath (1993; 2006; 2008), Alexiadou (2010), Haspelmath et al. (2014), and Heidinger (2015) for a cross-linguistic perspective.

- (22) María (se) adelgazó mucho aquel verano. (Sp.)
 María (SE) lose.weight.PRT much that summer
 'María lost a lot of weight that summer.'

(23) **French**

- a. Les branches de l' arbre ont cassé.
 the branches of the tree have break.PTCP
 'The branches of the tree have broken.'
- b. Le vase s' est cassé.
 The vase SE is break.PTCP
 'The vase has broken.'

Another interesting case in point are French prefixed anticausatives, which are normally marked with SE regardless of any other semantic consideration. Compare, for example, *s'agrandir* 'extend' vs *grandir* 'increase', both of them expressing atelic change of state events but only prefixed *s'agrandir* being marked with SE.

In view of examples such as the ones above, Schäfer (2008), Martin and Schäfer (2014), and Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer (2015) argue against such a systematic connexion between the conceptualization of events and the presence of SE, and consider instead that the presence of SE on an individual anticausative verb is to a large extent idiosyncratic (i.e., lexically stored).

The discussion of the morphological marking of anticausatives is also connected to another issue of theoretical relevance: the derivational relation, if any, between the causative and the anticausative alternants. Two major approaches exist (for an overview see, for example, Haspelmath 1993 and Alexiadou, Anagnostopoulou, and Schäfer 2006). Under a *causativization* hypothesis, the intransitive (anticausative) alternant is the basic one, whereas the causative form is derived by adding an external argument to a predicate which would be monadic (Lakoff 1968; 1970; Dowty 1979; Williams 1981; Brousseau and Ritter 1991; Pesetsky 1995). On the contrary, the *detransitivization* perspective considers the anticausative alternant to be inherently dyadic (i.e., bieventive predicate), although it lacks the explicit external argument as a result of the lexical process of detransitivization (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995; Reinhart 2000; 2002; and also Chierchia 1989/2004). All in all, it is again the case that languages show huge variation in this regard, so that neither account seems to be better than the other in general terms. However, if we focus on Romance languages, the fact that anticausatives are generally marked (with SE) could suggest that the transitive alternant is the basic one in these languages: that is to say that under a derivational approach to the causative alternation, the derived counterpart will be more complex, since it requires an additional operation, and in this

regard the frequent morphological marking (qua morphological complexity) of Romance anticausatives would match with their alleged derived status.

Many authors have observed that, beside its appearance in anticausative constructions, which marks them as intransitive, *se* is also involved in alternations involving either two transitive (cf. 24) or two intransitive alternants (cf. 25):⁸

- (24) La Llúcia {ha/s'ha} menjat un albercoc. (Cat.)
 the Llúcia {has/*se*=has} eat.PTCP an apricot
 'Llúcia has {eaten/eaten up} an apricot.'

- (25) {Han/se han} caído dos hojas. (Sp., based on Cuervo 2015: 408)
 {have/*se*=have} fall.PTCP two leaves
 'Two leaves have {fallen/fallen off}.'

As pointed out by De Cuyper (2006: 131), facts like those in (24) and (25) pose a *prima facie* obstacle for a unifying analysis of *se*, since they challenge the early claims that the reflexive pronoun is a valency-reducing morpheme withholding accusative case and the subject theta-role (cf. Burzio 1986: 408). To circumvent this problem, early studies considered this kind of *se* optional (see De Cuyper 2006: 132–35), a position that no one would defend nowadays. Other authors have on the contrary investigated what *se* could teach us about the nature of case. For example, Rigau (1994) argues that in *se*-constructions like that in (24), *se* absorbs partitive case, which would explain why in these constructions the object must bear accusative case: in Rigau's terms, it cannot be a non-definite, i.e., a mass singular or a bare plural, a claim later subsequently questioned (e.g., Barra Jover 1996; Todolí 1998). More recently, Armstrong (2013) argues, for a subset of cases like (24) in Spanish, that *se* is licensed by incorporation, rather than case.

Case assignment is, however, not the main issue that constructions like (24) and (25) invite us to explore. Most authors have rather focused on the contribution that *se* makes to the aspectual interpretation of the predicate, both in transitive and in intransitive cases, which is why this *se* has often been dubbed *aspectual* or *telic*. The latter label is due to the claim that *se*-constructions such as those in (24) and (25) are obligatorily telic (partly

⁸ With respect to the extension of aspectual *se*, at least in transitive cases like (24), De Cuyper (2006: 130f.) reports that it is found in Spanish, Catalan, Italian, Romanian, and, although more dialectally and diastatically constrained, also in French, though it is absent from Galician and Portuguese. This distribution partly explains why most studies on aspectual *se* have been carried out on Spanish and, to a lesser extent, Italian. The preponderance of Spanish will be reflected in the works surveyed here.

disputed: see Armstrong 2013; MacDonald 2017), and, relatedly, that the internal argument must be definite, specific or bounded:

- (26) La Llúcia s' ha menjat {un albercoc / **melmelada d' albercoc}
 the Llúcia SE= has eat.PTCP an apricot jam of apricot
 en un minut. (Cat.)
 in one minute
 'Llúcia has eaten up {an apricot/**apricot jam} in one minute.'

The endeavour to provide a natural structural analysis of telicity and other semantic dimensions of aspectual SE has shed considerable light on the structure of the VP, and is in tune with the increased attention that the formalization of the syntax–semantics interface has received in the last two decades within generative syntax. While the first analyses emphasized the lexical nature of the association between the verb and aspectual SE (Nishida 1994; Zagona 1996; De Miguel and Fernández Lagunilla 2000), other analyses emerging in the wake of minimalism applied the mechanism of feature-checking to formalize the telicizing effect of SE (Sanz 2000; Sanz and Laka 2002). As more articulated proposals on the syntactic representation of event structure became available (Travis 2000; Borer 2005; Ramchand 2008; MacDonald 2008), authors came up with new ways of accommodating SE in the configuration while explaining the aspectual effects and other semantic effects, like agentivity/non-agentivity (Folli and Harley 2005; De Cuyper 2006; Boneh and Nash 2011; Armstrong 2013). For instance, Folli (2001: 127f.) observes that, added to certain intransitive and aspectually ambiguous sentences like (27a), SE (It. *si*) renders them obligatorily telic, as shown in (27b). She then proposes that *si* is a lexicalization of an eventive head, V, encoding the notion of process, while the verb (*fuso* 'melted') lexicalizes a lower eventive head of resultative semantics, providing an end result for the event and, thereby, telicity (see 28, from Folli 2001: 133, an analysis of 27b):

- (27) **Italian**
 a. Il cioccolato è fuso in / per pochi secondi.
 the chocolate is melt.PTCP in during few seconds
 'The chocolate has melted in/during a few seconds.'
 b. Il cioccolato si è fuso in / **per pochi secondi.
 the chocolate SE is melt.PTCP in during few seconds
 'The chocolate has melted down in/*during a few seconds.'

- (28) $[_{VP} \text{ il cioccolato } [_{V'} V = si \text{ } [_{RVP} \text{ il-} \cancel{\text{cioccolato}} \text{ } [_{RV'} RV = fuso]]]]$

Other analyses in which SE realizes an eventive V-type head are Folli and Harley (2005), Basilico (2010), Cuervo (2015), and Armstrong (2013), while Boneh and Nash (2011) make use of an applicative head (see Section 16.4) to analyse the SE-transitive cases in French.

Alternatively, other authors, such as MacDonald (2004), De Cuyper (2006), and Armstrong (2013) (for the classical *SE*-transitive cases involving ingestion verbs, like 26), propose that *SE* occupies a low argumental position in the abstract representation of the predicate. For instance, MacDonald (2004) analyses *SE* (in this example, Sp. *me* ‘me’) as the complement of a null locative preposition merged under the verb:

- (29) a. Me comí la paella. (Sp., from MacDonald 2004: 1)
 SE.1SG ate.1SG the paella
 ‘I ate the paella up.’
 b. $[_{VP} V [_{VP} [la\ paella] [_V V = comí [_{PP} P = \emptyset [me]]]]]$ (MacDonald 2004: 5)

These latter analyses, and also, in a different way, that of Folli and Harley (2005), are particularly interesting in that they allow a comparison between the expression of notions like resultativity in Romance and Germanic, thus making a valuable contribution to a general theory of the VP. In particular, the claim is made, though not in Folli and Harley (2005), that the locus hosting *SE* in Romance corresponds to that hosting resultative particles (De Cuyper 2006) or goal PPs (MacDonald 2004) in Germanic, which allows to account for a cluster of shared properties: resultativity itself, unselectedness of the internal argument (De Cuyper 2006; see Section 16.5 n. 13), or even blockage of idiomatic interpretations (MacDonald 2004).

Considerably less attention has been given to *SE* in object-oblique alternations of the following kind taken from Rigau (1994: 30):

- (30) En Pere {lamenta això /es lamenta (d’ això)}. (Cat.)
 the Pere regrets that *SE* regrets of that
 ‘Pere regrets that.’

What is an object in the *SE*-less alternant is presented as an oblique, introduced by *de*, in the corresponding alternant with *SE*, yielding a kind of *antipassive* construction (Masullo 1992b; Legendre 1994; Kempchinsky 2004).⁹ Assuming that argument and event structure are kept the same in both alternants, the discussion about antipassive *SE* has revolved rather on case. Authors such as Burzio (1986), Masullo (1992b), and Rigau (1994) have argued that antipassive *SE* absorbs accusative case, forcing the internal argument to be licensed by a preposition. More recent, minimalist works, like Basilico (2005), Armstrong (2016), and MacDonald (2017), have focused on a unification of antipassive *SE* with other kinds, often making use of a Late Insertion of the *SE* exponent.

⁹ Verbs like Cat. *queixar-se* ‘complain’ do not alternate, but are grouped together with the *SE*-alternants of alternating verbs (Kempchinsky 2004; Armstrong 2016).

16.4 Datives

Datives in Romance are interesting from different points of view, such as their availability to be clitic-doubled and the associated semantic and structural effects, their (apparent) formal coincidence with Differential Object Marking (DOM), their alleged subject-like properties in a number of contexts, and their alternation with accusative marking in certain cases. We discuss these aspects below.

One first point has to do with clitic doubling. In some Romance languages, such as Spanish (31), Catalan (32) or Romanian (33), dative arguments can be clitic-doubled; but this is not an option in other languages such as Portuguese (34) or French (35) (see Jaeggli 1982 for an overview). There are also some Romance varieties, such as Trentino (36) (Cordin 1993) or the Spanish varieties spoken in Río de la Plata, Chile, and Caracas (37) (see Parodi 1998; Senn 2008; Pujalte 2009), where clitic doubling of dative arguments is compulsory:¹⁰

- (31) (Le) dimos el libro al presidente. (Sp.)
 DAT.3SG= gave.1PL the book to.the president
 'We gave the book to the president.'
- (32) (Li) vam donar el llibre al president. (Cat.)
 DAT.3SG= AUX.PST.1PL give.INF the books to.the president
 'We gave the book to the president.'
- (33) Mihaela (ii) trimite o scrisoare Mariei. (Ro., based on Diaconescu and Rivero 2007: 213)
 Mihaela DAT.3SG= send.3SG a letter Maria.DAT
 'Mihaela sends a letter to Maria.'
- (34) O João deu(**-lhe) o livro à Maria. (Pt., based on Torres Morais and Salles 2010: 182f.)
 the João gave.3SG=DAT.3SG the book to.the Maria
 'João gave the book to Maria.'
- (35) Jean (**lui) a donné le livre à Marie. (Fr., based on Fournier 2010: 120)
 Jean DAT.3SG= has give.PTCP the book to Marie
 'Jean has given the book to Marie.'
- (36) ** (Le) dimos el libro al presidente. (LAmSp.)
 DAT.3SG= gave.1PL the book to.the president
 'We gave the book to the president.'
- (37) ** (Ghe) dago el regal al Mario. (Trn., based on Cordin 1993: 130)
 DAT.3=give.1SG the present to.the Mario
 'I'm giving the present to Mario.'

¹⁰ For many speakers of European Spanish the clitic-less variant of cases like (31) is very marginal or ungrammatical.

Some theoretical implications of dative clitic doubling have to do with the categorical status of the doubled dative phrase (see Jaeggli 1982 and subsequent works), as well as with the type of ditransitive construction we are dealing with. Spanish has played an important role in these discussions. As a matter of fact, it has been extensively argued that Spanish clitic-doubled datives (38) are case-marked DPs, whereas non-doubled ones (39) are PPs (Masullo 1992c; Demonte 1995; Cuervo 2003; Ormazabal and Romero 2013; but see also Kayne 2005).

- (38) Dimos el libro al presidente. (Sp.)
 gave.1PL the book to.the president
 'We gave the book to the president.'

- (39) Le dimos el libro al presidente. (Sp.)
 DAT.3SG= gave.1PL the book to.the president
 'We gave the book to the president.'

The analysis of clitic-doubled datives as DPs, and not PPs, is connected to the existence of double object constructions in Romance and, by extension, of a dative alternation as the English one, composed of a *to*-dative prepositional construction where the goal argument is a PP (40) and a double object construction where the dative argument is a DP (41).

- (40) The teacher gave a book to her student.

- (41) The teacher gave her student a book.

The double object pattern in (41) was traditionally considered absent in Romance (Kayne 1984; Holmberg and Platzack 1995), where only the prepositional pattern (40) was clearly found, but nothing similar to (41) in terms of word order or lack of preposition could be identified (cf. also Section 1.2.2.1). However, after challenging the assumption that double object constructions had to be superficially identical to the one in English, and focusing instead on the structural and semantic properties of the pattern, authors were able to identify the pattern in a greater number of languages, including the Romance family and, in particular, Spanish (Strozer 1976; Masullo 1992c; Demonte 1995; Romero 1997; Blean 2003). These authors established a parallelism between Spanish clitic-doubled ditransitives (40) and the English double object construction (41), on the one hand, and Spanish non-doubled ditransitives (38) and the English prepositional construction (40), on the other hand. More recently, on the basis of Pykkänen's (2002) work on applicatives, Cuervo (2003) argues further in this direction, and similar claims are made for Romanian, another clitic doubling language (Diaconescu and Rivero 2007). However, the existence of clear-cut

structural and semantic contrasts between doubled and non-doubled ditransitives in Spanish has been challenged by Pineda (2013; 2016; 2020a), who argues instead that the double object pattern (with an applicative head) exists in this language (and Catalan, another clitic doubling language) regardless of the presence or absence of the clitic. Actually, assuming Pykkänen's applicative analysis of ditransitives, double object constructions have also been claimed to exist in non-doubling Romance languages, such as Portuguese (Torres Morais and Salles 2010) and French (Fournier 2010). Whereas in doubling languages the clitic is taken to be the spell-out of the applicative head, in non-doubling languages this head is assumed to remain always phonologically silent.

The discussion about whether dative and differentially marked objects constitute a homogenous class is a long-standing one. One of the cross-linguistically robust, yet puzzling uses of dative morphology is to signal certain classes of structural (direct) objects, normally including animates, specifics, definites, or a combination thereof (Givón 1984; Bossong 1991; Lazard 2001; de Swart 2007; Manzini and Franco 2016, among others). This picture is the most common one in those Romance varieties featuring DOM (with Romanian being an important exception), as illustrated by Spanish (42) (see Ormazabal and Romero 2010; 2013). The animate definite object in (42a) must take a marker which is homophonous with the dative *a* (42c), under DOM (see Moravcsik 1978; Comrie 1979; 1981; Croft 1988; 1990; Bossong 1991; 1998; Aissen 2003; López 2012, among others):

(42) Spanish

- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|-------------|----------|------|------------------|
| a. | He | encontrado | **a) | la | niña. |
| | have.1SG | find.PTCP | DAT/DOM | the | girl |
| | 'I have found the girl.' | | | | |
| b. | He | encontrado | (**a) | el | libro. |
| | have.1SG | find.PTCP | DAT=DOM | the | book |
| | 'I have found the book.' | | | | |
| c. | Les | regalé | un libro | a | los estudiantes. |
| | DAT.3PL= | offered.1SG | a | book | DAT the students |
| | 'I offered a book to the students.' | | | | |

The same picture is seen in many other languages, such as Indo-Aryan varieties, Guaraní, Tigre, Yiddish, Basque varieties that have DOM, and Arabic varieties – but there are also languages where differentially marked objects and datives are not homophonous: this is the case in Romanian, as mentioned above, where dative is inflexional or introduced by *la* 'at, to', whereas DOM is introduced by *pe* 'on'. Beyond Romance, this pattern is also found in Farsi, Hebrew, Turkish, Palauan, and Kannada, among others. An important question is whether this well extended syncretism signals a common syntactic source of dative and the differential marker of objects,

or is simply a matter of surface opacity. Under some accounts proposed for Romance languages, the homomorphism has a structural nature, for example DOM and (certain types of) datives occupy the same (licensing) position (López 2012) or encode the same relation (Manzini and Franco 2016). Various contributions have also pointed out important structural differences between datives and differentially marked objects (see Ormazabal and Romero 2007 for Spanish, and Bárány (2018) for a cross-linguistic picture), motivating a morphological solution to the syncretism. Yet, a mixed explanation is proposed under other analyses: differential objects are accusatives structurally but require additional marking due to their complex featural make-up (Irimia 2018).

Dative-marked arguments of psychological (and other) verbs have been considered in some languages an instance of quirky subjects akin to the Icelandic type described, for instance, in Zaenen, Maling, and Höskuldur Thráinsson (1985) and Sigurðsson (1989). In particular, in the Romance family such an analysis has been proposed for Italian (see Belletti and Rizzi 1988; Cardinaletti 2004) and Spanish (see Masullo 1992a; 1993; Campos 1999; Fernández Soriano 1999), among others. Within these approaches, the fact is highlighted that the dative-marked argument exhibits a number of subject-like properties, and therefore it is to be analysed as a quirky (non-nominative) subject. An example of a Spanish psychological verb is provided below, showing that the dative-marked argument (*a tu hija*), and not the nominative one (*el futbol*), appears in preverbal position, as subjects usually do in Romance.

- (43) A tu hija le gusta el futbol. (Sp.)
 to your daughter DAT.3SG=pleases the football
 ‘Your daughter likes football.’

However, the identification of such configurations with quirky subject constructions has been called into question by a number of authors (see, for example, Gutiérrez Bravo 2006 for Spanish) arguing that preverbal oblique (dative) arguments actually lack many of the defining characteristics of quirky (or non-nominative) subjects of the Icelandic type.

Dative case marking alternates with accusative case marking in a number of contexts across Romance languages. A well-known example is that of the experiencer argument of psychological verbs, which in languages such as Spanish (see Gómez Torrego 1993; Fernández-Ordóñez 1999; Mendivil Giró 2005; Marín and McNally 2011) and Catalan (see Cabré and Mateu 1998; Rosselló 2008; Royo 2018) displays a case alternation. This variation is normally linked to different word orders and to different thematic relations between the arguments. Catalan examples below illustrate the dative-marked experiencer (44), in a stative unaccusative configuration (OVS

order), and the accusative-marked one (45), in a transitive causative configuration (SVO order):

- (44) A la Maria li preocupa aquesta situació. (Cat.)
 to the Maria DAT.3SG=worries this situation
 'Maria is worried about this situation.'
- (45) Aquesta situació preocupa la Maria. → Aquesta situació la preocupa. (Cat.)
 this situation worries the Maria this situation ACC.FSG=worries
 'This situation worries Maria. → This situation worries her.'

Interestingly, in Romanian, although there is no such alternation, many of these psych-predicates typically occur with accusative experiencers (see Nicula 2013):

- (46) L-a interesat foarte mult. (Ro.)
 ACC.MSG=has interested very much
 'It interested him very much.'

Dative/accusative alternations in Romance languages are also found with a variety of agentive verbs, such as 'help', 'call on the phone', 'rob' or 'pay'.¹¹ Examples of the alternation in several Romance languages and varieties are provided below:

- (47) **Catalan**
- a. El Joan {truca/telefona} a la seva filla. → Li {truca/telefona}.
 the Joan phones to the her daughter DAT.3SG=phones
 b. El Joan {truca/telefona} la seva filla. → La {truca/telefona}.
 the Joan phones the her daughter ACC.FSG=phones
 'Joan calls his daughter on the phone. → He calls her on the phone.'
- (48) **Spanish (Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española 2009: 16.9q)**
- a. Le telefonarías para entrenarla en llamarte Tito.
 DAT.3SG=phone.COND.2SG for train.INF=ACC.FSG in call.INF=you Tito
 '(When you returned to Europe,) you would call her to train her in calling you Tito.'
 b. Al día siguiente la telefoneó para invitarla al cine.
 at.the day following ACC.FSG=phoned.3SG for invite=ACC.FSG to.the cinema
 'The following day he phoned her to invite her to the cinema.'
- (49) **Asturian (Xulio Viejo, p.c.)**
- a. ?Telefonée-y.
 phoned.1SG=DAT.3
 'I phoned him/her.'

¹¹ See Fernández-Ordóñez (1999) and Sáez (2009) for Spanish; Ramos (2005) and Morant (2008) for Catalan; Ledgeway (2000; 2009) for Neapolitan, Altamurano, Cosentino, Trebisacce, and Sicilian; Troberg (2008) for French (in a diachronic perspective); Andriani (2011) for Barese; and Pineda (2016) for a comprehensive Romance view including Catalan, Spanish, Asturian, and Italo-Romance varieties.

- b. Telefonéelu, telefonéela
 phoned.1SG=ACC.MSG phoned.1SG=ACC.3FSG
 'I phoned him, her.'

(50) **Barese (Andriani 2011: 50f.)**

- a. 'Ngə so' tələfonátə.
 DAT.3=be.1SG phone.PTCP
 'I have phoned her.'
- b. La so' tələfonátə.
 ACC.3FSG=be.1SG phone.PTCP
 'I have phoned her.'

(51) **Neapolitan (Ledgeway 2000: 30)**

- a. Nce telefunaje a socrama.
 DAT.3=phoned.1SG to mother-in-law
 'I phoned my mother-in-law.'
- b. 'A telefunaje a socrama.
 ACC.3.FSG=phoned.1SG DOM mother-in-law
 'I phoned my mother-in-law'

Different analyses have been proposed for this alternation, sometimes reducing it to case-confusing phenomena (*laísmo/loísmo/leísmo*), sometimes proposing two different structures for the dative option and the accusative one, and yet sometimes assuming an 'underlying' ditransitive structure behind agentive verbs, e.g., *help someone* = *give help to someone* (following Torrego 2010), and analysing the alternation as an ongoing syntactic change from a structure with a dative-assigning head towards a transitive one, namely *transitivization* (see Pineda 2015; 2020b).

16.5 Lexicalization Patterns

Since Talmy (1975; 1985; 1991; 2000), the term *lexicalization pattern* refers to a language-dependent distribution of certain semantic notions in lexical elements. Talmy (1991; 2000) focuses primarily on the variation concerning the semantic notion of path or transition:

- (52) a. We dance_{Motion+Manner}-d out_{Path} together.¹²
 b. Sort_{Motion+Path} -iguèrem amassa (en dançant_{Manner}). (Occ.)
 go.out -PST.1PL together dancing

¹² From A. Golden's *Memoirs of a Geisha*, New York: Knopf, 1997.

Example (52) shows one same conceptual scene as expressed in English and Occitan: some people coming out from somewhere while dancing. In English-type languages the semantic notions of Motion and Manner (i.e., how the change of location took place) can be expressed in the verbal root. The Path of motion is expressed in a different morphosyntactic element, what Talmy (2000: 101f.) calls the *satellite*: here the particle *out*, although, as will be shown, later work has generalized the expression of path in these languages to directional PPs. In Occitan-type languages, the Motion and the Path are expressed through the same exponent, i.e., the verbal root, while the Manner of motion has to be expressed separately, as an adjunct. In fact, a ‘direct’ translation of (52a) into Occitan is ungrammatical:

- (53) **Danc_{Motion+Manner} -èrem defòra_{Path} amassa. (Occ.)
 dance -PST.1 PL out together

In Talmy’s framework, the two main patterns of lexicalization of the path of motion are, thus, the satellite-framed pattern (cf. 52a) in which the Path is typically encoded in an element morphologically different from the verbal root, and the verb-framed pattern (cf. 52b) in which the Path is encoded in the verbal root.¹³

Crucially, already Talmy extended the typology to understand differences in the expression of change of state:

- (54) a. Der Hund hat den Schuh kaputt-gebissen. (Ger., Talmy 2000: 247)
 the dog has the.ACC shoe.ACC broken-bite.PTCP
 b. El perro destruyó el zapato (a mordiscos). (Sp.)
 the dog destroyed the shoe to bites
 ‘The dog bit the shoe to pieces.’

In satellite-framed German the verb may express an event concomitant to a change of state (‘destroying through biting’). In verb-framed Spanish this component is, again, expressed in an adjunct, and the verb must encode the transition itself.

While other semantic notions have been explored in relation to their lexicalization patterns in different languages, we will concentrate on the

¹³ De Cuyper (2006) makes the interesting proposal that Romance aspectual *se* (see Section 16.3) functions as a satellite. As such, *se* may license, in some cases, unselected objects (see Sp. *se* in i.a), much in the same way, De Cuyper argues, as Germanic prepositional-like satellites (cf. Dch. *op* ‘up’ in i.b):

- (i) a. Juan *(se) bebe su fortuna. (Sp., De Cuyper 2006: 180)
 Juan *se* drinks his fortune
 b. Jan drinkt zijn fortuin *(op). (Dch.)
 Jan drinks his fortune up
 ‘Juan/Jan drinks away his fortune.’

kind of variation illustrated in (52) and (54),¹⁴ which has received, since the 1970s, massive attention in the literature of different theoretical persuasions, because it impacts on central aspects of the expression of argument and event structure (for recent reviews, see Acedo-Matellán and Mateu 2015; Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2019). The contribution of research on Romance to our understanding of the nature of this typology has been decisive, since these languages have been taken as the paradigm of verb-framed systems. Moreover, it is significant that most Romance varieties – including less studied ones, like Aragonese (see, e.g., Ibarretxe-Antuñano, Hijazo-Gascón, and Moret-Oliver 2017) or Raeto-Romance (see, e.g., Berthele 2006) – have been drawn upon to bear on the issue. In what follows, we will mention the main advances made with respect to this kind of cross-linguistic variation and based on research on Romance.¹⁵

The first qualification of Talmy's generalizations on the expression of directed motion cross-linguistically was due to an observation by Aske (1989) on Spanish. The next example, based on Aske's (1989: 3), shows that manner of motion verbs are allowed to be combined with directional expressions, provided that they encode an unbounded path (cf. *hacia* 'towards'), as opposed to a bounded one (cf. *a* 'to'):¹⁶

- (55) La botella flotó {hacia / **a} la cueva. (Sp.)
 the bottle floated {towards to} the cave

Aske's observation – replicated elsewhere in Romance (cf. Fong and Poulin 1998 for French, and Stringer 2002 for French and Italian) – indicates that the directional expressions that cannot be combined with manner of motion verbs in verb-framed languages are the ones that induce telicity in the predicate, i.e., those that may change its event structure (cf. *The bottle floated into the cave in/#for five minutes*), and thus that they should be merged VP-internally (cf. Klipple 1991). Klipple (1997) implements this idea by proposing that a node expressing direction/aspect within the VP may be *conflated*, i.e., morphologically bundled, with a preposition in languages like English, while it conflates with the verb in French. This proposal suggests the importance of prepositional systems in understanding the typology (an

¹⁴ Another semantic primitive related to two main lexicalization patterns is possession, distinguishing between so-called BE- and HAVE-languages (Harves and Kayne 2012). See Real-Puigdollers (2013: 315–69) for a theoretical analysis and an application to measure verbs in Romance.

¹⁵ We leave out of the discussion the case of creation predicates claimed to involve a manner co-event, like *bake a cake*, i.e., 'create a cake through baking' (Levin and Rapoport 1988). Mateu (2003; 2012) observes that Romance disallows this kind of predicate, and in the latter work proposes to analyse this cross-linguistic variation through Snyder's (2001) *Compounding Parameter* (see below). Acedo-Matellán (2010: 148–55) argues that this cross-linguistic variation is reducible to the satellite-verb vs framed typology.

¹⁶ Other authors (Folli 2001; Fábregas 2007; Beavers, Levin, and Tham 2010) have claimed, however, that Romance may combine manner of motion predicates with expressions encoding a bounded path like PPs headed by *hasta* 'up to, until' in Spanish. It is unclear, however, whether *hasta*-like prepositions really encode paths of motion (see Gehrke 2008: 223 and Real-Puigdollers 2013: 95–101).

aspect much exploited later: see, for example, Folli 2008; Real-Puigdollers 2010; 2013), and also indicates that it could be a purely morphological phenomenon. This proposal has been followed by other authors. For instance, Mateu (2002) and Mateu and Rigau (2002), for Catalan, Spanish, and Sardinian, and working with Hale and Keyser's (1993; 1998) theory of Lexical Syntax, propose that a Path node is specified to be conflated with a null light verb in Romance, which precludes this verb from combining with any other element encoding Manner (cf. the ungrammaticality of 53), and yields the collection of monomorphemic path verbs typical of Romance, such as Glc. *sa-ír* 'go out', Ro. *a intr-a* 'go in', etc., and also verbs of change of state (cf. 54b). In satellite-framed languages the absence of this requirement explains that movement and path are typically expressed separately, as in *go in/out/up/etc.*, and that manner verbs can also be combined with path or resultative expressions (cf. 52a or 54a). Interestingly, Mateu (2002) applies this kind of approach to an analysis of the so-called locative alternation in Germanic and Romance (example from Acedo-Matellán and Mateu 2015: 119):

- (56) a. Sue sprayed the sheets with perfume.
 b. Sue sprayed perfume onto the sheets.
- (57) **Catalan**
 a. La Sue ruixà els llençols de perfum.
 the Sue sprayed the sheets of perfume
 b. **La Sue ruixà perfum sobre els llençols.
 the Sue sprayed perfume on the sheets

While satellite-framed languages liberally allow verbs like *spray* to be used in change of state alternants (56a) or in change of location alternants (56b), Romance usually disallows the latter kind of construction (see 57b), since these languages do not admit the combination of a manner of motion verb (Cat. *ruixar* 'spray') with a directional expression.¹⁷ More recently, Acedo-Matellán (2010; 2016) implements the idea of the obligatory conflation of *v* and Path in Distributed Morphology terms as operations that take place at PF.

Other authors have proposed syntactic accounts of the typology, exploring both the macroparametric and the microparametric approaches to variation (Baker 2008). In Sugisaki's (2003) macroparametric approach locatives PPs may be dominated or not by a light *p* head inducing a goal

¹⁷ For other works on the locative alternation, see Demonte (1991) and Lewandowski (2014) on Spanish; Munaro (1994) on Italian; Hirschbühler and Labelle (2009) on French; and Mateu (2017) on Catalan.

interpretation. Verb-framed French is negatively specified for the parameter, whereby sentences like *The boat floated under the bridge*, which license a directional interpretation in English, do not in French. Also macroparametric are the proposals in Zubizarreta and Oh (2007) and Gehrke (2008). These authors, however, follow Snyder (1995; 2001) and Beck and Snyder (2001), among others, rather than Talmy, in the description of the variation. Gehrke (2008), for instance, puts the focus on the ability of languages to create complex predicates with an accomplishment interpretation (see 52a or 54a), through Snyder's (1995) seminal *Compounding Parameter*, rather than on the lexical or syntactic properties of the element encoding path. Among the microparametric accounts, Real-Puigdollers (2010; 2013) proposes an analysis in terms of phase theory (Chomsky 2000), as understood in works like Marantz (2007): in verb-framed Romance, the functional head Path is defective, and has therefore to be spelled out with the previous functional head, *v*. In satellite-framed languages, Path is not defective, so *v* can be spelled out independently, and may therefore express manner of motion. Beyond the morphological facts, the proposal crucially captures some previously unnoted syntactic differences between Romance and Germanic. Folli and Harley (2016; 2020) propose that, in verb-framed Italian, the light verb carries a feature that makes it attract the functional head expressing Res(ult) (cf. Ramchand 2008). Res lexicalizes with *v*, yielding, again, the kind of change of location/state verbs encountered in Romance.

Analyses in the Ramchandian-nanosyntactic tradition (Folli and Ramchand 2005; Fábregas 2007; Folli 2008; Romeu 2014) treat the variation at the lexicon–syntax interface, although denying any notion of parameter. It is rather the (non-)existence of particular lexical items that explains the differences. Folli and Ramchand (2005), for instance, propose that Italian does not have any preposition like Eng. *to*, able to lexicalize the feature +R(essult). As a result, Italian must use verbs endowed with this feature, such as *andare* 'go' or *correre* 'run', to lexicalize such configurations.

The observation that manner verbs such as It. *correre* 'run', which encode 'forward motion' (cf. Nichols 2008), admit being used in expressions of bounded directed motion spawned yet another refinement of the typology (Fong and Poulin 1998; Folli 2001; Folli and Ramchand 2005; Fábregas 2007; Zubizarreta and Oh 2007; Real-Puigdollers 2010; 2013). For instance, Mateu and Rigau (2010) and Mateu (2012), partly in response to claims in works such as Iacobini and Masini (2007), point out that the Germanic-like combinations of verb and particle found in Italic and Raeto-Romance varieties, and also in Catalan, Spanish, and French, are all possible because the verb, which may encode some notion of manner, also encodes directionality/resultativity, the particle specifying rather than introducing path/result (example from Mateu and Rigau 2010: 259):

- (58) Gianni è corso / **danzato via. (It.)
 Gianni is run.PTCP.MSG dance.PTCP.MSG away

Romance has also been prominent in diachronic studies of the expression of directionality/resultativity. Talmy (1991; 2000) claimed that Latin was a satellite-framed language, using verbal prefixes as satellites, and this claim is explored in depth in Acedo-Matellán (2010; 2016) and Acedo-Matellán and Mateu (2013). The development towards verb-framed Romance has been dealt with in different works, notably those devoted to old French. Dufresne, Dupuis, and Tremblay (2000), Dufresne, Dupuis, and Longtin (2001), and Dufresne, Dupuis, and Tremblay (2003) claim that old French verbal prefixes still codified path/transition.¹⁸ More recently, Troberg and Burnett (2017) have qualified the claim, arguing that in old French the prefixes have lost the locative interpretation that they had in Latin and have become mere markers of aspect. These same authors explore the adjectival resultative constructions of old French such as *abattre mort* ‘strike down dead’. Interestingly, they are argued to be, unlike those in Germanic, of the *weak* type (Washio 1997; see Acedo-Matellán and Mateu 2015), i.e., the verb already encodes result, and the adjective merely helps specifying it. Thus, old Romance turns out not to be very different from modern Romance (see the remarks on example 58).

16.6 Concluding Remarks

Descriptive and formal studies on argument structure in Romance are both abundant and influential, and they have greatly fostered the advancement of our understanding of this area of natural language. In this chapter we have surveyed what we believe are the most significant contributions: unaccusativity diagnostics, approaches to the causative alternation and other event structure alternations involving the clitic *se*, explorations of events of transfer based on the grammar of dative clitics as well as other relevant aspects of dative-marked arguments, and several refinements made to Talmy’s typology.

Several other interesting issues have been left out, for space reasons: light verb constructions (see, e.g., Acedo-Matellán and Pineda 2019), cognate objects (see, e.g., Gallego 2012; Real-Puigdollers 2013: 231–313; Melloni and Masini 2017), other constructions with *se*: reflexives, causatives, reciprocals, middles, and passives (see, e.g., Mendikoetxea 1999; Bartra Kaufmann 2008; Labelle 2008; Pescarini 2015), and the argument structure

¹⁸ Kopecka (2004: 246f.) claims that modern French prefixed verbs like *é-pépin-er* ‘de-seed’ also represent the satellite-framed pattern, the prefix counting as a satellite. See Acedo-Matellán and Mateu (2013) for a different position.

of other lexical categories, e.g., nominalizations and adjectival predicates (see, among others, Sleeman and Brito 2010; Oltra-Massuet 2013; Fábregas 2016; Meinschaefer 2016).

Selected References

Below you can find selected references for this chapter. The full references can be found online at the following page: www.cambridge.org/Romancelinguistics

- Acedo-Matellán, V. and Mateu, J. (2013). 'Satellite-framed Latin vs verb-framed Romance: a syntactic approach', *Probus* 25: 227–65.
- Acedo-Matellán, V. and Pineda, A. (2019). 'Light verb constructions in Basque and Romance'. In Ortiz de Urbina, J., Fernández, B., and Berro, A. (eds), *Basque and Romance. Aligning Grammars*. Leiden: Brill, 176–220.
- Belletti, A., and Rizzi, L. (1988). 'Psych-verbs and θ -theory', *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 6: 291–352.
- Borer, H. (2005). *Structuring Sense, Vol. 2: the Normal Course of Events*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199263929.001.0001>.
- Hale, K. and Keyser, S. (2002). *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Levin, B. and Rappaport Hovav, M. (2005). *Argument Realization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mateu, J. and Rigau, G. (2010). 'Verb-particle constructions in Romance: a lexical-syntactic account', *Probus* 22: 241–69.
- Pineda, A. (2016). *Les fronteres de la (in)transitivitat. Estudi dels aplicatius en llengües romàniques i basc*. Barcelona: Institut d'Estudis Mòn Juïc.
- Real-Puigdollers, C. (2013). *Lexicalization by Phase: The Role of Prepositions in Argument Structure and Its Cross-linguistic Variation*. PhD dissertation, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona.
- Rigau, G. (1997). 'Locative sentences and related constructions in Catalan: ésser/haver alternation'. In Mendikoetxea, A. and Uribe-Etxebarria, M. (eds), *Theoretical Issues at the Morphology–Syntax Interface*. Bilbao/Donosti/San Sebastián: Euskal Herriko Unibertsitatea, Gipuzkoa Foru Aldundia, 395–421.
- Sorace, A. (2004). 'Gradience at the lexicon–syntax interface: evidence from auxiliary selection and implications for unaccusativity'. In Alexiadou, A. Anagnostopoulou, E., and Everaert, M., (eds), *The Unaccusativity Puzzle. Explorations of the Syntax–Lexicon Interface*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 243–68.
- Talmy, L. (2000). *Toward a Cognitive Semantics, Vol. 2: Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.