

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

(i) In ‘Optional SI/SE Constructions’ (OSCs) found in Italian (1a), French (1b) and Spanish, a transitive verb is optionally enriched with a reflexive dative clitic. We argue that OSCs make use of a low applicative phrase as a syntactic building block to explicitly express information that is normally left implicit at the level of the verb’s lexical-conceptual structure.

- (1) a. *Gianni (si) mangia una mela.* b. *Jean (se) fume une cigarette.*

John (REFL) eats an apple John (REFL) smokes a cigarette

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

- (2) a. *Lui_i (si_i) beve una birra.* b. *Tu_i (ti_i) bevi una birra.*

He REFL.DAT drinks a beer You (you(rself). DAT) drink a beer

- (3) a. **Lisa gli mangia una mela.* b. **Lisa mangia una mela a suo papà.*

Lisa him.DAT eats an apple Lisa eats an apple to her dad.DAT

- (4) a. *Lisa ha guardato un film.* b. *Lisa si è guardata un film.*

Lisa has watched. MAS.SG. a movie. Lisa REFL is watched.FEM.SG. a movie

- (5) a. *Lisa gli ha dato un consiglio.* b. *Lisa si è data un consiglio.*

Lisa him.DAT has given an advice Lisa REFL.DAT is given.FEM.SG.an advice

‘Lisa has given him advice’ ‘Lisa has given advice to herself’

(iii) **The class of verbs entering OSCs** is restricted (Arce 1989, Nishida 1994, Zagana 1996). Verbs of consumption (*eat, drink, smoke*; 1a-b, 2) are most productively used. In addition, OSCs are found with verbs dubbed by Zagana (1996) as “psychological consumption verbs” (*read, watch*; 4b). Finally, some activity verbs taking cognate objects enter OSCs (6a-b).

- (6) a. *(Lui) si è ballato un tango. (It.)* b. *Il s’ est couru un marathon. (Fr.)*

He REFL is danced a tango He REFL is run a marathon

All the above verbs are Non-Core Transitive Verbs (Levin 1999), i.e. their objects can easily be left out (7). In OCSs, however, the very same verbs obey a strict object restriction (8).

- (7) a. *Gianni mangia (una mela).* b. *Gianni ha ballato (un tango).*

John eats (an apple) John has danced (a tango)

- (8) a. *Gianni si mangia *(una mela).* b. *Gianni si è ballato *(un tango).*

John REFL eats (an apple) John REFL is danced (a tango)

Core Transitive Verbs like *break* or *open* never enter OSCs: if they combine with applied datives, these are never restricted to reflexive clitics and are interpreted as affected arguments (cf. Cuervo 2003), an interpretation not relevant for the reflexive clitic in OSCs (see (iv)). Stative verbs (*know, hate*) and achievements (*recognize*) are also excluded from OSCs. Spanish *saber* (know) enters OSCs iff it is re-interpreted as a dynamic event (Zagana 1996). Some unaccusatives seem to enter OSCs, but we will show this is a different phenomenon.

(iv) **The interpretation of OSCs:** Inserting the reflexive clitic does not change the truthconditions of the clause (Nishida 1994, Boneh & Nash 2010); therefore, OSCs differ from prototypical (high or low) applicatives. Yet, several authors have argued that the insertion of the reflexive has an aspectual effect in that it shifts the event type expressed by the verb from an activity to a delimited situation or culminating/telic transition (Nishida 1994, Zagana 1996, DeMiguel & Fernández 2000). Finally, some authors report a pragmatic flavour in OSCs concerning the subject’s attitude towards the event (volitional involvement or affectedness (D’Introno et al. 2007), or “enjoyment and easy-goingness” (Boneh & Nash 2010)).

(v) **Analysis:** We avoid stipulating a (further) reflexive element in Romance peculiar to OSCs, as has been assumed in earlier approaches which analyze the *se/si* under discussion as

a verbal aspectual head (Folli & Harley 2005) or an aspectual/telic operator (Zagona 1996/1999, D’Introno et al. 2000, a.o.). Similarly, a high applicative analysis (Boneh & Nash 2010) has to stipulate inherent reflexivity, the verb class and transitivity restriction, and the interpretative properties of OSCs. Instead, we treat the reflexive clitic as an ordinary anaphor bound by the subject; this relates the agreement between the subject and the reflexive (2), *be*-selection and participle agreement (4b) to other, unequivocal cases of anaphoric clitic binding in Romance. Specifically, we propose that OSCs have the bi-eventive structure in (9b) which is built from (9a) by addition of a low applicative phrase. (9a), without a reflexive, denotes an activity, but (9b) is a bi-eventive accomplishment in which the reflexive clitic is introduced in the specifier of a low applicative head, i.e. an applicative that relates an entity to another entity and expresses a possessive HAVE-relation between the two (Pylkkänen 2002/8, Cuervo 2003, Beck & Johnson 2004). Thus, (9b) has roughly the interpretation in (9c); we propose to interpret the possessive relation as one of *inalienable* possession (part-whole relation).

- (9) a. [VoiceP John *Voice* [VP eats the apple]]
 b. [VoiceP Johni *Voice* [VP eats [ApplP REFLi *Appl* the apple]]]
 c. Johni causes, by eating, that hei (inalienably) possesses/has the apple.

The structure in (9b) relates the verb-class restriction to inherent reflexivity in the following way. Recall that consumption verbs are at the heart of OSCs; Nishida (1996) characterizes them as “incorporative verbs which have the general meaning ‘taking something into oneself’”. This “incorporative” semantics is part of the very concept of consumption verbs and does not need to be structurally encoded (cf. (9a)). In (9b), however, this meaning aspect is structurally encoded by a low applicative. In any case, it is a conceptual necessity of consumption events that the agent and the possessor/incorporator are identical; if we choose to express the possessor overtly, this must be bound to the agent. Such a necessity never arises with non-consumption verbs. Under a high applicative analysis of OSCs it would not even arise with consumption verbs, as the individual affected by a consumption event is not necessarily the same as the agent of the event. Since the applicative in (9b) overtly expresses information that is already part of the concept denoted by the verb in (9a), we predict no difference in the truth-conditions between (9a) and (9b); but overtly expressing implicit information can lead to the pragmatic effects reported for OSCs (cf. (iv)). The addition of the low applicative shifts a mono-eventive to a bi-eventive structure. This explains the aspectual effect noted for OSCs (shift to a culminating/telic transition). Finally, the structure in (9b) explains the object restriction on OSCs; only if the theme-DP of the verb is realized can a low applicative enter the structure. Further syntactic data support the claim that OSCs involve low applicatives, e.g. embedding below French *faire*-causatives: while high applicatives are excluded (10a), OSCs (10b) and clear low applicatives (10c) are licensed (pace Boneh & Nash 2010). We suggest that the complement of *faire* is too small to host high applicatives.

- (10) a. **Elle a fait [me/se_i peindre la porte à Paul_i].* (‘She made Paul paint the door for me/himself’)
 She has made me/REFL paint the door to Paul
 b. *Elle a fait [se_i fumer un cigare à Paul_i].* (‘She made Paul smoke a cigar’)
 She has made REFL smoke a cigar to Paul
 c. *Elle a fait [me donner un cadeau à Paul].* (‘She made Paul give a present to me’)
 She has made me give a present to Paul

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