

## Pass *Se* in Spanish and French as a Product of Cyclic Interaction

**Introduction:** Spanish has various types of *se*; e.g., reflexive (1), anticausative (2), passive (3).

(1) Juan se lava. (2) Se quemó el bosque. (3) Se vendieron los pisos.  
John Refl<sub>se</sub> washes AntiC<sub>se</sub> burned the forest Pass<sub>se</sub> sold the flats  
"John washes himself." "The forest burned down." "The flats were sold."

We argue that Pass<sub>se</sub> is the result of interaction between two "linguistic cycles" in the sense of Bahtchevanova & Van Gelderen (2016). We make two claims: i) *pro*, which MacDonald (to appear) argues to occur in Spec, Voice in Pass<sub>se</sub>, can merge there due to the subject agreement cycle; and ii) *se* is a Voice head due to the reflexive (*se*) cycle. The different *se* structures are derived by the presence/absence of *pro* and *se*'s status as Voice head rather than a DP argument. A resulting prediction is that the types of reflexive constructions that a language has depends on whether it has *pro* and whether it has grammaticalized the reflexive as verbal inflection.

**The *se* cycle:** The reflexive pronoun *se* came into Spanish from Latin. Maddox (2016) argues based on diagnostics of movement, coordination, modification, and auxiliary selection that *se* underwent a grammaticalization cycle whereby it changed from a full DP pronoun in Latin and Old Spanish (OS) to a D-head in Middle Spanish (MidS) to a Voice head in Modern Spanish (ModS). That *se* heads Voice or a similar projection is independently claimed by others such as Cuervo (2003, 2014), Folli & Harley (2005), *i.a.* In Latin, *se* has the distribution of a DP. It can be coordinated and be separated from the verb via XP-movement (4) and it can be modified (5).

(4) mē et sē hīscē impēdīvit nuptiīs! (5) sē ipse ... dēfēderēt.  
me and Refl<sub>se</sub> this shackled marriage Refl<sub>se</sub> very.M.S defended

"He shackled me and himself in this marriage!" "He defended his very self..."

Previous scholars (Rivero 1986, Fontana 1993, *i.a.*) have argued that separation from the verb, "interpolation," is evidence for *se* as a DP in OS. Further support comes from auxiliary selection following McGinnis (2004). In OS, unaccusatives select the *be* auxiliary while reflexives select *have*, suggesting transitive syntax in the latter. Thus, *se* is still a DP argument in OS.

(6) Minaya Alvar Fáñez essora es llegado. (7) quando el se ha echado en tierra...

Minaya Alvar Fáñez then is arrived when he Refl<sub>se</sub> has thrown on ground  
"Minaya Alvar Fáñez then arrived." "...when he has cast himself to the ground..."

In MidS, interpolation is lost. Auxiliary selection patterns as in OS (Aranovich 2003), so *se* is still a DP argument that moves as a D-head/determiner clitic. In ModS, *se* has inflectional properties as identified by Fábregas & Scalise (2012); *i.e.*, like subject agreement (8) it does not change the category of its base (9) and it obeys strict ordering with other morphemes (10).

(8) Juan com-e mucho. (9) Se-comieron las manzanas. (10) Se -pre- (\*se) - dice el futuro.  
John eat-3S a-lot Pass<sub>se</sub>-ate the apples Pass<sub>se</sub>-pre- Pass<sub>se</sub>- says the future  
"John eats a lot." "The apples were eaten." "The future is predicted."

**The subject agreement cycle:** Subject agreement affixes are grammaticalized from subject pronouns (Givón 1976, Lambrecht 1981, Jelinek 1984, Van Gelderen 2011). Spanish subject affixes from Latin were grammaticalized from full pronouns in Proto-Indo-European (Bopp 1857, Shields 1992). The subject cycle has three stages (Van Gelderen 2011). At stage (a), the pronoun is a DP merged in Spec, *v* and moved to Spec, *T* to contribute interpretable  $\varphi$ -features. At stage (b), the pronoun/clitic is reanalyzed as a D-head and feature loss begins. At stage (c), the clitic is reanalyzed as uninterpretable  $\varphi$ -features on *T*, triggering another element to merge. This "renewal" restarts the cycle. Spanish is at stage (c) since there is subject agreement on the verb and the subject pronouns are full DPs; *i.e.*, they can be coordinated (11), modified (12), and

be separated from the verb via XP movement (12). Crucially, the affix can be doubled by an overt pronoun or *pro* (13); i.e., renewal. Thus, having *pro* licensed by agreement in the sense of Rizzi (1982) is a result of the subject agreement cycle.

(11) Tú y yo somos amigos. (12) Yo mismo no quiero ir. (13) Tú / (pro) com-es  
 you and I are friends I myself not want-1.S to-go you *pro* eat-2S  
 “You and I are friends.” “I myself do not want to go.” “You eat.”

**Cyclic interaction:** We adopt MacDonald’s (to appear) structures for  $\text{AntiC}_{\text{se}}$  and  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$ :

(14)  $\text{AntiC}_{\text{se}}$ : [Voice<sub>P</sub> Voice<sub>se</sub> [VP DP]] (15)  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$ : [Voice<sub>P</sub> *pro* Voice<sub>se</sub> [VP DP]]

Having *se* as Voice head (due to the *se*-cycle) and *pro* in Spec, Voice (due to the subject agreement cycle) in  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  in (15) is a type of cyclic interaction. *Pro* is in Spec, Voice in  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  because of renewal. It is absent in  $\text{AntiC}_{\text{se}}$ . In both constructions, *se* heads Voice. The difference between them reduces to distinct configurations of *se* (Voice) and the presence or absence of *pro*. Two predictions fall out of this: A) languages that have not grammaticalized the reflexive as a head may have  $\text{AntiC}_{\text{se}}$  but will not develop  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  because there cannot be renewal due to the reflexive occupying a Spec position (see Schäfer 2008 for German); B) a language that lacks subject agreement affixes of the kind that license *pro* per Rizzi (1982) will not develop  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  even if *se* heads Voice since there is no *pro* to merge in Spec, Voice (no renewal). Both predictions are consistent with the historical data.

In Latin, a null subject language, *se* was a full DP, but it only had  $\text{Refl}_{\text{se}}$  (see 4 and 5) and  $\text{AntiC}_{\text{se}}$  as in (16) below (Geniušienė 1987).  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  developed in Late Latin and early Romance (Green 1991, Cennamo 1999, Adams 2013), during which time some speakers began to reanalyze *se* as a head. This explains the appearance of  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  in the earliest Spanish texts, despite evidence such as interpolation showing that, at least for some speakers, it was still a full DP. In Latin, interpolation with *se* was frequent while in OS, it was rare (Maddox 2016), suggesting reanalysis as a head was still in progress but almost complete in OS.

(16) dum calor se frangat. (17) Les pieds (\**pro*) se bougent sur la piste de danse.  
 while heat  $\text{AntiC}_{\text{se}}$  breaks the feet *pro*  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  move on the floor of dance  
 “While the heat breaks...” “One moves one’s feet on the dance floor.”

French appears to contradict our second prediction since it has  $\text{Refl}_{\text{se}}$ ,  $\text{AntiC}_{\text{se}}$ , and  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$ , as in (17) above. However,  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  existed in Old French (Cennamo 1993), during which time it was a null subject language (Adams 1987, Roberts 1993, Vance 1997) so *pro* was available to merge in Spec, Voice in  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$ . Thus, French is actually consistent with our prediction: it developed  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  at a time when French had subject *pro* and *se* as Voice head.  $\text{Pass}_{\text{se}}$  survived into Modern French as a historical remnant left behind from a period when French was a null subject language.

**References:** Bahtchevanova, M. & E. van Gelderen. 2016. The interaction between the French subject and object cycles. In E. van Gelderen (ed.), *Cyclical Change Continued*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. Geniušienė, E. 1987. *Typology of Reflexives*. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. Gelderen, E. van. 2011. *The Linguistic Cycle: Language Change and the Language Faculty*. Oxford: UP. Givón, T. 1976. Topic, Pronoun, and Grammatical Agreement. In Charles Li (ed.), *Subject and Topic*, 151-188. New York: Academic Press. Rivero, M. 1986. Parameters in the Typology of Clitics in Romance and Old Spanish. *Language* 62: 774-807. Schäfer, Florian. 2008. *The Syntax of (Anti-)Causatives*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. Shields, K. 1992. *A History of Indo-European Verb Morphology*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. **Diachronic data:** (4), Terence, *Phormio*, 2.4; (5), Caesar, *de Bello Gallico*, 20.5; (6) *Cid*, l. 2449; (7), Ferrer Sayol, *Libro de Pallado BNM 10211*, para. 115; (16), Cicero, *De oratore* 1.265.