Abstract: This article discusses four properties of Spanish aspectual se constructions. 1. The telicity inducing effects of se; 2. The ungrammaticality of bare noun direct objects; 3. Leísta Spanish Person Case Constraint (PCC) repairs; and 4. A central/terminal coincidence relation between the direct object and the subject. I show that aspectual se does not induce telicity with stative VPs. The ungrammaticality of bare noun direct objects results from the direct object functioning as an ‘inner subject’ of a complex predicate formed by the verb and a null preposition, the complement of which is a pro coreferential with the external argument. The semantics of the null P plus verb give rise to a central/terminal coincidence relation between the direct object and the complement of P. Moreover, I argue that the null pro moves to Spec, Appl and functions as an indirect object. In this respect, aspectual se is an indirect object reflexive. The resulting structure, moreover, is fundamentally a double object construction, a construction in which PCC effects are known to hold.
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1 Introduction

Spanish (and other Romance languages) has a variety of uses of se that go beyond its use as a reflexive clitic pronoun. The main focus of this article is on one such use, so-called aspectual se (Aspse), two examples of which are in (1).\footnote{I translate these and other Aspse constructions in Spanish with a particle (i.e. up/down), yet, there are dialects of English that appear to have exactly the same construction as in Spanish: John drank himself a beer; Mary ate herself an ice-cream.}
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Several properties of Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions have been noted in the literature. Consider four of them. First: Asp\textsubscript{se} occurs with otherwise transitive predicates (Nishida 1994; Basilico 2010; Armstrong 2013).\textsuperscript{2} Second: It is often referred to as \textit{aspectual se}, because it is widely thought to always give rise to a telic VP (Sanz 2000; Sanz and Laka 2002; Basilico 2010; Campanini and Schäfer 2011).\textsuperscript{3} This is illustrated in (2).

(2) a. \textit{Juan bebió una cerveza en 10 minutes/?durante 10 minutos.} \\
Juan drank a beer in 10 minutes/?for 10 minutes. \\
‘Juan drank a beer in 10 minutes/?for ten minutes.’

b. \textit{Juan se bebió una cerveza en 10 minutes/*durante 10 minutos.} \\
Juan Asp\textsubscript{se} drank a beer in 10 minutes/*for 10 minutes. \\
‘Juan drank down a beer in 10 minutes/*for ten minutes.’

(2a) illustrates that, without Asp\textsubscript{se}, an in-adverbial or a for-adverbial is grammatical (although the for-adverbial is marked for some speakers).\textsuperscript{4} In contrast, in the presence of Asp\textsubscript{se}, as in (2b), the in-adverbial is still grammatical, while the for-adverbial is altogether ungrammatical. The grammaticality of an in-adverbial and the ungrammaticality of a for-adverbial is an indication that the VP in (2b) is telic. Thus, in the presence of Asp\textsubscript{se} the VP is (ensured to be) telic.

\textsuperscript{2} In fact, Basilico (2010) refers to this \textit{se} as \textit{transitive se} because of this fact. Importantly, we must distinguish between the Asp\textsubscript{se} construction that is the focus of this article and another construction in which a \textit{se} appears with a transitive verb. Armstrong (2013) calls the latter an \textit{agentive reflexive clitic} construction. He highlights three properties that distinguish it from the Asp\textsubscript{se} construction: ‘(i) it requires an agent, (ii) it adds a conventional implicature of \textit{willful intent} to the agent and (iii) it imposes an aspectual restriction on the VP where it appears (= only accomplishments).’ (Armstrong 2013: 82). Some examples marked ungrammatical with Asp\textsubscript{se} are grammatical as agentive reflexive clitics, namely those discussed in Section 6.

\textsuperscript{3} Nishida (1994) observes that Asp\textsubscript{se} occurs with stative predicates and argues that situations denoted by predicates with Asp\textsubscript{se} are ‘quantitatively delimited’, a notion akin to telic. She assumes the same for the stative predicates with Asp\textsubscript{se} as well.

\textsuperscript{4} Some speakers prefer Asp\textsubscript{se} to be present when the in-adverbial is present.
Third: In the presence of Asp\textsubscript{se} the direct object cannot be a bare noun (Arce-Arenales 1989; Nishida 1994; Zagona 1996; Sanz and Laka 2002; Basilico 2010, among others).\textsuperscript{5} This is illustrated in (3).

(3) a. Juan (*se) bebió cerveza.
Juan (*Asp\textsubscript{se}) drank beer
‘María ate up ice-cream.’

b. María (*se) comió helado.
María (*Asp\textsubscript{se}) ate ice-cream
‘Juan drank down beer.’

Fourth: In a particular Spanish leísta dialect from Spain – what Ormazabal and Romero (2013) refer to as the Central Peninsular Leísta Dialect (CPLD) – where le is normally used to pronominalize a masculine animate direct object like Juan in (4a), in the Asp\textsubscript{se} construction, they resort to lo, as indicated in (4b).\textsuperscript{6}

(4) a. El lobo se comió a Juan.
The wolf Asp\textsubscript{se} ate DOM Juan
‘The wolf ate John up.’

b. El lobo se lo/*le comió.
The wolf Asp\textsubscript{se} him ate
‘The wolf ate him up.’

The substitution of le for lo has previously been taken as a Person Case Constraint (PCC) (a.k.a. \textit{me lui}) violation repair strategy in leísta dialects (see Ormazabal and Romero 2007; Bonet 2008). Thus, in the CPLD leísta dialect, there are PCC effects in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions.\textsuperscript{7}

In this article, I focus on these four properties of Asp\textsubscript{se}. I claim that Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions have the underlying configuration of a double object construction.

---

\textsuperscript{5} Nishida (1994: 434) states the constraint in the following way: ‘the direct object must denote a quantitatively delimited entity.’ Basilico (2010) assumes that the direct object must be quantized. See footnote 27.

\textsuperscript{6} I gloss the differential object marker \textit{a}, as in (4a), as DOM throughout the article. It appears before human/animate/specific direct objects.

\textsuperscript{7} See Campinini and Schäfer (2011) for claims that Spanish Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions do not show PCC effects. Rivero (2008) discusses a leísta dialect where the \textit{le}→\textit{lo} PCC repair strategy is not used. There is attested variation among leísta Spanish dialects along a variety of dimensions. See Fernández-Ordóñez (1999), Ormazabal and Romero (2007) and references therein for discussion.
and that *se* itself is fundamentally an indirect object reflexive. My proposal is illustrated in (5).\(^8\)

\[(\text{VoiceP DP}_1 \text{ Voice}_{se} \ [\text{AppP} \text{ pro}_i \text{ App} \ [\text{VP} \text{ DP} \text{ V} \ [\text{PP} \text{ P}_0 \text{ pro}_i]]])\]

I assume that *se* heads Voice, following many others (Kempchinsky 2004; Folli and Harley 2005; Basilico 2010; Armstrong 2011, among others).\(^9\)\(^10\) Additionally, I claim that Voice spells out *se* because the external argument (in Spec, Voice) is coreferential with an internal argument, specifically with pro in Spec, Appl. This defines Asp\(_{se}\) constructions as reflexive predicates à la Reinhart and Reuland (1993). The PCC effects, I claim, are the result, in part, of the presence of pro in Spec, Appl. The presence of the ApplP, between VoiceP and VP, which introduces the indirect object, following Marantz (1993) and Bruening (2010), aligns Asp\(_{se}\) constructions structurally with double object constructions. The grammatical object in Spec, VP, I claim, functions as a (inner) subject of a complex predicate formed by V and a null prepositional phrase (PP). It is this function as an inner subject that restricts it to non-bare nouns, following assumptions on inner subjects by Cuervo (2003, 2014). Moreover, following MacDonald (2004, 2006), the null PP is responsible for any telicity effects on the VP in the presence of Asp\(_{se}\), much like goal PPs and telicizing particles in English (and other languages). Finally, I suggest that pro is not base generated in Spec, Appl, but moves there from a position as a sister to P, essentially undergoing indirect object movement. This conclusion is based on a less-discussed property of Asp\(_{se}\) constructions, something that MacDonald (2004, 2006) refers to as an on/with

---

\(8\) Campinini and Schäfer (2011) argue that Asp\(_{se}\) constructions are double object constructions, yet, they adopt a low applicative analysis à la Pylkkänen (2002, 2008), Cuervo (2003), where the direct object is the sister to an applicative head. In the context of the discussions in Sections 3 and 6, the problems that a low applicative account runs into become apparent.

\(9\) Alternatively, little v is the external argument introducing head that is associated with accusative Case checking (Chomsky 2001). While there is mounting evidence that a Voice head must be distinguished from a CAUSE head, often called v (see Alexiadou et al. 2006; Pylkkänen 2008; Schäfer 2008; Harley 2013; Legate 2014), I simply represent a single head Voice for simplicity since this is not the main focus of the discussion.

\(10\) An alternative that is consistent with the rest of the proposal is Marantz’s (1984) and McGinnis’s (2004) approach to reflexives where *se* itself is based generated in Spec, Voice, and where the full coreferential DP moves from a position internal to the verb phrase to a position structurally c-commanding *se* for binding purposes. The full DP would correspond to pro in (5), but would continue to move to a position above *se*. See Section 7 for further discussion and implications.
entailment, a property that, as I illustrate here, can be subsumed under Hale’s (1986) terminal/central coincidence relation.

The article is structured as follows. In Section 2, I discuss the appearance of \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) with stative VPs. I illustrate that, even in the presence of \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \), these VPs remain stative and consequently, they are atelic. Moreover, these statives with \( \text{se} \) pattern with other \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) constructions by being otherwise transitive predicates and by disallowing bare nouns, among other properties that I point out. Thus, I conclude, \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) does not always give rise to a telic VP. As I illustrate, this aligns \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) with goal PPs, which also do not give rise to a telic VP when they combine with stative VPs. In Section 3, I address the source of the bare noun constraint. I present arguments that it is not tied to telicity – one of which comes from Section 2 where we see that \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) can appear with stative VPs and the bare noun constraint still holds – but tied to the structural position of the direct object: it is an inner subject of a complex predicate formed by \( V \) and the null PP. This approach is based on conclusions about inner subjects from Cuervo (2003, 2014). In Section 4, I show that \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) constructions show PCC effects in the CLPD leísta dialect, which motivates the underlying double object approach to \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) constructions where a null indirect object \( \text{pro} \) is located in Spec,Appl. In Section 5, I illustrate three parallels between \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) constructions and ‘true’ indirect object reflexive constructions as well as two differences. I argue that, despite these differences, \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) can still be fundamentally treated as an indirect object reflexive. In Section 6, I motivate the movement of \( \text{pro} \) from the sister of \( P \) to Spec,Appl by offering more examples of a less-widely discussed property of \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \), where the direct object is interpreted as on/with the subject. I show how this relation can be understood in terms of a central/terminal coincidence relation. In Section 7, I briefly recap the main conclusions from this article and discuss an alternative approach to reflexives which is consistent with the present proposal: Marantz’s (1984) and McGinnis’s (2004). As I note, an application of their approach to reflexives has suggestive implications for double object constructions in general.

2 Aspectual \( \text{se} \) and stativity

As noted in the introduction, in the presence of \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \), the telicity of a VP can be ensured. In fact, some assume that all VPs with \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) are telic (Sanz 2000; Sanz and Laka 2002; Basilico 2010; Campanini and Schäfer 2011). In this section, I discuss instances of \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) that appear with stative VPs. What we see is that these stative VPs remain stative even in the presence of \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \). Consequently, in these instances, \( \text{Asp}_\text{se} \) does not give rise to a telic VP. Moreover, I discuss parallels
between Asp$\text{se}$ with stative VPs in Spanish and goal PPs with stative VPs in English. Goal PPs in English can give rise to telic VPs – as is well-known – but with stative VPs they do not, much like what we will see for Asp$\text{se}$. Consequently, I expand the discussion in MacDonald (2004, 2006), MacDonald and Huidobro (2010), where parallel telicity inducing effects between English goal PPs and Spanish Asp$\text{se}$ are noted. I take these sets of parallels as evidence in favor of the presence of a null PP in Asp$\text{se}$ constructions, which is responsible for any telicity inducing effects. As we will see, since Asp$\text{se}$ can appear with stative VPs, which remain stative, an important observation surfaces: Asp$\text{se}$ does not always give rise to a telic VP. Before discussing the stative predicates, however, I briefly discuss the telicizing role of English Goal PPs and telicizing particles to initially motivate the null PP analysis of Asp$\text{se}$. While this recaps the discussion in MacDonald (2004, 2006), MacDonald and Huidobro (2010), it also expands on it by illustrating an aspectual asymmetry that holds for goal PPs, telicizing particles and Asp$\text{se}$, which adds further support for the null PP hypothesis of Asp$\text{se}$.

It is well known that a goal PP and a telicizing particle can give rise to a telic VP (Pustejovsky 1991; Borer 2005; MacDonald 2008; Travis 2010; among others) and it is also well known that Asp$\text{se}$ can give rise to a telic VP (Strozer 1976; Nishida 1994; Zagona 1996; MacDonald 2006; Basilico 2010; MacDonald and Huidobro 2010; Armstrong 2011; among others). The examples in (2) illustrate this for Asp$\text{se}$, while the examples in (6b) and (6c) illustrate this for goal PPs and telicizing particles in English, respectively.

\[(6)\]
\[\begin{align*}
\text{a. John ate an apple} & \quad \text{for a minute/in a minute.} \\
\text{b. John ate an apple to the core} & \quad \text{*for a minutes/in a minute.} \\
\text{c. John ate an apple up} & \quad \text{*for a minute/in a minute.}
\end{align*}\]

While it is standardly thought that in the presence of a DP that denotes a bounded quantity, like an apple in (6a), a for-adverbial is ungrammatical, it

\[\text{(11) Asp$_{se}$ shares some properties with telicizing particles and some properties with goal PPs. The telicizing effects with non-stative predicates and the lack of telicizing effects with stative predicates is one way in which Asp$_{se}$ patterns with goal PPs, but not with telicizing particles. The bare noun restriction on the direct object is one way in which Asp$_{se}$ patterns with telicizing particles, but not with goal PPs. Asp$_{se}$ patterns with both, as discussed above, by unambiguously inducing a telic VP, which is not the case for bounded DPs. Moreover as discussed in Section 6 below, Asp$_{se}$ interacts with the lexical semantics of predicate in a way reminiscent of PPs in general.}\]

\[\text{(12) The data in (6) are based on examples from Smollet (2005: 55). See also Piñon (2008) for discussion.}\]
has been observed that it is compatible on an interpretation in which, for example, the apple in (6a), was not entirely consumed (see Alsina 1999; Jackendoff 1996; Tenny 1987; Smollet 2005). On this interpretation, the predicate behaves as if atelic. Thus, as illustrated in Spanish in (2a), and in English in (6a), a bounded DP does not unambiguously give rise to a telic VP. This contrasts with goal PPs, telicizing particles, and Asp_{se}, which do unambiguously give rise to a telic VP, as illustrated in (6b), (6c) and (2b) respectively; they ensure the telicity of the VP (see Smollet 2005; van Hout 1998 for a discussion of the asymmetry between DPs and PPs and telicizing particles). Thus, English goal PPs and telicizing particles pattern with Asp_{se} in unambiguously giving rise to telic VPs, in contrast to DPs. This aligns Asp_{se} with English goal PPs and telicizing particles. In fact, we argue that any telicity inducing effect of Asp_{se} results from the presence of a null PP that has the same telicity inducing properties as goal PPs and telicizing particles, following MacDonald (2004, 2006), MacDonald and Huidobro (2010). This is illustrated in (7).

(7) \[ [\text{VoiceP} \text{Voice}_{se} [\text{VP} \text{V PP}_0]] \]

It has been noted, however, that a goal PP does not give rise to a telic VP when it appears with a stative predicate (MacDonald 2008: 140), illustrated in (8).

(8) a. John is into folk music now.
   b. John is into the cookies again.
   c. John owes $100 to his poker-playing buddies.
   d. John loves/hates that game to the core.

---

13 Another parallel discussed in MacDonald (2004, 2006) and MacDonald and Huidobro (2010) is that goal PPs, telicizing particles and Asp_{se} all prevent idiomatic interpretation, suggesting that they are all low in the VP.

14 Observe that the into in (8a) entails that John and folk music share some psychological space, which, is fundamentally a central coincidence relation à la Hale (1986) as discussed in more detail below in Section 6. This central coincidence relation is established in a physical space in (8b). One difference that is seen between goal PPs that give rise to telic VPs and those in (8) is that in the former case there is often a terminal coincidence relation, while this is not the case in the latter. I assume that the terminal coincidence relation is the result of the combination of the goal PP and a certain directional property of the verb. In the case of statives, there is no directional property of the verb and, thus, there is no terminal coincidence relation. Regardless, I still consider the PPs in (8) goal PPs.
If the analysis in (7) is on track, then we expect Asp$_{se}$ to pattern with goal PPs in English and not give rise to a telic VP when the verb is stative.$^{15}$ This expectation is met, as illustrated in (9).$^{16}$

(9) a. Juan se sabe la lección desde el martes.
   Juan Asp$_{se}$ knows the lesson since the Tuesday.
   ‘Juan has known the lesson since Tuesday.’

b. Juan se conoce muy bien a María desde hace años.
   Juan Asp$_{se}$ knows very well DOM María since make years.
   ‘Juan has known María very well for years now.’

c. Juan se cree la historia desde hace una semana.
   Juan Asp$_{se}$ believes the story since makes a week
   ‘Juan has believed the story for a week.’

There are not many stative predicates that allow the presence of a goal PP or Asp$_{se}$. I assume that the limited number of verbs that these elements can appear with is a function of the interaction of some property, or properties, of goal PPs and the null PP of Asp$_{se}$, be them featural or structural, and the stativity of these predicates. What the property might be is not at all clear to me at this point. Nevertheless, that there is a limited number in both cases constitutes, yet, another parallel between goal PPs and Asp$_{se}$.

Something more has to be said, however, since there are statives that cannot appear with Asp$_{se}$, namely, odioar ‘hate’; amar ‘love’ (See Zagona 1996; Sanz 2000), but which can take a goal PP in English, as illustrated in (8d). It is tempting to link the stricter distribution of Asp$_{se}$ in Spanish to a well-known difference between English (among other languages) and Spanish (among other languages) which Snyder (2001, 2012) explains with The Compounding

---

$^{15}$ When it comes to telicizing particles, the story is more complex. The few examples that I have mustered up are illustrated in (i).

i. a. John doesn’t feel up to it now.
   b. John is out of it this morning.
   c. John wants out of the program.

The particles in (i) show different properties from telicizing particles, like the one in (6c). First, in (ia), there is a sequence of particles up to. Second, in both (ib) and (ic) of is required to be present. It may be the case that there are no good examples of stative verbs with particles.

$^{16}$ Asp$_{se}$ with the verb saber is often cited in the literature on Asp$_{se}$, although often claimed to be telic in the presence of Asp$_{se}$ (see for instance Sanz 2000; Sanz and Laka 2002; Basilico 2010). Zagona (1996) calls the verb saber a quasi-state, comparing it to verbs whose objects undergo a transition from one state to another.
Parameter, a parameter that is directly related to the ability of a verb to combine with a secondary predicate. A further exploration of this possibility here, however, would take the article too far afield. Thus, I leave it for future research.\footnote{Below in Section 6, I discuss a property of \textsc{Asp$_{se}$} constructions which requires the direct object to be understood as \textit{on/with} the subject. An alternative might be to leverage this \textit{on/with} interpretation to explain why \textsc{Asp$_{se}$} cannot appear with \textit{odiar} ‘hate’ and \textit{amar} ‘love’ along the lines carried out for other verbs below in Section 6, although it is not clear whether this line can extend to a verb like \textit{contener} ‘contain’, which also cannot appear with \textsc{Asp$_{se}$}.}

Given the noted telicity inducing effects of both goal PPs and \textsc{Asp$_{se}$}, one might raise the question of whether or not the VPs in (9) are still stative. They appear to be. First: All of the VPs in (9) show the subinterval property, a property that statives are to known to possess (see, for instance, Dowty 1979), even in the presence of \textsc{Asp$_{se}$}. Second: Consider the proform \textit{hacerlo} ‘do so’. Eventive VPs allow \textit{hacerlo} substitution (Zagona 2002: 134), as illustrated in (10). Stative VPs do not. (11) illustrates that \textit{hacerlo} substitution leads to ungrammaticality with the VPs in (9), again, even when \textsc{Asp$_{se}$} is present.

(10) a. \textit{Juan toma café por la mañana y Pablo lo hace también.} \par
Juan takes coffee by the morning and Pablo it does also ‘Juan has coffee in the morning and Pablo does so too.’

b. \textit{María come pescado para cenar y Pablo lo hace también.} \par
María eats fish for dine and Pablo it does also ‘María eats fish for dinner and Pablo does so too.’

(11) a. *\textit{Juan se sabe la lección y Pablo lo hace también.} \par
Juan \textsc{Asp$_{se}$} knows the lesson and Pablo it does also ‘Juan knows the lesson and Pablo does so too.’

b. *\textit{Juan se conoce a María y Pablo lo hace también.} \par
Juan \textsc{Asp$_{se}$} knows \textsc{DOM} María and Pablo it does also ‘Juan knows María and Pablo does so too.’

c. *\textit{Juan se cree la historia y Pablo lo hace también.} \par
Juan \textsc{Asp$_{se}$} believes the story and Pablo it does also ‘Juan believes the story and Pablo does so too.’

Third: Consider a test discussed in Marín (2000). Eventive VPs can be the complement of \textit{parar} ‘stop’, while statives cannot. (12) illustrates that eventive VPs are grammatical, and (13) illustrates that statives with \textsc{Asp$_{se}$} are not.
Fourth: Marín (2000) also observes that statives in present tense do not allow for a habitual interpretation, while eventive VPs do. The addition of todos los días ‘every day’ forces a habitual interpretation. The eventives (14) are perfectly grammatical, while this is not the case for the statives with Asp$_{se}$ in (15).

(14) a. Juan se toma un café todos los días.
    Juan takes a coffee each the days
    ‘Juan has a coffee every day.’

b. María se come una manzana todos los días.
    María eats an apple each the days
    ‘María eats an apple everyday.’

(15) a. #Juan se sabe la lección todos los días
    Juan knows the lesson each the days
    ‘Juan knows the lesson every day.’

b. #Juan se conoce muy bien a María todos los días.
    Juan knows very well María each the days
    ‘Juan has known María very well every day.’

The stative verb creer ‘believe’ shows a different behavior. Consider the example in (16).
(16) Juan %(se) cree la historia todos los días.

Juan (Asp$_{se}$) believes the story each the days

‘Juan has believed the story everyday.’

With Asp$_{se}$, creer ‘believe’ can felicitously appear with todos los días ‘every day’. Without Asp$_{se}$ there is considerable variation among speakers ranging from slightly marked to strongly dispreferred. While the strong preference for Asp$_{se}$ for some speakers, would suggest that it does favor an eventive interpretation of creer ‘believe’ – at least in this context – since there are speakers who only find the sentence marked, for these speakers, at least it appears that any aspectual shift is the result of the properties of the verb itself, and not necessarily the result of the presence of Asp$_{se}$.

Notwithstanding the datum in (16), there is strong support that even in the presence of Asp$_{se}$, these stative VPs remain stative. Importantly, stative VPs are atelic.

Now, since these VPs remain stative even in the presence of Asp$_{se}$, one might raise the question of whether the se that appears with them is in fact Asp$_{se}$. I contend that it is.

First: The verbs with which se appears are otherwise transitive predicates. Second: Observe that the direct object cannot be a bare noun when se is present, as illustrated in (17).

---

18 Marín (2000) discusses other tests that distinguish eventives vs. statives in Spanish. Note that some statives can shift to eventives, in which case, they can sometimes pattern with eventives with respect to these diagnostics (Dowty 1979; Smith 1983,1991; Mufwene 1984; Rothstein 2004; de Swart 1998; Zucchi 1998). Nevertheless, any type of aspectual shift that the verbs in (9) do undergo – for instance, when in the preterit, they all pattern with eventives – appears to be independent of the presence of Asp$_{se}$.

19 The se with these statives is not Armstrong’s (2013) agentive reflexive clitic, since these predicates do not meet any of three conditions on agentive reflexives clitics. See footnote 2. In fact, Armstrong (2013: 94) specifically claims that the se in a sentence like saberse la lección ‘know the lesson’ is not an agentive reflexive clitic.

20 An anonymous reviewer notes that Se cree mentiras ‘He believes lies’ with the bare plural lies is grammatical. Some speakers consulted share the judgment, some do not. The same speakers find (17c) with bare plural mitos ‘myths’ ungrammatical, as well as with noticias/periódicos ‘news/newspapers’, as in *Juan se cree noticias/periódicos ‘Juan believes newspaper/magazines’. Armstrong (2013: 90) observes that some speakers also find El niño se comió veneno sin querer ‘The child ate poison on accident’ with bare mass noun poison grammatical in a prototypical Asp$_{se}$ construction. Other parallel examples, however, are ungrammatical: *El niño se comió arroz/pasta/sopa. ‘The boy ate up rice/pasta/soup.’ I do not have an explanation for why limited examples of bare nouns are grammatical in Asp$_{se}$ constructions. Nevertheless, they are not generally grammatical, as noted in the literature.
(17)  a. Juan (*se) conoce ciudades.
   Juan (*Asp_{se}) knows cities
   ‘Juan knows cities.’
  b. Juan (*se) sabe matemáticas.
   Juan (*Asp_{se}) knows mathematics
   ‘Juan knows math.’
  c. Juan (se) cree *(los) mitos
   Juan (Asp_{se}) belies *(the) myths
   ‘Juan believes the myths.’

With the verb *creer* ‘believe’ in (17c), the article appears to have to be present, independently of the presence of Asp_{se}, thus, we are not able to apply this test here. Nevertheless, based on these two parallels, and others discussed below (see footnote 21), I conclude that the *se* that appears with these statives is in fact Asp_{se}.

The overall conclusion from this section is that Asp_{se} does not always give rise to a telic VP. In this way, Asp_{se} patterns with English goal PPs. Based on this parallel, their ability to unambiguously induce a telic VP – something we also saw for telicizing particles – and parallels observed in MacDonald (2004, 2006) and MacDonald and Huidobro (2010) (see footnote 13), I claim that any telicity inducing effect of Asp_{se} is the result of a null PP that merges as the sister to the lexical verb, as illustrated in (7), and repeated below in (18).

(18) \[\text{Voice}_{P} \text{Voice}_{se} [\text{VP V PP}_{\emptyset}]\]

Since we know that goal PPs with stative VPs do not induce telicity (see 8), we can assume that the reason that Asp_{se} does not induce telicity with stative VP is for the same reason that goal PPs do not, whatever that might be.

3 The source of the bare noun constraint

We have already seen that in the presence of Asp_{se}, bare noun direct objects are not allowed (see 3 above). A very common explanation of this fact is related to the telicity

21 Another parallel is that *se* with these predicates, like Asp_{se}, cannot be doubled. We will see two other ways in which these stative predicates with Asp_{se} pattern with canonical instances of verbs with Asp_{se}. Specifically, *conocer* ‘know’ shows PCC effects, as discussed in Section 4, and *creer* ‘believe’ shows the on/with entailment or central/terminal coincidence relation, as discussed in Section 6.
inducing effect of Asp\textsubscript{se}. There is logic to this explanation. It is based on the observation that a bounded direct object gives rise to a telic VP, while an unbounded direct object gives rise to an atelic VP.\textsuperscript{22} This is illustrated in (19) from English.

(19) a. John drank a beer in 10 minutes/?for 10 minutes.
   b. John drank beer *in 10 minutes/for 10 minutes.

The direct object in (19a), a beer, is non-bare and denotes a bounded quantity of beer; the VP is telic, as indicated by the in/for-adverbial patterns.\textsuperscript{23} In contrast, in (19b), the noun beer is bare and, consequently, does not denote a bounded quantity of beer; the VP is atelic indicated by the in/for-adverbial patterns. In the presence of a bare noun, the VP is atelic. In the presence of Asp\textsubscript{se}, the VP is telic. Thus, Asp\textsubscript{se}, which induces a telic VP, is incompatible with a bare noun direct object, which induces an atelic VP. The logic is sound.\textsuperscript{24} However, we just saw in the previous section that with statives, Asp\textsubscript{se} does not give rise to a telic VP. At the same time, bare nouns are still not allowed. This suggests that the bare noun constraint in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions is not directly related to the telicity inducing effects of Asp\textsubscript{se}. Consider further support for the separation of telicity from the bare noun constraint. Recall from above that a goal PP induces a telic interpretation of the VP with non-stative predicates. As (20) illustrates, however, the direct object is allowed to be bare in the presence of a goal PP.

(20) a. John dragged rope into the shed.
   b. John sent beer to a friend.

Thus, the null PP in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions diverges in behavior from goal PPs in this respect. It patterns with telicizing particles, however, which also do not allow bare nouns, as illustrated in (21).

(21) a. John ate up *(the) pizza.
   b. John drank down *(the) beer.

\textsuperscript{22} The exact nature of the relevant property of DPs that gives rise to the telic/atelic alternation is not relevant here, but see Borer (2005), Krička (1989, 1992), Moltmann (1991), Rothstein (2004), Verkuyl (1972, 1993) or Zucchi and White (2001) for discussion of the relevant property. Moreover, as we saw in (2a) and (6a) above, bounded DPs do not unambiguously give rise to a telic VPs. What is important is that bare nouns give rise to atelic VPs. See footnote 27.

\textsuperscript{23} Recall from the discussion in Section 2, surrounding examples (2a) and (6a), that the for-adverbial is grammatical on an interpretation in which the beer in (19a) is not finished.

\textsuperscript{24} This is the approach adopted by Nishida (1994), Zagona (1996), Sanz and Laka (2002), Basilico (2010).
The contrast between telicizing particles and goal PPs illustrates that the bare noun constraint is independent of the ability of a secondary predicate to induce telicity.

Moreover, on the assumption that the direct objects in (21) are subjects of a small clause headed by the telicizing particle (Kayne 1985; Hoekstra 1988; den Dikken 1995; Ramchand and Svenonius 2002; Folli and Harley 2005), it is natural to explore the possibility that the bare noun constraint holds of subjects. If so, Cuervo’s (2003, 2014) *Naked Noun Phrase Constraint Revised* in (22), a constraint that is independent of (a)telicity, can help understand the patterns.\(^{25}\)

(22) An unmodified common noun cannot be the subject of a predicate under conditions of normal stress and intonation.

In fact, in this section, I claim that in Asp\(_{se}\) constructions, the direct object is an (inner) subject of a complex predicate formed by the lexical verb and the null PP. In order to see how this works, first consider the effects of the *Naked Noun Phrase Constraint Revised* with external arguments in Spanish in the examples in (23) and (24)

(23) a. *Estos/los/unos científicos estudian el asunto.*
   Those/the/some scientists study the issue
   ‘Those/the/some scientists are studying the issue.’
   b. *Científicos estudian el asunto.*
   Scientists study the issue
   ‘Scientists are studying the issue.’

   Those/the/some juices caused the reaction allergic
   ‘Those/the/some juices caused the allergic reaction.’
   b. *Zumos provocaron la reacción alérgica.*
   Juices caused the reaction allergic
   ‘Juices caused the allergic reaction.’

In (23a) and (24a) a determiner is present and the sentences are grammatical. In (23b) and (24b), in contrast, the subjects are bare and the sentences are

\(^{25}\) This is a revision of Suñer’s (1982: 209) *Naked Noun Constraint*, and reflects the fact that in Spanish, pre and post-verbal external arguments, preverbal subjects of unaccusatives and subjects of small clauses cannot be bare.
ungrammatical. We find the same patterns for direct objects in the presence of \(\text{Asp}_{se}\), illustrated in (25) and (26).

(25) a. \(\text{El león se comió a estos/los/unos científicos}\)

The lion \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) ate \(\text{DOM}\) those/the/some men.

‘The lion ate up those/the/some scientists.’

b. \(\ast\) \(\text{El león se comió a científicos}\).

The lion \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) ate \(\text{DOM}\) scientists.

‘The lion ate up scientists.’

(26) a. \(\text{Juan se bebió estos/los/unos zumos}\).

Juan \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) drank those/the/some juices

‘Juan drank up those/the/some juices.’

b. \(\ast\) \(\text{Juan se bebió zumos}\).

Juan \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) drank juices.

‘Juan drank up juices.’

These data not only suggest that the bare noun constraint in \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) constructions may be related to the direct object patterning with a subject, it also adds further support to the conclusion above that the bare noun constraint in \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) constructions is independent of any telicity inducing effect of the direct object.

We can draw this conclusion based on the fact that external

---

26 Some speakers prefer sentences like (25a) without the differential object marker \(a\).

27 Consider the sentence in (i) based on observations by Suñer (1982), which illustrates how a modified bare plural can be a preverbal external argument.

i. \(\%\text{Zumos de Aldi provocaron la reacción alérgica}\).

Juices from Aldi caused the reaction allergic

‘Juices from Aldi caused the allergic reaction.’

Some speakers fine (i) marked, indicated by \(\%\). As illustrated in (ii), a modified bare plural can also be a direct object in an \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) construction, which some speakers find marked as well.

ii. \(\%\text{Juan se bebió zumos de Aldi}\).

Juan \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) drank juices from Aldi.

‘Juan drank up juices from Aldi.’

Importantly, those who find (i) unmarked also find (ii) unmarked. This illustrates, again, that preverbal external arguments and the direct objects of \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) constructions pattern together, which is the main point of this section. Moreover, for these speakers, these data take on even more importance, since modified bare plurals like \textit{zumos de Aldi} ‘juices from Aldi’ in (ii) denote an unbounded quantity. Recall the logic that concludes that \(\text{Asp}_{se}\) is incompatible
arguments do not affect the (a)telicity of the VP, as illustrated in (27) (see Tenny 1987; MacDonald 2008).

(27) a. A mouse ate corn *in 10 minutes/for 10 minutes.
    b. Mice ate a bag of corn in 10 minutes/?for 10 minutes.

Although the external argument a mouse denotes a bounded quantity, the VP is atelic. If a mouse were affecting the (a)telicity of the VP, we would expect the VP to be telic. It is not, however, because the direct object corn, which denotes an unbounded quantity, affects the (a)telicity of the VP, not the external argument. In parallel fashion, the external argument mice denotes an unbounded quantity, but the predicate is telic. If mice were affecting the (a)telicity of the VP, we would expect the VP to be atelic. It is not, however, because the direct object a bag of corn, which denotes a bounded quantity, affects the (a)telicity of the VP, not the external argument. External arguments do not affect the (a)telicity of the VP like direct objects do.

External arguments in Spanish cannot be bare, yet, external arguments do not interact – in any direct way – with the (a)telicity of the VP. Bare noun direct objects in Asp$_{se}$ are not allowed, I claim, not because of the telicity of the VP, but because of their status as inner subjects. Recently, Cuervo (2014), makes the same claim for certain unaccusative verbs that can appear with se, but need not, as illustrated in (28).

(28) a. Cayeron las hojas.
    Fell the leaves
    ‘The leaves fell.’
    b. Se cayeron las hojas.
    Se fell the leaves.

As Masullo (1992) (see also Fernández Soriano 1999) observes, in the presence of se, although post-verbal, a bare noun is not allowed with these unaccusatives, as in (29b), which is not the case when se is not present, as in (29a), from Cuervo (2014:50).

with bare nouns: Asp$_{se}$ induces a telic VP and bare nouns give rise to atelic VPs. Bare nouns, then, are incompatible because their presence leads to conflicting (a)telicity conditions on a single VP. Modified bare plurals, like those in (ii), which denote an unbounded quantity, also give rise to atelic VPs, yet, as indicated in (ii), some speakers find them natural in Asp$_{se}$ constructions. This is unexpected if the bare noun constraint were related to the telicity inducing effects of Asp$_{se}$. 
(29) a. Cayeron hojas.
    Fell leaves
    ‘Leaves fell.’
b. *Se cayeron hojas.
    Se fell leaves.

Based on her *Naked Noun Phrase Constraint Revised* – see (22) above – Cuervo (2014: 52) analyzes the instances of *se* with the unaccusative verbs in (28b) and (29b) as anticausative *se*, where the post verbal grammatical subject is an inner subject of a stative *be* plus root predicate, illustrated in (30).

(30) \[\text{vGO [vBE} \text{DP [vBE} \text{Ø Root}_{\text{state}}\text{]]}\]

Assuming Cuervo’s *Naked Noun Phrase Constraint Revised*, I claim that in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions, the direct object is an inner subject of a complex predicate formed by the verb plus the null PP, as illustrated in (31).

(31) \[\text{VoiceP Voice}_{\text{se}} [\text{VP} \text{DP [V PP}_{\text{Ø}}\text{]]}\]

As an inner subject, the direct object in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions is subject to the *Naked Noun Phrase Constraint Revised* in (22) and, therefore, cannot be bare.

4 CPLD PCC repairs in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions

In this section, we will see that within the Spanish leísta dialect from Spain referred to as *Central Peninsular Leísta Dialect* (CPLD) by Ormazabal and Romero (2007), Asp\textsubscript{se} shows PCC effects. Concretely, I focus on one PCC repair strategy employed by this dialect, which consists of changing *le* to *lo* (Ormazabal and Romero 2007, 2013; Bonet 2008). I will refer to this as the *le*→*lo* PCC repair. Asp\textsubscript{se} shows the *le*→*lo* PCC repair. Based on conclusions from the literature regarding the syntactic conditions that give rise to PCC effects, I take the *le*→*lo* repair to indicate that there is a pronominal within the verb phrase that, together with the direct object, gives rise to PCC effects. I claim that this element is *pro* in Spec,Appl.

Perlmutter (1971) is often cited as the first to observe what is now commonly referred to as the PCC (a.k.a the *me-lui* constraint), a constraint that rules out certain ungrammatical combinations of clitics (weak pronouns and
agreement markers). For instance, the sequence *me le* is ungrammatical as illustrated by Spanish in (32).

(32)  
\[ *Me \ le \ recomendaron \]
\[ 1sg.DO \ 3sg.IO \ recommended \]
‘They recommend me to him.’

(32) illustrates a PCC violation in Spanish. (33a) illustrates a PCC repair, where the clitic no longer surfaces, but a strong form of the pronoun does. Interestingly, speakers resort to this strategy, which is otherwise ungrammatical in the grammar, as illustrated in (33b).

(33)  
a.  
\[ Me \ recomendaron \ a \ él. \]
\[ 1sg.DO \ recommended \ to \ him. \]
‘They recommend me to him.’

b.  
\[ *Mandaron \ un \ regalo \ a \ él. \]
\[ Sent \ a \ gift \ to \ him. \]
‘They sent a gift to him.’

There are three important aspects of the PCC to understand their violations. First: The construction in (32) is widely assumed to be a double object construction (Demonte 1995; Cuervo 2003). It has been widely observed that in the double object construction PCC effects arise (Anagnostopoulou 2005; Rezac 2006; Ormazabal and Romero 2007; Nevins 2007). Second: PCC effects arise when two pronominals (or weak elements) syntactically establish an Agreement relation with the same functional head (Bejar and Rezac 2003; Anagnostopoulou 2005; Rezac 2006; Nevins 2007). Third: It is often assumed that PCC effects arise because [person] features of both pronominals must

28 As Bonet (1991: 179) observes if *me* is interpreted as an ethical dative, the sentence is grammatical. I assume, following Anagnostopoulou (2003) and Rezac (2006) that ethical datives do not enter into the calculation of PCC effects because they are merged in a position higher than Voice, and thus will never agree with Voice. See Bosse et al. (2012) for arguments for merging ethical datives high in the structure. Essentially, an ethical dative is in a distinct Case/Agree domain (Albizu 1997; Rezac 2006).

29 I gloss *me* as direct object (DO), and *le* as indirect object (IO), and not as Accusative and Dative respectively, because, as we will see, within the leísta dialect under discussion, the direct object can surface as *le*, the clitic pronoun homophonous with dative *le*.

Agree with Voice (or little v) in order to receive Case (Anagnostopoulou 2005; Rezac 2006). Alternatively, [participant] is the relevant feature (See Nevins 2007; Adger and Harbour 2007). I will assume that the first two points are fundamentally correct, however, with respect to the third, at least for Spanish, Ormazabal and Romero (2007) make some important observations regarding leísta PCC repairs. First, a little background on the leísta dialect that is the focus of our discussion is in order.

In the leísta dialects under discussion, le (homophonous with dative le) is used for masculine animate direct objects, as illustrated in (34).

(34) (a) Vi a Juan
Saw DOM Juan.
‘I saw Juan.’
(b) Le vi.
Him saw
‘I saw him.’
(c) Lo vi
Him saw
As illustrated in (34b), leísta speakers uses le to pronominalize Juan from (34a). This contrasts with standard dialects, illustrated in (34c), that use lo to pronominalize Juan. When it comes to masculine inanimate direct objects, the leísta dialect under discussion patterns with standard Spanish in using lo, as indicated in (35b), a pronominalization of el coche from (35a).

(35) (a) Vi el coche.
Saw the car
‘I saw the car.’
(b) Lo vi.
It saw
‘I saw it.’

Now consider a PCC violation within this leísta dialect, illustrated in (36).

32 Specifically, these leísta speakers use le for masculine animate direct objects, and lo for masculine inanimate direct objects, la for feminine (animate or inanimate) direct objects and le for dative arguments. The speakers consulted are from a variety of regions of Spain but show the same patterns of the Central peninsular leísta dialect of Spanish (in contrast to Basque leísta dialect) as discussed in Ormazabal and Romero (2013), except regarding the le→lo PCC repair. The speakers consulted here do not find it marked.
Since leísta Spanish allows for *le* to pronominalize masculine animate direct objects and *me* can pronominalize a direct or an indirect object, the sentence in (36), string equivalent to the standard Spanish PCC violation in (32), has a different meaning, where *le* is the direct object and *me* is the indirect object. A repair strategy available to leísta speakers is changing *le* to *lo*, as illustrated in (37), as noted in Ormazabal and Romero (2007, 2013) and Bonet (2008).

Parallel to the standard Spanish PCC repair from (32a), a strategy otherwise ungrammatical in leísta Spanish – the use of *lo* for an animate indirect object – is used to repair the PCC violation. This is the *le*→*lo* leísta PCC repair strategy.

Importantly, as Ormazabal and Romero (2007) point out, *le* in (36) and *lo* in (37) are both third person. Consequently, were the relevant feature of pronominals underlying PCC effects related to the feature [person], it would not be clear how the PCC violation would be avoided in (36). Ormazabal and Romero (2007, 2013) propose that [animacy] is the relevant feature for PCC effects in leísta dialects and offer a version of the PCC in (38a) based on animacy, a specific instantiation of a the broader Object Agreement Constraint (OAC) in (38b):

(38) a. Person Case Constraint (revised): If object agreement encodes animacy, no other argument can be licensed through verbal agreement.  

b. Object Agreement Constraint: If the verbal complex encodes object-agreement, no other argument can be licensed through verbal agreement.

I follow Ormazabal and Romero (2007) in assuming that the relevant feature involved in the PCC is animacy, at least in Spanish. Based on this, we can understand how the *le*→*lo* leísta PCC repair strategy avoids a PCC violation. (39a) illustrates the leísta PCC violation, and (39b) illustrates the repair.

---

33 On the basis of the Catalan PCC repair which changes dative *li* to locative *hi*, Bonet (2008) argues that animacy is also relevant for indirect objects as well.

b. \[ \text{[VoiceP Voice [ApplP pro[1] Appl [VP V pro[3]]]]} \]

As mentioned above, I assume that these constructions are underlying double object constructions. I adopt an applicative-style analysis, based on Marantz (1993) (see also Bruening 2010). Moreover, following Borer (1984); Suñer (1988); Bleam (1999); Fernández-Soriano (1999); Franco (2000); Nevins (2007); among others, I assume that object clitics are fundamentally agreement markers, with a corresponding null pro in argument position.\(^{34}\)

In (39a), when the direct object is animate (i.e. pro[3,anim]), given the PCC as stated in (38a), animacy is encoded in verbal agreement – Agree being indicated by a two-way arrow – reflected in the clitic le surfacing; thus, no other argument can show verbal agreement. However, as indicated in (39a), the indirect object also shows verbal agreement, reflected in the clitic me surfacing.\(^{35}\) Thus, there are two objects involved in verbal agreement, violating the OAC in (38b).

In contrast, in (39b), direct object lo does not encode verbal agreement – because it is not animate (i.e. pro[3]) – indicated by the lack of a two-way arrow, thus no PCC violation arises. The indirect object is free to show verbal agreement. The important point of this section is that, in this leísta dialect, there is a unique le→lo PCC repair strategy. This le→lo PCC repair strategy, then, is a diagnostic for a PCC violation. Consider the Asp\(_se\) constructions in (40) with masculine animate full DP direct objects.\(^{36}\)

(40) a. El lobo se comió a Juan.
   The wolf Asp\(_se\) ate DOM Juan
   ‘The wolf ate Juan up.’

\(^{34}\) Modulo ‘mixed’ approaches to clitics, such as Ormazabal and Romero (2013) and Marchis and Alexiadou (2013). See footnote 35.

\(^{35}\) I do not have a technical reason as to why the indirect object in the double object construction must show verbal agreement. Nevertheless, in many languages, in the double object construction it is the applied/indirect object that shows verbal agreement, not the direct object (Baker 1996; Dryer 1986; Woolford 2000; Ormazabal and Romero 2007). Moreover, as Ormazabal and Romero (2013) argue, 1\(^{st}\) and 2\(^{nd}\) person clitics, and 3\(^{rd}\) person dative clitics in Spanish – in contrast to 3\(^{rd}\) person accusative clitics – are agreement markers. Thus, they show verbal agreement. This will be relevant below in Section 5, where I discuss a contrast between indirect object reflexives and direct object reflexives with respect to PCC effects.

\(^{36}\) Some speakers find (40b) marked, although they still find (41b) with lo fine.
b. **María se **conoce muy bien a Juan.
   María Asp$_{se}$ knows very well DOM Juan
   ‘María knows Juan very well.’

As illustrated in (41), when the direct object is pronominalized, *lo* surfaces, not *le*. As illustrated in (42), without Asp$_{se}$, *le* surfaces.

(41) a. El lobo se lo/*le comió.
   The wolf Asp$_{se}$ him ate.
   ‘The wolf ate him up.’
   b. María se lo/*le conoce muy bien.
   María Asp$_{se}$ him knows very well.
   ‘María knows him very well.’

(42) a. El lobo le comió.
   The wolf Asp$_{se}$ him ate
   ‘The wolf ate him up.’
   b. María le conoce muy bien.
   María him knows very well.
   ‘María knows him very well.’

Asp$_{se}$ constructions in this leísta dialect are subject to the PCC. The conclusion that I draw from this is that there is some other pronominal that must Agree with Voice in the Asp$_{se}$ construction which gives rise to a PCC.

---

37 Rivero (2008: 238) provides the same example as ours in (41a). However, she reports that with Asp$_{se}$, *le* is grammatical. All of the leísta speakers consulted find these sentences with *le* ungrammatical, while the sentences with *lo* are perfectly fine. There is a possibility that the leísta speakers consulted form a different dialect of leísta speakers than those reported in Rivero (2008). Variation among leísta dialects is known to exist (see Fernández-Ordóñez 1999; Ormazabal and Romero 2007 and references therein).

38 Note also that *conocer* ‘know’ in (41b) is a stative verb. The fact that this verb patterns like other instances of Asp$_{se}$ with respect to the PCC lends further support to the conclusion from Section 2, that the *se* with *conocer* ‘know’ is in fact Asp$_{se}$.

39 An anonymous reviewer correctly points out that the argument made here can extend to standard dialects, since we expect PCC violations to arise between 1st and 2nd person clitics as well. The example and judgment provided by the reviewer is in (i), gloss and translation is mine.

i. *Me te conozco muy bien
   Asp$_{se}$ DOMte know very well
   Intended: ‘I know you very well.’
violation when the direct object pronoun is animate. I will adopt a double object construction and propose that this pronominal is a null *pro* in Spec,Appl, as illustrated in (43).

(43) \[\text{VoiceP Voice [ApplP} \text{ pro App [VP DP [V PP\_0]]}]\]

5 Aspectual *se* as an indirect object reflexive

If the structure in (43) is correct, then, fundamentally the *se* in Asp\(_{se}\) is an indirect object reflexive (IO\(_{se}\)). In this section, I discuss three ways in which Asp\(_{se}\) patterns with ‘true’ indirect object reflexives: they both show PCC effects, *pro* linked to *se* is underspecified for animacy, and they are both paradigmatic. I also discuss two ways in which the *se* in Asp\(_{se}\) does not pattern like a ‘true’ indirect object reflexive: Asp\(_{se}\) cannot double, while IO\(_{se}\) can, and direct objects can be bare with IO\(_{se}\), but not with Asp\(_{se}\). As I illustrate neither contrast requires abandonment of the structure of (43), thus, I conclude that we can still fundamentally treat Asp\(_{se}\) as an indirect object reflexive.

Consider the first way in which IO\(_{se}\) patterns with Asp\(_{se}\): it also shows PCC effects, something already observed for reflexive pronouns in general (Kayne 1975; Bonet 1991, 2008; but see footnote 40), although, as far as I know, not explicitly illustrated with indirect object reflexives within leísta dialects. Consider two sets of examples in (44) and (45).

(44) a. *María se asignó el asistente a sí misma.*
    María IORefl\(_{se}\) assigned the assistant to self same
    ‘María assigned the assistant to herself.’
    b. *María se lo/*le asignó.*
    María IORefl\(_{se}\) him assigned.
    ‘María gave him to herself.’

(45) a. *María se regaló un chico a sí misma (para ayudarla en el jardín).*
    María IORefl\(_{se}\) gifted a boy to self same (for help.her in the yard)
    ‘María gave herself a boy (to help her in the yard).’
    b. *María se lo/*le regaló.*
    María IORefl\(_{se}\) him gifted
    ‘María gave him to herself.’

---

40 Bonet (1991: 192) observes that a sentence in Catalan parallel to (44a) is grammatical for some speakers and ungrammatical for others.
As indicated in (44b) and (45b) the animate direct object is pronominalized in this léísta dialect as *lo* and not *le* in the presence of an indirect object reflexive. Indirect object reflexives, like Asp*se*, show PCC effects, as indicate by the *le*→*lo* PCC repair. On the assumption that IO*se* constructions are double object constructions, we can hypothesize the same underlying structure argued for Asp*se* from (43), minus the null PP, as illustrated in (47). The PPC effects observed for both IO*se* and Asp*se*, then, find the same explanation.

(47) \[\text{VoiceP} \text{Voice} \text{se} \text{[AppP pro App [VP V DP]]}\]

Now consider a contrast with direct object reflexives (DO*se*), which do not show PCC effects (see Rivero 2008), as illustrated in (48).

(48) a. María se regaló a sí misma a su marido.
   María DORefl*se* gifted DOM self same to her husband
   ‘María gave herself to her husband.’

   b. Se le regaló.
   DORefl*se* him.IO gifted
   ‘She gave herself to him.’

First note that these patterns are consistent with the conclusions from above that Asp*se* patterns with indirect object reflexives. Nevertheless, it raises the question of why there is a difference between direct object and indirect object reflexives with respect to the PCC. I claim here that Ormazabal and Romero’s (2007) approach to the PCC can handle these facts straightforwardly if we add to it that reflexive *se* (or *pro* linked to *se*) in Spanish is underspecified for animacy. Concretely, it lacks an [animate] feature altogether. Consider support for the lack of an [animate] feature in (51).

---

41 Rivero’s (2008: 227) example is: Ella se le entregó en cuerpo y alma. ‘She gave herself to him in body and soul.’

42 Note that these patterns are problematic for conclusions drawn by Nevins (2007), whereby a paradigmatic use of a reflexive pronoun is an indication that they will show PCC effects. The story is a bit more complex.

43 Observe in (i) and (ii) that the differential object marker *a* cannot appear with nouns like *la aplicación* ‘the application’ and *i-phone* ‘i-phone’.

i. El técnico informatico estudió (*a*) la aplicación/el i-phone.
   The technician computer studied (*DOM*) the application/el i-phone.
   ‘The computer technician studied the application/the i-phone.’

---
In (49a), we see a direct object reflexive and in (49b) we see an indirect object reflexive. In both cases, the reflexive is coreferential with an inanimate DP – *la aplicación* ‘the application’ in (49a) and *mi i-phone* ‘my i-phone’ in (49b) – and *se* surfaces grammatically. With this in mind, consider the structures for indirect object reflexives and direct object reflexives in (50a) and (50b), respectively.

First, recall that the indirect object/applied object in the double construction Agrees with Voice. (See footnote 35). This is indicated by the two-way arrows from *pro*(*se*) in Spec,Appl in (50), regardless of the person, number or animacy of *pro*(*se*). Thus, when indirect object reflexive *pro*(*se*) is in Spec,Appl in (50a) or (50b), it Agrees with Voice, independently of animacy. Consequently, when there is an animate DP direct object, as in (50a), there is a PCC/OAC violation. In contrast, when direct object reflexive *pro*(*se*) is the complement of V as in (50b), it does not Agree with Voice, as indicated in by the lack of a two-way arrow, since, as I claim above, it does not have an animacy feature. Thus, the indirect object in Spec,Appl is free to Agree with Voice, and there is no PCC/OAC

---

**ii. El técnico informático estudió *(a) la aprendiz*  
The technician computer studied *(DOM) the apprentice.*  
‘The computer technician studied the apprentice.’

**44** Nevins (2007) draws the same conclusion about indirect object dative *le*, that it is underspecified for animacy, since it can be coreferential with an animate or an inanimate DP. That the indirect object can be inanimate is not consistent with the conclusions drawn in Charnavel and Mateu (2014).
These patterns support the overall approach to PCC effects rooted in animacy.

From this discussion a second way in which Asp\textsubscript{se} patterns with indirect object Refl\textsubscript{se} comes to light: \textit{pro} linked to Asp\textsubscript{se} is also underspecified for animacy. This can be shown with observations from Folli and Harley (2005). They note for Italian Asp\textsubscript{se} that when the external argument is inanimate, \textit{se} is obligatorily present. Basilico (2010) (see also Armstrong 2013) shows that Spanish Asp\textsubscript{se} patterns in the same way, as illustrated in (51), from Basilico (2010: 278–279).

(51) a. El mar *(se) ha comido la playa.
   The sea *(Asp\textsubscript{se}) has eaten the beach
   ‘The sea has eaten up the beach.’
   b. El sol *(se) ha bebido el lago.
   The sun *(Asp\textsubscript{se}) has drunk the lake
   ‘The sun has drunk up the lake.’

Folli and Harley (2005) take these facts to mean that the presence of \textit{se} is related to the type of external argument introduced in the structure, concluding that Asp\textsubscript{se} spells out a $v_{\text{CAUSE}}$ head. This head allows for inanimate external arguments. Importantly, Asp\textsubscript{se} can – and as illustrated in (51) must – appear when linked to an inanimate external argument. This is consistent with the claim that \textit{pro} linked to Asp\textsubscript{se} is underspecified for animacy even in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions, illustrating another parallel between Asp\textsubscript{se} and indirect object Refl\textsubscript{se}.

Note, moreover, that even in the presence of an inanimate external argument in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions, we find the same PCC effects in the CPLD dialect, illustrated in (52).

(52) a. La tierra se ha tragado a Juan.
   The earth Asp\textsubscript{se} has swallowed DOM Juan
   ‘The earth has swallowed Juan up.’
   b. La tierra se lo/*le ha tragado.
   The earth Asp\textsubscript{se} him has swallowed
   ‘The earth has swallowed him up.’

Since the external argument in (52) is inanimate, \textit{pro} in Spec,Appl cannot be specified as animate. At the same time, we still see PCC effects when there is

\footnote{Se is like \textit{lo} in that it is 3\textsuperscript{rd} person and does not give rise to PCC effects.}
an animate direct object. The same explanation applied to indirect object reflexives from above applies here. The patterns are explained if we assume Ormazabal and Romero's (2007) approach to the PCC based on the animacy of the direct object and if both pro linked to Ref$_{se}$ and pro linked to Asp$_{se}$ are underspecified for animacy.

Now consider the third way in which IO$_{se}$ and Asp$_{se}$ pattern together: They are both paradigmatic, as illustrated for IO$_{se}$ in (53) and for Asp$_{se}$ in (54).$^{46}$

(53) a. Yo$_{i}$ me$_{i}$ mandé un regalo.
    I Refl$_{se}$ sent a gift
b. Tú$_{i}$ te$_{i}$ mandaste un regalo.
   You. sg Refl$_{se}$
c. Él/ella$_{i}$ se$_{i}$ mandó un regalo.
   He/She Refl$_{se}$
d. Nosotros$_{i}$ nos$_{i}$ mandamos un regalo.
   We Refl$_{se}$ sent a gift
e. Vosotros$_{i}$ os$_{i}$ mandasteis un regalo
   You.pl Refl$_{se}$
f. Ellos/ellas$_{i}$ se$_{i}$ mandaron un regalo.
   They Refl$_{se}$

(53) a. Yo$_{i}$ me$_{i}$ bebí unas cervezas.
   I Asp$_{se}$ drank some beers
b. Tú$_{i}$ te$_{i}$ bebite unas cervezas.
   You. sg Asp$_{se}$
c. Él/ella$_{i}$ se$_{i}$ bebió unas cervezas.
   He/She Asp$_{se}$
d. Nosotros$_{i}$ nos$_{i}$ bebimos unas cervezas.
   We Asp$_{se}$ drank some beers
e. Vosotros$_{i}$ os$_{i}$ bebisteis unas cervezas.
   You.pl Asp$_{se}$
f. Ellos/ellas$_{i}$ se$_{i}$ bebieron unas cervezas.
   They Asp$_{se}$

$^{46}$ This is not the case for all se constructions in Spanish. Some only appear in 3rd person, such as passive se, impersonal se, and middle se. Consequently, calling the construction under consideration in the present article aspectual ‘se’ is a misnomer.
I assume that their paradigmatic status is a result of both predicates being fundamentally reflexive predicates.\textsuperscript{47,48}

We now turn to the first contrast between $\text{IO}_{se}$ and $\text{Asp}_{se}$: the former can be doubled, while the latter cannot, as illustrated in (54a) and (54b) respectively.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Juan se mandó un regalo (a sí mismo).}  
\textit{Juan IO}_{se} sent a gift (to self same)  
\textit{Juan sent himself a gift.}'
\item \textit{Juan se bebió una cerveza (*a sí mismo).}  
\textit{Juan Asp}_{se} drank a beer (*to self same)  
\textit{John drank up a beer.}'
\end{enumerate}

I suggest here that we can appeal to the internal make up $pro$ in these constructions as a way to explain this difference. If we assume the general account of doubling from Uriagereka (1995), we might say that the $pro$ linked to $\text{Asp}_{se}$ is either lacking a D layer/feature altogether, or it has a ‘weak’ D. In contrast, $pro$ linked to $\text{IO}_{se}$ does not lack a D layer/feature or is not ‘weak’, and can therefore double. On a technical solution of this sort, we can still maintain the basic underlying double object construction for both, as in (47). Although this solution allows us to maintain the structure in (47), the question still remains why $pro$ linked to $\text{Asp}_{se}$ is deficient compared to $pro$ linked to $\text{IO}_{se}$.

The second way in which $\text{IO}_{se}$ and $\text{Asp}_{se}$ differ is that the direct object in $\text{IO}_{se}$ constructions can be bare, illustrated in (55), which is not the case for $\text{Asp}_{se}$, as discussed extensively in Section 3 above.\textsuperscript{49}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textit{Juan se mandó regalos (a sí mismo).}  
\textit{Juan IO}_{se} sent gifts (to self same)  
\textit{Juan sent himself gifts.}'
\item \textit{Juan se recomienda películas (a sí mismo).}  
\textit{Juan IO}_{se} recommended movies (to self same)  
\textit{Juan recommended movies to himself.'}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{47} My focus is not on how the person and number features of $se$ vary as a function of the person and number features of the DP in Spec,Voice. Nevertheless, a cyclic Agree approach à la Rezac (2003) would work. See Armstrong (2011) for an alternative.

\textsuperscript{48} The final spell-out position of $se$ is not Voice, but some other position. This might be the result of a process that takes place in the syntax (Uriagereka 1995) or in the post-syntactic morphological component.

\textsuperscript{49} I thank an anonymous reviewer for drawing attention to this important contrast. The example in (55b) is theirs.
However, there is a parallel dative construction that has also been analyzed as a double object construction by Cuervo (2003): possessor dative (Poss_se) constructions. Observe in (56), that the direct object in the possessor dative construction cannot be bare.

(56) a. Ayer en el accidente, Juan se rompió *(unos) huesos.  
Yesterday in the accident, Juan Poss_se broke *(some) bones

b. Anoche, antes de acostarse, mi hijo no se lavó *(los) dientes.  
Last night, before of laying down, my son not Poss_se *(the) teeth

Assuming the same basic underlying double object configuration for Asp_se, IO_se and Poss_se, we see that there is variation in terms of whether the direct object(inner subject) can be bare or not. This variation is not surprising. Recall that the direct object with telicizing particles in English cannot be bare. Assuming the particle to head a small clause (Kayne 1985; Hoekstra 1988; den Dikken 1995; Ramchand and Svenonius 2002; Folli and Harley 2005), we can treat the direct object in a telicizing particle verb construction in English as an inner subject. The data in (57) illustrate that not all subjects of small clauses need to be non-bare either. Examples in (57) are based on Borer (2005: 55–57).

(57) a. John walked (*mail/*the letter).
    b. John walked mail/the letter to the post office.

(57) illustrates that the direct object is licensed by the secondary predicate, arguably analyzable as a small clause with the letter/mail as its subject. The subject of this small clause can be bare. Moreover, observe that English external arguments can be bare, illustrated in (58), unlike Spanish external arguments, as discussed in Section 4.

(58) Wildlife drank the water.

IO_se constructions allow their direct object(inner subjects) to be bare, in contrast to Asp_se and Poss_se constructions. External arguments in English can be bare in contrast to Spanish. It appears that some predicates have a property that restricts their subjects to being non-bare. These patterns raise an important

---

50 We also saw that the constraint was independent of any telicity inducing property these predicates have.
question about when a predicate has the relevant property and when it does not. An attempt at answering this question would lead us astray of the main focus of this article. Nevertheless, given the empirical patterns, it is not unexpected that parallel underlying structures allow for distinct requirements on a subject. The fact that there is no restriction on bare noun direct objects for some IO\textsubscript{se} while there is for Asp\textsubscript{se} does not necessarily entail that they do not share the basic configuration argued for in (43).

Given the three parallels noted between Asp\textsubscript{se} and IO\textsubscript{se}, and despite the two contrasts discussed, I conclude that Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions are fundamentally indirect object reflexive constructions, as the present proposal entails (see also Campanini and Schäfer 2011).\footnote{In Section 6 we will discuss reasons for concluding that pro in Asp\textsubscript{se} and the external argument are coreferential as well. This would constitute another parallel between IO\textsubscript{se} and Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions.}

### 6 A less widely discussed property of Asp\textsubscript{se}

Recall from the introduction that I claim that pro is not base generated in Spec, Appl, but moves from an initial merge position as the sister of the null P. In this section, I motivate this movement by looking at a less widely discussed property of Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions, something that MacDonald (2004, 2006) refers to as an on/with entailment. I illustrate here that this on/with entailment is fundamentally the same as Hale’s (1986) central and terminal coincidence relations. Thus, I first illustrate two relevant aspects of the central and terminal coincidence relations, as a point of departure for the discussion of Asp\textsubscript{se}.

Consider the basic distinction between terminal coincidence and central coincidence, which can be illustrated by the examples in (59a) and (59b) respectively.

\begin{align*}
(59) & \text{ a. John went in his room.} \\
& \text{ b. John sat in his room.}
\end{align*}

In (59a), John (the figure) changes location with respect to his room (the ground), such that the end of John’s path of motion terminally coincides with the room. In (59b), John (the figure) does not change location with respect to his room (the ground); John’s location centrally coincides with his room.
Importantly, while prepositions play a role in the central vs. terminal coincidence relation between the figure and ground, the lexical semantic properties of the verb also play a role. The sentences in (59) illustrate this, since the same prepositions are involved, yet, we have different relations between the figure and the ground. The distinct relations are a result of the PPs interacting with the lexical semantics of the verbs, which in this case is related to the property of directionality, or lack thereof. Now consider an observation from MacDonald (2004) regarding the sentences in (60).\textsuperscript{52}

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(60)a] Juan abrochó la camisa.
Juan closed the shirt

\textit{‘Juan buttoned the shirt.’}

\item[(60)b] Juan se abrochó la camisa.
Juan Asp\textsubscript{se} closed the shirt
\end{enumerate}

In (60a), there are at least two interpretations available, one where the shirt is on a hanger while Juan buttons it, and one where Juan is wearing the shirt while he buttons it.\textsuperscript{53} In (60b), with the addition of Asp\textsubscript{se}, however, only the interpretation where the shirt is on Juan is possible. MacDonald (2004) observes a similar pattern in the examples in (61) as well.

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(61)a] Juan lavó el coche.
Juan washed the car

\textit{‘Juan washed the car.’}

\item[(61)b] Juan se lavó el coche.
Juan Asp\textsubscript{se} washed the car.
\end{enumerate}

In (61a) there are at least two interpretations available, one where Juan sits in his car (sipping a coffee, for instance) while his car is washed by being automatically moved through a carwash tunnel, and one where Juan is actively involved in the car washing event, say, by physically scrubbing the car with a sponge. In (61b), in contrast, the only interpretation available in the presence of Asp\textsubscript{se} is one where Juan is actively involved in the car-washing event, where the car is with him (or he is with the car). MacDonald (2004) refers to the relation

\textsuperscript{52}These and the data presented in this section illustrate that the presence of Asp\textsubscript{se} changes the truth conditions of the clause, contra claims by Campinini and Schäfer (2011).

\textsuperscript{53}Some speakers have a strong preference for the shirt not being on Juan in (60a), although they still share the judgment reported for (60b) with Asp\textsubscript{se}.
between the direct object and the subject illustrated in (60b) and (61b) as an on/with entailment, where the direct object is entailed to be on/with the subject. Here I note that these interpretations can be considered central coincidence relations where the car and shirt are the figure and Juan is the ground. Fundamentally, the shirt and the car are interpreted as centrally coinciding with Juan.

In the presence of Asp_{se}, we can also find relations between the direct object and the subject that can be characterized as a terminal coincidence. This can be illustrated with ingestion verbs like comer and beber, as in (62).

(62) a. Juan se bebió la cerveza.
   Juan Asp_{se} drank the beer
   ‘Juan drank down the beer.’

b. María se comió el helado.
   María Asp_{se} ate the ice-cream
   ‘María ate up the ice-cream.’

Considering the relationship between the direct object (the figure) and the subject (the ground) in these instances, they are consistent with a terminal coincidence relation, where the beer and the ice-cream undergo a change of location, the end of the path of which is Juan and María, respectively. They come to ingest the drink and food. The same Asp_{se} is involved, but the central vs. terminal coincidence relation varies as a function of the lexical semantic properties of the verbs. Thus, Asp_{se} patterns like the prepositions in (59) and interact with the lexical semantic properties of the verb to give rise to a central coincidence or a terminal coincidence relation between the direct object and the subject.

Consider further instances of Asp_{se} that illustrate an interaction with the lexical semantic properties of the verb. Consider it first with the verb acabar ‘finish’ in (63).

---

54 Zagona (1996: 447) seems to suggest something similar stating: ‘aspectual se relates the subject and object arguments ... with respect to the[ir] location ... at the endpoint of the event. That is, se ... expresses a relation of co-location in the eventual structure of the predicate.’ She executes this by following Zubizarreta’s (1987) analysis of Romance se as a verbal operator that ‘forces a predication relation between a VP-internal position and the subject’ (486), ‘such that the object is ‘at’ the subject, for verbs of consumption.’ (489). Schroten (1972: 90) states that instances with Asp_{se} ‘express a ‘narrower’ relation between the subject and the verbs’ than those without Asp_{se}. Arce-Arenales (1989) observes an ‘incorporative’ sense of Asp_{se} constructions. Campanini and Schäfer (2011) encode this ‘incorporative’ sense in the semantics of a low Appl-into head. Given the interpretations discussed regarding examples (60), (61), (67) and (69), the low Appl-into analysis seems too strong.
(63) a. Juan acabó el libro  b. Juan se acabó el libro.
  Juan finished the book  Juan Asp_se finished the book
i: ‘Juan finished reading the book’  i: ‘Juan finished reading the book’

As indicated in the two translations of (63a), there are two possible interpretations available, one where Juan finishes reading the book, and one where Juan finishes writing the book. With the addition of Asp_se, only the reading interpretation is available. (See Nishida (1994) for the original observation and Campanini and Schäfer (2011) who observe the same patterns of interpretation with Asp_se in Italian and French with this verb as well.) This example is parallel to both examples (60) and (61) on the one hand and to the examples in (62) on the other. First, on a par with (60) and (61), in the presence of Asp_se, only a subset of possible interpretations is available. This indicates an interaction between Asp_se and the lexical semantics of the verb. Second, like (62), there seems to be a terminal coincidence relation involved in (63) in the presence of Asp_se, where the book undergoes a change of location, the end of the path of which is Juan. One might speculate that a sort of psychological ingestion of the book takes place when one reads a book, and the book, as a psychological object can, like drink and food, come to be ingested by Juan. A similar pattern can be observed with the verb inventar ‘invent’ as illustrated in (64).

(64) a. Juan inventó la excusa.
  ‘Juan invented the excuse.’
   b. Juan inventó la máquina (en la mesa).
  ‘Juan invented the machine (on the table).’

The important difference to highlight between (64a) and (64b) is that in (64a), the excuse is not a physical/tangible object, but an intangible psychological object. In contrast, the intended reading of (64b) is one where the object is a physical/tangible machine that one can point to and touch etc., external to the inventor. What we see in (65), is that in the presence of Asp_se, la can only refer to

55 I do not have an explanation as to why Asp_se is only possible with a subset of the lexical meanings of the verb. One speculation as to why the writing interpretation is not available in the presence of Asp_se is that by externalizing the book, there is no longer a central coincidence (or on/with interpretation) relation between the direct object and the subject, yet, this is required by the presence of Asp_se, specifically by the semantics of the null P.
the intangible psychological object, the excuse, not to the physical/tangible externalized object, the machine.

(65) Se la inventó. → la = una escusa ‘an excuse’
Asp_{se} it invented → la ≠ una máquina ‘a machine’
‘He invented it.’

Consider one final illustration of yet another contrast, in this case with the stative verb creer ‘believe’.\(^{56}\) Consider the sentences in (66).

(66) a. Juan cree la historia.
   Juan believes the story
   ‘Juan believes the story.’

b. Juan cree a María.
   Juan believes DOM María
   ‘Juan believes María.’

Now consider the interpretation of la in (67) in the presence of Asp_{se}.

(67) Se la cree. → la = la historia ‘the story’
Asp_{se} it believes → la ≠ María ‘María’
‘He believes it.’

The only possible reference of la in (67) is the story. A story, compared to a person (in this case María), is an intangible psychological object.\(^{57}\) We find the

\(^{56}\) This illustrates yet another way in which stative verbs with se pattern with clear cases of Asp_{se}, supporting the conclusion from Section 2 that the se that appears with these statives is Asp_{se}.

\(^{57}\) Sanz and Laka (2002: 323) observe the contrast between (i) and (ii) (gloss and translations mine):

i. Rosa se vio el video de la boda entero.
   Rosa Asp_{se} saw the video of the boda entire
   ‘Rosa saw the entire wedding video.’

ii. *Claudio se vio un pájaro que pasaba por allí.
    Claudio Asp_{se} saw a bird that passed by there
    ‘Claudio saw a bird that passed by over there.’

They tie the contrast to the presence of an agentive subject in (i) and an experiencer subject in (ii). It is not clear that there is an agentive subject in (i). It is possible, however, that this illustrates the same contrasts discussed between (64) and (65) and between (66) and (67) above,
same patterns as above. In each case, I argue, the direct objects must be interpreted as *on/with* the subject.\textsuperscript{58,59}

There are two important points to take from this discussion. 1. In the presence of \textsubscript{Asp}se, there is a consistent interpretation that can be subsumed under a *central/terminal coincidence relation* between the direct object and the subject, essentially where the direct object is interpreted as *on/with* the subject; 2. Similar to prepositions involved in the central/terminal coincidence relation, \textsubscript{Asp}se interacts with the lexical semantic properties of the verb, evidenced by there being only a subset of the total possible interpretations of a verb available in the presence of \textsubscript{Asp}se. To account for these facts, we follow MacDonald and Huidobro (2010), who assume that the *on/with* entailment is the result of a predication relation where a complex predicate formed by the lexical verb and the null PP take the direct object as a subject. As the subject of the predicate, the direct object is interpreted as *on/with* the denotation of the complement of the P – taken to be \textsubscript{Asp}se itself by MacDonald and Huidobro (2010) – which I claim is pro. Moreover I assume pro is coreferential with the DP external argument. This is illustrated in (68).

\begin{align}
(68) \quad [\text{VoiceP} \text{ DP}_1 \text{ Voice}_se \text{ [ApplP pro} \text{ Appl [VP DP V [PP P on/with pro]]]}]
\end{align}

As illustrated in (68), pro is the sister of P, where it is interpreted as the ground. The DP in Spec,VP is interpreted as the figure which is related (abstractly) spatially with respect to the ground via the P plus V complex where the intangible psychological object is compatible with \textsubscript{Asp}se, while the physical external object is not, at least not in this context. Some speakers allow (iii) with \textsubscript{Asp}se in a context where the bird lands and is sitting in their lap, for instance. The bird is *on/with* the subject.

\begin{itemize}
\item[iii.] \text{Me lo vi encima.}
  \text{Asp}_se \text{ it saw on}
  \text{‘I saw it on me.’}
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{58} Nishida (1994: 431) observes that for the sentence \textit{Juan se conoce bien la poesía española.}, where \textit{la poesía española} could have a generic interpretation referring to ‘Spanish poetry’ or a specific interpretation referring to a concrete ‘Spanish poem’, only the latter is possible: ‘Juan knows the Spanish poem/*Spanish poetry well.’ It is not entirely clear how to assimilate this example into the present account by relying on an *on/with* or central/terminal coincidence relation between the object and the subject.

\textsuperscript{59} Schrötten (1972: 90) classifies the following verbs that can take a *se* with a sentential complement differently from cases of \textsubscript{Asp}se: \textit{imaginar(se), ‘imagine’; suponer(se), ‘suppose’; pensar(se), ‘think’; and saber(se) ‘know’}. From the perspective of psychological objects located within the mental space of the subject, it initially seems possible to treat the *se* that appears with these verbs as \textsubscript{Asp}se.
In this way, the semantics of the P – \textit{on/with} – and the semantics of the verb play a role in determining this relation. Moreover, as a complex predicate, it is not surprising that there are lexical restrictions (although I do not offer any concrete explanations of them here). Since \textit{pro}, the complement of P, is coreferential with the external argument, the direct object is interpreted as \textit{on/with} the subject.\footnote{Perhaps P incorporation à la Baker (1988) is involved in the formation of this complex predicate. If incorporation underlies restructuring, then we can also understand how \textit{pro} can strand the P, and move to a higher domain. It might also explain why the P is not overt. This makes Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions look like a double object construction derived from a prepositional dative construction. Since the P never surfaces overtly, moreover, this would look like a non-alternating double object construction. It may be the case that the P never surfaces overtly because there is no overt preposition in Spanish that has the exact semantics of the null P in Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions. See Rappaport-Hovav and Levin (2008) for a parallel approach to the Russian verb \textit{give} and why it only appears in a double object construction.}

To conclude this section, I draw attention to two aspects of the proposal that highlight parallels with other elements: one with goal PPs and another with IO\textsubscript{se}. First, consider the relationship between the direct objects and the complements of the goal Ps in (69).

(69) a. \textit{John threw the paper onto the sofa.}

b. \textit{John rolled the ball into the hole.}

There is an entailment that the paper is on the sofa in (69a) and that the ball is in the hole in (69b). There is a specific spatial relation entailed between the denotation of the direct object and that of the complement of the goal P, where the paper is \textit{on} the sofa in (69a) and the ball is \textit{in} the hole. This parallels the \textit{on/with} entailments of Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions, illustrating another parallel between Asp\textsubscript{se} and goal PPs, as discussed in MacDonald and Huidobro (2010).

Second, recall from Section 5, that I argued that Asp\textsubscript{se} is fundamentally an IO\textsubscript{se}. In that context, the conclusion drawn above that \textit{pro} and the external argument are coindexed is not surprising, since the indirect object and the external argument in IO\textsubscript{se} constructions are also coindexed. If \textit{pro} in Asp\textsubscript{se} is, in fact, coindexed with the external argument, we can explain the appearance of \textit{se} in Asp\textsubscript{se}, based on an observation by Otero (1999). Otero (1999) notes that ‘true’ reflexive \textit{se} (Refl\textsubscript{se}) surfaces in Spanish only when the subject is the

\footnote{An advantage of approaching the \textit{on/with} interpretation in this way, is that it is coherent with the conclusions from Section 3 above that the direct object in Spec,VP is an inner subject of the complex predicate formed by V plus PP. It is also coherent with the conclusions from Section 5 that Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions are fundamentally reflexive, since \textit{pro} is coreferential with the external argument DP, as I discuss below.}
antecedent of another DP within the VP. This is illustrated by the paradigm in (70), from Otero (1999: 1461–1462).

(70) a. Las transnacionales (*se) vendieron la madre patria; a sí misma.
   The multinational Refl\textsubscript{se} sold the mother land to self same
   ‘The multinational corporations sold the mother land to itself.’

   b. Las transnacionales, se concedieron y otorgaron la madre patria
   the multinational\textsubscript{se} allowed and gave the mother land
   a sí mismas.
   to self same
   ‘The multinational corporations allowed and gave the mother land to
   itself.’

   c. La madre patria, se vendió y compró a
   The mother land\textsubscript{se} sold and bought to
   sí misma a las transnacionales.
   self same to the multinationals
   ‘The motherland sold itself to and bought itself from the multinational
   corporations.’

In (70a), the direct and indirect objects are coreferential and se cannot surface. In (70b) the external argument and the indirect object are coreferential, and in (70c), the external argument and the direct object are coreferential. In both (70b) and (70c), se surfaces. Only when the external argument is coindexed with an internal argument does se surface. In Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions, as illustrated by the structure in (68), pro in Spec,Appl is coindexed with the external argument. These are the same conditions under which reflexive se surfaces as well. If a predicate is reflexive when two of its arguments are coindexed (Reinhart and Reuland 1993), then, like IO\textsubscript{se}, Asp\textsubscript{se} would appear to be a reflexive construction.

7 Conclusion

I this paper I have proposed that Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions share the same underlying configuration with double object constructions, where se spells out Voice. Given that the external argument (in Spec,Voice) is coreferential with pro in Spec,Appl, Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions are reflexive predicates à la Reinhart and Reuland (1993). The PCC effects that arise in the CPLD leísta dialect discussed result, in part, from the presence of pro in Spec,Appl. I have also claimed that the bare noun constraint observed in these Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions is not the result of the telicity
inducing effects of Asp\textsubscript{se}, but because the grammatical object in Spec,VP functions as a (inner) subject of a complex predicate formed by V and a null PP. Moreover, the null PP is responsible for any telicity effects on the VP in the presence of Asp\textsubscript{se}, much like goal PPs and telicizing particles in English (and other languages). Finally, I have argued that pro is not base generated in Spec, Appl, but moves there from a position as a sister to P, essentially undergoing indirect object movement, based on a less-discussed property of Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions, an on/with or central/terminal coincidence relation.

In this concluding section, I take a moment to discuss the implications of the proposed analysis for double object constructions. I also illustrate an alternative approach to Asp\textsubscript{se} based on Marantz’s (1984) and McGinnis’s (2004) approach to reflexives.

If we take the conclusion from Section 6, that pro is a sister to P, together with the conclusion from Section 3, that pro is in Spec,Appl, the result is that there are two positions for pro. If Asp\textsubscript{se} constructions are double object constructions this leads to another consequence: there are two positions available for indirect objects in, at least, some double object constructions. Consider support for two positions for indirect objects in English double object constructions in (71).

(71) a. Anne is curious as to why her father sent her a telegram to America to return home at once.  
   (Rappaport-Hovav and Levin 2008: 136)
   b. Bill gave him a kick to the head.  
   (MacDonald 2015)

Adopting the underlying structure from (68), these sentence can be accommodated straightforwardly, as in (72), where one indirect object is sister to P and the other is in Spec,Appl.

(72) a. [Voice\textsubscript{P}her father sent-Voice [Appl\textsubscript{P}her [VP\textsubscript{P}a telegram [PP\textsubscript{P}to America]]]]
   b. [Voice\textsubscript{P}Bill gave-Voice [Appl\textsubscript{P}him [VP\textsubscript{P}a kick [PP\textsubscript{P}to the head]]]]

The existence of two indirect objects in the double object construction lends independent support for the proposal in (68). Moreover, it bears on an important debate regarding whether the double object construction and the prepositional dative construction are two independent constructions, as argued in Oehrle (1976); Marantz (1993); Pesetsky (1995); Harley (1995, 2002); Bruening (2001, 2010); and Pylkkänen (2002, 2008), or whether one is derived from the other, as argued in Larson (1988, 1990); Baker (1988, 1997); den Dikken (1995); Ormazabal and
Romero (2010, 2012) among others. Specifically, it is not clear how, by assuming no syntactic transformational relation between the prepositional dative construction and the double object construction, two positions for two indirect objects can be accommodated in the double object construction, since there is only one position for an indirect object. Moreover, it is not clear where the preposition would come from on those accounts, either. At the minimum, a syntactic transformational approach that derives the double object construction from the prepositional dative construction has a basis for an explanation.

Now consider an alternative approach to se. McGinnis (2004), following Marantz (1984), argues that Romance se is not an internal argument but an external argument, for both direct and indirect object se. This is illustrated for I0se in (73).

(73)  \[
\text{[VoicePse}_i \text{Voice [ApplDP}_i \text{Appl [VP V DP]]]}
\]

The arrow indicates that the DP moves to a position higher than se in Spec,Voice in order to bind se. On an account like this, se constructions are expected to pattern with unaccusatives. Evidence for this comes from auxiliary selection in languages that show a be-have alternation. When the direct or indirect object is se, be surfaces, the same auxiliary that surfaces with unaccusative verbs. I note here that a se approach like this automatically explains Otero’s (1999) observation, since se is an external argument and consequently will only surface when some other DP, internal to the VP is coindexed with se. The result of applying this reflexive approach to the structure proposed here for Asp_se is illustrated in (74).

(74)  \[
\text{[VoicePse}_i \text{Voice [ApplDP}_i \text{Appl [VP DP V [PPP_on/with DP]]]]}
\]

This alternative also offers an explanation for why the DP has to escape the PP: it must raise to bind se in Spec,Voice. Moreover, it further suggests that some double object constructions may be derived from a prepositional variant, the same conclusion reached above.
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