Copyright by
Sandra Scharff Babcock
1965

THE SYNTAX OF SPANISH REFLEXIVE VERBS:

THE PARAMETERS OF THE MIDDLE VOICE

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Sandra Scharff Babcock, B.A., M.A.

* * * * *

The Ohio State University
1965

Approved by

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Clemon W. Bulatkin". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Adviser

Department of Romance Languages

TO MY HUSBAND,
With whom I speak a
Present,
Visible language,
[+[Tangible] and [reciprocal]],
Here
Near us

VITA

June 8, 1935 Born - Dayton, Ohio

1957 B.A., cum laude, The Ohio State University,
Columbus, Ohio

1960 M.A., The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

1960 Research Assistant in Romance Linguistics,
Department of Romance Languages, The Ohio
State University, Columbus, Ohio

1960-1961. . Graduate Teaching Assistant in Spanish,
Department of Romance Languages, The Ohio
State University, Columbus, Ohio

1961 Instructor in Spanish, Department of Romance
Languages, The Ohio State University, Columbus,
Ohio

PUBLICATIONS

"First Flight," a poem, Counterpoint, May, 1956

"Chant Féodal," a poem, Counterpoint, November, 1956

MLA - Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students: member of construction committee (1960-61) for the "Spanish Speaking Test." See PMLA LXXVII No. 4, 2; September, 1962, p. 39.

FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Romance Linguistics

Studies in Phonological Theory. Professors William S-Y Wang
and David A. Griffin

Studies in Syntactic Theory. Professor Charles J. Fillmore

Studies in Comparative Romance Linguistics. Professors
David A. Griffin and Eleanor Webster Bulatkin

Studies in Stylistic Theory. Professors Carlos Blanco Aguinaga
and Elias Rivers

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	1
Chapter	
I. SOME TRADITIONAL ANALYSES OF THE REFLEXIVES IN SPANISH	8
II. CATEGORIES, RELATIONS, AND GRAMMATICAL FIELDS	20
III. REFLEXIVE VERBS: EXPLANATORY ADEQUACY	40
IV. PSEUDOREFLEXIVE CONSTRUCTIONS: THE PARAMETERS OF THE MIDDLE VOICE	68
V. THE STRUCTURE OF VOICE IN SPANISH AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR LINGUISTIC METATHEORY	98
VI. RESULTS AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS	122
Bibliography	127

FOREWORD

...when we explain anything we must take into account at once its material, its essential character, and the source of its movement; this being principally how explanations of occurrences are sought. "What comes into existence, and what has preceded it?" "What was the force or agent that started the process, and on what did it act?" -- questions such as these, properly ordered, are essential to every scientific investigation.

-- Aristotle

When we attempt to explain any segment of the syntax of a natural language, we must ask at least those questions Aristotle considered essential to any scientific investigation. To explain linguistic occurrences is not merely to describe and classify the observable, audible forms; to explain is to grasp the 'why' of language -- that is, to grasp the underlying principles of linguistic processes.

Formal description of the rule-governed basis of related sets of sentences, and the ways in which the sets are interrelated, has for the past decade been the concern of generative, transformational theory. Developed in its present form by Noam Chomsky,¹ the theory of generative grammar assumes that language structures consist essentially

of a core of simple, kernel sentence-types upon which several sorts of changes may be imposed. An active sentence may be converted into a passive; two or more sentences may be combined to form a complex which is not identical to any one of its component sentences. The concepts of 'conversion' and 'complex sentence' are, of course, quite traditional ones. Equally traditional is the notion that a language can be 'explained' in terms of rules for the production of grammatically correct sentences. What is new about generative, transformational theory is the view that the production of grammatical conversions can be actively portrayed by a set of ordered rules. This set of rules is defined as a formal theory of a language. In the present study, I am concerned with portraying the syntax of Spanish reflexive constructions. In accord with the aims of generative grammar, I wish to describe the process by which reflexive sentences are converted, or derived from active sentences. My view of what the generative process is, however, differs in certain respects from those expressed by others who have been concerned with generative grammar.

Since we wish to describe the generation of sentences in the simplest intuitively sound way and not merely the simplest way, I think that the base must contain all the essential clues to the type of conversion rules that can be applied to it.² In the case of middle and passive voice-conversions, this means, as we will see in Chapters III and IV, that we must specify, in the base, the force, or source, or agent that starts the conversion process. A fundamental

difference between this study and previous transformational observations of reflexives and passives is this theoretical assumption that all the elements and categories explicit in the surface sentence are derived from some major category of the base. In other words, every explicit element results from an expansion, reduction, or permutation of some element in the base. Consequently, it will generally be the case that, although the bases for voice transformations are active simple sentences, they are not kernel sentences.

In constructing the bases for voice transformations, I have assumed that a linguistic explanation must take into account the whole grammatical field of reference of a sentence-type. The term grammatical field, as I use it here, is not to be confused with semantic field. A semantic field is related strictly to the meanings of the lexical morphemes in a sentence; whereas the grammatical field of reference cannot be explained in terms of any lexical item or group of lexical items. By grammatical field, I mean, then, a holistic unity of syntactic form and content that is greater than the sum of the observable sentence parts. For example, in terms of the observable parts of reflexive passive sentences in Spanish, the original, active-sentence object is converted into the grammatical subject, in concord with the verb. Thus, in Se abren las puertas a las diez 'The doors get opened at ten o'clock,' las puertas is the grammatical subject, even though it retains the position of object. The 'reason' for retention of the object position is, of course, that, logically, the noun remains an object. In the Spanish passive,

a subject noun precedes the verb only when it is the logical, as well as the grammatical, subject.³ 'Logic' is not an observable part of speech; nevertheless, as we will see in Chapter IV, logical position is grammatically determined in Spanish.⁴

An explanation of the grammatical field must take into account also, the fact that one observable sentence-part may represent two or more categories. For example, the al niño of Le lavé las manos al niño 'I washed the child's hands for him,' is ambiguously either 'the child's' or 'for the child.' The pronoun le indicates both possession 'his' and Reference 'for him.' This phenomenon can perhaps best be explained in terms of syntactic blends. I use the term here to refer to a morphosyntactic process that corresponds essentially to haplology, in the sense of the singularizing of plurals.⁵ This singularizing can take place both within a simple sentence and across sentence boundaries. If a noun represents, say, grammatical agent and logical subject, we can assume that identical nouns in the base string, one being the subject and the other, the agent, have been blended: $N + N \Rightarrow N$.⁶ Thus, we account for what comes into existence by asking what precedes it in the base structure; and in asking what precedes, we are asking what is the essential character of the field of the observable pattern. And to ask what is the essential character is to ask what is the source of movement or change: what is the force or agent that starts the process and on what does it act?

Now then, the grammatical field of reference of the reflexive object-sentence includes the feeling that the subject is both passive

subject and active agent. The sentence containing a reflexive object is, then, a kind of actional passive involving self-agency. The 'himself' of 'John hit himself' is a blend of the object 'him' and the agent '(by) himself.' It has been noted that in English the reflexive object cannot become the subject of a passive sentence.⁷ The same is true of the Spanish reflexive object, as we shall see. What I propose to show in this study is why the reflexive sentence cannot be passivized, why a reflexive sentence in Spanish corresponds to a type of passive, or causative, or possessive, or intransitive in English. I propose to show why and how the same set of base structures underlies a reflexive sentence in Spanish and a secondary intransitive in English; how the same base structure does, in fact, underlie the English equivalent of each of the Spanish reflexive types. And finally, I propose to show why the unstressed reflexive pronoun in Spanish is the sign of the middle voice; and why the corresponding English intransitives or passives also represent a middle-passive relationship to the active and passive voices -- for knowledge is the object of our studies, and we can scarcely be said really to know a thing until we have grasped the 'why' of it....

FOOTNOTES

¹Chomsky's formulation of the goals of transformational theory and linguistic theory in general may be found in Syntactic Structures (s'-Gravenhage: Mouton, 1957) and many other publications.

²'Simplest' is to be interpreted as 'the fewest possible rules.' 'Intuitively sound' refers to the condition that the rules should explain the grammatical implications of the surface structure. If, for example, we feel that the object of the main clause in 'I want him to go' is also the subject of the infinitive, our rules must reveal precisely how this is true.

³Notice that what I have referred to as retention of the object position in the reflexive passive sentence has quite consistently been interpreted as inversion of the subject. It has been assumed by many authors of textbooks for speakers of English that there is no difference between Me conozco (a mí mismo) 'I know myself,' and Se abren las puertas. The latter is supposedly most accurately translated as 'The doors open themselves.' The persistence of this misinterpretation is somewhat curious. Even the grammar of the Spanish Academy, which is quite Latin-oriented in its statements about the reflexive, describes the se of the reflexive passive as merely a sign of the passive voice. Chapter IV contains a thorough discussion of this construction.

⁴As Marta Morello-Frosch has pointed out in conversation, the grammatical function of logical positioning in Spanish is quite generalized. The basic order of 'verb + subject' in the reflexive passive is only one of many examples.

⁵In treating the phenomenon of syllabic superposition in compounds and morphological derivatives, Grammont formulated as a law of operation that, in the superposition of two syllables beginning with the same consonant, it is the vowel of the second syllable that is retained. Hence, the Italian sotterra sotto+terra. (Cited in Eleanor Webster Bulatkin, "The Spanish Word 'Matiz': Its Origin and Semantic Evolution in the Technical Vocabulary of Medieval Painters," Traditio, Vol. IX (1954), 460-527). Mrs. Bulatkin has pointed out to me that the concept of syntactic blends is essentially the same thing as haplology at the syntactic level. Whether there is a law concerning which category must be considered overt in all cases (even where the blend is complete) is yet to be seen.

⁶ It might be thought that what I refer to as a blend is simply a deletion operation. I believe there is a crucial difference between the two. For example, the reduction of the sentence 'John is not as good as a poet as he is as a linguist,' by blending, may result in 'John is not as good a poet as he is a linguist.' At this stage of reduction, no information is lost. The next step in reduction, however, produces an ambiguous sentence: 'John is not as good a poet as a linguist.' This last sentence could be derived, either as demonstrated here, or by reduction of the sentence, 'John is not as good a poet as a linguist is (a poet).' The operation in this case, I would call deletion. In other words, the crux of the distinction is retention versus loss of information. Blending is reduction without loss of information. Deletion involves loss of information, and may lead to syntactic ambiguity. Syntactic ambiguity often involves deletions; whether the opposite is true is not yet clear. But it is clear that there is a difference between reduction involving loss of information and reduction without such loss. Furthermore, it seems obvious that the logical explanation of multiple grammatical reference of one sentence element involves the notion of fusion rather than deletion.

⁷See R. B. Lees and E. S. Klima, "Rules for English Pronominalization," Language, Vol. 39, No. 1 (1963), 17-28.

CHAPTER I

SOME TRADITIONAL ANALYSES OF THE REFLEXIVES IN SPANISH

Traditional grammars have in common with generative transformational grammars the goal of explaining the formation of the sentences of a language. The copious descriptions and examples contained in a traditional grammar provide much valuable information concerning the structural descriptions that must be assigned to sentences in a generative (explicit) model of a language; therefore I begin this investigation of the grammar of Spanish reflexive constructions with an analysis of the kinds of information presented in the best traditional grammars of the Spanish language: the Gramática de la lengua castellana (hereafter, GDLC) of Andrés Bello and Rufino J. Cuervo, and the Gramática castellana (hereafter, GC) of Amado Alonso and Henríquez Ureña. I will discuss briefly some modern descriptivist-views on the structure of the reflexives.

1. Bello's views. Bello recognizes three kinds of regular transitive sentences: oblique, reflexive, and reciprocal. All three are defined in terms of the object of the verb. In the oblique¹ sentence the subject and object cannot be identical. In the reflexive and reciprocal sentences, the subject and the object must be identical. The same person is actor and acted upon. However, there are many types

of reflexive sentences, according to Bello, which are reflexive only in form. The "object" in such sentences is certainly the reflexive pronoun, but the speaker does not feel that the subject is acting upon itself. "...la reflexividad no pasa de los elementos gramaticales y no se presenta al espíritu sino de un modo sumamente fugaz y oscuro."² Such sentences he describes as pseudoreflexives.

All the sentences described by Bello as direct object-reflexives (versus pseudoreflexives) contrast with oblique sentences. The reflexive pronoun occurs as the object of a verb which may freely be followed by other object nominals. The pseudoreflexive, on the other hand, occurs only in constructions where no oblique object is normally permitted. Therefore, although Bello distinguishes between the reflexives and pseudoreflexives according to whether the meaning is reflexive, his descriptions reveal a formal distinction between the two categories.

1.1. For simplicity of reference, I summarize here the characteristics attributed by Bello to four types of reflexive constructions in Spanish.

- a. The reflexive passive: Examples -- Se admira la elocuencia 'Eloquence gets admired,' se promulgaron sabias leyes 'Wise laws were proclaimed.' This construction occurs only in the third person. Bello points out that although the reflexive contains both active and passive features, in these sentences only

the passive idea remains. He points out also that the reflexive passive is to be avoided when there is any possibility of confusion with the reflexive object, especially if the subject is a person.

- b. The reflexive verb: Examples -- El se queja 'He complains,' nos arrepentimos 'We repent.' These verbs require the reflexive pronoun.
- c. The reflexive with verbs of emotion: Examples -- Nos espantamos de la muerte 'We get scared of death,' Me alegro 'I become happy.' These he compares to sentences like La muerte me espanta 'Death frightens me,' stating that the reflexive sentences announce the existence of a certain emotion or state, the real cause of which is indicated by a phrase such as de la muerte.
- d. The reflexive with intransitive verbs: Examples -- Los presos se salieron 'The prisoners got out.' Bello includes in this category all the intransitive verbs which can become reflexive -- quedar 'to be left;' ir 'to go;' entrar 'to enter;' salir 'to leave;' morir 'to die;' etc. -- even though the meaning of the reflexive depends on the choice of verb. With some verbs (estar, quedar, ir) the reflexive denotes voluntary action: with others (morir, nacer) it is considered to be simply a sign of spontaneity.

1.1.1. The discussions of types a., b., and c. in GDLG include enough grammatical information to distinguish each construction from the others. The structural requirements for each of these can be restated in formal rules, as I will show in Chapter IV. Analysis of the examples and descriptions of the Intransitive-Reflexive sentences, however, reveals that they cannot be accounted for by any set of simple, related grammatical rules. This may mean either that Bello's descriptions are incomplete, or incorrect (or both), or that these constructions are of a marginal sort that resist systematizing. At any rate, they must be investigated further, to determine what sorts of regularities they exhibit.

1.1.2. Consider as an example of adequate description the information concerning the Reflexive Passive (a):

- (1) (i) The string Se admira la elocuencia 'Eloquence is (gets) admired.' is a sentence (S); se admira is a verb phrase (VP) consisting of the verb admira and the reflexive pronoun (Prn) se (Rf); la elocuencia is a noun phrase (NP), consisting of the determiner (Det) la and the noun (N) elocuencia; la is furthermore an article (Art).
- (ii) The NP la elocuencia functions as the subject of S, whereas the VP se admira functions as the predicate; logically, the NP is also an object -- that is, it is interpreted as an NP belonging to a predicate of some

underlying sentence, of which it is a transform; Se admira is a predicate phrase. The grammatical relation subject-verb holds between la elocuencia and admira; a relation of concord holds between admira and se in person (P) and Number (Nº), ignoring for the moment the question of whether se is also the object of admira.

- (iii) The N elocuencia is an abstract noun (as distinct from the count noun muchacho and the mass noun leche) and a common noun (as distinct from the proper noun Juan and the pronoun ello); it is also an inanimate noun (as distinct from the animate noun perro and the human noun muchacho); the NP elocuencia exhibits concord in gender (G) and number with the determiner la; admira is a transitive verb (as distinct from ocurrir) which occurs either with a human subject and any object, or with an inanimate subject and the reflexive pronoun se, or with a human subject, reflexive pronoun and a prepositional phrase (which will be described in Chapter IV); it does not allow object deletion (as distinct from leer); it inflects for tense (Tns), stem class (Cl), and person; the pronoun se is a conjunctive reflexive pronoun (as distinct from si, which is disjunctive), which is, of course, attached to the verb and is in this case inflected for third person (P3) and singular (Sg) Nº; in

this sentence it also bears the feature, reflexive passive, and this feature, in turn imposes on the Rf Prn the restriction that it must be marked as P3.

The information presented above in outline form must be incorporated in an adequate explicit grammar; it appears implicitly in any good traditional grammar of Spanish. On the other hand, consider the explanation of the Intransitive Reflexives in GDLC;

- (2) (i) At the Constituent Structure level the description is essentially the same as for (1) (i), with respect to the subject, but the intransitive sentences exhibit different kinds of adverbs (Adv), such as Source, with ir, caer (but not with quedar), and certain characteristic prepositional phrases (P-Ph) of place.
- (ii) There is uncertainty concerning the status of the reflexive pronoun in its relation to the VP. Is it a direct object (DO) or an indirect object (IO)? According to Bello, it must be one or the other.
- (iii) Subject-NP's include all the noun categories outlined in (1) (iii), except that all of the examples of irse occur with human subjects; verbs include some which require prepositional complements or place-phrases, etc.; the features that must be assigned to the Rf-Prn vary with the type of verb; they range from 'voluntary action' to 'spontaneity,' and it is not clear whether these features are to be interpreted as grammatical or semantic.

1.1.3. It is obviously impossible to assign grammatical labels to the constituents of the intransitive-reflexive constructions as they are described in GDLC. On the one hand, Bello insists that the Rf-Prn must be defined as an object pronoun; on the other, he admits that with intransitive verbs (and, indeed, in all pseudoreflexive constructions) the pronoun does not indicate that the subject is acting upon itself. In his concern with the shades of meaning which the Rf-Prn adds to various intransitive verbs, Bello has overlooked the fact that with some verbs, the pronoun is not added at all; it is an obligatory part of the sentence. We can say Juan se va de la casa 'John goes off from the house,' but not *Juan va de la casa '*John goes from the house.' Surely the Rf in this sentence cannot be interpreted either as a sign of spontaneity or of voluntary action, since it makes no difference whether the subject acts voluntarily or spontaneously: in any case the sentence must be reflexive.

1.2. Modern descriptivist views. Though there has been quite a lot of disagreement among grammarians concerning the structure and usage of the various pseudoreflexive constructions, authors of textbooks for speakers of English have generally repeated and enlarged upon Bello's explanations. Even some descriptive linguists maintain that, formally, such constructions as the reflexive passive are no different from those in which the Rf-Prn is clearly the object of a verb, and that whenever an Rf-Prn is chosen, it must be at least vaguely reflexive in meaning. In the case of the intransitive verbs, it has been said that the Rf-Prn is used to emphasize the actor's interest or willingness in

performing the action. The authors of Modern Spanish, are of the opinion that the reflexive is 'added' to intransitive verbs in order to indicate that the subject is in a position to affect the course of the action. For example, the reflexive is 'added' to caer 'to fall,' in order to imply that the subject is swept down by force, or that, in falling, he fails to keep erect, or that he resists falling. The difference between caer and caerse, according to the authors, is the difference between 'to fall' and 'to come tumbling down.'³

This interpretation (like that of Bello) is based on the assumption that the reflexive is always optional with intransitive verbs, and that, since the pronoun is clearly reflexive, it must somehow indicate some attitude of the subject toward the action. Both these assumptions are disproved by the fact that the verbs given as examples in Modern Spanish require the reflexive pronoun in certain formally specifiable environments (as I will demonstrate in Chapter IV). This requirement is independent, therefore, of the presence or absence of a supposed attitude on the part of the subject. In the sentences Juan se va de la casa, and Juan se cayó del árbol 'John fell out of the tree' the verbs ir and caer must "add" the reflexive se.

1.2.1. The structure of the reflexive passive (Rpas) is also misrepresented in Modern Spanish. Since the se of the Rpas-sentence is a reflexive pronoun, it must, the authors imply, be treated as the direct object of the verb. According to their rules, the sentence Se admira la elocuencia would be most accurately glossed as 'Eloquence admires itself' -- a gloss which relates Rpas to the English reflexive,

when the fact is that it is comparable to the English passive and certain other constructions, not including the reflexive. The se of Se admira la elocuencia is, first of all, not a direct object. It is a sign of the passive, and as such, it is related to a kernel of the type, Uno admira la elocuencia, as we shall see in Chapter IV.

1.3. The analyses of Bello and the authors of the MLA textbook do not always accurately reflect actual Spanish usage. Bello's treatment of the Rpas (type a.) is intuitively and grammatically sound. However, neither analysis of the intransitive reflexive constructions qualifies as a grammatical explanation or as an adequate semantic description. No statements of grammatical regularities or relations can be extracted from the explanations in Modern Spanish.

1.4. Amado Alonso and Henríquez-Ureña adopt Bello's terminology for the reflexive constructions, but they point out that a crucial difference exists between the reflexive and the pseudoreflexive, namely, that the relation of the pronoun to the verb in the latter constructions is not that of verb-object: "...no lo tienen como complemento directo, y, por lo tanto, la acción no recae sobre el sujeto: me voy, te sorprendes, se murió....⁴ Included among these are verbs of "inner life" and verbs of movement. The first category seems to have at least three subdivisions in the Gramática Castellana: verbs of emotion and causation, verbs of mental process, and certain verbs which, although they do not indicate inner life, attain some nuance of it when they occur with the Rf-Prn.

1.4.1. With verbs of emotion and causation, the Rf-Prn indicates 'entry into a state.' Its function is that of an inceptive particle as well as passive auxiliary Enojarse is 'to become angry'; (as distinct from enojar, 'to make angry') espantarse is 'to become frightened' (as distinct from espantar, 'to frighten, cause fright'); enfriarse, 'to become cold'; (as distinct from enfriar, 'to cause to become cold, to chill'); calentarse, 'to become hot' (as distinct from calentar, 'to heat, cause to become hot').

1.4.1.1. With the other verbs of this category, the Rf-Prn is defined in GC as the "reflexive of interest," saber, creer, imaginar, temer, comer, beber, tomar, quedar, estar are given as examples of this type. The addition of the Rf-Prn to these verbs supposedly indicates an intensification of the inner life with which the action is executed.

1.4.2. Verbs of movement are also subcategorized, in the GC, into those which are primary intransitives and those which may occur either with an oblique object or with the Rf-Prn. With the latter, the reflexive functions as an intransitivizing morpheme.

1.4.2.1. With some primary intransitives of motion, the Rf-Prn functions as an inceptive particle; with others, according to the GC, it serves as some sort of completive particle. Irse and marcharse are 'to take leave, begin going' (as distinct from ir and marchar 'to go (somewhere)'). Entrarse, on the other hand, is 'to get in.'

1.4.2.2. Transitive verbs of movement include levantar 'to raise' (as distinct from levantarse 'to rise'); sentar 'to seat' (as

distinct from sentarse 'to come to a sitting position, to sit'); acostar 'to put to bed' (as distinct from acostarse 'to go to bed').

1.5. The information presented in 1.4. seems to me to be essential to any account of the usage and syntax of Spanish reflexive constructions. This is true also of those explanations of Bello which are presented in 1.1. (a., b., and c.) and in example (1) on pages four, five, and six. At best, however, the information is incomplete with respect to what must be incorporated in an explicit grammar. It is simply a fact that even the most thorough handbook of usage can and does rely heavily on the linguistic intuitions of the reader, who, to the extent of his knowledge of the system, fills in the gaps automatically. The problem that must be solved in constructing a generative model is essentially this: how much and to what extent can information of the sort presented in this chapter be formally set forth in a structural description, and how can such descriptions be generated by a system of explicit rules. The present study represents an attempt to find an adequate solution to this problem.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER I

¹Bello uses the term oblique to refer to ordinary non-reflexive object nominals.

²Andrés Bello and Rufino J. Cuervo, Gramática de la lengua castellana, Editorial Sopena, 6th edition, 1960, p. 248.

³Bolinger and Others, Modern Spanish: A Project of the MLA, Harcourt-Brace, 1960, p. 200.

⁴See Amado Alonso and Henríquez-Ureña, Gramática castellana, segundo curso, Editorial Losada, S. A., 1959, p. 105.

CHAPTER II

CATEGORIES, RELATIONS, AND GRAMMATICAL FIELDS

Consider now the grammatical fields of reference that any adequate description of the reflexive must explain. The grammatical field (as defined in the Foreword), is a holistic unity of linguistic form and content that is greater than the sum of the observable sentence parts. For example, a reflexive rule such as the one proposed for English by R. B. Lees and E. S. Klima¹ does not achieve explanatory adequacy. It accounts only for the fact that in a sentence such as 'He saw himself,' the reflexive object represents the second occurrence of a nominal in a simplex sentence. The grammatical field of the reflexive, however, includes its relationship to the intensifier constructions ('I myself,' 'you yourself'). It includes also the feeling that the reflexive sentence is a kind of actional passive; that is, the subject of a reflexive sentence is both actor and acted upon. Although this double function of the nouns in a reflexive sentence is not observable, it must be grammatically specified in the underlying string, in order to explain the relationship of the reflexive to the passive. In other words, it is not enough to say that the reflexive object cannot become the subject of a passive sentence,² if, as is the case, there is some reason why it cannot. In the treatment of the reflexive that is presented in this

study, constant attention to the whole keeps the analysis from being merely a more or less rigorous description of the categories found in traditional grammars. I will try to show that such varied notions as possession, separation, inception of movement, causation, passivization, and change of state or position, are all part of the grammatical field - the essential character - of the reflexive affix in Spanish. Since the reflexive is usually referred to as an object pronoun, I begin with a discussion of object pronouns in Spanish.

2.1. The properties of direct object pronouns in Spanish.

Consider the differences in the shapes of the following sentences:

- (3) (a) (La) conozco a María
 'I know (her) Mary'
 (b) A María la conozco
 'Mary, I know (her)'
 (c) La conozco a ella
 'I know her (her)'
 (d) A ella la conozco
 'Her, I know (her)'
 (e) La conozco
 'I know her' or 'I know it'
- (4) (a) Conozco el libro
 'I know the book'
 (b) Lo conozco
 'I know it'

Notice in (3) (a) that the direct object is a human noun ([+ Human]) and that it is directly preceded by the human object marker a. Notice also, that a direct object pronoun is optionally prefixed to the verb, and that this prefix agrees with the noun object in gender, number, and case. This agreement can be specified in terms of syntactic features: ([+ direct object pronoun, [+ Feminine], [+ third person singular]). In (3) (c) the object is replaced by the disjunctive³ Prn ella, and the conjunctive object Prn la is required. Ella possesses, in addition to the features of la, the feature [+ Human].

Sentence (4) (a) differs from (3) (a) in that the noun object is specified as [- Animate], and no disjunctive Prn is permitted.

There is no

(5) *Lo conozco el libro⁴

A parallel distinction exists between (4) (b) and (3) (c), since the string

(6) *Lo conozco a ello

is ungrammatical. Thus, the disjunctive phrase occurs only as a substitute for human nouns.

2.1.1. Those third person, preclitic object pronouns which can replace both human and non-human nouns⁵ are grammatically differentiated according to the restrictions of occurrence of the disjunctive pronouns. Whether an ambiguous sentence such as (3) (e), La conozco, replaces a sentence containing a human object (or one specified as [- Human]) depends on its transformational history. If (3) (a) is the base, its conversion into (3) (c), La conozco a ella, must precede

the conversion into (3) (e). This means, of course, that the object pronouns which replace human nouns are actually discontinuous parts of the same pronoun. They consist of an object Prn affixed to the verb, and a disjunctive phrase. The object Prn in (3) is la-ella.

2.1.2. Observations concerning deletion and permutation of objects. An attempt at specification of the deletion and permutation rules that apply to object pronouns would be premature at this stage of investigation, but certain observations are relevant. The disjunctive phrases in (3) (b) and (c), are referred to in many places as redundant phrases, added for clarity or emphasis. I hope it is clear from the above examples that the disjunctive phrase is introduced as an obligatory part of the base. In its basic position it specifies the conjunctive Prn. By transformational rule, this phrase can be switched to the front of the sentence to provide emphasis, as is illustrated in (3) (a) with the noun object, and in (d) with the pronoun.⁶ In both cases, the preclitic Prn is required. Both

(7) *A María conozco

and

(8) *A ella conozco

are ungrammatical. If the emphasis transformation is not chosen, the object can be de-emphasized by a rule which deletes the disjunctive phrase, producing grammatically ambiguous sentences such as (3) (e).⁷

2.1.2.1. From the point of view of much recent work in English syntax, this interpretation of emphasis in Spanish may seem somewhat odd. In English, the emphasis morpheme⁸ (phonetically realized as

loud stress) is interpreted as an optional addition. In Spanish sentences like (3) (b), A María la conozco, the disjunctive phrase may optionally receive loud stress, but the verb is unstressable. Loud stress on the verb is optional when the disjunctive phrase is deleted; but note that the preclitic object-marker can never be stressed. Thus, the unstressed object pronoun bears the same kind of relation to the disjunctive phrase that the person-marker of the verb bears to subject pronouns. Subject nouns (including the pronouns yo-'I' and tú 'thou') must be introduced in the base because the verb agrees with the subject in person and number. Once the concord rules have been applied, subject pronouns automatically possess a relative syntactic prominence⁹ (and may receive loud stress). A deletion rule (perhaps the same rule that deletes the disjunctive phrase) de-emphasizes the subject.

2.2. The properties of indirect object pronouns. The indirect object Prn agrees in person, number, and case with the human noun it represents. The sentence

(9) (1e) dí un libro a María

'I gave a book to (her) Mary'

can be converted into

(10) Le dí un libro a ella

'I gave a book to her'

and, finally, to

(11) Le dí un libro

'I gave her a book'

Restrictions on permutation and deletion of the disjunctive phrase are essentially those of direct objects.¹⁰

2.2.1. Superficially similar to the examples in 2.2. are such sentences as the following:

(12) El dentista me sacó una muela (a mí)

'The dentist took one of my teeth out'

(13) Le puse los zapatos (al niño)

'I put the child's shoes on (for him)'

(14) Le lavé las manos (al niño)

'I washed the child's hands (for him)'

These have identical surface structures, but three different base structures.¹¹ The object pronouns in all of these indicate possession of the object by the so-called indirect object. They also may indicate that the subject is the agent performing the action on the indirect object (or for the indirect object). Here the similarity stops, because the three sentences are ambiguous in different ways. The disjunctive phrase a mí in (12) can represent either an adverb of 'Separation from a Source' (in this case, from a person) or the adverb of Reference 'for someone.' In (13) the phrase al niño can be either Place 'on the child' or Inherence 'to the child.' In (14), the phrase al niño may be either 'the child's' or 'for the child.' The differences among the deep structures of these sentences can only be described in terms of syntactic blends, whereby elements derived from two or more categories (in simple or complex sentences) are fused in such a way

that no information is lost.¹² Accordingly, the structure of (12) can be characterized as follows:

Inherence Source Reference

(15) [^](a) El dentista sacó una muela a mí a mí a mí

where Inherence indicates that the whole of which the object is a part, Source is 'from me,' and Reference, 'for me.' The next step would produce something like

(15) [^](b) El dentista sacó una muela me a mí me

leaving the Source adverb untouched. Now, since a mí can also be felt as Reference, it must be assumed that Inherence and Source can be blended, leaving Reference untouched.

Inherence Source Reference

(16) [^](a) El dentista sacó una muela a mí a mí a mí

[^](b)

[^](c) El dentista sacó una muela me me a mí

where the remaining a mí is 'for me.' In both sentences it is the Inherence indicator which becomes the possessor. Notice, incidentally, that in (16), all three datives may be fused into one.

(17) [^](a) El dentista sacó una muela me me me

[^](b) El dentista sacó una muela me

(c) El dentista me sacó una muela

Thus, the me indicates possession of the object, action performed for the possessor, and separation from a source.

The analysis of (13) and (14) parallels that of (12).

It should be clear from the discussion that the similarity

between the sentences in 2.2. and 2.2.1. is only superficial. In the indirect object sentences, the Prn is part of a single indirect object (le a María). With respect to the latter types, the clitic preverbal form always indicates possession, and the disjunctive phrase may be either specification of the possessor, Reference, Location, or Source. In all cases, Reference is implied in the grammatical field.

The conjunctive Prn in these constructions is often referred to as the 'dative of interest,' a term I have avoided for several reasons. First, it is badly misinterpreted: 'interest' is construed as some emotional involvement of the indirect object in an action being performed to his advantage or disadvantage. There is no grammatical basis for such an interpretation¹³ nor for the extension of this interpretation to cover certain intransitive reflexive types. The interest that the indirect object holds in the sentence is that the hands, clothes, tooth, are his. His interest, therefore, is nothing more than possession. There is nothing in the grammatical field, and nothing in the extra-contextual semantic field¹⁴ that indicates that the action is performed for the benefit of anyone.

2.2.3. Categorizing these possessives as indirect object-constructions has simply been a question-begging device, as has the assumption of emotional involvement and advantage. In the sentence

(18) Le retorció el pie

'I twisted his foot for him'

it can certainly be said that the action results in some disadvantage to the indirect object, for the obvious reason that the verb is 'twist'

and the twisting is performed on someone's foot. The indirect object in this sentence indicates the same degree of involvement as the 'someone's' of the gloss, or, as the 'his' and 'for him' of

(19) I washed his hands for him.

All of which brings up the theoretically very interesting question of the relationship between the dative construction in Spanish and the possessive determiner in English. It is most commonly said that, although we translate these sentences with the possessive construction, the best gloss for the Spanish would be 'I washed to him the hands.' In fact, the most appropriate gloss is 'I washed his hands for him.' The base structures are the same:

	<u>Inherence</u>	<u>Reference</u>
(20) ^ (a) I washed the hands	to John	for John
^ (b) I washed John the hands for John		
(c) I washed John's (his) hands for John ¹⁵		
(d) I washed John's (his) hands for him		

It seems clear that the behavior of the two languages is identical up to (20) (c), where English proceeds beyond the dative stage to form the possessive. An independent reason for assuming a prepossession stage for English is to be found in such dialectal forms as

(21) I washed me hands

which represents a historically earlier stage for this construction.¹⁶

The description of

(22) I put John's clothes on for him

and

(23) I took his shoes off for him

parallel the Spanish in the same way.¹⁷

2.3. The derivation of pronouns in a generative grammar.

In their pronominalization rules, Lees and Klima treat pronouns as transformational replacements.¹⁸ In later papers,¹⁹ Klima presents them as part of the Constituent Structure grammar; but he introduces them as alternatives to nouns. It seems obvious that these pronouns are actually part of the NP. They may co-exist with or completely replace the NP, as does the Wh-morpheme (Qu-morpheme in Spanish). The Wh-like behavior of the pronoun can be observed in sentences such as

(24) (a) Le ví a Juan

'I saw (him) John'

which has as a base,

(24) (b) ^Yo R ví Juan R

'I R saw John R'

The development of R depends on the function of the NP it represents. If the NP functions as an object, as in (24) (b), R is developed as an object Prn. In Spanish, the R of the object undergoes a later case-transformation that converts it into both the clitic object Prn and the disjunctive Prn. This development of R is (generally) optional with proper-noun direct objects and any human indirect-object noun. If, on the other hand, the noun is replaced by a pronoun, the

conjunctive Prn is obligatory (as we have seen). Thus, (24) (b) can be converted either into (24) (a) or into

(25) Le ví a él

'I saw him (him)'

In (25) the Prn has replaced the noun.

2.3.1. The naturalness of this interpretation of pronoun derivation emerges more clearly from the observation of certain noun + Prn or Prn + Prn combinations in English. As we have seen, it is the object which may be represented by both noun and Prn in a Spanish sentence, where any noun subject automatically has double reference through verbal concord. In English, both subject and object may be doubly represented, although repetitions of the subject noun are considered substandard (and archaic). Ungrammatical in terms of standard English are such sentences as

(26) *My ma she said never to do that again

(27) *Old Griffin he stood there, the grizzly old drake

(28) *Some of the boys they pulled him away²⁰

Now we have observed frequently that transformational history recapitulates chronological development. It seems also to be the case that there is a substantial correlation between transformational history and the order in which rules are acquired by a child. Certainly quite early in the language-learning process, a child associates with physical objects the inherent qualities that relate them to him. A boy is a 'he'; a girl, a 'she'; then there is a 'boy-dog,' a 'girl-dog,' and a 'thing-it.' In short, a Prn is part of a NP in the base.

The fact that R is not developed for subject nouns in standard English (unless the noun is to be replaced with a Prn) might weaken this argument, if there were no cases in which the N + R co-occurs in grammatical sentences. Consider, for example, the following:

(29) It is interesting that you should say that

(30) It was a good movie

The pronouns of these sentences are usually described as expletives that merely point to the real subject, or that are equated with the subject. The question of their derivation has been the subject of some controversy,²¹ which is solved by including R in the base. For (29) we would produce first,

(31) ^That you should say that it is interesting

and, for (30),

(32) ^A movie it was good

The presence of the Prn in these strings automatically triggers (29) and (30). Development of R is optional in (31), but obligatory in (32) since there is no

(33) *A movie was good²²

2.3.2. In Spanish there are many examples of the Noun + Prn construction with the object noun, as we saw in 2.2. We saw also, that the combination le a él may refer to two different nouns in the simplex. Furthermore, there are sentences containing NP and Prn, which are ambiguous.

(34) A María la ví ayer

could be either

(35) Mary I saw yesterday

or

(36) En cuanto a María, la ví ayer

'As for Mary, I saw her yesterday'

Similarly,

(37) Mary she went home

could be either a simplex, or a reduction of

(38) As for Mary, she went home

Additional parallels can be found with the English sentence in (30):

(39) *Una película era buena

'A movie it was good'

can be produced by the base and obligatorily transformed into

(40) Era una buena película

Our feeling that an identity relation exists between 'it' and the NP is explained in the present interpretation; and there would not seem to be any reason for adding 'it' in sentences like (29), or for setting up an impersonal, non-replacive 'it' as a type of nominal. In other words, it is assumed that all occurrences of third person pronouns have a reference, whether to a single NP or a whole string.²³

2.4. Of central concern to linguistic metatheory is the fact that the structure of the base is common to Spanish and English -- and most certainly to French and Catalan. Only the conversion rules

differ; Spanish uses an Inherence dative to show possession and leaves the article alone. English formerly used this dative (probably as a replative for the article); later historical (and conversion) rules create the possessive determiner. The Inherence Prn in Spanish indicates possession, obviously, because it specifies to whom the object belongs. Its function is the same as the possessive determiner in English.

Chomsky has proposed the notion that much of the structure of the base is common to all languages.²⁴ This certainly seems to be proving true for Spanish and English, as I will continue to show. It should be stressed, however, now and again, that I am in no sense trying to impose the structure of one language on the other. I am, of course, constantly concerned with correspondences at all syntactic levels, and will continue to illustrate them whenever they are striking. English is, after all, the metalanguage in which the grammar of Spanish is being discussed. Accordingly, I am concerned with finding those translations in grammatical English which best capture the grammatical fields of the Spanish sentences. Accordingly, also, it becomes increasingly instructive to break down the fields of the corresponding English sentences into their base components. Thus far, in every case where I feel reasonably sure of my analysis of both languages, the structures of the base turn out to be identical. This with no inclination to interpret one language in terms of the other. Nothing is important to the analysis except what emerges, in a natural way, from the grammatical fields of the Spanish constructions, viewed always

in terms of the whole system. I work at this synthetically, then, by constant internal comparison, with the goal of setting up just those categories and subcategorical features which adequately explain the whole. In other words, I am trying to explicate what literary critics would call the inner form, what Chomsky calls the deep structure, in all its relationships to the surface structure. To the extent that I succeed, I hope to have discovered something of the essential character of natural language.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER II

¹See R. B. Lees and E. S. Klima, "Rules for English Pronominalization," Language, Vol. 39, No. 1, 1963, 17-28.

²Lees and Klima (*ibid.*) handle this by ordering the rules so that passivization precedes reflexivization.

³Disjunctive Prns are the forms required as prepositional objects; conjunctive Prns immediately precede or follow the verb.

⁴In this study an asterisk is used to indicate that a sentence is judged to be ungrammatical; a circumflex accent to identify an example as a string (^); and a question mark to indicate that an example is of doubtful grammaticality.

The term 'grammatical sentence' is a technical one: a grammatical sentence is one that is unquestionably well formed. For example, we can say in English, 'She wore a red dress,' but not *'She wore a dress red,' or 'She a red dress wore.' The rules that relate 'Mary she wore a dress that was red' to 'She wore a red dress' must specify only one possible re-ordering of the base elements in English. The base elements, however, are the same as those underlying the Spanish sentence, Ella llevaba un vestido rojo 'She wore a dress red.' Only the conversion rules differ.

As Chomsky points out in Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, judgments of grammaticality are mentalistic and hence not subject to the behavioral tests of data-oriented statisticians. In fact, whether or not a sentence is considered grammatical has nothing to do with frequency or probability of occurrence. There are grammatically possible sentences that have never occurred; there are many occurrences of acceptable 'sentences' which are not unquestionably grammatical. Or, a sentence may be perfectly grammatical, but not very acceptable. For example, 'John picked his clothes, books, and papers up' is perfectly well formed, as is 'John picked up his books, clothes, and papers.' The latter sentence might be considered by many speakers as more likely and more acceptable. But both are grammatical. In short, it is an axiom of transformational theory that the speakers of a language have stored in their minds a characterization of well-formedness and that, because they know what is well formed, they can recognize what is deviant.

⁵There are, of course, many verbs that can take only inanimate objects. Hence, the object Prn with such verbs is unambiguous in its reference. A masculine, human object represented by le is unambiguous since le is always [+ Masculine, [+ Human]].

⁶We shall see later that the disjunctive phrases are switched to the beginning of a sentence by a (psycho)logical subject transformation.

⁷In context, the antecedent reference of these Prns is usually quite clear.

⁸English can, however, achieve syntactic emphasis by switching the object to the beginning of the sentence. The glosses in (3) (b) and (d) are grammatical English sentences.

⁹By this I mean that whether or not these Prns receive phonetic loud stress, their presence, in any position, constitutes a special emphasis. Relative syntactic prominence of obligatory sentence elements is achieved also through switching a phrase from its base position to some other position in the string. An example of this is the logical subject transformation which will be discussed in Chapter IV.

¹⁰It should be noted that the indirect object has three possible positions in the simplex; after the object (where it functions as a specifier); directly preceding the object (where it functions essentially as a shared object -- that is, it is more closely united to the direct object); and directly preceding the conjunctive Prn (where it functions as logical subject, as we shall see).

¹¹Recall the definitions of deep structure and surface structure in the Foreword.

¹²Recall the discussion of blends in the Foreword. This kind of syntactic behavior is not to be confused with telescoping and embedding. Telescoping refers to simple deletions required in forming compound or complex sentences. Embedding refers to replacement of some node by a subordinate sentence-clause or infinitival clause. Embedding transformations may involve blends: for example, two occurrences of a noun may be fused into one. For definition of the terms embedding and telescoping, see C. J. Fillmore, "The Position of Embedding Transformations in a Grammar," Word, Vol. 19, No. 25 (August, 1963), 208-231.

¹³Recall the explanation of caerse in Modern Spanish. The same 'rule' is supposed to account for Se puso los zapatos.

¹⁴As J. Katz and J. Fodor point out, the most we can expect of a semantic theory is that it explicate ambiguities, synonymies, and paraphrases that are possible for a sentence without reference to context. There is no possible extra-contextual paraphrase of the Reference phrase which allows the notions of benefit or disadvantage. See J. Katz and J. Fodor, "The Structure of a Semantic Theory," Language, Vol. 39, No. 2 (1963), 170-210.

¹⁵Another possibility here, according to some grammarians, is 'I washed his hands for John,' which, they say, is ambiguous. The spontaneous reaction to this, I think, is that 'his' refers to someone other than John. In short, this sentence does not seem ambiguous out of context. Compare it with 'Starving children can be dangerous,' which is undoubtedly ambiguous out of context.

¹⁶Thus we would assume a stage of 'I washed me the hands' or even, perhaps, 'I washed me my hands.'

¹⁷The possessive determiner in (22) and (23), and the dative of the Spanish equivalents may be derived from a second sentence, such as 'The hands belong to John.' Carlota Smith has proposed a rule whereby all possessive determiners are derived from sentences with 'have.' Thus, 'John's clothes,' no matter what syntactic role it plays, would be derived from 'John has clothes.' There are many difficulties with Smith's rule, beginning with her choice of an ambiguous sentence as the base for all possessive genitive transformations. The transformation of 'John has a hat' into 'The hat is John's' is untenable for several reasons. First, there is no necessary relation between the two sentences. If the second is to be considered a transformational paraphrase of the first, the grammatical fields should be identical with respect to possession. But, 'John has a hat' does not necessarily indicate that 'the hat is John's.' It may well belong to someone else. 'John has a hat,' does not seem to be a complete base sentence. It could be 'John has a hat with him,' for example. Second (though no further reason is needed to show that the interpretation won't hold), a phrase such as 'John's present' could be either 'the present given to John' or 'the present that John gave to someone.' In other words, contrary to the assumption that apparently underlies 'John has a present,' the relationship of the possessive determiner to the noun is often not that of subject-object. 'John's' can be derived (most certainly) in several ways: from an indirect object, an agent, or a subject. 'Shakespeare's plays,' are 'plays written by Shakespeare'; 'my hands' is not 'the hands which are mine' (by Smith's rule, 'John has a hat' the hat is John's the hat which is John's the hat of John's John's hat'). In fact, there are a number of nouns -- either human or parts of the human body -- that require possessive determiners (unless the indefinite article is chosen). In the sentence 'Father was here,' 'my' is implied. In short, there is

a class of nouns that requires the Inherence determiner, and to assume that the 'Inherence possessive' is derived by a complex sentence transformation involving all the stages hypothesized by Smith is counterintuitive. It is the definite determiner required by a certain class of nouns. Furthermore, there would seem to be many cases in which juxtaposition precedes the genitive transformation ('I washed me hands,' 'himself~hissself').

'John's hat' is most probably derived from 'the hat that belongs to (is of) John.' As G. O. Curme points out in his English Grammar, among the possessive genitives are subjective genitives and objective genitives; and these, in turn, may indicate either sphere, a belonging to, association with, or inherence. The implication that there are different ways in which a possessive genitive may be derived is quite clear.

¹⁸R. B. Lees and E. S. Klima, op. cit., 23.

¹⁹See E. S. Klima, "Negation in English," in Readings in the Philosophy of Language (J. Katz and J. Fodor, editors), Prentice-Hall, (1964), 247-323.

²⁰(27) and (28) are quoted from "The Ballad of Moosehead Lake," as recorded in Alan Lomax's The Folk Songs of North America, Doubleday, (1960).

²¹Both R. B. Lees and D. L. Bolinger have discussed these constructions in Language, Vol. 36, No. 2 and Vol. 37, No. 1, respectively. Lees produces sentences such as (29) by an additive rule: Nom + VP $\Rightarrow$ it + Nom + VP. Such a rule does not explain the antecedent reference of 'it.' It seems to be based on an assumption that the Prn in these sentences has no antecedent.

²²Notice that the restrictions on the base are reduced in this approach, since the string underlying (33) is permitted and automatically converted into a grammatical surface pattern. Indeed, this patterning of the base is quite productive. Consider the puzzle of the expletive 'there.' If we start with 'Some people they were in the yard,' we can derive 'They were (or was) some people in the yard' (which is common enough in substandard English), and finally, 'There were some people in the yard.' The expletive rule (which converts 'they' into 'there') and the verbal agreement rule are obviously late ones, since substandard speakers continue to say 'they was.' Similarly, 'It was the Smiths who came' could be based on

'The Smiths + R + BE the people who came.' R is converted into 'it,' and 'it,' in turn, requires singular verbal concord. (There may well be an analogy between 'they was' and 'it was.') Intermediate between the base and the American standard is 'The Smiths it was who came.'

²³Thus, such sentences as 'It is raining' have understood reference to 'the sky,' 'the clouds,' or, most probably, a cognate subject: 'The rain (it) was raining.' It is true, of course, that the 'it' of 'It was a blue book' can refer to a noun such as 'object.' The base, in this case, would be 'The object + it + that I refer to is a book + that is blue.'

I return to the question of impersonal constructions in Chapter IV.

²⁴See Noam Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, forthcoming from MIT Press.

CHAPTER III

REFLEXIVE VERBS: EXPLANATORY ADEQUACY

In terms of comparison of Spanish with English, it is obvious that the surface structures of the two languages differ at times quite widely. However, the base structures for all types of reflexive sentences in Spanish turn out to be identical with the corresponding English sentences. In this chapter I present an analysis of these constructions, with the aim of making explicit most of the information needed for the construction of descriptively adequate rules and of characterizing the basis for these rules. In short, I am aiming for the highest level that can be attained in linguistic description: the level of explanatory adequacy, by which I mean a language-independent characterization of the device for selecting descriptions of a set of related constructions.¹

3.1. The reflexive object pronouns. As illustrated in Chapter II, proper selection of object pronouns requires that the nouns be specified for the feature [+ Human], as well as for the inherent gender and number. These requirements hold for the reflexive object, which represents the second and third occurrence of the same noun in a string.

(41) Juan se conoce a sí mismo

'John knows himself'

(42) María se miró a sí misma

'Mary looked at herself'

(43) María se conoce bien

'Mary knows herself well'

The reflexive phrases in (41) and (42) consist of a reflexive Prn affixed to the verb, the human object marker a, and a disjunctive phrase.² These sentences are derived as follows:

Reading this diagram from left to right, we see that in (a), the first NP, marked [+ Human], is the subject noun. The second NP, marked exactly like the first, is the object noun. The third NP repeats the first and second in every detail. The choice of identical human nouns as subject, object, and agent can be interpreted as the automatic signal by which the second noun is replaced by the stressed reflexive Prn and the third NP by the stressed Prn + Idem (which is rewritten as the intensifier mismo 'self').

In steps (b), (c), (d), and (e), then, we have actively portrayed the essential character of the reflexive: the subject performs and receives the action of the verb. Step (b) develops Reflexive into 'Prn + Idem,' and replaces the object with Prn. Step (c) portrays the blending of Prn + Prn $\Rightarrow$ Prn; and Step (e) represents the resulting sentence generated by final morphophonemic and phonological rules that specify case markers, auxiliaries of identity, and phonemicphonetic shape.

3.1.1. It seems clear that the mismo of the Agency phrase (and the 'self' in English) is the same morpheme as the intensifier that can accompany other nouns in a sentence. However, the mismo of

(45) Juan mismo lo hizo

'John himself did it'

can occur only in case no Idem is required in the Agency (and in English, in the Reference) phrase. In other words, there is just one Idem in a simple sentence, and the rules must be constructed so that a string is scanned first for whether the Agency node contains a third repetition of a noun. Once it is determined that the mismo is not required as an indicator of a reflexive object-relation, it may be attached to some other noun in a string. Furthermore, if the Idem is attached as part of a reflexive phrase, the Prn must replace its noun. This 'attachment,' as we see in (44), leaves the object represented only by sí and the Agency by sí mismo. The Prn of the object is fused with that of the Agency node, Resulting in (44) (e). In

other words, the overt difference between the intensifier *Prn* and the reflexive is that the former is preceded by a noun, and the latter is not.³

3.1.2. With most verbs, the reflexive Aux is unambiguously an object only when the a sí mismo is recoverable.⁴ Therefore, it is obvious that the disjunctive phrase is what marks the se as part of the object. In the sentence

(46) María la conoce a ella

'Mary knows her (her)'

the oblique object contrasts with the reflexive of

(47) María se conoce bastante bien

'Mary knows herself well enough'

because we can say

(48) María se conoce a sí misma

'Mary knows herself'

If no disjunctive phrase is recoverable, there is no way to show that the reflexive se agrees with an underlying object noun in gender, number, and [+ Human]; hence, there is no way to show that it is an object. The a indicates the relation 'human object,' the sí mismo is marked for the appropriate agreements. The Aux se agrees with the subject in person and number (as does, say, the passive Aux BE EN in English), but not in gender.

3.1.3. Comparison of reflexive object rules with those proposed for English. In the rules proposed by Lees and Klima for reflexive pronominalization in English,⁵ the intensifier 'self' is

treated as a transformational replacive: 'John shaves John John shaves John + Prn + Self John shaves himself.' Some important relationships between reflexivization, passivization, and the intensifier constructions are obscured by this rule. If we assume that the bases of the English and Spanish reflexive object-constructions are identical, we can account for these relationships in a way that is natural both historically and transformationally.⁶ The steps in derivation would be as follows:

The interpretation in (49), like the rule presented for the Spanish reflexive object, is based on an integrated theory of agentive constructions.⁷ According to my theory, the derivation of passives, reflexives, mediopassives (in the sense of both 'middle' and 'half-passives'), reflexive causatives, secondary intransitives (and perhaps certain other constructions),⁸ depends on the choice of noun in the Agency and Reference nodes. In the case of the direct object-reflexive, I have assumed that the object is, transformationally, as well as chronologically, a blend of object and agentive intensifier. In order to determine the validity of these assumptions, we must ask whether there are cases that cannot be accounted for by Lees and

Klima's rule. We must ask also if there are any simple sentences of the type 'NP Vb (Reference) Agency,' in which the identity relationships can vary. Can we show, for example, that we must recognize, within this base frame, identity of object and agent (but not subject)? Subject-Reference-Agency? Only Subject and object? Subject-object-Reference, but not Agency? Subject, object, Reference, and Agency? The answers to these questions can be learned from observing sentences like the following:

- (50) (a) John shaved (by) himself
 (b) John was shaved by the barber
 (c) *John was shaved by himself
 (d) John got (himself) shaved at the barbershop
 (e) John got (himself) shaved
 (f) John always shaves before breakfast
 (g) Does he shave yet?
 (h) ?*John always shaves himself before breakfast
 (i) *Does he shave himself yet?
 (j) Did he shave (by) himself (or did he get it done at the barbershop?)
- (51) (a) Mary got (herself) dressed
 (b) Mary got dressed by herself
 (c) *Mary was dressed by herself
 (d) Mary (always) dresses well
 (e) She dresses to please her husband

- (f) ?Mary always dresses herself well
- (g) *She (always) dresses herself to please her husband
- (h) Did you dress (by) yourself, or did your mother
help you?

The intimate relationship of intransitive reflexive-passive-causative can be shown by analysis of (50) (a) and (j), and (51) (h). In all three sentences, the reflexive object is simultaneously object and agent. However, whether or not we feel the reflexive Prn as 'mostly object' or 'mostly agent' -- or 'mostly intensifier' -- depends on whether we place loud stress on the verb or on the Prn. If the verb is stressed, the Prn feels like 'mostly object.' If the Prn is stressed, the verb feels simultaneously reflexive and intransitive, and the pronoun is felt to be both intensifier and agent. 'I dressed myself' parallels 'I did it myself,' and, in both cases, the agentive preposition 'by' is optional.

It might be argued that 'I shaved myself' and 'I shaved (by) myself' have different structures. We could interpret the former as 'NP Vb NP' and the latter as 'NP Vb--Agency.' But such an interpretation would be possible only if these verbs optionally permitted object-deletion. A glance at (50) (f) through (i) and (51) (d) through (g) shows us that there are, in fact, severe restrictions on the occurrence of the reflexive object with these verbs. It shows us also, that in those cases where the reflexive pronoun cannot occur, the understood object is nevertheless reflexive.⁹

The deletion of the object in (50) (g) and (h) and (51) (d) and (e) is a function, apparently, of the presence (or implied presence) of a Frequency adverb, which changes the aspect of these verbs from perfective to iterative. In sentences like (50) (a) and (j), we can focus the goal achieved or on the agent by whom it is achieved. In the intransitive sentences the action is viewed as customary, or as characteristic of the subject: 'It is characteristic of Mary that she is well dressed.' In other words, 'Mary always dresses well' can be paraphrased as 'Mary is always well dressed.' (Siempre va bien vestida).

3.1.3.1. It should be clear from the preceding discussion that there are simple, transitive-reflexive sentences that cannot be accounted for by Lees and Klima's rule. A rule based on a single repetition of a noun in a simple sentence -- the categorial function of the second noun is presumed to have no syntactic significance -- cannot explain the fact that in sentences like (50) (g) and (51) (h), the reflexive *Prn* replaces either the agent and object, or the agent, but not the object alone. The presence of 'by,' like the presence of the Frequency adverb, requires the verb to be intransitivized. Intransitivization is also permitted (and in many cases required) for some verbs when certain types of negative Frequency-adverbs are present -- that is, when the action is viewed as not yet having resulted in a goal.

3.1.3.2. The second claim implied by the agentive theory proposed in 3.1. is that a simple-sentence string containing identical subject and object may have another agent. This is clearly the case

in (50) (c), 'John got (himself) shaved at the barbershop.' However, if we remove the dependent phrase, 'while John was at the barbershop,' the sentence is ambiguous, as is sentence (50) (d).

An account of the ambiguities in these sentences involves, first of all, an explanation of how and why, in spite of minor differences, the essential character of these sentences is the same: all of them can be defined as 'reflexives of actional passivization.' For example, in (50) (c) through (e), the grammatical subject is the logical object -- that is, it possesses the features of a passive subject. Furthermore, since the sentences are reflexive, the subjects are also felt to be active participants. The ways in which they participate differ, however, according to the choice of agent and reference. For example, in (50) (b), the agent implied is obviously 'the barber.' In (d), however, the agent may be either 'John' or 'the barber.' If the agent is different from the subject, the sentence must be interpreted as a reflexive causative. By this I mean that the subject, acting reflexively 'for himself,' brings about the action; but does not carry it out 'by himself.' It gets carried out by someone else. On the other hand, in 'John shaved John for John by John,' the result is a kind of reflexive (actional) passive in which the subject starts the process, and proceeds to carry it out by and for himself, thereby producing a change in his status with respect to the verb. The result of this change is the statal passive: 'John (already (got) himself) shaved' may be paraphrased as 'John was (already) shaved.'¹⁰

3.1.3.3. Lees and Klima have pointed out that a reflexive object cannot become a passive subject, and that a passive sentence cannot contain a reflexive agent (see (50) (b) and (51) (c)). They suggest, therefore, that the reflexive transformation must follow the passive rule, in order to keep the sentence from being passivized. If the claims made by the authors are accepted as unconditionally valid, how do we explain that, in (50) and (51), all the examples containing 'Get + past participle (+ reflexive Prn)' are felt as passives. Although we cannot say 'Mary was dressed by herself,' we can certainly say 'Mary got dressed by herself.' The 'Get' of all these sentences must be analyzed as a type of passive aux, if we are to explain the intuition that the subject is acted upon. 'Get' must be further analyzed as an 'actional passive aux,' in order to explain the active part played by the subject.¹¹

3.2. Reflexive constructions containing non-reflexive direct objects. There are several types of indirect (dative) reflexives in Spanish. They have commonly been divided into two main groupings: indirect objects and reflexives of interest. The former category has been said to include such diverse sentences as

(52) Juan se lo repetía muchas veces a sí mismo

'John repeated it to himself often'

(53) Juan cree en sí mismo

'John believes in himself'

(54) María lo trajo consigo

'Mary brought it with her (to her present location)'

(55) María se lo llevó consigo

'Mary took it away with her from here'

(56) Juan la acercó a sí

'John drew her toward him'

Now since the indirect objects in the preceding sentences must be assigned logically to the same major category -- the category of Destination -- the differences in overt form must be explained by some other part or parts of the predicate. These parts can be identified as members of the universal category of Change, the grammatical subcategories of which correspond essentially to the subcategories of Aristotelian logic: Change is subcategorized into Motion and Result; and Motion is further subcategorized into Origin and Direction. Finally, Direction is divided into Elative (Direction From) and Translative (Direction Toward). Given these categories, we can explain the reflexive relation in (52) as identity of subject, Origin, Agency, and Destination. Identity relations in (53) obtain among subject, Origin, and Destination; the latter being subcategorized as Inessive. In (54) the subject and the Comitative (Accompaniment) adverb are the same, and the Destination is understood as the 'place in which the subject is presently (Inessive or simply Essive) located, having come (terminative) from elsewhere.' The difference between (54) and (55) is that in the latter, the subject = the agent initiating movement that is specified in terms of Origin and Elation; and in terms of Translation (toward the subject). Finally, in (56) the Destination

(which is the same as the subject) is defined as Adessive, and the Direction as Translative toward the Destination (which is the subject). The reflexive Prn in sentences (54) - (56) must stand alone: there is no

(57) *Lo acercó a sí mismo

3.2.1. It is instructive to compare examples (54) through (57) with their English equivalents, all of which contain simple pronouns. The rule presented by Lees and Klima restricts reflexivization to the repetition of a noun in the same clause (simplex sentence).¹² They suggest that such a sentence as

(58) John had no covering over him
is complex, consisting of

(59) (a) John had + Complement no covering

(b) No covering is over John

Such an interpretation seems to me to be quite counterintuitive.

There is no more feeling of a transformational break in this sentence than there is in

(60) John had (put) no blanket on the bed

or

(61) John had (put) no coat on (him)

Analyzing this sentence as Verb + Complement is begging the question, since no instructions are given for the automatic expansion of Complement. In fact, the evidence against such a hypothesis as Complement is both intuitively and formally compelling. The only verbs which

might accurately be called Complement verbs are modals, which cannot stand alone (must, can, may, etc.) and, perhaps, those which can transformationally replace modals before BE ING (keep, stop, and several others).¹³ In other words, most of the constructions previously analyzed as Complement expansions¹⁴ are, in fact, replacements for some major categorial node.¹⁵ Thus,

(62) I told him to go

is based, not on

(63) I told + Complement him

but on

(64) I told him something

where 'him' is both indirect (Destination) object of the verb and subject of the object-infinitive (as any traditional grammar book would explain it).¹⁶

Now then, in (58), (60), and (61), there is no feeling that 'covering,' 'blanket,' or 'coat' is both object of the matrix sentence and subject of the constituent. Nor is there any such feeling about

(65) He had (scattered) many books about him

(66) He took it with him

(67) He drew her near him

or

(68) He pushed it away from him

On the contrary, there certainly is a break in

(69) John has many books about himself

(70) They appointed only men like themselves to the position

Both of these have suppressed relative clauses:

- (71) (a) books which are (written) about John + him
 (b) men who were like them

If the clauses are retained, the simple Prn is required; if they are deleted, the Prn must be reflexivized. Reflexization is obviously not restricted to nouns in the same simplex.

3.2.2. The discussion in 3.2.1. must now be considered in terms of the Spanish indirect reflexives. English uses the simple Prn within a simplex sentence when the repeated noun is part of certain adverbial phrases -- namely, Comitative, Origin, and Superessive or Adessive Destination. The reflexive Prn, on the other hand, must be used when the noun repeated in a relative clause is part of either a Cognate or Specification phrase (69), or a phrase of Comparison (like + NP).

In those cases where English uses the simple Prn, Spanish has the stressed Prn without mismo. That is, it uses the simple reflexive Prn. Mismo is used in just those cases where English uses 'self' (though the latter is used in some cases where Spanish permits only se or sí).¹⁷

3.2.3. The second type of indirect reflexive referred to in 3.2. is the so-called reflexive of interest. This definition is supposed to cover

- (72) Juan se lavó las manos
 'John washed his hands'

- (73) Juan se puso la chaqueta
'John put his jacket on'
- (74) Juan se rompió la pierna
'John broke his leg'
- (75) Juan se buscó una habitación
'John looked for a room for himself'
- (76) Juan se bebió una cerveza
'John drank a beer for himself'
- (77) Yo me temo algo
'I fear something (deep down)'
- (78) Juan se cortó el pelo
'John had his hair cut'
- (79) Juan se comió la manzana
'John ate the apple up'

The description of (72) through (74) parallels the analysis of possession and Reference in 2.2.1. - 2.3., except with respect to disjunctive phrases. Although we can say

- (80) Juan se lavó a sí mismo
'John washed himself'

there is no

- (81) *Juan se lavó las manos a sí mismo

or

- (82) *Juan se lavó las manos a sí

Thus, the se in these sentences indicates action performed by the subject, on some part of the subject, for the subject.

In sentences (75) and (76) the se refers to action performed by the subject and for the subject. It is the reflexive of personal Reference, corresponding to the dative of Reference discussed in Chapter II. I will return to the question of the relationship between Reference and Possession at the end of this chapter.

In (77) Yo me temo algo, we have an example of a reflexive of Inessive Origin (subject = Origin). This is called a pseudo-reflexive by Amado Alonso and Henríquez Ureña, presumably because the verb does not literally affect the subject. Me temo is 'I fear from inside,' or 'mentally,' or 'privately.' The Reference of the verb is automatically specified as 'for the subject.' By automatically I mean that the specification is made by redundancy rules. All that must be specified in the base is

- (83) NP Vb NP Inessive¹⁸
 Yo temo algo Yo

The reflexive Prn in (78), Juan se cortó el pelo, is ambiguous. Its surface structure is identical to that of the Reference reflexives. However, the sentence may also be felt as a causative of the type 'John got himself shaved.' This construction corresponds to certain types of ambiguous reflexive sentences in English, -- namely,

- (84) I built a house for myself

which is either reflexive or

- (85) I got a house built for myself

Similarly, in Spanish,

(86) Me construí una casa

can be related to either

(87) Me hice construir una casa

'I got (= had got) a house built for myself'

or

(88) Tengo construída una casa

'I have a house built (as a result of having built it
by myself)'

Similarly, (74) may indicate either self-Agency or

(89) Juan se hizo cortar el pelo¹⁹

'John got his hair cut in the barbershop'

The last example (79), Juan se comió la manzana, another so-called reflexive of interest, can only be analyzed as a 'pseudo-reflexive.' The usual explanation of this reflexive is that it indicates either that the action is performed for the benefit (interest) of the subject, or that the subject performs the action willingly, or that he completes the action willingly (or with pleasure).²⁰ In fact, it is true for both Spanish and English that a Reference Prn can be chosen only if the object is indefinite. We can say

(90) Comí una manzana

'I ate an apple'

(91) Me comí una manzana

'I ate me an apple'²¹

Notice next that we cannot say in English

(92) *I ate up an apple

or

(93) *I ate me the apple

but only

(94) I ate the apple (all) up

In (79) the se is based on an equation of the subject with the Translative Motion; and Motion is qualified by an adverb that specifies completion (Degree). Whether or not the Result - the 'eaten state' of the apple - is achieved, depends on the choice of perfective or imperfective tense. Regardless of tense, however, the Movement is specified as Translative. Finally, in Juan se comió una manzana, se is Reference. Thus, in both the definite and indefinite sentences, the action is directed back to the Subject, but by different routes.²²

3.3. The possibilities of conversion of transitive to reflexive, and of transitive or reflexive to an intransitive which can be paraphrased as a passive have been observed in the oldest English texts. From transitive causatives have derived:

- (95) (a) The door is opening (= is being opened)
- (b) The tea is boiling (= is being boiled)
- (c) Paper tears easily (is easy to tear)
- (d) Sugar dissolves in water (= is dissolvable)
- (e) Hydrogen combines with oxygen (= is combinable)

And from original reflexives, we have:

- (96) (a) Mary is bathing
- (b) I turned toward the door
- (c) I lay (lie) down²³

What remains to be shown is just how these sentences are related to reflexives and passives, just how the sentences referred to as actional passives fit into the same set, and how all of the intransitives derived from reflexives are related to 'John washed his hands.'

3.3.1. We have seen several types of reflexive sentences in this chapter, some of which require the intensifier 'self,' others which require a simple pronoun in English, and a simple reflexive *Prn* in Spanish. I am not concerned with the latter except in so far as they help to explain the 'self.' It seems rather obvious that the logic of reflexivizing goes well beyond the factor of repetition of the same noun. Indeed, in 'They appointed men like themselves to succeed them,' the reflexive refers to men other than themselves: nothing can be acted upon by itself in so far as it is of a single nature, for in this respect its oneness allows of no otherness....

Aristotle's reference to the essential difference between the agentive power of the agent *qua* agent and the patient *qua* initiating source (the proneness of the patient to be acted upon in a specific way) is at once a logical and a linguistic reference. In 'He pushed it away from him,' the Origin is external. But in 'He couldn't escape from himself,' or 'He couldn't tear himself away from

his family,' either the Origin or the Agency is Inessive. In other words, the subject is participating, acting on, for, and by, or simply for himself, or by himself (+ for someone else), but never simply on himself. Either 'by' or 'for' or 'from within,' or 'the self in the guise of otherness' is implied in reflexive sentences.

3.3.2. Now then, just how do the intransitives of the types exemplified represent reflexive relations which are simultaneously passive? If we start with a sentence like

(97) (a) X opened the door by X + R

we can derive

(97) (b) The door got opened

Or, we can vary the agent and produce from

(98) (a) X opened the door by the door + R $\Rightarrow$

(b) The door opened (by itself)

Suppose that we are describing something about the door from the point of view of the power of the implied agent:

(99) (a) X can open the door easily for X by X $\Rightarrow$

(b) The door is easy (for X) to open

Or, suppose we are simply describing the essential character of the door. For the agent in (99) (a), we substitute 'the door,' and we produce

(99) (c) The door opens easily

3.3.3. Still we are not through showing how the agentive chain unwinds. With reflexive possessive sentences, the ordinary BE-passive is not grammatical. We cannot convert

(100) (a) John caught his coat on a nail
into

(100) (b) *John's coat was caught on a nail by John

(c) *His coat was caught on a nail by John

But English has another way of forming a passive for this sentence.

If we start with

(101) (a) John caught his coat on a nail by John + R

we can derive

(101) (b) John got his coat caught on a nail

Now then, assuming that 'his' is associated with 'for John,' and that some other Agency is responsible, we derive:

(102) (a) John's coat got caught on a nail (for him)²⁴

or even, if we are in some sense blaming the coat,

(102) (b) His coat caught on a nail (for him)

Finally, after the coat 'has got caught,' we can paraphrase the sentence as

(102) (c) His coat was caught on a nail

3.3.4. Notice incidentally that the Inherence phrase hypothesized in Chapter II to account for the reflexive possessive can be dispensed with if we analyze the 'his' in the preceding sentences as the genitive case of the article that accompanies a unique noun. That is, the coat cannot belong to anyone but John (unless another owner is

specified), and when this is the case, English requires the article to agree with the human noun to whom the coat belongs. Thus, the reflexive can be attached to the verb, as in Spanish, or the noun that is part of the reflexive object-phrase, 'his coat for him';²⁵ and in fact, the reflexive object is essentially to be understood as an extension of some part or possession of a human being to the whole person: 'He washed himself' = 'He washed his body.'

The whole transformational set depends on the variations of Reference, object, and Agency. These variations control the passive, the reflexive, the self-Agency ('He did it by himself'), the causative reflexive, and the secondary intransitives of process. And the structure of the base is identical for Spanish and English -- a fact that will be of vital interest to the rest of the study. What is most interesting about this interpretation in terms of linguistic metatheory is that all these transformations that specify changes in the relationship between the actors and the action -- in short, all voice transformations -- seem to belong to the same set. The reflexive construction cannot undergo the passive transformation for the simple reason that a member rule of the Agency set has already been applied, in order to generate the reflexive. There is no ordering relevant to the set. The rule applies according to what is specified as agent, and Reference, and so on.

3.3.5. Now then, we shall see in Chapter IV, that the term 'Pseudoreflexive,' is to be explained as 'the ways in which the

transitive shades into reflexive and passive and intransitive.' The pseudoreflexive constructions correspond, as I will show, to the intransitivizing and passivizing rules discussed in this chapter with respect to English. Again, the bases will be the same for both languages.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER III

¹Chomsky's definition of explanatory adequacy in "The Logical Basis of Linguistic Theory" (Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists, Mouton, 1964, 914-1008) involves the abstract formal characterization of a universal theory. What I am hoping to characterize here is a basis for selecting descriptions of Agency constructions.

²A must be introduced as part of a case-transformation, after the passive transformations have been applied.

³For example, Se admira mucho would probably be interpreted out of context as 'He is quite amazed.' 'He admires himself' is Se admira a sí mismo.

⁴There are some restrictions on deletion of disjunctive phrases that seem to be questions of the behavior of individual verbs. (See note 3). Yo me llamo Juan can only be 'I am called John.' I call myself John' could only be Yo me llamo a mí mismo Juan. The disjunctive phrase is not deletable in the latter sentence; the former cannot have a disjunctive phrase. These are two different types of reflexives, as we shall see later. On the other hand, in Juan se conoce bien, the Prn can only be interpreted as part of a reflexive object. Whether there is a general rule for deletion of the disjunctive phrase is not yet clear.

⁵It is not clear whether the authors consider the intensifiers to be unrelated to reflexives. They simply state that they are not dealing with the former.

⁶In Old English a noun or an object pronoun could be followed by the intensifier 'self,' without a pronoun of its own or with a pronoun in the dative and the 'self' in the same case as the noun. This corresponds somewhat to the Latin construction, Cicero laudavit se ipse, where ipse is in the nominative and se is supposedly accusative (though of course it could have been ablative). Many verbs, now mostly intransitives, alternated between simple object (used reflexively) and intransitive. The obligatory use of the compounds of 'self' as direct object is comparatively recent.

⁷In other words, I believe that the base of the various Agency constructions is universal.

⁸Reflexive causatives, as we will see, involve both action and passivity in the simple sentence.

⁹'She dressed the baby in his new rompers' cannot be transformed into 'She dressed in his new rompers.' The latter sentence would most likely be considered humorous, for the simple reason that it is clearly derived from 'She dressed herself in his new rompers.'

¹⁰The statal passive is formally distinct from sentences like 'Mary is always well dressed.' (See 3.1.3.) We can say 'Mary was dressed (= had got herself dressed) by ten o'clock;' but not *'Mary was (always) well dressed by ten o'clock.' Similarly, 'I was (= had got myself) dressed right on time,' but not, *'I was always well dressed right on time.' The iterative paraphrase is attributive; therefore, we might assume that 'Mary is well dressed' can be combined with 'Mary is a woman' to produce 'She is a well-dressed woman.' In this way, an attributive participle is converted into an attributive adjective. In 'Mary is a changed person,' on the other hand, the stative-participial force is felt quite strongly. This difference in feeling reflects a derivational difference. 'Mary is a person + Mary has (been = become) changed Mary is a changed person.'

¹¹The trend in transformational analysis has been to analyze sentences in which a noun phrase can occur between a main verb and a past participle as a complex sentence ('I wanted it (to be) done by tomorrow.'). It could be argued that such sentences as 'John got himself shaved' or 'John got himself hurt' are complex sentences consisting of 'John got + C for John' and either 'John was hurt by himself' or 'by someone.' There are several difficulties with this interpretation. First, it does not explain why 'himself' is felt as both object and Reference. We would have to allow a reflexive sentence to be passivized if it occurs as a constituent along with 'John got for John' which means we would have to have two reflexive rules, one preceding and one following the passive. The second rule would exist for the ad hoc purpose of generating a reflexive Prn which would in many cases be obligatorily deleted: there is no *'He got hurt by himself.'

R. B. Long (See The Sentence and Its Parts, Chicago; The University of Chicago Press, 1961) insists that in 'John got arrested by the police' -- as well as 'John got shaved,' and so on -- 'arrested by the police' must be interpreted as a complement. He argues that 'arrested' is really no different from 'dirty,' 'clean,' and other adjectives. The argument won't hold, since we cannot have an agentive phrase with the adjective 'dirty.' *'John got dirty by himself' is ungrammatical, as is *'John got dirty by the police.' I return to the question of 'get + adjective' in Chapter IV.

¹²This rule, in fact, will not hold, as we will see.

¹³There is certainly no doubt that any verb following a modal is an infinitive, a fact which is obscured -- or even implicitly denied -- in existing formalizations of the verb phrase, where Aux → Tense (Modal) (HAVE EN) (BE ING) Vb. It is apparently assumed that all infinitives are derived from finite verbs. If this were true, would we not have to assume that 'modal + infinitive' constructions in Old English, all of Romance, German, etc., are derived, and that, therefore, the occurrence of a finite modal (which requires an infinitive) implies two source sentences? To say that puedo ir 'I can (am able to) go' is derived from puedo + Complement and yo voy 'I go' makes no linguistic sense. Implicit in the grammatical field of the infinitival object is the notion that the verb never was finite. An infinitive may either be part of a kernel sentence or a subordinate clause: 'I can go' is kernel; 'I hope to go' is derived. In the case of the derived infinitival object, it is clear, at least historically, that it is not the infinitive itself which is derived. An infinitive in a complex sentence is retained from its original sentence. 'I hope to go' is based on 'I hope for something (for myself),' where 'something' is expanded as '(that) I subjunctive + go.' The modal in this subordinate clause is rewritten as mood (subjunctive) plus modal. The subordinate verb is, therefore, an infinitive in the base. Its implied tense, in this case, is "indefinite future" (with respect to the tense of the main clause). The 'to' of the English infinitive is the overt sign of this relation (whereas Spanish uses finite forms in the subjunctive mood). Similarly, 'I told him to go' cannot possibly be based on 'I told him' and 'He went' (or even 'He was to go'). The logical, and linguistically related base, is something like 'I told something to him' and '(that = something) he Subjunctive + go.'

¹⁴The sentences examined in the preceding footnote have been previously analyzed as complement expansions.

¹⁵In other words, infinitives and gerunds are not just added to the verb: they replace objects of verbs and prepositions, as any traditional grammar tells us.

¹⁶These are traditionally referred to as abridged accusative clauses: 'I want that I (may) go ⇒ I want to go.' I see no reason for obscuring this relationship by an ad hoc conversion of a finite verb into an infinitive. G. O. Curme describes an abridged clause (as distinct from an elliptical clause) as one which never had a finite verb, expressed or understood.

¹⁷If we keep in mind that English once used the simple Prn for both simplex and complex references to an antecedent, it becomes unnecessary to try to prove that whenever the Prn is simple, it must

belong to a clause other than that of the noun to which it refers. Curme points out that the simple Prn is retained in modern English when it expresses literal relations of Place (place adverbs). The sentence 'I kept it near me' does not have to be analyzed as 'I kept + Complement' and 'It was near me,' in order to explain why 'me' is not reflexive. It makes no semantic or grammatical sense to assume that 'I put it on me' consists of 'I put - Complement' and 'It was on me.' The phrase 'on me' is a Place adverb of the type 'on the table.' There seems to be agreement that 'I put it on the table' is a simplex sentence. Why, then, the need for analyzing 'on me' as part of a constituent sentence rather than as a Place adverb in a simple sentence, which is undoubtedly what it is. In 'I placed it near me,' 'it' is near me because I placed it there. In other words, 'It was (placed) near me' seems quite clearly to be derived from something like 'I (or someone) placed it near me.' The analysis of 'I kept it near me,' therefore, is essentially the opposite of what has been supposed.

¹⁸Compare this with the English 'I fear me,' which is 'I fear (from with) in me.'

¹⁹In (89) we have an example of a causative passive.

²⁰When a parent says to a child, Cómetelo todo 'Eat it all up,' the sentence does not imply that the child is willing to perform the action. Whether he wants to eat or likes to eat is grammatically and semantically irrelevant, although it is quite probably to his advantage to follow his father's orders.

²¹Lees and Klima are of the opinion that this use of 'me' is nonstandard colloquial for 'myself.' There are certainly many people who speak a consistently rather formal variety of standard English (people who, for example, would say 'Everyone has arrived, hasn't he?'), who feel that there is nothing at all wrong with 'I fixed me a drink' or 'I bought me a new shirt.' These same people would not say 'He fixed him a drink' for 'He fixed himself a drink.' In other words, the use of the simple Prn is a standard option in the first person. The fact that the use of the reflexive Prn in these sentences is more formal (Lees and Klima base their judgments of grammaticalness on maximally formal speech) does not mean necessarily that it must therefore be considered more grammatical. 'It is I' is more formal than 'It is me.' Indeed, it is not just formal; it is clearly affected -- and clearly less grammatical in standard English than 'I fixed me a drink.'

²²I return to these pseudoreflexive constructions in Chapter IV.

²³'Lie' is a replacement for 'lay' here. Both verbs existed right along, of course, the former being used intransitively. When 'lay' lost its reflexive object in 'I lay me down,' the transitive-reflexive verb fell together with the reverse (passive intransitive) causative, at least in standard English. This verb is a troublesome one, of course, with the transitive form often being used intransitively.

²⁴Although this 'for him' is perhaps not 'tacked on' very often in semi-cultured language, it is quite common in informal language.

²⁵Compare with the French, sa main à lui.

CHAPTER IV

PSEUDOREFLEXIVE CONSTRUCTIONS:

THE PARAMETERS OF THE MIDDLE VOICE

As we have seen, many terms have been used to explain the grammar and semantics of the pseudoreflexive Prn. Among these are interest, spontaneity, emotional involvement, -- in short, affect. This means, apparently, that in all those cases where the reflexive Prn does not represent action by the subject on or for the subject, it indicates that the subject is somehow affected by something else. Therefore, it is argued that the pseudoreflexive corresponds to the middle (affective) voice. The accepted definition of the middle relation, of course, is 'action by the subject, on or for the subject.' That the Spanish pseudoreflexives (those requiring the clitic Prn) are middle verbs is undeniable. Also undeniable is the fact that the relational function of the middle voice has been as thoroughly misrepresented as has the Spanish reflexive.¹ The middle (reflexive, reciprocal, directional), like the passive and the causative, has a mediating function with respect to the active. It serves to divert the action, or to refer it back to its starting point. The passive relation is simply reversive; the causative relation involves action that reaches a goal and is redirected. The middle may include features

of the active, of the passive, or the causative, according to the type of sentence in which the middle verb occurs. In all cases where the middle (se) occurs, it indicates some modification of the active direction of the verb, or some change in the status of the object -- or the subject, if the verb is intransitive. Hence, the previous status of the object (or subject) is felt in the grammatical field, just as the previous status of the passive subject is felt. In other words, passive implies active; middle implies active process or a contrasting process.²

The essence of the middle emerges from the study of the pseudo-reflexives. It turns out to be the case, that the clitic reflexive *Prn*, in all its occurrences, is the sign of the middle voice. Observe, for example, the structure of the reflexive passive.

4.1. The reflexive passive. It has often been repeated that the only grammatical feature which distinguishes the Mismo-reflexive from the reflexive passive (henceforth *Rpas*) is that in the latter the subject is inanimate.³ However, there are other formal differences between the two constructions. *Rpas* must be interpreted, not as a kernel, but as a type of passive transformation. If we interpret the se of

(103) *Se abren las puertas a las nueve*

'The doors are opened at nine o'clock'

as a replative for a repeated nominal, certain linguistic facts and relations are obscured. First, and by no means trivial, is the fact that this sentence is felt to be a type of impersonal passive in which

the NP is a passive subject and an expressed agent is not permitted.⁴ Furthermore, there is no recoverable disjunctive phrase, as there is in sentences where se is an object.

(104) (a) *Se abren las puertas a sí mismas

and

(104) (b) *Las puertas se abren a sí mismas

'The doors open themselves'

are ungrammatical. Notice next that this verb, when it has an inanimate subject, cannot occur with any Prn except se. There is no

(105) *Lo abren las puertas

*'The doors open it'

In short, sentence (103) is related to a kernel having an indefinite human subject and agent.

(106) Uno abre la puerta N + R

In (103) the NP is the grammatical subject. In (106) it is the object. The presence of the se, then, in (103) changes the constituent structure of the sentence. Therefore, (103) is a transformation of (106). It is, furthermore, the only passive that can be derived from a kernel containing the indefinite human agent uno. There is no

(107) *Son abiertas las puertas (por uno)

'The doors are opened (by one = them)

Both in the Rpas and its English equivalent, there is a contrast with the agentive passive of action (BE EN and SER DO). The latter refers to the contact of the passive verb with the subject, whereas the Rpas refers to the verb in process, action being carried

on and affecting the subject. The Rpas differs from English equivalents with respect to inversion, however. If the NP in a Spanish sentence has no determiner, or is a que-clause nominalization (attached to a minimal Rpas string), inversion is not permitted.

Thus, we can say

(108) Se cantaron himnos

'Hymns were sung'

(109) Se sabe que es verdad

'It is known that it is true'

but not

(110) *Himnos se cantaron

(111) *Que es verdad se sabe

Now, although it is difficult to establish inversion rules for all the Rpas verbs, it is important to note that a large number of verbs that permit switching of the Rpas subject, are converted into intransitives by this inversion. Hence, a base such as

(112) Uno abre la puerta la puerta + R + sola

'One opened the door the door + R alone'

cannot be converted into

(113) *Se abre la puerta sola

but only into the intransitive of process,

(114) La puerta se abre sola

'The door opens alone (= by itself)

If the kernel contains an adverb of Manner, a further conversion is permitted, creating a simple intransitive:

- (115) La puerta abre bien
'The door opens well'⁶

4.1.1. The interpretation of word order just presented, while it concurs with the feelings of Spanish grammarians, is at odds with the rule presented by D. L. Bolinger, who has stated that sentences like (103) can be used as illustrations of an optionally inverted subject.⁷ According to his rule, Spanish places the most important element (the information point) in final position. He would have us translate

- (116) Páper tears (' = phonetic loud stress)

as

- (117) Se rasga el papel

and

- (118) Paper teárs

as

- (119) El papel se rasga⁸

As I have already indicated, these inversions are grammatically conditioned. They occur independently of loud stress. Moreover, there are restrictions on inversion: what has been called an example of inversion (117) is grammatically the basic order in the impersonal Rpas. Furthermore, in (114), the subject cannot follow the verb. The difference between (117) and (119) is the difference between Rpas and R-intransitive. The effect of the inversion in (119), then,

is to attribute to paper the inherent capacity for entering the process of tearing (as distinct from the reference of the Rpas in (117), in which the NP gets torn by some indefinite agent). In short, this inversion is not at all equivalent to phonetic loud (or emphatic) stress in English. An element in its basic position can obviously not have been switched to that position for emphasis.

(117) is converted into an intransitive in the same way as (112), obligatorily. Hence, to attribute to a door the capacity for opening by itself, to paper the capacity for tearing, is to attribute to the original inanimate object the capacity for being a logical subject, as well as a grammatical one. This is true of all cases in which the subject of a Rpas sentence precedes the verb, whether the verb remains passive or is converted into an intransitive.⁹

4.1.2. The invariable se of the Rpas sentence functions as a verbal Aux. It changes the direction of the verb (or verbal process): the original object becomes the subject in concord with the verb. The verb, regardless of whether it is inherently one of process, is converted into a passive of process -- that is, of action being carried on. An Rpas verb may, of course, include completion of the process. For example, in

(120) Se abrió la puerta a las nueve

'The door was opened at nine o'clock'

the verb is in the past completive (preterite) tense, but the action

is viewed as being carried on, as well as completed, as distinct from

(121) Juan abrió la puerta

'John opened the door'

in which the process is simply completed. By way of further illustration, the progressive passive in English,

(122) A house is being built

is equivalent to

(123) Se construye una casa

but, there is no sentence

(124) *Una casa está siendo construída

Finally, it is instructive to note that Bello divides verbs into two main categories with respect to their capacity for conversion into SER DO-passive versus Rpas. Desinent (perfective process or movement) verbs prefer the latter. By desinent verbs he means those expressing action which remains in process unless terminated by some adverb of Direction, Place, or Destination, or by a perfective tense. Permanent verbs, on the other hand (ver 'see'; oír 'hear,' notar 'notice'), have no inherent beginning, process, or end. That is, we can say 'I saw' without implying necessarily 'I then left off seeing.'

Now, in general, it is verbs which are inherently perfective (desinent) that permit conversion into R-intransitives. However, it does not seem likely that this distinction provides us with a rule of grammar. Rather, the question of which verbs can be converted into Rpas, as well as of which Rpas verbs permit inversion of the subject, depends on the lexical features of individual verbs. Therefore, the

rules for Rpas and SER DO-passive will include only the structural requirements for the transformations. Before characterizing these requirements further, we must consider two other kinds of impersonal, Rpas sentences.

4.1.3. The se of the Rpas is derived from the R of the Agency node, the agentive noun being obligatorily attached by R. The se retains its reference to the indefinite agent, and, in some cases, is felt to be simultaneously the sign of the passive and the impersonal agent. Notice the following sentences.

(125) X (= Uno) vive (una vida) bien aquí X + R

'X lives (a life) well here X + R'

(126) X habló de la guerra X + R

'X spoke of the war X + R'

(127) X mató a los cristianos X + R

'X killed the Christians X + R'

In (125) and (126) we have examples of verbs that can take only Cognate objects. In (127), the object is a human one, which, according to the rules already presented, cannot be converted into an Rpas subject. All three of these sentences, however, permit a reflexive conversion.

(128) Se vive bien aquí

'One lives well here,' or 'There is good living here'

(129) Se habló de la guerra

'There was talk about the war,' or

'The war got talked about'

(130) Se mató a los cristianos

'The Christians got killed'

In (128), the Cognate object (Rpas subject) is deleted, resulting in an impersonal construction in which se is both the Aux of the Rpas and an indefinite human subject reference.¹⁰ The same is true of the se in (129) and (130); but the Cognate in (129) and the direct object in (130) are retained. In all three cases the verb is singular. The concord is with the original indefinite subject (the agent). Although Bello recognized the relationship of the impersonal se to the Rpas Aux, he considered these constructions to be grammatically inexplicable anomalies. However, the rules outlined informally above reveal the intuitively felt relationship of the impersonal construction to the Rpas, by providing the grammatical basis for the interpretation of se both as Aux and indefinite subject reference. The base structure underlying Rpas has a subject and an agent marked for [+ Human, [+ Indefinite]]. No lexical item need ever be chosen for nodes marked in this way. If the object in these sentences is marked [- Animate], the Rpas rule automatically applies, and concord with the Rpas subject is required. If the object is a Cognate, or is marked [+ Human], the impersonal Rpas rule applies. Finally, if the agent is the same as the object (of perfective process verbs), the R-intransitive rule applies, and the object is switched to the subject position.

4.1.4. There is much to be said about the Rpas with respect to the corresponding English types and with respect to the resultative

(state) passive in both languages. Such sentences as

(131) La puerta está abierta

'The door is (standing) open'

are clearly related to

(132) Se ha abierto la puerta

'The door has been (got) opened'

rather than to the passive of action. In other words, the resultative (changed state) passive clearly implies previous completion of a process.¹¹ We shall see this more clearly in the discussion of the mediopassive reflexive.

4.2. The mediopassive reflexive with verbs of causation.

The analysis of this construction parallels that of Rpas in that it involves the relationship of a mediopassive (Rmpas) of process to an underlying kernel. The term Rmpas refers to a transformation which converts the object of a causative verb into a subject which participates in the process and is affected by the causal agent (the original subject). The structure of the base for the Rmpas transformation is

	<u>NP</u>	<u>Vb</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>(Origin)</u>	<u>Destination</u>	<u>Agency</u>
(133)	La muerte		Juan	(Juan)	(con Juan)	La muerte + R

Thus, a string such as

(134) ^La muerte espanta Juan de la muerte R

'Death frightens John Prep + death + l

is obligatorily transformed into

(135) Juan se espanta de la muerte

'John becomes (gets) frightened of death'

In (134), the subject and the Agency are identical. In (135) the object has been inverted; the se indicates both passive of induced process and the participation of the subject in the experience. In other words, in the mediopassive construction, the subject is both actor and acted upon. This being the case, it might seem that we are dealing with a reflexive object rather than with a pseudoreflexive. However, there is no sentence

(136) *Juan se espanta a sí mismo (de la muerte)

Nor is there a SER DO-passive:

(137) *Juan fué espantado por la muerte

4.2.1. The Rmpas differs from the Rpas with respect to inversion. The phrase de la muerte in (135) is the agent, and inversion of the original object is required when the Agency adverb is overtly expressed. If it is not retained, the original word order may be kept.¹² Choice of a Destination adverb may result in a double reflexive construction: if we have as basis,

(138)	<u>NP</u>	<u>Vb</u>	<u>NP</u>	<u>Destination</u>	<u>Agency</u>
	María	enfada	María	con María	María + R

the obligatory result is

(139) María se enfada consigo misma

'Mary gets angry with herself'

The se of this sentence results from the Rmpas transformation; it is the mediopassive Aux. The consigo misma results from the reflexive transformation which applies, under certain conditions, to adverbs of Destination.

4.2.2. The English equivalents to the Rmpas sentences are derived in essentially the same way. The result of this transformation in English is the conversion of the past participle into a participial adjective. We can say

(140) I became (got) very frightened of him
but not

(141) *I was very hit by him

The mediopassive transformation seems to me to be the source of many verbal adjectives other than the participle.

(142) He angered me with him by him
must surely be related to

(143) He made me (get) angry with him by him
and

(144) I became angry with him
And finally,

(145) I am frightened (afraid) of him

(146) I am angry with him

are resultative (state) passives. In English it is only mediopassives and their resultative passives in which the participles behave as adjectives (see Chapter III, section 3.3.). In Spanish, all passive participles are inflected as adjectives. Perhaps it is because the passive (BE EN) participle in English does not behave like an adjective that grammarians have failed to notice this relationship of passive - mediopassive - resultative. It seems to me

to be undeniable. Once again, then, we see how the same base will account for a set of Spanish sentences, as well as for the equivalent set of English sentences.

4.3. The pseudoreflexive of process with transitive verbs of movement. It has repeatedly been said that such verbs as sentarse, acostarse, levantarse are most accurately glossed as 'to seat oneself,' 'to put oneself to bed,' 'to raise oneself.' But notice that such glosses are, in fact, incorrect:

(147) *Juan se sentó a sí mismo

(148) *Juan se acostó a sí mismo

(149) *Juan se levantó a sí mismo

are all ungrammatical. In fact, the verbs which are listed as equivalents in ordinary English turn out to be more nearly accurate glosses. Sentarse is 'to sit (up or) down'; levantarse 'to rise up'; 'get (raised) up.' The se with these verbs performs both the function of the English Directional adverbs and the function of an intransitivizing morpheme. Thus we have either

(150) Juan le sentó (a Pablo) en una silla

'John seated Paul in a chair'

or

Origin

(151) Juan sentó Juan en una silla (por) Juan + R

'John seated John in a chair by John + R'

Again, as in the Rpas and Rmpas, the verb undergoes a change in its

direction, indicating movement in process. The Translative movement in English is 'downward.'¹³ The result of the process is

(152) Juan está sentado en una silla

'John is seated (sitting) in a chair'

The relationship is middle -- the subject participates in and carries out the movement -- 'seat (someone)' versus 'sit(ting) down' versus 'sitting.' Similarly, bajarlo 'to take it down' versus bajarse 'to get down' versus bajar 'to go down.' There are, then, verbs like sentarse which occur either transitively or reflexively (intransitively); and verbs like subir 'to climb up' and bajar, which can occur as non-reflexive intransitives as well. 'Get down' implies -- in the grammatical field -- a previous state of having been up; 'get up,' a (previous) state of having been down. This is precisely the function of the reflexive middle Aux with the Spanish equivalents.¹³

4.4. The reflexive with primary intransitives of movement.

These are perhaps the most consistently misinterpreted of the pseudo-reflexive verbs: ir 'to go,' escapar 'to escape,' caer 'to fall,' regresar and volver 'to return,' and others. As I pointed out in Chapter I, both traditional grammarians and linguists have defined the reflexive with these intransitives as a sign of emotional involvement in the action of the verb -- a sign of some sort of inner psychic emphasis. The Prn has been considered completely optional, an element to be chosen when the speaker wants to convey this involvement.

Examination of certain structural regularities in the behavior of these verbs reveals, on the contrary, that the reflexive is obligatory in the simplex sentence containing an adverb of Origin.

4.4.1. In the base, these verbs occur either with an adverb of Destination (Dest) or Origin. Notice the following sentences.

(153) Juan va a la escuela

'John goes to school'

(154) Juan cayó al río

'John fell into the river'

(155) Juan marchaba hacia las montañas

'John went toward the mountains'

(156) El libro cayó al suelo

'The book fell to the floor'

The phrases a la escuela, al río, hacia las montañas, al suelo, are all adverbs of Destination. In the following sentences are illustrations of Source adverbs:

(157) Juan se va de Madrid

'John goes away from Madrid'

(158) Juan se marchó de la casa

'John went off from the house'

(159) Juan se cayó del árbol

'John fell out of the tree'

That these adverbs must be considered formally different from each other is concluded from the fact that sentences having a human

subject and Source must contain the reflexive Aux. There are no such sentences as

(160) *Juan va de Madrid

'*John goes from Madrid'

(161) *Juan marchó de la casa

'John went from the house'

(162) *Juan cayó del árbol

'John fell from the tree'

That the reflexive here is distinct from reflexive object Prns is concluded from the fact that there is no

(163) *Juan se va a sí mismo de la casa

4.4.2. Next I turn to the group of sentences in which the reflexive is optional, if indeed it is optional. It is sentences like

(164) Juan se va a la escuela

'John goes off (away) to school'

(165) Juan se cayó al río

'John fell down into the river'

(166) Juan se marchaba hacia las montañas

'John went off (away) towards the mountains'¹⁴

that are invariably given to exemplify the description of these structures as reflexives of involvement. Here again, important features have been overlooked. Previous discussions of these constructions have been based on the view that the only difference between

(167) Juan fué a la biblioteca

'John went to the library'

and

(168) Juan se fué a la biblioteca

'John went off to the library'

is the optional occurrence of the reflexive in a simple sentence. On the contrary, in a sentence of this type, if the reflexive occurs without the Origin adverb, the speaker feels that the Source is implied. In other words, the reflexive is not the optional element. In the simple sentence there is an adverb of Origin or an adverb of Destination. We cannot say

(169) *Juan se fué de la casa a la biblioteca¹⁵

'*John went away from the house to the library'

Therefore, (168) is a compound sentence consisting of

- (170) (a) Juan se fué de la casa }
 (b) Juan fué a la biblioteca } $\Rightarrow$
 (c) Juan se fué a la biblioteca

4.4.3. A characteristic difference between Destination and Origin is that the Destination phrase must be explicit in the kernel; we may say

(171) Juan se fué

'John went away'

leaving de la casa (or de aquí 'from here') implicit; but there is no

(172) *Juan fué

or

(173) *Juan cayó

The Destination phrase is deletable only if some other adverb is chosen, as in

(174) Juan no va

'John isn't going'

and

(175) Juan va a las diez

'John is going at ten o'clock'

In both (174) and (175), the Destination adverb (and no other) remains implicit.

4.4.4. Amado Alonso refers to this reflexive as inceptive.

It indicates departure, regardless of whether the Destination is present.

It indicates movement in process with respect to the Source. There-

fore, we are again dealing with the middle voice. With the Origin

adverb, the process is being completed; with the Destination explicit,

se is movement being started.¹⁶ "... irse o marcharse indica la

partida de un sitio, ir o marchar se refiere más a la dirección o

destino."¹⁷

4.4.5. The reflexive with these intransitive verbs of move-

ment seems to be a blend of Origin, Translation, and Agency. It is

equivalent to 'off,' 'away,' or 'out,' or 'down' from some place.

Hence, there is simply no way of showing, either grammatically or

semantically, that the subject is emotionally involved in his action,

or indeed, that he has any attitude at all in the matter. Since the

subject must go away reflexively, whether or not he resists going or

goes willingly is syntactically and semantically irrelevant. To say

that the reflexive in these sentences indicates emotional involvement is to assume that there is such an involvement in 'He goes away.'

4.5. More intransitives of movement, process, and state. A number of primary intransitives may take the reflexive Aux. Again, the function of the Aux is to change the direction of the verb, implying, of course, the opposite state or direction. Among these are salir 'to go forth,' entrar 'to enter,' quedar 'be left,' estar 'be located' or 'be in some state,' and others. The change in direction with these verbs results from the specification in the base of the subject as the Origin and the Agency with entrarse 'to get in,' and salirse 'to get out'; and as Origin ($\pm$ Agency) with quedarse and estarse 'to remain.' Again, se is the Aux of the middle voice. Thus,

Agency Origin

(176) ^Juan entró en la casa	Juan + R
'John entered the house	John + R'

is transformed into

- (177) Juan se entró en la casa
- 'John got into the house'

4.5.1. In 4.5. the examples referred to are verbs of movement or state (lack of movement). Now we turn to the intransitive verbs of process: morir 'to die,' nacer 'to be born,' ocurrir 'to occur, happen.' The usual interpretation of this reflexive is, of course, interest on the part of the subject. And again, the usual interpretation does not hold up under grammatical analysis. Bello, it will be remembered, says that the reflexiveness of these verbs is

simply not felt by the speaker. Morirse, according to him, is 'to approach death.' It indicates natural death as opposed to violent death. We can say

(178) Se murió de pulmonía

'He died of pneumonia'

but not

(179) *Se murió ahogado

'He died of suffocation (or drowning)',¹⁹

What these observations add up to is self-Origin. Notice that this is not the same as self-induced. In (178) the cause of death is pneumonia; but the death is natural, from within as opposed to being inflicted by some agent. The reflexive, therefore, is derived from the Origin node; and the agentive Aux agrees with the subject. The reflexive functions, then, as a mediopassive Aux. Juan se murió is 'He finished (preterite tense) the process of dying' or, in more acceptable English, 'He succumbed (to death),' or 'passed away.' Notice, incidentally, that when the process of dying cannot be viewed as finished -- that is, in the present or past imperfect tense -- the reflexive is obligatory. (178) could occur equally well without the reflexive; however, in

(180) Juan se muere (se está muriendo) de pulmonía

'John is dying of pneumonia (right now)'

there is no non-reflexive alternative.

The conversion of nacer into the middle voice may well be interpreted as a stylistic one rather than a completely grammatical

one. It is perhaps best glossed as 'to spring to life' spontaneously, or, in other words, from within, with no outside help.

4.6. The gratuitous reflexive. It is perhaps because verbs of the types discussed in 4.5. so often occur in this construction that the reflexive is interpreted as a sign of involvement or affect. Observe the following sentences.

(181) Se me cayó el libro

'My book fell for (on) me'

(182) Se me ocurrió una idea

'An idea occurred to me'

(183) Se me murió mi padre

'My father died on (for) me'

(184) Se me perdió el dinero

'My money got lost (on me)'

In all of these sentences the grammatical subject (logical object) is in care of the human Reference Prn. But the movement (or process) of the inanimate subject is caused by some outside agent or force. Only if the subject is human (183) can it be interpreted as an original one -- that is, as the subject in the base. Self-agency is not attributed to the inanimate nouns, and they cannot be shifted into subject position.²⁰ The unspecified causal agent must be considered the original subject. In other words, these constructions represent

yet another type of mediopassive. The structure of the base for these sentences could be characterized as

	<u>Origin</u>	<u>Reference</u>
(185)	X perdió X el dinero a mí X + R	

which is the base for a Rmpas sentence. To permit perder and caer to be introduced in this slot would seem to imply that they may function as causative verbs. However, the lexical rules for these verbs will include the specification that they can occur in this frame only in case the subject and agent (and Origin) are X, and there is a human Reference -- in short, only when mediopassive conversion is obligatory.²¹ That the Reference must be explicit here is proved by the fact that the conversion cannot take place without it. There is no

(186) *Se cayó el libro²²

or

(187) *Se ocurrió una idea

Equally ungrammatical are

(188) *Me murió mi padre

and

(189) *Me ocurrió una idea

It is obvious, then, that what governs this reflexive is the human Reference. The reflexive Aux and the Reference Prn are preclitic in the surface structure, as in all other constructions with a single, finite verb. The mediopassive subject (logical object) remains in its original object position. And, if the disjunctive phrase of the

Reference Prn is retained, it must be shifted into subject position (hence, the Reference Prn is the logical subject). We can say

(190) A mí se me cayó el libro

but not

(191) *Se me cayó el libro a mí

or

(192) *El libro se me cayó a mí

4.7. Active voice as passive equivalent. In this chapter we have seen many examples of mediopassive (actional passive) sentence-types, all of which have a base structure identical with the base of the equivalent type in English. The surface structures of the two languages are, of course, quite different. Spanish makes the relation of logical subject or logical object (or agent) overt by placing a NP in the position corresponding to the logical, rather than the grammatical relation. One of the most striking examples of this, perhaps, is in the gratuitous reflexive, where the grammatical Reference (a type of indirect object) is placed in the subject position, and the grammatical subject is placed in the object position. There are other ways of indicating a passive relation in Spanish, however. One of these I consider briefly below.

4.7.1. The indirect (Connection) object in English may become the subject of a passive sentence.²³ We can say either

(193) I was told that by Robert

or

(194) That was told to me by Robert

Translation of (193) and (194) into either a SER DO-passive or an Rpas is impossible. However, Spanish has an equivalent. Starting with a base structure of

Agency

(195) Roberto dijo eso (lo) a mí + me Roberto

'Robert told that + (it) to me (by) Robert + R'

we can derive either

(196) (A mí) me lo dijo Roberto

'I was told that by Robert'

or

(197) Eso me lo dijo (a mí) Roberto

'That was told to me by Robert'

In both sentences Roberto is felt to be subject and agent. In (196) the Connection object is the logical subject; in (197), the logical subject is the original direct object. The grammatical categories are left unchanged; but the inversion in word order effects a change in logical relations. This change, furthermore, is not merely a way of stressing one element or another. Contrary to what has often been said, this is not an illustration of the flexibility of Spanish word order. This order is dictated by the Agency transformation. The only option the speaker has here is the choice of either the direct object or the Destination object as logical subject. If the former is chosen, the obligatory result is (197); choice of the latter results in (196). As an illustration of the rigidity of word order in these

constructions, notice that we cannot say

(198) *Me lo dijo (eso) a mí Roberto

or

(199) *Me lo dijo (eso) Roberto a mí

Equally impossible would be the rewriting of (197) as

(199) *Eso a mí me lo dijo Roberto

or

(200) *Eso me lo dijo Roberto a mí

4.8. Now, though the grammatical bases of the various Agency constructions presented in this chapter are the same in both languages, it is obvious that the individual verbs that can occur in one construction or another cannot be accounted for by grammatical rule. A given mediopassive rule may be optional for some verbs of a class and obligatory for others of the same class (process, causative, state, and so on). Furthermore, some verbs in Spanish -- and certain passives in English -- have no active counterpart in the grammar any longer. For example, in English we can say

(201) He is said to be a genius

but not

(202) *They say him to be a genius

although (202) was grammatical in Shakespeare's day. Similarly, quejarse 'to complain' is not preceded by *quejar; nor acordarse 'to remember' by *acordar; although these verbs were originally transitive and active.

The problem of which verbs can or must occur in a given frame will be handled in the explicit grammar very much as it is handled by the language learner. The child gets a thorough and very early hold on "directional relations": relations of direction with respect to himself and, later, relations of Agency with respect to [+ Human]. Gradually, he classifies verbs according to their relations with these "directive" adverbs. These classifications will be handled formally by lexical structure rules, which assign to individual lexical morphemes the characteristics of the base frames in which they can occur. The formalization of the base, and the rules which produce the sentence-types discussed in this study, will be the concern of the following chapter.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER IV

¹The most commonly agreed upon definition of the middle voice is concisely stated by Adelaide Hahn in "Partitive Apposition," (Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists, p. 789): "The middle verb indicates that the subject acts either (a) directly on himself, or (b) indirectly for himself." In fact, as we shall see, this definition accounts only for those occurrences of the middle with expressed or recoverable reflexive objects (whether in Greek or Spanish). A much more accurate definition of the middle was given by Dionysius of Thrace in Art of Grammar (in the translation found in General Course in Language, Vol. 1, The Chicago University Press, 1944): "action ... 'I-strike'; passion [is] 'I-am-struck,' while the intermediate [middle] represents sometimes action, sometimes passion, as 'I-stand-fixed.' 'I-stand-ruined,' 'I-did-for-myself,' 'I-wrote-for-myself.'" In this chapter we shall see that the middle is precisely a combination of active and passive features never wholly equivalent to either of the other voices.

²There is a relationship between verbs which can undergo the middle transformation and those which can be converted into resultative (state) passives, as we shall see.

³Recall the analysis of Modern Spanish. See also page 156 of Nida's Morphology (The University of Michigan Press, 1949, second edition), where the se of se pega 'he hits himself' and se dice 'it is said,' are formally equated. The difference between these two is semantic, according to Nida.

⁴By "not permitted" I mean that the agentive phrase por + NP is ungrammatical in these sentences. It does occur in substandard language, however, its occurrence being one more proof that the se is a passive Aux.

⁵Se abrió sola la puerta 'It opened by itself, the door (did),' is obviously a different transformation.

⁶This transformation does not apply to a large number of verbs in Spanish; whereas in English, the secondary intransitive (formerly reflexive or mediopassive) is quite common.

⁷See D. L. Bolinger, "English Prosodic Stress and Spanish Sentence Order," Hispania, Vol. 37, 1954, 152-156.

⁸In fact, (119) is not a grammatical sentence. Having uttered El papel se rasga, one is compelled to add an adverb of Manner, such as fácilmente 'easily.'

⁹When a reflexive passive sentence is not converted into an intransitive by shifting the inanimate noun into the subject slot, the switch involves one of two types of changes. If, for example, we say Las montañas se ven desde aquí, the sentence is essentially equivalent to 'The mountains are visible from here' whether or not an observer happens to be available to see them.

¹⁰Notice incidentally the failure to make concord (in sub-standard Spanish) in Se vende flores 'Flowers sold' (or 'for sale'). The rule for concord is, of course, among the latest rules in the syntactic component.

¹¹F. Agard, in Modern Approach to Spanish, (Holt, 1964) implies that the resultative passive is indifferently interpretable as a conversion of either the Rpas or the SER DO-passive. Such an interpretation does not take account of the relation of the resultative to the Mediopassive and the intransitive of process. The resultative implies that the action has been (got) achieved, and is, essentially, a paraphrase of the mediopassive (and only the mediopassive).

¹²Retention of the original word order in these sentences is also retention of overt causation. That is, Se enfadó el niño is 'The child was made angry.' El niño se enfadó is 'The child became angry (because of something).'

¹³Notice, by the way, that the resultative of Se ha bajado is the adjectival sentence, Está abajo. 'Downward' would be Translative; 'Down,' the Result.

¹⁴The Resultative Directional 'away' may well be distinct from the Destination 'away.' The former is 'away from' and is interchangeable with 'off.' The latter is 'to' or 'in another place.'

¹⁵The sentence 'John went from the house to school in ten minutes,' is a different type of sentence, containing an adverb of Measured Distance. I am not concerned with these sentences here. If the Spanish sentence here were uttered, it would be incomplete without something like Sin despedirse de su madre 'without saying good-by to his mother.'

¹⁶Anna Granville Hatcher has noted that the reflexive with verbs of movement in Old French served to mark the action as inceptive. She points out also that the same is true of modern French Il s'en va 'he goes away from (en) place,' although the number of verbs in the category is reduced to two: aller and venir. (See her book, Reflexive Verbs: Latin, Old French, Modern French, The John Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Vol. XLIII.)

¹⁷Translation: irse 'to go away' indicates departure from a place; ir 'to go' refers more to the direction or destination. (In Amado Alonso and Henríquez-Ureña, Op. cit., 111.) This explanation of the difference between the middle verb and the active verb in Spanish (or Greek) holds, obviously for the English glosses. In other words, the verb-plus-separable-particle (separable prefixes in German) represents precisely a middle relation. If the verb is intransitive-plus-particle it represents the subject carrying out the process or movement; without the particle, the action-plus-goal is represented; 'I-go-away (from someplace)' is middle; 'I go-to-school' is active. Similarly, with a transitive verb, 'I eat-the-apple' is active; 'I-eat-the-apple-up' is middle. It is in this sense that the middle can be said to involve the subject. It is a purely grammatical involvement, having nothing to do with benefit, or disadvantage, or emotions.

¹⁸It should be mentioned that quedar and estar can be transformed into the middle by a different route: with adjectives of state, such as triste 'sad,' they represent adjectival sources of resultative passives. Se quedó triste 'he became (fell) sad.'

¹⁹See GDLC. This refers to a note of Cuervo's -- note 103, page 460.

²⁰Again it must be stressed that to say that inversion of the inanimate subject in these sentences is not permitted, is not equivalent to saying such inversion does not occur. It does occur, as a stylistic device for producing some effect. Notice the following dialogue:

El Daciano Quiruelas, por más que se esforzó,
no fue a lo suyo y permitió que la ocasión se le
escapase.

--¿Como una anguila?

--Pues, sí... O como un avecica, ¿qué más da?

(This occurs in Camilo José Cela's novel, Tobogán de Hambrientos, Barcelona, Editorial Noguer, S. A., 1962, page 267.) Translation,

'El Daciano Quiruelas, no matter how hard he tried, did not succeed in paying attention to his own interests, and allowed the opportunity to (take its own initiative and) escape from him. Like an eel? Well, yes, or like a little bird, what difference does it make?'

The response, 'like an eel...' would not be normal (in the sense of completely grammatical) with que se le escapase la ocasión. With the latter, Origin of movement is attributed to the human subject; with the former, 'opportunity' is its own agent and, therefore, the logical subject.

²¹An alternative way of handling this construction would be to allow these verbs to occur in base frames containing Reference and Agency. However, if the subject precedes the verb in the base, it must be obligatorily switched to object position by an ad hoc rule, since all other switching rules involving logical positioning work the other way around. That is, we start with the noun in its basic grammatical position, apply the mediopassive rule, and change the position of the noun only if the transformation specifies that it is to be changed logically, as well as grammatically. To put it another way, the evidence indicates overwhelmingly that whenever we feel that a grammatical subject is the logical object of a sentence, it is because the subject in the surface structure is derived from an object in the base structure.

²²Me cayó el libro could only be 'The book fell to me (as a prize).' It has been argued that (187) is a possible sentence. The answer to the argument is yes, it certainly is a possible sentence in the appropriate context. We can say Se cayó el libro in precisely the same context in which we might say 'The book fell down,' implying that the book was actively engaged in some activity which caused it to fall without outside agency. The stylistic intent of such an utterance is often a humorous one. But the contextual use does not make 'The book fell down' a grammatical -- that is, an unquestionably well formed -- sentence.

²³See Charles J. Fillmore, Indirect Object Constructions in English and the Ordering of Transformations. The Ohio State University Research Foundation Project 1303, Report I.

CHAPTER V

THE STRUCTURE OF VOICE IN SPANISH AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR LINGUISTIC METATHEORY

Any attempt to construct an explanatory theory of a structure such as a natural language presupposes, of course, some set of axioms and some notion of the essential hierarchy of those approaches most likely to produce the simplest explanatory definition. Axiomatically, the possibility of an explanatory definition of the unique grammatical character of any one language hinges on the possibility of explaining all other languages in like terms. And if all languages can be explained in like terms, it follows, of course, that all languages, simply because they are members of the set L(language), must be assumed to have a common grammatical substratum: the substratum relation L which holds between English and German, or Mandarin and Cantonese, must hold among Mandarin, German, English, and Cantonese. Operationally then, an explanation of differences between one language and any other language, presupposes a characterization of the universal basis, for the simple reason that it is impossible to understand the differentiating properties until we know what properties are shared by all languages.

Every language has a way of expressing, grammatically, all of the relations that can be categorially or inflectionally explicit in any one language. This is unconditionally true and there is demonstrably no such thing as an 'exotic' or unique linguistic category, in the sense of a major category or categorial or relational feature that must be hypothesized to explain the syntax of any one language. This becomes apparent when we ask just what it is that is exotic about the inflection of nouns in Language X as being [$\pm$ Present], [$\pm$ Tangible], [$\pm$ Visible], [$\pm$ Position near speaker]. Just what is so unique about the adverbial category of Movement in a sentence glossed as 'He brought it (here) with him, coming from elsewhere'? Certainly no less exotic than these are English sentences like 'This here friend of mine told me a good one about the time...', where the NP 'This here friend of mine' contains at least the grammatical features [+ Possessed presently], [+ Count], and [- Visible], [+ Human]. And in the phrase 'told me a good one,' we know from the grammatical context that 'one' is a Quantifier [+ Counter] which represents the cognate noun 'story [- Tangible], [- Visible].' All of these categories are specified in the sentential contexts of Time and Place. Similarly, the sentence, 'He brought it with him,' must be specified grammatically as [+ Presently here, having come from elsewhere].

Since voice relations exist universally and independently of an overt inflectional 'passive morpheme' or 'middle desinence,' it makes no sense to say that English has no middle voice because it has no verbal inflection specifically and exclusively definable as

'middle.' Nor does it make sense to say that in any language which has a passive or middle marker, the passive relation is grammatically delimited by the marker itself, and that any verb which is relationally passive, but formally undifferentiated from the active transitive (or intransitive), must be defined in terms of the overt shape, regardless of its relational function. In other words, to assume that the conversion relation 'passive' is somehow determined by the occurrence of an overt verbal aux such as BE EN, the passive participle, and the agentive 'by + NP,' is to deny that 'passive' is in fact a relation. But 'passive,' in the generally accepted definition, is a reversal of the active relation. If this definition has any validity, there must be as many possible types of reversals (or rather, alterations of some sort) as there are active and passive participants in any sentence properly (relationally) defined as transitive or active. And the proper definition of transitive is based, not on the possible occurrence of a so-called direct object, but on the inherent conversion potential of the verb itself. If the verb possesses an inherent capacity for a certain type of motion or direction with respect to the participants, it follows that any alteration of this verbal direction is simultaneously a change in its relationship to its participants; and any overt indication of such Change, whether of Change beginning, in progress, or ceasing, must be defined as a sign of passivization -- or of some degree (middle) thereof. Between the opposite poles of active and passive there are as many degrees of passivization as there are ways in which the verb can be related to the participants.

My task in this chapter, and the primary aim of this study, is to explain, by formal definition, the ways in which verb-participant relations can change in a simple sentence in Spanish. This explanation can be achieved only by assuming that any original (active) subject (agent or force) must be itself inherently capable of Movement. In basing my definition of base-subject on this assumption, I am making a claim that is denied, at least operationally, by modern linguists and philosophers of language; namely, that there is a direct connection between the major categories and relation-potentials of natural language and the 'real world.'¹ A Grammar is a Gestalt, basically subdividable in terms of an active predication (directed away from the subject) and a subject that is potentially capable of altering the pattern. The Sentence is defined, then, in terms of the performance of some predication by a causal subject, acting alone or with some Means or Instrument, or through some other cause Agency. This performance occurs in Place and Time and involves the production of some Change: Change in position or state of participants; Change in the form of the object and the material of which it is constructed ('build a house out of stone'); or Change in the sense of completion of the specific, or cognate, potential of the verb itself -- the cognate object being the result of thinking, sensing, defining, talking, and so on. The object changed must, of course, be inherently capable of being changed in the specific terms of the predication.

5.1. Some problems in construction of the base. The base-subject must be specified as [+ SN] 'Source Noun.' A Source Noun can be a natural force or source of energy, an abstract such as thought, imagination, or feeling, or, of course, an animate being.

It follows from this definition of subject that copular sentences, all transitives or intransitives with inanimate, non-causal subjects (subjects having only passive potential) are explainable only in terms of conversion from a base having one of several types of transitional predication and a Source-Noun subject -- even if that subject in a specific instant is 'Chance.' The major categorial delimiters of the transition-indicator (the verb) are the subject, the object, if there is one, and the causal determinants: adverbs of Change and Source. The ultimate accidental shape of the verb is determined -- whenever the verb is the category inflected for voice or mood -- by the interaction of temporal adverbs with the category of Mood and the causal determiners. The voice of the sentence is determined by the number of identity relations existing among the participants, in terms of their categorial function and their inherent voice-potential.

Aspect auxiliaries are determined by the interrelations of Time and Change; and modal auxiliaries, which combine with auxiliaries of voice and aspect, are shaped by the category of Mood and Time in various relational combinations with any or all of the adverbs.

5.1.1. Although the major theoretical differences between the present theory and the model most recently proposed by Chomsky lies in my definition of the character of the subject in a base string, there are other differences which require some explanation. In Chomsky's model (which is offered as a sample of what a base looks like, rather than a base for a specific segment of a grammar) he does not recognize Change, Source, and Cognation as major categories.² Rather, he defines one type of VP-expansion as 'V(NP) (Prepositional Phrase) (Prepositional Phrase) (Manner).' The recognition of Manner as a major category is based on the assumption that verbs capable of passive conversion are strictly subcategorized, or selected, in terms of their possible co-occurrence with a Manner adverb.³ All other adverbs (except Time and Place) are defined as strict subcategorizations of a Prepositional Phrase. The motivation for this analysis is not clear, but it is clear that there are strong reasons for rejecting it here. First, prepositions must be defined in terms of what they are: surface-structure indicators of intercategory relations. They serve the same general purpose as case-inflections.⁴ Prepositions are derived, then, by some kind of case-rules. And the choice of the relevant particle depends upon the verb, the NP's, and the types of blending operations that have been performed. The particle 'of,' for example, may represent a partitive relation, a Cause-phrase, an Agency, a Means -- or possibly a blend of the last three. 'On' may indicate a relation of Place, or Reference, or Comitation

(Accompaniment) -- or all three, unambiguously and inseparably.⁵ It is obvious then, that prepositions are relationally defined and that Change, Source, and so on, are categorially prior from the logical linguistic point of view.

5.2. The universal structure of the base. Since I am concerned with the base for voice conversions, subcategorization in the rules that follow is largely determined by relevance to the explanatory definition of passivization and the middle. However, I have tried to indicate, at least to some extent, the types of categorial subdivisions that must be hypothesized in an explanation of aspect-derivation and copular sentences. Finally, I present a sketch of the kinds of subcategorial features needed to specify the co-occurrence restrictions of nouns.

Although the specific conversion rules to be explained here are rules for Spanish, I propose the base rules to be those underlying voice conversions in any language.

R1. #S# $\rightarrow$ #NP PP Mood#

R2. PP $\rightarrow$ VP Tm

R3. VP $\rightarrow$ $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Vb (NP) (NP)} \\ \text{Vm } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Essive} \\ \text{-V-} \end{array} \right\} \text{ NP} \\ \text{Cognition} \end{array} \right\} \quad (\text{Change}) \quad (\text{Source})$

R4. Cognition $\rightarrow$ Vc (NP) (CgnP)

$$R5. \begin{Bmatrix} Vb \\ Vm \\ Ve \\ -V- \end{Bmatrix} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{Bmatrix} + Vb \\ + Vm \\ + Vc \\ + Vfc \end{Bmatrix} \right\} [+ Vfc]$$

R6. Source $\rightarrow$ (Involvement) (Origin)

R7. Involvement $\rightarrow$ (Destinative) (Instrumental)

R8. Destinative $\rightarrow$ ($\begin{Bmatrix} PlaceP \\ DatP \end{Bmatrix}$) (PurP) (RefP)

R9. Instrumental $\rightarrow$ (MannerP) (Instrum)

R10. Instrum $\rightarrow$ (MeansP) (Comit) (InstrP) (MatP)

R11. Comit $\rightarrow$ (ComP) (CompP)

R12. Origin $\rightarrow$ (InoP) (CauseP) (AgencyP)

R13. Change $\rightarrow$ Motion (Result)

R14. Motion $\rightarrow$ (Orig) (Direction)

R15. Orig $\rightarrow$ $\begin{Bmatrix} OrP \\ ToP \end{Bmatrix}$

R16. PlaceP $\rightarrow$ TdP/ToP

R17. Tm $\rightarrow$ (Tns) Tms

R18. Tms $\rightarrow$ (Restr) (Point) (Aspect) $\begin{Bmatrix} Pres \\ Past \\ Fut \end{Bmatrix}$

R19. Point $\rightarrow$ (PtP) (DaP) (MoP) (YrP)

R20. Aspect $\rightarrow$ (Perf) (Prog) (FreqP)

R21. Restr $\rightarrow$ (Intens) (Rstr)

R22. $-(-P)- \rightarrow NP$

R23. NP $\rightarrow$ Qualifiers N R (Add) (S)

R25. $[+ SN] \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} [+ Anim] \\ [+ Abs] \end{bmatrix}$

R26. $[+ CN] \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} [+ Abs] \\ [+ Abs] \end{bmatrix}, \ / \# [+ Abs] --$

R27. $[+ IN] \rightarrow [+ Hum]$

R28. $[+ RN] \rightarrow [+ Anim]$

R29. $[+ Nfc] \rightarrow [+ Nfs] \ [+ Nfi]$

R30. $[+ Nfs] \rightarrow [+ Count]$

R31. $[+ Count] \rightarrow [+ Tangible]$

R32. $[+ Tangible] \rightarrow [+ Anim]$

R33. $[+ Anim] \rightarrow [+ Hum]$

R34. $[- Count] \rightarrow [+ Abs]$

R35. $[+ AN] \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [+ Hum] / \# [+ Hum] V [+ Hum] '--- \\ [+ Anim] \end{array} \right.$

R36. $[+ Nfi] \rightarrow ([\pm Genus]) ([\pm Specific]) ([\pm Shape]) ([\pm Sense])$

R37. $[+ Specific] \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} [+ Pgen] \\ [+ Prop] \\ [+ Prof] \end{array} \right\} / [+ Hum] -$

R38. $[+ Sense] \rightarrow ([\pm Vis]) ([\pm Aud]) ([\pm Odor]) ([\pm Taste]) ([\pm Feel])$

R39. Qualifiers $\rightarrow$ Determiners (Adherents)

R40. R $\rightarrow$ (Deictic) Prn

R41. Deictic $\rightarrow$ (Intens) (Vicin $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{SpeakerP} \\ \text{HearerP} \\ \text{OtherP} \end{array} \right\}$)

R42. Determiners $\rightarrow$ (Det) (Quan)

R43. Det $\rightarrow \left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} [+ Demons] / -- \text{Deictic} \\ [+ Possess] / -- [+ Pgen] \\ [+ Def] / -- \\ [- Def] / -- \end{array} \right\} \right)$

R44. Quan $\rightarrow \left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Def} \\ \text{Indef} \end{array} \right\} (\text{Number}) (\text{Counter}) / -- \right)$

R45. Adherents $\rightarrow$ (Shape) (Size) (Gender) (Position)

R46. Position $\rightarrow \left(\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{AdP} \\ \text{AbP} \\ \text{InP} \\ \text{SubP} \\ \text{SupP} \end{array} \right\} / [+ PL] \right)$

$$R47. \text{ Direction} \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{Elative} \\ \text{Delative} \\ \text{Sublative} \end{array} \right] \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{Equative} \\ \text{Factive} \\ \text{Translative} \end{array} \right] \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{Illative} \\ \text{Terminative} \end{array} \right] \end{array} \right\} / \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{OrP} \\ \text{SupP} \\ \text{SubP} \end{array} \right] \text{ --- } \\ \left[\begin{array}{l} \text{V } [+ \text{ Cg}] \text{ } [+ \text{ Cg}] \text{ ---} \\ \text{V NP } [+ \text{ Cg}] \text{ ---} \\ (\text{Essive}) \text{ --- Result} \end{array} \right] \\ \text{--- Dest} \end{array} \right\}$$

$$R48. [+ \text{ Vfc}] \rightarrow [+ \text{ V}] / \# \text{NP } \underline{\text{VP}}$$

$$R49. \text{ Result} \rightarrow (\text{DAdv}) (\text{ReI})$$

R50.-? Breakdowns in terms of features for individual languages: for example, where English uses an adjective such as 'little,' Spanish and many other languages represent size with a nominal affix, and so on.

R?- All symbols of the type $-(\text{-P})-$ will be re-cycled through the $[+\text{Nfc}]$ -rules beginning with R24.

5.2.2. Symbolization and Interpretation. Many of the symbols and bracketings used here are in general use among transformationists. Many more, however, though they are familiar enough in chronological and traditional studies, are incorporated in the present study for the purpose of constructing the base of more nearly universal dimensions. As a result, although all of the major categorial definitions are either explicitly or implicitly Aristotelian, the sub-categorial breakdowns are labeled in terms of a wide range of languages.⁶

R1. # =S(entence)-boundary; PP = Predicate Phrase.

R2. VP = Verb Phrase; Tm = Time.

R3. { } indicate that any one (but only one) of the possible re-writings of VP may be chosen. The rule should be read as follows:

(a), Verb and one or two optional noun phrases, as symbolized by (); or (b), Vmake (the causative auxiliaries) and either an Essive - an adjective of State or Condition, such as 'angry' - or -V-, which means 'any verb' (either of the choices in (b) is followed by NP); or (c), we may choose Cognation. No matter which choice is made from the brackets, Change and Source are optional. All of these ()'s are optional in the sense that they are not required for all verbs; the verbs themselves are subcategorized in terms of possible co-occurrence with members of these two categories.

R4. Vc = Cognate Verb; the CgnP is 'about books' in 'think about books.' The object is, of course, 'thoughts.'

R5. Of symbols enclosed in rectangular brackets, only one can be chosen, and in specific order; that is, Vb can only be paired with [+ Vb]. The individual []'s indicate subcategorial features; [+ Vfc] = 'plus verb-feature complex.' The / means 'in the context of what follows.'

R6. Involvement corresponds essentially to many Dative (or Accusative of motion) categories in Latin. Origin includes various categories of the Ablative types.

R8. DatP = Dative Phrase, or indirect object-phrase; PurP = Purpose Phrase; RefP = Reference Phrase.

R10. Means - adverb; Accompaniment or Comitative adverb; Instrument with which; Material out of which.

R11. Comitative adverb; Comparison adverb.

R12. Inessive (inner) Origin: 'I make John angry' versus 'John gets angry (from inside)'; the original Cause of any Change; the immediate agent.

R15. Origin in Place; or Origin in Time; the Place or Tm from which.

R16. If the Motion is in Tm, the PlaceP Tm-Destination Phrase.

R17. Tense and Time. Notice that in English, the choice of Pres Tm and Past Tns triggers a Mood-transformation: 'I was going tomorrow, but....'

R18. Time Specification; Restriction.

R19. The PointP (at this minute or hour); the day, month, and year.

R20. Perfective; Progressive; Frequency. The various possible combinations of Freq, Point, Perf, and Prog determine aspects: 'I started to go'; 'I always go.'

R21. Intensifiers such as 'just,' 'quite'; Restrictives such as 'almost,' 'only.' This whole area of Tm-adverbs needs much more thorough analysis.

R22. -(-P)- indicates that any symbol enclosed in parentheses, ending with P and preceded by anything = NP.

R23. Add = an additive. There are many ways in which a NP may be expanded other than through (S); and both are possible in the same sentence. In contrast with many previous analyses, I remain conservative in feeling that 'John (is) a man of genius' is a simplex,

underlying 'John is a genius.' The same goes for 'Johnny (is) a little boy,' which is paraphraseable as 'Johnny is little.'⁷

R24. These are categorially restricted features of nouns. A noun marked [+ T] occurs only in one of the Time-categories. A noun marked [+ Ins], cannot occur as a base-subject. In a sentence such as 'The brick hit the window' or 'The bullet hit the soldier,' the original sentence must have a Causal [+ SN] subject and an unspecified agent: 'X [+ Hum] hit the soldier with the bullet.' Transformationally, the Instrument can be turned into the subject. This analysis I present as a hypothesis with respect to [+ Ins] for any language.

R29. [+ Nfc] = Noun-feature complex; selectional features of nouns; inherent features.

R30-34. [+ Anim] = Animate; [+ Hum] = Human; [+ Abs] = Abstract.

R36. Chomsky maintains in Aspects that the inherent features of nouns have no status as grammatical rules, since, presumably, they do not define co-occurrence restrictions. It seems to me that there are both intra-NP restrictions and restrictions on Add and S that indicate a rule-status for inherent features: restrictions on counters, adjectives, and Additives, or Material. We can say 'I built a house out of stones'; but not 'I built a house out of stains.' Both 'stones' and 'stains' are [+ Count]; both are [- Anim]. But 'stones' are Material out of which a [+ Count] [+ Tangible] [+ Shape] [+ Size] house can be built, and 'stains' are not Material. 'Stones'

are [+ Tang] and 'Stains' are [-Tang]. And the result is that 'stains' must be grammatically rejected as Material. Chomsky does not include [+ Tang] in the [+ Nfs]-rules.

Genus = a generic noun, as well as class marker, and Gender; [+ Specific] = 'man' (as distinct from 'human'); 'son' (as distinct from 'man'); [+ Shape] = round, square, oblong; [+ sense] asks the question, 'Is it available to the senses?'

R37. [+ Pgen] = Partitive genitive-Noun: a noun such as a particular person, wearable article, part of the body, which, if definite, must be possessed in many languages. 'I lost my gloves.'
[+ Prop] = Proper Noun; [+ Prof] = a man's profession.

R40. The term 'Deictic' refers here to what is in English a post-nominal phrase in 'John here (= next to me) thinks that's wrong'; 'I put it beside her on the table.' It is these Deictics which determine the choice of the Demonstrative Det.

R41. Vicinity = near me (here); near him (there).

R43. /-- indicates 'as yet unspecified' co-occurrence restrictions. The three dots indicate that there are other possible rewritings.

R45. These Adherents can materialize, within a simplex, as inflectional markers, adjectives, or Nouns; 'John boy,' 'a little, round ball.'

R46. Adessive (near) Phrase; Abessive = outside; Inessive = inside; Subessive = under; Superessive = on top of.

R47. Elative = movement in order to leave a place; Delative = movement down from; Equative = forming of cognate equalities, or comparison in terms of 'like manner.' Factive = becoming something; Translative = coming into a new state; Illative = movement toward the inside of something; Terminative = movement toward a Destination. These are the rules for alteration of Motion (in the sense of any thing that starts and stops). The various overt changes brought about by voice transformations will derive their markers from some part of Direction and/or Result, as well as from (Perf) (Prog).

R49. Dadv = a resultative Directional adverb such as 'up,' 'down.' (ReI) = Time-result indicators, such as 'already.'

5.3. The parameters of the description of voice. The conditions which govern conversion into the middle voice in Spanish are statable, as we have observed, in terms of the relations of identity that can hold among the participants in a sentence. I have suggested the hypothesis that there are as many possible degrees of passivization as there are ways in which the relation of verb-participants can be altered. These ways were explored informally in the preceding chapters, with the aim of arriving at the most precise categorial specification of the force or agent that starts the process of passivization, on what does it act, by what means, and what is the result. In constructing a formal base to account for voice constructions, we have been able to subcategorize the role of the agent more specifically and more revealingly than in the previous chapters.

Recall that in Chapter IV, the causal agent and the immediate human agent - or inanimate agent, in some cases - were all derived from the category of Agency. Now, having subcategorized Source into the several possible types of Agency, we will be able to see more precisely just what the possible participants in the voice relation are, and how they affect the shape of the verb.

The participants in the voice relation are Agency, Origin, Destination, Means, Instrument, Reference, the subject, and the objects. Under Objects we must include direct, indirect, and cognate. The relevant identity-combinations are described below:

SD1. Human subj: Mismo-Rf; Ref; Rf-causative (=Mediopassive I).

Subj[+Hum] { $\begin{matrix} \text{Obj}' \\ \text{Pgen} \\ \text{Obj}^0 \end{matrix} \} \text{ (CgnP)}^0 \text{ (DestP)}' \text{ (Ref)}' \text{ (IoP)}' \text{ (Agency)} \pm'$

SD2. Subj[+Hum]=X: Rpas; Subj[+Ins]; Cintrans; Inhintrans.

X Subj[+Hum] { $\begin{matrix} \text{Obj}[-\text{Anim}]'' \\ \text{Obj}[+\text{Hum}]^0 \end{matrix} \} \text{ (Manner)} \text{ (Instrum)}^{\pm} \text{ (Means)}'' \text{ (IoP)}'' \text{ (Agency)}'$

SD3. Causal subj [+Abs]: CMpas and Cintrans.

$\left\{ \begin{matrix} \text{XSubj}[+\text{Abs}]' \\ \text{Subj}[+\text{Abs}]' \end{matrix} \right\} \left[\begin{matrix} \text{Obj}[-\text{Anim}]^0 \\ \text{Obj}[+\text{Hum}]'' \\ \text{Obj}[-\text{Anim}]^0 \end{matrix} \right] \text{ (IoP)}'' \text{ (Cause)}'$

5.3.1. The parameters of possible change. The changes that can be effected by the choice of a particular combination of categories are limited in several ways. In every case there must be identity of one of the specified subcategories of Instrument or Origin with either the subject, the object, the cognate, or the Destination. Several different combinations of these are possible

with each of the three types of subjects indicated in the preceding structural descriptions: These are in SD1:

- a. Subject-Object-Agent
- b. Subject-Object-Reference-Agent
- c. Subject-Object-(Reference)-Origin-Agent
- d. Subject-DestP-Agency
- e. Subject-(CgnP⁰) DestP-Origin
- f. Subject-Origin
- g. Subject-Agency
- h. Subject-Reference-Agency

The possible combinations for SD2 are:

- a. Subject-(implied Reference)-Agency
- b. Obj"-Instrument or Means-(Agency)'
- c. Obj"-IoP/Manner

For SD3, the following combinations are possible:

- a. Subj X - Cause
- b. Subj[+Abs]-Cause
- c. Obj"-IoP

5.3.2. The results of these combinations in Spanish. Of the possible combinations outlined in 5.3.1., only two of them have a non-reflexive result. These are the combination of subject and agent in SD1.g., and the combination of object and IoP in SD2.c.

The former combination results in the passive of reversal; the latter, in the intransitive of inherent characteristic.⁹ In the Rf-intransitive, the inanimate subject is identical with Means or Instrument, but, though it acts by itself, it is responding to an agent or cause. In the intransitive of inherent characteristic, Agency is irrelevant; it is the potential of the subject that is important.

Now then, the parameters of change in these constructions involve alteration of the inherent direction of the verb with respect to the participants. This may be done either by reversing the positions of the participants, as in the indirect object-constructions discussed in Chapter IV, or by changing the shape of the verb.¹⁰ As far as the verb itself is concerned, Spanish converts it into an overt middle as a result of fourteen different combinations of identity of participants. Whether the middle is mediopassive or intransitive depends on the relation between IoP or Reference, and Cause or Agency. The changes in the shape of the verb can be derived from the directional adverbs. The changes from active to middle or passive are describable as either (a), a blend of active and passive; (b), actional reversals of actives and active causatives; (c), temporary neutralizations of actives; (d), permanent or iterative neutralizations; or (e), active and passive potentials. These can be illustrated as follows:

- a. Transitives and goal-intransitives $\longrightarrow$
- b. Causatives $\longrightarrow \longrightarrow$
- c. Reflexive Objects and Reference $\longleftrightarrow$

d. Rpas = all Mediopassives	
e. Mediopassive Intransitives	
f. Resultative Passives	
g. Iterative Passives and '-able' adjs.	
h. Iterative Intransitives	
i. Potential Passives	
j. Potential Actives	
k. Iterative Potential Passives	
l. Iterative Potential Actives	
m. Reverse Reflexive Causatives	
n. Reverse goal-intransitives	
o. Passives	
p. Reverse Causative Passives	

In these illustrations, an arrow pointing to the right is active; the reversal is passive. In all cases, the beginning of the movement is indicated by tracing from top to bottom. An unbroken arrow indicates continuous movement from the starting point. Where the arrows are broken, the topmost one precedes in time. A horizontal line indicates temporary state. An = indicates a passive equative construction. Whether or not the movement is viewed as completed is indicated by the point at which the bottom arrow stops. Fourteen types of middles are identifiable above, the actives and passives being the opposite poles.¹¹ Not all of these require overt middle-reflexive conversion in Spanish, but this does not mean that the others are actives. They are all specifiably middle. Insofar as generative rules are concerned, however, I restrict the present set

to the reflexives and the passive of reversal. Given the structural descriptions for SD1.-SD3., the transformational rules can be constructed in terms of changes in Motion and Direction:

TR1. Rule for derivation of the middle aux.

- a. $\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Terminative} \\ \text{Illative} \\ \text{Elative} \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Terminative} \\ \text{Illative} \\ \text{Elative} \end{array} \right\} + \text{Translative} / \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Subj} \\ \text{Obj}^* \end{array} \right\} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Orig}' \\ \text{Ref} \\ \text{Involve} \end{array} \right\}$
- b. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Terminative} \\ \text{Illative} \\ \text{Elative} \end{array} \right\} + \text{Translative} \Rightarrow \text{Maux}'$

TR1.1. Rule for derivation of passive of reversal.

- a. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Terminative} \\ \text{Illative} \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow \text{Ablative} / \text{Subj}' \text{ -- Agency}'$
- b. $\text{Ablative} \Rightarrow \text{Paux}$

TR2. Pronominalization switching, and blending rules for middles.

- a. $[+AN] + R \Rightarrow \text{Prn}' + \text{Idem} / \text{Subj}' \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Obj}' \\ \text{Obj} \\ (\text{CgnP}) \\ \text{Ref} \end{array} \right\} \text{DestP}' \text{ --}$
- b. $\text{Obj}' + R \Rightarrow \text{Prn}'$
- c. $\text{Prn}' \text{ Maux}' \quad \text{Prn}' + \text{Idem} \Rightarrow \text{Maux}' \text{ Prn}' + \text{Idem}$
- d. $\# \text{Subj} \text{ -- Agency}' \Rightarrow \text{--Agency}' / \text{--Obj}'' \text{ IoP}''$
- e. $\#X \text{ -- -- AgencyX}' \Rightarrow X'$
- f. $\text{--Obj}'' \Rightarrow \# \text{Subj} / \text{-- -- IoP}''$

Later rules will blend X' with Maux' and switch Maux' into its appropriate position. The morphophonemic rules will assign the proper shapes to Maux', Prn', Idem, and Paux.

5.3.3. The ordering of the rules, as presented above, differs somewhat from the order presented in Chapter III. This is a natural consequence of combining all the reflexive derivations into what seem to be the fewest possible rules. Thus, the rule for the reflexive objects is amended slightly:

- a. $\text{^Juan mira Juan} + R \text{ Terminative Juan} + R$
- b. $\text{Terminative} \Rightarrow \text{Terminative} + \text{Translative}$
- c. $\text{Terminative} + \text{Translative} \Rightarrow \text{Maux'}$
- d. $\text{Obj' + R} \Rightarrow \text{Prn'}$
- e. $[+ \text{AN}]' + R \Rightarrow \text{Prn' + Idem}$
- f. $\text{Prn' Maux' Prn' + Idem} \Rightarrow \text{Maux' Prn' + Idem}$
- g. $\text{Juan mira Maux' Prn' + Idem}$
- h. $\text{Juan mira se sí mismo}$

5.3.4. The preceding rules illustrate the fact that passive and middle are two possible outcomes of voice-conversion, each of the choices being mutually exclusive.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER V

¹J. Fodor, in a review of H. Werner and B. Kaplan's Symbol Formation (Language, Vol. 40, No. 4, 1964), claims, quite correctly, that there is no connection between the verbal inflection for person, which is required in many languages, and man's cognitive functioning. He claims further that the 'Human-action model' proposed by Werner and Kaplan is implausible because in 'X dies,' and 'X feels a pain,' X does nothing to pain. Fodor apparently assumes that passive is a form, not a relation. The relations in these sentences are clearly mediopassive.

²Chomsky's sample fragment of the base structure and grammatical features are used as the point of departure for the rules presented here. It should be stressed that, although I reject some of Chomsky's specific suggestions, I accept and work within his basic theoretical approach.

³Chomsky derives the passive from the Manner adverb. This derivation poses a problem, since passive and Manner can co-exist in a simplex.

⁴A glance at any highly inflected language shows us, of course, that prepositions have the same functions as case-endings.

⁵In Los gitanos se viven del baile 'The gypsies live by dancing,' or 'make their living by dancing,' the phrase, del baile is clearly Means, Cause, and Purpose.

⁶The next step in constructing the base is to start revising in terms of more economical ordering and a more refined breakdown. Or, quite possibly, the next step is to tear the whole thing apart and start over. But no matter what the base eventually looks like, all the information presented here will have to be incorporated in some way.

⁷In all of the generative rules presented previously, recursion takes place only through S. There are obviously several ways to expand from a minimal simplex. Among the non-sentence, recursive devices are 'reduplication' of like NP's ('this and that and'), and Additives, such as - cognate specifiers - ('man of genius'), and so on.

⁸I believe this is equally true of 'a round square.'
Languages go to a great deal of trouble to define shapes and sizes with special counters. Differentiation of shapes and sizes certainly seems to be a question of grammatical features.

⁹The specification of IoP as inanimate is itself a transformation, since active potential does not exist for nouns that are intangible and inanimate.

¹⁰Other ways of showing voice relations include, of course, inflecting the nouns for active or passive.

¹¹Examples of these constructions in English can be found in 3.0.-3.5.

CHAPTER VI

RESULTS AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

In this study I have proposed an integrated theory of voice relations in natural language. The structure of this theory is illustrated informally with examples from Spanish and English, and formally with rules for the generation of the overtly marked middle voice in Spanish. The overt middle form in Spanish is commonly referred to as the reflexive.

Any attempt to construct an integrated, or explanatory, theory of a structure or substructure of language presupposes certain axioms and certain notions of the kinds of questions that must be answered. The question that must be asked about voice-constructions is: precisely how is each of the possible participants in a sentence related to all of the others and to the inherent direction of the verb.

Axiomatically, the possibility of an explanatory definition of the way in which a universal relation is represented in a language hinges on the possibility of explaining all other languages in like terms. If we assume that such explanations are possible, we are assuming the existence of a universal substratum-relation which holds between any one language and all others.

Operationally, an explanation of the inter-language differences presupposes a characterization of the universal basis, for the simple reason that an understanding of the common properties is logically prior to a knowledge of the differentiating properties. Operationally, then, one of the best ways to begin an investigation of grammatical structure is to turn to the traditional grammarians for insights into the inner form of sentences. Accordingly, Chapter I is devoted to an analysis of some traditional statements concerning the reflexives in Spanish. The view most commonly held among Spanish grammarians is that the clitic reflexive pronoun must be, in all of its occurrences, either a direct or an indirect object. Another view, expressed by a very few grammarians, is that the reflexive pronoun is, in most of its occurrences, not an object at all but part of the verb itself; and that it often serves as an intransitivizing morpheme. The remainder of my study is devoted to an explanation of why the clitic reflexive is not an object pronoun in any of its occurrences, but rather the auxiliary of the middle voice.

In Chapter II, I present a generative analysis of pronouns in Spanish in order to show that se is not a member of the pronominal set in the way that yo, tú, mí, sí are. The result of this analysis is: (1) a rejection of the popular notion of emotional involvement or 'interest'; (2) a theory of pronoun derivation in natural language; and (3) a theory of syntactic haplology (structural blends), which explains why it is that one category can represent several categorial functions at once. This theory is expanded and further exemplified in the following chapters.

Chapter III deals with the analysis of the inner form of reflexive object-constructions. I show that it is only in those sentences where the disjunctive phrase sí mismo 'himself' can occur, that the se unambiguously represents a direct object. The mismo represents in Spanish -- and in English -- a blend of object and agent. I show why it is that the reflexive object cannot be passivized: the reflexive sentence has already undergone the 'passive' transformation appropriate to its underlying structure.

The rules for reflexive object-pronominalization in Spanish are compared with those offered by R. B. Lees and E. S. Klima for English, and an alternative analysis is suggested for the English constructions.

In Chapter IV, I establish the structural parameters of the middle voice: parameters that are valid for Western Romance, for Greek, for English, and I believe, for all languages. I illustrate the ways in which the traditional definition of the middle voice -- as action on the subject, by the subject, or indirectly for the subject -- does not hold. The essential character of the middle is explained in terms of two factors: the tension between the opposite poles of active and passive -- the coming into being or the 'being borne along' of something -- and the participation of the subject. The subject of the reflexive passive, for example, must follow the verb, for the simple reason that (like other passive subjects) it is the underlying object, which, in Spanish, retains its original, or basic position.

Inversion of the subject in these constructions involves placing the passive subject in the basic subject position, and the result of the inversion is intransitivization of the verb. It should be noted that this analysis contradicts one of the popular notions of inversion in Spanish. It is often assumed that the reflexive passive is simply a reflexive-object sentence that has a 'passive meaning.' The exact translation of Se abre la puerta, according to this notion, is 'The door opens itself.' But, in fact, as is explained in this chapter, the se of these constructions can only be interpreted as a medio-passive auxiliary. Also explained in this chapter are all of the reflexive intransitive and mediopassive transformations: Me voy de la casa 'I go away (start off) from the house,' is an inceptive-mediopassive which involves the subject only in the purely logical-grammatical sense of 'change of position.' The participation of the subject and the 'starting out on the road and continuing in motion' are the signs of the middle voice.

In Chapter V, I construct a sketch of the universal basis of linguistic theories in sufficient detail to account for the active and passive, and all of the stages between: the middles. Theoretically, there should be as many possible degrees of passivization as there are possible alterations of participant relations in a sentence. I have established fourteen possible alterations for Spanish, and fourteen for English -- and fourteen possible variations in the overt shape of the verb phrases, all of which undeniably indicate middle relations with respect to the participants.

The basis is constructed in terms of the Aristotelian categories, primarily the causal determinants: subject, transitive, causative, or cognate verb, object, and the major adverbial categories of Change and Source. These major breakdowns must, I believe, be the primary ones in the universal base structure of language. Explanations of other segments of grammar will require further breakdowns, and constant revisions will be needed. However, even as it stands, it has served as the basis for an extremely simple explanation of a very complex segment of Spanish grammar, and the corresponding segment in English. Seven rules suffice to explain even those reflexives which the grammarian Bello called anomalous that would not yield to logical analysis. Of these seven rules, one of them derives the middle auxiliary by altering the category of Direction. The others explain the pronominalization, switching, and blending rules. The result is the explanation of the clitic reflexive; the sign of the middle voice in Spanish.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, W. Sidney. "Transitivity and Possession," Language, Vol. 40, No. 3 (1964), 337-343.
- Alonso, Amado and Henríquez-Ureña, Pedro. Gramática castellana, segundo curso. Buenos Aires: Editorial Losada, S. A., 1959.
- Alonso, Martín. Evolución sintáctica del español. Madrid: Aguilar, 1962.
- Bach, Emmon. An Introduction to Transformational Grammars. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1964.
- _____. "Subcategories in Transformational Grammars," Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists. 's.-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1964, 672-678.
- Bello, Andrés, and Cuervo, Rufino J. Gramática de la lengua española (Sixth edition). Buenos Aires: Editorial Sopena, 1960.
- Benveniste, Émile. "Actif et Moyen dans le Verbe," Grammaire et Psychologie (special number of the Journal de Psychologie). Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950, 119-127.
- Bolinger, Dwight L. "English Prosodic Stress and Spanish Sentence Order," Hispania, Vol. 37 (1954), 152-156.
- _____. "Retained Objects in Spanish," Hispania, Vol. 33 (1950), 237-239.
- _____. "Syntactic Blends and Other Matters," Language, Vol. 37, No. 3 (1961), 366-381.
- Bolinger, Dwight L. and others. Modern Spanish: A Project of the MLA. New York: Harcourt-Brace, 1960.
- Bulatkin, Eleanor Webster. "The Spanish Word 'Matiz': Its Origin and Semantic Evolution in the Vocabulary of Medieval Painters," Traditio, Vol. IX (1954), 460-527.

Bull, William E. "Spanish Adjective Position: Present Rules and Theories," Hispania, Vol. 33 (1950), 297-303.

_____. "Spanish Adjective Position: The Theory of Valence Classes," Hispania, Vol. 37 (1954), 32-38.

Bull, William E., Gronberg, Allison, and Abbott, James. "Subject Position in Contemporary Spanish," Hispania, Vol. 35, No. 2 (1952), 185-188.

Chomsky, Noam A. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge: MIT, 1964 (Mimeographed).

_____. Categories and Relations in Syntactic Theory. MIT, 1964 (Mimeographed).

_____. "Formal Properties of Grammars," Handbook of Mathematical Psychology, Vol. II (1963), eds. P. Luce, R. Bush, E. Galanter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 269-321.

_____. "On the Notion 'Rule of Grammar,'" Structure of Language and Its Mathematical Aspects, Proceedings of the Twelfth Symposium in Applied Mathematics, ed. R. Jakobson. Providence: American Mathematical Society, (1961), 6-24.

_____. "The Logical Basis of Linguistic Theory," Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists, 1964, 915-1008.

_____. Syntactic Structures. 's.-Gravenhage: Mouton and Co., 1957.

Chomsky, Noam A. and Miller, George A. "Introduction to the Formal Analysis of Natural Languages," Handbook of Mathematical Psychology, Vol. II (1963), eds. P. Luce, R. Bush, E. Galanter. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 323-418.

Collinge, N. E. "The Greek Use of the Term 'Middle' in Linguistic Analysis," Word, Vol. 19, No. 2 (August, 1963), 232-241.

Curme, George, O. English Grammar. New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1947.

_____. Parts of Speech and Accidence (Vol. II of A Grammar of the English Language). Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1935.

- _____. Syntax (Vol. III of A Grammar of the English Language). Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1931.
- Fillmore, Charles J. Indirect Object Constructions in English and the Ordering of Transformations. Columbus: The Ohio State University Research Foundation Project on Syntactic Analysis, Report No. 1, 1962.
- _____. "The Position of Embedding Transformations in a Grammar," Word, Vol. 19, No. 2 (August, 1963), 208-231.
- Fodor, Jerry A. A Review of Symbol Formation: An Organismic-Developmental Approach to Language and the Expression of Thought. By Heinz Werner and Bernard Kaplan. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963.
- Gili y Gaya, Samuel. Curso superior de sintaxis española. (Fourth edition), Barcelona: Publicaciones y Ediciones Spes, S. A., 1954.
- Hahn, E. Adelaide. "Partitive Apposition," Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1964, 785-794.
- Hatcher, Anna Granville. Reflexive Verbs: Latin, Old French, Modern French. Baltimore: The John Hopkins Studies in Romance Literatures and Languages, Vol. CLIII, 1942.
- _____. "Theme and Underlying Question: Two Studies of Spanish Word Order," Word, Monograph No. 3, December, 1956.
- Irving, T. B. "The Spanish Reflexive and the Verbal Sentence," Hispania, Vol. 35 (1952), 305-309.
- Katz, Jerrold. "Mentalism in Linguistics," Language, Vol. 40, No. 2 (1964), 124-137.
- Katz, J. and Fodor, J. "The Structure of a Semantic Theory," Language, Vol. 39, No. 2 (1963), 170-210.
- Keniston, Hayward. Spanish Syntax List. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1937.
- Klima, Edward S. "Negation in English," in Readings in the Philosophy of Language. Edited by J. Katz and J. Fodor. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., (1964), 246-323.

- _____. "Relatedness Between Grammatical Systems," Language, Vol. 40, No. 1 (1964), 1-20.
- Lees, Robert B. The Grammar of English Nominalizations. Bloomington: Publication Twelve of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics, 1960.
- _____. "A Multiply Ambiguous Adjectival Construction in English," Language, Vol. 36, No. 2 (1960), 207-221.
- _____. Review of Syntactic Structures, Language, XXXIII, 1957. Also in The Bobbs-Merrill Reprint Series in the Social Sciences, A-141.
- Lees, Robert B. and Klima, Edward R. "Rules for English Pronominalization," Language, Vol. 39, No. 1 (1963), 17-28.
- Lenz, Rodolfo. La oración y sus partes. Madrid: Centro de Estudios Históricos, 1920.
- Long, Ralph B. The Sentence and Its Parts, A Grammar of Contemporary English. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Menéndez-Pidal, Ramón. Manual de gramática histórica española (Eleventh edition). Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1962.
- Miller, George A. and Chomsky, Noam A. "Finitary Models of Language Users," in Eugene Galanter, R. Luce, R. Bush, Handbook of Mathematical Psychology, Vol. II. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1963, 419-491.
- Nida, Eugene A. Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words. (Second edition). Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1949.
- Postal, Paul M. Constituent Structure: A Study of Contemporary Models of Syntactic Description. Bloomington: Publication 30 of the Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology Folklore, and Linguistics, 1964.
- _____. "Mohawk Prefix Generation," Proceedings of the Ninth International Congress of Linguists. The Hague: Mouton and Co., 1964, 346-357.
- Real Academia Española. Gramática de la lengua española. 1931 edition, revised in 1959. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, 1962.

Smith, Carlota S. "A Class of Complex Modifiers in English,"
Language, Vol. 37, No. 3 (1961), 342-365.

_____. "Determiners and Relative Clauses in a Generative
Grammar of English," Language, Vol. 40, No. 1 (1964), 37-52.

Spaulding, Robert K. Syntax of the Spanish Verb. New York: Henry
Holt and Co., 1931.

Vogt, Hans. "Un Aspect du Problème Actif-Passif Dans le Verbe,"
Grammaire et Psychologie (Special number of the Journal
de Psychologie) Paris: Presses Universitaires de
France, 1950, 128-136.

Wallis, Ethel, and Bull, William E. "Spanish Adjective Position:
Phonetic Stress and Emphasis," Hispania, Vol. 33 (1950), 221-229.