

Semantic and Pragmatic Contributions of a Non-Adicity Reducing Reflexive Clitic in Spanish
 Grant Armstrong
 Georgetown University

Spanish contains a reflexive clitic, SE, that does not reduce the adicity of the verbal predicate with which it combines. In this presentation I examine three different classes of transitive verbs that productively admit this clitic and propose a meaning for SE that captures the semantic and pragmatic contributions that it makes to these sentences. The three verb classes under investigation are shown in (1).

- (1) a. **Me** tomé la cerveza. Literal Consumption
 SE.1s drink.1s.PST the beer
 b. María **se** ve una película diaria. Performance (internalization)
 María SE.3s watch.3s.PRES a film daily
 c. Los mariachis **se** cantaron todo el repertorio. Performance (creation)
 The mariachis SE.3p sing.3p.PST all the repertoire

As can be seen in these examples, the effect of the reflexive clitic cannot be the same as the one in passives, reflexives and anti-causatives because the transitive verbs in each case contain both an external and internal argument and no SELF (= mismo) anaphor. Traditional and formal literature on the subject has described two primary meaning contributions of SE in these sentences. One popular intuition is that the clitic adds a special type of reflexive affective meaning related to subject effort/involvement/satisfaction/benefactivity (Bello 1981/1847, Molina Redondo 1974, Maldonado 1999) and a more recent one is that it simply marks telicity (Nishida 1994, Zagona 1996, Sanz 2000). I argue that the different predicate classes cited above show distinct behaviors with respect to these two meaning components.

For one class of verbs, which includes primarily those of literal consumption, SE is treated as a morphological marker of telicity: it is the realization of an Asp head (Travis 2000) that introduces a time *t* and a predicate CUL (Parsons 1990) and says of the event in question that it must culminate in time *t* (3a). In these verbs phrases, for a vast majority of speakers, the presence of SE is mandatory for the predicate to be interpreted as telic and there is generally no affective meaning perceived. For the other verb class, which includes nearly all of the performance verbs I have looked at thus far, telicity can be computed in the absence of SE. When SE does appear, it forces a telic interpretation but also has a notably different flavor. In these verbs, the affective meaning mentioned above (i.e. subject involvement) is clearly noted by speakers but is often difficult to articulate. The main claim is that in these cases SE is a telic identity function that adds a conventional implicature that is labeled ‘subject indulgence/satisfaction’, similar to claims made by Horn (2008) with respect to the meaning of the personal dative construction in vernacular English (3b).

- (3) a. $[[SE]]_1 = \lambda f_{\langle ev, t \rangle} . \lambda e. f(e) = 1 \wedge \exists t. CUL(e, t)$ (combines with VP, consumption verbs)
 b. $[[SE]]_2 = \lambda f_{\langle ev, t \rangle} . f$ (where *f* is [+telic]) (combines with AspP, performance verbs)
 Adds the follow conventional implicatures:
 (i) SUBJECT INDULGENCE (= the activity is an indulgence for the subject)
 (ii) SUBJECT SATISFACTION (= the subject is satisfied through the completion of the event)

The paper evaluates this claim with respect to its ability to account for speaker variation, the interaction of these constructions with negation as well as the wide-spread appearance of positive adjectives and temporal compression adverbial phrases (i.e. *in one sitting*) in these sentences. It is shown that there are different patterns manifested in the different verb classes that have plausible explanations given the denotations of SE proposed in (3). A more long-term (and less developed) part of the project is to compare and contrast these constructions with other reflexive dative phenomena such as the personal dative construction of vernacular English (Christian 1991, Conroy 2007, Horn 2008) and to reflexivity in general (Reuland & Reinhart 1993, Lidz 2001).