

## The first phase syntax of the stative-locative alternation in Spanish: the fine line between source paths, the ablative case, and partitives

Diana Gómez Vázquez - Universitat Pompeu Fabra

**PROBLEM.** The stative-locative alternation in Spanish, with verbs of internal causation such as *rebosar* ‘overflow’, *pulular* ‘swarm’, *bullir* ‘boil’, *hormiguesear* ‘swarm’, *reverberar* ‘reverberate’, or *brillar* ‘shine’, has been analyzed as a subtype of other locative alternations, whether transitive or intransitive (cf. Mulder & Wehrmann 1989, Hoekstra & Mulder 1990, Mulder 1992, Mateu 2017, Dowty 2000, Salkoff 1983, Boons et al. 1976, Di Tullio 2001, Mayoral Hernández 2010, Fried 2005, among others). A verb such as *rebosar* ‘overflow’ shows two variants: in *variant A*, the Locatum appears as subject and the Location as adjunct (1a), while in *variant B* the Location assumes the role of subject and the Locatum appears as adjunct (1b).

(1a) *Variant A:* **El vino** rebosa **del vaso** (Spanish)  
The wine overflows from.the glass

(1b) *Variant B:* **El vaso** rebosa **de vino**  
The glass overflows with wine

I argue that this alternation differs from other locative-alternations in non-trivial ways regarding the assumed stativity of these predicates and the properties of the Locatum PP.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.** I adopt Ramchand’s (2008, 2014, 2018) syntactically represented event structure decomposition framework, which assumes that the verbal phrase involves several verbal projections, each of which contains relevant Type-A meaning information, namely, the category labels *initP*, *procP*, and *resP*. These correspond to subevent projections identifying the subevents of a macro-event: a causative subevent, a process denoting subevent, and a result state subevent, respectively. Different event roles are associated to the specifier positions of these heads, specifically, initiator, undergoer, and resultee. Thus, each lexical item contains a rigid set of category labels identifying subevent components and participants, along with lexical encyclopedic content, that is, Type-B meaning.

**OBJECTIVES.** Firstly, I show that the stative-locative alternation is productive in both American and Peninsular varieties of Spanish by means of a brief corpus of examples retrieved from CORDE and Google. Furthermore, its existence can be traced back to stages previous to Modern Spanish. Secondly, this construction does not denote a state, but rather a dynamic event, that is, a predicate with an event variable for which a succession of stages or phases can be distinguished (Silvagni 2017). The examples in (2) confirm it: events that can be conceived as containing stages (e.g. *correr* ‘run’) admit the progressive periphrasis, while states (e.g. *saber* ‘know’) reject it (2a). Verbs of internal causation conform to the pattern of the former class, that is, events (2b). In Ramchand’s framework this amounts to the presence of a process phrase.

(2a) *está corriendo* / *\*sabiendo* (Spanish)  
is running / knowing

(2b) *está pululando* / *hirviendo* / *rebosando* / *brillando* / *resonando*  
is swarming / boiling / overflowing / shining / resonating

Thirdly, the verbs that enter the alternation contain an action component that I will identify with Ramchand’s initiation phrase. The examples in (3) show that internally caused verbs behave just like active events (e.g. *correr* ‘run’) in contrast to states (e.g. *estar cansada* ‘be tired’).

(3a) *Lo que hace Ana es correr* / *\*estar cansada* (Spanish)  
what does Ana is run / be tired.F

(3b) *Lo que hace la abeja es pulular*

what does the bee is swarm

Fourthly, the properties of the PP introduced by *de* in *variant B* are those of an initiator, using Ramchand's terminology. The semantic meaning contributed by this phrase stems from the notion of source or origin associated to the preposition, stemming from its use in Latin with the ablative case (Company Company & Sobrevilla Moreno 2014). The difference in meaning between initiator PPs and source paths is confirmed using data from auxiliary selection in the perfect in Italian (4). *Essere* 'be' selection is accompanied by a source path interpretation of the PP (4a), while *avere* 'have' selection correlates with the initiator interpretation of the PP (4b), suggesting the existence of different first phase syntax, and hence merging points for the PPs in the variants (cf. Sorace 2000, Mateu 2002, among others).

(4a) *Variant A*: Il vino **è** traboccato **dal** vaso (Italian)  
the wine is overflowed.M from.the glass

(4b) *Variant B*: Il vaso **ha** traboccato **di** vino  
the glass has overflowed.M with wine

Finally, I discard that the PP introduced by *de* 'of' in *variant B* can be taken as a genitive object as argued for in Carlier, Goyens & Lamiroy (2013) or in Haspelmath & Michaelis (2008). Treviño (2004, 2010) shows that Spanish has a partitive phrase, *de todo* 'of everything', which is only possible as internal argument (5a). As shown in (5b-c), internally-caused verbs in *variant B* reject this element.

(5a) Comió / llegó / \*trabajó **de todo** (Spanish)  
ate / arrived / worked of everything

(5b) El jardín pulula **de abejas**  
the garden swarms with bees

(5c) \*El jardín pulula **de todo**  
the garden swarm of everything

The ungrammaticality of (5c) does not follow from a general incompatibility of this phrase with internally-caused verbs, as it is possible to find it in cases where a PP appears as external argument, to satisfy the EPP, and a bare plural NP as logical subject of the predicate, showing agreement in number and person with the verb (6) (cf. Torrego 1989).

(6a) Aquí {anidan **cigüeñas** / anida **de todo**} (Spanish)  
here nestle.PL storks / nestle.SG of everything

(6b) En sus ojos {brillan **lucos de orgullo** / brilla **de todo**}  
in his eyes shine.PL lights of pride / shine.SG of everything

**PROPOSAL.** The first phase syntax assumed for both *variant A* and *B* consist of init and proc phrases (7), however, in accordance with the initiator properties ascertained for the PP in *variant B* (7b), this element appears as an adjunct to initP, whereas in *variant A* the PP appears as a source path (7a). Note also the different roles of the subjects: in *variant A* the Locatum subject is both an initiator and undergoer, while in *variant B* the Location subject is solely the undergoer of the event.

(7a) *Variant A*: [evtP [DP *el vino*] [evt' [evt *rebosar*] [initP [init *rebosar*] [procP [DP *el vino*] [proc *rebosar* **[Path<sub>Source</sub> *del vaso*]]]]]]]]**

(7b) *Variant B*: [evtP [DP *el vaso*] [evt' [evt *rebosar*] [initP [init' [initP *rebosar*] **[PP<sub>Cause</sub> *de vino*]** [procP [DP *el vaso*] [proc *rebosar*]]]]]]

**SELECTED REFERENCES.** Carlier, A., et al. (2013). De: A genitive marker in French? Its grammaticalization path from Latin to French. In *Case and grammatical relations across languages*. Haspelmath, M., & Michaelis, S. (2008). Leipzig fourmille de typologues: Genitive objects in comparison. In *Case and grammatical relations*. Mulder, R. H. (1992). *The aspectual nature of syntactic complementation*. Ramchand, G. C. (2008). *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A first phase*

*syntax*. **Treviño, E.** (2004). Una prueba de inacusatividad para el español. In *VII Encuentro Internacional de Lingüística del Noroeste*.