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Introduction

All Romance languages have a reflexive clitic pronoun, exemplified in (1) by Spanish.

(1) a. Yo me veo.
   I 1s see.1s
   ‘I see myself’

   d. Nosotros nos vemos.
   We 1p see.1p
   ‘We see ourselves’

   b. Tú te ves.
   You 2s see.2s
   ‘You see yourself’

   e. Vosotros os veis
   You 2p see.2p
   ‘You all see yourselves’

   c. Él/Ella se ve.
   He/she SE.3 sees.3s
   ‘He/she sees him/herself’

   f. Ellos/Ellas se ven.
   They.masc/They.fem SE.3 see.3p
   ‘They see themselves’

Moreover, all Romance languages have appropriated the 3rd person form se for non-reflexive uses, such as anticausative (AntiCse), passive (Passse) and impersonal (Impse), among others, which we will refer to as SE. The SE type that we will discuss today is Impse, in (2).

(2) a. Se llamó a los bomberos.
   Impse called DOM the firefighters
   "They called the firefighters."

   b. Se está bien aquí.
   Impse is good here
   "It is nice here."

First observation: It appears that only those languages that are consistent null subject (CNS) languages have developed Impse (or were when Impse developed, as in Brazilian Portuguese (BP)), an idea that may be implicit in some work on SE, and only sporadically assumed in others, as in Belletti (1982), Cinque (1992).¹

- Spanish, Italian, European Portuguese (EP) are CNS languages and have Impse.
- Conservative French is not a CNS language and does not have Impse.


(3)  Reflse > AntiCse > Passse > Impse
Yet: As far as we are aware, no formal approach has been offered to account for the development of Imp$se$ from Pass$se$.

The main goal: Is to offer a first stab at a formal approach to the development of Imp$se$ from Pass$se$ that integrates the observation that only CNS languages develop Imp$se$.

Two central claims:

1: Following previous work (Belletti 1982, Otero 1986, Cinque 1988), we assume that Imp$se$ spells-out a T head with a valued version of the [uD] feature à la Holmberg (2005, 2010), Holmberg, Nayudu & Sheehan (2009), Roberts (2010), as illustrated in (4), thereby linking Imp$se$ with a property of CNS languages.

(4) $[\text{TP } T_{se}[D] [\text{VoiceP pro Voice } [\text{VP V } ] ]]$

2: Assuming that Pass$se$ spells out the Voice head itself (see MacDonald 2017 and MacDonald & Maddox 2018) (see also Folli & Harley 2005, Basilico 2010, Armstrong 2011 for Asp$se$, as well as Alexiadou et al. 2006 and Schäfer 2008 for anti-causative se), we argue that Pass$se$ was reanalyzed as T (see also Wolsfgruber 2017), as an instance of grammaticalization up the tree (Roberts & Roussou 2003, van Gelderen 2011).

(5) a. Passive $se$
   
   $[\text{TP } T [\text{voiceP pro Voice}_{se}[D] [\text{VP V } ] ] ]$

   b. Impersonal $se$

   $[\text{TP } T_{se}[D] [\text{voiceP pro Voice } [\text{VP V } ] ] ]$

One expected implication: [uD] in T is lost $\rightarrow$ Imp$se$ is lost

- A CNS language with Imp$se$ which changes to a non-CNS language, will lose its [uD] feature in T, and, we would expect the language to lose Imp$se$ constructions as a consequence. Caribbean varieties of Spanish (in general) are said to be losing their CNS status (Camacho 2013, among others). Specifically, we discuss Imp$se$ in Puerto Rican Spanish, where Ticio (2018) argues specifically that T lacks [uD], and there seems to be an effect on Imp$se$.

The structure of the talk:

1. We contrast Imp$se$ and Pass$se$; 2. We link Imp$se$ to CNS languages via [D] in T; 3. How Pass$se$ is reanalyzed as Imp$se$; 4. Where [D] on $se$ came from; 5. We discuss Puerto Rican Spanish Imp$se$. 6. We conclude by briefly recapping the talk.
1. Impersonal *se vs. Passive *se

- The main difference between Imp*se and Pass*se (as noted in the literature) is that the sole overt DP in Imp*se patterns with as a grammatical direct object, whereas the sole overt DP in Pass*se patterns with a grammatical subject.

  - **Imp*se** - Sole overt DP $\rightarrow$ non-agreeing, accusative direct object
  - **Pass*se** - Sole overt DP $\rightarrow$ agreeing, nominative subject

- Thus, in cases like in (6), where the DP does not control verbal agreement, we have Imp*se (6a) and where it does, we have Pass*se (6b), from European Portuguese (EP) from Naro (1976:780) (glosses ours).ii

  (6) a. Vende-se estas casas. [Imp*se $\rightarrow$ non-agreeing DP]
      sell.3sg.-se these houses
      "They are selling these houses."

  b. Vendem-se estas casas. [Pass*se $\rightarrow$ agreeing DP]
      sell.3pl.-se these houses
      "They are selling these houses."

- The difference in agreement parallels differences in case on the pronoun that corresponds to the agreeing vs. non-agreeing DP, as illustrated in (7) from Italian from D’Alessandro (2004:59).

  (7) a. In Italia *essi /li si mangia [Imp*se $\rightarrow$ non-agreeing DP]
       in Italy *they.Nom.3pl/them.Acc.3pl si eat.3sg $\rightarrow$ accusative DP]
       "In Italy, people eat them."

  b. In Italia essi /*li si mangiano [Pass*se $\rightarrow$ agreeing DP]
       in Italy they.Nom.3pl/*them.Acc.3pl si eat.3pl $\rightarrow$ nominative DP]
       "In Italy, people eat them."
Interim summary: In Imp<sub>se</sub>, the sole overt DP is a grammatical object (and does not control verbal agreement, appears in accusative case, can appear with DOM), while in Pass<sub>se</sub>, the sole overt DP is a grammatical subject (and controls agreement and appears in nominative case). Spanish, Italian, and EP have both constructions; Romanian does not have Imp<sub>se</sub>.

**Imp<sub>se</sub>** - Sole overt DP → non-agreeing, accusative direct object  
**Pass<sub>se</sub>** - Sole overt DP → agreeing, nominative subject

The proposal: *se* spells-out Voice without accusative in Pass<sub>se</sub> (8a) and T in Imp<sub>se</sub> (8b).

(8)  
\[
\text{Pass<sub>se</sub> } \quad \text{Imp<sub>se</sub>}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{a. TP} \\
\text{T<sub>Nom</sub> VoiceP} \\
\text{pro Voice'} \\
\text{Voice<sub>se</sub> VP} \\
\text{V DP<sub>NOM</sub>} \\
\end{array} \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{b. TP} \\
\text{T<sub>se</sub> VoiceP} \\
\text{pro Voice'} \\
\text{Voice<sub>Acc</sub> VP} \\
\text{V DP<sub>ACC</sub>} \\
\end{array}
\]

A consequence: Since *se* heads T in Imp<sub>se</sub>, and is outside the verb phrase, the appearance of Imp<sub>se</sub> is not necessarily conditioned by the argument structure of the predicate and thus can appear in a wider range of configurations, such as in the periphrastic passive (9a) and with copula verbs (9b), illustrated in Spanish but also true for Italian and EP. It can also appear with DOM, as in (9c).

(9) a. *Se* es perseguido por la policía en este país.  
Imp<sub>se</sub> is followed by the police in this country.  
"One is followed by the police in this country."

b. *Se* está bien aquí  
Imp<sub>se</sub> is good here  
"It is nice here."

c. *Se* conoce a María como buena madre.  
Imp<sub>se</sub> knows DOM María as good mother.  
"Mary is known as a good mother."

Romanian: Romanian lacks Imp<sub>se</sub> (Dobrovie-Sorin 1998). Thus, as expected they are ungrammatical as illustrated in (10).
(10)a. *Adesea se este trădat de prieteni falsi. 
   frequently, se is betrayed by friends false 
   "One is frequently betrayed by false friends."

b. *Nu se este niciodata multiat. 
   not se is never satisfied 
   "One is never satisfied."

c. *In scolala asta se pedepeste pe elevi. 
   in school this se punish DOM students.the. 
   "In this school, they punish the students."

**Conclusion:** Imp_{se}, heads T, is outside the verb phrase, and can appear in *periphrastic passive*, *copula constructions* and with *DOM*.

2. **Consistent null subject languages and [uD] in T**

2.1. Null subjects - some background

• In a highly specified UG in which parameters are binary, the value of one of the values has effects on other aspects of the grammar. This was thought to be the case for the null subject parameter, regarding at least three properties: 1. the availability of null pronominal subjects; 2. the availability of post-verbal subjects; and 3. the ability to avoid *that*-trace effects. See Perlmutter (1971) and, especially, Rizzi (1982, 1986).

**A problem:** On this approach there should be a biconditional relation among all properties. If you have null subjects, then you have post-verbal subjects, and avoid *that*-trace violations. However, at least since Gilligan (1986), we have known that this is not the case. See discussions in Biberauer et al. (2010), D’Alessandro (2014).
2.2. Consistent null subject languages

**Our focus:** The property that is shared by (all) consistent null subject languages: the presence of definite/referential null subjects (not restricted to particular syntactic contexts, like they are in partial null subject languages) (Holmberg 2005, 2010; Holmberg, Nayudu, & Sheehan 2009).

- Holmberg (2010) (see also Holmberg, Nayudu, & Sheehan 2009, Holmberg 2010, Roberts 2010 a.o.), claims that consistent null subject (CNS) languages have a \([uD]\) in T. \([uD]\) gets valued via Agree by an (null) Aboutness-shift topic (A-topic) in the left periphery à la Frascarelli (2007). The A-topic provides a referential index for the null *pro* in Spec, Voice via the unvalued \([uD]\) in T, resulting in a definite referential *pro*.

\[
\begin{align*}
(11) & \quad \text{[TopP A-Topic}_j \ldots [TP T[Dj] [vP pro}_j [vP \ldots ] ]] \quad \rightarrow \text{pro refers to } j
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\text{(12)a. Juan llegó a casa tarde otra vez. }
\text{Juan arrived to home late other time.}
\text{“Juan got home late again.”}
\]

\[
\text{(12)b. [TopP Juan}_j \ldots [TP T[Dj] [vP pro}_j [vP Va a tener problemas ahora] ] ] ]
\text{ Goes to have problems now.}
\text{“He's gonna have problems now.”}
\]

**The take home:** \([uD]\) in T \(\rightarrow\) referential interpretation of null external argument *pro*.

**Corollary:** No \([uD]\) in T \(\rightarrow\) no referential interpretation of null external argument *pro*.

- Holmberg (2005) claims in non-CNS languages, there is no \([uD]\) in T, thus, a null *pro* can receive a generic non-referential interpretation when the verb is 3rd. sg. since it is not linked to an A-topic. See Perlmutter (1972), Cinque (1998) for this observation regarding 3rd sg. in CNS languages.

\[
\begin{align*}
(13) & \quad \text{No Sul come churrasco. [Brazilian Portuguese, Carvalho 2018]}
\end{align*}
\]

in.the south eat3sg. barbecue.
“*In the south one eats a lot of barbecue.*”
*“In the south, s/he eats a lot of barbecue.”

- No \([uD]\) in T \(\rightarrow\) pro not linked to discourse \(\rightarrow\) non-referential *pro*
Aquí come bien.  [Peninsular Spanish]
Here eat 3sg. well
"Here s/he eats well."
*"Here one eats well."

- [uD] in T → pro linked to discourse → non-referential pro NOT available

- Holmberg (2005, among others) observes that CNS languages use "special" morphology for a non-referential interpretation of pro in 3rd sg.: Imp<sub>se</sub>, illustrated in (15).

Aquí se come bien.
Here Imp-se eats well
"Here one eats well."
*"Here s/he eats well."

The observation: The presence of Imp<sub>se</sub> results in non-referential interpretation of the null external argument (akin to someone, one, arbitrary they, or man in German. See, for instance, Dobrovie-Sorin 1992, Egerland 2003).

Important: Holmberg does not offer a formal account of the role of Imp<sub>se</sub> is deriving this non-referential interpretation of the null external argument. We do, however.

2.3. Impersonal se & [uD] in T

- Capitalizing on this empirical difference and linking it to the presence vs. absence of [uD] in T, we propose that se spells out a T with a valued [D] feature. Since it is valued, no A-topic can value it, and no referential index can be passed on to pro, resulting in a non-referential interpretation of pro in Spec, Voice, as in (16). See also Sigurðsson (2011) for the same idea, although executed differently.

The CNS & Imp<sub>se</sub> link: Imp<sub>se</sub> spells-out a "special" T in CNS languages, one which does not have a [uD], but one which has a valued [D] feature. In order to have Imp<sub>se</sub>, you must have in your inventory a T<sub>[uD]</sub> - you must be a CNS language.
3. The reanalysis of passive se

- Here we offer an idea of how we might understand the development of Imp$se$ from Pass$se$.

**Our claim:** se of Pass$se$ heads Voice (see MacDonald 2017, MacDonald & Maddox 2018) (see also Folli & Harley 2005, Basilico 2010, Armstrong 2011 for Asp$se$ as well as Alexiadou et al. 2006 and Schäfer 2008 for anti-causative se), as in (17a). Se as a clitic moves and adjoins to T (as in 17b), which is the structure that feeds reanalysis of Pass$se$ as Imp$se$, illustrated in (17c).

(17) a. Pass$se$

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
T_{[uD]} \quad \text{VoiceP} \\
pro \quad \text{Voice} \\
\text{Voice}_{se[D]} \quad \text{VP} 
\end{array}
\]

b. Structure feeding reanalysis

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
T_{[uD]} \quad \text{VoiceP} \\
pro \quad \text{Voice} \\
\text{Voice}_{se[D]} \quad \text{VP} 
\end{array}
\]

c. Structure after reanalysis: Imp$se$

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{TP} \\
T_{se[D]} \quad \text{VoiceP} \\
pro \quad \text{Voice} \\
\text{Voice}_{se[D]} \quad \text{VP} 
\end{array}
\]

- This is fundamentally a case of "grammaticalization up the tree" and is consistent with Roberts & Roussou's (2003:198) general schematic in (18) underlying many historical patterns they discuss, where X = T_{[uD]}; Y = Voice$_{se[D]}$. Ultimately T$_{[uD]}$ is reanalyzed as T$_{se[D]}$.

(18) \( [XP \ Y+X [YP \ ...Y...] ] \rightarrow [XP \ Y=X [YP \ ...Y...] ] \)

- This reanalysis is also consistent with what Clark & Roberts (1993), Roberts & Roussou (2003) assumes drive grammaticalization: structure simplification. Less formal features is simpler than more formal features (Roberts & Roussou 2003: 201); See also van Gelderen (2004, 2011).
• Reanalysis often takes place when the input to the learner is ambiguous or obscure (Kroch 1989, Santorini 1989, Pintzuk 1991, Roberts & Roussou 2003). This is the case with sentences like those in (19a), in terms of agreement, thematic relations, structure, and word order as in (19b,c).ix

(19)a. **Ambiguous string**
    Se vendió la casa
    sell.3sg the house

    **Pass**\textsubscript{se}: "The house was sold."

    **Imp**\textsubscript{se}: "They sold the house."

---

**Important:** Crucial to reanalysis: the [D] feature. The [D] feature on se and the [uD] feature on T (a CNS trait). The same types of features involved feeds reanalysis.

**Question:** But where does the [D] feature on se come from?

**Short answer:** From Pass\textsubscript{se}, when se itself is has a [D] feature.

4. **Passive se and the [D] feature**

• **Imp**\textsubscript{se} is widely thought to evolve from Pass\textsubscript{se}, resulting in a path as in (20) (Kärde 1943), Monge (1954), Cennamo (1993, 1999), Portilla (2007), not limited to Romance languages, nor to Indo-European languages, (see Geniušienė 1987; Haspelmath 1990; Cennamo 1993; a.o.).

(20) Refl\textsubscript{se} > AntiC\textsubscript{se} > Pass\textsubscript{se} > Imp\textsubscript{se}

• In MacDonald & Maddox (2018), however, we offer a modified version of the path, as illustrated in (21), where there are two Pass\textsubscript{se}.

(21) Refl\textsubscript{se} > AntiC\textsubscript{se} > Pass\textsubscript{se1} > Pass\textsubscript{se2} > Imp\textsubscript{se}
• In this talk, we suggest a further modification to the path with respect to the timing of when Imp<sub>sc</sub> develops, illustrated in (22).

(22) \[ \text{RefI}_{sc} > \text{AntiC}_{sc} > \text{Pass}_{sc1} > \text{Pass}_{sc2} \]

\[ \text{Imp}_{sc} \]

**The claim:** There is a particular moment, a window, where a language will develop Imp<sub>sc</sub> from Pass<sub>sc</sub>. The window is when se of Pass<sub>sc</sub> has a [D] feature.

4.1 Passive se<sub>1</sub> vs. Passive se<sub>2</sub>

• It has been observed for Portuguese (Naro 1976), Italian (Cinque 1988, Cennamo 1993), French (Heidinger & Schäfer 2010) and Spanish (MacDonald & Maddox 2018) that by-phrases in Pass<sub>sc</sub> constructions were once grammatical, but no longer are.

(23)a. *Esta explicación no se entiende por nosotros.* [Modern Spanish]

   this explanation no Pass<sub>sc</sub> understand by us
   ‘This explanation is not understood by us.’

   b. Lo que...vos dezides, no se entienda por vos. [Old Spanish]

   it that...you say not Pass<sub>sc</sub> understand by us
   ‘What you say is not understood by us.’ (Milagros, 1260)

• **Their account:** a by-phrase saturates the external argument slot when present (Bruening 2010). If another argument saturates the external argument slot, the by-phrase will be ungrammatical. Following Legate (2014), only with a D(eterminer)-feature can an argument saturate the external argument position (see, for instance, Longobardi (1994), among others).\textsuperscript{xi} If it lacks a D-feature, the by-phrase is grammatical.\textsuperscript{xi}

(24) \[ \text{Pass}^{se1}: \text{by-phrases grammatical} \]  \[ \text{Pass}^{se2}: \text{by-phrases ungrammatical} \]

("Old Spanish") \[ (\text{Modern Spanish})\]

a. \[ \text{TP} \]

   \[ \text{T}_{[uD]} \quad \text{VoiceP} \]

   \[ \text{pro} \quad \text{Voice'} \]

   \[ \text{Voice}_{se[D]} \quad \text{VP}... \]

b. \[ \text{TP} \]

   \[ \text{T}_{[uD]} \quad \text{VoiceP} \]

   \[ \text{pro[D]} \quad \text{Voice'} \]

   \[ \text{Voice}_{se} \quad \text{VP}... \]
The claim: The valued [D] feature on T in Impₜₑ comes from se, when it had a [D] feature, at Passₜₑ₁ stage, as in (24a) above.

Expectation: Reanalysis of Passₜₑ as Impₜₑ would happen at a time when by-phrases were grammatical with Passₜₑ.

4.2 The expectation tested

- We expect Impₜₑ to begin to develop at a time when by-phrases were grammatical. Data from Spanish and Italian that are consistent with this expectation. Portuguese patterns the same, although we do not show the data here.

4.2.1 Spanish

- by-phrases: 1205-1550 (Monge 1954, MacDonald & Maddox 2018)
- Emergence of Impₜₑ, namely, non-agreeing DPs, direct object clitics, and DOM: 1500-1550

- One of the first instances of non-agreeing construction, from 1200s.

(25) E, si se cree los magicos, expellan las tempestades... and if Imp-se believes.3S the magicians  expel.3P  the storms

‘And, if one believes the magicians, they (the magicians) expel storms.’
(Lapidario 5:14, (13th century); in Ein Spanisches Steinbuch, ed. Vollmöller, p. 4)

- A clear instances of a direct object pronoun with a se construction, from 1499.

(26) O malvado, como que no se te entiende!

‘Oh wicked one, how no one understands you!’
(Fernando de Rojas, La Celestina, (1499); ed. Severin, p. 124)

- Another clear instance of a direct object pronoun with se construction, from 1552.
(27) aunque ellos mereciesen pena por ello, no se les ha de althought they deserve punishment for it not SE them.Acc has of castigar ni hacer guerra. chastise.Inf nor make.Inf war

‘Although they deserve punishment for it (sin), one must not chastise them nor make war.’

(Bartolomé de las Casas, Controversia con el Doctor Sepulveda (1552); ed. Castro, p. 205)

• The differential object marker (DOM) starts to co-occur regularly with Imp\textsubscript{se} in the 1500s (Kärde 1943:107, Monge 1954:66, Barry 1985:211, Portilla 2007:145).\textsuperscript{xii}

4.2.2 Italian

• by-phrase (with specific agents): 1250-1450 (abundant), start decreasing 1450-1600 (Sansó 2011).

• Emergence of Imp\textsubscript{se}: lack of agreement, near end of 13th century (Giacalone Ramat & Sansò 2011:203–206); earliest examples of Imp\textsubscript{se} with 3rd direct object pronoun in the early 14th century (see Wehr 1995:116).

• Observe two examples with by-phrases in (28), adapted from Sansò (2011:234-235).

(28)a. Elli si richiamano \textit{per lo Grande Kane}, ma no li they refl reclaim:prs.3pl by art.def Great Khan but neg to.him fanno neun trebuto, perché son sì a la lunga che make:prs.3pl any tribute because be:prs.3pl so far away that la gente de-l Grande Kane non vi potrebbe andare. the people of-art.def Great Khan neg there could:3sg go:inf ‘They are reclaimed by the Great Khan, but they do not pay any tribute to him because they are so far away that the Great Khan’s people could not go there.’ (Milione, 162, 4; early 14th c.)

b. Né si poté tanto tener-lo secreto che non si sapessi neg refl could:3sg so keep:inf-it secret that neg refl know:sbjv.pst.3sg per qualcuno e ancora \textit{per il Piovano Arlotto} by anybody and again by art.def parish.priest Arlotto ‘And this fact could not be kept so secret as to pass unnoticed by anybody and in particular by Arlotto, the parish priest.’ (Piovano Arlotto 157, 7; early 15th c.)
• Two examples in (29) with lack of agreement, from Giacalone Ramat & Sansò (2011: 203).

(29)a. E ancho vi si rameta tutti i miei denari propi, ch’io and also there si recalls all the my money[pl] own that I debo avere di chostà must have from there
'and all my money that I must have back from there is mentioned there (i.e. in that letter)' (Lettera di Iacomo de’ Sansedoni da Siena a Goro e Gonteruccio de’ Sansedoni, in Parigi, 1294)

b. uno paramento da prete, co-l quale vi si debia dicere masse one paraments for priest with-which with.it si should[sg] say masses per anima del conte Guido Guerra, mio figluolo for soul of the count G. G. my son
‘priest vestments, with which masses should be said for the soul of Count Guido Guerra, my son’ (Testamento della contessa Beatrice da Capraia, 1279)

• In (30), find one example of Imp_{se} with a direct object clitic, from Giacalone Ramat & Sansò (2011: 220).

(30) ke ’l mi debbie sotterare, sì che no-it:obj si sappia that he me should bury so that neg:it:obj si know:svbjv.3s ‘He should bury me so that nobody will know it’ (Volgarizzamento di un frammento della Disciplina Clericalis di Pietro di Alfonso; 1300)

4.2.3 Portuguese

• by-phrases: +/-1300 - 1614 (Naro 1976)
• Imp_{se} (non-agreeing se): +/-1550 (Naro 1963).

Conclusion: It appears that Imp_{se} emerges when by-phrases were grammatical, at a time when se had a [D], on MacDonald & Maddox's (2018) analysis.
5. An implication for Puerto Rican Spanish

The approach has consequences for languages that are losing their status as a CNS language, like the Caribbean Varieties of Spanish (Camacho 2017). For the purposes of this talk, we focus on Puerto Rican Spanish.

5.1 The CNS status of Puerto Rican Spanish

- The frequency with which Puerto Rican speakers use overt pronouns has been noted to increase, when compared to Peninsular Spanish, data in (31) from Ticio (2018). (See also Navarro 1948, Morales 1986, Toribio 2000.)

(31) Yo no pude estar allí, **yo** oí la gritería, pero **yo** estaba en mi oficina en una reunión. I not could be there, I heard the cries but I was in my office in a meeting.

- Observe another difference in pronoun distribution between Peninsular Spanish and Puerto Rican Spanish, so-called Montalbetti's (1984) "Overt Pronoun Constraint". Observation in (32) from Ticio (2018). In Puerto Rican Spanish, **ellos** can be bound by **muchos**, while it cannot (unless contrastively focused) in Peninsular Spanish.

(32) %Muchos chicos dijeron que **ellos** no lo habían hecho. many children said that they not it had done. ‘Many children said that they didn't do it.’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peninsular Spanish</th>
<th>→ ungrammatical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rican Spanish</td>
<td>→ grammatical</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Relevance:** Puerto Rican Spanish appears to be losing its CNS status. In fact, Ticio (2018) claims that Puerto Rican Spanish T lacks [uD] in T. We assume this is the case.

**Implication:** We expect Imp_{sc} in Puerto Rican Spanish to be affected. Loss of [uD] in T → loss of Imp_{sc}
The main observation: Most of our PRS speakers (total number = 7) do not like Imp\textsubscript{se} with DOM (33a), in copula constructions (33b) nor in the periphrastic passive (33c), in contrast to Peninsular Spanish, although some do.

(33)a. %Se llamó a los bomberos. \text{[DOM]}
   Imp\textsubscript{se} called DOM the firemen
   “Someone/they called the firemen.”

b. % Aquí se está bien. \text{[Copula]}
   Here Imp\textsubscript{se} is good
   “It is nice here.”

c. % En este país se es perseguido por la policía. \text{[Periphrastic passive]}
   In this country Imp\textsubscript{se} is pursued by the police
   “In this country, one is pursued by the police.”

Also: Our informal probe of speakers matches what we find in the Corpus del Español: NOW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOM: se llamó a...</th>
<th>Peninsular Spanish: 169 tokens</th>
<th>Puerto Rican Spanish: 21 tokens</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copula: se está pendiente:</td>
<td>Peninsular Spanish: 310 tokens</td>
<td>Puerto Rican Spanish: 1 token</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periphrastic passive: se es atacado..., se es tentado...</td>
<td>Peninsular Spanish: 41 tokens</td>
<td>Puerto Rican Spanish: 4 token</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Brief recap

- We have claimed that only languages that have [uD] in T have Imp\textsubscript{se}, because se spells out a valued [D] in T. This [D] came from se in Pass\textsubscript{se} when reanalyzed as T in Imp\textsubscript{se}.
- Puerto Rican Spanish appears to be losing its CNS status, which entails losing Imp\textsubscript{se}.
- However, recall that some speakers still use Imp\textsubscript{se}, and all of our speakers only allow for a referential interpretation of 3rd sg., which is the case for CNS languages.

(34) Aquí come bien. \text{[Puerto Rican & Peninsular Spanish]}
   Here eat3sg. well
   "Here s/he/*one eats well."

- Patterns suggest that there may be two sets of T: T\textsubscript{[uD]}, and T, a multiple grammar/universal bilingualism situation (Amaral & Roeper 2014, Roeper 1999).
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PRIMARY SOURCES:

---

i Belletti (1982:2) assumes that Imp_{se} constructions are "interpreted as a particular instance of the so-called pro-drop phenomenon".

ii Naro (1976) observes also that Imp_{se}, but not Pass_{se} in EP can license a reflexive: Não se deve falar tanto de si mesmo. "One should not talk about oneself so much." vs. *Escreveram-se cartas a si mesmo (por João). "Letters to himself were written by John."

iii According to much of the literature, especially Cinque (1992), nominative case is required in Imp_{se}. This is consistent with the idea that se heads T, the locus of nominative. We might also expect it to interact with the finiteness and phi-features of T. See Cinque (1988) for a detailed discussion of se with (inflected) infinitives.
In Spanish, Italian, EP, and Romanian, SE can appear with unaccusatives and unergatives. Many assume that SE in these instances is Imp(se), while Dobrovie-Sorin (1992) claims they are Pass(se). It may be the case that the presence of SE with unergatives and unaccusatives does not tell us whether or not a language has Imp(se), given that, as discussed in Cenammo (1999), Late Latin reflexive se/sibi was used with both unergatives and unaccusatives and were inherited into Romance.

See Maddox (2018) who discusses environments in which 3rd sg. can receive a non-referential interpretation without Imp(se).

Roberts & Roussou (2003:181) make a similar claim about subject clitics in Veneto, which were reanalyzed as agreement. They merge in PersP (à la Poletto 2000, Manzini & Savoia 2002) and value its features.

Roberts & Roussou (2003: 202) "...grammaticalization can be successive, namely once Y has been reanalyzed as X, it can further be reanalyzed as an even higher functional head Z."

Modern English modals were originally main verbs with argument structure but were reanalyzed as auxiliaries. Roberts & Roussou (2003) assume the difference in argument structure properties result from the modals, when main verbs, headed V, but as auxiliaries they head T. My claims regarding se are consistent with this idea.

Van Gelderen's (2004, 2011) principles: 1. Head Preference or Spec-to-Head Principle (Be a head, rather than a phrase); and 2. Late Merge Principle (Merge as late as possible).

Legate (2014) also assumes that the D-feature relates to referentiality, something we do as well.

Barry (1985) observes the following use of DOM outside of se constructions. From the 13th to 16th centuries: DOM is used 50-60% of the time (in her data); 17th century: DOM is used 78% of the time; 18th century: DOM used "fairly consistently".