

## Against a reflexivization analysis of reflexively marked anticausatives

A. According to the standard semantics of lexical causatives and anticausatives along the lines of (2a, b), the truth of a causative clause (1a) entails the truth of its anticausative counterpart (1b):

- 1a. Juan aumentó los precios  
Juan increased the prices  
b. Los precios aumentaron (UAC)  
the prices increased
- 2a.  $\lambda x \lambda y [(y) \text{ CAUSE } [\text{BECOME } [(x) \textit{higher}]]]$   
b.  $\lambda x [\text{BECOME } [(x) \textit{higher}]]]$

While (1b) is an unmarked anticausative (UAC), many languages also have a set of reflexively marked anticausatives (RAC) (e.g. Spanish 3b). This reflexive morpheme is often assumed to reflect the absence of a causer argument (e.g. Grimshaw 1981, Reinhart 2000, Doron 2003, Schäfer 2008). But, why can the same marker that normally produces *canonically reflexive verbs* (CRV) as in (4) serve this purpose?

- 3a. Juan rompió el vaso  
Juan broke the glass  
b. El vaso se rompió (RAC)  
the glass REFL broke
4. El niño se lavó (CRV)  
the boy REFL washed

B. Koontz-Garboden (K-G 2009) defends that the morphological identity between RACs in (3b) and CRVs in (4) reflects semantic identity. In both cases, the clitic acts as a *reflexivizer* (5) that takes a transitive relation  $\mathfrak{R}$  such as (6a) or (7a) as its argument and identifies the two arguments of the relation (6b)/(7b). The only difference between CRVs and RACs concerns the external argument  $\theta$ -role: verbs like *romper* select an underspecified *effector* (cf. 7a) lacking agent entailments, so the non-human theme can also be assigned this effector role: (3b/7b) mean that 'the glass caused its own breaking'. (The Neo-Davidsonian formulas in (5-7) are adapted from K-G 2009).

5.  $[\text{se}] = \lambda \mathfrak{R} \lambda x [\mathfrak{R}(x, x)]$

- 6a.  $[\text{lavar}] = \lambda x \lambda y \lambda e [\textit{wash}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e, y) \wedge \text{PATIENT}(e, x)]$   
b.  $[\text{se}](\text{lavar}) = \lambda x \lambda e [\textit{wash}(e) \wedge \text{AGENT}(e, x) \wedge \text{PATIENT}(e, x)]$

- 7a.  $[\text{romper}] = \lambda x \lambda y \lambda s \lambda e [\exists v [\text{CAUSE}(v, e) \wedge \text{EFFECTOR}(v, y) \wedge \text{BECOME}(e, s) \wedge \text{THEME}(s, x) \wedge \text{broken}(s)]]]$   
b.  $[\text{se}](\text{romper}) = \lambda x \lambda s \lambda e [\exists v [\text{CAUSE}(v, e) \wedge \text{EFFECTOR}(v, x) \wedge \text{BECOME}(e, s) \wedge \text{THEME}(s, x) \wedge \text{broken}(s)]]]$

C. We argue that RACs do not have the causative-reflexive meaning in (7b) but the inchoative one in (2b), just as UACs and other inchoative structures. If true, it follows that the reflexive morpheme does not always act as a reflexivizer. Nothing, except world knowledge, blocks reflexivization of (2a), producing the meaning in (7b); on the other hand, the account in (7a, b) wrongly predicts meaning (2b) to be generally unavailable for RACs. Our evidence comes from Spanish (and German).

D. (7a,b) predicts that the truth of the causative clause does not entail the truth of its RAC counterpart, i.e., a vase can be caused to break without causing its own breaking just as a boy can be washed without him washing himself. K-G sees this prediction confirmed in (8a,b) where a RAC is negated while its transitive counterpart is asserted, involving, according to him, negation of CAUSE in (7b):

- 8a. El vaso no se rompió, lo rompiste tú  
The glass no REFL broke, it broke you
- b. No se rompió ningún vaso, los rompiste todos tú  
No se broke any/no glass, them broke all you

We will argue that these are cases of 'metalinguistic' negation (MN), where the upper bound of a conversational implicature is negated, as in *It's not (just) warm here, it is hot* (Horn 1985). K-G dismisses MN in (8a, b) by arguing that *ningún* is an NPI and as such is incompatible with MN (Horn 1985), as suggested by (9). But the claim that *ningún* is an NPI is problematic, because of its licensing in other cases of MN (10) (see also Geurts 1998).

9. No consiguió resolver \*ningún/algún problema, consiguió resolverlos todos  
No managed to.solve \*any/no/ some problem, managed to.solve.them all  
'S/he didn't manage to solve \*any/some problem, s/he managed to solve them all'

10. Luisa no odia a ningún niño, los aborrece a todos (Luisa dislikes no child,  
Luisa no hates to any/no children, them loathes to all she hates all children)

The contrast between (9) and (10) is expected if *ningún* is a *negative quantifier*, which also triggers negative concord (e.g., Bosque 1980, de Swart 2010). A negative quantifier (cf. English *no*) differs from an existential one (cf. English *some*) in that it does not trigger, by itself, any implicature that could be metalinguistically negated in (9). In (10), however, the *verb* makes available such an implicature (*only hate* vs. *even loathe*). This means that (8a, b) could involve MN: according to (2a, b), the RAC in (8a, b) is inchoative and triggers the implicature that the corresponding causative is too strong. Note that (2a,b) force the negation in (8a, b) to be interpreted as metalinguistic, since logical negation would lead to a contradiction, while (7a, b) predict that (8a, b) cannot involve MN as they do not make the causative stronger than the RAC.

**E.** In support of the presence of MN, note that (8a) licenses the counterpart of English *just* (Spanish *solo*) (*The glass did not just break, you broke it*), which is typical for MN (Horn 1985) but odd with logical negation (*#He did not just wash, you washed him*).

**F.** Conjunctions like English *but* diagnose MN (Horn 1985). *But* has two uses, overtly distinguished in Spanish and German: *concessive* (but1, pero/aber) and *corrective* (but2, sino que/sondern). While 'logical' negation allows but1 and but2 (*He is not rich {but1/but2} he is smart*), MN only licenses but2 (*It's not warm {\*but1/but2} it is hot*), as we see in 11. This test shows that RACs (12a), like other inchoative predicates (b-d), involve MN and reject logical negation, unlike CRVs (e).

11. Luisa no odia a ningún niño {#pero / sino que} los aborrece a todos.  
Luisa no hates to any/no children, but1 / but2 them loathes to all

- 12a. El vaso no se rompió, {#pero / sino que} tú lo rompiste (RAC)  
The glass no REFL broke but1 / but2 that you it broke
- b. Los precios no aumentaron, {#pero / sino que} tú los aumentaste. (UAC)  
The prices no increased but1 / but2 that you them increased
- c. El rosal no floreció, {#pero / sino que} el jardinero lo hizo florecer (pure unacc.)  
The rosebush no blossomed but1 / but2 that the gardener it made blossom
- d. El niño no se puso enfermo, {#pero / sino que} tú lo infectaste (copula+adj.)  
The kid no REFL get sick but1 / but2 that you him infected
- e. El niño no se lavó, {pero / sino que} lo lavó la niñera (CVR)  
The kid no REFL washed but1 / but2 him washed the nanny

**G.** Unlike the negative quantifier *ningún*, *true* NPIs are non-licensed in (8) nor in (13), which is expected given our claim that (8) involves metalinguistic negation. This test gives exactly the same results as the one in (12). The RAC in (14a) cannot combine with the NPI *siquiera* (not even), thereby

behaving like other inchoative predicates which we leave out in (14) for reasons of space. CRVs (14b), on the other hand, are compatible with the NPI, as predicted by (6a, b) (and wrongly by (7a, b) for RACs), since the negation must be interpreted as logical. (Note: Horvath & Siloni 2011 argue that the Spanish NPI *en absoluto* (at all) is not licensed in (8a). However, Beavers & K-G 2013 report judgments suggesting that *en absoluto* can escape standard conditions on NPI licensing (cf. Giannakidou 2006, 2011). *Siquiera* does not face such problems).

13. #Luisa no odia *siquiera* a los niños, los aborrece.  
Luisa no hates not.even to the children them loathes

14a. #El vaso no se rompió *siquiera*, tú lo rompiste  
The glass no REFL broke not.even you it broke  
b. El niño no se lavó *siquiera*, lo lavó la niñera  
The kid no REFL washed not.even him washed the nanny

**H.** RACs have the inchoative semantics in (2b). But why can't strings as (3b), at least optionally, have a reflexive construal derived from (2a) via reflexivization? We argue that this option is not blocked by formal grammar because reflexivization is a productive process for all transitive verbs. Instead, we think that it is blocked by conceptual considerations; but in specific contexts, if the nonsensical construal is negated and/or enforced by an intensifier (Spanish *sí mismo*), it becomes available as the licensing of *but1* and *but2* in (15a) shows. (15a) has nothing to do with anticausativization since UACs as in (1b) enter the reflexive construal under such conditions, too (15b).

15a. El vaso no se rompió a *sí mismo*, lógicamente, {pero / sino que} tú lo rompiste.  
The glass no REFL broke to himself logically *but1 / but2* you it broke  
b. Los precios no se aumentaron a *sí mismos*, lógicamente, {pero/sino que} Juan los aumentó  
The prices no REFL increased to themselves logically *but1/but2* Juan them increased

**I.** Our conclusions: RACs pattern together with UACs and other inchoative constructions, but not with CRVs, therefore they have the inchoative meaning in (2a) and not reflexive one in (7b). Thus the causative construction entails its intransitive counterpart: the latter can be negated while the former is asserted iff the negation is metalinguistic, not logical. This claim is supported by the distribution of *pero* and true NPIs such as *siquiera*, both disallowed in MN contexts. Negative concord elements like *ningún* must not be taken into account, given that their licensing conditions differ from those of true NPIs and they are fine in canonical MN contexts such as (10).