

FIXED ADJUNCTS
ARMANDO MORA-BUSTOS
ESCUELA NACIONAL DE ANTROPOLOGÍA E HISTORIA
lucioamora@gmail.com

Adjuncts in Spanish can be classified basically into two groups: in the first one, those adjuncts that modify the predicate's nucleus, sentence's adverbs and adjuncts' adjective modifiers. In the second group, I have placed the fixed adjuncts or subcategorized adjuncts. Semantically, these fixed adjuncts denote different meanings, such as: manner, time, aspect, place, frequency, etc. Throughout this presentation, I will call all lexical units found in group one, free adjuncts or peripheral adjuncts and I have decided to label adjuncts of the second group, as fixed adjuncts.

In Spanish there are verbs which subcategorize or require fixed adjuncts. These verbs can only express a specific state of affairs if a fixed adjunct appears as a complement. These verbs are intransitive, as in (1). The syntactic form of these adjuncts can be a prepositional phrase, an adjectival phrase, a bare-NP adverbs and an adjunct subordinate clause or may appear as lexical adverbs.

- (1) a. El niño se comporta *mal*
DET boy CL.PRN=behave-3PSG.PR badly
'The boy misbehaves'
a'. *El niño se comporta
DET boy CL.PRN=behave-3PSG.PR
b. La gente procede *con cautela*
DET people proceed-3PSG.PR with caution
'The people proceed cautiously'
b'. *La gente procede
DET people proceed-3PSG.PR
c. María se siente *enferma*
María CL.RF=feel-3PSG.PR sick
'María feels sick'
c'. *María se siente

- María CL.RF=feel-3PSG.PR
- d. Pedro vivió *una tarde perfecta*
 Pedro live-3PSG.PD DET afternoon perfect
 ‘Pedro lived a perfect afternoon’
- d’. *Pedro vivió
 Pedro live-3PSG.PD
- e. La corte actuó *cuando llegó el acusado*
 DET court act-3PSG.PD when arrive-3P.SG DET defendant
 ‘The court acted when the defendant arrived’
- e’. *La corte actuó
 DET court act-3PSG.PD

On the other hand, if the verb is transitive, the direct object argument can also be replaced by a fixed adjunct, as in (2)

- (2) a. La actriz viste *un traje rojo/ elegantemente*
 DET actress wear-3PSG.PR DET dress red / elegantly
 ‘The actress is wearing a red dress / dresses elegantly’
- a’. *La actriz viste
 DET actress wear-3PSG.PR
- b. Las FARC asesinan *policías / en la noche*
 DET FARC murder-3PPL.PR police / at night
 ‘The FARC murders police / at night’
- b’. *Las FARC asesinan
 DET FARC murder-3PPL.PR
- c. Juan conduce *un BMW / cuando su padre está enfermo*
 Juan drive-3PSG.PR DET BMW/ when PS3PL father be-3PSG.PR sick
 ‘Juan drives a BMW / when his father is sick’

In these clauses, (1) and (2), a nuclear predicate verb only has meaning if it has a complement in the form of fixed adjunct. So far, I could say that in these clauses, (1) and

(2), the lexical verb features necessarily need a fixed adjunct as complement. Nevertheless there are different constructions which can't express a complete meaning of state of affair. These clauses, as in (3), once again, are also grammatically with a fixed adjunct complement.

- (3) a. El puente fue construido *por el gobierno/ ayer*
 DET bridge AUX.be-3PSG.PD build-PP by DET government/ yesterday
 'The bridge was built *by the government / yesterday*'
 a'.*El puente fue construido
 DET bridge AUX.be-3PSG.PD build.PP
- b. El libro de Rulfo se vende *en las tardes / rápidamente*
 DET book of Rulfo CL.MV=sell-3PSG.PR in DET afternoons / quickly
 'Rulfo's book is sold in the evenings / sells quickly'
 b'.*El libro de Rulfo se vende
 DET book of Rulfo CL.VM=sell-3PSG.PR
- c. Se nace *con poco pelo*
 CL.IM=born-3PSG.PR with little hair
 'We are born with little hair'
 c'.*Se nace
 CL.IM=born-3PSG.PR
- d. El jugador considera *injusta* la decisión
 DET player consider-3PSG.PR unfair DET decision
 'The player considers the decision unjust'
 d'.??El jugador considera la decisión
 DET player consider-3PSG.PR DET decision
 'The player considers the decision'
- e. El disco suena *horrible*
 DET album sound-3PSG.PR horrible
 'The album sounds horrible'
 e'.*El disco suena
 DET album sound-3PSG.PR

The set of sentences in (3) shows different types of constructions, like a periphrastic passive in (3a), middle voice in (3b), impersonal with unaccusative verb in (3c), secondary predication in (3d) and short adverbs or *naked adjectives* in (3e). Notice that in each case, the fixed adjunct appears as an essential constituent.

For now, using as reference these examples, (1) to (3), I can say that the linguistic properties of these adjuncts are lexical or structural. I decided to appoint them fixed adjuncts because they have special syntactic and semantic features. Basically, the main idea which I will justify in this presentation is the following: it is possible that the fixed adjuncts may appear in the core. To demonstrate this idea, I am going to divide this work in two parts. In the first one, I will present a general description of these units, and in the second, I will argue the fact that fixed adjuncts may be found in the core.

Here are some fixed adjuncts features. Fixed adjuncts almost always appear in intransitive sentences. Syntactically, these clauses have three basic units: subject, verb and fixed adjunct. These adjuncts may in principle occur in any order, principally in post-verbal adjacent position, but they can appear before the verb also if the subject moves to a post-verbal position. Intransitive verbs in clauses may be in the initial position but not at the end of the clause, as in (4).

- (4) a. Mariana actuaba *compulsivamente* / *a mis espaldas*
Mariana act-3PSG.CO compulsively / to my backs
'Mariana acted compulsively/ behind my back'
- b. *Compulsivamente/ a mis espaldas* actuaba Mariana
- c. Actuaba Mariana *compulsivamente/ a mis espaldas*
- d. ?? Mariana *compulsivamente/ a mis espaldas* actuaba

In sentences with peripheral adjuncts which are not subcategorized by the verb, as in (5), their movement is flexible, because they may be in different positions, even the nuclear verb occurs in the final position in the clause.

- (5) a. Pedro se afeita *cuidadosamente*
 Pedro CL.RF=shave.3PSG.PR carefully
 ‘Pedro shaves carefully’
 b. *Cuidadosamente* Pedro se afeita
 c. Pedro *cuidadosamente* se afeita

As already mentioned, fixed adjuncts are obligatory constituents, particularly in well formed clauses; nevertheless fixed adjuncts, as in (6), like peripheral adjuncts, as in (7), may be in cleft sentences. This fact implies that the grammatical units’ information can be the focus or emphatic constituent.

- (6) a. La senadora se expresa *libremente*
 DET senator CL.PRN=express-3PSG.PR freely
 ‘The senator expresses herself freely’
 b. *Libremente* es como se expresa la senadora
 freely be-3PSG.PR how CL.PRN=express-3PSG.PR DET senator
 ‘The senator freely expresses herself’
- (7) a. El paciente está sangrando *internamente*
 DET patient be-3PSG.PR bleed-GD internally
 ‘The patient is bleeding internally’
 b. *Internamente* es como el paciente está sangrando
 internally be-3PSG.PR how DET patient be-3PSG.PR bleed.GD
 ‘Internal bleeding is harming the patient.’

The set of sentences in (6) and (7) are different. (6b) isn’t exactly a clefted counterpart of the canonical clause of (6a), because in the last one, the verb *expresarse* ‘express itself’ only denotes a meaning if a fixed adjunct is a clause’s constituent, meanwhile (7a) is clefted in (7b), *sangrar* ‘bleed’ denotes a meaning by itself.

Besides, fixed adjuncts have scope at the nucleus and core level. In order to justify this point, the scope of negation and interrogation is over these fixed adjuncts. The fixed adjuncts only modify the nucleus and core, so in a context, when the negation modifies the

nucleus, as in (8a), it has scope over the fixed adjuncts, otherwise the clause isn't grammatical, as in (8b). On the other hand, if a sentence is modified by a free adjunct that takes a core in its scope, as in (8c), negation has scope over the core where the adjunct is one of its constituents, or this adjunct may not be over the negation's scope, as in (8d), because this peripheral adjunct is a clause modifier. It can be noticed that the meaning in (8c) and (8d) is different. In the first one, the sentence's meaning may be restated as the cyclist doesn't finish the race so well after having some complications; in the second one, fortunately, the cyclist does not finish the race.

- (8) a. El deslizamiento no sucedió *inesperadamente*
 DET slide NEG happen-3PSG.PD unexpectedly
 'The slide didn't happen unexpectedly'
- b. *El deslizamiento no sucedió, *inesperadamente*
- c. El ciclista no terminó la competencia *afortunadamente*
 DET cyclist NEG finish-3PSG.PD DET race luckily
 'The cyclist didn't finish the race as well as he had hoped'
- d. El ciclista no terminó la competencia, *afortunadamente*
 DET cyclist NEG finish-3PSG.PD DET race luckily
 'Fortunately, the cyclist didn't finish the race.'

The scope of negation is evident in these sentences because only an adjunct that takes a nucleus or core in their scope, as in (9a), may add an additional comment about the referential topic, whereas adjuncts as those in (9b) can not.

- (9) a. El deslizamiento no sucedió inesperadamente, de hecho, ha
 DET slide NEG happen-3PSG.PD unexpectedly, in fact, AUX.have-3PSG.PR
 sucedido *progresivamente*
 happen.PP progressively
 'The slide did not happen suddenly, in fact, it occurred progressively'

b. El ciclista no terminó la competencia, *afortunadamente*, ??de hecho,
 DET cyclist NEG finish-3PSG.PD DET race, luckily, in fact,
 ha terminado *desgraciadamente*
 AUX.have-3PSG.PR finish.PP unluckily
 ‘The cyclist did not finish the race, well, in fact, he finished very poorly.’

In this same way, interrogation has also scope over fixed adjuncts, as in (10a). This isn’t possible with sentence peripheral adjuncts, as in (10c). In (10b), interrogation takes a fixed adjunct in its scope, this fixed adjunct may be in an initial or final position. While on the contrary, clause peripheral adjuncts aren’t under interrogation’s scope, neither in the initial position nor the final position, as in (10d).

- (10) a. ¿El deslizamiento no sucedió *inesperadamente*?
 DET slide NEG happen-3PSG.PD unexpectedly
 ‘¿Didn’t the slide happen unexpectedly?’
- b. (**Inesperadamente*) ¿*Inesperadamente* El deslizamiento no sucedió *inesperadamente*? (**Inesperadamente*)
- c. ¿El ciclista no terminó la competencia? *Afortunadamente*
 DET cyclist NEG finish-3PSG.PD DET race luckily
 ‘¿Didn’t the cyclist finish the race well? Luckily he didn’t’
- d. ¿**Afortunadamente* el ciclista no terminó la competencia, *afortunadamente*?
 luckily DET cyclist NEG finish-3PSG.PD DET race luckily
 ‘¿*Fortunately the cyclist didn’t finish the race, luckily)?’

Besides these two tests, both fixed adjuncts and the core modifiers are subject to the interrogative form introduced by *como* ‘how’ as in (11a), since both adjuncts appear as an answer to the how question. On the other hand in (11b) the sentence adjuncts are not within of the scope of the question.

- (11) a. ¿Cómo sucedió el deslizamiento? –*Inesperadamente*
 how happen-3PSG.PD DET slide unexpectedly
 ‘¿How did the slide happen?’ -‘Unexpectedly’
- b. ¿Cómo terminó el ciclista la competencia? –**Afortunadamente*
 how finish-3PSG.PD DET cyclist DET race luckily
 ‘¿How did the cyclist finish the race?’ -*‘Unfortunately.’

Next, as shown in (12), *desgraciadamente* and *afortunadamente*, as well as nucleus and core adjuncts like *inesperadamente* or *puntualmente*, can occur in a sentence, therefore, the semantic and syntactic status is different because they are constrained by the layers of the operator projection.

- (12) a. *Desgraciadamente*, el deslizamiento sucedió *inesperadamente*
 Unfortunately DET slide happen-3PSG.PD unexpectedly
 ‘Unfortunately, the slide happened unexpectedly’
- b. *Afortunadamente*, el ciclista termino *puntualmente* la competencia
 luckily DET cyclist finish-3PSG.PD punctual DET race
 ‘Fortunately, the cyclist finished the race in time’

Finally, examples of the verb form of the different aktionsart classes with fixed adjuncts are given in (13). States in (13a), accomplishment in (13b), achievement in (13c), active accomplishment in (13d) and activity in (13e).

- (13) a. La propuesta final permanece *en la mesa de negociaciones*
 DET proposal final remain-3PSG.PR on DET table of negotiation
 ‘The final proposal is still on the negotiation table’
- b. Se desarrolló *completamente* el proyecto de investigación
 CL.PV=develop-3PSG.PD completely DET project of investigation
 ‘The investigation was fully completed’

- c. Otra amenaza ocurrió a las 10:39
 another threat occur-3PSG.PD at 10:39
 ‘Another threat occurred at 10:39’
- d. Los atletas se dirigen a la meta
 DET athletes CL.PRN=go-3PPL.PR to goal
 ‘The athletes head toward the goal’
- e. *En la película* actuaba Orson Welles
 in DET movie act-3PSG.CO Orson Welles
 ‘Orson Welles acted in the movie’

In general sense, these verb classes may appear with temporal, manner, place, aspectual and locative fixed adjuncts. In intransitive form, these verbs can’t appear in a sentence without a fixed adjunct. Each predicate can take a fixed adjunct according to their meaning. Here, the main point is that the verb necessarily subcategorizes a fixed adjunct as a complement.

So far, the semantic and syntactic features of fixed adjuncts have been shown. Hereafter, I am going to argue why this adjunct must not be represented on the clause margin. It isn’t an optional modifier of the core. So, the clause consists of the core with its arguments and its fixed adjuncts.

The Role and Reference Grammar (RRG) notion of clause structure is called ‘the layered structure of the clause’ and it is based on two fundamental contrasts: between the predicate and non-predicating elements, on the one hand, and among the non-predicating elements, between arguments and non-arguments, on the other. From this point of view, the primary constituent of the clause is the ‘nucleus’, which contains the predicate, the ‘core’, which contains the nucleus and the arguments of the predicate, and a ‘periphery’, which subsumes non-arguments of the predicate (Van Valin 2005:4). Since the adjunct group is very heterogeneous and this doesn’t have the same syntactic or semantic status, I consider that core subsumes not only nucleus and arguments but also the fixed adjunct.

Since their syntactic status is different from direct object, indirect object or prepositional complements, fixed adjuncts do not constitute themselves as arguments of a verb. Nevertheless, these syntactic units are demanded by the lexical features of the nuclear verb, i.e., despite their non-argument status, fixed adjuncts are obligatory units of the core

instead of peripheral elements. Furthermore, these have a particular status which is different both the arguments such as the peripheral adjuncts. All fixed adjuncts' features are coded in a set of grammatical constituents, such as prepositional phrase, bare-NP adverbs, adjunct subordinate clause and lexical adverbs.

The RRG conception of the layer structure of the clause is thus a semantic based theory of non-relational syntactic structure; In other words, the fundamental units in the hierarchical organization of sentence and clause are semantically motivated by contrast between predicate and argument on the one hand, and that between XPs, i.e NPs and PPs, which are related to the predicate and those which are not, on the other (Van Valin 2005:8). In this way, the verbs which demand fixed adjuncts select complements which are notionally easily encoded as peripherals or peripheral adjuncts complement. Prepositional phrases and bare-NP adverbs are treated as units which refer to concepts such as place, temporality, manner, mood, instrument, etc. These constituents are usually seen as external elements to the subcategorization, but this is due to a more logical semantic than syntactic use.

Fixed adjuncts do not have the status of the syntactic core arguments, as in (14a), nor core adjunct-argument, as in (14b), nor oblique core argument, as in (14c), nor core movement verbs argument which are appositionally marked, as in (14d); but semantically the fixed adjuncts status is similar to all these syntactic units, because these fixed adjuncts are subcategorized by the verb.

- (14). a. Juan golpeó la ventana
 Juan hit-3PSG.PD DET window
 'Juan hit the window'
- b. José puso el libro en la mesa
 José put-3PSG.PD DET book on DET table
 'Jose put the book on the table'
- c. Rosa le da el libro a Juan
 Rosa CL.DAT.3PSG=give-3PSG.PR DET book to Juan
 'Rose is giving the book to Juan.'

- d. Juan fue a la casa de Luisa
 ...Juan go-3PSG.PD to DET house of Luisa
 ‘Juan went to Luisa’s house’

The direct object argument, as in (14a), may be replaced by a fixed adjunct in a simple sentence, as in *Juan golpeó certeramente* ‘Juan hit accurately’, this means that semantically arguments and fixed adjunct are similar because the predicate needs a unit as a complement. The same occurs with predicative adpositions, for the reason that they function like predicates since they contribute substantive semantic information to the clause (in which they occur), in terms of their own meaning and of the meaning of the argument that they govern. An example of a predicative adposition is a peripheral core locative (setting) preposition (Van Valin 2005: 21), as in (15).

- (15) a. Juan limpió el carro después del trabajo
 Juan clean-3PSG.PD DET car after DET work
 ‘John cleaned the car after work.’
 b. **be-after**’ (work,[[**do**’ (Juan, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **cleaned**’ (car)])]

On the other hand, fixed adjuncts also contribute substantive semantic information to the clause. They denote different meanings and their basic role is setting the verb’s sense on specific communicative context, as in (16). In the logical structure the argument and predicate are modify according to a temporal or spatial referential point. This is, in this representation the logical structure of the event is treated as an entity being located with respect to a special or temporal reference point, on the one hand, or an entity modified by a manner adjunct, on the other.

- (16) a. Los alumnos conviven *armoniosamente / diariamente / en la ciudad*
 DET students coexist-3PPL.PR harmoniously daily in DET city
 ‘The students hang out together harmoniously / daily/ in the city’
 b. **be-in** (city [**harmoniously**’/**daily**’ (do’ (students, [**coexist**’ (students))]))]

The predicative prepositional phrase, in (16), *en la ciudad* ‘in the city’, may appear, in the same clause, with a manner or temporal adjunct. This peripheral phrase typically takes the logical structure of the core as their argument. It takes a core in their scope, however, this grammatical unit may appear as fix adjunct, as *los alumnos conviven en la ciudad*, ‘the students hang out together in the city’, given their meaning, its semantic status causes that this constituent will be obligatory and not optional. About this point, Van Valin (1997), Van Valin (2005) and Ibáñez (2009) have argued that this kind of prepositional phrase has an argument status if they occur typically with motion, creation or consumption verbs. From the perspective of this paper it is not possible yet to argue about their argument syntactic status. Up to this point, it is just feasible to say that this grammatical units occur as fixed adjuncts.

There is one more type of predicative PP which is also semantically related to fixed adjuncts. This is the argument-adjunct PP of the core, as in (17a). The PP can mark an argument of the verb and contribute its semantics to the clause. A verb like *poner* ‘put’ requires a locative expression, but the choice of locative preposition is not determined by the verb (Van Valin 2005:23) as in *Yolanda puso el libro en/ sobre/ junto/ detrás/ encima/ bajo de la caja* ‘Yolanda puts the book in / on / next to / behind / on top of / under the box’. This grammatical behavior is similar with fixed adjuncts, as in (17a). The PP contributes its semantic meaning to the clause. The nuclear verb requires a temporal expression and the choice of the temporal preposition is not determined by the verb, as *el accidente se produjo en / durante / hacia / hasta / por el mes de marzo* ‘the accident happened in / during / *towards / *until / * by the month of March’, in (17b) on opposite way to (17a), the PP doesn’t mark the verb argument, here it is basically a grammatical constituent which contribute its semantic meaning to the clause.

- (17) a. Yolanda puso el libro en la caja
 Yolanda put-3PSG.PD DET book in DET box
 ‘Yolanda puts the book in the box’
 a’. ([do’ (Yolanda, ∅) CAUSE [BECOME **be-in**’ (box, book)])

- b. El accidente se produjo en el mes de marzo
 DET accident CL.VP=occur-3PSG.PD in DET month of march
 ‘The accident occurred in the month of March.’
 b’. BECOME (**be-in**’(March (**occured**’ (accident)))

In English, a verb like *put* does not always take three arguments; if it combines with an intransitive preposition as *down*, the result is a two-argument core, e.g. *Yolanda put the book down* ([**do**’ (Yolanda, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **be-down**’ (book)]). The preposition lacks an object but is linked to the third argument position in the core. These intransitive prepositions can fill core slots (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997: 160 and Van Valin 2005:142). The argument reduction in verbs like *put* is similar in Spanish, but instance of intransitive preposition a fixed adjunct fill the core slots, as *Yolanda puso el libro allá* ([**do**’ (Yolanda, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **be-loc**’ (book)]).

So far, semantic similarities existing between fixed adjuncts and core arguments have been presented. Fixed adjuncts are essential constituent in the semantic configuration of the clause where they occur in spite of, noticeably, having not the same syntactic status as core arguments. Farther, in the same way as core arguments correlate with the semantic structure of the core, fixed adjuncts do.

Now I am going to present a short contrast between free and fixed adjuncts. As it has already been said in other studies, for example Van Valin & LaPolla (1997:162), adverbs, in this presentation, free adjuncts, are not restricted to the periphery and may modify any layer of the clause. Semantically, Van Valin & LaPolla treat them as one-place predicates which take a logical structure or subpart of a logical structure as their argument. The peripheral bare NP adverbs like *mañana* ‘tomorrow’ or *ayer* ‘yesterday’, as in (18), take the logical structure of the core as their argument.

- (18) a. Rosa baked a cake yesterday.
 b. **yesterday**’ ([**do**’ (Rosa, Ø)] CAUSE [BECOME **baked**’ (cake)])

When a predicative prepositional phrase function as adjunct modifiers, they take the logical structure of the main verb as one of their argument, as in (19) Van Valin (2005-49)

- (19) a. Rosa corre en el parque
 Rosa run-3PSG.PR on DET park
 ‘Rosa runs in the park’
 b. **be-in’ (park’, [do’ (Rosa, [run’ (Rosa)])])**

In (19), Rosa’s running takes place in the park, and the logical structure of the predicative preposition *in* is the highest predicative in the logical structure; it takes *en el parque* ‘in the park’ and the logical structure for *correr* ‘run’ as its two arguments. This contrasts with the logical structure of the active accomplishment, as in (20), where the prepositional phrase expresses the location of the reference of *Rosa*, not the location of the event of *running*, and in this example the prepositional phrase is an argument-adjunct.

- (20) a. Ana ran to the park
 b. **(do’ (ana, [run’ (Ana)]) & INGR be-at’ (park, Ana))**

Manner adjuncts modify primary activity predicate, while place adjuncts can modify any kind of durational predicate, as in (21a). Aspectual adjuncts modify the basic state or activity predicate, as in (21b), Van Valin (2005:49).

- (21) a. Pedro elegantly closed the door slowly
 a’. **[elegant’ (do’(Pedro, ∅))] CAUSE [slow’ (BECOME closed’ (door))]**
 b. The ice melted completely
 b’. **BECOME (complete’ (melted’ (ice)))**

This Van Valin’s description of adverbs and adpositions is important because the form of the fixed adjuncts may be a prepositional phrase, a bare-NP adverb or a lexical adverb. Fixed adjuncts always occur in clauses with one argument, the argument and the nuclear verb of the core don’t express the full meaning by themselves. As shown before, they may combine with quite diverse aktionsart verb classes, as in (22). Hence, the meaning of the fixed adjunct modifying the verb is semantically correlated with core units.

- (22) a. El paro duró *una semana*
 DET strike last-3PSG.PD one week
 ‘The strike lasted one week’
 a’. BECOME (**lasted**’ (**one week**’ (the strike)))
- b. El niño se comporta *mal*
 DET child CL.PRN=behave-3PSG.PR bad
 ‘The child misbehaves’
 b’. (**do**’ (children, [(**behave**’ (**badly**’ (children))])) V y L (105)
- c. El feto se desarrolló *completamente*
 DET fetus CL.RF=develop-3PSG.PD completely
 ‘The fetus developed completely’
 c’ BECOME (**developed**’ (**complete**’ (fetus)))
- d. Ese secuestro sucedió *hoy*
 DET kidnapping occur-3PSG.PD today
 ‘That kidnapping happened today’
 d’ INGR (**occur**’ (**today**’ (kidnapping)))

Temporal fixed adjuncts, as in (22a) y (22d), manner, as in (22b), aspectual, as in (22c) primary modify predicate; they take a specific position in the logical structure. Like adverbs (free adjuncts) are represented in logical structure as one-place predicates, which modify different parts of a logical structure. Fixed adjuncts in the logical structure occur over the aktionsart scope operator, because they modify any layer of the clause, nucleus or core, and it is a basic constituent of the verb. In a clause, as in (23), two peripheral adjuncts may occur, anyone of them by exclusion has the possibility to become a fixed adjunct, as in *hoy sucedió un secuestro* ‘the kidnapping occurred today’ or *inexplicablemente sucedió un secuestro* ‘The kidnapping occurred inexplicably’.

- (23) a. Hoy inexplicablemente sucedió un secuestro
 Today inexplicably occur-3PSG.PD DET kidnapping
 ‘Today, inexplicably a kidnapping occurred’
 b. **today**’ (INGR (**occured**’ (**inexplicable**’ (kidnapping))))

If there are multiple adjuncts, fixed or free (peripheral), they are layered, with the last one represented as the highest predicate, as in (23). They are represented in the logical structure like one-place predicate, *today* takes the logical structure of the core as their argument and *inexplicably* modifies any achievement or accomplishment logical structure. The last one is over INGR scope and it modifies the nuclear verb. This fixed manner adjunct would be represented as a constituent of the core in the constituent projection and as a modifier of the core in the operator projection. This point will be explained deeply in another study.

Finally, peripheral adjuncts are not restricted to the periphery and may modify any layer of the clause, but fixed adjuncts may be represented like constituents of the core. Van Valin & LaPolla (1997) have described the peripheral adjuncts as one-place predicates which take a logical structure or subpart of a logical structure as their argument. I have decided to place fixed adjuncts as grammatical units which modify the logical structure. The fixed adjuncts' scope depends on its semantic features, for example, NP bare adverbs take the logical structure, temporal adjuncts take scope over the core, manner adjuncts modify activity logical structure, place adjuncts modify any durative or dynamic logical structure, and aspectual adjuncts are modifiers of the basic state or activity predicates themselves (Van Valin & LaPolla 1997); besides the fixed adjuncts complete the nuclear verb meaning.

Here, I still have not presented the way how fixed adjuncts are related with the operators projection. Given their meaning, they should be represented not only in the logical structure but also in the operator projection. This is to say, they will be represented in both constituent and operator projections; in the constituent projection, they will be treated as constituents of the core, they occupy a special syntactic position, and their scope of modification will be represented in the operator projection.

ABBREVIATIONS

AUX auxiliar, CL clitic, CO copreterit, COP copula, DAT dative, DET determinant, GD gerund, IM impersonal, MV middle voice, NEG negation, P person, PD past, PL plural, PP participle, PR present, PS possessive, PRN pronominal, PT participle, PV passive voice, RF reflexive, SG singular

REFERENCE

- Cinque, G. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ernst, T. 2002. *The syntax of adjuncts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hernanz, M. L and J. Brucart. 1987. *La sintaxis. Principios teóricos. La oración simple*. Barcelona: Editorial Crítica.
- Goldberg, A. and F. Ackerman. 2001. "The pragmatics of obligatory adjuncts". *Language*. 77, 4. 798-84.
- Grimshaw, J. and S. Vikner 1993. 'Obligatory Adjuncts and the Structure of Events'. In *Knowledge and Language, Vol. II: Lexical and Conceptual Structure* E. Reuland and A. Werner (eds.). Kluwer: Dordrecht, pp. 145-159.
- Grimshaw, J. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: THE MIT Press
- Ibáñez, S. 2005. *Los verbos de movimiento intransitivos del español. Una aproximación léxico-sintáctica*. México: INAH-UNAM.
- Ibáñez S. 2009. "Prepositional phrases. A case study from Spanish Studies in Role and Reference Grammar" In *Studies in Role and Reference Grammar*. L. Guerrero, S. Ibáñez and V. Belloro (eds.). México: Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México.
- Jolly, J. A. 1993. "Preposition Assignment in English". In *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*. R. Van Valin (ed.). Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins: 275-310.
- Larson, R. 1985. 'Bare-NP Adverbs'. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16, 595-621.
- Mora Bustos, A. 2008. *La transitividad en construcciones subordinadas introducidas por "que"*. Alemania: LINCOM EUROPA.
- Rodríguez Ramalle, M. T. 2003. *La gramática de los adverbios en -mente*. Madrid: Universidad Autónoma de Madrid.
- Van Valin, R. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax and Semantic Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, R. 2001. *An introduction to syntax*. Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, R. and R. LaPolla 1997. *Syntax. Structure, meaning, and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.