

## *Arguments, adjuncts and PP types in Spanish*

2009 International Conference on Role and Reference Grammar, University of California at Berkeley, August 7 2009, Berkeley, CA.

Sergio Ibáñez Cerda

[cecser@prodigy.net.mx](mailto:cecser@prodigy.net.mx) / [sergioimx@yahoo.com.mx](mailto:sergioimx@yahoo.com.mx)

### I. INTRODUCTION

- Three types of PPs in RRG (Jolly, 1993; Valin & LaPolla, 1997; Van Valin, 2005): 1) PPs introduced by predicative prepositions, which functions as peripheral modifiers of the clause (i.e. adjuncts); 2) PPs introduced by non-predicative prepositions, which mark a verbal argument (i.e. oblique core arguments); 3) PPs introduced by a predicative preposition, which, nevertheless, mark a verbal argument (i.e. argument-adjuncts in the core):

- (1) a. *John walks everyday **in the park**.*
- b. *Peter gave the book **to Mary**.*
- c. *Leslie put the book **in /on behind / under the box**.*

- Main goal of this work: To outline a more fine-grained characterization of PP functions in terms of three main features: a) the semantic nature of the participant they code (+/- argument), b) the syntactic behavior they have (+/- core) and c) the nature of their prepositions (+/- predicative).

- The combination of features yields a system of 8 logical PP types, which are exemplified with data from Spanish.

### II. DISTINGUISHING THE SEMANTICS AND SYNTAX OF ARGUMENT STRUCTURE

#### 2.1 A semiotic frame for the definition of the notion of argument.

- The concepts of argument and adjunct have been treated as syntactic notions by most theories and have been used in a very reductive way (argument: what is obligatorily emitted/coded for the grammaticality of a sentence).

- In contrast, RRG takes lexical semantics as a starting point for the analysis of the clause. Two fundamental contrasts: 1) Between the predicate and non-predicating elements; 2) an among the non-predicating elements, between arguments and non-arguments. The concept of argument is treated like a semantic notion. It has a syntactic correlation in the notion of core participants.

-Within this general frame, I propose that the notion of argument has to be maintained as a pure semantic one, but in a broad semiotic context, in which:

- a) Language is a communication mean and an interaction artifact.
- b) Communication is an interactive process, which goal is the cooperation among the members of a community.
- c) Cooperation takes place to satisfy the biological, psychological, cultural and social needs of the members of the community.
- d) Communicate implies to share projective and retrospective common representations about reality.

e) These shared representations are founded in cognitive and sensory-motor schemas or frames (Arbib, 1987; Cervantes-Pérez, 1985) about states of affairs (situations, events, actions, processes, etc.) that are relevant for a community.

f) Cognitive schemes are the basis for the elaboration and use of the linguistic schemas that we use in the dialogical construction of concrete instances of such representations.

g) The clause is the basic linguistic artifact for the representation of state of affairs and the communication of these representations.

h) The clause is a dialogic construction between the two interlocutors; it is the result of the emission and interpreting processes. It is a shared construct.

- In this context, the status of a participant as argument or adjunct is a function of the semantics of the verb, regardless of its syntactic properties in a particular clause. An argument is a semantic feature that plays its role in the interpreting of that sentence. It is use by the interpreter and the speaker in the communication process, to construct a shared mental representation of the denoted state of affairs. If it is not explicitly coded, then it has to be found in the context.

#### 2.2. The core status of a participant

- The core status is defined by the presence of privileged syntactic properties: obligatory syntactic coding, privileged word order, controller and pivot functions, morphological unmarked coding, etc (i.e. PSA properties in RRG terms).

- In RRG (Van Valin, 2005), *controller*: the syntactic element that in a given sentence controls the reference of an omitted element in a coordinated or a subordinate clause; *pivot*: function that bears the omitted element.

- It is important to consider that the PSA functions can be split among the various arguments in the clause.

- By considering in a separate way the syntactic and semantic status of a participant, is possible to expect that not all of the arguments of a predicate have to be in the core in all the constructional options of that predicate. Clearly, this is the case in PSA modulation constructions (as passive, in a language like English):

- There are other types of arguments that are not always coded as core participants:

- (2) a. *Pedro habló con María (**en Francés**)*  
      ‘Pedro talked to María in French’
- b. *Mauricio le declaró su amor a Tere (**con un gesto**)*  
      ‘Mauricio declared his love to Teresa with a gesture’
- c. *Pedro habla **francés** perfectamente*  
      ‘Pedro speaks French perfectly’
- d. ***El gesto** del hombre lo declaró todo*  
      ‘The man’s gesture declare it all’

- PPs in (2a) and (2b) are participants that belong to an enhanced frame that defines the argument structure of saying verbs (Ibáñez, 2008). In these examples, they are not syntactically obligatory and they are likely to be peripheral participants, that is, arguments in the periphery.

- But they can be coded as subject and direct object in other direct constructions, as in (2c) and (2d), and in these cases, they are (oblique) core arguments.

- All the same way, not all adjuncts must be in the periphery; they can be in the core (see Mora's paper for this same conference). This is the case of some manner, temporal and locative PPs as the ones in (3):

- (3) a. *La mujer viste con elegancia*  
 'The woman dresses with elegance'  
 b. *María actuó en el momento adecuado*  
 'María acted in the right moment'  
 c. *El Puente fue construido en el lado este de la ciudad*  
 'The bridge was built in the east side of the city'  
 d. \**La mujer viste*  
 'The woman dresses'  
 e. \**María actuó*  
 'María acted'  
 f. \**El Puente fue construido*  
 'The bridge was built'

- These PPs are syntactically obligatory. They are in the core.  
 - To sum up: the argument status and the core status of a participant are independent. The only obligatory syntactic value of a verbal participant is the possibility of being coded in the core, at least in one of the constructional options of that verb (its diathesis).

### III. AN ENHANCED DESCRIPTIVE SYSTEM OF PP TYPES

- Additionally RRG uses the distinction between predicative prepositions and non-predicative prepositions (Jolly, 1993): the former licenses adjuncts in a clause; the later marks a verbal argument.  
 - The combination of categorial, semantic and syntactic features yields a system of 8 logical types of PPs: (+/- argument), (+/- core), (+/- predicative).  
 - The combination of features gives us the next set of possibilities:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. (+) Argument<br>(+) Core<br>(-) Predicative preposition | 2. (-) Argument<br>(-) Core<br>(+) predicative preposition |
| 3. (+) Argument<br>(+) Core<br>(+) Predicative preposition | 4. (+) Argument<br>(-) Core<br>(-) Predicative preposition |
| 5. (+) Argument<br>(-) Core<br>(+) Predicative preposition | 6. (-) Argument<br>(+) Core<br>(+) Predicative preposition |
| 7. (-) Argument<br>(+) Core<br>(-) Predicative preposition | 8. (-) Argument<br>(-) Core<br>(-) Predicative preposition |

The last one is ruled out for functional reasons.

#### 3.1. Oblique core argument

(+) Argument, (+) Core, (-) predicative preposition

- These are canonical oblique core arguments in RRG terms. Clearer example (Van Valin, 2005), recipient argument of transference verbs in languages like English:

- (4) *Tony gave the book to Peter*

The dative arguments in Spanish are kind of different: they can be, and usually are, duplicated by a kind of agreement mark, namely the clitic *le*:

- (5) a. *Luisa le dio el libro a Rogelio*  
 'Luisa gave the book to Rogelio'  
 b. *Luisa les dijo la noticia a sus hermanos*  
 'Luisa told the notice to his brothers'

- They can be seen as a type of direct core argument (Belloro, 2007),  
 - Other examples of OCA in Spanish are goal and source arguments of intransitive verbs of motion and the goal of change of place verbs (Ibáñez, 2005, 2009):

- (6) a. *Juan fue al cine*  
 'John went to the movies'  
 b. *Tere salió de la ciudad*  
 'Teresa went out of the city'  
 c. *Adriana puso el vaso en la mesa*  
 'Adriana put the glass on the table'

- 1) They are semantically required: 2) they are 'optional', but they strongly tend to be coded (70% to 90% of cases); 3) they can control pivots in coordinated clauses and in non-finite final subordinate clauses; and 4) they are more frequently coded with their canonical prepositions: *de*, with source verbs as *salir* 'to get out'; *a* with goal verbs as *ir* 'to go', and *en* with change of place verbs as *poner*; 5) these prepositions are predictable from the LS of these predicates (see Ibáñez 2009).  
 - Other examples of OCA: *suplementos* (Alarcos, 1968, et. al.):

- (7) a. *Juan carece de oportunidades.*  
 'John lacks opportunities'  
 b. *Juan aspira a un buen empleo.*  
 'John aspires to a good job'  
 c. \**Juan carece.*  
 'John lacks'  
 b. \**Juan aspira.*  
 'John aspires.'

#### 3.2. Peripheral adjuncts

(-) Argument

(-) Core

(+) Predicative preposition

These are the canonical peripheral clause participants. Clearer example, temporal and locative setting PPs:

- (8) a. *John baked a cake after work*  
 b. *John baked a cake in the kitchen*

It's pretty much the same in Spanish. Examples: in (9c) and (9d) show that these PPs cannot function as controllers,

- (9) a. *Marta corría en el parque para ejercitarse*  
 'John ran in the park for exercise'  
 b. *Julia cenó en la sala*  
 'Julia had dinner in the leaving room'  
 c. *Juan<sub>i</sub> cenó en la sala nueva<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>\*j</sub> se ve bien*  
 'John had dinner in the new living room and (he/it) looks nice'  
 d. *Juan<sub>i</sub> corría en el parque<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>\*j</sub> se veía bien*  
 'John ran in the park and (he/it) looked nice'

### 3.3. Argument-adjunct in the core

- (+) Argument
- (+) Core
- (+) Predicative preposition

- These are the standard case of AAC in RRG (Van Valin, 2005).
- Examples in Spanish are goal PPs of motion and change of place verbs, but only when they are introduced by non-canonical prepositions (Ibáñez, 2009).
- The non-canonical prepositions add a semantic specification to the referent of the argument, but this and the preposition variability are lexical features of the predicate.
- Besides, these PPs can function as controllers of pivot; they are in the core.

- (10) a. *En la mañana, Juan<sub>i</sub> fue para la casa nueva<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>j</sub> se veía bien.*  
 'In the morning, John went to the new house and (he/it) looked nice.'  
 b. *Juan<sub>i</sub> puso un pez<sub>h</sub> dentro de la pecera nueva<sub>j</sub> y <sub>\*i</sub>/<sub>h</sub> /<sub>j</sub> se ve bien.*  
 'John put a fish inside the new fish bowl and (it) looks good.'

### 3.4. Argument in the periphery

- (+) Argument
- (-) Core
- (-) Predicative preposition

- Clearest case: the agent PP of passive construction in languages like English,
- Examples in Spanish, which doesn't involve a voice process:

- (11) a. *Mauricio le declaró su amor a Tere (con un gesto)*  
 'Mauricio declared his love to Teresa with a gesture'  
 b. *El gesto del hombre lo declaró todo*  
 'The man's gesture declare it all'

- These PPs are clearly optional, but they code participants that are lexically required, as it is shown by the fact that they can be coded in core functions, as in (12c) and (12d).
- Other example: locative arguments of 'two theme' verbs (Ibáñez, 2008):

- (12) a. *El presidente reunió a los gobernadores con los alcaldes (en el salón principal)*

- 'The president gathered the gubernators with the mayors in main hall'  
 b. *El presidente reunió a los gobernadores y a los alcaldes (en el salón principal)*  
 'The president gathered the gubernators and the mayors in main hall'  
 c. *El salón principal reúne a los gobernadores y a los alcaldes*  
 'The main hall gathers the gubernators and the mayors'

The locative of these verbs (as *juntar*, *agrupar*, *incluir* etc) can be coded as subject – (12c)- or as a PP introduced by *en*, as it is expected from the LS of *reunir* -something like “[do'(w, Ø)] CAUSE [INGR **be.at'**(z, [**be.together'** (x,y)]]”-, It is a peripheral argument: it is syntactically optional and cannot function as controller:

- (13) *El presidente<sub>i</sub> reunió a los gobernadores con los alcaldes en el salón principal<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>\*j</sub> se veía bien*  
 'The president gathered the gubernators with the mayors in main hall and (he/it) looked nice'

### 3.5. Argument-adjunct in the periphery

- (+) Argument
- (-) Core
- (+) Predicative preposition

- This type of PP codes an argument introduced by a predicative, non-canonical, preposition, with no core properties (they are different from AAC; 3.3, above):

- (14) a. *Israel<sub>i</sub> llegó al edificio<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>j</sub> estaba sucio*  
 'Israel arrived at the building and (he/it) was dirty'  
 b. *Julio<sub>i</sub> llegó hasta el edificio<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>j</sub> estaba sucio*  
 'Julio arrived at the building and (he/it) was dirty'  
 c. *Lola<sub>i</sub> salió a la calle<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>j</sub> estaba sucia*  
 'Lola went out to the street and (she/it) was dirty'  
 d. *Marisa<sub>i</sub> salió para la cabaña<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>\*j</sub> estaba sucia*  
 'Marisa went out to go to the cabin and (she/it) was dirty'  
 e. *Ramón<sub>i</sub> partió al bosque<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>j</sub> estaba sucio*  
 'Ramón left for the woods and (he/it) was dirty'  
 f. *Toño<sub>i</sub> partió para el bosque<sub>j</sub> y <sub>i</sub>/<sub>\*j</sub> estaba sucio*  
 'Toño left to the wood and (he/it) was dirty'

- (14ab) have a predicate that inherently requires and focalize a goal argument. In both cases, with canonical and non-canonical prepositions, the PP is in the core.

- PPs in (14e) can be core arguments (Ibáñez 2005), with *salir* and *partir*, even though these verbs focalize a source. But, if the PP is coded with non-canonical prepositions (14df), they cannot have core functions.

### 3.6. Adjuncts in the core.

- (-) Argument
- (+) Core
- (+) Predicative preposition

- This PP type implies the coding in the core of an adjunct participant. This is the case of some manner, temporal and locative PPs as the ones in (3), repeated here as (15):

- (15) a. *La mujer viste con elegancia*  
 ‘The woman dresses with elegance’  
 b. *El Puente fue construido en el lado este de la ciudad*  
 ‘The bridge was built in the east side of the city’  
 c. \**La mujer viste*  
 ‘The woman dresses’  
 d. \**El Puente fue construido*  
 ‘The bridge was built’

- These PPs are syntactically obligatory. Besides, they have movement restrictions - (16bc)-, that peripheral adjuncts don’t have - (16d-f)- (Mora, 2009).

- (16) a. *Con elegancia viste la mujer*  
 ‘The woman dresses with elegance’  
 b. ??*Con elegancia la mujer viste*  
 ‘The woman dresses with elegance’  
 c. ?? *La mujer con elegancia viste*  
 ‘The woman dresses with elegance’  
 d. *Pedro se afeita cuidadosamente*  
 ‘Peter shaves carefully’  
 e. *Cuidadosamente Pedro se afeita*  
 ‘Peter shaves carefully’  
 f. *Pedro cuidadosamente se afeita*  
 ‘Peter shaves carefully’

- Other diagnostics for establishing core status of these PPs are negation scope and extraction possibility (Mora, 2009).

- Important. They are not lexically required. Either 1) two place predicates syntactically need a two XP template, or 2) those PP are imposed by pragmatic conditions –like informative relevance- (Goldberg and Ackerman, 2001).

### 3.7. Adjuncts-arguments in the core

(-) Argument

(+) Core

(-) Predicative preposition

- 2 types of dative construction in Spanish (Gutiérrez Ordóñez, 1999; Demonte, 1994): 1) one with semantically required recipient PPs (core arguments) - (17a-b)-; and 2) one with PPs that code participants that are not inherently arguments of the verbs -(17c-d)-:

- (17) a. *Susana (le) dio un regalo a María*  
 ‘Susana gave a gift to María’  
 b. *Dulce (le) ofreció un vaso de vino a Julio*  
 ‘Dulce offered a glass of wine to Julio’

- c. *Mario le pintó la casa a Rosa*  
 ‘Mario painted Rosa’s house’  
 d. *Ramiro le trabajó dos años al Sr. Rodríguez*  
 ‘Ramiro worked for Mr. Rodríguez Turing two years’  
 e. \**Mario pintó la casa a Rosa*  
 ‘Mario painted Rosa’s house’  
 d. \**Ramiro trabajó dos años al Sr. Rodríguez*  
 ‘Ramiro worked for Mr. Rodríguez Turing two years’

- In the first construction the presence of clitic *le* is optional. In the second one, the clitic is obligatory. However, both PP types have core behavior:

- (18) a. *Juan<sub>i</sub> dio un libro a Pedro<sub>j</sub> para <sub>-j</sub> leer*  
 ‘John gave a book to Peter to read.’  
 b. *Juan<sub>i</sub> le hizo un traje a Pedro<sub>j</sub> para <sub>-j</sub> usar en la fiesta*  
 ‘John made Peter a suit to wear it at the party.’

- Ibáñez (2003) argues that (17cd) exemplify a kind of applicative construction: a semantic adjunct is being introduced as a core participant by means of the clitic *le*. The PP is an adjunct in the core; but its preposition *a* is non-predicative, it’s imposed by the argument modulation constructional scheme. The PP is an adjunct-argument in the core.

References:

- Arbib, A. M. (1987). *From Schema Theory to Language*, Oxford University Press: Oxford-New York.
- Belloro, V. 2007. *Spanish Clitic Doubling. A Study of the Syntax-Pragmatics Interface*, Unpublished PhD Dissertation, University of New York at Buffalo.
- Cervantes-Pérez, F. (1985). “Modelling and Analysis of neural networks in the visuomotor system of anura amphibia”, en *COINS Tech Rep 85-27*, MA: University of Mass. At Amherst.
- Demonte, V. 1994. “La ditransitividad en español; léxico y sintaxis”, in Demonte, V. (ed.) *Gramática del español*, México: El Colegio de México, pp. 431-470.
- Goldberg, A. and F. Ackerman. 2001. The pragmatics of obligatory adjuncts”, *Language*.
- Gutiérrez, S. 1999 “Los dativos”, in Bosque, I. y V. Demonte (eds.) *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*, Madrid: Espasa-Calpe, pp. 1855-1928.
- Ibáñez, S. 2009. “Some functions of prepositional phrases in Spanish”, en L. Guerrero, S. Ibáñez y V. Belloro (eds.) *Studies in Role and Referente Grammar*. México: IIFL, UNAM.
- Ibáñez, S. (2008). “Saying verbs. Deepening the lexical semantics”, in *Investigations on the Syntax-Semantics-Pragmatics Interface*, New York: John Benjamins, pp. 3-21
- Ibáñez, S. (2006). “Verbos de objetos simétricos en español” en A. Viguera (coor.) *Jornadas Filológicas 2004. Memoria*. México: IIFL-UNAM.
- Ibáñez, S. (2005). *Los verbos de movimiento intransitivos del español. Una aproximación léxico-sintáctica*, México: INAH-UNAM.
- Ibáñez, S. (2003). “Introduciendo participantes en la estructura argumental: el caso del clítico *le* del español” en *Actas del XIII congreso Internacional de ALFAL*. San José: Universidad de Costa Rica. (versión en CD).
- Jolly, J. A. 1993. “Preposition assignment in English”, in R. Van Valin (ed.) *Advances in Role and Reference Grammar*, pp 275-310, Amsterdam-Philadelphia: Benjamins.
- Mora-Bustos, A. 2009. *Fixed adjuncts*. Paper presented during the 2009 International Conference on RRG, august 2009, Berkeley, CA.
- Tesnière, L. (1959). *Elementos de sintaxis estructural*, Edición de 1979, Madrid: Gredos.
- Van Valin, R. and LaPolla, R. J. 1997. *Syntax, Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Van Valin, R. 2005. *Exploring the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

