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1. Introduction

1.1. The problem

In Cornilescu (1998) it is remarked that DPs that are [+Animate/Personal] and have only <e>-type denotations, excluding the property reading, may not occur in reflexive passive sentences (1a), while they may occur in copula-passives (1b). Nominals which may be interpreted as generalised quantifiers or as properties are not subject to this restriction (1c).

(1)  a. *S-a adus Ion / el la judecată
    SE=has brought Ion he to trial
    b. Ion / el a fost adus la judecată
       John he has been brought to trial
       “John has been brought to trial”
    c. S-au adus cămăși /
       SE=have brought shirts
       S-au adus deja cămășile
       SE=have brought already shirts.DEF
       “(The) shirts have been already brought”
Old Romanian\(^1\) (c. 16-18) and earlier stages of Modern Romanian (c. 19 – present day) are not subject to this constraint. Here are a few examples from the *Treatise on the History of Romanian* (Zafiu 2012:322) from the beginning of the 19\(^{th}\) c. in which <e>-type DPs do appear in reflexive passive constructions (2a-d); (2e-g) show that there is no restriction on the denotation of definite DP subjects in this period.

(2) a. **domnul** Alexandru Scarlat Ghica Voievod
(...), mister.DEF Alexander Scarlat Ghica Voivod
carele s-au luat de muscali din scaunul
who SE=has taken by Russians from city
Bucureştilor (Dionisie Eclisiarhu)
Bucharest.GEN
“Voivod Alexandru Scarlat Ghica was taken away by the Russians from the leadership of Bucharest”

b. acolo s-au omorât preaslăvitul domn Mihai-
there SE=has killed glorified.DEF ruller Mihai-
voivodă Viteazul (D. Golescu)
voivod Brave.DEF
“The glorified voivod Mihai The Brave was killed there”

c. **Coconiţa** Drăgana s-a crescut cu bună
lady Drăgana SE=has raised with good
ducaţioane la părinţii dumneaei (Heliade Rădulescu)
education at parents her
“Lady Drăgana was raised with a good education at her parents”

d. [**pro**] a şi încetat din viaţă, înmormântându-se la
pro has also passed-away burying=SE at
biserica Aubeştii (Aricescu)
church Aubeştii
“he/she also passed way, being buried at church
Aubeştii”

e. s-a biruit craiul cu oştile sale
SE=has defeated ruler.DEF with armies.DEF his
de către muscali (Dionisie Eclisiarhu)
by Russians
“The ruler with his armies was defeated by the
Russians”

f. **cei din Ardeal** ce să hrănesc de stăpânul
the from Ardeal who SE feed by master.DEF

\(^1\) We use the chronology proposed by Ion Gheție (1975:86-87): Old Romanian – 16\(^{th}\)-18\(^{th}\) c.; Modern Romanian – 19\(^{th}\) – present day.
moşiei (D. Golescu)
domain. DEF. GEN
“The ones from Ardeal who are fed by the master of the domain”
g. vreo zidire pentru copii ce să arunc some building for children who SE throw
pe la răspântii (Mumuleanu)
at crossroads
“an establishment for children which are abandoned”

A further difference between earlier stages of Romanian (i.e. Old Romanian and Early Modern Romanian) and Late Modern Romanian (the end of the 19th c. – present day) is that the reflexive-passive is used only in the third person in the latter, while there was no such restriction in the former, as illustrated by the following examples taken from the 19th c. representative grammars (Zafiu 2012:322-323)². First and second person DPs also occurred as Agentive phrases, as they still do (3c).

(3) a. mă învăţ de tatăl
CL.REFL.ACC.1SG teach by father
“I am being taught by my father”
(Heliade-Rădulescu [1828] 1980:149)
b. mă bat eu de către tine
CL.REFL.ACC.1SG beat I by you
“I am beaten by you”
(Iordache Golescu 1840:150)
c. cutare să iubeşte dă către mine
someone SE loves by me
“Someone is loved by me”
(Văcărescu [1787] 1982: 160)

1.2. The goal of the paper is to give an account of this change, identifying the microparameter whose switch has triggered the change. Anticipating the answer, the constraint illustrated in (1) is a type of crossing constraint, which prevents an [Animate/Personal] DP to crossover an Agentive subject, in the spirit of McGinnis’ (2004) lethal ambiguity.

² Some of these quoted grammarians remark that the reflexive passive was in competition with the copula-passive (cf. Zafiu 2012:322-323): cutare iaste iubit de mine “someone is loved by me” (Văcărescu [1787] 1982:160), cf. (3a); sănt iubit de lume “I am loved by the people” (Heliade-Rădulescu [1828] 1980: 149), cf. (3b); sănt bătut “I am beaten” (Iordache Golescu 1840:31), cf. (3c).
The discussion of this constraint requires understanding the syntax of reflexive passive sentences and their domain in Romanian (against the other uses of the clitic SE). The main

2. On SE in Romanian and Romance

2.1. The Heterogeneity Hypothesis

GB theory has chiefly considered reflexives in light of Condition A, essentially adhering to a Homogeneity Hypothesis according to which all reflexives must, at least in certain contexts, be bound by a local antecedent (cf. Reuland 2011), contrasting with pronouns, which were locally free. As noticed a long time ago, the homogeneity hypothesis faces immediate problems in Romance, where 1st and 2nd person pronominal can be both locally bound and free.

(4)  
\begin{align*}  
\text{a. } & \text{Mă văd în oglindă} \\
& \text{CL.ACC.1SG (I)see in mirror} \\
& \text{“I see myself in the mirror”} \\
\text{b. } & \text{Mă vede în oglindă} \\
& \text{CL.ACC.1SG (he/she)sees in mirror} \\
& \text{“(S)he sees me in the mirror”} 
\end{align*}

An important recent paper Déchaine and Wiltschko (2012), examining reflexives from a crosslinguistic perspective, convincingly defends the Heterogeneity Hypothesis which claims that:

(5)  
\textbf{The Heterogeneity Hypothesis}  
\text{Reflexives are both syntactically and semantically heterogeneous.}

Of the several dimensions which may differentiate between reflexive markers, the following are particularly relevant for Romance reflexive clitics, too.

(i) Reflexives differ in their syntactic status: they can be phrasal DPs, clitics, agreement markers, intransitivizers, or bound nouns. The cross-linguistic survey in Déchaine and Wiltschko (2012) shows five types of reflexives, each illustrating one type of projection in the spine of a DP.

(6)  
\text{DP} > \phi \text{P} > \text{Class P} > n \text{P} > \text{NP}

Three of these forms are pronouns in a typology argued for in an earlier paper by the same authors (Déchaine and Wiltschko 2012): pro-
(ii) Reflexives are *multifunctional*. While a marker is reflexive if it may show that two arguments of a predicate are referentially identical, reflexives differ in the pattern of multifunctionality they exhibit: “they may also appear as logophors, reciprocals, middles, inchoatives, medio-reflexives, applicatives, subject/object agreement, adverbializers, numeral classifiers and compounds” (Déchaine and Wiltschko 2012). Indeed, individual reflexives markers may differ across languages in the number of functions they can express, in addition to their “reflexive meaning”, by means of which a form is identified as reflexive.

An important remark in this context is that unlike many other Romance languages, the Romanian SE is not an applicative clitic, since Romanian has *dative reflexive clitics*. The form SE must be taken to be in the accusative.

(7) a. Au admirat tabloul: „Cleopatra (they)have admired painting.DEF Cleopatra dându-şi /*-se moartea” (Rom.)
giving=SE.DAT/*-SE.ACC death.DEF “They have admired the painting ‘Cleopatra dying”

b. Ils ont admiré le tableau « Cléopâtre se donnant la mort » (Fr.)

(iii) Reflexives differ in their syntactic integration in the clause: they may be introduced as DPs, as functional heads/specifiers or as modifiers, external or internal to the VP.

We retain that, according to this description, the same reflexive marker may have different merge positions, depending on its phrasal status and its semantic role.

2.2. Merging Romanian SE

Under the hypothesis that SE/SI merges in different positions in the functional domain of the verb, a natural parameter distinguishing between related languages is represented by the merge positions of SE/SI, in other words, by analogy with the syntax of the verb, the parameter becomes how high SE/SI is (internally or externally) projected.

Anticipating the results of our analysis, Romanian SE will appear to be a *low clitic*, always remaining below the App(licative)P. A correlative morphologic property is that the Romanian reflexive SE is case-valued as an Accusative, while in other Romance languages SE/SI may have its case
feature valued not only as an Accusative, but also as Dative or even Nominative.

These properties of Romanian SE immediately come out by comparing Romanian with Spanish or Italian, two of the languages that apparently exhibit the widest variety of SE/SI uses. Traditionally SE/SI has been viewed as an operator whose domain is the a-structure of the verb: it indicated the coreference of two arguments (the reflexive/anaphoric) use, and/or it “reduces” the verb’s addicity, “binding” and thus eliminating the realization of one argument. Research on situation/ eventuality aspect (inner aspect) has revealed a second range of semantic roles for SE, this approach opening up the possibility of accounting for reflexive/non-reflexive pairs of the same (unaccusative) verb, as well as for cases where SE/SI is not part of the verb’s a-structure. Expectedly, even when SE/SI has an aspectual role, its presence in the vP also has syntactic consequences. At the same time, event structure is related to a-structure, since arguments identify subevents and event structure may constrain the realization of arguments.

2.2.1. As far as the a-structure role of Romanian SE is concerned, SE, an accusative clitic, uniquely relates to the internal argument. This is also the lowest merge position for Italian or Spanish. In all its uses SE/SI merges as a phrase and cliticizes on T. Here is the analysis of an unaccusative constructions like Italian (8a), from (D’Alessandro 2007:198), an analysis which carries over to the Romanian counterpart:

(8) a. Si arriva (D’Alessandro 2007:198)
   Si arrives
b. Se ajunge
   SE arrives
   “People/they arrive”

T’
   T
   VP
   V
   SI

In Italian (Spanish, French, a. o.) but not in Romanian, SE may also represent the next higher (optional or obligatory) internal argument, an indirect object, which merges as the specifier of an App head (see also Cuervo 2003, 2010, Torrego), as in the examples of the following paradigm, which will be relevant for the comparison with Romanian:
(9) Gianni e Maria se lo sono raccontato
Gianni and Maria SI it.ACC are told
“Gianni and Mary have told each other that”

(10) a. Gianni si compra una mela al giorno per stare bene
Gianni SI buys an apple.ACC all the day for stay well
“Gianni buys an apple a day to keep healthy”

b. Ion îşi/*se cumpără un măr pe zi pentru a fi în formă
Ion SE.DAT buy an apple a day for be in shape
“AIon buys an apple a day to keep healthy”

As seen in the examples, Italian SI corresponds to the Romanian Dative 3rd person clitic îşi, SE being ungrammatical in this environment. Thus SI represents the Dative argument and furthermore marks coreference of the indirect object and the subject.

The analysis assigned to such sentences in d’Alessandro (2001) is as shown in (11) below. Since they include a Dative argument, sentences (9) and (11) are essentially a kind of DOC (Double Object Construction), with a complex decomposition which includes a causative head v₁ which introduces the external argument and an applicative head v₂ which introduces the Dative constituent. Furthermore, by assumption, the applicative head v₂ “doesn’t assign accusative case, but only inherent Dative case” (D’Alessandro 2001).

(11)

```
      v₁P
     /  
    v₁  v₂P
       /    
      v₁    v₂
           /  
          v₂    VP
             /   
            v     V
                 
               compra
dei buoni libri
```

Since SE/SI is moving up the verbal spine, one might expect to find it merging as a subject clitic, starting out as the specifier of the causative
head $v_1$ which introduces the external argument. This is the analysis commonly assigned to the following kind of Italian and BP examples:

(12) a. In Italia si mangia (gli) spaghetti
    In Italy SI eat.3.SG (the) spaghetti
b. In Italia si legge libri in continuazione (It., D’Alessandro 2001)
    in Italy SI reads(3.SG) books.ACC in continuance
    “In Italy, people read books all the time”

(13) Compra-se sempre demasiadas salsichas no talho
    buy.3SG=SE always too-many sausages at-the butcher-shop
    Sanzot (BP, Raposo and Uriagereka 1996:750)
    Sanzot
    “One (people) always buy too many sausages at the Sanzot butcher-shop”

These examples illustrate Nominative SE/SI (Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, Raposo and Uriagereka 1996, d’Alessandro 2001, 2007 a. o.). The configuration corresponding to (15) and (16) is active and transitive; SE/SI is assigned the external theta role.

The syntax of a sentence like (16a) is simple, SI merges as the specifier of causative $v_1$ and is assigned the external argument role. Causative $v_1$ is free to check accusative case. The internal arguments in such clauses are apparently restricted to bare nouns (see Cinque 1998, d’Alessandro 2001, 2007). The bare noun object libri is merged with the verb and incorporates into the verb. SI is merged in the specifier of $v_1$ and gets the external theta role$^3$.

(14)

---

$^3$ When T merges, SI cliticizes on it. Notice that an accusative object cannot raise, unless it is a clitic:

*Patate/ Le si mangia in Germania
potatoes/ them si eats in Germany
“In Germany, people eats potatoes”
Under the natural assumption that Romanian SE merges along a continuous segment of the verbal spine, given that SE does not reach the ApplP, we expect it to be unable to merge higher; therefore Romanian is not expected to have the counterpart of examples (15) and (16). This prediction is indeed borne out.

(17) *În România, se citeşte cărţi în continuare (Rom.)
in Romania SE reads(3.SG) books in continuance

The inexistence of this pattern in Romanian is predicted by the low SE hypothesis which we have adopted.

The aspectual role of SE/SI is more evident in those cases where the role of SE is purely aspectual, since its presence does not follow from the a-structure of the verb. Consider the following Italian and Spanish examples and notice that they are based on simple transitive verbs. The impossibility of inserting a corresponding Dative clitic in Romanian and the absence of any morpheme corresponding to SE/SI in the English translations apparently confirm that this use of SE/SI is unrelated to the verb’s addicity. SE/SI also marks coreference with the subject.

(18) a. Gianni *si mangia una mela* al giorno per stare bene (It., D’Alessandro 2001)
    Gianni SI eats an apple-ACC all the day for stay well
    “Gianni eats an apple a day to keep healthy”

b. *Ion îşi mănâncă un măr pe zi pentru a fi în formă*
    Ion SE.DAT eat an apple a day for to be in shape

(19) a. Juan *se leyó un libro* (Sp., Basilico 2010:277)
    Juan SE read a book
    “Juan read a book”

b. Pedro *se comió dos paellas en una hora*
    Pedro SE ate two paellas in one hour

Examples of this type have been described in detail in Kempchinsky (2004), Basilico (2010) a.o. Essentially it is proposed that in such sentences SE/SI signals an accomplishment interpretation and requires the event to have a (scalar) path structure overtly expressed by the direct object. The construction thus occurs with accomplishments that may have incremental Themes. Therefore, the presence of SE imposes constraints on the selection of the verb, as well as on the direct object; these requirements
are apparent when one compares the simple transitive with the augmented SE/SI construction. A sentence like (20) without SE/SI can refer to an activity in which some reading was done for a while, but when SE is present (in 19), the book must have been read through, as shown by Basilico (2010:276).

(20) Juan leyó un libro (Sp., Basilico, 2010:277)
    Juan read a book
    “Juan read a book”

The same effect is detectable in the following Italian pair, where only the simple transitive sentence is felicitous with a continuation that shows that the result state hasn’t been attained:

(21) a. Gianni a mangiato una mela, ma non l’ha finita
    Gianni has eaten an apple, but not it-has finished
    “Gianni has eaten an apple, but didn’t finish it”
    (It., Basilico 2010:278)

b. #Gianni si e mangiato una mela, ma non l’ha
    Gianni SI is eaten an apple, but not it-has
    finite finished
    “Gianni has eaten an apple, but didn’t finish it”

Since the interpretation is telic, bare plurals and mass nouns cannot appear as direct objects. Acceptable direct objects should be quantized.

(22) *Juan se tomo vino anoche antes de acostarse
    Juan SE drank wine last night before going to bed
    “John drank wine last night before going to bed”

It is likely that comparable aspectual interpretations may be induced by the presence of the Romanian so-called ‘possessive dative clitic’, whose range is clearly not restricted to possession:

(23) a. A citit cărți de la bibliotecă / niște cărți
    has read books form library some books
    de la bibliotecă
    from library
    “(S)he read some books from the library”

b. A citit cărțile de la bibliotecă,
    has read books.DEF from library
    (dar nu pe toate)
In conclusion, it is expected that in Romanian too, SE may also have an aspectual role, contributing to the interpretation of the (lower) subevent that it is associated with.

Secondly, the Romanian reflexive clitic merges in a domain which is lower than the applicative head and not higher, as is the case in Spanish and Italian. This result confirms the conclusions reached by Dobrovie-Sorin (1998).

2.3. Some further assumptions on SE

We adopt the Heterogeneity Hypothesis on the Romanian clitic SE and propose the following tentative description partly defended below:

(i) Syntactic properties
   (a) Phrasal status: SE is a D-pronoun or a phi-pronoun.
   (b) Merge positions:
       It merges as a phrase in the IA position.
       It merges as a head/specifier of the Inner Aspect projection (MacDonald 2008)
   (c) At least some of the configurations where SE merges are transitive.

(ii) Range of interpretations (by syntactic configuration)
   (a) reflexive and reciprocal

   (24) a. Se urăște pe sine mai mult decât pe ceilalți
       SE hates PE self more than PE the others
       “He hates himself more than he hates the others”
   b. Se ajută unul pe altul
       SE help(PL) one PE another
“They help one another”

(b) **anticausative**

(25) S-a spart geamul  
SE=has broken window.DEF  
“The window broke”

(c) **passive**  
(A) (true) **passive**

(26) Toate schimbările cerute s-au făcut  
all changes.DEF requested SE=have made  
de către manageri  
by managers  
“All the requested changes have been made by the managers”

(B) **medio-passive** (at least some middles, as in Lekakou 2005)

(27) Textul se traduce ușor de orice student cu pregătire medie  
text.DEF SE translates easily by any student with average training  
“The text is easy to translate for any average student”

(C) **unergative**

(28) Se doarme (un somn bun) în orice cameră din hotelul ăsta  
SE sleeps (a good sleep) in any room from hotel.DEF this  
“One may sleep well in any room of this hotel”

(d) **complex unaccusative constructions** (locative/existential)  
(Irwin 2012; cf. Dragomirescu 2010, for Romanian)

(29) a. S-a ajuns la un consens  
SE=has arrived at a consensus  
“A consensus has been reached”

b. Nu se află nimeni în grădină  
not SE be nobody in garden  
“There’s nobody in the garden”

(iii) Featural make up of SE  
(a) SE is endowed with a [Person] features, but it is unspecified for number which it may get through agreement. Its default number
interpretation is singular. The [\(i\pi]\) feature of se explains why the reflexive clitic is attracted to Tense or to higher Person projections [\(\pi Ps\)].

(b) Its essential feature is [+reflexive], which informally indicates coreference of two arguments. Reflexivisation is viewed as an operation on binary relations which restricts them to those pairs where the first argument is identical to (or, at least, a function of) the first, as in Koontz-Garboden (2009), Labelle (2008). [+Reflexive] is an LF interpretable feature which correlates with a particular semantic operation:

(30) \textit{Reflexivisation} (slightly adapted version of Koontz-Garboden 2009:83)

Reflexivisation is an operation that takes a relation as an argument, setting both arguments of the relation to be the same. It restricts the relation to those sets of pairs each of whose members is identical to the other.

(31) \[\lambda R \lambda x [R (x, x)]\] (Koontz-Garboden 2009:83)

(c) The second important interpretative feature associated with Romanian se is [Agentivity]. When it is positively marked for this feature, SE announces the presence in the a-structure of an argument which is an Agent in the (extended) sense of Bowers (2010). Thus [+Agent] SE is thematically associated with an Agent in the extended sense which includes other active roles (Instrument, causer) or Human roles (Experiencer). Significantly, when it signals a one-argument structure (with unergatives and unaccusatives), the one thematic argument of the verb must be [+Agent/+Person], a condition which is not ordinarily required.

(32) a. Se pleacă la Piteşti
SE leaves at Piteşti
“One leaves to Piteşti”
Trenul pleacă la Piteşti
train.DEF leaves at Piteşti
“The train leaves to Piteşti”

b. Se lucrează mult în fiecare zi
SE works a lot in every day
“One works a lot every day”
Instalaţia lucrează mult
machine.DEF works a lot
“The machine works a lot”
A property of Romanian which strengthens the Agent-Parameter in the range of Romanian reflexive constructions is the specialisation of a preposition for agentive adjuncts, *de către* “by” (alongside *de* “by”). This is apparent in comparing anticausatives and passives.

(33) a. Uşile se încuie la oră fixă de către cei abilitaţi
doors.DEF SE lock at hour fixed by those authorised
să o facă [+Animate, Agentive]
SĂSUBL it do.SUBJ
“The doors are locked at a fixed hour by those authorised to do it”

b. Uşa s-a încuiat *de către vânt / *de către sine
doors.DEF=has locked by wind by self
“The door got locked (*by (de către) wind / itself)”

c. Uşile astea se încuie de la sine
doors.DEF these SE lock by self
“The doors get locked by themselves”

On the whole neither [+Reflexive], nor [+Agent] is an obligatory property. The distribution of the two features along the various uses of SE is as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reflexive</th>
<th>SE [reflexive]</th>
<th>SE [agentive]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticausative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>a. <em>passives</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. (some) <em>middles</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c. <em>unergatives</em></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. The reflexive derivation

In the preceding paragraph, we have spelled out the general comparative background of our analysis of reflexive passive sentences, which represent the focus of our analysis. Before doing this we consider the analysis of the prototypical SE construction: the true reflexive and reciprocal use.

This use is prototypical in as much as in this use both (semantic) properties are *aligned*, i.e. [SE] is [+reflexive, +Agentive]. This feature cluster occurs only in reciprocal and true reflexive constructions (see above).
(34)  

a. Ion se dispreţuieste ş$i pe sine ca şi pe ceilalţi
   “Ion despises himself as well as the others”

b. Ion se place numai pe sine
   “Ion only likes himself”

c. Ei se luptă unul cu altul
   “They are fighting one another”

d. Ei se admiră unul pe altul
   “They admire one another”

The prototypicality of this use is overtly marked by the fact that in this case SE is a D-pronoun, capable of projecting a big DP in clitic doubling constructions. In all its other uses SE is a phi-pronoun just as its counterparts in some other Romance languages (Italian, French).

If Agency is extended as suggested above (see Bowers 2010), then this use includes the following classes of verbs from Cinque (1988) and Dobrovie-Sorin (1998):

(i) transitive verbs, in true reflexive and reciprocal constructions
(ii) psych verb in their Agentive (transitive) interpretation

(35)  

a. Ion se/îl agită ca să fie luat în seamă
   “John stirred himself/him in order to be taken into account”

b. Ion şi Petru se ceartă unul pe altul/unul cu altul
   “Ion and Peter are arguing”

c. Maria se găteşte
   “Mary dresses elegantly”

For all such sentences (ignoring at this point aspect or case projection that could occur between the higher and the lower verb phrase, the lexical vP looks as follows. Since a big DP has been projected, the IA shows differential object marking (=DOM) if it is lexically expressed. The
Romanian differential object marker is the preposition PE “on”, necessarily accompanied by clitic-doubling.

(36)    Ion  se admiră pe sine  
Ion  SE admires PE self  
“John admires himself”

5. Reflexive passive constructions

The aim of this section is to prove that in Romanian (as well as in other Romance languages; cf. Raposo and Uriagereka 1996, for European Portuguese, Kempcinsky 2004, 2007 for Spanish; Ruwet 1972, Dobrovie-Sorin 1998, 2007 for French; Cinque 1988 for Italian) passive SE-sentences represent a distinct subtype of SE-structures, differing from anticausatives, but also from true reflexives and impersonal constructions.

Passive SE is non-anaphoric [-reflexive] and [+agentive]. The non-anaphoric nature of this use follows from the definition of the passive voice which relies on the referential disjointness of the Agent and the Theme. It is important that the passive undoubtedly shows the presence of a syntactically active agent (see Corniles cu 1998). This in turn indicates projection of the external argument in passive constructions. Agentivity and disjointness of reference are the most salient characteristics of reflexive passives.

5.1. Agentivity
An undoubtedly true property of reflexive passives is that like other types of reflexives (middles, anticausatives, and transitive impersonals) they are based on transitive verbs. Given the binary a-structure of transitive verbs, a legitimate question is whether in any/all /some of these structures both arguments are merged and what their merge configuration is.

Romanian passive reflexives license an Agent, which can always be overt and appears as a by-phrase, as in any other passive construction.

The fact that a by-phrase is licensed differentiates between reflexive passives and impersonal constructions. This difference is explicitly made in D’Allessandro (2007) as sketched below:

**Impersonal transitive vs. passive reflexive constructions.**

D’Allessandro offers a detailed analysis of Italian transitive impersonals, illustrated by the two sentence type in (37) and (38):

(37) In Italia si mangiano gli spaghetti
in Italy SE eat.PL the spaghetti

(38) In Italia si mangia (gli) spaghetti
in Italy SE eat.SG the spaghetti

“In Italy people eat spaghetti”

The immediately apparent difference between them is that in (37) the verb agrees with the IA; in contrast, in sentence (38), SI is a Nominative subject and the object presumably gets accusative case. In fact, as d’Allessandro argues, SI is assigned the external theta role in both cases, but the two sentences differ in that the V-O agreement sentence (37) has a more complex functional structure, which explains the different agreement pattern, namely the fact that in the second sentence, the Acc case is valued on SE, while the IA ends up valuing the phi features on Tense and getting Nominative Case. Crucially as explicitly stated by d’Allessandro both impersonal sentences of type (37) with V-O agreement, and impersonal sentences of type (38) exclude a by-phrase, while true reflexive passives, as well as copular passives naturally license a by-phrase.

(39) *In Italia si mangiano gli spaghetti da tutti
in Italy SE eat.PL the spaghetti by all

(40) *In Italia si mangia (gli) spaghetti da tutti
in Italy SE eat.SG the spaghetti by all

(41) In Italia gli spaghetti sono mangiati da tutti
In Italy the spaghetti are eaten.PL by all

“In Italy, the spaghetti are eaten by all the people”

(42) Si e visti da tutti
In d’Alessandro’s analysis, the answer to the question why is it that impersonal sentences do not authorize a by-phrase is precisely the fact in impersonal sentences the external \textit{theta role is assigned to SI} and cannot be further re-assigned to a by-phrase. Italian impersonal proves to be active sentences.

In Romanian, there do not seem to exist sentences which have a passive interpretation, but in which a by-phrase cannot be legitimately added:

\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. \textit{Declarația s-a făcut chiar de prim-ministru} \textit{statement.DEF SE=has \textit{made} even by prime minister} “The statement was made by the prime minister himself”
  \item b. \textit{În Italia spaghete se mănâncă și de foarte mulți turiști} \textit{ind.PL.PRES.3SG≡PL and by very many tourists} “In Italy, spaghetti are eaten by many tourists as well”
\end{enumerate}

The contrast with Italian is obvious. As already discussed above, Romanian lacks sentences of type (38), with Nominative SE. It also seems to lacks sentences of type (37), in which Accusative SE is assigned the external theta role. Rather in the Romanian constructions, the external role is assigned to the by-phrase. Both Italian and Romanian have reflexive passive sentences, provisionally defined as sentences with V-O agreement, in which the external theta role may be realized as a by phrase. Sentences like (43a) and (43b) are passive, but not impersonal. If the impersonal is defined as the reflexive construction which introduces an indefinite subject (cf. Raposo and Uriagereka 1996, D’Alessandro 2001) then the passive and the impersonal semantically overlap, just in case the Agent of the passive construction is null.

\begin{enumerate}
  \item a. \textit{În bibliotecă se citesc cărțile rare} \textit{(Rom.) in library SE read.PL books.DEF rare.F.PL} “In the library, one reads the rare books”
  \item b. \textit{În bibliotecă sunt citite cărțile rare} \textit{(Rom.) in library are read.F.PL books.DEF rare.F.PL} “In the library, the rare books are read”
  \item c. \textit{In biblioteca si legonno (i) librì} \textit{(It.) in library SE read.PL the books} “In a library one reads books”
\end{enumerate}
To what extent passive reflexives and impersonals have the same range of uses is an empirical problem which deserves further investigation.

*Middles and Agents in Romance languages.* A second type of constructions in which the (im)possibility of licensing a*by*-phrase has been widely discussed is that of middle constructions. Authier and Reed (1996) argue that whether Agents are licensed or not in middle constructions is a microparametric property differentiating among Romance languages. Two major dialects which license Agents in middle constructions are Canadian French and Madrid Spanish, as illustrated below. Nongeneric passives with *by* phrases are also expectedly ruled in these dialects. Here are relevant examples:

(45) a. En général, ces débats s’enregistrent par Anne (…) in general these discussions *se=record._PL* by Anne
   “These discussions are generally recorded by Anne”
   b. Ce costume traditionnel se porte surtout par les femmes
   this costume traditional *se=wear._SG* especially by the women
   “This traditional costume is worn especially by women”
   c. Ça se dit par les soldats
   this *se=say* by the soldiers
   “This is said by the soldiers”

(Authier and Reed 1996:5)

(46) illustrates obligatory *by*-phrase in non generic contexts:

(46) a. Ces promesses se sont faites *(par aux moins deux politiciens)*
   these promises *se=we=made* by at least two politicians
   “These promises are made by at least two politicians”
   b. Hier des rubans noirs se sont portés *(par les étudiants)*
   yesterday of=the ribbons black._pl *se=were* worn by the students
   “Yesterday black ribbons were worn by the students”

(Authier and Reed 1996:4)

Romanian also may license *by*-phrases in middle constructions.

(47) Examenul acesta se trece ușor chiar și de un student mai puțin
“This exam can be passed easily even by a less prepared student”

In the first place the Agent may be overtly expressed, in the specialised de (către) phrase:

(48) a. Se va cânta imnul de către toţi participanţii
SE will sing hymn.DEF by all participants.DEF
“The hymn will be sang by all the participants”

b. Rugăciunea se va rosti de către toţi credincioşi prayer.DEF SE will utter by all christians.DEF
parohiei în fiecare zi (internet)
parish.DEF.GEN every day
“The prayer should be uttered by all the believers of the parish every day”

Agent orient adverbs and PPs may also identify an Agent.

(49) a. Casa s-a distrus cu bună ştiinţă / house.DEF SE=has destroyed knowingly
în mod intenţionat de către foşti chiriaşi deliberately by former.DEF tenants
pentru a o cumpăra la un pret cât mai scăzut for A-INF It buy at a price more low
“The house was deliberately/knowingly destroyed by the former tenants so that they could buy it at a very low price”

b. Florile din această specie s-au cultivat flowers.DEF in this species SE=has cultivated
cu devotement / cu pricepere ani de-a rândul with devotion with skill years in row
“The flowers of this species have been cultivated with devotion/skilfully for many years”

c. Uşa s-a deschis în mod intenţionat de door.DEF SE=has opened deliberately for
zece ori în timpul conferinţei ten times during conference.DEF.GEN
“The door has been deliberately opened ten times during the conference”
The semantic presence of an Agent in reflexive passives is also made manifest in a number of control phenomena. Passive and Reflexive SI which in our description are Agentive allow PRO-control in infinitive purpose clauses, while anti-causatives, which are [− Agentive] do not.

(50)  

a. Acest medicament s-a administrat pentru a scădea tensiunea (passive) 
A_{INF} lower blood-pressure.DEF  
“This medicine was administrated in order to lower the blood pressure”

b. Actorii se emoţionează pentru a emoţiona la rândul lor publicul (reflexive) 
A_{INF} get-excited in turn.DEF their public.DEF  
“Actors get themselves excited in order to excite the public”

c. *Actorul s-a înrosit pentru a emoţiona publicul  
actor.DEF=has reddened for A_{INF} touch public.DEF

However agent oriented modifiers and PRO control in purpose are not sufficient for distinguishing between situations when an agent is “inferred” and those where it is syntactically represented as an argument; Agent oriented adverbs and PRO control indicate the (LF) presence of an external argument, without indicating whether the latter is syntactically

---

4 Parallel examples of agent-control and agent-oriented modifiers are quoted by Autier and Reed (1996) for French Canadian and Madrid Spanish:

a. Cette racine se mange pour maigrir  
“One eats this root in order to lose weight”

b. Les contrats de location, ça se lit attentivement  
“Rent contracts, these are read attentively”

c. Una fabrica, eso se incendia para cobrar el seguro  
“A factory, this was put to fire to collect the insurance”

d. Los contratos, eso se lee con cuidado  
“Contracts, these are read attentively”

---
represented or not. This problem has been solved by Jaeggli (1986:616-617) who distinguishes between what he calls Thematic control and Argumental control. Thematic control may rely on implicit arguments, while with Argumental control the controller must occupy an argument position. Jaeggli proposes that control in infinitive *passive* purpose clauses is an instance of argument control, not merely Thematic control. The difference between the two types of control becomes noticeable in the following types of English examples due to Jaeglli (1986):

(51)  
a. John wants PRO to be loved by everyone  
b. *The bridge was blown up PRO to be awarded a medal

Thus only in (21a) is there an explicit argument to control the PRO subject of the passive infinitive. Applied to Romanian, this test shows that reflexive passives contain a syntactically represented Agent, since control in *passive* purpose clauses is possible.

(52)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Asemenea glume se spun pentru PRO such jokes SE tell for } A_{INF} \text{ be admired by public} \\
& \quad \text{admired by public} \\
& \quad \text{“One tells such jokes in order to be admired by the public”}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Aceste promisiuni se făceau uneori pentru PRO these promises SE made sometimes for } A_{INF} \text{ be forgiven by family} \\
& \quad \text{be forgiven by family} \\
& \quad \text{“Such promises were sometimes made to be forgiven by the family”}
\end{align*}

The same conclusion is reached by Authier and Reed (1996:15) for passive reflexives of other languages (French, Italian, Spanish) on the basis of similar examples:

(53)  
\begin{align*}
\text{De tells mensonges se racontent parfois pour PRO être admiré par les gens (Fr.)}
\end{align*}

(54)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Tali mensogne si raccontono spesso per PRO essere ammirati dalla gente (It.)}
\end{align*}

(55)  
\begin{align*}
\text{Esas mentiras se cuentan a veces para PRO ser admirado (Sp.)}
\end{align*}

Control with passive infinitive purpose clauses is expectedly possible with true reflexives, which are also agentive, but not with anticausative SE, even when the subject is Animate. For verbs that allow both anticausative
and reflexive readings, in control constructions only the reflexive reading is possible.

(56)  a. Actorii se emoţionează când intră pe scenă actors.DEF SE get-excited when enter on stage “Actors get excited when they enter on stage” (anticausative)

b. Actorii se emoţionează pentru a fi admirat actors.DEF SE get-excited for A_{INF} be admired de public (only reflexive/*middle) by public
“Actors get themselves excited in order to be admired by the public”

The similar behaviour of true reflexives and passives derives from the fact that both have a syntactically represented Agent.

Conclusions so far. The data presented so far differentiate among reflexive uses on the parameter of Agentivity. Reflexive passives are necessarily agentive. They rely on the disjoint reading of the subject and object. Anticausatives are always non-agentive. True reflexives are agentive, at least in as much as they have the syntax of agentive sentences.

5.2 Aspectual properties of reflexive passives

In a complex event configuration (accomplishment) the two subevents, and to a certain extent their properties are identified by the two arguments of the transitive configuration. The causing activity is thus linked to the Agent, the change of state subevent is identified by the Theme. As has been stressed many times (Tenny (,), Borer (1995, 2005), MacDonald (2008), among many), the lower argument may also serves as en Event Measure. Assuming with MacDonald (2008) that in the space between the higher vP and the lower VP there is an Inner Aspect Projection, the IA is attracted to its specifier to verify the aspectual properties of the lower event.

(57)  \[ [vP [AspP DP Asp [VP V DP]]] \]

More recent work on the SE/SI in Romance languages (Kempcinsky 2004, 2007, Basilico 2010, de Cuyper, Torrego (2004?)) for Spanish, D’Alessandro 2007) for Italian stressed on the possible aspectual role of the reflexive pronoun. This role has been identified particularly in configuration where SE/SI does not merge as an argument.
As proposed by Kempcinsky (2004, 2007) when SE/SI is not thematically licensed by the verb it may assume a temporal/aspectual role, merging in the specifier of the inner AspP. When this happens, SE/SI will be the identifier of the lower event, while the thematically licensed argument may assume only an event-measure role. For instance Basilico (2010:274), (in a DM approach to the internal verb structure), analyses SE in sentences like () “as a head of an underspecified eventive light verb; the presence of SE forces the verb to be quantized, excluding certain nominals (e.g. bare nouns) from appearing in such sentences. SE-verbs of this type select a path complement, which expresses the scalar structure of the event.”

The idea that we will retain is that SE may serve as the identifier of the change of state component of a complex predication, endowing the sentence with particular aspectual properties.

While the aspectual role of SE has not, to our knowledge, been systematically investigated, certain important aspectual properties of the impersonal passive SE construction have come out through the comparison of passive SE and the copular fi-passive (see Manoliu-Manea 1993, Dobrovie-Sorin 1994, GBLR 2010). We here mention only two of the empirical facts that may be related to the aspectual role of SE. Since SE identifies the lower sub-event, with SE-passives it is often the case that not only the Agent, but also the Theme is not expressed, even if passive constructions should highlight the object. The object is made sufficiently visible through the presence of SE. Corresponding copular sentences are ill-formed.

(58) a. Aici se mănâncă bine / ** Aici este mâncat bine
    here SE eats good   here is eaten good
    “One eats good here”

b. Aici se bea mult /**Aici este băut mult
    here SE drink a lot  here is drunk a lot
    “One drinks a lot here”

The contribution to telicity of the reflexive marker is apparent in pairs of the following type, where the transitive verb phrase has a telic reading, while the unergative reflexive structure is atelic.

(59) a. Ion a gândit o soluție economică
    John has thought a solution economic
    “John has thought an economic solution”

b. Ion s-a gândit la o soluție economică
    John SE=has thought about a solution economic
    “John has thought about an economic solution”
Coming back to the structure above, we will assume that in Romanian too, SE may merge as the specifier of the Aspectual node, serving as a sub-event identifier, while the object will specify other event properties (qualitative properties (60a) or quantitative (60b)).

(60)  
a. S-au construit sate/nu orașe  
\[\text{SE}=\text{has built villages not towns}\]  
“One has built villages, not towns”

b. S-au parcurs 20 de mile  
\[\text{SE}=\text{has covered 20 of miles}\]  
“20 miles have been covered”

(61) \[\text{[vP [AspP [DPSE] Asp [VP V DP ]]]}\]

The presence of SE in Spec Asp phrase has interpretative consequences, as already mentioned, but it also has syntactic effects. Notice that SE becomes the closest DP to v [or Tr], blocking agreement between v and the object; this is how SE detransitivizes the transitive verb.

5.3. Constraints on reflexive passives

In late Modern Romanian the domain of reflexive passive sentences is more restricted than in older stage of the language, by a number of phenomena that may be subsumed under the Animacy Hierarchy parameter (Bianchi 2006 for Italian, Săvescu 2009 for Romanian). Informally, the passive use of SE is more and more signalled by the differentiation of the Agent and the Theme along the Animacy Hierarchy. One manifestation of this parameter is that transitive constructions are sensitive to the relative prominence of the external and internal arguments on the Animacy hierarchy. As stressed by Bianchi (2006: 2026), there isn’t just one universally fixed Animacy hierarchy, different languages make slightly different options. One universally valid claim of the hierarchy is the relative ranking of Speech Act Participants: 1\(^{\text{st}}\) and 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) person participants outrank 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) person participants. Within 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) person participants, the animate versus inanimate dimension becomes highly relevant in Romanian, as also shown by the differential object marking phenomenon. We tentively formulate the relevant aspects of the Animacy Hierarchy Parameter as follows:

(62) *Animacy hierarchy* (see Silverstein 1976 for an early formulation)

(a) first, second person > third person
(b) the internal argument cannot outrank the external argument on the Animacy hierarchy.

Assuming that the Agent is prototypically [+Animate/+person/ + <e>-type denotation], the Theme, therefore the subject of the passive sentence tends to be negatively marked for these convergent features. This led to three distinct phenomena: (i) first, a person restriction on reflexive passives, which must be 3\textsuperscript{rd} person; (ii) secondly, certain types of DP simply may not occupy the canonical subjects in reflexive passive sentences; (iii) thirdly, the grammar of reflexive passives shows an important split along the dimension of Animacy. We now turn to these empirical facts.

5.2.1. Person. True reflexives and anticausatives are possible in all the persons, passives are no longer possible in the first and second person. In other words, in the first and second person there is no difference between the reflexive/anticausative use and the passive use. This means that in late modern Romanian a first/second person DP is automatically assigned the subject role and it is conceived of as the initiator or passive cause of the event. Absence of the passive is signalled by the impossibility of adding an agentive by-phrase. Consider first the examples in (((63)-(64)). Example (63a), with a first person subject, may be read as a true reflexive or as a psych anticausative; the true reflexive reading is strengthened by the focus adverb singur (alone, on my own); a by-phrase cannot occur. The same is true for second person subjects in (64). The reflexive reading is confirmed by the possibility of doubling, the passive by-phrase is completely ungrammatical.

\[(63)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Eu mă păcălesc repede} \quad (+/-\text{Agentive}) \\
& \quad I \text{ CL.ACC.1.SG deceive quickly} \\
& \quad “I deceive myself quickly” \quad \text{(reflexive)} \\
& \quad “I get easily deceived” \quad \text{(psych anticausative)} \\
& \quad b. \quad ??/\star\text{Eu mă păcălesc ușor de către oricine} \\
& \quad I \quad \text{CL.ACC.1.SG deceive easily by anyone} \\
& \quad c. \quad \text{Eu mă păcălesc singur foarte ușor} \\
& \quad I \quad \text{CL.ACC.1.SG deceive by-myself very easily} \\
& \quad (*\text{de către oricine}) \\
& \quad \text{by anyone} \\
\end{align*}

\[(64)\]
\begin{align*}
a. & \quad \text{Te pedepsești pe tine însuși} \quad \text{punish.2.SG yourself} \\
& \quad \text{CL.ACC.2.SG not-going to cinema} \\
& \quad “You are punishing yourself by not going to the cinema” \\
& \quad b. \quad \text{Te-ai pedepsit *de către} \\
\end{align*}
While in the first and second person, only the reflexive and/or anticausative SE-readings are available, for the same verbs, in the third person there emerges a third reading, the passive SE-reading.

(65)  

a. Alegătorii se păcălesc cu bună stiinţă când ascultă promisiunile din campanie (reflexive)  

“The people deceive themselves when they listen to campaign promises”

b. Alegătorii s-au păcălit când au votat pentru el (anticausative)  

“The people got deceived when they voted for him”

c. În campanie e uşor să se păcălească alegătorii, chiar şi de către politicieni foarte slabi  

“During a campaign, the voters are easy to trick, even by the very unprofessional politicians”

d. Politicienii știu că în campanie e ușor să se păcălească alegătorii (passive)  

“Politicians know that in electoral campaigns, it is easy to deceive the voters”

(66)  

a. Ion s-a pedepsit singur nemergând la cinema (reflexive)  

“John punished himself by not going to the cinema”

b. Profesorul acesta nu știe cum se pedepsesc copii răi (passive, Agent≠Theme)  

“This teacher does not know how to punish bad children”
The Person constraint discussed in this section directly follows from the Animacy hierarchy: in a transitive configuration, first and second person DPs must merge as subjects.

As already mentioned, this person constraint was not active in earlier stages of Romanian, and this change requires an explanation.

5.2.2 Selectional restrictions. A second manifestation of the Agent/Theme differentiation on the Animacy Hierarchy is that nominals which always have all the properties of prototypical Agents, being [+Animate, +personal, +<e>-type denotation], i.e. pronouns and proper names, cannot occur in reflexive passive sentences. By contrast, there are no constraints on the semantic types of the object/subject of reflexives or anticausative SE-constructions.

(67)  
(a)  La noi întodeauna se întâmpină musafirii la gară  
“With us guests are always met at the station”
(b)  *Întodeauna se întâmpină Ion/el la gară  
always SE meet John he at station
(c)  Întotdeauna este întâmpinat Ion/el la gară  
always is met John he at station
“John/he is always met at the station”

Like the person constraints, the ban on nominals which always have an <e> reading was not operative in an earlier Romanian.

5.2.3. Some Animacy effects. On the side of syntax, in late modern Romanian the most striking manifestation of the Animacy Hierarchy in the domain of reflexive passives concerns the distribution of [+Animate] and [-Animate] IAs in passive sentences:

(68)  
*Distributional Constraint* on reflexive passives
(i) When the IA is [+Animate], it does not occupy the canonical subject position even if it is preverbal and even if the verb agrees with it.
(ii) When the IA is [-Animate] the passive subject may occupy the canonical subject position.

The clearest kind of evidence for this contrast regards subject-to-object raising (=SOR) data. [+Animate] passive subjects do not raise, presumably because they cannot reach the canonical subject position, (likely to be occupied by a null expletive.) Similar, but not identical restrictions on the canonical subject position in reflexive passive have been discussed for
Brazilian Portuguese (see Raposo and Uriagereka 1996) and French (Ruwet 1972, Dobrovie-Sorin 2007).

5.2.4. SE-passives and SOR. As known, Romanian allows SOR out of finite clauses (e.g. că ‘that’ clauses) and out of non-finite clauses (e.g. gerund clauses).

A striking property of animate personal (= [+A, +P]) subjects of SE-passives is that they do not undergo Subject-to-Object Raising (=SOR). In contrast to [+A, +P] nouns, inanimate nouns follow the general rule, permitting SOR if the main verb is suitable.

5.2.4.1 Let us first consider the behaviour of [+A, +P] nouns with respect to Raising out of finite clauses. The nominative subject of SE-constructions can optionally undergo SOR, as shown by the following examples, with anticausative verbs:

(69) a. Am văzut că Maria se înroșește în obraji când îl vede (anticausative)

CL.ACC.3.MASC sees

“I saw that Maria blushed when she sees him”

b. Am văzut-o pe Maria că se înroșește când îl vede (SOR)

when CL.ACC.3.M sees

‘I saw Maria blushing when she sees him’

c. Pe cine ai văzut că se înroșește când îl vede?’

CL.ACC.3.MASC sees

“Who did you see blushing when she sees him?”

In the examples above, the formal marks of SOR with [+A, +P] DPs are Accusative marking by PE, clitic doubling, the possibility of PE cine ‘whom’ questions. Notice that the raised noun appears left of the complementizer că ‘that’, therefore, there is overt movement into the main clause, not merely ECM. Intriguingly, passive readings of SE-constructions with [+A, +P] nouns do not allow SOR, regardless of DP type.

Let us examine bare plurals (=BPs) first. In a SE-passive sentence, the [+A, +P] BP subject can only be interpreted as a Theme. SOR is simply impossible. The BP cannot A-move into the main clause, as shown by the fact that BPs do not occur to the left of the complementizer că “that”. This
indicates absence of SOR. Expectedly, given that they are NPs, not DPs, BPs cannot be clitic doubled and differentially marked by PE, since these properties may only be true of DPs. A second relevant property is that the suitable question, to which (70a) with a BP-subject is an answer is (70c), with the interrogative question word ‘ce’, used for inanimate referents rather than *pe cine, used for [+A,+P] ones. The use of ce instead of pe cine (in (69c)) is in line with the property reading assigned to BPs in Romance languages (see Dobrovie Sorin and Beyssade 2010).

(70)  

a. Deseori am văzut că se împuşcau prizonieri of war
    “Often I have seen that even prisoners of war were shot”

b. *Deseori am văzut prizonieri de război
    (I)have seen prisoners of war
    că se împuşcau that SE shoot
    “What did you see being shot without a trial?”

c. Ce/*Pe cine ai văzut că se împuşcau fără judecată?
    what/*whom you have seen that shot without trial?
    Prizonieri de război “Prisoners of war”

The fact that BPs do not raise might be related to the general impossibility of BPs to occupy Spec, T in Romanian (and other Romance languages). Expectedly, nominals which do not reach Spec,T cannot undergo Raising (i.e., further movement out of Spec, T). More generally, even in languages like English, where BPs may raise to SpecT, it has been shown that SOR is sensitive to the contrast between NPs and DPs, being restricted to DPs.

(71)  

I consider those books to be relevant
    *I consider books to be relevant

In conclusion, the impossibility of bare plurals to undergo raising need not be the effect of the reflexive passive structure. The restriction is observed for all types of [+A, +P] DPs.

Thus, with other [+A, +P] DPs, for instance, definite DPs, SOR is possible, but never in the passive reading. Reflexive (or reciprocal) and anticausative readings survive raising, passive readings are ruled out (see examples (72)). If only passive readings are available, SOR does not apply. Consider, for example, sentences (72) and (73). The reflexive in
(72a) allows both a reciprocal interpretation (with children beating each other in the classrooms) and a passive reading (with children being beaten by the schoolmasters). In the raising structure (72b), the raised definite object is differentially marked with the preposition pe and it is also clitic doubled. Only the reciprocal reading is available. The questions in (72c) and (72d) form a relevant minimal pair. The interrogative pronoun pe cine “whom” is [+A, +P] and it shows differential object marking. Given its form, this DP has undergone raising (A-movement) followed by wh-Movement (A’-Movement). Questions (72c) with the [+A, +P] differentially marked pe cine ‘whom’ only allows the reciprocal interpretation of the reflexive. In contrast, question (72d) uses the [-A] interrogative ce ‘what’, even if it refers to an animate noun (copii “the children”); just as before, this apparent conflict can be explained away if one assumes that in the passive reading this definite DP is coerced into having a property reading, rather than an object-level reading. The only interpretation of the reflexive in (672d) is the passive interpretation.

Sentence (72e) shows that if there is no SOR, the subject of the lower verb can also be questioned by the [+A, +P] cine “who”, with the same ambiguity as (72a). The form cine is marked as Nominative, indicating lack of SOR and successive wh-movement.

In line with the interpretation, the derivation of this sentence involves only successive cyclic wh-movement of the interrogative (i.e. A’-Movement). Example (73) further confirms that SOR is impossible with reflexive passives. Sentence (73b) is ungrammatical on the intended reading and could only be given the unnatural reflexive or reciprocal reading that children punish each other or themselves.

(72) a. Am văzut că se bat copiii în școli (I-)have seen that SE beat children.DEF in schools “I saw that children beat/fight with each other in schools” (√ reciprocal, √ passive)
   “I saw that children are being beaten in schools”

b. I-am văzut pe copii că se bat în școli (I-have seen PE children that SE beat in schools (+SOR, √ reciprocal / *passive)
   beat in schools

c. Pe cine ai văzut că se bat în școli PE whom (you)have seen that SE beat in schools “Whom did you see beating each other in schools?” (+SOR, √ reciprocal, *passive)

d. ?Ce ai văzut că se bat în școli what (you)have seen that SE beat in schools “What did you see being beaten in schools?”
5.2.4.2. Gerund clauses, SOR and differential object marking.
Contrasts are equally sharp with Romanian gerund clauses with verbs of physical perception. There is however an important syntactic difference between gerund complements and finite complements of verbs of physical perception. In the gerund construction, SOR is obligatory. There continues, however to be a sharp contrast between the passive reading of SE and the reflexive and anticausative interpretation, in that the former does not allow differential object marking (occurrence of PE), while the latter strongly prefer it.

Unlike the finite clause case, BP are possible, they are assigned weak accusative Case and they clearly prefer the post-verbal position if the reading is passive; the preverbal position is, however possible, favouring nevertheless other interpretations of SE. Even if the noun is [+A, +P], in the passive reading, it is questioned with the inanimate interrogative pronoun ce “what”, in keeping with the property reading of the BP. Use of the [+A, +P] interrogative pronoun, pe cine “whom” is ungrammatical in the passive-SE reading, triggering a reflexive-SE interpretation. Interestingly, since SOR is obligatory in this construction, there is no possibility of questioning the DP “before SOR”, as shown by the ungrammaticality of (74e).

(74) a. Am văzut împuşcându-se oameni nevinovaţi
(I)have seen shooting=SE people innocent
“I have seen innocent people being killed”

b. ??Am văzut oameni nevinovaţi
(I)have seen people innocent
împuşcându-se (??reflexive, *passive)
shooting=SE
c. Ce ai văzut împuşcându-se?
   what you-have seen shooting=SE
   “What did you see being shot?”

d. *Pe cine ai văzut împuşcându-se?
   whom (you)have seen shooting=SE
   “Whom did you see shooting themselves?”

e. ***Cine ai văzut împuşcându-se?
   who (you)have seen shooting=SE
   “Who did you see shooting themselves?”

In contrast with BPs, other types of DPs, such as definite ones, exhibit a contrast between the passive SE and Reflexive or Anticausative SE. Passive clauses may not show DOM. In contrast with reflexive and anticausative SE clauses the raised subject (in reflexive and anticausative uses) is differentially marked by PE, clitic doubled (75a-b) and questioned by the [+A,+P] interrogative pronoun pe cine “whom” (75c):

(75) a. L-am văzut pe copil spălându-se
   CL.ACC.3SG=(I)have seen PE child washing=SE
   “I saw the child washing himself” (reflexive)

b. L-am văzut pe copil înroșindu-se la față
   CL.ACC.3SG=(I)have seen PE child reddening=SE at face
   “I saw the child growing red in the face” (anticausative)

c. Pe cine/*ce ai văzut
   PE whom what (you)have seen
   înroșindu-se la față?
   reddening=SE at face
   “Whom/*What did you see growing red in the face?”

Sentences (76a-c) illustrate the reflexive passive paradigm. DOM and clitic doubling, as well as the possible use of the interrogative pe cine “whom”, rather than ce “what” do not occur in reflexive passive sentences:

(76) a. Am văzut pedepsindu-se copiii cu asprime
   (I)have seen punishing=SE children.DEF severely
   “I saw the children being punished severely” (passive)

b. *(I)-am văzut pe copii
   CL.DAT.3PL=(I)have seen PE children
   pedepsindu-se cu asprime (*SOR, passive)
   punishing=SE with harshness
   “I saw the children being punished severely”

c. Ce/*Pe cine ai văzut pedepsindu-se cu asprime?
   what whom (you)have seen punishing=SE severely
   “What/*Whom did you see being punished severely?”
If there is an ambiguity, DOM disambiguates in favour of a non-passive interpretation. Thus, sentence (77a) is an instance where the weak Acc subject is postverbal. Both the reciprocal and the passive reading are felicitous. Sentence (77b), where there is DOM clearly excludes the passive reading:

(77) a. Am văzut bătându-se copiii (?de către profesori/ (I)have seen beating=SE children.DEF by teachers unul cu altul)
    “I saw the children being beaten by the professors / I saw the children fighting one another”

b. I-am văzut pe copii bătându-se
    (I)have seen PE children beating-SE
    by teachers one with other.DEF
    “I saw the children fighting one another”

The absence of DOM is expected if one recalls that DOM is actually a filter on DP denotations (Dobrovie Sorin 1994, Cornilescu 2000) eliminating the property (<e, t>) reading. Since as already seen above subjects of reflexive passive clauses have property denotations, they are not compatible with DOM when they become objects of the main verb.

Conclusion on SOR. In both finite and gerund clauses reflexive passive sentences exhibit properties that distinguish them from other types of reflexive sentences. Two generalizations have emerged. In finite clauses, the [+A, +P] subject (= internal argument) of a reflexive passive sentence may not undergo raising into the object position of the main clause. Lack of SOR with these nominals proves that, in finite SE-passive clauses, the subject does not occupy the canonical subject position (Spec, TP), and hence cannot continue movement to the object position of the main clause.

5.2.4.3 Topicalisation. While the [+A, +P] subject of finite reflexive passive sentences does not occupy the canonical subject position, the subject may be topicalized occurring in preverbal position, as in (78b). Topicalization freely occurs in root reflexive passive sentences like (78).

(78) a. În zilele următoare se vor judeca prizonierii
    in days.DEF next SE will try prisoners.DEF
    arestaţi ieri
    arrested yesterday

b. Prizonierii arestaţi ieri se vor judeca în
The differences between finite and gerund clauses are further observable under topicalization of definite DPs. What is important is that in Romanian topicalization of a definite DP must be accompanied by clitic doubling, whether or not there is DOM.

(79)  
a. Copilul l-am văzut în camera lui
child.DEF CL.ACC.3SG seen in room his

b. Pe copil l-am văzut în camera lui
pe child CL.ACC.3SG seen in room his

“I saw the child in his room”

Coming back to Topicalization, this rule is possible (with less than perfect results) out of a finite SE-passive clause. Sentence 80a) shows that the lower Nominative is topicalized at the LP of the main clause. Clitic doubling is impossible since the topicalized constituent is a subject.

(80)  
a. Prizonierii arestați ieri am văzut că
prisoners.DEF arrested yesterday (I)have seen that
s-au împuşcat fără judecată
SE=have shot without trial

b. Am văzut că s-au împuşcat fără judecată
(I)have seen that SE=have shot without

judecată prizonierii arestați ieri
trial prisoners.DEF arrested yesterday

Consider now, in (81), the possibility of topicalizing the definite subject of a gerund clause, which must have gone through SOR. Topicalization must be accompanied by clitic doubling, as shown by the contrast between (81a) and (81b); clitic doubling confirms that the lower subject has become a main clause object through SOR. Still, sentences like
(81b) are not fully acceptable. DOM continues to be impossible (81c), for the reasons explained above.

(81) a. **Prizonierii arestaţi ieri am văzut prisoners arrested yesterday (I)have seen împuşcându-se fără judecată shooting=SE without trial
b. ?Prizonierii arestaţi ieri i-am văzut prisoners arrested yesterday CL.DAT.3PL=(I)have seen împuşcându-se fără judecată shooting=SE without trial
c. *Pe prizonierii arestaţi ieri i-am văzut PE prisoners arrested yesterday CL.DAT.3PL=(I)have seen împuşcându-se fără judecată shooting=SE without trial

Topicalisation data strengthen the conclusions already reached through the analysis of SOR in Se-passive sentences.

5.2.4.3. Inanimate nouns behave differently with respect to SOR. At first sight it is empirically difficult to decide whether SOR has applied with such nouns. The formal marks of raising are absent: inanimate nouns do not take PE, are not doubled by pronominal clitics if they are in post-verbal position, and are always questioned using ce (‘what’). It may, however, be shown that there is sufficient evidence to conclude that SOR out of reflexive passive sentences is possible with inanimate nouns, which, therefore, may target the canonical subject position.

One relevant property of Romanian definite direct objects (true for all types of definite DPs) is that they cannot appear in preverbal position unless they are doubled. This property thus distinguishes preverbal definite Accusatives from preverbal definite Nominatives. A second relevant empirical fact is that inanimates do not always allow SOR out of finite clauses introduced by că “that”, but allow SOR out of clauses introduced by the complementizer cum “how”. Taking these facts into account, consider the following examples, illustrating SOR and topicalization out of clauses introduced by că and cum. Examples (82b) shows that SOR of an inanimate out of că “that” clause is ungrammatical. Câmăsile astea cannot appear in post-verbal (Acc) position to the left of că “that”. As expected the Accusative continues to be ungrammatical if it is topicalized after SOR as shown in (82c). On the other hand, it is possible to topicalize the Nominative subject of the lower clause, which can simply undergo successive A’movement from the lower to the higher periphery. In contrast to că-clauses, cum-clauses allow optional SOR of
the lower subject, as shown in (83b), where *camasile astea* occurs in postverbal position to the left of the complementizer *cum*. Consequently, for clauses like (83d), there are two topicalization strategies available, topicalization of the nominative subject without SOR, or topicalization of the Accusative object after SOR, the latter indicated by obligatory clitic doubling. The paradigm in (83) contrasts with that of (81).

(82) a. Cămășile astea am văzut că s-au
shirts.DEF these (I)have seen that SE=has
adus ieri la magazinul din colț
brought yesterday at shop of corner

b. *Am văzut cămășile astea că s-au
(I)have seen shirts.DEF these that SE=has
adus ieri la magazinul din colț
brought yesterday at shop of corner

c. *Cămășile astea le-am văzut că s-au
shirts.DEF these CL.ACC.F.3PL=(I)have seen that SE=has
adus ieri la magazinul din colț
brought yesterday at shop of corner

d. Am văzut că s-au adus ieri
(I)have seen that SE=has brought yesterday
cămășile astea la magazinul din colț
shirts.DEF these at shop of corner

(83) a. Cămășile astea am văzut cum se
shirts.DEF these (I)have seen how SE
aduceau ieri la magazinul din colț
bring.IMPERF.PL yesterday at shop of corner

b. Am văzut cămășile astea cum se
(I)have seen shirts.DEF these how SE
aduceau ieri la magazinul din colț
bring.IMPERF.PL yesterday at shop of corner

c. Cămășile astea le-am văzut cum se
shirts.DEF these CL.ACC.F.3PL=(I)have seen how SE
aduceau ieri la magazinul din colț
brought yesterday at shop of corner

d. Am văzut cum se aduceau ieri
(I)have seen how SE bring.IMPERF.PL yesterday
cămășile astea la magazinul din colț
shirts.DEF these at shop of corner

A stronger piece of evidence that inanimates may undergo SOR in reflexive passive sentences is offered by demonstrative and personal
pronouns, which are differentially object marked and clitic doubled in the Accusative, even in post-verbal position.

(84) Am cumpărât roboții ăstia

"I have bought these robots"

I-am cumpărăt pe ăștia

"I have bought these"

So in this case the formal marks of SOR are present. Pronouns also raise out of cum clauses and gerunds, and even out of că-clauses. Here are examples which prove that SOR is indeed applicable to inanimate DPs.

(85) a. Le-am văzut pe astea vânzându-se

destul de repede

"I saw these things being sold fast enough"

b. Bisericile astea au fost refăcute de curând.

Le-am văzut dărâmându-se

sub ochii mei înainte de 1989. //

under eyes my before of 1989

Le-am văzut cum se dărâmau

sub ochii mei

under eyes my

""

c. Pe astea le-am văzut chiar eu că s-au

dărâmat cu buldozerul (SOR, topicalisation)

demolished with bulldozer.DEF

On the strength of such examples we may safely conclude that SOR is possible with inanimate nouns in the reflexive-passive construction. The contrast between [+A,+P] nouns and inanimate is systematic and requires an explanation.

The more significant result is that inanimate nouns may successfully target Spec, TP while animate nouns may not.
Conclusions on the SOR data. 1. The data on SOR indicate that in SE-passives, animate, personal nominals do not reach the canonical subject case position (Spec, T). As a consequence, the subject cannot raise further into the object position of the main clause. 2. Passive SE-sentences are sensitive to a Hierarchy of Animacy. In Romanian the ban on SOR is clear for [+A,+P] DPs, but inanimate DPs clearly escape it.

6. The Analysis

6.1. Assumptions

A similar restriction on the subject of reflexive passives apparently holds in Brazilian Portuguese. As convincingly shown in Raposo and Uriagereka (1996: 760), subjects of reflexive passives do not occupy the Spec TP position even when they are preverbal. Romanian and Brazilian Portuguese offer an interesting contrast, since in BP all types of nominals are subject to this restriction, while in Romanian only animate personal nominals fail to reach Spec TP. Given that in BP all subjects of reflexive passive sentences are subject to this constraint, irrespective of their semantics, Raposo and Uriagereka treat this phenomenon as a purely syntactic one, proposing to incorporate this restriction in the mechanism of Agree [...]. A modified form of the same analysis is adopted by Kempcinsky (2007) for Spanish. Raposo and Uriagereka reject the possibility of a passive analysis of the data, since, in their view, passive relies on NP-movement to Spec, TP, and in this passive (indefinite SE) construction the NP cannot move to Spec, TP. The analysis adopted treats the indefinite SE like an active sort of construction, an instance of an impersonal, rather than a passive SE in the terminology proposed by Cinque (1988) and D’Alessandro (2007) adopted here. Nothing is said about the (im)possibility of licensing a by-phrase. Additionally, their analysis faces considerable difficulties in accounting for Nominative

---

5 Consider the Brazilian Portuguese data (apud Raposo and Uriagereka 1996: 760)

i. **O Nestor compra salsichas no talho Sanzot**
   the Nestor buys sausages at-the butcher-shop Sanzot
   “Nestor buys sausages at the Sanzot butcher shop”

ii. *salsichas są compradas t no talho Sanzot*
    sausages are bought at-the butcher-shop Sanzot
    “(intended:) Sausages are bought at the Sanzot butcher shop”

iii. *Salsichas custam caro no talho Sanzot*
    sausages cost expensive at-the butcher-shop Sanzot
    “(intended:) Sausages are expensive at the Sanzot butcher shop”
licensing and V-O agreement. For all of these reasons, we will adopt a different analysis or reflexive passives.

Essentially, the analysis that we propose makes two important claims:

(a) Reflexive passives sentences are passive configurations and rely on the same syntactic mechanisms as copular passives. From a strictly syntactic perspective, SE has the same role as passive morphology, it blocks valuation of the internal argument’s (Acc) case feature by the light v.

(b) All the distributional restrictions on reflexive passives follow from the Animacy hierarchy, which claims that the internal argument cannot outrank the external argument on the Animacy hierarchy. As already explained, the difference between [+A, +P] nouns and inanimates is likely to be due to the fact that DPs ranking high on the Animacy Hierarchy are potential Agents. Yet in passive middles, they are projected as Themes, and their interpretation as Agents should be blocked.

The idea that SE has the same role as passive morphology “absorbing” the Acc case feature can be implemented in different ways. For instance, under a consistent phasal feature-inheritance approach (as in Pestesky and Torego (2004, 2007) or Alboiu (2012), where the [uϕ] features of v are inherited by the case projection TrP [ToP], SE might directly value the phi features of the Tr/To or v head, thus also valuing its Acc feature.

As already explained, we prefer to let SE merge in the specifier position of an inner Aspect phrase (as also proposed for Italian impersonal reflexive V-O agreement sentences by d’Alessandro 2007), a hypothesis which goes a long way towards explaining some of the properties of this form of passive, in particular the possibility of omitting the IA argument in situations where it does not seem to be omissible in the copular passives. Also, since nothing hinges on this, we will allow v to directly value case, rather than transmit its phi features to a specialized case projections (TrP or ToP), so that the vP includes only the following projections vP> AspP> VP (instead of vP > ToP> AspP > VP).

An additional reason for not treating SE as a verbal head has to do with the syntax of clitics. It has been shown by Săvescu (2009) that, at least in Romanian, clitics move as phrases to some middle field position and then target a Person field above T; this view can account for Romanian clitic clusters. The analysis proposed here is compatible with these assumptions (even if we’ll continue to assume that there cliticization to TP rather then to τPs).

6.2. Adapting Collins’s analysis of the passive to reflexive passive derivations
In the early transformational analyses of the passive (e.g. Chomsky 1957), the subject of an active voice sentence and the agent of the corresponding passive one were derived from a common underlying subject position. Beginning with Chomsky (1981) this straightforward approach was abandoned and it was assumed that the by-phrase in passive sentences didn’t have any direct relation to the subject of the corresponding active sentence. This assumption is incorporated into the well-known analyses of the passive of Jaeggli (1986) and Baker Johnson and Roberst (1989).

However, to account for the data that motivated the common DS analysis, these analyses are forced to resort to some very unusual operations, which barely find their place in the MP, such as theta-role absorption by the –en morpheme and theta role transmission of the external theta role to the by-phrase. These problems have prompted a return to forms of the earlier analysis which assumed the same underlying structure for corresponding active passive pairs, in a series of works including: Collins (2005), Bowers (2010), Berke and Grillo. At the same time, as already shown above, more careful research has shown that the status of the by-phrase in passives is that of an argument, c-commanded (at some level of structure, by all the other arguments (see Bowers 2010: 31-75) One argument which carries over to Romanian is supplied by Principle C effects.

(86) a. *The books were given to himi by Johni
    *Cărțile i s-au dat luii de către Ionii
b. *Casa i s-a atribuit luii de către Băsescui

We propose to develop an analysis of SE-passives along the lines of Collins (2005). Essentially, the common DS analysis of the passive faces a locality problem: how can the IA inside the VP target SpecT, as long as the EA, in Spec, vP is closer to it ? To solve this problem, Collins proposes that the whole phrase containing the object (the Part containing the VP) first moves to a position above the subject, specifically the PartP moves to Spec Voice P, where the VoiceP is immediately above the vP and is headed by the preposition by, viewed as a functional element which signals the passive. The IA is thus “smuggled” to a position above the EA, where it is closer to T than the EA. This allows it to move to SpecT. Technically, the smuggling step is required to license the uninterpretable features of the participle head -en. The voice head has this role in Collins’s analysis

Inanimate IA
Let us see how this derivation could work for an inanimate IA, a situation where the IA ends up in the Spec,T position, as testified by the possibility of SOR.

(87) Plângerea se semnează de toți cei implicați
    complaint.DEF SE sign by all those involved
    “The complaint is signed by all those involved”

The initial vP is as shown below. The lexical V raises the Asp. The light v will value its features by Agree with SE; assuming that SE is number defective, the light v will probe further down agreeing in number with the IA. What matters is the blocking effect of SE with respect to the IA. Since the light v has valued the Case feature of v, it cannot also value the Case feature of the IA. The IA is active having an unvalued structural Case feature.

(88)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
vP \\
| \text{EA} & \text{v'} \\
| \text{toți} & \text{v} & \text{AspP} \\
| \text{cei} & [u\phi] & \text{SE} & \text{Asp'} \\
| \text{implicați} & [u\text{Case}] & \text{Asp} & \text{VP} \\
| \text{IA} & [i\phi] & \text{semnează} \\
\end{array}
\]

plângerea

At the next step, the Voice P is projected, headed by the functional Preposition de (către) “by”. For reasons that require an explanation, the AspP moves to the specifier of the VoiceP. Consider the configuration that arises following merger of the T head.

(89)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
T \\
| \text{VoiceP} \\
| \text{AspP} \\
| \text{Voice'} \\
| \text{SE} & \text{Asp'} & \text{Voice} \\
| \text{IA} & \text{VP} \\
\end{array}
\]
Intuitively the smuggling step has the same motivation as in Collins’s analysis. The IA argument, which has an unvalued Case feature escapes to a position where it is closer to T than the external argument. The reflexive pronoun is no longer active since its case feature has been valued. The V+Asp raist to T (or higher). The T head agrees with the IA, as it does in passive configurations. The reflexive pronoun, which is in a specifier position in (ii) will cliticize on T, moving to T in one step or in two. The EA argument, which is theta-licensed by the light v, is left behind and is case assigned by the functional preposition de. While the smuggling step solves a lot of problems, it is quite unclear what forces this step. Recall that in Collins’ analysis the movement of the Participle phrase to Spec, Voice P is a means of checking the uninterpretable features of participle head -en (Collins 2005: pagina). Since in SE-passives the verb is active, it does not have any need to raise to Voice (with or without pied-piping) and anyway the Voice head is not specified as [-active], since such a specification on the Voice head would require merge of the passive auxiliary be. We propose that the AspP moves to Spec Voice P in order to satisfy the selectional properties of SE. We will assume that passive SE c-selects the Voice head [Voice de]. In fact such a proposal has already been made by Authier and Reed (1996: 17), who propose that in those dialects where middle SE/SI is compatible with the by-phrase requiring a passive derivation, SE/SI has the following lexical entry:

(90) The middle SE of Canadian French and Madrid Spanish

Absorption 0-externe
Acc

c-selection ___ (par) DP (Authier and Reed 1996: 17)

If this proposal is correct, then passive SE moves to a position where it can satisfy its selectional restriction. Since SE is a phrase, its movement past the subject also causes a locality problem, this is why SE pied-pipes the whole phrase that contains it. Assuming that T has an EPP feature, the IA will be attracted to Spec T to delete this feature.
The derivation of passive SE sentences thus follows from the features of SE, as desired. Thus, the lexicon entry of SE must be modified SE \([-\text{anaphoric}, \pm \text{agentive} ([\text{Voice de}])].\)

**Animate IA**

From the analysis of the data above, the most significant property of \([+A, +P]\) is their obligatory property interpretation. From a syntactic point of view, SE-passive sentences with \([+A, +P]\) subjects show the following properties:

(a) NPs which do not have the property reading (proper names and pronouns) are excluded from SE-passive sentences.

(b) When SOR is obligatory (i.e. raising out of gerund clauses), animate personal nouns are exceptionally case-marked by the main verb, but they cannot have DOM because of their property interpretation.

(c) When SOR is optional (i.e. raising out of finite clause), it is ruled out of SE-passive sentences. We have interpreted this as evidence that in finite SE-passives the subject does not target the canonical subject position. We turn to the syntax of finite SE-passives now.

As already explained above, coercion of the IA into a property reading is a manifestation of the Animacy Hierarchy. In a passive sentence the Theme should not outrank the Agent on the Animacy Hierarchy. But when the Theme is \([+A, +P]\) it appears to have equal rank with the Agent, so the Theme is coerced into a non-argumental property, \(<e, t\>\) reading, becoming the equivalent of verbal modifier. Since at least in finite passive-SE clauses, \([+A, +P]\) nominals do not reach TP, they cannot be said to check structural Nominative through agreement with T. Rather, as also suggested by d’Alessandro (2007), following Cinque (1988), these subjects check case through incorporation into the V. This is a common case valuation strategy for arguments which have a property interpretation.
and are licensed as modifiers. In SE-passive sentences of this type, Spec T is occupied by a null expletive pro, available in Romanian (cf. Alboiu 2012). The role of the null expletive pro is to check the EPP and phi features of Tense, while also valuing its own Case features. Pro itself has interpretable, but unvalued phi features at merge and it is in a c-commanding position which allows it to probe the subject and gets its phi-features valued. Thus there is Agree between pro and the subject and pro and T. The outcome is that in null-expletive languages like Romanian, the verb agrees with the logical subject, even when the latter does not occupy the canonical Spec T position. The expletive plays its usual role. It allows the true subject to signal its specific pragmatic and semantic properties (see Alboiu 2012), i.e. it allows the subject to signal the property reading (and Theme interpretation through its strongly preferred post verbal position.

(92)

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
TP & pro & T' \\
\text{iϕ} & \text{uCase} & \text{se} & \text{Voice'} & \text{T} & \text{AspP} \\
\text{Voice} & \text{V} \text{P} & \text{Asp} \\
\text{VP} & \text{EA} & \text{v'} & \text{V+Asp} & \text{V} \\
\text{IA} & \text{de} & \text{v} & \text{….} \\
\end{array}
\]

The presence of the expletive in Romanian is confirmed by comparable examples in French, which uses the overt expletive il or the non-expletive ce to satisfy the EPP property of the verb. The phi features of the overt expletive are fully specified. The expletive satisfies the EPP property and values the phi features of T, while T values its Nominative case features. The verb agrees with the overt expletive, which is not in a chain with the logical subject, since the overt expletive has no reason to target the logical subject. A similar conclusion is reached in Ruvet (1972)

(93) a. Il s’est vendu beaucoup de livres
   “A lot of books have been sold”
 b. Une foule, ça se disperse aisemment
   “A bunch of people is easy to disperse”
 c. La foule s’est dispersée vers huit heures
   “The bunch of people dispersed around eight o’clock”
6. Explaining the diachronic facts

The comparison of the 19th century Romanian data with later Romanian shows a clear tendency, namely, that of strengthening the effects of the Animacy Hierarchy, which require that in reflexive passive sentences the Theme should not outrank the Agent along the Animacy hierarchy. Some of the effects of this process have been grammaticalized.

(i) One constraint which has been grammaticalized is the ban on proper names and pronouns; both are excluded from the IA position of reflexive passive sentences. Remember that DPs could be smuggled across Agents in the passive derivation, only if they were coerced into denoting properties. This is not possible since pronouns and proper names do not have a property denotation. It appears that this constraint is a (more) recent grammatical development in the syntax of reflexive passives.

(ii) It is for the same reason that passives are not longer possible in the first and second person. Such a derivation would again entail smuggling a necessarily personal e-type constituent (first or second pronoun) across an agent.

(94) *Eu mă învăț de el
I CL.ACC.1SG teach by him
(intended): “I am being taught by him”

(95) 

The strengthening of the Animacy constraint is likely to be the effect of the competition between the BE-passive and the SE passive.
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