

A cross-linguistic analysis of IL/SL copular constructions in Romance

Federico Silvagni
Universidad Complutense de Madrid
f.silvagni@ucm.es

Goal and main claims. This paper deals with the Individual/Stage-Level aspectual distinction in the domain of non-verbal predication in Romance languages. Particular attention is given to the way IL and SL-copular structures (CopPs) are derived across languages, by comparing those languages that have two copulas (*ser* and *estar*, such as Catalan, Portuguese and Spanish) with mono-copular languages (French, Italian and Romanian). I argue that a single aspectual formal feature drives the derivation of SL-CopPs, and it is thus implicated in the IL/SL distinction across Romance languages. More precisely, I put forward the proposal that SL-ness is encoded as an uninterpretable instance of a [Stage] feature in non-verbal SLPs and that SL-CopPs are derived by virtue of a concord phenomenon between the predicate and an Asp head that functions as the locus of interpretation of SL-ness, which is realized as *estar* in languages such as Catalan, Portuguese and Spanish. The conclusion is that the inventory of aspectual elements is the same across Romance languages, which thus differ only with respect to the presence of a SL-copula (namely, *estar*).

The problem and some data. As it is well known, Catalan, Portuguese and Spanish alternate between two copulas (*ser/estar*), and this phenomenon has commonly been related to the Individual-Level/Stage-Level aspectual distinction (Arche, 2006, 2012; Cunha, 2011; Fábregas, 2012; Fernández Leborans, 1999; Leonetti, 1994; RAE & ASALE, 2009; Raposo, 2013; Silvagni, 2017, 2018; a.m.o.). Oppositely, very little attention has been paid to the IL/SL contrast in mono-copular languages, such as French, Italian or Romanian.

We can observe that in these languages the lack of a specific SL-copula does not prevent the IL/SL distinction. In fact, some *être*Ps (French), *essere*Ps (Italian) and *a fi*Ps (Romanian) exhibit the typical SL-grammatical effects: for example, they allow event-related locatives (1) and quantifiers (2). Moreover, some predicates, as typical SLPs, can function as secondary depictive predicates (3) and they can be exclusively postnominal (4).

- | | | |
|-----|--|------------|
| (1) | a. Anne est {allongée / *intelligente} dans son lit. | (French) |
| | b. Anna è {stesa / *intelligente} nel suo letto. | (Italian) |
| | c. Ana e {întinsă / *inteligentă} în patul ei.
'Ana is lying / intelligent on her bed.' | (Romanian) |
| (2) | a. À chaque fois qu'Anne est {malade / *étudiante}, elle pleure. | (French) |
| | b. Ogni volta che Anna è {ammalata / *studentessa}, piange. | (Italian) |
| | c. De câte ori Ana e {bolnavă / *studentă}, plânge.
'Every time Ana is sick / a student she cries.' | (Romanian) |
| (3) | a. Anne est allée au travail {fatiguée / *intelligente}. | (French) |
| | b. Anna è andata al lavoro {stanca / *intelligente}. | (Italian) |
| | c. Ana a mers la lucru {obosită / *inteligentă}. | (Romanian) |
| | 'Ana went to work tired / intelligent.' | |
| (4) | a. l' (*malade) enfant (malade). | (French) |
| | b. la (*ammalata) bambina (ammalata). | (Italian) |
| | c. (*bolnavă) fetiță (bolnavă). | (Romanian) |
| | 'The sick child.' | |

Proposal. I build the proposal on recent studies on Spanish, which suggest that SL-structures (*estar*Ps) are distinguished from IL-structures (*ser*Ps) by virtue of an AspP (Camacho, 2012; Fábregas, 2012; Silvagni, 2015, 2017). Following Zeijlsta's (2004, 2008, 2012, 2014) theory on formal features, in Silvagni (2017) a doubling phenomenon with respect to SL-ness is observed in Spanish copular clauses (5a), and thus *estar*Ps are analysed as an

instance of syntactic agreement between an uninterpretable [Stage] feature, located on the SLP, and its interpretable counterpart on the Asp head, which is overtly realized as *estar* (5b). Therefore, the inventory of aspectual elements in Spanish is argued to be as in (6).

- (5) a. Ana *(está) sola.
 [Stage] [Stage]
- b. [AspP [Asp estar_[iS]] [AP ... [A sola_[uS]]]]
- (6) Asp (*estar*) [iS]
 SLPs [uS]

As it has been argued for Spanish, I analyse data from mono-copular languages (such as the above-mentioned grammatical effects [1-4]) as evidence for the presence of an AspP in SL-structures and a formal requirement of SLPs to stand in a proper syntactic relation with an Asp operator. Therefore, I propose that the same formal feature [i/uS] is involved in the derivation of SL-CopPs in French, Italian and Romanian: even though an overt doubling phenomenon is not observed in these structures (due to the lack of an *estar*-copula), I argue that SLPs exhibit a concord with a covert Asp head (7). Oppositely, IL-structures, as *ser*Ps, would simply lack that feature (8). In conclusion, the inventory of aspectual elements in mono-copular languages would be coincident with that of *ser/estar* languages, the only difference being the lack of a SL-copula (9).

- (7) [AspP [Asp_[iS]] [VP [V être/essere/a fi] [AP ... [A seul/solo_[uS]]]]]
- (8) [VP [V être/essere/a fi/ser] [AP ... [A intelligente]]]
- (9) Asp [iS]
 SLP [uS]

The idea that the same formal feature drives the derivation of SL-CopPs across languages (and it is thus responsible for the IL/SL distinction) has relevant implications also for feature theory. Mainly, the analysis points out that Romance languages show an “aspectual concord” phenomenon that is completely independent from the expression of resultativity (Arsenijević 2011) or telicity (MacDonald 2008) and, instead, it looks like negative and modal concord phenomena (Zeijlstra 2004, 2008; Biberauer & Zeijlstra 2012; Dekker & Zeijlstra 2012).

References

- Arche, M. J. (2006). *Individuals in Time: Tense, aspect and the individual/stage distinction*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Arche, M. J. (2012). On the Aspectuality of the Individual-Level/Stage-Level dichotomy. *Borealis*, 1(2), 109–131.
- Arsenijević, B. (2011). *Verb prefixation of the Slavic type in terms of concord and relativization*. Ms., UPF.
- Biberauer, T., & Zeijlstra, H. (2012). Negative concord in Afrikaans: filling a typological gap. *Journal of Semantics*, 29, 345–371.
- Camacho, J. (2012). *Ser and estar: the Individual/Stage-level Distinction and Aspectual Predication*. In J. I. Hualde, A. Olarrea, & E. O'Rourke (Eds.), *The Handbook of Hispanic Linguistics* (pp. 453–475). Wiley-Blackwell.
- Cunha, L. F. (2011). Phase states and their interaction with individual-level and stage-level predicates. In A. Carrasco Gutiérrez (Ed.), *Sobre estados y estatividad* (pp. 45–62). Muenchen: Lincom.
- Dekker, P., & Zeijlstra, H. (2012). Concord and Doubling Phenomena: an Introduction. *Journal of Semantics*, 29(3), 295–303.
- Fábregas, A. (2012). A guide to IL and SL in Spanish: Properties, problems and proposals. *Borealis*, 1(2), 1–71.
- Fernández Leborans, M. J. (1999). La predicación: las oraciones copulativas. In I. Bosque & V. Demonte (Eds.), *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española* (pp. 2357–2460). Madrid: Espasa Calpe.
- Leonetti, M. (1994). *Ser y estar: estado de la cuestión*. *Barataria*, 1, 182–205.
- MacDonald, J. E. (2008). *The Syntactic Nature of Inner Aspect. A minimalist perspective*. Amsterdam - Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- RAE & ASALE. (2009). *Nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Madrid: Espasa Libros.
- Raposo, E. B. P. (2013). Orações copulativas e predicacões secundárias. In E. P. Raposo et al. (Eds.), *Gramática do Português*. Lisboa: Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian.
- Silvagni, F. (2015). *Ser-I, Estar-S. Lingue e Linguaggio*, 14(2), 215–232.
- Silvagni, F. (2017). *Entre Estados y Eventos. Un estudio del aspecto interno del español*. PhD Thesis, UAB.
- Silvagni, F. (2018). Sobre la distinción Individuo/Estadio y su relación con ser y estar. *Revista Española de Lingüística*, 48, 15–56.
- Zeijlstra, H. (2004). *Sentential Negation and Negative Concord*. PhD Thesis, University of Amsterdam.
- Zeijlstra, H. (2008). On the syntactic flexibility of formal features. In T. Biberauer (Ed.), *The Limits of Syntactic Variation* (pp. 143–174). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zeijlstra, H. (2012). There is only one way to agree. *The Linguistic Review*, 29(3), 491–539.
- Zeijlstra, H. (2014). On the uninterpretability of interpretable features. In P. Kosta et al. (Eds.), *Minimalism and Beyond. Radicalizing the interfaces* (pp. 109–129). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.