PAST PARTICIPLE AGREEMENT IN MAJORCAN CATALAN:
THE RELEVANCE OF INNER ASPECT

SEBASTIÀ SALVÀ I PUIG
Centre de Lingüística Teòrica (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Majorcan Catalan (at least for some speakers, especially the elder ones) admits, optionally, past participle agreement with the object *in situ* (PPA$_{OIS}$) (1). However, a fact not observed until now is that PPA$_{OIS}$ is not always felicitous: it is accepted in *telic dynamic* events, but is very odd in stative situations and in *some atelic* dynamic constructions, but not in all of them.

(1) S'   ha   {*rentades*/rentat}   ses   mans.
     CL.REFL has washed.{FEM.PL/MAS.SG} the.FEM.PL hands.FEM.PL
     '{He/she} has washed {his/her} hands'.

Firstly, PPA$_{OIS}$ seems to be infelicitous with *K(imian)* or *pure states* (2a); and also with *D(avidsonian)* or *interval states* (2b), which involve an event argument, although they still denote non-dynamic or homogeneous situations:

(2) *a*. Na   Maria sempre ha {temut/*temudes}   ses bubotes.
         ART.PERS.FEM Maria always has feared.{MAS.SG/FEM.PL} the ghosts
         'Maria has always been afraid of ghosts'.

     b. Sa pobresa ha {preocupat/*preocupada} na   Maria des de sempre.
         the poverty has worried.{MAS.SG/FEM.SG} ART Maria since   always
         'Maria has always worried about poverty'.

Nevertheless, PPA$_{OIS}$ is possible with some «stative» verbs that can be used in *telic dynamic* constructions (3). These are the same kind of verbs that allow accusative case in Finnish, instead of partitive case, as reported by KIPARSKY (1998) —e. g.: *omistaa* ('have, own')—, and they are called *high* (or *level-2*) *pure stative verbs* by JAQUE (2014), which can unfold more verbal structure —not only Init(iation), but also Proc(ess) and Res(ult), in RAMCHAND's (2008) terms— if they are used in past simple or present perfect.

(3) Has   {*tenguda*/tengut}   una   idea extraordinària!
     have.2SG had.{FEM.SG/MAS.SG} an   idea extraordinary
     'You've had a great idea!'.

Just like the Finnish accusative/partitive case distinction observed by KIPARSKY, in Majorcan Catalan we find a very interesting contrast: in (4a), with PPA$_{OIS}$, *all* the female students the professor had are brilliant; but this is not necessarily true for (4b), without PPA$_{OIS}$.

(4) *a*. Aquest curs he *tengudes* [$_{SC}$ [unes estudiants] [brillants]].
     b. Aquest curs he *tengut* [$_{DP}$ unes estudiants brillants].
         'This academic-year I've had some brilliant female-students'.

Secondly, PPA$_{OIS}$ seems also to be impossible in some *atelic dynamic* constructions, those ones with nouns bounded by a determiner/quantifier (5). By contrast, it is perfectly gramma-tical with bare plurals (6a) and with bare mass nouns (6b).

(5) He   {cercat/*cercada}   sa solució, però no l' he   trobada.
     have.I searched.{MAS.SG/FEM.SG} the solution but   not CL have.I found.FEM.SG
     'I've looked for the solution, but I haven't found it'.

(6) *a*. En   Pere ha {*cantades*/cantat}   cançons tot s' horabaixa.
         ART.PERS.MAS Pere has sung.{FEM.PL/MAS.SG} songs   all the afternoon
         'Pere has been singing songs all afternoon'.

     b. Hem   {*beguda*/begut}   cervesa durant tota una hora.
         have.we drunk.{FEM.SG/MAS.SG} beer   during all   one hour
         'We've been drinking beer for a full hour'.

For KAYNE (1989), PPA$_{OIS}$ would be a case similar to right-dislocations, with a null resumptive clitic moving through the specifier of Agr$_O$. But for BELLETTI 2006, it would be strange that a direct object systematically be right-dislocated, and the presence of the silent clitic would need

to be independently justified. I argue that KAYNE's analysis can be (at least partially) maintained, considering sentences like (7), where PPA with an NPI is ungram-matical (unless it is modified), and I propose that the *pro*-object moves to a LowTop position:

(7) No havia   *presa*   [cap rabiada   *(tan grossa)]NPI mai.
     not had.3SG taken.FEM.SG any rage   so big   never
     '{He/she} had never been so enraged'.

D'ALESSANDRO & ROBERTS (2008), considering the position of measure adverbs, claim that PPA$_{OIS}$ in Abruzzese would imply that both the participle and the object remain in a position lower than v^* (a phase head), in contrast to current standard Italian (which do not allow PPA$_{OIS}$). Nevertheless, as for adverbs, Majorcan Catalan behaves just like standard Catalan and Italian (8). Moreover, their proposal (and also KAYNE's) would not explain the contrasts from (1)-(6), which show that, as for PPA$_{OIS}$, event structure should be taken into account.

(8) *a*. Le   so   poche   capite.   *[Abruzzese]*
         CL.it am   little understood
     b. L'   ho   capito poco.   *[Standard Italian]*
     c. Ho   he   entès   poc.   *[Standard and Majorcan Catalan]*
         CL.it have.I understood little
         'I (have) understood it little'.

I follow BORER (2005), MACDONALD (2008) and TRAVIS (2010) in assuming that a specific functional head (Asp), related to so-called *inner aspect* and *event quantisation*, can be present in the clausal structure, between vP and VP. Asp instantiates syntactically the so-called *object-to-event mapping* through an *Agree* relation, as the NP object can influence the aspectual interpretation of the whole predicate, depending on the NP being *quantised* or *non-quantised*. I propose that Asp establishes a double *Agree* relation with the object, in order to get two kind of unvalued features valued: on the one hand, its quantity or quantisation features (if Asp is valued as [+q], the predicate will be interpreted as telic; if it is valued as [–q], the predicate will be atelic) and, on the other hand, its [$u\phi$] (gender and number) features.

If Asp is not present in the structure —as in K-states, according to BORER (2005) and MACDONALD (2008)—, the impossibility of PPA$_{OIS}$ follows. I assume with BORER (2005), contra MACDONALD (2008), that neither do sentences like (5) have Asp, although they could involve a functional shell (F^S) or, better yet, Proc, in order to license the event argument (as argued by JAQUE 2014 to account for D-states). As a consequence, PPA$_{OIS}$ is also forbidden here. Thus, I argue that Asp is, in fact, Proc with [uq] and [$u\phi$] extra features.

Contra RAMCHAND (2008) (who claims that telicity can emerge either from the presence of a ResP or, with no Res, simply as a semantic entailment), Majorcan PPA$_{OIS}$ shows, like the Finnish accusative/partitive case distinction, that event quantisation is grammatically encoded.

In conclusion, in Majorcan Catalan, the morphophonological insertion of inflectional (gender and number) suffixes in the past participle would be sensitive to the presence of Asp (or Proc$_{[uq][u\phi]}$), which, previously, has maintained a double *Agree* syntactic relation with the NP object. This is coherent with the so-called *Borer-Chomsky conjecture*: parametric variation is restricted to the lexicon and to a narrow category of morphological inflectional properties.

REFERENCES (SELECTED): A. BELLETTI (2006): «(Past) Participle Agreement», in M. Everaert *et al.* (eds.): *The Blackwell Companion to Syntax*, vol. 3, Oxford: Blackwell. **H. BORER (2005):** *Structuring Sense, vol. 2: The Normal Course of Events*, Oxford: OUP. **R. D'ALESSANDRO & I. ROBERTS (2008):** «Movement and Agreement in Italian Past Participles and Defective Phases», *Linguistic Inquiry*, 39. **M. JAQUE (2014):** *La expresión de la estatividad en español: niveles de representación y grados de dinamicidad*, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid; PhD thesis. **R. KAYNE (1989):** «Facets of Romance Past Participle Agreement», in P. Benincà (ed.): *Dialect Variation on the Theory of Grammar*, Dordrecht: Foris. **P. KIPARSKY (1998):** «Partitive Case and Aspect», in M. Butt & W. Geuder (eds.): *The Projection of Arguments: Lexical and Compositional Factors*, Stanford: CSLI. **J. MACDONALD (2008):** *The Syntactic Nature of Inner Aspect*, Amsterdam: J. Benjamins. **G. RAMCHAND (2008):** *Verb Meaning and the Lexicon: A First-Phase Syntax*, Cambridge: CUP. **L. TRAVIS (2010):** *Inner Aspect: The Articulation of VP,* Dordrecht: Springer.