1. Introduction

It is an old observation that languages of the Spanish type fail to deploy both preposition stranding and pseudopassives, as the examples in (1) and (2) below show (cf. Law 2006 and references therein for discussion).

(1) *
Quién contaron todos con?

who counted all with

‘Who did everybody count on?’

(Spanish)

(2) *
José es contado con por todos

José be counted with by everybody

‘José is counted on by everybody’

[from Campos 1991:741]
Plausibly, the factor responsible for (1) is also behind (2), at least if the key element for both processes to take place is the category P, a locus of parametric variation (cf. Abels 2003, Hornstein & Weinberg 1981, Kayne 1984, 1994, 2005, and references therein). In more abstract terms, we seem to be before two constraints affecting prepositions blocking both A and A-bar dependencies, which is what (3) is meant to capture:

(3) In the context \[ \text{Probe} \gg \ P \gg \ XP \ (\gg = c\text{-command}) \]

(ii) \ldots \ XP cannot move (no P-stranding)

(iii) \ldots \ XP cannot be a Goal (no pseudopassives)

This paper discusses data from certain dialects of Spanish that depart from (3) in the context of passive SE sentences, at least for agreement cases. In particular, it will be shown that Long Distance Agreement (LDA) is possible between T (the locus of Nominative Case; cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001) and a DP Goal within a PP. I will compare the data with previously reported evidence involving the Differential Object Marking preposition \( a \) (cf. Torrego 1998, López 2012) in order to argue that there are three types of prepositions when it comes to the possibility for external Probes (φ-complete T) to bypass them.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the agreement options of passive SE sentences. Sections 3 discusses the main properties of two patterns where T can agree with a DP introduced by a preposition; the first pattern covers what RAE-ASALE (2009) dubs “hybrid pattern” (agreement across the differential marker \( a \)), whereas the second pattern involves agreement in the context of more full-fledged prepositions; section 4 puts forward a Probe-Goal analysis of the facts (cf. Chomsky 2000, 2001) that makes use of the idea that P can undergo incorporation (cf. Hornstein & Weinberg 1981, Law 2006). Section 5 contains the main conclusions.
2. Agreement properties of SE sentences in Spanish

Passive/Impersonal SE sentences have been the focus of much research (cf. Raposo & Uriagereka 1996, D’Alessandro 2007, Mendikoetxea 1992, 1999, López 2007, among others). If we concentrate on Spanish, it has been noted that the clitic SE can be part of structures where T agrees with the internal argument (IA, henceforth) (so-called Passive SE; see (4)), but it can also be part of structures where agreement fails (so-called Impersonal SE; see (5)), where T shows default agreement and the IA is headed by a Case marker or not, which depends on independent factors:

(4) Se criticaron los recortes  
SE criticize-3.pl the cuts  
‘Budget cuts were criticized’

(5) a. Se criticó los recortes  
SE criticize-3.sg the cuts  
‘Budget cuts were criticized’

b. Se criticó a los políticos  
SE criticize-3.sg DOM the students  
‘Politicians were criticized’

Consider the patterns above. The sentence in (4) contains a φ-defective v that cannot Case-license the IA los recortes (Eng. ‘the budget cuts’). As argued by both Raposo & Uriagereka (1996), SE may be taken to occupy the external argument position (cf. López 2007), thus behaving like an expletive of sorts (an idea that has been applied to spurious SE in clitic
combinations; cf. Kayne 2000:160, Gallego & Uriagereka 2017). The sentences in (5) are not a bona fide passive: In such cases, v is presumably φ-complete, and the IA receives accusative Case, which can be differentially marked (as in (5b)) or not (as in (5a)); as expected, T shows defective (3rd person singular) agreement.

The two agreeing patterns of sentences involving SE have also been reported in traditional atlases, like in the ALPI (Atlas Lingüístico de la Península Ibérica). The following ALPI maps, taken from De Benito (2010), show that: 

(6)  
a. Se **cortaron treinta pinos** (Eng. ‘Thirty pines were cut’)

b. Se **castigó a los ladrones** (Eng. ‘Thieves were punished’)

---

1 Just to address a question of an anonymous reviewer, although the ALPI also collects information from Portugal, I am here focusing on Spanish data alone.
As a closer look to the data in (4) and (5) reveal, passive and impersonal SE sentences have a common base—they have the same argument structure, the only difference being agreement. In this context, Mendikoetxea (1999: §26.3.2.2.) observes that passive SE sentences can manifest full or partial (defective) agreement, as illustrated in (7a) and (7b) respectively (cf. Zorraquino 1979 for discussion):

(7) a. En este país se dicen muchas gilipollceces (Spanish)
    in this country SE say-3.pl many bullshit
    ‘People say bullshit in this country’

a. En este país se dice muchas gilipollceces (Spanish)
    in this country SE say-3.sg many bullshit
    ‘People say bullshit in this country’

Although (7a) is clearly better to my ear, the patterns in (7) are both possible, and there is no consistent dialectal tendency, as far as I can tell. The $\phi$-defective configuration has been reported in Old Spanish texts, and it is also present in varieties of present-day European and
American Spanish (cf. Mendikoetxea 1999). The \( \varphi \)-complete configuration involves unproblematic local agreement between T and the IA—a situation also displayed in DAT-NOM structures, whose intricacies I put aside here (cf. López 2007, Chomsky 2008).

There are more interesting cross-clausal cases, where agreement takes place at a distance. Thus, matrix T can long-distance agree with the IA of an embedded infinitive. This is well-known in the case of auxiliaries, but the pattern covers semiauxiliaries and other verbs:

(8)  
   a. \[ T [ SE \ V_{AUX} \ [ INF XP ] ] \]  \[ AUX = \text{can, should, etc.} \] 
   b. \[ T [ SE \ V_{SEMIAX} \ [ INF XP ] ] \]  \[ SEMIAUX = \text{try, need, etc.} \]

Consider the following (RAE-ASALE 2009: ch.28), where I indicate Probe and Goal (the agreeing elements) with bold letters.

(9)  
   a. \[ \text{Se} \ \text{intentan}\ [ \text{eliminar} \ \text{ciertas leyes} ] \]  \[ \text{(Spanish)} \] 
   SE tried.3.pl eliminate-inf certain laws
   ‘Certain laws are tried to be eliminate’

\[ \text{\footnotesize 2} \] RAE-ASALE (2009) discusses a series of factors that may be behind the lack of agreement in such cases (the category of the internal argument, its preverbal/postverbal position, the presence of dative arguments, etc.).

\[ \text{\footnotesize 3} \] An anonymous reviewer points out that we should not forget about discourse features and their valuation, as they are key in DAT-NOM constructions. It is unclear what the reviewer means here. If he/she refers to notions like topic or focus, I simply do not assume they are features in the Probe-Goal sense (for discussion, see Chomsky 2001, 2008, Chomsky et al. 2017, Ott & Šimik to appear). The fact that IOs participate in an agreement relations before DOs (or internal arguments more generally) can be accounted for without resorting to any discourse feature.
b. Se **necesitan** [ conocer sus **propiedades** ]

SE need-3.pl know-inf their properties

‘Their properties are needed to be known’

c. No se **supieron** [ usar esos **recursos** ]

not SE knew-3.pl use-inf those resources

‘Those resources were not known to be used’

d. Se **han querido** [ manchar **reputaciones** ]

SE have-3.pl wanted damage-inf reputations

‘Reputations were wanted to be damaged’

Evidence like the one provided by RAE-ASA LE (2009) was also collected by dialectologists working on atlases:

(10) En el huerto se **podían** plantar **rosales** (Eng. ‘Rose bushes can be planted in the garden’)

[from de Benito 2010: 13]
Interestingly, LDA situations go beyond SE scenarios, as in (11). Like before, the φ-Probe on T scans into the embedded clause, displaying a phenomenon we can dub “hyperagreement”.

(11) a. Siempre nos **tocaron** [ resolver **problemas** ]
always to.us be-our-turn-3.pl solve problems
‘We always had to solve problems’

b. Nos **faltan** [ hacer **dos goles** ]
to.us lack-3.pl make two goals
‘We still have to score two goals’

Notice that, in both SE and SE-less cases, agreement is only in number, not person (cf. Etxepare 2005), but there seems to be robust evidence that we are dealing with syntactic LDA. To

---

4 Fernández-Serrano (2016) provides a detailed analysis of the data above based on the idea that agreement takes place whenever the embedded clause projects less layers of structure (undergoing a restructuring of sorts, but from a phase-theoretic perspective; cf. Gallego 2009), which has morphological and interpretive consequences.

5 A reviewer points out that agreement is also in third person, but this is not accurate, as this is a default value. If agreement was complete (number and person), then one would expect to find, for instance, SE sentences with 1st or 2nd person agreement; however, as López (2007) points out, this is impossible in Spanish:

(i) *Se **vimos** unos lingüistas en el mercado ayer  
SE saw-1.pl some linguists in the market yesterday
‘Some linguists were seen in the market yesterday’
(intended meaning: Some of us linguists were seen in the market)

(ii) *Se **visteis** unos lingüistas en el mercado ayer  
SE saw-2.pl some linguists in the market yesterday
conclude, consider previously unnoticed situations in which intervention-like effects arise in the context of an auxiliary:

(12)  
a. ?Me  \textit{faltaron}  [ corregir \textit{esos exámenes} ] 
    to.me  lacked-3.pl  mark  those exams
    I couldn’t mark those exams
b. ?*Me  \textit{faltaron}  [ haber corregido \textit{esos exámenes} ] 
    to.me  lacked-3.pl  have  marked  those exams
    I couldn’t have marked those exams

A second piece of evidence comes from clitic climbing (cf. Gallego 2016, Paradis 2016, and references therein). As (13) shows, LDA is worse if a clitic stays in-situ:

(13)  
a. Se  \textit{pueden}  [ leer \textit{esos libros} ] 
    SE  can-3.pl  read  those  books
    Those books can be read
b. Se  me  \textit{pueden}  [ leer(*me) \textit{esos libros} ] 
    SE  to.me  can-3.pl  read  to.me  those  books
    Those books can be read to me

Let us conclude. This section has reviewed the main properties of SE sentences in Spanish, paying attention to the various agreement patterns they display in the different varieties of

\begin{quote}
‘Some linguists were seen in the market yesterday’
\end{quote}

(intended meaning: Some of you linguists were seen in the market)

[from López 2007:127]
Spanish. Two main patterns have been identified, following the literature. One features a φ-defective v, which explains the lack of Accusative Case (and thus agreement with T). The other features a φ-complete v, which blocks Agree (T, IA). As we have seen, the agreeing / non-agreeing option is not subject to any systematic dialectal logic (there is no “isogloss” telling us where agreement stops), so we seem to have a case of optionality—with a preference towards full agreement, a murky issue that seems to have semantic consequences in biclausal scenarios (cf. Martin & Uriagereka 1998, Fernández Serrano 2016).

As we have seen, such optionality is frequent whenever the IA is not differentially marked. However, agreement has also been reported in cases where the DO is preceded by a Case marked, a pattern I would like to refer to as hybrid and that I discuss in the following section.

3. Agreement across P in Spanish

This section considers two configurations in which agreement between T and the complement of a preposition can take place in Spanish. The first one involves differential marker a (cf. Torrego 1998, López 2012) and the second one does full-fledged prepositions. Roughly, the relevant abstract patterns are as in (14), where K and P give rise to Case and P projections.\(^6\)

\[(14) \quad \text{a. } [ \text{SE } T \text{ (Probe) } [vP \ldots [ K \text{ XP (Goal) } ] ] ] \quad [K = \text{differential marker}] \]
\[\uparrow \]
\[\text{b. } [ \text{SE } T \text{ (Probe) } [vP \ldots [ P \text{ XP (Goal) } ] ] ] \quad [P = \text{full fledged preposition}] \]
\[\uparrow \]

\(^6\) The distinction between K and P is equivalent to that between functional or lexical prepositions (van Riemsdijk 1990 and references therein for discussion).
After briefly discussing the case of agreement across DOM (namely, (16a)), I turn my attention to (16b), suggesting that P undergoes incorporation, giving rise to a P-stranding-less version of pseudopassives. In terms of parametric tendencies, the second scenario is unexpected, given the properties of Romance languages. This should explain its limited availability, which seems to be largely restricted to American varieties.

3.1. Agreement across DOM

We have already seen that SE sentences can be passive (with agreement) and impersonal (without agreement). Above we saw the relevant data in (4) and (5), repeated as (15) and (16):

(15) Se criticaron los recortes (Spanish)
    SE criticize-3.pl the cuts
    ‘Budget cuts were criticized’

(16) a. Se criticó los recortes (Spanish)
    SE criticize-3.sg the cuts
    ‘Budget cuts were criticized’
    b. Se criticó a los políticos (Spanish)
    SE criticize-3.sg DOM the students
    ‘Politicians were criticized’

As noted, if $v$ is $\phi$-complete (the (15) example), the IA presumably receives accusative Case, which can be coupled with the differential marker $a$, as in (16b). This is precisely the pattern in which agreement is most unlikely to happen—for the same reason agreement does not bypass prepositions more generally. This said, agreement seems to be possible in some cases,
even in the context of DOM; this variant of the pattern in (16b), to which I return below, is called “hybrid” by RAE-ASALE (2009).\textsuperscript{7}

The v of (16) should be $\varphi$-complete v, therefore $v^*$ in the sense of Chomsky (2001). However, it is not immediately obvious that bona fide accusative Case is assigned in the two examples offered in (16). Consider the contrast in (17), where the accusative clitic lo (Eng. ‘it’) can only be used if the antecedent is animate (a Trump – Eng. ‘Trump’):\textsuperscript{8}

(17) a. *Los poemas, se \textit{los} recita en clase de literatura \hspace{1cm} \text{(Spanish)}

the poems SE it-ACC.m.pl read-3.sg in class of Literature

‘Poems, we read them in Literature class’

b. ?A Trump, aquí se \textit{lo} ve como a un matón \hspace{1cm} \text{(Spanish)}

DOM Trump here SE it-ACC.m.sg see-3.sg like to a thug

‘Trump, he is seen like a thug’

\textsuperscript{7} Variation in this domain does not seem to adhere to any clear cut geographic distinction. For some speakers, agreement is optional, and has no interpretive consequences. Planells (2017) approaches the facts by taking T to agree optionally with SE or the (shifted, for DOM reasons) internal argument—which is responsible for partial and complete agreement respectively. The approach makes use of Chomsky’s (1995) equidistance (cf. Gallego 2013 for discussion), but it could also be approached by the approach to variation put forward in Obata & Epstein (2016), where parameters boil down to SMT-compliant derivations whose order of operations vary.

\textsuperscript{8} As an anonymous reviewer rightly points out, there is non-trivial variation concerning the case of clitics in these constructions, even within European varieties of Spanish. Taking into account all the dialectal subtleties that concern clitics is beyond the scope of this paper.
The asymmetry in (17) looks consistent, so let’s assume the following generalization, taking it for granted that only DOM signals accusative Case assignment:

(18) If the IA is differentially-marked (a XP), then SE v is v* (φ-complete)

An interesting piece of evidence, indicating that accusative Case may not be at play even in the presence of DOM, comes from the observation that leísta varieties of Spanish show a preference for the dative clitic le (Eng. ‘to him/her’) in the presence of SE, as in (19):

(19) a. Se lo critica
    SE cl.acc criticize-3.sg
    ‘He is criticized’

b. Se {lo / le} critica
    SE cl.acc cl.dat criticize-3.sg
    ‘He is criticized’

This raises the more general question whether differentially-marked IAs receive true accusative. If the answer is negative, it would explain the restricted availability of lo/la (only with animates), and the preference for le in European Spanish. The tendency to have a lo > le shift in the context of SE is noted by Ordóñez (2004):

---

* Although (18) is stable across dialects, there are well-known exceptions. In particular, the pattern is more restricted in European Spanish. In non-European varieties, on the other hand, RAE-ASAILE (2009: §41.12m) observes that v* can assign accusative Case to inanimate IAs in the Andean, Chilean, and River Plate areas (cf. Gallego 2016).
(20) Si hay que fusilar-lo, SE le fusila (European Spanish)

if there-be-3.sg that shoot-CL SE CL shoot-3.sg

‘If he must be shot, he is shot’

[from P. Preston, Franco, cited by Ordóñez 2004]

This accusative – dative connection would naturally align with leísmo, which seems to be present in the only Romance language with consistent DOM: Spanish. Colomina et al. (2017) in fact argue that DOM involves a process of accusative case displacement, assuming that the structure that underlies (21) is (22):

(21) Nadie visitó a Trump (Spanish)

nobody visited-3.sg DOM Trump

‘Nobody visited Trump’

(22) [vP Nadie v [vP PROVIDE [ to Trump [ VISIT ] ] ] ]

In this context, it is interesting to note that Mexican Spanish, which is not leista, becomes (obligatorily) leista if SE is introduced. In fact, as (23) reveals, this type of leismo is more general than the one present in European varieties, for it applies to both masculine and feminine DPs (as in bona fide datives, which is emphasized by Colomina et al 2017).

(23) a. A tu amigo SE le ve preocupado (Mexican Spanish)

DOM your friend-m.sg SE him-dat.m.sg see.3.sg worried

‘Your friend, he looks worried’

b. A tu amiga SE le ve preocupada (Mexican Spanish)
In Gallego (2016), the previous description of the facts is built on to argue that impersonal SE sentences can be divided into two broad dialects:

(24)  

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Dialect A: $v$ is $\phi$-defective
  \item b. Dialect B: $v$ is $\phi$-complete
\end{itemize}

The morphological distinction targeting $v$ implies the following:

(25)  

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Dialect A: $[vP \, v \, [vP \, V \, [pp \, a \, \text{DP}_{\text{OBLIQUE}}]]]$ (leísta Spanish)
  \hline
  \item b. Dialect B:  
    \begin{itemize}
      \item i. $[vP \, v \phi \, [vP \, V \, [KP \, a \, \text{DP}_{\text{ACC}}]]]$ (non-leísta Spanish)
      \hline
      \item ii. $[\ldots \, T \phi \ldots \, [vP \, V \, [KP \, a \, \text{DP}_{\text{NOM}}]]]$ (hybrid pattern)
    \end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

The key distinction between A and B dialects is whether accusative Case is assigned or displaced. If the latter, some oblique (dative, if some version of Marantz’s 1991 Dependent Case approach is at work) assigner takes care of the IA.

The most intriguing pattern is (25bii), which is reported by Ordóñez & Treviño (2007). As these authors note, Mexican and Argentinian varieties of Spanish, feature what RAE-ASALE (2009) calls “hybrid” pattern (cf. Planells 2017 and references therein for discussion).
These data are not expected if the IA is inactive, after receiving accusative Case. In order to account for them, we would need to assume that: (i) the IA is Case-less (otherwise the \( \varphi \)Probe on T could not match it) and (ii) the Case marker a cannot give rise to a PP or a KP projection. It must in fact be analyzed as PF stuff, inserted in the NS → PF wing of the derivation. In other words, as a dissociated morpheme (cf. Halle & Marantz 1993).

Once we have reviewed agreement across differential markers, in the next section I pay attention to situations where agreement is rampant, in fact ignoring not mere functional Case elements, but seemingly full fledged prepositions.

### 3.2. Agreement across full fledged P

We have just discussed data where the \( \varphi \)-Probe on T within SE sentences matches a differentially marked IA. Such cases, though subject to a rather unclear dialectal distribution, fall into place the moment Spanish a can be considered a functional element, not a preposition of its own right. Surprisingly, some American Spanish dialects seem to allow a pattern of agreement that can also ignore prepositions other than a. Consider the examples in (27), taken from internet searches:

\[(26) \quad \text{a. Finalmente, se castigaron a los culpables} \quad \text{(Mexican Spanish)} \]

\[
\text{finally SE punished-3.pl to the culprits} \\
\text{‘Finally, the culprits were punished’} \\
\]

\[(26) \quad \text{b. Se evacuaron a más de 120.000 damnificados} \quad \text{(Argentinian Spanish)} \]

\[
\text{SE evacuated-3.pl to more of 12.000 damaged} \\
\text{‘More than 120.000 damaged people were evacuated’} \\
\]
a. Dijo que se **hablaron** con **las autoridades** (American Spanish)

   say  that SE talked-3.pl  with  the  authorities

   ‘He said that the authorities were talked to’


b. En Santiago anoche se **informaron** de **cuatro homicidios** (American Spanish)

   in  Santiago last night SE informed-3.pl of  four  homicides

   ‘Four homicides were reported last night in Santiago’

   [http://www.periodismoglobal.cl/2006/08/la-democracia-de-la-udi.html]

c. El comercio online sumó [...] 100 millones de transacciones (American Spanish)

   the trade  online  added-3.sg 100  millions  of  transactions

   [...] cuando se **llegaron** a **los 74,3 millones de operaciones**

   when SE arrived-3.pl to the 74,3 milions of operations

   ‘The online trading added 100 million transactions when 74,3 million operations were reached’


d. En realidad se **dependen** de **tantos factores** (American Spanish)

   in reality SE depend-3.pl of so-many factors

   que  esto provoca  una extrema dificultad

   that this provokes a  extreme difficulty

   ‘Actually, one depends on so many factors that it makes things extremely difficult’

   [http://diegotenis9.wordpress.com/]
Analogous data can be obtained after searches in both the CREA data bank and Google:

(28)  a. Sólo se dispone de datos de matrículas . . . (El Salvador)

just SE dispose-3.pl of data of registration

‘We just have data on registration’

b. Aunque no se disponen de cifras exactas . . . (Costa Rica)

although not SE dispose-3.pl of numbers exact

‘Although we don’t have exact numbers’

c. Sí se saben de diversos factores que influyen . . . (Spain)

yes SE know-3.pl of diverse factors that influence

‘We do know factors that influence’

[from CREA: http://corpus.rae.es/creanet.html]

(29)  a. Todavía se confían en los milagros (Mexico)

yet SE trust-3.pl in the miracles

‘They still believe in miracles’

[http://www.sinembargo.mx/30-03-2014/947521]

b. Cuando se hablan de las supuestas desigualdades (Chile)

when SE talk-3.pl of the alleged asymmetries

‘When they talk about the alleged asymmetries’

[http://blog.lanacion.cl/2014/03/11/desigualdades-de-genero-en-el-emprendimiento/]

These data have not been described in the reference grammars of Spanish (cf. Bosque & Demonte 1999, RAE-ASALE 2009), plausibly because they can be can be regarded as
production errors. The data have also been reported by the Syntactic Atlas of Spanish (ASinEs):

(30) Syntactic Atlas of Spanish

Furthermore, note that the texts from which I have gathered the examples are not oral, and they are not isolated on-line hits. The fact that this type of evidence can also be found in the CREA database seems to me enough to regard it as part of the speakers’ competence. Therefore, what one could plausibly conclude from these examples is that American dialects of Spanish display a restricted variety of pseudopassives (modulo P-stranding). Let us refer to this process as “P-phasing”, merely to indicate that the P undergoes a change of state that allows the φ-Probe on T to match the DP.

4. A Probe-Goal analysis of the facts
Some questions arise, if, as I have argued, the prepositions in the examples. To begin with, one may wonder whether the same phenomenon is found with preiphrastic (BE) passives, apart from SE passives. The answer is negative, as examples like the following are ruled out by American Spanish speakers that accept the data in (27), (28) and (29):

(31)   a. *Fueron habladas con las autoridades (American Spanish)

       be-3.pl talked-3.fem.pl with the authorities

       ‘Authority were spoken to’

   b. *Fueron informados de cuatro homicidios (American Spanish)

       be-3.pl informed-3.masc.pl of four homicides

       ‘Four homicides were reported’


(32)   a. He pensado (en) la respuesta (Spanish)

       have-1.sg thought in the answer

       ‘I thought (of) the answer’

   b. Hemos discutido (de) ese asunto en la reunión (Spanish)

       have-1.pl discussed about that matter in the meeting

       ‘We have discussed about that matter in the meeting’

¹⁰ Plausibly too, the speakers that allow for P-phasing also accept P-stranding in Spanish (cf. Lemos 2013, Depiante & Thompson 2013, and references therein).
This very point takes us back to a second question the data above pose. What is the relevant parameter that makes agreement possible across prepositions? I will assume that the T head is morphologically equivalent in all the Spanish dialects under consideration—hence, there is no parametrically ‘tweaked’ version of T that allows for a deeper search (cf. Chomsky 2001). I will instead argue that it is the status of P that varies, as whatever happens in these dialects it affects the vP syntax. There are three specific alternatives to implement the idea that the parameter si anchored to P:

(33) Parametrizing P

a. P is external to the VP (as in Kayne’s 2004 analysis of causatives)

b. P is inserted at PF (as a dissociated morpheme)

c. P is reanalyzed with V

The first option is tempting in the case of the hybrid pattern, where the preposition has a clear-cut functional nature—like complementizers, as Kayne (2004) argues. This is in fact the approach that Ordóñez & Roca (2017) put forward in the analysis of DOM, whose derivation is reproduced in (35) for a sentence like (34):

(34) Vimos a María (Spanish)

saw-1.pl DOM María

‘We saw María’


b. Merge of a

... a [vP v [vP vimos [DP María ] ] ]
c. Movement to Spec

\[
\ldots [_{a_P}[\text{María}], a [v_P v [v_P \text{vimos} [t]]]]
\]

d. Merge of W

\[
\ldots W [_{a_P}[\text{María}], a [v_P v [v_P \text{vimos} [t]]]]
\]

e. Head raising

\[
\ldots [_{a_j}[W] [_{a_P}[\text{María}], t_j [v_P v [v_P \text{vimos} [t]]]]
\]

f. Remnant movement

\[
\ldots [_{WP} [v_P v [v_P \text{vimos} [t]]]k [_{a_j}[W] [_{a_P}[\text{María}], t_j t_k]]
\]

Suppose that, following the logic of these authors’ analysis, the differential marker is introduced above the TP (not the vP), then there is no obstacle for T’s φ-Probe to match the IA. It is not obvious, though, that the same idea should be adopted for prepositions that have a semantic flavor, like many of those featured in the examples above. For this very reason, it is not obvious that the analysis in (34) can be phrased in terms of PF insertion: the prepositions in (27), (28) and (29) are not dissociated morphemes. We are left, therefore, with some variant of the reanalysis approach (cf. Hornstein & Weinberg 1981, Kayne 1975, 2004 among many others). Of course, notice that it must be the case that the preposition is not heading an adjunct, since these seem to block agreement at all costs. Hence, the examples in (36) are totally out:

(36)  
   a. *Se trabajaron en las reuniones  (Spanish)  
       SE work-3.pl in the meetings  
       ‘People worked in the meetings’  
   b. *Se criticaron al Presidente por varias razones  (Spanish)  
       SE criticize-3.pl DOM-the president for various reasons
‘The President was criticized for various reasons’

Consequently, the V-P reanalysis option seems to be necessary with some prepositions. Accordingly, the process depicted in (37) seems to be relevant to capture the data in (27), (28) and (29):

(37)  a. [ SE T (φ-Probe) [VP V . . . [ P XP (Goal) ] ] ] [P = full fledged preposition]
      |____________________!!!↑

      b. [ SE T (φ-Probe) [VP [V-P] . . . [ t XP (Goal) ] ] ] [P = full fledged preposition]
      |________________________↑

Literally, what (37) is saying is that P is incorporated into P so that the XP Goal is probeable by T and agreement can take place. This raises interesting typological questions of the sort teasing apart satellite-framed and verb-framed languages (cf. Mateu 2012 and references therein). An observation to keep in mind in order to support toe Probe-Goal analysis is that, again, agreement is only in number (cf. Etxepare 2006), as the following asymmetries reveal:

(38)  *Se {pensa-mos / -áis} en {nosotros / vosotros} (Spanish)
      SE think-1.pl / 2.pl in we you
      ‘We/You are thought about’

Finally, there is evidence arguing against the existence of a non-referential (indefinite) 3pl pronoun (cf. Suñer 1983, Cabredo Hofherr 2003). These pronouns can be spelled-out, and then the non-referential reading is lost. However, these sentences reject the spell-out of a pronoun. So, the following is possible:
In Spain, (they / people) go to bed late

But the following is not:

Very important topics were talked about in the meeting

And the same holds if the subject is indefinite, which can also trigger the impersonal reading that the sentences we are considering deploy:

Very important topics were talked about in the meeting

Nonetheless, definiteness does seem to be relevant when it comes to the Goal of the agreement process. Consider the following examples, which indicate that the more indefinite it is, the more possible the agreement dependency becomes:

More than 200,000 affected were evacuated
5. Conclusions

This paper has discussed new data from Spanish dialects concerning agreement in SE sentences. Although this is a well-known topic in the literature, the previous pages have shown that along with the “hybrid pattern”, some dialects of Spanish display a pseudopassive structure of sorts. Needless to say, more careful empirical study is needed, and the factors to control for are the following: (i) the type of verb (non-pronominal, agentive, etc) that allows pseudopassives, (ii) the preposition that allows agreement, (iii) the type of Goal (DP, NP, bare plural, etc.), and (iv) the source from which the data have been obtained.

I have argued against the possibility that the facts can be considered as typos or oral errors. There are various arguments to reject that possibility: the pattern does not appear in isolated on-line hits (we could add more examples to the data in (27), (28) and (29)), one cannot find analogous examples with adjuncts (see (36)), and similar agreement facts are found with DOM and partitive prepositions, as noted by Treviño (2005) for Mexican Spanish:
(43) Por aquí **pasaron** de **esos aviones** (Mexican Spanish)

   by here passed-3.pl of those planes

   ‘Some of those planes passed by here’

The descriptive and theoretical consequences of the discussion above is not minor. It forces us not only to reconsider the distinction between different types of prepositions in Spanish (and more generally (cf. Abels 2003, Cuervo 2003, Demonte 1987, 1991, 1995, Pesetsky & Torrego 2004, Romero 2011), but also to sharpen our analysis of how micro and macroparameters interact. Since the agreement data reported here align with phenomena that concern the V-P connection, we are in a good position to improve our understanding about linguistic variation, typological correlations, and language contact.
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