

P). A related situation is one in which the input verb selects a P-A and a P-P, but in the clitic-marked reflexive form its semantics is changed with respect to the original meaning; this is the case, for instance, with the verb *buttarsi* in Italian or *baciti se* in Serbian ('throw oneself'), where throwing somebody else and throwing oneself out the window do not entail exactly the same action, and where the reflexive clitic is not interchangeable with a stressed reflexive pronoun (cf. Kayne 1975). In this case the verb loses some of its agentivity and its participant is more prominently a P-P than a P-A (i.e. it has a higher number of P-P than P-A entailments). Lastly, the participant loses all of the agentivity, and with it also the reflexive marking, reaching plain unaccusative verbs such as *arrivare/stiçi* 'arrive'. A simplified schema is shown in (2) for the Italian verbs *vestirsi* 'dress', *buttarsi* 'throw oneself' and *arrivare* 'arrive'.

(2) Reflexive → unaccusative

θ -structure:	P-A	P-P	P-A ⁻	P-P ⁺	P-P
a-structure:	<i>vestirsi</i> \langle Arg ₁ Arg ₂ \rangle	<i>buttarsi</i> \langle Arg ₁ Arg ₂ \rangle	<i>arrivare</i> \langle Arg ₁ \rangle		
	[-o]	[-r]	[-o]	[-r]	[-r]
f-structure:	SUBJ ₁		SUBJ ₁		SUBJ

With reciprocals, the process goes in the opposite direction, and the property that is progressively lost is patienthood. Proper reciprocals such as *baciarsi/poljubiti se* 'kiss' imply an equal degree of agenthood and patienthood; if the input verb takes a P-A and a P-P, but with a somewhat changed meaning (as in the case of *vedersi/videti se* meaning 'meet up, get together', rather than the literal 'see each other'), agenthood becomes more prominent, reaching the maximum in plain unergatives such as *collaborare/sarađivati* 'collaborate', which still must have two semantic participants, but which express the non-subject ones as comitative arguments rather than objects. This is illustrated in (3), for the Italian verbs *baciarsi* 'kiss', *vedersi* 'meet up' and *collaborare* 'collaborate'.

(3) Reciprocal → unergative

θ -structure:	P-A	P-P	P-A ⁺	P-P ⁻	P-A
a-structure:	<i>baciarsi</i> \langle Arg ₁ Arg ₂ \rangle	<i>vedersi</i> \langle Arg ₁ Arg ₂ \rangle	<i>collaborare</i> \langle Arg ₁ \rangle		
	[-o]	[-r]	[-o]	[-r]	[-o]
f-structure:	SUBJ ₁		SUBJ ₁		SUBJ

In addition to being a new piece of evidence for the intransitive non-reductionist position on reflexive and reciprocal clitics, this proposal also speaks in favour of a non-atomic approach to thematic roles, fully compatible with LFG's view of verbal argument structure.

References

- Ackerman, F. and J. Moore (2001). *Proto-Properties and Grammatical Encoding: A Correspondence Theory of Argument Selection*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Alsina, A. (1996). *The Role of Argument Structure in Grammar: Evidence from Romance*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Dowty, D. (1991). Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67, 547–619.
- Grimshaw, J. (1982). On the lexical representation of Romance reflexive clitics. In J. Bresnan (Ed.), *The Mental Representation of Grammatical Relations*, pp. 87–148. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.
- Grimshaw, J. (1990). *Argument Structure*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.
- Kayne, R. (1975). *French Syntax: The Transformational Cycle*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.
- Marantz, A. (1984). *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*. Cambridge, MA and London: MIT Press.
- Reinhart, T. and T. Sioni (2004). Against the unaccusative analysis of reflexives. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou, and M. Everaert (Eds.), *Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of the Syntax–Lexicon Interface*, pp. 159–180. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reinhart, T. and T. Sioni (2005). The Lexicon–Syntax parameter: Reflexivization and other arity operations. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 389–436.
- Sells, P., A. Zaenen, and D. Zec (1987). Reflexivization variation: Relations between syntax, semantics, and lexical structure. In I. Masayo, S. Wechsler, and D. Zec (Eds.), *Working Papers in Grammatical Theory and Discourse Structure: Interactions of Morphology, Syntax and Discourse*, pp. 169–238. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Zaenen, A. (1993). Unaccusativity in Dutch: Integrating syntax and lexical semantics. In J. Pustejovsky (Ed.), *Semantics and the Lexicon*, pp. 129–161. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.