



2005:212). In fact, we find that all attested telic occurrences of ingestion verbs crucially lack the preposition. For instance, according to CES and SM data, conative variants combine with *cessar de* ‘stop’ but not with *acavar de* ‘finish’, which is the prototypical pattern of atelic predicates.

- (5) a. *Asento se sobre el canto et el buitre cesso de comer en la molleja* (15th c., CES)  
 seated se over the pebble and the vulture ceased of eat in the gizzard  
 ‘He sat on the pebble and the vulture stopped eating at the gizzard’  
 b. *El solo comiessa el pan*  
 he alone eat the bread ‘He only ate the bread’

In **COSL**, alternation between direct object/oblique (PP) expressions in OSp also reflect alternation between telic/atelic uses. Like (5)a, (6)a is natural as the conative only entails that an unspecified (nonquantized) amount of people was killed (cf. causative/transitive entailing total affectedness, hence telicity (6)b). Similarly, in (3)a the endpoint PP headed by *hasta* imposes an event boundary that is otherwise missing (cf.(6)a). It follows that, even if the P used in OSp is different (linked in English to another (body-part-poss) alternation, Levin 1993), it still yields the event-type shift that sets CA apart (van Hout 1996 *i.a.*). In this sense, the selectional patterns attested in OSp (endpoint PP) are indicative of the expected contrast (cf. *killed #(at) them as many as they could*). In **VERBS OF CONTACT**, OSp alternation also yields a similar change in aspectual (Vendler 1967; Dowty 1979) structure. The generalization proposed for English holds here, as OSp conatives (i) do not necessarily involve a result state ((7) allows for the entailment that contact did not obtain as a result (*He shot at them, but didn’t hit them*)); and (ii) **unlike Modern Spanish [MSp] prepositional variants (Acevedo 2011)**, they succeed in delivering the *missed contact* entailment (Dixon 1991) expected from hit-conatives (cf. MSp *golpeó a la puerta #pero no la tocó* ‘He hit at the door but didn’t touch it’), otherwise (7) would be odd. In turn, productivity in (3)-(4) suggests that MOTION+CONTACT denotation may not be necessary conditions for CA, or at least that the widely-claimed restriction on conatives (LR 2015*i.a.*) may be language-specific (hold for e.g. English).

- (6) a. *mataua en ellos quanto alcançaua.* (14<sup>th</sup>c SM)  
 kill.PST.IMP.3S in them how-much sufficed  
 ‘He killed at them as many as he could’  
 b. *Los sieruos que mataron a sus señores.* (15<sup>th</sup>c SM)  
 ‘The servants that killed their lords’  
 (7) *Y ordenó el Emperador que disparasen en los enemigos para que se apartasen.* (16<sup>th</sup>c SM)  
 and ordered el Emperor that shoot.SBJ.3P in the enemies for that se move-away  
 ‘And the Emperor ordered them to shoot #(at) the enemies so that they would move away’

**MAIN VARIATION:** For **COSL**, we propose that in OSp verbs suggesting a causative/conative alternation differ in the realization of the external argument, instantiating a Cause(r)-Agent opposition amenable to a distribution linked to distinct  $v$  heads in the literature: while  $v_{DO}$  requires an animate *agent* subject, the subject licensed by  $v_{CAUSE}$  need not be (Folli & Harley 2005, 2007). We suggest that this difference in realization of the external argument can be seen in the OSp conative with causative verbs like *matar*: whereas the external argument in the causative only needs to be interpretable as cause(r) (*La ponçoña lo mato* ‘The poison killed him’(15<sup>th</sup>c SM)), the (null) external argument of *matar* in the conative ((3)a, (6)a) requires an intentional agent, as in all attested cases. If correct, the analysis for conative (8)a vs. causative (8)b alternates could bear on composition with distinct  $v$  heads. This would capture the distribution drawn by restricted subject (*agent*) interpretation in CA, vs. causative-alternation instances of the same verbs. It follows that, apparently, both derivational paths are available for these verbs at least in OSp. New data (Múgica 2018) from (modern) Argentinian Spanish supports this possibility, as a number of verbs show all the hallmarks of a conative-structure-like derivation (result/telicity drop, missed contact entailment). Yet, while (8)a is fully and transparently productive in OSp, in MSp, (8)a is systematically used in incorporated forms (*Mateamos por horas* ‘We drank at the mate for hours’).

(8) a. [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub><sub>1</sub>, v' [<sub>VDO</sub>, PP [<sub>TARGET</sub> en <sub>DP</sub><sub>2</sub>]]]]

b. [<sub>VP</sub> [<sub>DP</sub><sub>1</sub>, v' [<sub>VCAUSE</sub>, SC [<sub>DP</sub><sub>2</sub>, RES<sup>√</sup>]]]]