
Alexis Dimitriadis

The argument structure of “discontinuous” reciprocals

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 16:30

The construction in (1a) is sometimes called a “discontinuous reciprocal”. It involves a reciprocalized verb whose logical subject appears to be split between the syntactic subject and a with- phrase (henceforth comitative argument), and is found in numerous languages including Hebrew, Hungarian, German, Russian, Polish, Serbian, and Bantu languages including Chiche^{wa}, Swahili, Kinyarwanda and Ciyao, but not in French, Italian or Dutch (Mchombo and Ngunga 1994, Siloni 2001).

- (1) a. O Giannis filithike me ti Maria
 the John kissed.Rcp.Sg with the Maria
 ‘John and Maria kissed each other’
 b. O Giannis kje i Maria filithikan
 the John and the Maria kissed.Rcp.Pl
 ‘John and Maria kissed each other’

I show that discontinuous reciprocals, contrary to appearances, are not semantically reducible to the corresponding simple reciprocal. In a discontinuous reciprocal construction the reciprocal verb is semantically a two-place verb, and the comitative argument functions as an argument distinct from the subject. This finding requires us to reconsider our understanding of reciprocal formation: If a discontinuous reciprocal is a two-place predicate, then it has not undergone identification of its two argument positions (i.e., the argument structure operation of Reflexivization), as commonly assumed. I argue that (one type of) this construction imposes semantics of necessarily symmetric events, and propose an analysis that treats reciprocal verbs of this type as two-place predicates. The discontinuous argument structure is therefore the basic structure for those reciprocal types that allow it, and the “simple” reciprocal is derived from it. Analogous constructions are found with symmetric verbs that are not grammatically reciprocal, suggesting that symmetry is essential to the discontinuous reciprocal construction.

The two sentences in (1) are, broadly speaking, synonymous, and have been treated as equivalent by prior analyses (Vitale 1981, Mchombo and Ngunga 1994, Siloni 2001). But the two variants are not identically interpreted when the syntactic subject and/or comitative argument of the discontinuous sentence denote a plural NP:

- (2) a. Maria und Sabine schlugen sich mit Johan.
 Maria and Sabine hit each other with Johan
 ‘Maria and Sabine fought with Johan.’
 b. Maria, Sabine und Johan schlugen sich.
 Maria Sabine and Johan hit each other
 ‘Maria, Sabine and Johan fought.’

Example (2a) only states that Maria and Sabine fought with John, not that Maria and Sabine fought each other; but the equivalent simple reciprocal example (2b) is vague with respect to who fought with whom, allowing any combination of individuals to have fought (subject only to the condition that every individual must have been involved in some fighting).

This effect cannot be derived in an analysis which treats discontinuous reciprocals as being derived from the corresponding simple reciprocal: Schwarzschild (1996) has shown that plural individuals correspond to simple unions of atomic individuals, with no intermediate structure such as might be created by the conjunction of two plural NPs; hence an analysis that combines the comitative argument with the syntactic subject of the reciprocal could never separate them again. It follows that the two are separate arguments at all stages of the derivation.

I will show that the semantics of (2a) cannot be derived from those of (2b). I conclude that the former is the basic version, and I propose a semantic analysis that can account for both types of reciprocal constructions. But if discontinuous reciprocals do not involve an intransitized reciprocal verb, what makes them reciprocal? I show that reciprocal verbs that allow the discontinuous construction must denote an inherently symmetric event, that is, an event expressing a binary relationship whose two participants have necessarily identical participation (Gleitman et al. 1996). I consider this to be the core meaning of such reciprocals; in contrast, other reciprocal types (e.g., those formed with *einander*) can apply to collections of possibly non-symmetric events. (Bantu languages are a systematic exception to this pattern, and must be treated separately).

The two argument positions appear to have identical thematic roles, but are distinguished by discourse-prominence aspects such as topichood (Gleitman et al. 1996), and there is some evidence that they differ subtly in the degree of agency they require.

Berit Gehrke

How temporal is telicity?

Freitag/Friday: 13:00

There is evidence for a structural as well as semantic asymmetry between Slavic prefixes, which can be divided into internal vs. external prefixes (cf. DiSciullo & Slabakova (forthcoming)). I will assume that in Slavic languages, telicity is (partially) grammaticalized by internal prefixes that apply to verbs (i.e. lexical items) whereas external prefixes apply to (telic or atelic) predicates (VPs) and can act as markers for grammatical Perfectivity without changing the telicity property of the predicate they apply to.

Filip (2003) claims that Czech source-oriented prefixes like *vy-* ‘out’ as in *vyjít* – ‘to go out, leave’, do not yield telic (Filip uses the term *quantized* in the sense of Krifka (1989)) predicates because they can still be combined with measuring expressions like *asi metr* – ‘about a metre’ or the (external) prefix *po-* supplying the additional meaning ‘a bit’, both being ungrammatical on verbs with goal-oriented prefixes:

- (1) **Povytáhl** káru z příkopu. (Filip (2003))
 PO-out-pull-PAST cart-ACC from ditch-GEN
 ‘He pulled the cart out of the ditch a bit.’
 ***Podotáhl** káru do příkopu. (Filip (2003))
 PO-to-pull-PAST cart-ACC (in)to ditch-GEN
 ‘He pulled the cart (in)to the ditch a bit.’

This would suggest that source-oriented prefixes should be treated on a par with other external prefixes in not marking telicity but applying above VP level. On the other hand, predicates containing the source-oriented prefix *vy-* still imply a distinct point of change. In

the actual case this point of change will be interpreted as a temporal boundary to the left, which is a unique starting-point.

The issue is deeply connected to the problem of defining telicity. If it is taken to be a temporal notion in implying an inherent end-point, then predicates containing source-oriented prefixes cannot be considered telic but if it is defined as implying some point of change such predicates have to be telic since the particular prefixes signal an intrinsic point of change (in this case with the derived temporal interpretation of being the starting-point) and the prefix *vy-* is in fact an internal one rendering the verb telic. This is preferable since both source- and goal-oriented prefixes lead to a change in argument structure: Whereas the simple verb *táhnout něco* – ‘draw, pull, drag s.th.’ has only one obligatory internal argument (acc), the (source) argument of *dotáhnout něco do čeho* has to be specified as well just as the goal argument has to be specified with *vytáhnout něco z čeho*.

Such observations suggest defining telicity as a structural property of VPs in terms of implying an internal event boundary, which is an intrinsic point of change comparable to Moens & Steedman’s (1988) *culmination point*. This is compatible with Ramchand’s (forthcoming) claim that for the concept of telicity there is a crucial notion of the argument undergoing some sort of identifiable change or transition. Telicity should not be taken as a temporal notion as it does not imply temporal boundaries of a described actual eventuality but event boundaries of an *atomic eventuality type* in the sense of de Swart (1998), which applies to the VP level. In actual cases, event boundaries can be identical to temporal boundaries but this does not always have to be the case.

Wolfgang Heydrich

Kontamination und Dekontamination in der Argumentstruktur

Donnerstag/Thursday: 12:00

Als Alternative zu einer Grammatikkonzeption, die sich am Paradigma rekursiver Definitionen von Mengen maximal wohlgeformter Ausdrücke orientiert, werden seit einiger Zeit Konzeptionen diskutiert, die die primäre Aufgabe der Grammatik in der Lizenzierung von Ausdrücken durch syntaktisch-semantische Prinzipien sehen. Motiviert wird diese Alternative häufig mit dem angeblich grundsätzlichen Kontrast von E- und I-Sprache. Seltener wird auf den Aspekt abgehoben, dass die Alternative prinzipiell Raum gibt für das Konzept einer *insuffizienten* Lizenzierung von Ausdrücken: sei es *qua* Unterspezifikation bloß partieller, sei es *qua* Überspezifikation durch inkohärente Mehrfachlizenzierung.

Eine Ausarbeitung dieses Aspekts könnte m.E. u.a. auch den Zusammenhang von Sprachsystem und Sprachverwendung in einem neuen Licht erscheinen lassen und insbesondere einen genuin systembezogenen Zugang zu Phänomenen wie Satzfragmenten, Ellipsen, Anakoluthen und Kontaminationen eröffnen, der sie grammatisch nicht marginalisiert, indem er sie systemextern in den Zusammenhang von Sprachverwendung, Fehlleistungen, Produktion und Verarbeitung stellt.

Charakteristisch für die genannten Phänomene scheint mir zu sein, dass sie in dissoziierter, nicht voll wohlgeformter Ausprägung auftreten können wie auch in – durch Lexikalisierung, Grammatikalisierung, Reanalyse oder sonst wie – grammatisch integrierter Form. Sie stellen somit ein Brückenphänomen dar zwischen devianten und wohlgeformten Ausdrücken. Ihre Behandlung im Rahmen einer Theorie – auch insuffizienter – grammatischer Lizenzierung könnte einer dynamisierten Konzeption des Sprachsystems den Weg bereiten.

In meinem Vortrag möchte ich mich mit Verbalphrasen der Form [V...DP...PP] beschäftigen, wie man sie etwa in (1) findet:

(1) *Kafka schreibt den Brief an den Vater.*

Man mag hier zwei sich überlagernde Ereignisschematisierungen mit je eigenen Partizipantenrollen diagnostizieren: *Schreiben* als Produktion UND *Schreiben* als Übermittlung. In beiden Schematisierungen hat *Kafka* die Rolle eines Agenten. Unter dem Produktionsschema ist der *Brief* effizientes, unter dem Übermittlungsschema affiziertes Objekt. Die Rolle Adressat (der *Vater*) tritt nur im Übermittlungsschema auf. Verfolgt man nun die Strategie, Partizipantenrollen durch syntaktische Strukturpositionen „sichtbar“ zu machen, gilt es, hier zunächst eine beide Schemata vereinheitlichende Rollenzuweisung zu finden. Ich möchte dagegen für eine Entkopplung von Ereignisschematisierungen als lexikalischsemantischem Phänomen von der funktionalen Struktur syntaktisch-semantischer Komposition plädieren.

Es sei *schreib-* in (1) ein verbaler Kopf mit genau einem Komplement, nämlich einer DP. Ich nehme dann zwei syntaktische Strukturen als unabhängig lizenziert an, die sich überlappenden Fragmenten aus (1) zuordnen lassen:

(1a) [_{VP}...V DP₁] für *schreibt def. Brief* (1b) [DP₁...PP] für *def. Brief an den Vater*.

Die Frage ist nun, wie genau (1b) konstruiert sein soll. Wird die Struktur kopulativ konstruiert, ergibt sich semantisch ein Wert vom Typ *t* und eine kohärente Integration von (1a) und (1b) ist ausgeschlossen: (1b) kann nicht an die Position von DP₁ in (1a) treten und die beiden Strukturfragmente bleiben dissoziiert. Es ist aber auch möglich, (1b) attributiv zu konstruieren (genauer: PP als nicht-restriktives Attribut zu DP₁). Dann ist (1b) als DP selber semantisch vom Typ *e* und kann DP₁ in (1a) ersetzen. Die syntaktische Kontamination von (1a) und (1b) führt zu der integrierten, grammatisch lizenzierten (mithin dekontaminierten) Struktur

(1c) [_{VP}V [_{DP}DP₁ ... PP]].

Mein Vorschlag hat eine Reihe von Nebeneffekten, die ich hier kurz auflisten möchte: Es ergibt sich in Umrissen

- (a) eine Konzeption des Zusammenhangs von restriktiven und nicht-restriktiven PPAttributen – etwa *der Autor aus Prag*. (dito: Relativsätze),
- (b) eine Konzeption sog. loser Appositionen (*Kafka, der Autor aus Prag*)
- (c) eine Konzeption des Zusammenhangs von definiten und indefiniten DPen,
- (d) eine Konzeption ditransitiver VPen (*Kafka schreibt dem Vater einen Brief*), die die Binarität syntaktischer Strukturen respektiert und ohne *shells* (vPen) auskommt.
- (e) Theta-Rollen sind (zumindest im Bereich der betrachteten Phänomene) für syntaktischsemantische Komposition überflüssig.
- (f) Schrille Argumentstrukturen (*He sneezed the napkin off the table. Maria argumentiert Wolfgang an die Wand.*) machen für die syntaktisch-semantische Komposition (fast) keine Probleme.

Patrycja Jabłońska

Flavors of verbalizers and the syntax-morphology interface

Donnerstag/Thursday: 11:30

Every syntactic theory of argument structure which treats morphology seriously must have a way to tackle the so-called ‘anticausative’ (Haspelmath 1993), where the conceptually simpler (i.e. inchoative) variant of a causative/inchoative alternation is conveyed by a form that is more complex morphologically. Polish is one such language and the alternation is illustrated in (1).

- (1) a. Maria otworzyła drzwi.
 Maria opened door
 ‘Maria opened the door.’
 b. Dzwi otworzyły się.
 door opened się
 ‘The door opened.’

It will be argued that the presence of the ‘reflexive’ (for lack of a better word) marker is induced by the kind of verbalizer (i.e. -i/y-) occurring with the verbs participating in causative/inchoative alternation.

Extending the idea in Déchaine (2003), where languages are taken to differ w.r.t. the place and way of merging the root, I will argue that this parametrization option is also valid on an intra-language level, taking Polish as an example.

Thus, Polish roots are necessarily augmented (in their verbal uses) by $su_{\pm}xes$, which define several conjugation classes. I will argue that those suffixes are crucial in determining the verb’s argument structure in the sense that they require a specific place of root merger. Thus, -i/y-suffix will be argued to be an instantiation of a light v , i.e. a high verbalizer. On the other hand, -ej- and inchoative -ną-suffixes are taken to be low (V-level) verbalizers.

The following predictions of the system are borne out:

- (i) -i/y-stems will have to be detransitivized in their inchoative use;
- (ii) the majority of ‘reflexiva tantum’ will belong to -i/y-conjugation;
- (iii) -ej- and -n , a- stems will never be used transitively and will never participate in a caus/inch alternation;
- (iv) -ej- and -ną-stems will (almost) never take a reflexive marker;
- (v) semantically equivalent minimal pairs of the root occurring in two different conjugation classes: -i/y- with a reflexive marker (*biel-i-ć się* ‘be white’) and -ej- without one (*biel-e-ć* ‘be white’) are predicted to exist.

More generally speaking, the system will amount to redefining split intransitivity for Polish in terms of high vs low root merger rather than argument merger. By the same token, split intransitivity diagnostics (i.e. impersonal -NO/TO formation and participle formation) will be shown to correlate with different conjugation classes.

Ingrid Kaufmann

Middle voice

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 17:30

Middle voice is a diathesis that can be encoded either by inflectional morphology (e.g. Greek, Fula) or by a reflexive marker (e.g. German, Spanish, Russian). One of the peculiar properties of middle voice is that apparently the deleted argument can be either the agent (anticausative reading: *Die Tür schloss sich* ‘The door closed’), or the patient (direct reflexive reading: *Er wusch sich* ‘He washed’), and in some cases even the beneficiary (*Er mietet sich eine Wohnung* ‘He rented a flat’). Which of the arguments is deleted depends on the semantics of the verb class and on the sortal properties of the arguments.

From a conceptual perspective, verbs with an active and a middle form can be characterized as referring to concepts of situations that might include either one or two participants. I will argue that in languages, in which these “hybrid” concepts are lexicalized as semantically transitive verbs, the middle is a means to realize the intransitive variant. Whether intransitive change of state verbs are realized as active or middle forms does not depend merely on the concept (or world knowledge), but on the semantic representation that is part of the lexical information of the verbal root. However, middle verb forms are not derived from the corresponding active verb forms by argument deletion. They are independent stems that share the semantic representation of the active form, but differ in that they do not project the agent argument into argument structure. On the assumption that argument structure is associated with event structure in that it represents the participants of the event, a “reduced” argument structure leads to a reduced event structure.

The various readings of the middle result from the interaction between the “rich” semantic representation of the base verb on the one hand, and the “reduced” argument and event structure. Which reading comes about depends on verb class and the sortal properties of the subject argument. Under the perspective taken in this analysis, argument structure functions as a kind of filter that cuts a partial event structure out of the complex ‘potential’ event structure associated with a rich semantic representation.

Anja Latrouite

Verb meaning, argument structure and argument realization in Tagalog

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 15:00

In lexical semantics it is usually assumed that argument structure can be derived from the semantic structure associated with the lexical representation of verbs. The basic idea is that event structurally more complex verbs are derived from event structurally simple verbs, a fact that is very often reflected in morphology. In Tagalog all verb forms are equally complex with respect to morphology. As the examples in (1) show all verbs carry voice morphology regardless of the valence or the assignment of nominative/topic case. There seems to be no basic form.

- (1) a. **Um**-akyat ka sa puno. ‘Climb (you) up a/the tree.’
 UM-go up 2s.NOM DAT tree.
- b. **Akyat-in** mo ang puno. ‘Climb (you) up the tree.’
 go up-IN 2s. GEN DAT tree.
- c. **Mag**-akyat ka ng libro sa kaniya. ‘Bring (you) a book upstairs to him.’
 MAG-go up 2s. NOM GEN book DAT 3s. DAT
- d. **I**-akyat mo ang libro sa kaniya. ‘Bring (you) the book upstairs to him.’
 I-go up 2.s. GEN NOM book DAT 3s. DAT
- e. **Akyat-an** mo siya ng libro. ‘Bring (you) a/the book upstairs to him.’
 go up-AN 2s. GEN 3s.NOM GEN book
- f. **Na**-akyat siya (sa puno). ‘He is (/got) up (on the tree).’
 NA-go up 3s.NOM (DAT tree).

Traditional approaches assume that the voice affixes in (1) are arbitrary inflectional features that trigger the promotion to subject of certain thematic/semantic roles. While it is still common practice to refer to the voice affixes via semantic role labels, it has been argued by many linguists that it is difficult to reduce the appearance of voice affixes down to the thematic role of the subject argument. In this talk I show that this is true, even if even if more flexible and abstract approaches to thematic roles (e.g. Reinhart (2001)) are considered. Another claim often found in the literature is that the voice affixes cause changes in argument structure. As all voice affixes may appear with verbs that are intransitive, transitive or ditransitive, it is equally difficult to maintain this claim. In this paper, I take a closer look at a subset of voice affixes and argue that they do not cause but *reflect* changes in verb meaning and thus may signal changes in argument structure, too. The questions that remain are what is the meaning of bare verb stems, how can shifts in verb meaning be accounted for and what properties do the voice affixes refer to when singling out an argument as the nominative/topic argument. Following Chierchia (1998), I assume that verbs in Tagalog refer to ‘kinds’, i.e. to types of events. These types of events are characterised by a set of results which are brought about with respect to the participants involved in the event (Naumann 1998, Latrouite & Naumann 2000). The basic idea is that the voice affixes contribute information with respect to event structural and event structurally relevant properties of a certain object participating in the event and thus constrain both, the meaning of the verb and the assignment of nominative/topic case to the argument denoting this object.

Jaume Mateu

Lexical syntactic typology and the locative alternation

Freitag/Friday: 11:30

In this paper, I provide a lexical syntactic explanation (cf. Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002) of why Romance languages do not present certain productive cases of locative alternation that are typically found in Germanic languages: Such a difference in productivity will be shown to be related to the *systematic* typological differences wrt. *lexicalization patterns* between ‘satellite-framed languages’ (e.g., English, German, Dutch, Chinese, etc.) and ‘verb-framed languages’ (e.g., Spanish, French, Catalan, Japanese, etc.): cf. Talmy (1985, 1991, 2000), Snyder (1995), Mateu (2001a,b) or Mateu & Rigau (1999, 2002), among others; see also Hirschbühler (2002) for an interesting critical review of some typological perspectives on the locative alternation. Indeed, a cursory look at Levin (1993: 50ff.), Mulder (1992: 166ff.) or Brinkmann (1997)

suffices for one to realize that the locative alternation is much more productive in the Germanic languages than in the Romance ones (e.g., cf. the relevant contrast in (1-2)). Let us concentrate on two “syntactically relevant components of meaning” (cf. Pinker (1989); Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1991); Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998)): *manner/means* and *directionality/result*. As pointed out by Talmy (1991, 2000), one of the most visible differences between satellite-framed languages like English and verb-framed languages like Spanish is that only the former languages allow both components to be expressed in a single clause: cf. (1a) vs. (2a). The main lexical syntactic structure corresponding to (1a) is depicted in (3a). The directional element *off* cannot saturate the null phonological matrix of the abstract causative verb because of its “satellite” (i.e., nonconflating) nature. So it is necessary to resort to an independent lexical syntactic structure, e.g., that expressing Talmy’s ‘manner component’: *rubbing* (cf. (3b)). My claim is that this subordinate structure expressing an activity is to be conflated into the main causative verb via a ‘generalized transformation’ (cf. (3c)); see Mateu (2001a,b); cf. also McIntyre (2002) for some interesting qualifications. By contrast, this operation is not carried out in verb-framed languages like Spanish (cf. (2a)), because the directional element is conflated into the verb (cf. (2b); notice that *quitar* ‘to get out’ is an atom as far its morphophonological status is concerned: i.e., what corresponds to the verb and what to the directional relation cannot be distinguished any longer). Finally, I would like to point out that my lexical syntactic analysis can be regarded as providing Hoekstra’s (1988, 1992) or Mulder’s (1992) Small Clause approach with an adequate account of the conflation process involved in complex resultative constructions. That is, the present analysis provides an explanation to why activity verbs like *rub* can take a SCResult in satellite-framed languages (cf. (1a)), but not in verb-framed languages (cf. (2a)), an important fact which was passed over by Hoekstra and Mulder (cf. Mateu 2001b).

- (1) a. Joe rubbed the fingerprints *off* the crystal ball.
 b. Joe rubbed the crystal ball (*of fingerprints; cf. Joe rubbed the crystal ball *clean* (of fingerprints)).
- (2) a. *Joe frotó las huellas fuera de la bola (Spanish)
 Joe rubbed the fingerprints out of the ball
 b. Joe quitó las huellas de la bola (frotándolai)
 Joe got+*out* the fingerprints from the ball rubbing-it
 c. Joe frotó la bola (*de huellas) (*Joe frotó la bola *limpia* (de huellas))
 Joe rubbed the ball (of fingerprints) (Joe rubbed the ball clean (of fingerprints))
- (3) a. [V1 [V1 Ø_{CAUSE}][P N [P *off* N]]]
 b. [V2 [V2 Ø_{DO}] [N RUB]]
 c. [V1 [V1 [V2 RUB-DO]-CAUSE] [P N [P *off* N]]]

Nataša Milićević & Eugenia Romanova

Is telicity a lexical property?

Freitag/Friday: 12:30

Unlike English verbs Russian and Serbian seem unambiguous with respect to inherent Aktionsart (or telicity). For example, English “write” can be either an activity (1a) or an accomplishment (1b):

- (1) a) He wrote books/stuff.
 b) He wrote a book.

The object plays a crucial role in distinguishing the Aktionsart with incremental verbs (Filip, 1999) in English. Thus, bare plurals or mass noun objects bring about the non-quantized or atelic reading of an event, as illustrated by (1a). However its absence will have the same (atelic) effect as shown by (2)

(2) What do you do for living? - I write.

In Slavic languages aspectual properties of events such as those in (1) and (2) are not derived from the properties of their arguments. The imperfective ‘write’ in Russian or Serbian can occur with both quantized and non-quantized objects remaining imperfective. However, perfectivizing verbal prefixes do affect verb meaning, the number and realization of their arguments, and are not outer aspect markers.

We will take a closer look at the issue of verbal prefixation in Russian and Serbian following the distinction lately assumed between at least two categories of verbal prefixes in Slavic languages, lexical and superlexical (cf Svenonius (2003), Romanova (2003), Milićević (2003)), based on the traditional considerations of Slavic aspect (Isačenko (1960)). On this approach only a subset of Slavic verbal prefixes, the lexical ones, in charge of structuring events. Following the view of Levin (1999) that the event types condition verb argument structure (simple events, like activities and achievements, have fewer arguments than more complex events, like activities, which have so-called structural arguments), we will consider the transitivity variations of optionally transitive verbs when they are prefixed. Only lexical prefixes can change the inherent activity reading of "write" in Russian and Serbian into accomplishment with two obligatory structural arguments, originator (initiator, agent etc.), the argument of CAUSE, and an effected object (theme), the argument of BECOME. Thus the varying argument structure will demonstrate the possible changes in the complexity of event structure brought about by prefixation and the independence of the inherent, though compositional, Aktionsart from the ‘outer aspect’ marking.

With lexical perfectivizing prefixes the occurrence of the object is obligatory, the single-event reading is obtained and the «process» reading is cancelled. This doesn’t happen, for example, with the Russian measuring superlexical prefixes, like *po-*. That forces us to conclude that there are (at least) two levels/types of aspectual modification of the verbs in Slavic languages, and that only a subset of verbal prefixes in Slavic languages are responsible for argument structure adjustments.

Albert Ortmann & Corinna Handschuh

**Semantic factors of valence-changing processes with nouns:
Possession in the Mayan languages**

Mittwoch/Wednesday: 14:00

Introduction: Valence-changing processes are not only found with verbs, but also with nouns. In many languages, the introduction of a possessor argument of a non-relational noun must be morphologically established. Using data from three Mayan languages – Yucatec, Mam, and Itzaj –, we show how the realization of a possessor in non-prototypical contexts of possession is licensed by a morphological operation on the possessee. Such contexts that require morphological licensing are those where (i) the noun is not inherently relational, or (ii) the possessor is not sufficiently salient.

Facts and generalizations: Yucatec and Mam are particularly explicit in the sense of (i): absolute nouns are transformed in relational nouns by means of suffixation of *-il* as in (1)

(Yucatec; Lehmann 1998: 56) or by means of vowel lengthening as in (2) (Mam; England 1983: 67).

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------------|----|--------------------------|----|--------------------|
| (1) | a. | le nah=o' | b. | in=nah-il | c. | * in=nah |
| | | DET house=DISTAL | | 1.SG.E=house-POSS | | 1.SG.E=house |
| | | 'the house' | | 'my house' | | |
| (2) | a. | xaq | b. | n-xaaq=a | c. | * n-xaq=a |
| | | rock | | 1.SG.E-rock(POSS)=NON3RD | | 1.SG.E-rock=NON3RD |
| | | 'rock' | | 'my rock' | | |

As far as (ii), the role of salience, is concerned, Itzaj obligatorily shows *-il* in cases where the possessor is inanimate (Hofling 1990, 2000):

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------------|-----------|----|----------------------------|------------|
| (3) | a. | u-tz'omen | aj-Jwan | b. | u-wakax-il | San Andres |
| | | 3-brain | MASC-Juan | | 3-cow-POSS | San Andres |
| | | 'the brain of Juan' | | | 'the cattle of San Andres' | (a town) |

Similarly, most Yucatec nouns do not require this suffix as long as the possessor is higher in animacy than the possessee; otherwise, *-il* is obligatory (Lehmann 1998: 42):

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------------------|------------------|----|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
| (4) | a. | u=y-ùuk' | le pàal-o' | b. | u=y-ùuk'-il | ho'l le pàal-o' |
| | | 3.SG.E=EP-louse | DEF child-DISTAL | | 3.SG.E=EP-louse-POSS | head DEF child-DISTAL |
| | | 'that child's lice' | | | 'the lice of that child's head' | |

Even inherently relational nouns must realize *-il* if the possessor is lower in animacy, e.g. non-human combined with a human possessee. This latter use of the suffix *-il* can neither be ascribed to inherent properties of the head noun nor to those of the possessor. What all uses of *-il* have in common, however, is that non-prototypical possession is involved. Hence, one crucial function of the suffix is to introduce a possessor argument by transforming a one-place predicate into a two-place predicate.

Notice that in both Mam and Yucatec, the converse case is also marked; that is, a relational noun must be overtly 'derelationalized' in order to be construed without a possessor:

- | | | |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| (5) | Mam (England, 1983: 69): | |
| | a. | n-yaa'=ya |
| | | 1.SG.ERG-grandmother=NON3RD |
| | | 'my grandmother' |
| | b. | yaa-b'aj |
| | | grandmother-DERELATIONAL |
| | | 'grandmother' |

Thus, we are dealing with an overt valency-reducing operation, similar to the passive or antipassive found with verbs: the variant that realizes fewer arguments is the one that is morphologically marked.

Analysis: We account for these observations by a compositional analysis which characterizes each of the semantic operations as the contribution of the involved morphological exponent. The saliencegoverned alternations in (3) and (4) seem at first sight to pose a challenge for such an approach, since we are not simply dealing with the introduction of a possessor argument. Rather, one of the functions of *-il* is to signal that the argument hierarchy and the animacy hierarchy do not align: the structurally higher argument is not the one which is higher in animacy. Building on work on differential object marking by Aissen (2003) and Stiebels (2002), we explain the distribution of *-il* in terms of the interpolation of an expressivity constraint into hierarchy of economy constraints derived from the animacy scale.

Gillian Ramchand

The structural basis of argument relations

Donnerstag/Thursday: 10:00

One well established tradition in the literature has approached the issue of syntactically relevant lexical information by classifying lexical items in terms the number and type of thematic relations they determine (Gruber 1965, Baker 1988, Grimshaw 1991 etc). Another type of approach has attempted to decompose the lexical item into semantically relevant syntactic projections as a way of capturing generalisations (McCawley 1968, Hale and Keyser 1993). In this paper, I follow the latter group of authors in exploring a view of the architecture of grammar whereby the Lexicon is eliminated as a module with its own special primitives and modes of combination. By this, I do not intend to deny that there are items within the language that need to be listed/memorised, or that they are associated with grammatical information. Rather, I will seek to claim that to the extent that lexical behaviour is systematic and generalisable, this is due to syntactic modes of combination and not to distinct lexicon internal processes (cf. Hale and Keyser (1993) etc.).

Turning now to the specific proposal, first phase syntax is constructed from projections which correspond to particular subevental primitives. I assume a decomposition which consists maximally of vP (the causing projection), VP (a process projection) and RP (a result projection), thus extending the intuitions behind recent work by Ritter and Rosen 1998, Borer 1998. Concerning the v, V and R heads, I assume interpretational rules which combine the eventualities introduced by the respective heads into a single complex event, corresponding to an Initiational state, followed by a Process followed by a State to create a derived accomplishment structure (cf. Pustejovsky 1991, Grimshaw 1991, Higginbotham 1999, van Hout 1998).

This view of first phase syntax is constrained by the assumption that only certain event compositions are possible, and conversely that the particular functional heads assumed here always correspond to particular kinds of event compositions.

With regard to argument positions and thematic role assignment, Chomsky (e.g. 2001) assumes that the position of Merge is the position of thematic interpretation. In the present account, however, thematic information can be added to the interpretation of an argument after movement (cf. Borer 2001, and Hornstein 2001 in a somewhat different domain). The thematic primitives proposed are tied to the Spec positions of the individual projections and encode criterial participation in the corresponding subevents (INITIATOR = specifier of vP; UNDERGOER = specifier of VP; RESULTEE = specifier of RP). Thematic roles in the traditional sense are thus composed from the position of initial Merge together with positions achieved via Move within the first phase syntax.

I show from an examination of the different lexical verb types in English that such a view is sufficient to account for the variability in behaviour within and among lexical items in this language, and is also explanatory for more morphologically complex verbal forms in languages such as Bengali. I conclude by discussing how the idea of first phase syntax might solve some of the long standing paradoxes in the division of labour between the lexicon and the syntax.

 Luka Szucsich

Syntactic derivation of the theta-domain and aspectual interpretation – evidence from Russian
Freitag/Friday: 12:00

In this paper I present an approach where different argument relations resulting from the derivation of the verbal theta domain correspond to rather broad interpretive types. In this analysis causation plays a crucial role for the syntactic derivation of different *generalized* verb classes constraining aspectual compositionality. I assume that the relation between Spec- vP and the v° -head yields a causative interpretation. v° (semantically a predicate) contains a feature licensing a corresponding [+c]-DP (*agent/force/causer*). On the other hand, the relation between v° and its VP-complement containing the direct object establishes an affectedness interpretation. This *asymmetric* relation between v° and its complement (semantically a subordinate predicate) makes it possible to relate a predicate representing a resulting situation to the internal argument (making the latter a so-called incremental theme). This fact accounts for the well-known “compositional transmission” of aspectual/quantitative interpretations, cf. (1) for the aspect marking Russian and (2) for Finnish which marks internal argument-DPs for (un-)boundedness and thus determining the aspectual interpretation of sentences.

- (1) a. Pětr vypil pivo za čas / *celyj čas.
 Pětr_{NOM} drank_{PF} beer_{ACC} in hour_{ACC} / whole hour_{ACC}
 ‘P. drank a/the beer in/*for one hour.’
- b. Pětr pil pivo *za čas / celyj čas.
 Pětr_{NOM} drank_{IMP} beer_{ACC} in hour_{ACC} / whole hour_{ACC}
 ‘P. was drinking beer *in/for one hour.’
- (2) a. Mari kirjoitti kirjeet yhdessä tunnissa / *yhden tunnin.
 Mari wrote letters_{ACC} in one hour_{INESS} / one hour_{ACC}
 ‘M. wrote the letters in/*for an hour.’
- b. Mari kirjoitti kirjeitä *yhdessä tunnissa / yhden tunnin.
 Mari wrote letters_{PART} in one hour_{INESS} / one hour_{ACC}
 ‘M. was writing letters *in/for an hour.’

Furthermore, the relation between the two possible arguments of V0 (its specifier and its complement) yields a stative interpretation. Stative transitive verbs lack a causative $v0$ and, hence, lack the possibility of transmitting quantitative interpretation. There is no resulting situation which applies to the internal argument only. There is only one (stative) predicate *symmetrically* relating the two arguments of V.

This approach is corroborated by the fact that stative transitive verbs do not exhibit aspectual compositionality effects, cf. (3) for Russian. I take these subject experiencer verbs to be stative predicates where the “*theme*” doesn’t cause the mental state of the *experiencer*. This also accounts for the impossibility in Russian to combine them with instrumental adverbials denoting a cause or reason (these instrumentals are licensed by v°), cf. (4a). Furthermore, this accounts for the fact that subject experiencer verbs like *love*, *hate*, *hear*, *see*, etc. in aspect marking languages like Russian are *imperfectiva tantum*. And last, these verbs are also morphologically less complex, being simplex verbs in Russian.

- (3) On slyšal golosa v korridore.
 he heard_{IMP} voices_{ACC:PL} on corridor
 ‘He heard (some/the) voices in the corridor.’
- (4) a. *Ja ljublju eti starye knigi (ix) illjustracijami.
 I_{NOM} love_{IMP} these old books_{ACC} (their) illustrations_{INST}.
 ‘I love these old books by their illustr.-s.’
- b. Ivan razočaroval menja ploxim znaniem.
 Ivan_{NOM} disappointed_{PF} me_{ACC} bad knowledge_{INST}.
 ‘Ivan's bad knowledge disappointed me.’
- c. Maša nnavitsja mne svoej smelost'ju.
 Maša_{NOM} like_{SJA:IMP} me_{DAT} her bravery.
 ‘I like M. because of her bravery.’

In contrast, with object experiencer verbs the alleged “*theme*” is the causer of the denoted situation allowing for instrumental adverbials denoting a cause or reason in Russian. In Russian, these verbs like most other accomplishment and achievement verbs form regular aspectual pairs being also morphologically more complex (cf. (5)). I assume that in these cases a *v0* is part of the Numeration establishing an asymmetric relation with the lower VP-shell (and licensing instrumentals, cf. (4b)). (4c) is a quirky case experiencer verb which also involves a causer and, hence, allows for instrumentals.

- (5) opečalivat'_{IMP} – opečalit'_{PF} ‘to sadden’; bespokoit'_{IMP} – obespokoit'_{PF} ‘to worry’;
 uspokaivat'_{IMP} – uspokoit'_{PF} ‘to calm’; utešat'_{IMP} – utešit'_{PF} ‘to soothe’; etc.

Thus, thematic information doesn't contain direct aspectual information, but rather specifies *types* of relations between arguments of one or more predicates the verbal domain is composed of. Aspectual features on the other hand range over predicates linking the latter to successive time intervals. Only asymmetrically derived verbal domains allow for a 'change-of-state' interpretation. To merge a symmetrically derived (simplex) theta-domain with a [+pf]-Asp-head would lead to an uninterpretable temporal structure at LF leaving the [+pf] feature (demanding two predicates to be temporally linked) with only one predicate denoting a state.

József Tóth

Kontrastive verbalsemantische Analyse – der ereignisstrukturbasierte Ansatz

Freitag/Friday: 14:00

Angesichts der verschiedenen theoretischen Ansätze im Bereich der Verbalsemantik ist es sehr schwierig und weitgehend unmöglich, verbindliche und unangefochtene Methoden der Bedeutungsbeschreibung zu vermitteln. Es ist aber durchaus möglich und sinnvoll, zu zeigen, wie man bisher versucht hat, an verbalsemantische Fragen heranzugehen.

Seit der kognitiven Wende in der Linguistik fragt man, wie Wortbedeutungen im menschlichen Gehirn repräsentiert sind. Mein Beitrag beschäftigt sich vor allem mit der lexikalischen Repräsentation von deutschen und ungarischen Verben und der Frage, inwiefern die modernen Repräsentationsmodelle zur kontrastiven semantischen Analyse der Verben zweier genetisch nicht verwandter und auch typologisch unterschiedlicher Sprachen beitragen können.

Die Grundidee meines Vortrages besteht in der Repräsentation der Verbbedeutungen als Ereignisstrukturen. Er setzt sich zum Ziel, einige verwandte lexikalisch-semantische Ereignisstrukturtheorien zu präsentieren und mit dem vorgestellten Ansatz zu vergleichen. Im Mittelpunkt des Beitrags steht eine ereignisstrukturbasierte Theorie, die in eine Rahmentheorie zur Repräsentation der Argumentstruktur und Valenz von Verben eingebettet wird. Ein vordringliches Ziel besteht darin, den semantischen Gehalt der in den Ereignisstrukturen verwendeten Prädikate und Relationen im Deutschen und Ungarischen möglichst präzise zu bestimmen und zu vergleichen.

Mario van de Visser

**The marked status of ergativity
(or the universal basis of nominative-accusative patterns)**

Freitag/Friday: 13:30

The majority of the languages we know is strictly nominative-accusative. Those languages which have an absolutive-ergative pattern are estimated to comprise a rough 25 % (Dixon 1994:2). Often, the ergative pattern is not applied to all kinds of arguments or to all tenses/aspects: split ergative patterns seem to be common. From these facts, as well as from the observation that even ‘deep ergative’ languages like Dyirbal do not show reverse binding, I conclude that all languages are nominative-accusative underlyingly. This implies that ergative case may only appear on NPs which are not in argument position. My proposal is largely based on the Pronominal Argument Hypothesis (Jelinek 1984, 1993, to appear) and the Polysynthesis Parameter (Baker 1996, to appear).

In Djaru, a Pama-Nyungan language, verbal arguments are obligatorily realized by bound pronouns. These pronouns, attached to a catalyst element, have nominative-accusative forms. They can be doubled by free pronouns or full NPs, which show ergativity (cf. (1)):

(1) Djaru (Tsunoda 1981:201, 103, 194):

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| a. <i>ad^hu a- a jan-an</i> | b. <i>ad^hu- gu a- a- gu undu a -an</i> |
| 1SG C-1SG go-PRES | 1SG-ERG C-1SG.-2SG.ACC 2SG see-PRES |
| ‘I go.’ | ‘I look at you.’ |

Jelinek (1984, 1993) claims that in such languages every argument is obligatorily realized as a bound pronoun. All other NPs are base-generated as adjuncts because they cannot occur in argument positions. This may cause a split ergative pattern: bound pronouns show nominative-accusative behaviour, whereas the NP-doubles pattern absolutive-ergatively. I will push this analysis somewhat further and claim that an ergative pattern may only occur in languages which base-generate nonclitic NPs in adjunct positions. In other words: every language primarily uses a nominative-accusative pattern in distinguishing between the core arguments. The ergative pattern is only available as a second option, hence this part of my proposal is called the Second Option Hypothesis (SOH).

There are immediate counterexamples to this claim. For instance, in Northwest Caucasian, verbal marking shows an absolutive-ergative pattern:

(2) Abkhaz (Northwest Caucasian, slightly adapted from Kathman (1994:133)):

- | | |
|--|---|
| a. <i>sarà s-y^w nà-le-yt'</i> | b. <i>Zaira sarà s-l-bé-yt'</i> |
| 1SG <u>1SG</u> -in-come-AOR.ACT | Zaira 1SG <u>1SG</u> -3SG.F.ERG-see-AOR.ACT |
| ‘I came in.’ | ‘Zaira saw me.’ |

- c. *sarà Zaira d -z-g^w -yt'*
 1SG Zaira 3SG.H-1SG.ERG-kiss-AOR.ACT
 'I kissed Zaira.'

The ergative pattern in languages like Abkhaz cannot be explained by the SOH. Therefore, I will argue that only the ergative prefixes are real arguments and that absolutes in Abkhaz show agreement with pro-drop. The verbal paradigms found in Gitksan (Tsimshian, Penutian) and Basque (isolate) provide evidence for this claim. I assume that the rules underlying passive formation are responsible for this type of language where only transitive subjects cliticize. I will call this the Ergative as Passive Hypothesis (EPH).

Together, the SOH and the EPH account for a typologically motivated range of ergative languages. In order to account for split patterns, I assume that languages allow for clitic left-dislocation in only part of their grammar, suggesting that the theories of Jelinek and Baker should not be interpreted as the macro-parameters they are claimed to be.

Ronnie B. Wilbur

**Semantics, morphology and iconicity in argument realization
 in American Sign Language**

Donnerstag/Thursday: 9:00

To date, discussion regarding the proper representation of verb argument realization has focused on two main approaches: mapping from some version of lexical conceptual/event structure or constructing/filtering through syntactic functional phrases. This presentation will complicate matters by dealing with data from ASL that appear at first glance to be strongly iconic, that is, there is a direct mapping between the formation of the sign and the meaning it conveys. I show that an analysis based purely on iconicity is inadequate. In particular, I show that the mapping is *grammatical*, being restricted to the verb system. This has the benefit of providing new support for grammatical categories of noun and verb, but has the drawback of adding semantics, morphology and phonology into the discussion of argument realization.

I discuss the potentially universal (for sign languages) mapping between semantic primitives and the phonological formation of predicates. The semantic concepts are location, path, individual, plural, and elapsed time. The phonological characteristics are geometric: point (1-d), line (2-d), plane (3-d). From the domain of physics, the relevant variables are space, movement and time. Points in space are morphologically mapped with the set-theoretic semantic *meaning* 'individual (x)', which can be any entity that is a member of a set, be it individual, countable or mass, nonexistent, location, or event. Because of the metaphorical linguistic relationship between space and time, it is not surprising to find that points in space not only function as the start (e₀) and end (e_n) states of events but also as temporal start (t₀) and end (t_n) times.

Movement of the hands between two points along a straight line represents *elapsed time*, either for an event or between events, whereas curving the line indicates *greater* elapsed time. In contrast, path movement in nominal classifier structures show *extent*; however, translation to the temporal domain is not possible. Thus, the classifier system involves not just iconicity (longer extent of movement means longer extent of object) but also semantics (longer extent of movement does *not* mean longer time of event), that is, it is *grammatically* constrained. Furthermore, depending on the type of predicate, the path movement can express transfer of a theme (represented by a handling classifier handshape). The start and end points identify the *arguments* that the verb agrees with (verbs with no movement do not show agreement and

require separate (pro)nominals). If true, this mapping accounts for certain similarities among sign languages, especially in the use of space and movement.

I illustrate the morphological composition of the telic (end-marked) compared to atelic, clearly seen in the resultative, and the processes involving reduplication (incessant, habitual, iterative; distributive). Using the ‘distributive embedded in the iterative’, I suggest formal syntactic representations, in particular functional phrases associated with arguments, telicity, temporal aspect, distributive, and reduplication. In this form, the sign ‘give to’ follows a line from signer/source to recipient/goal using a handling classifier; stops at each recipient (is endmarked, hence telic), repeated for distributive, and then makes the iterative path; thus, telicity is a lower projection than distributive, which is lower than temporal aspect (iterative) which is lower than viewpoint aspect.

The theoretical problem that this analysis raises is this – if the argument realization is visible in the morphophonological/iconic mapping with event/conceptual/semantic structure (cf. Van Hout 2000 for one approach that would work here), why would we want to use a syntactic approach to represent it (which we can do)? Are there advantages that can be derived from the syntactic approach compared to the projection of the syntactic structure from the events themselves? I hope to provide challenges to the standard approaches. Perhaps workshop participants can help find answers.