REPRÉSENTATIONS DE L'ÉVÉNEMENT

COLLOQUE INTERNATIONAL
28-30 OCTOBRE 2010

**Université Sorbonne Nouvelle - Paris 3
Maison de la recherche**

LIVRET DES ABSTRACTS

Mohamed Naji
Université Moulay Smail, Meknès, Maroc

L'identité catégorielle et la fonction sémantique du verbe en arabe

Il est communément admis que le verbe se caractérise par les traits [+V,-N] et l'adjectif par les traits [+V,+N] (Cf. Chomsky (1965)). Il existe, cependant, une classe de verbe en arabe appelée « verbes de qualité » où la fonction sémantique et la fonction grammaticale semblent être en discordance. Ces verbes tombent sous le schème morphologique « faᶜula ». Ils ont la particularité de fonctionner sémantiquement comme des adjectifs, et syntaxiquement comme des verbes à part entière. C'est ainsi qu'un verbe comme « karuma » dans (1) attribue la qualité « généreux » au sujet. Cette même qualité est exprimée par un vrai adjectif dans (2).

   1 .Zaydun Karuma.
    Zayd-nom généreux-3.mas.s.pres
    « Zayd devient généreux. »
  2. Zaydun karïmun.
    Zayd-nom généreux-sg.m
    « Zayd est généreux. »

Notons que d'un point de vu comparatif, d'autres langues, comme l'anglais, ne permettent pas au verbe d'attribuer des qualités à leurs sujets ; seul l'adjectif peut assumer ce rôle. Ainsi la qualité attribuée au sujet dans l'exemple anglais (3) est portée par un vrai prédicat adjectival :

3. John is handsome.
   « Jean est beau. »

Pour que la phrase (3) soit sémantiquement équivalente à l'exemple arabe (1), l'insertion du verbe inchoatif «become» devient obligatoire, comme le montre la structure (4) .

4. John becomes handsome.
   « Jean devient beau.»

Dans ce papier, nous essayerons de répondre à la question de savoir si les « verbes de qualité » sont à l'origine des adjectifs ou de vrais verbes. S'ils sont des adjectifs, nous devons alors expliquer le processus par lequel ils acquièrent l'identité et le comportement syntaxique verbaux. Nous présenterons, donc, une analyse basée sur l'idée que la mutation catégorielle d'une catégorie à une autre est possible en syntaxe (Marantz (1997)). En effet, nous admettons que la phrase (1) à une structure complexe dans laquelle l'adjectif s'incorpore dans une tête verbale nulle, à l'instar de celle proposée par Pesetsky (1995) pour des verbes tels que (amuse) en anglais.
Cette analyse a plusieurs conséquences : Elle permet de léguer la différence entre les langues dans la computation de certaines notions sémantiques à « la richesse » ou à « la pauvreté » morphologique de ces mêmes langues. Comme, elle permet de remettre en question l'idée selon laquelle la dérivation catégorielle se faisait à partir de la racine «root».

Références sélectionnées :
Belleti, A & L . Rizzi. (1988). Psych-Verbs and Theta Theory. Natural language and linguistic Theory, 6, 291-352.
Cinque,G & L.Rizzi. (2008). The cartography of Syntactic Structures. STIL-Studies in Linguistics, CISCL-working papers.
Chomsky, N . (1995). The Minimalist Program. MIT Press.
Halle, K & Jay Keyser. (1991). On the syntax of argument structure. MIT Center for Cognitive Science : LPWP N° 34. Cambridge MITWPL.
Pesetsky, D. (1995). Zero Syntax. MIT Press : Cambridge.
Marantz, A. (1997). No Escape from Syntax : Don't try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of Your Own Lexicon. University of Pennsylvania working Papers in Linguistics, Vol 4.2.

Francesca Strik Lievers
Istituto di Linguistica Computazionale "A.Zampolli"

On the Event Structure of Italian Verbs with Predicative Complement

Subeventual analysis of events has proven to be useful in accounting for a number of phenomena, e.g., the scope of some adverbials (Pustejovsky 1995), or the properties of interlexical relations between verbs (Engelberg 2004). Here we show the advantages of adopting (sub)eventual analysis (based on the Generative Lexicon model, Pustejovsky 1995), taking as a case study a specific class of verbs in Italian: intransitive (e.g., *diventare,* 'become') and transitive (e.g., *considerare*, 'consider') verbs obligatorily requiring a predicative complement (pred. compl.) to form a 'complete' event, e.g. *Marco è diventato ricco*, 'Marco became rich' (**Marco è diventato*). These verbs can be interpreted as the realization of an analytical strategy to code events: the 'skeleton' of the event structure already emerges at the expression level. The "verb + pred. compl." complex can be interpreted as a single event composed by two subevents, e1 and e2: e1 is lexicalized by the verb, e2 is lexicalized by the pred. compl.

The proposed analysis can be exemplified considering the verb *rimanere*, 'remain'. At a first glance, it may appear as the 'prototypical' stative verb, thus characterized by the simplest event structure. However:

1) Both a stative sense (*È rimasta bellissima* 'She remained very beautiful') and a 'dynamic' sense occur (*È rimasto intrappolato* 'He remained trapped'), depending on the type of pred. compl. Corpus analysis shows that the 'dynamic' sense occurs with some stage-level Adjs, and with Resultant-State (Parsons 1990) past participles. It is here proposed to analyse this sense as a right-headed transition (where e1 is a process, preceding the state e2 coded by the pred. compl.), that introduces an opposition (cf. Pustejovsky 2000) modifying a property of the subject from ¬P to P.

2) The stative sense is itself complex. How do we account, for instance, for the difference between *Luca è il miglior alunno* ('Luca is the best pupil') and *Luca rimane il miglior alunno* ('Luca remains the best pupil')? In both cases it is only asserted the state P expressed by the pred. compl. (*il miglior alunno*). In the sentence with *rimanere*, however, it also presupposed (cf. Engelberg 2004) a subevent preceding the event time, where the same state P holds.

A representation in terms of subevents, and presupposed subevents, will be shown to be convenient from both a theoretical and a lexicographical point of view, allowing to isolate and independently describe the meaning of the V and that of the pred. compl.

References

Engelberg, S. (2004). "Lexical Event Structures for Verb Semantics". Journal of Language and Lingusitics 3, 1. 62-108.

Parsons, T. (1990). Events in the Semantics of English. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pustejovsky, J. (1995). The Generative Lexicon. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Pustejovsky, J. (2000). "Events and the Semantics of Opposition". In Tenny, C., Pustejovsky, J. (eds.). Events as Grammatical Objects. Stanford: CSLI Publications. 445–482.

Schlücker, B. (2004), "On the Event Structure of German *bleiben*", in Meier, C., Weisgerber, M. (eds.), *Proceedings of the Conference "sub8 – Sinn und Bedeutung"*, Arbeitspapier Nr. 117, Universität Konstanz, FB Sprachwissenschaft, pp. 259-272.

Schmitt, C. (2005). "Semi-Copulas: Event and Aspectual Composition". In Kempchinsky, P., Slabakova, R. (eds.). Aspectual Inquiries. Dordrecht: Springer. 121-45.

Elena Gorishneva
Department of Slavic Studies / Humboldt University Berlin

About the expression of genericity in Slavic languages

The goal of the present talk is to investigate how the inductive vs. non-inductive genericity are encoded in two Slavic languages, Russian and Bulgarian. Both kinds of generic expressions have been widely discussed in the literature (cf. Cohen 2001, Dobrovie-Sorin 2003, Greenberg 2003, Mari 2008, Krifka 2009, among others). Inductive (or descriptive) generalizations are inferred from a sufficient number of observed relevant entities. By way of contrast, non-inductive statements (also labelled as 'accidental', 'definitional' or 'in virtue of' generics) express analytic truths which are not based on inductive inference but have the underlying causal relation. Different theories have been developed in order to explain the formal and semantic distinction between these kinds of generics. In the talk I will briefly introduce recent accounts of Greenberg (2003) and Krifka (2009), proposed for English inductive and non-inductive generics, and discuss whether they can capture the data in Russian and Bulgarian.

The choice of Russian and Bulgarian for the present study has been motivated by the following facts. Firstly, the verbal systems of both languages manifest the imperfective vs. perfective aspect opposition which enables us to investigate the contribution of aspectual properties of verbs to the interpretation of generic sentences. Secondly, Russian and Bulgarian display different patterns in the nominal domain: the article-less language is opposed to the language with an incomplete article system (with the postponed definite article).

The data from the Slavic languages under discussion shows that imperfective verbs support descriptive reading of generics whereas the perfective aspect can express non-inductive generalizations. As for the nominal domain, the following tendencies have been observed: Russian bare plural NPs and Bulgarian definite plural NPs receive preferably descriptive interpretation while bare singulars in Russian and indefinite singular with *edin* 'one' in Bulgarian occur in non-inductive expressions.

Cross-linguistically, the distinction between inductive and non-inductive generalizations can be expressed in the nominal and verbal domain. Whereas in languages like English and French this difference is encoded by means of bare plurals and indefinite singulars, in article-less languages like Russian, Polish the verbal aspect fulfil this function. Bulgarian takes a position between these two groups, indicating descriptive and deductive readings by means of aspectual features of verbs as well as using definite NPs and indefinite NPs headed by *edin* 'one'.

Eric Corre
Université Paris 3 – Sorbonne Nouvelle.

Are Russian verbal prefixes grammatical or lexical objects ? An empirical exploration of the meaning of prefixes and their relevance for event structure

There are (at least) two ways of dealing with Russian verbal prefixes: the dominant (syntactic and/or formal semantic) models are interested in capturing relevant grammatical generalizations (Binnick 1991, Svenonius 2004, Ramchand 2004, Filip 2005, 2008; Borer 2005). From that perspective, Slavic verbal morphology offers a unique paradigm: the combinations of a prefix and a bare IMPFV verb stem makes the compound verb obtained invariably perfective**.** In turn, this indisputable morphological fact seems to translate into a single generalization that matters for the grammar; one such powerful structural notion that permits important generalizations is **(a)telicity**. So it is legitimate to explore the link between (a)telicity and (im)perfectivity, and since perfectivity is massively ensured by the presence of a verbal prefix, it is legitimate to explore the link between (a)telicity and prefixation.

French and Russian slavists (Šmelev and Zaliznjak 1997, Šmelev, Zaliznjak and Mikaelian 2008, Krongauz 1997, 1998, Dobrušina, Paillard, Mellina, 2001, Paducheva and Pentus 2008) have different assumptions: they advocate a lexical-conceptual approach of verbal prefixation. Observing the fact that there are twenty or so different prefixes in Russian and that not a single set of them is dedicated to marking telicity or some other *Aktionsart* notion, they consider that each prefix has meaning and conceptually contributes to the creation of a new verbal lexeme. In the words of Krongauz (1998), 'aspectology' has been replaced by 'prefixology'.

The goal of this talk is to evaluate the merits of both approaches, and above all to examine where points of contact can emerge in a better comprehension of verbal prefixation. From the grammatical perspective, it is indisputable that prefixes contribute to Quantity (telicity) assignment (Borer 2005) or that they "*specify a criterion for the ordering of events in their denotation*" (Filip 2008), but they do so by "***adding meaning components…*** *at a lexical (pre-functional) level*" (Filip *ibid.*). The difficulty is that sometimes, these meaning components have no grammatical effect but seem to be merely lexical, hence the generally admitted partition between lexical, super-lexical and purely perfectivizing prefixes (Romanova, Ramchand, Svenonius 2004). But from the perspective of "lexicalists-conceptualists", verbal prefixation being a derivational process, no such distinction exists ("all prefixation is lexical", J. Levin 1985; also Janda 2007): not only do all prefixes contribute to adding meaning components, but to a single bare imperfective verb stem there often correspond more than one prefixed perfective. A strictly grammatical account of prefixes (*viz.*, as marking telicity) runs into many problems which will be discussed in the paper, namely: 1) the one-to-one correspondence expected between a grammatical notion (say, inchoativity) and one form (say, "superlexical *za-*) does not hold; 2) it is sometimes difficult to decide if a given prefixal formation is lexical or superlexical; 3) some prefixes induce a very idiosyncratic notion of telicity, not necessarily telicity understood as "endpoint", but as "post-state" telicity; 4) the addition of some prefixes (*po-, pro-*) does not give rise to telicity at all. The approach presented here will develop a version of this lexicalist account of prefixes, one which considers prefixes as lexical objects first, combined with lexical objects that are verbs ("listemes"), in a very idiosyncratic way, but by no means erratic.

One general goal of this talk is to shed some light on the complexity of the conceptual component and offer a more fine-grained view of notions such as telicity and change of state. It will cover a lot of data, and is thus empirical in spirit.

Polina Eysmont
Saint-Petersburg State University, Russia
Event structuring process by children and adults in Russian

The paper discusses the question of children's event interpretation and its description in their own narratives by studying the verb argument structures and their realization in speech of children and adults, which is one of the most discussed, but still vague problems in Russian grammar (Apresjan 1995, Iordanskaja, Mel'čuk 2007). The conclusions are based on the data of two similar experiments – one with adults as the subjects, and the other one – with children. 4-minute cartoon was chosen to elicit verbal reports of the subjects. The original soundtrack is composed of several dialogues which include a lot of highly emotional interrogatives, exclamations or the kitten's complaints and requests.

The analysis dealt with the descriptions of 8 episodes which in turn may be subdivided into 34 different events. Each event may be described in different ways, depending on what character is chosen to be the lead one (to be the narrator) and depending on what other characters seem to be important enough to be mentioned in Ss. reports. This choice influences the usage of verbs. In their reports both children and adults used more than 800 verbs, which were classified according to their argument structure and their semantics. The paper discusses the dependence of argument structure on verb semantics, focusing on verbs of speech, verbs of movement, verbs of thinking and verbs of sense. It also pays special attention to the way how children analyze and structure every event of the cartoon in comparison with the adults.

The analysis proved that the percentage of different verb argument structures coincides in both adults' and children's texts and the most popular in both children's and adults' texts were the 1-argument and 2-argument verbs, where the first arguments are in the form of nominative case and the second in the form of the accusative one. The distribution of verb argument structures which are realized in the texts shows that children tend to focus on the lead character of the event and omit second and/or third arguments as well as complements, while adults tend to simplify their sentences by omitting the first arguments (subjects) and fulfilling all other verb slots.

References:
1. L. Iordanskaja & I. Mel'čuk (2007) Smysl i sočetaemost´ v slovare [Meaning and combination in dictionaries]. Moscow.
2. J. Apresian (1995) Izbrannye trudy. Tom 1: Leksicheskaya semantika [Selected works. Part 1. Leksical semantics.]. Moscow.

Hagit Borer
USC

In the Event of a Nominal

This paper embarks upon a detailed comparison of the event structure and properties of Argument Structure Nominals (Grimshaw's Complex Event Nominals), on the one hand, and the event structure (or rather lack thereof) and properties of Synthetic Compounds, traditionally assumed to derive from the incorporation, into a derived nominal, of the internal argument of the verb. Under (preliminary) consideration, then, would be the minimal pairs in (1)-(2):

1.   *AS-Nominals*
   a. The driving of the truck
   b. The sinking of the ship
   c. the writing of the letter
   d. the growing of the tomato

2.   *Synthetic Compounds*
   a. Truck driving
   b. ship sinking
   c. letter writing
   d. tomato growing

Superficial similarities notwithstanding, I will proceed to show that the properties of these two phrases are extremely different. Specifically, while AS-Nominals have the properties of grammatical events, Synthetic Compounds do not; while AS-Nominals are always compositional, Synthetic Compounds need not be; while AS-nominals must have a well-formed clausal VP correlate (or an equivalent thereof), synthetic compounds need not. Finally, while Synthetic Compounds must be transitive (cf. 2 b,d) AS-Nominals need not be (cf. 1 1b,d).

In accounts that invest event properties and argument roles in lexical entries, indeed, in accounts that invest event properties and argument roles in verbs or even in roots, these contrasts cannot be captured. Rather, as I will show, the comparison provides a particularly strong argument for the non-lexical nature of argument structure and event structure, and for its representation through structural, rather than lexical-semantic means.

Elitzur Bar-Asher Siegal
School of Language Science/The Department of the Hebrew Language
The Hebrew University in Jerusalem

The participants of the events as the arguments of their simple predicates

One of the main issues that set apart the Davidsonian semantic approach from the Neo-Davidsonianism is the location of the participants in the semantic representation of the events: are they the arguments of the predicate or are they asserted separately? (Parsons 1990: 94)

From a theoretical point of view this debate reintroduces the question whether lexical items should be decomposed into their semantic representation or remain simple. Among the famous adherents of the simple approach (sometimes called "lexical atomism") one should mention Fodor 1970 and more recently Fodor and Lepore 1998, while the predicate decomposition approach was introduced by generative semanticists (Lakoff 1968; McCawley 1968; Ross 1972). Similar ideas can be found in many other later semantic approaches (Jackendoff 1976, Van Valin and LaPolla 1997, *inter alia*) and in lexical semantics approaches (Rappaport et al. 1988 *inter alia*).

Thus, sentence (1) is represented by Davidson as (2a) and by Parsons as (2b)

(1) Brutus stabbed Caesar with a knife

(2) a. ($\exists$e) [Stabbing(e,Brutus, Caesar)&with(e,knife)]

   b. ($\exists$e) [Stabbing(e)&Agent(e, Brutus)&Theme(e, Caesar)&with(e,knife)]

Considering the following set of sentences provides a support for the Davidsonian approach:

(3) a. Brutus stabbed Caesar in the back with a knife
   b. Brutus stabbed Caesar in the back
   c. Brutus stabbed with a knife
   d. Brutus stabbed Caesar
   e. Brutus stabbed a knife into Caesar's back

It seems to be the case that sentences (a-c) can be inferred from (e),[1] while clearly "Caesar" and "knife" should be represented with different thematic roles in the various sentences. Thus, if the participants of the events are not arguments of the event-predicate but rather asserted separately, it is hard to explain these deductions.

In my paper I shall argue that there must be a level of the representation of events where the participants are the arguments of the event-predicate. This predication involves the instantiation of the predicate with its arguments (with their <u>lexical meaning)</u> and the specification of them. This representation is blind to their thematic roles (which might still be relevant for other syntactic phenomena) and therefore allows the deductions demonstrated in (3).

---

[1] It seems also that (d) can be inferred from (e), however we also need a theory about inference from body parts to their owner.

Elitzur Bar-Asher Siegal
School of Language Science/The Department of the Hebrew Language
The Hebrew University in Jerusalem

In my paper I will deal with the arguments in favor of the Neo-Davidsonian approach as well as demonstrate other advantages of the "simple approach" for the representation of events with various regular alternations between constructions. At the same time, I shall compare my proposal with other approaches for these alternations (*inter alia*, Anderson 1971; Verkuyl 1972; Givón 1984; Goldberg 1995; Wasow 2002 and Beavers 2006).

Isabelle Roy, Elena Soare
Université Paris 8
Naming participants in the event(uality)

Since Grimshaw (1990)´s work on deverbal nominalizations, an important correlation has come to light between the obligatory presence of an argument structure (AS) and the event interpretation for such nominals (*the (frequent) destruction of the city by the enemy / the (*frequent) destruction*). Recent syntactic approaches to deverbal nominalizations argue that the correlation is linked to the presence of a full verbal / aspectual structure in one case, and its absence in the other; cf. (1), as implemented in Borer 2001, 2005 (here nominal suffixes realize aspectual heads responsible for introducing the arguments; but see also Alexiadou 2001, for a different view):

(1) [DP/NP N [Asp$_E$ [Asp$_Q$ [-*ation*] [XP->VP form]]]]]   (AS-nominals)
(2) [DP/NP N [-*ation*] [XP->VP form]]   (R-nominals)

In this context, deverbal names of participants in the event(uality) (agents, patients, holders, etc.) have received relatively little attention (to the notable exception of –*er* nominals; cf., Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1992, Van Hout & Roeper 1998, Schäfer 2010, Alexiadou & Schäfer (to appear)). However, they present an interesting challenge: since they nominalize an argument, they can only be built from a structure akin to the one in (1) (abstracting away from the actual affix present in (1) and (2) above), thus involving full AS, as opposed to (2). If built from a structure akin to (1), they should necessarily give rise to an eventive interpretation (correlating with full AS). This is *not* the case, however – e.g., English –*er* nominals can have an eventive meaning (e.g., *the saver of lives*), along with a non-eventive or dispositional meaning (e.g., *the life-saver*), as well as an instrument meaning (e.g., *the grinder*).

Alternatively, one could argue that dispositions and instruments are derived from the non-eventive / non-verbal structure akin to (2), which means that these nominals are never related to any underlying event. If this claim is tenable for instruments, we argue, dispositions must, at some level, be eventive as they allow for modifications with adjectives such as *happy, big* in their event-oriented interpretation (3). In actuality, we show that a three-way classification of names of participants, in terms of a contrast between episodic, dispositional and referential nominals is warranted, departing from a bi-partite distinction, either in terms of an [inanimate-eventive] contrast (as in Rappaport Hovav and Levin 1992) or in terms of the [episodic-dispositional] distinction alone (as in Alexiadou & Schäfer (to appear)):

(3)	Referential Ns	Dispositional Ns	Episodic Ns
frequent-modifiers	# *a frequent grinder*	# *a frequent consumer*	Ok *a frequent user of soft drugs*
big, happy-modifiers	# *a big grinder*	Ok *the big consumers*	Ok *a happy/big user of soft drugs*

Leaving aside instruments (which are non-eventive), we must assume that both dispositional and episodic nominals are derived from an underlying verbal base involving full AS (4). The source of the two readings remains to be explained:

(4) [DP/NP N [Asp$_E$ [Asp$_Q$ [XP->VP form]]]]]   (AS-nominals)

We argue, on the basis of data from French, that the tight connection between AS and event interpretation, goes beyond what has been suggested so far for event nominals (e.g., Grimshaw's 1990): the very nature (specific or non-specific) of the arguments plays a crucial role in building the episodic *vs*. dispositional meaning in names of participants. The episodic reading of nominals arises in presence of specific arguments, associated to an episodic underlying event (5a). The dispositional reading arises in two ways: in the absence of argument structure altogether (cf. *vendeur* 'seller') and when the arguments are realized as a bare plural or singular (5b). (We note, incidentally, that bare plurals and singulars are not otherwise allowed in French: **Lucas achète vin / pommes* 'Lucas buys wine/apples'). In both cases, the arguments (non-specific, including when empty) give rise to a generic reading for the underlying eventuality:

(5)   a.   cette voiture `this car´   >   specific DP object
           /vendre cette voiture/ `sell this car´   >   particular episodic event
           le vendeur de cette voiture `the seller of this car´ >   episodic `agent´ nominal
      b.   des voitures `PART. cars´   >   non-specific DP object
           /vendre des voitures/ `sell cars´   >   generic event
           le vendeur de voitures `the car-seller´       >        dispositional `agent´ nominal

As expected, the modification by *frequent* type adjectives correlates with specific arguments only (the paradigm in (6) raising, incidentally, the issue of the role of adjectives and number in specificity):

(6)   a. un admirateur occasionnel des opéras de Verdi
            an occasional admirer of the operas by Verdi
         b. un admirateur occasionnel d´opéras italiens
            an occasional admirer of italian operas

c. ?*un admirateur occasionnel d´opéras

an occasional admirer of the operas by Verdi

d. * un admirateur occasionnel d´opéra

an occasional admirer of opera

In sum, both dispositional and episodic –*eur* nominals can be derived from (4), as long as the nature of the arguments is accessible to the interpretation of the entire nominal.

(7)   a. *le conducteur du train de 19h30*   'the driver of the 7:30 train '

[n [Asp$_E$ -*eur*$_N$ [Asp$_Q$ le train de 19h30   [XP->VP   conduct]]]

b. *un éleveur (de chiens)*   'a dog-breeder'

[n [Asp$_E$ -*eur*$_N$ [Asp$_Q$ chiens / ∅   [XP->VP   élev]]]

French can also express external arguments (or more accurately, we shall argue, *subjects*) with an apparently competing form, namely –*ant* nominals (*trafiquant* 'dealer', *mourant* 'dier', *détachant* 'stain remover'*; cf., enseignant* 'teacher' but *chercheur* 'researcher'*; attaquant* 'attacker' but *agresseur* 'agressor', *servant* 'servant' but *serveur* 'waiter'), which differ from –*eur* nominals in one important respect – they never nominalize an agent, as shown by their incompatibility with agent-oriented modifiers and their compatibility with unaccusative bases:

(8)   a. *l'attaquant / l'agresseur délibéré de la vieille dame

the attacker / the agressor deliberate of the old lady

b. les arrivants vs. *les arriveurs 'the comers'; un habitant vs. *un habiteur 'an inhabitant'

Nevertheless, they may exhibit the AS alternations between specific and non-specific DPs, leading to an episodic interpretation in one case (*le gagnant du gros lot* `the winner of the jackpot´), and a dispositional one in the other (*l´accédant à la propriété* `the home buyer´, *les aidants* `the helpers´). Adding the fact that they can be formed from true agentive activity verbs (*trafiquer* 'deal', *enseigner* 'teach', *détacher* 'remove stain', etc), what sort of th-role they nominalize needs to be explained. We show that –*ant* nominals are always underlyingly stative on the basis of the fact that they do not realize agents of agentive basis (8) and they don't allow imperatives in copular constructions (9).

(9)   a. sois accompagnateur! *vs*. *sois accompagnant!   b. sois passeur! *vs*. *sois passant !

'be a guide' *vs*. 'be an accompanying person!'   'be a smuggler' *vs*. 'be a passer-by'

On the basis of numerous nominal forms that do not have a related adjective (*habitant* 'inhabitant', *arrivant* 'comer', *fabricant* 'manufacturer', *trafiquant* 'dealer', *enseignant* 'teacher', etc.), we claim that –*ant* nominals are built on the present participle rather than the adjective. Present participles are not stative per se, and we argue that the stative meaning comes from a null nominalizing head realizing the subject of a PredP:

(10)   [n [PredP ∅$_N$ Pred [PartP   perdant]]]   'looser'

[n [PredP ∅$_N$ Pred [PartP   gagnant du gros lot]]]   'winner of the jackpot'

In other words, we claim that *attaquant* `attacker/assailant´ (as opposed to *agresseur* `aggressor´) does not mean `the one who attacks´, but `the one who has the property of being the agent in an attack event´ - realizing a holder (the subject of the predication) rather than the agent below. This result fits nicely with the result of Roy (to appear) who has shown that deadjectival nominals must be constructed on PredPs as well, suggesting that nominalizations must necessarily take a truly predicative basis.

Finally, we address the apparent issue of the nominalizations of internal arguments, which must be episodic and systematically lack a dispositional reading *(*e.g., *la mariée* (lit. married) meaning 'the bride' and not somebody who has the disposition to be married). Our system seems to predict that both readings should be available (as nominalizations of internal arguments involve a verbal base with full argument structure, and internal arguments can potentially be either specific or non-specific).

(11)   [n [Asp$_E$ [Asp$_Q$ –é/u$_N$ [XP->VP mari-]]]

We argue, however, that the restriction makes sense if only specific arguments can be nominalized, leading necessarily to an episodic reading in (11).

Selected references Alexiadou, A. & F. **Schäfer** (to appear). On the syntax of episodical vs. dispositional –*er* nominals. In Alexiadou & Rathert eds, *Nominalizations across languages and frameworks*. Mouton de Gruyter. **Borer, H. 2005**. *The Normal Course of Events. Structuring Sense, Volume II*. Oxford University Press. **Grimshaw, J. 1990**. *Argument Structure*. MIT Press. **Rappaport Hovav, M. & B. Levin. 1992**. ``-*er* Nominals: Implications for a Theory of Argument Structure", in Stowell & Wehrli, eds, *Syntax and Semantics 26*. **Roy, I.** (to appear).Deadjectival nominalizations and the structure of the adjective. In Alexiadou & Rathert eds, *Nominalizations across languages and frameworks*. Mouton de Gruyter.

Scott Carlton Thomas
Alexandria, Virginia

Differences in lexicalized event construals drive differences in verb behavior

For many events, how they are expressed via a predicate and its arguments depends on how the events are construed (Levin and Rappaport Hovav 2005; DeLancey 1991). Thus English frames THEFT as an agent acting on a victim (*robbing someone*) or on the goods being taken (*stealing something*). Labeling these as construals reflects the idea that different facets of meaning are encoded (or encoded differently) during word learning, causing, possibly, diverging argument realizations (e.g. *rob* and *steal*'s realization of victim and goods, respectively, as grammatical object). Crucially, such lexicalized construals should also cause differences in event composition. (Even the idiosyncratic *She stole/*robbed away from the party* could involve *steal* alone having a semantic core for some 'manner' of (real or abstract) movement, getting the complete 'theft event composition' of thief, victim, and goods only when more fully extended.)

Following Levin and Rappaport Hovav closely, it seems that verb behaviors will appear less idiosyncratic only when many facets of meaning and event structure are discovered and brought together. A certain check can be performed, however, just by looking for the following correspondence between lexicon-wide patterns of argument realization and event composition. Suppose that (1) all verbs lexicalize particular construals; (2) argument realization is highly regular; and (3) event composition is highly productive. Then it would not be surprising if every verb pair that exhibits diverging argument realization also exhibits diverging event compositions. Regular mechanisms using lexicalized construals that differ should lead to realizations and event compositions that differ.

And this is highly consistent with English verb behavior. In fact, in our study, all across the lexicon, argument realization divergences appear as a sufficient condition for event composition divergences. Interestingly, a system of 'interface rules' fixed by words themselves (Jackendoff 2002) doesn't have quite the same constraint. Jackendoff's view of argument realization (starting with Jackendoff 1990) provides overlapping paths from conceptual structure to realizations of its elements; verbs with divergent argument realizations could share identical sets of event compositions—contrary to fact, it seems. The degree to which different lexicalizations really do fix different construals seems to be underestimated here, and it is around these construed forms, rather than Jackendoff-style conceptual structures, that event compositions appear to be formed most productively.

References

DeLancey, S. 1991. Event construal and case role assignment. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, pp. 338–353. Berkeley, CA.

Jackendoff, R. 1990. *Semantic Structures*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

Jackendoff, R. 2002. *Foundations of Language*. Oxford University Press, New York, NY.

Levin, B. and Rappaport Hovav, M. 2005. *Argument Realization*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Achievements and Accomplishments

Robert D. Van Valin, Jr.
Heinrich Heine University–Düsseldorf
Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics
University at Buffalo, The State University of New York

The terms 'achievement' and 'accomplishment' have been used in the analysis and description of the semantic properties of verbs (and verb phrases) since their introduction in Vendler's seminal paper (1957). The interpretation of these terms, however, has often not been in terms of Vendler's original work but rather in terms of Dowty (1979)'s reanalysis and decomposition of them. For Vendler, achievements differed primarily from accomplishments along the punctual/non-punctual dimension, with achievements being punctual and accomplishments non-punctual. For Dowty, on the other hand, they are differentiated along two dimensions, punctual/non-punctual and causative/non-causative, with accomplishments being non-punctual, telic and causative. Early work in Role and Reference Grammar [RRG] (e.g. Foley & Van Valin 1984, Van Valin 1990, 1993) followed the Dowty interpretation and decomposition, but this led to a number of problems, e.g. since telicity and causality are linked, atelic verbs cannot be causative, but there are many examples of atelic causative verbs, e.g. *the sergeant marched the soldiers in the park for an hour*. The search for a solution to these problems led to the revised Aktionsart classifications in Van Valin & LaPolla (1997) and Van Valin (2005), in which all basic Vendler classes have a causative counterpart.

The purpose of this paper is to explore the properties of achievements and accomplishments, with the goal of explicating their properties leading to a revised decomposition for them. The two classes have been considered telic change-of-state predicates with a result state, but there are change-of-state predicates which signal a change without a result, and some languages, e.g. Mparntwe Arrernte (Australia) and Lakhota (North America) explicitly code the difference between change and change+result in verbal expressions. A great deal of discussion has focused on another kind of accomplishment, namely the telic use of activity verbs, e.g. *The boy ran to the store in fifteen minutes*, where an atelic manner-of-motion verb is used telicly. In RRG these are termed 'active accomplishments' in order to distinguish them from 'plain accomplishments' like intransitive *dry*, *melt*, *freeze* and *die*. There are at least four types of active accomplishments, each with a slightly different decompositional template. Furthermore, there is another type of achievement and accomplishment involving activity predicates, namely punctual vs. non-punctual onset of activity verbs, e.g. *burst out laughing* (punctual onset) vs. (*slowly*) *start walking* (non-punctual onset). Vendler mentions an example of the first type, but for the most part these predications have not figured prominently in discussion of *Aktionsart*. Even though they are represented by complex constructions in English, there are lexicalized versions of them in other languages, e.g. Russian, and in some languages, e.g. Georgian, they are marked by the same morpheme that indicates a change-of-state. Finally, within the domain of punctual predications, it is necessary to distinguish punctual events from punctual changes-of-state or onsets-of-action; the former are termed 'semelfactives' in Smith (1997), and are distinguished from achievements in several ways. In sum, the terms 'achievement' and 'accomplishment' cover a complex web of verbal expressions, which require a more complex decomposition than provided in Dowty or in early RRG.

Aliyah Morgenstern et Christophe Parisse
Université Paris 3 – Sorbonne Nouvelle.

**Constructing "basic" verbal constructions:
a longitudinal study of the blossoming of constructions with six frequent French verbs**

In the course of their development, children make their way along successive transitory systems with their own internal coherence. This phenomenon can be observed at all levels of linguistic analysis but the gradual assembling of verbal constructions (Goldberg 2006, Tomasello 2003) in language development is of particular interest for linguistic theory.

In this study, the development of verb constructions in young French speaking children is analyzed by focusing on spontaneous language data from three children age 1;06 up to 3;06 (*Paris Corpus*, CHILDES). The focus of the work is on six specific verbs which are quite frequent in young child speech (all children produced these verbs) and which present different patterns of verbal constructions. These verbs are divided into three sets:

1) *attendre* (to wait) and *tenir* (to hold), verbs with two arguments but used in nearly only one type of construction
2) *mettre* (to put) and *enlever* (to remove), verbs with a pattern of two or three arguments
3) *dire* (to say) and *donner* (to give), in theory verbs with three arguments but they do not follow this theoretical pattern.

Despite the differences between these six common verbs, the development of verbal constructions in young children follows a similar pattern. Some specific verb constructions are learned first for each verb and used frequently. These patterns most often include pronouns as opposed to lexical words. They belong to a specific subset: the most 'simple' constructions that can be produced with these verbs in standard oral French. Other and more complex constructions appear infrequently and much later. They seem to be more variable than the frequent constructions and tend to be less adultlike.

This opposition between frequent construction and unusual production is probably a key to understand children's language development, as it offers them both a way to enter quickly and efficiently into language, and a way to be more "creative" and produce their own forms. These two types of productions may represent the evidence of a two-sided process, which participates in the dynamics of language acquisition: taking advantage of frequent forms, and creating new language material.

Goldberg, A. (2006). Constructions at work. The nature of Generalization in Language. Oxford University Press.

Tomasello, M., 2003, *Constructing a language, a usage-based theory of language acquisition*, Cambridge, M.A., Harvard University Press.

John Beavers
University of Texas at Austin

Anticausatives in Sinhala: Involitivity and Causer Suppression

Several recent theories of causative/inchoative alternations (e.g. "John broke the vase"/"The vase broke") have adopted an anticausativization analysis, wherein inchoatives are derived from their corresponding causatives via some operation that eliminates the causer argument from a verb's argument structure, provided the causer is semantically unspecified for agentivity (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995, Chierchia 2004, Koontz-Garboden 2008). In this paper we explore the properties of such an analysis for causative/inchoative alternations in Colloquial Sinhala, which have two typologically unusual properties: (1) they are overtly indicated by a volitive/involitive mood contrast marked on the verb, and (2) the subject of the inchoative (marked in the involitive) shows a nominative/accusative case alternation. We propose an analysis of these properties that has ramifications for anticausativization theories more broadly.

First, we argue that Sinhala causative/inchoative alternations arise from a causer suppression operation that syntactically deletes a causer argument unspecified for agentivity from the verb's argument structure, but preserves it in the verb's event structure. However, the operation also formally marks the causer as grammatically unresolvable for agentivity. We implement this via a typology of causers. Agentive causation reflects a causing event, non-agentive causation reflects a causing state (assuming a bieventive theory of causation; Dowty 1979). We show that verbs that undergo causative/inchoative alternations are unspecified for the type of their causer argument, which may be resolved in grammatical or pragmatic context to either an event or state. But because Sinhala inchoatives may occur in pragmatic contexts in which agentive causation is favored, but not grammatical contexts requiring it (e.g. with purposive modifiers), we argue that causer suppression fixes the causer not as an eventuality but as an individual, which may not be subsequently grammatically resolved as either a state or event (although one must exist). Volitive stems, we argue, grammatically require agentive causation, thus forcing inchoatives to be realized as involitive (which has no such requirement). Thus the fact that the involitive serves as an overt inchoative marker is epiphenomenonal. We compare this to Spanish, where no such unresolvability condition obtains, and thus inchoatives may take on agentive (i.e. reflexive) readings in grammatical contexts favoring it.

Second, we show that the nominative/accusative case alternation reflects two ways suppressed causers can be interpreted --- via reflexivization (as in Spanish; Koontz-Garboden 2008) or existential binding respectively. These options lead to different interpretations of inchoatives: with nominative subjects there is no interpretation of an external causer, but with accusatives there is (much like a passive). In sum, these data support an analysis of causative/inchoative alternations as a type of non-agentive causer elimination, but they also expand the typology of ways a causer can be unspecified for agentivity, how causer elimination can occur, and what overt morphology can indicate such an alternation.

John Lumsden
Université du Québec, Montréal.

On the propositional format of clausal expressions

All clausal argument structures can be described using a small inventory of thematic roles or predicate functions (cf., Gruber 1965, Jackendoff 1990, etc.). Clausal aspectual structures are also very limited (cf., Dowty 1979). I will argue that an explicit formal representation of Figure/Ground and Force Dynamic relations provides a simple account of these universal semantic constraints. Moreover, this representation explains why a propositional format exists in human cognition.

Jackendoff (1990) represents Force Dynamic relations on a independent tier, using a binary relation AFFECT(Actor, Patient). A Patient is "affected" if it is created or destroyed or changed in any other way. Surprisingly, Jackendoff continues to express many dynamic phenomena as relations or properties on the Thematic Tier (e.g., GO(Thing, Path), CAUSE(Thing/Event, Event), INCHOATIVE (State), etc.) I argue that the Thematic Tier should be reduced to a static expression. I follow Talmy (2000) who argues that the basic static verb *to be* introduces a Figure/Ground relation.

The patterns that distinguish between different dynamic verbs are represented as implicit Action Tier arguments (just as states have been represented as implicit arguments on the Thematic Tier). Since Actors and Patients may be either explicit or implicit arguments, these provisions offer a straightforward account of the differences between intransitive and transitive ergative constructions and unergative constructions, unaccusative constructions and the English Middle construction. In fact, many other alternations in clausal argument structures have an immediate account within these same parameters.

I argue that aspectual structure depends on the relative timing of the Force Dynamic relation and the resulting situation. For example, both stage-level statives and activities involve a Force Dynamic relation and a resulting situation that both begin and end together, etc.

Why do clausal expressions have a propositional format? As Lucretius and other philosophers have observed, humans can only conceive of time through spatial images; for example, as a "time-line" with points marking temporal intervals (cf., Reichenbach 1980, etc.) It is the propositional format permits us to do this. BE(Figure, Ground) establishes a time-line by asserting the existential continuity of a Figure entity in the context of a Ground entity. AFFECT(Actor, Patient) establishes intervals on this line by identifying moments of change in the Patient/Figure entity. The universal propositional format provides a focus on continuity and change in spatial dimensions. It is only by attending to these matters that we are able to conceive of time.

Henry Wyld
Université de Cergy-Pontoise
(CLILLAC, Univ. Paris 7)
henry.wyld@wanadoo.fr

De la notion à l'événement représenté

Le but de cette communication sera de fournir une définition modèlo-théorique de l'événement dans le cadre de la théorie des repérages de la TOE.

Nous inspirant des propositions de Danon-Boileau (1982 et 1987), deux grands types d'énoncés sont retenus : énoncés de type événement, énoncés de type propriété.

Un énoncé de type événement se distingue fondamentalement d'un énoncé de type propriété dans la mesure où il implique, lors de sa construction, le repérage du construit prédicatif (relation prédicative, lexis) par rapport à un repère de type T2 ("repère de l'événement", "*event time*" (Reichenbach)), tandis que dans le cas d'un énoncé de type propriété ce rang de repère est absent du système référentiel de l'énoncé. Les énoncés de type propriété peuvent être répartis par la suite en « propriétés valables pour une classe de situations » et « propriétés valables pour une situation unique » (cf. distinction trad. entre états permanents vs temporaires).

La distinction entre énoncés événements et énoncés propriétés ainsi définie soulève la question de son articulation avec la détermination et la catégorisation des procès (car on ne saurait poser des correspondances simples de type : énoncé événement = verbe dynamique ; énoncé propriété = verbe d'état).

La construction d'un énoncé ayant comme point de départ en TOE l'instanciation d'un schéma de lexis par trois notions qui subissent ensuite des opérations de détermination, nous faisons l'hypothèse d'une corrélation directe entre le mode de détermination de la notion instanciant la place de prédicat dans la lexis et l'opposition énoncé événement / énoncé propriété.

Plus précisément, notre position s'articule autour des propositions suivantes :

• La détermination du terme associé au constituant prédicat-procès de la lexis est axiomatiquement transférée à, et donc régit, celle du construit prédicatif dans son ensemble.

• La présence/absence d'un repérage de type T2 est à mettre directement en relation avec la problématique de formatage des occurrences (Culioli [1991]1999, de Vogué 1989).

• Nous distinguons au départ deux grands types d'occurrences : occurrences QLT et occurrences QNT, correspondant respectivement à une saisie intensionnelle et une saisie extensionnelle de la notion associée.

• Un énoncé de type événement implique nécessairement la saisie extensionnelle de la notion du procès (occurrence QNT, ex. *J played the piano this morning*), tandis qu'un énoncé de

type propriété implique nécessairement la saisie intensionnelle de la notion du procès (occurrence QLT, ex. *J plays the piano*).

• La détermination des constituants de la relation prédicative (arguments, prédicat-procès) s'effectue de manière indépendante les uns les autres et tout constituant de la relation prédicative est susceptible d'apparaître en intension (occurrence QLT) ou en extension (occurrence QNT) dans l'énoncé surface (cf. *She left <u>hospital</u> this morning*, *J <u>taught</u> before he dropped out* vs *She left <u>the hospital</u> this morning*, *J <u>taught</u> all morning*).

• Le passage à l'extensionalité d'une notion de procès peut précéder la validation du construit prédicatif (cf. cas de la visée d'un état de choses événementiel, ex. *I want to leave*), de même que l'intensionalité de la notion du procès peut être maintenue au delà de la validation du construit prédicative (cf. cas des énoncés propriétés assertifs).

• En termes de repérages, la distinction entre saisie intensionnelle et extensionnelle du constituant prédicat-procès de la relation prédicative peut être ramenée aux deux cas de figure suivants :

(i) le repérage de la notion du procès (en intension) par rapport à un support argumental (attribution de propriété à x), où la notion de procès est saisie en intension mais sa portée est circonscrite par le support auquel elle s'applique (cas des énoncés propriétés).

(ii) le repérage de la notion du procès (en intension) par rapport à une "portion d'espace-temps" (Culioli, 1999, opération de quantifiabilisation), ce qui permet le passage à l'extensionalité et le formatage d'une occurrence QNT (abstraite) de la notion de procès en deçà de la validation et donc sans valeur référentielle (cas des énoncés événements).

• Le construit événementiel <<Sujet-préd.> loc T2>> peut faire, entre autres :
- l'objet d'une opération de validation (passage à une valeur référentielle)
- l'objet d'une visée (validation projetée)

Notre hypothèse concernant le rôle joué par le repère T2 se rapproche à certains égards de l'interprétation faite par Kratzer (1995) du rôle de l'argument davidsonian dans l'opposition qu'elle pose entre « individual-level » et « stage-level » predicates. Cependant, pour nous (i) l'événement est construit à partir de la notion et n'est donc pas une entité sémantique primitive comme chez Davidson ; (ii) notre traitement des états « temporaires » comme propriétés valables pour des situations uniques n'est pas analogue à l'analyse proposée par Kratzer, qui les range au niveau des « stage-level predicates ».

(communication et exemplier en anglais)

<u>Références</u>
• Culioli A. (1999) - *Pour une linguistique de l'énonciation*, t.3, Gap, Ophrys.
• Danon-Boileau L. (1982) - *Produire le fictif*, Paris, Klincksieck.
• Danon-Boileau L. (1987) - *Enonciation et référence*, Gap, Ophrys.
• Kratzer. A (1995) - « Stage-level and Individual-level Predicates » in *The Generic Book*, ed. Carlson G. & Pelletier F., University of Chicago Press.
• de Vogüé S. (1989) - "Discret, dense, compact : Les enjeux énonciatifs d'une typologie lexicale" in *La notion de prédicat* (ed) Franckel J-J., Collection ERA 642, UFRL, Univ. Paris 7.

Monique Lambert
Université Paris 8 UMR CNRS 7023

Do advanced L2 learners attend to aspects of motion events that are specific of their target language or remain influenced by their L1 preferences?

The present study forms part of an extensive research on ultimate attainment in L2 which takes into account the influence of the specific encoding system of languages in the way speakers select and organize information. We examine here how French learners of English express motion events and caused motion events in the light of native speakers of English (satellite framed L) and French (verb framed L) cf. Talmy 1991. Comparison of the ways speakers encode spatial information in verbs and satellites serves as a test to Slobin's claim (1996) that 'each native language has trained its speakers to pay different kinds of attention to events and experiences when talking about them. This training is carried out in childhood <u>and is exceptionally resistant to restructuring in adult second language acquisition</u>'.

The current study is based on (a) the description of video clips presenting an entity or a vehicle on his/her/its way to a manipulated goal destination, (b) motion events in the retellings of a silent film and (c) voluntary motion events and caused motion events in the retelling of an animation film. The data base includes 20 native speakers per language group and from 10 to 20 per learner groups depending on tasks. Participants consist mainly of university students.

In a first step robustness of lexicalization patterns in English and French L1s is examined taking into account (a) coding of Manner vs. Path in verb relative to the degree of saliency of an endpoint, (b) spatial information coded in satellites (configuration of the ground traversed vs. goal location vs. global localization) with Manner vs. Path verbs, (c) degree of compactness of spatial information, (d) aspecto-temporal coding.

Results in L1 English show that manner verbs are predominant with the proximity of a goal as only restriction, whereas in L1 French the verb encodes information on the direction taken or manner of motion depending on the saliency of the projected destination confirming Slobin 2006, Talmy 2000, Hickmann 2006. Ground based concepts coded in satellites are dominant and dense in English. This contrasts with French where direction of motion to goal correlates with path verbs and global localization with manner verbs. In narratives, non goal motivated displacements tend to be left unmentioned in French. In English they are coded with manner verbs presented as ongoing and contribute to the construction of a deictic frame of reference (Lambert, M., Carroll, M., Stutterheim, Ch. v. 2008).

Caused motion constructions are more frequent in English than French. The predominance of manner over change of place verbs reflects different perspectives: in English, focus is on the agent and mode of action, whereas in French focus is on the patient and change of location.

Concerning L2s, both groups globally continue to rely on their L1s lexicalization patterns and preferences in spatial information. Some learners display mixed patterns reflecting a sensitivity to certain aspects of target language options. These results will be discussed in the light of prior studies in L1 and L2 and in the light of production and acquisition processes.

Hickmann, M. (2006) The relativity of motion in first language acquisition. In M. Hickmann and S. Robert (eds.) Space in Languages. Linguistic Systems and Cognitive Categories. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins. (Typological Studies in Language 66) 281-308.

Monique Lambert
Université Paris 8 UMR CNRS 7023

Lambert, M., Carroll, M., Stutterheim, Ch. v. (2008). Acquisition en L2 des principes d'organisation de récits spécifiques aux langues. *Acquisition et Interaction en Langue Etrangère (AILE)* 26, 11-30.

Slobin, D. I. (1996). From 'thought and language' to 'thinking for speaking'. In J.J. Gumperz and S.C. Levinson (eds). Rethinking linguistic relativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 70-96.

Talmy, L. (1988). The relation of grammar to cognition. In Brygida Rudzka-Ostyn (ed.), *Topics in cognitive linguistics*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 165-205.

J. Fleischhauer, A. Latrouite & R. Osswald,
Heinrich-Heine Univ., Duesseldorf

Decomposition beyond event templates

A number of approaches on verb semantics and its impact on grammatical behavior assume that the meaning of a verb consists of an event structure component (with or without explicit event arguments) and an idiosyncratic component, the so-called "root". The event structure captures basic aktionsart distinctions. This view has been put forward, for instance, by Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998, 2010), but serves also as the basis of Van Valin's (2005) "logical structures". The motivation for this type of decomposition is not semantic classification per se but the explanation of a verb's grammatical behavior, notably with respect to alternations, resultative constructions, and argument linking in general.

In our paper, we discuss a number of phenomena at the syntax-semantics interface where the described separation into event structure and root (e.g. **do**' (x,[cry'(x)])) for *cry*) falls short with respect to its explanatory power. For example, gradation data from German and Tagalog reveal that activity verbs do not form a homogeneous class. As the sentences in (1) and (2) show, the interpretation of the adverbial modification by 'sehr' in German depends on the respective semantics of the verb it appears with: in (1) 'sehr' specifies the quantity of the substance emitted over time, while in (2) 'sehr' specifies the volume of the sound emitted. This shows that gradation takes out dimensions and aspects of meanings that are not part of the event template representations suggested in the literature.

(1) Die Wunde blutete *sehr*. 'The wound bled a lot.'

(2) Der Junge lachte *sehr*.   'The boy laughed very hard/loud.'

In Tagalog, intensification of activity verbs is achieved by *mag*-affixation (e.g. mag-tawa 'laugh out loud', mag-basa 'read much/study'). Interestingly, while *mag*-affixation yields an intensification reading with a number of activity verbs, it may yield a reflexive, reciprocal or causative reading with other activity verbs, showing once again that it is meaning components beyond the event templates that are taken out and modified.

All of the examples given call for a more elaborate decomposition of verb meaning where semantic components of the root can interact with the event structure in intricate ways. To this end, we will sketch a richer, frame-based representation as a natural extension of traditional event structure templates that captures the fine-grained distinctions necessary to account for the above-mentioned phenomena.