

The syntax of argument structure alternations across frameworks - SAS21

Svitlana Antonyuk, Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández & Isabel Oltra-Massuet,

(Karl Franzens Universität Graz, Universidad de Sevilla & Universitat Rovira i Virgili)

Argument structure and argument structure alternations have been a crucial area of investigation in generative linguistics since its inception, carrying implications for our understanding of the overall architecture of grammar per se and the issues related to the nature of the relation between the lexicon and syntax in particular (Levin 1993, Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2005; see also Ramchand 2013 for a general overview). The answers given to questions related to argument structure alternations, such as, for instance, whether the two alternating frames have the same or different semantics, i.e., whether they are merely thematic paraphrases of each other as opposed to being truth-conditionally distinct, have had wide-ranging implications, often determining one's position on the nature of said alternations, one's analysis thereof and, not infrequently, one's views on the clausal architecture underlying the alternation. Thus, for instance, whether one believes the Double Object construction (DOC) and the Prepositional Dative construction (PP Dative) to instantiate the same meaning or takes them to each encode a distinct semantics, often determined how these alternations are analyzed further. While the proponents of the monosemy/thematic paraphrases view often take the position that one of the alternating frames derives from the other (Larson 1988, Aoun and Li 1989, Baker 1997), the proponents of the polysemy view assume that the two constructions encode different semantic relations – change of possession for the DOC and movement to a goal for a PP Dative (Jackendoff 1990, Pesetsky 1995, Goldberg 1995, Harley 1995). Finally, in addition to these two positions, a third one exists which argues that the choice between the two constructions is more probabilistic and comes down to which construction is licensed in a given discourse context. Thus, while perhaps most naturally aligned with the monosemy/thematic paraphrase view (Bresnan et al. 2007, Bresnan and Nikitina 2009), this latter information structure view has nevertheless been argued to also be mostly compatible with the polysemy/alternative projection view (Krifka 2004).

While the monosemy/derivational view has been made prominent in accounts such as Larson (1988, 1990), (recast in Minimalist terms in Larson 2014), Baker (1988), and much work in Relational Grammar, the polysemy view appears to have enjoyed a somewhat wider overall popularity in the field in recent years (Bruening 2001, 2018, Dowty 1990, Hale & Keyser 2000, Harley 2002, 2007, Pesetsky 1995, Ramchand 2008). Accounts of arguments structure and argument structure alternations couched within the framework of the increasingly popular Distributed Morphology (Halle and Marantz 1993, 1994, Marantz 1997, 2013, Harley & Noyer 1999, Embick 2004a, b) in particular seem to favor, almost by default, the view on which each 'alternating' frame is built in the syntax rather than deriving one frame from the other (despite the fact that the framework itself is arguably fully compatible with and quite amenable to the possibility of deriving one 'alternating frame' from the other). Finally, the last two decades have witnessed the appearance of many attempts to sever arguments from the verb (Marantz 1984, Kratzer 1996, Borer 2005, Lohndal 2012, Wood & Marantz 2016, among others), with the most extreme position in this respect being that the only

argument of the verb is the event variable, with all other arguments being added in the syntax (Schein 1993, Borer 2005).

Interestingly though, a rather significant number of derivational accounts of the ditransitive alternation has been proposed for a number of languages in recent years, relying on a wide range of empirical and theoretical arguments (Antonyuk 2015, 2020, Bailyn 1995, 2012, Cépeda & Cyrino 2020, Cornilescu 2020, Hallman 2015, 2018, Ormazabal & Romero 2010, 2019, among others). Relatedly, a growing number of researchers have stressed the crucial role of Information Structural factors in the choice between the two alternating frames, for various types of alternations. For instance, Information Structure has been argued to influence the distribution of Dative Experiencers (DEs) in meaningful and predictable ways, with the syntactic position of Dative Experiencers in Spanish and Polish arguably determined both by argument structure and information structure, with DEs occurring sentence-initially only in contexts that are determined by information structural properties of the sentence (see Jiménez-Fernández & Rozwadowska 2017, Fábregas et al. 2017, Jiménez-Fernández 2020, Alexiadou & Anagnostopoulou 2019). Some researchers have gone so far as to insist that information structure *is* part of argument structure, for instance, Onea & Mardale (2020) argue that topics may sometimes be part of argument structure. Specifically, Onea & Mardale provide evidence in support of the hypothesis that in some languages differential object marking (DOM) may have evolved from the syntactic marking of topicality.

While there exist distinct schools of thought on the proper treatment of various types of argument structure alternations, we note that the proponents of various accounts often tend to lead a dialogue with only those who share in their convictions about the underlying architecture of grammar. One of the main goals of this workshop is to promote dialogue between the proponents of derivational and non-derivational accounts of various convictions by examining novel as well as classic arguments in the context of our present day understanding of these phenomena. This workshop is thus aimed at bringing together researchers working on argument structure and argument structure alternations, with a special focus on novel empirical and theoretical arguments for or against derivational and independent projection views. The role of information structure in various argument structure alternations is the topic of some of the selected abstracts.

Keywords: <syntax, argument structure, alternations, information structure, event structure>

Acknowledgments: This workshop is partially funded by research projects FFI2016-80142-P and PGC2018-093774-B-I00 of Spain's Ministry of Science, Innovation, and Universities (MICINN).

References

- Alexiadou, Artemis and Elena Anagnostopoulou (2019), Novel Experiencer-Object Verbs and Clitic Doubling, *Syntax* 22(2-3), 116–145.
- Antonyuk, Svitlana (2015), *Quantifier scope and scope freezing in Russian*, Doctoral dissertation, Stony Brook University, New York.
- Antonyuk, Svitlana (2020), The Puzzle of Russian Ditransitives. In A. Pineda, and J. Mateu (eds.), (2020), *Dative Constructions in Romance and Beyond*, Berlin: Language Science Press, 117–142.

- Aoun, Joseph and Yen Hui Li (1989), Scope and Constituency. *Linguistic inquiry* 20(2), 141–172.
- Baker, Mark C. (1997), Thematic Roles and Syntactic Structure. In L. Haegeman (ed.), (1997), *The Elements of Grammar*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 73–137.
- Bailyn, John F. (1995), *A configurational approach to Russian 'free' word order*, Doctoral dissertation, Cornell University.
- Bailyn, John F. (2012), *The syntax of Russian*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Borer, Hagit (2005), *Structuring sense: The normal course of events*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bresnan, Joan and Tatiana Nikitina (2009), The Gradience of the Dative Alternation. In L. Uyechi and L. Hee Wee (eds.), *Reality Exploration and Discovery: Pattern Interaction in Language and Life*, Stanford: CSLI Publications, 161–84.
- Bresnan, Joan, Anna Cueni, Tatiana Nikitina, and R. Harald Baayen (2007), Predicting the Dative Alternation. In G. Bouma, I. Krämer and J. Zwarts (eds.), (2007), *Cognitive Foundations of Interpretation*, Amsterdam: Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences, 69–94.
- Bruening, Benjamin (2001), QR Obeys Superiority: ACD and Frozen Scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(2), 233–273.
- Bruening, Benjamin (2018), Double Object Constructions and Prepositional Dative Constructions are Distinct: A Reply to Ormazabal and Romero. *Linguistic Inquiry* 49, 123–150.
- Cépeda, Paola and Sonia Cyrino (2020), Putting Objects in Order: Asymmetrical Relations in Spanish and Portuguese Ditransitives. In A. Pineda and J. Mateu (eds.), (2020), *Dative Constructions in Romance and Beyond*, Berlin: Language Science Press, 97–116.
- Cornilescu, Alexandra (2020), Ditransitive Constructions with Differentially Marked Direct Objects in Romanian. In A. Pineda and J. Mateu (eds.), (2020), *Dative Constructions in Romance and Beyond*, Berlin: Language Science Press, 117–142.
- Dowty, David R. (1990), Thematic Proto-Roles and Argument Selection, *Language* 67, 547–619.
- Embick, David (2004a), Unaccusative Syntax and Verbal Alternations. In A. Alexiadou, E. Anagnostopoulou and M. Everaert (eds.), (2004), *The Unaccusativity Puzzle: Explorations of the Syntax-Lexicon Interface*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 137–158.
- Embick, David (2004b) On the Structure of Resultative Participles in English, *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35(3), 355–392.
- Fábregas, Antonio, Ángel L. Jiménez-Fernández and Mercedes Tubino-Blanco (2017), ‘What's Up’ with Datives?. In R. Lopez, J. Avelar and S. Cyrino (eds.), (2017), *Romance Languages and Linguistic Theory 12. Selected Papers from the 45th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages (LSRL), Campinas, Brazil*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 29–48.
- Goldberg, Adelle E. (1995), *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz (1993), Distributed Morphology and the Pieces of Inflection. In K. Hale and S. J. Keyser (eds.), (1993), *The view from building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 111–176.

- Halle, Morris and Alec Marantz (1994), Some key features of Distributed Morphology. *MIT Working Papers in Linguistics* 21, 275–288.
- Hallman, Peter (2015), Syntactic neutralization in Double Object Constructions, *Linguistic Inquiry* 46, 389–424.
- Hallman, Peter (2018), Double Object Constructions in Syrian Arabic, *Syntax* 21: 238–274.
- Harley, Heidi (1995), *Subjects, events, and licensing*. Doctoral dissertation, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Harley, Heidi (2002), Possession and the Double Object Construction, *Yearbook of Linguistic Variation* 2, 29–68.
- Harley, Heidi (2007), The bipartite structure of verbs cross-linguistically, or Why Mary can't exhibit John her paintings, Ms. University of Arizona (Available on lingbuzz: <http://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/000435>).
- Harley, Heidi and Rolf Noyer (1999), Distributed Morphology, *Glott International* 4(4), 3–9.
- Jackendoff, Ray (1990), *Semantic structures*. Current Studies in Linguistic 18. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. (2020), *Syntax-information structure interactions in the sentential, verbal and nominal peripheries*, Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jiménez-Fernández, Ángel L. and Bożena Rozwadowska (2017), On Subject Properties of Datives in Psych Predicates. A Comparative Approach, *Acta Linguistica Academica* 64(2), 1–24.
- Kratzer, Angelika (1996), Severing the External Argument from its Verb. In L.A. Zaring and J. Rooryck (eds.), (1996), *Phrase Structure and the Lexicon*, Springer, Dordrecht, 109–137.
- Krifka, Manfred (2004), Semantic and Pragmatic Conditions for the Dative Alternation, *Korean Journal of English Language and Linguistics*, 4(1), 1–32.
- Larson, Richard K. (1988), On the Double Object Construction, *Linguistic Inquiry* 19(3), 335–391.
- Larson, Richard K. (2014), *On shell structure*, London: Routledge.
- Levin, Beth (1993), *English verb classes and alternations: A preliminary investigation*, Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Levin, Beth and Malka Rappaport Hovav (2005), *Argument realization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marantz, Alec (1984), *On the nature of grammatical relations*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Marantz, Alec (1997), No Escape from Syntax: Don't Try Morphological Analysis in the Privacy of your Own Lexicon. In A. Dimitriadis, L. Siegel, C. Surek-Clark, and A. Williams (eds.), (1997), *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics (vol. 4.2), 201–225.
- Marantz, Alec (2013), Verbal Argument Structure: Events and Participants, *Lingua* 130, 152–168.
- Onea, Edgar and Alexandru Mardale (2020), From Topic to Object. Grammaticalization of Differential Object Marking in Romanian, *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 65 (3), 350–392.
- Ormazabal, Javier and Juan Romero (2010), The Derivation of Dative Alternations. In M. Duguine, S. Huidobro and N. Madariaga (eds.), (2010), *Argument Structure*

- and Syntactic Relations: A Cross-linguistic Perspective*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 203–232.
- Ormazabal, Javier and Juan Romero (2019), Prolegomena to the Study of Object Relations, *Linguisticae Investigationes* 42(1), 102–131.
- Pesetsky, David (1995), *Zero syntax: Experiencers and cascades*, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Ramchand, Gillian K. (2008), *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A first phase syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ramchand, Gillian K. (2013), Argument Structure and Argument Structure Alternations. In M. den Dikken (ed.), (2013), *The Cambridge Handbook of Generative Syntax*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 265–321.
- Schein, Barry (1993), *Plurals and events*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tenny, Carol (1994), *Aspectual roles and the syntax-semantics interface*, Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Wood, Jim and Alec Marantz (2016), The Interpretation of External Arguments. In R. D'Alessandro, I. Franco and A. Gallego (eds.), (2016), *The Verbal Domain*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 255–278.