




Linguistic Inquiry
Monograph Forty-Nine

Introducing Arguments

Liina Pylkkänen



Introducing Arguments

Linguistic Inquiry Monographs

Samuel Jay Keyser, general editor

6. *Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding*, Noam Chomsky
10. *On the Nature of Grammatical Relations*, Alec Marantz
12. *Logical Form: Its Structure and Derivation*, Robert May
13. *Barriers*, Noam Chomsky
15. *Japanese Tone Structure*, Janet Pierrehumbert and Mary Beckman
18. *Argument Structure*, Jane Grimshaw
19. *Locality: A Theory and Some of Its Empirical Consequences*, Maria Rita Manzini
21. *Syntax of Scope*, Joseph Aoun and Yen-hui Audrey Li
22. *Morphology by Itself: Stems and Inflectional Classes*, Mark Aronoff
23. *Thematic Structure in Syntax*, Edwin Williams
24. *Indices and Identity*, Robert Fiengo and Robert May
25. *The Antisymmetry of Syntax*, Richard S. Kayne
26. *Unaccusativity: At the Syntax–Lexical Semantics Interface*, Beth Levin and Malka Rappaport Hovav
27. *Lexico-Logical Form: A Radically Minimalist Theory*, Michael Brody
28. *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*, Ray Jackendoff
29. *Local Economy*, Chris Collins
30. *Surface Structure and Interpretation*, Mark Steedman
31. *Elementary Operations and Optimal Derivations*, Hisatsugu Kitahara
32. *The Syntax of Nonfinite Complementation: An Economy Approach*, Željko Bošković
33. *Prosody, Focus, and Word Order*, Maria Luisa Zubizarreta
34. *The Dependencies of Objects*, Esther Torrego
35. *Economy and Semantic Interpretation*, Danny Fox
36. *What Counts: Focus and Quantification*, Elena Herburger
37. *Phrasal Movement and Its Kin*, David Pesetsky
38. *Dynamic Antisymmetry*, Andrea Moro
39. *Prolegomenon to a Theory of Argument Structure*, Ken Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser
40. *Essays on the Representational and Derivational Nature of Grammar: The Diversity of Wh-Constructions*, Joseph Aoun and Yen-hui Audrey Li
41. *Japanese Morphophonemics: Markedness and Word Structure*, Junko Ito and Armin Mester
42. *Restriction and Saturation*, Sandra Chung and William A. Ladusaw
43. *Linearization of Chains and Sideward Movement*, Jairo Nunes
44. *The Syntax of (In)dependence*, Ken Safir
45. *Interface Strategies: Optimal and Costly Computations*, Tanya Reinhart
46. *Asymmetry in Morphology*, Anna Maria Di Sciullo
47. *Relators and Linkers: The Syntax of Predication, Predicate Inversion, and Copulas*, Marcel den Dikken
48. *On the Syntactic Composition of Manner and Motion*, Maria Luisa Zubizarreta and Eunjeong Oh
49. *Introducing Arguments*, Liina Pyllkkänen

Introducing Arguments

Liina Pylkkänen

The MIT Press
Cambridge, Massachusetts
London, England

© 2008 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced in any form by any electronic or mechanical means (including photocopying, recording, or information storage and retrieval) without permission in writing from the publisher.

MIT Press books may be purchased at special quantity discounts for business or sales promotional use. For information, please e-mail special_sales@mitpress.mit.edu or write to Special Sales Department, The MIT Press, 55 Hayward Street, Cambridge, MA 02142.

This book was set in Times New Roman on 3B2 by Asco Typesetters, Hong Kong and was printed and bound in the United States of America.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Pylkkänen, Liina.

Introducing arguments / Liina Pylkkänen.

p. cm.—(Linguistic inquiry monograph)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-262-16254-8 (hardcover : alk. paper) — ISBN: 978-0-262-66209-3

(pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Grammar, Comparative and general—Verb phrase. 2. Generative grammar.

I. Title.

P281.P95 2008

415—dc22

2007039871

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Contents

Series Foreword	vii
Preface	ix
Acknowledgments	xi
List of Tables	xiii
List of Abbreviations	xv

Chapter 1

Introduction	1	1.1 “Noncore” Arguments	1
		1.2 Representing Verbs and Their Arguments	3
		1.3 Summary of the Proposal: Seven Argument Introducers	7

Chapter 2

Applicatives	11	2.1 High and Low Applicatives	12
		2.2 Hebrew Possessor Dative Constructions as Low Source Applicatives	46
		2.3 Japanese Adversity Passives as High and Low Applicatives	64
		2.4 Other Applicative Asymmetries and Previous Approaches	74

Chapter 3**Causatives** 81

 3.1 Summary of the Proposal on the
Syntax and Semantics of Causatives
83

 3.2 Similarity: CAUSE Is Not a
 θ -Role 86

 3.3 Variation: Cause and Voice
Bundling 99

 3.4 Variation: Cause Selects for
Roots, Verbs, or Phases 101

 3.5 Voice Bundling and Transitivity
Restrictions 119

 3.6 Summary of Sections 3.1–3.5
123

 3.7 Implications for Bantu
Morpheme-Ordering Restrictions
125

 3.8 Previous Approaches to
Causativization 127

Chapter 4**Closing Remarks** 133

 4.1 High Applicatives and the
Representation of External Arguments
133

 4.2 Eliminating Linking 137

Notes 141

References 145

Index 155

Series Foreword

We are pleased to present the forty-ninth in the series *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs*. These monographs present new and original research beyond the scope of the article. We hope they will benefit our field by bringing to it perspectives that will stimulate further research and insight.

Originally published in limited edition, the *Linguistic Inquiry Monographs* are now more widely available. This change is due to the great interest engendered by the series and by the needs of a growing readership. The editors thank the readers for their support and welcome suggestions about future directions for the series.

Samuel Jay Keyser
for the Editorial Board

Preface

This book is a relatively unchanged version of my 2002 MIT Ph.D. thesis, which was distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics (MITWPL) between 2002 and 2006. Parts of this work have also appeared in other form in the proceedings of the 19th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics (WCCFL), the 24th Penn Linguistics Colloquium, and Semantics and Linguistic Theory (SALT) 10. The only substantial change to the MITWPL version is the addition of a discussion on resultatives (section 2.1.4). All other changes are essentially stylistic.

Since the thesis was written, much research has appeared on the topics discussed in this book, expanding, enriching, and challenging aspects of the theory laid out here. Most of this research has not been incorporated into the book; nevertheless, I wish to point the reader to at least some of it in this preface.

Martha McGinnis's work on applicatives and syntactic locality domains is a systematic investigation of the syntactic side of the theory of applicatives given in chapter 2 (McGinnis 2001a,b, 2002; McGinnis and Gerdtz 2004). Although McGinnis's work is mentioned here at times, this book includes no comprehensive discussion of it, unfortunately. Cristina Cuervo's work on Spanish datives adds interestingly to the analysis in chapter 2, showing that there are in fact three different types of low applicatives, instead of just the two argued for here (Cuervo 2003). Julie Legate's work on Warlpiri is important for the theory presented here as it involves a semantically explicit investigation of Warlpiri applicatives in the context of this theory (Legate 2002). Finally, Ju-Eun Lee provides a detailed study of indirect passives that compares the predictions of complex predicate analyses and the applicative analysis argued for here, giving new evidence in favor of the (traditional) complex predicate analysis (Lee 2004).

Acknowledgments

This book owes the greatest intellectual debt to the members of my Ph.D. thesis committee: Shigeru Miyagawa, Irene Heim, and, most of all, Alec Marantz. Angelika Kratzer's work on external arguments and event structure has also substantially influenced and inspired this work; I wish to thank her for her support and interest.

Along the years, many other people have also left their mark on the research reported here. In particular, I wish to thank Sabine Iatridou and Kai von Stechow, who provided detailed comments on the chapter on causatives. For helpful comments and discussions, I also wish to thank Maya Arad, Karlos Arregi, Jonathan Bobaljik, Benjamin Bruening, Cristina Cuervo, Paul Elbourne, David Embick, Danny Fox, Ken Hale, Daniel Harbour, James Higginbotham, Larry Hyman, Richard Kayne, Paul Kiparsky, S.-Y. Kuroda, Idan Landau, Julie Legate, Beth Levin, Martha McGinnis, Sam Mchombo, David Pesetsky, Steven Pinker, Andrea Rackowski, Norvin Richards, Amanda Seidl, Masayoshi Shibatani, Michal Starke, Peter Svenonius, Anna Szabolcsi, Lisa Travis, and Stephen Wechsler.

A primary goal of this research was to develop an explicit system for studying argument structure phenomena crosslinguistically. This would not have been possible without the extreme generosity of my language consultants. For the Japanese data, I wish to thank Ken Hiraiwa, Shin-ichiro Ishihara, Shogo Suzuki, Keiko Yoshida, Tomo Yoshida, and, in particular, Shigeru Miyagawa and Shoichi Takahashi. I wish to thank Mustafa Seguya Kamoga-Bombokka and Hassan Sekabira for the Luganda data, Mulalo Doyoyo for the Venda data, Dalina Kallulli and Mirel Sharxhi for the Albanian data, Youngjoo Lee for the Korean data, and Maya Arad and Danny Fox for the Hebrew data.

Finally, I am grateful to Anne Mark for her extraordinarily careful editorial work in the final preparation of the manuscript.

Tables

- 1.1 Argument introducers
- 2.1 Applicative diagnostics
- 2.2 Predictions of the possessor-raising and low applicative analyses of possessor dative constructions
- 2.3 HAVE-languages and possessor datives
- 2.4 BE-languages and possessor datives
- 2.5 Diagnostics for distinguishing between gapped and gapless Japanese adversity passives (Kubo 1992)
- 2.6 Predictions made by the applicative analysis of Japanese adversity passives
- 3.1 A causative typology predicted by the selection and Voice-bundling parameters
- 3.2 Predicted properties of root-selecting, verb-selecting, and phase-selecting causatives

Abbreviations

1, 2, 3, . . .	person; noun class markers (Bantu)
ABL	ablative
ACC	accusative
ADESS	adessive
AGR	agreement
ALL	allative
APPL	applicative morpheme
ASP	aspect
BEN	benefactive
COMP	complementizer
CAUSE	causative morpheme
CL	clitic
COND	conditional
DAT	dative
DEP	depictive head
DES	desiderative
ELA	elative
ESS	essive
EXC	excessive marker
FEM	feminine
FOC	focus
FUT	future tense
FV	final vowel
GEN	genitive
INESS	inessive
INF	infinitive
INTRANS	intransitive
LOC	locative

MASC	masculine
NOM	nominative
OP	object marker
PART	partitive
PASS	passive
PAST	past tense
PL	plural
PLAIN	plain (level of formality in the Korean honorific system)
POSS	possessive
PRES	present tense
PROG	progressive
REC	reciprocal
REV	reversive
SG	singular
SP	subject prefix
STAT	stative
TOP	topic

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 “Noncore” Arguments

A comprehensive theory of linguistic representations must minimally (i) define the nature of the primitive building blocks that enter into linguistic computation, (ii) characterize the manner in which the basic units combine into complex representations, and (iii) identify the ways in which languages may differ with respect to their inventory of possible representations. This book aims to meet these requirements in the domain of verbal argument structure, focusing on the question of how arguments that are not, in a sense, “core” arguments of the verb get introduced into argument structures. For example, even though the English verb *melt* minimally only needs to combine with an argument describing an entity undergoing the melting, as in (1a), English grammar also allows the sentence in (1b), where the entity that melts is now the object of the sentence and the subject position is filled with a noun phrase describing a causer of the melting event. Further, it is possible to add yet another argument to this structure, as in (1c), where the new argument is realized as an indirect object and is interpreted as some type of beneficiary of the melting event.

- (1) *English*
 - a. The ice melted.
 - b. *John* melted the ice.
 - c. *John* melted *me* some ice.

This type of argument structure variation is a pervasive property of human language; most languages have verbs that exhibit precisely the behavior illustrated in (1). For example, the data in (2) show that the Venda verb *nok* ‘melt’ can appear in all the same environments as the English verb *melt*.

(2) *Venda*

- a. Mahaḍa o-nok-a.
snow 3SG.PAST-melt-FV
'The snow melted.'
- b. Mukasa o-nok-is-a mahaḍa.
Mukasa 3SG.PAST-melt-CAUSE-FV snow
'Mukasa melted the snow.'
- c. Mukasa o-nok-is-el-a Katonga mahaḍa.
Mukasa 3SG.PAST-melt-CAUSE-APPL-FV Katonga snow
'Mukasa melted Katonga the snow.'

Given the similarity between (1) and (2), it is natural to hypothesize that the grammatical elements that allow for the variation in (1) and (2) are, in fact, the same. However, on closer inspection, this hypothesis proves hard to maintain, as the inventories of verbs that allow the addition of causer and benefactive arguments are drastically different in English and in Venda. For example, in Venda these two types of arguments can productively be added to unergative verbs, as shown in (3), while this is impossible in English, (4).

(3) *Venda*

- a. Mukasa o-se-is-a Katonga.
Mukasa 3SG.PAST-laugh-CAUSE-FV Katonga
'Mukasa made Katonga laugh.'
- b. Mukasa o-amb-el-a Katonga.
Mukasa 3SG.PAST-speak-APPL-FV Katonga
'Mukasa spoke for Katonga.'

(4) *English*

- a. *Mary laughed Sue.
(Intended meaning: 'Mary made Sue laugh.')
- b. *Mary spoke Sue.
(Intended meaning: 'Mary spoke for Sue.')

The distributional difference can be explained in two ways. One possibility is that the additional arguments in the two languages are introduced by different elements with different distributions, despite superficial similarities. Alternatively, it is possible that the elements allowing the addition of the new arguments in the two languages are in fact the same, and some other factor is responsible for the distributional difference. Distinguishing between these two types of explanations and articulating the properties of argument-introducing elements is the essence of this book.

1.2 Representing Verbs and Their Arguments

The question of what grammatical elements are responsible for allowing noncore arguments to appear in argument structures cannot be investigated without making some basic assumptions about the representations of verbs and their arguments. In other words, we must have a hypothesis about what the representations are to which so-called noncore arguments can be added. In some very intuitive sense, verbs describe events in the world and verbal arguments name individuals that stand in some relevant relations to these events. However, even though most theories of lexical semantics aim to capture this basic intuition in some way, the details of the representations vary widely from one researcher to another. A quick glance at some of the leading works on lexical semantics and argument structure from the past few decades reveals a lack of agreement on how to represent just a simple unergative verb.

(5) a. *Levin and Rappaport Hovav 1995*

run: [x ACT_{<RUN>}]

b. *Jackendoff 1990*

Bill walked into the room.

[Event GO [Thing BILL] [Path TO [Place IN([Thing ROOM])]]]

c. *Pustejovsky 1995*

$$\left[\begin{array}{l} \mathbf{run} \\ \text{[EVENTSTR = [E}_1 = e_1: \text{process]]} \\ \text{[QUALIA = AGENTIVE = run_act(e}_1, x)] \\ \dots \end{array} \right]$$

d. *Hale and Keyser 1993*

$$\begin{array}{cc} & \diagdown & \diagup & \\ & \text{V} & & \text{N} \\ & \text{(do)} & & \text{run} \end{array}$$

Clearly, then, even basic questions having to do with the representation of verbs and their arguments—such as “What is the fundamental nature of lexical complexity?”—are still open. In (5a–c), the lexical semantic representations are all different from the *syntactic* structures in which verbal arguments appear; the theories proposing these representations hold that the lexical entries of verbs are semantically complex in a way that differs from the complexity encountered at the sentential level. Given this difference, these theories must be accompanied by a theory that states

exactly how the predicates and arguments in the lexical semantic representations map onto syntactic positions. Developing such *linking theories* has in fact been the main focus of argument structure research for decades. For example, in their seminal work *Unaccusativity*, Levin and Rappaport Hovav (1995) propose the rules in (6b,c) to account for the fact that the causer of an eventuality is generally realized as the subject of the sentence and the individual undergoing change as the direct object.

(6) a. break: [[X DO-SOMETHING] CAUSE [Y BECOME BROKEN]]

b. *Immediate Cause Linking Rule*

The argument of a verb that denotes the immediate cause of the eventuality described by that verb is its external argument.

(p. 135)

c. *Directed Change Linking Rule*

The argument of a verb that corresponds to the entity undergoing the directed change described by that verb is its direct internal argument. (p. 136)

In contrast to the theories that consider lexical complexity to be different from syntactic complexity, a number of theories today hypothesize that in fact no such difference exists (see, e.g., Baker 1988a; Hale and Keyser 1993; Borer 1994, 1998; Harley 1995; Marantz 1997; Miyagawa 1998; Travis 2000). In these theories, lexical semantic representations *are* syntactic representations, and consequently no mapping problem arises. This eliminates the need for linking rules, which in any case are seldom more than generalizations over observed correspondences between argument positions and their interpretations.

The syntactic approach is not without its challenges, though; differences do exist between morphological constituents such as *joyful* in *joyfulness* and syntactic constituents such as *the girl* in *The girl ran*. One much-discussed difference is that *joyfulness* exhibits “lexical integrity” (Di Sciullo and Williams 1987); that is, it behaves as a unit in a way that *The girl ran* does not. For example, the morphological constituent *joyful* fails all traditional tests of syntactic constituency (such as extractability and conjoinability; see in particular the discussion in Bresnan 1995 and Bresnan and Mchombo 1995). Clearly, then, syntactic theories of word formation must provide a theory about extraction, conjunction, and so forth, such that constituents that depend on other constituents within a phonological word cannot be targeted by them. However, on the basis of lexical integrity alone, it seems unwarranted to draw the strong conclu-

sion that entirely different modules of grammar must be responsible for the construction of complex entities such as *joyfulness* as opposed to complex entities such as *The girl ran*. In this book, I will entertain the (to my mind, more interesting) hypothesis that syntactic structure building is the only mode of structure building in natural language.

For present purposes, then, the assumption that word formation is syntactic means that the elements that introduce noncore arguments into argument structures must be syntactic heads. These syntactic heads combine with their complements and specifiers via the traditional modes of semantic composition, which I take to be Functional Application and Predicate Modification.

(7) a. *Functional Application*

If α is a branching node, $\{\beta, \gamma\}$ is the set of α 's daughters, and $\llbracket \beta \rrbracket$ is a function whose domain contains $\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket$, then $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket = \llbracket \beta \rrbracket(\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket)$.
(Heim and Kratzer 1998, 44)

b. *Predicate Modification*

If α is a branching node, $\{\beta, \gamma\}$ is the set of α 's daughters, and $\llbracket \beta \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \gamma \rrbracket$ are both in $D_{\langle e, t \rangle}$, then $\llbracket \alpha \rrbracket = \lambda x \in D_e. \llbracket \beta \rrbracket(x) = \llbracket \gamma \rrbracket(x) = 1$.
(Heim and Kratzer 1998, 65)

Verbs in general will be taken to have neo-Davidsonian meanings, where the verb itself names a property of an eventuality (which I take to be a cover term for events and states, following Bach 1981) and the syntactic arguments of the verb name event participants, that is, individuals who stand in thematic relations to the eventuality (Parsons 1990, building on proposals in Castañeda 1967 and Davidson 1967). In this type of framework, the meanings of sentences involve underlying quantification over events, as shown in (8) (temporal relations are ignored here).

(8) a. Brutus stabbed Caesar.

b. $(\exists e)$ stabbing(e) & agent(e, Brutus) & theme(e, Caesar)
(Parsons 1990, 97)


As Kratzer (1996, to appear b) discusses, a neo-Davidsonian approach to logical forms does not entail that the *syntax* must be neo-Davidsonian. In other words, maintaining that the agent and the theme are syntactic arguments of *stab* (rather than separate predicates) is possible even if we consider representations in conceptual structure to be neo-Davidsonian, as shown in (9).

(9) *Ordered argument association in the syntax and neo-Davidsonian association in conceptual structure*stab: $\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda e.$ stabbing(e) & agent(e, y) & theme(e, x)

However, Kratzer's thesis is that when it comes to the external argument, argument association *is* neo-Davidsonian even in the syntax. In other words, Kratzer argues that the external argument is introduced not by the verb but by a separate predicate, which Kratzer calls Voice. Voice is a functional head denoting a thematic relation that holds between the external argument and the event described by the verb; it combines with the VP by a rule called Event Identification. Event Identification allows one to add various conditions to the event that the verb describes; Voice, for example, adds the condition that the event has an agent (or an experiencer or whatever one considers possible thematic roles for external arguments). Event Identification is stated in (10) and exemplified in (11). (As in Kratzer 1996, *s* is the semantic type for eventualities.)

(10) *Event Identification* $\langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle \langle s, t \rangle \rightarrow \langle e, \langle s, t \rangle \rangle$

(11) a. Brutus stabbed Caesar.



The proposal that external arguments are not true arguments of the verb was first made in Marantz 1984. Marantz observes that internal arguments often trigger special interpretations of the verb while external arguments hardly ever do so, and he argues that this is straightforwardly accounted for if the external argument is not a true argument of the verb. Kratzer's proposal builds on Marantz's insight and develops a theory about how Marantz's idea can be executed in the syntax without sacrificing traditional assumptions about semantic composition and projection. In other words, Kratzer's theory is an account of how external arguments

are syntactically introduced even though they are not projected by the verb.

The assumption that the external argument is not a true argument of the verb has become standard in much syntactic research. For example, all current work within the Minimalist Program assumes it. In Chomsky 2000, 2001, the external-argument-introducing head plays a special role in defining a domain for cyclic interpretation and spell-out, namely, a phase. The assumption that the external argument is not an argument of the verb is also crucial here: the properties of applicative constructions (chapter 2) and their interactions with causative constructions (chapter 3) could not otherwise be accounted for. Thus, one of the main contributions of this book is to provide a new empirical argument for separating the external argument from its verb: I will show that even though external arguments are obligatory in some syntactic environments (unlike, say, most indirect objects), they are “additional” in that they involve an argument introducer that is separate from the verb.

A terminological remark is in order. I will call the external-argument-introducing head *Voice*. In this, I follow Kratzer, rather than Chomsky, who calls it v (read “little v ”). The label v is, however, also used in a broader sense in Marantz’s work, where it stands for any functional head that is of verbal category (i.e., for any verbal derivational affix, in traditional terms). To avoid confusion, and because this book focuses on the interpretations and argument structures of argument-introducing heads, I will label functional heads according to their meanings (rather than categories) throughout. Thus, *Voice* can be taken as a metavariable ranging over possible interpretations of the relation between an external argument and the event described by the complement of *Voice*.

1.3 Summary of the Proposal: Seven Argument Introducers

I will argue that to a large extent, noncore arguments are introduced by the seven functional heads listed in table 1.1. I take these heads to belong to a universal inventory of functional elements from which a particular language must select (Chomsky 2000). I argue that crosslinguistic variation has two sources: (i) selection (Chomsky 2000) and (ii) the way a language packages the selected elements into syntactic heads.

In chapter 2, I propose a new applicative typology. The syntax of applicative constructions has been heavily studied, the main discovery being that in some applicatives both the direct object and the indirect object

Table 1.1
Argument introducers

Head	Meaning	Example construction
1. High applicative	Thematic relation between an applied argument and the event described by the verb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chaga benefactive (sec. 2.1) • Luganda benefactive (secs. 2.1.2, 2.1.3) • Venda benefactive (secs. 2.1.2, 2.1.3) • “Gapless” Japanese adversity passive (sec. 2.3)
2. Low recipient applicative	Transfer-of-possession relation between two individuals: asserts that the direct object is <i>to</i> the possession of the indirect object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • English double object construction (secs. 2.1, 2.1.1, 2.1.2) • Japanese double object construction (secs. 2.1.1, 2.1.2)
3. Low source applicative	Transfer-of-possession relation between two individuals: asserts that the direct object is <i>from</i> the possession of the indirect object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hebrew possessor dative (sec. 2.2) • Japanese adversity causative and “gapped” adversity passive (sec. 2.3)
4. Root-selecting Cause	Relates a causing event to a category-free root	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Japanese lexical causative (sec. 3.4.2.1) • English zero-causative (sec. 3.4.2.2)
5. Verb-selecting Cause	Relates a causing event to a verb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bemba <i>-eshya</i> causative (sec. 3.4.3.1) • Finnish <i>-tta</i> causative (sec. 3.4.3.2)
6. Phase-selecting Cause	Relates a causing event to a phase (i.e., is able to combine with a constituent to which an external argument has been added)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Venda <i>-is</i> causative (sec. 3.4.4) • Luganda <i>-sa</i> causative (sec. 3.4.4)
7. Voice (Kratzer 1996)	Thematic relation between the external argument and the event described by the verb	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any construction with an external argument, diagnosable via, say, passivization. For empirical evidence, see in particular secs. 2.1 and 3.4.4.

exhibit object properties while in others only the applied argument does. Various syntactic solutions to this difference have been proposed, relying on thematic hierarchies or Government-Binding Theory notions such as Case theory (Baker 1988a) or government (Marantz 1993).

I show that applicative constructions in fact divide into two types *semantically*. In one type, the applicative head denotes a thematic relation between an individual and the event described by the verb. I call this type a *high applicative* (see point 1 in table 1.1), since the applicative head attaches above the VP. The other type of applicative is *low* (see points 2 and 3 in table 1.1); the head combines with the direct object and denotes a transfer-of-possession relation between the direct object and the applied argument. This proposal accounts naturally for various applicative asymmetries, including new data on the combinatorics of secondary predication with the two types of applicatives (sections 2.1.3, 2.1.4). Further, I argue that low applicatives come in two varieties: one describes a recipient relation between the indirect and direct objects and the other a source relation. It will turn out that so-called adversity constructions, which otherwise constitute a puzzling syntax-semantics mismatch, are in fact ordinary double object constructions except that they exemplify the source variety of the low applicative.

In chapter 3, I develop a theory about causativization. I argue that causative constructions are crosslinguistically *similar* in that they all involve a causative head that introduces a causing event into the semantics of the construction. Crucially, though, the causative head does not introduce an external argument; external arguments are always introduced by Voice. Crosslinguistic *variation* in causative constructions derives from two sources: (i) the syntactic dependence of Cause on Voice (section 3.3) and (ii) the size of the complement of Cause (section 3.4). Important differences in the distribution of causative constructions follow from these two parameters.

References

- Alsina, Alex. 1992. On the argument structure of causatives. *Linguistic Inquiry* 23, 517–557.
- Alsina, Alex, and Sam A. Mchombo. 1993. Lexical mapping in the Chicheŵa applicative construction. Paper presented to the Summer Working Group on Argument Structure and Syntax, CSLI, Stanford University. Revised and expanded from a paper presented at the 19th Annual African Linguistics Conference, Boston University, 14–17 April 1988.
- Aoun, Joseph, and Yen-hui Audrey Li. 1989. Constituency and scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 20, 141–172.
- Aoun, Joseph, and Yen-hui Audrey Li. 1993. *Syntax of scope*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Arad, Maya. 1999. VP-structure and the syntax-lexicon interface. MIT Occasional Papers in Linguistics 16. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Bach, Emmon. 1981. On time, tense and aspect: An essay in English metaphysics. In Peter Cole, ed., *Radical pragmatics*, 63–81. New York: Academic Press.
- Bach, Emmon. 1982. Purpose clauses and control. In Pauline Jacobson and Geoffrey K. Pullum, eds., *The nature of syntactic representation*, 35–57. Dordrecht: Reidel.
- Baker, Mark. 1988a. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function changing*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Baker, Mark. 1988b. Theta theory and the syntax of applicatives in Chichewa. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 6, 353–389.
- Baker, Mark C. 1997. Thematic roles and syntactic structure. In Liliane Haegeman, ed., *Elements of grammar: Handbook of generative syntax*, 73–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Baker, Mark, and Osamuyimen T. Stewart. 1999. On double-headedness and the anatomy of the clause. Ms., Rutgers University.
- Barss, Andrew, and Howard Lasnik. 1986. A note on anaphora and double objects. *Linguistic Inquiry* 17, 347–354.

- Barwise, Jon, and Robin Cooper. 1981. Generalized quantifiers and natural language. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 4, 159–219.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David. 1995. Morphosyntax: The syntax of verbal inflection. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Bobaljik, Jonathan David, and Höskuldur Thráinsson. 1998. Two heads aren't always better than one. *Syntax* 1, 37–71.
- Borer, Hagit. 1993. Derived nominals. Ms., University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Borer, Hagit. 1994. The projection of arguments. In Elena Benedicto and Jeffrey Runner, eds., *Functional projections*, 19–47. University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 17. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Borer, Hagit. 1998. Passive without theta grids. In Steven G. Lapointe, Diane K. Brentari, and Patrick M. Farrell, eds., *Morphology and its relations to phonology and syntax*, 60–99. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Borer, Hagit. 2003. Exo-skeletal vs. endo-skeletal explanations. In John Moore and Maria Polinsky, eds., *The nature of explanation in linguistic theory*. Chicago: CSLI and University of Chicago Press.
- Borer, Hagit, and Yosef Grodzinsky. 1986. Syntactic cliticization and lexical cliticization: The case of Hebrew dative clitics. In Hagit Borer, ed., *The syntax of pronominal clitics*, 175–215. *Syntax and Semantics* 19. Orlando, Fla.: Academic Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1982. The passive in lexical theory. In Joan Bresnan, ed., *The mental representation of grammatical relations*, 3–86. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Bresnan, Joan. 1995. Lexicality and argument structure. Paper presented at the Paris Syntax and Semantics Conference, 12–14 October 1995.
- Bresnan, Joan, and Sam A. Mchombo. 1995. The Lexical Integrity Principle: Evidence from Bantu. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 13, 181–254.
- Bresnan, Joan, and Lioba Moshi. 1993. Object asymmetries in comparative Bantu syntax. In Sam A. Mchombo, ed., *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar 1*, 47–91. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Bruening, Benjamin. 2001. QR obeys Superiority: ACD and frozen scope. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32, 233–273.
- Castañeda, Hector-Neri. 1967. Comments on Davidson's "The logical form of action sentences." In Nicholas Rescher, ed., *The logic of decision and action*, 104–112. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Chierchia, Gennaro. 1989. A semantics for unaccusatives and its syntactic consequences. Ms., Cornell University.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Chomsky, Noam. 2000. Minimalist inquiries: The framework. In Roger Martin, David Michaels, and Juan Uriagereka, eds., *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, 89–155. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz, ed., *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Cooper, Robin. 1976. Lexical and nonlexical causatives in Bantu. In Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *Grammar of causative constructions*, 313–324. Syntax and Semantics 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Cormack, Annabel, and Neil Smith. 1999. Why are depictives different from resultatives? In Corinne Iten and Ad Neeleman, eds., *UCL working papers in linguistics 11*, 251–284. London: University College London, Department of Phonetics and Linguistics.
- Cuervo, María Cristina. 2003. Datives at large. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Davidson, Donald. 1967. The logical form of action sentences. In Nicholas Rescher, ed., *The logic of decision and action*, 81–95. Pittsburgh, Pa.: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Davies, William D. 1981. Possessor ascension in Choctaw. In Victoria Burke and James Pustejovsky, eds., *Proceedings of NELS 11*, 38–57. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Di Sciullo, Anna-Maria, and Edwin Williams. 1987. *On the definition of word*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Doron, Edit. 1999. Semitic templates as representations of argument structure. In *Proceedings of the 1999 Texas Linguistics Society Conference: Perspectives on argument structure*. Austin: University of Texas, Department of Linguistics.
- Dubinsky, Stanley, Maria-Rose Lloret, and Paul Newman. 1988. Lexical and syntactic causatives in Oromo. *Language* 64, 485–500.
- Embick, David. 2004. On the structure of resultative participles in English. *Linguistic Inquiry* 35, 355–392.
- Fodor, Jerry A. 1970. Three reasons for not deriving “kill” from “cause to die.” *Linguistic Inquiry* 1, 429–438.
- Fodor, Jerry A., and Ernie Lepore. To appear. Morphemes matter: The continuing case against lexical decompositions. Technical report, Rutgers Center for Cognitive Science, Rutgers University.
- Freeze, Ray. 1992. Existentials and other locatives. *Language* 68, 553–595.
- Geuder, Wilhelm. 2000. Oriented adverbs: Issues in the lexical semantics of event adverbs. Doctoral dissertation, Universität Tübingen.
- Givón, Talmy. 1976. Some constraints on Bantu causativization. In Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *Grammar of causative constructions*, 325–351. Syntax and Semantics 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Guéron, Jacqueline. 1985. Inalienable possession, PRO-inclusion and lexical chains. In Hans-Georg Obenauer, Jean-Yves Pollock, and Jacqueline Guéron, eds., *Grammatical representations*, 43–86. Dordrecht: Foris.

- Guéron, Jacqueline. 1986. Le verbe 'avoir'. In Peter Coopmans, Ivonne Bordelois, and Bill Dotson Smith, eds., *Formal parameters of generative grammar II: Going Romance*, 155–188. Dordrecht: ICG Printing.
- Hale, Kenneth, and Samuel Jay Keyser. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, eds., *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 53–109. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Hale, Ken, and Samuel Jay Keyser. 1998. The basic elements of argument structure. In Heidi Harley, ed., *Papers from the UPenn/MIT Roundtable on Argument Structure and Aspect*, 73–118. MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 32. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT, Department of Linguistics and Philosophy, MITWPL.
- Halle, Morris, and Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Kenneth Hale and Samuel Jay Keyser, eds., *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 111–176. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi. 1995. Subjects, events, and licensing. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Harley, Heidi. 1996. *Sase bizarre*: The Japanese causative and structural case. In Päivo Koskinen, ed., *Proceedings of the 1995 Canadian Linguistics Society Meeting*. Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics. Toronto: University of Toronto, Department of Linguistics.
- Harley, Heidi. 2000. Possession and the double object construction. Ms., University of Arizona.
- Hasegawa, Kinsuke. 1964. Nihongo-bunboo-siron. *Genkobunka* 1, 3–46.
- Heim, Irene, and Angelika Kratzer. 1998. *Semantics in generative grammar*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hoekstra, Teun. 1988. Small clause results. *Lingua* 74, 101–139.
- Howard, Irwin, and Agnes M. Niyekawa-Howard. 1976. Passivization. In Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *Japanese generative grammar*, 201–238. Syntax and Semantics 5. New York: Academic Press.
- Hyman, Larry. 2002. Suffix ordering in Bantu: A morphocentric approach. Ms., University of California at Berkeley.
- Hyman, Larry, and Sam A. Mchombo. 1992. Morphotactic constraints in the Chichewa verb stem. In Laura A. Buszard-Welcher, Lionell Wee, and William Weigel, eds., *Proceedings of the Eighteenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 2, 350–364. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Iatridou, Sabine. 1990. About Agr(P). *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 551–577.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. *Semantic structures*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Jacobsen, Wesley M. 1992. *The transitive structure of events in Japanese*. Tokyo: Kurosio.
- Jang, Youngjun. 1997. On the so-called adjunct predicates in Korean. In Ralph Blight and Michelle Moosally, eds., *Texas Linguistics Forum 38: The syntax and*

- semantics of predication*, 149–159. Austin: University of Texas, Department of Linguistics.
- Kachru, Yamuna. 1976. On the semantics of the causative construction in Hindi-Urdu. In Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *Grammar of causative constructions*, 353–369. Syntax and Semantics 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Kempchinsky, Paula. 1992. The Spanish possessive dative constructions: θ -role assignment and proper government. In Paul Hirschbühler and Konrad Koerner, eds., *Romance languages and modern linguistic theory: Papers from the 20th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, 135–149. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Kikuchi, Akira. 2001. A verb of excess in Japanese. Handout for a talk presented at the conference “Formal Approaches to Japanese Linguistics,” MIT, 18–20 May 2001.
- Kimenyi, Alexandre. 1980. *A relational grammar of Kinyarwanda*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1997. Partitive case and aspect. Ms., Stanford University.
- Koizumi, Masatoshi. 1994. Secondary predicates. *Journal of East Asian Linguistics* 3, 25–79.
- Koster, Jan. 1984. On binding and control. *Linguistic Inquiry* 15, 417–459.
- Kratzer, Angelika. 1996. Severing the external argument from its verb. In Johan Rooryck and Laurie Zaring, eds., *Phrase structure and the lexicon*, 109–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Kratzer, Angelika. To appear a. Building resultatives. In Claudia Maienborn and Angelika Wöllstein-Leisten, eds., *Event arguments in syntax, semantics, and discourse*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Kratzer, Angelika. To appear b. *The event argument and the semantics of voice*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kubo, Miori. 1992. Japanese passives. In *Working papers of the Department of Languages and Cultures* 23, 231–302. Sapporo: University of Hokkaido.
- Kuno, Susumu. 1973. *The structure of the Japanese language*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1965. Generative grammatical studies in the Japanese language. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1979. On Japanese passives. In George Bedell, Eichi Kobayashi, and Masatake Muraki, eds., *Explorations in linguistics: Papers in honor of Kazuko Inoue*, 305–347. Tokyo: Kenkyusha.
- Kuroda, S.-Y. 1993. Lexical and productive causatives in Japanese: An examination of the theory of paradigmatic structure. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics* 15, 1–83.
- Landau, Idan. 1999. Possessor raising and the structure of VP. *Lingua* 107, 1–37.

- Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19, 335–391.
- Larson, Richard K. 1990. Double objects revisited: Reply to Jackendoff. *Linguistic Inquiry* 21, 589–632.
- Lee, Ju-Eun. 2004. Ditransitive structures and the (Anti-) Locality Principle. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2002. Warlpiri: Theoretical implications. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Legate, Julie Anne. 2003. Some interface properties of the phase. *Linguistic Inquiry* 34, 506–515.
- Levin, Beth, and Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Maling, Joan. 2001. Dative: The heterogeneity of the mapping among morphological case, grammatical functions, and thematic roles. *Lingua* 111, 419–464.
- Manzini, Maria Rita. 1983. On control and control theory. *Linguistic Inquiry* 14, 421–446.
- Marantz, Alec. 1984. *On the nature of grammatical relations*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Marantz, Alec. 1989. Projection vs. percolation in the syntax of synthetic compounds. In Robert Davis, ed., *Selected papers from the Annual Spring Colloquium*, 95–112. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina, UNC Linguistics Circle.
- Marantz, Alec. 1992. Case and licensing. In German Westphal, Benjamin Ao, and Hee-Rahk Chae, eds., *Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics (ESCOL) 1991*, 234–253. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, CLC Publications.
- Marantz, Alec. 1993. Implications of asymmetries in double object constructions. In Sam A. Mchombo, ed., *Theoretical aspects of Bantu grammar 1*, 113–151. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Marantz, Alec. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. In Alexis Dimitriadis, Laura Siegel, Clarissa Surek-Clark, and Alexander Williams, eds., *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, 201–225. Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 4.2. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Penn Linguistics Club.
- Matisoff, James A. 1976. Lahu causative constructions: Case hierarchies and the morphology/syntax cycle in a Tibeto-Burman perspective. In Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *Grammar of causative constructions*, 413–442. Syntax and Semantics 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Matsumoto, Yo. 1998. A reexamination of the cross-linguistic parameterization of causative predicates: Japanese perspectives. In Miriam Butt and Tracy Holloway King, eds., *Proceedings of the LFG98 Conference*. Available at <http://csli-publications.stanford.edu/LFG/3/lf98.html>.
- McCawley, Noriko A. 1972. On the treatment of Japanese passives. In Paul M. Peranteau, Judith N. Levi, and Gloria C. Phares, eds., *Papers from the Eighth Re-*

- gional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 256–270. Chicago: University of Chicago, Chicago Linguistic Society.
- McGinnis, Martha. 2001a. Phases and the syntax of applicatives. In Minjoo Kim and Uri Strauss, eds., *NELS 31*, 333–349. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- McGinnis, Martha. 2001b. Variation in the phase structure of applicatives. *Linguistic Variation Yearbook 1*, 105–146.
- McGinnis, Martha. 2002. Object asymmetries in a phase theory of syntax. In John T. Jensen and Gerard van Herk, eds., *Proceedings of the 2001 Canadian Linguistic Association Annual Conference*, 133–144. Ottawa: University of Ottawa, Department of Linguistics.
- McGinnis, Martha, and Donna Gerdts. 2004. A phase-theoretic analysis of Kinyarwanda multiple applicatives. In Sophie Burelle and Stanca Somesfalean, eds., *Proceedings of the 2003 Canadian Linguistic Association Annual Conference*, 154–165. Montreal: University of Quebec at Montreal, Department of Linguistics.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1980. *Complex verbs and the lexicon*. Coyote Papers 1. Tucson: University of Arizona, University of Arizona Linguistics Circle.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1989. *Structure and case marking in Japanese*. Syntax and Semantics 22. San Diego, Calif.: Academic Press.
- Miyagawa, Shigeru. 1998. (*s*)*ase* as an elsewhere causative and the syntactic nature of words. *Journal of Japanese Linguistics 16*, 67–110.
- Munro, Pamela. 1984. The syntactic status of object possessor raising in Western Muskogean. In Claudia Brugman and Monica Macaulay, eds., *Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 2, 634–649. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Nedjalkov, V. P. 1969. Nekotorye verojatnostnye universalii v glagol'nom slovoobrazovanii. In I. F. Vardul, ed., *Jazykovye universalii i lingvističeskaja tipologija*, 106–114. Moscow: Nauka.
- Nissenbaum, Jon. 2000. Covert movement and parasitic gaps. In Masako Hiro-tani, Andries Coetzee, Nancy Hall, and Ji-yung Kim, eds., *NELS 30*, 541–556. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Nissenbaum, Jon. 2001. Investigations of covert phrase movement. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Oehrle, Richard, and Hiroko Nishio. 1981. Adversity. In Ann K. Farmer and Chisato Kitagawa, eds., *Proceedings of the Arizona Conference on Japanese Linguistics*, 163–187. Coyote Papers 2. Tucson: University of Arizona, University of Arizona Linguistics Circle.
- Ouhalla, Jamal. 1991. *Functional categories and parametric variation*. London: Routledge.
- Parsons, Terence. 1990. *Events in the semantics of English: A study of subatomic semantics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

- Perlmutter, David, and Paul Postal. 1984. The 1-Advancement Exclusiveness Law. In David Perlmutter and Carol Rosen, eds., *Studies in Relational Grammar* 2, 81–125. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pesetsky, David. 1995. *Zero Syntax*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pesetsky, David, and Esther Torrego. 2004. Tense, Case, and the nature of syntactic categories. In Jacqueline Guéron and Jacqueline Lecarme, eds., *The syntax of time*, 495–537. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pinker, Steven. 1989. *Learnability and cognition: The acquisition of argument structure*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pustejovsky, James. 1995. *The generative lexicon*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2000. Deriving adversity. In Roger Billerey and Brook Danielle Lillehaugen, eds., *WCCFL 19*, 399–410. Somerville, Mass.: Cascadilla Press.
- Pylkkänen, Liina. 2001. What applicative heads apply to. In Michelle Minnick Fox, Alexander Williams, and Elsi Kaiser, eds., *Proceedings of the 24th Annual Penn Linguistics Colloquium*, 197–210. Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics 7.1. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Penn Linguistics Club.
- Rackowski, Andrea. 2002. Subject and specificity: The case of Tagalog. In Masako Hirotsu, ed., *NELS 32*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts, GLSA.
- Richards, Norvin. 2002. Applicatives. Handout of talk presented at seminar “Topics in the Syntax-Phonology Interface,” MIT.
- Sanz, Montserrat. 2002. Interpretable features of the object position: Options for parameters. *Estudios de Lingüística Española* 16. Available at <http://elies.rediris.es/elies16>.
- Seidl, Amanda. 2000. Minimal indirect reference: A theory of the syntax-phonology interface. Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1972. Three reasons for deriving “kill” from “cause to die” in Japanese. In John Kimball, ed., *Syntax and semantics 1*, 125–137. New York: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1973. Semantics of Japanese causativization. *Foundations of Language* 9, 327–373.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1976. The grammar of causative constructions: A conspectus. In Masayoshi Shibatani, ed., *Grammar of causative constructions*, 1–40. Syntax and Semantics 6. New York: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1994. An integrational approach to possessor raising, ethical datives and adversative passives. In Susanne Gahl, Andy Dolbey, and Christopher Johnson, eds., *Proceedings of the Twentieth Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society*, 461–486. Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley Linguistics Society.
- Soh, Hooi Ling. 1998. Object scrambling in Chinese. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Speas, Margaret. 1991. *Phrase structure in natural language*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

- Stechow, Arnim von. 1996. The different readings of *wieder* 'again': A structural account. *Journal of Semantics* 13, 87–138.
- Tenny, Carol. 2000. Core events and adverbial modification. In Carol Tenny and James Pustejovsky, eds., *Events as grammatical objects: The converging perspectives of lexical semantics and syntax*, 285–334. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Thráinsson, Höskuldur. 1996. On the (non-)universality of functional categories. In Werner Abraham, Samuel David Epstein, Höskuldur Thráinsson, and C. Jan-Wouter Zwart, eds., *Minimal ideas: Syntactic studies in the minimalist framework*, 253–281. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Travis, Lisa. 2000. Event structure in syntax. In Carol Tenny and James Pustejovsky, eds., *Events as grammatical objects: The converging perspectives of lexical semantics and syntax*, 145–185. Stanford, Calif.: CSLI Publications.
- Ura, Hiroyuki. 1996. Multiple feature checking: A theory of grammatical function splitting. Doctoral dissertation, MIT.
- Williams, Edwin. 1980. Predication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 11, 203–238.
- Yatsushiro, Kazuko. 1999. Secondary predicates in Japanese revisited. In Rebecca Daly and Anastasia Riehl, eds., *Proceedings of the Eastern States Conference on Linguistics (ESCOL) 1999*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University, CLC Publications.
- Zepeda, Ofelia. 1987. Desiderative-causatives in Tohono O'odham. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 53, 348–361.

