THE EVENT ARGUMENT and ARGUMENT INTRODUCERS: little \( \nu \), and the Applicative Head

\[
\lambda e \langle s, t \rangle \nu \text{ Appl}^\circ
\]
OUR ROADMAP

- Review of how little $v$ came to be and its morphosyntactic function
- The event argument
- The high and low $Applicative^o$ heads
The Accusative Case-Assigner

• **Burzio’s Generalization**: If a verb assigns accusative case, then it assigns an external θ-role.
  - When a VP combines with a head that introduces an external argument, that head assigns accusative case to the internal argument of the verb.

• b/d have only an internal argument, which surfaces in the syntactic subject position.

a. She fired me.
b. I was fired. (from Burzio 2000)
c. They broke the window. (EX26)
d. The window broke. (EX 2)
Refresher: “Normal” v’s and “Special” v’s

Icelandic
1. a. Við lásum bókina.
   ‘We read the book.’ (Sigurðsson 1996, Ex 14)
   -Normal v: assigns accusative to the object

b. Einum málfræðingi líkuðu þessar hugmyndir.
   ‘One linguist liked these ideas.’ (Sigurðsson and Holmberg 2008, EX 1)
   -Special v: assigns dative to the subject

Gujarati
2. a. Sudha away-i.
   ‘Sudha came.’
   -Normal v: there’s no object here

b. Sudha-e radio khàridy-o.
   ‘Sudha bought a radio.’ (Woolford 2006, EX 38c/39)
   -Special v: assigns ergative to the subject
English
The students gave their professor a necklace.

Icelandic
Ég sendi Hildi fiskinn
‘I sent Hildur the fish.’

Greek
Much more on ditransitives in a couple weeks.

a. Tha μα in to στιλύνε fut cl.Gen.sg.1 cl.Acc.sg.3 neat send.3.pl
‘They will send it to me.’

b. Tha su to στιλύνε fut cl.Gen.sg.2 cl.Acc.sg.3 masc send.3p
‘They will send him to you.’

c. *Tha su me στιστίσυνε fut cl.Gen..sg 2 cl.Acc.sg 1 introduce.3.p
‘They will introduce me to you.’

d. *Tha τυ se στιλύνε fut cl.Gen.masc.sg.3 cl.Acc.sg.2 send.3;
‘They will send you to him.’ (Bonet 1991:182)
Kratzer’s Primary Arguments

- Argument/event structure interacts with the syntactic structure (contra previous proposals).
- Verb meanings are functions.
- The “agent” is not part of the meaning of a verb.
- The “agent” argument is introduced by a functional head that is higher than VP and lower than TP.
- The semantic operation Event Identification combines the “agent” with the VP.

- The verb has two arguments
  - e: the event of buying
  - x: the thing that was bought

- Consequence is that transitive verbs have the same meaning as unaccusatives.
Hung 1988: In Malagasy, the agent is introduced by the prefix -an that resides in a V head that is higher than the V head which hosts the verb.

- an does two things:
  - Introduces the subject argument.
  - Assigns case to the object - ny lamba ‘the clothes’.

This sounds a lot like v !!!
Kratzer argues that external argument-introducing head in English is functional - not lexical.

**The data argument:** The head that introduces the external argument is not present in of gerund, so that head should not be lexical.

- **His rebuilding of the barn took five months.**
- *Rebuild* is a V that is nominalized. *The barn* gets case from the preposition here.
- No Voice head → no external argument.
- *He rebuilding of the barn took five months.*

**The theory argument:** Structural vs lexical case. Structural case is assigned by functional heads.

- Structural case: The normal/expected case. E.g. - nominative on subjects and accusative on objects.
  - The functional head I/T assigns nominative → the case on the object should also come from a functional head.

- Lexical case: Cases that are determined by specific lexical items. E.g., prepositions in lots of languages - German, Russian, Icelandic - determine the case of their objects.
Enter $\mu$

- Johnson 1991: objects move to the specifier of VP and are assigned (accusative) case by $\mu$.
- The verb moves and adjoins to $\mu$.
- For Johnson, $\mu$’s sole function is case assignment.

  NOTE: At the time, it was assumed that case was assigned in a very local configuration. Now, it is assumed that the case-assigning and the DP can be farther away in the structure.

For Kratzer, $\mu$ has another role...

“Having acquired semantic content, $\mu$ deserves a meaningful name. I will call it VOICE.” (p. 120)
The Compositional Operations

- **Functional Application:** This is the normal way of composing meaning. There is an open argument slot and the sister node saturates (provides the content for) that slot.

- **Passing Up:** When node doesn’t have a sister, then the meaning of that node travels up to the next highest node.

- **Event Identification:** This operation combines the external argument with the event denoted in the VP.
  - There is an agent and that agent is the agent of the event described in the VP.
  - “Event Identification makes it possible to chain together various conditions for the event described by a sentence.” (p.122)
Tense and the Event Argument

• $\nu$ has to be higher than VP because it relates the agent to the event denoted in the VP.

• $\nu$ has to be lower than Tense because the role of tense is to “existentially quantify” the event argument.

• There is at least one event

• The meaning for past tense. (The * isn’t relevant here.)

\[(31) \quad \text{past} - * = \lambda P_{<s,t>} \exists e [ P(e) & \text{past}(e) ]\]

• There is some proposition (a state of affairs), $\lambda P$, and there exists at least one event, $\exists e$, such that the proposition encodes the event and the event happened in the past.

• Tense combines with $\nu P$ and the meaning of $\nu P$ saturates $\lambda P$.

• $T' = \exists e. \text{feed (the dog)(e) & (agent)(Mittie)(e) & past(e)} <s,t>$

• There is at least one event of feeding the dog and of which Mittie is the agent and which happened in the past.

• The real-world situation(s) that maps to the sentence saturates $\exists e$ and we end up with the meaning of the sentence.

• $TP = t$
Mapping the event argument to events

Three architects designed four buildings.

- **Collective** and **Cumulative**: total number of buildings designed is four.
  - **Collective**: all three of the architects collaboratively design all four buildings.
  - **Cumulative**: underspecified as to how many architects design each building.
- **Distributive**: there are twelve buildings; each architect designs four buildings.

- The events that the collective, cumulative, and distributive interpretations map to are independent of the meaning delivered by the combination of the verb and the object.
- **Collective**: one event in which all three architects design four buildings.
- **Distributive**: three events in which each architect designs four buildings.
- **Cumulative**: we don’t know how many events there are. We just know that some subset of architects designed some subset of buildings.

- Whatever the event is, it supplies the value for the event argument within the TP projection.

See Kratzer’s chapters *The Event Argument and the Semantics of Verbs* posted on the Semantics Archive for much more detailed discussion of quantifying over events. [http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/GU1NWM4Z/](http://semanticsarchive.net/Archive/GU1NWM4Z/)
- *Voice* was proposed in order to build into the syntax the semantic observation that verbs have an asymmetric relationship with objects versus subjects.
  - Objects have a closer relationship with the verb and the compositional meaning of the verb plus its object select for the subject.
  - The subject is external to the meaning of the verb.
  - *Voice* builds on $\mu$, which was proposed (by a syntactician) as the accusative case-assigner.

- Kratzer proposes Event Identification, which combines the external argument with the denotation of the VP.
- In contemporary theory, Kratzer’s *voice* is often represented as $\nu$ and *voice* is used to encode other kinds of information.
- There are many $\nu$’s in contemporary theory.
  - *V*-ergative/dative/genitive all introduce an argument into the structure and they assign case to that DP.
- The tense head combines with $\nu P$ and the event argument is saturated at the TP level.
Some Practice

Part 1. Draw a tree which includes both type theory and lambda notation up to TP. You can triangle the DPs and label them as type e.

1. Three architects designed four buildings.
2. The professor wore a new necklace.
3. The exhausted athletes sleep.
4. The ice melted.

Part 2. For these trees, just do type theory. NOTE: Think carefully. You will have to propose types for some words.

5. Many contemporary chefs believe people prefer locally-grown food.
6. Mary claims John saw her duck. [Remember this one? It’s ambiguous. Draw two trees.]
7. The delicious sushi made Cherlon happy.
8. Icelandic chefs seem to attend exquisite culinary schools.
9. Cherlon refused to eat pulverized bacon.
10. *It refused Cherlon to eat pulverized bacon. [In terms of type theory, describe what goes wrong with this sentence. You don’t have to draw a tree.]
Argument Structure and the Applicative Head
English and Venda (a Bantu language) both allow *melt* in the same argument structure configurations - (1)/(2).

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

(2) Venda
      snow 3SG.PAST-melt-FV  
      ‘The snow melted.’
   b. Mukasa o-nok-is-a  
      Mukasa 3SG.PAST-melt-CAUSE-FV  
      snow  
      ‘Mukasa melted the snow.’
   c. Mukasa o-nok-is-el-a  
      Mukasa 3SG.PAST-melt-CAUSE-APPL-FV  
      Katonga mahağa.  
      Katonga snow  
      ‘Mukasa melted Katonga the snow.’
But, Venda allows some intransitives (unergatives) such as laugh/speak to take applicatives, while English does not - (3)/(4).

Pylkkänen (2008) proposes that there is an applicative head which introduces the applicative argument.

High applicatives (HA): the applicative head attaches above the verb.

- There is a relation between an individual/entity and an event. =Venda

Low applicatives (LA), the applicative head attaches below the verb.

- There is a relation between two individuals/entities. The applicative is either the recipient or the source. =English
- LA requires a direct object because the relationship is between the direct object and the applicative argument.
Mary bought John a book.

- The applicative, John, has a relation with the direct object.
- John is the intended recipient of the book.

```
High: Attaches higher than the verb and relates “extra” argument to an event.
```

```
Low: Attaches lower than the verb and relates “extra” argument to the direct object.
```

(2) Chaga

a. N-ää-i-lyi-i-ä m-kä k-élyá.
   FOC-1SG-PRES-eat-APPL-FV 1-wife 7-food
   ‘He is eating food for his wife.’

b. N-ää-i-zric-i-ä mbuyá.
   FOC-1SG-PRES-run-APPL-FV 9-friend
   ‘He is running for a friend.’

(Bresnan and Moshi 1993, 49–50)

- *Wife* has a benefactive relation to the event of eating but no relation to the object of eating, *food*.
- *Friend* benefits from the event of running.

“A high applicative head is very much like the external-argument-introducing head: it simply adds another participant to the event described by the verb.” (Pylkkänen 2008:14)
"A comprehensive theory of linguistic representation 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." (p.1)

Pylkkänen will:
- Argue for specific heads in the syntax (the primitive building blocks);
- Propose denotations for those heads (which encode how those heads combine with other building blocks); and
- Illustrate a typology of those heads (showing how languages differ).

Like Kratzer:
- Pylkkänen assumes a very tight connection between syntax and semantics. "...syntactic structure building is the only mode of structure building in natural language." (p.5)
- Pylkkänen builds on Kratzer’s work directly: “Thus, one of the main contributions of this book is to provide a new empirical argument for separating the external argument from its verb.” (p.7)
Back to the Compositional Operations

- **Functional Application**

- **Passing Up:** [Pylkkänen doesn’t use this operation. There aren’t empty nodes in her derivations.]

- **Event Identification:** Combines the external argument - the agent or the high applicative - with the event denoted in the VP.

- **Predicate Modification:** New for us. Combines two daughters of the same type and returns a value of that type. Like Event Identification, it’s a conjunction operation of sorts.
  
  This will become relevant for depictives; the two nodes that are combined both have type $<e, <s,t>>$. They combine and their mother has type $<e, <s,t>>$. 
Big Difference Between the Denotations for the High and Low Applicative Heads

- High Appl is like Voice
- It adds an entity to an event denoted in the VP and relates that entity to the event in the VP.

(4) *Chichewa instrumental*
Mavuto a-na-umb-ir-a mpeni mtsuko.
Mavuto SP-PAST-mold-APPL-ASP knife waterpot
‘Mavuto molded the waterpot with a knife.’
(Baker 1988b, 354)

\[ \lambda x. \lambda e. \text{Appl}(e, x) \]
(collapsing AppL\text{Ben}, AppL\text{Instr}, AppL\text{Loc}, etc.)

- This looks a lot like the denotation for Voice!
- High Appl has 2 arguments: the applicative \([\lambda x]\) and the event \([\lambda e]\).
High Appl Derivation

(3) Marantz 1993, in the framework of Kratzer 1996, to appear

The Steps:

- The transitive verb combines with the direct object.

- Appl combines with the VP. Just like Voice, High Appl introduces a spot for an entity argument to saturate. Here, it’s the applicative.

- The Applicative is merged in the specifier of ApplP and saturates the λx slot.

- Voice combines with ApplP and introduces a spot for the external argument.

- The subject is merged in the specifier of VoiceP and saturates the λx slot.
- Low Appl is not like Voice. There is no semantic relationship between the Applicative and the event.
- The relationship is between the Applicative and the direct object.

(7) Low recipient applicative: English
   a. I wrote John a letter. ‘I wrote a letter and the letter was to the possession of John.’
   b. I baked my friend a cake. ‘I baked a cake and the cake was to the possession of my friend.’
   c. I bought John a new VCR. ‘I bought a new VCR and the VCR was to the possession of John.’

(15) a. Low-Appl$_{To}$ (Recipient applicative)
    $\lambda x . \lambda y . \lambda f < e, s, t > . \lambda e . f (e, x) \ & \ \& \ \text{theme}(e, x) \ & \ \& \ \text{to-the-possession}(x, y)$
   b. Low-Appl$_{From}$ (Source applicative)
    $\lambda x . \lambda y . \lambda f < e, s, t > . \lambda e . f (e, x) \ & \ \& \ \text{theme}(e, x) \ & \ \& \ \text{from-the-possession}(x, y)$

Low Appl has 4 arguments: the direct object [$\lambda x$], the applicative [$\lambda y$], the verb [$\lambda f$] (a function), and the event [$\lambda e$].
Low Appl Derivation

(16) Low applicative

a. Mary bought John the book.
   VP λ.e. buying(e) & agent(e, Mary) & theme(e, the book) & to-the-possession(the book, John)
   Voice' Mary
   Voice λ.x.λ.e. agent(e, x)
   ApplP buy
   λ.x.λ.e. buying(e) & theme(e, the book) & to-the-possession(the book, John)
   Appl' John
   Appl the book
   Appl the book
   λ.x.λ.y.λ.f(⟨e,<s,t⟩⟩) λ.e. f(e, x) & theme(e, x) & to-the-possession(x, y)

The Steps:

► In the HA derivation, the verb combines with its object. NOT SO in the LA derivation. The verb combines with ApplP.

► The direct object combines with the Appl head and saturates the λx slot.

► The applicative is merged in the specifier of ApplP and saturates the λy slot.

► The verb combines with ApplP and saturates the λf slot.

► f stands for function and, here, the function is necessarily of type ⟨e,⟨s,t⟩⟩.

► Only a verb of type ⟨e,⟨s,t⟩⟩ can combine with ApplP.

► Voice combines with VP and introduces a spot for the subject external argument.

► The subject is merged in in the specifier of VoiceP and saturates the λx slot.
Low Recipient vs Low Source Applicatives

- English has a low recipient applicative.

- Korean has a low source applicative.
  - The applicative is the source of the direct object.

- The denotation encodes “from the possession of” instead of “to the possession of”.

(12) Low source applicative: Korean
    Totuk-i Mary-hanthey penci-lul humchi-ess-ta.
    thief-nom Mary-dat ring-acc steal-past-plain
    ‘The thief stole a ring from Mary.’ (Lit.: ‘The thief stole Mary a ring.’)
    Hypothesized meaning: ‘The thief stole a ring and it was from Mary’s possession.’

(15) a. Low-\textit{Appl}_\textsubscript{To} (Recipient applicative)
    \[ \lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda f_{<e,\langle s,t\rangle>}.\lambda e. f(e, x) \land \text{theme}(e, x) \land \text{to-the-possession}(x, y) \]
    b. Low-\textit{Appl}_\textsubscript{From} (Source applicative)
    \[ \lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda f_{<e,\langle s,t\rangle>}.\lambda e. f(e, x) \land \text{theme}(e, x) \land \text{from-the-possession}(x, y) \]
What about “normal” ditransitives?

- For Pylkkänen, these are the same as low applicatives.

(8) Small clause | Causative analysis of double object verbs
   a. I gave Mary a book.
   b. I CAUSE [Mary HAVE a book]

(10) Causative
   a. #I flew the kite over the field but it didn’t fly.
   b. #I broke the vase but it didn’t break.
   c. #I cooked the meat but it didn’t cook.

(9) Double object construction
   a. I threw John the ball but he didn’t catch it.
   b. I sent Bill the letter but he never got it.
   c. I wrote Sue a letter but she never got it.

(11) a. Double object construction
     *I told John the news drunk.
     b. Small clause
        I saw John drive his car drunk.

Pylkkänen argues against a causative/small clause analysis of ditransitives, based on...

...Entailment:
- Resulting states are entailed in causatives. =(10)
- Resulting states aren’t entailed in double objects. =(9)

...Depictives:
- Depictives describe a state that one of the arguments of a verb is in during the event described by the verb.
- Small clauses can have depictive modification of the subject of the small clause. =(11b)
- Ditransitives can’t have depictive modification of the indirect object. =(11a)
Diagnostics and Predictions

- **Transitivity Restrictions**: Only High Appl should be able to combine with an unergative. Low Appl requires a direct object.

- **Verb Semantics**: Only High Appl should be able to combine with static verbs. Low Appl involves an (intended) transfer of possession.

**Low**

(20) **English**

a. *Un ergative verb
   *I ran him.
   b. *Static verb
   *I held him the bag.

(21) **Japanese**

a. *Un ergative verb
   *Taroo-ga Hanako-ni hasit-ta.
   Taroo-NOM Hanako-DAT run-PAST
   ‘Taro ran for Hanako.’
   b. *Static verb
   *Taroo-ga Hanako-ni kanojo-no kaban-o mot-ta.
   Taroo-NOM Hanako-DAT she-GEN bag-ACC hold-PAST
   ‘Taro held Hanako her bag.’

(22) **Korean**

a. *Un ergative verb
   Mary-NOM John-DAT run-PAST-PLAIN
   ‘Mary ran to/from John.’
   b. *Static verb
   John-NOM Mary-DAT bag-ACC hold-PAST-PLAIN
   ‘John held Mary her bag.’

(23) **Luganda**

a. *Un ergative verb
   Mukasa ya-tambu-le-dde Katonga.
   Mukasa 3SG.PAST-walk-APPL-PAST Katonga
   ‘Mukasa walked for Katonga.’
   b. *Static verb
   Katonga ya-kwaant-i-dde Mukasa ensawo.
   Katonga 3SG.PAST-hold-APPL-PAST Mukasa bag
   ‘Katonga held the bag for Mukasa.’

(24) **Venda**

a. *Un ergative verb
   Ndi-do-shum-el-a musadzi.
   1SG-FUT-work-APPL-FV lady
   ‘I will work for the lady.’
   b. *Static verb
   Nd-o-far-el-a Mukasa khali.
   1SG-PAST-hold-APPL-FV Mukasa pot
   ‘I held the pot for Mukasa.’

(25) **Albanian**

a. *Un ergative verb
   I vrhopo.
   him-DAT-CL ran.1SG
   ‘I ran for him.’
   b. *Static verb
   Agimi i mban Drites çanten time.
   Agim.NOM CL holds Drita.DAT bag-ACC my
   ‘Agim holds my bag for Drita.’
Descriptive generalization: There is a typology of applicatives. In some constructions, the extra argument is related to an event. In other constructions, the extra argument is related to the direct object.

Analysis: An applicative head (Appl) that mediates the relationship between the applicative argument and the rest of the construction.

When the applicative has a relationship with the event denoted in the VP, Appl attaches higher than the verb.

- Appl combines with VP.
- The denotation for High Appl includes argument positions for an entity (the applicative) and an event. It’s like Voice.
- High Appl Languages: Venda, Chaga, Chichewa, Luganda, Albanian

When the applicative has a relationship with the direct object, Appl attaches lower than the verb.

- Both the applicative and the direct object are merged inside of ApplP.
- Appl combines with the direct object and Appl’ combines with the applicative.
- The denotation for Low Appl includes argument positions for the direct object, the applicative, the verb, and an event.
- Low Appl Languages: English, Korean, Japanese

Predictions and diagnostics: High Applicatives are compatible with unergatives and stative verbs. Low Applicatives are not.
The Descriptive Observations:

- Subjects and direct objects can be modified by a depictive (26a)/(27), but indirect objects can’t (26b).
  - Predicts that depictives can’t modify low applicatives.
- Depictives are like adverbs in that “they attribute a property to the event described by the verb.” (p.23)
- The state described by the adjective holds during the event encoded in the verb.
- Back to the stage level/individual level distinction:
  - Depictives describe a state that holds during an event; sound odd with individual level adjectives. = (29)

The Proposal:

- Depictive phrases have two parts - (1) the adjective, (2) a depictive head (Dep)
  - In some languages (e.g. Finnish) depictives are morphologically marked. = (32)

(26) a. I gave Mary the meat raw.
    b. *I gave Mary the meat hungry.
    (Baker 1997, (23c,d))

(27) a. Object depictive
    John ate the meat raw.
    b. Subject depictive
    John wrote this letter drunk.

(29) He entered the room annoyed/crazy/tall.

(32) a. Adjective
    Söi-n raa’a-n tomaati-n.
    eat-PAST-1SG raw-ACC tomato-ACC
    ‘I ate a raw tomato.’

    b. Depictive
    Söi-n tomaati-n raaka-na.
    eat-PAST-1SG tomato-ACC raw-ESS
    ‘I ate a tomato raw.’
We traveled **tired**.

The “state” gets related to the event. (But there’s no “state” argument; no \( \lambda s \).)

There is some function (an adjective) of type \(<e, <s,t>>\) and some entity and some event such that:
There is at least one state such that the adjective holds of \( x \) in that state and that state holds during an event.

- \( \lambda f \) is a function. Here, it’s the adjective, which is type \(<e, <s,t>>\).
- \( \lambda x \) is an entity
- \( \lambda e \) is an event
Pylkkänen proposes that DepP is of type \(<e, <s,t>>\).

The nodes that DepP combines with are also of type \(<e, <s,t>>\).
- Object depictives combine with the verb.
- Subject depictives combine with Voice’.
DepP contains the adjective and the depictive head.

- The adjective saturates $\lambda f$ of Dep.
  - DepP is type $\langle e, \langle s,t \rangle \rangle$.
- The verb combines with DepP.
  - The verb is also $\langle e, \langle s,t \rangle \rangle$.
- DepP and the verb combine via Predicate Modification.
  - $V'$ is type $\langle e, \langle s,t \rangle \rangle$.
- The subject of the small clause VP is merged in the specifier and saturates the $\lambda x$ slot. We get:

  There is some event such that the event is a seeing event and Peter is the theme of that event and there is at least one state which is a state of being tired and Peter is in that state and that state holds during the event.

  WHEW!!!!!!

- Voice combines with VP and introduces a spot for the subject external argument.
- Event Identification applies as normal.
  - Voice is $\langle e, \langle s,t \rangle \rangle$ and VP is $\langle s,t \rangle$.
- The subject is merged in in the specifier of VoiceP and saturates the $\lambda x$ slot.
Subject Depictives

- This one is structurally trickier.
- The verb see combines with the direct object.
- Voice combines with the VP as normal. Event Identification.
- Here’s where things get slightly more complex.
- Again, DepP contains the adjective and the depictive head. The adjective saturates λf of Dep.
- DepP is type \(<e, <s,t>>\).
- DepP combines with Voice’, which is \(<e, <s,t>>\).
- Structurally, DepP is in an adjunct position - it’s daughter and sister to a bar-level. Here, there are two Voice’ levels.

DepP and Voice’ combine via **Predicate Modification** and the higher Voice’ is \(<e, <s,t>>\). We get:

**There is some entity and some event such that the event is a seeing event and there is an entity that is the agent of that event and Peter is the theme of that event and there is at least one state which is a state of being tired and an entity is in that state and that state holds during the event.**

Again...WHEW!!!!

Unlike with object depictives, we don’t know who is in the state of being tired at this point in the structure.

The subject is merged in the specifier of VoiceP and saturates the λx slot. Sue is the agent of the seeing and is in the state of being tired.

**Predicate Modification:**
**Voice’ + DepP**

(34) **Subject depictives: DepP combines with Voice’**

a. Sue saw Peter tired.
Depictives and Applicatives

- DepP combines with phrases that are $<$e, $<$s,t$>$$. Predictions:
  - Depictives can’t modify low applicatives/indirect objects. = (26b)
    - DepP would have to attach to Appl’ and Appl’ is the wrong type!
    - DepP attaches below the DP it modifies.
  - Depictives can modify direct objects (even in ditransitive/applicative constructions). = (26a) /(38)
    - DepP attaches to the verb. (See next page.)

(26) a. I gave Mary the meat raw.
b. *I gave Mary the meat hungry.
   (Baker 1997, (23c,d))

(38) Depictive modification of the direct object in a low applicative construction
a. I bought John the VCR new.

(37) Low applicative

$$\lambda e. \text{buying}(e) \& \text{agent}(e, \text{Mary}) \& \text{theme}(e, \text{the book}) \& \text{to-the-possession}(\text{the book, John})$$
Depictive Modification of Direct Object in an Applicative Construction

Remember the denotation for Low Appl

(15) a. $\text{Low-App}_{to}$ (Recipient applicative)
\[
\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda f(x,y).\lambda e. f(e, x) \& \text{theme}(e, x) \& \text{to-the-possession}(x, y)
\]

b. $\text{Low-App}_{from}$ (Source applicative)
\[
\lambda x.\lambda y.\lambda f(x,y).\lambda e. f(e, x) \& \text{theme}(e, x) \& \text{from-the-possession}(x, y)
\]

- DepP combines with the verb, just as in the Object Depictive Derivation.
- The verb and DepP combine via Predicate Modification.
- ApplP combines with V’. In syntactic terms, ApplP occupies the specifier of the VP.
- Voice combines with VP and things proceed as expected.

VP: There is an event such that the event is of buying & the VCR is the theme of that event & there is at least one state which is a state of being new & the VCR is in that state & that state holds during the event & the VCR is to the possession of John.

Predicate Modification: $V + \text{DepP}$
Both Japanese and English are Low Appl languages and the Depictive can’t modify the applicative.
Luganda is a High Appl language and the Depictive can modify the applicative.
From Kratzer:
- The “meaning” of a verb includes its internal argument (if there is one) and an event.
- The semantic job of \( v \) is to add the external argument to the event encoded in the VP.

From Pylkkänen:
- Languages vary in how they add “extra” arguments to the structure.
- There is an applicative head (Appl) that mediates the relationship between the applicative argument and the rest of the construction.
- High Appl attaches above the verb and mediates the relationship between the applicative and the event encoded in the VP.
- Low Appl attaches below the verb and mediates the relationship between the applicative and the direct object.
- The distribution of depictives interacts with the typology of applicatives.
  - Depictives can modify high applicatives, but not low applicatives.
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