

## A neo-constructionist approach to argument structure and the syntax-morphology interface. Issues in Latin and other languages

Víctor Acedo Matellán (Victor.Acedo@uab.cat)

Centre de Lingüística Teòrica-Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

In this talk I present the main points of my recently defended dissertation (Acedo-Matellán 2010). The talk is structured in three parts: the theoretical framework, an application to Latin data and a proposal to account for cross-linguistic variation. The theoretical framework incorporates, on the one hand, the adoption of a neo-constructionist theory of argument structure (Marantz 1997, Mateu 2002, Borer 2005), whereby argument structure is undistinguishable from plain syntax and, on the other, the assumption of the Distributed Morphology model of the syntax-semantics interface. While the former allows for uniformity of LF representations of the vP across languages, the latter aims, on the contrary, at accounting for cross-linguistic differences in the expression of those structures. Variation is therefore restricted to the PF interface, specifically to the PF realisation of functional heads. With respect to the first aspect of the theory, I focus on the structuring of events of change and, in particular, on the syntactic and semantic properties of Path, a functional head introducing a transition. With respect to the second aspect, I implement PF as a series of operations, focusing on Lowering and Fusion (Embick & Noyer 2001) and proposing that *conflation* à la Hale & Keyser (1993) constitutes one of these operations (see also Harley 2004). I consider, next, Talmy's (2000) theory of the cross-linguistic expression of events of change, where a basic divide is drawn between the languages in which the transition can be encoded by a non-verbal element —*satellite-framed* languages— and the languages in which the transition must be encoded by the verb —*verb-framed* languages. I explore a wide range of constructions in Latin and analyse them in terms of the theory presented above to show that this language is a satellite-framed one. Time permitting, I will discuss Complex Directed Motion Constructions, Unselected Object Constructions, Complex Effected Motion Constructions and Pseudoreversative Constructions. On the cross-linguistic side, I propose, drawing on Mateu & Rigau 2002, that the s-/v-framed distinction is explainable in purely morphophonological terms: in v-framed languages the eventive v head *lowers*, at PF, to the head encoding transition —Path— and *fuses* with it, yielding a unique locus for phonological realisation. On the other hand, in s-framed languages this Fusion operation does not take place, so v and Path are free to be phonologically realised independently from each other. Finally, I propose a refinement of Talmy's typology within the class of s-framed languages: in *strong* s-framed languages, like Germanic, v and Path are not required to form one word, so constructions like complex adjectival resultative constructions are allowed; in *weak* s-framed languages, like Latin, v and Path must form one word and, hence, constructions like adjectival resultative constructions are disallowed. This distinction is accounted for in terms of a v-to-Path (PF) Lowering operation for weak s-framed languages, which creates a complex head. A three-way, gradual typology emerges encompassing strong s-framed languages (no v-to-Path Lowering and no Path-v Fusion), weak s-framed languages (v-to-Path Lowering, no Path-v Fusion) and v-framed languages (v-to-Path Lowering and Path-v Fusion).

### References

Acedo-Matellán, Víctor. *Argument Structure and the Syntax-Morphology Interface. A Case Study in Latin and Other Languages*. Universitat de Barcelona PhD thesis.

Borer, Hagit. 2005b. *Structuring Sense*, vol. 2: *The normal course of events*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Embick, David & Rolf Noyer. 2001. Movement operations after syntax. *Linguistic Inquiry* 32(4). 555-595.
- Hale, Kenneth & Samuel J. Keyser. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In Kenneth Hale & Samuel J. Keyser (eds.), *The View from Building 20: Essays in Linguistics in Honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 53-109. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Harley, Heidi. 2004. Merge, conflation, and head movement: The First Sister Principle revisited. *North East Linguistic Society (NELS)* 34(1). 239-254.
- Marantz, Alec. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. *Penn Linguistics Colloquium (PLC)* 21. 201-225.
- Mateu, Jaume. 2002. *Argument Structure. Relational Construal at the Syntax-Semantics Interface*. Bellaterra: Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona dissertation. <http://seneca.uab.cat/clt/publicacions/tesis/index.html>. (12 September 2010.)
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics*, vol. 2: *Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.