Events and Entities

Appropriateness of separately categorizing events from entities in the MRS

Syntactic-semantic properties of e vs x

- Events e may have, but instances may never have:
  - Tense
  - Aspect
  - Mood
  - Sentential Force
- Instances (entities) x may have, but events may never have:
  - Person
  - Number
  - Gender

Tense on Instances?

- Instances with (apparent) tense from Nuuchahnulth (nuk):

1) ḥaẃiⱡ=it
   chief=PST
   'the former chief'
   interpretation: dead, or living but passed on chieftainship

ʔaṁii- 'one day away'

2) ʔaṁii-mit
   1day-PST
   'yesterday'

3) ʔaṁii-ƛik
   1day-FUT
   'tomorrow'

Tense on Instances?

- Future, too:

4) n̓up-čiiɫ=ʔaaqƛ=ʔi
    one-day=FUT=the
    'next Monday'

I hear German does similar things at least with adjectives. (German speakers?)

Aspect on Instances?

- Verbs, adjectives, and nouns, appear to require an inherent aspect.
  - NB: This may be lexical aspect, not grammatical aspect.
  - Lexically specified, can be modeled as a selected-for form that bears suspicious resemblance to aspectual morphemes (but is this a lie?)
  6) ča-ʔak (noun)
     flow-DURATIVE
     'river'
  7) tupk-uk (adj)
     dark-DURATIVE
     'black'

Mood?

- Depends on what you call mood.
  - I've been analyzing evidentiality as mood

1) ʔuḥ=uk   haʔum suuḥaa   čiḥaa=ča   ʔaaya-ca=qa.
   be=POSS food   soha   ghost=the.HRSY   many-AUG=EMBD
   'The ghosts (I hear) get lots of spring salmon as food.' (Nootka Texts 2)

Sentential Force? PNG?

- Is sentential force on an instance conceptually coherent?

- PNG on events?
  - Many languages have number marking on the verb, but this is interpreted as meaning some argument of the verb is plural or singular.
  - Other forms of plural-like marking on the verb indicate aspect (e.g., repetition)
  - Person and gender morphology likewise always refers to an argument
  - Is PNG conceptually coherent on events?

Scoping of *e* vs *x*

- Current implementation: All instances x must be bound by a quantifier, but not e
- Is e assumed to have highest scope in a clause?
- Can we create a test that would check for this?

e vs *x* Ambiguity

English:

8) His reading the book was beautiful.
   - ERG analysis: his_{DET} [[reading the book]$_{VP}$]$_{NP}$
   - MRS: nominalization predication with LABEL of book as ARG1.
   - *his* is in POSS relationship with a def_explicit_q (??)
   - as well as ARG1 of *read*

9) Him reading the book was beautiful
   - Similar to (8), [reading the book] is nominalized, and NP *him* is attached via subj-head embedded clause.

- Are these predicate-wrappings necessary? What is the *nominalization_rel* really doing for us?

x => e

- Nuuchahnulth:
  - Lexical parts of speech, but weakly differentiated in syntax
  - Any lexical part of speech (minus adverbs) can be the syntactic predicate:

    [predicate] [=second position clitics] [arguments(=?i)]*
  - When the predicate is a non-verb, is it best analyzed as a lexical rule adding a copula to an *x*?
  - Or better to leave the lexical entry as *i*, and have syntactic rules determine it?
  - Does one analysis – copula vs *i* – have predictive power over the other?
  - (Similar problems in Japanese, see extra slides)

x => e

13) quuʔas=int=iič   saštup

    person=PST=3   animal

    'Animals were people.'

14) wiƙiit-šiƛ   quuʔas

    none-PERF   person

    'The people had gone'

e => x

- Nuuchahnulth:
  - Second position clitic =ʔi (more or less) marks arguments for a syntactic predicate
  - Optional on nouns, required for non-nominal arguments (verbs, adjectives)
  - Is it really warranted to have =ʔi insert a nominalization predicate for non-nouns?
    - This is perhaps necessary for verbs, where the meaning is "the one who ..."
    - Adjectives though?
  - Why not say every part of speech that is potentially an argument is *i* at the lexical level? What is the fallout from that?

e => x

15) ʔiiqḥuk=!aƛ   ʔačỷaap=ʔi   "hił=maa   ʔaḥʔaa   łuucsma."
    tell=NOW   gather.wood=the   "there=3   that   woman
    'The wood-gatherer told (him), "That woman is there." (Nootka Texts 1)

16) ... ʔuyi   ʔuuqumḥi=ʔaƛ=ʔi
    ... at.time   good.weather=NOW =the
    '... when it was good weather' (community story, Vince Smith & Fidelia Haiyupis)

17) ʔuyi=mit=ʔi   ʔukłaa=mit   Hakoda Bay
    at=PST =the   call=PST   Hakoda Bay
    'At that time it was called Hakoda Bay' (story from Bob Mundy)

e, x, i

- So why bother with converting between *e* and *x* in these cases?
- Does this gain us anything or just make our grammars more unwieldy?

Discussion

- Do we really want to forbid TAM & SF properties from instances?
- Do we really want to forbid PNG properties from events?
- Can we leave flexible lexical entries underspecified as i?
- If a lexical entry is underspecified, is it necessary to always resolve to e or x in the tree?
- Should we really be scoping events and instances differently? How can we test for a scoped event vs a nominalization?
- What are the tests that can distinguish 0-copula interpretations of non-verbal predicates vs interchangeable events and instances?

Extras

- Nuuchahnulth:
  - Past tense is a 2nd position clitic, applies to phrase (can't be a suffix –former)
  4) cumaa=ʔaƛ=quu   [ʔaḥʔaa   ʔiiḥ=it=ʔi   maḥʔtii]_{NP} ...
     full=NOW=3.WHENEVER   [that   big=PST=the house]_{NP} ...
     'That big house was always full of people' (context: house no longer exists)

e vs *x* Ambiguity

- Japanese (from Stanford summit):
  - Some words can be nouny or verby depending on context. Which is the version in the lexicon, or is it underspecified?

10) 田中　　　　が　　　日本語　　を　　　勉強　　　　　　　する
Tanaka　　　ga　　　nihongo　wo　　benkyou　　　　　suru
Tanaka　　　NOM　　Japanese　ACC　study　　　　　　　do
'Tanaka studies Japanese.'

11) 日本語　　　の　　　勉強　　　　　　　が　　　面白い
Nihongo　　　no　　　benkyou　　　　　ga　　　omoshiroi
Japanese　　　ADN　　study　　　　　　　NOM　　interesting
'Studying Japanese is interesting'

12) 学生　　　　が　　　勉強　　　　　　　に　　　行く
Gakusei　　　ga　　　benkyou　　　　　ni　　　iku
Student　　　NOM　　study　　　　　　　LOC　　go
'The students are going to study'