

Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2016

Edited by

Denisa Lenertová

Roland Meyer

Radek Šimík

Luka Szucsich

Draft
of January 24, 2019, 15:26

Open Slavic Linguistics

Editors: Berit Gehrke, Denisa Lenertová, Roland Meyer, Radek Šimík & Luka Szucsich

In this series:

1. Lenertová, Denisa, Roland Meyer, Radek Šimík & Luka Szucsich (Eds.). *Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2016*.

Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2016

Edited by

Denisa Lenertová

Roland Meyer

Radek Šimík

Luka Szucsich

Lenertová, Denisa, Roland Meyer, Radek Šimík & Luka Szucsich (eds.). 2019.
Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2016 (Open Slavic Linguistics 1). Berlin:
Language Science Press.

This title can be downloaded at:

<http://langsci-press.org/catalog/book/189>

© 2019, the authors

Published under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 Licence (CC BY 4.0):

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/> [./langsci/graphics//ccby.eps](#)

ISBN: 978-3-96110-127-6 (Digital)

978-3-96110-128-3 (Hardcover)

DOI: [10.5281/zenodo.2546440](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2546440)

Source code available from www.github.com/langsci/189

Collaborative reading: paperhive.org/documents/remote?type=langsci&id=189

Cover and concept of design: Ulrike Harbort

Typesetting: Radek Šimík, Roland Meyer, Andrei Konjaev, Sebastian Nordhoff,
and authors (alphabetically): Julia Bacsikai-Atkari, Olga Borik, Mojmír Dočekal,
Anja Gattnar, Berit Gehrke, Matías Guzmán Naranjo, Johanna Heininger, Robin
Hörnig, Ivona Kučerová, Franc Marušič, Petra Mišmaš, Olav Mueller-Reichau,
Gereon Müller, Andrew Murphy, Vesna Plesničar, Zorice Puškar, Tina Šuligoj,
Maria D. Vasilyeva, Marcin Wągiel, Karolina Zuchewicz

Proofreading: Denisa Lenertová, Roland Meyer, Radek Šimík, Luka Szucsich,
Jake Walsh

Fonts: Linux Libertine, Libertinus Math, Arimo, DejaVu Sans Mono

Typesetting software: Xe_{La}TeX

Language Science Press

Unter den Linden 6

10099 Berlin, Germany

langsci-press.org

Storage and cataloguing done by FU Berlin

[./langsci/graphics/storage/logo.pdf](#)

Contents

Preface	iii
1 How factive is the perfective? On the interaction between perfectivity and factivity in Polish Karolina Zuchewicz	1
Index	17

Preface

The present volume, *Advances in Formal Slavic Linguistics 2016*, marks a delectable double premiere: It initiates both the book series *Open Slavic Linguistics* as a whole, and its sub-series of collective volumes on formal Slavic linguistics.

Open Slavic Linguistics aims at publishing high quality books with a focus on Slavic languages on the empirical side, which at the same time reflect the state of the art and current developments in general linguistics. Its core principles are strict adherence to a genuine Open Access policy and to quality control through double-blind peer review. The series takes a broad linguistic perspective and invites monographs and topical collective volumes from virtually all subdisciplines. This may include theoretically oriented work on Slavic linguistic phenomena, advanced empirical/experimental work on Slavic languages, as well as handbooks, introductions and companions to the linguistic analysis of a given language. The defining characteristics of the series is that it seeks a solid grounding in up-to-date theoretical and empirical methods, fosters mutual understanding of linguists across object languages and subdisciplines, and seeks to contribute both to narrowly defined Slavic linguistics and to general linguistics and linguistic typology.

Advances in Formal Slavic Linguistics 2016 presents a selection of high quality papers authored by young and senior linguists from around the world and contains both empirically oriented work, underpinned by up-to-date experimental methods, and more theoretically based contributions. The volume covers all major linguistic areas, including morphosyntax, semantics, pragmatics, phonology, and their mutual interfaces. The particular topics discussed range from argument structure, word order, case, agreement, tense, aspect, and the left clausal periphery to segmental phonology. The thematic breadth and analytical depth of the contributions reflect the vitality of the field of formal Slavic linguistics and testify to its relevance for the global linguistic endeavor.

Early versions of the papers included in this volume were presented at the conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages 12 or at the satellite Workshop on Formal and Experimental Semantics and Pragmatics, which were held in Berlin on 7–10 December 2016 – the year referred to in the title of the volume. Half of the submitted abstracts made it into the 44 presentations of the

Preface

conference. The 21 papers in the present volume were developed from these contributions in the course of a further thorough reviewing process. Neither the original conference nor the present volume would have been possible without the readiness of so many experts to devote their time and thoughts to the critical evaluation and helpful commenting of their colleagues' research papers. We wish to express our gratitude both to the 75 anonymous reviewers of the original conference abstracts, and to the more than 50 external reviewers for the present volume. Their commitment testifies to the liveliness and ambition of the field of Slavic linguistics. This book would have also been impossible without our student assistants, Bella Badt, Justina Bojarski, Andrei Koniaev and Jake Walsh, and the invaluable help of the Language Science Press editors Sebastian Nordhoff and Felix Kopecky. We gratefully acknowledge their efforts and support. Finally, we would like to acknowledge the authors themselves. Open Access publishing is a collective endeavor and we appreciate the authors' willingness to collaborate with us closely not just on linguistic and scientific issues, but also on editorial matters. We sincerely hope that the authors and readers of this volume will share our conviction that it has been worthwhile.

Denisa Lenertová, Roland Meyer, Radek Šimík & Luka Szucsich
Berlin, 14 December 2018

Chapter 1

How factive is the perfective? On the interaction between perfectivity and factivity in Polish

Karolina Zuchewicz

Leibniz-Zentrum Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft &
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin

This paper aims to provide evidence for a systematic correlation between the perfective aspect of the matrix verb and the factive interpretation of embedded object sentences in Polish. Embedding by perfective matrix verbs makes propositions systematically ‘more factive’ than embedding by their imperfective counterparts. The strength of the inference depends on the semantic class the verb belongs to. The perfective operator introduces a nearly undefined truthfulness feature, which is specified as factive, veridical or reliable depending on the relation between the truth of the proposition expressed by the embedded clause and the event described by the matrix verb.

Keywords: perfectivity, factivity, veridicality, presupposition, entailment, implicature

1 Introduction

There is no one simple way to define factivity, and especially the truth-related inferences in general. In this paper, I will adopt assumptions which can be used to describe perfectivity-dependent truthfulness in Polish. It should be pointed out that the whole spectrum of the literature available is much broader.

According to Kiparsky & Kiparsky (1970), a verb V that takes a that-clause p is called FACTIVE if asserting Vp presupposes the truth of the complement p (but see also Karttunen 1971 for a discussion of the presuppositional account). Following Egré (2008: 101), a verb V is called VERIDICAL if it entails the truth of

its complement when used in the positive declarative form, more precisely if it satisfies the scheme $Vp \rightarrow p$ for all p , where p is a that-clause.

I will refer to the first option as TRUTH PRESUPPOSITION (factivity in a common sense). It holds when the inference remains under negation or after the insertion of a modal adverbial (for a semantic definition of presupposition, see [Strawson 1950](#)). Truth presupposition concerns for instance perfective *przewidzieć*, as can be seen in the following examples. ‘ \gg ’ marks presupposition.¹

- (1) Ola nie / prawdopodobnie przewidziała, że Marek boi się
 Ola NEG probably predicted.PFV that Marek fears.IPFV REFL
 duchów.
 ghost.PL
 ‘Ola did not predict / probably predicted that Marek fears ghosts.’
 \gg Marek fears ghosts.
- (2) Ola nie / prawdopodobnie przewidywała, że Marek boi się
 Ola NEG probably predicted.IPFV that Marek fears.IPFV REFL
 duchów.
 ghost.PL
 ‘Ola was not predicting / was probably predicting that Marek fears
 ghosts.’
 \nrightarrow Marek fears ghosts.

Examples (1) and (2) consist of an aspectual minimal pair exhibiting complementary behavior of the feature $[\pm\text{perfective}]$ with respect to the enforcing of a factive interpretation of their complement sentences. Whereas the perfective variant presupposes the truth of its sentential argument, the imperfective one does not. After the insertion of a sentence negation or a modal adverbial, (1) implicates that Marek fears ghosts. Sentence (2) only says that Ola was guessing / tried to predict that Marek fears ghosts, but it leaves it open whether she was correct or not.

The second option will be called TRUTH ENTAILMENT. Truth entailment results in an occurrence of a veridical meaning of the proposition expressed by the subordinate clause. Here, the inference is present in affirmative sentences, but it does not project. We can find it for example in the perfective *potwierdzić*. I will use ‘ \rightarrow ’ to mark entailment.

¹All embedded verbs are marked for the imperfective aspect and used in the present tense in order to exclude the influence of perfectivity and past tense morphology within the subordinate clause on the truth inferences observed.

- (3) Komisarz potwierdził, że Marek boi się duchów.
 commissioner confirmed.PFV that Marek fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
 ‘The commissioner confirmed that Marek fears ghosts.’
 → Marek fears ghosts.
- (4) Komisarz potwierdzał, że Marek boi się duchów.
 commissioner confirmed.IPFV that Marek fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
 ‘The commissioner was confirming that Marek fears ghosts.’
 → Marek fears ghosts.

Truth entailment can be found in *potwierdzić* and is absent in *potwierdzać*; whereas it seems to follow from (3) that Marek fears ghosts, (4) states that this is a possible, but not an obligatory interpretation. The inference presented in (3) does not project, which excludes it from being a presupposition. Consider (5).

- (5) Komisarz nie / prawdopodobnie potwierdził, że Marek
 commissioner NEG probably confirmed.PFV that Marek
 boi się duchów.
 fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
 ‘The commissioner did not confirm / probably confirmed that Marek fears
 ghosts.’
 → Marek fears ghosts.

The third and weakest option is the TRUTH IMPLICATURE (see also [Hacquard 2006](#) for the so-called actuality implicature, as illustrated in (9)). I will use this term to refer to an inference which cannot be captured by factivity or veridicality (it is clearly pragmatic, since it can be canceled). Here, the proposition embedded under a perfective communication verb is taken for granted due to the reliability of the sentence subject (cf. [Schlenker 2010](#) for the factivity of announcements). The same proposition embedded under a particular imperfective counterpart is neutral with respect to the reliability condition. Consider examples (6a) and (6b). I will use ‘ \sim ’ to mark implicature.

- (6) a. Ela powiedziała, że jest w pracy.
 Ela said.PFV that is.IPFV at work
 ‘Ela said that she is at work.’
 \sim Ela is at work.
- b. Ela mówiła, że jest w pracy.
 Ela said.IPFV that is.IPFV at work
 ‘Ela was saying that she is at work.’
 \nrightarrow Ela is at work.

In the perfective variant (6a), the speaker takes the truth of what the sentence subject said for granted; Ela is considered reliable and she is expected to tell the truth. In the imperfective variant (6b), the speaker does not want to commit herself to the truth of the proposition. It is left open whether the speaker considers the sentence subject reliable. As a result, there is no implicature that Ela is at work. The reliability effect seems to correlate with fulfilling all the parts of the speech act (see §4.3), which is necessarily the case when using the perfective and which does not have to be the case when using the imperfective (see Cohen & Krifka 2014; Krifka 2015 for commitment space semantics).

We could refer to the abovementioned inferences as a TRUTHFULNESS SCALE. The strongest inference – truth presupposition – represents the highest value on that scale, while truth implicature stands for the lowest one. Between them there is the medium strength inference – truth entailment. A more detailed classification may be developed after more conclusive research has been done.

Perfectivity-dependent truthfulness needs to be distinguished from the truthfulness of inherently factive imperfectives, where the perfectivizing operation only results in the specification of a temporal boundary of an event, for instance: *żałować* ‘regret.IPFV’ vs. *pożałować* ‘start regretting.PFV’ (cf. Egré 2008 for an interesting discussion about *regret*, though), unless the meaning of the derivate becomes non-compositional (*wiedzieć* ‘know.IPFV’ + factive vs. *powiedzieć* ‘say.PFV’ + non-factive). In contrast, all truth inferences which originate from the perfective do not occur in the case of the respective imperfective counterparts.

At this point, I would like to make an important remark concerning the tense of the matrix verb. I use the past tense in all examples, because it is available for any verbal stem regardless of the aspectual marking. The present tense morphology results in future reference in the case of the perfective, whereas both present tense and the periphrastic future construction are available for the imperfective. Because the analyzed sentences are supposed to be minimal pairs (differing only in the aspectual marking on the matrix verb), using the past tense was the only option.

In this paper, I will examine different verbs falling into class 1 (truth presupposition), class 2 (truth entailment) and class 3 (truth implicature). I provide an account of perfectivity-dependent truth inferences in Polish, which will be presented in §5. Before coming to that, I will briefly discuss the influence of aspect on the interpretation of nominal arguments, which serves as a starting point for an investigation of the correlation between the perfectivity of the matrix verb and the interpretation of complement sentences.

2 Aspect and the interpretation of nominal arguments

It has been pointed out by Wierzbicka (1967) that in perfective sentences in Polish the direct object is interpreted as definite, while in imperfective ones it is understood as indefinite. Consider example (7).

- (7) On zjadł / jadł orzechy.
 he ate.PFV ate.IPFV nut.PL
 ‘He ate all of the nuts / was eating (some) nuts.’

In the case of *zjadł*, the reference is to a definite group of entities – the nuts. The object is completely affected by the verbal process (as a result, there are no more nuts left). In contrast, neither the definite nor the totality reading is enforced when using *jadł*. Here, the partitive interpretation is available amongst others, corresponding to ‘some of the nuts’.

However, Filip (2005: 128) shows that perfective aspect does not always require that bare nominal arguments in its scope refer to one whole and specific individual (consider for instance the perfective Czech and Polish equivalents of the English verb *bring*). That means that not only aspect, but also verb semantics and especially the thematic relation between the nominal object and the verb determine the referential properties of the entire predicate.

The crucial point is that the perfective operator can take scope over both the matrix verb and its nominal complement. A formal analysis of this correlation has been developed by Krifka (1989a,b; 1992; 1998). Different theoretical implementations are possible; because it is not the main focus of this paper, I will not discuss them in greater detail.

According to Krifka, complex verbal expressions (verb plus direct object) have either a cumulative or a quantized reference. We can define them in terms of the sum operation: $x \sqcup y$ ‘the sum of x and y ’. For example, the sum of two events of ‘eating grapes’ still yields an event of ‘eating grapes’. The predicate ‘eating grapes’ has a cumulative reference – we can apply it not only to the single events, but also to the sum of them. In contrast, the joining of two events of ‘eating two grapes’ can no longer be described with ‘eating two grapes’, because ‘eating two grapes’ plus ‘eating two grapes’ does not equal ‘eating two grapes’. The predicate ‘eating two grapes’ has a quantized reference – we can apply it to the single events, but not to the sum of them. Apart from the sum operation, the proper part relation can be defined: $x \sqsubset y \leftrightarrow x \sqsubseteq y$ and $x \neq y$. For example, there is no proper part of an event ‘eating two grapes’ which is an event of ‘eating two grapes’. This illustrates another property of the quantized reference.

Krifka assumes that the perfective operator presupposes the quantization of the entire predicate, whereas the imperfective operator requires its cumulativity. This correlation primarily (but not exclusively, cf. [Krifka 1998](#)) holds for predicates which allow mapping of objects to events and vice versa (the so-called homomorphism of objects to events). Certainly, it cannot be considered a 1:1 relationship (cf. [Filip 1996; 2005](#) or [Borik 2006](#)). In Polish, the verbal predicate marked with the perfective aspect is quantized iff the whole verbal complex receives a telic interpretation, particularly in the case of predicates with nominal objects that are incremental themes. On the other hand, we get the combination of features [+perfective] and [–telic] after adding the delimitative prefix *po-* to the imperfective stem; in these cases the predicate is to be interpreted as atelic despite the perfective marking on the verb. Thus, the following generalization holds for Polish: telicity implies quantization, but perfectivity does not imply telicity (see also [Gehrke 2008](#)). As will become clear later, the truth inference of a sentential complement is triggered by perfectivity.

3 Cross-linguistic evidence for the interaction between perfectivity and factivity

The influence of the perfective aspect of a matrix verb on the factive interpretation of complement clauses has already been observed. [Hacquard \(2006\)](#) shows that both actuality entailment and actuality implicature can be found in some modal constructions in French, when a modal is marked with the perfective.

Actuality entailment refers to the uncancelable inference stating that the proposition expressed by the complement clause holds in the actual world.² Consider (8), adapted from [Hacquard \(2006: 21\)](#).

- (8) Jane #a pu / pouvait soulever cette table, mais elle ne
 Jane AUX could.PFV could.IPFV lift this table but she NEG
 l’a pas soulevée.
 it.AUX NEG lift
 ‘Jane could lift this table, but she did not lift it.’

Example (9) demonstrates an actuality implicature (adapted from *ibid.* 16).

²[Bhatt \(1999\)](#) observed the correlation between perfectivity marked on ability modals and the presence of the actuality entailment in Greek and Hindi.

- (9) Darcy a eu / avait la possibilité de rencontrer Lizzie.
 Darcy AUX had.PFV had.IPFV the possibility to meet Lizzie
 ‘Darcy had the possibility to meet Lizzie.’

When used with the perfective, (9) strongly suggests (but does not entail) that Darcy did meet Lizzie.

The correlation between perfectivity and factivity can also be seen in Hungarian; it concerns the influence of embedding verbs of saying on the interpretation of their sentential complements. Whereas *megmond* ‘say.PFV’ requires the argument to be true, *mond* ‘say.IPFV’ does not (see Kiefer 1986). Even though aspect is not grammaticalized in Hungarian (it is not obligatory for every verb to have its (im)perfective twin), informal investigations among speakers show that we can observe clear aspect-dependent differences with respect to the truthfulness of propositions embedded under verbs marked as perfective.

In the next section I am going to present Polish data showing a systematic interaction between perfectivity and truthfulness. In Polish, the category of aspect is fully grammaticalized, which allows us to take a closer look at the abovementioned dependency.

4 Aspect-dependent truth inferences in Polish

4.1 Case 1: Truth presupposition

One group of verbs where the truth presupposition of the perfective can be found is verbs of guessing.³ From (10) it follows that the proposition from the embedded clause – Marek fears ghosts – is true. Example (11) demonstrates that this inference projects, i.e. it remains under negation and after the insertion of a modal adverbial.

- (10) Jan zgadł / wyчуł, że Marek boi się duchów.
 Jan guessed.PFV sensed.PFV that Marek fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
 ‘Jan guessed that Marek fears ghosts.’
 >> Marek fears ghosts.

³The strength of the inference may also depend on aktionsart. For example, a resultative verb *wyczuć* ‘sense.PFV’ is factive, whereas the inchoative *poczuć* ‘start feeling.PFV’ is not (a similar observation holds for Czech, Radek Šimík, p.c.). It seems that inchoativity does not give rise to factivity, but to a weak truth implicature.

- (11) Jan nie / prawdopodobnie zgadł / wyczuł, że Marek
 Jan NEG probably guessed.PFV sensed.PFV that Marek
 boi się duchów.
 fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
 ‘Jan did not guess / probably guessed that Marek fears ghosts.’
 ⇒ Marek fears ghosts.

Contrary to this, no such inference appears with the particular imperfective counterparts. Example (12) shows that there is no entailment, let alone presupposition, that Marek fears ghosts when the subordinate clause is embedded under the imperfective variants of ‘guess’ / ‘sense’.

- (12) Jan zgadywał / wyczuwał, że Marek boi się duchów.
 Jan guessed.IPFV sensed.IPFV that Marek fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
 ‘Jan supposed that Marek fears ghosts.’
 → Marek fears ghosts.

As expected, the truth inference is also absent under negation and after the insertion of a modal adverbial. Consider (13).

- (13) Jan nie / prawdopodobnie zgadywał / wyczuwał, że Marek
 Jan NEG probably guessed.IPFV sensed.IPFV that Marek
 boi się duchów.
 fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
 ‘Jan did not suppose / probably supposed that Marek fears ghosts.’
 → Marek fears ghosts.

Examples (12) and (13) leave it open whether it is true that Marek fears ghosts. Other members of this class are: *odkryć*, *odkrywać* ‘discover’, *rozgryźć*, *rozgryzać* ‘figure out’, and *rozpoznać*, *rozpoznawać* ‘identify’.

4.2 Case 2: Truth entailment

Many perfective matrix verbs show an implicative behavior with respect to the truth inference of the proposition from the subordinate clause. For instance, verbs of proving seem to entail that their sentential argument is true, which can be seen in (14). *Udowodnić* and *wykazać* are much stronger in their veridicality than *pokazać* however.

- (14) Jan udowodnił / wykazał / pokazał, że Marek boi się
 Jan proved.PFV revealed.PFV showed.PFV that Marek fears.IPFV REFL
 duchów.
 ghost.PL
 ‘Jan proved / revealed / showed that Marek fears ghosts.’
 → Marek fears ghosts.

Interestingly, this inference is apparently cancelable in particular contexts. Consider (15) (cf. Anand & Hacquard 2014: 74).

- (15) Jan udowodnił Basii, że Marek boi się duchów, jednak
 Jan proved.PFV Basia.DAT that Marek fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL but
 Krzysiek w to wątpi.
 Krzysiek in this doubts
 ‘Jan proved to Basia that Marek fears ghosts, but Krzysiek doubts that.’
 → Marek fears ghosts.

All the predicates in (14) allow an overt experiencer, which makes veridicality questionable. (15) says that Jan succeeded in convincing Basia that Marek fears ghosts, but he did not manage to convince Krzysiek. As a result, the lexical entry of the matrix predicate corresponds more to *convince* than to *prove*.

The ‘weak entailment’ from (14) does not project under negation or after the insertion of a modal adverbial, which can be seen in (16).

- (16) Jan nie / prawdopodobnie udowodnił / wykazał / pokazał, że
 Jan NEG probably proved.PFV revealed.PFV showed.PFV that
 Marek boi się duchów.
 Marek fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
 ‘Jan did not prove / reveal / show / probably proved / revealed / showed
 that Marek fears ghosts.’
 → Marek fears ghosts.

Example (16) only says that Jan did not succeed / that Jan probably succeeded in providing arguments for Marek’s fear of ghosts, but it leaves it open whether the complement sentence is true or not.

We have just seen that the weak truth entailment in the case of perfective verbs of proving can disappear in particular contexts, especially after an overt realization of an experiencer. Furthermore, the significance or trustworthiness of the authority also plays a role in acknowledging a complement proposition as

veridical. No projection pattern can be observed, which means that we are not dealing with a presupposition here.

Particular imperfective forms lack any kind of truth-contributing potential. Consider example (17) for affirmative sentences.

- (17) Jan udowadniał / wykazywał / pokazywał, że Marek boi się
Jan proved.IPFV revealed.IPFV showed.IPFV that Marek fears.IPFV REFL
duchów.
ghost.PL
'Jan was proving / revealing / showing that Marek fears ghosts.'
→ Marek fears ghosts.

Example (17) asserts that Jan was trying to prove / reveal / show that Marek fears ghosts, but it does not make any statement about the final results of Jan's investigations. As expected, no truth inference can be found under negation or after the addition of a modal adverbial, which can be seen in (18).

- (18) Jan nie / prawdopodobnie udowadniał / wykazywał / pokazywał,
Jan NEG probably proved.IPFV revealed.IPFV showed.IPFV
że Marek boi się duchów.
that Marek fears.IPFV REFL ghost.PL
'Jan was not / probably proving / revealing / showing that Marek fears
ghosts.'
→ Marek fears ghosts.

Example (18) demonstrates possible modifications of the likelihood of Jan having tried to prove / reveal / show that Marek fears ghosts. No contribution to the truth-related meaning of the complement sentence can be observed. Another member of this group is for instance *przekonać, przekonywać* 'convince'.

4.3 Case 3: Truth implicature

Truth implicature refers especially to the perfective communication verbs, which differ from their imperfective counterparts in that the former, but not the latter, entail the complete realization of all parts of the speech act. Austin (1962) defines a speech act as consisting of three partial acts. The first one, a locutionary act, is the act of uttering itself. The second one, an illocutionary act, affects the area of the speaker's intention. Finally, a perlocutionary act describes an actual effect the particular speech act had on the hearer. A speech act is presumed to

be completely realized only if all three parts have been fulfilled. In Polish, perfective communication verbs, in contrast to imperfective ones, enforce complete fulfillment of all parts of the speech act, as example (19) illustrates.⁴

- (19) Iza właśnie go o tym #poinformowała / informowała, ale
 Iza just him about that informed.PFV informed.IPFV but
 przerwał jej w pół słowa.
 interrupted her in middle word
 ‘Iza has just informed / was just informing him about that, but he
 interrupted her in the middle of the sentence.’

Only *poinformowała* entails that the hearer received the information.

5 Perfectivity-dependent truthfulness

First of all, a short note on telicity should be made. My object of investigation is embedding predicates, which are transitive verbs. They all require a direct object, realized as a sentential complement; for the purpose of my analysis, I consider that-clause a definite argument. For this reason, the whole complex predicate receives a telic interpretation, independently of the (im)perfective marking on the verb. The truth inference is present when the matrix predicate has the features [+telic, +perfective], and it is absent when the matrix predicate has the features [+telic, -perfective].

Based on the influence of aspect on the interpretation of nominal arguments, I also assume a dependency between aspect and a propositional argument. The aspectual operator PFV introduces a further undefined truthfulness feature, which is specified as factive, veridical or reliable via the dependency between the truth of p (where p stands for the proposition expressed by the that-clause) and an event e described by the matrix verb. For now, the three truthfulness-realizations can be formalized as follows:⁵

- (20) For a VP with a propositional complement p
 a. $\text{PFV}(\lambda e. \llbracket \text{VP} \rrbracket(e))$ such that the truth of p is independent of e)
 $\rightarrow p$ is factive

⁴I would like to thank Manfred Krifka for inspiring this idea.

⁵The operations are based on the semantics of the perfective and not on the formation patterns. In future work, the morphology will be integrated into the semantic account (cf. Młynarczyk 2004).

- b. $\text{PFV}(\lambda e. \llbracket \text{VP} \rrbracket(e))$ such that the truth of p is dependent on e
 $\rightarrow p$ is veridical
- c. $\text{PFV}(\lambda e. \llbracket \text{VP} \rrbracket(e))$ such that the truth of p is communicated by e
 $\rightarrow p$ is reliable

Truth presupposition comes about when the truth of p is independent of the truth of e . Here, no incremental creation of belief can be observed. For example, the truth of propositions embedded under *zgadnąć* or *przewidzieć* holds independently of the process of guessing or predicting. In contrast, the truth of propositions embedded under *udowodnić*, *wykazać* or *pokazać* does depend on the result of the proving-process; we have an incremental creation of belief. This explains why the authority of an experiencer or its overt realization are crucial for judging complement sentences as veridical. In the case of truth implicature, the truth of p is ‘only’ communicated by e .

The question remains whether ‘being reliable’ should be considered a feature at all, or if it should be labeled as ‘no feature present’. In the latter case, truthfulness set up by the perfective operator would remain unrealized if the inference was an implicature. Another open question concerns the role of morphology in determining the strength of the inference. It seems that perfective underlying forms tend to enforce factive meaning of the proposition expressed by the subordinate clause. Additionally, verb semantics and argument structure may also be taken into consideration, since specifying an experiencer can influence the entailment pattern. In general, the semantic type of the matrix verb could be used to distinguish between different verb classes and to establish a more fine-grained truthfulness scale. All this will be the subject of further investigations.

In the last section of this paper I will briefly discuss the inherently factive imperfectives and their perfective counterparts. It will be shown that they constitute a unique group with factivity being an aspect-independent, lexical property of the root form, which automatically projects to the perfective derivate.

6 Remark on inherently factive imperfectives

As has been mentioned before, inherently factive imperfectives (for example emotive factives) require their complements to be true. Consider example (21).

- (21) Ania cieszyła / ucieszyła się, że idzie lato.
 Ania was.happy.IPFV was.happy.PFV REFL that comes.IPFV summer
 ‘Ania was happy / started being happy about the fact that the summer was coming.’
 >> The summer was coming.

The only difference between *cieszyła* and *ucieszyła* lies in the marking of the beginning of a state in the case of the latter. The underlying imperfective form is inherently factive (lexical factivity), so it remains factive when perfectivized. In the case of inherently factive imperfectives the perfectivizing operation leads to the marking of a temporal boundary of an event, but it does not enforce or change the truth inference of the proposition from the embedded clause (see also §1). This pattern needs to be distinguished from the ones discussed in §4 and §5, where the truth inference ascribed to the perfective was absent in the particular imperfective forms. Other inherently factive imperfectives are *rozumieć* ‘understand’ and *kapować* ‘get’.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, I demonstrated three kinds of perfectivity-dependent truth inferences in Polish: truth presupposition, truth entailment and truth implicature. In the case of truth presupposition, the proposition from the embedded clause receives a factive interpretation. The inference remains under negation or after the insertion of a modal adverbial. In the case of truth entailment, a veridical interpretation of the complement sentence can be observed; only the positive sentence is interpreted as true. In the case of truth implicature, the inference in question is neither factivity nor veridicality. It is due to a pragmatic principle giving preference to the perfective verb if the speaker assumes that the sentence subject is reliable (speaker commitment to the truth of *p*).

Despite the differences in the strength of particular inferences, the truthfulness of the proposition from the embedded clause is only due to perfectivity – it is absent with imperfective forms. Embedding by imperfective matrix verbs results in the occurrence of a neutral interpretation of a that-clause with respect to its truthfulness, provided that the embedding imperfective verb is not inherently factive. The aspectual operator PFV introduces a truthfulness feature, which is realized as factive, veridical or reliable depending on the relation between the truth of the proposition expressed by the embedded clause and an event described by the matrix verb.

The question remains as to how truthfulness interacts with perfectivity itself. In the case of communication verbs, the completedness condition of the perfective enforces the complete performance of the speech act denoted by the matrix verb. The speaker of the sentence chooses the perfective if she considers the speaker of the speech act reliable. As a result, the proposition expressed by the that-clause is understood to be true. In the case of verbs of proving, the com-

pletedness effect of the perfective interacts with the incrementality, which is a part of lexical verb semantics. A proof is a proof after its final step is completed. For verbs of guessing, the truth presupposition is triggered in combination with the integration of the proposition ‘someone guessed something’ into the common ground. The speaker uses the perfective in order to demonstrate that the guessing event has been completely realized. The cooperative hearer accepts the proposition as true, which triggers the presupposition rooted in the lexical verb semantics.⁶

In future work, a detailed study with different semantic groups of verbs will be conducted. In addition the type of embedding is to be controlled for, since it may be involved in determining the strength of the inference available. An interesting observation concerns perfective verbs of saying which embed *wh*-phrases; they seem to function as exhaustivity triggers. Thus, exhaustivity could also be used to make the truthfulness scale more fine-grained.

Abbreviations

DAT	dative	NEG	negation	REFL	reflexive
(I)PFV	(im)perfective	PL	plural		

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Luka Szucsich, Manfred Krifka and Radek Šimík. I thank Berit Gehrke, Kyle Johnson, Dara Jokilehto, Denisa Lenertová, Clemens Mayr, Roland Meyer, Brandon Waldon, Ilse Zimmermann and audiences from ZAS, HU Berlin, ELTE and MTA. I am also grateful to the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments. Finally, I thank Kirsten Brock and Jake Walsh for correcting my English. All remaining errors are my own.

This work was supported by the German Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (BMBF) (Grant No. 01UG1411).

References

- Anand, Pranav & Valentine Hacquard. 2014. Factivity, belief and discourse. In Luka Crnić & Uli Sauerland (eds.), *The art and craft of semantics: A festschrift for Irene Heim*, vol. 1, 69–90. Cambridge: MIT Working Papers in Linguistics.

⁶I would like to thank one of the anonymous reviewers for inspiring this idea.

- Austin, John L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bhatt, Rajesh. 1999. *Covert modality in non-finite contexts*. University of Pennsylvania dissertation. <https://repository.upenn.edu/dissertations/AAI9937701>.
- Borik, Olga. 2006. *Aspect and reference time*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199291298.001.0001
- Chomsky, Noam. 2001. Derivation by phase. In Michael Kenstowicz (ed.), *Ken Hale: A life in language*, 1–52. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cohen, Ariel & Manfred Krifka. 2014. Superlative quantifiers and meta-speech acts. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 37(1). 41–90. DOI:10.1007/s10988-014-9144-x
- Egré, Paul. 2008. Question-embedding and factivity. *Grazer Philosophische Studien* 77(1). 85–125.
- Filip, Hana. 1996. Integrating telicity, aspect, and NP semantics: The role of thematic structure. In Jindřich Toman (ed.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 3: The College Park Meeting 1994*, 61–96. Ann Arbor, MI: Michigan Slavic Publications.
- Filip, Hana. 2005. On accumulating and having it all: Perfectivity, prefixes and bare arguments. In Henk Verkuyl, Henriëtte de Swart & Angeliek van Hout (eds.), *Perspectives on aspect*, 125–148. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI:10.1007/1-4020-3232-3_7
- Gehrke, Berit. 2008. *Ps in motion: On the semantics and syntax of P elements and motion events*. Utrecht: LOT. <https://www.lotpublications.nl/ps-in-motion-ps-in-motion-on-the-semantics-and-syntax-of-p-elements-and-motion-events>.
- Hacquard, Valentine. 2006. *Aspects of modality*. Cambridge, MA: MIT dissertation. <https://dspace.mit.edu/handle/1721.1/37421>.
- Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. Some observations on factivity. *Papers in Linguistics* 4(1). 55–69. DOI:10.1080/08351817109370248
- Kiefer, Ferenc. 1986. Some semantic aspects of indirect speech in Hungarian. In Florian Coulmas (ed.), *Direct and indirect speech*, 201–217. Berlin: Mouton. DOI:10.1515/9783110871968.201
- Kiparsky, Paul & Carol Kiparsky. 1970. Fact. In Manfred Bierwisch & Karl Erich Heidolph (eds.), *Progress in linguistics*, 143–173. The Hague: Mouton.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1989a. *Nominalreferenz und Zeitkonstitution: Zur Semantik von Massentermen, Pluraltermen und Aspektklassen*. München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1989b. Nominalreferenz, Zeitkonstitution, Aspekt, Aktionsart: Eine semantische Erklärung ihrer Interaktion. In Werner Abraham & Theo

- Janssen (eds.), *Tempus – Aspekt – Modus: Die lexikalischen und grammatischen Formen in den germanischen Sprachen*, 227–258. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1992. Thematic relations as links between nominal reference and temporal constitution. In Ivan Sag & Anna Szabolcsi (eds.), *Lexical matters*, 29–53. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Krifka, Manfred. 1998. The origins of telicity. In Susan Rothstein (ed.), *Events and grammar*, 197–235. Dordrecht: Kluwer. DOI:[10.1007/978-94-011-3969-4_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-3969-4_9)
- Krifka, Manfred. 2015. Bias in commitment space semantics: Declarative questions, negated questions, and question tags. In Sarah D’Antonio, Mary Moroney & Carol Rose Little (eds.), *Semantics and Linguistic Theory* 25, 328–345. Washington, D.C.: LSA Open Journal Systems. DOI:[10.3765/salt.v25i0.3078](https://doi.org/10.3765/salt.v25i0.3078)
- Młynarczyk, Anna. 2004. *Aspectual pairing in Polish*. Utrecht: LOT. <https://www.lotpublications.nl/aspectual-pairing-in-polish-aspectual-pairing-in-polish>.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2010. Local contexts and local meanings. *Philosophical Studies* 151(1). 115–142. DOI:[10.1007/s11098-010-9586-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-010-9586-0)
- Strawson, Peter. 1950. On referring. *Mind* 59(235). 320–344. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2251176>.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1967. On the semantics of verbal aspect in Polish. In *To honor Roman Jakobson*, 2231–2249. The Hague: Mouton.

Name index

- Abels, Klaus, 362
Abney, Steven, 342, 417
Abraham, Werner, 72
Abulizi, Abudoukelimu, 428
Abusch, Dorit, 456, 464, 466, 471
Acquaviva, Paulo, 327
Adam, Nina, 174, 175
Adger, David, 147, 148, 151, 159, 165
Akamatsu, Tsutomu, 118
Alexiadou, Artemis, 30, 32, 36, 59
Aljović, Nadira, 344
Alsina, Aleks, 313
Altshuler, Daniel, 454
Alvestad, Silje, 289
Al'muhamedova, Z. M., 121
Anand, Pranav, 485
Anderson, Stephen, 161
Anstatt, Tanja, 130
Antonenko, Andrei, 223
Antonyuk, Svitlana, 373
Aoun, Joesph, 360
Apresjan, Jurij D., 131
Arregi, Karlos, 365
Arregui, Ana, 289
Arsenijević, Boban, 313–315
Artstein, Ron, 17
Asarina, Alya, 218, 222–224, 231, 236
Austin, John L., 130, 487
Avanesov, Ruben I., 110, 111, 114–116
Avilova, Natal'ja S., 130
Avrutin, Sergey, 386, 392
Baayen, R. Harald, 434, 435
Babby, Leonard H., 53, 55
Babyonyshev, Maria, 387, 391
Bacskai-Atkari, Julia, 3–5, 19
Bailyn, John F., 149, 232, 402
Baker, Mark C., 340, 357–359, 362, 370
Baltin, Mark, 2, 4
Bandi-Rao, Shoba, 339
Barentsen, Adrian, 305, 307
Barker, Chris, 417
Barnetová, Vilma, 233
Barrie, Michael, 316
Bartošová, Jitka, 179
Bartula, Czesław, 255
Bates, Douglas, 139, 434
Bayer, Josef, 2, 3, 5, 6, 194, 197, 368
Bech, Kristin, 1
Beck, Sigrid, 25–28, 30–33, 40
Béjar, Susana, 170
Belić, Bojan, 156
Benjamini, Yoav, 435
Berger, Tilman, 289
Bertram, Raymond, 428, 440, 442
Bhatia, Tej K., 339
Bhatt, Rajesh, 78, 178, 179, 482
Bianchi, Valentina, 4
Bittner, Maria, 357, 359, 362
Bloom, Paul, 387
Blutner, Reinhard, 30
Bobaljik, Jonathan D., 226, 315–318,

- 326, 359, 370, 405
Boersma, Paul, 285
Bondarko, Aleksandr V., 130, 132
Boneh, Nora, 43, 48
Bonet, Sebastià, 417
Borik, Olga, 54, 60, 482
Bosch, Sina, 430
Bošković, Željko, 8, 17, 162, 178, 208,
245, 247, 251, 337–343, 346,
361, 368, 402, 404
Brandner, Ellen, 2, 5
Brecht, Richard, 53, 55, 222, 233
Breu, Walter, 130, 132, 143, 289
Broekhuis, Hans, 251, 255
Browne, Wayles, 149
Brozović, Dalibor, 273
Brucart, Josep M., 417
Bruening, Benjamin, 32, 48, 360
Brysbaert, Marc, 434
Bryzgunova, Elena, 416
Bucci, Jonathan, 121
Bukrinskaja, Irina A., 115
Büring, Daniel, 415
Butt, Miriam, 365

Cable, Seth, 464
Caha, Pavel, 432, 439, 443
Campos, Hector, 382
Cardinaletti, Anna, 387, 417
Carman, J. N., 123
Carmona, Jaqueline, 387
Carvalho, Joaquim, 120
Castilla, Anny P., 387
Čavar, Damir, 251
Čavar, Małgorzata, 271–274, 278, 281,
283–285
Cheng, Lisa, 202
Chierchia, Gennaro, 121

Chomsky, Noam, 2, 18, 148, 169, 178,
244, 341, 357, 362, 384
Chumakina, Marina, 405
Chung, Sandra, 196
Cinque, Guglielmo, 210
Clahsen, Harald, 430, 432
Cohen, Ariel, 480
Comrie, Bernard, 72, 130
Cooper, Robin, 325, 326, 330
Corbett, Greville, 149, 171, 188, 313,
315
Costa, João, 387, 394
Cowper, Elizabeth, 219, 224, 226–
230, 232, 235
Cresswell, Max, 464
Crosswhite, Katherine, 109, 121, 122
Cruschina, Silvio, 4
Cubberley, Paul, 220, 221, 223
Cuervo, María, 26, 47
Cummins, George, 291, 297, 303
Cummins, Sarah, 381, 383–385, 394

Dahl, Östen, 289
Dalrymple, Mary, 170
Damborský, Jiří, 255
de Hoop, Helen, 417
De Vries, Mark, 315
De Wit, Astrid, 132, 143
Delsing, Lars-Olof, 417
den Dikken, Marcel, 339
Despić, Miloje, 314, 329, 344
Dickey, Stephen M., 129, 130, 132–
134, 289–291, 293, 294, 296,
297, 305–308
Diependaele, Kevin, 434
Diesing, Molly, 162
Dimitriadis, Alexis, 382
Dimitrova-Vulchanova, Mila, 241,
243, 248, 254

- Disner, Sandra, 265, 266
Dobrovie-Sorin, Carmen, 342
Dočekal, Mojmir, 78
Doetjes, Jenny, 79, 99–101, 417
Donazzan, Marta, 78
Dostál, Antonín, 255
Dresher, B. Elan, 109
Dryer, Matthew S., 241
Dübbers, Valentin, 289
Dvořák, Věra, 303, 382

Eckardt, Regine, 128, 131
Egré, Paul, 477, 480
Elbourne, Paul, 470
Embick, David, 219, 226
Emonds, Joseph E., 1, 384
Enguehard, Guillaume, 121, 122

Faarlund, Jan Terje, 1
Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine, 30
Farkas, Donka, 170, 178
Fehrmann, Dorothee, 54, 73, 381
Feldman, Laurie B., 428
Fellbaum, Christiane, 384
Fennig, Charles, 269
Filip, Hana, 481, 482
Filipović Đurđević, Dušica, 429, 439
Fischer, Olga, 242
Forsyth, James, 64, 132
Fortuin, Egbert, 289, 296, 302, 307
Fowler, Carol A., 428
Franks, Steven, 246, 247, 340, 371, 381, 401, 402, 418, 419
Frey, Werner, 360
Frolova, Anna, 386, 392

Galton, Herbert, 130, 132
Garde, Paul, 110, 111
Gattnar, Anja, 289

Gawron, Jean Mark, 61
Gehrke, Berit, 59, 63, 289, 482
Geurts, Bart, 64
Giannakidou, Anastasia, 224, 382
Giusti, Giuliana, 417
Gluschenko, O. A., 115
Gobeski, Adam, 81, 92, 95
Golden, Marija, 11–13, 207
Gonzales Velásquez, María Dolores, 338, 339
Gor, Kira, 428, 432, 433, 440, 442
Gordishevsky, Galina, 386, 392
Gračanin-Yuksek, Marina, 314, 315
Greenberg, Joseph H., 241
Gribanova, Vera, 47
Groefsema, Marjolein, 384
Grohmann, Kleanthes, 387
Grønn, Atle, 55, 62–65, 68, 69, 72, 292, 298, 305–307
Gruet-Skrabalova, Hana, 8, 9, 197, 198
Grüter, Theres, 387
Guasti, Maria Teresa, 387, 391

Hacking, Jane F., 221, 232, 233
Hacquard, Valentine, 479, 482, 485
Hadfield, Jarrod D, 332
Haeberli, Eric, 242
Hagstrom, Paul, 197, 198
Haider, Hubert, 360
Hale, Ken, 357, 359, 362
Hale, Mark, 109
Halle, Morris, 219, 226, 327
Hamann, Cornelia, 387
Hamann, Silke, 266, 271–273, 278, 284, 285
Hamilton, William S., 109
Harizanov, Boris, 47
Harley, Heidi, 25, 26, 179, 327, 405

Name index

- Harnish, Robert M., 131
Harrison, William, 217, 220, 221, 223
Hawkins, John A., 242
Heck, Fabian, 18
Heim, Irene, 92, 93, 177, 178, 188, 325, 456, 462, 464, 471
Hernanz, M. Lluïsa, 417
Heycock, Caroline, 170
Hjelmlev, Louis, 109, 121
Hladnik, Marko, 11–15
Hochberg, Yosef, 435
Hoekstra, Eric, 6
Hofweber, Thomas, 77
Höhle, Tilman, 360
Horn, Laurence, 94
Hornstein, Norbert, 455
House, Richard, 401, 418, 419
Hyönä, Jukka, 428

Iatridou, Sabine, 225, 226, 230
Ingham, Richard, 394
Ionin, Tania, 77, 417
Israeli, Alina, 134, 135, 143
Ivić, Pavle, 266

Jaeggli, Osvaldo A., 349
Jäger, Gerhard, 30
Jakubowicz, Celia, 387
Jespersen, Otto, 232
Johannessen, Janne Bondi, 171
Johnson, Kyle, 25–28, 30–32
Jongman, Allard, 275
Joppen, Sandra, 362
Jung, Hakyung, 243, 246, 250
Jung, Hyun Kyoung, 26
Jung, Yeun-Jin, 26
Junghanns, Uwe, 381

Kagan, Olga, 268

Kallestinova, Elena, 232
Kamp, Hans, 457
Kamphuis, Jaap, 289, 296, 302, 307
Kang, Yoonjung, 284
Kaplan, David, 464
Karlík, Petr, 171, 175, 187
Karttunen, Lauri, 477
Kaspar, Jiri, 8, 9
Katičić, Radoslav, 149
Katz, Leonard, 428
Kaye, Jonathan, 118
Kayne, Richard, 25, 26, 148, 244, 362, 408
Kegl, Judy, 384
Kelleher, Ann, 267
Kennedy, Christopher, 82, 91, 93
Keuleers, Emmanuel, 434
Khrizman, Keren, 78
Kiefer, Ferenc, 483
Kihm, Alain, 327
King, Tracy Holloway, 170, 246
Kiparsky, Carol, 477
Kiparsky, Paul, 357, 362, 477
Klein, Wolfgang, 64, 130
Knjazev, Jurij P., 55, 62
Knjazev, Sergej Vladimirovič, 121
Koivisto, Mika, 428
Kondrashova, Natalia, 234
Koopman, Hilda, 2, 362
Koschmieder, Erwin, 132
Kostić, Aleksandar, 428, 429, 432
Kramer, Ruth, 314, 315, 327
Krapova, Ilyana, 159
Kratzer, Angelika, 35, 73, 93, 325, 462
Křen, M., 79
Krifka, Manfred, 64, 94, 98, 298, 480–482
Kroch, Anthony, 148, 242

- Kučerová, Ivona, 179
 Kul'sharipova, R. E., 121
 Kupisch, Tanja, 268
 Kuryłowicz, Jerzy, 306
 Kuznetsova, Alexandra, 434
- Labov, William, 148
 Ladefoged, Peter, 265, 266, 273
 Laine, Matti, 428
 Lambova, Mariana, 251, 253, 254
 Landau, Idan, 178, 314, 330
 Landman, Fred, 77, 78
 Larsen, Uffe B., 121
 Larson, Richard, 4
 Lasersohn, Peter, 98, 170
 Lasnik, Howard, 2, 148
 Łaziński, Marek, 133–135
 Le Fleming, Stephen, 217, 220, 221, 223
- Lechner, Winfried, 30, 32, 36
 Lee, Goun, 275
 Legate, Julie Anne, 374
 Lehmann, Volkmar, 130
 Lema, José, 251
 Lenth, Russell V, 435
 Levin, Ted, 358, 362
 Lewis, David, 464
 Li, Yen-Hui Audery, 360
 Lillo-Martin, Diane, 387, 394
 Lindseth, Martina, 381
 Lipták, Anikó, 327
 Lobo, Maria, 387
 Lomashvili, Leila, 26
 Longobardi, Giuseppe, 178
 Lopes, Ruth, 387, 394
 Lukatela, Georgije, 428
 Lyashevskaya, Olga N., 434
 Łyskawa, Paulina, 284
- MacSwan, Jeff, 338
 Maddieson, Ian, 272, 273
 Maling, Joan, 367
 Marantz, Alec, 219, 226, 327, 357–359, 403, 405
- Marco, Cristina, 59
 Marelj, Marijana, 371
 Marin, Stefania, 387, 391
 Marinis, Theodoros, 387
 Martí i Girbau, M. Núria, 418
 Marušič, Franc, 4, 12, 13, 170, 193–197, 201, 203–209, 212
- Maslov, Jurij S., 62, 130, 307
 Mateu, Victoria Eugenia, 387
 Mathesius, Vilém, 55
 Matushansky, Ora, 77, 330
 McCoy, Svetlana, 197, 198
 McFadden, Thomas, 357, 359, 367–369, 405
- McIntyre, Andrew, 26, 39, 47
 McNally, Louise, 82
 Mehlig, Hans Robert, 62, 63, 130, 292
 Mel'čuk, Igor', 409
 Melara, Emilia, 229, 234
 Merchant, Jason, 4, 193–196, 203, 204, 313, 315, 316, 318, 324–327, 331, 332, 382
- Mezhevich, Ilana, 217–222, 234
 Migdalski, Krzysztof, 243, 245–251, 255
- Miletić, Branko, 270
 Milin, Petar, 429, 434, 439
 Milner, Jean-Claude, 417
 Mišeska-Tomić, Olga, 156
 Mišmaš, Petra, 8, 13, 200
 Mitrović, Moreno, 197
 Mittwoch, Anita, 306
 Miyagawa, Shigeru, 26

Name index

- Młynarczyk, Anna, 487
Morzycki, Marcin, 92, 95, 97
Moscoso del Prado Martín, Fermín, 429, 439
Mueller-Reichau, Olav, 63, 306
Müller, Gereon, 381, 432, 433, 439, 441, 442
Munn, Alan Boag, 178
Muysken, Pieter, 338
Myers, James, 388
Mykhaylyk, Roksalana, 386, 392, 393

Nagy, Naomi, 284
Narita, Hiroki, 178
Nash, Léa, 43, 48
Neokleous, Theoni, 387
Nevins, Andrew, 178, 365
Niemi, Jussi, 428
Nikolaeva, Liudmila, 188
Noyer, Rolf, 219, 226, 327
Nunes, Jairo, 316, 318

Obenauer, Hans-Georg, 194, 197
Ogihara, Toshiyuki, 454, 462–464
Opitz, Andreas, 430, 441
Orešnik, Janez, 207, 208
Otheguy, Ricardo, 268
Ott, Dennis, 210

Padgett, Jaye, 109
Padučeva, Elena V., 62, 63, 130, 131, 292, 299
Pancheva, Roumyana, 78, 92, 93, 241, 243–257, 260
Panevová, Jarmila, 171, 173, 174
Parmenter, C. E., 123
Partee, Barbara H., 462
Paslawska, Alla, 55, 60
Penke, Martina, 430, 441

Percus, Orin, 464
Pérez-Leroux, Ana Teresa, 383, 385, 387, 389
Pesetsky, David, 26, 169, 170, 313, 330, 402, 409, 413, 416
Peti-Stantić, Anita, 149
Petinou, Kakia, 387
Petkevič, Vladimír, 171, 173, 174
Petroj, Vanessa, 339, 342, 344, 345, 347, 349
Petruchina, Elena V., 130, 131, 289
Picallo, M. Carme, 224, 330
Pintzuk, Susan, 242
Plungjan, Vladimir A., 289
Polinsky, Maria, 267–269, 284
Pollock, Jean-Yves, 362
Poplack, Shana, 338
Preminger, Omer, 170, 180, 358, 359, 362
Progovac, Ljiljana, 365, 371, 375
Pshekhotskaya, Ekaterina, 44
Puškar, Zorica, 329, 331
Pylkkänen, Liina, 25, 26

Quer, Josep, 224

Radanović-Kocić, Vesna, 245, 247, 248
Radeva-Bork, Teodora, 386, 389, 390, 392
Ramchand, Gillian, 228, 229, 235
Ramos, Joan Rafel, 417
Rapp, Irene, 32, 33
Rassudova, Ol'ga P., 130
Rathmayr, Renate, 132, 135
Reiss, Charles, 109
Rett, Jessica, 96, 97
Reyle, Uwe, 457
Rezac, Milan, 170

- Rigau, Gemma, 417
 Rigaut, Catherine, 387
 Riqueros, José, 340
 Ritchie, William C., 339
 Ritter, Elizabeth, 179, 188, 218, 225, 226, 229, 230
 Rivero, María-Luisa, 251, 256, 289
 Rizzi, Luigi, 19, 194, 195, 228, 234, 384
 Rjabceva, Nadežda K., 133, 134
 Roberge, Yves, 381, 383–385, 394
 Roelofsen, Floris, 188
 Ronelle, Alexander, 161
 Rooryck, Johan, 202
 Ross, John R., 194, 196
 Rothstein, Susan, 77
 Rudin, Catherine, 8
 Rullmann, Hotze, 93

 Saab, Andrés, 327
 Samojlova, Maria, 432, 434, 439–442
 Sauerland, Uli, 199, 325, 464
 Schaeffer, Jeannette, 387, 389, 391, 392
 Schäfer, Florian, 26, 73
 Schane, Sanford A., 118, 120
 Scheer, Tobias, 121
 Schlenker, Philippe, 224, 479
 Schoorlemmer, Maaïke, 54, 55, 60
 Schulz, Katrin, 94
 Schütze, Carson, 403, 405
 Schwabe, Kerstin, 9
 Schwarzschild, Roger, 88, 91–93
 Scontras, Gregory, 267, 268
 Ségéral, Philippe, 121
 Ševa, Nada, 429
 Sharoff, Sergej, 434
 Sharvit, Yael, 454, 462, 464
 Sheppard, Milena Milojević, 12, 207
 Sigurðsson, Halldór Ármann, 405

 Silva, Carolina, 387
 Simons, Gary, 269
 Škarić, Ivo, 270, 271
 Slabakova, Roumyana, 232
 Sławski, Franciszek, 249, 250
 Sleeman, Petra, 417
 Slioussar, Natalia, 432, 434, 439–442
 Šmelev, Aleksej D., 130
 Smith, Jennifer, 147, 148, 151, 159
 Smith, Peter, 314
 Snoj, Marko, 201
 Snyder, William, 40
 Solà, Joan, 417
 Solt, Stephanie, 91
 Sonnenhauser, Barbara, 298, 307
 Sopata, Aldona, 386, 392, 393
 Spathas, Giorgos, 316, 318, 325, 326
 Spencer, Andrew, 218, 221
 Stankiewicz, Edward, 266
 Stanković, Branimir, 344
 Starke, Michal, 387
 Stephany, Ursula, 387
 Sternefeld, Wolfgang, 368
 Stiasny, Andrea, 386, 387, 391, 392
 Stiebels, Barbara, 357, 362
 Stipčević, Balša, 369, 370, 373
 Stjepanović, Sandra, 361
 Strawson, Peter, 478
 Struckmeier, Volker, 210
 Stunová, Anna, 289, 305, 307, 308
 Sudo, Yasutada, 177, 178, 316, 318, 325, 326
 Sussex, Roland, 409
 Švedova, Natalija J., 132
 Švedova, Natalija Ju., 55
 Svenonius, Peter, 40, 228, 229, 235
 Svetozarova, Natalija Dmitrievna, 121

Name index

- Swan, Oscar, 130
- Talić, Aida, 344
- Tatevosov, Sergei, 35, 36, 40, 301, 307
- Tedeschi, Roberta, 387, 391
- Terzi, Arhonto, 387
- Thepboriruk, Kanjana, 284
- Titov, Elena, 361, 415, 416, 422
- Todorović, Dejan, 428
- Todorović, Nataša, 156
- Todorović, Neda, 156, 157, 159, 160, 164
- Toman, Jindřich, 259
- Tomić, Olga Mišeska, 248, 249
- Toporišič, Jože, 207
- Torrego, Esther, 169, 170
- Trousdale, Graeme, 147, 148, 151
- Tryzna, Marta, 386, 392, 393
- Tsakali, Vina, 387
- Uhmann, Susanne, 360
- Ungureanu, Manuela, 342
- Uriagereka, Juan, 338
- Vaillant, André, 257
- Van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen, 195
- Van der Sandt, Rob, 64
- van Gelderen, Elly, 2, 5, 6
- van Hout, Angeliek, 384
- van Rooij, Robert, 94
- Varlokosta, Spyridoula, 384, 389, 394
- Vasilyeva, Maria D., 431
- Večerka, Radoslav, 257
- Velnić, Marta, 361
- Veltman, Calvin, 269, 283
- Vennemann, Theo, 241
- Vicente, Luis, 204
- Vinokurova, Nadya, 357, 359, 362
- von Fintel, Kai, 100
- von Stechow, Arnim, 25, 30, 32, 33, 55, 60, 92, 93, 360, 462, 464
- Vulchanov, Valentin, 241, 243, 248, 254
- Vysotskij, S. S., 121
- Wągiel, Marcin, 78, 87, 99
- Walkden, George, 1
- Walkow, Martin, 178, 179
- Wang, Qi, 387, 394
- Wechsler, Stephen, 313, 329
- Wedel, Andrew, 273
- Weenink, David, 285
- Wexler, Kenneth, 387, 391
- Wiemer, Björn, 133–135, 142, 289, 293
- Wierzbicka, Anna, 481
- Wiese, Bernd, 431–433, 439, 441, 442
- Wilder, Chris, 251
- Wilkinson, Karina, 91, 93
- Willis, David, 243, 252, 255, 257, 258
- Wiltshko, Martina, 188, 218, 219, 224–226, 229, 230
- Wood, Jim, 359, 370
- Wunderlich, Dieter, 357, 362, 430, 432, 439, 441, 442
- Wurmbrand, Susanne, 156, 157, 159, 160, 164
- Xu, Ting, 47
- Yadloff, Michael, 409, 410, 421
- Yatsushiro, Kazuko, 199
- Yip, Moira, 357, 405
- Yu, Kristine, 161
- Zaenen, Annie, 366, 405
- Zaliznjak, Anna A., 130
- Zaliznyak, Andrey, 433
- Zamparelli, Roberto, 170

Žaucer, Rok, 208
Zec, Draga, 170, 178
Zimmermann, Malte, 11, 197, 210
Zlatić, Larica, 313, 329
Zlatoustova, L. B, 121
Zocca, Cynthia Levart, 315–318, 326
Žygis, Marzena, 266

Language index

Abkhaz, 273

Baltic, 105

Basque, 365

BCS, 208, 265, 266, 266¹, 267, 269, 271, 272⁷, 273, 275¹⁰, 283, 286, 314, 315, 317, 320, 326, 332, 360

Belarusian, 290, 291

Bohemian, 171⁴, 188

Bosnian, 265, 267, 273⁸, 278, 279, 284–286, 320

Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, *see* BCS

Brazilian Portuguese, 315, 317, 382, 384, 388, 390, 391, 393–395

British English, 284

Bulgarian, 243–256, 260, 340, 382, 384–386, 388–390, 392, 393, 395

Čakavian, 266, 272

Catalan, 224, 384, 388, 390, 391, 393, 395, 418

Chinese, 47¹³, 272, 340³, 382, 384, 386, 388, 390, 391, 393–395

Croatian, 148–151, 153, 155, 163–165, 201, 245², 246, 249, 250, 256, 265, 267, 270–273, 278, 279, 284–286, 290, 320, 361¹, 361², 365, 382, 384, 386, 388–390, 392, 393, 395, 413¹⁵

Czech, 7, 8, 8⁹, 9, 9¹¹, 10, 10¹³, 11, 12, 12¹⁷, 13–16, 18, 20, 21, 73, 78, 79, 79², 81, 83, 84, 84⁹, 86, 87¹², 91–93, 96, 97, 99, 104, 105, 133, 149, 170, 170², 171⁵, 174, 175, 176¹¹, 180, 186–188, 197, 197⁷, 198, 201, 246, 258, 259, 290–294, 296–301, 303–307, 382, 481, 483³

Danish, 4²

English, 1¹, 2–8, 11, 14, 17, 18, 20, 25, 25¹, 26, 27, 27², 27³, 29, 30, 31⁶, 32, 32⁷, 34, 35⁹, 39, 42, 47, 48, 59, 72, 77, 78, 78¹, 81⁶, 83, 87¹², 92, 131, 131³, 148, 198, 204, 212, 227–229, 229², 234, 235, 242, 266, 267, 268³, 269, 273, 274, 278, 283, 284, 286, 340, 341, 382, 383¹, 384, 385, 388, 391, 393, 395, 403³, 404⁴, 455⁵, 456, 457, 471–473, 481, 490

Finnish, 340, 428, 443

French, 56, 78, 99, 202, 383¹, 384, 386, 388, 391, 393, 395, 482

Georgian, 382

German, 1¹, 3, 5³, 7⁸, 11¹⁵, 15²³, 20, 33, 33⁸, 34, 35⁹, 59, 59⁵, 60, 149,

- 197, 207, 210, 210¹⁵, 224, 225,
242, 271, 273, 367, 368, 369⁶,
382, 430, 490
- Germanic, 1, 1¹, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10¹³, 11, 15–
20, 243
- Greek, 315, 316, 325, 326, 340, 382,
384, 386, 388, 390, 393, 395,
482²
- Hebrew, 454, 454²
- Hindi, 340, 482²
- Hungarian, 78, 483
- Icelandic, 224, 359, 366, 370
- Ijekavian, 149
- Irish, 4²
- Italian, 123, 384, 388, 390–393, 395
- Kajkavian, 266, 272
- Latin, 276, 320, 340
- Macedonian, 247, 340
- Moravian, 171⁴, 187, 188
- Polish, 78, 84⁹, 132, 133, 246³, 250,
258, 259, 265, 266¹, 271,
272, 285, 285¹⁴, 290–300,
300¹⁰, 304–308, 382, 384,
386, 388–395, 477, 480–483,
487, 489
- Romance, 340
- Romanian, 338, 339, 341, 342, 342⁵,
343–345, 345⁸, 346–351,
351¹³, 352, 353, 384, 388,
391–393, 395
- Russian, 25, 25¹, 27, 27², 27³, 28, 29,
31⁶, 32, 34, 35, 35⁹, 37, 39,
40, 40¹¹, 41, 42, 44, 47, 47¹³,
48, 53–56, 60, 61, 64⁸, 67⁹,
71–73, 78, 84⁹, 109–114, 117,
119–122, 122¹⁰, 123, 128–130,
130², 131–133, 135, 136, 136⁶,
143, 197, 198, 198⁸, 217–221,
226, 228, 229, 229³, 230, 231,
234–238, 246³, 250, 258⁶,
259⁷, 290–294, 296, 300¹⁰,
304–308, 361², 382, 384,
386, 388–393, 395, 401, 402¹,
403, 403³, 404, 404⁴, 405,
405⁴, 405⁵, 406, 406⁷, 411,
413¹⁵, 413¹⁶, 414, 415¹⁸, 416,
419, 422, 428, 431–433, 434²,
438–441, 443, 453, 454, 454¹,
454², 454³, 455–459, 462,
463, 468, 472, 473
- Serbian, 149, 150, 153, 160, 162–165,
245, 265, 267, 273⁸, 278, 279,
284–286, 290, 320, 338–340,
340⁴, 341–345, 345⁸, 346–
351, 351¹³, 352, 353, 360–
362, 368, 368⁵, 370, 373⁸,
375, 428, 429, 439, 443
- Slavic, v, vi, 3, 15–20, 53, 54, 73,
73¹², 78, 78¹, 92, 96, 165, 187,
188, 197, 201, 243, 245, 245²,
246–249, 251, 252, 255, 256,
259⁷, 260, 265, 266², 289–
291, 307, 308, 340, 381, 383,
386, 388, 390, 392, 393
- Slavonic, 201, 243, 247, 248, 250–254,
254⁴, 255–257, 260
- Slovak, 133, 246
- Slovene, 290
- Slovenian, 4², 8¹⁰, 8⁹, 11, 12¹⁷, 13¹⁸, 14,
14²¹, 15, 16, 18–21, 84⁹, 194,
194¹, 194³, 195–197, 197⁷,

198, 198⁸, 200, 201, 203–210,
210¹⁵, 211, 212, 246, 250
Spanish, 59, 224, 268, 283, 340, 349¹²,
382, 384, 388, 390, 391, 393,
395
Štokavian, 266, 272
Swahili, 382

Turkish, 149

Ubykh, 273
Ukrainian, 291, 384, 386, 388, 390–
393, 395
Uyghur, 428, 443

Subject index

- accusative, 27, 27², 35, 37, 38, 43, 45, 157, 208, 244, 247, 248, 349¹², 358, 359, 362, 363, 365, 371⁷, 373, 375, 435, 441, 442
- adjective, 55, 56, 58–61, 65, 71, 73, 78, 78¹, 84, 84⁹, 85–87, 87¹², 88, 89, 92, 96–99, 104, 151, 174, 176, 185, 186, 242, 315, 318, 323, 329, 330, 332, 340³, 341, 342, 342⁶, 344, 345, 345⁹, 346, 347, 403³, 409¹¹, 413, 413¹⁶, 414, 428, 430, 441
- adverb, 27, 32–35, 37¹⁰, 39, 44, 47, 47¹³, 100, 197, 199, 201, 210, 211, 246, 254
- adverbial, 61, 78¹, 84, 85, 89, 98, 254, 455, 456, 458, 470, 472, 473
- affricate, 272, 273, 280
- agreement, v, 148, 164, 170, 170¹, 171, 171⁵, 172–174, 174⁹, 175, 175¹⁰, 176–179, 181–188, 199⁹, 225, 227, 229–231, 313, 314, 315¹, 318, 319, 322–324, 326⁶, 327–330, 332, 340³, 345, 345⁹, 382, 405, 412, 413, 413¹⁴, 414, 416, 416¹⁹, 419, 421²², 422, 459
- anaphora, 65, 70
- animate, 38, 170–174, 174⁹, 175, 175¹⁰, 176, 176¹¹, 179, 180, 182, 183, 188, 392, 394, 421
- applicative, 26, 32⁷, 44, 45, 47–49
- archiphoneme, 117–120
- aspect, 55, 62, 72, 73, 129, 132–134, 143, 197, 199–201, 211, 219, 229, 236, 289–291, 294, 298, 303–305, 307, 308, 478, 480, 487, 489
- case assignment, 231, 358, 359, 363–365, 369, 375
- case feature, 358, 359, 362, 413¹⁶
- clitic, 9, 12¹⁷, 151, 162, 200, 203, 204, 207, 231, 244, 245, 245², 246–249, 252–254, 258⁶, 375, 384, 385, 389, 394
- clitic cluster, 150, 196, 207–209, 210¹⁴, 212
- clitic placement, 151, 154, 164, 207, 243, 248, 249
- cliticization, 243–247, 249, 258⁶
- comparative, 88, 90, 92, 96, 103, 104, 290
- complement clause, 222, 224, 234–236, 454, 455, 462, 482
- complementary distribution, 2, 9, 14, 87, 235, 371
- complementizer, 2–4, 4², 5, 5⁵, 5⁶, 9¹¹, 10, 11, 12¹⁷, 13¹⁸, 15, 18, 18²⁶, 19, 20, 96, 156, 197, 197⁷, 201, 207, 208, 222, 223, 232, 233, 235, 247, 257, 258

Subject index

- conjunct, 97, 171⁵, 173⁸, 174, 177, 179,
183, 185, 186, 233, 319, 329,
332, 467
- conjunction phrase, 176–186
- consonant, 111, 112, 114, 120, 285¹⁴
- contrastive, 361, 414, 416, 422, 423
- contrastive focus, 162, 198, 202,
203¹³, 233
- dative, 25, 27, 27², 29, 35, 37–
39, 41–49, 152², 208, 223,
231, 247, 359, 360, 363–366,
368⁵, 369, 369⁶, 370, 372–
375, 433, 435, 438, 441
- definite article, 342⁶, 344, 345, 347
- dialect continuum, 148, 149, 151, 161,
164
- direct object, 26, 28, 32⁷, 38, 44–46,
49, 241, 349, 360, 383, 389,
392, 394, 481, 487
see also DO
- discourse particle, 193, 197⁷, 199, 202
- ditransitive, 26, 27, 29–32, 32⁷, 35,
37–39, 41–43, 47, 349, 351¹³,
369, 370, 373, 375
- DO, 26, 349, 351, 352, 354, 360–362,
365, 372, 375
see also direct object
- double object, 27, 42¹², 351, 360
- double object construction, 25, 26,
27², 28⁴, 30, 32, 32⁷, 40, 47,
48, 375
- echo interpretation, 10, 11, 14–16, 20
- ellipsis, 4², 194, 196, 210¹⁵, 315, 316,
318, 325, 327, 328, 331, 332,
366
- entailment, 329, 478, 479, 482, 482²,
484, 485, 488
- equative, 95, 96, 103
- ergative, 358, 359, 362, 363, 365, 370,
374
- experiencer, 150, 155, 156, 163–165,
485, 486, 488
- external argument, 160, 231, 364, 372,
373
- factivity, 73, 477–480, 482, 483, 483³,
487–489
- feature geometry, 178, 180, 219, 226,
228
- feature resolution, 170, 171⁵, 172, 176,
177, 181, 186, 188
- feminine, 151, 170, 171, 171³, 174, 175,
180, 182, 183, 314–316, 318,
319, 322–324, 326, 326⁶, 327,
329, 330, 332, 403³, 421²²,
429, 431–433, 433¹, 435–442
- finite complementizer, 2, 5, 6, 16, 17,
19, 20
- functional load, 269, 273
- future, 37¹⁰, 66, 71, 102, 129, 130, 132,
134, 135, 135⁵, 136, 138–141,
161, 188, 219, 222, 224, 235–
237, 258, 329, 338, 351¹³,
367⁴, 368⁵, 375, 404, 405⁴,
457, 460, 462, 466⁹, 471, 473,
480, 487⁵, 490
- gender, 170–178, 180–185, 314, 315,
315¹, 316–318, 323, 325–327,
329–332, 345⁹, 388, 421²²,
433, 435, 435⁶, 437
- genitive, 359, 367, 367⁴, 401, 402,
402¹, 403, 403³, 404, 404⁴,
405–408, 411–414, 418, 419,
431, 433¹, 436–438, 440, 442

- grammatical gender, 314, 315, 318,
324, 326, 327, 330–332
- head directionality, 241–243, 246,
249, 258⁶, 259
- heritage language, 266–268, 268³,
269, 277, 284
- imperfective, 54–64, 64⁸, 65–73, 137,
219, 289, 290, 292, 292²,
293–296, 296⁶, 297, 297⁷,
298–300, 300¹⁰, 303–306,
306¹⁵, 307, 478–482, 484,
486, 487, 489
- implicature, 94, 298, 479, 480, 482,
483, 486, 488
- inanimate, 170, 171, 171³, 173, 175, 179,
180, 182, 297, 392, 394, 420,
421, 431
- indirect object, 26–28, 32⁷, 349, 360
see also IO
- infinitive, 130, 154, 157, 159–161, 218,
223, 229, 231
- inflectional class, 429, 439, 440
- information structure, 20, 63, 64, 68,
71
- instrumental, 61, 88¹⁴, 432, 433, 437–
440
- internal argument, 87, 352, 353, 373
- interrogative, 2, 4–6, 9–11, 14²¹, 15–
17, 17²⁴, 18, 19, 197
- IO, 349, 351, 352, 354, 360–362
see also indirect object
- language change, 257⁵, 267, 268, 284,
286
- LBE, 338, 340, 340³, 340⁴, 341–
343, 346–351, 351¹³, 352–
354, 368⁵
- left branch extraction, *see* LBE
- left periphery, 46, 194–196, 201, 206,
210, 210¹⁴, 212
- lexical decomposition, 26, 30, 33, 42
- lexicalization, 2–5, 7, 7⁸
- locative, 29, 40, 44–47, 49, 431, 433,
435, 437–439, 441, 442
- main clause, 2, 7, 10, 11, 11¹⁵, 13–15,
15²³, 454, 458
- masculine, 151, 170, 171, 171³, 172–174,
174⁹, 175, 176, 179, 180, 182,
183, 314–316, 318, 319, 322–
324, 326, 328–332, 421²²,
429, 431–433, 433¹, 435–442
- matrix clause, 157³, 218, 223, 224, 231,
234, 235, 460, 469–472
- matrix verb, 157, 159, 235, 236, 480–
482, 487–490
- modal adverbial, 478, 483–486, 489
- mutual entailment, 324, 325, 327,
329, 331, 332
- narrow syntax, 169, 170, 177, 178, 181,
186, 362
- natural gender, 314, 318, 324, 326–
328, 330–332
- negation, 63, 66, 67, 69, 69¹¹, 110¹,
207, 210¹⁵, 243, 251, 256–
258, 258⁶, 259, 260, 478,
483–486, 489
- neuter, 151, 170–173, 175, 176, 176¹¹,
180–182
- nominal, 70, 78, 84, 84⁹, 85, 87–89, 97,
171, 178, 241, 242, 315, 327,
330, 427, 428, 430, 432, 439,
481, 482, 487
- nominalization, 65, 71

Subject index

- nominative, 111⁴, 174, 185, 223, 227, 229, 231, 358, 359, 365, 370, 371, 403, 403³, 405, 412, 413, 416, 419, 428, 430, 431, 433, 433¹, 435–438, 442
- null object, 381, 383¹, 385, 386, 392–394
- numeral, 78, 83, 91, 94, 102, 402, 402¹, 403, 403², 403³, 404, 404⁴, 405, 405⁴, 406, 407, 407⁹, 408, 408¹⁰, 412, 413, 413¹⁶, 414–419, 421²², 422, 423
- object drop, 381–383, 388, 392–395
- object omission, 382, 384, 390–395
- oblique case, 428, 430–432, 436, 438, 440, 443
- participle, 53, 56, 57, 59, 60, 68, 71, 174, 220, 251–258, 258⁶, 315
- partitive, 93, 103, 407, 417, 417²¹, 418, 419, 422, 423, 481
- past, 53, 55–58, 63, 64, 66, 69¹⁰, 71–73, 137–140, 144, 159–161, 174, 218–220, 223–232, 235–238, 251–253, 258, 260, 292, 293, 454–457, 459–464, 466, 466⁹, 467, 468, 470–473
- perfective, 54, 54¹, 55, 56, 60, 62, 63, 64⁸, 65, 66, 69, 71, 73, 129, 132, 133, 135–137, 142, 219, 221, 229³, 258, 289–291, 293–300, 300¹⁰, 301, 302, 304–306, 306¹⁵, 307, 308, 392, 478–484, 486, 487, 487⁵, 488–490
- performative speech act, 128, 129, 131, 133–136, 139, 143, 144
- plural, 170, 173, 175, 176¹¹, 177, 179–182, 259, 401–403, 403³, 405, 406, 408, 411–414, 417–419, 422, 431, 432, 433¹, 438–443
- polar operator, 3, 7, 17, 19
- prenominal modifier, 151, 162
- present, v, vi, 8⁹, 11¹⁵, 14²⁰, 15, 16, 18²⁵, 18²⁶, 20, 37, 37¹⁰, 39, 43, 48, 78, 79, 109, 128–130, 131³, 132, 133, 135–144, 148–150, 154, 156, 157, 157³, 158, 159, 159⁵, 160–165, 177, 178, 182, 187, 188, 196, 199, 218, 219, 222, 224, 227¹, 235, 236, 238, 243, 253, 255, 260, 278, 289, 290, 296, 301, 305, 331, 346, 348, 358, 368⁵, 369, 370, 385, 386, 388, 390, 391, 393, 402, 402¹, 404⁴, 406⁶, 407, 414–416, 418, 429, 430, 441, 443, 455⁵, 456, 462, 468, 471–473, 478, 483, 487, 488
- presupposition, 30, 64, 136, 198⁸, 325–328, 332, 456, 460–464, 466, 466⁹, 467, 472, 473, 478–480, 483, 484, 486, 488–490
- pretonic, 111, 111³, 112, 113, 115, 116, 121, 122
- processing, 351¹³, 427–432, 438, 439, 441–443
- pronominal, 70, 159, 210¹⁴, 243, 244, 245², 246, 246³, 247–250, 254, 385, 462, 470
- pronoun, 60, 63, 70, 96, 178, 315¹, 375, 384, 389, 394
- repetitive, 27, 27³, 30, 30⁵, 31, 32, 32⁷, 33, 35⁹, 36, 37, 37¹⁰, 39, 44,

- 47, 47¹³
- restitutive, 27, 27², 28, 28⁴, 29–32, 32⁷, 33, 33⁸, 34, 35, 35⁹, 36, 37¹⁰, 38–44, 47, 47¹³, 48, 49
- second position, 12¹⁷, 201, 207, 232, 235, 243–245, 245², 246–248, 250, 256, 258⁶
- semantic recoverability, 410, 422, 423
- semantics, v, 17, 27, 30, 30⁵, 32, 35, 37, 39, 47, 55, 64, 78, 79, 83, 91–93, 96–98, 102–104, 143, 157⁴, 162, 165, 177, 179, 182, 226–228, 230, 232, 235–237, 257, 291, 298, 300¹⁰, 301, 305, 307, 318, 383, 412, 456, 460–462, 466, 467, 469–471, 474, 480, 481, 487⁵, 488, 490
- sibilant, 274, 285, 286
- sluice, 204, 205, 210
- small clause, 25–27, 28⁴, 29–32, 32⁷, 34, 39–41, 45, 47, 48
- soft consonant, 112–114, 116, 117, 119
- specifier, 2, 4, 5⁶, 10, 12¹⁷, 13¹⁸, 15–17, 20, 28⁴, 32⁷, 231, 245²
- speech act, 128–131, 131⁴, 132–134, 136, 141–143, 480, 487, 490
- speech act verb, 128–132, 134, 135, 140, 141, 143
- spell-out domain, 338, 351, 351¹³, 353, 354
- stative, 27, 29–31, 34, 35, 37, 37¹⁰, 39, 41–48, 61⁶, 101, 102, 227, 229, 229³
- structural case, 404, 405
- subjunctive, 217, 219–226, 229, 232, 235–237
- subjunctive mood, 217, 219, 221, 224
- subordinate clause, 223, 478, 478¹, 484, 488
- syncretism, 170, 171⁴, 176, 187, 188, 403³, 431, 432, 435, 439
- syntax-semantics interface, 26, 170, 177, 178, 181, 186
- topicalization, 245, 254, 254⁴, 255, 406, 407, 407⁸, 418, 419, 422, 423
- transitive verb, 150, 155, 156, 163, 164
- unaccusative, 373, 375, 385
- verbal, 37, 39, 55, 56, 59–61, 65, 70, 71, 73, 120, 128, 130², 134, 143, 149, 177, 227, 242–244, 248, 256, 292, 480–482
- vowel inventory, 111–114, 116, 117
- vowel reduction, 109–113, 115, 117, 120–123
- word order, v, 27², 35, 47¹³, 56, 68, 71, 72, 231, 242, 252, 253, 360, 361, 361², 362, 368⁵, 369, 373, 374, 407⁸

Did you like this book?

This book was brought to you for free

Please help us in providing free access to linguistic research worldwide. Visit <http://www.langsci-press.org/donate> to provide financial support or register as a community proofreader or typesetter at <http://www.langsci-press.org/register>.

./langsci/graphics/langsci_

Advances in formal Slavic linguistics 2016

Advances in Formal Slavic Linguistics 2016 initiates a new series of collective volumes on formal Slavic linguistics. It presents a selection of high quality papers authored by young and senior linguists from around the world and contains both empirically oriented work, underpinned by up-to-date experimental methods, as well as more theoretically grounded contributions. The volume covers all major linguistic areas, including morphosyntax, semantics, pragmatics, phonology, and their mutual interfaces. The particular topics discussed include argument structure, word order, case, agreement, tense, aspect, clausal left periphery, or segmental phonology. The topical breadth and analytical depth of the contributions reflect the vitality of the field of formal Slavic linguistics and prove its relevance to the global linguistic endeavour. Early versions of the papers included in this volume were presented at the conference on Formal Description of Slavic Languages 12 or at the satellite Workshop on Formal and Experimental Semantics and Pragmatics, which were held on December 7–10, 2016 in Berlin.

ISBN 978-3-96110-127-6



9 783961 101276