

# Chapter 16

## Adverbial modification with causative verbs

Uwe Junghanns

University of Göttingen

It is not unusual to render the meaning of verbs just by naming a monolithic semantic predicate and indicating its adicity. This approach does not uncover the differences between various verb classes, however. One type of evidence that speaks against such treatment is modification. In the present chapter, I will show that the various cases of adverbial modification with causative verbs require the decomposition of their lexical meaning. Consequently, the semantic representations must display a higher degree of granularity than Davidson (1967b) suggested for action verbs. Adverbials may be anchored to variables that refer to cause, effect, or state. A dilemma emerges: Semantic integration of an adverbial modifier requires that the relevant variable be bound by a  $\lambda$ -operator (cf. Higginbotham 1985, Bierwisch 1988, von Stechow 2012). Only the highest-ranked referential argument variable can be  $\lambda$ -bound at the point of determining reference. I will offer a solution that is based on the modification template as originally proposed by Zimmermann (1992). The template, however, needs to be refined in order for technical implementation to work and, thus, cover the entire range of cases. The empirical data discussed in the present chapter come from the Slavic languages.

### 1 Introduction

The investigation presented in this contribution is concerned with causative verbs, adverbial modifiers and their “anchors” (i.e. the targets of adverbial predication). As will be seen, the question of how to integrate adverbials in sentence semantics is of crucial importance. There must be more than one way of integra-



tion – adverbial modifiers may target different entities, not only events as such.<sup>1</sup> Looking from another angle, we find that adverbials may be used as a heuristic means to pin down the meaning structure of causative verbs.

An initial observation is that adverbials have the potential to be related to a diversity of aspects of what is communicated: the causing situation – (1a)–(1b), the agent – (1c), the caused situation – (1d), the duration of the resulting state (1e), or the degree, the extent of the resulting state – (1f).<sup>2,3</sup> The mapping from abstract sentence semantics to conceptual structure would have to be taken as intransparent, if the semantic decomposition of the involved causative verbs was not assumed.

- (1) a. [XP V pátek] 25letý útočník zabil  
on Friday.ACC 25\_year\_old attacker.NOM.SG.M kill.LP.SG.M  
jednoho policistu.  
one.GEN/ACC.SG.M policeman.ACC.SG.M  
'On Friday a twenty-five-year-old attacker killed a police officer.'  
(Cz, cf. novinky.cz 2021\_0403)
- b. Nacbank [XP mynuloho týžnja] prodav  
national\_bank.NOM.SG.M last.GEN week.GEN sell.LP.SG.M  
rekordnu kil'kist' valjuty.  
record.ACC amount.ACC convertible\_currency.GEN  
'Last week the National Bank sold a record sum of convertible  
currency.'  
(Ukr, pravda.com.ua 2022\_0530)
- c. Toj [XP namerno] go skrši  
3SG.M.NOM intentionally CL.3SG.M.ACC break.AOR.3SG  
prozorecot.  
window.SG.M.DEF  
'He broke the window intentionally.'  
(Mac)

<sup>1</sup>Events as targets of adverbial modifiers were originally suggested by Davidson (1967b).

<sup>2</sup>The examples that are used to illustrate the points made in this contribution come from the Slavic languages. Languages are abbreviated as follows: BCS (Bosnian, Croatian, Serbian) · Bel(arusian) · Bg (Bulgarian) · Croat(ian) · Cz(ech) · LSorb (Lower Sorbian) · Mac(edonian) · OCS (Old Church Slavonic) · Po(lish) · Ru(ssian) · Serb(ian) · Sk (Slovak) · Slvn (Slovenian) · Ukr(ainian) · USorb (Upper Sorbian). For examples that were extracted from websites, the date when the news report appeared is specified. Where no source is indicated, the examples were constructed and discussed with native speakers.

<sup>3</sup>In the example sentences, the adverbials that are relevant for the discussion are given in square brackets. The label XP is meant to cover different cases of realization, with the syntactic head X ∈ {P, N, Adv}, cf., e.g., (1a)–(1c). One should, however, bear in mind that there are good reasons to analyze all occurrences of adverbials as PPs. I refrain from discussing the details of such a unified analysis here.

- d. Vratata se zatvori [<sub>XP</sub> s trjasâk].  
 door.SG.F.DEF REFL close.AOR.3SG with bang  
 ‘The door closed with a bang.’ (Bg)
- e. Neugomonnaja vražda nas razdelila [<sub>XP</sub>  
 incessant.NOM.SG.F enmity.NOM.SG.F 1PL.ACC divide.LP.SG.F  
 navsegda]!  
 for\_good.ADV  
 ‘Incessant enmity divided us for good!’ (Ru, Lermontov: *Dva brata*)
- f. Siły rosyjskie [<sub>XP</sub> całkowicie] zniszczyły  
 force.NOM.PL Russian.NOM.PL completely destroy.LP.PL  
 Donbas.  
 Donbas.ACC  
 ‘Russian (military) forces completely destroyed the Donbas.’  
 (Po, tvn24.pl 2022\_0520)

It is important to emphasize that, in the semantic field of causativity, we have to distinguish between lexical causatives and causative constructions (Kulikov 2001).<sup>4</sup> The differences between the two types manifest themselves in the number of lexical items involved, the steps and complexity of syntactic structure building, and the way in which the semantic representation of the sentence is created.

The examples in (2)–(5) present verbs that are lexically causative. Since the Slavic languages are morphologically rich, one would expect causative verbs to be recognizable by a morphological marker. However, not every causative verb has an exponent of causativity, e.g., a suffix. Compare the (a) and (b)-examples in (2)–(5). Evidently, derived causative verbs form only a subset of the entire set.

(2) Russian:

- a. vy/žec’ (PFV/IPFV, vt) ‘burn’ < \*žēg-ti<sup>5,6</sup>  
 b. vy/suš-i-t’ (PFV/IPFV, vt) ‘dry’ < \*sux- ‘dry’

(3) Polish:

- a. u/kraść (PFV/IPFV, vt) ‘steal’ < \*krad-ti  
 b. u/top-i-ć (PFV/IPFV, vt) ‘drown, immerse sb., sth.’ < \*top-<sup>7</sup>

<sup>4</sup>For lexical causatives, see, e.g., Fabricius-Hansen (1991). Causative constructions are dealt with by Song (2011a,b), inter alia.

<sup>5</sup>The convention of historical linguistics to mark reconstructed forms with an asterisk is used where applicable.

<sup>6</sup>-ti is the infinitive marker in Proto-Slavic. The modern Slavic languages show variants of the marker that resulted from language-specific changes. The prefixes (separated by the slash) contribute perfective (grammatical) aspect.

<sup>7</sup>Compare *to-nq-ć* (vi) ‘drown, sink, go under (in water)’ < \*top-nq-ti (Leskien 1922: 60).

(4) Croatian:

- a. po/mes-ti (PFV/IPFV, vt) ‘sweep (out)’ < \*met-ti
- b. po/čist-i-ti (PFV/IPFV, vt) ‘clean’ < \*čist- ‘clean’

(5) Slovenian:

- a. iz/bos-ti (PFV/IPFV, vt) ‘gouge out; sting’ < \*bod-ti
- b. iz/modr-i-ti (PFV/IPFV, vt) ‘make sb. wise’ < \*mōdr- ‘wise’

Causative constructions are syntactically complex structures in contrast to causative verbs, which are syntactic atoms.<sup>8</sup> See examples (6a)–(6h).

- (6) a. Cēsar’i sŭtvori jŭ slyšati rěči sijq.  
 emperor.NOM make.AOR.3SG 3SG.M.ACC hear.INF speech.ACC this.ACC  
 ‘The Emperor had him (Constantine) listen to this matter (lit. speech).’  
 (OCS, *Vita Constantini*)
- b. Evo ću ih učiniti da dođu i da  
 behold AUX.1SG CL.3PL.ACC make.INF PRTCL come.PRS.3PL and PRTCL  
 se poklone pred nogama tvojim.  
 REFL bow.PRS.3PL before feet.INS.PL your.INS.PL  
 ‘Behold, I will make them come and bow before thy feet.’  
 (Serb, Rev. 3:9)
- c. Učinio ju je da u životu ponovo  
 make.LP.SG.M CL.3SG.F.ACC AUX.3SG PRTCL in life.LOC anew.ADV  
 vidi smisao.  
 see.PRS.3SG sense.ACC  
 ‘He brought about that she perceived her life as meaningful once again.’  
 (Croat, cf. jutarnji.hr 2022\_0715)
- d. Turecký prezident nechal  
 Turkish.NOM.SG.M president.NOM.SG.M let.LP.SG.M  
 ruského prezidenta čakať takmer  
 Russian.GEN/ACC.SG.M president.GEN/ACC.SG.M wait.INF almost  
 minútu.  
 minute.ACC  
 ‘The Turkish president let the Russian president wait for almost a minute.’  
 (Sk, startitup.sk 2022\_0720)

<sup>8</sup>A lexicalist approach to morphology is adopted here.

- e. Žona            zmusila        go            do    sprzedania PS5.  
 wife.NOM.SG.F force.LP.SG.F CL.3SG.M.ACC into selling.GEN PS5.GEN  
 ‘His wife forced him to sell the PlayStation 5.’  
 (Po, tech.wp.pl 2020\_1130)
- f. Ty            sy            ju            glucnu            wucynił.  
 2SG.NOM AUX.2SG 3SG.F.ACC happy.ACC.SG.F make.LP.3SG.M  
 ‘You made her happy.’  
 (LSorb, <https://niedersorbisch.de/dnw/woerterbuch/machen>)
- g. Anonimnyj            žurnalist            podverg            operu  
 anonymous.NOM.SG.M journalist.NOM.SG.M subject.LP.SG.M opera.ACC  
 Šostakoviča            rezkoj            kritike.  
 Shostakovich.GEN harsh.DAT criticism.DAT  
 ‘An anonymous journalist subjected Shostakovich’s opera to harsh criticism.’  
 (Ru)
- h. Padstavili arhanizataraw            perapisu    pad  
 put.LP.PL organizers.GEN/ACC.PL.M census.GEN under  
 rèprèsii.  
 repression.ACC.PL  
 ‘They subjected the organizers of the census to repressions.’  
 (Bel, cf. bielarus.net 2020\_0603)

Causativity in natural languages has been a long-standing topic in linguistics. See McCawley (1968), Nedjalkov & Sil’nickij (1969a,b), Fodor (1970), Wierzbicka (1975), Comrie (1976), Farber (1976), Shibatani (1976a,b, 2002), Talmy (1976), Wali (1981), Kemmer & Verhagen (1994), Levin & Rappaport Hovav (1994), Wunderlich (1997), Dixon (2000), Kulikov (2001), Bierwisch (2002, 2005), Wolff et al. (2002), Song (2011a,b), Neeleman & van de Koot (2012), and many more. Work on causative verbs specifically in Slavic includes Batistić (1978), Padučeva (2001), Karlík (2002), Bilandžija (2014), and Bondaruk (2021).

The empirical distinction between causative verbs and causative constructions cannot be under doubt. What has been debated, though, are the issues of whether the meaning of causative verbs is monolithic or not and whether causative verbs are lexical items and, hence, represented by a V-head in syntax or emerge by combining a number of heads whose nature is rather semantic than syntactic. For the latter approach see, e.g., McCawley (1971), von Stechow (1996), Alexiadou et al. (2006), Ramchand (2008), Schäfer (2008), Alexiadou (2010), or Bondaruk (2021), who have made assumptions that are based on ideas developed in the framework of generative semantics of the 1960s and revived by adherents of the theory of distributed morphology, cf. Halle & Marantz (1993), among others.

The fact that we find both non-derived and derived causative verbs has implications for claims concerning the representation of their meaning. Some, but not all, verbs are recognizable as causative verbs through a morphological exponent, e.g., a suffix, see above, examples (2)–(5). Hence, membership in the lexical class of causative verbs does not imply morphological signalling. From this it follows that there must be a causative component in the meaning representation of the respective verbs as such. This leads to the conclusion that the meaning of causative verbs must be given in a decomposed form.

Now the question arises whether a coarse-grained analysis as in (7) should suffice or whether we have to go further and suggest an even more fine-grained analysis.

- (7) [ $x$  CAUSE [BECOME [STATE  $y$ ]]]

To answer this question is a major task of the present chapter. My claim is that an investigation into the issue of adverbial modification is essential for answering the question.

Two general aspects must be taken into account: (i) The verbs encode a relation between a cause and an effect (Bierwisch 2005). (ii) Causal relations hold between events (Davidson 1967a, Lewis 1973), or in more general terms: situations (Barwise & Perry 1983); see also McCawley (1976).

The task is to propose a precise analysis of the semantic structure of causative verbs, that is, to uncover enough structure in order to be able to adequately describe and explain the properties of the verbs and the sentences in which they appear. Prerequisites are a formal framework, explicit assumptions concerning the structure and interpretation of linguistic expressions, and an adequate semantic metalanguage. I will use a lambda-categorial language as developed in the *Two-level semantics framework* (Bierwisch 1982, 1986, 2007; for a general characterization of this framework see Lang & Maienborn 2011).

Among the semantic ingredients are cause (causing situation), effect (caused situation), transition, source state, and target state. These ingredients imply that causative verbs belong to the so-called change-of-state verbs (Dowty 1979, Fabricius-Hansen 1991, Rappaport Hovav & Levin 2005).

The lexical systems of the Slavic languages display relations between items that encode states, transitions that result in states, and caused transitions resulting in states, respectively. This might suggest a general way of building up meaning. See Table 1 and the paradigms in (8) and (9).<sup>9</sup> What is exemplified here is not the only pattern, however.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup>Table 1 has been modelled after the one presented by Bierwisch (2005: 43) for German.

<sup>10</sup>See Tables 2 and 3 below for another pattern.

Table 1: One pattern of lexical relations

'State' (ADJ)	'Become State' (vi · IPFV/PFV)	'Cause Become State' (vt)	
slěpŭ	osli(p)nŏti	oslěpiti	(OCS)
slepoj	slepnut' / oslepnut'	oslepit'	(Ru)
slipyj	slipnuty / oslipnuty	oslipyty	(Ukr)
sljapy	slepnut' / aslepnuc'	asljapic'	(Bel)
ślepy	ślepnąć / oślepnąć	oślepić	(Po)
slepý	slepnout / oslepnout	oslepit	(Cz)
slijep	slijepjeti / oslijepjeti	oslijepiti	(Croat)
slep	slepeti / oslepeti	oslepiti	(Serb)
sljap	slepeja, -eeš / oslepeja, -eeš	oslepja, -iš	(Bg)
'blind'	'become blind'	'make sb. blind'	

- (8) a. Odežda                      suxa.  
           clothing.NOM.SG.F dry.NOM.SG.F  
           'The clothes are dry.'
- b. Odežda                      vysoxla.<sup>11</sup>  
           clothing.NOM.SG.F dry.LP.SG.F  
           'The clothes have dried.'
- c. Solnce                      vysušilo    odeždu.  
           sun.NOM.SG.N dry.LP.SG.N clothing.ACC.SG.F  
           'The sun has dried the clothes.' (Ru)
- (9) a. Bielizna                      jest                      sucha.<sup>12</sup>  
           laundry.NOM.SG.F be.PRS.3SG dry.NOM.SG.F  
           'The laundry is dry.'
- b. Bielizna                      wyschła.  
           laundry.NOM.SG.F dry.LP.SG.F  
           'The laundry has dried.'
- c. Słońce                      wysuszyło    bieliznę.  
           sun.NOM.SG.N dry.LP.SG.N laundry.ACC.SG.F  
           'The sun has dried the laundry.' (Po)

<sup>11</sup>According to Tixonov (1985), *sux-* and *sox-* are variants of one and the same root. The variants reflect an old ablaut relation, Vasmer (1955: 704 and 1958: 54).

<sup>12</sup>{-*such-*, -*sch-*, -*susz-*, -*sychn-*} are allomorphs of the root.

Although the relations appear systematic, it must be emphasized that corresponding lexical items do not exist in all cases. Also, the lexical relations are not necessarily identical in the various languages, if they exist at all. While, for example, English *open* (adj.) > *to open* (verbum intransitivum) > *to open* (verbum transitivum) may exemplify the adjective > inchoative verb > causative verb derivation (albeit without any overt morphological reflex), in Slavic we see a different path for this lexical field, with the causative verb as the starting point for two processes: (i) The adjective derives from the stem of the passive participle of the transitive causative verb, and (ii) the inchoative verb (“decausative”) results from combining the causative verb with the reflexive marker (cf. Padučeva 2003: 174, Fehrman et al. 2014: 292).<sup>13</sup> Morphological structure and complexity show this clearly. See Tables 2 and 3.

Table 2: Adjective derivation

Causative verb (infinitive)	Passive Participle (stem)	Adjective
otkryt’	otkry-t-	otkry-t-yj (Ru)
otevřít	otevř-en-	otevř-en-ý (Cz)
otvoriti	otvor-en-	otvor-en-i (BCS)
‘to open’ (vt)	‘opened’	‘open’

Table 3: Decausative formation

Causative verb	Inchoative verb
otkryt’	otkryt’-sja (Ru)
otevřít	otevřít se (Cz)
otvoriti	otvoriti se (BCS)
open.INF	open.INF.REFL
‘to open’ (vt)	‘to open’ (vi)

Importantly, we must be aware of the fact that the existence of related or related lexical items speaks neither for nor against the decomposition of the mean-

<sup>13</sup> A similar claim was made by Reinhart (2016: 9): “Unaccusative and one-place [verbs] originate as two-place predicates, and they are derived from their transitive alternate by a reduction operation.”



ing of causative verbs. The semantic representation that results from decomposing a verb's meaning is abstract (cf. Bierwisch 2011: 324), it does not depend on the existence or non-existence of other lexical items, and it is irrelevant whether the object language has a syntactic construction with identical or similar meaning. The discussion whether or not the English verb *kill* means 'cause to die' is obsolete – *kill* is a verb with an abstract meaning representation, whereas the object-language expression *cause to die* is a syntactic construction comprising a number of lexical items; their abstract meanings yield, by composition, the abstract meaning of the whole.<sup>14</sup>

Among the issues that need to be addressed in order to solve the question of how to represent the meaning of causative verbs are the following: (i) What is the conceptual and semantic structure of the causing situation? (ii) Is the "causer" always an agent? (iii) What is the conceptual and semantic structure of the caused situation? (iv) What is the formal correlate of the causal relation?

Interestingly, adverbials will contribute to the solution, since, as I claim, the decomposition of the lexical meaning of causative verbs is necessary for covering all types of adverbial modification occurring with them. What is needed is, in fact, a fine-grained semantic representation which reflects the partial situations involved and comprises a sufficient number of variables referring to those situations.

In what follows, an approach will be developed that, as I will argue, comes up to the goal of finding an adequate analysis for causative verbs and adverbial modifiers. In Section 2, I will present and discuss proposals as to how the meaning of causative verbs is to be represented. Section 3 will be devoted to adverbials – their syntax and semantics (Section 3.1) as well as the issues of adverbials and states (Section 3.2), adverbials and caused situations (Section 3.3), and adverbials and causing situations (Section 3.4). Problems will come to light that concern the impossibility of semantically integrating adverbials in certain cases, unless refinements of the apparatus are introduced the necessity of which follows from empirical observations and considerations of their impact. In Section 4, I will introduce my proposal, namely refinements of Zimmermann's (1992) modification template and what the newly proposed templates effect in the course of semantic composition. By the extended and refined apparatus, I will argue, it is possible to cover not only the case of adverbial modification of the causing situation, but also the cases that, in the course of the discussion in Section 3, have turned out

---

<sup>14</sup>The discussion had been ongoing since the 1960s, see, e.g., McCawley (1968), Fodor (1970), Wierzbicka (1975), Shibatani (1975, 1976a,b), Saksena (1982), Fanselow & Staudacher (1991), and Kulikov (2001).

to pose problems for the semantic integration of adverbials modifying the target state and the caused situation, respectively. Section 5 summarizes the discussion, lists the specific versions of the modification template, and shows in what form these versions can be generalized.

## 2 Representation of verb meaning

In the linguistic literature, the meaning of causative verbs is often rendered as a relation as simple as that in (10).

(10)  $P(x, y)$

Accordingly, verbs like English *open* or *kill* and their equivalents in other languages would be represented as in (11a) and (12a), respectively. Consequently, these representations would have to be taken as the basis for the computation of the meaning of sentences as in (11b)–(11c) and (12b)–(12c).

(11) a.  $OPEN(x, y)$

b. Som list wó(t)cynił.  
AUX.1SG letter.ACC open.LP.SG.M

‘I opened the letter.’

(LSorb, <https://niedersorbisch.de/dnw/woerterbuch/oeffnen>)

c. Sym wokno wočińił.  
AUX.1SG window.ACC open.LP.SG.M

‘I opened the window.’

(USorb, Breu 2011: 161, fn 14)

(12) a.  $KILL(x, y)$

b. Kain swójogo bratša wusmjerši.  
Cain.NOM.SG.M his brother.GEN/ACC kill.PST.3SG

‘Cain killed his brother.’

(LSorb, cf. New Testament, 1 John 3,12)

c. Kain swojeho bratra zabi.  
Cain.NOM.SG.M his brother.GEN/ACC kill.PST.3SG

‘Cain killed his brother.’

(USorb, cf. New Testament, 1 John 3,12)

(13)–(16) show some examples from the literature.

(13) a.  $BUTTER(x, y)$

b. Jones buttered the toast. (cf. Davidson 1980 [1967b]: 107)

(14)  $HIT_{HARRY, MARY}$  (cf. Fillmore 1968: 374)

- (15) a. (for which person  $x$ ,  $x$  hit Bill)  
b. Who hit Bill? (cf. Chomsky 1981: 324)
- (16) a.  $BREAK(x(y))$   
b. The girl broke the window. (cf. Grimshaw 1990: 24)

The above representations (and other similar ones) of the meaning of causative verbs are not adequate.<sup>15</sup> This is for the following three reasons: (i) It is coarse-grained and does not render the event structure. (ii) The way conceptual interpretation could be derived from it is non-transparent and, thus, unclear. (iii) Different anchors of adverbial modification do not have formal counterparts – they do not occur in the analysis and would have to be inferred. The notation is not complex enough: It names the verbal predicate and indicates its adicity (number of arguments). If this is all that is stated in a representation, claims that lexical meaning should not be decomposed at all (e.g., Putnam 1975) would be strengthened.

There is a further deficiency: Any difference between actions, on the one hand, and natural occurrences and states, on the other, could not be detected; consider (17) and (18), respectively.

- (17) a. Sunce            je            dostiglo        zenit.  
sun.NOM.SG.N AUX.3SG reach.LP.SG.N zenith.ACC  
‘The sun reached the zenith.’ (BCS)  
b.  $REACH(x, y)$
- (18) a. Petâr obiĉa            Marija.  
Petâr love.PRS.3SG Marija  
‘Petâr loves Marija.’ (Bg)  
b.  $LOVE(x, y)$

Classifications of verbs would be the result of pure intuition; it would, de facto, have to suffice to simply declare a verbal lexeme as a member of a lexical class. Structural grammar, however, has to invoke features, e.g. functors, as the basis for class formation (cf. Steube 1988, chapter 6).

<sup>15</sup>I concede that those semantic notations are, of course, legitimate in case issues are investigated for whose treatment more fine-grained analyses are not required. However, if lexical semantics proper is the object of investigation, then coarse-grained representations of verb meaning clearly are simplifications.

Bierwisch (2005: 43) points out systematic relations between different types of predication. Proceeding from this we may assume a schema as the following.<sup>16</sup>

- (19) [CAUSE [TRANSITION [STATE]]]

Based on this schema we get the following representations for *kill* and *open*, respectively.

- (20) [[*x* does something] CAUSE [BECOME  $\neg$ [*y* is alive]]]  
(cf. Dowty 1979: 91)
- (21)  $\lambda y \lambda x \lambda s$  [[[ACT *x*] [CAUSE [BECOME [OPEN *y*]]]]] *s*  
(Bierwisch 2002: 337)

The assumption of semantic predicates like ACT (Bierwisch 2002, 2005), DO-something (Dowty 1979, Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995), or *do* as a realization of a “higher predicate of intentionality” with the action verb proper more deeply embedded (Ross 1972) provokes the following question: Is it always the case that an action occurs as the cause?

Many causative verbs co-occur not only with agents but also with non-volitional causers. Compare:

- (22) a. Mladý chlapec zabil dievča.  
 young.NOM.SG.M guy.NOM.SG.M kill.LP.SG.M girl.ACC.SG.N  
 ‘A young man killed a girl.’  
 (Sk, <https://www.kkbagala.sk/texty/bitky-na-papieri-su-bez-krvi/>)
- b. Plyn zabil dievča.  
 gas.NOM.SG.M kill.LP.SG.M girl.ACC.SG.N  
 ‘Gas killed a girl.’ (Sk, cf. cas.sk 2009 0112)

That is why Fehrmann et al. (2014: 304) proposed abstracting over the semantic predicate in order to avoid the exclusion of non-actions. They treat the predicate variable  $P$  as a semantic parameter.<sup>17</sup>

- (23)  $\lambda y \lambda x \lambda s [ [ [P\ x] [\text{CAUSE} [\text{BECOME} [\text{OPEN}\ y]]]] s ]$   
(Fehrmann et al. 2014: 304)

<sup>16</sup>I should like to emphasize that this is a semantic schema. It represents structured lexical semantics but not a hierarchy of abstract syntactic heads (for a syntactic approach, see, for example, Ramchand 2008). As I will argue below, Slavic verbs are syntactic atoms and, therefore, inserted under the lexical V-head in syntax.

<sup>17</sup>At the level of Conceptual Structure the parameter is specified by way of an interpretation that is based on the context.

As stated above, adverbial modification with causative verbs may relate to different situations – the causing situation vs. the caused situation, leaving states for the moment aside.

The local and temporal adverbial in (24) and (25), respectively, predicate over the causing situation. Thus, they are represented as predicates of  $s$  in the formal notation. See below, Section 3.4.

- (24) [XP Pid Izjumom] ukrajins'ki vojiny zbyly  
near Izyum.INS Ukrainian.NOM.PL soldier.NOM.PL shoot\_down.LP.PL  
rosijs'kyj vertolit.  
Russian.ACC helicopter.ACC  
'Near Izyum Ukrainian soldiers shot down a Russian helicopter.'  
(Ukr, pravda.com.ua 2022\_0613)
- (25) Miroslav Polcar svou přítelkyni zavraždil [XP v březnu].  
Miroslav Polcar his girlfriend.ACC murder.LP.SG.M in March.LOC  
'Miroslav Polcar murdered his girlfriend in March.'  
(Cz, cf. blesk.cz 2014 1022)

The example in (26) presents a complex verb that is the result of attaching the reflexive marker to the transitive verb *začynic* ‘close’. In the course of this process, the argument structure of the verb is affected, which is the basis for the decausative interpretation of the sentence.<sup>18</sup> The modal adverbial *cixa* ‘quietly’ that occurs in (26) characterizes the caused situation, i.e. the transition to the target state.<sup>19</sup>

- (26) Dzvery [XP cixa] začynilisja.  
 door.NOM.PL.F quietly close.LP.PL.REFL  
 'The door quietly closed.' (Bel)

In order to cover the various cases, the semantic representation in (23) has to be improved. The variable  $s'$  is introduced. It stands for the caused situation. The two situation variables –  $s$  and  $s'$  – are related by the CAUSE operator.<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup>The term “decausative” goes back to Padučeva (2003) who considers the reflexively marked verb as the result of a derivation process. Fehrman et al. (2014) support Padučeva’s view that the causative component of the underlying transitive verb persists. See below, Section 3.3, for further discussion.

<sup>19</sup>The equivalent of ‘door’ is a *plurale tantum* in the majority of the modern Slavic languages.

<sup>20</sup>Davidson (1967a), Dowty (1979), and Bierwisch (2002, 2005), assume a CAUSE operator relating events (situations). “:” in (27) represents the asymmetric logical conjunction, cf. Heidolph (1992). The INST functor maps from the situation class to an instance of the class, cf. Bierwisch (1990: 176).

- (27)  $\lambda y \lambda x \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P \ x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [\text{OPEN } y]]]]]$   
(Fehrmann et al. 2014: 305)

The assumption of the variable  $s'$  provides the basis for explaining adverbials as predicates of the caused situation. We are now able to cover both cases of adverbial predication that have been discussed so far.

Have we already reached the final, optimal, representation of the meaning of causative verbs? Consider examples such as the following:

- (28) Stanciju metro “Park Pobedy” zakryli [<sub>XP</sub> na dva  
station.ACC subway.INDECL Park Pobedy close.LP.PL for two.ACC  
dnja].  
day.GEN.SG  
‘They closed the subway station “Park Pobedy” for two days.’  
(Ru, spbdnevnik.ru 2021\_0103)
- (29) Dálnici D5 na sedmém kilometru ve směru na  
motorway.ACC D5 at seventh.LOC kilometer.LOC in direction.LOC to  
Prahu v neděli večer [<sub>XP</sub> na zhruba dvě hodiny]  
Prague.ACC on Sunday.ACC evening for about two.ACC hour.ACC.PL  
uzavřela nehoda osobního auta a  
close.LP.SG.F accident.NOM.SG.F passenger.GEN car.GEN and  
motorky.  
motorbike.GEN  
‘An accident between a passenger car and a motorbike led to the closure  
of the D5 motorway for about two hours at kilometer seven in the  
direction to Prague.’  
(Cz, lidovky.cz 2021\_0627)

In these examples, the adverbial relates to the resulting state (target state). It turns out that a variable referring to this state must be introduced. This variable is given as  $z$  in the following representation.<sup>21</sup>

- (30)  $\lambda y \lambda x \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P \ x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST BECOME } [z \approx [Q \ y]]]]]$

Now we have arrived at a fine-grained meaning representation for causative verbs, with the three variables  $s$ ,  $s'$  and  $z$  as potential anchors for adverbial mod-

<sup>21</sup>The variable  $z$  in (30) stands for an abstract state argument. “ $\approx$ ” is a junctor that relates  $z$  to an expression that characterizes it; see Maienborn (2003, 2005, 2007), Geist (2006), and Pitsch (2014).

ification.<sup>22</sup> In a way, the analysis suggested here zooms in on the meaning structure.<sup>23</sup>

We turn next (in Section 3 below) to general aspects of adverbials and the non-trivial problem of how to properly integrate adverbials in the compositional semantics.

### 3 Adverbials

#### 3.1 Syntax and semantics

In principle, there are two types of adverbials: (i) free adverbials (adjuncts) and (ii) necessary adverbials (complements).<sup>24</sup> In the most common case, adverbials are expressions which can freely occur in sentences. They are phrases (XPs) adjoining to phrases in sentence structure.<sup>25</sup>

- (31) PPO [[XP unoči] [[ zbyla 2  
air\_defense.NOM.SG.F in\_night shoot\_down.LP.SG.F two  
litaky RF] [XP nad Dnipropetrovščynoju]].  
planes.ACC Russian\_Federation.GEN above Dnipro\_region.INS  
'During the night, the (Ukrainian) air defense shot down two airplanes of  
the Russian Federation that were flying over the district of Dnipro.'  
(Ukr, pravda.com.ua 2022\_0317)
- (32) Ozbroyenyj čolovik [[XP u supermarketi v  
armed.NOM.SG.M man.NOM.SG.M in supermarket.LOC in  
amerykans'komu misti Buffalo] [rozstriljav ščonajmenše 10  
American.LOC city.LOC Buffalo shoot.LP.SG.M at\_least ten  
ljudej]].  
people.GEN.PL  
'An armed man shot at least ten people in a supermarket in the American  
city of Buffalo.'  
(Ukr, pravda.com.ua 2022\_0515)

<sup>22</sup>Three variables are also suggested by Koontz-Garboden (2009: 85) – *v* (causing eventuality), *e* (caused change-of-state event), and *s* (resulting state).

<sup>23</sup>The global reference of a causative verb to an event is not undermined: "A verb refers to one and only one [...] event, irrespective of the complex structure of causatives and inchoatives involving causation, cause, effect, transition, source [state], and target state" (Bierwisch 2005: 11).

<sup>24</sup>Apart from these, sentences can contain parenthetical adverbials. They have a special status and are thus not considered in this paper.

<sup>25</sup>PPO in (31) stands for *Protypovitřjana oborona* 'air defense'.

- (33) [[<sub>XP</sub> Na drodze krajowej nr 83, pod Turkiem], [wiatr  
on road.LOC state.LOC No. 83 near Turek.INS wind.NOM.SG.M  
przewrócił na bok naczepę ciężarówki, w której  
overturn.LP.SG.M on side.ACC trailer.ACC truck.GEN in which.LOC  
były puste puszki na piwo]].  
be.LP.PL empty.NOM.PL.F can.NOM.PL.F for beer.ACC  
'On state road N<sup>o</sup>. 83, near Turek, the trailer of a truck laden with empty  
beer cans was overturned by the wind.' (Po, tvn24.pl 2017\_0303)
- (34) [[<sub>XP</sub> Na gaj paradi u Jerusalmu] [pripadnik radikalne  
on gay parade.LOC in Jerusalem.LOC follower.NOM.SG.M radical.GEN  
jevrejske organizacije Haredi [[<sub>XP</sub> nožem] [je  
Jewish.GEN organization.GEN Haredi knife.INS AUX.3SG  
ranio šestoro ljudi]]]].  
injure.LP.SG.M six people.GEN.PL  
'At the gay parade in Jerusalem a follower of Haredi, a radical Jewish  
organization, wounded six people with a knife.' (Serb, rts.rs 2015\_0730)

In the special case, adverbials are necessitated by the semantics of the verb and, therefore, realized as complements in syntax (see, e.g., Steube 1988: ch. 6.2, Werkmann 2003: 52–53). Local, directional, and temporal expressions are instances of such adverbials.<sup>26</sup>

- (35) Piotr [mieszka \*([<sub>XP</sub> w Warszawie])].  
Piotr live.PRS.3SG in Warsaw.LOC  
'Piotr lives in Warsaw.' (Po)
- (36) Marija [otiva \*([<sub>XP</sub> v grada])].  
Marija go.PRS.3SG to town.DEF  
'Marija goes to town.' (Bg)
- (37) Rebënok [rodilsja \*([<sub>XP</sub> v prošlom godu])].  
child.NOM.SG.M be\_born.LP.SG.M.REFL in last.LOC year.LOC  
'The child was born last year.' (Ru)

<sup>26</sup>By convention, an asterisk preceding round brackets means that the object-language expression must not be omitted.



Semantically, adverbials serve as modifiers of situations, see example (38), or states, see Section 3.2.<sup>27</sup>

- (38) a. Policijata zatvori ulicata [<sub>XP</sub> zaradi bomba].  
 police.SG.F.DEF close.AOR.3SG street.DEF because\_of bomb  
 ‘The police closed the street due to a bomb alert.’ (Bg)  
 b.  $R_{\text{CAUS}}(s, [\exists y [[\text{BOMB } y] : [\text{QUANT } y = 1]]])$

Adverbial modifiers of nominal expressions restrict the denotation as in example (39).

- (39) a. glasovi [<sub>XP</sub> iza zida]  
 voice.NOM.PL behind wall.GEN.SG  
 ‘voices behind the wall’ (Croat)  
 b.  $[[[\text{VOICE } x] : [\text{QUANT } x \supseteq 2]] : [x \text{ BEHIND THE WALL}]]$

Specific questions arise concerning the syntactic positions of adverbials. What positions do adverbials occupy in the underlying structure and in what positions do they occur at the surface? These questions are not trivial for languages with so-called free constituent order.

There has been a long-lasting discussion concerning the criteria and factors for adverbial placement, cf. Steinitz (1969), Maienborn (1996), Alexiadou (1997), Frey (2003), Frey & Pittner (1999), Cinque (1999, 2004), *inter alia*. Many linguists adhere to the view of a rigid, semantically determined hierarchy of adverbials. No convincing evidence for this can be found in the Slavic languages. In these languages, there are almost no restrictions and adverbials of different types show up in many positions. The positions that we see at the surface reflect requirements of information structure rather than fixed syntactic placement. Relative scope can be an additional factor (cf. Junghanns 2002, 2006, Szucsich 2002, Werkmann 2003, Biskup 2011).

In Slavic languages, free adverbials are merged as adjuncts to VP but can occur in higher positions at the surface (cf. Junghanns 2002 and Werkmann 2003, *amongst others*). A relatively low base-generated position can be shown even for so-called sentential adverbials (Junghanns 2006: 116–117). Compare the following examples:

<sup>27</sup>Bartsch (1972), *inter alia*, distinguishes between VP-modifying and S(entence)-modifying adverbials. In the Slavic languages, the difference is not brought to light by different syntactic behaviour of the adverbials.

- (40) a. ... abych  $\mu_i$  [<sub>DP</sub> ten zvláštní a  
in\_order\_to.COND.1SG CL.3SG.M.DAT this.ACC special.ACC and  
pravdivý námet]<sub>j</sub> [[<sub>SA</sub> skutečně] [daroval <sub>-i -j</sub> ]].  
true.ACC story.ACC really give\_as\_present.LP.SG.M  
‘... so that I really would give him this special and true story.’  
(Cz, Junghanns 2006: 117)
- b. Vždyť já<sub>i</sub> ho<sub>j</sub> [[<sub>XP</sub> jednou] [[<sub>SA</sub> opravdu] [[<sub>XP</sub>  
after\_all 1SG.NOM CL.3SG.M.ACC someday.ADV really  
úplně] [ <sub>-i</sub> opustím <sub>-j</sub> ]]]].  
completely leave.PRS.1SG  
‘After all, one day I really will leave him for good.’  
(Cz, Junghanns 2006: 117)

How do adverbials get integrated in the course of semantic composition?

The operation effecting the integration of adjunct adverbials has been given different names – theta identification (Higginbotham 1985), unification of theta roles (Bierwisch 1988), or predicate modification (von Stechow 2012). The approach chosen by Zimmermann (1992) is specific in that it involves a modification template. The differently named operations all yield the same result: logical conjunction of predicates.

In the following example we see in (41b) the result of amalgamating the meaning of the VP (modificandum) and the meaning of the adverbial (modifier), irrelevant details omitted.

- (41) a. Blesk [<sub>XP</sub> v Tatrách] zabil  
lightning.NOM.SG.M in Tatra\_mountains.LOC.PL kill.LP.SG.M  
otca rodiny.  
father.GEN/ACC family.GEN  
‘In the Tatra mountains, a bolt of lightning killed the father of a family.’  
(Sk, noviny.sk 2016\_0727)
- b.  $\lambda s$  [[<sub>s</sub> INST [<sub>P</sub> ...]] : [[<sub>s</sub> CAUSE ...] : [[<sub>LOC</sub> <sub>s</sub>]  $\subset$  [<sub>LOC</sub> TATRA]]]]

Necessary adverbials are semantically integrated in a different way. Since they have the status of an argument of the verb, they replace a predicate variable *Q* in the verb’s meaning representation (42), via functional application. Technically this is achieved by lambda conversion. As a result we get conjoined predicates.

- (42)  $\lambda Q \dots \lambda s$  [<sub>s</sub> INST [...] : [<sub>Q</sub> <sub>s</sub>]]

The interaction of syntax and semantics sketched here is transparent and non-redundant. In other approaches (e.g., Schäfer 2008), syntax encodes event structure, proceeding from state via change of state to causation. In my opinion, this puts a semantic overload on syntax, however. One reason to reject such an approach is the integrity of the verbal lexeme in Slavic.<sup>28,29</sup>

### 3.2 Adverbials and states

Adverbials can predicate over states. This is a rather restricted case. Durative adverbials are one type that can be used in this function. They indicate the time period for which the resulting state is claimed to last or has lasted.

- (43) Stanciju metro “Park Pobedy” zakryli [XP na dva  
station.ACC subway.INDECL Park Pobedy close.LP.PL for two.ACC  
dnja].  
day.GEN.SG  
‘They closed the subway station “Park Pobedy” for two days.’  
(Ru, spbdnevnik.ru 2021\_0103)
- (44) Dálnici D5 [XP na zhruba dvě hodiny] uzavřela  
motorway.ACC D5 for about two.ACC hour.ACC.PL close.LP.SG.F  
nehoda osobního auta a motorky.  
accident.NOM.SG.F passenger.GEN car.GEN and motorbike.GEN  
‘An accident between a passenger car and a motorbike led to the closure  
of the D5 motorway for about two hours.’ (Cz, lidovky.cz 2021\_0627)
- (45) Obor zavrel jaskyňu [XP na večné časy].  
giant.NOM.SG.M close.LP.SG.M cave.ACC for eternal.ACC.PL time.ACC.PL  
‘The giant closed the cave for good.’ (Sk)
- (46) Zavřu ti hubu [XP navždy]!  
close.PRS.1SG CL.2SG.DAT mouth.ACC for\_good  
‘I will close your mouth for good!’ (Cz)

<sup>28</sup>For a detailed argumentation against lexical decomposition in syntax see Jäger & Blutner (1999).

<sup>29</sup>It might be claimed that syntactic decomposition would yield positions syntactically determining specific semantic differences. However, there is no evidence for adverbials in the assumed abstract positions. Since explicit semantic representations provide the basis for the respective interpretations, an over-articulated syntax is superfluous and should be ruled out by economy requirements.



- (51) Rosjanie [XP częściowo] zniszczyli budynek szpitala  
 Russian.NOM.PL partially destroy.LP.PL building.ACC hospital.GEN  
 rejonowego.  
 regional.GEN  
 ‘The Russians partially destroyed the building of the district hospital.’  
 (Po, cf. wyborcza.pl, 2022\_0402)

These adverbials name the degree (grade, extent, scale) as to which the implicit predicate that corresponds to the resulting state holds.

Although not obvious at first sight, the adverbial in (52) belongs in this group too.

- (52) Muž nožem [XP smrtelně] zranil knihovnici.  
 man.NOM.SG.M knife.INS deathly wound.LP.SG.M librarian.ACC.SG.F  
 ‘A female librarian was stabbed with a knife to death by a man.’  
 (Cz, zpravy.aktualne.cz 2015\_0525)

Modification by degree expressions is a topic of its own and will be left aside here.

### 3.3 Adverbials and caused situations

Adverbial modification of the caused situation can be very clearly seen in de-causatives.<sup>30</sup>

- (53) a. *Transitive structure*  
 Petr [XP v tomto okamžiku] otevřel dveře.  
 Petr.NOM.SG.M in this.LOC moment.LOC open.LP.SG.M door.ACC.PL.F  
 ‘In this moment, Petr opened the door.’ (Cz)
- b. *Decausative*  
 Dveře se [XP v tomto okamžiku] otevřely.  
 door.NOM.PL.F REFL in this.LOC moment.LOC open.LP.PL  
 ‘In this moment, the door opened.’ (Cz)

In the case of (53b), what caused the transition to the door being open remains implicit. The adverbial contributes the temporal specification of the transition and, therefore, modifies the caused situation.

<sup>30</sup>Slavic decausatives represent a type of interpretation of linguistic structures containing a verb that is derived from a causative verb and occurs with a reflexive marker. The marker signals a change in the argument structure of the original verb (Fehrman et al. 2014).

One can make the same point with modal adverbials.

- (54) a. Vrata su se [XP tiho] zatvorila.  
 door.NOM.PL.N AUX.3PL REFL quietly close.LP.PL.N  
 ‘The door quietly closed.’ (BCS)
- b. Drzwi otworzyły się [XP ze skrzypieniem].  
 door.NOM.PL open.LP.PL REFL with creak.INS.SG  
 ‘The door opened with a creak.’ (Po)
- c. Dzvery [XP bjazhučna] začynilisja.  
 door.NOM.PL.F soundlessly close.LP.PL.REFL  
 ‘The door closed without any noise.’ (Bel)

It is not the causing situation that happens ‘quietly’, ‘with-a-creak’, or ‘soundlessly’. Rather, the transition to the state gets characterized in this way.

The Semantic Form (SF) of causative verbs in (55) has an anchor for those adverbials, namely the variable  $s'$ .

- (55)  $\lambda y \lambda x \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST BECOME } [z \approx [Q y]]]]]$

Similarly as in the case of adverbial modification of states (see the preceding sub-section), the relevant variable is not lambda-bound. Due to this, the necessary step in the process of semantic composition is technically impossible. This problem is addressed in Section 4.

The possibility of adverbial modification of the caused situation as in the examples given above does not constitute a special, exceptional case. We find adverbial modification also with inchoatives. These have a less complex semantic structure as compared with causative verbs. However, the situations interpreted for the inchoatives in a way resemble the caused situations in the more complex structures.

- (56) a. [XP Cora wjacor] jo wumrěl Michail Gorbatšow.  
 yesterday evening AUX.3SG die.LP.SG.M Mikhail Gorbachev  
 ‘Mikhail Gorbachev died yesterday evening.’  
 (LSorb, rbb-online.de/radio 2022\_0831)
- b. Britanskata kralica Elizabet II počina [XP v zamâka  
 British.SG.F.DEF queen.SG.F Elizabeth II die.AOR.3SG in castle.DEF  
 Balmoral].  
 Balmoral  
 ‘The British Queen Elisabeth II died in Balmoral castle.’  
 (Bg, 24chasa.bg 2022\_0908)

- c. Kraljica je [XP danes] [XP mirno] umrla [XP na  
queen.NOM.SG.F AUX.3SG today peacefully die.LP.SG.F in  
Balmoralu].  
Balmoral.LOC  
'The Queen today died peacefully in Balmoral.'  
(Slvn, zurnal24.si 2022\_0908)
- d. [XP Wčera] je kralowna Elisabeth II. [XP w  
yesterday AUX.3SG queen.NOM.SG.F Elisabeth II in  
Šotiskej] zemrēla.  
Scotland.LOC die.LP.SG.F  
'Yesterday afternoon Queen Elisabeth II died in Scotland.'  
(USorb, serbske-nowiny.de 2022\_0909)

### 3.4 Adverbials and causing situations

The semantic integration of adverbials modifying causing situations does not pose any problem at all. The variable  $s$  provides the anchor for the adverbial's meaning contribution. This variable is technically accessible, since it is lambda-bound, cf. (57).

$$(57) \lambda y \lambda x \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST BECOME } [z \approx [Q y]]]]]$$

The relevant variables of the modificandum and the modifier get identified via application of the modification rule schema, see below. As a consequence, the adverbial is predicated over the causing situation. This can be illustrated as follows:

- (58) [XP V nedēli večer] policie uzavřela dálnici  
on Sunday.ACC evening police.NOM.SG.F close.LP.SG.F motorway.ACC  
D5.  
D5  
'On Sunday evening, the police closed the D5 motorway.'  
(Cz, adapted from lidovsky.cz 2021\_0627)

- (59) a. *Semantic value of the VP*  
 $\lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5}]]]]]]]$   
b. *Meaning representation for the temporal adverbial*  
 $\lambda x [\text{TIME } x \subset \text{SUNDAY EVENING}]$

- c. *Modification template*<sup>31</sup>  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s] : [Q_2 s]]$
- d. *Application of the template to the modifier*  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s] : [Q_2 s]] (\lambda x [\text{TIME } x \subset \text{SUNDAY EVENING}])$   
 $\equiv \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s] : [\lambda x [\text{TIME } x \subset \text{SUNDAY EVENING}] s]]$   
 $\equiv \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s] : [\text{TIME } s \subset \text{SUNDAY EVENING}]]$
- e. *Application of the preceding result to the modificandum*  
 $\lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s] : [\text{TIME } s \subset \text{SUNDAY EVENING}]]$   
 $(\lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5 } ]]]]])$   
 $\equiv \lambda s [[\lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5 } ]]]]]) s] :$   
 $[\text{TIME } s \subset \text{SUNDAY EVENING}]]$   
 $\equiv \lambda s [[[[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5 } ]]]]])] :$   
 $[\text{TIME } s \subset \text{SUNDAY EVENING}]]$

Adverbials of one special type are restricted to modification of the causing situation, namely Agent-oriented adverbials (AOA). An illustrating example is given below.

- (60) Petr [XP záměrně] zlomil tužku.  
 Petr.NOM.SG.M intentionally break.I.P.SG.M pencil.ACC  
 ‘Petr intentionally broke the pencil.’ (Cz, Karlík 2002: 413)

The meaning for the Slavic equivalents of 'intentionally' may tentatively be represented as follows:

- (61)  $\lambda s [[\text{AGENT}(x, s)] : [\exists w [\text{PURPOSE}(w, s) : [\text{HAVE}(x, w)]]]]$

This meaning contribution gets integrated in the usual way by means of the template (compare above, (59c)–(59e). This gives us:

- (62)  $\lambda s [[ [s \text{ INST } [P [\text{PETER}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME}$   
 $[z \approx [\text{NOT INTACT } [\text{THE PENCIL}]]]]]] : [[\text{AGENT}(x, s) :$   
 $[\exists w [\text{PURPOSE}(w, s) : [\text{HAVE}(x, w)]]]]]$

The variable  $x$  remains a semantic parameter. It will be interpreted as coreferential with [PETER] at the level of Conceptual Structure.

<sup>31</sup>Compare Zimmermann (1992: 256). For more details on this, see Section 4.



In Section 2, (22a)–(22b), we saw that causative verbs can be used with both agents and non-agents in some cases. Where there is a co-occurrence of a causative verb and a non-agent, an AOA is excluded:

- (63) a. Marko je [XP namjerno] otvorio  
 Marko.NOM.SG.M AUX.3SG intentionally open.LP.SG.M  
 vrata.  
 door.ACC.PL.N  
 ‘Marko intentionally opened the door.’  
 b. Vjetar je (\*[XP namjerno]) otvorio  
 wind.NOM.SG.M AUX.3SG intentionally open.LP.SG.M  
 vrata.  
 door.ACC.PL.N  
 ‘The wind opened the door.’ (Croat)

Only in the case of volitional causation does the use of an AOA yield a well-formed expression. Exclusion of an AOA, thus, is a diagnostic for non-agents (non-volitional causation). Compare the following examples with volitional ((64a), (65a)) and non-volitional ((64b)–(64c), (65b)–(65c)) causation.

- (64) a. Ukrajins’ki zaxysnyky vidbyly dev’’jat’  
 Ukrainian.NOM.PL defender.NOM.PL repel.LP.PL nine.ACC  
 sprob nastupu okupantiv.  
 attempt.GEN.PL.F attack.GEN occupying\_force.GEN.PL.M  
 ‘The Ukrainian defenders repelled nine attempted attacks by the  
 (Russian) occupying forces.’  
 b. Dzerkalo vidbylo jiji oblyččja.  
 mirror.NOM.SG.N reflect.LP.SG.N her face.ACC  
 ‘The mirror reflected her face.’  
 c. Viter vidbyv korabel’ vid pryčalu.  
 wind.NOM.SG.M tear\_away.LP.SG.M ship.ACC from pier.GEN  
 ‘The wind tore the ship away from the pier.’ (Ukr)  
 (65) a. Ukrajins’ki zaxysnyky [XP uspišno] vidbyly  
 Ukrainian.NOM.PL defender.NOM.PL successfully repel.LP.PL  
 dev’’jat’ sprob nastupu okupantiv.  
 nine.ACC attempt.GEN.PL.F attack.GEN occupying\_force.GEN.PL.M  
 ‘The Ukrainian defenders successfully repelled nine attempted attacks  
 by the (Russian) occupying forces.’ (pravda.com.ua 2022\_0905)

- b. Dzerkalo (\*[<sub>XP</sub> uspišno]) vidbylo jiji oblyččja.  
 mirror.NOM.SG.N successfully reflect.LP.SG.N her face.ACC  
 ‘The mirror reflected her face.’
- c. Viter (\*[<sub>XP</sub> uspišno]) vidbyv korabel’ vid  
 wind.NOM.SG.M successfully tear\_away.LP.SG.M ship.ACC from  
 pryčalu.  
 pier.GEN  
 ‘The wind tore the ship away from the pier.’ (Ukr)

## 4 Proposal

The expression in (66) represents – omitting irrelevant details – the result of semantically combining the SF of a VP (modificandum) with the SF of an adverbial (modifier).

$$(66) \quad \lambda s [ [s \text{ INST } \dots] : [\dots s \dots] ]$$

modificandum    modifier

The lambda operator binds the situation variable *s*. The lambda-bound *s* is the only active argument slot left. Thus, the variable *s* may serve as an anchor for an adverbial.

Davidson (1967b) used adverbial modification as an argument for the introduction into the theory of the event variable, enriching the set of arguments of verbal predicates.<sup>32</sup> However as we can conclude from our preceding discussion, adverbials anchored to the causing situation variable represent only one of the various cases of adverbial modification. This case does not pose any problem at all (see above, Section 3.4). But we still have to find a solution for the other two cases – modification of *s'* and *z*, respectively.

The solution offered here involves the use of the semantic-template tool in a way similar to that originally suggested by Zimmermann (1992) in her paper on modifiers. We need, however, a more flexible templatic structure in order to be able to cover all cases of adverbial modification. Below, in the course of discussing the problematic cases refined versions of Zimmermann’s original template will be proposed.

Templates are “silent” linguistic elements in that they contribute meaning but lack phonetic form, cf. Zimmermann (1992: 275, fn 4). Using templates has the

<sup>32</sup>Instead of the term “event variable”, the more general term “situation variable” is used in the present chapter.

effect of adapting linguistic expressions to the contexts in which they have to fulfill certain functions and cannot do so on their own.<sup>33</sup>

Zimmermann's original proposal is given in (67).<sup>34</sup>

(67) *Modification template*

$\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda x [[Q_1 x] : [Q_2 x]]$

where  $Q_1, Q_2 \in S/N$  and “:”  $\in (\alpha/\alpha)/\beta$  (Zimmermann 1992: 256)

Unfortunately, the template in this form is insufficient for our purposes. We have to refine it in order to be able to technically implement the modification of  $s'$  and  $z$ , respectively.

As a first step, the SF of causative verbs needs improvement. For the purpose of covering all types of adverbial modification, the SF must, besides binding  $s$ , provide options for lambda-binding of  $z$  and  $s'$ . This is taken care of in (68).

(68)  $\lambda y \lambda x (\lambda z) (\lambda s') \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [Q y]]]]]]]$

Proceeding from the versatile SF proposed here, we will discuss each case in need of a solution in turn.

#### 4.1 Modification of $z$

(69) Policie                      uzavřela              dálnici                      D5 [<sub>XP</sub> na dvě  
police.NOM.SG.F close.LP.SG.F motorway.ACC D5              for two.ACC  
hodiny].  
hour.ACC.PL

‘The police closed the D5 motorway for two hours.’

(Cz, adapted from lidovky.cz 2021\_0627)

<sup>33</sup>Apart from modification, Zimmermann introduced templates for deriving case meanings (Zimmermann 2003), the interaction of tense and mood (Zimmermann 2016), and the integration of subordinate clauses (Zimmermann 2018).

<sup>34</sup>Here, Zimmermann used S(entence) and N(ame) as semantic types in the way proposed by Ajdukiewicz (1935). The notation can be easily adapted to a system using logical types like  $t$  and  $e$  (cf., e.g., von Stechow 2012).

- (70) a. *Semantic value of the VP*  
 $(\lambda z)^{35} \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5}]]]]]]]$
- b. *Meaning representation for the temporal adverbial*  
 $\lambda x [\text{TIME INTERVAL } x = \text{TWO HOURS}]$
- c. *Modification template*  
 (1st refined version of Zimmermann's (1992: 256) original template)  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[[[Q_1 z] s] : [Q_2 z]]]$   
 $Q_1 \in S/N/N, Q_2 \in S/N$
- d. *Application of the template to the modifier*  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[[[Q_1 z] s] : [Q_2 z]]] (\lambda x [\text{TIME INTERVAL } x = \text{TWO HOURS}])$   
 $\equiv \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[[[Q_1 z] s] : [\lambda x [\text{TIME INTERVAL } x = \text{TWO HOURS}] z]]]$   
 $\equiv \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[[[Q_1 z] s] : [\text{TIME INTERVAL } z = \text{TWO HOURS}]]]$
- e. *Application of the preceding result to the modificandum*  
 $\lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[[[Q_1 z] s] : [\text{TIME INTERVAL } z = \text{TWO HOURS}]]] (\lambda z \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5}]]]]]]])$   
 $\equiv \lambda s [[[\lambda z \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5}]]]]]]] z] s] : [\text{TIME INTERVAL } z = \text{TWO HOURS}]]]$   
 $\equiv \lambda s [[[\lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5}]]]]]]] s] : [\text{TIME INTERVAL } z = \text{TWO HOURS}]]]$   
 $\equiv \lambda s [[[[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE POLICE}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT ACCESSIBLE } [\text{MOTORWAY D5}]]]]]]] : [\text{TIME INTERVAL } z = \text{TWO HOURS}]]]$

#### 4.2 Decausative: Modification of $s'$

- (71) Vratata se zatvori [<sub>XP</sub> tixo].  
 door.SG.F.DEF REFL close.AOR.3SG quietly  
 'The door closed quietly.' (Bg)
- (72) a. *Meaning representation for the causative verb*  
 $\lambda y \lambda x (\lambda s') \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } y]]]]]]]$

<sup>35</sup>The round brackets mark the argument slot as optional. It will be activated only in case of need. The case arises when an adverbial is meant to predicate over  $z$ .

- b. *Argument-blocking reflexive marker*  
 $\lambda P \lambda x [P u x]$  (Fehrmann et al. 2014: 302)
- c. *Blocking of the internal argument*  
 $\lambda P \lambda x [P u x] (\lambda y \lambda x (\lambda s' ) \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } y]]]]]])$   
 $\equiv \lambda x [\lambda y \lambda x (\lambda s' ) \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } y]]]]]] u x]$   
 $\equiv \lambda x [\lambda x (\lambda s' ) \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } u]]]]]] x]$   
 $\equiv \lambda x (\lambda s' ) \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } u]]]]]]]$
- d. *Semantic value of the VP, including the meaning of the subject*  
 $(\lambda s' ) \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE DOOR}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } u]]]]]]^{36}$
- e. *Meaning representation for the modal adverbial*  
 $\lambda s^* [\text{QUIET } s^*]$
- f. *Modification template*  
 (2nd refined version of Zimmermann's (1992: 256) original template)  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s'] s] : [Q_2 s']]$   
 $Q_1 \in S/N/N, Q_2 \in S/N$
- g. *Application of the template to the modifier*  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s'] s] : [Q_2 s'] (\lambda s^* [\text{QUIET } s^*])$   
 $\equiv \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s'] s] : [\lambda s^* [\text{QUIET } s^*] s']]$   
 $\equiv \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s'] s] : [\text{QUIET } s']]$
- h. *Application of the preceding result to the modificandum*  
 $\lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s'] s] : [\text{QUIET } s'] (\lambda s' \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE DOOR}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } u]]]]]])$   
 $\equiv \lambda s [[\lambda s' \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE DOOR}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } u]]]]]] s'] s] : [\text{QUIET } s']]$   
 $\equiv \lambda s [[\lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE DOOR}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } u]]]]]] s] : [\text{QUIET } s']]$   
 $\equiv \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P [\text{THE DOOR}]]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [\text{NOT OPEN } u]]]]]] : [\text{QUIET } s']]$

The adverbial, which is predicated over  $s'$ , has been integrated in a transparent, formally correct way. At the level of Semantic Form,  $s'$  remains unbound and,

<sup>36</sup> *Vratata* 'the door' is the syntactic subject of the sentence. At the level of Conceptual Structure, the variable  $u$  will be interpreted as having the same referent as the subject.

hence, is a semantic parameter. Later at the level of Conceptual Structure, it will be existentially quantified by default.

The lambda operator that binds the variable *s* will, in the course of further semantic amalgamation, be replaced by an existential quantifier. For details regarding this operation see Zimmermann (2009: 486) and Zimmermann (2016: 290).

By assuming various versions of the modification template and the optional activation of argument slots through the binding of the respective variables by a lambda operator, it has become possible to provide solutions for the problematic cases of adverbial modification.

## 5 Summary

Adverbials that appear as modifiers in sentences induced by causative verbs are not always linked to the causing situation. By closer inspection, it became clear that the caused situation and the resulting state may also be semantic anchors for adverbials, given the right contexts. Two issues arose: (i) We were in need of determining the appropriate semantic representation for causative verbs, that is, uncovering enough structure to account for the empirical facts. (ii) Technical means had to be found for the integration of adverbials predicating over (a) caused situations and (b) resulting states in the course of semantic composition.

In order to solve issue (i), I have defended the view that the meaning of causative verbs has to be decomposed, yielding a more fine-grained structure than the simple  $P(x, y, e)$  analysis. Ultimately, the meaning representation must display three variables: *s*, *s'* and *z*, referring, respectively, to the causing situation, the caused situation, and the target state.

- (73) *Generalized meaning representation of causative verbs*  
 $\lambda y \lambda x (\lambda z) (\lambda s') \lambda s [[s \text{ INST } [P \ x]] : [[s \text{ CAUSE } s'] : [s' \text{ INST } [\text{BECOME } [z \approx [Q \ y]]]]]]]$

This representation is sufficiently detailed, in that it displays all the potential anchors for adverbial modifiers.

Zimmermann's (1992) approach to modification was based on the assumption of a semantic template, which, among other things, accounted for the case of adverbials predicated over the event as a whole. The discussion in the present chapter showed that we have to go further than this. It became clear that it must be possible to activate the arguments *s'* and *z* and, thus, make them accessible for steps in the process of semantic composition. My proposal consists in the lambda-binding of the respective variables, cf. the representation in (73). Since

the argument slots need not be opened in all cases, lambda-binding is optional, which is indicated by the use of round brackets. We are thus not forced to assume default deactivation in case the respective argument is not needed as an anchor, which is desirable for reasons of economy.

As I have argued, the solution for issue (ii) can be reached by refining Zimmermann's (1992) original template. We have ended up with three specific versions of the modification template. These are the following:

- (74) a. *Version for s*  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[Q_1 s] : [Q_2 s]]$   
 $Q_1, Q_2 \in S/N$   
 see Zimmermann (1992: 256)
- b. *Version for s'*  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[[Q_1 s'] s] : [Q_2 s']]$   
 $Q_1 \in S/N/N, Q_2 \in S/N$
- c. *Version for z*  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [[[Q_1 z] s] : [Q_2 z]]$   
 $Q_1 \in S/N/N, Q_2 \in S/N$

We can generalize over the specific versions. This gives us the modification template in its final form:

- (75) *Generalized modification template*  
 $\lambda Q_2 \lambda Q_1 \lambda s [{}_{\alpha}(\text{I}_{\alpha} [Q_1 {}_{\alpha}(w)]_{\alpha} s) : [Q_2 {}_{\alpha}(w)_{\alpha} {}_{-\alpha}(s)_{-\alpha}]]$   
 $Q_1 \in S/N_{\alpha}(/N)_{\alpha}, Q_2 \in S/N, w = s' \vee z$

If  $\alpha$ -marked brackets apply,  $-\alpha$ -marked brackets do not apply, and vice versa.

## Abbreviations

1	first person	COND	conditional mood
2	second person	DAT	dative case
3	third person	DEF	definite
ACC	accusative case	F	feminine
ADJ	adjective	GEN	genitive case
ADV	adverb	INDECL	indeclinable
AOR	aorist	INF	infinitive
AUX	auxiliary	INS	instrumental case
CL	clitic	IPFV	imperfective aspect

LOC	locative case	PRS	present tense
LP	<i>l</i> -participle	PRTCL	particle
M	masculine	PST	past tense
N	neuter	REFL	reflexive marker
NOM	nominative case	SA	sentential adverbial
PFV	perfective aspect	SG	singular number
PL	plural number	vi	verbum intransitivum
POSS	possessive	vt	verbum transitivum

## Acknowledgements

Before I met Ilse Zimmermann for the first time in person, I got acquainted with her work back in the 1980s when I was a student at the University of Leipzig. The way she presented linguistic problems and developed solutions made a deep impression on me. In 1989, she read a paper at a workshop that I attended. At this workshop, I presented a paper too, and she commented on it. She did that in a very careful way, giving hints rather than full instruction. Then as well as in our discussions to follow through the years, I understood that her intention was not to take others by the hand and guide them step by step but to stimulate independent thinking. She set an example in various ways – think for yourself, be clear in what you say, become a visible member of the community and stand your ground. I will always remember her with warmth and respect.

Thanks are due to Svitlana Adamenko, Krâstina Arbova, Elena Grimmig, Marianna Leonova, Olga Liebich, Małgorzata Małolepsza, Zrnka Meštrović, Lubomír Sůva, Lucia Vlášková, Viktor Zakar, and Rok Žaucer for checking object-language examples. I am grateful to Petr Biskup, Hagen Pitsch, Luka Szucsich, and Carla Umbach for helpful discussion, which stimulated me to try and make myself clearer where assumptions were not obvious. I am indebted to Elliott Lash for checking my English and suggesting improvements. Any remaining mistakes, errors, and shortcomings are my own responsibility.

## References

- Ajdukiewicz, Kazimierz. 1935. Die syntaktische Konnexität. *Studia Philosophica* 1. 1–27.
- Alexiadou, Artemis. 1997. *Adverb placement: A case study in antisymmetric syntax* (Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today 18). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.18.



- Alexiadou, Artemis. 2010. On the morphosyntax of (anti)causative verbs. In Malka Rappaport Hovav, Edit Doron & Ivy Sichel (eds.), *Lexical semantics, syntax and event structure* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 27), 177–203. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199544325.003.0009.
- Alexiadou, Artemis, Elena Anagnostopoulou & Florian Schäfer. 2006. The properties of anticausatives crosslinguistically. In Mara Frascarelli (ed.), *Phases of interpretation* (Studies in Generative Grammar 91), 187–211. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110197723.4.187.
- Bartsch, Renate. 1972. *Adverbialsemantik: Die Konstitution logisch-semantischer Relationen von Adverbialkonstruktionen* (Linguistische Forschungen 6). Frankfurt (Main): Athenäum.
- Barwise, Jon & John Perry. 1983. *Situations and attitudes*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Batistić, Tatjana. 1978. O nekim aspektima analize kauzativnih glagola. *Južnoslovenski filolog* 34(1). 59–87.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1982. Formal and lexical semantics. *Linguistische Berichte* 80. 3–17.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1986. On the nature of Semantic Form in natural language. In Friedhart Klix & Herbert Hagedorf (eds.), *Human memory and cognitive capabilities: Mechanisms and performances. Symposium in memoriam Hermann Ebbinghaus, 1885, Berlin Humboldt University, 1985*, 765–784. Amsterdam: North-Holland.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1988. On the grammar of local prepositions. In Manfred Bierwisch, Wolfgang Motsch & Ilse Zimmermann (eds.), *Syntax, Semantik und Lexikon. Rudolf Růžicka zum 65. Geburtstag* (Studia grammatica 29), 1–65. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 1990. Verb cluster formation as a morphological process. In Geert Booij & Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of morphology*, vol. 3, 173–199. Dordrecht: Foris. DOI: 10.1515/9783112420744-012.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 2002. A case for CAUSE. In Irene Kaufmann & Barbara Stiebels (eds.), *More than words: A Festschrift for Dieter Wunderlich* (Studia grammatica 53), 327–353. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. DOI: 10.1515/9783050081274-013.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 2005. The event structure of CAUSE and BECOME. In Claudia Maienborn & Angelika Wöllstein (eds.), *Event arguments: Foundations and applications* (Linguistische Arbeiten 501), 11–44. Tübingen: Niemeyer. DOI: 10.1515/9783110913798.11.

- Bierwisch, Manfred. 2007. Semantic form as interface. In Andreas Späth (ed.), *Interfaces and interface conditions* (Language, Context, and Cognition 6), 1–32. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110926002.1.
- Bierwisch, Manfred. 2011. Semantic features and primes. In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 33.1), 322–357. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110226614.322.
- Bilandžija, Sofija A. 2014. *Semantika kauzativnih konstrukcija u norveškom i srpskom jeziku*. Beograd: Univerzitet u Beogradu. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Biskup, Petr. 2011. *Adverbials and the phase model* (Linguistik Aktuell / Linguistics Today 177). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.177.
- Bondaruk, Anna. 2021. Causation in Polish anticausatives. *Lingua* 256(1). 1–32. DOI: 10.1016/j.lingua.2021.103073.
- Breu, Walter. 2011. Il verbo slavomolisano in confronto con altre lingue minoritarie: Mutamento contatto-dipendente, resistenza e sviluppo autonomo. In Walter Breu (ed.), *L'influsso dell'italiano sul sistema del verbo delle lingue minoritarie: Resistenza e mutamento nella morfologia e nella sintassi. Atti del 2° Convegno Internazionale Costanza, 10–13 dicembre 2008*, 149–184. Bochum: Brockmeyer.
- Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on government and binding* (Studies in Generative Grammar 9). Dordrecht: Foris. DOI: 10.1515/9783110884166.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 1999. *Adverbs and functional heads: A cross-linguistic perspective* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Syntax). Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780195115260.001.0001.
- Cinque, Guglielmo. 2004. Issues in adverbial syntax. *Lingua* 114(6). 683–710. DOI: 10.1016/S0024-3841(03)00048-2.
- Comrie, Bernard. 1976. The syntax of causative constructions: Cross-language similarities and divergences. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causative constructions* (Syntax and Semantics 6), 262–312. New York, NY: Academic Press. DOI: 10.1163/9789004368842\_011.
- Davidson, Donald. 1967a. Causal relations. *The Journal of Philosophy* 64(21). 691–703. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2023853.pdf>. Reprinted in Donald Davidson. 1980. 149–162.
- Davidson, Donald. 1967b. The logical form of action sentences. In Nicholas Rescher (ed.), *The logic of decision and action*, 81–95. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press. Reprinted in Donald Davidson. 1980. 105–122.
- Davidson, Donald. 1980. *Essays on actions and events*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Dixon, Robert M. W. 2000. A typology of causatives: Form, syntax and meaning. In Robert M. W. Dixon & Alexandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.), *Changing valency: Case studies in transitivity*, 30–83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511627750.003.
- Dowty, David R. 1979. *Word meaning and Montague grammar: The semantics of verbs and times in generative semantics and Montague's PTQ* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 6). Dordrecht: Reidel. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-009-9473-7.
- Fabricius-Hansen, Cathrine. 1991. Verbklassifikation. In Arnim von Stechow & Dieter Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantik: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 6), 692–709. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110126969.9.692.
- Fanselow, Gisbert & Peter Staudacher. 1991. Wortsemantik. In Arnim von Stechow & Dieter Wunderlich (eds.), *Semantik: Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 6), 53–70. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110126969.1.53.
- Farber, Judith. 1976. *The semantics of causative verbs*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Fehrmann, Dorothee, Uwe Junghanns & Denisa Lenertová. 2014. Slavic reflexive decausative. *Russian Linguistics* 38(3). 287–313. DOI: 10.1007/s11185-014-9133-2.
- Fillmore, Charles J. 1968. Lexical entries for verbs. *Foundations of Language* 4(4). 373–393. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/25000345>.
- Fodor, Janet A. 1970. Three reasons for not deriving “kill” from “cause to die”. *Linguistic Inquiry* 1(4). 429–438.
- Frey, Werner. 2003. Syntactic conditions on adjunct classes. In Ewald Lang, Claudia Maienborn & Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen (eds.), *Modifying adjuncts* (Interface Explorations 4), 163–210. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110894646.163.
- Frey, Werner & Karin Pittner. 1999. Adverbialpositionen im deutsch-englischen Vergleich. In Monika Doherty (ed.), *Sprachspezifische Aspekte der Informationsverteilung* (Studia grammatica 47), 14–40. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. DOI: 10.1515/9783050078137-002.
- Geist, Ljudmila. 2006. *Die Kopula und ihre Komplemente: Zur Kompositionalität in Kopulasätzen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. DOI: 10.1515/9783110891744.
- Grimshaw, Jane B. 1990. *Argument structure* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 1). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Halle, Morris & Alec Marantz. 1993. Distributed Morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Kenneth Hale & Samuel Jay Keyser (eds.), *The view from building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger* (Current Studies in Linguistics 24), 111–176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Heidolph, Karl-Erich. 1992. Adjektivische Modifizierung. In Ilse Zimmermann & Anatoli Strigin (eds.), *Fügungspotenzen: Zum 60. Geburtstag von Manfred Bierwisch* (Studia grammatica 34), 63–87. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Higginbotham, James. 1985. On semantics. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16(4). 547–593. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/4178457.pdf>.
- Jäger, Gerhard & Reinhard Blutner. 1999. Against lexical decomposition in syntax. In Adam Zachary Wyner (ed.), *The Israeli Association for Theoretical Linguistics: The proceedings of the fifteenth annual conference*, 113–137. Haifa: University of Haifa.
- Junghanns, Uwe. 2002. Syntaktische Positionen und Diskursfunktionen von Adverbialen im Russischen. In Uwe Junghanns (ed.), *Untersuchungen zur Syntax und Informationsstruktur slavischer Deklarativsätze* (Linguistische Arbeitsberichte 80), 91–162. Leipzig: Institut für Linguistik der Universität Leipzig.
- Junghanns, Uwe. 2006. Scope conflicts involving sentential negation in Czech. In Sue Brown & Adam Przepiórkowski (eds.), *Negation in Slavic*, 105–133. Bloomington, IN: Slavica Publishers.
- Karlík, Petr. 2002. Sloveso kauzativní. In Petr Karlík, Marek Nekula & Jana Pleskalová (eds.), *Encyklopedický slovník češtiny*, 412–413. Praha: Nakladatelství Lidové noviny.
- Kemmer, Suzanne & Arie Verhagen. 1994. The grammar of causatives and the conceptual structure of events. *Cognitive Linguistics* 5(2). 115–156. DOI: 10.1515/cogl.1994.5.2.115.
- Koontz-Garboden, Andrew. 2009. Anticausativization. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 27. 77–138. DOI: 10.1007/s11049-008-9058-9.
- Kulikov, Leonid I. 2001. Causatives. In Ekkehard König, Wulf Österreicher & Wolfgang Raible (eds.), *Language typology and language universals: An international handbook* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 20.2), 886–898. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110194265-003.
- Lang, Ewald & Claudia Maienborn. 2011. Two-level semantics: Semantic form and conceptual structure. In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Stechow & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Hand-

- books of Linguistics and Communication Science 33.1), 709–740. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110226614.709.
- Leskien, August. 1922. *Handbuch der altpulgarischen (altkirchenslawischen) Sprache: Grammatik – Texte – Glossar*. 6th edition. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1994. A preliminary analysis of causative verbs in English. *Lingua* 92(1). 35–77. DOI: 10.1016/0024-3841(94)90337-9.
- Levin, Beth & Malka Rappaport Hovav. 1995. *Unaccusativity: At the syntax–lexical semantics interface* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 26). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Lewis, David. 1973. Causation. *The Journal of Philosophy* 70(17). 556–567. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2025310.pdf>.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 1996. *Situation und Lokation: Die Bedeutung lokaler Adjunkte von Verbalprojektionen* (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 53). Tübingen: Stauffenburg.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 2003. *Die logische Form von Kopula-Sätzen* (Studia grammatica 56). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 2005. A discourse-based account of Spanish *ser/estar*. *Linguistics* 43(1). 155–180. DOI: 10.1515/ling.2005.43.1.155.
- Maienborn, Claudia. 2007. On Davidsonian and Kimian states. In Ileana Comorovski & Klaus von Heusinger (eds.), *Existence: Semantics and syntax* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 84), 107–130. Dordrecht: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4020-6197-4\_4.
- McCawley, James D. 1968. Lexical insertion in a transformational grammar without Deep Structure. In Bill J. Darden, Charles-James N. Bailey & Alice Davison (eds.), *Papers from the fourth regional meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*, 71–80. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.
- McCawley, James D. 1971. Prelexical syntax. In Richard O’Brian (ed.), *Report on the 22nd roundtable meeting on linguistics and language studies*, 19–33. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press.
- McCawley, James D. 1976. Remarks on what can cause what. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causative constructions* (Syntax and Semantics 6), 117–129. New York, NY: Academic Press. DOI: 10.1163/9789004368842\_004.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Georgij G. Sil’nickij. 1969a. Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij. In Aleksandr A. Xolodovič (ed.), *Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij: Morfoložičeskij kauzativ*, 5–19. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. & Georgij G. Sil’nickij. 1969b. Tipologija morfoložičeskogo i leksičeskogo kauzativov. In Aleksandr A. Xolodovič (ed.),

- Tipologija kauzativnyx konstrukcij: Morfologičeskij kauzativ*, 20–50. Leningrad: Nauka.
- Neeleman, Ad & Hans van de Koot. 2012. The linguistic expression of causation. In Martin Everaert, Tal Siloni & Marijana Marelj (eds.), *The theta system: Argument structure at the interface*, 20–51. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199602513.003.0002.
- Padučeva, Elena V. 2001. Kauzativnyj glagol i dekauzativ v ruskom jazyke. *Russkij jazyk v naučnom osveščanii* 1(1). 52–79.
- Padučeva, Elena V. 2003. Is there an “ANTICAUSATIVE” component in the semantics of decausatives? *Journal of Slavic Linguistics* 11(1). 173–198. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/24599713>.
- Pitsch, Hagen. 2014. *Die Grammatik prädikativer Ausdrücke im Polnischen und Russischen*. Göttingen: Georg-August-Universität Göttingen. (Doctoral dissertation).
- Putnam, Hilary. 1975. The meaning of “meaning”. In *Mind, language and reality: Philosophical papers*, vol. 2, 215–271. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511625251.
- Ramchand, Gillian C. 2008. *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A first phase syntax* (Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 116). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511486319.
- Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Beth Levin. 2005. Change-of-state verbs: Implications for theories of argument projection. In Nomi Erteschik-Shir & Tova Rapoport (eds.), *The syntax of aspect: Deriving thematic and aspectual interpretation* (Oxford Studies in Theoretical Linguistics 10), 274–286. Oxford: Oxford University Press. DOI: 10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199280445.003.0013.
- Reinhart, Tanya. 2016. The theta system: Syntactic realization of verbal concepts. In Martin Everaert, Marijana Marelj & Eric Reuland (eds.), *Concepts, syntax, and their interface: The theta system* (Linguistic Inquiry Monograph 72), 1–113. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. DOI: 10.7551/mitpress/8496.003.0003.
- Ross, John R. 1972. Act. In Gilbert Harman & Donald Davidson (eds.), *Semantics of natural language* (Synthese Library 40), 70–126. Dordrecht: Reidel. DOI: 10.1007/978-94-010-2557-7\_4.
- Saksena, Anuradha. 1982. Contact in causation. *Language* 58(4). 820–831. DOI: 10.2307/413958.
- Schäfer, Florian. 2008. *The syntax of (anti-)causatives* (Linguistik Aktuell/Linguistics Today 126). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/la.126.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1975. *A linguistic study of causative constructions*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.



- Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.). 1976a. *The grammar of causative constructions* (Syntax and Semantics 6). New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi. 1976b. The grammar of causative constructions: A conspectus. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causative constructions* (Syntax and Semantics 6), 1–40. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Shibatani, Masayoshi (ed.). 2002. *The grammar of causation and interpersonal manipulation* (Typological studies in language 48). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. DOI: 10.1075/tsl.48.
- Song, Jae Jung. 2011a. Nonperiphrastic causative constructions. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <https://wals.info/chapter/111>.
- Song, Jae Jung. 2011b. Periphrastic causative constructions. In Matthew S. Dryer & Martin Haspelmath (eds.), *The world atlas of language structures online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. <https://wals.info/chapter/110>.
- Steinitz, Renate. 1969. *Adverbial-Syntax* (Studia grammatica 10). In collaboration with Ewald Lang. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Steube, Anita. 1988. *Einführung in die kognitive Semantik*. Class lectures. University of Leipzig. [https://www.philol.uni-leipzig.de/fileadmin/Fakult%C3%A4t\\_Philol/Linguistik/Personen/Steube/Steube\\_1988.pdf](https://www.philol.uni-leipzig.de/fileadmin/Fakult%C3%A4t_Philol/Linguistik/Personen/Steube/Steube_1988.pdf).
- Szucsich, Luka. 2002. *Nominale Adverbiale im Russischen*. *Syntax, Semantik und Informationsstruktur* (Slavistische Beiträge 414). München: Sagner.
- Talmy, Leonard. 1976. Semantic causative types. In Masayoshi Shibatani (ed.), *The grammar of causative constructions* (Syntax and Semantics 6), 43–116. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Tixonov, Aleksandr N. 1985. *Slovoobrazovatel'nyj slovar' russkogo jazyka*. Moskva: Russkij jazyk.
- Vasmer, Max. 1953–1958. *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Vol. 1 (1953), vol. 2 (1955), vol. 3 (1958). Heidelberg: Winter.
- von Stechow, Arnim. 1996. The different readings of *wieder* ‘again’: A structural account. *Journal of Semantics* 13(2). 87–138. DOI: 10.1093/jos/13.2.87.
- von Stechow, Arnim. 2012. Syntax and semantics: An overview. In Claudia Maienborn, Klaus von Heusinger & Paul Portner (eds.), *Semantics: An international handbook of natural language meaning* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 33.3), 2173–2223. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110253382.2173.

- Wali, Kashi. 1981. Cause, causer and causee: A semantic perspective. *Journal of Linguistics* 17(2). 289–308. DOI: 10.1017/S0022226700007015.
- Werkmann, Valja. 2003. *Objektklitika im Bulgarischen* (Studia grammatica 57). Berlin: Akademie-Verlag. DOI: 10.1515/9783050082394.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 1975. Why “kill” does not mean “cause to die”: The semantics of action sentences. *Foundations of Language* 13(4). 491–528. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/25000935.pdf>.
- Wolff, Phillip, Grace Song & David Driscoll. 2002. Models of causation and causal verbs. In Mary Andronis, Christopher Ball, Heidi Elston & Sylvain Neuval (eds.), *Papers from the 37th meeting of the Chicago linguistics society: Main session*, vol. 1, 607–622. Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistics Society.
- Wunderlich, Dieter. 1997. Cause and the structure of verbs. *Linguistic Inquiry* 28(1). 27–68. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/4178964.pdf>.
- Zimmermann, Ilse. 1992. Der Skopus von Modifikatoren. In Ilse Zimmermann & Anatoli Strigin (eds.), *Fügungspotenzen: Zum 60. Geburtstag von Manfred Bierwisch* (Studia grammatica 34), 251–279. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Zimmermann, Ilse. 2003. On the semantics of cases. In Uwe Junghanns & Luka Szucsich (eds.), *Syntactic structures and morphological information* (Interface Explorations 7), 341–380. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110904758.341.
- Zimmermann, Ilse. 2009. Satzmodus. In Tilman Berger, Karl Gutschmidt, Sebastian Kempgen & Peter Kosta (eds.), *Die slavischen Sprachen / The Slavic languages: Ein internationales Handbuch zu ihrer Struktur, ihrer Geschichte und ihrer Erforschung / An international handbook of their structure, their history, and their investigation* (Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft / Handbooks of Linguistics and Communication Science 32/1), 484–505. Berlin: Mouton De Gruyter. DOI: 10.1515/9783110214475.1.7.484.
- Zimmermann, Ilse. 2016. Approaching the morphosyntax and semantics of mood. In Joanna Błaszczak, Anastasia Giannakidou, Dorota Klimek-Jankowska & Krzysztof Migdalski (eds.), *Mood, aspect, modality revisited. New answers to old questions*, 286–309. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Zimmermann, Ilse. 2018. Das Korrelat in temporalen Nebensätzen. *Linguistische Berichte* 253. 37–57.