Semantic Shifts

Guido Vanden Wyngaerd

HUB/Crissp/K.U. Leuven

This paper examines different types of approaches to semantic shifts. Taking stative-dynamic shifts as a case in point, it is argued that they provide evidence for an approach to the phenomenon of semantic shift which is, at least in part, syntactic. At the same time, the approach defended leaves room for a degree of lexical vagueness. This is a second important contributing factor which needs to be taken into account in analyzing the phenomenon of semantic shifts.[1]

1. Introduction

In this paper, I want to discuss the problem of semantic shifts, taking stative-dynamic shifts as a case in point. An example is given in (1).

(1)	a.	De dief sprong uit het raam.		(dynamic)
		the thief jumped out the window		
		'The thief jumped out of the window.'		
	b.	De baksteen springt uit de muur.		
		the brick jumps out the wall		
		'The brick jumps out of the wall'		(dynamic)
		'The brick juts out from the wall'		(stative)

The Dutch verb *springen* 'to jump' has a dynamic interpretation in (1a) and can also have one in (1b). This would be the case in a context where my neighbor would be hammering the wall on his side, causing a brick to jump out of the wall

1 I thank the audience at the May 2009 spring meeting of the Belgian Linguistic Society for their comments, as well as Marijke de Belder for interesting data and judgments. I also wish to thank Marcel den Dikken and Jeroen Van Craenenbroeck for their comments on an earlier draft.

on my side. The stative reading is one where I could be looking along the wall and observe that one brick disrupts the geometrical pattern of a straight line ('The brick juts out from the wall'). This interpretation of disruption of a geometrical pattern is clearly stative.

Shifts of this kind can be observed in many areas of the grammar. Borer (2005a) and Michaelis (2005) list examples like the following.

(2) a. Cat came. (common noun → proper name)
b. There are three Sams in my class.
(proper name → common noun)
(3) a. That's quite a bit of carpet for the money.
(count → mass)
b. She sampled some wines. (mass → count)
(4) a. She liked him in a minute. (state → achievement)
b. I'm feeding him a line and he's believing every word.
(state → accomplishment)

Michaelis further notes changes in the argument structure frame of verbs, as in the examples in (5):

(5) a. Down at the harbor there is a teal-green clubhouse for socializing and parties. Besides it sparkles the community pool.
b. When a visitor passes through the village, young lamas stop picking up trash to mug for the camera. A gruff 'police monk' barks them back to work.

In these sentences, the one-place predicates *sparkle* and *bark* are used, respectively, as a two-place predicate with a location and a theme, and a three-place predicate with an agent, a theme and a goal. This may be considered to be yet another instance of the phenomenon of semantic shift. In the next section, I shall discuss the more general question how semantic interpretation arises. Depending on the answer to that question, different accounts can be developed to explain semantic shifts of the kind discussed in this section. In section 3, I return to the case of (1) and show how the stative-dynamic shifts reveals an intricate set of correlations with prepositional and postpositional word order. Though I will not attempt to account for these correlations themselves, I will argue that they support an analysis of stative-dynamic shifts in syntactic terms, at least in part. In section 4, I turn to the syntax of motion verbs such as *springen* 'jump in (1),

drawing extensively on Den Dikken (2008). Section 5 analyses stative-dynamic shifts in terms of Den Dikken's proposal.

2. How does meaning arise?

In the following, I present two possible ways of conceiving of the composition of the semantic interpretation of sentences on the basis of words. I call these the *conventional view* and the *alternative view*. The conventional view on the way we derive meaning from words and sentences may be represented as in (6):

(6) The Conventional View
I. Lexicon → II. Syntactic structure → III. Semantic Interpretation

The lexicon contains the words of a language. Words have all sorts of properties built into them, which are syntactically relevant: word class, subcategorization features, argument structure frames, selection properties; nouns may be mass or count, verbs dynamic or stative, etc. Following Borer (2005a,b) this view may be called *endo-skeletal*: words are the skeleton supporting the syntactic structure. They contain all sorts of properties relevant for the construction of syntactic structures. This happens when they are used as building blocks to build syntactic structures. Ultimately, however, meaning is associated with sentences when they are used in a particular context: this process involves far more than strictly grammatical knowledge, such as pragmatic knowledge, etc. This distinction between grammatical and extra-grammatical language components is indicated by bold and nonbold typeface, respectively, in (6).

The alternative view, which has been first articulated in the context of the Distributed Morphology framework (Halle & Marantz 1993, Harley & Noyer 1999) and is also represented in the work of Borer (2005a,b), can be represented as in (7):

(7) The Alternative View
I. Functional lexicon → II. Syntactic structure → III. Words →
IV. Semantic Interpretation

In this view, the building blocks for the syntax are contained in the functional lexicon. The functional lexicon contains syntactic and semantic features, such as tense features, number features, (in)definiteness features; also items like quantifiers and numerals. Apart from the functional lexicon, there is the

substantive vocabulary of a language (called Words in (7), or listemes in Borer's terminology). They represent an extra-grammatical conceptual system of world knowledge.[2] Words in this view have no grammatical properties (e.g. word class), and whatever, semantic or other, properties they have can easily be overridden by the grammar, as illustrated in (2) through (5). They are inserted into structures post-syntactically, i.e. after the syntactic structure had been built. Borer calls this the *exo-skeletal view*: syntactic structure functions as an exo-skeleton providing the supporting structure for sentences and sentence meanings. Words may be inserted into these structures post-syntactically, but word meaning are typically vague and malleable, so that words may be inserted into a variety of syntactic structures, as the examples in (2) through (5) demonstrate. In contrast, the meanings of grammatical formatives contained in the functional lexicon, and of the syntactic structures they occur in are strong, and not easily coerced. The following examples illustrate this point for mass-count shifts:

(8) a. *That's quite a bit of three carpets for the money.
b. *There are three wine in the cellar.

In (8a), the noun *carpet* has a plural morpheme attached to it and is accompanied by a numeral. This combination of elements in a partial syntactic structure cannot shift from count to mass, unlike the single word *carpet* in (3a) above. Similarly, the syntactic structure in (8b), with a plural verb and a plural quantifier, requires a plural noun, which it does not find. No shift from singular to plural is possible in this case, because elements of the functional lexicon are crucially involved here.

Let us return to the case of semantic shifts, and see how they can be analysed under the views just sketched. Reconsider the example in (1) above, repeated here:

(1) a. De dief sprong uit het raam. (dynamic)
the thief jumped out the window
'The thief jumped out of the window.'

2 I represent Borer's (2005a,b) view on the status of words here. Marantz (1996) takes a somewhat different view, in which what in (7) are called the *Words* correspond with what he calls *the Encyclopedia*, which represents the encyclopedic knowledge associated with words. Encyclopedic knowledge for him is used in semantic interpretation at LF, but not in grammatical computations over LF. Under such a perspective, the Encyclopedia might be taken to belong to the grammar proper. We disregard these potentially different views on the status of encyclopedic knowledge, since they are irrelevant to the point we wish to make.

b. De baksteen springt uit de muur.
the brick jumps out the wall
'The brick jumps out of the wall' (dynamic)
'The brick juts out from the wall' (stative)

Under the conventional view, verbs are listed in the lexicon with a feature that specifies whether they are [+dynamic] or [–dynamic]. A [+dynamic] verb inserted into a syntactic structure will give rise to a dynamic interpretation. It is not immediately obvious under this view how stative-dynamic shifts arise. One possibility would be to assume that there are two different verbs *springen* 'jump': *springen*$_1$ with the feature [+dynamic] and *springen*$_2$ with the feature [-dynamic].[3] It is clear that such an approach, when applied to the other kinds of shifts discussed earlier, will result in lexicon that is characterized by massive homophony. More seriously, it is ultimately unexplanatory, because it reduces the phenomenon of shifts to a mere listing of lexical entries. Another possibility, suggested by Jackendoff (1990, 1997) and De Swart (1998), is that semantic shifts are the result of the presence of coercion operators in semantic structure. These coercion operators may cause shifts from dynamic to stative, as well as other kinds of shifts. The drawback of this approach is that it is very powerful, and runs the risk of seriously overgenerating: in principle, anything could be coerced into anything. More importantly, it is unclear under this approach why semantic coercion seems to correlate with clearly syntactic phenomena such as word order, as we shall see in the following section.

Under the alternative view, two possibilities exist for looking at semantic shifts in general, and at stative-dynamic shifts in particular. These two possibilities are summarized as the *Alternative View I* in (9) and the *Alternative View II* in (10), respectively. In this paper, I shall be defending the view in (10):

(9) Alternative View I: 'Generalized Vagueness': the meaning of verbs, e.g. the verb *springen* 'jump', is vague and flexible. Depending on the syntactic context, verbs may be interpreted dynamically or statively, as illustrated in (1). The syntactic properties of the verbs themselves play no role of any significance in this process.[4]

[3] A reviewer suggests that verbs could be listed as [±dynamic] with the syntax activating either the + or the – value. Such an approach suffers from most of the drawbacks mentioned in the text, however.
[4] A reviewer asks if a stative verb can be interpreted dynamically. The example (4b) above seems to illustrate just this. Other cases include the Justin Timberlake single *I'm lovin' it*; this phrase was also used as the slogan in a major fast-food company publicity campaign. The string *I'm hating it* also generates a fair number of Google hits (9650).

(10) Alternative View II: while acknowledging that the meaning of verbs may be vague and flexible, this view assumes that ultimately verbs have syntactic properties that are the basis for the stative-dynamic distinction.

Under (9), the source of the shift is situated entirely outside the grammar, in component III of (7), the extra-grammatical conceptual system of world knowledge. Under (10), however, shifts are taken to belong to the grammar proper, i.e. to components I and II of (7). In the following section, I shall present an argument to the effect that (10) rather than (9) is correct.

Before doing that, however, I want to very briefly mention the framework of Construction Grammar (Michaelis 1994, Zwicky 1994, Goldberg 1995, Michaelis & Lambrecht 1996, Kay & Fillmore 1999, Koenig 1999), and what it has to say about semantic shifts, because I believe its approach shares some important characteristics with the one adopted here. Construction grammar takes constructions to be the basic units of language. Michaelis (2005) proposes to account for semantic shifts in Construction Grammar by the following principle:

(11) Override Principle
If a lexical item is semantically incompatible with its syntactic context, the meaning of the lexical item conforms to the meaning of the structure in which it is embedded.[5]

This principle formulates, albeit in a slightly different way, the observation also made by Borer (2005a,b) to the effect that word meanings are vague and flexible, whereas the meaning of structures is strong and not easily coerced: in much the same way, (11) puts the meaning of structure over that of lexical items ('words'). Marantz (1996) also states that Distributed Morphology shares with construction grammar the assumption that structural meanings may arise divorced from lexical items. It differs from it, however, in that DM denies that such constructional meanings are special and should be listed construction by construction. Since a full discussion of Construction Grammar would takes us too far afield, I will not undertake it here. I shall attempt to make the observation of (11) more precise in terms of the model in (7).

[5] A reviewer asks if the Override Principle does not suffer from the same drawback as the mechanism of Coercion in being similarly unrestricted. There is a difference between both, however, in so far as under the Override Principle, semantic shifts are in principle restricted by whatever mechanisms the syntax makes available, whereas coercion operators are not so restricted.

3. Semantic shifts and word order

Evidence suggesting that (10) rather than (9) is correct is found in the existence of correlations between the interpretation of the verb and prepositional/postpositional word order of the PP. Alongside (1a) (with prepositional order) we have (12), with postpositional order:

(1)	a.	De dief	sprong	uit	het raam.		(dynamic)
		the thief	jumped	out	the window		
		'The thief jumped out of the window.'					
(12)		De dief	sprong	het raam		uit.	(dynamic, directional)
		the thief	jumped	the window		out	
		'The thief jumped out of the window.'					

This alternation is not found with the example (1b), on either of its readings:

(13)	*De baksteen	springt	de muur	uit.[6]	
	the brick	jumps	the wall	out	
	'The brick juts out of the wall.'				

The contrast between (12) and (13) reveals a correlation between the stative-dynamic distinction on the one hand, and prepositional/postpositonal word order on the other: on the dynamic reading of *springen* 'jump', we find an alternation between prepositional and postpositional order, as illustrated by the pair (1a) and (12). But stative *springen* 'jump' does not show this alternation and is restricted to prepositional order, as the contrast between (1b) and (13) reveals. Nothing of the sort is expected under the 'Generalized Vagueness' view in (9), which holds that verbs can shift from dynamic tot stative at will. The empirical picture is actually more complicated than that, in that postpositonal order is sometimes ruled out with nonstative cases as well, as in the examples of (14):

(14)	a.	Mijn pennen	vielen	in	de modder / *de modder		in.
		my pens	fell	in	the mud	the mud	in
		'My pens fell into the mud.'					

[6] Judgments on the dynamic reading tend to vary. M. den Dikken (p.c.) suggests that the dynamic reading can be made compatible with postpositional order, as in the following example:

i. Door al het gedrilboor bij ons in de straat sprongen de bakstenen haast de muur uit.
'Because of all the drilling in our street the bricks almost jumped out of the wall.'

b. De vlek ging makkelijk uit de jas / *de jas uit.
the speck went easily out the coat the coat out
'The speck went out of the coat easily.'
c. Het stoplicht sprong op rood / *rood op.
the traffic-light jumped on red red on
'The traffic light jumped to red.'

Furthermore, the case of (13) does not generalize to all cases: postpositional order can be found with stative interpretations. In such cases, we observe a difference in meaning: postpositional order yields a directional interpretation, and prepositional order a locative one.

(15) a. Het spoor loopt het dal in/uit. (stative, directional)
the track runs the valley in/out
'The track runs into/out of the valley.'
b. De weg loopt de berg op.
the road runs the mountain on
'The road runs onto the mountain.'
c. Treinen op spoor 7 gaan de stad in.
trains on track 7 go the town in
'Trains on platform 7 go into town.'
d. De pijl wijst de heuvel op.
the arrow points the hill on
'The arrow points up the hill.'

(16) a. Het spoor loopt in het dal. (stative, locative)
the track runs in the valley
'The track runs in the valley.'
b. De weg loopt op de berg.
the road runs on the mountain
'The road runs on the mountain.'
c. *?Treinen op spoor 7 gaan in de stad.
trains on track 7 go in the town
'Trains on platform 7 go in town.'
d. *?De pijl wijst op de heuvel.
the arrow points on the hill
'The arrow points up the hill.'

Let me start by stressing that in this paper I do not intend to present a full account for this intricate pattern of data. I merely want to use it as an argument in

favour of the view that stative-dynamic shifts ultimately have a syntactic basis (i.e. (10) above), and consequently against the generalized vagueness view in (9). If vagueness were involved, one would expect the stative (1b) to be possible with postpositional order, just like its dynamic counterpart (1a). The syntactic view in (10) at least holds more promise in this respect. In the following section, I want to explore some elements of a more syntactic approach to stative-dynamic shifts. This approach takes Den Dikken (2008) analysis of the syntax of motion verbs as a starting point.

4. The syntax of motion verbs

Den Dikken suggests that there exist abstract functional categories expressing such notions as directed motion, inchoativity, causation, etc. These are listed in (17):

(17) GET (inchoativity)
GO (directed motion)
CAUSE (causation)
DO
BE

He calls these event-structural operators, which, in terms of the picture in (7), would clearly be a part of the functional lexicon. This approach fits into the view in (10), which holds that the stative-dynamic distinction has a syntactic basis: the distinction can be tied to the presence of one of these operators in the syntactic structure, with only BE giving rise to stative interpretations, and the other operators in (17) to dynamic readings (see also Rothmayr 2009).

Turning to motion verbs, Den Dikken argues that there are two basic structures for motion verbs with a PP (see Den Dikken 2006 for a detailed discussion of the structure embedded under these operators):

(18) a. GO $[_{RP}$ DP_{subj} [Relator = ∅ $[_{PP}$ P_{dir} $[_{PP}$ P_{Loc} DP]]]]
b. GET $[_{RP}$ DP_{subj} [Relator = PRT $[_{PP}$ P_{dir} $[_{PP}$ P_{Loc} DP]]]]

The null P_{dir} contained in these structures must be licensed, and it can do so in three different ways, each correlating with a particular word order, as shown in (19),

(19) i. via incorporation of P_{dir} into the event-structural operator
P_{dir} +GO [$_{RP}$ DP_{subj} [~~P~~$_{dir}$ [$_{PP}$ ~~P~~$_{dir}$ [$_{PP}$ P_{Loc} DP]]]]
→ prepositional order

ii. via incorporation of P_{loc} into P_{dir}
GO [$_{RP}$ DP [Relator = ∅ [$_{PP}$ DP P_{loc}+P_{dir} [$_{PP}$ ~~P~~$_{Loc}$ ~~DP~~]]]]
→ postpositional order

iii. by a particle under the RELATOR head of the RP (as in (18b))
→ prepositional order

Postpositional order only arises if P_{loc} incorporates into P_{dir} (as per (19-ii)): this is because such incorporation will trigger the movement of the complement of P into the spec of PP, resulting in postpositional word order. Under the other licensing methods, prepositional order results.

Den Dikken further assumes that manner-of-motion verbs (like *springen* 'jump') involve the adjunction of a MANNER component to the abstract event-structural operators GO/GET. In the case of *springen* 'jump' this implies that it is to be analyzed either as a combination of GO+MANNER, or as a combination of GET+MANNER:

(20) a. GO+MANNER [$_{RP}$ DP_{subj} [Relator = ∅ [$_{PP}$ P_{dir} [$_{PP}$ P_{Loc} DP]]]]
b. GET+MANNER [$_{RP}$ DP_{subj} [Relator = PRT [$_{PP}$ P_{dir} [$_{PP}$ P_{Loc} DP]]]]

The difference, according to Den Dikken, between (20a) with GO and (20b) with GET is that with GO the MANNER component modifies the entire activity of going (i.e. the entire motion path), whereas with GET, the MANNER component only modifies the inception of the activity. This is the case in (1a) above, where a single jump sets of the motion of the thief, i.e. the manner concerns only the inception of the activity. Such an interpretation is not necessary in (21), however, where the most likely interpretation is one of multiple jumps that take the thief out of the room, i.e. the jumping manner modifies the entire motion path.

(21) a. *De dief sprong uit de kamer.
'The thief jumped out of the room.'
b. De dief sprong de kamer uit.
'The thief jumped out of the room.'

This difference is accounted in Den Dikken's analysis for by assuming that (1a) involves the GET structure (20b), whereas (21) involves the GO structure (20a). In addition, we find that the GO structure is incompatible with prepositional word

order in the PP. This is because the adjunction of a MANNER component to GO blocks adjunction of P_{dir} to GO, i.e. the licensing strategy (19-i). As a result, only strategy (19-ii) remains, which yields postpositional word order.

Another, related, example involves the verb *rennen* 'run'. In contrast to *springen* 'jump', the manner modifies the entire motion path, not just its inception. In other words, a GET-structure is unavailable in this case. Since in Den Dikken's analysis the licensing strategy (19-iii) is uniquely tied to the GET-structure, only (19-i) and (19-ii) remain. But of these, (19-i) is blocked because a MANNER component is already adjoined to GO, and therefore P_{dir} cannot adjoin to go as well. As a result, only (19-ii), with postpositional order, remains, and we expect prepositional word order to be ruled out. This prediction is confirmed:

(22) Hij rende *uit de deur / de deur uit
he ran out the door / the door out
'He ran out of the door.'

Support for the analysis of manner-of-motion verbs that separates the motion from the manner component comes from the fact that certain languages systematically do not permit directional readings with manner-of-motion verbs. In such languages, the GO and MANNER components must be expressed separately. French is a case in point.

(23) a. Marie a dansé dans la maison. (locative/*directional)
'Marie danced in the house.'
b. Marie est entrée dans la maison en dansant. (directional)
'Marie entered the house dancing.'

We see that (23a) only has the locative meaning. this is a general phenomenon of French PPs with manner-of-motion verbs. To express a directional sense, one needs a 'pure' motion verb like *entrer* 'enter', and express the manner component separately in an adjunct (*en dansant* 'in a dancing way').

This analysis can be applied to certain verbs of sound emission which may permit an interpretation of directional movement. The verbs in question can have a literal reading of sound emission but not involving movement (e.g. (24a)), or one involving movement, as in (24b):

(24) a. De bal knalde op het veld. (locative/*directional)
the ball banged on the field

'The ball banged on the pitch.'

b. De bal knalde het veld op. (*locative/directional)
the ball banged the field on
'The ball burst onto the pitch.'

(25) a. De bijen zoemden in de kamer. (locative/*directional)
the bees buzzed in the room
'The bees buzzed in the room.'

b. De bijen zoemden de kamer in. (*locative/directional)
the bees buzzed the room in
'The bees buzzed into the room.'

In terms of the analysis involving the event-structural operators in (17), the verb *knallen* 'bang' in the directional reading (24b) is an instance of the structure in (20a), i.e. a combination of GO+MANNER: move in a banging manner.[7] The PP gets a directional reading. In contrast, the sound emission reading involves something like DO+THING, i.e. do a bang (with the PP specifying the location). The interpretations are quite distinct, and so are in fact the building blocks and the two syntactic structures built on the basis of them. The surprising thing now is that we find the same verb in (24a) and (24b). At this point, vagueness and lexical flexibility come into play. The listeme *knallen* 'bang' belongs to the conceptual system of world-knowledge (component III in (7)). As such, its meaning is vague and malleable: it can be inserted into structures which are as distinct as those of (24a) and (24b). A similar analysis holds for the verb *zoemen* 'buzz' in (25).

5. Stative-dynamic shifts

Let us now return to the case of stative-dynamic shifts, as exemplified by (1) above, and repeated here.

(1) a. De dief sprong uit het raam. (dynamic)
'The thief jumped out of the window.'

b. De baksteen springt uit de muur.
'The brick jumps out of the wall' (dynamic)
'The brick juts out from the wall' (stative)

[7] We assume a GO-structure here rather than one with GET because the MANNER modifies the entire activity, not just its inception.

Again, we take Den Dikken (2008) as a starting point. Den Dikken suggests that positional verbs (like *sit, lie, stand*, etc) involve the following syntactic structure:

(26) a. BE $[_{RP}\ DP_{subj}\ [\ Relator\ [_{PP}\ P_{Loc}\ DP\ ]]]$
b. BE+MANNER $[_{RP}\ DP_{subj}\ [\ Relator\ [_{PP}\ P_{Loc}\ DP\ ]]]$

This structure does not accommodate the stative directional interpretations as found in the examples (1b) and (15), however. This is because directional interpretations require a complex PP involving both a P_{dir} and a P_{loc}, as in the structures given in (18).

That the directional readings occur in stative environments as well is further confirmed by the following (a locative case is given in (27d) for good measure):

(27) a. De pijl wijst naar het noorden. (stative, directional)
'The arrow points to the north.'
b. Zijn hoofd ligt naar het voeteind.
'His head lies toward the footboard.'
c. De spijker steekt door/uit het tafelblad.
'The nail sticks through/out of the tabletop.'
d. Het snoepje zit in de doos. (stative, locative)
'The candy is in the box.'

In order to accommodate the stative directional cases, we propose to enrich Den Dikken's structure in (26) with a directional PP.

(28) a. BE $[_{RP}\ DP_{subj}\ [\ Relator\ [_{PP}\ P_{dir}\ [_{PP}\ P_{Loc}\ DP\ ]]]]$
b. BE+MANNER $[_{RP}\ DP_{subj}\ [\ Relator\ [_{PP}\ P_{dir}\ [_{PP}\ P_{Loc}\ DP\ ]]]]$

The stative-dynamic shift in (1) can now be accounted for as follows. The dynamic (1a) is analysed as in Den Dikken (2008): it is a combination of GET+MANNER, i.e. the thief moves in a jumping manner. The full representation is the one given in (20b) above.[8] By contrast, the stative case (1b) involves a combination of BE+MANNER, i.e. the brick is in a jumping manner. The meaning of the verb *springen* 'jump' is vague like that of the verbs of sound emission

8 Under Den Dikken's analysis, this structure never gives rise to postpositional order, contrary to fact. In his analysis, the postpositional order results from the structure in (20a), i.e. with GO rather than GET, and the licensing strategy (19-ii), i.e. incorporation of P_{loc} into P_{dir}. Incorporation of P_{dir} into GO is blocked because there is already a manner adjunct there. We must conclude that *springen* 'jump' can lexicalize both a derivation based on GO (20a) and one based on GET (20b).

discussed above: it can be inserted into structures which are as distinct as GET+MANNER, GO+MANNER and BE+MANNER. In other words, stative-dynamic shifts can be accounted for under the view that stative-dynamic shifts have a syntactic basis (i.e. the view given in (10) above).

As a final issue in this section, let us reconsider the correlations that we observed in section 3 between locative or directional interpretations on the one hand, and pre- or postpositional word order on the other. A first observation that we made is that (1b) does not permit postpositional order (see (13) above). Adopting the structure in (28b) for this example, we are led to the paradoxical conclusion that only postpositional order should be acceptable, contrary to fact. We are therefore led to the conclusion that (1b) (on its stative sense) involves licensing strategy (19-iii), i.e. with a particle under the RELATOR head of the RP:

(29) BE+MANNER $[_{RP}\ DP_{subj}\ [\ Relator = PRT\ [_{PP}\ P_{dir}\ [_{PP}\ P_{Loc}\ DP\ ]]]]$

This analysis is confirmed by the possibility of having an overt particle *ver–* with *springen* 'jump' on its stative sense:

(30) De naden van dat doek verspringen.
the seams of that cloth prt-jump
'The seams of that cloth are not in a straight line.'

Another observation that we made was that stative interpretations do arise with postpositional word orders, as in (15), repeated here:

(15) a. Het spoor loopt het dal in/uit. (stative, directional)
'The track runs into/out of the valley.'
(16) a. Het spoor loopt in het dal. (stative, locative)
'The track runs in the valley.'

This pattern can be accounted for by assuming the structure in (28b) for the directional meaning. The presence of a MANNER component blocks licensing strategy (19-i), so that only (19-ii) remains, with concomitant postpositional order. The locative sense does not involve a null P_{dir} in need of licensing, so that prepositional order is licit.

It is obvious that many questions remain to be answered at this point concerning the ways in which locative and directional meanings interact with the event-structural operators and manner adjuncts in the syntactic structure. The main

point we have tried to make in this section is that, while the syntactic structures underlying stative and dynamic interpretations may be strongly different, the lexicalizations of these structures may show surprising similarities. Looked at in this way, these cases provide evidence for an approach to stative-dynamic shifts that takes there to be a syntactic basis for them in the properties of the functional elements involved in these shifts.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, I have argued that the stative-dynamic distinction has a syntactic basis: it is a function of the presence of certain event-structural operators in the structure. Stative-dynamic shifts can be accounted for under the view that words (whose meanings are flexible) are inserted post-syntactically into structures which can be quite different. A systematic account of the correlations between stative/dynamic contrasts and prepositional and postpositional order awaits further research.

References

Borer, H. (2005a) *In Name Only*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Borer, H. (2005b) *The Normal Course of Events*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Den Dikken, M. (2006) *Relators and Linkers*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Den Dikken, M. (2008) Directions from the GET-GO. On the syntax of manner-of-motion verbs in directional constructions. Handout of talk presented at FUSL-colloquium on Expressions of posture and motion in the Germanic languages.

Goldberg, A. (1995) *A Construction Grammar Approach to Argument Structure*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

Halle, M. and A. Marantz (1993) 'Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection'. In K. Hale and J. Keyser, eds, *The View from Building 20*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 111-176

Harley, H. and R. Noyer (1999) 'State-of-the-article: distributed morphology'. *Glot International* 4:3-9.

Jackendoff, R. (1990) *Semantic Structures*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Jackendoff, R. (1997) *The Architecture of the Language Faculty*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.

Kay, P. and C. Fillmore (1999) 'Grammatical constructions and linguistic generalizations: the 'what's X doing Y' construction'. *Language* 75, 1-33.
Koenig, J-P. (1999) *Lexical Relations*. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
Marantz, A. (1996) 'Cat as a phrasal idiom: consequences of late insertion in Distributed Morphology'. Ms. MIT.
Michaelis, L. (1994) 'A case of constructional polysemy in Latin'. *Studies in Language* 18, 45-70.
Michaelis, L. (2005) 'Entity and event coercion in a symbolic theory of syntax'. In J-O. Oestman and M. Fried, eds, *Construction Grammar(s): Cognitive Grounding and Theoretical Extensions*. *Constructional Approaches to Language*. Benjamins, Amsterdam, 45-88.
Michaelis, L. and K. Lambrecht (1996) 'Toward a construction-based theory of language function: the case of nominal extraposition'. *Language* 72, 215-247.
Rothmayr, A. (2009) *The Structure of Stative Verbs*. Amsterdam : Benjamins.
Swart, H. de (1998) 'Aspect shift and coercion'. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 347-385.
Zwicky, A. (1994) 'Dealing out meaning: fundamentals of grammatical constructions'. *BLS* 20, 611-625.